Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2001-11 - 2001-12

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2001-11-01 through 2001-12-31

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 6,514

Message records with no readable body available in the source text: 1

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: ******6 to 7 kilowatts on CB??????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 00:26:03 UTC
From: Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com>
Message-ID: <tu15ksk2d9jo4e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 23048
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> > That was one, of about 20, different sections.
> >
> > If you would like to take the time to research it all, be my guest.
> >
> > I provided the link more than anything, to show people where to START
> > looking.
>
>
> Now everyone else is stupid and can't use a search engine and you have to
> lead them by the hand. Oh Great Troll Free!

That's your statement, Dwight, not mine.

I was merely providing a starting point for people, so they wouldn't have to
waste the time to find the url.

You are the one that made a point out of calling people stupid.

>
> >
> > I, myself, have better things to do than educate people here about the
> > finer points of motor vehicle laws.
>
>
> How can you educate someone about something you are ignorant of yourself?

Really? I provided a link to look it up. I see nothing from you but drivel
and diatribe.

>
>
>
> > Which is something more than I can say for most all >of your posts,
Aaron.
>
>
> Go pat yourself on the back some more. Your boring me

Good, Dwight. I suggest you look elsewhere for entertainment. Your time is
about up.

Toll_Free

> >
> >
> > Toll_Free

>
>
>

2. Contests (was: 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 00:39:08 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <9rq5jc$2nu$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 23078
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com> wrote:
>Contesting in ANY form is idiotic.

Any form? That would include all sports, gambling, lotteries, applying for a job in competition against others, working for a job promotion in competition against others, and dozens of other day-to-day challenges ("contests").

Your attempt at oneupmanship on the newsgroups is a form of contesting so you've snagged yourself on a self-made paradox. Luckily, your opinion won't mean one iota to the thousands of happy competitors in the next contest; they'll go about having a fun weekend all the while your BP is soaring!

Jeff KH6O

--
Telecommunication Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard University of Hawaii System
jherman @ d14.uscg.mil jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

3. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 00:56:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be09e10$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23049

If you'd make some sense, we might be able to dialogue.

Kim W5TIT

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
news:#IXHuXkYBHA.1872@cpimsnntpa03...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
>
> > Indeed, it would be wonderful (though a pipedream) that we'd be the
nation
> > to look to for agreement and resolution.
>
> Agreement that we are a nation that you *NEVER* piss off.
>
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

4. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 00:57:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be09e53_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23050

No, but thank you for your comments.

Kim W5TIT

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
news:#YfEFNIYBHA.1372@cpimsnntpa03...
> OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy, but this _is_ rec.RADIO.AMATEUR.policy,
> not rec.terrorists.are.ruining.my.life.policy.
>
> Can we move all the bin-laden-has-civil-rights-too crap to a more
> appropriate newsgroup?
>
> Thank you.
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

5. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 01:42:21 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <uskb2ZnYBHA.1308@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 23051

> "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote:

> > OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy, but this _is_
rec.RADIO.AMATEUR.policy,
> > not rec.terrorists.are.ruining.my.life.policy.
> >
> > Can we move all the bin-laden-has-civil-rights-too crap to a more
> > appropriate newsgroup?
> >
> > Thank you.
> >
> > (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> replied:

> No

Why not?

Since this is an amateur radio newsgroup, why clutter it
up with issues which are better treated in one of the many
newsgroups dedicated to such topics. Here are a few which
seem much more appropriate venues:

alt.current-events.terror-war
alt.society.civil-liberties
alt.terrorism.world-trade-center
alt.society.civil-liberty
alt.politics.usa.constitution
alt.support.religion.islam.taliban

Thank you for your reconsideration.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

6. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 02:49:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be0b730_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23052

It would seem that the predominant topic on most peoples' minds these days are things that are currently being discussed here even in this newsgroup. This newsgroup is a group of radio amateurs, who are prone discuss any one of a number of topics at any given time--specific or not to amateur radio.

We "know" each other in this newsgroup, and discuss things with each other on that basis. We may not always be specific to amateur radio--in fact often are not.

Check back often for topical subject lines to see if there are any you feel inspired to participate in.

No reconsideration here, none was intended.

Kim W5TIT

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
news:uskb2ZnYBHA.1308@cpimsnntpa03...
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote:
>
> > > OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy, but this _is_
> rec.RADIO.AMATEUR.policy,
> > > not rec.terrorists.are.ruining.my.life.policy.
> > >
> > > Can we move all the bin-laden-has-civil-rights-too crap to a more
> > > appropriate newsgroup?
> > >
> > > Thank you.
> > >
> > > (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> replied:
>
> > No
>
>
> Why not?
>
> Since this is an amateur radio newsgroup, why clutter it
> up with issues which are better treated in one of the many
> newsgroups dedicated to such topics. Here are a few which
> seem much more appropriate venues:
>
> alt.current-events.terror-war
> alt.society.civil-liberties

> alt.terrorism.world-trade-center
> alt.society.civil-liberty
> alt.politics.usa.constitution
> alt.support.religion.islam.taliban
>
> Thank you for your reconsideration.
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>

7. Re: ******6 to 7 kilowatts on CB??????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 03:06:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE0BC30.3FD0568D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23053
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Toll Free wrote:
>
> That's your statement, Dwight, not mine.

That is not my statement, Toll. Again, I'm not Aaron. I do not, nor have I ever, posted to this newsgroup, or any other newsgroup, using an identity other then my own.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

8. Re: A Challenge to James Miccolis

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 03:12:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011031221243.14773.00000041@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23054

In article <20011030122548.08658.00000200@nso-fz.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>This is a forum for policy matters regarding amateur
>radio. It isn't some playground where some regulars
>whine and bitch and moan about their personal feelings
>of persecution by demanding exact quotes to "prove"
>something that matters little to others.

Now, HERE's a guy who just DOES NOT "get it!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

9. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:00:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011031230009.14773.00000045@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23056

In article <3be09e53_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>No, but thank you for your comments.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Wrong answer, Kim. Of course we can. And, we definitely should.
And don't look now, but *you're* not the one who makes that
decision!

73 de Larry, K3LT

>"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
>news:#YfEFNlYBHA.1372@cpimsnntpa03...
>> OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy, but this _is_ rec.RADIO.AMATEUR.policy,
>> not rec.terrorists.are.ruining.my.life.policy.
>>
>> Can we move all the bin-laden-has-civil-rights-too crap to a more
>> appropriate newsgroup?
>>
>> Thank you.
>>
>> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

10. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:00:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011031230009.14773.00000044@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23059

This is a perfect example of something else that can be moved
off this newsgroup.

Memo to Steve:

You don't like Lennie. Lennie doesn't like you...although I can't
imagine why! We got it, already. Give us a break from this sophomoric
Anderson-bashing. Direct your displeasure at someone who is
infinitely more deserving. Bin Laden comes readily to mind. Just
don't do it here...PLEASE!

In fact, why don't we all take a long, hard look at ourselves, and see if
we can make better use of the time we spend on this newsgroup. I'm
not saying stop spending that time here, just make it more productive
and less chaotic.

73 de Larry, K3LT

In article <20011031015302.12142.00000681@mb-mj.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
>>Subject: Re: ur right dwight
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 10/30/2001 7:50 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20011030205033.08267.00000174@nso-fg.aol.com>
>
>>First point: The "Bull" crier did not answer the challenge
>>except to write more crap which has nothing to do with
>>the subject, everything to do with his personal obsession.
>
> Liar.
>
> Your "challenge" was answered. Of course you have tried to lie your way
>out of this one too.
>
> You didn't like the answer, especially since it once again proved you
>foolish.
>
> Doesn't take much, you know.
>
>>Second point: Picking flyspecks out of pepper, in this case
>>on real, live dates of the start of a major war period, is rather
>>pointless at this time.
>
> At at what point do you consider accurate reporting of historical facts

>to
>be appropriate, Your Putziness?
>
>
>
>>It does serve whatever is Brakob's
>>purpose in running off at the keyboard with too much
>>testosterone on a demonstration of "rightness." Is there any
>>question that the USA was NOT in a state of war on
>>December 7, 1941?!?
>
> Since that was not your original assertion, it does not matter. Yes, we
>were "technically" at war.
>
> However you once again attempt to redirect the conversation after having
>been proven (again) to be wrong.
>
>>ex-RA16408336
>
> As meaningless as your expired GROL, Lennie.

11. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:00:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011031230010.14773.00000046@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23055

In article <9rpvvg029u2@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>Agreed, but you have to admit that it's been a relief from the code/no code
>arguments that have been permeating the group for the past 23,497 eons.
>

Krell:

Don't look now, but we haven't even got the code/no code arguments
warmed up yet! Just wait until the FCC NPRM to totally eliminate
code testing comes up! It ain't gonna be pretty!

73 de Larry, K3LT

12. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:00:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011031230011.14773.00000048@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23057

In article <#YfEFNlYBHA.1372@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> writes:

>
>OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy, but this _is_ rec.RADIO.AMATEUR.policy,
>not rec.terrorists.are.ruining.my.life.policy.
>
>Can we move all the bin-laden-has-civil-rights-too crap to a more
>appropriate newsgroup?

Hansl:

Bin Laden ain't got no steenkin' civil rights! He is an international terrorist, he kills people for the sheer terror of it. He has the blood of over 5,000 people from over 80 countries on his hands from the WTC/Pentagon attacks. He ain't got the steenkin' civil right to take a crap, much less go on living. Ignore the bleeding hearts. The don't understand what America is all about, never did, and never will. They have no functional understanding of the meaning of words like liberty, freedom, and independence. Most of all, they don't respect the civil rights of good, decent people if they must insist that animals like Osama Bin Laden and his fellow terrorist-trash gangsters have any civil rights whatsoever.

Bin Laden has a right to be slowly lowered into a large pot full of boiling pork fat. Let's see what the bleeding hearts have to say about THAT!

73 de Larry, K3LT

13. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:00:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011031230011.14773.00000047@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23058

In article <uRfWKHmYBHA.224@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> writes:

>
>Keep ramming it at them until we get a session which doesn't end
>in some "crisis" mode, leaving no time to consider "non-vital"
>legislation.

Hansl:

Sounds reasonable to me, and may be possible if we can keep a
Republican majority in the House, regain a Republican majority in
the Senate, and keep a Republican administration in the White
House. Elect more democrats, and we'll always be in "crisis mode."

>Here are some other "policy" questions for consideration:
>
>-- Should it be the policy of USA to ask for worldwide 40M allocation
> at:
>
> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz

C.

>-- If push came to shove, should we accept a worldwide allocation
> of 6.900-7.100 amateur-exclusive, in exchange for the current?
> (Which is 7.000-7.100 in R1 anr R3, 7.000-7.300 in R2).

Y knot?

>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?

Permit any legitimate amateur activity EXCEPT contesting and DX
nets.

>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
> transmissions on Amateur Radio.

No. Not just "no," but hell no. K1MAN is not conducting legitimate
one-way information service in the same way as W1AW is. All he's
doing is massaging his ego. This needs to be nipped in the bud, and
the rules changed to give W1AW exclusive right to conduct regular
scheduled "broadcasts," and provide special protection from harmful
interference to W1AW transmissions.

>-- Should it be FCC policy to periodically conduct occupancy monitoring
> of VHF/UHF amateur bands, and adjust those allocations based on
> observed usage?

Absolutely. Use it or lose it. Crap or get off the pot. Make hay while
the sun shines. You get the idea.

>Surely we can think of more Amateur Radio policy matters that
>should be publicly discussed. Maybe we can get some ham radio
>back in this ham radio newsgroup.

What we really need to do is get some more ham radio into ham
radio.

73 de Larry, K3LT

14. Re: ur right dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:10:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE0CB26.2B961688@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23060

Krell wrote:
>
> It's certainly what Israel would
> do. Alledgedly, they have 24 nukes
> aimed at the most populous cities
> in the Middle East. If there is a
> nuclear or biological attack
> within their borders, they're not
> going to look for any evidence.
> They're just going to push the
> button and let every last missle
> fly with a harty "Hallelujah!"

Well, I don't know if you're right about Israel's nuclear weapons policy, but that certainly doesn't mean that we should do the same in this country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

15. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:30:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE0CFDF.1B55B209@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23061

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> We "know" each other in this newsgroup,
> and discuss things with each other
> on that basis. We may not always be
> specific to amateur radio--in fact
> often are not.

I agree, Kim. This is a newsgroup for ham operators and ham operators occasionally have things on their minds other than ham radio. And if they want to discuss those things with other ham operators, this is the place to do it - not some other newsgroup where it would be almost impossible to find other ham operators.

Furthermore, I wouldn't pay too much attention to complaints from Hans, Larry, and so forth. They've participated in many off-topic discussions in this newsgroup and I've never seen them preach the same for themselves.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

16. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:38:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011031233851.16813.00000890@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23062

>Subject: Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 10/31/2001 10:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011031230009.14773.00000044@nso-dh.aol.com>

>This is a perfect example of something else that can be moved
>off this newsgroup.

Which will then allow Lennie the Liar to spew his hatred and rhetoric
unchallenged.

Sorry...not on my watch.

>We got it, already. Give us a break from this sophomoric
>Anderson-bashing

As opposed to sophmoric no-coder or Kim bashing, Larry? Holding that
Putz's nose to the grindstone for his own misadventures is NOT "sophmoric".
It's a priviledge.

>In fact, why don't we all take a long, hard look at ourselves, and see if
>we can make better use of the time we spend on this newsgroup.

I would agree, and posted several items to that very effect. One was
picked up and subsequently published by "Worldradio". (Who else in this group
has been published FROM the NG?)

>I'm
>not saying stop spending that time here, just make it more productive
>and less chaotic.

Please note my response to Hans in another thread. I have suggested and
re-suggested over the last two or three years that we try to come to some
concensus on 40 meter band reallocation and the spectrum protection act, none
of which requires any "opinion" on code testing.

All three "threads" dissolved into the now-familiar code/no code rants
within four replies.

If Lennie makes a post I consider inaccurate or slanderous, I am going to
comment. I will not let that bullying twit get away with his lies and
propagandist misadventures unchallenged.

73

Steve, K4YZ

17. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:40:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011031234013.16813.00000891@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23063

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@QWEST.NET
>Date: 10/31/2001 7:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <uskb2ZnYBHA.1308@cpimsnntpa03>

>Here are a few which
>seem much more appropriate venues:

SNIP

But we like it HERE......

Steve

18. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 04:45:31 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <eHp5LApYBHA.1880@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 23064

> Furthermore, I wouldn't pay too much attention to complaints from
> Hans, Larry, and so forth. They've participated in many off-topic
> discussions in this newsgroup and I've never seen them preach the same
> for themselves.

Dwight -- with all due regard, I opened my request with the words "OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy...". But, like you said, you don't pay too much attention..."

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

19. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 05:04:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101000413.20853.00000141@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23065

In article <uRfWKHmYBHA.224@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> writes:

>Here are some other "policy" questions for consideration:
>
>-- Should it be the policy of USA to ask for worldwide 40M allocation
> at:
>
> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz

A is best, B is next, C is worst.
>
>-- If push came to shove, should we accept a worldwide allocation
> of 6.900-7.100 amateur-exclusive, in exchange for the current?
> (Which is 7.000-7.100 in R1 anr R3, 7.000-7.300 in R2).
>
Yes. 200 kHz worldwide exclusive is more useful than 100 worldwide exclusive and 200 shared with highpower SWBC stations. Split the 200 kHz right down the middle - 100 phone and 100 digital/CW.

>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?

Nope. No way to enforce it, anyway.
>
>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
> transmissions on Amateur Radio.

Only if they are done on a preannounced schedule.
>
>-- Should it be FCC policy to periodically conduct occupancy monitoring
> of VHF/UHF amateur bands, and adjust those allocations based on
> observed usage?
>
Heck no!

>Surely we can think of more Amateur Radio policy matters that
>should be publicly discussed. Maybe we can get some ham radio
>back in this ham radio newsgroup.

There's a start.

73 de Jim, N2EY

20. Re: Complements and Compliments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 05:04:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101000413.20853.00000140@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23066

In article <20011029164646.06769.00000168@nso-bd.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <9f4bfe89.0110230832.7ce5d918@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com >(N2EY) writes:
>
>>Yet your behavior and comments here show otherwise. You repeatedly >>attack the messenger (me) for having the audacity to disagree with you >>and point out errors in your posts.
>
>There is no "audacity" in disagreement.

Anyone who disagrees with you here displays it.

>There IS audacity in >manufacturing "errors" that aren't there...such as in the >amateur radio statistics tabulated by AH0A. :-)

Then you audaciously manufacture plenty of them. Shall I get your posts from the thread where you made errors in interpreting those numbers, and refused to acknowledge them? It's really easy for me to do....
>
>>I think you are angry that the person you described as phony, idiotic >>and delusional turns out to have EE degrees and some experience with >>both RF design and the Smith Chart.
>
>Heh heh heh. :-)
>
Yep - just as I said.

>As n2ey@aol.com once wrote, "full of yourself, aren't you?"

Nope. I never wrote anyhting close to that. You're manufacturing quotes now, too.

>>As Babe Ruth said: "It ain't braggin' if ya really done it."
>
>It IS bragging if all you've done is claim it and cannot >provide any proof of accomplishment.

Then I'm not bragging at all.
>
>>> So far, in >>> regards to "mastery of the Smith Chart" all that anyone >>> has seen is some homework on "examples" that were >>> contributed after at least a week.
>>

>>All that YOU have seen.
>
>All that ANYONE in this newsgroup has seen. :-)

Nope. Others in this newsgroup know my skills and knowledge. Besides, there's
nothing I could post that would convince you otherwise.
>
>>The posts I made were practical examples of Smith Chart use in HF
>>amateur radio applications. All of them could also have been done
>>other ways. And your "deadlines" mean nothing to me.
>
>They might even have been cribbed from the May 1978 issue
>of Ham Radio magazine for all I know. :-)

They weren't. I made them up myself.
>
>For someone who has an inordinate amount of free time to
>spend on amateur radio newsgoop messaging, I'm surprised
>that there was no immediate response of a "tutorial" on
>Smith Chart use. Anyone who claims to have "mastered the
>Smith Chart" should have jumped right in on the subject just
>like he jumps in about morse code use. :-)

The only person who fits that description is you, Len.
>
>>What is ridiculous and absurd is the idea that all proposed change is
>>somehow automatically "good" and must be accepted by all. What is
>>ridiculous and absurd is the idea that those who oppose change are
>>somehow automatically "bad" because they see the proposed "new order"
>>as inferior to the old.
>
>I've not claimed any "new order," just some reasons for ending
>the morse code test for an amateur radio license.

You've done more than that. You want an age limit of 14 for any amateur
license, and a reduction to a single class of license.

> I've only
>claimed that removing the code test would give more citizens
>freedom to enter a hobby activity involving radio.

There has been no code test for the Tecnician class of license for more than a
decade. Thus, the code test is no barrier to entering amateur radio.
>
>OTHERS opposed to the elimination of code test seem to think
>that such elimination is "bad."

Yep. And they have posted reasons for that opinion. Is it forbidden to
disagree?

>Their judgemental viewpoint is
>in here, standing out, no ambiguity. Under those circumstances
>retention of the code test is "good" while elimination is "bad."

>I don't agree with such a personalized viewpoint.

Is that why you abuse those with the audacity to disagree with you and point out your logical errors?
>
>>> Anyone who continues to favor a code test as a pass-fail
>>> criterion for amateur radio licensing seems to think they
>>> are "deserving" of a federal welfare program to yield them
>>> titles, status, and privilege.
>>
>>That's your distortion of reality, Len.
>
>It is based on what other code-lovers have written in here.
>The "distortion" is not mine.

Nope. The distortion is yours. You just equated code test with "code lovers". Not the same thing. But it shows your hatred of the mode itself, not just the test.
>
>>Translation: "Old" = "bad", "new" = "good"
>
>No. Incorrect. Retention of old regulations with the only
>reasons given as personal desires are not good...those
>are selfish.

The only reasons for removing the test are personal desires.
>
>>You and others promote "change" as if all change is automatically good
>>and any resistance or opposition to change is automatically bad. I
>>simply gave a clear example of how "change" is not always good.
>>Simple.
>
>Incorrect in judgement.

Why? Who made your opinion the only correct one?

> FREEDOM is not a bad word.

Neither is RESPONSIBILITY. Neither is TRADITION.
>
>Removal of the amateur code test will remove the strict,
>regimented alignment of amateur radio = morse code.

What alignment? Where is that alleged alignment documented?
>
>While that may seem revolutionary to some, the FCC does
>not consider that morse code skill to be a qualification for
>decision on whether or not an examinee is worth the grant
>of an amateur radio license

I've only told you that many, many times since December 1999. The code test issue is a dead duck, finished, finito, end of story. The only thing keeping it alive is the treaty requirement. Almost everyone has accepted that and moved on

- except you, Len.
>
>To a limited degree, the IARU now agrees with that.

More than a limited degree.
>
>Freedom from old, antiquated regulations is considered is
>considered "bad."

Again you reveal your bias against old things.

>Interesting. Maybe even "fascinating."
>The new order that was the old order. Status quoism.

Nope. Spin and twist from the spinmeister. The mere fact that a regulation is
old doesn't mean it is no longer needed.

N2EY

>
>

21. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 06:21:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101012155.22765.00001061@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 23067

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 10/31/2001 11:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011101000413.20853.00000141@nso-cc.aol.com>

Hans' suggestions:

>> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
>> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
>> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz

Personally, I'd prefer option b. The broadcasters would be required
(under one proposal I read) to move up, also. The get an "exclusive" and we
would too.

>Yes. 200 kHz worldwide exclusive is more useful than 100 worldwide exclusive
>and 200 shared with highpower SWBC stations. Split the 200 kHz right down the
>middle - 100 phone and 100 digital/CW.

I agree on the 200kHz being more useful as an exclusive than 300 shared,
but not the CW/digital split.

I'd make it 80/120.

>>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
>> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
>
>Nope. No way to enforce it, anyway.

I disagree that they could not enforce it, Jim. Riley et al have been
doing a pretty fair job of cleaning a lot of the mess up on the "regular"
bands...I wouold think it a lot easier to "police" with only very specific
modes and applications allowed.

Besides, if we move the traffic nets, etc, off the other bands, I don't
think the other ops would come to 60M anyway. Make 60M exclusive for Public
Service/Traffic Handling/ARES-type operations, and the rest of the unwashed
masses will stay away.

>>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
>> transmissions on Amateur Radio.
>
>Only if they are done on a preannounced schedule.

And only if done on 27.185mHz, where he belongs.

73

Steve, K4YZ

22. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 06:34:12 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <udtS78pYBHA.1308@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 23068

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> writes:

> >-- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> > and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> responds:

> Permit any legitimate amateur activity EXCEPT contesting and DX
> nets.

Since it will almost certainly be a "US Mainland Only" band, not much DX to be had -- not even VE's or XE's. For the same reason, little or no contest interest.

What I'd hate to see is a takeover by the "3850" style yokels, or the lumbago nets now common on 80M. Since we're starting with a clean sheet of paper, it would be nice to go in with a plan which supports the aims of 97.1.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

23. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 11:29:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9rrbke015rd@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23070

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011031230009.14773.00000044@nso-dh.aol.com...
> This is a perfect example of something else that can be moved
> off this newsgroup.
>
> Memo to Steve:
>
> You don't like Lennie. Lennie doesn't like you...although I can't
> imagine why! We got it, already. Give us a break from this sophomoric
> Anderson-bashing. Direct your displeasure at someone who is
> infinitely more deserving. Bin Laden comes readily to mind. Just
> don't do it here...PLEASE!
>
> In fact, why don't we all take a long, hard look at ourselves, and see if
> we can make better use of the time we spend on this newsgroup. I'm
> not saying stop spending that time here, just make it more productive
> and less chaotic.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Like you did when you spent several weeks kvetching about Kim's callsign?
Well, a callsign, at least, has *something* to do with the newsgroup, but
still...

24. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 11:35:02 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9rrbv80162i@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23069

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011031230010.14773.00000046@nso-dh.aol.com...

> Don't look now, but we haven't even got the code/no code arguments
> warmed up yet! Just wait until the FCC NPRM to totally eliminate
> code testing comes up! It ain't gonna be pretty!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Sounds like you can't wait to get into the thick of it.

25. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 12:04:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be139d3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23072

You are cordially invited, Larry, to ignore Subject Matters such as, oh, let's see "ur right Dwight" and "Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar" where you know there is absolutely no discussion of ham radio going on. Improve your cognition--satisfy your desire not to see posts that aren't 100 percent ham radio.

Kim W5TIT

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9rrbke015rd@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011031230009.14773.00000044@nso-dh.aol.com...
> > This is a perfect example of something else that can be moved
> > off this newsgroup.
> >
> > Memo to Steve:
> >
> > You don't like Lennie. Lennie doesn't like you...although I can't
> > imagine why! We got it, already. Give us a break from this sophomoric
> > Anderson-bashing. Direct your displeasure at someone who is
> > infinitely more deserving. Bin Laden comes readily to mind. Just
> > don't do it here...PLEASE!
> >
> > In fact, why don't we all take a long, hard look at ourselves, and see
if
> > we can make better use of the time we spend on this newsgroup. I'm
> > not saying stop spending that time here, just make it more productive
> > and less chaotic.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
> Like you did when you spent several weeks kvetching about Kim's callsign?
> Well, a callsign, at least, has *something* to do with the newsgroup, but
> still...
>
>

26. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 12:06:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be139d3$2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23071

Ya mean you're actually going to have some power to do something about your CW desires this time, Larry? Rather than the usual, boring, stuff--kind of like the same stuff you just griped about with Steve and Len? We know your feelings about CW--ignore most if not all your posts. What was it you said? "Give it up already" yeah, that was it.

Kim W5TIT

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9rrbv80162i@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011031230010.14773.00000046@nso-dh.aol.com...
>
> > Don't look now, but we haven't even got the code/no code arguments
> > warmed up yet! Just wait until the FCC NPRM to totally eliminate
> > code testing comes up! It ain't gonna be pretty!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Sounds like you can't wait to get into the thick of it.
>
>

27. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 12:08:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be13a3e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23073

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011031230009.14773.00000044@nso-dh.aol.com...
> This is a perfect example of something else that can be moved
> off this newsgroup.
>
> Memo to Steve:
>
> You don't like Lennie. Lennie doesn't like you...although I can't
> imagine why! We got it, already.
>

Oh, yeah, that was it. "We got it, already." Could you make an attempt to remember that, Larry, when you want to start some full-circle mud slinging contest with some unsuspecting person again over CW?

Kim W5TIT

28. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 12:10:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be13a9f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23074

I'll discuss whatever, whenever, and wherever I choose, Larry. I think that makes me the decision maker. But you have been delusional for at least as long as I have been reading and posting in this newsgroup.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011031230009.14773.00000045@nso-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3be09e53_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
>
> >No, but thank you for your comments.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Wrong answer, Kim. Of course we can. And, we definitely should.
> And don't look now, but *you're* not the one who makes that
> decision!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> >"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> >news:#YfEFNlYBHA.1372@cpimsnntpa03...
> >> OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy, but this _is_ rec.RADIO.AMATEUR.policy,
> >> not rec.terrorists.are.ruining.my.life.policy.
> >>
> >> Can we move all the bin-laden-has-civil-rights-too crap to a more
> >> appropriate newsgroup?
> >>
> >> Thank you.
> >>
> >> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >

29. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 12:12:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be13b20_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23075

Hans, at least you've inspired Larry to--maybe--care just a teencey bit
about ham radio again. Congrats.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011031230011.14773.00000047@nso-dh.aol.com...
> In article <uRfWKHmYBHA.224@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> writes:
>
> >
> >Keep ramming it at them until we get a session which doesn't end
> >in some "crisis" mode, leaving no time to consider "non-vital"
> >legislation.
>
> Hansl:
>
> Sounds reasonable to me, and may be possible if we can keep a
> Republican majority in the House, regain a Republican majority in
> the Senate, and keep a Republican administration in the White
> House. Elect more democrats, and we'll always be in "crisis mode."
>
> >Here are some other "policy" questions for consideration:
> >
> >-- Should it be the policy of USA to ask for worldwide 40M allocation
> > at:
> >
> > a) 7.000-7.300MHz
> > b) 6.900-7.200MHz
> > c) 6.800-7.100Mhz
>
> C.
>
> >-- If push came to shove, should we accept a worldwide allocation
> > of 6.900-7.100 amateur-exclusive, in exchange for the current?
> > (Which is 7.000-7.100 in R1 anr R3, 7.000-7.300 in R2).
>
> Y knot?
>
> >-- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public
service,
> > and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
>
> Permit any legitimate amateur activity EXCEPT contesting and DX
> nets.
>

> >-- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
> > transmissions on Amateur Radio.
>
> No. Not just "no," but hell no. K1MAN is not conducting legitimate
> one-way information service in the same way as W1AW is. All he's
> doing is massaging his ego. This needs to be nipped in the bud, and
> the rules changed to give W1AW exclusive right to conduct regular
> scheduled "broadcasts," and provide special protection from harmful
> interference to W1AW transmissions.
>
> >-- Should it be FCC policy to periodically conduct occupancy monitoring
> > of VHF/UHF amateur bands, and adjust those allocations based on
> > observed usage?
>
> Absolutely. Use it or lose it. Crap or get off the pot. Make hay while
> the sun shines. You get the idea.
>
> >Surely we can think of more Amateur Radio policy matters that
> >should be publicly discussed. Maybe we can get some ham radio
> >back in this ham radio newsgroup.
>
> What we really need to do is get some more ham radio into ham
> radio.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

30. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 13:52:21 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9rrk2l0djf@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23076

Leland KC8LDO
>
>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> We "know" each other in this newsgroup,
>> and discuss things with each other
>> on that basis. We may not always be
>> specific to amateur radio--in fact
>> often are not.
>
>
> I agree, Kim. This is a newsgroup for ham operators and ham
>operators occasionally have things on their minds other than ham
>radio. And if they want to discuss those things with other ham
>operators, this is the place to do it - not some other newsgroup where
>it would be almost impossible to find other ham operators.
>
> Furthermore, I wouldn't pay too much attention to complaints from
>Hans, Larry, and so forth. They've participated in many off-topic
>discussions in this newsgroup and I've never seen them preach the same
>for themselves.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
Hey Dwight,stop posting as Aaron Voobner in the rec.radio.cb newsgroup.

You've been warned !

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

31. Re: ****Toll Free puts 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 13:57:43 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9rrkcn0e94@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23077

```
Leland KC8LDO
>
>>http://www.bigradios.com
>
>Hey Toll, how come suddenly...none of the links work? There's a whole
>bunch of interested hams who'd like to read your "thoughts" regarding
>defiance of FCC rules and see your friends showing off their 70,0000
>watt CB mobiles.
>
>-Aaron-
>
That's enough Dwight.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO
```

32. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 18:30:49 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <uQ2tZNwYBHA.1972@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 23079

"Leland KC8LD0" <Leland_member@newsguy.com> wrote

> You've been warned !

Oh, we are sooooooooooooooo afraid!

To see how afraid we are, go to http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

With all kind wishes,

Hans

33. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 19:06:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111011106.585e30a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23080

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message news:<uRfWKHmYBHA.224@cpimsnntpa03>...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Want to discuss MEANINGFUL policy...?!?! The "spectrum protection act"
> or
> > it's variants has died in committee or allowed to expire at session end
> three
> > times now despite having scores of "co-sponsors".
> >
> > What can we do to get this through...?!?
>
> Keep ramming it at them until we get a session which doesn't end
> in some "crisis" mode, leaving no time to consider "non-vital"
> legislation.
>
>
Amen.
>
>
> Here are some other "policy" questions for consideration:
>
> -- Should it be the policy of USA to ask for worldwide 40M allocation
> at:
>
> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
>
The broadcasters would absolutely raise merry hell, they have huge
investments in frequency-defined gear which would have to be reworked
at serious expense. Fuhgeddit. MAYBE they'll grudgingly surrender
7.100-7.200. They are not gonna bail outta 7.200-7.300.
>
>
> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz
>
>
There are signals on 6.800 - 6.900, 6.900-7.000 is an RF desert. The
interesting question in my mind being how we can get all these "type
accepted" radios to transmit below 7.000? Yeah sure, I know how to
snip the diodes on my archaic 940. But how 'bout the current crop of
xcvrs which have read-only BIOS chips which control the freq limits?
And the clueless owners of these whiz boxes who don't even know how to
pop the cases open to get inside the things let alone how to deal with
replacing SMT chips? Obsolete new radios. Nightmare. Bring it on . .

anybody out know where I can get a 40m ARC-5?
>
>
> -- If push came to shove, should we accept a worldwide allocation
> of 6.900-7.100 amateur-exclusive, in exchange for the current?
> (Which is 7.000-7.100 in R1 anr R3, 7.000-7.300 in R2).
>
>
That's the phone guy's problem. Just gimmee 6.900-7.000.
>
>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
>
What would be the point of that maneuver??! Ain't gonna happen, the
FCC obviously ain't looking for more enforcement responsibilities.
>
>
>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
> transmissions on Amateur Radio.
>
>
Hell NO!
>
>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to periodically conduct occupancy monitoring
> of VHF/UHF amateur bands, and adjust those allocations based on
> observed usage?
>
>
Me suspects that the commercials who covet those allocations are
already working overtime monitoring usage in order to justify gloming
them. We don't need the FCC working for them too.
>
>
> Surely we can think of more Amateur Radio policy matters that
> should be publicly discussed. Maybe we can get some ham radio
> back in this ham radio newsgroup.
>
>
Code test issues seem to generate occasional discussion.
>
>
> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½)
>
>
clever.
>
>

> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
w3rv

34. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 19:11:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE19E72.D09B5035@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23081

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Don't look now, but we haven't even got the code/no code arguments
> warmed up yet! Just wait until the FCC NPRM to totally eliminate
> code testing comes up! It ain't gonna be pretty!

"Hope springs eternal from the human breast."
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

35. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 19:24:12 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wjhE7.92189$WW.5210800@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23082

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
news:#IXHuXkYBHA.1872@cpimsnntpa03...
> Agreement that we are a nation that you *NEVER* piss off.
>
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
That is exactly the point we must make if we are ever going to obtain peace.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

36. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 19:30:58 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <u7uX#uwYBHA.1308@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 23083

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> And the clueless owners of these whiz boxes who don't even know how to
> pop the cases open to get inside the things let alone how to deal with
> replacing SMT chips?

Assuming you are right (which I don't accept), perhaps that would be
a good thing. It would incentivize people to do a little technical
exploration
(as in 97.1 b, c,and d). Or it might provide a nice little part time
business
for a superior electronics wizard like you.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

37. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 19:39:08 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <#UZTizwYBHA.1232@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 23084

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:wjhE7.92189$WW.5210800@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> news:#IXHuXkYBHA.1872@cpimsnntpa03...
> > Agreement that we are a nation that you *NEVER* piss off.
> >
> >
> > (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> That is exactly the point we must make if we are ever going to obtain
peace.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim

If we are not prepared to wage total unconditional war in response to a direct attack on our homeland, then we invite continued attacks and a disaster on a scale that we can barely imagine. If 19 guys can turn 4 commercial airlines into guided missiles, then 19 more guys, each with a suitcase nuke, can destroy America. It is no longer enough for America to"warn" of dire consequences --- we must search them out and make horrific examples of them.

With all kind wishes,

Hans

38. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 19:46:13 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <9EhE7.92207$WW.5211594@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23085

Hans, sometimes we do get off topic a bit; certainly we often do not talk about the hobby per se on the air. Often it's "honey, don't forget the bread" on 2 meters or 440, but amateur radio includes many facets. I will agree, however, that some of the threads such as the boy scouts or morse code do get out of hand (and they are 'in topic' so to speak). With that, I will promise not to mention the war again and try and keep it to amateur radio.

Anyone know the propogation effects of a couple of 50 megaton hydrogen devices going off in the middle East?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
news:#YfEFNIYBHA.1372@cpimsnntpa03...
> OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy, but this _is_ rec.RADIO.AMATEUR.policy,
> not rec.terrorists.are.ruining.my.life.policy.
>
> Can we move all the bin-laden-has-civil-rights-too crap to a more
> appropriate newsgroup?
>
> Thank you.
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

39. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 20:13:00 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BE19E27.AF31B050@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23086

The first step should have been to wipe Saddam Hussen off the map.

K0HB wrote:
>
>
> If we are not prepared to wage total unconditional war in response to a
> direct attack on our homeland, then we invite continued attacks and a
> disaster on a scale that we can barely imagine. If 19 guys can turn
> 4 commercial airlines into guided missiles, then 19 more guys, each
> with a suitcase nuke, can destroy America. It is no longer enough for
> America to"warn" of dire consequences --- we must search them out
> and make horrific examples of them.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> Hans

40. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 20:33:43 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0111011233.6a1f0505@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23087

Both Hans and Steve are right about what "policy" hams should be looking at. These issues -- much more than code/no code will determine the future of ham radio. Speaking of which, I have a sense that many folks are coming or going to code to take a shot at QRP. Some new techs are interested in learning so they can use it, not just so they can get HF. Just a sense, not a scientific study.

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message news:<uRfWKHmYBHA.224@cpimsnntpa03>...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Want to discuss MEANINGFUL policy...?!?! The "spectrum protection act"
> or
> > it's variants has died in committee or allowed to expire at session end
> three
> > times now despite having scores of "co-sponsors".
> >
> > What can we do to get this through...?!?
>
> Keep ramming it at them until we get a session which doesn't end
> in some "crisis" mode, leaving no time to consider "non-vital"
> legislation.
>
> Here are some other "policy" questions for consideration:
>
> -- Should it be the policy of USA to ask for worldwide 40M allocation
> at:
>
> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz
>
> -- If push came to shove, should we accept a worldwide allocation
> of 6.900-7.100 amateur-exclusive, in exchange for the current?
> (Which is 7.000-7.100 in R1 anr R3, 7.000-7.300 in R2).
>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
> transmissions on Amateur Radio.
>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to periodically conduct occupancy monitoring
> of VHF/UHF amateur bands, and adjust those allocations based on
> observed usage?

>
> Surely we can think of more Amateur Radio policy matters that
> should be publicly discussed. Maybe we can get some ham radio
> back in this ham radio newsgroup.
>
> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

41. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 20:39:38 UTC
From: Rick Tannehill <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3BE1B30A.967BEFFA@firstinter.net>
Source record: 23088

But it will be a swift, clean, almost bloodless execution Larry :_)
Rick T.

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <9rpvvg029u2@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Agreed, but you have to admit that it's been a relief from the code/no code
> >arguments that have been permeating the group for the past 23,497 eons.
> >
>
> Krell:
>
> Don't look now, but we haven't even got the code/no code arguments
> warmed up yet! Just wait until the FCC NPRM to totally eliminate
> code testing comes up! It ain't gonna be pretty!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

42. Re: W5NET: Changing to a "policy question"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 20:45:56 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0111011245.39da9e7f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23089
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<1x3C7.156594$W8.4354025@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> We had been using N and A before the allocations began at the 1927
> conference and simply added a dah to them for W and K.

Dick Nï¿½BK,

Do you happen to know where one might find a history of US amateur
call sign protocol?

Some of my thoughts and questions ...

I know, for example, that at one time a Novice was issued a WN, KN
call which became a W, K, WA, KA, call when upgraded. That stopped
when?

What is the protocol for the N calls? I know that the A's are now
issued to Extra class. Was N ever class-reserved?

I always assumed that the 1x1, 1x2, 1x3 calls were just sequential
progressions, but I have been told that they are class-reserved. Has
it always been that way? Is there any significance other than sequence
for the 2x1 and 2x2's?

Not necessarily looking for the answers, just a resource or two.

73
Carl [KB9RVB]

43. Re: W5NET: Changing to a "policy question"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 21:03:08 UTC
From: Train <likeicare@all.com>
Message-ID: <gMiE7.2038$Ie.291444@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 23090
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The station I talked on as a child prior to ever owning my own radio equipment was W2EJT. This is a call that goes back MANY decades. SK..RPA

Train

"Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote in message news:77f1797e.0111011245.39da9e7f@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:<1x3C7.156594$W8.4354025@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > We had been using N and A before the allocations began at the 1927
> > conference and simply added a dah to them for W and K.
>
> Dick N BK,
>
> Do you happen to know where one might find a history of US amateur
> call sign protocol?
>
> Some of my thoughts and questions ...
>
> I know, for example, that at one time a Novice was issued a WN, KN
> call which became a W, K, WA, KA, call when upgraded. That stopped
> when?
>
> What is the protocol for the N calls? I know that the A's are now
> issued to Extra class. Was N ever class-reserved?
>
> I always assumed that the 1x1, 1x2, 1x3 calls were just sequential
> progressions, but I have been told that they are class-reserved. Has
> it always been that way? Is there any significance other than sequence
> for the 2x1 and 2x2's?
>
> Not necessarily looking for the answers, just a resource or two.
>
> 73
> Carl [KB9RVB]

44. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 21:05:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101160502.02880.00000250@nso-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 23091

In article <20011031233851.16813.00000890@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

> (Who else in this group
>has been published FROM the NG?)

Well, if having one's NG posts wind up on other people's websites, and in club bulletins, constitutes being published, then I qualify.

73 de Jim, N2EY

45. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 21:05:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101160503.02880.00000252@nso-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 23092

In article <20011031230010.14773.00000046@nso-dh.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Just wait until the FCC NPRM to totally eliminate
>code testing comes up! It ain't gonna be pretty!

Larry,

You think the FCC will even bother with an NPRM if/when S25.5 changes? I wouldn't be surprised if they just issued an order dropping Element 1. No NPRM, no comments, nothing. I hope I'm wrong on this, but the skids are well greased already.

73 de Jim, N2EY

the poached salmon is fantastic!

46. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 21:05:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101160503.02880.00000251@nso-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 23093

In article <20011101012155.22765.00001061@mb-fl.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Hans' suggestions:
>
>>> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
>>> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
>>> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz
>
> Personally, I'd prefer option b. The broadcasters would be required
>(under one proposal I read) to move up, also. The get an "exclusive" and we
>would too.

Ah, Steve, reread Hans' question. It was about which should the ARRL ask for as a worldwide exclusive allocation. The only reason to move the band is if it gets us exclusive territory.
>
>>Yes. 200 kHz worldwide exclusive is more useful than 100 worldwide exclusive
>>and 200 shared with highpower SWBC stations. Split the 200 kHz right down
>the
>>middle - 100 phone and 100 digital/CW.
>
> I agree on the 200kHz being more useful as an exclusive than 300 shared,
>but not the CW/digital split.
>
> I'd make it 80/120.
>
Why? Digital is up. Did you see the results from FD 2001? CW QSOs up, digital QSOs up, phone QSOs down, compared to 2001.

>>>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
>>> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
>>
>>Nope. No way to enforce it, anyway.
>
> I disagree that they could not enforce it, Jim. Riley et al have been
>doing a pretty fair job of cleaning a lot of the mess up on the "regular"
>bands...I wouold think it a lot easier to "police" with only very specific
>modes and applications allowed.

Enforcement by content is tough to do, if the content is legal. Suppose somebody starts a "60 meter emergency preparedness net" where hams from all 50 states are invited to check in. But suppose the net actually functions to manufacture QSOs for WAS. Is that worth policing?

> Besides, if we move the traffic nets, etc, off the other bands, I don't
>think the other ops would come to 60M anyway. Make 60M exclusive for Public
>Service/Traffic Handling/ARES-type operations, and the rest of the unwashed
>masses will stay away.

The problem is that if the band can't be used for many activities, like ragchewing, many hams won't bother to go there. The argument being made for 60 is not that it will take all the public service and emergency stuff, but that it fills a propagation gap between 80 and 40. If it is lightly used it won't fulfill its mission.

>>>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
>>> transmissions on Amateur Radio.
>>
>>Only if they are done on a preannounced schedule.
>
> And only if done on 27.185mHz, where he belongs.

Who IS this guy, and what's the beef about him? I came across an AM station sending something called "newsline" a few days ago on 75 meters - was that K1MAN?
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

47. Re: W5NET

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 21:42:15 UTC
From: aaronvoobner <aaronvoobner@home.coms>
Message-ID: <XkjE7.169764$5A3.63445289@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 23094

why is this thread being crossed posted to rec.radio.cb???
<K0HB@qwest.net> wrote in message news:9raqtg$6l6$1@news.netmar.com...
> Dwight Stewart writes:
>
> > And that callsign is not a valid callsign here.
>
> Of course it's a valid callsign here.
>
> Taking advantage of the CEPT agreement (and before that reciprocal
operating
> agreements) G4ZOW could operate freely in the US, with the full blessing
of
> the FCC.
>
> And here I thought you'd "checked the facts" before you spoke, chiding me
for
> not having done so. Tsk, tsk!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
eb -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
abuse@newsone.net

48. Re: W5NET: Changing to a "policy question"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 21:43:04 UTC
From: aaronvoobner <aaronvoobner@home.coms>
Message-ID: <IljE7.169786$5A3.63446250@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 23095
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Carl, what does this have to do with CB radio???
Keep that Ham bull crap in the Ham NG

"Carl Zager" <kb9rvb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:77f1797e.0111011245.39da9e7f@posting.google.com...

49. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 22:12:33 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9rshag01k5s@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23097

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:wjhE7.92189$WW.5210800@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> news:#IXHuXkYBHA.1872@cpimsnntpa03...
> > Agreement that we are a nation that you *NEVER* piss off.
> >
> >
> > (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> That is exactly the point we must make if we are ever going to obtain
peace.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim

During the Reagan years there was a slogan that I liked quite well: "Peace through superior fire power."

50. Re: ****Toll Free puts 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 22:19:09 UTC
From: aaronvoobner <aaronvoobner@home.coms>
Message-ID: <xTjE7.169927$5A3.63479897@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 23096

This is a Forged post of Leland Scott kc8ldo

"Leland KC8LD0" <Leland_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:9rrkcn0e94@drn.newsguy.com...
> Leland KC8LDO
> >
> >>http://www.bigradios.com
> >
> >Hey Toll, how come suddenly...none of the links work? There's a whole
> >bunch of interested hams who'd like to read your "thoughts" regarding
> >defiance of FCC rules and see your friends showing off their 70,0000
> >watt CB mobiles.
> >
> >-Aaron-
> >
> That's enough Dwight.
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>

51. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 22:52:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101175251.23252.00000731@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23098

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 11/1/2001 3:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011101160503.02880.00000251@nso-fl.aol.com>

>Ah, Steve, reread Hans' question. It was about which should the ARRL ask for
>as
>a worldwide exclusive allocation. The only reason to move the band is if it
>gets us exclusive territory.

I understand this. The ARRL's proposal was that we move down, the
broadcasters move up and we both get exclusive "primary" allocations.

73

Steve, K4YZ

52. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 23:23:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE1D959.5E18B30A@uci.edu>
Source record: 23099

K0HB wrote:
>
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote:
> > > Can we move all the bin-laden-has-civil-rights-too crap to a more
> > > appropriate newsgroup?
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> replied:
>
> > No
>
> Why not?

Because there isn't a rec.radio.amateur.gossip for her to post to.

53. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-01 23:31:19 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <C4E4ADF925124E0A.A1CEF8BAE36E6A0D.979C84A0A30CC1BC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23100

On Wed, 31 Oct 2001 23:14:22 -0000, "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote:

>-- Should it be the policy of USA to ask for worldwide 40M allocation
> at:
>
> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz

All three are too damn random looking. Make it 7.0-8.0MHz. Nice
round numbers are far more practical.

>-- If push came to shove, should we accept a worldwide allocation
> of 6.900-7.100 amateur-exclusive, in exchange for the current?
> (Which is 7.000-7.100 in R1 anr R3, 7.000-7.300 in R2).

Ok, then make it 6.0-8.0 so everybody can be happy.

>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?

Only if they'll add bitching-about-the-new-tests-not-being-hard-enough
nets there, and ban those discussions from all other bands.

>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
> transmissions on Amateur Radio.

Not on the established 2-way bands, but how about a few small bits of
the broadcast band set aside for totally non-commercial amateur
broadcasting. No new tests, no fees, just request a frequency and
weekly time slot.

>-- Should it be FCC policy to periodically conduct occupancy monitoring
> of VHF/UHF amateur bands, and adjust those allocations based on
> observed usage?

Probably too much of a pain in the ass for the manufacturers to change
their band edges every time the FCC makes a new allocation, and their
products already on the shelf when a band is enlarged would likely
have to be sold at a loss if they couldn't be upgraded easily enough.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

54. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 01:04:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101200455.23334.00000179@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 22901

In article <udtS78pYBHA.1308@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> writes:

>What I'd hate to see is a takeover by the "3850" style yokels, or
>the lumbago nets now common on 80M. Since we're starting with
>a clean sheet of paper, it would be nice to go in with a plan which
>supports the aims of 97.1.

I got it - make it like 30 meters: all digital/CW, no phone.

73 de Jim, N2EY

55. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 01:04:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101200456.23334.00000180@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 22902

In article <d22b54c3.0111011106.585e30a5@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Here are some other "policy" questions for consideration:
>>
>> -- Should it be the policy of USA to ask for worldwide 40M allocation
>> at:
>>
>> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
>>
>The broadcasters would absolutely raise merry hell, they have huge
>investments in frequency-defined gear which would have to be reworked
>at serious expense.

Which is why we've been sharing 7100 - 7300 since 1938.

> Fuhgeddit. MAYBE they'll grudgingly surrender
>7.100-7.200.

The real question is, what do the SWBC folks have to gain? They are not bothered by hams, even those running 1.5 kW PEP into three-element Yagis at 120 feet. QRP and a wet string compared to what they've got.

>They are not gonna bail outta 7.200-7.300.

It's a question of bargaining. I say ask for the whole thing (7000-7300 worldwide exclusive amateur) and then compromise down to something less than that but better than what we have now.
>>
>> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
>> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz
>>
>There are signals on 6.800 - 6.900, 6.900-7.000 is an RF desert. The
>interesting question in my mind being how we can get all these "type
>accepted" radios to transmit below 7.000? Yeah sure, I know how to
>snip the diodes on my archaic 940. But how 'bout the current crop of
>xcvrs which have read-only BIOS chips which control the freq limits?
>And the clueless owners of these whiz boxes who don't even know how to
>pop the cases open to get inside the things let alone how to deal with
>replacing SMT chips? Obsolete new radios. Nightmare.

The manufacturers might actually be allies in that it would generate a market for new rigs and dealer-mods for old ones.

The nonsynthesized rigs, from the S-line to the 520/820 Kenwoods, just need a new heterodyne xtal and a realignment. An enterprising ham could make some bucks by having a batch of new rocks made for the popular BA rigs (Drake,

Heath, etc.) Some of the synth rigs will be lame ducks, though.

Oddly enough, the Elecraft K2 needs only a touch-up to the alignment, and maybe a new firmware chip, to do the job. The firmware in that box is all in sockets, too.

My Southgate Type 7 works down to 6900 right now.

> Bring it on . .
>anybody out know where I can get a 40m ARC-5?

Lot of 'em on eBay. BC-459. Or get a BC-458 (5.3 - 7.0 Mc) and tweak the trimmers. There may even be one or two in your storage bins...
>>
>> -- If push came to shove, should we accept a worldwide allocation
>> of 6.900-7.100 amateur-exclusive, in exchange for the current?
>> (Which is 7.000-7.100 in R1 anr R3, 7.000-7.300 in R2).
>>
>That's the phone guy's problem. Just gimmee 6.900-7.000.

The 'phone guys keep pushing lower and lower into the band. Time for subbands-by-mode worldwide.
>>
>> -- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
>> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
>>
>What would be the point of that maneuver??! Ain't gonna happen, the
>FCC obviously ain't looking for more enforcement responsibilities.

Bingo.

>> -- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
>> transmissions on Amateur Radio.
>>
>Hell NO!

I gotta find out why folks hate this K1MAN character so much.
>>
>> -- Should it be FCC policy to periodically conduct occupancy monitoring
>> of VHF/UHF amateur bands, and adjust those allocations based on
>> observed usage?
>>
>Me suspects that the commercials who covet those allocations are
>already working overtime monitoring usage in order to justify gloming
>them. We don't need the FCC working for them too.
>>
Which is just how it would go.

>> Surely we can think of more Amateur Radio policy matters that
>> should be publicly discussed. Maybe we can get some ham radio
>> back in this ham radio newsgroup.
>>
>Code test issues seem to generate occasional discussion.

>>
Who is more supportive of code testing - the Taliban or the Northern Alliance?
;-)

>> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½)

73 de Jim, N2EY

56. Re: Contests (was: 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 02:11:37 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0111011811.47f2645e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 22903
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
news:<9rq5jc$2nu$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com> wrote:
> >Contesting in ANY form is idiotic.
>
> Any form? That would include all sports, gambling, lotteries,
> applying for a job in competition against others, working for
> a job promotion in competition against others, and dozens of
> other day-to-day challenges ("contests").
>
> Your attempt at oneupmanship on the newsgroups is a form
> of contesting so you've snagged yourself on a self-made
> paradox. Luckily, your opinion won't mean one iota to the
> thousands of happy competitors in the next contest; they'll
> go about having a fun weekend all the while your BP is
> soaring!
>
> Jeff KH6O

what sort of mathematics do you teach???? also did they have a
episode of anthrax in mini grass????

57. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 02:27:55 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9rt0ae0rfo@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 22904

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011101200455.23334.00000179@nso-da.aol.com...
> In article <udtS78pYBHA.1308@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
writes:
>
> >What I'd hate to see is a takeover by the "3850" style yokels, or
> >the lumbago nets now common on 80M. Since we're starting with
> >a clean sheet of paper, it would be nice to go in with a plan which
> >supports the aims of 97.1.
>
> I got it - make it like 30 meters: all digital/CW, no phone.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

...and, of course, they would migrate to the alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest
newsgroup. They'd have their forum for ranting, and serious hams would have
a clear band for advancing communicating skills. Everybody's happy.

58. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 03:26:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be21150_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 22905

Oh, heck, Jim. There's *enough* gossip to listen to on 2M around here! The newsgroup is at least more challenging! Hell, this newsgroup is a level above that of the intelligence I hear on the air around here!

Kim W5TIT

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message news:3BE1D959.5E18B30A@uci.edu...
>
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote:
> > > > Can we move all the bin-laden-has-civil-rights-too crap to a more
> > > > appropriate newsgroup?
> >
> > "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> replied:
> >
> > > No
> >
> > Why not?
>
> Because there isn't a rec.radio.amateur.gossip for her to post to.

59. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 03:46:51 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <enFAEE1YBHA.1992@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 22906

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

> I got it - make it like 30 meters: all digital/CW, no phone.

I think the current proposal is not to segment the band by mode,
but rather let "market forces" decide, ala the top-band model.

Serious question, however -- why "no phone"?

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

60. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 03:50:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111011950.3184ab4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 22907

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message news:<u7uX#uwYBHA.1308@cpimsnntpa03>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
> > And the clueless owners of these whiz boxes who don't even know how to
> > pop the cases open to get inside the things let alone how to deal with
> > replacing SMT chips?
>
> Assuming you are right (which I don't accept),
>
>
An HRO guy told that the current 1000 series Yeasu HF xcvrs need a
chip swap to get away from the current transmit freq limitations - and
that they have different chips depending on the country in which they
are sold.
>
>

perhaps that would be
> a good thing. It would incentivize people to do a little technical
> exploration
> (as in 97.1 b, c,and d).
>
>
That would not be a "little" for most hams and swapping a chip doesn't
qualify as "technical exploration".
>
>
> Or it might provide a nice little part time
> business
>
>
Uh-huh. For the Yaesu, Icom & Kenwood shops. This one would be a
double-whammy: We'd need both 6.9-7.0 and 60m mods.
>
>
> for a superior electronics wizard like you.
>
>
Yeah, right, ship me yer radio, I'll fix it for ya . .
>
>
> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

w3rv

61. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 04:05:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011101230554.08355.00001058@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 22908

In article <9rrbke015rd@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> In fact, why don't we all take a long, hard look at ourselves, and see if
>> we can make better use of the time we spend on this newsgroup. I'm
>> not saying stop spending that time here, just make it more productive
>> and less chaotic.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>Like you did when you spent several weeks kvetching about Kim's callsign?
>Well, a callsign, at least, has *something* to do with the newsgroup, but
>still...

My "kvetching" about Kim's call sign was an entirely legitimate,
appropriate, and necessary topic on this newsgroup. My reaction to
it has been validated by no less than Riley Hollingsworth, who, when
Kim attempted to trick him into endorsing her choice, pointed out that
by exercising her freedom of choice in a callsign, she actually
managed to take ham radio "...one step closer to extinction" by
reinforcing a negative image of ham radio operators. So, if you don't
mind my asking, "...but still..." -- what?

73 de Larry, K3LT

62. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 04:05:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011101230555.08355.00001059@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 22909

In article <3be13a3e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> Memo to Steve:
>>
>> You don't like Lennie. Lennie doesn't like you...although I can't
>> imagine why! We got it, already.
>>
>
>Oh, yeah, that was it. "We got it, already." Could you make an attempt to
>remember that, Larry, when you want to start some full-circle mud slinging
>contest with some unsuspecting person again over CW?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Don't look now, but this newsgroup is by, for, and about people who wish to discuss the code testing issue, among other amateur radio policy matters. The thing you object to, like most other no-coders, is the fact that I call attention to the fact that the no-coder's primary objection to "CW" is (or was) the necessity to learn and master a useful communications mode in order to gain higher operating privileges. It's all about the basic issue of laziness and the Welfare State mentality vs. those who saw the value of the Morse/CW mode and found that once they gave it a try, they actually liked it and were able to succeed at it. My postings, over a decade's worth both here and on Fidonet, have been a reaction to the abject hatred of the CW mode expressed by the lazy people who saw it primarily as a barrier to HF phone privileges.

You haven't been here nearly long enough to tell me what this newsgroup is about, so I suggest you don't presume to try.

73 de Larry, K3LT

63. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 04:20:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011101232047.12183.00000820@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 22910

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@QWEST.NET
>Date: 11/1/2001 1:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <#UZTizwYBHA.1232@cpimsnntpa03>

>If we are not prepared to wage total unconditional war in response to a
>direct attack on our homeland, then we invite continued attacks and a
>disaster on a scale that we can barely imagine. If 19 guys can turn
>4 commercial airlines into guided missiles, then 19 more guys, each
>with a suitcase nuke, can destroy America. It is no longer enough for
>America to"warn" of dire consequences --- we must search them out
>and make horrific examples of them.

Absolutely. Well said.

73

Steve, K4YZ

64. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 04:29:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111012029.6743e36@posting.google.com>
Source record: 22911

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20011101012155.22765.00001061@mb-fl.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 10/31/2001 11:04 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20011101000413.20853.00000141@nso-cc.aol.com>
>
> Hans' suggestions:
>
> >> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
> >> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
> >> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz
>
> Personally, I'd prefer option b. The broadcasters would be required
> (under one proposal I read) to move up, also. The get an "exclusive" and we
> would too.
>
Don't you mean they move up 100 and we move down 100? Seconded &
approved. Somebody call the ITU and let 'em know.
>
>
> >Yes. 200 kHz worldwide exclusive is more useful than 100 worldwide exclusive
> >and 200 shared with highpower SWBC stations. Split the 200 kHz right down the
> >middle - 100 phone and 100 digital/CW.
>
> I agree on the 200kHz being more useful as an exclusive than 300 shared,
> but not the CW/digital split.
>
How 'bout 300 with the lower 200 exclusive and the top 100 shared?
>
>
> I'd make it 80/120.
>
> >>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> >> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
> >
> >Nope. No way to enforce it, anyway.
>
> I disagree that they could not enforce it, Jim. Riley et al have been
> doing a pretty fair job of cleaning a lot of the mess up on the "regular"
> bands...I wouold think it a lot easier to "police" with only very specific
> modes and applications allowed.
>
> Besides, if we move the traffic nets, etc, off the other bands, I don't

> think the other ops would come to 60M anyway. Make 60M exclusive for Public
> Service/Traffic Handling/ARES-type operations, and the rest of the unwashed
> masses will stay away.
>
Nah, I agree with Jim, it's too much of a probable enforcement hassle.
There's no precedent for regulated qso content anywhere else in ham
radio, we'd wind up with scams galore and arguing abt interpreting the
reg, etc. The current philosophy of the FCC seems to be in the
direction of them setting the lower & upper band limits and telling us
to play nice and sort it out ourselves. I don't have any particular
problem with that.
>
>
> >>-- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
> >> transmissions on Amateur Radio.
> >
> >Only if they are done on a preannounced schedule.
>
w1aw has been a broadcasting station for how long?
>
>
>And only if done on 27.185mHz, where he belongs.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
w3rv

65. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 04:37:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111012037.7778b113@posting.google.com>
Source record: 22912

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<9rpvvg029u2@enews2.newsguy.com>...
> "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> news:#YfEFNlYBHA.1372@cpimsnntpa03...
> > OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy, but this _is_ rec.RADIO.AMATEUR.policy,
> > not rec.terrorists.are.ruining.my.life.policy.
>
>
> Agreed, but you have to admit that it's been a relief from the code/no code
> arguments that have been permeating the group for the past 23,497 eons.
>
>
Don't look now but this NG was created specifically to brawl abt the
code tests. And it ain't over by a long shot.
>
>
w3rv

66. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 06:14:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE239A0.574706D2@sccoast.net>
Source record: 22913

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> (snip) The thing you object to, like
> most other no-coders, is the fact that
> I call attention to the fact that the
> no-coder's primary objection to "CW"
> is (or was) the necessity to learn
> and master a useful communications
> mode in order to gain higher operating
> privileges. It's all about the basic
> issue of laziness and the Welfare
> State mentality vs. those who saw
> the value of the Morse/CW mode and
> found that once they gave it a try,
> they actually liked it and were able
> to succeed at it. My postings, over
> a decade's worth both here and on
> Fidonet, have been a reaction to the
> abject hatred of the CW mode expressed
> by the lazy people (snip)

Again, like so many of your previous postings, you misrepresent the position of those opposed to code TESTING, Larry. Yes, those opposed to code testing do feel it is absurd to continue the testing requirement to gain operating privileges - just like it would be absurd to require skill with a manual typewriter before one could use a computer in the home.

But that objection to code testing is saying nothing whatsoever about those who like code and want to use it - they will always be free to do so. And it also has nothing to do with a "hatred of the CW mode." It is a simple acknowledgment that radio has changed over the many years since code testing began and there is no longer a legitimate need today for that code testing requirement.

Your assertion that this attitude equates to laziness is also absurd. Things change with time, Larry. Is a person lazy because he uses a computer instead of that manual typewriter? I have no problem with a person using a manual typewriter, but not all should have to know how simply because he does. Is a person lazy because he uses an automobile today instead of walking? I enjoy a nice walk, but would think it very strange to be tested in that to get a drivers license. Why, then, would a person be "lazy" for choosing one of the more convenient operating modes, or for resisting continued testing for a mode that is no longer required to be a good radio operator today?

But, we do understand your feelings, Larry. You're an old fashioned guy that doesn't like many of the newfangled contraptions like SSB, microphones, push buttons, AC power, and so forth. But, at the same time, you also have to understand, and recognize, that the rest of us have moved into a new century looking towards the future, not living in the past. Why don't you come join us - you have nothing to fear but fear itself (as someone many years ago, which I'm sure you're familiar with, said)? :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

67. Re: W5NET: Changing to question "Why Train Is Illegal"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 06:44:33 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0111012244.6c80a9c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 22914
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Train" <likeicare@all.com> wrote in message
news:<gMiE7.2038$Ie.291444@news02.optonline.net>...
> The station I talked on as a child prior to ever owning my own radio
> equipment was W2EJT. This is a call that goes back MANY decades. SK..RPA
>
> Train

So at what point did you decide to become an unlicensed "radio outlaw"?

-Aaron-

68. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 11:29:54 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ru01k02mtr@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 22915

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011101230554.08355.00001058@nso-mq.aol.com...
> In article <9rrbke015rd@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:

> My "kvetching" about Kim's call sign was an entirely legitimate,
> appropriate, and necessary topic on this newsgroup. My reaction to
> it has been validated by no less than Riley Hollingsworth, who, when
> Kim attempted to trick him into endorsing her choice, pointed out that
> by exercising her freedom of choice in a callsign, she actually
> managed to take ham radio "...one step closer to extinction" by
> reinforcing a negative image of ham radio operators. So, if you don't
> mind my asking, "...but still..." -- what?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

By "but still..." meaning that you add to the chaos that you bemoan. If, as
you say, you want to make this newsgroup "more productive and less chaotic",
you should start with yourself.

69. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 11:55:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be28a32_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 22916

Ah, and here's yet another testimony of your caring about ham radio. Well, I am just tickled to death that you're caring again, Larry.

"Trick" Riley Hollingsworth, huh? You don't give that man much credit at all do you? Or, you're not as smart as you pretend to be--because if you think Riley Hollingsworth could be "tricked" into endorsing a callsign, you have underestimated Riley.

I don't care what Riley Hollingsworth thinks of my callsign, nor anyone else. That should be quite apparent to you by now. You know damned well that the point I made with you (and to the idiot up in the NW) by writing to Riley was that the callsign was legal, valid, and could not/would not be revoked. You also know that I did that after *months* of your stomping around making innuendoes that you were going to write to the FCC and make sure that they took my callsign away, blah, blah, blah. I actually did something about it, while you just griped, complained, whined and snickered. Which, by the way, you continue to do.

Why in Hell's bells would I care about Riley's--or anyone else's--endorsement of my callsign?! I think everyone pretty much has the idea that I don't. And, that my callsign is detrimental to the amateur radio society is an opinion anyone is allowed to have. My opinion is that it is not.

Your attitudes expressed in here against people because of the simplistic argument you hold on CW is a whole other matter. If you spout off on the air to and about people as much as you do in here, Larry, you are far more trouble to the integrity of ham radio than anyone's callsign *ever* could be.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011101230554.08355.00001058@nso-mq.aol.com...
> In article <9rrbke015rd@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> In fact, why don't we all take a long, hard look at ourselves, and see if
> >> we can make better use of the time we spend on this newsgroup. I'm
> >> not saying stop spending that time here, just make it more productive
> >> and less chaotic.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >

> >Like you did when you spent several weeks kvetching about Kim's callsign?
> >Well, a callsign, at least, has *something* to do with the newsgroup, but
> >still...
>
> My "kvetching" about Kim's call sign was an entirely legitimate,
> appropriate, and necessary topic on this newsgroup. My reaction to
> it has been validated by no less than Riley Hollingsworth, who, when
> Kim attempted to trick him into endorsing her choice, pointed out that
> by exercising her freedom of choice in a callsign, she actually
> managed to take ham radio "...one step closer to extinction" by
> reinforcing a negative image of ham radio operators. So, if you don't
> mind my asking, "...but still..." -- what?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

70. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 11:59:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be28b21_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 22917

Larry, you're never going to learn are you? I don't *PRESUME* to try anything. I did it. Period. Except, you think that I am trying to tell you what you can and cannot discuss--which is your own twisted, evil little way of trying to thump the chest you think you have.

I always forget that I need crayons with you: I am suggesting that the next time you get onto someone for beating a dead horse topic; that you stop and think about your own beating of dead horses. But, if you want to continue to play the hypocrite--everyone else will be watching and laughing their asses off. OK, giggling...your antics aren't worth much more than that.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011101230555.08355.00001059@nso-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3be13a3e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >> Memo to Steve:
> >>
> >> You don't like Lennie. Lennie doesn't like you...although I can't
> >> imagine why! We got it, already.
> >>
> >
> >Oh, yeah, that was it. "We got it, already." Could you make an attempt to
> >remember that, Larry, when you want to start some full-circle mud slinging
> >contest with some unsuspecting person again over CW?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Don't look now, but this newsgroup is by, for, and about people who
> wish to discuss the code testing issue, among other amateur radio
> policy matters. The thing you object to, like most other no-coders,
> is the fact that I call attention to the fact that the no-coder's primary
> objection to "CW" is (or was) the necessity to learn and master a useful
> communications mode in order to gain higher operating privileges.
> It's all about the basic issue of laziness and the Welfare State
> mentality vs. those who saw the value of the Morse/CW mode and
> found that once they gave it a try, they actually liked it and were
> able to succeed at it. My postings, over a decade's worth both here
> and on Fidonet, have been a reaction to the abject hatred of the CW

> mode expressed by the lazy people who saw it primarily as a
> barrier to HF phone privileges.
>
> You haven't been here nearly long enough to tell me what this
> newsgroup is about, so I suggest you don't presume to try.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

71. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 12:08:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be28d1c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 22921

OHMYGAWD...

Brian: you are smarter than that, aren't you? What, exactly, do you hope to accomplish with a continuing debate, from anyone you can possibly engage, on the CW issue? CW and all its politics, etc., are one of those things that peoples' minds don't really change on...haven't you ever figured that out?

It's kind of like Coke and Pepsi. Why the hell do those companies advertise--at least to the extent that they do? Coke and Pepsi are mainstays in American life; and preferences are developed by family and friends--not their advertising.

CW and the politics that are generated because of it (for what reason people get so excited about I'll never understand and don't care to), are just that: nothing but politics. You're not going to change anyone's mind about CW, I'm not going to change anyone's mind about CW; you're not going to convince me any more than I've ever been convinced about anything to do with CW; and I'm not going to convince you any more than you're convinced on the different issues surrounding CW. It's a dead damned horse, through and through, and the meat's even begun to grow mold now.

Maybe it means something to the FCC and other governments in terms of policy in ham radio, but change is evident because of the times, Brian.

Kim W5TIT

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0111012037.7778b113@posting.google.com...
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<9rpvvg029u2@enews2.newsguy.com>...
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> > news:#YfEFNlYBHA.1372@cpimsnntpa03...
> > > OK, I'm as guilty as the next guy, but this _is_
rec.RADIO.AMATEUR.policy,
> > > not rec.terrorists.are.ruining.my.life.policy.
> >
> >
> > Agreed, but you have to admit that it's been a relief from the code/no
code
> > arguments that have been permeating the group for the past 23,497 eons.
> >
> >
> Don't look now but this NG was created specifically to brawl abt the
> code tests. And it ain't over by a long shot.
> >
> >

> w3rv

72. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 12:09:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102070921.29609.00000277@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 22919

In article <3bdf5bf4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>Indeed, it would be wonderful (though a pipedream) that we'd be the nation
>to look to for agreement and resolution.
>
Yep. But most Americans, (including you, Kim) are probably not yet willing to
make the kind of changes needed to make that happen.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 12:09:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102070922.29609.00000278@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 22918

In article <3BE19E27.AF31B050@mailcity.net>, JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
writes:

>The first step should have been to wipe Saddam Hussen off the map.

We had the chance a decade ago, but Papa Bush ordered Stormin' Norman to stop
short. Think about why that was done.

73 de Jim, N2EY

74. Re: W5NET: Changing to a "policy question"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 12:09:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102070923.29609.00000279@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 22920

In article <77f1797e.0111011245.39da9e7f@posting.google.com>, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) writes:

>Do you happen to know where one might find a history of US amateur
>call sign protocol?

You might try searching deja.com for "The Past 50 Years of Amateur Radio Licensing", which has some info on this.

Briefly, it went like this:

After 1912, when licenisng of amateur stations became mandatory, callsigns consisted of a numeral (1 through 9) and two or three letters. A typical call might be 1AW or 3ZS. The numeral was determined by the location of the station, and if it moved to a different call area, the callsign had to change.

Other countries adopted similar schemes, which led to confusion as the range of amateur stations increased. About 1927 prefix letters were added. US ham calls in the 48 states all began with W (W6AM, W9AZS) and those in the territories and possessions with K and a specific number (K7ABC). Some possessions had two-letter prefixes (KG6GJX).

In addition to all this, when the licensing of mobile and portable ham stations first began, (early 1930s) special calls with four suffix letters were issued for portable and mobile use. W6AM was W6ZZAM when mobile under those short-lived rules.

Note that 0 was not used in US ham calls before WW2.

After WW2, the whole system was revised. The boundaries of the call areas were changed to avoid splitting states, and 0 was added. All of the territories and possessions got specific two-letter-and-a-number prefixes, and all of those prefixes began with K.

When the Novice class was created in 1951, special calls were used. In the 48 states, N or V was added before the number to indicate "Novice", and was dropped when the licensee upgraded. In the possessions, the initial K was changed to W to indicate Novice status.

When the W calls were all issued in some districts, the FCC went to K calls, then WA, calls, etc.

In the mid 1970s the FCC began issuing calls beginning with N and A, and calls with single-letter suffixes. The purpose of this was to increase the number of short calls available. Because the USA does not "own" the entire A prefix, all A calls begin with two letters. In addition, the requirement to change callsigns when moving to a new call area was dropped.

>Some of my thoughts and questions ...
>
>I know, for example, that at one time a Novice was issued a WN, KN
>call which became a W, K, WA, KA, call when upgraded. That stopped
>when?

Mid 1970s, when the Novice became renewable.
>
>What is the protocol for the N calls? I know that the A's are now
>issued to Extra class. Was N ever class-reserved?

The reservation is by call format. 1x2 and 2X1 calls of all types are only
issued to Extras. 1x3 calls are issued to all classes of license except Novice.
Calls beginning with A are only issued to Extras, even if they are 2X2.
>
>I always assumed that the 1x1, 1x2, 1x3 calls were just sequential
>progressions, but I have been told that they are class-reserved.

1x1 are special-event stations. 1x2 and 2x1 are Extra-only. 1x3 are available
to any class except Novice.

> Has
>it always been that way?

No.

>Is there any significance other than sequence
>for the 2x1 and 2x2's?

All 2x1s are Extras, All 2x2s beginning with A are Extras. I'm not sure about
other 2x2s, but I know that 2x2s are not issued to Novices or Techs.
>
>Not necessarily looking for the answers, just a resource or two.
>
I don't know of any single source, other than a big pile of QSTs or the CD-ROMs
of same.

73 de Jim, N2EY, ex WA3IYC, WN3IYC (all issued sequentially, 1977, 1968, 1967,
respectively)

75. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 12:17:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be28f23_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 22922

Dwight, you have to think of the mentality you are trying to reason with. These guys live on sinking ships and they're going down with the ship and enjoying the ride.

Just like any expression people have that is different from theirs, from the CW issues, to Osama bin Laden, they use their "love of CW and God and Country" as some sort of weapon to be wielded against others for thinking any differently than they.

You're going to try and try and try to make them understand that you are not attacking their love of CW; that you are attacking their distaste for others who don't. They are never, ever going to see that.

Now, I am out of the CW discussion 1) because I truly don't give a hoot's ass about it; 2) because it's about the same as trying to make any sense and reasonability about the discussion we've been having on terrorism: the folks with whom we try to debate and reason with are beyond the ability to debate and reason. They enjoy more being armchair generals because that's all they got.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BE239A0.574706D2@sccoast.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > (snip) The thing you object to, like
> > most other no-coders, is the fact that
> > I call attention to the fact that the
> > no-coder's primary objection to "CW"
> > is (or was) the necessity to learn
> > and master a useful communications
> > mode in order to gain higher operating
> > privileges. It's all about the basic
> > issue of laziness and the Welfare
> > State mentality vs. those who saw
> > the value of the Morse/CW mode and
> > found that once they gave it a try,
> > they actually liked it and were able
> > to succeed at it. My postings, over
> > a decade's worth both here and on
> > Fidonet, have been a reaction to the
> > abject hatred of the CW mode expressed
> > by the lazy people (snip)
>
>

> Again, like so many of your previous postings, you misrepresent the
> position of those opposed to code TESTING, Larry. Yes, those opposed
> to code testing do feel it is absurd to continue the testing
> requirement to gain operating privileges - just like it would be
> absurd to require skill with a manual typewriter before one could use
> a computer in the home.
>
> But that objection to code testing is saying nothing whatsoever
> about those who like code and want to use it - they will always be
> free to do so. And it also has nothing to do with a "hatred of the CW
> mode." It is a simple acknowledgment that radio has changed over the
> many years since code testing began and there is no longer a
> legitimate need today for that code testing requirement.
>
> Your assertion that this attitude equates to laziness is also
> absurd. Things change with time, Larry. Is a person lazy because he
> uses a computer instead of that manual typewriter? I have no problem
> with a person using a manual typewriter, but not all should have to
> know how simply because he does. Is a person lazy because he uses an
> automobile today instead of walking? I enjoy a nice walk, but would
> think it very strange to be tested in that to get a drivers license.
> Why, then, would a person be "lazy" for choosing one of the more
> convenient operating modes, or for resisting continued testing for a
> mode that is no longer required to be a good radio operator today?
>
> But, we do understand your feelings, Larry. You're an old fashioned
> guy that doesn't like many of the newfangled contraptions like SSB,
> microphones, push buttons, AC power, and so forth. But, at the same
> time, you also have to understand, and recognize, that the rest of us
> have moved into a new century looking towards the future, not living
> in the past. Why don't you come join us - you have nothing to fear but
> fear itself (as someone many years ago, which I'm sure you're familiar
> with, said)? :-)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

76. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 12:39:35 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be2946c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 22923

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011102070921.29609.00000277@nso-fm.aol.com...
> In article <3bdf5bf4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >Indeed, it would be wonderful (though a pipedream) that we'd be the
nation
> >to look to for agreement and resolution.
> >
> Yep. But most Americans, (including you, Kim) are probably not yet willing
to
> make the kind of changes needed to make that happen.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I don't think it will take only "most Americans" and I hope I am not stepping out on a limb here by *thinking* that you will understand the next fairly philosophical statements:

Like I said, I used to be a peacenik, trying to make a difference in the world. Then, I moved away from the peaceful seclusion of the Adirondack Mtns., and found out just how huge a task it would be to realize, by walking straight into the grips of huge city life down here in the south.

Nope, I am no longer willing to feel like I am in an extremely small minority of people who would like to see a different world and actually think I could do something about it. I have property; yearn for a bigger, better yard; ignore government (and the rest of the world) for the most part; don't think twice about paying taxes--just tell me how much I owe; just bought a foreign vehicle--ask me if I care; and truly don't care about people as much as I used to--because I got tired (once again) of pretty much being in such a small minority. I often review my emotions and check for bitterness--but I really don't think I am bitter at all, that would be pretty silly. I am just 'resigned'.

Well, let's word that differently: I still care a great deal about people in terms of a collective "we"; but on an individual basis it's a whole lot more effort to deal with than I am willing to. I have *maybe* 10 friends (not counting family) and I actually choose it to be that way. I have no "true" friends other than my husband and my parents. I am just not willing to be the person I used to be with people. As an example: why would I put myself through constantly listening to people gripe (and so, so many do) about their marriages/jobs/kids/financial situations while they choose not to do a damned thing about it? After a while, the stories and the attitude get old

(goodness, just look at this newsgroup). I am a "talk to the hand" person real quick. Peoples' tendencies are to gripe, not to change. And, I still dearly love Mother Earth--though I am far less proactive even on that any more.

I got a little confused a long time back--I had a rooted belief in the basic principles of Christianity and started exploring the beliefs of the Eastern philosophy--which I find absolutely fascinating. The Eastern Philosophies made me yearn for a deeper commitment to my basic principles; however all this began happening at the same time I needed to make a choice as to live like a poor person (stay up north in the country and try to do with what I could through the oil crisis of the 70s) or "make something of myself" for my kids and family and move down here to the south. I chose the larger distraction and now use it as an excuse for being a realist. :)

My ultimate belief is that God will straighten it all out by starting over again. My Karma is bad, bad, bad, but hopefully some kind of credit will be realized for deep-seated passion and desire.

Willing? Not by myself--not as a tiny, tiny majority. Count me out--as disgusting as that is for me to even think about, I made my peace with it years ago.

Kim W5TIT

77. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 13:32:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111020532.647c8e12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 22924

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message news:<enFAEE1YBHA.1992@cpimsnntpa03>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> > I got it - make it like 30 meters: all digital/CW, no phone.
>
> I think the current proposal is not to segment the band by mode,
> but rather let "market forces" decide, ala the top-band model.

There is a movement to divide 160 into mode subbands, like the rest of HF. FCC recently went after some SSB users for deliberate and malicious interference to CW folks on 160. See the FCC enforcement letters on the ARRL website.

The lack of mode subbands on 160 is an artifact of the days when the band was shared with LORAN and was allocated in little 25 kHz slices to various regions, with day and night power limits and all sorts of gunk. That's a thing of the past, now.

> Serious question, however -- why "no phone"?

Somebody made a comment about the 3850 bunch, lumbago nets and other stuff they didn't want to see moving to 60 meters. Since all that stuff is pretty much confined to 'phone, the answer seems clear.

Plus 30 meters has no 'phone, either.

One question is how wide such an allocation would be.

73 de Jim, N2EY

78. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 13:56:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE2A62B.BBD0B124@IEEE.org>
Source record: 22925

N2EY wrote:
> We had the chance a decade ago, but Papa Bush ordered Stormin' Norman to stop
> short. Think about why that was done.

Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

79. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 16:19:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011102111904.10701.00001057@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 22926

In article <3BE239A0.574706D2@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> Again, like so many of your previous postings, you misrepresent the
>position of those opposed to code TESTING, Larry.

Dwight:

My comments have always been specifically directed toward code
testing, Dwight. If you say they were not and are not, then it is
incumbent upon you to prove it. Proceed, if you can. If you can't,
then you will have, by default, admitted that you were wrong.

SNIP

> But, we do understand your feelings, Larry. You're an old fashioned
>guy that doesn't like many of the newfangled contraptions like SSB,
>microphones, push buttons, AC power, and so forth. But, at the same
>time, you also have to understand, and recognize, that the rest of us
>have moved into a new century looking towards the future, not living
>in the past. Why don't you come join us - you have nothing to fear but
>fear itself (as someone many years ago, which I'm sure you're familiar
>with, said)? :-)

This is simply absurd, Dwight. My very presence on this newsgroup
proves you wrong, unless you believe I employ a private secretary to
take my hand-chisled notes on stone tablets and transcribe them on
a computer to be posted on this newsgroup.

73 de Larry, K3LT

80. "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 16:19:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011102111905.10701.00001058@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 22927

In article <3be28a32_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>I don't care what Riley Hollingsworth thinks of my callsign,

Kim:

There's no need to belabor the obvious; you have very clearly expressed
your contempt for what Riley thinks of your callsign by *not* changing it!

nor anyone
>else. That should be quite apparent to you by now. You know damned well
>that the point I made with you (and to the idiot up in the NW) by writing to
>Riley was that the callsign was legal, valid, and could not/would not be
>revoked.

When was *that* ever an issue? Of course your callsign is legal, valid,
and will not be revoked by the FCC. Nobody, least not I, ever expressed
such a desire. If your callsign were not legal, it would not have been
issued -- that should be obvious even to a person of limited cognitive
ability, such as yourself.

>You also know that I did that after *months* of your stomping
>around making innuendoes that you were going to write to the FCC and make
>sure that they took my callsign away, blah, blah, blah.

You really are much more delusional than usual today, Kim. When did
I ever state that I was going to ask the FCC to revoke your callsign?
Please provide fully attributed quotes, or admit that you are a liar.

>I actually did
>something about it, while you just griped, complained, whined and snickered.
>Which, by the way, you continue to do.

Yes, what you did was to write to Riley and attempt to trick him into
endorsing your choice of callsign based on your "right" to do so. And,
like I have before, he admitted that you do have a clear right to select such
a call sign, in spite of it's unsuitability in a family-oriented radio service.
Which is why he said, that when someone with young children encounters
you and your callsign on-the-air, and decides to choose another activity
other than ham radio, you have taken our hobby/service "...one step closer
to extinction."

>Why in Hell's bells would I care about Riley's--or anyone
>else's--endorsement of my callsign?!

Well, you obviously did at one time, so much so that you attempted to
trick him into giving it, on the basis of your "right" to "freedom of

expression." You were grasping at any straw you could possibly reach, in order to justify your callsign, which is demeaning to yourself, the ARS, and women in general, in the hope of denying it's corrosive effect on all concerned.

>I think everyone pretty much has the
>idea that I don't. And, that my callsign is detrimental to the amateur
>radio society is an opinion anyone is allowed to have. My opinion is that
>it is not.

Of course you think that way. That's the same muddy thinking that caused to select your callsign in the first place. We understand perfectly; no need to belabor the obvious.

>Your attitudes expressed in here against people because of the simplistic
>argument you hold on CW is a whole other matter.

My "argument" on "CW" is, and always has been, that it is a valuable mode to the ARS, and that the testing requirement is the vehicle which brought it into widespread use among hams. My more contentious postings have been directed at those who object to the testing requirement on the basis of their unadmitted laziness.

>If you spout off on the
>air to and about people as much as you do in here, Larry, you are far more
>trouble to the integrity of ham radio than anyone's callsign *ever* could
>be.

All I'm doing is expressing an opinion in which I truly believe. You, of all people, should understand this, were it not for the fact that you possess a child-like need to be right in spite of the self-serving nature of your opinion. My opinions are based on what's best for the ARS; your opinion is based on what's best for YOU. There's a big difference here, one which you, apparently, do not possess the emotional intelligence to understand.

73 de Larry, K3LT

81. ARNewsline 1264 - Nov 2 2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 17:07:35 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102120735.29980.00000704@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 22928

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1264 – NOV. 2, 2001

==========

A NOTE TO THOSE WHO ONLY “READ” AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm)

For those of you who only know of the Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) as a text newsletter we would like to invite you to listen to the audio version. This Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) script is actually written for the “spoken word.” It is recorded each by professional broadcasters and is available for private listening or rebroadcast over your repeater. Three methods of delivery are available: Streaming audio using RealAudio, FTP RealAudio or dial-in telephone. Please visit our website at http://www.arnewsline.org for a list of telephone numbers (you have to pay your own long distance charges) and links to audio servers providing our voice newscast (for free). We think you will find the time you spend listening to be a rewarding experience.

de
The Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Production Team

==========

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1264 with a release date of Friday, November 2nd, 2001 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Hand held radios to Antarctica, Georgia to host the 2002 United States Amateur Radio Direction Finding championship games and the F-C-C takes action on illegal C-B radios. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1264 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO TECHNOLOGY: IRLP REACHES ANTARCTICA

Imagine picking up your H-T, calling your friend and asking him how the weather is. He responds with a crisp clear signal and tells you that its 70 below Zero and snowing. Outside your window the thermometer says its 80 and you plan a day at the beach. Welcome to the world of Internet Repeater Linking as the system expands its global coverage to Antarctica. Nate Dueher, WYZ0X, has more from Denver Colorado:

--

The Internet Radio Linking Project has come to Antartica. On October 23rd, Chuck N0NHJ, set up the first Internet radio link on the continent. A few days

later we caught Chuck and a few other hams on the air to ask him a few questions. Let's listen in...

Terry, N0PQV in Denver, Colorado was the first to say hello:

--

[recording]

--

I got a chance to ask a question of Chuck that I wanted to know. Chuck, how many hams are on the station and how many are active on
IRLP?

--
[recording]
--

And yet another question from Ian, M0CJY in Rottherham, Yorkshire, England...

--
[recording]
--

One of the other questions we had was Justin KC0LBH who wanted to know all about that famous Anartic daylight:

--
[recording]
--

That's all we have time for today. If you'd like more information on the IRLP project on the World Wide Web, go to www.irlp.net. This is Nate Duehr, WY0X reporting.

--

Once again, if you are interested in tying your repeater to the Internet Repeater Linking Project go to www.irlp.net on the world wide web. (NY0X, ARNewsline(tm)) {This complete very ecxciting QSO is available in RealAudio at www.arnewsline.org on the FTP transfer page}

**

RADIOSPORTS: ATLANTA TO HOST NEXT US ARDF CHAMPIONSHIP GAMES

The South-East will host the next United States 2002 Amateur Radio Direction Finding competition. Newsline's Joe Moell, K0OV, tells us where and when the event will be held.

--

The Georgia Orienteering Club has been selected to host the second USA Radio-Orienteering Championships, to take place April 19-21, 2002. The competition will get under way near Atlanta on Friday afternoon with a practice

event, followed on Saturday by the main two-meter hunt and on Sunday by the 80-meter hunt.

In addition to the hunts, there will be a cookout on Friday evening, a dinner on Saturday night, and an award ceremony following the 80 meter hunt, all included in the registration fee. Lodging options include cabins in the park and campgrounds with RV hookups. There are also many local motels and bed-and-breakfast inns.

Standard international rules will be used for these foxhunts, which are all on foot in beautiful woods near Callaway Gardens. The Championships are open to anyone, beginner or expert.

Slovakia will host the next World Championships of foxhunting in fall 2002. Positions on USA's team that will travel to these championships will be determined by individual performances in the Atlanta event, as well as in last summer's USA Championships in Albuquerque.

It's not too early to start making plans to attend the second Radio-Orienteering Championships near Atlanta. For more details and registration information, see the official Championships Web site. The exact URL is rather long, but you can get there in just a couple of clicks by going to my foxhunting Web site: www.homingin.com. That's "homingin" -- as one word -- homingin.com. Or you can write to me at my callbook address.

From sunny southern California, where foxhunters are already practicing for the championships, this is Joe Moell K0OV, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Again, the web address for more information is www.homingin.com. (ARNewsline(tm), K0OV)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC VS ILLEGAL CB SETS

The FCC has gone after some illegal gear seemingly designed for operation on the Class D 11 meter Citizens Band. This, as it issues a citation to an alleged supplier of the equipment in Oregon. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Norm Steely, KI7UP has the details.

--

In its September 17th letter to Truck-n-Travel and copied to its owner, Eugene Trucking Haven, FCC Portland Oregon Resident Agent Ben Nugen leaves no doubt as to what is going to happen. Either stop selling non-FCC Certified radio gear or the consequences.

His letter states that last July 23 that agents from the FCC observed uncertified Citizens Band radios displayed and offered for sale inside the Truck-n-Travel located on East Pearl Street in the city of Coberg. The FCC says the radios included four models from Galaxy and one from a company called Delta Force. The Commission says its records show that one of these CB sets

have been granted an FCC equipment authorization. It warns Truck-n-Travel that the marketing of these CB radios, or even just advertising them is a violation of Sections 2.803 and 15.101 of the Commission’s rules. It tells Truck-n-Travel that it can fine them up to $10,000 per violation per day and that can go on to a maximum of $82,500.

The letter then gives Truck-n-Travel the same warning that numerous ham radio violators have received over the past several years. It tells the company that, in accordance with Section 503(b)(5) of the Communications Act, it has 14 days from the date it received the citation to submit any statement it has to make concerning the alleged violation. And the FCC adds that the Commission staff will use all relevant material information it has -- including information disclosed in the Truck-n-Travel reply to determine what, if any, enforcement action is required to assure current and future rules compliance.

--

More on this case as information is made available. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NY REPEATER UNDER SCRUTINY

The FCC has told a repeater owner to explain the operation of his machine. A repeater that FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth says is on the air all by itself:

--

Hollingsworth: “We opened an audit of a repeater opewrating in Elmhurst New York, KB2PRV, after our evidence showed no identification, no appart control operator, and no apparent coordination.”
--

Hollingsworth says that the letter of inquiry went to Ramon D. Florimon who holds the KB2PRV callsign. He was given 30 days from reciept of the October 2nd letter to respond to the FCC. (FCC)

**

BREAK 1

This is ham radio news coming to you from the United States of America. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world, including the Southern California Amateur Teleprinter Society net serving West Covina California.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO REGULATIONS: FCC CLARIFIES FUTURE OF CORES

The FCC's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau has clarified several issues regarding Amateur Service implementation of the Commission Registration

System--or CORES. The ARRL Letter says that starting December 3, everyone doing business with the FCC--including amateur licensees--must obtain and use a 10-digit FCC Registration Number when filing.

Amateur licensees now registered in the Universal Licensing System or U-L-S already have been cross-registered in CORES and issued a FCC Registration Number by mail. The FCC said it planned another cross-registration by November 28th. Amateurs can check to see if they have an FCC Registration Number via a U-L-S license search. Many Internet call sign servers, including ARRL's, also can provide this information. (ARRL)

**

RESCUE RADIO: JUNGLE RESCUE ASSIST

Ham radio played a role in reuniting with his family a man who had been hiding in the jungles of Guatemala for over three decades. The C-Q Magazine website reports that 72-year-old Salomon Vides of El Salvador emerged from the Guatemalan jungle recently after hiding there for 32 years from a war that lasted about 100 hours.

In 1969, El Salvador invaded Honduras and Vides, a migrant worker, ran into the jungle to escape retaliatory raids. The Organization of American States quickly brought the war to an end, but Vides says he never got the word. He was discovered in August by Rene Sonabo, a taxi driver and Guatemalan ham radio operator, and Sonabo’s son. After persuading Vides that no one was trying to kill him, Sonabo used his amateur station to relay the news to Vides’s stunned family in El Salvador. He has since been reunited with his brother, but the family had not been able to locate his wife and three children. (CQ)

**

THE LAW: THE COST OF ATTACHING TO POLES

The United States Supreme Court is examining a complex Internet case that could eventually affect the availability of online services and what most people pay for them. The court is expected to rule by next summer on a fight over the cost of establishing and maintaining some Internet and wireless networks.

Specifically, the fight concerns the rent that cable television companies must pay utilities to attach wires for high-speed Internet service to the utilities' poles, and whether the Federal Communications Commission can control the rate. The justices also will consider whether cellular telephone companies are entitled to pay government-limited rates for attaching their equipment to utility poles.

A federal appeals panel ruled last year that the FCC does not have the authority to regulate pole rental rates for Internet service. The FCC claims Congress intended it to have that power. The Supreme Court will decide. (Published News Reports)

**

REPEATER OWNERS ATTENTION: RADIO TOWERS FOR SALE

Are you a repeater owner or a club that operates a repeater? Have you ever dreamed of owning your own mountain-top or high rise repeater site? Well if you have, listen up.

In an e-mail to Amateur Radio Newsline, Tom Swierczewski, the Zoning Representative for American Tower Corporation says that the company has several hundred communications towers for sale throughout the United States. According to Swierczewski, sites vary in height from 100 to 400 feet tall and many include large buildings.

If you or anyone you know is interested in this or if you want to receive additional information on specific tower sites, please contact Swierczewski at American Tower Corporation. The information you need to do this is in the printed edition of this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report. More information is in cyberspace at www.americantower.com.

(Contact information: 1101 Perimeter Drive, Suite 225, Schaumburg, Illinois 60173. His phone number is 847-240-1508 X 663 - Central US time. E-mail is thomas.swierczewski@americantower.com.) (Tom Swierczewski)

**

HAM RADIO BUSINESS: VK MAGAZINE BITES THE DUST

Another failure in the international ham radio marketplace. This, with the announcement that Australia's longest-running electronics magazine has ceased publication.

Victoria’s A-P-C News reports the current issue of Electronics Australia Today will be the last and it’s a decision saddens many V-K amateurs. This is because many generations grew up building equipment from circuits published in the magazine.

Electronics Australia Today traces its history back to Wireless Weekly, which started in 1922. Radio and Hobbies was formed out of Wireless Weekly in 1939. This was renamed Radio Television and Hobbies in the 1950s and Electronics Australia in 1965. (APC News)

**

HAMVENTION 2002 UPDATE: HAMVENTION TO HONOR THOSE WHO PERISHED ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The Dayton Amateur Radio Association will honor the memory of those killed in the September 11th terrorist attacks and the hams who then volunteered their services to the nation by dedicating the 2002 Hamvention to the theme of Emergency Preparedness. In a letter to potential vendors, the Hamvention Planning Committee said that it was very concerned over the terror attacks and believes that emphasizing the emergency communications aspect of ham radio was a very apropos way to honor those lost in the tragedy.

The letter also contained another rather surprising announcement. The Hamvention planners say that they will limit the number of non-ham radio booths normally purchased by those in the computer industry. In fact, the letter makes it clear that the only computer related vendors permitted to the inside

display area will be those whose products directly relate to Amateur Radio.

This will be the 51st annual Hamvention. The venue remains the HARA Arena just North-West of downtown Dayton. The dates are May 17th, 18th and 19th, 2002. More information is on the web at www.hamvention.org (DARA)

**

RADIO MILESTONE: NRCDXAS AT #200

The National Radio Club's D-X Audio Service will have its 200th issue available this month. Founder and producer Fred Vobbe, W8HDU says he does not think that is a bad record for what he describes as a little audio based magazine talking about broadcast radio that was started in April 1985. We say, congratulations to Fred and to the National Radio Club's D-X Audio Service on this milestone. (W8HDU)

**

BREAK 2

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website - www.arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**

OUR HERITAGE: HELP RESTORE THE LST-325 RADIO ROOM

Bob Wilder, AF2HD, is part of the team that's restoring the LST-325 Radio Room and he needs your help. Bob says that most of the radio equipment needed for the restoration of the radio room has been found. Also, they have received a donation from a trucking company in the east who is going to pack and ship the stuff on that side of the country and transport it to Mobile Alabama where the work is taking place.

Unfortunately, some of the gear is on the West Coast. It took $190,000 to perform all the work needed to repair the ships hull, front door and ramp, as well as to sandblast and paint the ship. As a result, cash is short.

Bob says that what's needed now is to receive a donation by some west coast trucker or person who can help getting the equipment out there packed and shipped eastward. At least as far as Dallas where the East coasts trucker can move it to Mobile.

Wilder says that Fred Chapman, W4CHT is coordinating the move. If you can help -- or at least direct the group to a trucking company willing to make such a donation, please contact W4CHT by e-mail to nnn0ppe@infi.net . Bob Wilder can be e-mailed at bwild@earthlink.net (AF2HD)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: HAM RADIO BALLOON LAUNCH DECEMBER 1ST

Arizona Near Space Research says that it will launch a ham radio carrying balloon on December 1st, weather permitting. The group had hoped to launch from a local hamfest but the urban location of the event is in enhanced Class B airspace which is currently off limits. Instead, a monitoring station will be at the hamfest event. Full information on the flight can be found on the Superstition Amateur Radio Club website. It's in cyberspace at www.qsl.net/wb7tjd. (Superstition Amateur Radio Club)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: LOTS OF HAMS TALKING TO THE ISS

And while on the subject of Amateur Radio in space, hams world-wide are excited about being able to talk to the International Space Station fairly often these days. This is because Commander Frank Culbertson tries to get on the air for general Q-S-O's whenever he can. And he recently had one with Berto Willems, ON1CAU, who had his tape recorder rolling. Take a listen.

--
Audio Only - No Text Available (Download Newscast Real Audio File at www.arnewsline.org)

--

ON1CAU says that contact took place at about 15:25 UTC during the recent Scouts Jamboree on the Air. And obviously signals were 5 9 full quieting – both ways. (ON1CAU, AMSAT BBS)

**

SPACE EXPLORATION: 2001 A MARS ODYSSEY - A SUCCESS

NASA's 2001 Mars Odyssey spacecraft was safely inserted into orbit around the red planet on October 25 th. This, slighly over two years after the space agency suffered back-to-back failures by Mars missions.

Odyssey arrived nearly directly on its target - 480 miles above Mars' surface. No orbital insertion or areobraking problems were reported by ground controllers. 2001 - A Mars Odyssey is the space probe that hams had been invited to track when it was launched earlier this year. (NASA)

**

INTERNATIONAL: NZART STRAIGHT KEY NIGHT

The first ever Straight Key Night in Kiwi-Land is slated to be held on the evening of Sunday November 4th. Operation will be limited to 80 Meters from 8pm until 11pm local New Zealand time.

The event is sponsored by the New Zealand's Amateur Radio Transmitters which says to lubricate that old Morse key and enjoy an evening of old time radio fun. NZART it will be an activity night in which everyone can be a winner with a certificate to prove it. For more information visit www.nzart.org.nz on the world wide web. (NZART)

**

DX

In D-X, Gary Halstead, K8KFJ in West Virginia reports a top notch trans-Atlantic QSO on 6 meters. On October 23rd at about 13:50 U-T-C Gary contacted CN8LI in gridsquare IM64. The Q-S-O took place on 50.130 MHz with K8KFJ running 100 watts to a M2 loop at only 20 feet. Gary lives in grid EM98 in the Charleston West Va. area. (VHF Reflector)

Also, Reid Hill, KC5YKX of Corpus Christi Texas says by way of the VHF Reflector that he will be doing VHF - UHF Century Club QSL card checking at the South Texas Amateur Radio Club annual Hamfest on November 10th. Reid also says that Mark Mireles, AD5CA will be doing the Worked All States checking at the same event. The Hamfest will be held at Swanter Park in Corpus Christi. Festivities start at 8:00 AM and go to at least after lunch. Contact Reid by e-mail to kc5ykx@swbell.ne if you need card checking but can not attend this event. (VHF Reflector)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: NEW LOOK TO THE G4NJH PAGES

And finally, a regular voice heard here on the Amateur Radio Newsline is that of Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, in Nottingham England. And over the past several years Jeramy has become known the world over as the Internet voice of the Radio Society of Great Britain’s’ weekly GB2RS newscast. But you may not know that Jeramy is also a webmaster in his own right. In fact he hosts a very popular U-K cyberspace address. We invited him to tell you a bit about its past and where it is today:

--
Audio Only - No Text Available (Download Newscast Real Audio File at www.arnewsline.org)
--

Obviously the next question is where to find the G4NJH web pages. They are actually located at www.innotts.co.uk/~asperges. But don’t worry if you did not have the time to copy it. Just go to the links page at www.arnewsline.org and click on G4NJH. (G4NJH)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address
is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that Amateur Radio Newsline scripts are now available weekly on a self maintained list at Yahoogroups. To have a free text edition of this newscast delivered each week by e-mail go to www.yahoogroups.com, follow the

directions and sign up for the ARNewsline list.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm _____ saying God Bless America, 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2001. All rights reserved.

**

Terminal ID Break

(5 Sec)

**

RAIN PROMO - NOAA WEATHER MONTH

I’m Blair Alper, KA9SEQ. Whether you are a member of your local EMA, ARES, RACES, SKYWARN -- or simply weather afficianado, you no doubt have at least one weather radio handy.

RAIN kicks off its month long series of programs anout NOAA Weather Radio Services this week. Take your web browsert over to http://www.rainreport.com. You will need either a RealAudio or Windows Media player. Otherwise, pick up your telephone and call 847-827-7246.

82. Free Thinkers Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 17:12:43 UTC
From: ac5ez@webtv.net
Message-ID: <18282-3BE2D40B-184@storefull-112.iap.bryant.webtv.net>
Source record: 22929

Would anyone happen to know if there is a free thinkers net on the Hf bands ? There was one on the bands some years back but I lost the info.
Thanks

K1zw
Larry
Qcwa

83. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 18:31:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE2E692.4BA4D975@IEEE.org>
Source record: 22930

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> My opinions are based on what's best for the ARS;

Nope, your opinions are based upon *your opinion* of what's
best for the ARS, not upon what is best for the ARS in
objective reality. That's a big difference. You could be
completely wrong and IMO getting your wishes would lead
to the slow death of the ARS through attrition.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

84. Re: W5NET: Changing to a "policy question"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 18:55:49 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0111021055.27298d60@posting.google.com>
Source record: 22931

Thank you for the time and effort put into this answer.
Really appreciated. Just one of those nagging. "How did we get here?" thoughts.
73
Carl KB9RVB

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20011102070923.29609.00000279@nso-fm.aol.com>...
> In article <77f1797e.0111011245.39da9e7f@posting.google.com>, kb9rvb@arrl.net
> (Carl Zager) writes:
>
> >Do you happen to know where one might find a history of US amateur
> >call sign protocol?
>
> You might try searching deja.com for "The Past 50 Years of Amateur Radio
> Licensing", which has some info on this.
>
> Briefly, it went like this:
>
> After 1912, when licenisng of amateur stations became mandatory, callsigns
> consisted of a numeral (1 through 9) and two or three letters. A typical call
> might be 1AW or 3ZS. The numeral was determined by the location of the station,
> and if it moved to a different call area, the callsign had to change.
>
> Other countries adopted similar schemes, which led to confusion as the range of
> amateur stations increased. About 1927 prefix letters were added. US ham calls
> in the 48 states all began with W (W6AM, W9AZS) and those in the territories
> and possessions with K and a specific number (K7ABC). Some possessions had
> two-letter prefixes (KG6GJX).
>
> In addition to all this, when the licensing of mobile and portable ham stations
> first began, (early 1930s) special calls with four suffix letters were issued
> for portable and mobile use. W6AM was W6ZZAM when mobile under those
> short-lived rules.
>
> Note that 0 was not used in US ham calls before WW2.
>
> After WW2, the whole system was revised. The boundaries of the call areas were
> changed to avoid splitting states, and 0 was added. All of the territories and
> possessions got specific two-letter-and-a-number prefixes, and all of those
> prefixes began with K.
>
> When the Novice class was created in 1951, special calls were used. In the 48
> states, N or V was added before the number to indicate "Novice", and was
> dropped when the licensee upgraded. In the possessions, the initial K was

> changed to W to indicate Novice status.
>
> When the W calls were all issued in some districts, the FCC went to K calls,
> then WA, calls, etc.
>
> In the mid 1970s the FCC began issuing calls beginning with N and A, and calls
> with single-letter suffixes. The purpose of this was to increase the number of
> short calls available. Because the USA does not "own" the entire A prefix, all
> A calls begin with two letters. In addition, the requirement to change
> callsigns when moving to a new call area was dropped.
>
> >Some of my thoughts and questions ...
> >
> >I know, for example, that at one time a Novice was issued a WN, KN
> >call which became a W, K, WA, KA, call when upgraded. That stopped
> >when?
>
> Mid 1970s, when the Novice became renewable.
> >
> >What is the protocol for the N calls? I know that the A's are now
> >issued to Extra class. Was N ever class-reserved?
>
> The reservation is by call format. 1x2 and 2X1 calls of all types are only
> issued to Extras. 1x3 calls are issued to all classes of license except Novice.
> Calls beginning with A are only issued to Extras, even if they are 2X2.
> >
> >I always assumed that the 1x1, 1x2, 1x3 calls were just sequential
> >progressions, but I have been told that they are class-reserved.
>
> 1x1 are special-event stations. 1x2 and 2x1 are Extra-only. 1x3 are available
> to any class except Novice.
>
> > Has
> >it always been that way?
>
> No.
>
> >Is there any significance other than sequence
> >for the 2x1 and 2x2's?
>
> All 2x1s are Extras, All 2x2s beginning with A are Extras. I'm not sure about
> other 2x2s, but I know that 2x2s are not issued to Novices or Techs.
> >
> >Not necessarily looking for the answers, just a resource or two.
> >
> I don't know of any single source, other than a big pile of QSTs or the CD-ROMs
> of same.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY, ex WA3IYC, WN3IYC (all issued sequentially, 1977, 1968, 1967,
> respectively)

85. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 19:54:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102145434.19863.00000181@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 22934

In article <20011102111905.10701.00001058@nso-mv.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>All I'm doing is expressing an opinion in which I truly believe. You, of all >people, should understand this, were it not for the fact that you possess a >child-like need to be right in spite of the self-serving nature of your >opinion.

"A child-like need to be right" pervades tRoll's postings along with a way-too-liberal dose of tRollian ego.

>My opinions are based on what's best for the ARS; your opinion is >based on what's best for YOU.

Another who has put on the Final Judge "robes" who presumes to "speak" for the ARS. :-)

>There's a big difference here, one which >you, apparently, do not possess the emotional intelligence to understand.

It would seem that amateur extra turnips have enormous egos. :-)

86. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 19:54:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102145435.19863.00000182@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 22932

In article <3BE19E72.D09B5035@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Don't look now, but we haven't even got the code/no code arguments
>> warmed up yet! Just wait until the FCC NPRM to totally eliminate
>> code testing comes up! It ain't gonna be pretty!
>
>"Hope springs eternal from the human breast."

Nope springs eternal from the human beast... :-)

87. Re: A Challenge to James Miccolis

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 19:54:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102145436.19863.00000184@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 22933

In article <d22b54c3.0110310822.21ad2263@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Dipshit.

Another demonstration of 97.1 (e): "Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique ability to enhance international goodwill."

:-)

88. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 19:54:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102145436.19863.00000183@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 22937

In article <20011101230555.08355.00001059@nso-mq.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3be13a3e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
>>> Memo to Steve:
>>>
>>> You don't like Lennie. Lennie doesn't like you...although I can't
>>> imagine why! We got it, already.
>>>
>>
>>Oh, yeah, that was it. "We got it, already." Could you make an attempt to
>>remember that, Larry, when you want to start some full-circle mud slinging
>>contest with some unsuspecting person again over CW?
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>
>Kim:
>
>Don't look now, but this newsgroup is by, for, and about people who
>wish to discuss the code testing issue, among other amateur radio
>policy matters.

That's correct.

>The thing you object to, like most other no-coders,
>is the fact that I call attention to the fact that the no-coder's primary
>objection to "CW" is (or was) the necessity to learn and master a useful
>communications mode in order to gain higher operating privileges.

That's incorrect.

That's a Larry tRollism (practically a macro) which is colored
by tRoll's own love and devotion to OOK CW.

The FCC does not share the same feelings.

>It's all about the basic issue of laziness and the Welfare State
>mentality vs. those who saw the value of the Morse/CW mode and
>found that once they gave it a try, they actually liked it and were
>able to succeed at it.

On the other hand, the "laziness and Welfare State mentality"
has infected those who have long since been tested at CW and
haven't learned much else...and are determined to dumb down
everyone to their level.

>My postings, over a decade's worth both here
>and on Fidonet, have been a reaction to the abject hatred of the CW
>mode expressed by the lazy people who saw it primarily as a
>barrier to HF phone privileges.

What "abject hatred" of CW? What is (or rather should be)
discussed is the morse code TEST.

God did not appear to some ancient amateur Moses and
proclaim that amateur radio licensees be given privileges
commensurate with morse code skill. Ancient amateurs
proclaimed that, got it, and now there is time for a change.
Most of the ancient amateurs have gone SK.

Quit beating around the burning bushes and start accepting
change.

>You haven't been here nearly long enough to tell me what this
>newsgroup is about, so I suggest you don't presume to try.

Oh, my, "tenure" in a newsgroup as a qualifier for "truth!" :-)

89. Re: A Challenge to Leonard H. Anderson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 19:54:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102145437.19863.00000185@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 22936

In article <20011031064647.29905.00000202@nso-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>More errors and mistakes from LHA. I post here most days, sure. Nothing wrong
>with that. The rest of your sentence is pure rubbish. Not even grammatically
>correct.

However Miccolis rephrases the above or repeats it, it is not
a qualifier.

>>N2EY does not represent the entire US ARS nor does he
>>speak for same.
>
>Never said I do. Where do you get such ideas?

From Miccolis' own statements taken in context rather than
his taking others' statements out of context.

>Sounds like you are against free speech for those who disagree with you or
>your ideas. Double standard.

Not at all. Miccolis seems to wish to be the Final Judge as
to the "truth" in opinions...namely his opinions.

>The subject was about your misquote and false attribution. Stay focused.

I don't think so. It is mostly about ego-bruised pique at not
being honored and revered as the Final Judge for opinions
as to their "truth" or "falseness."

>We know, Len. Why do you post so much that is obvious to a turnip?

Many licensed turnips post in here. :-)

>Too bad. You can whine, bitch and moan but it doesn't change the fact that
>you have misquoted and falsely attributed - more than once.

Those who are without fault seem not only to have stowed
thrones but sit on them and attempt to rule...

90. Re: Complements and Compliments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 19:54:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102145438.19863.00000186@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 22938

In article <20011101000413.20853.00000140@nso-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>Anyone who disagrees with you here displays it.

Quite true...and becoming more and more like rec.radio.amateur.misc
every day. :-)

>>It IS bragging if all you've done is claim it and cannot
>>provide any proof of accomplishment.
>
>Then I'm not bragging at all.

There has been NO proof presented accept some more
unverified claims...along with a great deal of anguished
argumentation about such claims not being believed. :-)

>Nope. Others in this newsgroup know my skills and knowledge. Besides, there's
>nothing I could post that would convince you otherwise.

Fish stories are still fish stories, even after the fish has
been eaten.

>>They might even have been cribbed from the May 1978 issue
>>of Ham Radio magazine for all I know. :-)
>
>They weren't. I made them up myself.

So...they are "made up" and not based on real situations. :-)

>>For someone who has an inordinate amount of free time to
>>spend on amateur radio newsgoop messaging, I'm surprised
>>that there was no immediate response of a "tutorial" on
>>Smith Chart use. Anyone who claims to have "mastered the
>>Smith Chart" should have jumped right in on the subject just
>>like he jumps in about morse code use. :-)
>
>The only person who fits that description is you, Len.

On a thread involving Smith Charts I did jump in and talk
about them without needing a week to "research" the
material and make up some "examples" of use.

>You've done more than that. You want an age limit of 14 for any amateur
>license, and a reduction to a single class of license.

That is all public knowledge...but taken out of context from
my 13 January 1999 14-page-text Comments on 98-143.

My suggestion to the FCC on age limits was the LAST item
in those 14 pages, prompted more by the (referenced) "news"
from the ARRL of two six-year-old new amateur licensees.

The main part of my Comments on 98-143 concerned the
elimination of the morse code test for any class amateur
radio license, followed by the elimination of the "class"
distinction to eventually lead to only one license.

>Yep. And they have posted reasons for that opinion. Is it forbidden to
>disagree?

Why does Miccolis project his own feelings on this?

I've never said that Miccolis is "forbidden" to disagree.

>Is that why you abuse those with the audacity to disagree with you and point
>out your logical errors?

Who is "abused?" Those with overwhelming egos who insist
on being the Final Judge of what is "good" and what is "bad"
in opinions?

>Nope. The distortion is yours. You just equated code test with "code lovers".
>Not the same thing. But it shows your hatred of the mode itself, not just the
>test.

Incorrect "showing." I've said repeatedly that those who favor
morse code USE should be able to enjoy that mode as long as
it is allocated. No one favoring the retention of the code test has
yet claimed anything logical or regulatory for its retention...only a
lot of personal feelings that cite the implicit need for it on the
tacit opinion that "they had to do it, so everyone else has to."

>>No. Incorrect. Retention of old regulations with the only
>>reasons given as personal desires are not good...those
>>are selfish.
>
>The only reasons for removing the test are personal desires.

Then the Final Judge has "ruled" that both the FCC and IARU
are "wrong." (not a good judgement call)

>> FREEDOM is not a bad word.
>
>Neither is RESPONSIBILITY. Neither is TRADITION.

How is the morse code test related to "responsibility?"

Does it show something "to the ARS community" that a
prospective licensee is "worthy" of a license? No. The
"ARS community" does not, cannot grant amateur licenses.
Some turnips in the "ARS community" insist they do but
then they are rooted in the local ground and will eventually

wither and die without doing anything productive.

"Tradition" keeping is not a task of the FCC. If it were, then
"tradition" should insist on keeping damped-wave RF
generation, should it not? It was the very first practical
method of RF generation by radio amateurs.

>What alignment? Where is that alleged alignment documented?

It is firmly locked-in to those who consider morse code skill
as the epitome of the amateur radio experience. See the
oft-repeated trolling messages of:

"No code = No ham Know code = Know ham."

>I've only told you that many, many times since December 1999. The code test
>issue is a dead duck, finished, finito, end of story.

...a turnip thinking that others are turnips. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Sorry, but the "code test issue" is NOT a "dead duck." The FCC
IWG-6 had not yet decided on it as of last week. The IARU had
not changed its position until the beginning of October, 2001. The
IARU is not permitted a vote in any WRC, but the FCC is one
agency of three that represent the USA administration.

>Nope. Spin and twist from the spinmeister. The mere fact that a regulation is
>old doesn't mean it is no longer needed.

The fact that a regulation is old does not mean that it should be
retained.

91. Re: ur right dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 19:54:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102145439.19863.00000187@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 22935

In article <3BE06BC8.CF604676@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> (snip) Germany went a similar route
>> but used a different philosophy of
>> aggression. They lost, too, but the
>> Communist forces had marched in from
>> the east and for a long time there
>> were two Germanys, complete with
>> internal conflict along with two
>> new philosophical views. Eventually
>> Germany was able to unite and become
>> a single "western" nation and an
>> ally in NATO as well as an ally in
>> the fight against terrorism.
>
> Interesting (?) account of the events, Len. First, there was very
>little internal conflict between the two Germanys (the Berlin airlift,
>decades ago, was the big one). Second, West Germany has been a member
>of NATO, and an ally, for decades (decades before the reunification of
>East and West Germany). I realize that is what you were trying to say,
>but I wanted to clarify that which was unclear.

Was there something "unclear" in what I said? As far as history
is concerned, the split of Germany into "east" and "west" was
due to the Communist influence. The Communists built "the
Wall," not the "west."

In an abtuse way, I liken the on-going morse code test issue to
that "Wall." Those who have established their "turf" in amateur
radio keep insisting that all who enter the sacred kingdom below
30 MHz must "present papers" on going through the "checkpoint."

I think everyone knows what happened to that infamous "Wall."
:-)

92. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 20:44:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE305A6.CDD84E20@uci.edu>
Source record: 22939

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011102070921.29609.00000277@nso-fm.aol.com...
> > In article <3bdf5bf4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >Indeed, it would be wonderful (though a pipedream) that we'd be the
> nation
> > >to look to for agreement and resolution.
> > >
> > Yep. But most Americans, (including you, Kim) are probably not yet willing
> to
> > make the kind of changes needed to make that happen.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> I don't think it will take only "most Americans" and I hope I am not
> stepping out on a limb here by *thinking* that you will understand the next
> fairly philosophical statements:
>
> Like I said, I used to be a peacenik, trying to make a difference in the
> world. Then, I moved away from the peaceful seclusion of the Adirondack
> Mtns., and found out just how huge a task it would be to realize, by walking
> straight into the grips of huge city life down here in the south.
>
> Nope, I am no longer willing to feel like I am in an extremely small
> minority of people who would like to see a different world and actually
> think I could do something about it. I have property; yearn for a bigger,
> better yard; ignore government (and the rest of the world) for the most
> part; don't think twice about paying taxes--just tell me how much I owe;
> just bought a foreign vehicle--ask me if I care; and truly don't care about
> people as much as I used to--because I got tired (once again) of pretty much
> being in such a small minority. I often review my emotions and check for
> bitterness--but I really don't think I am bitter at all, that would be
> pretty silly. I am just 'resigned'.
>
> Well, let's word that differently: I still care a great deal about people in
> terms of a collective "we"; but on an individual basis it's a whole lot more
> effort to deal with than I am willing to. I have *maybe* 10 friends (not
> counting family) and I actually choose it to be that way. I have no "true"
> friends other than my husband and my parents. I am just not willing to be
> the person I used to be with people. As an example: why would I put myself

> through constantly listening to people gripe (and so, so many do) about
> their marriages/jobs/kids/financial situations while they choose not to do a
> damned thing about it? After a while, the stories and the attitude get old
> (goodness, just look at this newsgroup). I am a "talk to the hand" person
> real quick. Peoples' tendencies are to gripe, not to change. And, I still
> dearly love Mother Earth--though I am far less proactive even on that any
> more.
>
> I got a little confused a long time back--I had a rooted belief in the basic
> principles of Christianity and started exploring the beliefs of the Eastern
> philosophy--which I find absolutely fascinating. The Eastern Philosophies
> made me yearn for a deeper commitment to my basic principles; however all
> this began happening at the same time I needed to make a choice as to live
> like a poor person (stay up north in the country and try to do with what I
> could through the oil crisis of the 70s) or "make something of myself" for
> my kids and family and move down here to the south. I chose the larger
> distraction and now use it as an excuse for being a realist. :)
>
> My ultimate belief is that God will straighten it all out by starting over
> again. My Karma is bad, bad, bad, but hopefully some kind of credit will be
> realized for deep-seated passion and desire.
>
> Willing? Not by myself--not as a tiny, tiny majority. Count me out--as
> disgusting as that is for me to even think about, I made my peace with it
> years ago.
>
> Kim W5TIT

What kind of changes did you think Jim was referring to? I don't think
he meant we all need to strap on explosives or become survivalists or
something.

93. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 21:50:17 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9rv4ct0faj@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 22941

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE2A62B.BBD0B124@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> > We had the chance a decade ago, but Papa Bush ordered Stormin' Norman to
stop
> > short. Think about why that was done.
>
> Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

That depends on how much you value liberty. Who was it that said, "From time to time, the tree of liberty must be watered with the blood of free men and tyrants alike." (I'm probably paraphrasing, but I think it gets the point across)

94. Re: Complements and Compliments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 21:50:29 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE31525.655D4B61@uci.edu>
Source record: 22940

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20011101000413.20853.00000140@nso-cc.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Anyone who disagrees with you here displays it.
>
> Quite true...and becoming more and more like rec.radio.amateur.misc
> every day. :-)

And less like it on days that you don't post here. :-)

> The main part of my Comments on 98-143 concerned the
> elimination of the morse code test for any class amateur
> radio license, followed by the elimination of the "class"
> distinction to eventually lead to only one license.

What is your interest in the Morse code requirement, aside from being
something to harang a newsgroup about?

> I've never said that Miccolis is "forbidden" to disagree.

No, but apparently you do feel that it is "audacious" for anyone to do
so. :-)

> Who is "abused?"

Anyone with whom you correspond, of course.

> See the
> oft-repeated trolling messages of:
>
> "No code = No ham Know code = Know ham."

That bozo? Great debate fodder there Len, you bet.

95. Re: Contests (was: 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 22:26:21 UTC
From: aaronvoobner <aaronvoobner@home.coms>
Message-ID: <h4FE7.173183$5A3.64918555@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 22942
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

SD Joneses, I am wondering about your facination with anthrax? BTW, Do you ever post anything CB related?

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in message
> what sort of mathematics do you teach???? also did they have a
> episode of anthrax in mini grass????

96. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 23:23:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102182335.16767.00001292@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 22943

>Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 11/2/2001 1:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011102145434.19863.00000181@nso-mg.aol.com>

>"A child-like need to be right" pervades tRoll's postings along
>with a way-too-liberal dose of tRollian ego.

Pot/Kettle/Black.

>Another who has put on the Final Judge "robes" who presumes
>to "speak" for the ARS.

Pot/Kettle/Black...except Larry's on the inside looking out, not
vice-versa.

97. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 23:30:24 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111021530.9ed6b1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 22944

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:<3be28d1c_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> OHMYGAWD...
>
> Brian: you are smarter than that, aren't you? What, exactly, do you hope to
> accomplish with a continuing debate, from anyone you can possibly engage, on
> the CW issue? CW and all its politics, etc., are one of those things that
> peoples' minds don't really change on...haven't you ever figured that out?
>
> It's kind of like Coke and Pepsi. Why the hell do those companies
> advertise--at least to the extent that they do? Coke and Pepsi are
> mainstays in American life; and preferences are developed by family and
> friends--not their advertising.
>
> CW and the politics that are generated because of it (for what reason people
> get so excited about I'll never understand and don't care to), are just
> that: nothing but politics. You're not going to change anyone's mind about
> CW, I'm not going to change anyone's mind about CW; you're not going to
> convince me any more than I've ever been convinced about anything to do with
> CW; and I'm not going to convince you any more than you're convinced on the
> different issues surrounding CW. It's a dead damned horse, through and
> through, and the meat's even begun to grow mold now.
>
> Maybe it means something to the FCC and other governments in terms of policy
> in ham radio, but change is evident because of the times, Brian.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
Here comes Le Ditz factor again: What I sed was that this NG was
established to provide brawling space for the online code test war(s).
Which is well known USENET historical fact in the ham NGs. What I also
sed was that there will be further brawls over the code tests in this
NG. Not "historical fact" today but you're naive as hell and/or dumber
than a box of rocks if you think we've seen the last of the
"discussions" abt code tests in this NG.
>
>
None of which are "political statements" on my part or any kind of
attempt to continue The War or "change anybody's mind". Least of all
yours, there's nothing to change.
>
>
w3rv

98. Re: A Challenge to James Miccolis

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 23:30:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102183057.16767.00001294@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 22945

>Subject: Re: A Challenge to James Miccolis
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 11/2/2001 1:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011102145436.19863.00000184@nso-mg.aol.com>

>Another demonstration of 97.1 (e): "Continuation and extension
>of the amateur's unique ability to enhance international goodwill."

"elitist...."radio nazi"..."jackbooted thug"..."dill sahgent"....

WHO spoke those words? Oh yes...Excuse me, I forgot...YOU are unlicensed, ergo you can continue to use whatever "potty mouth" language you care to and not "violate" Part 97. (Even tho we are NOT on an FCC regulated medium)

Carry on.

99. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 23:32:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102183210.16767.00001295@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 22946

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 11/2/2001 1:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011102145435.19863.00000182@nso-mg.aol.com>

>
>Nope springs eternal from the human beast...

Such as "Nope, I won't get a license...???"

100. Re: A Challenge to Leonard H. Anderson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 23:40:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102184007.16767.00001296@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 22947

>Subject: Re: A Challenge to Leonard H. Anderson
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 11/2/2001 1:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011102145437.19863.00000185@nso-mg.aol.com>

>>The rest of your sentence is pure rubbish. Not even grammatically
>>correct.
>
>However Miccolis rephrases the above or repeats it, it is not
>a qualifier.

Doesn't need to be. Truth is truth.

>>Never said I do. Where do you get such ideas?
>
>From Miccolis' own statements taken in context rather than
>his taking others' statements out of context.

From which statements? I have read both sides of tis ongoing thread, and nothing you ahve accused Jim of is apparent. YOUR lying and attempts to discredit him are...THAT'S transparent.

>>Sounds like you are against free speech for those who disagree with you or
>>your ideas. Double standard.
>
>Not at all. Miccolis seems to wish to be the Final Judge as
>to the "truth" in opinions...namely his opinions.

He doesn't need to be a "judge" (there you go quoting things others have not said again). Truth is truth. You have not disproven a single thing Jim has said. Jim on the otherhand HAS proven his knowledge of Smith Chart, et al.

>>The subject was about your misquote and false attribution. Stay focused.
>
>I don't think so. It is mostly about ego-bruised pique at not
>being honored and revered as the Final Judge for opinions
>as to their "truth" or "falseness."

Nothing is "ego-bruised" or "piqued". Defending one's self against lies and misrepresentation from someone who is obviously doing both for arrogance sake is part of human nature and is only fair.

You lie and misrepresent...we prove why you are wrong...It's like sunrise and sunset. It's going to happen.

>Many licensed turnips post in here.

And at least one UN-licensed one.

>Those who are without fault seem not only to have stowed
>thrones but sit on them and attempt to rule...

Yep...from the Left Coast, to boot....

101. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-02 23:46:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102184609.16767.00001297@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 22948

>Subject: Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 11/2/2001 1:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011102145436.19863.00000183@nso-mg.aol.com>

>>Don't look now, but this newsgroup is by, for, and about people who
>>wish to discuss the code testing issue, among other amateur radio
>>policy matters.
>
>That's correct.

Ergo you have now admitted that this NG IS for other policy matters that involve Amateur Radio. In previous posts you have adamantly stated that the ONLY topic here was the Morse Code issue.

>>The thing you object to, like most other no-coders,
>>is the fact that I call attention to the fact that the no-coder's primary
>>objection to "CW" is (or was) the necessity to learn and master a useful
>>communications mode in order to gain higher operating privileges.
>
>That's incorrect.

No it's not. You have stated so before.

>The FCC does not share the same feelings.

They don't have to. This about OUR opinions, not the FCC's. That we will have to live with thier ruling is inevitible, but does not mean we cannot express alternate opinions.

>What "abject hatred" of CW? What is (or rather should be)
>discussed is the morse code TEST.

One canot be discussed without the other. We KNOW what YOR motivation is.

>Quit beating around the burning bushes and start accepting
>change.

Cute. Words YOU should live by...Like taking advantage of the No Code Technician created for you almost 11 years ago.

You know...the one with NO Morse Code "test".

102. Re: Complements and Compliments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 00:04:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011102190447.16767.00001305@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 22949

>Subject: Re: Complements and Compliments
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 11/2/2001 1:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011102145438.19863.00000186@nso-mg.aol.com>

>Quite true...and becoming more and more like rec.radio.amateur.misc
>every day.

And since YOU are the catalyst, I guess we have YOU to thank, Huh Lennie?

>>Then I'm not bragging at all.
>
>There has been NO proof presented accept some more
>unverified claims...along with a great deal of anguished
>argumentation about such claims not being believed.

Sure there has...Jim's discussions on the actual USE of the Smith Chart,
for example. Just for one.

And speaking of "unverified claims", where is your tutorial on microwave
techniques? Still NO evidence that YO posses any of the knowledge or skills
YOU lay claim to.

>Fish stories are still fish stories, even after the fish has
>been eaten.

And some fish-story tellers just SMELL fishy.

>On a thread involving Smith Charts I did jump in and talk
>about them without needing a week to "research" the
>material and make up some "examples" of use

Prove it. You never seem to post anything "meaningful" without at least a
several-day "absence" preceeding it. Boning up, Lenie?

>>You've done more than that. You want an age limit of 14 for any amateur
>>license, and a reduction to a single class of license.
>
>That is all public knowledge...but taken out of context from
>my 13 January 1999 14-page-text Comments on 98-143.
>My suggestion to the FCC on age limits was the LAST item
>in those 14 pages, prompted more by the (referenced) "news"
>from the ARRL of two six-year-old new amateur licensees.

What's taken out of "context", Your Putziness? Did you or did you not
suggest to the FCC that they create a totally new barrier to Amateur licensure
that has been totally unnecessary in over 80 years of Amateur Radio existence?

Your rants are, allegedly, about removing percieved unnecessary barriers
to licensure, yet you create a totally new one.

And you STILL haven't told us of your PRACTICAL experience in raising kids
that would lend any credence to your suggestion. Maybe children YOU raised
were not mature enough to handle that responsibility, but then I would not be
surprised.....

>The main part of my Comments on 98-143 concerned the
>elimination of the morse code test for any class amateur
>radio license, followed by the elimination of the "class"
>distinction to eventually lead to only one license.

AND...creation of a new artificial and unnecessary barrier to licensure,
seemingly based soley on some age bigotry. Still unfounded nor adequately
explained.

>>Yep. And they have posted reasons for that opinion. Is it forbidden to
>>disagree?
>
>Why does Miccolis project his own feelings on this?

He could project someone ELSE'S feelings?

>"No code = No ham Know code = Know ham."

You are finally showing some sense, Lennie.

>>I've only told you that many, many times since December 1999. The code test
>>issue is a dead duck, finished, finito, end of story.
>
>...a turnip thinking that others are turnips

What "turnip"...??? The FCC has (while not using YOUR adjectives) said
that when S25.5 is gone, so is code testing. YOU are the only one not
accepting it, Your Gameiness.

>The FCC IWG-6 had not yet decided on it as of last week.

I guess the other "representitives" at WRC have no vote? Lack of
subscription to Amateur related publications has left you (again) lacking in
the current events arena.

>>Nope. Spin and twist from the spinmeister. The mere fact that a regulation
>is
>>old doesn't mean it is no longer needed.
>
>The fact that a regulation is old does not mean that it should be
>retained.

What does your frequent abuse of the King's English have to do with the
"age" of Amateur regulations?

103. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 00:38:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111021638.58d78054@posting.google.com>
Source record: 22950

>
> Anyone know the propogation effects of a couple of 50 megaton hydrogen
> devices going off in the middle East?
>
>
Yeah, it'll "propogate healthy walking" to the neighborhood C-store to
pick up yer smokes & Cokes instead of being able to mount yer
stupidass 9,000 pound Excursion to chase 'em down. Because we'll have
wiped out the fuel supply for the thing.
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
73's from the Philadelphia Main Line
Brian w3rv
Dit-dit.

104. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 02:53:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111021853.56826841@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23101

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:<C4E4ADF925124E0A.A1CEF8BAE36E6A0D.979C84A0A30CC1BC@lp.airnews.net>...
>
> >-- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
> > transmissions on Amateur Radio.
>
> Not on the established 2-way bands, but how about a few small bits of
> the broadcast band set aside for totally non-commercial amateur
> broadcasting. No new tests, no fees, just request a frequency and
> weekly time slot.
>
>
Not a bad idea. Actually though there are licenses available out there
already for doing that on a qrp basis in the FM broadcast band.
Problem is that the likes of k1man wouldn't go for it because their
intent is to make a mockery of ham radio so they gotta do their thing
on the established ham bands.
>
>
Which is why for the most part I sorta "killfile" the "phone bands".
>
>
Dit-dit.
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
>
>
w3rv

105. Re: ur right dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 02:55:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE35C95.D071C5A2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23102

```
Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > > Man, your numbers are totally
> > > false. According to the Time's
> > > World Almanac (2000 edition),
> > > the total population of Israel
> > > today is 5,749,760.
> > >
> > > Does that include the occupied
> > > territories or not?
>
> As far as I know, the Almanac lists the population of the actual
> country, not occupied territories (those territories would not be
> considered "Israel").

So the 5 million Arafatt was talking about are probably in the
occupied territories.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

106. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 02:57:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE35D06.D2EF5E22@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23103

Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?

> That depends on how much you value liberty. Who was it that said, "From time
> to time, the tree of liberty must be watered with the blood of free men and
> tyrants alike." (I'm probably paraphrasing, but I think it gets the point
> across)

Is getting Saddam Hussein worth your life?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

107. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 03:12:46 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9rvnan016hj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23115

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0111021638.58d78054@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Anyone know the propogation effects of a couple of 50 megaton hydrogen
> > devices going off in the middle East?
> >
> >
> Yeah, it'll "propogate healthy walking" to the neighborhood C-store to
> pick up yer smokes & Cokes instead of being able to mount yer
> stupidass 9,000 pound Excursion to chase 'em down. Because we'll have
> wiped out the fuel supply for the thing.
> 73's from the Philadelphia Main Line
> Brian w3rv
> Dit-dit.

...and as soon as that happens, the environMENTALists will be screaming to
have gas for their SUVs. That's when they'll change their minds about
drilling Alaska's North slope.

108. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 03:13:41 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be3614e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23104

Ah, OK. Well forgive my misperception. Yeah, the arguments about CW will go on...I agree.

WHEW...I just knew you were smarter than that!

I'll ignore all the other stuff.

Kim W5TIT

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message news:d22b54c3.0111021530.9ed6b1b@posting.google.com...
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:<3be28d1c_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > OHMYGAWD...
> >
> > Brian: you are smarter than that, aren't you? What, exactly, do you hope to
> > accomplish with a continuing debate, from anyone you can possibly engage, on
> > the CW issue? CW and all its politics, etc., are one of those things that
> > peoples' minds don't really change on...haven't you ever figured that out?
> >
> > It's kind of like Coke and Pepsi. Why the hell do those companies
> > advertise--at least to the extent that they do? Coke and Pepsi are
> > mainstays in American life; and preferences are developed by family and
> > friends--not their advertising.
> >
> > CW and the politics that are generated because of it (for what reason people
> > get so excited about I'll never understand and don't care to), are just
> > that: nothing but politics. You're not going to change anyone's mind about
> > CW, I'm not going to change anyone's mind about CW; you're not going to
> > convince me any more than I've ever been convinced about anything to do with
> > CW; and I'm not going to convince you any more than you're convinced on the
> > different issues surrounding CW. It's a dead damned horse, through and
> > through, and the meat's even begun to grow mold now.
> >
> > Maybe it means something to the FCC and other governments in terms of policy
> > in ham radio, but change is evident because of the times, Brian.

> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> Here comes Le Ditz factor again: What I sed was that this NG was
> established to provide brawling space for the online code test war(s).
> Which is well known USENET historical fact in the ham NGs. What I also
> sed was that there will be further brawls over the code tests in this
> NG. Not "historical fact" today but you're naive as hell and/or dumber
> than a box of rocks if you think we've seen the last of the
> "discussions" abt code tests in this NG.
> >
> >
> None of which are "political statements" on my part or any kind of
> attempt to continue The War or "change anybody's mind". Least of all
> yours, there's nothing to change.
> >
> >
> w3rv

109. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 03:26:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be36434_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23105

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011102111905.10701.00001058@nso-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3be28a32_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >I don't care what Riley Hollingsworth thinks of my callsign,
>
> Kim:
>
> There's no need to belabor the obvious; you have very clearly expressed
> your contempt for what Riley thinks of your callsign by *not* changing it!
>

Thank you.

> >
> >nor anyone
> >else. That should be quite apparent to you by now. You know damned well
> >that the point I made with you (and to the idiot up in the NW) by writing
to
> >Riley was that the callsign was legal, valid, and could not/would not be
> >revoked.
>
> When was *that* ever an issue? Of course your callsign is legal, valid,
> and will not be revoked by the FCC. Nobody, least not I, ever expressed
> such a desire. If your callsign were not legal, it would not have been
> issued -- that should be obvious even to a person of limited cognitive
> ability, such as yourself.
>

As I recall, you never actually said it would or could be revoked--there was
lots of innuendo about it. And, quite regardless of whether it was an issue
or not, the fact still remains that you're making some kind of tort about my
"tricking" Riley. That is just ludicrous.

> >
> >You also know that I did that after *months* of your stomping
> >around making innuendoes that you were going to write to the FCC and make
> >sure that they took my callsign away, blah, blah, blah.
>
> You really are much more delusional than usual today, Kim. When did
> I ever state that I was going to ask the FCC to revoke your callsign?
> Please provide fully attributed quotes, or admit that you are a liar.
>

Like I said, I don't think you ever actually state anything about it; it was all supplied via innuendo. Once again, the fact still remains that you are saying I was trying to "trick" Riley. Trick him into what?

> >
> >I actually did
> >something about it, while you just griped, complained, whined and snickered.
> >Which, by the way, you continue to do.
>
> Yes, what you did was to write to Riley and attempt to trick him into
> endorsing your choice of callsign based on your "right" to do so. And,
> like I have before, he admitted that you do have a clear right to select such
> a call sign, in spite of it's unsuitability in a family-oriented radio service.
> Which is why he said, that when someone with young children encounters
> you and your callsign on-the-air, and decides to choose another activity
> other than ham radio, you have taken our hobby/service "...one step closer
> to extinction."
>

Once again, if you think for one minute that Riley could be tricked into anything I think it is you that is delusional.

> >
> >Why in Hell's bells would I care about Riley's--or anyone
> >else's--endorsement of my callsign?!
>
> Well, you obviously did at one time, so much so that you attempted to
> trick him into giving it, on the basis of your "right" to "freedom of
> expression." You were grasping at any straw you could possibly reach,
> in order to justify your callsign, which is demeaning to yourself, the
> ARS, and women in general, in the hope of denying it's corrosive effect
> on all concerned.
>

Oh gawd, Larry, you're inane.

> >
> >I think everyone pretty much has the
> >idea that I don't. And, that my callsign is detrimental to the amateur
> >radio society is an opinion anyone is allowed to have. My opinion is that
> >it is not.
>
> Of course you think that way. That's the same muddy thinking that caused
> to select your callsign in the first place. We understand perfectly; no need
> to belabor the obvious.
>

OK, thank you. Then is there any need for you to belabor the obvious opinion you have? Or is that just my obvious stuff I am not supposed to belabor?

> >
> >Your attitudes expressed in here against people because of the simplistic
> >argument you hold on CW is a whole other matter.
>
> My "argument" on "CW" is, and always has been, that it is a valuable
> mode to the ARS, and that the testing requirement is the vehicle which
> brought it into widespread use among hams. My more contentious
> postings have been directed at those who object to the testing requirement
> on the basis of their unadmitted laziness.
>

You're right about it being a valuable mode to ARS. I don't agree with it being included as a testing requirement. I may have said it incorrectly before, Larry, and used the word "wrong." But, notice the lack of my telling you that you are wrong. I just simply say I don't agree with you.

> >
> >If you spout off on the
> >air to and about people as much as you do in here, Larry, you are far
more
> >trouble to the integrity of ham radio than anyone's callsign *ever* could
> >be.
>
> All I'm doing is expressing an opinion in which I truly believe. You, of
all
> people, should understand this, were it not for the fact that you possess
a
> child-like need to be right in spite of the self-serving nature of your
> opinion. My opinions are based on what's best for the ARS; your opinion
is
> based on what's best for YOU. There's a big difference here, one which
> you, apparently, do not possess the emotional intelligence to understand.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Bleh, bleh, bleh. I can't even believe I let myself get sucked up into another drivel with you, Larry. You're right, I don't have any emotional intelligence when it comes to you. With you there is serious lack of emotion, and certain absence of intelligence.

Kim W5TIT

110. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 04:13:07 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <5de891baccf7dffa078ce536daafe884.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23106

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> This is a newsgroup for ham operators ......

No it isn't. This is a newgroup for everyone to
discuss Amateur Radio Policy.

There are other newsgroups to discuss terrorism,
war, the constitution, etc., etc., etc.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas04poolc248.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.7.248]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

111. Re: ur right dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 04:40:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE37529.6D29D1D7@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23107

CAM wrote:
>
> So the 5 million Arafatt was
> talking about are probably in
> the occupied territories.

Yep, I would suspect so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

112. Re: Contests (was: 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 04:48:47 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0111022048.75633eef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23108
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"aaronvoobner" <aaronvoobner@home.coms> wrote in message
news:<h4FE7.173183$5A3.64918555@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>...
> SD Joneses, I am wondering about your facination with anthrax? BTW, Do you
> ever post anything CB related?
>
>
> "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
> message
> > what sort of mathematics do you teach???? also did they have a
> > episode of anthrax in mini grass????

oh sometimes dwight...do you ever post anything ham radio related
pal.????? a friend of mine wants to talk to you .....he said he is in
your area right now....you mind if he comes by..????

113. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 04:49:40 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3be37600.2402954@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 23109

On 2 Nov 2001 15:30:24 -0800, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
> What I sed was that this NG was
>established to provide brawling space for the online code test war(s).
>Which is well known USENET historical fact in the ham NGs. What I also
>sed was that there will be further brawls over the code tests in this
>NG.

There may be further discussions, but I doubt they will
be lasting or lenthy. The train is flying down the track
towards the end of code testing as a requirement. The
path is clear, the route is clear, it's just the need to pass through
various stops along the way to the final treaty decisions
at WRC2003 followed by individual actions by individual
countries.

The FCC has been clear enough on what rational
keeps even 5 wpm in US regs now and that is only the treaty
requirement.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

114. Re: ur right dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 05:02:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE37A4D.F1B059F9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23110

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> (snip) The Communists built "the
> Wall," not the "west." (snip)

You know, this has bothered me ever since I first saw the Berlin Wall (actually plural "walls"). There were two walls running parallel to each other - one built by the east and the other built by the west. There were two check points at each border crossing - one operated by the east and the other operated by the west. And there were two sets of guard towers - some built by the east and the others built by the west. And there were arrests on both sides of that border - east germans arrested anyone sneaking in or out of the east and west block troops arrested anyone sneaking in or out of the west. And, in areas without a real wall, there were two parallel fences guarded on each side by troops from the east or west. So, the concept of the wall may have started with the Soviets, but we certainly jumped on the bandwagon when the building actually began.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

115. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 05:06:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE37B42.334CE57B@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23111

Hans Brakob wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>
> > This is a newsgroup for ham
> > operators ......
>
> No it isn't. This is a newgroup
> for everyone to discuss Amateur
> Radio Policy.

Then, if that's what you think, discuss policy and ignore the rest.
Simple, isn't it?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

116. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 05:36:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE38246.6BFD00A9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23112

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> (snip) There's no need to belabor the
> obvious; you have very clearly expressed
> your contempt for what Riley thinks of
> your callsign by *not* changing it!
>
> (snip) And, like I have before, he
> admitted that you do have a clear right
> to select such a call sign, in spite
> of it's unsuitability in a family-oriented
> radio service. Which is why he said, that
> when someone with young children encounters
> you and your callsign on-the-air, and
> decides to choose another activity other
> than ham radio, you have taken our
> hobby/service "...one step closer to
> extinction."

Larry, what is it with your obsession with Kim's callsign? Is it because she is a woman? Is it because a woman selected a callsign that vaguely relates to a part of the female anatomy? I seriously doubt you would be complaining so hard if that callsign were randomly issued by a computer to a man. So it is not the letters "TIT" in the callsign that you find so objectionable - it is the fact that those letters were selected by a woman. And perhaps this particular woman (Kim) does not find the female anatomy, or a reference to that, as objectionable as you do. So why should your view be given any more weight than hers - after all, she has to live with her anatomy each day while you can only obsess about it?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

117. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 05:49:02 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9s00ge02sje@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23116

Leland KC8LDO
>
>Hans Brakob wrote:
>>
>> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>>
>> > This is a newsgroup for ham
>> > operators ......
>>
>> No it isn't. This is a newgroup
>> for everyone to discuss Amateur
>> Radio Policy.
>
>
> Then, if that's what you think, discuss policy and ignore the rest.
>Simple, isn't it?
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
That's a fact,and then Dwight will stop posting as Aaron Voobner too.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

118. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 06:24:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE38D84.E060D134@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23113

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>
> > Again, like so many of your previous
> > postings, you misrepresent the position
> > of those opposed to code TESTING, Larry.
>
> My comments have always been specifically
> directed toward code testing, Dwight. If
> you say they were not and are not, then
> it is incumbent upon you to prove it.
> Proceed, if you can. (snip)

Okay, I'll quote your exact words - the words I replied to when I wrote the sentence above. You said...

"It's all about the basic issue
of laziness and the Welfare State
mentality vs. those who saw the
value of the Morse/CW mode and
found that once they gave it a
try, they actually liked it and
were able to succeed at it. My
postings, over a decade's worth
both here and on Fidonet, have
been a reaction to the abject
hatred of the CW mode..."

Note that you used the word "mode" twice, not "testing." So, in spite of what you say above, your comments have NOT "always been specifically directed toward code testing."

> This is simply absurd, Dwight. My very
> presence on this newsgroup proves you
> wrong, unless you believe I employ a
> private secretary to take my hand-chisled
> notes on stone tablets and transcribe them
> on a computer to be posted on this newsgroup.

It's not really that absurd, Larry. The fact that you're relatively up to date in one area does not mean that you're not a old fashioned in another. And, when it comes to radio (which is what we're talking about here), you appear to be an old fashioned guy - perhaps even a luddite in some ways.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

119. Hans...Two-faced Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 09:16:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011103041600.16755.00001238@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 23114

I always love it when someone "demands" a certain type of conduct, yet they themselves have a real maturity problem.

Case in point, Herr Brokeslob, K (BIG zero) HB, of Nowhere Minnesota. He takes issue with someone else's conduct, yet takes advantage of e mail to promulgate his own childish behaviour.

The purpose of this e mail was to...WHAT, Hans? Show off your indeterminable wit? Make a poignant political statement? Satisfy your own desire to wade in the pool for a while?

Why am I not surprised...??? Two of the biggest braggards and hooligans herein are the oldest and allegedly well educated retired "professionals".

Oh well...no wonder the current generation has "responsibility" issues, considering the lack of same demonstrated by the previous.

Subj: Re: A Challenge to James Miccolis
Date: 11/2/2001 7:58:22 PM Central Standard Time
From: HHBrakob@email.msn.com (K0HB H. Brakob)
Reply-to: HHBrakob@msn.com (K0HB H. Brakob)
To: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

Len and Steve,

3rd grade called. They changed their mind.
They want their debating plaques returned.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

120. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 13:46:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111030546.54a6e12b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23118

billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote in message
news:<3be37600.2402954@news.mindspring.com>...
> On 2 Nov 2001 15:30:24 -0800, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
> > What I sed was that this NG was
> >established to provide brawling space for the online code test war(s).
> >Which is well known USENET historical fact in the ham NGs. What I also
> >sed was that there will be further brawls over the code tests in this
> >NG.
>
> There may be further discussions, but I doubt they will
> be lasting or lenthy. The train is flying down the track
> towards the end of code testing as a requirement. The
> path is clear, the route is clear, it's just the need to pass through
> various stops along the way to the final treaty decisions
> at WRC2003 followed by individual actions by individual
> countries.
>
> The FCC has been clear enough on what rational
> keeps even 5 wpm in US regs now and that is only the treaty
> requirement.
>
>
Uh-huh. Maintain yer stiff & defensive upper lip, 2003 ain't over yet.
>
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
w3rv

121. Capital FM - Jingle

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 14:27:40 UTC
From: muenchen23 <muenchen23@talknet.de>
Message-ID: <VhSE7.6214$t04.637331601@news.tli.de>
Source record: 23117
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,uk.radio.amateur

Hi there,

does anyone know where I can download jingles from 95,8 Capital FM's radio station? Would be great if you could quickly let me know at muenchen23@talknet.de

Many thanks !!!

122. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 14:49:38 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3be40368.1245555@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 23119

On 3 Nov 2001 05:46:40 -0800, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:

>billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote in message
news:<3be37600.2402954@news.mindspring.com>...
>> On 2 Nov 2001 15:30:24 -0800, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>> > What I sed was that this NG was
>> >established to provide brawling space for the online code test war(s).
>> >Which is well known USENET historical fact in the ham NGs. What I also
>> >sed was that there will be further brawls over the code tests in this
>> >NG.
>>
>> There may be further discussions, but I doubt they will
>> be lasting or lenthy. The train is flying down the track
>> towards the end of code testing as a requirement. The
>> path is clear, the route is clear, it's just the need to pass through
>> various stops along the way to the final treaty decisions
>> at WRC2003 followed by individual actions by individual
>> countries.
>>
>> The FCC has been clear enough on what rational
>> keeps even 5 wpm in US regs now and that is only the treaty
>> requirement.
>>
>Uh-huh. Maintain yer stiff & defensive upper lip, 2003 ain't over yet.
>w3rv

Next stop is fantasy land if you believe morse testing won't be
dropped from the treaty at WRC2003.

Cheers,
Bill k2unk

123. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 15:00:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be405b9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23120

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0111021853.56826841@posting.google.com...
>
> Which is why for the most part I sorta "killfile" the "phone bands".
>
>
> Dit-dit.
>
>
> w3rv

Killfiling the phone bands because of actions you disagree will have exactly the opposite affect you are probably hoping for.

I don't think bad operating practices are so prolific *from anyone* on the HF bands that anyone should refrain from using any of them.

Kim W5TIT

124. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 15:01:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be405ba_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23121

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE35D06.D2EF5E22@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?
>
> > That depends on how much you value liberty. Who was it that said, "From
time
> > to time, the tree of liberty must be watered with the blood of free men
and
> > tyrants alike." (I'm probably paraphrasing, but I think it gets the
point
> > across)
>
> Is getting Saddam Hussein worth your life?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

I bet it's only worth the life of "someone else" to get Hussein ;)

Kim W5TIT

125. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 15:05:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be406c7$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23122

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BE38D84.E060D134@sccoast.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > This is simply absurd, Dwight. My very
> > presence on this newsgroup proves you
> > wrong, unless you believe I employ a
> > private secretary to take my hand-chisled
> > notes on stone tablets and transcribe them
> > on a computer to be posted on this newsgroup.
>
>
> It's not really that absurd, Larry. The fact that you're relatively
> up to date in one area does not mean that you're not a old fashioned
> in another. And, when it comes to radio (which is what we're talking
> about here), you appear to be an old fashioned guy - perhaps even a
> luddite in some ways.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Pssst, he ain't all that up-to-date, either.

Kim W5TIT

126. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 15:14:18 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BE3FB1B.15C3402A@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23123

Putting 'tit' in her call sign is the only way she could ever have
any.

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3be28a32_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> > >
> > >I don't care what Riley Hollingsworth thinks of my callsign,
>
> Kim:

>
> > >Why in Hell's bells would I care about Riley's--or anyone
> > >else's--endorsement of my callsign?!

Typical attitude of the 'me' generation.

127. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 15:27:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be40be0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23124

You mean kind of like the only way you grow balls is through comments like the one below?

By the way, I am 47 years old, far from being a part of the 'me' generation. I just don't agree with the notion that it is my responsibility to make bigots and hypocrites happy, just as it is not theirs to make me happy.

Larry cannot understand that Riley Hollingsworth is a man who is quite stern, cannot be "tricked" as Larry loves to imply, and who has a deep commitment to ham radio without the bigotry attached. Larry can't stand it that I respect Riley for his thoughts and the way he makes them--but disregard the notion that a callsign will move ham radio "one step closer to extinction." In fact, I downright will tell Riley (and have) or anyone else that he's wrong. Larry doesn't like that, either.

Larry doesn't like a lot of stuff.

Kim W5TIT

"JJ" <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3BE3FB1B.15C3402A@mailcity.net...
> Putting 'tit' in her call sign is the only way she could ever have
> any.
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <3be28a32_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
> >
> > >
> > >I don't care what Riley Hollingsworth thinks of my callsign,
> >
> > Kim:
>
> >
> > >Why in Hell's bells would I care about Riley's--or anyone
> > >else's--endorsement of my callsign?!
>
> Typical attitude of the 'me' generation.

128. Re: Capital FM - Jingle

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 16:01:14 UTC
From: Simon <mail@simonfoy.com>
Message-ID: <CyUE7.6077$CI3.1498679@news6-win.server.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 23126
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,uk.radio.amateur

"muenchen23" <muenchen23@talknet.de> wrote in message
news:VhSE7.6214$t04.637331601@news.tli.de...
> Hi there,
>
> does anyone know where I can download jingles from 95,8 Capital FM's radio
> station? Would be great if you could quickly let me know at
> muenchen23@talknet.de
>
> Many thanks !!!
Try www.audiogalaxy.com

I have one or two if you want me to send them to you.

Kindest regards

Simon

129. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 16:01:56 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011103110156.18027.00001136@mb-fz.news.cs.com>
Source record: 23125

>Next stop is fantasy land if you believe morse testing won't be
>dropped from the treaty at WRC2003.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill k2unk

Then I must be on Fantasy Island, Bill, because I don't think Morse testing will be completely eliminated until 2013. Take it easy.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

130. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 16:34:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE41C86.F6B373FA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23127

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Larry, what is it with your obsession with Kim's callsign? Is it
> because she is a woman? Is it because a woman selected a callsign that
> vaguely relates to a part of the female anatomy? I seriously doubt you
> would be complaining so hard if that callsign were randomly issued by
> a computer to a man.

Larry has a "Large Tits" call sign. I think he should trade
it in for a more decent one.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

131. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 16:37:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE41D55.C49094B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23128

JJ wrote:
> Putting 'tit' in her call sign is the only way she could ever have
> any.

It's obvious that you've never seen Kim.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

132. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 16:45:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE41F20.F6EC494D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23129

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >Next stop is fantasy land if you believe morse testing won't be
> >dropped from the treaty at WRC2003. Cheers, Bill k2unk
>
> Then I must be on Fantasy Island, Bill, because I don't think Morse testing
> will be completely eliminated until 2013. Take it easy.

Note that Bill did NOT say Morse testing will be completely
eliminated in 2003. He said Morse code testing will probably
be dropped from the *treaty* at WRC2003. That's a big difference.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

133. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 16:51:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011103115157.29609.00000314@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23130

Here are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583

Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209

As of November 1, 2001:

Novice - 40,764 (decrease of 8,565)
Tech - 232,007 (increase of 26,613)
Tech Plus - 87,200 (decrease of 41,660)
General - 138,265 (increase of 25,588)
Advanced - 86,832 (decrease of 12,950)
Extra - 97,458 (increase of 18,708)
Total - 682,526 (increase of 7,734)

Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,971 (decrease of 23,612)

Total General/Advanced/Extra: 322,555 (increase of 31,346)

73 de Jim, N2EY

134. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 17:21:20 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011103122120.18011.00001210@mb-fz.news.cs.com>
Source record: 23131

>
>Note that Bill did NOT say Morse testing will be completely
>eliminated in 2003. He said Morse code testing will probably
>be dropped from the *treaty* at WRC2003. That's a big difference.
>--
>cheers, CAM

Quite true Cecil, thanks. That's what I meant, I don't think it'll even be dropped fom the ITU treaty until 2013. Sorry for the "fuzzy" post. Take it easy. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

135. Evolution of Techs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 17:54:11 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <0307235490d1627ab8d69bf4d8c16cae.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23132

Saw this on a history reflector, and thought it was interesting.

(ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

THE WAYBACK MACHINE #16 by Bill Continelli, W2XOY

When the FCC created the Technician class license back in 1951, their intention was to give it a separate and unique purpose. The Commission stated that the Technician class license was established expressly for serious minded experimenters who needed spectrum space in which to conduct their tests. It was not established as a communicators' service and was not to be a stepping stone between the Novice and General class licenses. The original Technician class operator only had privileges above 220 Mc. In 1955, they were given six meters and in 1959, the 145-147 Mc. segment of two meters. Getting additional frequencies for Technicians was difficult--the petitions could not mention "communications" as a reason, but rather had to show that there was a need for additional experimentation on the six and two meter bands. Because of the "experimental" nature of the license, Technicians were not allowed to become RACES stations. They also faced some discrimination by a few higher class amateurs--in fact, several proposals were made to the FCC to "punish" Technicians who used the airwaves to communicate, rather than to experiment.

In 1962, two events occurred. First, the FCC denied petitions to give Technicians the 29.5-29.7 Mc. segment of ten meters as well as full two meter privileges. In rejecting these petitions, the FCC said there was "considerable misunderstanding" about the role of the Technician class, and restated the "experimenter" policy they had issued in 1951.

Also that year, a new amateur publication hit the market- "VHF Horizons." Concentrating on six meters and above, this magazine was full of technical articles, construction projects, contest information, and VHF news. But it was the editorial content of "VHF Horizons" that broke new ground. For the first time, an amateur magazine called for a rewrite of FCC policy. They wanted Technicians to be considered full-fledged amateurs and not just experimenters. Naturally, this caused controversy in the amateur community. Technicians who considered themselves communicators flocked to this new publication, while some higher class amateurs condemned it and restated their position that "communicating" Technicians were violating FCC policy. Unfortunately, "VHF Horizons" was not able to turn a profit, and expired after only two years.

In 1967, the FCC instituted "incentive licensing". While the actual frequency loss by Technicians was minimal--just the first 100 kc. CW segment of six meters--the FCC still struck a blow to those wishing to remove the "experimenter" status from this license. The FCC once again turned aside

requests to expand Technician privileges to the full two meter band. In addition, the FCC also removed two meter voice privileges for Novices and took away the right for an amateur to simultaneously hold a Novice and Technician license. According to the Commission, too many Novices were operating two meter voice, were not increasing their code speed, and were upgrading only to Technician instead of General when their Novice license expired. Once again, the 1951 policy was restated.

However, despite the FCC's position, thousands of Technicians were on the VHF bands as communicators. With the rise of two meter FM, new Technicians were taking to the airwaves every day, mostly with surplus wide-band commercial equipment. Recognizing that the role of this class of license had evolved, the ARRL Board of Directors met on November 1, 1969 and came to a decision. In an editorial in the December 1969 issue of "QST" entitled "Technicians as Communicators", the ARRL's new position was stated--Technicians were no longer just experimenters, but rather full fledged communicators. The ARRL proposed that they be given the full two meter band, the 29.5 to 29.7 Mc. segment of ten meters, and the ability to once again hold a Novice license simultaneously. The ARRL put these proposals before the FCC in a petition.

The FCC did not immediately respond to this petition, but rather, in 1971 issued an odd ruling in which they stated that a Technician class amateur could not use a repeater in which the input was in the Technician subband of 145-147 MHz, but the output was above 147. Nevertheless, since the repeater subband in the early 70's was 146-148 MHz and the Technician was not allowed above 147, the FCC was under pressure. On October 17, 1972, Technicians were given the 147-148 MHz segment of two meters. The FCC denied Technicians ten meters, Novices privileges, and the 144-145 MHz portion of two meters, but the door was opened.

With thousands of Technicians on two meter FM, the FCC then moved slowly towards full VHF privileges for them, realizing that the "experimenter" designation was obsolete. In 1975, Technicians were given Novice frequency privileges. When the new repeater subband was opened at 144.5-145.5 MHz, Technician privileges were expanded to 144.5-148. The FCC also realized that Technicians could no longer be excluded from RACES operation. In 1976, the FCC eliminated the "mail order" status of the Technician exam and required applicants to show up at an FCC examination point.

Finally, in 1978, Technicians received full two meter privileges. In the eyes of the FCC, they were full-fledged amateurs. In 1987, the exam was made easier by splitting element 3--the General written exam--into 3A for Technician and 3B for General. This is why those Technicians licensed before March 1987 only have to take the 5 WPM code test to upgrade to General. Also in 1987, Technicians received sideband privileges in the 28.3 to 28.5 MHz segment of ten meters. And, in a final act of "Technician Liberation" in 1991, 40 years after the license was established, the code-free Technician was created.

--
Posted from [204.31.51.107]

via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

136. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 18:13:17 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be43421$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23133

Yeah, something like maybe K3LD. (The L=Lacking).

Kim W5TIT

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE41C86.F6B373FA@IEEE.org...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > Larry, what is it with your obsession with Kim's callsign? Is it
> > because she is a woman? Is it because a woman selected a callsign that
> > vaguely relates to a part of the female anatomy? I seriously doubt you
> > would be complaining so hard if that callsign were randomly issued by
> > a computer to a man.
>
> Larry has a "Large Tits" call sign. I think he should trade
> it in for a more decent one.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

137. Re: Contests (was: 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 19:39:39 UTC
From: Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com>
Message-ID: <tu8hvskq94c765@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 23134
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

> >Contesting in ANY form is idiotic.
>
> Any form? That would include all sports, gambling, lotteries,
> applying for a job in competition against others, working for
> a job promotion in competition against others, and dozens of
> other day-to-day challenges ("contests").

No, that would be taking my statement out of context. We are talking
about radio contesting, that has already been established. Please follow
along before you post and make yourself look innane./

>
> Your attempt at oneupmanship on the newsgroups is a form
> of contesting so you've snagged yourself on a self-made
> paradox. Luckily, your opinion won't mean one iota to the
> thousands of happy competitors in the next contest; they'll
> go about having a fun weekend all the while your BP is
> soaring!

My bloodpressure soars little to none over radio.

Toll_Free

>
> Jeff KH6O
>
>
> --
> Telecommunication Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
> U.S. Coast Guard University of Hawaii System
> jherman @ d14.uscg.mil jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

138. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 19:42:24 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <a88a634ee9063c28c93f35aff160ea22.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23135

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote:

> Yeah, something like maybe K3LD. (The L=Lacking).
>
> Kim W5TIT

And what is that Dianne is lacking (in your humble opinion)?

(ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas02poolc44.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.3.44]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

139. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 20:12:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011103151210.22754.00000265@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 23136

In article <3be37600.2402954@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>The FCC has been clear enough on what rational
>keeps even 5 wpm in US regs now and that is only the treaty
>requirement.
>
Yup. If it wasn't clear in 1991, they made it perfectly clear in late 1999. The treaty is the ONE AND ONLY reason they kept code testing in the restructuring that went into effect April 15, 2000.

If/when that reason is eliminated, it would be completely illogical for the FCC to continue code testing, unless there is a major FCC policy change. And that's not very likely. Heck, the FCC has been pushing the nocodetest idea since 1975.

Opinion question, Bill: If S25.5 is eliminated, will there even be an NPRM, or will the FCC just issue an order of some sort suspending Element 1? I would not be at all surprised if they just did the latter,, saying that they had already considered the matter thoroughly in 1998-1999.

Fun fact: In the results of Field Day 2001, CW and digital QSOs are UP and 'phone QSOs are down, compared to FD 2000. The FD 2000 writeup gives actual numbers, but the FD 2001 writeup just gives percentages of increase/decrease. Some numbers:

FD2000: CW QSOs 509,562 (35.8%)
Phone QSOs 901,869 (63.4%)
Digital QSOs 10,385 (0.8%)
Total QSOs 1,421,816

FD2001: CW QSOs up 5.1% (about 535,549) (37.8%)
Phone QSOs down 4% (about 865,795) (61.2%)
Digital QSOs up 37.9% (about 14,321) (1.0%)
Total QSOs about 1,415,665

Participation is just about the same both years.

73 de Jim, N2EY

140. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 23:24:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE47C97.A993C8AC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23137

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry has a "Large Tits" call sign.
> I think he should trade it in for
> a more decent one.

Absolutely disgusting. He should be ashamed of himself - dragging
down the image of ham radio like that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

141. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 23:27:11 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be48a54_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23142

Let's put it this way: the lacking is nothing that a person with the gender name of Dianne would be carrying around. Then again, Larry doesn't carry much of one around either (at least not from what I can tell).

Nighty night.

Kim W5TIT

"Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message news:a88a634ee9063c28c93f35aff160ea22.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote:
>
> > Yeah, something like maybe K3LD. (The L=Lacking).
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> And what is that Dianne is lacking (in your humble opinion)?
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

142. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 23:30:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE47E2D.8F164A54@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23138

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > It's not really that absurd, Larry.
> > The fact that you're relatively up to
> > date in one area does not mean that
> > you're not a old fashioned in another.
> > And, when it comes to radio (which is
> > what we're talking about here), you
> > appear to be an old fashioned guy -
> > perhaps even a luddite in some ways.
>
>
> Pssst, he ain't all that up-to-date, either.

LOL. You're a hard woman, Kim. I was trying to give Larry a break by
not pointing that out (but to cover myself, I did use the word "relatively").

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

143. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 23:37:26 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Wc%E7.95535$WW.5465332@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23139

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011103151210.22754.00000265@nso-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3be37600.2402954@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
> (Bill Sohl) writes:
>
> >The FCC has been clear enough on what rational
> >keeps even 5 wpm in US regs now and that is only the treaty
> >requirement.
> >
> Yup. If it wasn't clear in 1991, they made it perfectly clear in late
1999. The
> treaty is the ONE AND ONLY reason they kept code testing in the
restructuring
> that went into effect April 15, 2000.
>
> If/when that reason is eliminated, it would be completely illogical for
the FCC
> to continue code testing, unless there is a major FCC policy change. And
that's
> not very likely. Heck, the FCC has been pushing the nocodetest idea since
1975.
>
> Opinion question, Bill: If S25.5 is eliminated, will there even be an
NPRM, or
> will the FCC just issue an order of some sort suspending Element 1? I
would not
> be at all surprised if they just did the latter,, saying that they had
already
> considered the matter thoroughly in 1998-1999.
>
> Fun fact: In the results of Field Day 2001, CW and digital QSOs are UP and
> 'phone QSOs are down, compared to FD 2000. The FD 2000 writeup gives
actual
> numbers, but the FD 2001 writeup just gives percentages of
increase/decrease.
> Some numbers:
>
> FD2000: CW QSOs 509,562 (35.8%)
> Phone QSOs 901,869 (63.4%)
> Digital QSOs 10,385 (0.8%)
> Total QSOs 1,421,816
>
> FD2001: CW QSOs up 5.1% (about 535,549) (37.8%)
> Phone QSOs down 4% (about 865,795) (61.2%)

> Digital QSOs up 37.9% (about 14,321) (1.0%)
> Total QSOs about 1,415,665
>
> Participation is just about the same both years.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I would agree with you, Jim, except I expect to see the Commission inundated with petitions for everything from refarming the Novice bands to making it a revocable offense to observe that Techs have a renewal rate of about 15%.

144. Re: Evolution of Techs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-03 23:37:59 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10111032336030.14446-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 23140

On Sat, 3 Nov 2001, K0HB wrote:
> THE WAYBACK MACHINE #16 by Bill Continelli, W2XOY
>
>When the FCC created the Technician class license back in 1951, their ...
>
>Finally, in 1978, Technicians received full two meter privileges. In the
>eyes of the FCC, they were full-fledged amateurs. In 1987, the exam was made
>easier by splitting element 3--the General written exam--into 3A for
>Technician and 3B for General. This is why those Technicians licensed before
>March 1987 only have to take the 5 WPM code test to upgrade to General.
>Also in 1987, Technicians received sideband privileges in the 28.3 to 28.5
>MHz segment of ten meters. And, in a final act of "Technician Liberation" in
>1991, 40 years after the license was established, the code-free Technician
>was created.

Wrong. Technicians licensed before 1991, INCLUDING those licensed before March 1987, ALREADY HAVE PASSED a 5wpm code test. They don't have ANY TEST to take to upgrade to General class under the licensing provisions effective April 15, 2000.

145. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 00:08:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE486FA.20D5FD84@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23141

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Larry has a "Large Tits" call sign. I think he should trade it in for
> > a more decent one.
>
> Absolutely disgusting. He should be ashamed of himself - dragging
> down the image of ham radio like that.

That's quite a statement coming from "Not Enough Tits". :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

146. Re: Contests (was: 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 01:11:57 UTC
From: fgillil@tincan.org
Message-ID: <e182e02.0111031711.4d89ec6e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Toll Free" <tollfree@bigradios.com> wrote in message
news:<tu8hvskq94c765@corp.supernews.com>...
> > >Contesting in ANY form is idiotic.
> >
> > Any form? That would include all sports, gambling, lotteries,
> > applying for a job in competition against others, working for
> > a job promotion in competition against others, and dozens of
> > other day-to-day challenges ("contests").
>
>
> No, that would be taking my statement out of context. We are talking
> about radio contesting, that has already been established. Please follow
> along before you post and make yourself look innane./

So are you saying that field days and QRP contests are idiotic?
How about fox/beaver hunts? Those all take quite a bit of skill.
Have you ever participated in any of those "idiotic" contests?

147. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 02:57:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gm90ap0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23144

On 03 Nov 2001 20:12:10 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Opinion question, Bill: If S25.5 is eliminated, will there even be an
>NPRM, or will the FCC just issue an order of some sort suspending
>Element 1? I would not be at all surprised if they just did the
>latter,, saying that they had already considered the matter thoroughly
>in 1998-1999.

An NPRM or NOI is not required to relax a restriction short of a
major restructuring.

Lest we forget, the entire question of Morse Code and its testing
for amateur licensing is totally non-existent and off the radar of
top-level FCC management who deal with issues of national broadcast
and telecommunications policy. The highest level of FCC staffer
with any "ownership" of this area would be Bill Cross, one of the
non-supervisory people who handles amateur rulemaking.

Something like this would be handled by Memorandum Opinion and Order
(MO&O) which is done by circulation (passed around amongst the
Commissioners' offices for signature and announced by title only at
an open meeting with no public hearing, no public vote).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

148. Re: Contests (was: 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 04:44:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE4C792.B1624E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Sparky wrote:
> So are you saying that field days and QRP contests are idiotic?
> How about fox/beaver hunts? Those all take quite a bit of skill.
> Have you ever participated in any of those "idiotic" contests?

The beaver hunts sound interesting.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

149. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 05:03:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011104000331.00126.00001376@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23146

Dwight:

I've seen Kim's photo, and trust me, I definitely do *not* obsess over her so-called anatomy!

Kim's call sign is obviously intended to call attention to a particular part of her anatomy, for whatever purpose she has. Unfortunately, this off-hand reference is considered by members of polite society to be offensive and demeaning to women, and not worthy conduct for radio amateurs. We value the fact that our hobby/service is family-oriented and we are constantly making the observation that we need more young people to become involved. However, when their parents see such poor examples of hams like Kim, with her callsign full of demeaning sexual innuendo, they are justifiably concerned about the example this gives to young people. Thus, she has, as Riley so aptly stated, taken us "...one step closer to extinction." Unfortunatley, Kim doesn't see the damage she has done, because it doesn't serve her purpose to do so.

73 de Larry, K3LT

150. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 06:05:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111032205.6f31a6f3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23147

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<Wc%E7.95535$WW.5465332@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> I would agree with you, Jim, except I expect to see the Commission inundated
> with petitions for everything from refarming the Novice bands to making it a
> revocable offense to observe that Techs have a renewal rate of about 15%.
>
>
The longer-view giggle here Dick is the assumption that what currently
appears to be a steamroller-effect wrt to eliminating the code tests
is somehow carved in stone for the millenia at the policy making and
regulatory level. So were the concepts behind Lyndon Johnson's Great
Society which were implemented and have since been clearly proven to
be one of the all-time high policy-making disasters in this country's
history. From which we've been struggling to recover from for how long
now?
>
>
The thrust to eliminate the code tests is simply a "phase-delayed"
microscopic-version attempt to dump Great Society free lunch mindset
into HF ham radio. There is no visible reason to expect that the
results would be any different from Lyndon's resounding thud.
>
>
If there was ever a point in this country's history when regulatory
agencies are in a mood to avoid more disasters via lack of forsight
this is it. Would not surprise me one bit if the FCC did a 180 on the
code test thingey.
>
>
Dit ditty dit-dit.
>
>
w3rv

151. Re: Evolution of Techs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 08:00:56 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <YA6F7.172227$W8.5443272@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23148

Hans, I don't remember exactly when these things transpired, but when I obtained my novice ticket in 1962 the only classes were novice, technician, and general. I obtained my extra class ticket in 1966 - so I have to assume that incentive licensing was underway at that time. The loss of some frequencies for advanced and generals may have well been after 1970, but the incentive licensing was underway before that. A good friend of mine was licensed as a technician back in the late 50s or early 60s. He only has to file paperwork to be a general. He has passed all of the tests. They downgraded the technician technical portion (well, written portion) of the test back in the 80s. Folks who can prove a technician license before that will become generals without taking ANY more tests.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:0307235490d1627ab8d69bf4d8c16cae.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Saw this on a history reflector, and thought it was interesting.
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> THE WAYBACK MACHINE #16 by Bill Continelli, W2XOY
>
> When the FCC created the Technician class license back in 1951, their
> intention was to give it a separate and unique purpose. The Commission
> stated that the Technician class license was established expressly for
> serious minded experimenters who needed spectrum space in
> which to conduct their tests. It was not established as a communicators'
> service and was not to be a stepping stone between the Novice
> and General class licenses. The original Technician class operator only
had
> privileges above 220 Mc. In 1955, they were given six meters and in 1959,
> the 145-147 Mc. segment of two meters. Getting additional frequencies for
> Technicians was difficult--the petitions could not mention
"communications"
> as a reason, but rather had to show that there was a need for additional
> experimentation on the six and two meter bands. Because of the
> "experimental" nature of the license, Technicians were not allowed to
become
> RACES stations. They also faced some discrimination by a few higher class
> amateurs--in fact, several proposals were made to the FCC to "punish"
> Technicians who used the airwaves to communicate, rather than to
experiment.

>
> In 1962, two events occurred. First, the FCC denied petitions to give
> Technicians the 29.5-29.7 Mc. segment of ten meters as well as full two
> meter privileges. In rejecting these petitions, the FCC said there was
> "considerable misunderstanding" about the role of the Technician class,
and
> restated the "experimenter" policy they had issued in 1951.
>
> Also that year, a new amateur publication hit the market- "VHF Horizons."
> Concentrating on six meters and above, this magazine was full of technical
> articles, construction projects, contest information, and VHF news. But it
> was the editorial content of "VHF Horizons" that broke new ground. For the
> first time, an amateur magazine called for a rewrite of FCC policy. They
> wanted Technicians to be considered full-fledged amateurs and not just
> experimenters. Naturally, this caused controversy in the amateur
community.
> Technicians who considered themselves communicators flocked to this new
> publication, while some higher class amateurs condemned it and restated
> their position that "communicating" Technicians were violating FCC policy.
> Unfortunately, "VHF Horizons" was not able to turn a profit, and expired
> after only two years.
>
> In 1967, the FCC instituted "incentive licensing". While the actual
> frequency loss by Technicians was minimal--just the first 100 kc. CW
segment
> of six meters--the FCC still struck a blow to those wishing to remove the
> "experimenter" status from this license. The FCC once again turned aside
> requests to expand Technician privileges to the full two meter band. In
> addition, the FCC also removed two meter voice privileges for Novices and
> took away the right for an amateur to simultaneously hold a Novice and
> Technician license. According to the Commission, too many Novices were
> operating two meter voice, were not increasing their code speed, and were
> upgrading only to Technician instead of General when their Novice license
> expired. Once again, the 1951 policy was restated.
>
> However, despite the FCC's position, thousands of Technicians were on the
> VHF bands as communicators. With the rise of two meter FM, new Technicians
> were taking to the airwaves every day, mostly with surplus wide-band
> commercial equipment. Recognizing that the role of this class of license
had
> evolved, the ARRL Board of Directors met on November 1, 1969 and came to a
> decision. In an editorial in the December 1969 issue of "QST" entitled
> "Technicians as Communicators", the ARRL's new position was
> stated--Technicians were no longer just experimenters, but rather full
> fledged communicators. The ARRL proposed that they be given the full two
> meter band, the 29.5 to 29.7 Mc. segment of ten meters, and the ability to
> once again hold a Novice license simultaneously. The ARRL put these
> proposals before the FCC in a petition.
>

> The FCC did not immediately respond to this petition, but rather, in 1971
> issued an odd ruling in which they stated that a Technician class amateur
> could not use a repeater in which the input was in the Technician subband
of
> 145-147 MHz, but the output was above 147. Nevertheless, since the
repeater
> subband in the early 70's was 146-148 MHz and the Technician was not
allowed
> above 147, the FCC was under pressure. On October 17, 1972, Technicians
were
> given the 147-148 MHz segment of two meters. The FCC denied Technicians
ten
> meters, Novices privileges, and the 144-145 MHz portion of two meters, but
> the door was opened.
>
> With thousands of Technicians on two meter FM, the FCC then moved slowly
> towards full VHF privileges for them, realizing that the "experimenter"
> designation was obsolete. In 1975, Technicians were given Novice frequency
> privileges. When the new repeater subband was opened at 144.5-145.5 MHz,
> Technician privileges were expanded to 144.5-148. The FCC also realized
that
> Technicians could no longer be excluded from RACES operation. In 1976, the
> FCC eliminated the "mail order" status of the Technician exam and required
> applicants to show up at an FCC examination point.
>
> Finally, in 1978, Technicians received full two meter privileges. In the
> eyes of the FCC, they were full-fledged amateurs. In 1987, the exam was
made
> easier by splitting element 3--the General written exam--into 3A for
> Technician and 3B for General. This is why those Technicians licensed
before
> March 1987 only have to take the 5 WPM code test to upgrade to General.
> Also in 1987, Technicians received sideband privileges in the 28.3 to 28.5
> MHz segment of ten meters. And, in a final act of "Technician Liberation"
in
> 1991, 40 years after the license was established, the code-free Technician
> was created.
>
>
>
>
> --
> Posted from [204.31.51.107]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

152. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 09:03:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011104040320.22754.00000272@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 23149

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gm90ap0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 03 Nov 2001 20:12:10 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Opinion question, Bill: If S25.5 is eliminated, will there even be an
>>NPRM, or will the FCC just issue an order of some sort suspending
>>Element 1? I would not be at all surprised if they just did the
>>latter,, saying that they had already considered the matter thoroughly
>>in 1998-1999.
>
> An NPRM or NOI is not required to relax a restriction short of a
> major restructuring.

I did not know that for sure. Thanks, Phil.
>
> Lest we forget, the entire question of Morse Code and its testing
> for amateur licensing is totally non-existent and off the radar of
> top-level FCC management who deal with issues of national broadcast
> and telecommunications policy. The highest level of FCC staffer
> with any "ownership" of this area would be Bill Cross, one of the
> non-supervisory people who handles amateur rulemaking.

I hear ya. It's a nonissue to the top dogs.
>
> Something like this would be handled by Memorandum Opinion and Order
> (MO&O) which is done by circulation (passed around amongst the
> Commissioners' offices for signature and announced by title only at
> an open meeting with no public hearing, no public vote).
>
Understood. Since the FCC's position on why code testing is still needed was
defined in 1999, the rest is pretty obvious.

Years ago, there were regs that required stuff like having to get a callsign
that matched your address if you moved, detailed logkeeping and
send-a-postcard-if-you're-operating-away-from-home-more-than-48-hours. As I
recall they all disappeared with little fanfare.

73 de Jim, N2EY

153. Re: Evolution of Techs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 13:03:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011104080328.02880.00000358@nso-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 23150

In article <YA6F7.172227$W8.5443272@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Hans, I don't remember exactly when these things transpired, but when I
>obtained my novice ticket in 1962 the only classes were novice, technician,
>and general.

Actually, James, that's not true. The Extra existed back then, too, requiring the 20 wpm code tests and a written test. Few hams got one back then because it gave no additional operating privileges.

Advanced also existed but it was closed to new licenses from the beginning of 1953 until 1967. Folks who already had Advanced licenses could keep renewing them and modifying them.

> I obtained my extra class ticket in 1966 - so I have to assume
>that incentive licensing was underway at that time. The loss of some
>frequencies for advanced and generals may have well been after 1970, but the
>incentive licensing was underway before that.

The discussion started as early as 1958, and the first serious proposals came in 1963. The Advanced was reopened to new licensees in 1967, and the HF license class subbands came into effect in two stages on November 22, 1968 and 1969.

> A good friend of mine was
>licensed as a technician back in the late 50s or early 60s. He only has to
>file paperwork to be a general. He has passed all of the tests. They
>downgraded the technician technical portion (well, written portion) of the
>test back in the 80s.

March 21, 1987 is the effective date. Old Element 3 was split into 3A and 3B.

> Folks who can prove a technician license before that
>will become generals without taking ANY more tests.
>
Yup - a paperwork upgrade.

For a detailed description of how this all came to be, surf over to deja.com and search on "The Past 50 Years of Amateur Radio Licensing" and my call.

73 de Jim, N2EY

154. Re: Evolution of Techs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 13:29:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111040529.88eb6a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23301

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<YA6F7.172227$W8.5443272@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> Hans, I don't remember exactly when these things transpired, but when I
> obtained my novice ticket in 1962 the only classes were novice, technician,
> and general. I obtained my extra class ticket in 1966 - so I have to assume
> that incentive licensing was underway at that time.
>
>
I believe the Extra was available from sometime back in the late 40s
when the FCC reorganized the ham license structure and eliminated the
old Class A and Class B licenses and created the General, etc. I don't
have a clue about when the Advanced Class license was created. Not
many hams pursued the Extra because it did not convey any more
priveleges than Generals had, it just got you a spiffy piece of
wallpaper. Generals had the whole ball of wax like Extras have today.
The FCC issued an 8 x 10 "Extra certificate" in addition to the actual
license from dunno when (40s?) thru the inception of Incentive
Licensing and to some point beyond when they quit passing them out.
The examiner filled it out on the spot and handed it to ya when ya
passed the Extra test but ya still had to wait the usual 6-8 weeks for
the license. The Incentive Licensing maneuver in 1968 +/- put teeth
into the Extra and Advanced licenses and spanked Generals. That's when
most of us Olde Farts with Extras now went back to the FCC Field
Offices to grunt thru the Extra exam in order to get dxing freqs back.
Long after we thought we had it made for life with our Generals.
>
>
Good thing RRAP wasn't around then, the brawls over Incentive
Licensing would have nuked USENET.
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
w3rv

155. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 14:13:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be54fe6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23302

Oh yeah, hey Dwight. The hilarious thing is that the photo I used to have on QRZ was of me while I was driving and was from the shoulders up...LOL Larry's only fantasized about what he believes.

In addition, I am 5'5", and weigh 210 pounds. Now, that may be obese to you, or whomever. But it certainly isn't to me.

The only problem here is that Larry is so full of self-hate for the way he is, looks and his failure with women, that he thinks it's normal for everyone to feel the same way when he slings mud around. Larry is so used to attacking people that his social skills are so minimal he must live by himself and carry on a lonely, lonely job.

Yeah, that's mud-slinging too. Larry brings out the worst in me...LOL

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011104000331.00126.00001376@mb-dh.aol.com...
> Dwight:
>
> I've seen Kim's photo, and trust me, I definitely do *not* obsess over her
> so-called anatomy!
>
> Kim's call sign is obviously intended to call attention to a particular part of
> her anatomy, for whatever purpose she has. Unfortunately, this off-hand
> reference is considered by members of polite society to be offensive and
> demeaning to women, and not worthy conduct for radio amateurs. We value the
> fact that our hobby/service is family-oriented and we are constantly making the
> observation that we need more young people to become involved. However, when
> their parents see such poor examples of hams like Kim, with her callsign full
> of demeaning sexual innuendo, they are justifiably concerned about the example
> this gives to young people. Thus, she has, as Riley so aptly stated, taken us
> "...one step closer to extinction." Unfortunatley, Kim doesn't see the damage
> she has done, because it doesn't serve her purpose to do so.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

156. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 14:33:04 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be551fe_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23303

By the way, Larry: Would you like to see what Riley Hollingsworth would have to say about your remarks that you've made here in the newsgroup in terms of whether they reflect good moral character, spirit of friendship, etc.? I'd be more than happy to be the one to piss him off with a whole bunch of your postings and ask that he share any opinion he may have. I could even suggest that he just peruse some of your posts. I can guarantee of what his response would be if he read your "stuff."

Put up or shut up, Larry. Just let me know.

Kim W5TIT

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3be54fe6_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> Oh yeah, hey Dwight. The hilarious thing is that the photo I used to have
> on QRZ was of me while I was driving and was from the shoulders up...LOL
> Larry's only fantasized about what he believes.
>
> In addition, I am 5'5", and weigh 210 pounds. Now, that may be obese to
> you, or whomever. But it certainly isn't to me.
>
> The only problem here is that Larry is so full of self-hate for the way he
> is, looks and his failure with women, that he thinks it's normal for
> everyone to feel the same way when he slings mud around. Larry is so used
> to attacking people that his social skills are so minimal he must live by
> himself and carry on a lonely, lonely job.
>
> Yeah, that's mud-slinging too. Larry brings out the worst in me...LOL
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011104000331.00126.00001376@mb-dh.aol.com...
> > Dwight:
> >
> > I've seen Kim's photo, and trust me, I definitely do *not* obsess over
her
> > so-called anatomy!
> >
> > Kim's call sign is obviously intended to call attention to a particular
> part of
> > her anatomy, for whatever purpose she has. Unfortunately, this off-hand
> > reference is considered by members of polite society to be offensive and
> > demeaning to women, and not worthy conduct for radio amateurs. We value

> the
> > fact that our hobby/service is family-oriented and we are constantly
> making the
> > observation that we need more young people to become involved. However,
> when
> > their parents see such poor examples of hams like Kim, with her callsign
> full
> > of demeaning sexual innuendo, they are justifiably concerned about the
> example
> > this gives to young people. Thus, she has, as Riley so aptly stated,
> taken us
> > "...one step closer to extinction." Unfortunatley, Kim doesn't see the
> damage
> > she has done, because it doesn't serve her purpose to do so.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

157. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 14:36:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE55273.75258DB3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23304

Brian Kelly wrote:
> The thrust to eliminate the code tests is simply a "phase-delayed"
> microscopic-version attempt to dump Great Society free lunch mindset
> into HF ham radio.

The Great Society was filled with affirmative action programs.
Morse code testing is an affirmative action program. Seems to
me, eliminating Morse code testing is a step away from forced
social engineering toward freedom of choice of modes in a hobby
in a free society. You, OTOH, seem to want to continue a "Great
Society" of forced Morse code operation. Why can't Morse code
stand on it own merits? Why does Morse code need an affirmative
action program?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

158. Re: Evolution of Techs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 14:39:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE5531E.732B28E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23305

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
> Hans, I don't remember exactly when these things transpired, but when I
> obtained my novice ticket in 1962 the only classes were novice, technician,
> and general.

Since the Extra class license was available in 1957, was it eliminated
between 1957 and 1962?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

159. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 14:58:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE55799.EB4D7DD6@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23306

CAM wrote:
>
> That's quite a statement coming
> from "Not Enough Tits". :-)

Hey, watch it. That can be taken the wrong way. As a guy, I wouldn't want any more than what I have. However, if you're talking about availability, then that may be another story.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

160. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 15:12:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE55ABC.804CD38D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23307

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> (snip) Kim's call sign is obviously
> intended to call attention to a
> particular part of her anatomy, for
> whatever purpose she has.

And I'll leave that purpose up to her - it's none of my business.

> Unfortunately, this off-hand reference
> is considered by members of polite
> society to be offensive and demeaning
> to women, and not worthy conduct for
> radio amateurs.

First of all, this is hardly a "polite" society. Second, breasts are not offensive and demeaning to women - it is only so when a person chooses to make it so in their own mind.

> We value the fact that our hobby/service
> is family-oriented (snip)

The last I checked, it was a good thing to have breasts around when starting a family - which seems pretty family oriented to me.

> demeaning sexual innuendo

Only in your own mind, Larry. I don't tend to view a simple reference to breasts that way.

> (snip) Thus, she has, as Riley so aptly
> stated, taken us "...one step closer to
> extinction." (snip)

And I think that is going a little overboard. A single person's callsign is not going to have any effect on ham radio - much less bring it closer to extinction. If Riley truly feels that way, why was the callsign available and issued?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

161. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 15:30:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE550AF.BAE4D044@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23308

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3BE19E27.AF31B050@mailcity.net>, JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
> writes:
>
> >The first step should have been to wipe Saddam Hussen off the map.
>
> We had the chance a decade ago, but Papa Bush ordered Stormin' Norman to stop
> short. Think about why that was done.

Basically to appease the Saudis, who have a very tenuous hold on their own government due to all the radical Islamics and their sympathizers who are among their own population. They could bring down the Saudi monarchy at will, if they wanted to badly enough to make the necessary sacrafices, and that fact is well known. It would not seem that sitation has abated at all to this time, rather is instead worsened. They dread what's going on now, as they know it will serve to stir up the fundamentalist Islamics.

162. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 15:37:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be5611d$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23310

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BE55ABC.804CD38D@sccoast.net...
>
> And I think that is going a little overboard. A single person's
> callsign is not going to have any effect on ham radio - much less
> bring it closer to extinction. If Riley truly feels that way, why was
> the callsign available and issued?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Thank you for the point...exactly.

Kim W5TIT

163. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 15:37:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE55249.6E227913@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23309

I woulda bet on it. I bet she was at the original Woodstock, too....

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011102070921.29609.00000277@nso-fm.aol.com...
> > In article <3bdf5bf4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >Indeed, it would be wonderful (though a pipedream) that we'd be the
> nation
> > >to look to for agreement and resolution.
> > >
> > Yep. But most Americans, (including you, Kim) are probably not yet willing
> to
> > make the kind of changes needed to make that happen.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> I don't think it will take only "most Americans" and I hope I am not
> stepping out on a limb here by *thinking* that you will understand the next
> fairly philosophical statements:
>
> Like I said, I used to be a peacenik, trying to make a difference in the
> world. Then, I moved away from the peaceful seclusion of the Adirondack
> Mtns., and found out just how huge a task it would be to realize, by walking
> straight into the grips of huge city life down here in the south.
>
> Nope, I am no longer willing to feel like I am in an extremely small
> minority of people who would like to see a different world and actually
> think I could do something about it. I have property; yearn for a bigger,
> better yard; ignore government (and the rest of the world) for the most
> part; don't think twice about paying taxes--just tell me how much I owe;
> just bought a foreign vehicle--ask me if I care; and truly don't care about
> people as much as I used to--because I got tired (once again) of pretty much
> being in such a small minority. I often review my emotions and check for
> bitterness--but I really don't think I am bitter at all, that would be
> pretty silly. I am just 'resigned'.
>
> Well, let's word that differently: I still care a great deal about people in
> terms of a collective "we"; but on an individual basis it's a whole lot more
> effort to deal with than I am willing to. I have *maybe* 10 friends (not
> counting family) and I actually choose it to be that way. I have no "true"
> friends other than my husband and my parents. I am just not willing to be

> the person I used to be with people. As an example: why would I put myself
> through constantly listening to people gripe (and so, so many do) about
> their marriages/jobs/kids/financial situations while they choose not to do a
> damned thing about it? After a while, the stories and the attitude get old
> (goodness, just look at this newsgroup). I am a "talk to the hand" person
> real quick. Peoples' tendencies are to gripe, not to change. And, I still
> dearly love Mother Earth--though I am far less proactive even on that any
> more.
>
> I got a little confused a long time back--I had a rooted belief in the basic
> principles of Christianity and started exploring the beliefs of the Eastern
> philosophy--which I find absolutely fascinating. The Eastern Philosophies
> made me yearn for a deeper commitment to my basic principles; however all
> this began happening at the same time I needed to make a choice as to live
> like a poor person (stay up north in the country and try to do with what I
> could through the oil crisis of the 70s) or "make something of myself" for
> my kids and family and move down here to the south. I chose the larger
> distraction and now use it as an excuse for being a realist. :)
>
> My ultimate belief is that God will straighten it all out by starting over
> again. My Karma is bad, bad, bad, but hopefully some kind of credit will be
> realized for deep-seated passion and desire.
>
> Willing? Not by myself--not as a tiny, tiny majority. Count me out--as
> disgusting as that is for me to even think about, I made my peace with it
> years ago.
>
> Kim W5TIT

164. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 15:47:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE55494.E3F25C53@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23311

CAM wrote:

> Richard Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > it is my sincere desire and hope that I'll always be able to accept things
> > > for what they are.
> >
> > And most of the rest of us will do our utmost to change that which is
> > diametrically opposed to our freedom loving way of life, ...
>
> Last week you were advocating giving up constitutional freedoms,
> allowing unreasonable search and seizure, and the aborting of
> due process. Would you please make up your mind?

So show the posting where I said anything remotely like that- you can't because it didn't happen.

We know that it's much too late for you, Kim or Dwight to acquire any common sense, but could
you at least take it as a given that in wartime the nation must be put on some kind of a wartime
footing if we are to have any chance of winning? That clearly means closing some of our openness
that was very much a part of adding to the terrorists advantage on Sept 11. If you can't understand
that, you reveal a lot about yourself(ves).

165. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 16:05:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE558BE.7D778196@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23312

K0HB wrote:

> Here are some other "policy" questions for consideration:
>
> -- Should it be the policy of USA to ask for worldwide 40M allocation
> at:
>
> a) 7.000-7.300MHz
> b) 6.900-7.200MHz
> c) 6.800-7.100Mhz
>
> -- If push came to shove, should we accept a worldwide allocation
> of 6.900-7.100 amateur-exclusive, in exchange for the current?
> (Which is 7.000-7.100 in R1 anr R3, 7.000-7.300 in R2).

Yes but only after losing a hard fight to make it 6.8-7.1

>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
>

No, but restrict it to digitial modes only, including radiotelegraphy, as the
30 meter band now is.

>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to permit "talk shows" such as the K1MAN
> transmissions on Amateur Radio.
>

No way!

>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to periodically conduct occupancy monitoring
> of VHF/UHF amateur bands, and adjust those allocations based on
> observed usage?
>

Couldn't blame them if they did...

>
> Surely we can think of more Amateur Radio policy matters that
> should be publicly discussed. Maybe we can get some ham radio
> back in this ham radio newsgroup.
>

Not a bad idea, but many participants evidently don't know much about the main subject....

166. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 16:39:21 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be56e38_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23313

Does being at the original Woodstock create a criminal or something, Dick?
I don't understand your implication.

Once again, you're great at innuendo, but nothing remotely constructive
about dialogue or debate.

No, I was not at the original Woodstock, I was too young to make the
decision by myself to go.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3BE55249.6E227913@worldnet.att.net...
> I woulda bet on it. I bet she was at the original Woodstock, too....
>
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011102070921.29609.00000277@nso-fm.aol.com...
> > > In article <3bdf5bf4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > writes:
> > >
> > > >Indeed, it would be wonderful (though a pipedream) that we'd be the
> > nation
> > > >to look to for agreement and resolution.
> > > >
> > > Yep. But most Americans, (including you, Kim) are probably not yet
willing
> > to
> > > make the kind of changes needed to make that happen.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > I don't think it will take only "most Americans" and I hope I am not
> > stepping out on a limb here by *thinking* that you will understand the
next
> > fairly philosophical statements:
> >
> > Like I said, I used to be a peacenik, trying to make a difference in the
> > world. Then, I moved away from the peaceful seclusion of the Adirondack
> > Mtns., and found out just how huge a task it would be to realize, by
walking

> > straight into the grips of huge city life down here in the south.
> >
> > Nope, I am no longer willing to feel like I am in an extremely small
> > minority of people who would like to see a different world and actually
> > think I could do something about it. I have property; yearn for a
bigger,
> > better yard; ignore government (and the rest of the world) for the most
> > part; don't think twice about paying taxes--just tell me how much I owe;
> > just bought a foreign vehicle--ask me if I care; and truly don't care
about
> > people as much as I used to--because I got tired (once again) of pretty
much
> > being in such a small minority. I often review my emotions and check
for
> > bitterness--but I really don't think I am bitter at all, that would be
> > pretty silly. I am just 'resigned'.
> >
> > Well, let's word that differently: I still care a great deal about
people in
> > terms of a collective "we"; but on an individual basis it's a whole lot
more
> > effort to deal with than I am willing to. I have *maybe* 10 friends
(not
> > counting family) and I actually choose it to be that way. I have no
"true"
> > friends other than my husband and my parents. I am just not willing to
be
> > the person I used to be with people. As an example: why would I put
myself
> > through constantly listening to people gripe (and so, so many do) about
> > their marriages/jobs/kids/financial situations while they choose not to
do a
> > damned thing about it? After a while, the stories and the attitude get
old
> > (goodness, just look at this newsgroup). I am a "talk to the hand"
person
> > real quick. Peoples' tendencies are to gripe, not to change. And, I
still
> > dearly love Mother Earth--though I am far less proactive even on that
any
> > more.
> >
> > I got a little confused a long time back--I had a rooted belief in the
basic
> > principles of Christianity and started exploring the beliefs of the
Eastern
> > philosophy--which I find absolutely fascinating. The Eastern
Philosophies
> > made me yearn for a deeper commitment to my basic principles; however
all

> > this began happening at the same time I needed to make a choice as to
live
> > like a poor person (stay up north in the country and try to do with what
I
> > could through the oil crisis of the 70s) or "make something of myself"
for
> > my kids and family and move down here to the south. I chose the larger
> > distraction and now use it as an excuse for being a realist. :)
> >
> > My ultimate belief is that God will straighten it all out by starting
over
> > again. My Karma is bad, bad, bad, but hopefully some kind of credit
will be
> > realized for deep-seated passion and desire.
> >
> > Willing? Not by myself--not as a tiny, tiny majority. Count me out--as
> > disgusting as that is for me to even think about, I made my peace with
it
> > years ago.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>

167. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 16:40:20 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be56e6e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23314

No, we've never done that before, and it's wrong that it is done this time.
PERIOD.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3BE55494.E3F25C53@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Richard Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > > it is my sincere desire and hope that I'll always be able to accept
things
> > > > for what they are.
> > >
> > > And most of the rest of us will do our utmost to change that which
is
> > > diametrically opposed to our freedom loving way of life, ...
> >
> > Last week you were advocating giving up constitutional freedoms,
> > allowing unreasonable search and seizure, and the aborting of
> > due process. Would you please make up your mind?
>
> So show the posting where I said anything remotely like that- you can't
because it
> didn't happen.
>
> We know that it's much too late for you, Kim or Dwight to acquire any
common
> sense, but could
> you at least take it as a given that in wartime the nation must be put on
some
> kind of a wartime
> footing if we are to have any chance of winning? That clearly means
closing some
> of our openness
> that was very much a part of adding to the terrorists advantage on Sept
11. If you
> can't understand
> that, you reveal a lot about yourself(ves).
>

168. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 19:31:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BE588F6.DC097B31@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23315

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Dwight:
>
> I've seen Kim's photo, and trust me, I definitely do *not* obsess over her
> so-called anatomy!
>
> Kim's call sign is obviously intended to call attention to a particular part of
> her anatomy, for whatever purpose she has.

Some people strive for the lowest common denominator.

169. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 19:57:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE59D9B.1BD78D7D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23316

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Last week you were advocating giving up constitutional freedoms,
> > allowing unreasonable search and seizure, and the aborting of
> > due process. Would you please make up your mind?
>
> So show the posting where I said anything remotely like that- you can't because it
> didn't happen.

Of course it did, Dick. A few of us said we didn't want to give up any
constitutional rights in order to catch terrorists and you argued that
was not the way to be - that we *should* be willing to give up
constitutional rights in order to catch terrorists. You continue
to advocate such in your closing paragraph below in this posting.

> We know that it's much too late for you, Kim or Dwight to acquire any common
> sense, but could
> you at least take it as a given that in wartime the nation must be put on some
> kind of a wartime
> footing if we are to have any chance of winning?

That is why I advocate that we declare war. When war is declared and rights
are taken away because of the war, we get those rights back when the war
is over. We never get rights back after an undeclared war.

> That clearly means closing some of our openness
> that was very much a part of adding to the terrorists advantage on Sept 11.

There you go again, talking with a forked tongue. Please make up your
mind. You are either for or against giving up constitutional rights.
A few paragraphs above you deny what you are advocating in your last
paragraph. You simply cannot both deny advocating something while
continuing to advocate it. Nobody is stupid enough to allow you to
get away with that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

170. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 20:03:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE59F2A.6257DC00@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23317

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> > -- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> > and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
>
> No, but restrict it to digitial modes only, including radiotelegraphy, as the
> 30 meter band now is.

One of the stated purposes of a 60-meter band is to close the gap in
emergency communications between 75m and 40m. SSB is by far the most
popular mode for HF emergency communications. Most of the announced HF
emergency frequencies during hurricanes are in the voice portions of
the bands.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

171. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 20:05:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE59F91.70291A54@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23318

JJ wrote:
> Some people strive for the lowest common denominator.

I'm teaching math in the GED program. That's exactly what
they should do.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

172. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 21:26:20 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9s4bq202dpn@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23320

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE59F91.70291A54@IEEE.org...
> JJ wrote:
> > Some people strive for the lowest common denominator.
>
> I'm teaching math in the GED program. That's exactly what
> they should do.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I think that in this context, lowest common denominator = cheap laughs.
```

173. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 21:43:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111041343.73f344bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23319

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3BE55273.75258DB3@IEEE.org>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > The thrust to eliminate the code tests is simply a "phase-delayed"
> > microscopic-version attempt to dump Great Society free lunch mindset
> > into HF ham radio.
>
> The Great Society was filled with affirmative action programs.
> Morse code testing is an affirmative action program. Seems to
> me, eliminating Morse code testing is a step away from forced
> social engineering toward freedom of choice of modes in a hobby
> in a free society. You, OTOH, seem to want to continue a "Great
> Society" of forced Morse code operation. Why can't Morse code
> stand on it own merits? Why does Morse code need an affirmative
> action program?
>
Yeah, right. Bass ackwards as usual. Eliminating the requirement to do
a bit of work for what ya get instead of passing out freebies isn't
what "affirmative action" was all about? We already been there Cecil.
>
w3rv

174. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 21:51:47 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9s4d7i02fk0@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23322

> > That depends on how much you value liberty. Who was it that said, "From time
> > to time, the tree of liberty must be watered with the blood of free men and
> > tyrants alike." (I'm probably paraphrasing, but I think it gets the point
> > across)
>
> Is getting Saddam Hussein worth your life?

Do I get to ride the bomb like Slim Pickens in "Dr. Strangelove?"

175. Re: Contests (was: 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 22:17:38 UTC
From: fgillil@tincan.org
Message-ID: <e182e02.0111041417.50afc47a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23321
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3BE4C792.B1624E@IEEE.org>...
> Sparky wrote:
> > So are you saying that field days and QRP contests are idiotic?
> > How about fox/beaver hunts? Those all take quite a bit of skill.
> > Have you ever participated in any of those "idiotic" contests?
>
> The beaver hunts sound interesting.

The only problem is getting the beaver to cooperate...

176. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-04 23:03:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmakbq0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23323

On 04 Nov 2001 09:03:20 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Years ago, there were regs that required stuff like having to get a callsign
>that matched your address if you moved, detailed logkeeping and
>send-a-postcard-if-you're-operating-away-from-home-more-than-48-hours. As I
>recall they all disappeared with little fanfare.

Yup. By a stroke of the pen. Ditto for the detailed technical
filings for amateur repeater stations parallel to those for
commercial two-way radio repeaters.

Blame yours truly for pushing the elimination of the above-mentioned
requirements, aidied and abetted by my compadre at the Washington
office who commuted 75 miles each day with the 2-meter rig mike in
hand.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

177. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 00:23:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE5DC1A.DEAB91F1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23324

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> Yes, what you did was to write to Riley and attempt to trick him into
> endorsing your choice of callsign based on your "right" to do so. And,
> like I have before, he admitted that you do have a clear right to select such
> a call sign, in spite of it's unsuitability in a family-oriented radio service.
> Which is why he said, that when someone with young children encounters
> you and your callsign on-the-air, and decides to choose another activity
> other than ham radio, you have taken our hobby/service "...one step closer
> to extinction."

I suppose Kim is a birdwatcher. There's a kind of small bird called a
"tit". If you think of something else, that's not her fault.

And there's "tit for tat". Somewhat related to flame wars on
newsgroups.

:-)

178. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 01:55:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE5F192.82A7C4C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23325

Brian Kelly wrote:
> Yeah, right. Bass ackwards as usual. Eliminating the requirement to do
> a bit of work for what ya get instead of passing out freebies isn't
> what "affirmative action" was all about? We already been there Cecil.

Affirmative action is artificially inflating the population of a
group with members of certain minority groups. The majority of hams
use Morse code "rarely or never". That puts Morse code users in a
minority group among ham radio operators. You want to artificially
inflate the Morse coded ham population through governmental
requirements. That's exactly what affirmative action is.

Not enough blacks on the police force. Not enough Morse code
operators on the ham bands. It's the same concept.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

179. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 01:57:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE5F1F0.1B8A33A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23326

```
Krell wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Is getting Saddam Hussein worth your life?
>
> Do I get to ride the bomb like Slim Pickens in "Dr. Strangelove?"

If so, would you volunteer to ride it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```


```
-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

180. Re: Evolution of Techs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 01:58:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011104205852.20853.00000235@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23327

In article <d22b54c3.0111040529.88eb6a2@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:<YA6F7.172227$W8.5443272@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
>> Hans, I don't remember exactly when these things transpired, but when I
>> obtained my novice ticket in 1962 the only classes were novice, technician,
>> and general. I obtained my extra class ticket in 1966 - so I have to
>assume
>> that incentive licensing was underway at that time.
>>
>>
>I believe the Extra was available from sometime back in the late 40s
>when the FCC reorganized the ham license structure and eliminated the
>old Class A and Class B licenses and created the General, etc.

There was a license called "Amateur Extra" back in the early 1920s but it was short lived.

The Extra as we know it was created by the FCC in the restructuring of 1951. That shakeup brought us the Novice and Technician, too.

>I don't
>have a clue about when the Advanced Class license was created.

The original FRC/FCC setup from the early 1930s was "ABC" - Class A was all privs, Class B was all privs except no phone between 3 and 26 Mhz, and Class C was a Class B taken by mail. In the 1951 changes A became Advanced, B became General and C became Conditional.

Advanced required a year as Class B or C and a heavy-duty written test. All code tests were 10 wpm until 1936 and 13 wpm until 1951.

The Extra was supposed to replace the Advanced, but it didn't work out that way.

>Not
>many hams pursued the Extra because it did not convey any more
>priveleges than Generals had, it just got you a spiffy piece of
>wallpaper. Generals had the whole ball of wax like Extras have today.

That started in Feb, 1953.

>The FCC issued an 8 x 10 "Extra certificate" in addition to the actual
>license from dunno when (40s?) thru the inception of Incentive
>Licensing and to some point beyond when they quit passing them out.
>The examiner filled it out on the spot and handed it to ya when ya

>passed the Extra test but ya still had to wait the usual 6-8 weeks for
>the license. The Incentive Licensing maneuver in 1968 +/- put teeth
>into the Extra and Advanced licenses and spanked Generals.

Yup. FCC actually retooled the 1951 plan they abandoned in 1953.

>That's when
>most of us Olde Farts with Extras now went back to the FCC Field
>Offices to grunt thru the Extra exam in order to get dxing freqs back.
>Long after we thought we had it made for life with our Generals.

I had full privs for a few weeks in '68 and then lost 'em. Had to wait almost 2
years to take the Extra test. Piece of cake.
>>
>Good thing RRAP wasn't around then, the brawls over Incentive
>Licensing would have nuked USENET.

Yeah, those old time weenies could REALLY complain!

73 de Jim, N2EY

181. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 02:04:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE5F388.DC9CF879@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23328

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Oh yeah, hey Dwight. The hilarious
> thing is that the photo I used to
> have on QRZ was of me while I was
> driving and was from the shoulders
> up...LOL. Larry's only fantasized
> about what he believes.

You know Larry has a vivid imagination. He really believes things
like your callsign will bring ham radio "one step closer to extinction."

> Yeah, that's mud-slinging too. Larry
> brings out the worst in me...LOL

Larry seems to like bringing out the worst in people. If he didn't,
he wouldn't endlessly bring up controversial subjects and take such a
contemptuous position on them.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

182. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 02:29:22 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE5F982.8DCC8189@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23329

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011102111905.10701.00001058@nso-mv.aol.com...
> > In article <3be28a32_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >
> > >I don't care what Riley Hollingsworth thinks of my callsign,

Well, these other ham have such callsigns:

TRINI, TONINO I4TIT
YAMAGUCHI, KENICHI JA6TIT
LINDBERG, JAMES W. K6TIT
FRANZ KRAMER OE7TIT
Desmarais, Richard VA2TIT
Dupras Fontaine, Remy VE2TIT
Cubberley, Neil VE3TIT
McBain, Shanta VE7TIT
BOWLING, LARRY M. W4TIT
HENDRIX, MICHAEL D. W6TIT
TAYLOR, A F ZL2TIT
Kenichi Yamaguchi, JA6TIT
Miss. Andrie Evans, VU2TIT
Jacek Malec, SP5TIT

Must all be birdwatchers.... :-)

And then there is:

FUCITO, MICHELE I8FUC
ROSATI, GIANFRANCO IK6FUC
GROOSCORS C, ROLANDO E YV5FUC
MARQUEZ F, MARCIAL E YV2FUC
PEREZ, GUILLERMO YV1FUC
Hector F. Verolin, LU2FUC
Hector G. Ortiz, LU3FUC
Hector J. Franceschina, LU4FUC
Leandro O. Aguiar, LU5FUC
Angel J. Andreuchi, LU6FUC
David O. Attaccalite, LU7FUC
Hector F. Bartolome, LU8FUC
Juan A. Mainardi, LU9FUC
LUIS SOLER GRAU, EA3FUC
JOSE L. PAREDES LOPEZ, EA5FUC

ANTONIO CERVANTES MAZA, EA7FUC

SARNELLI, FRANCESCO IK8FUK
BONGIORNO, GERLANDO IW2FUK
MICHIUE, TAKAHIRO JH3FUK
Bisaillon, Richard Paul VE2FUK
Whiting, Patricia VE3FUK
Lee, Kevin VE7FUK
MARTINEZ S, JESUS S YV1FUK
Osvaldo J. Dumois, LU1FUK
Atilio A. Rodriguez, LU3FUK
Enzo R. Steel, LU4FUK
Hugo M. Agatiello, LU5FUK
Oscar E. Bustos, LU6FUK
Hugo D. Torres, LU7FUK
Fernando M. Mihoevich M., LU8FUK
Fabian A. Diaz, LU9FUK
Mi Ran Song, HL5FUK
TAKASHI ONIKURA, JA6FUK
VIVES. JOSE ORIOL ALTISENCH, EA3FUK
PEDRO F. VELAZQUEZ GEA, EA5FUK

I don't know where this world is comming to....

:-)

183. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 02:33:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE5FA6A.97F9EF33@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23330

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> Kim's call sign is obviously intended to call attention to a particular part of
> her anatomy, for whatever purpose she has. Unfortunately, this off-hand
> reference is considered by members of polite society to be offensive and
> demeaning to women, and not worthy conduct for radio amateurs. We value the
> fact that our hobby/service is family-oriented and we are constantly making the
> observation that we need more young people to become involved. However, when
> their parents see such poor examples of hams like Kim, with her callsign full
> of demeaning sexual innuendo, they are justifiably concerned about the example
> this gives to young people. Thus, she has, as Riley so aptly stated, taken us
> "...one step closer to extinction." Unfortunatley, Kim doesn't see the damage
> she has done, because it doesn't serve her purpose to do so.
>

Like I said before, she's a birdwatcher. As everyone knows, a
tit is a small bird..... If you think of something else, well....

73 de wa2ise

184. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 02:37:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111041837.8c37c61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23331

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message news:<uRfWKHmYBHA.224@cpimsnntpa03>...
> "Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
>
> -- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
>
>
Additional note on this topic Hans: The Brits are also well into
creating a 60m band of their own according to some newsletter or
another which floated thru here recently. This brings up the prospect
of 60m being "dxable" like the existing WARC bands. No ITU involvement
in any of it yet that I've heard. That's a twist.
>
>
>
> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
w3rv

185. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 02:40:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE5FC25.4C5CE080@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23332

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> We know that it's much too late for
> you, Kim or Dwight to acquire any common
> sense, but could you at least take it
> as a given that in wartime the nation
> must be put on some kind of a wartime
> footing if we are to have any chance
> of winning? That clearly means closing
> some of our openness that was very
> much a part of adding to the terrorists
> advantage on Sept 11. If you can't
> understand that, you reveal a lot
> about yourself(ves).

Does that "closing some of our openness" include torture in your book, Dick? Did you see the Larry King show (I believe - does anyone else know what show this was actually on) the other day where a well known "hollywood" lawyer and another guest sat there talking about the need to legalize, and establish orderly laws for, torture in this country - both agreeing that torture will be a routine thing in this country in the coming years? Did you see the poll results during that show where a large number supported the idea of torture? Did you also notice that none on that show talked about limiting torture to just terrorist?

Wake up and smell the roses, my friend. Everything that makes this country what it is (a country where citizens have rights and are treated with dignity) is under attack by someone (and I'm not talking about "those" people over there). If you don't begin to take a stand now in defense of your rights, don't cry later when an out of control government or military walks all over you.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

186. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 02:46:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011104214651.23267.00001264@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23333

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
>Date: 11/4/2001 5:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmakbq0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>

> Blame yours truly for pushing the elimination of the above-mentioned
> requirements, aidied and abetted by my compadre at the Washington
> office who commuted 75 miles each day with the 2-meter rig mike in
> hand.

Much of the administrative relief could have been appreciated without
shirking it's responsiblities.

The FCC of your era, Phil, is an agency that "solved" problems by throwing
it's collective hands in the air and "deregulating" the services so that it
would no longer need to hold them to the rules.

We see the result on 11 meters, and we see the present-day need to have
"enforcers" (ie: Riley Hollingsworth) on the Amateur bands in order to clean up
the nearly three decades long period of neglect and irresponsiblity of the FCC.

I wouldn't be owning up to any "responsibility" for that period, Phil. It
wasn't a period of FCC history I'd want MY name attached to.....

Steve

187. Re: Contests (was: 6 to 7 kilowatts on CB?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 02:53:32 UTC
From: Randy <randy28@swbell.net>
Message-ID: <ManF7.3436$CS6.1061950677@newssvr11.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 23334
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Not where I live. There are times when I wish the damn thing would leave me alone and go do something to a tree.

;-)

"Sparky" <fgillil@tincan.org> wrote in message news:e182e02.0111041417.50afc47a@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3BE4C792.B1624E@IEEE.org>...
> > Sparky wrote:
> > > So are you saying that field days and QRP contests are idiotic?
> > > How about fox/beaver hunts? Those all take quite a bit of skill.
> > > Have you ever participated in any of those "idiotic" contests?
> >
> > The beaver hunts sound interesting.
>
> The only problem is getting the beaver to cooperate...

188. Re: Evolution of Techs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 03:18:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE60517.2E017F48@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23335

K0HB wrote:

> When the FCC created the Technician class license back in 1951, their
> intention was to give it a separate and unique purpose. The Commission
> stated that the Technician class license was established expressly for
> serious minded experimenters who needed spectrum space in
> which to conduct their tests. It was not established as a communicators'
> service and was not to be a stepping stone between the Novice
> and General class licenses.

> In 1967, the FCC instituted "incentive licensing". While the actual
> frequency loss by Technicians was minimal--just the first 100 kc. CW segment
> of six meters--the FCC still struck a blow to those wishing to remove the
> "experimenter" status from this license.
>
>

I suppose this explains why Dave Popkin, FCC engineer for the NYC
area and a higher level ham licensee, discouraged me from going for
the Tech license. "Real hams start with the Novice" and operate HF.
I wanted to use phone.

My father and I went to his house so I could take
the tech tests, CW and written. I studied code in the slow 5wpm
character method, Dave through at me a code test with Farnsworth
13 or 20wpm at 5 wpm spacing. So I failed badly.

>
> With thousands of Technicians on two meter FM, the FCC then moved slowly
> towards full VHF privileges for them, realizing that the "experimenter"
> designation was obsolete. In 1975, Technicians were given Novice frequency
> privileges.

> In 1976, the
> FCC eliminated the "mail order" status of the Technician exam and required
> applicants to show up at an FCC examination point.

When I did get my Tech, I had to go to the FCC field office in NYC in 76
(which I understand is now condos). Took the code test at 5wpm
at 5wpm speed, not farnsworth. Random 5 word words. Had to
send with their straight key. Pass with ease. Then the written
which I passed with 1 plus the minimum correct number of answers
required. I thought I'd choke on code and ace the written when I went in,
being an EE major at the time. Wonder if someone at that office
picked out "ISE" for me as they might have thought I'd be a code
fan. I doubt it, though, the office that assigns calls is elsewhere.

>
>
> Finally, in 1978, Technicians received full two meter privileges. In the
> eyes of the FCC, they were full-fledged amateurs. In 1987, the exam was made
> easier by splitting element 3--the General written exam--into 3A for
> Technician and 3B for General. This is why those Technicians licensed before
> March 1987 only have to take the 5 WPM code test to upgrade to General.
> Also in 1987, Technicians received sideband privileges in the 28.3 to 28.5
> MHz segment of ten meters.

That was my first taste of HF DXing. Then when restructuring happened,
I did the Advanced and Extra CSCEs and with my old Tech, got my
"Extra Lite" :-).

189. Great Fun with Callsigns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 03:23:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be60543_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23336

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3BE5FA6A.97F9EF33@ix.netcom.com...
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >
> > Kim's call sign is obviously intended to call attention to a particular
part of
> > her anatomy, for whatever purpose she has.

OHMYGAWD, Larry!! Let me assure you I need *NO* callsign to call attention
to my, er, ahems.

Would you like me to repeat the whole story of how and why I have the
callsign that I do? Oh, heck. Let's just go for it. You're the one who
brought the topic up again.

Story:

When I first became a ham in 1993 (actually my hubby and a whole class of us
got our tickets), the Vanity callsign program had come and gone. I knew
several hams who had vanity callsigns, but none of us really had any
thoughts of such because it just wasn't an option available to us. Lo and
behold, a few years later, we heard the FCC was going to begin the program
again and would be doing it phases.

Quite frequently we would all discuss on the air, we new hams, old hams,
hams who'd never gotten a vanity call and hams who had. As is usual, most
hams down here (at least that are on the air) are guys. You know: males. I
am pretty much the only girl--or was--on the repeater at this time. Well,
the guys would get involved in long, protracted conversations about what
they were "going to get" when the vanity program became available to them.
Of course, it was always a boring name-initials thing. I really never had
even planned on getting a vanity call, though I'd never liked my originally
issued KC5HQJ.

One day, I happened to pipe up and tell "the guys" what whusses they were
for just getting their initials and not being creative at all with the
program. There was so much they could play with. Even my darlin' was going
to get W5CAW--his initials. Over the next few weeks they'd tease and make
comments on what I'd get if I got a vanity callsign--just daring me to tell
them what I'd get (this was given the fact that everyone knows me, we're all
friends, and I am DDD). They'd giggle, etc. Until the day I finally keyed
up and told them that *if* I were to ever get a vanity callsign, that I
thought I would probably get something like K5TIT. Well, the frequency went
absolutely dead for just a few moments. (My husband, of course, had heard

this part of the story so he was cracking up right along with me).

Anyway, they all proceeded to snarf and growl that I'd never dare do such a thing, etc., etc. I don't know what made me check but a couple/few weeks later my husband and I were online--he's got one side of the home office and I've got the other. He mumbled that W5TIT was available. I hadn't *even* guessed that a callsign like that would even be LEGAL, let alone available. So, I told him I ought to get it and just sign on one day with it.

Even a few weeks later, I applied for, sent the money and waited to get W5TIT (K5TIT was already taken by a man over in FL). Not just a few days later I got the call W5TIT, and signed on with it the next morning.

One night, a wonderful old coot, Howard, from Rockwall was talking simplex. This man is probably in his 70s-80s, is staunch and easily disagreeable, and is a churchgoing man with a lovely, dainty wife. At the time I came across the simplex conversation, I was not aware that Howard was on frequency, because I'd only heard Don and Rusty. I signed on, "W-5-T-I-T." Dead silence. I signed again, "W-5-T-I-T." Rusty came back this time, holding back hysterical laughter, and said, "Is that you, Kim?" Before I could answer, Howard keyed up and sounded none too happy. He said, "Please state that callsign again, phonetically. First tell me if that is you, Kim." I said yes it was me and gave my callsign, heart pounding, dreading what I was about to go through with Howard. I was envisioning that Bea had just heard me sign on and that Howard had sent her off to another room so that she'd not hear that again. I keyed up, "Whiskey-Five-Tango-India-Tango, W5TIT." After just a brief pause, Howard came back on, and I could hear the huge grin in his voice. He said, "I like it, I like it just fine" and started laughing.

I knew if Howard liked it, I liked it just fine too. The majority of responses to it have been quite positive--it works wonderfully in a pileup on HF (even though I don't frequent HF often), and it sure does lighten a serious moment on the radio. Not one woman ham, and I repeat not one, has ever expressed a problem with it. In fact, most giggle and play with what they might get as a vanity callsign if they ever did--and even I am embarrassed at what some of them have come up with.

I truly don't care that some don't like it. I doesn't matter a whit to me, because it's fun; is not meant to be malicious; and it's old hat around here now. It doesn't even have the original "shock" value that it had. Just as some are disgusted by people who do nothing but talk about traffic on the air (me, I *hate* it when people talk about traffic on the air); some don't think politics and religion should be topics on the air; and some think new hams should stay off for a year; there are others who get picky about callsigns.

That's the story, that's all there is to it. I have now taken every EmComm Course the ARRL offers, have mentored a couple of Level I and one Level II class, have just resigned as Hunt County ARES EC here in Texas (much too busy at work), have talked all 'round the world with this callsign, and Larry and a couple of other idiots here in the newsgroup are the *only*

people who've ever had a problem with it.

You all ought to hear it bust through a pileup--in any language! ;)

Kim W5TIT

190. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 05:05:17 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3be61d94.7741819@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 23337

On 03 Nov 2001 20:12:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <3be37600.2402954@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>
>>The FCC has been clear enough on what rational
>>keeps even 5 wpm in US regs now and that is only the treaty
>>requirement.
>>
>Yup. If it wasn't clear in 1991, they made it perfectly clear in late 1999. The
>treaty is the ONE AND ONLY reason they kept code testing in the restructuring
>that went into effect April 15, 2000.
>
>If/when that reason is eliminated, it would be completely illogical for the FCC
>to continue code testing, unless there is a major FCC policy change. And that's
>not very likely. Heck, the FCC has been pushing the nocodetest idea since 1975.
>
>Opinion question, Bill: If S25.5 is eliminated, will there even be an NPRM, or
>will the FCC just issue an order of some sort suspending Element 1? I would not
>be at all surprised if they just did the latter,, saying that they had already
>considered the matter thoroughly in 1998-1999.

I don't really know. It may well be that an NPRM would
be required...although if so, I doubt it would be anything more
than the minimal intervals for input rather than the lengthy
process that lead to restructuring.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

191. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 05:32:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BE623DB.C5E48755@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23338

CAM wrote:
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Yeah, right. Bass ackwards as usual. Eliminating the requirement to do
> > a bit of work for what ya get instead of passing out freebies isn't
> > what "affirmative action" was all about? We already been there Cecil.
>
> Affirmative action is artificially inflating the population of a
> group with members of certain minority groups. The majority of hams
> use Morse code "rarely or never". That puts Morse code users in a
> minority group among ham radio operators. You want to artificially
> inflate the Morse coded ham population through governmental
> requirements. That's exactly what affirmative action is.
>
> Not enough blacks on the police force. Not enough Morse code
> operators on the ham bands. It's the same concept.

Brian had you clocked, Cecil. You have the situation completely
backwoods backwards. So much for your homespun philosophy of things.
Affirmative action was a "gimme" like the reduction in licensing
requirements is a "gimme".

Dave K8MN

192. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 06:57:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE629DF.1A6E6715@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23339

CAM wrote:

> Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > >Next stop is fantasy land if you believe morse testing won't be
> > >dropped from the treaty at WRC2003. Cheers, Bill k2unk
> >
> > Then I must be on Fantasy Island, Bill, because I don't think Morse testing
> > will be completely eliminated until 2013. Take it easy.
>
> Note that Bill did NOT say Morse testing will be completely
> eliminated in 2003. He said Morse code testing will probably
> be dropped from the *treaty* at WRC2003. That's a big difference.

But just because the IARU wants it gone doesn't mean that the ITU will find room for the subject on its agenda. Last I heard there wasn't room on the agenda for it to be even brought up for discussion in 2003. I think Bert's right, 2013 is more likely..

193. Re: W5NET: Changing to a "policy question"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 07:20:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE62F53.5E2EBFFA@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23340

N2EY wrote:

>All 2x1s are Extras, All 2x2s beginning with A are Extras. I'm not sure about

> other 2x2s, but I know that 2x2s are not issued to Novices or Techs.

All the other 2x2's except those beginning with A are Advanced.

194. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 15:50:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE6A6C4.B6188D2D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23341

As I said, if you can't understand that, it reveals a lot about you. In short you're clueless and determined to stay that way. Don't confuse you with facts, your mind is made up.

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> No, we've never done that before, and it's wrong that it is done this time.
> PERIOD.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3BE55494.E3F25C53@worldnet.att.net...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Richard Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > it is my sincere desire and hope that I'll always be able to accept
> things
> > > > > for what they are.
> > > >
> > > > And most of the rest of us will do our utmost to change that which
> is
> > > > diametrically opposed to our freedom loving way of life, ...
> > >
> > > Last week you were advocating giving up constitutional freedoms,
> > > allowing unreasonable search and seizure, and the aborting of
> > > due process. Would you please make up your mind?
> >
> > So show the posting where I said anything remotely like that- you can't
> because it
> > didn't happen.
> >
> > We know that it's much too late for you, Kim or Dwight to acquire any
> common
> > sense, but could
> > you at least take it as a given that in wartime the nation must be put on
> some
> > kind of a wartime
> > footing if we are to have any chance of winning? That clearly means
> closing some

> > of our openness
> > that was very much a part of adding to the terrorists advantage on Sept
> 11. If you
> > can't understand
> > that, you reveal a lot about yourself(ves).
> >

195. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 15:58:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE6A8A4.C54FEC49@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23342

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > One word: inflation. Tuition was
> > $3000/yr in 1972 and $4500/yr in
> > 1975. You do remember the 1970s?
> > I had hair back then....
>
> That was a good one, Jim. I had a lot of hair back then (longer than
> my wife's hair today). In fact, most who know me today would be
> surprised if they saw a picture (if they even recognized me). It was
> another time.

Yeah, but it's still the same old Dwight......

196. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 16:11:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE6BA2E.6625E41A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23343

Dave Heil wrote:
> Affirmative action was a "gimme" like the reduction in licensing
> requirements is a "gimme".

Affirmative action is not necessarily a "gimme'. My home town
is an example. Although having a large black population, there
had never been a black law enforcement officer in the history
or the town. After affirmative action, there have been some
exceptional black law enforcement officers who, if anything,
were over-qualified compared to their white competition.
Because of their skin color, they had to be twice as good.

Affirmative action is an attempt at social engineering. The
Morse code requirement is one such attempt. What is wrong
with freedom of choice of modes in a hobby in a free society?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

197. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 16:13:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE6BA93.481D1B71@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23344

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Note that Bill did NOT say Morse testing will be completely
> > eliminated in 2003. He said Morse code testing will probably
> > be dropped from the *treaty* at WRC2003. That's a big difference.
>
> But just because the IARU wants it gone doesn't mean that the ITU will find
> room for the subject on its agenda. Last I heard there wasn't room on the agenda
> for it to be even brought up for discussion in 2003. I think Bert's right, 2013
> is more likely..

Bert has admitted that he made a mistake and didn't say what he intended
to say, yet you defend his mistake. How can you bring yourself to defend
a mistake?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

198. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 17:10:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111050910.1746a834@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23345

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3BE2A62B.BBD0B124@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > We had the chance a decade ago, but Papa Bush ordered Stormin' Norman to stop
> > short. Think about why that was done.
>
> Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?

I dunno. How many American lives has NOT getting him cost?

Why was it worth American and allied lives to free Kuwait, but not any
to get the person responsible for Kuwait being invaded?

73 de Jim, N2EY

199. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 17:16:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111050916.456f57e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23346

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message news:<#UZTizwYBHA.1232@cpimsnntpa03>...
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:wjhE7.92189$WW.5210800@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> > news:#IXHuXkYBHA.1872@cpimsnntpa03...
> > > Agreement that we are a nation that you *NEVER* piss off.
> > >
> > >
> > > (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > >
> > That is exactly the point we must make if we are ever going to obtain
> peace.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim
>
> If we are not prepared to wage total unconditional war in response to a
> direct attack on our homeland, then we invite continued attacks and a
> disaster on a scale that we can barely imagine.

The question is: war on whom?

> If 19 guys can turn
> 4 commercial airlines into guided missiles, then 19 more guys, each
> with a suitcase nuke, can destroy America.

Maybe. I don't know how powerful "suitcase nukes" are.

But I think that if the bad guys had SNs, they'd have used them on
Sept. 11.

> It is no longer enough for
> America to"warn" of dire consequences --- we must search them out
> and make horrific examples of them.

At the same time, we must not make martyrs of them. And we must
address the root causes of terrorism, and the holes in our security
that make it possible.

On Sept 10, one of the hot issues being debated was an antimissile
defense system. A system aimed at stopping an attack that will not
come. What we need today are systems aimed at stopping the attacks
that are likely to come.

In other words, fight this war, not the last one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

200. Re: A Challenge to James Miccolis

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 17:46:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE6D07E.88BE9D8E@uci.edu>
Source record: 23348

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0110310822.21ad2263@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >Dipshit.
>
> Another demonstration of 97.1 (e): "Continuation and extension
> of the amateur's unique ability to enhance international goodwill."

Something you obviously haven't signed on to, nor have any intention to
apparently.

201. Re: A Challenge to Leonard H. Anderson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 17:49:08 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE6D114.86975596@uci.edu>
Source record: 23347

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20011031064647.29905.00000202@nso-mj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
> >Never said I do. Where do you get such ideas?

> From Miccolis' own statements taken in context rather than
> his taking others' statements out of context.

More like, LHA's frequently recurring attacks of brain flatulance. :-)

202. Re: W5NET: Changing to a "policy question"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 17:51:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011105125114.12191.00001631@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 23349

>Subject: Re: W5NET: Changing to a "policy question"
>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 11/5/2001 1:20 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BE62F53.5E2EBFFA@worldnet.att.net>

>All the other 2x2's except those beginning with A are Advanced.

Small exception.....until they deplete 2x2's in KH6/KL7, 2x2's without the
"A" may be issued to Generals.

73

Steve, K4YZ

203. Re: IOTA List updated 04-Nov-2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 17:53:57 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE6D235.B1BA2A74@uci.edu>
Source record: 23251

Charles Johnston wrote:
>
> The free downloadable IOTA List has been updated to reflect NA-221
> (Veracruz State North Group). It is a 15k zip file and also includes
> the Top Ten Most Wanted IOTA's for each group.....
>
> Found on the IOTA List Page of the web site listed below....

http://www.rsgbiota.org/

204. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 17:58:52 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wrAF7.173980$W8.5616222@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23350

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0111050916.456f57e8@posting.google.com...
> On Sept 10, one of the hot issues being debated was an antimissile
> defense system. A system aimed at stopping an attack that will not
> come. What we need today are systems aimed at stopping the attacks
> that are likely to come.
>
> In other words, fight this war, not the last one.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Easier said than done, Jim. Remember Nam where the Air Force shows up with century series fighters and Thunder Thuds. We were flying ground support with T-28s and buying back Douglas Skyraiders (Spads) A1D's and Invaders (at various times A or B-26) from every bananna republic we had sold them to while the USAF bought McDonnell Phantoms (F4B) and the A7D renumbered to B-66. They prepared for the wrong new war.

And having the neat hardware only does any good when the grand honcho knows what to do with it. When the radar-equipped Washington and South Dakota joined the fleet in the Solomons, the admiral put the Wash back with the rest of the battlewagons where the radar op got a great view of the screening vessels being decimated in a nite battle. When it got up front, it did a great job of adding a lot of Japanese steel to Iron Bottom Sound.

We have always had a terrible time dealing with irregular warfare. The Civil War had both sides inviting Thayer down from West Point to rule on whether captured guerillas were POWs, Red Cloud beat the US Army hands down as did Cochise. This Afghan exercise could easily be like chasing Pancho Villa.

In the land of dopey dreams, happy peaceful Phillipines, where the bolo man is hiking nite and day. Where Tagalos steal and lie and Americanos die, you can hear the soldiers sing this evening lay. Damn, damn, damn the Filipinos, cross-eyed kakiak ladrones, underneath our starry flag, civilize them with a Krag, and return us to our own beloved homes.

The tune is God Save Ireland or Jesus loves the little children as your tastes lie.

I don't see the Taliban standing up to B-52s although it would be cheaper to simply buy their allegience in the traditional manner. If they could hold out about another six months, a major fiasco would be brewing. May very well get one anyway.

Dick N&#65533;BK

205. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 18:05:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011105130540.16497.00001123@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 23252

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 11/5/2001 11:16 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9f4bfe89.0111050916.456f57e8@posting.google.com>

>> If 19 guys can turn
>> 4 commercial airlines into guided missiles, then 19 more guys, each
>> with a suitcase nuke, can destroy America.
>
>Maybe. I don't know how powerful "suitcase nukes" are.

I dunno, Jim. They "only" destroyed two buildings in NYC, yet look at the economic havo that has befallen since.

Now....Had a "suitcase" nuke been detonated from the ROOF of one of those buildings, imagine the complete loss of the complete financial district of NYC, NOT just the two buildings (sa important as they were).

Let's be a bit conservative and say they have only half that number, or nine weapons...NYC, ATL, DFW, CLE, LAX, SFO, SEA, BOS, and SDG. That's most of the major metropolitan areas of the United States.

I'd say we'd be in the ox-cart mode for a while if we ever suffered even limitied strikes on the business districs of those areas, wouldn't you?

73

Steve, K4YZ

206. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 18:27:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE6DA1A.E759AB16@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23253

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?
>
> I dunno. How many American lives has NOT getting him cost?
>
> Why was it worth American and allied lives to free Kuwait, but not any
> to get the person responsible for Kuwait being invaded?

Because the State Department essentially gave Saddam Hussein permission
to invade when they earlier said the US would not defend Kuwait?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

207. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 18:36:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE6DC30.DC112934@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23254

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> I'd say we'd be in the ox-cart mode for a while if we ever suffered even
> limitied strikes on the business districs of those areas, wouldn't you?

How much do you think each of those nukes is worth? Maybe the bad
guys don't want to risk losing any during a US smuggling operation.
Maybe they are saving them for Israel.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

208. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 19:45:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011105144519.23232.00001455@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23255

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 11/5/2001 12:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BE6DC30.DC112934@IEEE.org>

>How much do you think each of those nukes is worth?

I guess that depends on wether you put a dollar value or a political value
on them.

>Maybe the bad
>guys don't want to risk losing any during a US smuggling operation.

Smuggling operation? These are terrorists, not drug kingpins. At least
drug lords have some motive in mind...money. Terrorists, despite the fascade
of the political agendas they use to hide behind, only do what they do for the
opportunity to be destructive and evil.

>Maybe they are saving them for Israel.

Maybe...maybe not...that's what has us on the edge of our seats now, isn't
it...?!??

73

Steve, K4YZ

209. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 20:19:36 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE6F458.44D9D2FD@uci.edu>
Source record: 23256

Let be clear not to confuse the word 'citizen' with the words 'traitor'
and 'terrorist', Dwight. I wouldn't be entirely opposed to hooking up
the latter to an IV filled with happy juice in order to get them into a
'chattier' mood.

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > We know that it's much too late for
> > you, Kim or Dwight to acquire any common
> > sense, but could you at least take it
> > as a given that in wartime the nation
> > must be put on some kind of a wartime
> > footing if we are to have any chance
> > of winning? That clearly means closing
> > some of our openness that was very
> > much a part of adding to the terrorists
> > advantage on Sept 11. If you can't
> > understand that, you reveal a lot
> > about yourself(ves).
>
> Does that "closing some of our openness" include torture in your
> book, Dick? Did you see the Larry King show (I believe - does anyone
> else know what show this was actually on) the other day where a well
> known "hollywood" lawyer and another guest sat there talking about the
> need to legalize, and establish orderly laws for, torture in this
> country - both agreeing that torture will be a routine thing in this
> country in the coming years? Did you see the poll results during that
> show where a large number supported the idea of torture? Did you also
> notice that none on that show talked about limiting torture to just terrorist?
>
> Wake up and smell the roses, my friend. Everything that makes this
> country what it is (a country where citizens have rights and are
> treated with dignity) is under attack by someone (and I'm not talking
> about "those" people over there). If you don't begin to take a stand
> now in defense of your rights, don't cry later when an out of control
> government or military walks all over you.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

210. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 20:37:58 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE6F8A6.8FE2070C@uci.edu>
Source record: 23257

CAM wrote:
> Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?

How 'bout we get all the extremist fundamentalists in every religion to all go out in the middle of the desert somewhere to fight it out amongst themselves, and leave the rest of us out of it?

211. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 20:40:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011105154039.23252.00001316@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23258

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>Date: 11/5/2001 2:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BE6F458.44D9D2FD@uci.edu>

>Let be clear not to confuse the word 'citizen' with the words 'traitor'
>and 'terrorist', Dwight. I wouldn't be entirely opposed to hooking up
>the latter to an IV filled with happy juice in order to get them into a
>'chattier' mood.

Ditto.

Steve

212. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 21:22:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE7032B.23C2687E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23259

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org wrote:
> >Maybe the bad
> >guys don't want to risk losing any during a US smuggling operation.
>
> Smuggling operation? These are terrorists, not drug kingpins.

Is there some other way to get nukes into the US without smuggling
them in?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

213. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 21:25:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE703E3.7809291E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23260

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?
>
> How 'bout we get all the extremist fundamentalists in every religion to
> all go out in the middle of the desert somewhere to fight it out amongst
> themselves, and leave the rest of us out of it?

My Southern Baptist preacher is an extremist fundamentalist.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

214. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 21:30:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE704FE.E735F541@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23261

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Let be clear not to confuse the word 'citizen' with the words 'traitor'
> and 'terrorist', Dwight. I wouldn't be entirely opposed to hooking up
> the latter to an IV filled with happy juice in order to get them into a
> 'chattier' mood.

Trouble is, to most law enforcers, you might look like a citizen. To one,
you might look like a terrorist. Unless all citizens possess constitutional
rights then no citizen possesses them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

215. NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 21:52:31 UTC
From: webdoc@mailandnews.com
Message-ID: <de9751ca.0111051352.7f8c787a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23262
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hey all, while I am in NYC with the Red Cross, I am going to take my license exam, 2 weeks from today I will be taking the test. Then I can go look for a place locally that sells radios. Since I will most likely be here until first part of December if not longer, I might as well put my license to use while I am up here eh?

73's

Keith Hosman

216. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 22:09:24 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3BE70DCB.774D6008@spam.me.not>
Source record: 23263
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Check out HRO in Delaware. It's probably near enough to drive there, and the prices are good. If you're looking for a good 2M rig, the Alinco DR-135 has treated me well, even if the modulation is a bit "hot" on it. (Anyone have the adjustment info on this radio so I can turn mine DOWN just a hair?) The DR-605 is a good dualbander, as well. I have several friends in the area who have them, and they're thrilled with the performance. If I could have afforded a dualbander (this set runs about $350) I would have gotten the 605.

Good luck on the test, and hopefully we'll be hearing you on the air soon!

73 de KC8RKQ, Chris

-SSB

Keith Hosman Red Cross Disaster Services wrote:
>
> Hey all, while I am in NYC with the Red Cross, I am going to take my
> license exam, 2 weeks from today I will be taking the test. Then I can
> go look for a place locally that sells radios. Since I will most
> likely be here until first part of December if not longer, I might as
> well put my license to use while I am up here eh?
>
> 73's
>
> Keith Hosman

217. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 22:51:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011105175149.16883.00001319@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23264

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 11/5/2001 3:22 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BE7032B.23C2687E@IEEE.org>

>
>Is there some other way to get nukes into the US without smuggling
>them in?

Yes...Do like they did the WTC attack..."build" it here.

73

Steve, K4YZ

218. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 23:12:05 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011105181205.23919.00001393@mb-fk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 23265

>Hey all, while I am in NYC with the Red Cross, I am going to take my
>license exam, 2 weeks from today I will be taking the test. Then I can
>go look for a place locally that sells radios. Since I will most
>likely be here until first part of December if not longer, I might as
>well put my license to use while I am up here eh?
>
>
>73's
>
>Keith Hosman

Hi Keith,

You might want to try Barry's Electronics. It's on Broadway close to Spring St. A word of caution: Barry's is notoriously overpriced, HOWEVER, they desperately tried to get me to walk out of there with a sub $1,000.00 IC-706Mk. IIG...and that ain't bad for NYC! I think they're trying to compete with the internet deals. Good luck and take it easy.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

219. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 23:23:09 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011105182309.23919.00001396@mb-fk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 23266

>> > Note that Bill did NOT say Morse testing will be completely
>> > eliminated in 2003. He said Morse code testing will probably
>> > be dropped from the *treaty* at WRC2003. That's a big difference.
>>
>> But just because the IARU wants it gone doesn't mean that the ITU will
>find
>> room for the subject on its agenda. Last I heard there wasn't room on the
>agenda
>> for it to be even brought up for discussion in 2003. I think Bert's right,
>2013
>> is more likely..
>
>Bert has admitted that he made a mistake and didn't say what he intended
>to say, yet you defend his mistake. How can you bring yourself to defend
>a mistake?
>--
>cheers, CAM

Geez Louise,

I can't win for losing! (Do they still say that?)

Bert's beliefs:

1. The ITU will NOT may or may not eliminate Morse "proficiency" as a
requirement for HF privies. I've got twenty bucks (...actually $10 ;-)) riding
on the "NOT until 2013" chip.

2. The FCC will still require Morse testing for HF privies, regardless of the
ITU's decision.

These beliefs supercede any and all previous "thoughts" due to dynamic cerebral
activity. I hope we're all cool with this. :-)

"Dagnamit!" I just felt like using that, Jerry.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

220. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 23:50:50 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net>
Message-ID: <uBFF7.30$oM5.5658@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 23267
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:3BE70DCB.774D6008@spam.me.not...
> Check out HRO in Delaware. It's probably near enough to drive there, and
> the prices are good. If you're looking for a good 2M rig, the Alinco
> DR-135 has treated me well, even if the modulation is a bit "hot" on it.
> (Anyone have the adjustment info on this radio so I can turn mine DOWN
> just a hair?) The DR-605 is a good dualbander, as well. I have several
> friends in the area who have them, and they're thrilled with the
> performance. If I could have afforded a dualbander (this set runs about
> $350) I would have gotten the 605.

Depending on how much he has to spend he could go right for a Yaesu FT-100D or the Icom IC-706MKIIG. Both rigs will let him do 3 bands, 6m - 2m - 70cm, all mode. Then when he upgrades he will have a mobile rig that will handle HF too. I think it's better to buy a bit more radio that you think you'll need so you don't out grow it so soon. Also many of the late model vehicles don't have room for two rigs, HF and V/UHF, much less even one. So the above two rig models helps save space.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

--
"... The greater part of our happiness or
misery depends on our dispositions
and not on our circumstances."

Martha Washington

221. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-05 23:57:34 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <5820505ee882e525c5dcf623a82330e1.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23268

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

>
> Is getting Saddam Hussein worth your life?
>

A lot of us answered "Yes" to that question when
we took our oath to serve you in the US armed forces.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from [204.31.48.60]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

222. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 00:12:52 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <e164d974ee9b6c46e18129c83e032b79.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23269

"Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:5820505ee882e525c5dcf623a82330e1.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> >
> > Is getting Saddam Hussein worth your life?
> >
>
> A lot of us answered "Yes" to that question when
> we took our oath to serve you in the US armed forces.
>

By way of a disclaimer however, I must add that I didn't
sign up to give my life for my country, but rather to make
the other son of a bitch give up _his_ live for _his_
country. For purposes of this conversation, that would
be Saddam.

With all kind wishes,

--
Posted from [204.31.48.60]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

223. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 00:34:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE6AA3B.5D984AF3@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23270

N2EY wrote:

> I was curious about the corrosion properties of tomato-based sauces, so I did a
> little experiment.

Didja know that the health gurus say the single most effective thing a person can do to prevent cancer is to drink a glass of tomato juice each day? It's loaded with

Lycopine (sp?) a highly effective anticancer compound. The more refined the tomato product the more potent the concentration. Fresh tomatos have the least concentrations.

224. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 01:04:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011105200421.23850.00000294@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 23272

In article <190F4C61E602B2DD.3B99A041A56A43B7.EED049605F23AB5E@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>When I travel, I just look for Italian restaturants run by *real*
>Italians. Enough garlic, olive oil, and tomatoes makes anything good.

One can never have "enough" garlic, olive oil or tomatoes.
>
>Failing that, I just look at the outside of the building; if it looks
>like it was once a topless bar or laundromat, or it should have been
>condemned years ago, the food's probably good.
>
Better yet, if it's still a topless bar...

73 de Jim, N2EY

225. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 01:04:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011105200422.23850.00000295@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 23271

In article <83A36673F080E630.4A45B4191C2F5E1E.9233ABF886CA8ED4@lp.airnews.net>,
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> writes:

>The docs keep telling me I should watch my diet because of the family
>history of heart attacks. Sure, great-grandma died of one at 84. Her
>brother had his second and last at 92, and my paternal grandma at 78,
>after smoking over a pack a day for most of her life.

You SHOULD watch your diet - to make sure it matches what those folks ate!

73 de Jim, N2EY

226. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 01:16:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE72B69.B498371C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23273

CAM wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Let be clear not to confuse the word 'citizen' with the words 'traitor'
> > and 'terrorist', Dwight. I wouldn't be entirely opposed to hooking up
> > the latter to an IV filled with happy juice in order to get them into a
> > 'chattier' mood.
>
> Trouble is, to most law enforcers, you might look like a citizen. To one,
> *you* might look like a terrorist. Unless all citizens possess constitutional
> rights then no citizen possesses them.
>

That's great as a statement of principle, but if we don't overcome this *large*
bunch of terrorists determined to'
take us down, they will be able to get the job done. People who have no sense of
the scope of the threat and who insist on demanding every consideration due any
citizen first and formost, will only help play into their hands eariliest.

check this out...
Gingrich Predicted Terror's Rise

The Atlanta Journal-Constitution
By Tom Baxter
Atlanta Journal-Constitution Columnist

Newt Gingrich has been enjoying a
renewed reputation lately as a
prophet.

The Hart-Rudman Commission on
National Security in the 21st
Century -- a bipartisan effort that Gingrich, when he was speaker
of the House, started with former President Clinton -- came out
with a report earlier this year that all-too-accurately set the stage
for Sept. 11 and its aftermath.

The combination of the proliferation of unconventional weapons
and the persistence of international terrorism "will end the relative
invulnerability of the U.S. homeland to catastrophic attack," the
report predicted.

It said creation of a homeland security agency should be the
nation's first priority.

"It's very sobering to look at what we went through and realize
how small it is," Gingrich said Wednesday at a luncheon sponsored

by the Georgia Public Policy Foundation. "This was like the precursor to a heart attack."

While not critical of President Bush's handling of the war effort, Gingrich, who also sat on the commission, said a "large element" of the administration, as well as the media, still haven't caught up with the enormity of the challenge.

"I don't want cheerleading from the administration," Gingrich said. "I don't want promises." What is needed, he said, is an ability like that of Churchill to steel the nation to a deadly struggle.

The country faces three parallel dangers, the former speaker said, as challenging as those of World War II or the Cold War.

The most pressing is the growing access by dictatorships such as Iraq and North Korea to weapons of mass destruction.

Without an aggressive effort to control that threat -- including, if necessary, bringing down Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq -- Gingrich said, "Our wake-up call could be 100,000 Americans dying."

International terrorism, in all its forms, constitutes a second threat. The third threat he called "medieval Islam."

At least 11,000 schools around the world teach young Muslim men a set of habits and values that render them both incapable of entering the new world economy and deeply resentful of the United States and the Western world.

"The lesson of Sept. 11 is, we can't live on the planet with a large school system teaching people to hate us," Gingrich said.

He advocated an all-out effort to win over the Islamic masses, including infusions of aid to refugee camps and a propaganda effort of Cold War proportions.

Hair-splitters in the history department might fault the former West Georgia professor's choice of "medieval." That, after all, was an era when the Muslim world was in many ways more socially tolerant and technologically advanced than Europe.

The word makes Gingrich's point, nevertheless, and it replaces "fundamentalist Islam," a connection that has caused some discomfort in conservative circles.

Whatever your view of Newt Gingrich there's no doubt he hit this nail dead center.

227. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 01:21:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE72CC3.456F0414@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23274

CAM wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?
> >
> > How 'bout we get all the extremist fundamentalists in every religion to
> > all go out in the middle of the desert somewhere to fight it out amongst
> > themselves, and leave the rest of us out of it?
>
> My Southern Baptist preacher is an extremist fundamentalist.

Indeed they all are. I'm afraid that about half the human race would be
engaged in that fray.

228. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 02:17:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be748bf_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23275

You've turned (maybe always were) into a sniveling paranoid, Dick. You truly need psychological help...if there's anything left to save.

Kim W5TIT
Watch out, they're all around you...LOL

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:3BE6A6C4.B6188D2D@worldnet.att.net...
> As I said, if you can't understand that, it reveals a lot about you. In short
> you're clueless and determined to stay that way. Don't confuse you with facts,
> your mind is made up.
>
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > No, we've never done that before, and it's wrong that it is done this time.
> > PERIOD.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BE55494.E3F25C53@worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Richard Carroll wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > it is my sincere desire and hope that I'll always be able to accept
> > things
> > > > > > for what they are.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And most of the rest of us will do our utmost to change that which
> > is
> > > > > > diametrically opposed to our freedom loving way of life, ...
> > > > >
> > > > > Last week you were advocating giving up constitutional freedoms,

> > > > allowing unreasonable search and seizure, and the aborting of
> > > > due process. Would you please make up your mind?
> > >
> > > So show the posting where I said anything remotely like that- you
can't
> > because it
> > > didn't happen.
> > >
> > > We know that it's much too late for you, Kim or Dwight to acquire any
> > common
> > > sense, but could
> > > you at least take it as a given that in wartime the nation must be put
on
> > some
> > > kind of a wartime
> > > footing if we are to have any chance of winning? That clearly means
> > closing some
> > > of our openness
> > > that was very much a part of adding to the terrorists advantage on
Sept
> > 11. If you
> > > can't understand
> > > that, you reveal a lot about yourself(ves).
> > >
>

229. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 02:43:37 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9s7io301dvp@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23276

"Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:e164d974ee9b6c46e18129c83e032b79.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> By way of a disclaimer however, I must add that I didn't
> sign up to give my life for my country, but rather to make
> the other son of a bitch give up _his_ live for _his_
> country. For purposes of this conversation, that would
> be Saddam.

This was originally said by Gen. George Patton.

230. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 04:18:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011105231807.18926.00001224@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 23277

In article <3BE55ABC.804CD38D@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> And I think that is going a little overboard. A single person's
>callsign is not going to have any effect on ham radio - much less
>bring it closer to extinction. If Riley truly feels that way, why was
>the callsign available and issued?

Dwight:

The legality and legitimacy of Kim's callsign is not the issue, and
never has been. The FCC's focus is not on the image of the ARS --
that is the job of our local and national amateur radio organizations,
and of individual hams themselves. However, Kim has been told
by a fellow ham, and an FCC official, that her callsign, while not
illegal, does have a negative impact on ham radio's image. Please
try to keep your comments focused on that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

231. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 04:18:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011105231807.18926.00001223@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 23278

In article <3be551fe_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>By the way, Larry: Would you like to see what Riley Hollingsworth would have
>to say about your remarks that you've made here in the newsgroup in terms of
>whether they reflect good moral character, spirit of friendship, etc.? I'd
>be more than happy to be the one to piss him off with a whole bunch of your
>postings and ask that he share any opinion he may have. I could even
>suggest that he just peruse some of your posts. I can guarantee of what his
>response would be if he read your "stuff."
>
>Put up or shut up, Larry. Just let me know.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I receive regular, positive feedback on my posts from people who
read this newsgroup. I'm sure Mr. Hollingsworth has plenty of
opportunity to read my postings, and comment on them directly
to me through E-mail or this newsgroup. So far, he has not seen
fit to do so, one way or another. If you choose to go out of your
way to forward my postings to him, just be sure to include *all*
of them, quoted in full, with all supporting quotes from other
participants fully attributed. I assure you that if he would accuse
me of taking ham radio "...one step closer to extinction," that I
would certainly take his comments under advisement, even
though you have not. Therefore, feel free to proceed.

73 de Larry, K3LT

232. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 04:32:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9s7opnncl1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 23280

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE704FE.E735F541@IEEE.org...
> Trouble is, to most law enforcers, you might look like a citizen.
> To one,
> *you* might look like a terrorist. Unless all citizens possess
constitutional
> rights then no citizen possesses them.

US citizenship is easily proved and Mohammed Atta and his crew were not
citizens.

What rights do you think terrorists are entitled to that they haven't been
afforded?

233. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 04:34:33 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9s7ottnhk1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 23279

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE703E3.7809291E@IEEE.org...
> My Southern Baptist preacher is an extremist fundamentalist.

Feel free to tell him where I think he and his fellow extremists should go.
:-)

234. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:03:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011106000338.29905.00000426@nso-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 23284

In article <20011105182309.23919.00001396@mb-fk.news.cs.com>,
kc2hmn@cs.comnospam (Bert Craig) writes:

>Bert's beliefs:
>
>1. The ITU will NOT may or may not eliminate Morse "proficiency" as a
>requirement for HF privies. I've got twenty bucks (...actually $10 ;-))
>riding
>on the "NOT until 2013" chip.

I'd be surprised if you're right, Bert, but one never knows until the lady
sings.

>2. The FCC will still require Morse testing for HF privies, regardless of the
>ITU's decision.

This I gotta disagree with - unless there is some sorta massive shakeup at the
FCC between now and if/whenever S25.5 goes away. FCC has made it officially
clear at least twice that the ONLY reason they keep the code test is the ITU
treaty. They said in no uncertain terms that the code test "serves no
regulatory purpose" other than meeting that requirement.

But ya never know. Stranger things have happened.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

235. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:04:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE73119.B468B237@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23281

CAM wrote:

> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org wrote:
> > >Maybe the bad
> > >guys don't want to risk losing any during a US smuggling operation.
> >
> > Smuggling operation? These are terrorists, not drug kingpins.
>
> Is there some other way to get nukes into the US without smuggling
> them in?

ARE you kidding??? We offload thousands of modular containers from ships daily at docks on all three coasts, and only about 1 in 10,000 even get opened for even the most cursury inspection by the badly outnumbered Customs inspectors. Virtually all are set on railraod flatcar trains and immediatley "Hot shot"ed to their destinations, mostly distribution centers in metro areas of the various regions of the country. WE never know exatly what is aboard. So did you really think that none of them ever contained contraband???

And, if that's too much trouble, to arrange a load on a container bound for the USA, there's always the 3500 mile Cnadian border to step across, wsithout so much as a single strand fence, and road crossings with inspection points few and VERY far between.

Scared yet???

236. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:04:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE73244.5109C3A8@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23282

N2EY wrote:

>I don't know how powerful "suitcase nukes" are.

From what I read they're roughly equal to the one that took out Hiroshima. Plenty big enough.

I recall thinking, after the first WTC attack in '93, that since it didn't work it seemed likely that they would use a suitcase nuke next time I (and I never really doubted their would be a next time-Why not, there was to be a first?). But they did one better than that-they used cheap, easily available Cruise missiles that we supplied and even fueled up for them. Clever, I must say.

237. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:04:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE73308.2CC2C719@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23283

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Poignant Piece
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Date: 11/5/2001 11:16 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <9f4bfe89.0111050916.456f57e8@posting.google.com>
>
> >> If 19 guys can turn
> >> 4 commercial airlines into guided missiles, then 19 more guys, each
> >> with a suitcase nuke, can destroy America.
> >
> >Maybe. I don't know how powerful "suitcase nukes" are.
>
> I dunno, Jim. They "only" destroyed two buildings in NYC, yet look at the
> economic havo that has befallen since.
>

Economies in free societies depend on confidence in the future. No confidence, not much of an outlook for the growth of the economy in the future. (yes, Cecil, Dwight and Kim., we and the rest of the Western world are very much free if you compare us to any other region in the world) Nothing is perfect, you know. Don't you??

> Now....Had a "suitcase" nuke been detonated from the ROOF of one of those
> buildings, imagine the complete loss of the complete financial district of NYC,
> NOT just the two buildings (sa important as they were).
>
> Let's be a bit conservative and say they have only half that number, or
> nine weapons...NYC, ATL, DFW, CLE, LAX, SFO, SEA, BOS, and SDG. That's most of
> the major metropolitan areas of the United States.
>
> I'd say we'd be in the ox-cart mode for a while if we ever suffered even
> limitied strikes on the business districs of those areas, wouldn't you?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

238. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:22:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE76530.8A3A906C@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23285

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> > > -- Should it be FCC policy to permit only traffic, weather, public service,
> > > and other such nets on the new 60-meter band?
> >
> > No, but restrict it to digitial modes only, including radiotelegraphy, as the
> > 30 meter band now is.
>
> One of the stated purposes of a 60-meter band is to close the gap in
> emergency communications between 75m and 40m. SSB is by far the most
> popular mode for HF emergency communications. Most of the announced HF
> emergency frequencies during hurricanes are in the voice portions of
> the bands.
> -

If they make it a 50 khz wide band as seems to be the trend they might as well not do it at all if SSB phone is allowed. It'll ge a huge goat roping. Besides, I thought you said that PACTOR was the more reliable mode to use.

239. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:25:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE765BE.4498D2FC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23286

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Note that Bill did NOT say Morse testing will be completely
> > > eliminated in 2003. He said Morse code testing will probably
> > > be dropped from the *treaty* at WRC2003. That's a big difference.
> >
> > But just because the IARU wants it gone doesn't mean that the ITU will find
> > room for the subject on its agenda. Last I heard there wasn't room on the agenda
> > for it to be even brought up for discussion in 2003. I think Bert's right, 2013
> > is more likely..
>
> Bert has admitted that he made a mistake and didn't say what he intended
> to say, yet you defend his mistake. How can you bring yourself to defend
> a mistake?

If a something said as a mistake turns out to be accurate how can you bring yourself to insist it is a still a mistake?

240. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:27:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE76650.1B16C92B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23287

CAM wrote:

> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Yeah, right. Bass ackwards as usual. Eliminating the requirement to do
> > a bit of work for what ya get instead of passing out freebies isn't
> > what "affirmative action" was all about? We already been there Cecil.
>
> Affirmative action is artificially inflating the population of a
> group with members of certain minority groups. The majority of hams
> use Morse code "rarely or never". That puts Morse code users in a
> minority group among ham radio operators. You want to artificially
> inflate the Morse coded ham population through governmental
> requirements. That's exactly what affirmative action is.
>
> Not enough blacks on the police force. Not enough Morse code
> operators on the ham bands. It's the same concept.

Only to you.

241. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:31:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE76746.B9A12E12@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23288

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 04 Nov 2001 09:03:20 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Years ago, there were regs that required stuff like having to get a callsign
> >that matched your address if you moved, detailed logkeeping and
> >send-a-postcard-if-you're-operating-away-from-home-more-than-48-hours. As I
> >recall they all disappeared with little fanfare.
>
> Yup. By a stroke of the pen. Ditto for the detailed technical
> filings for amateur repeater stations parallel to those for
> commercial two-way radio repeaters.
>
> Blame yours truly for pushing the elimination of the above-mentioned
> requirements, aidied and abetted by my compadre at the Washington
> office who commuted 75 miles each day with the 2-meter rig mike in
> hand.

As former holder of license WR0AQH, I thank yew, Phil. And I will always wonder what that genius, whoever he was, was thinking about when he instigated all that.

242. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:33:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE767C8.7CF0356@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23289

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

> >Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> >From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
> >Date: 11/4/2001 5:03 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmakbq0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
>
> > Blame yours truly for pushing the elimination of the above-mentioned
> > requirements, aidied and abetted by my compadre at the Washington
> > office who commuted 75 miles each day with the 2-meter rig mike in
> > hand.
>
> Much of the administrative relief could have been appreciated without
> shirking it's responsiblities.
>
> The FCC of your era, Phil, is an agency that "solved" problems by throwing
> it's collective hands in the air and "deregulating" the services so that it
> would no longer need to hold them to the rules.
>
> We see the result on 11 meters, and we see the present-day need to have
> "enforcers" (ie: Riley Hollingsworth) on the Amateur bands in order to clean up
> the nearly three decades long period of neglect and irresponsiblity of the FCC.
>
> I wouldn't be owning up to any "responsibility" for that period, Phil. It
> wasn't a period of FCC history I'd want MY name attached to.....

On tghe other hand, looks to me like he deserves a pat on the back for standing up to the clowns who seem to have been many.

243. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:38:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE7774C.8506B79D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23290

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That's great as a statement of principle, but if we don't overcome this *large*
> bunch of terrorists determined to'
> take us down, they will be able to get the job done.

If we lose our freedoms in the process of bringing the terrorists
down, the terrorists will have won.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

244. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:40:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE777BF.9B90E19E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23291

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> You've turned (maybe always were) into a sniveling paranoid, Dick. You
> truly need psychological help...if there's anything left to save.

Dick is giving the terrorists exactly what they want - fear.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

245. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:42:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE7783C.15A4C681@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23292

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> However, Kim has been told
> by a fellow ham, and an FCC official, that her callsign, while not
> illegal, does have a negative impact on ham radio's image. Please
> try to keep your comments focused on that. 73 de Larry, K3LT

When are you going to get rid of that obscene "Large Tits"
call, Larry?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

246. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:44:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE778D3.5A7A6965@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23293

Jim Kelley wrote:
> US citizenship is easily proved and Mohammed Atta and his crew were not
> citizens.

Who said they were?

> What rights do you think terrorists are entitled to that they haven't been
> afforded?

We're not discussing terrorists, Jim. We are discussing American citizens
losing constitutional rights. I'm against it. Dick thinks I should be
for it as he apparently is.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

247. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:52:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE77A85.7D18F306@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23294

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Is there some other way to get nukes into the US without smuggling
> > them in?
>
> ARE you kidding??? We offload thousands of modular containers from ships
> daily at docks on all three coasts, and only about 1 in 10,000 even get
> opened for even the most cursury inspection by the badly outnumbered
> Customs inspectors. Virtually all are set on railraod flatcar trains and
> immediatley "Hot shot"ed to their destinations, mostly distribution
> centers in metro areas of the various regions of the country. WE never
> know exatly what is aboard. So did you really think that none of them ever
> contained contraband???

Uhhhhhh Dick, that exactly matches the definition of "smuggle". From
Webster's: "smuggle - to import or export goods secretly, in violation
of the law". Exactly how are you going to get a foreign nuke into the
US without "importing it secretly, in violation of the law"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

248. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:55:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE77B6D.CD55A990@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23295

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Besides, I
> thought you said that PACTOR was the more reliable mode to use.

PACTOR II is extremely reliable but not popular enough (yet)
to do much serious emergency trafficking. SSB is the most
popular mode for HF emergency communications.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

249. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:56:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE77BA7.FEBA5303@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23296

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Bert has admitted that he made a mistake and didn't say what he intended
> > to say, yet you defend his mistake. How can you bring yourself to defend
> > a mistake?
>
> If a something said as a mistake turns out to be accurate how can you bring yourself
> to insist it is a still a mistake?

Because Bert admitted it was a mistake and corrected it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

250. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 05:59:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE77C50.44F45BA7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23297

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Not enough blacks on the police force. Not enough Morse code
> > operators on the ham bands. It's the same concept.
>
> Only to you.

Nope, not only to me. They are both attempts at social engineering
things that cannot be achieved in a free market.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

251. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 06:47:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BE78766.F803C7B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23298

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Affirmative action was a "gimme" like the reduction in licensing
> > requirements is a "gimme".
>
> Affirmative action is not necessarily a "gimme'. My home town
> is an example. Although having a large black population, there
> had never been a black law enforcement officer in the history
> or the town. After affirmative action, there have been some
> exceptional black law enforcement officers who, if anything,
> were over-qualified compared to their white competition.
> Because of their skin color, they had to be twice as good.
>
> Affirmative action is an attempt at social engineering. The
> Morse code requirement is one such attempt. What is wrong
> with freedom of choice of modes in a hobby in a free society?

You've STILL got it wrong, Cecil. Affirmative action was indeed a "gimme". It allowed those who could not pass an exam to gain employment. Had it not been for affirmative action, those individuals who could not pass an exam, set as a standard for obtaining a particular job, would not have been employed. Your "twice as good" blather and "over qualified" statements are quite subjective.

Those who would be radio amateurs with HF access are now able to get on the air because the morse testing standards have been lowered in order to admit them.

Your attempt at an explanation coupling Affirmative Action and morse testing fails as miserably as your past morse-testing-equates-to-racism crap.

Dave K8MN

252. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 06:47:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE78793.8DE3DCA2@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23299

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > That was a good one, Jim. I had a
> > lot of hair back then (longer than
> > my wife's hair today). In fact,
> > most who know me today would be
> > surprised if they saw a picture
> > (if they even recognized me). It
> > was another time.
>
> Yeah, but it's still the same old
> Dwight......

Actually, you might be surprised about that also, Dick. Back in my younger days, I was about as liberal as one could get. I believed all the crap teachers force feed students. I believed the garbage from the press. I believed in concepts like diversity, tolerance, and so forth. Today, I realized that 95% of it was total BS - liberalism sucks and concepts like diversity and tolerance have to go both ways (which they don't in this country).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

253. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 06:59:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BE78A52.54BC4C2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23300

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Getting Saddam Hussein is worth how many American lives?
> >
> > How 'bout we get all the extremist fundamentalists in every religion to
> > all go out in the middle of the desert somewhere to fight it out amongst
> > themselves, and leave the rest of us out of it?
>
> My Southern Baptist preacher is an extremist fundamentalist.

Good. He can be a participant.

Dave K8MN

254. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 07:18:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE78ECF.7E9CC2D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23151

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> The legality and legitimacy of Kim's
> callsign is not the issue, and never
> has been. (snip) Kim has been told
> by a fellow ham, and an FCC official,
> that her callsign, while not illegal,
> does have a negative impact on ham
> radio's image.

Of course legality is an issue. The FCC official you mention has direct authority over the legality of that callsign. If Riley truly believes it has a negative impact (in any way) on ham radio, then he has the authority to eliminate the callsign. Since he has not done so, he obviously does not feel that strongly about this issue. In other words, the fact that he has not moved to affect the legality of the callsign clearly shows his overall lack of concern. And, contrary to your attempts to use him as an ally in this, his lack of concern does little, if anything, to support your argument (in spite of what he might have said).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

255. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 07:31:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE791B9.38E0480@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23152

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Let be clear not to confuse the
> word 'citizen' with the words
> 'traitor' and 'terrorist', Dwight.
> I wouldn't be entirely opposed to
> hooking up the latter to an IV
> filled with happy juice in order
> to get them into a 'chattier' mood.

Then you would not mind being tortured then, Jim? What if someone spreads around a rumor that you're a terrorist? Are you totally convinced that you want to live in a world where that is a constant threat - where nothing more than a rumor believed by law enforcement could result in weeks of torture?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

256. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 07:43:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE79498.571A178F@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23153

N2EY wrote:
>
> Why was it worth American and allied
> lives to free Kuwait (snip)

Lets be careful about the use of the word "free" in this regard,
Jim. The people of Kuwait were not freed - we simply put the old
"monarchy" back in place, complete with his gold bathroom fixtures.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

257. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 07:43:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011106024351.23275.00001859@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23154

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 11/5/2001 11:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BE77A85.7D18F306@IEEE.org>

>Exactly how are you going to get a foreign nuke into the
>US without "importing it secretly, in violation of the law"?

Build it here.

Steve

258. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 07:47:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011106024747.23275.00001860@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23155

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: Dick Carroll dickc58@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 11/5/2001 11:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BE767C8.7CF0356@worldnet.att.net>

> On the other hand, looks to me like he deserves a pat on the back for
>standing up
>to the clowns who seem to have been many.

And they multiplied...

73

Steve, K4YZ

259. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 08:39:07 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060338490.21206-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23156

That looks pretty bad don't you think?

On 3 Nov 2001, N2EY wrote:

> Date: 03 Nov 2001 16:51:57 GMT
> From: N2EY <n2ey@aol.com>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
>
> Here are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the
> dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
>
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
>
> As of November 1, 2001:
>
> Novice - 40,764 (decrease of 8,565)
> Tech - 232,007 (increase of 26,613)
> Tech Plus - 87,200 (decrease of 41,660)
> General - 138,265 (increase of 25,588)
> Advanced - 86,832 (decrease of 12,950)
> Extra - 97,458 (increase of 18,708)
> Total - 682,526 (increase of 7,734)
>
> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,971 (decrease of 23,612)
>
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 322,555 (increase of 31,346)
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

260. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 08:46:25 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060345400.21206-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23157

Way to go Kim. Send me a private e-mail. This is dana. .73

On Sun, 4 Nov 2001, Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> Date: Sun, 4 Nov 2001 08:33:04 -0600
> From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
>
> By the way, Larry: Would you like to see what Riley Hollingsworth would have
> to say about your remarks that you've made here in the newsgroup in terms of
> whether they reflect good moral character, spirit of friendship, etc.? I'd
> be more than happy to be the one to piss him off with a whole bunch of your
> postings and ask that he share any opinion he may have. I could even
> suggest that he just peruse some of your posts. I can guarantee of what his
> response would be if he read your "stuff."
>
> Put up or shut up, Larry. Just let me know.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3be54fe6_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > Oh yeah, hey Dwight. The hilarious thing is that the photo I used to have
> > on QRZ was of me while I was driving and was from the shoulders up...LOL
> > Larry's only fantasized about what he believes.
> >
> > In addition, I am 5'5", and weigh 210 pounds. Now, that may be obese to
> > you, or whomever. But it certainly isn't to me.
> >
> > The only problem here is that Larry is so full of self-hate for the way he
> > is, looks and his failure with women, that he thinks it's normal for
> > everyone to feel the same way when he slings mud around. Larry is so used
> > to attacking people that his social skills are so minimal he must live by
> > himself and carry on a lonely, lonely job.
> >
> > Yeah, that's mud-slinging too. Larry brings out the worst in me...LOL
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20011104000331.00126.00001376@mb-dh.aol.com...

> > > Dwight:
> > >
> > > I've seen Kim's photo, and trust me, I definitely do *not* obsess over
> her
> > > so-called anatomy!
> > >
> > > Kim's call sign is obviously intended to call attention to a particular
> > part of
> > > her anatomy, for whatever purpose she has. Unfortunately, this off-hand
> > > reference is considered by members of polite society to be offensive and
> > > demeaning to women, and not worthy conduct for radio amateurs. We value
> > the
> > > fact that our hobby/service is family-oriented and we are constantly
> > making the
> > > observation that we need more young people to become involved. However,
> > when
> > > their parents see such poor examples of hams like Kim, with her callsign
> > full
> > > of demeaning sexual innuendo, they are justifiably concerned about the
> > example
> > > this gives to young people. Thus, she has, as Riley so aptly stated,
> > taken us
> > > "...one step closer to extinction." Unfortunatley, Kim doesn't see the
> > damage
> > > she has done, because it doesn't serve her purpose to do so.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >
>
>
>
>

261. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 08:47:56 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060347380.21206-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23158

Bet she isn't that old to remember that.

On Sun, 4 Nov 2001, Dick Carroll wrote:

> Date: Sun, 04 Nov 2001 15:37:44 GMT
> From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: Poignant Piece
>
> I woulda bet on it. I bet she was at the original Woodstock, too....
>
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011102070921.29609.00000277@nso-fm.aol.com...
> > > In article <3bdf5bf4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > writes:
> > >
> > > >Indeed, it would be wonderful (though a pipedream) that we'd be the
> > nation
> > > > >to look to for agreement and resolution.
> > > >
> > > Yep. But most Americans, (including you, Kim) are probably not yet willing
> > to
> > > make the kind of changes needed to make that happen.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > I don't think it will take only "most Americans" and I hope I am not
> > stepping out on a limb here by *thinking* that you will understand the next
> > fairly philosophical statements:
> >
> > Like I said, I used to be a peacenik, trying to make a difference in the
> > world. Then, I moved away from the peaceful seclusion of the Adirondack
> > Mtns., and found out just how huge a task it would be to realize, by walking
> > straight into the grips of huge city life down here in the south.
> >
> > Nope, I am no longer willing to feel like I am in an extremely small
> > minority of people who would like to see a different world and actually
> > think I could do something about it. I have property; yearn for a bigger,
> > better yard; ignore government (and the rest of the world) for the most
> > part; don't think twice about paying taxes--just tell me how much I owe;

> > just bought a foreign vehicle--ask me if I care; and truly don't care about
> > people as much as I used to--because I got tired (once again) of pretty much
> > being in such a small minority. I often review my emotions and check for
> > bitterness--but I really don't think I am bitter at all, that would be
> > pretty silly. I am just 'resigned'.
> >
> > Well, let's word that differently: I still care a great deal about people in
> > terms of a collective "we"; but on an individual basis it's a whole lot more
> > effort to deal with than I am willing to. I have *maybe* 10 friends (not
> > counting family) and I actually choose it to be that way. I have no "true"
> > friends other than my husband and my parents. I am just not willing to be
> > the person I used to be with people. As an example: why would I put myself
> > through constantly listening to people gripe (and so, so many do) about
> > their marriages/jobs/kids/financial situations while they choose not to do a
> > damned thing about it? After a while, the stories and the attitude get old
> > (goodness, just look at this newsgroup). I am a "talk to the hand" person
> > real quick. Peoples' tendencies are to gripe, not to change. And, I still
> > dearly love Mother Earth--though I am far less proactive even on that any
> > more.
> >
> > I got a little confused a long time back--I had a rooted belief in the basic
> > principles of Christianity and started exploring the beliefs of the Eastern
> > philosophy--which I find absolutely fascinating. The Eastern Philosophies
> > made me yearn for a deeper commitment to my basic principles; however all
> > this began happening at the same time I needed to make a choice as to live
> > like a poor person (stay up north in the country and try to do with what I
> > could through the oil crisis of the 70s) or "make something of myself" for
> > my kids and family and move down here to the south. I chose the larger
> > distraction and now use it as an excuse for being a realist. :)
> >
> > My ultimate belief is that God will straighten it all out by starting over
> > again. My Karma is bad, bad, bad, but hopefully some kind of credit will be
> > realized for deep-seated passion and desire.
> >
> > Willing? Not by myself--not as a tiny, tiny majority. Count me out--as
> > disgusting as that is for me to even think about, I made my peace with it
> > years ago.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
>
>

262. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 08:49:50 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060349070.21206-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23159

Hi Kim, send me a private e-mail when you get a chance. .73 from n4pge in Griffin, Georgia.

On Sun, 4 Nov 2001, Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> Date: Sun, 4 Nov 2001 10:39:21 -0600
> From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: Poignant Piece
>
> Does being at the original Woodstock create a criminal or something, Dick?
> I don't understand your implication.
>
> Once again, you're great at innuendo, but nothing remotely constructive
> about dialogue or debate.
>
> No, I was not at the original Woodstock, I was too young to make the
> decision by myself to go.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:3BE55249.6E227913@worldnet.att.net...
> > I woulda bet on it. I bet she was at the original Woodstock, too....
> >
> >
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20011102070921.29609.00000277@nso-fm.aol.com...
> > > > In article <3bdf5bf4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > > writes:
> > > >
> > > > >Indeed, it would be wonderful (though a pipedream) that we'd be the
> > > nation
> > > > >to look to for agreement and resolution.
> > > > >
> > > > Yep. But most Americans, (including you, Kim) are probably not yet
> willing
> > > to
> > > > make the kind of changes needed to make that happen.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY

> > > >
> > >
> > > I don't think it will take only "most Americans" and I hope I am not
> > > stepping out on a limb here by *thinking* that you will understand the
> next
> > > fairly philosophical statements:
> > >
> > > Like I said, I used to be a peacenik, trying to make a difference in the
> > > world. Then, I moved away from the peaceful seclusion of the Adirondack
> > > Mtns., and found out just how huge a task it would be to realize, by
> walking
> > > straight into the grips of huge city life down here in the south.
> > >
> > > Nope, I am no longer willing to feel like I am in an extremely small
> > > minority of people who would like to see a different world and actually
> > > think I could do something about it. I have property; yearn for a
> bigger,
> > > better yard; ignore government (and the rest of the world) for the most
> > > part; don't think twice about paying taxes--just tell me how much I owe;
> > > just bought a foreign vehicle--ask me if I care; and truly don't care
> about
> > > people as much as I used to--because I got tired (once again) of pretty
> much
> > > being in such a small minority. I often review my emotions and check
> for
> > > bitterness--but I really don't think I am bitter at all, that would be
> > > pretty silly. I am just 'resigned'.
> > >
> > > Well, let's word that differently: I still care a great deal about
> people in
> > > terms of a collective "we"; but on an individual basis it's a whole lot
> more
> > > effort to deal with than I am willing to. I have *maybe* 10 friends
> (not
> > > counting family) and I actually choose it to be that way. I have no
> "true"
> > > friends other than my husband and my parents. I am just not willing to
> be
> > > the person I used to be with people. As an example: why would I put
> myself
> > > through constantly listening to people gripe (and so, so many do) about
> > > their marriages/jobs/kids/financial situations while they choose not to
> do a
> > > damned thing about it? After a while, the stories and the attitude get
> old
> > > (goodness, just look at this newsgroup). I am a "talk to the hand"
> person
> > > real quick. Peoples' tendencies are to gripe, not to change. And, I
> still
> > > dearly love Mother Earth--though I am far less proactive even on that

> any
> > > more.
> > >
> > > I got a little confused a long time back--I had a rooted belief in the
> basic
> > > principles of Christianity and started exploring the beliefs of the
> Eastern
> > > philosophy--which I find absolutely fascinating. The Eastern
> Philosophies
> > > made me yearn for a deeper commitment to my basic principles; however
> all
> > > this began happening at the same time I needed to make a choice as to
> live
> > > like a poor person (stay up north in the country and try to do with what
> I
> > > could through the oil crisis of the 70s) or "make something of myself"
> for
> > > my kids and family and move down here to the south. I chose the larger
> > > distraction and now use it as an excuse for being a realist. :)
> > >
> > > My ultimate belief is that God will straighten it all out by starting
> over
> > > again. My Karma is bad, bad, bad, but hopefully some kind of credit
> will be
> > > realized for deep-seated passion and desire.
> > >
> > > Willing? Not by myself--not as a tiny, tiny majority. Count me out--as
> > > disgusting as that is for me to even think about, I made my peace with
> it
> > > years ago.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
>
>
>

263. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 08:53:34 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060352350.21206-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23160

Why don't you'all shut up about Kim's call sign. You'all sound like a
bunch of "CB'ERS. If she wants that call, that is her right.

On Sun, 4 Nov 2001, Robert Casey wrote:

> Date: Sun, 04 Nov 2001 21:33:14 -0500
> From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
>
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > >
> > > Kim's call sign is obviously intended to call attention to a particular part of
> > > her anatomy, for whatever purpose she has. Unfortunately, this off-hand
> > > reference is considered by members of polite society to be offensive and
> > > demeaning to women, and not worthy conduct for radio amateurs. We value the
> > > fact that our hobby/service is family-oriented and we are constantly making the
> > > observation that we need more young people to become involved. However, when
> > > their parents see such poor examples of hams like Kim, with her callsign full
> > > of demeaning sexual innuendo, they are justifiably concerned about the example
> > > this gives to young people. Thus, she has, as Riley so aptly stated, taken us
> > > "...one step closer to extinction." Unfortunatley, Kim doesn't see the damage
> > > she has done, because it doesn't serve her purpose to do so.
> > >
>
> Like I said before, she's a birdwatcher. As everyone knows, a
> tit is a small bird..... If you think of something else, well....
>
> 73 de wa2ise
>
>
>

264. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 08:57:08 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060356010.21206-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23161

If they can find a way, they will do it, and turn the whole dam bands into
the cb bands. That is what they want to do in the first place.

On Mon, 5 Nov 2001, CAM wrote:

> Date: Mon, 05 Nov 2001 10:13:07 -0600
> From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Note that Bill did NOT say Morse testing will be completely
> > > eliminated in 2003. He said Morse code testing will probably
> > > be dropped from the *treaty* at WRC2003. That's a big difference.
> >
> > But just because the IARU wants it gone doesn't mean that the ITU will find
> > room for the subject on its agenda. Last I heard there wasn't room on the agenda
> > for it to be even brought up for discussion in 2003. I think Bert's right, 2013
> > is more likely..
>
> Bert has admitted that he made a mistake and didn't say what he intended
> to say, yet you defend his mistake. How can you bring yourself to defend
> a mistake?
>

265. Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 09:04:48 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060400420.21206-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23162

When they drop the code all together, you won't have nothing but a bunch of low lifes and red necks on the bands just like the "CB" band is and was 20 years ago. The 75 meter band is like that now. I was tuning around on there listening last night, and some fellow ham broke into a conversation on there, and the group was verry rude to him. The 75 meter band is clandish, and if you don't fit into there little click, then you are dead Good buddy.

266. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 09:11:48 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060408340.21206-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23163

Hope you pass your test, but be sure not to check in on 3.898 and some of
the frequencies on 75 meters. If you aren't in there little clicks, they
will be verry rude to you and run you off. I am in the process of putting
a stop to that.

On 5 Nov 2001, Bert Craig wrote:

> Date: 05 Nov 2001 23:12:05 GMT
> From: Bert Craig <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: NYC Update
>
> >Hey all, while I am in NYC with the Red Cross, I am going to take my
> >license exam, 2 weeks from today I will be taking the test. Then I can
> >go look for a place locally that sells radios. Since I will most
> >likely be here until first part of December if not longer, I might as
> >well put my license to use while I am up here eh?
> >
> >
> >73's
> >
> >Keith Hosman
>
> Hi Keith,
>
> You might want to try Barry's Electronics. It's on Broadway close to Spring St.
> A word of caution: Barry's is notoriously overpriced, HOWEVER, they desperately
> tried to get me to walk out of there with a sub $1,000.00 IC-706Mk. IIG...and
> that ain't bad for NYC! I think they're trying to compete with the internet
> deals. Good luck and take it easy.
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN
>
>

267. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 12:13:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011106071324.29609.00000371@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23164

In article <3BE78ECF.7E9CC2D@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> The legality and legitimacy of Kim's
>> callsign is not the issue, and never
>> has been. (snip) Kim has been told
>> by a fellow ham, and an FCC official,
>> that her callsign, while not illegal,
>> does have a negative impact on ham
>> radio's image.
>
>
> Of course legality is an issue. The FCC official you mention has
>direct authority over the legality of that callsign. If Riley truly
>believes it has a negative impact (in any way) on ham radio, then he
>has the authority to eliminate the callsign.

The FCC has the authority to decide whether or not to issue a particular
callsign, but not Riley. He does not make policy, he only enforces it.

>Since he has not done so,
>he obviously does not feel that strongly about this issue. In other
>words, the fact that he has not moved to affect the legality of the
>callsign clearly shows his overall lack of concern.

Nope. Just the opposite.

Riley cannot change the FCC's policy directly. His statements in his email were
his personal opinion as a ham.

There's a big difference between the letter of the law and what is good for
society. Just because something is legal doesn't make it right or acceptable.
That's Riley's point, and Larry's.

73 de Jim, N2EY

268. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 12:21:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE7D5B0.A3A9DBB@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23165

Dana wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > As of May 14, 2000:
> >
> > Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
> >
> > Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
> >
> > As of November 1, 2001:
> >
> > Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,971 (decrease of 23,612)
> >
> > Total General/Advanced/Extra: 322,555 (increase of 31,346)
>
>
> That looks pretty bad don't you think?

Why? It shows a net increase of 7,734 operators during that period -
the decrease in the Novice/Techs was offset by the increase in the
other licenses (which means people were upgrading). I'd like to see a
larger overall increase, but any increase is not bad.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

269. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 12:47:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE7DBCB.3C209623@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23166

Dana wrote:
>
> When they drop the code all together,
> you won't have nothing but a bunch
> of low lifes and red necks on the
> bands just like the "CB" band is and
> was 20 years ago. The 75 meter band
> is like that now. (snip)

Code testing has nothing to do with the quality of people, Dana. It has been many years since they dropped the code test requirement for Technicians, yet there are no more problems on the bands they use than anywhere else. Even you complain about the 75 meter band, where those operators do have a code test requirement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

270. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 14:19:28 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9s8rfo0q2e@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23171

"Dana" <dana@randomc.com> wrote in message
news:Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060400420.21206-100000@cluster2...
> When they drop the code all together, you won't have nothing but a bunch
> of low lifes and red necks on the bands just like the "CB" band is and was
> 20 years ago. The 75 meter band is like that now. I was tuning around on
> there listening last night, and some fellow ham broke into a conversation
> on there, and the group was verry rude to him. The 75 meter band is
> clandish, and if you don't fit into there little click, then you are dead
> Good buddy.
>

Most of those hams recieved their licenses when code testing was at 13 and
20 WPM, so how do you figure that the elimination of the code test will
result in more of this type of activity? It certainly doesn't look like
high-speed code testing has stopped what's on 75.

271. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 14:26:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9s8rsp0qd9@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23172

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011105231807.18926.00001224@nso-fi.aol.com...
> The legality and legitimacy of Kim's callsign is not the issue, and
> never has been. The FCC's focus is not on the image of the ARS --
> that is the job of our local and national amateur radio organizations,
> and of individual hams themselves. However, Kim has been told
> by a fellow ham, and an FCC official, that her callsign, while not
> illegal, does have a negative impact on ham radio's image. Please
> try to keep your comments focused on that.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I would think that the crap on 75 and 20 meters has more of a negative
impact than a scatological callsign.

272. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 14:29:54 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9s8s3a0qht@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23173

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BE79498.571A178F@sccoast.net...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Why was it worth American and allied
> > lives to free Kuwait (snip)
>
>
> Lets be careful about the use of the word "free" in this regard,
> Jim. The people of Kuwait were not freed - we simply put the old
> "monarchy" back in place, complete with his gold bathroom fixtures.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

...and let's not forget how George Bush the First sent some Kuwaitees back
after the war because they were "property" of the wealthy oil sheiks.

273. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 14:33:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9s8sa40qog@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23174

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011106024351.23275.00001859@mb-cc.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Poignant Piece
> >From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 11/5/2001 11:52 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3BE77A85.7D18F306@IEEE.org>
>
> >Exactly how are you going to get a foreign nuke into the
> >US without "importing it secretly, in violation of the law"?
>
> Build it here.
>
> Steve

It wouldn't even have to be one that results in a nuclear chain reaction
when detonated. Check out this link...

http://www.psitech.net/reports/poormansnuke.htm

274. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 14:36:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE7F56F.26AF1308@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23167

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Affirmative action is an attempt at social engineering. The
> > Morse code requirement is one such attempt. What is wrong
> > with freedom of choice of modes in a hobby in a free society?
>
> You've STILL got it wrong, Cecil. Affirmative action was indeed a
> "gimme".

Sometimes yes, sometimes no. Many Southern blacks were prohibited from entering universities or gaining governmental jobs simply because of skin color no matter how qualified they were. The purpose of affirmative action was to level the playing field. The quota system was the predictable outcome of racism. If it weren't for racism, affirmative action programs would not have been necessary.

> Those who would be radio amateurs with HF access are now able to get on
> the air because the morse testing standards have been lowered in order
> to admit them.

Reducing or eliminating requirements based on outmoded skills is NOT lowering the standards. It is modernizing the standards. Are soldiers required to master the bow and arrow before being allowed to fire an M16?

> Your attempt at an explanation coupling Affirmative Action and morse
> testing fails as miserably as your past morse-testing-equates-to-racism
> crap.

I'm sure you believe that in your personal reality. From an objective perspective, it is obvious that the Morse Code Creed is the secret handshake of a pseudo-royal society and the starving commoners are still being encouraged to "eat cake". The social engineering of forced Morse code skill has outlived its usefulness.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

275. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 14:36:58 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <kb9tmp@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9s8tqmvne1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 23168

"Dana" <dana@randomc.com> wrote in message
news:Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060400420.21206-100000@cluster2...
> When they drop the code all together, you won't have nothing but a bunch
> of low lifes and red necks on the bands just like the "CB" band is and was
> 20 years ago. The 75 meter band is like that now. I was tuning around on
> there listening last night, and some fellow ham broke into a conversation
> on there, and the group was verry rude to him. The 75 meter band is
> clandish, and if you don't fit into there little click, then you are dead
> Good buddy.
>

I'm trying to learn code now to upgrade my license, but if they drop the requirement I'll be glad to accept a no-code General ticket. Now as for the CB'er like operators, it don't matter if you pass a code test or not you can still be stupid anywhere anytime, it doesn't require an HF radio!

(Some of the postings on this NG prove that as a fact)

BTW I consider it a PRIVILEGE to be a licensed amateur operator, there is no way VHF and up or 30MHz and down that I'm going to do anything that would be a rule violation and chance loosing my license, it means way to much to me for that kind of stupidity!!!

I left the CB ranks to get away from that crap, and I'm not ever going back!

276. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 14:39:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE7F63B.631BBD6C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23169

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org wrote:
> >Exactly how are you going to get a foreign nuke into the
> >US without "importing it secretly, in violation of the law"?
>
> Build it here.

Duuuuuhhhhhhhh Steve, then it wouldn't be "foreign', would it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

277. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 14:42:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE7F6D3.B322068E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23170

Dana wrote:
> When they drop the code all together, you won't have nothing but a bunch
> of low lifes and red necks on the bands just like the "CB" band is and was
> 20 years ago. The 75 meter band is like that now.

Guess all those guys on 75m are nocoders, huh?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

278. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 15:46:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE7F76C.B84FFC85@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23175

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Is there some other way to get nukes into the US without smuggling
> > > them in?
> >
> > ARE you kidding??? We offload thousands of modular containers from ships
> > daily at docks on all three coasts, and only about 1 in 10,000 even get
> > opened for even the most cursury inspection by the badly outnumbered
> > Customs inspectors. Virtually all are set on railraod flatcar trains and
> > immediatley "Hot shot"ed to their destinations, mostly distribution
> > centers in metro areas of the various regions of the country. WE never
> > know exatly what is aboard. So did you really think that none of them ever
> > contained contraband???
>
> Uhhhhhh Dick, that exactly matches the definition of "smuggle". From
> Webster's: "smuggle - to import or export goods secretly, in violation
> of the law". Exactly how are you going to get a foreign nuke into the
> US without "importing it secretly, in violation of the law"?

Ah, Cecil's DICKshunary rises its ugly head again. I'm sure the terrorists are carrying a copy
and checking it twice to be sure they understand all the definitions involved.

>
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

279. Re: Great Fun with Callsigns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 15:56:02 UTC
From: drpfrench@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011106105602.15943.00001570@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 23176

I must say I like your call sign also Kim. There are just to many people in the world like Larry. People have got to lighten up and drop all the PC garbage. They need to learn to laugh.

73
John
KF6VYH

280. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 16:00:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BE80915.5ECF263F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23177

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Affirmative action is an attempt at social engineering. The
> > > Morse code requirement is one such attempt. What is wrong
> > > with freedom of choice of modes in a hobby in a free society?
> >
> > You've STILL got it wrong, Cecil. Affirmative action was indeed a
> > "gimme".
>
> Sometimes yes, sometimes no. Many Southern blacks were prohibited from
> entering universities or gaining governmental jobs simply because of
> skin color no matter how qualified they were. The purpose of affirmative
> action was to level the playing field. The quota system was the predictable
> outcome of racism. If it weren't for racism, affirmative action programs
> would not have been necessary.

What you describe is not the Affirmative Action program. You've described the changes brought about because of the 1964 Civil Rights Law. The Affirmative Action program--a racial quota system--didn't work because it violated the civil rights of others. Be that as it may, we aren't discussing affirmative action or civil rights. We're discussing amateur radio licensing in which all citizens and most non-citizens have already had an equal opportunity at obtaining a license.

> > Those who would be radio amateurs with HF access are now able to get on
> > the air because the morse testing standards have been lowered in order
> > to admit them.
>
> Reducing or eliminating requirements based on outmoded skills is NOT
> lowering the standards. It is modernizing the standards. Are soldiers
> required to master the bow and arrow before being allowed to fire an
> M16?

We aren't discussing the military. We're discussing amateur radio licensing. The Morse code is still in widespread use. Bows and arrows aren't used by the military. By the way, the military is not known for democracy and choices of anything.

> > Your attempt at an explanation coupling Affirmative Action and morse
> > testing fails as miserably as your past morse-testing-equates-to-racism
> > crap.
>

> I'm sure you believe that in your personal reality. From an objective
> perspective, it is obvious that the Morse Code Creed is the secret
> handshake of a pseudo-royal society and the starving commoners are
> still being encouraged to "eat cake". The social engineering of
> forced Morse code skill has outlived its usefulness.

My personal reality pretty much coincides with universal reality. Your past squirrely postings lead me to doubt very much your ability to have an objective view. There is no Morse Code Creed, no pseudo-royal society and there are no starving commoners. Are your words those which would be chosen by someone making an objective decision? Good luck with this latest attempt to equate Morse testing with some social injustice.

Dave K8MN

281. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 16:06:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE7FC08.2756E68B@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23178

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Besides, I
> > thought you said that PACTOR was the more reliable mode to use.
>
> PACTOR II is extremely reliable but not popular enough (yet)
> to do much serious emergency trafficking. SSB is the most
> popular mode for HF emergency communications.
>

Of course it (Pactor II) would be much more popular if it wasn't so
proprietary that one had to buy a particular brand of
box to get it. An expensive box, at that.
But if you intend to go on popularity alone, might as well plan on CW,
too, and disregard Pactor II. Ever hear a hurrcane net
working during the hurricane? "Noisey" won't cover that circumstrance,
and SSB is often overpowered. CW *will* get through when SSB won't.

282. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 16:19:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE7FF2C.F21D0AEB@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23179

CAM wrote:

> Reducing or eliminating requirements based on outmoded skills is NOT
> lowering the standards. It is modernizing the standards.

So YOU decide what is an outmoded skill? Basic skills are never outmoded, and radiotelegraphy is the most basic method of radiocommunication yet devised,still very useful under dire circumstances where no other method of communications may be available. But only if one has trained himself to use it.

> Are soldiers
> required to master the bow and arrow before being allowed to fire an
> M16?

Of course not, but you will find bow and arrow or their functional descendents in use in military today, in the form of perhaps crossbows.Quite silent and very effective at ranges a bit too far for hand to hand combat. And I assure you, the forerunner of the bow and arrow is very much still in use-the handheld knife. Carrying a full sized bow and arrow around is not practical. A knife is. And a small crossbow may very well be.
Why can't you show some common sense?

283. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 17:00:39 UTC
From: Dave or Debby <truth@planetc.com>
Message-ID: <3be80db6@news.planetc.com>
Source record: 23180
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

YOU tell them MARTHA ! Why not recommend a FT-101 CB receivin' hambo radio instead? If it don't get CB, then IS it a radio? !
Dave!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

"Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net> wrote in message news:uBFF7.30$oM5.5658@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net...

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:3BE70DCB.774D6008@spam.me.not...
> Check out HRO in Delaware. It's probably near enough to drive there, and
> the prices are good. If you're looking for a good 2M rig, the Alinco
> DR-135 has treated me well, even if the modulation is a bit "hot" on it.
> (Anyone have the adjustment info on this radio so I can turn mine DOWN
> just a hair?) The DR-605 is a good dualbander, as well. I have several
> friends in the area who have them, and they're thrilled with the
> performance. If I could have afforded a dualbander (this set runs about
> $350) I would have gotten the 605.

Depending on how much he has to spend he could go right for a Yaesu FT-100D or the Icom IC-706MKIIG. Both rigs will let him do 3 bands, 6m - 2m - 70cm, all mode. Then when he upgrades he will have a mobile rig that will handle HF too. I think it's better to buy a bit more radio that you think you'll need so you don't out grow it so soon. Also many of the late model vehicles don't have room for two rigs, HF and V/UHF, much less even one. So the above two rig models helps save space.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

--
"... The greater part of our happiness or
misery depends on our dispositions
and not on our circumstances."

Martha Washington

284. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 17:27:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111060927.417d11d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23181

Dana <dana@randomc.com> wrote in message
news:<Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060338490.21206-100000@cluster2>...
> That looks pretty bad don't you think?

What looks bad?

Total number of hams is up. Total number of hams with full privileges
or almost full privileges is up. Total number of hams in the defacto
entry class is up. In fact, the only license classes to show decreases
are the ones no longer open to new licenses.

I don't see what looks pretty bad.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> On 3 Nov 2001, N2EY wrote:
>
> > Date: 03 Nov 2001 16:51:57 GMT
> > From: N2EY <n2ey@aol.com>
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Subject: Re: ARS License Numbers
> >
> > Here are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the
> > dates listed:
> >
> > As of May 14, 2000:
> >
> > Novice - 49,329
> > Tech - 205,394
> > Tech Plus - 128,860
> > General - 112,677
> > Advanced - 99,782
> > Extra - 78,750
> > Total - 674,792
> >
> > Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
> >
> > Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
> >
> > As of November 1, 2001:
> >
> > Novice - 40,764 (decrease of 8,565)
> > Tech - 232,007 (increase of 26,613)
> > Tech Plus - 87,200 (decrease of 41,660)
> > General - 138,265 (increase of 25,588)

> > Advanced - 86,832 (decrease of 12,950)
> > Extra - 97,458 (increase of 18,708)
> > Total - 682,526 (increase of 7,734)
> >
> > Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,971 (decrease of 23,612)
> >
> > Total General/Advanced/Extra: 322,555 (increase of 31,346)
> >
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >

285. Re: A Challenge to Leonard H. Anderson

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 17:39:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111060939.2ef1abac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23182

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20011102145437.19863.00000185@nso-mg.aol.com>...

> >>N2EY does not represent the entire US ARS nor does he
> >>speak for same.
> >
> >Never said I do. Where do you get such ideas?
>
> From

(N2EY's)

> own statements taken in context rather than
> his taking others' statements out of context.

I see. How about some examples?

> >Sounds like you are against free speech for those who disagree with you or
> >your ideas. Double standard.
>
> Not at all.

It's not a double standard when you apply one rule to yourself and a
completely different rule ot others? Interesting.

(N2EY)

>seems to wish to be the Final Judge as
> to the "truth" in opinions...namely his opinions.

Everyone with an independent thought process is the final judge of
what is truth and what isn't. Sounds like you want those who disagree
with you to give up their independent thought processes.
>
> >The subject was about your misquote and false attribution. Stay focused.
>
> I don't think so.

Yes, it was. Read the subject line. You misquoted me and I challenged
you to produce the post that contained the alleged quote. You have not
done so. Instead, you have tried to misdirect attention away from your
repeated misquoting. Nice try but no cookie.

> It is mostly about ego-bruised pique at not
> being honored and revered as the Final Judge for opinions
> as to their "truth" or "falseness."

Yep, you sure do display ego-bruised pique at not being honored and revered as the Final Judge for opinions as to their "truth" or "falseness."

> >We know, Len. Why do you post so much that is obvious to a turnip?
>
> Many licensed turnips post in here. :-)

Doesn't explain why you post the obvious.

> >Too bad. You can whine, bitch and moan but it doesn't change the fact that
> >you have misquoted and falsely attributed - more than once.
>
> Those who are without fault seem not only to have stowed
> thrones but sit on them and attempt to rule...

I think this means you realize you have misquoted me but cannot bring yourself to admit it here. So you attack the messenger.

N2EY

286. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 19:08:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE83514.6E7C76A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23183

Krell wrote:
> Most of those hams recieved their licenses when code testing was at 13 and
> 20 WPM, so how do you figure that the elimination of the code test will
> result in more of this type of activity? It certainly doesn't look like
> high-speed code testing has stopped what's on 75.

If I'm not mistaken, the highest per capita percentage of FCC NALs
have gone to Extra class licensees.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

287. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 19:10:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE835B9.FC38D3A0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23184

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Is there some other way to get nukes into the US without smuggling
> > > > them in?
> > >
> > > ARE you kidding??? We offload thousands of modular containers from ships
> > > daily at docks on all three coasts, and only about 1 in 10,000 even get
> > > opened for even the most cursury inspection by the badly outnumbered
> > > Customs inspectors. Virtually all are set on railraod flatcar trains and
> > > immediatley "Hot shot"ed to their destinations, mostly distribution
> > > centers in metro areas of the various regions of the country. WE never
> > > know exatly what is aboard. So did you really think that none of them ever
> > > contained contraband???
> >
> > Uhhhhhh Dick, that exactly matches the definition of "smuggle". From
> > Webster's: "smuggle - to import or export goods secretly, in violation
> > of the law". Exactly how are you going to get a foreign nuke into the
> > US without "importing it secretly, in violation of the law"?
>
> Ah, Cecil's DICKshunary rises its ugly head again. I'm sure the terrorists are
> carrying a copy
> and checking it twice to be sure they understand all the definitions involved.

It's unfortunate that you don't own and/or use a dictionary, Dick. You could
easily avoid ignorant/stupid mistakes like the above.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

288. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 19:22:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE8387C.F481BE3D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23185

Dave Heil wrote:
> What you describe is not the Affirmative Action program. You've
> described the changes brought about because of the 1964 Civil Rights
> Law.

The Affirmative Action program was necessitated because racists
violated the 1964 Civil Rights Law. Racists had their chance to
comply and the Affirmative Action program was the predictable
result of their non-compliance. The racists have only themselves
to blame for the swinging of the pendulum.

> My personal reality pretty much coincides with universal reality.

That's what everyone says (even the criminally insane).

> There is no Morse Code Creed, no pseudo-royal
> society and there are no starving commoners.

Give us an ever-loving break, Dave. The ham radio "royalty" system
is obvious to the most casual observer. The FCC has pulled the rug
out from under you people who obtained your self esteem and position
in ham radio from your Morse code ability and you people just cannot
stand it. I know. I've been observing this situation for over 50 years.
Morse code is only a mode and should never have been adopted as a creed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

289. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 19:33:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE83B05.13786420@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23186

CAM wrote:

>
>
> If I'm not mistaken, the highest per capita percentage of FCC NALs
> have gone to Extra class licensees.

uh-oh... I better behave myself! I have one of those
"Extra Lite" licenses.... :-)

Maybe it's the extras who's ham license is the top
achievement on their resumes....

as for my resume: BSEE, 13 patents, another pending.
No I don't get royalties, but I do get bragging rights :-)

I figure the extra ham license is equivalent to a 3 to
6 credit hour college class.

290. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 19:35:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE83B6B.83552F62@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23187

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Besides, I
> > > thought you said that PACTOR was the more reliable mode to use.
> > >
> > PACTOR II is extremely reliable but not popular enough (yet)
> > to do much serious emergency trafficking. SSB is the most
> > popular mode for HF emergency communications.
>
> Of course it (Pactor II) would be much more popular if it wasn't so
> proprietary that one had to buy a particular brand of
> box to get it. An expensive box, at that.

I agree.

> But if you intend to go on popularity alone, might as well plan on CW,
> too, and disregard Pactor II. Ever hear a hurrcane net
> working during the hurricane?

Of course, being on the edge of the hurricane belt, I monitor quite
often. SSB is the HF workhorse during hurricane emergencies. CW is
secondary.

> CW *will* get through when SSB won't.

Not true. At the low of the sunspot cycle on 10m, SSB won't
get through and neither will CW. There is a relatively small
window (15dB) when CW gets through and SSB won't at the same
power.

Atmospheric conditions have a magnitude more effect than mode.
Part of the SSB dB disadvantage is made up for with amplifiers.
Of course, amplifiers work just as well with CW but most CW
operators don't take advantage of the higher power option.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

291. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 19:43:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE83D69.6807E4A8@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23188

WW - KB9TMP wrote:

>
> BTW I consider it a PRIVILEGE to be a licensed amateur operator, there
> is no way VHF and up or 30MHz and down that I'm going to do anything
> that would be a rule violation and chance loosing my license, it means
> way to much to me for that kind of stupidity!!!

Too bad "Toll Free" (from that "6 to 7 KW on CB" thread last week) doesn't understand that. I once or twice operated with an incorrect mode in a ham subband, ie, answered a SSB CQ of foriegn DX station outside the USA phone subband without realizing at the moment I was out of subband, oops (using an unfamiliar rig, no excuse though). But I never have done any freebanding and don't really have any desire to. There's really nothing I can do there that

I can't do legally in the 10 or 12 meter ham bands. Besides, the freeband isn't empty space, it is allocated to someone like forest rangers or some such, and I'd get in their way.

>
>
> I left the CB ranks to get away from that crap, and I'm not ever going back!

292. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 19:51:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE83F40.FA96D3F3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23189

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Reducing or eliminating requirements based on outmoded skills is NOT
> > lowering the standards. It is modernizing the standards.
>
> So YOU decide what is an outmoded skill? Basic skills are never outmoded ...

Of course they are. Grinding flour is a basic skill that is outmoded.
The list of basic skills that have been outmoded by science and
civilization is virtually endless and Morse code is on that list.

> ... radiotelegraphy is the most basic method of radiocommunication yet
> devised,still very useful under dire circumstances where no other method of
> communications may be available. But only if one has trained himself to use it.

That's true. Where our argument lies is whether an individual should be
free to choose the modes for which he equips himself or whether he
should be forced to do so at the whim of the feds or, worse yet, at
the whim of the aging white male good old boy ham network.

There are, no doubt, many many things you could do and know that would
enhance your chances of survival. Have you done them all? If not, how
would you like the feds to force them down your throat? Do you have
storage food? Storage water? Gas masks? Do you think you should be forced
to have them or do you think it should be left up to the free will of the
individual citizens in a free country?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

293. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 19:57:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE840C2.550B918@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23190

Robert Casey wrote:
> I figure the extra ham license is equivalent to a 3 to
> 6 credit hour college class.

I figure maybe freshman level EE classes (minus English,
History, etc).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

294. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 21:30:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE85672.9EF246C9@uci.edu>
Source record: 23191

CAM wrote:
> We're not discussing terrorists, Jim. We are discussing American citizens
> losing constitutional rights. I'm against it.

Actually, I was replying to Dwight when you butted in. I'm discussing
terrorists.

295. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 21:33:49 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE8573D.4308B236@uci.edu>
Source record: 23193

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Let be clear not to confuse the
> > word 'citizen' with the words
> > 'traitor' and 'terrorist', Dwight.
> > I wouldn't be entirely opposed to
> > hooking up the latter to an IV
> > filled with happy juice in order
> > to get them into a 'chattier' mood.
>
> Then you would not mind being tortured then, Jim?

That's a stupid thing to ask, Dwight.

> What if someone
> spreads around a rumor that you're a terrorist?

Give it a try and see what happens. Start off by giving the FBI all the evidence you have to support your contention. (Hint: the FBI is concentrating on citizens of OTHER countries.)

> Are you totally
> convinced that you want to live in a world where that is a constant
> threat - where nothing more than a rumor believed by law enforcement
> could result in weeks of torture?

Where do you get this stuff? Comic books?

296. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 21:36:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE857DF.7D0A74A6@uci.edu>
Source record: 23192

CAM wrote:
> If we lose our freedoms in the process of bringing the terrorists
> down, the terrorists will have won.

Don't the terrorists win if they're able to conduct their terrorist
activities without fear of being apprehended?

297. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-06 21:58:36 UTC
From: "Mr. Middle Finger" <middlefinger4@home.coms>
Message-ID: <g2ZF7.184280$5A3.69512839@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 23194

How about N2SEX or perhaps N2T I T, N2ASS, N2BUT, N2MEN

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BE78ECF.7E9CC2D@sccoast.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > The legality and legitimacy of Kim's
> > callsign is not the issue, and never
> > has been. (snip) Kim has been told
> > by a fellow ham, and an FCC official,
> > that her callsign, while not illegal,
> > does have a negative impact on ham
> > radio's image.
>
>
> Of course legality is an issue. The FCC official you mention has
> direct authority over the legality of that callsign. If Riley truly
> believes it has a negative impact (in any way) on ham radio, then he
> has the authority to eliminate the callsign. Since he has not done so,
> he obviously does not feel that strongly about this issue. In other
> words, the fact that he has not moved to affect the legality of the
> callsign clearly shows his overall lack of concern. And, contrary to
> your attempts to use him as an ally in this, his lack of concern does
> little, if anything, to support your argument (in spite of what he
> might have said).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

298. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 00:25:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be87fd6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23195

Dick: Some will choose to be scared, some will choose to be indifferent, some will choose to live life as normally as they can.

IMHO, there is no more threat today from terrorists, than there ever has been. We just happen to have enjoyed approximately 20 years of what many people believe has been peaceful. It has not been 20 years of peace; it has been twenty years of Americans living fat, happy, and stupid.

That paraphrases a lot.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:3BE73119.B468B237@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org wrote:
> > > >Maybe the bad
> > > >guys don't want to risk losing any during a US smuggling operation.
> > >
> > > Smuggling operation? These are terrorists, not drug kingpins.
> >
> > Is there some other way to get nukes into the US without smuggling
> > them in?
>
> ARE you kidding??? We offload thousands of modular containers from ships
> daily at docks on all three coasts, and only about 1 in 10,000 even get
> opened for even the most cursury inspection by the badly outnumbered
> Customs inspectors. Virtually all are set on railraod flatcar trains and
> immediatley "Hot shot"ed to their destinations, mostly distribution
> centers in metro areas of the various regions of the country. WE never
> know exatly what is aboard. So did you really think that none of them ever
> contained contraband???
>
> And, if that's too much trouble, to arrange a load on a container bound
> for the USA, there's always the 3500 mile Cnadian border to step across,
> wsithout so much as a single strand fence, and road crossings with
> inspection points few and VERY far between.
>
> Scared yet???
>

>
>

299. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 00:26:41 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be88027_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23196

You crack me up....LOL You are too anti-social to take anything "under advisement" Larry.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011105231807.18926.00001223@nso-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3be551fe_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >
> >By the way, Larry: Would you like to see what Riley Hollingsworth would have
> >to say about your remarks that you've made here in the newsgroup in terms of
> >whether they reflect good moral character, spirit of friendship, etc.? I'd
> >be more than happy to be the one to piss him off with a whole bunch of your
> >postings and ask that he share any opinion he may have. I could even
> >suggest that he just peruse some of your posts. I can guarantee of what his
> >response would be if he read your "stuff."
> >
> >Put up or shut up, Larry. Just let me know.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I receive regular, positive feedback on my posts from people who
> read this newsgroup. I'm sure Mr. Hollingsworth has plenty of
> opportunity to read my postings, and comment on them directly
> to me through E-mail or this newsgroup. So far, he has not seen
> fit to do so, one way or another. If you choose to go out of your
> way to forward my postings to him, just be sure to include *all*
> of them, quoted in full, with all supporting quotes from other
> participants fully attributed. I assure you that if he would accuse
> me of taking ham radio "...one step closer to extinction," that I
> would certainly take his comments under advisement, even
> though you have not. Therefore, feel free to proceed.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

300. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 00:28:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be880a1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23197

Larry: How come there's only been yourself, and two other people (that creep named Lee Roberts or whatever and one other person I cannot even remember) who have *ever* had anything negative to say about my callsign?

OH NO...I started letting you get me into this debate again...

Nope, I am out of it. If you want to worry your purty little head, you go right ahead, be my guest.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011105231807.18926.00001224@nso-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3BE55ABC.804CD38D@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> >
> > And I think that is going a little overboard. A single person's
> >callsign is not going to have any effect on ham radio - much less
> >bring it closer to extinction. If Riley truly feels that way, why was
> >the callsign available and issued?
>
> Dwight:
>
> The legality and legitimacy of Kim's callsign is not the issue, and
> never has been. The FCC's focus is not on the image of the ARS --
> that is the job of our local and national amateur radio organizations,
> and of individual hams themselves. However, Kim has been told
> by a fellow ham, and an FCC official, that her callsign, while not
> illegal, does have a negative impact on ham radio's image. Please
> try to keep your comments focused on that.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

301. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 00:32:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE88100.61B4247A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23198

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > We're not discussing terrorists, Jim. We are discussing American citizens
> > losing constitutional rights. I'm against it.
>
> Actually, I was replying to Dwight when you butted in. I'm discussing
> terrorists.

Actually, you were replying to me. Here's the posting.
****
CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE704FE.E735F541@IEEE.org...
> Trouble is, to most law enforcers, you might look like a citizen.
> To one,
> *you* might look like a terrorist. Unless all citizens possess
constitutional
> rights then no citizen possesses them.

US citizenship is easily proved and Mohammed Atta and his crew were not
citizens.

What rights do you think terrorists are entitled to that they haven't been
afforded?
****
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

302. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 00:32:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be88193_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23200

ROFLMAO...I knew you'd handle this, Cecil. I was reading Dick's post
absolutely dumbfounded over the position he was taking as he was describing
a perfect smuggling enterprise.

Kim W5TIT

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE77A85.7D18F306@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Is there some other way to get nukes into the US without smuggling
> > > them in?
> >
> > ARE you kidding??? We offload thousands of modular containers from
ships
> > daily at docks on all three coasts, and only about 1 in 10,000 even get
> > opened for even the most cursury inspection by the badly outnumbered
> > Customs inspectors. Virtually all are set on railraod flatcar trains and
> > immediatley "Hot shot"ed to their destinations, mostly distribution
> > centers in metro areas of the various regions of the country. WE never
> > know exatly what is aboard. So did you really think that none of them
ever
> > contained contraband???
>
> Uhhhhhh Dick, that exactly matches the definition of "smuggle". From
> Webster's: "smuggle - to import or export goods secretly, in violation
> of the law". Exactly how are you going to get a foreign nuke into the
> US without "importing it secretly, in violation of the law"?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

303. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 00:34:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE881A7.38BD1678@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23199

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > If we lose our freedoms in the process of bringing the terrorists
> > down, the terrorists will have won.
>
> Don't the terrorists win if they're able to conduct their terrorist
> activities without fear of being apprehended?

Apprehend them! Punish them! It can be done without stripping US
citizens of their constitutional freedoms! Why do you think a
criminal should have no fear of being apprehended?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

304. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 00:44:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be88438$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23201

What do you have, Larry? Riley-envy? You would take under advisement the thoughts of one man?

Step out, Larry, become a man yourself. At least I have the "balls" to stand behind my own convictions, regardless of what anyone thinks of them.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011105231807.18926.00001223@nso-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3be551fe_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >
> > >By the way, Larry: Would you like to see what Riley Hollingsworth would have
> > >to say about your remarks that you've made here in the newsgroup in terms of
> > >whether they reflect good moral character, spirit of friendship, etc.? I'd
> > >be more than happy to be the one to piss him off with a whole bunch of your
> > >postings and ask that he share any opinion he may have. I could even
> > >suggest that he just peruse some of your posts. I can guarantee of what his
> > >response would be if he read your "stuff."
> > >
> > >Put up or shut up, Larry. Just let me know.
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > I receive regular, positive feedback on my posts from people who
> > read this newsgroup. I'm sure Mr. Hollingsworth has plenty of
> > opportunity to read my postings, and comment on them directly
> > to me through E-mail or this newsgroup. So far, he has not seen
> > fit to do so, one way or another. If you choose to go out of your
> > way to forward my postings to him, just be sure to include *all*
> > of them, quoted in full, with all supporting quotes from other
> > participants fully attributed. I assure you that if he would accuse
> > me of taking ham radio "...one step closer to extinction," that I
> > would certainly take his comments under advisement, even
> > though you have not. Therefore, feel free to proceed.
> >

> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

305. A Correlation between CW and Competitiveness

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 01:01:47 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be88861$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23204

Hey, Jim, and anyone else, just came across this on the ARRL website. It's the current "ARRL Web Survey" and the question is: "Did you participate in the 2001 CW Sweepstakes contest last weekend?"

Notice that 22.3% of the respondents thusfar are not interested in contesting; and
notice that 26.1% of the respondents thusfar do not operate CW

Yes&#65533;and I worked a Clean Sweep! 1.5 % (8)
Yes 9.9 % (52)
No, I&#65533;m not interested in contesting 22.3 % (117)
No, I don&#65533;t operate CW 26.1 % (137)
No, I didn&#65533;t have the time 19.8 % (104)
No (other) 20.2 % (106)
Total votes: 524

I wonder if there is a correlation (unproveable) along the lines of "attitude." I wonder if competitiveness is a factor in whether one likes and/or uses CW?

Kim W5TIT

306. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 01:03:00 UTC
From: webdoc@mailandnews.com
Message-ID: <de9751ca.0111061703.2274731c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23202
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net> wrote in message
news:<uBFF7.30$oM5.5658@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>...
> "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> news:3BE70DCB.774D6008@spam.me.not...
> > Check out HRO in Delaware. It's probably near enough to drive there,
> and
> > the prices are good. If you're looking for a good 2M rig, the Alinco
> > DR-135 has treated me well, even if the modulation is a bit "hot" on
> it.
> > (Anyone have the adjustment info on this radio so I can turn mine DOWN
> > just a hair?) The DR-605 is a good dualbander, as well. I have several
> > friends in the area who have them, and they're thrilled with the
> > performance. If I could have afforded a dualbander (this set runs
> about
> > $350) I would have gotten the 605.
>
> Depending on how much he has to spend he could go right for a Yaesu
> FT-100D or the Icom IC-706MKIIG. Both rigs will let him do 3 bands, 6m -
> 2m - 70cm, all mode. Then when he upgrades he will have a mobile rig
> that will handle HF too. I think it's better to buy a bit more radio
> that you think you'll need so you don't out grow it so soon. Also many
> of the late model vehicles don't have room for two rigs, HF and V/UHF,
> much less even one. So the above two rig models helps save space.
>
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>
> ARRL Member
> NCI Member
Thanks for all the input, but perhaps I should have made myself more
clear, what I am looking for at the moment is either a 2 meter HT or a
dual band HT, since it would be rather difficult to operate a mobile
unit without a car hehehe. I have found 2 places in NYC that deal in
amateur radio equipment, one I found by accident, when looking for
another one that had gone out of business, the place I had been
looking for was the "Radio Depot" on 36th btw 5th and 6th, it was on
the 6th floor, what I found instead was Communication Telecom
International in the same building on the 10th floor, they were
friendly, but do not carry much in stock, when I am ready to buy I
would rather get it the same day I buy it. The other place I found was
Barry Electronics Corp. which Bert told me about the other night when

we spoke on the phone. I will check them out later this week.

I don't need anything fancy, repeater capability and easy programming is what I am looking for.

Anyway hope everyone is having a good evening, I enjoyed having the day off, walked around the city a bit, rode one of the double decker tour buses, and enjoyed a good dinner at the B.B. King club on 42nd.

Keith Hosman

307. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 01:03:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011106200308.23334.00000372@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 23203

In article <3BE77B6D.CD55A990@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> Besides, I
>> thought you said that PACTOR was the more reliable mode to use.
>
>PACTOR II is extremely reliable but not popular enough (yet)
>to do much serious emergency trafficking.

If it's not popular, it's not reliable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

308. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 01:50:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmegtw7.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23206

On Tue, 06 Nov 2001 02:18:59 -0500, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Of course legality is an issue. The FCC official you mention has
>direct authority over the legality of that callsign. If Riley truly
>believes it has a negative impact (in any way) on ham radio, then he
>has the authority to eliminate the callsign.

Wrong. Licenses, call signs, and amateur radio rules are issued by
the Wireless Telecomm Bureau. Riley is in the Enforcement Bureau.
His job is to enforce the rules that WTB issues.

>Since he has not done so, he obviously does not feel that strongly
>about this issue.

Or that there is no rule violation.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

309. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 01:50:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmeg626.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23205

On Tue, 06 Nov 2001 05:31:38 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

>> Blame yours truly for pushing the elimination of the above-mentioned
>> requirements, aidied and abetted by my compadre at the Washington
>> office who commuted 75 miles each day with the 2-meter rig mike in
>> hand.
>
> As former holder of license WR0AQH, I thank yew, Phil. And I will
>always wonder what that genius, whoever he was, was thinking about
>when he instigated all that.

Is A. Prose Walker still alive?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

310. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 01:55:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BE8948E.EEE832C5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23207

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > What you describe is not the Affirmative Action program. You've
> > described the changes brought about because of the 1964 Civil Rights
> > Law.
>
> The Affirmative Action program was necessitated because racists
> violated the 1964 Civil Rights Law. Racists had their chance to
> comply and the Affirmative Action program was the predictable
> result of their non-compliance. The racists have only themselves
> to blame for the swinging of the pendulum.

Please offer proof of your claim to the origins of the Affirmative
Action program. Your final sentence is another piece of subjective pap.

> > My personal reality pretty much coincides with universal reality.
>
> That's what everyone says (even the criminally insane).

So we should take the word of the admitted Texas scofflaw as to whether
another lives in reality?

> > There is no Morse Code Creed, no pseudo-royal
> > society and there are no starving commoners.
>
> Give us an ever-loving break, Dave. The ham radio "royalty" system
> is obvious to the most casual observer. The FCC has pulled the rug
> out from under you people who obtained your self esteem and position
> in ham radio from your Morse code ability and you people just cannot
> stand it. I know. I've been observing this situation for over 50 years.

I don't believe you. As far as your "you people" comment: Get stuffed.
I've passed every exam the FCC offers. I did it to obtain the
privileges I desired. I operate anywhere the FCC permits me to operate.
Don't try to attribute any of your fanstasy to me.

> Morse code is only a mode and should never have been adopted as a creed.

Glad you feel that way. It never was.

Dave K8MN

311. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 01:57:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111061757.c4bb3aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23208

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3BE83B05.13786420@ix.netcom.com>...
> CAM wrote:
>
>
> Maybe it's the extras who's ham license is the top
> achievement on their resumes....
>
Horsepucky; The tougest radio exam I ever took was the test for the
Boy Scout Radio Merit badge. Not only did ya have to know the code, ya
also had to actually BUILD a working receiver AND explain in detail
exactly how every component in the radio functioned and why it was in
the circuit. I showed up at the merit badge counselor's lair with a
two tube regen and he kicked my slats in for a half hour trying to
trip me up on the technical details.
>
>
I'm trying to imagine the enormity of the flamefest in RRAP if the FCC
decided to pass out tickets only if ya actually built a radio and it
had to work.
>
>
w3rv
Extra HEAVY.

312. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 01:57:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BE8951D.5315F2BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23209

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Dick: Some will choose to be scared, some will choose to be indifferent,
> some will choose to live life as normally as they can.
>
> IMHO, there is no more threat today from terrorists, than there ever has
> been. We just happen to have enjoyed approximately 20 years of what many
> people believe has been peaceful.

I can't believe that this is your view after living on the planet for 47
years.

It has not been 20 years of peace; it has
> been twenty years of Americans living fat, happy, and stupid.

Speak for yourself.

Dave K8MN

313. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 01:58:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BE89558.120920FE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23210

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

At least I have the "balls"...

As I've long suspected.

Dave K8MN

314. Re: A Correlation between CW and Competitiveness

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 02:02:17 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <18d78a5eca8245c066302672bbbb1154.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23211

"Kim-W5TIT" wrote:

> Notice that 22.3% of the respondents thusfar are not interested in
> contesting; and
> notice that 26.1% of the respondents thusfar do not operate CW

Does that mean that 78.7% are interesting in
contesting, and 73.9% operate CW?

By the way, I got my sweep on CW this weekend,
and expect to get my sweep on phone in two weeks.

Does that mean there is a corelation beween a
winning competitive attitude and _both_ CW & phone?

Or did you just have a brain fart?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from [204.31.48.70]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

315. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 02:09:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111061809.622dac66@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23212

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3BE83514.6E7C76A3@IEEE.org>...
> Krell wrote:
> > Most of those hams recieved their licenses when code testing was at 13 and
> > 20 WPM, so how do you figure that the elimination of the code test will
> > result in more of this type of activity? It certainly doesn't look like
> > high-speed code testing has stopped what's on 75.
>
> If I'm not mistaken, the highest per capita percentage of FCC NALs
> have gone to Extra class licensees.
>
>
Maybe, and if so no doubt because Extras are on the HF bands more than
any other class. Per capita. Statistics. Twist.

316. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 02:19:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106211950.10701.00001511@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23213

In article <3BE55ABC.804CD38D@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> And I think that is going a little overboard. A single person's
>callsign is not going to have any effect on ham radio - much less
>bring it closer to extinction. If Riley truly feels that way, why was
>the callsign available and issued?

Dwight:

The legality and legitimacy of Kim's callsign is not the issue, and
never has been. The FCC's focus is not on the image of the ARS --
that is the job of our local and national amateur radio organizations,
and of individual hams themselves. However, Kim has been told
by a fellow ham, and an FCC official, that her callsign, while not
illegal, does have a negative impact on ham radio's image. Please
try to keep your comments focused on that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

317. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 02:19:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106211951.10701.00001512@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23214

In article <3BE5F388.DC9CF879@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
>
> Larry seems to like bringing out the worst in people. If he didn't,
>he wouldn't endlessly bring up controversial subjects and take such a
>contemptuous position on them.

Dwight:

Don't blame me for this. It was Kim who deliberately selected a
callsign which included a blatant vulgar reference to a part of her
anatomy which she believes deserves special recognition. This
has nothing to do with small birds. It has everything to do with
her breasts, and she thinks it is hilarious to call attention to them
through her callsign. Then, in a vain attempt to get Mr. Hollingsworth
to agree that she has every right to select and use such a callsign,
she is told that even though she does, her choice to do so does,
in fact, bring the ARS "...one step closer to extinction," due to the
effect it has on those seeking a family-oriented activity within the
ARS.

That list provided by Bob Casey, showing hams with similar
unfortunate callsigns, proves nothing, because it is quite likely
that those callsigns were sequentially issued. However, if I
were to be issued such a callsign, I would have to ask to have
it changed for the reason that I felt it was inappropriate for use
on-the-air in a family-oriented radio service. The fact that they
haven't doesn't change a single thing with relation to Kim. She
should know better, but still chooses to keep a callsign which
is demeaning to women and damaging to the image of the ARS.

This thread is about Kim, nobody else.

73 de Larry, K3LT

318. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 02:19:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106211952.10701.00001513@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23215

In article <3BE38D84.E060D134@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>>
>> > Again, like so many of your previous
>> > postings, you misrepresent the position
>> > of those opposed to code TESTING, Larry.
>>
>> My comments have always been specifically
>> directed toward code testing, Dwight. If
>> you say they were not and are not, then
>> it is incumbent upon you to prove it.
>> Proceed, if you can. (snip)
>
>
> Okay, I'll quote your exact words - the words I replied to when I
>wrote the sentence above. You said...
>
>
> "It's all about the basic issue
> of laziness and the Welfare State
> mentality vs. those who saw the
> value of the Morse/CW mode and
> found that once they gave it a
> try, they actually liked it and
> were able to succeed at it. My
> postings, over a decade's worth
> both here and on Fidonet, have
> been a reaction to the abject
> hatred of the CW mode..."
>
>
> Note that you used the word "mode" twice, not "testing." So, in
>spite of what you say above, your comments have NOT "always been
>specifically directed toward code testing."

Dwight:

Throughout my tenure on this newsgroup, and Fidonet before it, I have always
made a
clear and logical linkage between code *testing* and ultimate *use* of the
Morse/CW
mode. I believe that the two go hand-in-hand, always have, and always will. I
don't

believe that people will learn and use the Morse/CW mode in anything like the numbers
they did in the Post-Restructuring Era just because, as they claim, they are no longer
having "CW shoved down their throats." I have been nothing but logically consistent
on this issue, and your latest attempt to prove otherwise has failed as miserably as
all the others.

>> This is simply absurd, Dwight. My very
>> presence on this newsgroup proves you
>> wrong, unless you believe I employ a
>> private secretary to take my hand-chiseled
>> notes on stone tablets and transcribe them
>> on a computer to be posted on this newsgroup.

> It's not really that absurd, Larry. The fact that you're relatively
>up to date in one area does not mean that you're not a old fashioned
>in another. And, when it comes to radio (which is what we're talking
>about here), you appear to be an old fashioned guy - perhaps even a
>luddite in some ways.

Dwight, it may come as a shock, and a painful surprise for you to hear this, but my self-image does not depend on your opinion of me as a person or as a ham. To some hams, who, I will readily admit, are much more technically skilled than myself, I may, indeed, seem to be a Luddite. However, I have participated in this hobby strictly within it's context *as* a hobby. No, I do not have "professional-level" technical skills; and I probably never will. However, my technical skills will compare most favorably to those of the typical Post-Restructuring ham, and even to the Pre-Restructuring ham, from a standpoint of my ability to adapt to new modes and techniques. I am not limited to seeking self-aggrandizement for my heroic achievements in HT-slinging at the local Walk-A-Thon. I leave that to you, Kim, and the self-apologists who think they are Real Hams just because they can coordinate the action of a PTT switch and their own mouths! Unfortunately, I know plenty of such hams who can't even do that!

73 de Larry, K3LT

319. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 02:38:35 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <547820bc99c75b6ecee7eca9c521c796.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23216

"Dwight Stewart" wrote:

> The FCC official you mention has direct authority over the legality of
> that callsign. If Riley truly believes it has a negative impact (in any
> way) on ham radio, then he has the authority to eliminate the callsign.

Wrong (again!), Dwight.

Riley is just a cop on a beat. He can only enforce the rules that exist.
He has no authority to make up new rules about things that might piss
him off on principle. He can only express his distaste (which he did) --
he cannot eliminate the callsign.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from [204.31.48.70]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

320. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 02:48:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE8A10A.5140BDD6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23217

>
> >
> > "It's all about the basic issue
> > of laziness and the Welfare State
> > mentality vs. those who saw the
> > value of the Morse/CW mode and
> > found that once they gave it a
> > try, they actually liked it and
> > were able to succeed at it. My
> > postings, over a decade's worth
> > both here and on Fidonet, have
> > been a reaction to the abject
> > hatred of the CW mode..."
> >
>

I understand that the code test, while 5WPM, is
done Farnsworth style. That is, high speed characters
spaced at 5WPM. Heard that learning code this way
is an efficient method of getting proficient at higher
speeds quickly. So people who get on CW will
find themselves doing faster speeds.

>
>
> I leave that to you, Kim, and
> the self-apologists who think they are Real Hams just because they can
> coordinate the action of a PTT switch and their own mouths! Unfortunately,
> I know plenty of such hams who can't even do that!

I use VOX myself, so I don't have to worry about that.... :-)

321. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:10:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106221014.10701.00001516@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23223

In article <3BE78793.8DE3DCA2@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> Actually, you might be surprised about that also, Dick. Back in my
>younger days, I was about as liberal as one could get. I believed all
>the crap teachers force feed students. I believed the garbage from the
>press. I believed in concepts like diversity, tolerance, and so forth.
>Today, I realized that 95% of it was total BS - liberalism sucks and
>concepts like diversity and tolerance have to go both ways (which they
>don't in this country).

Dwight:

That is the problem with "diversity" and "tolerance" as political issues.
In America, cultural diversity is normal. We are all descended from people
who came from somewhere else -- including the so-called "Native Americans."
"Tolerance" for our differences is the thing which defines the true American
culture. It is something which is generally not found in other countries --
including countries in Africa and Asia, where Americans are usually given
unfavorable comparisons for our "cultural" defects.

I agree with you that liberalism sucks -- but the issues of diversity and
tolerance were, like most liberal issues, distorted in order to give power
to people with a hidden Socialist agenda. In reality, it is among true
conservatives like myself where the unique American culture -- one
which accepts "diversity" as normal and "tolerates" it as a natural way
of life, is best understood. The difference is we don't use these as
weapons in a political power struggle.

73 de Larry, K3LT

322. Re: Great Fun with Callsigns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:10:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106221014.10701.00001517@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23224

In article <20011106105602.15943.00001570@mb-cu.aol.com>, drpfrench@aol.com (Drpfrench) writes:

>I must say I like your call sign also Kim. There are just to many people in
>the world like Larry. People have got to lighten up and drop all the PC
>garbage. They need to learn to laugh.
>
>73
>John
>KF6VYH

John:

If participation in the ARS were limited to persons over the age of 18, then I would not be nearly as concerned with Kim's callsign as I am at present. However, the overwhelming emphasis, especially in the last decade or so, has been on getting younger people involved in amateur radio, and of the nature of the ARS as a family-oriented activity. I believe that Kim's callsign is inappropriate within that context. I assure you that I am no prude, nor would anyone who knows me well ever accuse me of being "politically correct." However, they would agree that I am a rational, fair-minded, and thoughtful person, who doesn't make outrageous statements about myself through devices like callsigns.

I have no problem with people having fun with callsigns, as long as that "fun" doesn't come at the expense of the image of the ARS as a whole. Kim's callsign goes far beyond that, by giving a negative to the ARS, female hams in particular, and women in general. A triple-whammy. How charming!

73 de Larry, K3LT

323. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:10:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106221015.10701.00001518@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23222

In article <3BE7783C.15A4C681@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> However, Kim has been told
>> by a fellow ham, and an FCC official, that her callsign, while not
>> illegal, does have a negative impact on ham radio's image. Please
>> try to keep your comments focused on that. 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>When are you going to get rid of that obscene "Large Tits"
>call, Larry?

Cecil:

I don't have any idea what you're talking about. My call sign doesn't
spell a damn thing. Kim's does. Whatever stupid phoenitics you make
of it doesn't give my call sign any meaning other than a legal station
identification. Get Mr. Hollingsworth to agree with you, and I'll certainly
take his comments under advisement, as I've already told Kim.

73 de Larry, K3LT

324. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:10:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106221015.10701.00001519@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23225

In article <3BE78ECF.7E9CC2D@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> Of course legality is an issue. The FCC official you mention has
>direct authority over the legality of that callsign. If Riley truly
>believes it has a negative impact (in any way) on ham radio, then he
>has the authority to eliminate the callsign.

Dwight:

Don't look now, but Riley does NOT have the authority to "eliminate"
anyone's callsign, unless they have violated FCC rules. Kim's selection
of her callsign is not a violation; this has been stated by Riley himself
in his "...one step closer to extinction" message. Riley does not
make the FCC rules, he just enforces them. His message to Kim was
his own personal opinion...one which did not have the desired effect
on Kim.

>Since he has not done so,
>he obviously does not feel that strongly about this issue.

I'd say that his response, in which he said

"While the call sign may fit the constitution, for every instance
where a parent or uncle or grandparent doesn't want a young person
to get involved in Ham Radio because of something they hear on the
bands, then you have taken the ARS one step closer to extinction."

constitutes a clear demonstration of how strongly he *does* feel
about this issue.

>In other
>words, the fact that he has not moved to affect the legality of the
>callsign clearly shows his overall lack of concern. And, contrary to
>your attempts to use him as an ally in this, his lack of concern does
>little, if anything, to support your argument (in spite of what he
>might have said).

Dwight, all you're doing here is demonstrating the same self-serving
attitude as Kim...or is it just plain ignorance? For the umpteenth time,
the legality of Kim's callsign is NOT THE ISSUE. Never has been.
Please try to "get it," the same why you keep pleading with me to
"get" the distinction between code *testing* and code *use*!

73 de Larry, K3LT

325. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:10:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106221016.10701.00001520@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23219

In article <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060352350.21206-100000@cluster2>, Dana
<dana@randomc.com> writes:

>
>Why don't you'all shut up about Kim's call sign. You'all sound like a
>bunch of "CB'ERS. If she wants that call, that is her right.

Dana:

That's true. It is her right to take the ARS "...one step closer to
extinction" if that's what she *wants* to do. Sadly, it must be noted,
to the detriment of any good opinion of Kim's character, that she
is, indeed, doing just that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

326. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:10:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106221016.10701.00001521@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23221

In article <d22b54c3.0111061757.c4bb3aa@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>I'm trying to imagine the enormity of the flamefest in RRAP if the FCC >decided to pass out tickets only if ya actually built a radio and it >had to work.

Brian:

I agree, it would be an interesting time on the newsgroup. However, I, for one, have built working radios long before I became a ham of *any* license class. I'd love to see that requirement levied once the code testing requirement is dropped!

>w3rv
>Extra HEAVY.

In that case, try Weight Watchers or Jenny Craig. They do a pretty good job.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Real Extra

327. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:10:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106221017.10701.00001522@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23218

In article <3BE83514.6E7C76A3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>If I'm not mistaken, the highest per capita percentage of FCC NALs
>have gone to Extra class licensees.

Cecil:

I believe that this is true. Now...what percentage of those NAL's
have involved the Morse/CW mode vs. phone?

73 de Larry, K3LT

328. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:10:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011106221017.10701.00001523@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 23220

In article <3be88438$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>What do you have, Larry? Riley-envy? You would take under advisement the
>thoughts of one man?
>
>Step out, Larry, become a man yourself. At least I have the "balls" to
>stand behind my own convictions, regardless of what anyone thinks of them.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

So, IOW, that was just an empty threat on your part. Nothing
new here, as usual.

73 de Larry, K3LT

329. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:12:21 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sa8ov0rnr@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23227

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BE89558.120920FE@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> At least I have the "balls"...
>
> As I've long suspected.
>
> Dave K8MN

Reminds me of a scene that spoofed "The Caine Mutiny" once...

Queeg/Bogey (twirling ball bearings in his hand) - "You have to have balls to run a ship, sailor. So tell me - do you have what it takes? Do you have balls?"

Sailor - "Yes, I do. But *I'm* not always playing with mine."

330. Evolution of Techs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:33:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmemuea.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23226

On 05 Nov 2001 01:58:52 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>The original FRC/FCC setup from the early 1930s was "ABC" -

The predecessor to the FCC in amateur licensing was the Department of Commerce. The FRC dealt only with broadcast stations. When we cleaned house at the FCC office in SF during a move in 1980 we found some old DoC envelopes well hidden in a storeroom.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

331. Re: A Correlation between CW and Competitiveness

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:35:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be8ac7e$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23228

"Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:18d78a5eca8245c066302672bbbb1154.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Kim-W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > Notice that 22.3% of the respondents thusfar are not interested in
> > contesting; and
> > notice that 26.1% of the respondents thusfar do not operate CW
>
> Does that mean that 78.7% are interesting in
> contesting, and 73.9% operate CW?
>

Yeah, but I think the correlation would be the same: CW interest =
Competitively inclined. If there's a correlation at all.

>
> By the way, I got my sweep on CW this weekend,
> and expect to get my sweep on phone in two weeks.
>

Congrats! Heard the bands have been pretty bad.

>
> Does that mean there is a corelation beween a
> winning competitive attitude and _both_ CW & phone?
>

Ya might have something, there, Hans!

>
> Or did you just have a brain fart?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Hmmm, no brain fart. But, I mighta hit a nerve.

Kim W5TIT

332. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 03:53:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be8b0a9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23229

Oh, Larry. I am so sorry you took that as a threat. It was more a challenge. And, I am certain--absolutely certain--that Riley has at least heard of you. I am also absolutely certain that Riley probably doesn't think much of either of us and would probably have serious question about whether either of us does merit to the ARS. A side bet would be that a) he thinks you're worse than me; and b) at a minimum he believes your actions are far worse than someone's callsign.

Only thing is: I don't agree with him, or you, or anyone else about it [the callsign issue]. In fact, I wholeheartedly disagree with Riley about any of the "one step closer to extinction" comments. The folks who've been on HF for years and years and years--the ones who are there every single night with their racist topics of conversation, swearing, threatening to kill each other, or do each others' wives, etc.? You know the frequencies, you've heard the conversations. I haven't noticed a bit of extinction on their behalf. I haven't noticed a decline in the number of people in the hobby. I have noticed a substantial increase in the number of young people getting their license and getting on the air--whole schools involved as a matter of fact [thanks to the Big Project that the ARRL is undertaking].

Tell me about your extinction stories, Larry. Tell me all about it--wink wink.

Now, since you've generated the "callsign" discussion again (as you do each year around this time); I'll leave it to you all to discuss and re-discuss. You'll never have an impact on my thoughts about my callsign; it will never change as long as it is within the law; and I don't feel a bit bad about it. Now, if you want to waste your time breathing in and out over my callsign (and my tits), well....

W5TIT - Kim

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011106221017.10701.00001523@nso-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3be88438$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >What do you have, Larry? Riley-envy? You would take under advisement the
> >thoughts of one man?
> >
> >Step out, Larry, become a man yourself. At least I have the "balls" to
> >stand behind my own convictions, regardless of what anyone thinks of them.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT

>
> Kim:
>
> So, IOW, that was just an empty threat on your part. Nothing
> new here, as usual.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

333. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 04:05:21 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5q2G7.159551$3d2.6032408@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23230

Ohhhh ... ouch! Larry, I am neither pro nor con on the code question. I've done a lot of CW and don't see the need to force someone else to use it; however you have raised a MOST interesting question. One that I am waiting to see who would care to answer (although I suspect you and I know that answer!). You just hit below the belt!!

73 from Rochester,
Jim AA2QA (and waiting but not holding my breath!)

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011106221017.10701.00001522@nso-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3BE83514.6E7C76A3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >
> > >If I'm not mistaken, the highest per capita percentage of FCC NALs
> > >have gone to Extra class licensees.
>
> Cecil:
>
> I believe that this is true. Now...what percentage of those NAL's
> have involved the Morse/CW mode vs. phone?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

334. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 04:09:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE8B401.31DEA96F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23231

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3BE77B6D.CD55A990@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> Besides, I
> >> thought you said that PACTOR was the more reliable mode to use.
> > >
> > >PACTOR II is extremely reliable but not popular enough (yet)
> > >to do much serious emergency trafficking.
>
> If it's not popular, it's not reliable.

:-p I can usually contact Germany with 20w even when I cannot
hear the received signal.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

335. Re: A Correlation between CW and Competitiveness

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 04:16:03 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7A2G7.159575$3d2.6032502@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23232

Kim, I've been off HF for quite a few years (um ... since 1969!). I let the ticket expire around 1981 and decided to get it back and simply tested out in 1993. Currently I'm on 440 FM only although I am (this IS getting old) in the process of trying to get back on HF. I never got into contests. Never cared for 'em. I've operated during an emergency, I've helped with communications for a marathon, and I've run a number of phone patches (years ago) for the guys when I was on Guam. My usual mode is a good rag chew. I used to do that on SSB, CW, and RTTY. Heck, I used to yak with Norm, VK2NP, for hours on end from Guam on teletype and I suspect that I'll be doing that again with other stations once I'm back on the air. The 10 meter port on one of the local repeaters has provided a lot of fun though - including talking with a couple of VKs. I suspect that contesting (in a SMALL number of cases) leads to 'my signal is bigger than your signal' which at times can lead to jamming (and sometimes someone getting nailed for running multiple tens of kilowatts). No, go ahead and help yourselves to the contests; I'll stay out of 'em.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3be88861$1_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> Hey, Jim, and anyone else, just came across this on the ARRL website.
It's
> the current "ARRL Web Survey" and the question is: "Did you participate in
> the 2001 CW Sweepstakes contest last weekend?"
>
> Notice that 22.3% of the respondents thusfar are not interested in
> contesting; and
> notice that 26.1% of the respondents thusfar do not operate CW
>
> Yes-and I worked a Clean Sweep! 1.5 % (8)
> Yes 9.9 % (52)
> No, I'm not interested in contesting 22.3 % (117)
> No, I don't operate CW 26.1 % (137)
> No, I didn't have the time 19.8 % (104)
> No (other) 20.2 % (106)
> Total votes: 524
>
> I wonder if there is a correlation (unproveable) along the lines of
> "attitude." I wonder if competitiveness is a factor in whether one likes
> and/or uses CW?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

>
>

336. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 04:20:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE8B6A6.90781A50@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23233

Dave Heil wrote:
> Please offer proof of your claim to the origins of the Affirmative
> Action program.

Huh? Study some history, will you?

> > Morse code is only a mode and should never have been adopted as a creed.
>
> Glad you feel that way. It never was.

Maybe on your planet, it wasn't. It certainly was on this one.
I lived through it happening and it's still alive for a certain
lunatic fringe of amateur radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

337. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 04:27:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE8B814.971E66B6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23234

Brian Kelly wrote:
> Maybe, and if so no doubt because Extras are on the HF bands more than
> any other class. Per capita. Statistics. Twist.

More likely, some Extras consider themselves to be prima donna
ARS Royalty and not subject to mortal standards.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

338. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 04:29:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE8B8A8.95F733E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23235

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> However, if I
> were to be issued such a callsign, I would have to ask to have
> it changed for the reason that I felt it was inappropriate for use
> on-the-air in a family-oriented radio service.

So are you going to turn in your "Large Tits" call sign for
a more appropriate one?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

339. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 04:34:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE8B9CC.8C89BB0B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23236

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I don't have any idea what you're talking about.

Your callsign phonetics are obscene, Larry.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

340. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 04:37:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE8BA8A.55C3466C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23237

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >If I'm not mistaken, the highest per capita percentage of FCC NALs
> >have gone to Extra class licensees.
>
> I believe that this is true. Now...what percentage of those NAL's
> have involved the Morse/CW mode vs. phone?

It doesn't matter. CW is not a proper tool for misbehaving. Choosing
CW for misbehaving is like choosing a BB gun to murder someone.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

341. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 04:42:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE8BBC1.3CEC25EC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23238

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
> Ohhhh ... ouch! Larry, I am neither pro nor con on the code question. I've
> done a lot of CW and don't see the need to force someone else to use it;
> however you have raised a MOST interesting question. One that I am waiting
> to see who would care to answer (although I suspect you and I know that
> answer!). You just hit below the belt!!

If one wants to misbehave, one would be stupid to choose CW except for
jamming purposes. Like anything else, the proper tool must be chosen
to match the goal.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

342. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 05:57:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BE8CD49.8B44AB5A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23239

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Please offer proof of your claim to the origins of the Affirmative
> > Action program.
>
> Huh? Study some history, will you?

I don't have the authorized Texas edition of American History. I asked
you to offer some proof for your statement. You have not done so. You
made some claims which are quite a stretch.

> > > Morse code is only a mode and should never have been adopted as a creed.
> >
> > Glad you feel that way. It never was.
>
> Maybe on your planet, it wasn't. It certainly was on this one.
> I lived through it happening and it's still alive for a certain
> lunatic fringe of amateur radio.

Which planet do you live on? What languages do you speak? I'm
surprised that you have amateur radio on your planet. We enjoy it here
on Earth.

Dave K8MN

343. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 07:15:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011107021550.23398.00001399@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 23240

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
>Date: 11/6/2001 7:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmeg626.pminews@or.news.verio.net>

> Is A. Prose Walker still alive?

He was as of a year or so ago...I have his QSL card on the wall from
several CW QSO's...Even at his age the man can wield a mean fist......(W4BW)

73

Steve, K4YZ

344. Re: Great Fun with Callsigns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 07:59:48 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9sapl1$o7g$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 23241

"Drpfrench" <drpfrench@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011106105602.15943.00001570@mb-cu.aol.com...
> I must say I like your call sign also Kim. There are just to many people
in
> the world like Larry. People have got to lighten up and drop all the PC
> garbage. They need to learn to laugh.
>
> 73
> John
> KF6VYH

I was WN4YIQ, then N4DCT, then I faded out from ham radio.When I got back in a few years ago, I decided to make a fresh start with a fresh call. I'm also a Simpsons fan. Does it show?

73
Corry
K4DOH

--
It Came From C. L. "I'm keeping this one" Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

Sean Ormond wrote in atl.general: "Do this for me Corry...Next time you conveniently get from point A to point B using a gas-powered vehicle (I'm guessing this will happen in less than 24 hrs), go ahead and drop to your knees and give a little prayer to Gaia, the Fairy Queen, or whatever it is you nut-jobs worship. You can thank her for schools like Georgia Tech, where students learn how to do something other than hug trees and hate America for a living."

345. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 08:18:24 UTC
From: rasta567@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011107031824.09162.00001638@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 23242

Barry electronics moved, they are no longer on broadway and spring street. I would tell you where but I hate them and that sales guy. Their price are crazy. Order from one of the mail order places in CQ or QST magazines. Lentini in CT is great, next day delivery to nyc.

346. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 08:24:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE8EFC5.E4004473@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23243

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> (snip) I agree with you that liberalism
> sucks -- but the issues of diversity
> and tolerance were, like most liberal
> issues, distorted in order to give
> power to people with a hidden Socialist
> agenda. In reality, it is among true
> conservatives like myself where the
> unique American culture -- one which
> accepts "diversity" as normal and
> "tolerates" it as a natural way
> of life, is best understood. The
> difference is we don't use these as
> weapons in a political power struggle.

Well, you're not going to get much argument from me with that. If diversity and tolerance were applied equally, instead of a weapon to strong arm the goals of those more interested in social engineering than unity in this country, I'd be their biggest champion also. However, until that situation changes, I'll add diversity and tolerance to the list of things that suck.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

347. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 08:41:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE8F393.CD1FD6AF@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23244

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Don't blame me for this. It was
> Kim who deliberately selected a
> callsign which included a blatant
> vulgar reference to a part of her
> anatomy which she believes
> deserves special recognition. (snip)

Well, I just can't get that upset about this, Larry. Kim is going to keep her callsign and there isn't a thing in the world you can do about it. So, about the only thing positive that can be said about this discussion is that it is good for a few laughs. And it is hard to take something very seriously when you're laughing about it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

348. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 08:50:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE8F5CE.737D29AA@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23245

N2EY wrote:
>
> The FCC has the authority to decide
> whether or not to issue a particular
> callsign, but not Riley. He does not
> make policy, he only enforces it.

Okay, perhaps "influence" would be a better word than "authority."
Regardless, if Riley really wanted to get rid of that callsign, I
don't doubt for a moment he could get it done. And, with that minor
change, my previous argument still stands.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

349. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 08:55:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE8F6DF.DA3DB54B@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23246

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> Wrong. Licenses, call signs, and
> amateur radio rules are issued by
> the Wireless Telecomm Bureau. Riley
> is in the Enforcement Bureau. His
> job is to enforce the rules that
> WTB issues.

Already answered in my message to Jim. However, since you know something about this, does Riley have any influence when it comes to the rules issued by the Wireless Telecomm Bureau? In other words, if Riley saw something he objected to, would he have the influence to get the rules changed to cover that?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

350. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 09:03:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE8F8CB.FD7016AC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23247

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Don't look now, but Riley does
> NOT have the authority to "eliminate"
> anyone's callsign, unless they have
> violated FCC rules. (snip)

Already addressed.

> I'd say that his response, in which
> he said

Do you have the entire message, Larry? I'd like to read more.

> Dwight, all you're doing here is
> demonstrating the same self-serving
> attitude as Kim...or is it just
> plain ignorance? For the umpteenth
> time, the legality of Kim's callsign
> is NOT THE ISSUE.

The laws are always an issue in this country, Larry. Because, as
long as that callsign is legal, you're simply beating a dead horse.
Got that?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

351. Re: Great Fun with Callsigns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 09:13:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE8FB0F.3DD5BE19@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23248

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> If participation in the ARS were
> limited to persons over the age
> of 18, then I would not be nearly
> as concerned with Kim's callsign
> as I am at present. (snip)

And exactly what children are you trying to protect, Larry. A very young child is not likely to make anything out of Kim's callsign and an older child has seen, and heard, far worse on television and the school playground for that matter. I'm sorry, but in this day and age, the word "tit" would not even raise the interest of most kids.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

352. Re: Leonard H. Anderson, Pathological Liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 09:50:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE903C8.8EF3752B@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23249

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Throughout my tenure on this newsgroup,
> and Fidonet before it, I have always
> made a clear and logical linkage between
> code *testing* and ultimate *use* of the
> Morse/CW mode. I believe that the two go
> hand-in-hand, always have, and always
> will. I don't believe that people will
> learn and use the Morse/CW mode in
> anything like the numbers they did in
> the Post-Restructuring Era (snip)

If CW use is that interesting and rewarding, it will win fans on
it's own, Larry. Testing, on the other hand, has obviously turned far
more off to CW than it has turned on - only a small portion of the
large number tested actually use CW.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

353. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 10:13:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BE90935.4487FE3E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23250

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Give it a try and see what happens.
> Start off by giving the FBI all the
> evidence you have to support your
> contention. (Hint: the FBI is
> concentrating on citizens of OTHER
> countries.)

Jim, the laws being passed are not limited to just the FBI. The recent "terrorist bill" gave equal authority to local law enforcement - the guy down the street hiding behind an overpass waiting to write you a speeding ticket. And we have no more reason to believe that any potential law affecting torture in this country would be limited to federal law enforcement agencies either.

And I know it gives you great comfort to know you don't look like "those" people, but who knows how these laws will be handled in the future. Just look at how much the expanded RICO laws have been twisted over the years. I'm sure many of the people who supported those laws were equally convinced those laws would never affect them ("I'm not involved in organized crime").

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

354. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 10:29:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011107052946.18926.00001353@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 23353

In article <3BE8EFC5.E4004473@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> Well, you're not going to get much argument from me with that. If
>diversity and tolerance were applied equally, instead of a weapon to
>strong arm the goals of those more interested in social engineering
>than unity in this country, I'd be their biggest champion also.
>However, until that situation changes, I'll add diversity and
>tolerance to the list of things that suck.

You're not "getting it" Dwight (again!). If you're saying that diversity
and tolerance suck, then you're saying the American culture sucks.
I say diversity and tolerance are normal in American society, and
do not "suck" in any way. If you think that "diversity" and "tolerance"
suck, go try to live in North Korea, or some small African village.
There, *you* would be the "diversity," and I'm sure that you wouldn't
think that tolerance of that diversity "sucked."

73 de Larry, K3LT

355. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 10:29:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011107052947.18926.00001355@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 23351

In article <3BE8B9CC.8C89BB0B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I don't have any idea what you're talking about.
>
>Your callsign phonetics are obscene, Larry.

Kilo Three Lima Tango is obscene?

73 de Larry, K3LT

356. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 10:29:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011107052947.18926.00001354@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 23352

In article <3BE8B8A8.95F733E5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> However, if I
>> were to be issued such a callsign, I would have to ask to have
>> it changed for the reason that I felt it was inappropriate for use
>> on-the-air in a family-oriented radio service.
>
>So are you going to turn in your "Large Tits" call sign for
>a more appropriate one?

Nope. There is a difference between reality and your silliness. My
callsign is not obscene, it is not vulgar, and it is not demeaning to
anyone. If only the same could be said for Kim's callsign.

73 de Larry, K3LT

357. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 10:45:11 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Xg8G7.160086$3d2.6066060@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23354

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE8B9CC.8C89BB0B@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I don't have any idea what you're talking about.
>
> Your callsign phonetics are obscene, Larry.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Is that why you got rid of Rotten Crotch Anyone?
```

358. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 12:15:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011107071530.03411.00000419@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 23355

In article <3BE8F5CE.737D29AA@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> The FCC has the authority to decide
>> whether or not to issue a particular
>> callsign, but not Riley. He does not
>> make policy, he only enforces it.
>
> Okay, perhaps "influence" would be a better word than "authority."
>Regardless, if Riley really wanted to get rid of that callsign, I
>don't doubt for a moment he could get it done. And, with that minor
>change, my previous argument still stands.

I think you are quite mistaken, Dwight. Riley is essentially the "cop on the beat" - his influence is limited to choosing which cases to go after most aggressively. One of the check and balance protections of our governmental system is division of enforcement power between lawmakers, courts and LEOs.

Riley's "influence" in this area is limited to his speaking out about the issue the way he did.

What might get the call revoked is enough interested parties telling the FCC that they find certain callsigns inappropriate and objectionable. That hasn't happened yet.

btw, a 6-land variation of Kim's call has been in the callbooks since at least 1979 - and it is held by a person with the first name of Michael.

73 de Jim, N2EY

359. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 12:15:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011107071531.03411.00000420@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 23356

In article <3BE8B401.31DEA96F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3BE77B6D.CD55A990@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >Dick Carroll wrote:
>> >> Besides, I
>> >> thought you said that PACTOR was the more reliable mode to use.
>> >
>> >PACTOR II is extremely reliable but not popular enough (yet)
>> >to do much serious emergency trafficking.
>>
>> If it's not popular, it's not reliable.
>
>:-p I can usually contact Germany with 20w even when I cannot
>hear the received signal.

Sorry about your hearing loss, Cecil.

Another reason you cannot "hear" the signal but the box can decode it is that you are listening with a receiving setup that is not optimum for the mode, but the decoder box is using an optimal setup.

Weak Morse or SSB signals cannot be decoded without a heterodyne oscillator. Same type of situation.

Something which cannot be counted to be there on when needed is not reliable. Or, to use the exact engineering terms, it may have high performance but low availability.

73 de Jim, N2EY

360. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 14:20:37 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111070920260.23334-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23357

You have a point there.

On Tue, 6 Nov 2001, Krell wrote:

> Date: Tue, 6 Nov 2001 09:19:28 -0500
> From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: Dropping the code.
>
>
> "Dana" <dana@randomc.com> wrote in message
> news:Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060400420.21206-100000@cluster2...
> > When they drop the code all together, you won't have nothing but a bunch
> > of low lifes and red necks on the bands just like the "CB" band is and was
> > 20 years ago. The 75 meter band is like that now. I was tuning around on
> > there listening last night, and some fellow ham broke into a conversation
> > on there, and the group was verry rude to him. The 75 meter band is
> > clandish, and if you don't fit into there little click, then you are dead
> > Good buddy.
> >
>
> Most of those hams recieved their licenses when code testing was at 13 and
> 20 WPM, so how do you figure that the elimination of the code test will
> result in more of this type of activity? It certainly doesn't look like
> high-speed code testing has stopped what's on 75.
>
>
>
>

361. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 14:24:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE935D1.80B44E3F@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23358

CAM wrote:

> JJ wrote:
> > Some people strive for the lowest common denominator.
>
> I'm teaching math in the GED program. That's exactly what
> they should do.

Got that, Kim? You're right where you belong!

362. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 14:26:44 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111070926290.23334-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 23359

```
There is a call here in Georgia k4sex.

On Tue, 6 Nov 2001, Mr. Middle Finger wrote:

> Date: Tue, 06 Nov 2001 21:58:36 GMT
> From: Mr. Middle Finger <middlefinger4@home.coms>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
>
> How about N2SEX or perhaps N2T I T, N2ASS, N2BUT, N2MEN
>
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> news:3BE78ECF.7E9CC2D@sccoast.net...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > The legality and legitimacy of Kim's
> > > callsign is not the issue, and never
> > > has been. (snip) Kim has been told
> > > by a fellow ham, and an FCC official,
> > > that her callsign, while not illegal,
> > > does have a negative impact on ham
> > > radio's image.
> > >
> > >
> > Of course legality is an issue. The FCC official you mention has
> > direct authority over the legality of that callsign. If Riley truly
> > believes it has a negative impact (in any way) on ham radio, then he
> > has the authority to eliminate the callsign. Since he has not done so,
> > he obviously does not feel that strongly about this issue. In other
> > words, the fact that he has not moved to affect the legality of the
> > callsign clearly shows his overall lack of concern. And, contrary to
> > your attempts to use him as an ally in this, his lack of concern does
> > little, if anything, to support your argument (in spite of what he
> > might have said).
> > >
> > >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
>
>
```

363. Re: A Correlation between CW and Competitiveness

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 14:29:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE936F2.B04CD7C2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23360

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:18d78a5eca8245c066302672bbbb1154.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Kim-W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > > Notice that 22.3% of the respondents thusfar are not interested in
> > > contesting; and
> > > notice that 26.1% of the respondents thusfar do not operate CW
> >
> > Does that mean that 78.7% are interesting in
> > contesting, and 73.9% operate CW?
> >
>
> Yeah, but I think the correlation would be the same: CW interest =
> Competitively inclined. If there's a correlation at all.
>
> >
> > By the way, I got my sweep on CW this weekend,
> > and expect to get my sweep on phone in two weeks.
> >
>
> Congrats! Heard the bands have been pretty bad.
>
> >
> > Does that mean there is a corelation beween a
> > winning competitive attitude and _both_ CW & phone?
> >
>
> Ya might have something, there, Hans!
>
> >
> > Or did you just have a brain fart?
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >
>
> Hmmm, no brain fart. But, I mighta hit a nerve.

Geez. She doesn't even recogize her own brain farts.

364. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 14:45:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE93A89.55A94B5E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23361

Robert Casey wrote:

> CAM wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > If I'm not mistaken, the highest per capita percentage of FCC NALs
> > have gone to Extra class licensees.
>
> uh-oh... I better behave myself! I have one of those
> "Extra Lite" licenses.... :-)
>
> Maybe it's the extras who's ham license is the top
> achievement on their resumes....
>
> as for my resume: BSEE, 13 patents, another pending.
> No I don't get royalties, but I do get bragging rights :-)
>
> I figure the extra ham license is equivalent to a 3 to
> 6 credit hour college class.

Doesn't that make you feel sorta stupid? Such a genius and you still had to wait for the Big Dumbdown to make it to Extra.....

365. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 15:03:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE94D5E.980AE867@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23362

Dave Heil wrote:
> I don't have the authorized Texas edition of American History. I asked
> you to offer some proof for your statement. You have not done so. You
> made some claims which are quite a stretch.

Huh? That racism is the cause of the Affirmative Action program? If
you lived in Madison County, Texas, it would be a self apparent primary.
The tyranny of the majority is in full force here. If the power structure
here had their way, there would be no blacks employed by the local
government regardless of their qualifications.

> > Maybe on your planet, it wasn't. It certainly was on this one.
> > I lived through it happening and it's still alive for a certain
> > lunatic fringe of amateur radio.
>
> Which planet do you live on? What languages do you speak? I'm
> surprised that you have amateur radio on your planet. We enjoy it here
> on Earth.

Copy-cat. You may not be part of the Morse Code Creed lunatic fringe,
Dave, but I know quite a few hams who are. They are not good for
amateur radio.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

366. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 15:10:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE94ED7.2D5D5963@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23363

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Just look at how much the expanded RICO laws have been twisted
> over the years. I'm sure many of the people who supported those laws
> were equally convinced those laws would never affect them ("I'm not
> involved in organized crime").

Yep, like the guy with $5000 cash in his pocket on his way to
pay cash for a motorcycle. The cops confiscated his money
under the RICO laws. Wonder how Jim would like that to
happen to him?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

367. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 15:13:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE94F97.813B12AE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23364

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Your callsign phonetics are obscene, Larry.
>
> Kilo Three Lima Tango is obscene?

'Keeping Three Large Tits' is obscene. Like your attitude toward
Kim's call, obscenity is in the eyes of the beholder.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

368. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 15:16:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE95052.309B9D63@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23365

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >So are you going to turn in your "Large Tits" call sign for
> >a more appropriate one?
>
> Nope. There is a difference between reality and your silliness. My
> callsign is not obscene, it is not vulgar, and it is not demeaning to
> anyone.

Larry, I find your callsign to be obscene, vulgar, and demeaning.
If you are free to find Kim's callsign vulgar, then I am free to
find your callsign vulgar. Vulgarity is in the eyes of the beholder.
'Keeping Three Large Tits' is certainly obscene. I think you should
change it immediately. I am losing sleep because it is so obscene.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

369. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 15:19:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE9511D.AFF1385B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23366

N2EY wrote:
> Something which cannot be counted to be there on when needed is not reliable.

Actually, it is the *ONLY* way I can establish reliable QSOs to Germany.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

370. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 15:22:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE951A9.4E3916D3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23367

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Doesn't that make you feel sorta stupid? Such a genius and you still had
> to wait for the Big Dumbdown to make it to Extra.....

If dunking a basketball had been a requirement, how low would they
have had to lower the basket before you qualified?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

371. Re: Great Fun with Callsigns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 15:29:17 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE9534D.9441ED66@psu.edu>
Source record: 23368

This is terrible terrible terrible! This is symptomatic of everything
that is wrong with ham radio, Corry. The ARS should only be approached
with the utmost of dignity and respect. You folks with all these snappy
calls are only making the ARS look frivolous and bad. I can't even sleep
at night for the chagrin and angst.

Besides, you took the call that I wanted. DOH!!!

Fellow Simpsons fan, - Mike -

Unclaimed Mysteries wrote:

>
> I was WN4YIQ, then N4DCT, then I faded out from ham radio.When I got back in
> a few years ago, I decided to make a fresh start with a fresh call. I'm also
> a Simpsons fan. Does it show?
>
> 73
> Corry
> K4DOH

372. The banned callsign list, was Great Fun with Callsigns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 15:42:31 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE95667.C885D2C2@psu.edu>
Source record: 23369

Well, I have heard other callsigns that evoke giggles, and wonder if there shouldn't be a banned callsign list. Especially since hams naturally make acronyms for their calls.

Part of the list of suffixes that might be banned:

BFD
GFY
FAM
AMF
DIC
NFG

And another thought, is that *if* Kim is doing this for attention and nose tweaking, then all this attention is giving her just what she is after. If she isn't doing this for that, than she isn't expecting comments and won't get them either. Win, win situation. I will assume she isn't doing it for the attention, and aside from this comment, won't give it any.

- Mike -

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> I have no problem with people having fun with callsigns, as long as
> that "fun" doesn't come at the expense of the image of the ARS as
> a whole. Kim's callsign goes far beyond that, by giving a negative
> to the ARS, female hams in particular, and women in general. A
> triple-whammy. How charming!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

373. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 16:14:53 UTC
From: Boatanchor Bob NA4G <na4g@weedcon1.cropsci.ncsu.edu>
Message-ID: <9sbmlt$8dt$1@uni00nw.unity.ncsu.edu>
Source record: 23401

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote:
> Dana wrote:
>> When they drop the code all together, you won't have nothing but a bunch
>> of low lifes and red necks on the bands just like the "CB" band is and was
>> 20 years ago. The 75 meter band is like that now.

> Guess all those guys on 75m are nocoders, huh?

Nah, the real ops will still be using CW, and still be miles ahead of the
75m fone crew, and better gents, to boot!

Bob/NA4G

374. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 16:28:12 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE9611C.5125973B@psu.edu>
Source record: 23370

I coulda qualified for dunking a basketball! Or how about making slapshots? Boy, I'd be extra plus if they had that!

Although I did the Morse part because I wanted the license badly, it was the hardest part of the whole testing for me. My hearing problems make it a hard hard thing to do to work Morse. The new psk31 mode is where I spend most of my time, as the type written on the screen isn't distorted by the roaring I hear in my ears 24/7.

There is a curious contradiction here with the people who think the morse code requirement is easy, yet anyone who is against it (or in some extreme cases doesn't use it) is stupid. Doggone it! After a while it gets annoying! I don't use CW because it isn't any fun for me. I proud I did it, and if I can do it, probably most people can.

But, I suggest that these folk pick something (probably more relevant than basketball or hockey) that is really hard for them, that they can only pass with months of hard effort, and all the while, other people can call them stupid and lazy while they are struggling to learn.

I know some people in my area who have passed the CW portion, but are struggling with the written parts which I've never had trouble with. Maybe I should call them stupid and lazy?

- mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Doesn't that make you feel sorta stupid? Such a genius and you still had
> > to wait for the Big Dumbdown to make it to Extra.....
>
> If dunking a basketball had been a requirement, how low would they
> have had to lower the basket before you qualified?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

375. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 17:03:47 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0111070903.1c0feff4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23371

rasta567@aol.com (Rasta567) wrote in message
news:<20011107031824.09162.00001638@mb-df.aol.com>...
> Barry electronics moved, they are no longer on broadway and spring street. I
> would tell you where but I hate them and that sales guy. Their price are crazy.
> Order from one of the mail order places in CQ or QST magazines. Lentini in CT
> is great, next day delivery to nyc.

You know what? I actually have to agree wrt the prices. I ordered an item from HRO on Tuesday morning and it was delivered on Wednesday afternoon. Re. the "sales guy," I believe he's gone. I'm pretty sure I know who you're talking about. The guy that's there now can be annoying, (He does put on "the sell.") but he's friendly. The "other" fella was just plain rude.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

376. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 17:31:23 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE96FEB.BABCA137@uci.edu>
Source record: 23372

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Why was it worth American and allied
> > lives to free Kuwait (snip)
>
> Lets be careful about the use of the word "free" in this regard,
> Jim. The people of Kuwait were not freed - we simply put the old
> "monarchy" back in place, complete with his gold bathroom fixtures.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Which they overwhelming prefer to Sadam Husein, by the way.

377. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 17:32:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE97045.ECC16B26@uci.edu>
Source record: 23373

CAM wrote:
> Why do you think a
> criminal should have no fear of being apprehended?

I don't think he should, but apparently you do.

378. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 17:34:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE970BD.98E2FAFB@uci.edu>
Source record: 23376

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > We're not discussing terrorists, Jim. We are discussing American citizens
> > > losing constitutional rights. I'm against it.
> >
> > Actually, I was replying to Dwight when you butted in. I'm discussing
> > terrorists.
>
> Actually, you were replying to me. Here's the posting.

Actually, no I wasn't. Here's the posting: (I can still see it above
this one in the thread.)

Let be clear not to confuse the word 'citizen' with the words 'traitor'
and 'terrorist', Dwight. I wouldn't be entirely opposed to hooking up
the latter to an IV filled with happy juice in order to get them into a
'chattier' mood.

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > We know that it's much too late for
> > you, Kim or Dwight to acquire any common
> > sense, but could you at least take it
> > as a given that in wartime the nation
> > must be put on some kind of a wartime
> > footing if we are to have any chance
> > of winning? That clearly means closing
> > some of our openness that was very
> > much a part of adding to the terrorists
> > advantage on Sept 11. If you can't
> > understand that, you reveal a lot
> > about yourself(ves).
>
> Does that "closing some of our openness" include torture in your
> book, Dick? Did you see the Larry King show (I believe - does anyone
> else know what show this was actually on) the other day where a well
> known "hollywood" lawyer and another guest sat there talking about the
> need to legalize, and establish orderly laws for, torture in this
> country - both agreeing that torture will be a routine thing in this
> country in the coming years? Did you see the poll results during that

> show where a large number supported the idea of torture? Did you also
> notice that none on that show talked about limiting torture to just terrorist?
>
> Wake up and smell the roses, my friend. Everything that makes this
> country what it is (a country where citizens have rights and are
> treated with dignity) is under attack by someone (and I'm not talking
> about "those" people over there). If you don't begin to take a stand
> now in defense of your rights, don't cry later when an out of control
> government or military walks all over you.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

> **
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BE704FE.E735F541@IEEE.org...
> > Trouble is, to most law enforcers, you might look like a citizen.
> > To one,
> > *you* might look like a terrorist. Unless all citizens possess
> constitutional
> > rights then no citizen possesses them.
>
> US citizenship is easily proved and Mohammed Atta and his crew were not
> citizens.
>
> What rights do you think terrorists are entitled to that they haven't been
> afforded?
> **
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

379. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 17:39:50 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE971E6.D541F406@uci.edu>
Source record: 23375

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Give it a try and see what happens.
> > Start off by giving the FBI all the
> > evidence you have to support your
> > contention. (Hint: the FBI is
> > concentrating on citizens of OTHER
> > countries.)

> Jim, the laws being passed are not limited to just the FBI. The
> recent "terrorist bill" gave equal authority to local law enforcement
> - the guy down the street hiding behind an overpass waiting to write
> you a speeding ticket. And we have no more reason to believe that any
> potential law affecting torture in this country would be limited to
> federal law enforcement agencies either.

The terrorist bill authorizes torture? Wow, the media sure missed a big
story there.

> And I know it gives you great comfort to know you don't look like
> "those" people, but who knows how these laws will be handled in the
> future.

Not only that, I'm not a member of any terrorist groups, nor do I
associate with members of terrorist groups or other criminals. I'd say
those kinds of activities would be inadvisable if you want to stay below
the law enforcement radar.

>Just look at how much the expanded RICO laws have been twisted
> over the years. I'm sure many of the people who supported those laws
> were equally convinced those laws would never affect them ("I'm not
> involved in organized crime").

And thus aren't affected by them. Have you been affected by the RICO
laws, Dwight?

380. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 17:40:43 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE9721B.C327228B@uci.edu>
Source record: 23374

CAM wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > Just look at how much the expanded RICO laws have been twisted
> > over the years. I'm sure many of the people who supported those laws
> > were equally convinced those laws would never affect them ("I'm not
> > involved in organized crime").
>
> Yep, like the guy with $5000 cash in his pocket on his way to
> pay cash for a motorcycle. The cops confiscated his money
> under the RICO laws. Wonder how Jim would like that to
> happen to him?

I'm more inclined to wish it would happen to you, Cecil. :-)

381. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 17:41:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111070941.13d75798@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23377

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<wrAF7.173980$W8.5616222@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0111050916.456f57e8@posting.google.com...
> > On Sept 10, one of the hot issues being debated was an antimissile
> > defense system. A system aimed at stopping an attack that will not
> > come. What we need today are systems aimed at stopping the attacks
> > that are likely to come.
> >
> > In other words, fight this war, not the last one.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Easier said than done, Jim. Remember Nam where the Air Force shows up with
> century series fighters and Thunder Thuds. We were flying ground support
> with T-28s and buying back Douglas Skyraiders (Spads) A1D's and Invaders (at
> various times A or B-26) from every bananna republic we had sold them to
> while the USAF bought McDonnell Phantoms (F4B) and the A7D renumbered to
> B-66. They prepared for the wrong new war.

'zactly. As I heard it, the original F-4 design did not have a machine
gun, because it was thought by Those Who Know that the days of the
aerial gunning dogfight were gone, and the air-to-air missile would
decide those encounters. Didn't work out that way.
>
> And having the neat hardware only does any good when the grand honcho knows
> what to do with it. When the radar-equipped Washington and South Dakota
> joined the fleet in the Solomons, the admiral put the Wash back with the
> rest of the battlewagons where the radar op got a great view of the
> screening vessels being decimated in a nite battle. When it got up front,
> it did a great job of adding a lot of Japanese steel to Iron Bottom Sound.

I did not know that!

The Japanese and Germans had better submarine technology in WW2 than
we did, but the top folks did not know how to use it properly, and did
not have enough of it. Had Germany put the resources wasted on
Bismarck and Tirpitz into the construction of more and better U-boats,
the Battle of the North Atlantic would have been even worse for the
Allies than it was.
>
> We have always had a terrible time dealing with irregular warfare. The
> Civil War had both sides inviting Thayer down from West Point to rule on
> whether captured guerillas were POWs, Red Cloud beat the US Army hands down
> as did Cochise. This Afghan exercise could easily be like chasing Pancho

> Villa.

I understand that there was a deal set up back in '98 for the Taliban
to hand over OBL to the Saudis.
>
> I don't see the Taliban standing up to B-52s although it would be cheaper to
> simply buy their allegience in the traditional manner.

This will happen in the long run. The Taliban will either be pushed
out or they will find a way to deliver OBL & Co. without "losing
face". Then billions of "humanitarian aid" will pour in to rebuild
Afghanistan.

> If they could hold
> out about another six months, a major fiasco would be brewing.

Winter is on the way. They don't send the 10th Mountain Division from
Fort Drum to do jungle ops.

> May very well get one anyway.

Sept 11 wasn't the Gulf of Tonkin. More like Pearl Harbor, the Titanic
and the Challenger all rolled into one, only worse.

73 de Jim, N2EY

382. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 17:57:31 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <fCeG7.160999$3d2.6093016@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23378

Cecil, W5DXP posted:

> 'Keeping Three Large Tits' is obscene. Like your attitude toward
> Kim's call, obscenity is in the eyes of the beholder.

You guys ever see the movie "Total Recall"? Those phonetics
would apply to one of the minor characters there, a Martian
prostitute with an 'interesting' mutation.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

383. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 18:19:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111071019.3ad566f3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23379

Sorry to take so long to reply, Kim, but your post demands a
well-thought-out reply.

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:<3be2946c_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011102070921.29609.00000277@nso-fm.aol.com...
> > In article <3bdf5bf4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >Indeed, it would be wonderful (though a pipedream) that we'd be the
> nation
> > >to look to for agreement and resolution.
> > >
> > Yep. But most Americans, (including you, Kim) are probably not yet willing
> to
> > make the kind of changes needed to make that happen.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> I don't think it will take only "most Americans" and I hope I am not
> stepping out on a limb here by *thinking* that you will understand the next
> fairly philosophical statements:

I'll try to not disappoint.

> Like I said, I used to be a peacenik, trying to make a difference in the
> world. Then, I moved away from the peaceful seclusion of the Adirondack
> Mtns., and found out just how huge a task it would be to realize, by walking
> straight into the grips of huge city life down here in the south.

In other words, you got a big lunch at the Reality Deli. A mayor of
Philadelphia once said: "A conservative is a liberal who just got
mugged".

You and I are almost the same age and grew up in a very confused era.
I had the good fortune to grow up in a place where things like the
realities of city-type life and "addytoods" are very clear.
>
> Nope, I am no longer willing to feel like I am in an extremely small
> minority of people who would like to see a different world and actually
> think I could do something about it.

The first thing that has to happen is a clear definition of what the
"different world" should be, and how to get there, and what's in it
for all of us. This is where the peaceniks and beatniks etc. fail

miserably - they focus on all the wrong things.

> I have property; yearn for a bigger,
> better yard; ignore government (and the rest of the world) for the most
> part; don't think twice about paying taxes--just tell me how much I owe;
> just bought a foreign vehicle--ask me if I care;

Nothing wrong with any of that.

"Foreign" vehicles are often made here in the USA (Honda, Toyota,
Nissan, Subaru and BMW all have plants here), while "American"
vehicles often have huge "foreign" content.

Would you have bought the car you did if you knew some of the price
was going to wind up funding terrorism?

> and truly don't care about
> people as much as I used to--because I got tired (once again) of pretty much
> being in such a small minority. I often review my emotions and check for
> bitterness--but I really don't think I am bitter at all, that would be
> pretty silly. I am just 'resigned'.

Sounds more like "frustrated" from here. Don't blame ya that much,
really.
>
> Well, let's word that differently: I still care a great deal about people in
> terms of a collective "we"; but on an individual basis it's a whole lot more
> effort to deal with than I am willing to. I have *maybe* 10 friends (not
> counting family) and I actually choose it to be that way.

I understand your definition of "friend" as opposed to "acquaintance".
Most of us are in the same boat, if for no other reason than time.

> I have no "true"
> friends other than my husband and my parents. I am just not willing to be
> the person I used to be with people. As an example: why would I put myself
> through constantly listening to people gripe (and so, so many do) about
> their marriages/jobs/kids/financial situations while they choose not to do a
> damned thing about it?

Don't just listen. But I understand your frustration in such
situations.

> After a while, the stories and the attitude get old
> (goodness, just look at this newsgroup). I am a "talk to the hand" person
> real quick. Peoples' tendencies are to gripe, not to change. And, I still
> dearly love Mother Earth--though I am far less proactive even on that any
> more.

There may not be a choice anymore.
>
> I got a little confused a long time back--I had a rooted belief in the basic
> principles of Christianity and started exploring the beliefs of the Eastern
> philosophy--which I find absolutely fascinating. The Eastern Philosophies

> made me yearn for a deeper commitment to my basic principles; however all
> this began happening at the same time I needed to make a choice as to live
> like a poor person (stay up north in the country and try to do with what I
> could through the oil crisis of the 70s) or "make something of myself" for
> my kids and family and move down here to the south. I chose the larger
> distraction and now use it as an excuse for being a realist. :)

I see nothing wrong with moving to another place in search of a better
life.

Which "Eastern Philosophies" are you talking about?
>
> My ultimate belief is that God will straighten it all out by starting over
> again. My Karma is bad, bad, bad, but hopefully some kind of credit will be
> realized for deep-seated passion and desire.
>
> Willing? Not by myself--not as a tiny, tiny majority. Count me out--as
> disgusting as that is for me to even think about, I made my peace with it
> years ago.
>
You're talking on a personal level, Kim. I'm talking on a societal
level.

The USA used to be a pretty independent place. We grew, mined and made
virtually everything we needed. In fact, we had trade surpluses. But
since WW2 the USA has become more and more dependent on things like
cheap foreign oil to keep us going. The result is that our wealth is
being exported, and some of those who get it are using it against us.
We Americans keep "enabling" those who hate us and everything we stand
for, then we are mystified when they get violent.

The answer is that we have to become more, not less, concerned about
America and what needs to be done for ourselves. This isn't some deep
philosophical exercise, but rather a practical one where we focus on
the long term rather than the short term. Our freedom depends on not
being dependent.

The kinds of changes I'm talking about are things like ending our
dependence on foreign oil. Focusing less on being the world's
policeman and more on keeping our borders secure and our country safe
from outside aggression. Learning to "vote with our wallets", which
has far more effect than people realize. Building up our own basic
infrastructure so that we don't have nonsense like the rolling
blackouts in California. "Sticking to our knitting", it used to be
called.

Most Americans today simply don't see the connection between their
behavior (like what car they buy and how they use it) and world
events. That has to change, or we will have more Sept. 11ths.

73 de Jim, N2EY

btw, Texas used to be a net exporter of energy. That changed about ten years ago, to where Texas is now a net importer of energy.

384. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 18:21:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111071021.2ba892e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23380

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3BE9511D.AFF1385B@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Something which cannot be counted to be there on when needed is not reliable.
>
> Actually, it is the *ONLY* way I can establish reliable QSOs to Germany.

Nope. It's the only way you've tried that has produced the results you got.

73 de Jim, N2EY

385. Re: A Correlation between CW and Competitiveness

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 18:44:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE98117.6E53B002@uci.edu>
Source record: 23381

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:18d78a5eca8245c066302672bbbb1154.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Kim-W5TIT" wrote:
> > Does that mean that 78.7% are interesting in
> > contesting, and 73.9% operate CW?

> Yeah, but I think the correlation would be the same: CW interest =
> Competitively inclined. If there's a correlation at all.

The correlation is that competitors very often employ CW as a useful
points gathering tool. The reverse of that correlation is not
necessarily implied, or valid.

386. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 19:08:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE986B8.240C9EB3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23382

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Why do you think a
> > criminal should have no fear of being apprehended?
>
> I don't think he should, but apparently you do.

Nope, you're wrong, as usual. What could me being against law-abiding citizens having to give up their constitutional rights possibly have to do with criminals having no fear of being apprehended?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

387. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 19:13:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE987BC.8F9610C4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23383

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > We're not discussing terrorists, Jim. We are discussing American citizens
> > > > losing constitutional rights. I'm against it.
> > >
> > > Actually, I was replying to Dwight when you butted in. I'm discussing
> > > terrorists.
> >
> > Actually, you were replying to me. Here's the posting.
>
> Actually, no I wasn't. Here's the posting: (I can still see it above
> this one in the thread.)

But that's not the posting I replied to. Look back through the threads
and you can verify it for yourself. Find my posting and click on the
preceeding one. Here it is again:
********************************************************************************
You wrote:
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BE704FE.E735F541@IEEE.org...
> > Trouble is, to most law enforcers, you might look like a citizen.
> > To one,
> > *you* might look like a terrorist. Unless all citizens possess
> constitutional
> > rights then no citizen possesses them.
>
> US citizenship is easily proved and Mohammed Atta and his crew were not
> citizens.
>
> What rights do you think terrorists are entitled to that they haven't been
> afforded?
********************************************************************************
Threaded newsgroups are a bitch, huh?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

388. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 19:14:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE98823.96120353@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23384

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > > Just look at how much the expanded RICO laws have been twisted
> > > over the years. I'm sure many of the people who supported those laws
> > > were equally convinced those laws would never affect them ("I'm not
> > > involved in organized crime").
> >
> > Yep, like the guy with $5000 cash in his pocket on his way to
> > pay cash for a motorcycle. The cops confiscated his money
> > under the RICO laws. Wonder how Jim would like that to
> > happen to him?
>
> I'm more inclined to wish it would happen to you, Cecil. :-)

Yep, you seem to think it's perfectly OK as long as it happens
only to someone besides you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

389. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 19:16:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE9889E.23FC2224@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23385

"Jim Bromley, K7JEB" wrote:
>
> Cecil, W5DXP posted:
>
> > 'Keeping Three Large Tits' is obscene. Like your attitude toward
> > Kim's call, obscenity is in the eyes of the beholder.
>
> You guys ever see the movie "Total Recall"? Those phonetics
> would apply to one of the minor characters there, a Martian
> prostitute with an 'interesting' mutation.

I missed that, Jim. I was too busy looking at Sharron Stone.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

390. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 19:19:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BE98928.80A897DC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23386

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3BE9511D.AFF1385B@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Something which cannot be counted to be there on when needed is not reliable.
> >
> > Actually, it is the *ONLY* way I can establish reliable QSOs to Germany.
>
> Nope. It's the only way you've tried that has produced the results you got.

Well, I've tried SSB, CW, and PACTOR. PACTOR II beats all of them
by a long shot.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

391. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 19:23:42 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sc1lo02vdv@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23389

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3BE9611C.5125973B@psu.edu...
> I coulda qualified for dunking a basketball! Or how about making
> slapshots? Boy, I'd be extra plus if they had that!
>
> Although I did the Morse part because I wanted the license badly, it
> was the hardest part of the whole testing for me. My hearing problems
> make it a hard hard thing to do to work Morse. The new psk31 mode is
> where I spend most of my time, as the type written on the screen isn't
> distorted by the roaring I hear in my ears 24/7.
>
> There is a curious contradiction here with the people who think the
> morse code requirement is easy, yet anyone who is against it (or in some
> extreme cases doesn't use it) is stupid. Doggone it! After a while it
> gets annoying! I don't use CW because it isn't any fun for me. I proud I
> did it, and if I can do it, probably most people can.
>
> But, I suggest that these folk pick something (probably more relevant
> than basketball or hockey) that is really hard for them, that they can
> only pass with months of hard effort, and all the while, other people
> can call them stupid and lazy while they are struggling to learn.
>
> I know some people in my area who have passed the CW portion, but are
> struggling with the written parts which I've never had trouble with.
> Maybe I should call them stupid and lazy?
>
> - mike -

Many don't see the correlation between code testing and usefullness. I saw an argument here that it's a "basic communcation skill." That may very well be, but by the same comparison, riding a bicycle is a basic transportation skill, yet one doesn't have to prove such ability in order to obtain a driver's license. When the pro-code testing crowd sees that you apply the same logic towards their sacred cow, you're then a stupid, lazy, dumded down, liberal.

392. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 19:29:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmfujxd.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23388

On Wed, 07 Nov 2001 03:55:15 -0500, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>However, since you know
>something about this, does Riley have any influence when it comes to
>the rules issued by the Wireless Telecomm Bureau? In other words, if
>Riley saw something he objected to, would he have the influence to get
>the rules changed to cover that?

Of course. He'd walk over to Bill Cross' office and start with
"Hey Bill, I think that....."

That's how we got the logging and notification changes through in
the '70s.

Sort of an in-house RFRM......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

393. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 19:29:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmfuxde.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23387

On Wed, 07 Nov 2001 09:03:58 -0600, CAM wrote:

>Huh? That racism is the cause of the Affirmative Action program? If
>you lived in Madison County, Texas, it would be a self apparent primary.
>The tyranny of the majority is in full force here. If the power structure
>here had their way, there would be no blacks employed by the local
>government regardless of their qualifications.

Good enough reason for me not to want to live in Madison County,
Texas.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

394. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 19:38:10 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sc2gs030t6@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23390

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011106211951.10701.00001512@nso-mv.aol.com...
> Don't blame me for this. It was Kim who deliberately selected a
> callsign which included a blatant vulgar reference to a part of her
> anatomy which she believes deserves special recognition. This
> has nothing to do with small birds. It has everything to do with
> her breasts, and she thinks it is hilarious to call attention to them

I can see that it certainly got *your* attention.

> through her callsign. Then, in a vain attempt to get Mr. Hollingsworth
> to agree that she has every right to select and use such a callsign,
> she is told that even though she does, her choice to do so does,
> in fact, bring the ARS "...one step closer to extinction," due to the
> effect it has on those seeking a family-oriented activity within the
> ARS.

Where, specifially, does the phrase "family-oriented" appear in part 97?

> That list provided by Bob Casey, showing hams with similar
> unfortunate callsigns, proves nothing, because it is quite likely
> that those callsigns were sequentially issued. However, if I
> were to be issued such a callsign, I would have to ask to have
> it changed for the reason that I felt it was inappropriate for use
> on-the-air in a family-oriented radio service. The fact that they
> haven't doesn't change a single thing with relation to Kim. She
> should know better, but still chooses to keep a callsign which
> is demeaning to women and damaging to the image of the ARS.
>
> This thread is about Kim, nobody else.

Then why are you even bothering to respond? Maybe you are just a troll. If
so, I guess the joke's on us, isn't it?

395. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 20:38:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0111071238.4fe1d2db@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23391

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0111061757.c4bb3aa@posting.google.com>...
> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3BE83B05.13786420@ix.netcom.com>...
> > CAM wrote:

> > Maybe it's the extras who's ham license is the top
> > achievement on their resumes....
> >
> Horsepucky; The tougest radio exam I ever took was the test for the
> Boy Scout Radio Merit badge. Not only did ya have to know the code, ya
> also had to actually BUILD a working receiver AND explain in detail
> exactly how every component in the radio functioned and why it was in
> the circuit. I showed up at the merit badge counselor's lair with a
> two tube regen and he kicked my slats in for a half hour trying to
> trip me up on the technical details.

And you were how old at the time? What grade in school?
> >
> I'm trying to imagine the enormity of the flamefest in RRAP if the FCC
> decided to pass out tickets only if ya actually built a radio and it
> had to work.

I'm for it. No kits, either.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Amateur Extra since 1970
Homebrewer since 1965

396. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 21:20:38 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <6b2e30544eccf7bc7fbf7ba5c22ec06d.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23392

"Brian Kelly" wrote:

> I'm trying to imagine the enormity of the flamefest in RRAP if the FCC
> decided to pass out tickets only if ya actually built a radio and it
> had to work.

I vote "aye"!

But the QCAO would gain tens of thousands of members overnight.
K3LT, W5YI, W5NET, and W5TIT would be on the Board of Directors.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

News Release: de K7SS
QCAO Reorganizes

The Quarter Century Appliance Operators was founded in the
early 1950's by a small group of Amateur Radio operators from
the Pacific Northwest. They had been active in their hobby for
over 25 years, yet still lacked the basic knowledge of radio
electronics and had no idea of how their equipment worked.

They banded together to try and protect each others honor
and pride. At radio gatherings and club meetings in the 1950s
one was considered unworthy of the name Ham Radio Operator if
he or she couldn't not only name components, but know how to
solder them together and make a radio work, or fix a broken set!

When faced with insults and dreision, those few hardy
pioneers banded together and formed the First Chapter and
National Organization of the QCAO. This was known as the "Cold
Solder" Chapter. They even coined the now-famous club byword
"e pluribus ignoramae" which is Latin for "We don't have to know
how to solder, we just wanna talk on our radios."

No veterans of that first chapter are known to be active on
the air today. In the late 1950s and early '60s, with the
worldwide interest in science and space and technology, the QCAO
membership went underground.

It is with great pride and dignity that today in the 21st
century that the revived QCAO stands ready to rise from the ashes,
and become the standard of mediocrity it once proudly was. In
honor of those first pioneering members, QCAO hereby invites all

eligible applicants to step forward and join!

The benefits of QCAO include not only the pride of membership. Think of the warm glow you will feel at club meetings and gatherings showing off your new all-plastic imprinted QCAO pocket protector! And that's not all! For your minimal membership fee, you will also receive a handsome, suitable-for-framing, certificate of honor, with hand-lettered name and Charter Membership Number. Other QCAO memorabilia will soon be available for members, including T-shirts, caps, pins, etc. At this date charter membership numbers are still available. Membership requires a 25 years (more or less) interest in Amateur Radio, coupled with a basic ignorance of how radios work and how to repair them.

Think of meeting other QCAO members on the air! No more embarrassing pauses when someone in the QSO mentions an RF choke or a parasitic bleeder...Be able to exchange meaningful sharing, talk about real things, yes, even swap QCAO numbers with each other! And soon perhaps . . . a worldwide QCAO contest!

You no longer have to shrink to the back of the room at post-meeting sessions of your radio club. Just display your QCAO protector and others will be able to identify you immediately. Who knows? Perhaps one of the originals from that old QCAO Chapter is just waiting for you to find him. Join now! Remember "We don't have to know how to solder, we just wanna talk on our radios"! Don't let technoids embarrass you and kick jargon in your face. Stand up for what's right! Join QCAO!

"e pluribus ignoramae"

--
Posted from [204.31.49.245]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

397. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 21:21:35 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net>
Message-ID: <zBhG7.698$oM5.44278@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 23393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Keith Hosman Red Cross Disaster Services" <webdoc@mailandnews.com> wrote in message news:de9751ca.0111061703.2274731c@posting.google.com...
> Thanks for all the input, but perhaps I should have made myself more
> clear, what I am looking for at the moment is either a 2 meter HT or a
> dual band HT, since it would be rather difficult to operate a mobile
> unit without a car hehehe.

I use a Kenwood THG-71A with the Maha NiMH 1600 Mah battery pack. Does 6w on 2m and 5w on 70cm. You can also buy a light weight VOX headset that plugs right in to the HT, and is powered off the HT battery pack.

http://www.kenwood.net/products/index.cfm?AMA=open&ama_hheld=open&radio=TH-G71A&selection=Amateur&ID=50

Another good HT would be the Yaesu FT-50R.

http://www.yaesu.com/amateur/ft50r.html

I would stay away from the super small rigs like the Yaesu VX-5R, not because they're bad rigs, but because they are TOO small. What many people forget is the case of the rig is used for the heat sink for the final PA section. A smaller rig gets way too hot way too fast at high power. You want something small to fit on your belt, or in your pocket, but still allows a useful TX duty cycle without burning your hand trying to hold the thing. The super compact rigs are mainly aimed at monitoring with a very low duty cycle TX. I assume you want one for emergency use so you will be doing a fair amount of transmitting I think, so consider a rig that can handle it.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a
bomb
technician
if you see me
running
try to keep up "

398. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 21:38:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE9A9EA.C647772B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23394

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BE8B9CC.8C89BB0B@IEEE.org...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > I don't have any idea what you're talking about.
> > >
> > Your callsign phonetics are obscene, Larry.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
>
> Is that why you got rid of Rotten Crotch Anyone?

I used to work there (RCA). :-)

399. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 21:41:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE9AA82.E4AF030@uci.edu>
Source record: 23395

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Why do you think a
> > > criminal should have no fear of being apprehended?

> > I don't think he should, but apparently you do.

> Nope, you're wrong, as usual. What could me being against law-
> abiding citizens having to give up their constitutional rights
> possibly have to do with criminals having no fear of being
> apprehended?

Who said anything about law abiding citizens? Who's trying to catch law
abiding citizens, and why?

400. Re: Great Fun with Callsigns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 21:42:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE9AAD8.59540F3C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23396

mike coslo wrote:

> This is terrible terrible terrible! This is symptomatic of everything
> that is wrong with ham radio, Corry. The ARS should only be approached
> with the utmost of dignity and respect. You folks with all these snappy
> calls are only making the ARS look frivolous and bad. I can't even sleep
> at night for the chagrin and angst.
>
> Besides, you took the call that I wanted. DOH!!!
>
> Try for K4DOH, N4DOH, etc :-)

Ahh-hahhh!

401. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 21:43:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE9AAF7.65E53BFB@uci.edu>
Source record: 23397

CAM wrote:
> > Actually, no I wasn't. Here's the posting: (I can still see it above
> > this one in the thread.)
>
> But that's not the posting I replied to. Look back through the threads
> and you can verify it for yourself. Find my posting and click on the
> preceeding one. Here it is again:

Cecil, you ignorant slut. I know which article I replied to. Stop
lying about it. You're wrong this time (or should I say, as usual).

402. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 21:43:57 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BE9AB1D.BE9D7F66@uci.edu>
Source record: 23398

CAM wrote:
> > I'm more inclined to wish it would happen to you, Cecil. :-)

> Yep, you seem to think it's perfectly OK as long as it happens
> only to someone besides you.

Nope. Just you. :-)

403. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 22:03:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BE9AF97.9C5735BE@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23399

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3BE8EFC5.E4004473@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> >
> > Well, you're not going to get much argument from me with that. If
> >diversity and tolerance were applied equally, instead of a weapon to
> >strong arm the goals of those more interested in social engineering
> >than unity in this country, I'd be their biggest champion also.
> >However, until that situation changes, I'll add diversity and
> >tolerance to the list of things that suck.

In that case Dwight, surf over to http://www.k-k-k.com/ or
http://www.kukluxklan.net/ or http://www.wckkkk.com/
http://www.americanknights.com/

>
>
> You're not "getting it" Dwight (again!). If you're saying that diversity
> and tolerance suck, then you're saying the American culture sucks.
> I say diversity and tolerance are normal in American society, and
> do not "suck" in any way. If you think that "diversity" and "tolerance"
> suck, go try to live in North Korea, or some small African village.
> There, *you* would be the "diversity," and I'm sure that you wouldn't
> think that tolerance of that diversity "sucked."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I agree with you on this one, Larry. 73s

404. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 22:57:13 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0111071457.58e11444@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23400

Dwight Stewart

> However, until that situation changes, I'll add diversity and
> tolerance to the list of things that suck.

Diversity sucks?

Tolerance sucks?

Sorry, but those are bedrock qualities on which our country
is built!

On my little one-block street we have people who belong to
4 different religions that I know of (Protestant Christian,
Roman Catholic Christian, Muslim, Jew). We have three ethnic
groups (caucasian, african-american, oriental). We have a
single mother, a gay man, 2 ham operators, republicans, democrats,
gun owners, a PETA member, and any number of other "diversities"
that I haven't counted. If we draw a bigger circle, let's say
20 blocks in radius, I could probably add 100 more "diversities"
to the list. It is an incredibly rich set of "diversities" that
probably wouldn't be tolerated in all but a handful of other
countries on this planet, let alone in a single small neighborhood.

And you think "tolerance" of "diversity" sucks? You are a
truly sick pup!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

405. Re: A Correlation between CW and Competitiveness

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 23:25:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111071525.370ddd3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23402

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:<3be88861$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> Hey, Jim, and anyone else, just came across this on the ARRL website. It's
> the current "ARRL Web Survey" and the question is: "Did you participate in
> the 2001 CW Sweepstakes contest last weekend?"
>
> Notice that 22.3% of the respondents thusfar are not interested in
> contesting; and
> notice that 26.1% of the respondents thusfar do not operate CW
>
> Yes—and I worked a Clean Sweep! 1.5 % (8)
> Yes 9.9 % (52)
> No, I’m not interested in contesting 22.3 % (117)
> No, I don’t operate CW 26.1 % (137)
> No, I didn’t have the time 19.8 % (104)
> No (other) 20.2 % (106)
> Total votes: 524
>
> I wonder if there is a correlation (unproveable) along the lines of
> "attitude." I wonder if competitiveness is a factor in whether one likes
> and/or uses CW?
>
>
Attitude and competiveness are inseparable, ya can't have one without
the other. I consider contesting a sport. A radiosport in which the
elderly can mix it up with the kids on even-up terms. And where the
infirm can take on the robust.
>
>
Contesting develops operatiing skills, phone, cw, RTTY, PSK, the mode
doesn't matter.
>
>
http://www.frc-contest.org/
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
w3rv - Member - Frankford Radio Club, Phila.

406. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-07 23:38:41 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3be9c67a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23403

I actually support the notion of having to build a radio, to FCC specifications, and not a kit, to get an amateur radio license. Or, something like having to build and connect altogether a packet station--with equipment provided by the FCC or approved examiners. Or, build an antenna capable, without tuning, of transmitting within 3:1 or lower SWR.

Anything, anything but testing a mode.

Leave me off the Board of Directors, though. a) Larry is there; and b) the above stringent requirements would leave me out of the hobby.

Kim W5TIT

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message news:6b2e30544eccf7bc7fbf7ba5c22ec06d.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> > I'm trying to imagine the enormity of the flamefest in RRAP if the FCC
> > decided to pass out tickets only if ya actually built a radio and it
> > had to work.
>
> I vote "aye"!
>
> But the QCAO would gain tens of thousands of members overnight.
> K3LT, W5YI, W5NET, and W5TIT would be on the Board of Directors.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> ----------
> News Release: de K7SS
> QCAO Reorganizes
> ----------
> The Quarter Century Appliance Operators was founded in the
> early 1950's by a small group of Amateur Radio operators from
> the Pacific Northwest. They had been active in their hobby for
> over 25 years, yet still lacked the basic knowledge of radio
> electronics and had no idea of how their equipment worked.
>
> They banded together to try and protect each others honor
> and pride. At radio gatherings and club meetings in the 1950s
> one was considered unworthy of the name Ham Radio Operator if
> he or she couldn't not only name components, but know how to
> solder them together and make a radio work, or fix a broken set!

>
> When faced with insults and dreision, those few hardy
> pioneers banded together and formed the First Chapter and
> National Organization of the QCAO. This was known as the "Cold
> Solder" Chapter. They even coined the now-famous club byword
> "e pluribus ignoramae" which is Latin for "We don't have to know
> how to solder, we just wanna talk on our radios."
>
> No veterans of that first chapter are known to be active on
> the air today. In the late 1950s and early '60s, with the
> worldwide interest in science and space and technology, the QCAO
> membership went underground.
>
> It is with great pride and dignity that today in the 21st
> century that the revived QCAO stands ready to rise from the ashes,
> and become the standard of mediocrity it once proudly was. In
> honor of those first pioneering members, QCAO hereby invites all
> eligible applicants to step forward and join!
>
> The benefits of QCAO include not only the pride of
> membership. Think of the warm glow you will feel at club
> meetings and gatherings showing off your new all-plastic
> imprinted QCAO pocket protector! And that's not all! For your
> minimal membership fee, you will also receive a handsome,
> suitable-for-framing, certificate of honor, with hand-lettered
> name and Charter Membership Number. Other QCAO memorabilia
> will soon be available for members, including T-shirts, caps,
> pins, etc. At this date charter membership numbers are still
> available. Membership requires a 25 years (more or less)
> interest in Amateur Radio, coupled with a basic ignorance of how
> radios work and how to repair them.
>
> Think of meeting other QCAO members on the air! No more
> embarrassing pauses when someone in the QSO mentions an RF choke
> or a parasitic bleeder...Be able to exchange meaningful sharing,
> talk about real things, yes, even swap QCAO numbers with each
> other! And soon perhaps . . . a worldwide QCAO contest!
>
> You no longer have to shrink to the back of the room at post-
> meeting sessions of your radio club. Just display your QCAO
> protector and others will be able to identify you immediately.
> Who knows? Perhaps one of the originals from that old QCAO
> Chapter is just waiting for you to find him. Join now! Remember
> "We don't have to know how to solder, we just wanna talk on our
> radios"! Don't let technoids embarrass you and kick jargon in
> your face. Stand up for what's right! Join QCAO!
>
> "e pluribus ignoramae"
>
>

>
>
> --
> Posted from [204.31.49.245]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

407. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 03:03:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011107220337.22754.00000317@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 23404

In article <3BE83F40.FA96D3F3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> CAM wrote:
>>
>> > Reducing or eliminating requirements based on outmoded skills is NOT
>> > lowering the standards. It is modernizing the standards.
>>
>> So YOU decide what is an outmoded skill? Basic skills are never outmoded
>...
>
>Of course they are. Grinding flour is a basic skill that is outmoded.

Since when have people stopped eating bread, pasta, etc.? And there isn't much skill to it.

Besides, nobody grinds flour. They grind grain, and the result is flour.

>The list of basic skills that have been outmoded by science and
>civilization is virtually endless and Morse code is on that list.

Science doesn't outmode anyhting. Engineering does.

"Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them" - Werhner Von Braun

And Morse code is not outmoded in ham radio. Last weekendm in the ARRL CW SS I worked 309 different stations in 75 ARRL sections using the mode, in about 12 hours. Used a 5 watt transceiver and an inverted V at 35 feet. Those totals are no big deal - folks with better setups and more stamina than I contacted well over 1000 different stations in 24 hours. And the SS is just a weenie domestic contest with a long exchange. The DX tests are even bigger and bring out many more stations.

Pretty good for something that is allegedly "outmoded".

73 de Jim, N2EY

408. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 04:17:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BEA0752.3CC12CFD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23405

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I don't have the authorized Texas edition of American History. I asked
> > you to offer some proof for your statement. You have not done so. You
> > made some claims which are quite a stretch.
>
> Huh? That racism is the cause of the Affirmative Action program? If
> you lived in Madison County, Texas, it would be a self apparent primary.
> The tyranny of the majority is in full force here. If the power structure
> here had their way, there would be no blacks employed by the local
> government regardless of their qualifications.

That isn't exactly what you stated is it, Cecil? Go back and read your
own statement and we'll talk further. As to Madison County, Texas: I
don't know about your county. I do know that prior to affirmative
action, the top scoring candidates received civil service jobs.
Standards were lowered under the quota system of Affirmative Action.
It doesn't really matter since your use of the Affirmative Action label
in comparing it to Morse testing was incorrect. You had it backwards.
This latest tangent is simply a Cecilian diversion.

> > > Maybe on your planet, it wasn't. It certainly was on this one.
> > > I lived through it happening and it's still alive for a certain
> > > lunatic fringe of amateur radio.
> >
> > Which planet do you live on? What languages do you speak? I'm
> > surprised that you have amateur radio on your planet. We enjoy it here
> > on Earth.
>
> Copy-cat. You may not be part of the Morse Code Creed lunatic fringe,
> Dave, but I know quite a few hams who are. They are not good for
> amateur radio.

There isn't a Morse Code Creed lunatic fringe, Cecil. Further, I'd no
more depend upon you as a source for what is good for amateur radio than
I would depend on "USA Today" for all of my news.

Dave K8MN

409. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 04:57:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEA10AF.EEC83165@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23406

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Wed, 07 Nov 2001 09:03:58 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >Huh? That racism is the cause of the Affirmative Action program? If
> >you lived in Madison County, Texas, it would be a self apparent primary.
> >The tyranny of the majority is in full force here. If the power structure
> >here had their way, there would be no blacks employed by the local
> >government regardless of their qualifications.
>
> Good enough reason for me not to want to live in Madison County,
> Texas.

When I no longer have to take care of my parents, I'm outta here.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

410. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 05:03:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEA1222.D8DDE2E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23407

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Who said anything about law abiding citizens? Who's trying to catch law
> abiding citizens, and why?

Please pay attention. I objected to law-abiding citizens losing
constitutional rights in the process of trying to catch terrorists.
Dick said (in so many words) that we cannot catch the terrorists
without taking constitutional freedoms away from law-abiding citizens.
I said his approach was playing right into the hands of the terrorists
and that law-abiding citizens need not lose any constitutional rights
during the process of catching the terrorists.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

411. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 05:16:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEA1511.5EA290AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23408

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > > Actually, no I wasn't. Here's the posting: (I can still see it above
> > > this one in the thread.)
> >
> > But that's not the posting I replied to. Look back through the threads
> > and you can verify it for yourself. Find my posting and click on the
> > preceeding one. Here it is again:
>
> Cecil, you ignorant slut. I know which article I replied to. Stop
> lying about it. You're wrong this time (or should I say, as usual).

You're wrong, Jim, and the threaded newsreader proves that you are
wrong. Here are the postings in order.
****
In response to MY posting, you wrote:
CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BE704FE.E735F541@IEEE.org...
> Trouble is, to most law enforcers, you might look like a citizen.
> To one,
> *you* might look like a terrorist. Unless all citizens possess
constitutional
> rights then no citizen possesses them.

US citizenship is easily proved and Mohammed Atta and his crew were not
citizens.

What rights do you think terrorists are entitled to that they haven't been
afforded?
****
I responded to your response to my posting:
Jim Kelley wrote:
> US citizenship is easily proved and Mohammed Atta and his crew were not
> citizens.

Who said they were?

> What rights do you think terrorists are entitled to that they haven't been
> afforded?

We're not discussing terrorists, Jim. We are discussing American citizens
losing constitutional rights. I'm against it. Dick thinks I should be
for it as he apparently is.
****
You wrote:

CAM wrote:
> We're not discussing terrorists, Jim. We are discussing American citizens
> losing constitutional rights. I'm against it.

Actually, I was replying to Dwight when you butted in. I'm discussing
terrorists.
****
I wrote:
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > We're not discussing terrorists, Jim. We are discussing American
citizens
> > losing constitutional rights. I'm against it.
>
> Actually, I was replying to Dwight when you butted in. I'm discussing
> terrorists.

Actually, you were replying to me. Here's the posting.
****
And I posted the first posting above, you know the one that proves
that you were replying to MY posting and NOT to Dwight's.

Threaded newsreaders are a bitch, huh? If you had taken one minute to
trace the postings back, you wouldn't be embarassing yourself by
stating falsehoods based on your confusion.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

412. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 05:22:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEA1684.59A63596@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23409

Dave Heil wrote:
> I do know that prior to affirmative
> action, the top scoring candidates received civil service jobs.

I'm talking about federal jobs, Dave. If it had been left up
to the local school board here, there never would have been a black
teacher in the schools around here. In my home county, the affirmative
action program forced the local racists to honor the civil rights
laws.

> There isn't a Morse Code Creed lunatic fringe, Cecil.

Of course there is, Dave. I have it on good authority that there
is an underground organization of lunatic fringe hams. The
organization is the Morse Forever Society Of Beepers (MFSOBs).
I know a few of them personally.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

413. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 05:38:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEA1A44.536C606E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23410

N2EY wrote:
> Since when have people stopped eating bread, pasta, etc.? And there isn't much
> skill to it.

So do you grind your own flour, Jim? Do you make your own weapons? Do
you manufacture your own light? Do you raise your own cows? Do you make
your own clothes? The statement was that some skills are outmoded by
progress. The fact that virtually all radio services except a hobby
has dropped Morse code use is prima facie evidence that it is outmoded.
But lots of things that are outmoded are useful and fun within hobbies.

> And Morse code is not outmoded in ham radio. Last weekendm in the ARRL CW SS I
> worked 309 different stations in 75 ARRL sections using the mode, in about 12
> hours.

Last weekend I rode a horse. That doesn't keep horses from being outmoded
for most acts of transportation.

> Pretty good for something that is allegedly "outmoded".

It's a hobby, Jim. Lots of people enjoy outmoded stuff as part of their
hobby. I load my own ammo. I preserve my own figs. I brew my own beer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

414. Re: Great Fun with Callsigns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 05:48:25 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9sd6b7$8t7$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 23411

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3BE9AAD8.59540F3C@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> mike coslo wrote:
>
> > This is terrible terrible terrible! This is symptomatic of
everything
> > that is wrong with ham radio, Corry. The ARS should only be approached
> > with the utmost of dignity and respect. You folks with all these snappy
> > calls are only making the ARS look frivolous and bad. I can't even sleep
> > at night for the chagrin and angst.
> >
> > Besides, you took the call that I wanted. DOH!!!
> >
> > Try for K4DOH, N4DOH, etc :-)
>
> Ahh-hahhh!

K4APU is not assigned.
"Silly customer! You cannot hurt a Twinkie!"

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

Willie <willie@waylonsplace.net> wrote in alabama.sports.auburn: "Because I
know your THE AUTHORITY."

415. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 05:59:40 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <A0406121E9C465DB.3189FB3878C87A0F.05C3273E434CD475@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23412

On Wed, 07 Nov 2001 23:38:12 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>I load my own ammo.

Hardly outmoded. Considering some of the crap on the market, it's
pretty damn near a necessity.

>I brew my own beer.

See above.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

416. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 11:27:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111080327.41384abc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23413

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011106221016.10701.00001521@nso-mv.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0111061757.c4bb3aa@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >I'm trying to imagine the enormity of the flamefest in RRAP if the FCC
> >decided to pass out tickets only if ya actually built a radio and it
> >had to work.
>
> Brian:
>
> I agree, it would be an interesting time on the newsgroup. However,
> I, for one, have built working radios long before I became a ham of
> *any* license class. I'd love to see that requirement levied once the
> code testing requirement is dropped!
>
Let's pelt 'em with requests for the NPRM. I was building for years
before I got my Novice. I still listen 99% of the time and transmit
for 1%.
>
>
> >w3rv
> >Extra HEAVY.
>
> In that case, try Weight Watchers or Jenny Craig.
>
>
Extra HEAVY vs. Extra Lite. Knocked off 50 pounds via Weight Watchers
20 years ago. Current configuration = six feet 160 pounds.
>
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Real Extra
>
>
dit-dit
>
w3rv

417. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 11:51:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011108065109.23850.00000344@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 23414

In article <3BE8BA8A.55C3466C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >If I'm not mistaken, the highest per capita percentage of FCC NALs
>> >have gone to Extra class licensees.
>>
>> I believe that this is true. Now...what percentage of those NAL's
>> have involved the Morse/CW mode vs. phone?
>
>It doesn't matter.

Sure it does. If the use of a mode promotes good behavior, that alone is a
reason to promote its preservation and use.

>CW is not a proper tool for misbehaving.

There ya go. Didya know that a ham worked out a plea bargain with the FCC where
he was limited to ONLY HF CW?

>Choosing
>CW for misbehaving is like choosing a BB gun to murder someone.
>--
Which is why BB guns are not as restricted as some other firearms. And it's a
good reason for beginners to start with them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

418. Re: Complements and Compliments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 13:03:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011108080305.03527.00000009@nso-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 23415

In article <20011102145438.19863.00000186@nso-mg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>>They might even have been cribbed from the May 1978 issue
>>>of Ham Radio magazine for all I know. :-)
>>
>>They weren't. I made them up myself.
>
>So...they are "made up" and not based on real situations. :-)

They are based on real situations. Ask W5DXP.
>
>>>For someone who has an inordinate amount of free time to
>>>spend on amateur radio newsgoop messaging, I'm surprised
>>>that there was no immediate response of a "tutorial" on
>>>Smith Chart use. Anyone who claims to have "mastered the
>>>Smith Chart" should have jumped right in on the subject just
>>>like he jumps in about morse code use. :-)
>>
>>The only person who fits that description is you, Len.
>
>On a thread involving Smith Charts I did jump in and talk
>about them without needing a week to "research" the
>material and make up some "examples" of use.
>
I didn't need a week. And your deadlines mean nothing to me. I don't work for you.

>>You've done more than that. You want an age limit of 14 for any amateur
>>license, and a reduction to a single class of license.
>
>That is all public knowledge...but taken out of context from
>my 13 January 1999 14-page-text Comments on 98-143.

How is it "out of context"? You proposed both those things to the FCC, and confirmed them here.

You claim that you are only interested in ending the code test. The above statements to the FCC prove that is simply not true.

btw, the comment period for 98-143 closed December 15 1998 and the reply comment period closed January 15, 1999. Reply comments are supposed to ONLY involve rebuttals to comments submitted by others, NOT new discussion. While most of your reply comments were indeed replies/rebuttals to others' comments, the age-limit and one-class proposals were not. You did not file comments during the comment period, and you waited to the very end of the reply comment

period to file.

>My suggestion to the FCC on age limits was the LAST item
>in those 14 pages, prompted more by the (referenced) "news"
>from the ARRL of two six-year-old new amateur licensees.

So? Does the order matter? You want an age restriction - that alone disproves your claim of wanting nothing other than an end to code testing. QED.

And you said they were four year olds in the reply comments. But you provided NO evidence that youth has any correlation or causation with problems in the amateur radio service.
>
>The main part of my Comments on 98-143 concerned the
>elimination of the morse code test for any class amateur
>radio license, followed by the elimination of the "class"
>distinction to eventually lead to only one license.

Which also disproves your claim of being ONLY interested in ending the code test. QED.
>
>>Yep. And they have posted reasons for that opinion. Is it forbidden to
>>disagree?
>
>Why does

(N2EY)

> project his own feelings on this?

I am asking a simple question. You have written that one cannot answer a question with another question.
>
>I've never said that

(N2EY)

>is "forbidden" to disagree.

That's nice to know.
>
>>Is that why you abuse those with the audacity to disagree with you and point
>>out your logical errors?
>
>Who is "abused?" Those with overwhelming egos who insist
>on being the Final Judge of what is "good" and what is "bad"
>in opinions?

Answering questions with questions again. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
>>Nope. The distortion is yours. You just equated code test with "code
>lovers".
>>Not the same thing. But it shows your hatred of the mode itself, not just
>the

>>test.
>
>Incorrect "showing."

Nope. simple observation.

> I've said repeatedly that those who favor
>morse code USE should be able to enjoy that mode as long as
>it is allocated.

But you equate those who love and use the code with code testing. Not the same thing at all.

>No one favoring the retention of the code test has
>yet claimed anything logical or regulatory for its retention...

Untrue.

And YOU have not provided any evidence that an age limit for a license is necessary.

> only a
>lot of personal feelings that cite the implicit need for it on the
>tacit opinion that "they had to do it, so everyone else has to."

Untrue.

>>> FREEDOM is not a bad word.
>>
>>Neither is RESPONSIBILITY. Neither is TRADITION.
>
>How is the morse code test related to "responsibility?"

Nobody said it was. But note that the FCC has not cited a single radio amateur for violations committed using the mode in many years. That says something.
>
>Does it show something "to the ARS community" that a
>prospective licensee is "worthy" of a license? No.

The word to think of is "qualified".

>The
>"ARS community" does not, cannot grant amateur licenses.

So? Does that mean they should have no say in license requirements?

>Some turnips in the "ARS community" insist they do but
>then they are rooted in the local ground and will eventually
>wither and die without doing anything productive.

Sounds like you are describing yourself again, Len ;-)
>
>"Tradition" keeping is not a task of the FCC.

Why not? Is all tradition a bad thing? You seem to think so.

>If it were, then
>"tradition" should insist on keeping damped-wave RF
>generation, should it not?

Only if ALL tradition is good.

>>What alignment? Where is that alleged alignment documented?
>
>It is firmly locked-in to those who consider morse code skill
>as the epitome of the amateur radio experience. See the
>oft-repeated trolling messages of:
>
> "No code = No ham Know code = Know ham."

Why? I didn't write that stuff. That's the work of ONE anonymous troll. For all anyone knows, the person who repeatedly posts that junk could be YOU, Leonard Anderson.
>
>>I've only told you that many, many times since December 1999. The code test
>>issue is a dead duck, finished, finito, end of story.
>
>Sorry, but the "code test issue" is NOT a "dead duck." The FCC
>IWG-6 had not yet decided on it as of last week. The IARU had
>not changed its position until the beginning of October, 2001. The
>IARU is not permitted a vote in any WRC, but the FCC is one
>agency of three that represent the USA administration.

Do you really think that S25.5 will last past WRC-2003? I don't.
>
>>Nope. Spin and twist from the spinmeister. The mere fact that a regulation
>is
>>old doesn't mean it is no longer needed.
>
>The fact that a regulation is old does not mean that it should be
>retained.

Agreed. Regulations must pass the test of necessity.

What evidence have you presented that the lack of an age limit for a US amateur license is necessary in any way? None.

N2EY

419. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 14:18:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEA9422.62EE5C97@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23416

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Now...what percentage of those NAL's
> >> have involved the Morse/CW mode vs. phone?
> > >
> > >It doesn't matter.
>
> Sure it does. If the use of a mode promotes good behavior, that alone is a
> reason to promote its preservation and use.

Recommending CW because it promotes good behavior is like recommending
walking to eliminate traffic deaths. Why do we need to promote walking
through governmental requirements? People who want to walk do so. People
who don't want to walk use a vehicle and take their chances. What's
wrong with freedom of choice?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

420. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 15:13:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAA0D4.B506B737@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23417

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> You're not "getting it" Dwight (again!).
> If you're saying that diversity and
> tolerance suck, then you're saying the
> American culture sucks. (snip)

No, you're not getting it, Larry. Again, if diversity and tolerance were applied EQUALLY, TO ALL in this country, I'd be a champion of those concepts too. But, that is not, AT ALL, how those concepts are being applied today (and THAT sucks). Now, I'm not going to sit here and explain why that is true because it would take an entire book to do so. So, I'll recommend a book instead. Try...

The Myths That Divide Us - How Lies Have Poisoned American Race Relations

http://www.atlasbooks.com/marktplc/00548.htm

It is an excellent book (over 600 pages, with 126 of those pages listing government documents, media sources, and other reference material for the book).

By the way, the fact that I don't champion those concepts does not mean that I have no tolerance for diversity. What it means is that I want that tolerance to be expanded to include ALL Americans.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

421. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 15:18:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAA225.858BBE4C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23418

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I do know that prior to affirmative
> > action, the top scoring candidates received civil service jobs.
>
> I'm talking about federal jobs, Dave. If it had been left up
> to the local school board here, there never would have been a black
> teacher in the schools around here. In my home county, the affirmative
> action program forced the local racists to honor the civil rights
> laws.

I assume that you meant that you are *not* talking about Federal jobs. Fine. So if a teacher does not meet the standards set for a teaching job in your area, you feel that it is fine to reduce the standards and allow an unqualified person teach your kids. Now I have a better handle on how you think. Aside from that, this is all diversion on your part since your little "Morse Code Affirmative Action" scenario was backwards. The diversion didn't work. I still remember what you wrote.

> > There isn't a Morse Code Creed lunatic fringe, Cecil.
>
> Of course there is, Dave. I have it on good authority that there
> is an underground organization of lunatic fringe hams. The
> organization is the Morse Forever Society Of Beepers (MFSOBs).
> I know a few of them personally.

If it is an underground organization, why would they let you in on the secret?

Dave K8MN

422. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 15:32:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011108103243.08355.00001660@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 23419

In article <3BE95052.309B9D63@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry, I find your callsign to be obscene, vulgar, and demeaning.
>If you are free to find Kim's callsign vulgar, then I am free to
>find your callsign vulgar. Vulgarity is in the eyes of the beholder.
>'Keeping Three Large Tits' is certainly obscene. I think you should
>change it immediately. I am losing sleep because it is so obscene.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil:

Not until you get rid of "Whacking Five Dirty eX Prostitutes,"
which *I* find offensive in the extreme.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Kissing Three Lovely Temptresses!

423. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 15:32:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011108103243.08355.00001659@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 23420

In article <3BE94F97.813B12AE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Your callsign phonetics are obscene, Larry.
>>
>> Kilo Three Lima Tango is obscene?
>
>'Keeping Three Large Tits' is obscene. Like your attitude toward
>Kim's call, obscenity is in the eyes of the beholder.

Cecil:

I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.
I don't recall ever calling it "obscene."

73 de Larry, K3LT

424. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 15:44:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAA819.DF4313A6@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23421

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> In that case Dwight, surf over to

No thanks. The web sites you seem familiar with, right down to the actual URL addresses, don't interest me.

> I agree with you on this one, Larry.

On extremely complex subjects like diversity and tolerance, a few lines of text is enough for you to start choosing sides? I guess simple minds are easily satisfied.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

425. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 15:57:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAAB3E.3749C5E0@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23422

K0HB wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart
>
> > However, until that situation
> > changes, I'll add diversity and
> > tolerance to the list of things
> > that suck.
>
> Diversity sucks?
>
> Tolerance sucks?
>
> Sorry, but those are bedrock
> qualities on which our country
> is built!

Don't cut off part of my message, the part that clarifies my position, and then attack what is left, Hans. I said _UNEQUAL_ diversity and tolerance, diversity and tolerance used as a weapon by those more interested in social engineering than unity, sucks. Sadly, there doesn't seem to be much tolerance for concepts like equality and unity in this newsgroup.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

426. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 16:11:06 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <u8yG7.17668$xS6.27731@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23423

Dwight Stewart says:

> Now, I'm not going to sit here and explain why that is true because
> it would take an entire book to do so. So, I'll recommend a book
> instead. Try...
>
>The Myths That Divide Us - How Lies Have Poisoned American Race Relations
>
>http://www.atlasbooks.com/marktplc/00548.htm
>
> It is an excellent book (over 600 pages, with 126 of those pages
>listing government documents, media sources, and other reference
>material for the book).
>

The fact that you would recommend a book by John Perazzo, the darling
of the KKK and other AmeriKan/skinhead groups, speaks volumes about
YOUR tolerance!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

427. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 16:15:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAAF58.603F3EEE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23424

N2EY wrote:
>
> I think you are quite mistaken, Dwight.
> Riley is essentially the "cop on the
> beat" - his influence is limited to
> choosing which cases to go after most
> aggressively. One of the check and
> balance protections of our governmental
> system is division of enforcement power
> between lawmakers, courts and LEOs.

Well, to be honest, I don't know for sure one way or the other. It just seems to me that someone as visible as Riley has been over the last few years would at least have some influence with those responsible for the rules. But, perhaps you're right, so I'll let it go with that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

428. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 16:27:36 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <YnyG7.17693$xS6.27966@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23425

Dwight Stewart says:

> Well, to be honest, I don't know for sure one way or the other.

Well, Dwight, it .....naw, I'll just bite my tongue and not say it.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

429. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 16:53:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAB841.96E31E6@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23426

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> Of course. He'd walk over to
> Bill Cross' office and start with
> "Hey Bill, I think that....."
>
> That's how we got the logging
> and notification changes through
> in the '70s.
>
> Sort of an in-house RFRM......

I thought so. It just didn't seem likely the different departments (sections, or whatever they're called) would be so isolated as to not heavily interact with each other, or those in more senior positions. And as visible, and as outspoken, as Riley has been over the last few years, he has to have some fairly strong backing somewhere in that agency (which generally leads to some influence).

But it is interesting how you describe it. Is it really that casual to get changes like the logging and notification you mention started? Have you ever considered a book on the day to day inner workings of the agency? I don't know how much of a market there would be, but I'd sure be interested in reading about how some of the more significant changes over the years went down (the people involved, the positions they took, the reasons behind the changes and the various positions of the people, how they perceived the outside reaction, some of the enforcement efforts, some of the more interesting cases, and so forth).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

430. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 17:19:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9seepo0jf0@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23429

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011108103243.08355.00001659@nso-mq.aol.com...
> Cecil:
>
> I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
> inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.
> I don't recall ever calling it "obscene."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Perhaps not, but you have used synonyms.

431. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 17:24:45 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sef2t0jtd@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23430

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BEAA225.858BBE4C@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I do know that prior to affirmative
> > > action, the top scoring candidates received civil service jobs.
> >
> > I'm talking about federal jobs, Dave. If it had been left up
> > to the local school board here, there never would have been a black
> > teacher in the schools around here. In my home county, the affirmative
> > action program forced the local racists to honor the civil rights
> > laws.
>
> I assume that you meant that you are *not* talking about Federal jobs.
> Fine. So if a teacher does not meet the standards set for a teaching
> job in your area, you feel that it is fine to reduce the standards and
> allow an unqualified person teach your kids. Now I have a better handle
> on how you think. Aside from that, this is all diversion on your part
> since your little "Morse Code Affirmative Action" scenario was
> backwards. The diversion didn't work. I still remember what you wrote.
>
> > > There isn't a Morse Code Creed lunatic fringe, Cecil.
> >
> > Of course there is, Dave. I have it on good authority that there
> > is an underground organization of lunatic fringe hams. The
> > organization is the Morse Forever Society Of Beepers (MFSOBs).
> > I know a few of them personally.
>
> If it is an underground organization, why would they let you in on the
> secret?
>
> Dave K8MN

432. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 17:27:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAC048.1003EC7A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23427

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Jim, the laws being passed are
> > not limited to just the FBI. The
> > recent "terrorist bill" gave equal
> > authority to local law enforcement
> > - the guy down the street hiding
> > behind an overpass waiting to write
> > you a speeding ticket. And we have
> > no more reason to believe that any
> > potential law affecting torture in
> > this country would be limited to
> > federal law enforcement agencies
> > either.
>
> The terrorist bill authorizes torture?
> Wow, the media sure missed a big
> story there.

Reading comprehension problem, Jim? I mentioned three things in that paragraph;

1. "...the laws being passed are not limited to just the FBI."

2. "The recent "terrorist bill" gave equal authority to local law enforcement - the guy down the street hiding behind an overpass waiting to write you a speeding ticket."

3. "And we have no more reason to believe that any potential law affecting torture in this country would be limited to federal law enforcement agencies either."

Where in any of that did I say "the terrorist bill authorizes torture?"

> Not only that, I'm not a member of
> any terrorist groups, nor do I
> associate with members of terrorist
> groups or other criminals. I'd say
> those kinds of activities would be
> inadvisable if you want to stay
> below the law enforcement radar.

Have you looked up the definition of "terrorist," Jim? Given enough creative interpretation, even the Girl Scouts could be defined as a terrorist group - they pound on our doors and threaten us with those

darn cookies every year (some consider sugar harmful).

> And thus aren't affected by them. Have
> you been affected by the RICO laws,
> Dwight?

No, thankfully I haven't. However that doesn't mean that I haven't read about those who have been unfairly affected, and the harm that has caused to those people.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

433. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 17:27:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sef8q0k8j@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23431

> If it is an underground organization, why would they let you in on the
> secret?
>
> Dave K8MN

Maybe there was a leak.

434. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 17:32:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAC17D.9E5FA4E3@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23428

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Lets be careful about the use
> > of the word "free" in this regard,
> > Jim. The people of Kuwait were not
> > freed - we simply put the old
> > "monarchy" back in place, complete
> > with his gold bathroom fixtures.
>
> Which they overwhelming prefer to Sadam
> Husein, by the way.

Did you ask them? They were not offered any other choice.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

435. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 18:01:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAC831.B80C7FE9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23432

K0HB wrote:
>
> The fact that you would recommend
> a book by John Perazzo, the darling
> of the KKK and other AmeriKan/
> skinhead groups, speaks volumes
> about YOUR tolerance!

If that is true, show me where the book is not factual, Hans? That book contains material, reprinted by permission, from HarperCollins Publishers, Random House, the Associated Press, Tribune Media Services, Georges Borchardt, the New Republic, the New York Times, United Media, Simon & Schuster, the Hoover Institution, US News & World Report, Beacon Press, William Morrow & Company, National Review, New York's Daily News, New Perspectives Quarterly, Saint Martin's Press, the Washington Post, various government agencies, and a number of other sources. Are all those organizations intolerant and darlings of the KKK and skinhead groups too? Or do you just define anyone who disagrees with your views, whatever they base those views on, as intolerant and a darling of the KKK and skinhead groups?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

436. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 18:03:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEAC8B5.5CF22CD@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23433

K0HB wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart says:
>
> > Well, to be honest, I don't know
> > for sure one way or the other.
>
> Well, Dwight, it .....naw, I'll
> just bite my tongue and not say it.

Well, before you say anything, make sure to read Phil's post later
in this thread.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

437. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:01:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BEAD683.3C73E26D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23434

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > If I'm not mistaken, the highest per capita percentage of FCC NALs
> > > have gone to Extra class licensees.
> >
> > uh-oh... I better behave myself! I have one of those
> > "Extra Lite" licenses.... :-)
> >
> > Maybe it's the extras who's ham license is the top
> > achievement on their resumes....
> >
>
>
> Doesn't that make you feel sorta stupid? Such a genius and you still had
> to wait for the Big Dumbdown to make it to Extra.....

Never had the time to learn 20wpm. Appears the FCC decided it wasn't
worth my time either.

438. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:03:59 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BEAD71F.D42292A2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23435

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Kissing Three Lovely Temptresses!

Good one! 73s

I know someone with the call : Always Kissing Two Females

439. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:07:05 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BEAD7D9.A86D5569@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23436

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > Of course. He'd walk over to
> > Bill Cross' office and start with
> > "Hey Bill, I think that....."
> >
> > That's how we got the logging
> > and notification changes through
> > in the '70s.
> >
> > Sort of an in-house RFRM......
>
> But it is interesting how you describe it. Is it really that casual
> to get changes like the logging and notification you mention started?
> Have you ever considered a book on the day to day inner workings of
> the agency?

Would make a good web page if it doesn't warrant a book, though.

440. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:09:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BEAD864.12CA983D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23437

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > In that case Dwight, surf over to
>
> No thanks. The web sites you seem familiar with, right down to the
> actual URL addresses, don't interest me.
>

All I did was a web search on "klux klan". I don't subscribe to
their views.

441. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:23:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEADBBB.20C6176B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23438

Dave Heil wrote:
> I assume that you meant that you are *not* talking about Federal jobs.

Yep, I changed it from "wasn't" to present tense and forgot the "not".

> Fine. So if a teacher does not meet the standards set for a teaching
> job in your area, you feel that it is fine to reduce the standards and
> allow an unqualified person teach your kids.

That's absolutely not what I said. What I said was that exceptionally
qualified black teachers were passed over so the job could be given
to some school board member's unqualified dumb $hit white cousin.
I would rather have a qualified black person teaching my children any
day than have some dumb $hit low-IQ white idiot teaching them.

I'm sorry you seem to support such a racist system. I'm glad
to see that system has been corrected to a large extent. Before you
object, why are you allowed to jump to irrational conclusions and
I'm not?

> If it is an underground organization, why would they let you in on the
> secret?

I acted like an MFSOB so they thought I was one of them.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

442. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:26:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEADC58.1D4F595E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23439

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
> inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.
> I don't recall ever calling it "obscene."

And I find your call obscene, vulgar, demeaning, and inappropriate.
What are you going to do about it?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP
```


```
-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

443. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:29:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEADD0E.D93CDE51@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23440

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Larry, I find your callsign to be obscene, vulgar, and demeaning.
> >If you are free to find Kim's callsign vulgar, then I am free to
> >find your callsign vulgar. Vulgarity is in the eyes of the beholder.
> >'Keeping Three Large Tits' is certainly obscene. I think you should
> >change it immediately. I am losing sleep because it is so obscene.
>
> Not until you get rid of "Whacking Five Dirty eX Prostitutes,"
> which *I* find offensive in the extreme.

Good! That's a mature attitude. I think you are beginning to
understand. Obscenity is in the eyes of the beholder.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

444. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:40:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sen24013us@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23445

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BEAC831.B80C7FE9@sccoast.net...
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > The fact that you would recommend
> > a book by John Perazzo, the darling
> > of the KKK and other AmeriKan/
> > skinhead groups, speaks volumes
> > about YOUR tolerance!
>
>
> If that is true, show me where the book is not factual, Hans? That
> book contains material, reprinted by permission, from HarperCollins
> Publishers, Random House, the Associated Press, Tribune Media
> Services, Georges Borchardt, the New Republic, the New York Times,
> United Media, Simon & Schuster, the Hoover Institution, US News &
> World Report, Beacon Press, William Morrow & Company, National Review,
> New York's Daily News, New Perspectives Quarterly, Saint Martin's
> Press, the Washington Post, various government agencies, and a number
> of other sources. Are all those organizations intolerant and darlings
> of the KKK and skinhead groups too? Or do you just define anyone who
> disagrees with your views, whatever they base those views on, as
> intolerant and a darling of the KKK and skinhead groups?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

I don't know who John Perazzo is. Let's assume that his is, indeed, a
darling of the KKK/Skinheads/Neo-Nazis. It's not uncommon for someone with a
certain agenda to do "research" and only include facts that fit their
agenda, ignoring anything else. Witness the rantings of Gary North, The late
William Cooper, and ham radio's own Wayne Green.

445. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:42:43 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <TeBG7.17946$xS6.28701@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23441

Dwight Stewart says:

> Or do you just define anyone who disagrees with your views,
> whatever they base those views on, as intolerant and a darling
> of the KKK and skinhead groups?

So far I've only defined John Perazzo as that. You may join
the list if that suits you.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

446. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:50:09 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BEAE1F1.79318812@uci.edu>
Source record: 23442

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Reading comprehension problem, Jim? I mentioned three things in that paragraph;

Sure, Dwight. As I told Cecil, I am too stupid to understand anything I read on this newsgroup - if that helps you make your point of debate.

> 1. "...the laws being passed are not limited to just the FBI."

didn't say they were

> 2. "The recent "terrorist bill" gave equal authority to local law
> enforcement - the guy down the street hiding behind an overpass
> waiting to write you a speeding ticket."

Gives authority for torture? I don't think so.

> 3. "And we have no more reason to believe that any potential law
> affecting torture in this country would be limited to federal law
> enforcement agencies either."

What is a potential law?

> Where in any of that did I say "the terrorist bill authorizes torture?"

You keep talking about torture in connection with the terrorist bill. Why?

> Have you looked up the definition of "terrorist," Jim?

Nope. Though I guess you had to look up the definition of terrorist in order to know what one was. Jeez, and you think I'M stupid?

447. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:51:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BEAE23E.125D2310@uci.edu>
Source record: 23444

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Did you ask them? They were not offered any other choice.

Are we to assume from this that you asked them?

448. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 19:56:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BEAE366.120BFB46@uci.edu>
Source record: 23443

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Who said anything about law abiding citizens? Who's trying to catch law
> > abiding citizens, and why?

> Please pay attention.

Please stop molesting your nieces and nephews.

> I objected to law-abiding citizens losing
> constitutional rights in the process of trying to catch terrorists.

Do you object to terrorists losing their "constitutional rights" too?
So far, you haven't demonstrated that ANYONE has lost any rights.

> Dick said (in so many words) that we cannot catch the terrorists
> without taking constitutional freedoms away from law-abiding citizens.

Yes, and I was responding to Dwight when you jumped in to yell at me
about it.

449. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 20:11:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BEAE6F2.D6947427@uci.edu>
Source record: 23446

CAM wrote:
> You're wrong, Jim, and the threaded newsreader proves that you are
> wrong. Here are the postings in order.

What part of "I replied to Dwight" don't you understand?

450. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 20:20:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BEAE90E.2385C89@uci.edu>
Source record: 23447

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
> inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.

Don't you ever feel like a ninny for saying that kinda stuff?

Maybe you should wash the callbook out with soap. :-)

451. Re: A Correlation between CW and Competitiveness

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-08 20:21:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111081221.39cc88a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23448

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:<3be88861$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> Hey, Jim,

Who, me?

> and anyone else, just came across this on the ARRL website. It's
> the current "ARRL Web Survey" and the question is: "Did you participate in
> the 2001 CW Sweepstakes contest last weekend?"

Cool!
>
> Notice that 22.3% of the respondents thusfar are not interested in
> contesting; and
> notice that 26.1% of the respondents thusfar do not operate CW

Which means that 77.7% of the respondents thusfar ARE interested in
contesting; and 73.9% of the respondents thusfar DO operate CW

> Yes—and I worked a Clean Sweep! 1.5 % (8)

I'll do that someday.

> Yes 9.9 % (52)

That's me, 309 QSOs, 75 sections, no big deal. Really a weenie score
compared to what I've done in the past.

> No, I’m not interested in contesting 22.3 % (117)
> No, I don’t operate CW 26.1 % (137)
> No, I didn’t have the time 19.8 % (104)
> No (other) 20.2 % (106)
> Total votes: 524
>
> I wonder if there is a correlation (unproveable) along the lines of
> "attitude."

Yes. The correlation is between contesting and competitiveness.

> I wonder if competitiveness is a factor in whether one likes
> and/or uses CW?
>
Nope. I know lots of ops who love CW but hate contests, and vice
versa. No correlation there. It's not a "guy thing" either.

As W3RV says, contesting is one form of radiosport. DXing is another.
Radioorienteering is another. Some folks love competitive sports,
others hate them, etc. Healthy competition is a very good thing.

SS is a good domestic contest, but it's only 30 hours long (of which you can only operate 24) and the exchange is quite long. Last year CW SS produced over 1200 logs, and the winners worked over 1500 different stations. 1440 QSOs in 24 hours is a QSO every single minute for the entire contest period.

The DX tests, with their much longer operating periods and worldwide scope are the World Series/Super Bowl events. Last year's ARRL CW DX test got about 2900 logs, with the winners bettering 2100 QSOs.

Whether Field Day counts as a "contest" is arguable.

Contests offer a way to rapidly build operating skill and test equipment capabilities under tough conditions. The desire for higher scores has pushed the development of many ham radio technologies, like antennas, amplifiers, receiver front ends, total station integration, etc., etc. First common use of computers in hamshacks was for contest logging. These are all good things.

Wait till next year!

73 de Jim, N2EY

452. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 01:07:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011108200700.23334.00000407@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 23449

In article <3be9c67a_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>I actually support the notion of having to build a radio, to FCC
>specifications, and not a kit, to get an amateur radio license. Or,
>something like having to build and connect altogether a packet station--with
>equipment provided by the FCC or approved examiners. Or, build an antenna
>capable, without tuning, of transmitting within 3:1 or lower SWR.

Works for me.
>
>Anything, anything but testing a mode.

That's a contradiction, Kim. No ham is required to use code, and no ham is required to build a rig or antenna, or work packet. Why is it OK to test for those things but not code?

Some years back I put forth the idea here on rrap of a "Homebrew Class" license. No code test, full privileges, fairly involved written. Only one special rule: the holder of a Homebrew class license could ONLY use equipment built by the operator.

73 de Jim, N2EY

453. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 01:27:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111081727.4d81ecda@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23450

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gmfuxde.pminews@or.news.verio.net>...
> On Wed, 07 Nov 2001 09:03:58 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >Huh? That racism is the cause of the Affirmative Action program? If
> >you lived in Madison County, Texas, it would be a self apparent primary.
> >The tyranny of the majority is in full force here. If the power structure
> >here had their way, there would be no blacks employed by the local
> >government regardless of their qualifications.
>
> Good enough reason for me not to want to live in Madison County,
> Texas.
>
>
Sometimes I get the notion that it's a shame that Santa Anna lost the damned battle.
>
>
w3rv

454. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 02:12:23 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <bYGG7.163102$3d2.6256057@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23501

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BEADD0E.D93CDE51@IEEE.org...
> Good! That's a mature attitude. I think you are beginning to
> understand. Obscenity is in the eyes of the beholder.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>

Obscenity is indeed in the eye of the beholder or more precisely the mind thereof. But stupidity, immaturity, tee-hee-giggle, and the inability to string together two coherent thoughts are right out there where everyone can see them.

Dick, N&#65533;BK

455. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 03:46:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3beb59bf_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23503

I live in "county" out here--outside city or town limits. However, in town, I thought it was very interesting that the usual 30mph applies *until* the first house on the black side, then the speed increases to 40mph. Another interesting thing is the cemetery(ies). One is at one end of town and I am told that no black person is buried there; the "blacks" are buried in their own cemetery, which is on the "black" side of town. Now all this "stuff" is what I've been told by some very mean and weird acting people.

I don't ask questions.

Kim W5TIT

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BEA10AF.EEC83165@IEEE.org...
> Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > On Wed, 07 Nov 2001 09:03:58 -0600, CAM wrote:
> >
> > >Huh? That racism is the cause of the Affirmative Action program? If
> > >you lived in Madison County, Texas, it would be a self apparent
primary.
> > >The tyranny of the majority is in full force here. If the power
structure
> > >here had their way, there would be no blacks employed by the local
> > >government regardless of their qualifications.
> >
> > Good enough reason for me not to want to live in Madison County,
> > Texas.
>
> When I no longer have to take care of my parents, I'm outta here.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

456. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 03:47:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111081947.20589712@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23502

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0111071238.4fe1d2db@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0111061757.c4bb3aa@posting.google.com>...
> > Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3BE83B05.13786420@ix.netcom.com>...
> > > CAM wrote:
>
> > > Maybe it's the extras who's ham license is the top
> > > achievement on their resumes....
> > >
> > Horsepucky; The tougest radio exam I ever took was the test for the
> > Boy Scout Radio Merit badge. Not only did ya have to know the code, ya
> > also had to actually BUILD a working receiver AND explain in detail
> > exactly how every component in the radio functioned and why it was in
> > the circuit. I showed up at the merit badge counselor's lair with a
> > two tube regen and he kicked my slats in for a half hour trying to
> > trip me up on the technical details.
>
> And you were how old at the time? What grade in school?
>
>
I dunno. Twelve, maybe thirteen. Or something. I was in Aldan Junior
High when I got the Rado Merit badge. But I distinclty remember that
when I wuz in fifth grade (1948?) old lady Fisler tossed me outta her
classroom and made me sit in the hallway for dorking around trying to
find the hot spot on the Galena xtal in the radio I'd built into a
WWII USAAF headset in the back row of her classroom. I wuz always
"back row" kinda kid. Getting tossed out worked for me, there wuz a
helluva lot more space to string antennas in the hallway.
>
>
> > >
> > I'm trying to imagine the enormity of the flamefest in RRAP if the FCC
> > decided to pass out tickets only if ya actually built a radio and it
> > had to work.
>
> I'm for it. No kits, either.
>
The U.S. ham population would forthwith shink back to it's 1945 stats.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Amateur Extra since 1970

> Homebrewer since 1965
>
>
I ain't goin' there.

457. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 03:56:35 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3beb59c1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23505

That (paraphrased) is also what I have understood Dick to be saying. And, I am in agreement with Cecil: we play right into the hands of evil doers when law-abiding citizens lose constitutional rights, and I'll add civil liberties, in the process of our government trying to catch terrorists.

I even go farther, I think, than Cecil or Dwight are willing to. I agree wholeheartedly with public access situations being under strict control. Why? Because they are public access areas (football games, grocery stores, shopping centers, airports, transportation terminals, whatever), and I have a *choice* as to whether I wish to be scanned and my belongings searched going in.

But, leave out phone/wire tapping, and *any* mechanism that impinges on private life/transactions in this country--regardless of whether or not I am a citizen, naturalized citizen, here on a Visa, or whatever. Whether or not I am killed by a terrorist, I'd rather die free than under the possibility of surveillance by my own government because "someone" thinks I am a terrorist.

The current anti-terrorism Bill, while making clear that the intention is to direct the actions toward non-US citizens, does not say or imply that it is exclusive in any way to other "types" of terrorism. By the way, I still have not found a definition for terrorism.

Kim W5TIT

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BEA1222.D8DDE2E5@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Who said anything about law abiding citizens? Who's trying to catch law
> > abiding citizens, and why?
>
> Please pay attention. I objected to law-abiding citizens losing
> constitutional rights in the process of trying to catch terrorists.
> Dick said (in so many words) that we cannot catch the terrorists
> without taking constitutional freedoms away from law-abiding citizens.
> I said his approach was playing right into the hands of the terrorists
> and that law-abiding citizens need not lose any constitutional rights
> during the process of catching the terrorists.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!

> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

458. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 04:05:04 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3beb59c3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23506

Thank goodness, Robert! Dwight, sometimes the best way to avoid an "enemy" is to know them--very, very well. What better way to do that than read their literature, websites, etc.?

Kim W5TIT

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3BEAD864.12CA983D@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > Robert Casey wrote:
> > >
> > > In that case Dwight, surf over to
> >
> > No thanks. The web sites you seem familiar with, right down to the
> > actual URL addresses, don't interest me.
> >
>
> All I did was a web search on "klux klan". I don't subscribe to
> their views.
>

459. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 04:19:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3beb59c5_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23504

To me, testing a mode "singles" out a mode and creates the very situation which exists today in the huge debate of CW vs. no-CW.

To leave CW as a testing phase of licensing does not prove (or disprove in the case of failure) one's aptitude for anything related to ham radio--other than CW use. It does not prove credibility in the area of operation, ability to properly operate, or anything to do with safety.

If a "construction" project of some sort were to be brought into the testing arena, it at least proves that the ham is aware of FCC specifications, rules, regulations, and guidelines. While it is not required that I build anything once I am a ham--a successful building project that meets specifications of the FCC will assure the FCC--and *should* assure hams--that the new licensee at least knows something about the R&R.

PLUS I think getting rid of CW testing without something to take its place will really piss off a bunch of people. I'm willing to have CW testing ousted, and feel that a building project is a more favorable way to "test" one's commitment to ham radio. Hence, I would be out--because I truly just want to know the R&R, buy what I need to operate, aren't the slightest bit interested in why things work, and so would not really expend the effort to build anything for a license, either. CW, to me, was a piece of cake compared to having to learn anything related to getting RF power from Point A to Point B without blowing anything up.

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011108200700.23334.00000407@nso-da.aol.com...
> In article <3be9c67a_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >I actually support the notion of having to build a radio, to FCC
> >specifications, and not a kit, to get an amateur radio license. Or,
> >something like having to build and connect altogether a packet
station--with
> >equipment provided by the FCC or approved examiners. Or, build an
antenna
> >capable, without tuning, of transmitting within 3:1 or lower SWR.
>
> Works for me.
> >
> >Anything, anything but testing a mode.
>
> That's a contradiction, Kim. No ham is required to use code, and no ham is

> required to build a rig or antenna, or work packet. Why is it OK to test
for
> those things but not code?
>
> Some years back I put forth the idea here on rrap of a "Homebrew Class"
> license. No code test, full privileges, fairly involved written. Only one
> special rule: the holder of a Homebrew class license could ONLY use
equipment
> built by the operator.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

460. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 04:26:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BEB5AFE.DFDBDBF1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23507

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I assume that you meant that you are *not* talking about Federal jobs.
>
> Yep, I changed it from "wasn't" to present tense and forgot the "not".
>
> > Fine. So if a teacher does not meet the standards set for a teaching
> > job in your area, you feel that it is fine to reduce the standards and
> > allow an unqualified person teach your kids.
>
> That's absolutely not what I said. What I said was that exceptionally
> qualified black teachers were passed over so the job could be given
> to some school board member's unqualified dumb $hit white cousin.
> I would rather have a qualified black person teaching my children any
> day than have some dumb $hit low-IQ white idiot teaching them.

But, Cecil, Affirmative Action is a quota system which lowers standards
for those incapable of meeting the standards which stood in place.
Civil Service, by the way, does not only refer to Federal Jobs but to
state, county and local governmental jobs. I'd rather have an
intelligent teacher teaching my kid than someone who could not pass the
teacher's exam. My statement does not address color.

> I'm sorry you seem to support such a racist system. I'm glad
> to see that system has been corrected to a large extent. Before you
> object, why are you allowed to jump to irrational conclusions and
> I'm not?

I'm sorry that you seem such an uncomprehending fool too.
By the way, are you ever going to get around to admitting that your
statement comparing Morse testing and Affirmative Action was 180 degrees
out of phase?

> > If it is an underground organization, why would they let you in on the
> > secret?
>
> I acted like an MFSOB so they thought I was one of them.

Yes you do. Does that have anything to do with amateur radio?

Dave K8MN

461. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 04:58:57 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sfnpr0192@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23512

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:bYGG7.163102$3d2.6256057@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Obscenity is indeed in the eye of the beholder or more precisely the mind
> thereof. But stupidity, immaturity, tee-hee-giggle, and the inability to
> string together two coherent thoughts are right out there where everyone
can
> see them.
>
> Dick, N&#65533;BK

And a handfull of comedians have earned fame, not to mention millions of dollars, by going for such cheap laughs. Maybe some people aren't as imature as what you think they are.

462. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 05:07:47 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <DwJG7.18486$xS6.29965@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23508

Kim-W5TIT SAYS:

> I'm willing to have CW testing ousted, and feel that a building
> project is a more favorable way to "test" one's commitment to
> ham radio.

"Commitment" has nothing to do with it.

Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write
something like:

" A really tough written test would surely separate those
who really have an interest in the hobby.", or..

" Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's
dedication to the service.", or..

" I think it is effective at minimizing the undesireables.",
or..

" ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming is
making it something to work for.", or..

463. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 05:15:28 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <QDJG7.18495$xS6.29626@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23510

Kim-W5TIT says:

> I'm willing to have CW testing ousted, and feel that a building
> project is a more favorable way to "test" one's commitment to
> ham radio.

"Commitment" has nothing to do with it.

Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write
something like:

" A really tough written test would surely separate those
who really have an interest in the hobby.", or..

" Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's
dedication to the service.", or..

" I think it is effective at minimizing the undesireables.",
or..

" ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming is
making it something to work for.", or..

464. Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 05:15:29 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <bafb68618bb2b55efa7de1f684fa9ecb.12989@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23509
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I am wondering if Mr. Hollingsworth is paying more attention to some of our maritime and traffic nets since Sept 11th?

Am I the only one who sees a connection? I mean I think that some of these terrorists could have valid ham tickets and use these nets to pass traffic related to thier acts of terror. Should we exmaine the ranks of the nets and see who is middle-eastern and be on the look-out? I think its time we did.

--
Posted from 1cust9.tnt1.athens.al.da.uu.net [63.16.138.9]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

465. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 05:19:19 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <a5dce8442e84e9c7a059cc0f1ac92442.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd Davies" wrote in message:

> I am wondering if Mr. Hollingsworth is paying more attention
> to some of our maritime and traffic nets since Sept 11th?
>
> Am I the only one who sees a connection?

Yes, you probably are the only one.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from [204.31.48.54]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

466. Re: Dropping the code. (Third msg attempt!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 05:24:35 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <b87371eb0c84bab04378b743ba750e9c.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23513

Previous two attempts to send this message were truncated
by the newsreader gizmo......

"Kim-W5TIT" says:

> I'm willing to have CW testing ousted, and feel that a
> building project is a more favorable way to "test"
> one's commitment to ham radio.

"Commitment" has nothing to do with it.

Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write
something like:

" A really tough written test would surely separate those
who really have an interest in the hobby.", or..

" Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's
dedication to the service.", or..

" I think it is effective at minimizing the undesireables.",
or..

" ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming is
making it something to work for.", or..
.
"My opinion is that any obstacle you put in the way to any
achievement guarantees that only those with dedication and
strong interest will get there."

All of the above quotations, gathered from RRAP threads, were
made by serious and well-intentioned licensees who want the best
for the Amateur Radio Service.

All of the above quotations also completely miss the mark, in
that they suggest that the examination process is the key to
ensuring that "the right kind of people" (those who are
"worthy") become licensed and, by extension, that "the wrong
kind of people" get filtered out.

First, the testing procedure is an "entrance" exam, not a
"graduation" exam.

Second, while "interest", "dedication", and "hard work" are
certainly hallmarks of good amateurs, the FCC and ITU regulations
do not specify levels of interest, dedication, hard work or other
measures of "worthiness" as requisites for a license. Therefor it
is not the function of the examination process to determine (even

if it could) if an applicant is "worthy" but rather to determine if he/she is QUALIFIED to use the spectrum assigned. There should be no "dumbing down", but neither can there be a requirement that the examination process screens out applicants who lack "commitment".

Don't get me wrong here, folks. I believe that the examination process ought to be rigorous enough to determine proper knowledge and skills so that a new licensee does not inadvertently trash the bands, hurt themselves, or harm other users/uses of the spectrum. I am not even suggesting that Morse testing is a "good thing" or a "poor idea". But I have no expectation that ANY examination can filter out "unworthy" applicants who lack the proper "commitment", "dedication" or "motivation".

Even if it could, who then would become the arbiter of "worthy"?

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from [204.31.48.54]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

467. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 06:01:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011109010104.23421.00001647@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 23514

>Subject: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?
>From: "Lloyd Davies" lloyd_vfp@msn.com
>Date: 11/8/2001 11:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <bafb68618bb2b55efa7de1f684fa9ecb.12989@mygate.mailgate.org>

>Am I the only one who sees a connection? I mean I think that some of these
>terrorists could have valid ham tickets and use these nets to pass traffic
>related to thier acts of terror.

I think you are in a drug induced, alcohol exacerbated worm-hole of
stupidity, and the idea doesn't warrant wiping with used TP.

What Clancy novel did you drag this out of, Porkchop?

468. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 06:01:47 UTC
From: markv@peewee.telescopemaking.org
Message-ID: <slrn9umsm5.2cr.markv@peewee.telescopemaking.org>
Source record: 23515

```
In article <Pine.GSO.4.10.10111060400420.21206-100000@cluster2>, Dana wrote:
> When they drop the code all together, you won't have nothing but a bunch
> of low lifes and red necks on the bands just like the "CB" band is and was
> 20 years ago. The 75 meter band is like that now. I was tuning around on
> there listening last night, and some fellow ham broke into a conversation
> on there, and the group was verry rude to him. The 75 meter band is
> clandish, and if you don't fit into there little click, then you are dead
> Good buddy.

Yeah, since they dropped the code requirement to operate on 75m, the
quality has really gone down.

Oh. Wait.

Would you like to rethink your premise?

--
main(){char*p="vandewettering.net";printf("\33[?38h\33\14\35\35(z)O\"oO!kHa(F "
"yFy,D!aDj+D\"j*](q])q+Dz,D*bDb)J\"\177&G*b\"_b F)zFq!I(qQ\"{Q!mIa E yEy#O!aOn"
"\"M\"{D(pD y%%Uy\\(z)O\35*b6Ib3M)zMt4GgN(fE#a2C'y/_(|P)kMy0AzN*bNb,W)zWq-P(k."
"F t1Ut\\(p5@)rRz6I*bI\35+w!@\37mark@%s\35*~@\37http://%s\33\3",p,p);}
```

469. Guide to the rec.radio Newsgroups

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 06:17:36 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <9sfse0pof1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 23516
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Archive-name: radio/personal-intro

This message describes the rec.radio.amateur.*, rec.radio.cb, rec.radio.info, and rec.radio.swap newsgroups, as well as their Internet mailing list counterparts and complements. It is intended to serve as a guide for the new reader on what to find where. Questions and comments may be directed to Jeffrey Herman, KH6O, jeffreyh@hawaii.edu, or Paul Schleck, K3FU, pschleck@novia.net.

This message was last changed on 14 March, 1998.

History
=======

Way back when, before there was a Usenet, the Internet hosted a mailing list for hams, called (appropriately enough) INFO-HAMS. Ham radio discussions were held on the mailing list, and sent to the mailboxes of those who had signed up for it. When the Usenet software was created, and net news as we now know it was developed, a newsgroup was created for hams: net.ham-radio. The mailing list and the newsgroup were gatewayed together, eventually.

Over the years, as the net grew, the volume of discussion became progressively higher. First one by one, and then as part of two reorganizations, what was once one group became many. In the process, developments elsewhere on the net were reflected in the groups as they were created, most notably the change to place all of the ham radio groups in one hierarchy.

The collection of newsgroups continues to grow as more people join the net, and as more topics of discussion gain volume, I expect to see more groups be created as well. This follows what is happening on the rest of the net.

Nearly all of the radio newsgroups have corresponding mailing lists, the notable exception being rec.radio.swap. There are also a few mailing lists that don't have newsgroups.

The Current Groups
==================

It's important to post messages to the group that's appropriate for them, and not to the groups that aren't. The whole idea of having different newsgroups is so that folks who aren't interested in, say, homebrewing, don't have to wade through messages about homebrewing on the way to read about Field Day. Posting appropriately is just good etiquette.

The rec.radio.amateur.misc group is the catchall. It is what rec.ham-radio was renamed to during the first major reorganization. Any amateur radio-related message that's not more appropriate in one of the other groups belongs here, from contesting to DX to ragchewing on VHF to information on becoming a ham.

The group rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc is for discussions related to (surprise!) digital amateur radio. This doesn't have to be the common two-meter AX.25 variety of packet radio, either; some of the most knowledgeable folks in radio digital communications can be found here, and anything in the general area is welcome. The name was changed to emphasize this, and to encourage discussion not only of other text-based digital modes, such as AMTOR, RTTY, and Clover, but things like digital voice and video as well. The former group, rec.radio.amateur.packet, was removed on September 21st, 1993. It is obsolete, and you should use .digital.misc instead (or the appropriate new mailing list, mentioned below). The group has .misc as part of the name to allow further specialization if the users wish it, such as .digital.tcp-ip.

The swap group is rec.radio.swap. This recognizes a fact that became evident shortly after the original group was formed: Hams don't just swap ham radio gear, and other folks besides hams swap ham equipment. If you have radio equipment, or test gear, or computer stuff that hams would be interested in, here's the place. Equipment wanted postings belong here too. Discussions about the equipment generally don't; if you wish to discuss a particular posting with the buyer, email is a much better way to do it, and the other groups, especially .equipment and .homebrew, are the place for public discussions. There is now a regular posting with information on how to go about buying and selling items in rec.radio.swap; please refer to it before you post there. To answer a frequently asked question: No, there is no mailing list that goes along with this group. If you can't read Usenet news directly, you're out of luck.

The group rec.radio.amateur.policy was created as a place for all the discussions that seem to drag on interminably about the many rules, regulations, legalities, and policies that surround amateur radio, both existing and proposed. Recent changes to the Amateur Radio Rules (FCC Part 97) have finally laid to rest the Great Usenet Pizza Autopatch Debate - it's now legal to order a pizza on the autopatch, if you're not in the pizza business - as well as complaints about now-preempted local scanner laws hostile to amateurs, but plenty of discussion about what a bunch of rotten no-goodniks the local frequency coordinating body is, as well as the neverending no-code debate, may still be found here.

The group rec.radio.cb is the place for all discussion about the Citizens' Band radio service. Such discussions have been very inflammatory in rec.ham-radio in the past; please do not cross-post to both rec.radio.cb and rec.radio.amateur.* unless the topic is genuinely of interest to both hams and CBers - and very few topics are.

The rec.radio.info group is just what its name implies: it's the place where informational messages from across rec.radio.* may be found, regardless of where else they're posted. As of this writing, information

posted to the group includes Cary Oler's daily solar progagation bulletins, ARRL bulletins, the Frequently Asked Questions files for the various groups, and radio modification instructions. This group is moderated, so you cannot post to it directly; if you try, even if your message is crossposted to one of the other groups, your message will be mailed to the moderator, who is currently David Dodell, WB7TPY. The email address for submissions to the group is rec.radio.info-moderator@primenet.com. Inquires and other adminis- trivia should be directed to rec.radio.info-request@primenet.com. For more information about rec.radio.info, consult the introduction and posting guidelines that are regularly posted to that newsgroup.

The groups r.r.amateur.antenna, .boatanchors, .dx, .equipment, .homebrew, and .space are for more specialized areas of ham radio: discussions about antennas, the older tube based amateur, military, and commercial gear, commercially-made equipment, homebrewing, and amateur radio space operations. The .equipment group is NOT the place for buying or selling equipment; that's what rec.radio.swap is for. Similarly, the .space group is specifically about amateur radio in space, such as the OSCAR program and SAREX, the Shuttle Amateur Radio EXperiment; other groups cover other aspects of satellites and space. Homebrewing isn't about making your own alcoholic beverages at home (that's rec.crafts.brewing), but rather construction of radio and electronic equipment by the amateur experimenter. The .dx group is devoted to long distance amateur communications. Each of these subgroups has its own charter and FAQ; please refer to the archives to find these documents.

Except for rec.radio.swap and rec.radio.cb, all of these newsgroups are available by Internet electronic mail in digest format; send a mail message containing "help" on a line by itself to listserv@ucsd.edu for instructions on how to use the mail server.

All of the groups can be posted to by electronic mail, though, by using a gateway at the University of Texas at Austin. To post a message this way, change the name of the group you wish to post to by replacing all of the '.'s with '-'s - for example, rec.radio.swap becomes rec-radio-swap - and send to that name@cs.utexas.edu (rec-radio-swap@cs.utexas.edu, for example). You may crosspost by including multiple addresses as Cc: entries (but see below). This gateway's continued availability is at the pleasure of the admins at UT-Austin, and is subject to going away at any time - and especially if forgeries and other net.abuses become a problem. You have been warned.

Mailing Lists
==========

In addition to the mailing lists that mirror the Usenet newsgroups, there also are a few that stand alone. These cover specific areas of ham radio, and discussion is focused on just those areas. PLEASE BE SURE TO SAVE THE WELCOME MESSAGE YOU RECEIVE AFTER SUBSCRIBING -- IT WILL CONTAIN IMPORTANT INFO REGARDING UNSUBSCRIBING!

The cq-contest mailing list is for discussions of contesting in ham radio. To join, send an email to cq-contesting-request@contesting.com.

The DX mailing list covers the finer points of DXing. This one is also joined by mailing "subscribe" on a line by itself, this time to dx-request@unbc.edu.

There's also a VHF mailing list, for VHF operators of the weak signal persuasion. You can join this one be sending "subscribe vhf" on a line by itself to vhf-request@w6yx.stanford.edu.

The QRP-L list is devoted to building and operating gear at low-power outputs. To subscribe, send an email to listproc@lehigh.edu and only write: subscribe qrp-l Your Name.

The TopBand e-list is devoted to all areas of operation on 160m. To subscribe, send an email to majordomo@contesting.com and only write: subscribe topband and follow the instructions you'll be sent. This site, contesting.com, also hosts a couple dozen other ham-related e-lists. Use the above address, and only write: lists to get the entire index.

The Boatanchors e-list is devoted to the older tube-based ham, military, and commercial communications gear. To subscribe, send an email to: listserv@listserv.tempe.gov and only write: subscribe boatanchors

For homebuilding transmitters and receivers using tube technology, there is the Glowbugs e-list; send an email to: majordomo@piobaire.mines.uidaho.edu and only write: subscribe glowbugs <your@address.here>

The VHF DX discussion list can be accessed by sending an email to: majordomo@blacksheep.org and only writing: subscribe VHF-DX-discuss.

We now have a list devoted to amateur radio history. To subscribe, send an email to: ham-radio-history-subscribe@egroups.com - leave the body of the message blank.

Qth.net hosts over 100 ham-related e-lists, including lists devoted to each state, manufacturer, mode, band - too many to state here. Send an email to majordomo@qth.net and only write: lists to get the complete index.

For one of the most complete indexes of email lists, see the excellent web site http://pw2.netcom.com/~ac6v/pageae.html

Please do NOT send subscription requests to the mailing lists themselves; that doesn't work very often, and is very annoying to those on the list. Also, please keep your electronic mail address current with any mailing lists you subscribe to, as dealing with returned email is a nuisance for the person maintaining the mailing list.

A Few Words on Crossposting
==========

Please do not crosspost messages to two or more groups unless there is genuine interest in both groups in the topic being discussed, and when you do, please include a header line of the form "Followup-To: group.name" in your article's headers (before the first blank line). This will cause followups to your article to go to the group listed in the Followup-To: line. If you wish to have replies to go to you by email, rather than be posted, use the word "poster" instead of the name of a group. Such a line appears in the headers of this article.

One of the few examples of productive cross-posting is with the rec.radio.info newsgroup. To provide a filtered presentation of information articles, while still maintaining visibility in their home newsgroups, the moderator strongly encourages cross-posting. All information articles should be submitted to the rec.radio.info moderator so that he may simultaneously cross-post your information to the appropriate newsgroups. Most newsreaders will only present the article once, and network bandwidth is conserved since only one article is propagated. If you make regular informational postings, and have made arrangements with the moderator to post directly to the group, please cross-post as appropriate.

--
Jeffrey Herman, KH6O

--
Telecommunication Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard University of Hawaii System
jherman @ d14.uscg.mil jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

470. Veteran's Day, 2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 08:08:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011109030804.16759.00002598@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 23517

Well, this year certainly finds us in a strange, new world, doesn't it? I don't think there is a veteran alive who could have ever (realistically) concieved of the events tht have occured in our Great Nation, but they have, and a terrible war has been brought home to us. We did not ask for it, but it is here and we have responded. Once more into the battle....

For those of us who have served overseas and under arms, I don't think there is a one of us that "welcome" another conflict. I for one continually hope that "this one" will be the one to open other's eyes as to the horrors of war, but even with nearly-instant reporting of the horrific results of it, it never seems to be enough...

How sad.

I find it hard to say "happy" Veterans Day...What can be "happy" about remembering that someone, somewhere had to die in order for there to BE a "Veteran's" day...

So to each of you who have served under arms, conscripted or volunteer, in peace or war, "declared" or not, I say "thank-you". Thank you for your service and Thank-you for your sacrifice. It is appreciated more than you could ever know.

Steven J Robeson, LPN
Gunnery Sergeant, USMC (ret'd)
Winchester, Tennessee
Amateur Radio Station K4YZ

471. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 10:36:52 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8lOG7.178915$W8.6066592@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23518

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9sfnpr0192@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:bYGG7.163102$3d2.6256057@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Obscenity is indeed in the eye of the beholder or more precisely the
mind
> > thereof. But stupidity, immaturity, tee-hee-giggle, and the inability
to
> > string together two coherent thoughts are right out there where everyone
> can
> > see them.
> >
> > Dick, N�BK
>
> And a handfull of comedians have earned fame, not to mention millions of
> dollars, by going for such cheap laughs. Maybe some people aren't as
imature
> as what you think they are.

Maybe their grammar is not right out of the hills.

472. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 11:04:48 UTC
From: Reg Edwards <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <9sgd76slj2@plutonium.btinternet.com>
Source record: 23519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> Am I the only one who sees a connection? I mean I think that
some of these
> terrorists could have valid ham tickets and use these nets to
pass traffic
> related to thier acts of terror. Should we exmaine the ranks of
the nets and
> see who is middle-eastern and be on the look-out? I think its
time we did.
==========

And don't forget to look under the bed before climbing into it.

473. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 11:20:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011109062052.20853.00000392@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23520

In article <d22b54c3.0111081947.20589712@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> > Horsepucky; The tougest radio exam I ever took was the test for the
>> > Boy Scout Radio Merit badge. Not only did ya have to know the code, ya
>> > also had to actually BUILD a working receiver AND explain in detail
>> > exactly how every component in the radio functioned and why it was in
>> > the circuit. I showed up at the merit badge counselor's lair with a
>> > two tube regen and he kicked my slats in for a half hour trying to
>> > trip me up on the technical details.
>>
>> And you were how old at the time? What grade in school?
>>
>>
>I dunno. Twelve, maybe thirteen. Or something. I was in Aldan Junior
>High when I got the Rado Merit badge. But I distinclty remember that
>when I wuz in fifth grade (1948?) old lady Fisler tossed me outta her
>classroom and made me sit in the hallway for dorking around trying to
>find the hot spot on the Galena xtal in the radio I'd built into a
>WWII USAAF headset in the back row of her classroom. I wuz always
>"back row" kinda kid. Getting tossed out worked for me, there wuz a
>helluva lot more space to string antennas in the hallway.

HAW! That's a good one!

Point I'm making is that the "build-a-radio" test has been done by preteenagers and is no big deal if a kid wants to do it bad enough.

>> > I'm trying to imagine the enormity of the flamefest in RRAP if the FCC
>> > decided to pass out tickets only if ya actually built a radio and it
>> > had to work.
>>
>> I'm for it. No kits, either.
>>
>The U.S. ham population would forthwith shink back to it's 1945 stats.

Ayup.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Amateur Extra since 1970
>> Homebrewer since 1965
>>
>>
>I ain't goin' there.
>

You been there, done that. Me too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

474. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 11:50:51 UTC
From: Ken Tough <ken@objectech.co.uk>
Message-ID: <TWzXpnAbM867EwGS@artslink.co.za>
Source record: 23531
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Lloyd Davies <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:

>I am wondering if Mr. Hollingsworth is paying more attention to some of our
>maritime and traffic nets since Sept 11th?
>
>Am I the only one who sees a connection? I mean I think that
>some of these terrorists could have valid ham tickets and use
>these nets to pass traffic related to thier acts of terror.
>Should we exmaine the ranks of the nets and see who is middle-eastern
>and be on the look-out? I think its time we did.

You may well be right, but given the apparent proportion of
whackos on shortwave it may be nigh on impossible to sort
out the ones of interest. Then again, wouldn't it be a bit like
using a licensed gun to commit your crime? Why would they bother
to have a license?

--
Ken Tough

475. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 12:38:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEBCE4F.6B522E43@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23521

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Thank goodness, Robert! Dwight,
> sometimes the best way to avoid
> an "enemy" is to know them--very,
> very well. What better way to do
> that than read their literature,
> websites, etc.?

True, but I've seen that type before. I'm just not into extremism - on either side. I don't buy the BS from the KKK/skinhead fanatics and I don't buy the BS from the "diversity and tolerance" fanatics. In the end, both groups of fanatics are just about the same - no diversity of opinion allowed and intolerant of any views other than their own.

I tend to sway more towards the middle. For example, there are problems for each racial group in this country ("blacks" and "whites" for example). And unless we honestly address these problems equally, they are not ever going to end. Sadly, both of the groups above don't seem to realize that - the KKK/skinhead fanatics point fingers at the "blacks" while the "diversity and tolerance" fanatics point fingers at the "whites." In reality, the rest of us in the middle should be pointing fingers at both of these groups - and extremism in general.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

476. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 13:03:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011109080328.24612.00000472@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 23522

In article <3beb59c5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>To me, testing a mode "singles" out a mode and creates the very situation
>which exists today in the huge debate of CW vs. no-CW.

It's not even a debate to most hams. And the FCC has made it clear where they stand on it.

Your proposal to test a packet setup singles out a mode, too.
>
>To leave CW as a testing phase of licensing does not prove (or disprove in
>the case of failure) one's aptitude for anything related to ham radio--other
>than CW use.

A CW test is only needed for access to the HF/MF ham bands. CW use is VERY related to ham radio in those bands.

The test determines whether the person being tested has a very minimal skill level, too.

> It does not prove credibility in the area of operation,
>ability to properly operate, or anything to do with safety.

Neither do the current written tests.
>
>If a "construction" project of some sort were to be brought into the testing
>arena, it at least proves that the ham is aware of FCC specifications,
>rules, regulations, and guidelines.

How?

>While it is not required that I build
>anything once I am a ham--a successful building project that meets
>specifications of the FCC will assure the FCC--and *should* assure
>hams--that the new licensee at least knows something about the R&R.

Maybe - but the simple tests you propose don't do that.
>
>PLUS I think getting rid of CW testing without something to take its place
>will really piss off a bunch of people. I'm willing to have CW testing
>ousted, and feel that a building project is a more favorable way to "test"
>one's commitment to ham radio. Hence, I would be out--because I truly just
>want to know the R&R, buy what I need to operate, aren't the slightest bit
>interested in why things work, and so would not really expend the effort to
>build anything for a license, either.

The only way folks would be out would be if mandatory retesting were instituted. Not gonna happen.

>CW, to me, was a piece of cake
>compared to having to learn anything related to getting RF power from Point
>A to Point B without blowing anything up.
>
That's what transmission lines are for.

On top of all this, such testing would be too dependent on the subjective judgement of the VEs. These days such tests simply wouldn't get through federal regs.

--

How about this idea:

Divide the bands into three segments: CW, digital, analog voice. Separate licenses for each moce - if a prospective ham wants access to the parts of the bands used for certain modes, they have to pass tests on just those modes. All hams have to pass a basic test on safety and general regs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

477. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 13:06:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEBD4C8.F60E959A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23523

Krell wrote:
>
> I don't know who John Perazzo is.

Read the book, Krell.

http://www.atlasbooks.com/marktplc/00548.htm

"John Perazzo has marshaled compelling facts and persuasive arguments showing that what was once a moral struggle for civil rights has turned into a racial spoils system. The Myths That Divide Us shows where we've gone wrong and what needs to be done to accomplish the original goals of the civil-rights movement." --Dr. Walter E. Williams, Distinguished Professor of Economics at George Mason University

"John Perazzo's book blasts us beyond the myths of 'racism' with a shocking incandescence of truth that will inspire all who do not have a political stake in the lies of hate." --George Gilder, author of Wealth and Poverty

"Perazzo exposes the hypocrisies of 'civil rights leaders' like Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, Louis Farrakhan, and Leonard Jeffries in the most devastating of waysï¿½by using their own words and deeds. His case is backed by a seemingly endless string of anecdotes, facts, and statistics. This book is well researched and a valuable resource for anyone involved in the race debate." --Andrew Oliver, National Review

"The myth that most divides us is the myth that whites are relentlessly racist, that virtually all the failures of blacks can be explained by the anti-black malice that permeates America. John Perazzo dissects this myth with the coolness of a surgeon and the passion of a patriot. Our country can make no progress in race relations until we grasp the hard truths this book so eloquently lays bare." --Jared Taylor, author of Paved With Good Intentions: The Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America

"John Perazzo's The Myths That Divide Us attempts to restore common sense and decency to issues lost in a sea of wishful, self-serving thinkers." --Phil Mushnick, New York Post

"Perazzo is a skilled writer who puts forth a most convincing argument that Martin Luther King's dream and worthy principles of racial harmony have been suborned and perverted by self-serving civil rights leaders who find racist bugaboos everywhere, everyday, to justify their own positions, power, financial backing, and political influence. Moreover, he shows how any critic who challenges them is immediately labeled a racist." --Independent Publisher

478. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 14:04:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEBE265.FA4A4A68@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23524

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > But it is interesting how you
> > describe it. Is it really that casual
> > to get changes like the logging and
> > notification you mention started? Have
> > you ever considered a book on the day
> > to day inner workings of the agency?
>
> Would make a good web page if it doesn't
> warrant a book, though.

I agree.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

479. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 14:11:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEBE3F6.5AB3C450@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23525

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Nope. Though I guess you had to
> look up the definition of terrorist
> in order to know what one was. Jeez,
> and you think I'M stupid?

Okay, Jim. Since you're just being silly at this point, I'll let
that go.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

480. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 14:18:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEBE588.E79B84AA@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23526

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > Which they overwhelming prefer
> > > to Sadam Husein, by the way.
> >
> > Did you ask them? They were
> > not offered any other choice.
>
> Are we to assume from this that
> you asked them?

No, but I didn't make a statement about their preferences - you did.
So, I'll repeat again, since you say they overwhelming prefer the
current monarchy to Sadam Husein, did you ask them? Or is that just
your opinion of what they prefer?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

481. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 14:26:33 UTC
From: CJ <cjr@visi.com>
Message-ID: <3BEBE799.9B032B05@visi.com>
Source record: 23527
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Lloyd Davies" wrote in message:
>
> > I am wondering if Mr. Hollingsworth is paying more attention
> > to some of our maritime and traffic nets since Sept 11th?
> >
> > Am I the only one who sees a connection?
>
> Yes, you probably are the only one.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> --
> Posted from [204.31.48.54]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

Yes, I'm sure thats so, too.

Hi, Hans. Good to see a post from you again.

73, CJ K0CJ

482. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 14:43:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111090643.698c9da5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23528

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3BEAAF58.603F3EEE@sccoast.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > I think you are quite mistaken, Dwight.
> > Riley is essentially the "cop on the
> > beat" - his influence is limited to
> > choosing which cases to go after most
> > aggressively. One of the check and
> > balance protections of our governmental
> > system is division of enforcement power
> > between lawmakers, courts and LEOs.
>
>
> Well, to be honest, I don't know for sure one way or the other.

I think it all depends on what the implications of a rule change are. It is clear from inspection of the callsign database that there are some calls that the FCC does not routinely issue. Look up calls ending in TIS or TIU, and you'll see almost all of them issued. Most of them are not vanity calls, either. Look up Kim's suffix and you'll see very few issued. The policy is obvious - certain calls are only issued if the licensee asks for them and is entitled via the vanity call rules. Kim ASKED for and paid for that call.

Refusing to issue that call, or trying to revoke it, would put the FCC in a tough spot. All other calls with the same suffix would have to be revoked or refused, too. Kim might have a really good discrimination case - after all, the person holding the W6 version has held it for more than two decades. She obviously doesn't find it offensive, and could probably produce lots of witnesses from the local amatuer radio community supporting that view. Riley & Co. know better than to get involved in such murky waters. Plenty of worse violations to go after. Look at the W6NUT repeater mess.

> It
> just seems to me that someone as visible as Riley has been over the
> last few years would at least have some influence with those
> responsible for the rules.

I'm sure he has some influence in how the rules are enforced and interpreted. But any decent LEO will tell ya that ya go after the clearcut big violators first. Specially when resources are so limited. And key elements in deciding what to go after is "who is being hurt?" and "what complaints have been filed?". Has anyone who has heard Kim's

call ON THE AIR actually complained to the FCC? I don't think so. End of story.

We only have Riley because the ARRL and others begged for YEARS to get him.

73 de Jim, N2EY

483. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 15:11:32 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sgrkr02u05@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23529
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd Davies" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:bafb68618bb2b55efa7de1f684fa9ecb.12989@mygate.mailgate.org...
> I am wondering if Mr. Hollingsworth is paying more attention to some of
our
> maritime and traffic nets since Sept 11th?
>
> Am I the only one who sees a connection? I mean I think that some of
these
> terrorists could have valid ham tickets and use these nets to pass traffic
> related to thier acts of terror. Should we exmaine the ranks of the nets
and
> see who is middle-eastern and be on the look-out? I think its time we
did.

I would tend to believe this if the recent raids would have produced ham radio equipment. I don't know if they have or not. Your idea is nothing more than speculation at this point.

484. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 15:21:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sgs7r02v4g@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23532

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:8lOG7.178915$W8.6066592@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

> > And a handfull of comedians have earned fame, not to mention millions of
> > dollars, by going for such cheap laughs. Maybe some people aren't as
> imature
> > as what you think they are.
>
> Maybe their grammar is not right out of the hills.

At 1:00am, I'm usually not concerned about grammar and typos, especially
anything I write on this newsgroup.

But it is interesting that you chose to respond not to what I said, but to
how I said it.

485. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 15:31:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sgsqm0300v@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23533

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BEBD4C8.F60E959A@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > I don't know who John Perazzo is.
>
>
> Read the book, Krell.

Funny how you only quoted the first sentence of my post. You remind me of those loudmouths in meetings that have to dominate the entire discussion. If anyone trys to say anything contrary, they get shouted down after their first two words.

486. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 15:46:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEBFA43.2B3BE75D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23530

Dave Heil wrote:
> But, Cecil, Affirmative Action is a quota system which lowers standards
> for those incapable of meeting the standards which stood in place.

The problem that Affirmative Action was trying to solve was just the
opposite - fully qualified individuals not being employed because of
their skin color. In places, the pendulum has swung the other way.
That's unfortunate but the predictable outcome of racism. Racism is
directly responsible for the Affirmative Action program.

> I'm sorry that you seem such an uncomprehending fool too.

I was simply treating you the way you were treating me. You
engaged in mind fornication toward me. I mirrored that action
right back at you.

> By the way, are you ever going to get around to admitting that your
> statement comparing Morse testing and Affirmative Action was 180 degrees
> out of phase?

They are both social engineering programs, Dave. In that way,
they are entirely similar. Not enough blacks on the police force.
Not enough Morse code operators. Why do you attempt to deny reality?
Morse code seems to some not to have enough merit to survive in a
free market of modes. That's exactly like Affirmative Action.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

487. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 16:30:47 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BEC059B.4040500@att.net>
Source record: 23534

N2EY wrote:

> How about this idea:
>
> Divide the bands into three segments: CW, digital, analog voice. Separate
> licenses for each moce - if a prospective ham wants access to the parts of the
> bands used for certain modes, they have to pass tests on just those modes. All
> hams have to pass a basic test on safety and general regs.
>

Hi Jim...

I think you mean 4 tests... three licenses... and the path is first the 'safety and regs' test then... whichever of three separate licenses in any order... correct?

This sounds like a great and simple solution... mmmm... now what are we missing... (can't be that easy...)

Rich

488. Re: Poignant Piece

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 17:16:47 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9sh2n4snn1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 23536

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BEBE588.E79B84AA@sccoast.net...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Are we to assume from this that
> > you asked them?

> No, but I didn't make a statement about their preferences - you did.
> So, I'll repeat again, since you say they overwhelming prefer the
> current monarchy to Sadam Husein, did you ask them? Or is that just
> your opinion of what they prefer?

Yes, mine, and the United Nations - based on their request for assistance to
rid their land of his army.

489. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 17:19:35 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9sh2sd$so3$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 23537

I certainly understand the sentiment. On the other hand, in the event of a follow-up tragedy, the American public would expect to have been protected. That is the purpose of the actions that are now being taken.

Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:3beb59c1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> That (paraphrased) is also what I have understood Dick to be saying. And, I
> am in agreement with Cecil: we play right into the hands of evil doers when
> law-abiding citizens lose constitutional rights, and I'll add civil
> liberties, in the process of our government trying to catch terrorists.
>
> I even go farther, I think, than Cecil or Dwight are willing to. I agree
> wholeheartedly with public access situations being under strict control.
> Why? Because they are public access areas (football games, grocery stores,
> shopping centers, airports, transportation terminals, whatever), and I have
> a *choice* as to whether I wish to be scanned and my belongings searched
> going in.
>
> But, leave out phone/wire tapping, and *any* mechanism that impinges on
> private life/transactions in this country--regardless of whether or not I am
> a citizen, naturalized citizen, here on a Visa, or whatever. Whether or not
> I am killed by a terrorist, I'd rather die free than under the possibility
> of surveillance by my own government because "someone" thinks I am a
> terrorist.
>
> The current anti-terrorism Bill, while making clear that the intention is to
> direct the actions toward non-US citizens, does not say or imply that it is
> exclusive in any way to other "types" of terrorism. By the way, I still
> have not found a definition for terrorism.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BEA1222.D8DDE2E5@IEEE.org...
> > Jim Kelley wrote:

> > > Who said anything about law abiding citizens? Who's trying to catch
law
> > > abiding citizens, and why?
> >
> > Please pay attention. I objected to law-abiding citizens losing
> > constitutional rights in the process of trying to catch terrorists.
> > Dick said (in so many words) that we cannot catch the terrorists
> > without taking constitutional freedoms away from law-abiding citizens.
> > I said his approach was playing right into the hands of the terrorists
> > and that law-abiding citizens need not lose any constitutional rights
> > during the process of catching the terrorists.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >
> > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
>
>

490. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 17:20:37 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9sh2ua$so6$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 23535

Please recall that you were the one who brought it up. Thanks.

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BEBE3F6.5AB3C450@sccoast.net...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Nope. Though I guess you had to
> > look up the definition of terrorist
> > in order to know what one was. Jeez,
> > and you think I'M stupid?
>
>
> Okay, Jim. Since you're just being silly at this point, I'll let
> that go.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

491. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 18:30:04 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MgVG7.179707$W8.6098446@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23538

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9sgs7r02v4g@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:8lOG7.178915$W8.6066592@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > > And a handfull of comedians have earned fame, not to mention millions
of
> > > dollars, by going for such cheap laughs. Maybe some people aren't as
> > imature
> > > as what you think they are.
> >
> > Maybe their grammar is not right out of the hills.
>
> At 1:00am, I'm usually not concerned about grammar and typos, especially
> anything I write on this newsgroup.
>
> But it is interesting that you chose to respond not to what I said, but to
> how I said it.
>
>

You said something???

492. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 22:21:17 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <xFYG7.19527$xS6.32213@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23539

N2EY says:

>Divide the bands into three segments: CW, digital, analog voice. Separate
>licenses for each moce - if a prospective ham wants access to the parts of the
>bands used for certain modes, they have to pass tests on just those modes.

The idea of mode-specific licenses should not be tossed aside
lightly. It should be hurled aside with great force!

Key to the notion of *amateur* radio is the tendency to tinker,
experiment, and try different (dare I say "sometimes new") things.

Under the idea of "you can't use a mode until you've passed a
test on that mode" amateur radio would immediately be frozen
in place with no possibility of "advancement of the radio art".

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

493. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-09 23:08:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111091508.223f8bb2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23540

Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message news:<3BEC059B.4040500@att.net>...
> Hi Jim...
>
> I think you mean 4 tests... three licenses... and the path is first the
> 'safety and regs' test then... whichever of three separate licenses in
> any order... correct?
>
> This sounds like a great and simple solution... mmmm... now what are we
> missing... (can't be that easy...)
>
>
Ya missed the implementation quagmire. How would that be done? Cancel
all existing liceses via one mechanisn or another and everybody has
the take the new tests? That woukld raise a few hackles. Or freeze all
exising licenses and only impose the new regime on newbies? Which
means that it would take a half century or more to fully implement.
>
>
> Rich
>
> w3rv

494. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 00:59:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BEC7BFE.22A4D10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23541

K0HB wrote:
> Under the idea of "you can't use a mode until you've passed a
> test on that mode" amateur radio would immediately be frozen
> in place with no possibility of "advancement of the radio art".

Especially since the two most popular ham modes are more than
50 years old.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

495. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 01:28:28 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <0p%G7.105896$WW.6195641@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23542
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I can't help but believe the use of unencrypted radio communications would be about the bottom of the list of choices for this. Using a hidden spred-spectrum might make more sense, except that if it IS detected, you know who will be really watching - and not running in to make a bust over an unlicensed radio. Consider the drug problem in this country. Sure, many get busted - but can you honestly believe that anyone gets busted the FIRST time they ever buy or sell drugs? I remember about 9 years ago a kid (oh, maybe about 20 years old) got busted selling 10 pounds of marijuana to an undercover cop in HIS EMPLOYERS parking lot! Oh gee, Your Honor, I've never done this before. Sure. The terrorists strike but once. If it is a suicide mission, you'll never get them. If it isn't, they disappear back to some foreign country. One possibility is the use of a pager. A lot of people have them. Certain calling numbers (rather, the numeric message sent to the pager) could be looked up against a key. One finishes his aircraft training and dials a pager and enters a telephone number. This number may actually mean 'I finished my training'. Someone calls his pager and the number means 'acknowleged'. Once something starts, the key is destroyed and off they go. This may not be what has happened, but it makes much more sense than using a radio that anyone can listen to.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Lloyd Davies" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message news:bafb68618bb2b55efa7de1f684fa9ecb.12989@mygate.mailgate.org...
> I am wondering if Mr. Hollingsworth is paying more attention to some of our
> maritime and traffic nets since Sept 11th?
>
> Am I the only one who sees a connection? I mean I think that some of these
> terrorists could have valid ham tickets and use these nets to pass traffic
> related to thier acts of terror. Should we exmaine the ranks of the nets and
> see who is middle-eastern and be on the look-out? I think its time we did.
>
>
>
> --
> Posted from 1cust9.tnt1.athens.al.da.uu.net [63.16.138.9]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

496. To all the veterans.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 01:37:03 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011109203703.17946.00001919@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 23543

Thank you. Although we may disagree on some issues, I appreciate what you've gone through to allow me the freedom to post my thoughts on those issues. Take care and 73.

Mark

497. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 01:43:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BEC8622.828C1CE2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23544

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > But, Cecil, Affirmative Action is a quota system which lowers standards
> > for those incapable of meeting the standards which stood in place.
>
> The problem that Affirmative Action was trying to solve was just the
> opposite - fully qualified individuals not being employed because of
> their skin color. In places, the pendulum has swung the other way.
> That's unfortunate but the predictable outcome of racism. Racism is
> directly responsible for the Affirmative Action program.

That makes no sense whatever. The Affirmative Action program led to quotas based on reducing standards for Civil Service exams, college entrance exams and the like. How is someone who can't pass such an exam without reducing standards better qualified than one who can pass the exam at the higher standard?

The pendulum swung the "other way" because qualified people were being discriminated against.

> > I'm sorry that you seem such an uncomprehending fool too.
>
> I was simply treating you the way you were treating me. You
> engaged in mind fornication toward me. I mirrored that action
> right back at you.

Please produce the post in which I accuse you of racism.

> > By the way, are you ever going to get around to admitting that your
> > statement comparing Morse testing and Affirmative Action was 180 degrees
> > out of phase?
>
> They are both social engineering programs, Dave. In that way,
> they are entirely similar. Not enough blacks on the police force.
> Not enough Morse code operators. Why do you attempt to deny reality?
> Morse code seems to some not to have enough merit to survive in a
> free market of modes. That's exactly like Affirmative Action.

Chevettes and Volvos are both cars too. The current reduction in morse testing standards for HF access more closely resembles Affirmative Action than your Chevette scenario. You, my backwoods philosopher, still have it backwards.

Dave K8MN

498. Re: NYC Update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 01:45:05 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011109204505.17946.00001920@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 23545

>Hey all, while I am in NYC with the Red Cross, I am going to take my
>license exam, 2 weeks from today I will be taking the test. Then I can
>go look for a place locally that sells radios. Since I will most
>likely be here until first part of December if not longer, I might as
>well put my license to use while I am up here eh?
>
>
>73's
>
>Keith Hosman

Best of luck to you, Keith. Take care and 73.

Mark

499. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 01:45:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BEC86CC.14C6D709@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23546

Nonya Bidniz wrote:
>
> On 07 Nov 2001 10:29:47 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >In article <3BE8B8A8.95F733E5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> >>So are you going to turn in your "Large Tits" call sign for
> >>a more appropriate one?
> >
> >Nope. There is a difference between reality and your silliness. My
> >callsign is not obscene, it is not vulgar, and it is not demeaning to
> >anyone. If only the same could be said for Kim's callsign.

> Bottom line as I see it is, if you don't like 'em, don't look at 'em.

She's 47, 5'5", 210 lbs. That takes care of number 1.

> If you don't like her callsign, don't answer her when you hear her
> calling CQ.

That takes care of number 2.

Dave K8MN

500. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 02:17:24 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <U60H7.105977$WW.6201550@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23547

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0111081727.4d81ecda@posting.google.com...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gmfuxde.pminews@or.news.verio.net>...
> > On Wed, 07 Nov 2001 09:03:58 -0600, CAM wrote:
> >
> > >Huh? That racism is the cause of the Affirmative Action program? If
> > >you lived in Madison County, Texas, it would be a self apparent
primary.
> > >The tyranny of the majority is in full force here. If the power
structure
> > >here had their way, there would be no blacks employed by the local
> > >government regardless of their qualifications.
> >
> > Good enough reason for me not to want to live in Madison County,
> > Texas.
> >
> >
> Sometimes I get the notion that it's a shame that Santa Anna lost the
damned battle.
> >
> >
> w3rv

Sometimes you wonder if the Texans didn't think so, too. The Alamo has been cleaned up a lot of recent years but the small memorial to San Jacinto is in the middle of the biggest toxic waste area this side of New Jersey.

501. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 02:40:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bec9292_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23548

I'm going to have to see if this is available in audio books so I can listen
on my way to work. Sounds compelling enough to investigate.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BEBD4C8.F60E959A@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > I don't know who John Perazzo is.
>
>
> Read the book, Krell.
>
>
> http://www.atlasbooks.com/marktplc/00548.htm
>
>
> "John Perazzo has marshaled compelling facts and persuasive
> arguments showing that what was once a moral struggle for civil rights
> has turned into a racial spoils system. The Myths That Divide Us shows
> where we've gone wrong and what needs to be done to accomplish the
> original goals of the civil-rights movement." --Dr. Walter E.
> Williams, Distinguished Professor of Economics at George Mason University
>
> "John Perazzo's book blasts us beyond the myths of 'racism' with a
> shocking incandescence of truth that will inspire all who do not have
> a political stake in the lies of hate." --George Gilder, author of
> Wealth and Poverty
>
> "Perazzo exposes the hypocrisies of 'civil rights leaders' like
> Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, Louis Farrakhan, and Leonard Jeffries in
> the most devastating of ways-by using their own words and deeds. His
> case is backed by a seemingly endless string of anecdotes, facts, and
> statistics. This book is well researched and a valuable resource for
> anyone involved in the race debate." --Andrew Oliver, National Review
>
> "The myth that most divides us is the myth that whites are
> relentlessly racist, that virtually all the failures of blacks can be
> explained by the anti-black malice that permeates America. John
> Perazzo dissects this myth with the coolness of a surgeon and the
> passion of a patriot. Our country can make no progress in race
> relations until we grasp the hard truths this book so eloquently lays
> bare." --Jared Taylor, author of Paved With Good Intentions: The
> Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America

>
> "John Perazzo's The Myths That Divide Us attempts to restore common
> sense and decency to issues lost in a sea of wishful, self-serving
> thinkers." --Phil Mushnick, New York Post
>
> "Perazzo is a skilled writer who puts forth a most convincing
> argument that Martin Luther King's dream and worthy principles of
> racial harmony have been suborned and perverted by self-serving civil
> rights leaders who find racist bugaboos everywhere, everyday, to
> justify their own positions, power, financial backing, and political
> influence. Moreover, he shows how any critic who challenges them is
> immediately labeled a racist." --Independent Publisher

502. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 02:44:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bec9386_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23550

Well, that's certainly true Jim. It's a damned if you do/damned if you don't situation to be sure.

Kim W5TIT

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message news:9sh2sd$so3$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> I certainly understand the sentiment. On the other hand, in the event of a
> follow-up tragedy, the American public would expect to have been protected.
> That is the purpose of the actions that are now being taken.
>
> Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3beb59c1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > That (paraphrased) is also what I have understood Dick to be saying. And, I
> > am in agreement with Cecil: we play right into the hands of evil doers when
> > law-abiding citizens lose constitutional rights, and I'll add civil
> > liberties, in the process of our government trying to catch terrorists.
> >
> > I even go farther, I think, than Cecil or Dwight are willing to. I agree
> > wholeheartedly with public access situations being under strict control.
> > Why? Because they are public access areas (football games, grocery stores,
> > shopping centers, airports, transportation terminals, whatever), and I have
> > a *choice* as to whether I wish to be scanned and my belongings searched
> > going in.
> >
> > But, leave out phone/wire tapping, and *any* mechanism that impinges on
> > private life/transactions in this country--regardless of whether or not I am
> > a citizen, naturalized citizen, here on a Visa, or whatever. Whether or not
> > I am killed by a terrorist, I'd rather die free than under the possibility
> > of surveillance by my own government because "someone" thinks I am a
> > terrorist.
> >
> > The current anti-terrorism Bill, while making clear that the intention

is
> to
> > direct the actions toward non-US citizens, does not say or imply that it
> is
> > exclusive in any way to other "types" of terrorism. By the way, I still
> > have not found a definition for terrorism.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3BEA1222.D8DDE2E5@IEEE.org...
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > > Who said anything about law abiding citizens? Who's trying to catch
> law
> > > > abiding citizens, and why?
> > >
> > > Please pay attention. I objected to law-abiding citizens losing
> > > constitutional rights in the process of trying to catch terrorists.
> > > Dick said (in so many words) that we cannot catch the terrorists
> > > without taking constitutional freedoms away from law-abiding citizens.
> > > I said his approach was playing right into the hands of the terrorists
> > > and that law-abiding citizens need not lose any constitutional rights
> > > during the process of catching the terrorists.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > >
> > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > > Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> > > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
> >
> >
>
>
>

503. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 02:45:10 UTC
From: Dave Moorman <dmoorman4@home.com>
Message-ID: <dmoorman4-E273B9.20451309112001@news1.elmhst1.il.home.com>
Source record: 23549
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article
<bafb68618bb2b55efa7de1f684fa9ecb.12989@mygate.mailgate.org>,
"Lloyd Davies" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:

> I am wondering if Mr. Hollingsworth is paying more attention to some of our
> maritime and traffic nets since Sept 11th?
>
> Am I the only one who sees a connection? I mean I think that some of these
> terrorists could have valid ham tickets and use these nets to pass traffic
> related to thier acts of terror. Should we exmaine the ranks of the nets and
> see who is middle-eastern and be on the look-out? I think its time we did.

It would be easier to make short, encrypted transmissions from
unlicensed stations. Why bother to get a license when you don't need
one? You're a terrorist after all, with no compunction to follow the
rules.

Dave

--
Dave Moorman
Downers Grove,
Illinois USA

Some men dream of fortunes, others dream of cookies.

504. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 02:48:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bec9475_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23451

That's par for the course, "Krell" when people can't find intellectual disagreement with things that are expressed they begin attacking how they are expressed.

Believe me, it is better left un-responded to.

Kim W5TIT

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:9sgs7r02v4g@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:8lOG7.178915$W8.6066592@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > > And a handfull of comedians have earned fame, not to mention millions of
> > > dollars, by going for such cheap laughs. Maybe some people aren't as
> > imature
> > > as what you think they are.
> >
> > Maybe their grammar is not right out of the hills.
>
> At 1:00am, I'm usually not concerned about grammar and typos, especially
> anything I write on this newsgroup.
>
> But it is interesting that you chose to respond not to what I said, but to
> how I said it.
>
>

505. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 02:59:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bec9704_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23452

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011109080328.24612.00000472@nso-cr.aol.com...
> In article <3beb59c5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >To me, testing a mode "singles" out a mode and creates the very situation
> >which exists today in the huge debate of CW vs. no-CW.
>
> It's not even a debate to most hams. And the FCC has made it clear where
they
> stand on it.
>

Yeah, that's true. CW doesn't seem to be a major concern for the majority
of hams. I think for the most part, the hobby is just that--a hobby.

>
> Your proposal to test a packet setup singles out a mode, too.
>

I will challenge that only with the statement that I didn't intend to have
the "mode" tested. The testing objective would be to grade one's ability to
understand how to put things together to make them work. It could be a
packet station, APRS tracker, PSK, etc.

> >
> >To leave CW as a testing phase of licensing does not prove (or disprove
in
> >the case of failure) one's aptitude for anything related to ham
radio--other
> >than CW use.
>
> A CW test is only needed for access to the HF/MF ham bands. CW use is VERY
> related to ham radio in those bands.
>

Only in terms of using the mode. It does nothing to prove a darned thing
amateur related other than the knowledge of the language of CW.

>
> The test determines whether the person being tested has a very minimal
skill
> level, too.
>
> > It does not prove credibility in the area of operation,
> >ability to properly operate, or anything to do with safety.

>
> Neither do the current written tests.
>

Ewww-boy. Don't even get me going on that. I wholeheartedly agree. One of my most emotional responses to the CW debate is if the people who want to use CW skill as a measurement of someone's genuine interest in the hobby of ham radio--spend as much energy changing what we can about the current written tests! What a joke.

> >
> >If a "construction" project of some sort were to be brought into the testing
> >arena, it at least proves that the ham is aware of FCC specifications,
> >rules, regulations, and guidelines.
>
> How?
>

Because the pass/fail score would be based on if the transmitting is within regulatory constraints; if the test provides for the building of an antenna that will transmit cleanly between a couple of bands--then the design would have to based on things like will a tuner be used, will it be a long-wire, inverted, etc. Not only would the project have to be built, it would have to be explained why it would work. Or, have the FCC exam present on paper a scenario with an embedded problem and the test is a full disclosure of what to do to resolve the problem.

>
> >While it is not required that I build
> >anything once I am a ham--a successful building project that meets
> >specifications of the FCC will assure the FCC--and *should* assure
> >hams--that the new licensee at least knows something about the R&R.
>
> Maybe - but the simple tests you propose don't do that.
>

Heh heh. Maybe that should be clue number one to you. I can guarantee you that you are far more "into" the hobby than I am. While I am not saying *you* are like this, many believe people like me should not be in the hobby. People like me don't see the above as "simple tests" :).

> >
> >PLUS I think getting rid of CW testing without something to take its place
> >will really piss off a bunch of people. I'm willing to have CW testing
> >ousted, and feel that a building project is a more favorable way to "test"
> >one's commitment to ham radio. Hence, I would be out--because I truly just
> >want to know the R&R, buy what I need to operate, aren't the slightest bit

> >interested in why things work, and so would not really expend the effort
to
> >build anything for a license, either.
>
> The only way folks would be out would be if mandatory retesting were
> instituted. Not gonna happen.
>
> >CW, to me, was a piece of cake
> >compared to having to learn anything related to getting RF power from
Point
> >A to Point B without blowing anything up.
> >
> That's what transmission lines are for.
>
> On top of all this, such testing would be too dependent on the subjective
> judgement of the VEs. These days such tests simply wouldn't get through
federal
> regs.
>
> --
>
> How about this idea:
>
> Divide the bands into three segments: CW, digital, analog voice. Separate
> licenses for each moce - if a prospective ham wants access to the parts of
the
> bands used for certain modes, they have to pass tests on just those modes.
All
> hams have to pass a basic test on safety and general regs.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Hmmmm, I like it.

Kim W5TIT

506. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 03:07:14 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bec98e1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23453

"Nonya Bidniz" <no_email@all.gov> wrote in message
news:3qvnutgohhu4mpi5eq15nk27bqhkrrl72l@4ax.com...
>
> Once again, we come to the question of effort. Expend the effort to
> build a suitable gadget, expend the effort to learn the code. Becomes
> a matter of what effort you think the license is worth, and what
> effort you consider not worth the trouble, doesn't it? Either way,
> Larry will subject you to the suitable amount of invective (and then
> some) both before and after the fact.
>

heh heh. Appreciate the comments and sentiment. However, one correction.
Larry cannot "subject" me to anything. That's what he has never understood.
I read his comments--*IF* (big if intended) I happen to have the time. Most
of the time, I don't. There are two peoples' posts I don't read, and one
person's posts I don't read if they are responses to Len (sorry Steve
Robeson--gotta luv ya): Len Anderson and Larry Roll. I know exactly what
both are going to say, know it is going to drag on and on, and know that
there will be no sense made of any of it by the time I've just wasted all
the time...LOL...so I don't bother.

Kim W5TIT

507. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 05:02:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BECB4F0.4471B46B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23454

Dave Heil wrote:
> That makes no sense whatever. The Affirmative Action program led to
> quotas based on reducing standards for Civil Service exams, college
> entrance exams and the like.

That is not what happened in my home town. What Affirmative Action
did was put legal teeth into the Civil Rights laws. Otherwise, black
people, no matter how well qualified would only have ever been hired
as servants and lawn mowers. The white power structure was determined
to keep them in their "place".

> Please produce the post in which I accuse you of racism.

You didn't accuse me of racism. You accused me of wanting to hire
unqualified people. That was a lie.

> You, my backwoods philosopher, still have it backwards.

Why are you afraid for Morse code to stand on its merits
without a social engineering program from the feds?

You want minorities to stand on their own merits without
a social engineering from the feds. Why not Morse code?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

508. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 05:28:27 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sidtt01qbm@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23455

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:U60H7.105977$WW.6201550@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Sometimes I get the notion that it's a shame that Santa Anna lost the
> damned battle.
> > >
> > >
> > > w3rv
>
> Sometimes you wonder if the Texans didn't think so, too. The Alamo has
been
> cleaned up a lot of recent years but the small memorial to San Jacinto is
in

...and this guy talks about *MY* grammar!

> the middle of the biggest toxic waste area this side of New Jersey.

Maybe Ozzy Osborne can pay San Jacinto a visit like he did at the Alamo.

509. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 10:06:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BECFBFF.16D87B41@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23456

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote...
>
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > I don't know who John Perazzo is.
> > >
> > Read the book, Krell.
>
> Funny how you only quoted the first
> sentence of my post. (snip)

You obviously don't understand how newsgroups work, Krell. Since I'm not obligated to respond to anything you write, I respond to what I want to respond to and ignore the rest. However, your message is still there for all the read, regardless of what I quoted.

> You remind me of those loudmouths in
> meetings that have to dominate the
> entire discussion. If anyone trys to
> say anything contrary, they get
> shouted down after their first two
> words.

For example, I could have just ignored this because quite obviously you have not been shouted down (again, what you said is there for all to read). With that in mind, this part of your message is nothing but foolish nonsense that adds nothing to the discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

510. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 10:35:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BED02F8.C9FC66B6@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23457

N2EY wrote:
>
> I think it all depends on what
> the implications of a rule change
> are. It is clear from inspection
> of the callsign database that there
> are some calls that the FCC does
> not routinely issue. (snip)

Everything you said is probably true. I think the FCC was perhaps "sensitive" of the fact that some operators might not want to have a "TIT" callsign (or some other callsign with a meaning outside radio). But, at the same time, I'm sure they also thought a callsign is a callsign, and they had no desire to caught up in endlessly changing callsigns every time a person objected. And you can be sure they've had objections over the years (you gave me an "ATT" callsign and I don't like that phone company, or whatever). In the end, they solved the whole problem with the vanity callsign system.

> We only have Riley because the ARRL
> and others begged for YEARS to get
> him.

And I'm glad he's around.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

511. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 10:40:41 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Ju7H7.181033$W8.6183409@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23458

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BECFBFF.16D87B41@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote...
> >
> > > Krell wrote:
> > > >
> > > > I don't know who John Perazzo is.
> > >
> > > Read the book, Krell.
> >
> > Funny how you only quoted the first
> > sentence of my post. (snip)
>
>
> You obviously don't understand how newsgroups work, Krell. Since I'm
> not obligated to respond to anything you write, I respond to what I
> want to respond to and ignore the rest. However, your message is still
> there for all the read, regardless of what I quoted.
>
>
> > You remind me of those loudmouths in
> > meetings that have to dominate the
> > entire discussion. If anyone trys to
> > say anything contrary, they get
> > shouted down after their first two
> > words.
>
>
> For example, I could have just ignored this because quite obviously
> you have not been shouted down (again, what you said is there for all
> to read). With that in mind, this part of your message is nothing but
> foolish nonsense that adds nothing to the discussion.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

We both seem to have discovered that Krell is a synonym for foolish
nonsense.

512. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 11:01:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BED08D6.440040EA@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23459

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I even go farther, I think, than Cecil
> or Dwight are willing to. I agree
> wholeheartedly with public access
> situations being under strict control.
> Why? Because they are public access
> areas (football games, grocery stores,
> shopping centers, airports,
> transportation terminals, whatever),
> and I have a *choice* as to whether
> I wish to be scanned and my belongings
> searched going in.

It's a balance, Kim. I have no problem with police officers at football games, grocery stores, shopping centers, and so forth (they've always been there - that's what we pay them for). But I don't think the National Guard has any business being in those places (they have no training in law enforcement). And I have no desire to have myself, or my belongings, searched when I walk into a mall, grocery store, or public event. At airports, I again have no problem police officers. And I'm even willing to have National Guard personnel at the airports as long as they act like security guards and leave the law enforcement to the people who are trained to do it.

> But, leave out phone/wire tapping,
> and *any* mechanism that impinges on
> private life/transactions in this
> country (snip)

And I certainly agree with this. I do not want to live my life with government employees watching my every move - listening to my phone calls, watching my bank transactions, video cameras on street corners, and so forth.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

513. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 13:02:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BED252E.756902BE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23460

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > That makes no sense whatever. The Affirmative Action program led to
> > quotas based on reducing standards for Civil Service exams, college
> > entrance exams and the like.
>
> That is not what happened in my home town. What Affirmative Action
> did was put legal teeth into the Civil Rights laws. Otherwise, black
> people, no matter how well qualified would only have ever been hired
> as servants and lawn mowers. The white power structure was determined
> to keep them in their "place".

So the Affirmative Action as set up in your home town is different than
that set up in other towns in America?

> > Please produce the post in which I accuse you of racism.
>
> You didn't accuse me of racism. You accused me of wanting to hire
> unqualified people. That was a lie.

Please produce a post where I showed belief that you could or would hire
anyone for anything.

> > You, my backwoods philosopher, still have it backwards.
>
> Why are you afraid for Morse code to stand on its merits
> without a social engineering program from the feds?

> You want minorities to stand on their own merits without
> a social engineering from the feds. Why not Morse code?

Morse testing is a dead issue yet you continue to flog the same horse.
I simply pointed out the error in your analogy.

Dave K8MN

514. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 13:03:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011110080342.24612.00000494@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 23461

In article <3BEC059B.4040500@att.net>, Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> How about this idea:
>>
>> Divide the bands into three segments: CW, digital, analog voice. Separate
>> licenses for each moce - if a prospective ham wants access to the parts of
>the
>> bands used for certain modes, they have to pass tests on just those modes.
>All
>> hams have to pass a basic test on safety and general regs.
>>
>
>
>Hi Jim...
>
>I think you mean 4 tests... three licenses... and the path is first the
>'safety and regs' test then... whichever of three separate licenses in
>any order... correct?

Hello Rich,

Yeah, that's a better explanation. Everybody would take the common
"safety/basic theory/general regs" test, which covers everything that is common
to all modes. The mode-specific stuff resides in the mode-specific tests.

Hams could hold more than one license "class". It could be like an endorsement
system - a license would say "TDP" or "TP" or "P" or whatever.
>
>This sounds like a great and simple solution... mmmm... now what are we
>missing... (can't be that easy...)
>
Main trouble is the complete overhaul of how we and the FCC think about
licensing. Also, some parts of some bands are not worldwide amateur, si simply
dividing them into 3 parts gets complicated. 40 meters, for example, is
7000-7300 kHz in ITU Region 2 but only 7000-7100 in the rest of the world.

But overall I think it's doable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

515. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 14:01:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bed323d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23462

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BED08D6.440040EA@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > I even go farther, I think, than Cecil
> > or Dwight are willing to. I agree
> > wholeheartedly with public access
> > situations being under strict control.
> > Why? Because they are public access
> > areas (football games, grocery stores,
> > shopping centers, airports,
> > transportation terminals, whatever),
> > and I have a *choice* as to whether
> > I wish to be scanned and my belongings
> > searched going in.
>
>
> It's a balance, Kim. I have no problem with police officers at
> football games, grocery stores, shopping centers, and so forth
> (they've always been there - that's what we pay them for).
>

It's true, I think, that police officers have "always been there." However, I hav never experienced a police officer as commonly as I do today (post 9-11). I also don't think that bags, purses, etc., are routinely searched as such places, are they? I don't know becuase I don't go to the airport, sports games, fairs, etc. *And* I am about to go to the mall for the first time since 9-11 today (hate shopping at malls but have to today). I'll see there if anything seems different than normal. It's hard to define and be familiar with normal when I only go to places like that maybe twice a year...LOL

>
> But I don't
> think the National Guard has any business being in those places (they
> have no training in law enforcement).
>

Hmmm, on that one I'd have to disagree. The National Guard have experience for "escalated" law enforcement conditions--which is their intended primary purpose (unless that's changed over the past years). It is my understanding that the National Guard are for heightened law enforcement required during times of disaster, emergency, etc. I like the National Guard at airports, and nearly any other public place--though I think it's much more "professional(?)" to have plain-clothed armed persons at places, say, like

malls, sports arenas, etc. The only reason I think that is I imagine that when people go to places like that, it is to "get away" and escape from reality for a while. Seeing an armed guardsmen is, I am sure, quite startling. I know it's a silly idea to have plain-clothed armed persons at the level of the National Guard--but it would be less alarming and more relaxing to go to a sports game without having to confront the scene of a camouflage suit with a rifle butt.

>
> And I have no desire to have
> myself, or my belongings, searched when I walk into a mall, grocery
> store, or public event.
>

Well, neither do I, I assure you. *However* I am willing to "concede" under current circumstances that the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few (love Spock) in places like airports and areas where my actions (traveling on an airplane for example) put me out of control to keep harm from happening to potentially thousands of people (a suicide nitwit could simply choose to cause a plane to "land" in a very populated area--doesn't even need those tall buildings). Think about potential damage that could be done if I looked down on NYC, San Francisco, Hong Kong, etc., and just "picked" a nice, tightly cloistered, group of buildings to force the plane to descend upon.

>
> At airports, I again have no problem police
> officers. And I'm even willing to have National Guard personnel at the
> airports as long as they act like security guards and leave the law
> enforcement to the people who are trained to do it.
>

I wasn't aware that the National Guardsmen are doing anything but patrolling the airports. What are they doing besides that? I don't have a problem with National Guardsmen, say, even going through bags and luggage. Isn't it kind of their duty and charge to even check IDs randomly as people walk by? I don't know if they *are* doing that--but I don't think it would concern me if they did. Now, if they walked up and said they were going to have to arrest me because I just put a cigarette out the wrong way, or ticket me for parking in the wrong area--I'd have a problem with that. That *is* for local enforcement and my federal tax dollars are not paying for "cops" trained at the level of National Guard to patrol for traffic violations. It would be a misappropriation of funds, and of resources, in my opinion.

>
> > But, leave out phone/wire tapping,
> > and *any* mechanism that impinges on
> > private life/transactions in this
> > country (snip)
>
> And I certainly agree with this. I do not want to live my life with
> government employees watching my every move - listening to my phone

> calls, watching my bank transactions, video cameras on street corners,
> and so forth.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

DITTO. And, I don't want government doing any of that *any* time--war or no war. (It's never--that I know of--been done before even in a time of war and I don't think that needs to change now).

Kim W5TIT

516. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 14:04:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sjc2m0i68@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23463

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BECFBFF.16D87B41@sccoast.net...

> You obviously don't understand how newsgroups work, Krell. Since I'm
> not obligated to respond to anything you write, I respond to what I
> want to respond to and ignore the rest. However, your message is still
> there for all the read, regardless of what I quoted.

I know how newsgroups work, and I also know how people twist words around to suit their own ends. I don't mind editing, but when I feel that something I posted has been edited in a way as to misrepresent what I said, I'm not going to sit back and ignore it.

> For example, I could have just ignored this because quite obviously
> you have not been shouted down (again, what you said is there for all
> to read). With that in mind, this part of your message is nothing but
> foolish nonsense that adds nothing to the discussion.

I originally pointed out that some people do research, and tehy only use that which supports their own agendas. They ignore anything to the contrary. How is that foolish nonsense that adds nothing to the discussion?

517. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 14:11:27 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sjcgb0j79@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23464

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Ju7H7.181033$W8.6183409@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> We both seem to have discovered that Krell is a synonym for foolish
> nonsense.

...and how do you think this little snippet adds to the discussion?

518. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 15:01:18 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3bed4015.2698333@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 23465

On Sat, 10 Nov 2001 01:43:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>CAM wrote:
>> They are both social engineering programs, Dave. In that way,
>> they are entirely similar. Not enough blacks on the police force.
>> Not enough Morse code operators. Why do you attempt to deny reality?
>> Morse code seems to some not to have enough merit to survive in a
>> free market of modes. That's exactly like Affirmative Action.
>
>Chevettes and Volvos are both cars too. The current reduction in morse
>testing standards for HF access more closely resembles Affirmative
>Action than your Chevette scenario. You, my backwoods philosopher,
>still have it backwards.

Nope..CAM got it right. The elimination of a requirement that
can not be justified is nothing like affirmative action because
the reason for eliminating the requirment is simply that it should
not be tested for anymore. Not because there is a desire to
attract any under epresented class of people, but rather because
it can't be justified. The same could be said for SOME changes
in requirements under affirmative action. There were, in fact,
some jobs that had artificially high requirements where some
of those requirements had no bearing at all on the ability
of an individual to do the job,

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
>Dave K8MN

519. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 15:03:57 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3bed4196.3083819@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 23466

Hans,

Well said...it is not, nor should it be, the role of government
licensing to try and determine anyone's "commitment".

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

On Fri, 09 Nov 2001 05:07:47 GMT, K0HB<K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote:

>Kim-W5TIT SAYS:
>
>> I'm willing to have CW testing ousted, and feel that a building
>> project is a more favorable way to "test" one's commitment to
>> ham radio.
>
>"Commitment" has nothing to do with it.
>
>Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write
>something like:
>
>" A really tough written test would surely separate those
>who really have an interest in the hobby.", or..
>
>" Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's
>dedication to the service.", or..
>
>" I think it is effective at minimizing the undesireables.",
>or..
>
>" ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming is
>making it something to work for.", or..

520. Re: Dropping the code. (Third msg attempt!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 15:07:09 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3bed425b.3280398@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 23467

Hans,

Your truncated posts were also on the mark...the full post
below really states it all quite well.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

On Fri, 9 Nov 2001 05:24:35 +0000 (UTC), "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net>
wrote:

>Previous two attempts to send this message were truncated
>by the newsreader gizmo......
>
>
>
>"Kim-W5TIT" says:
>
>> I'm willing to have CW testing ousted, and feel that a
>> building project is a more favorable way to "test"
>> one's commitment to ham radio.
>
>"Commitment" has nothing to do with it.
>
>Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write
>something like:
>
> " A really tough written test would surely separate those
> who really have an interest in the hobby.", or..
>
> " Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's
> dedication to the service.", or..
>
> " I think it is effective at minimizing the undesireables.",
> or..
>
> " ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming is
> making it something to work for.", or..
> .
> "My opinion is that any obstacle you put in the way to any
> achievement guarantees that only those with dedication and
> strong interest will get there."
>
>All of the above quotations, gathered from RRAP threads, were
>made by serious and well-intentioned licensees who want the best

>for the Amateur Radio Service.
>
>All of the above quotations also completely miss the mark, in
>that they suggest that the examination process is the key to
>ensuring that "the right kind of people" (those who are
>"worthy") become licensed and, by extension, that "the wrong
>kind of people" get filtered out.
>
>First, the testing procedure is an "entrance" exam, not a
>"graduation" exam.
>
>Second, while "interest", "dedication", and "hard work" are
>certainly hallmarks of good amateurs, the FCC and ITU regulations
>do not specify levels of interest, dedication, hard work or other
>measures of "worthiness" as requisites for a license. Therefor it
>is not the function of the examination process to determine (even
>if it could) if an applicant is "worthy" but rather to determine
>if he/she is QUALIFIED to use the spectrum assigned. There should
>be no "dumbing down", but neither can there be a requirement that
>the examination process screens out applicants who lack
>"commitment".
>
>Don't get me wrong here, folks. I believe that the examination
>process ought to be rigorous enough to determine proper knowledge
>and skills so that a new licensee does not inadvertently trash
>the bands, hurt themselves, or harm other users/uses of the
>spectrum. I am not even suggesting that Morse testing is a
>"good thing" or a "poor idea". But I have no expectation that
>ANY examination can filter out "unworthy" applicants who lack
>the proper "commitment", "dedication" or "motivation".
>
>Even if it could, who then would become the arbiter of "worthy"?
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>--
>Posted from [204.31.48.54]
>via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

521. Re: Dropping the code. (Third msg attempt!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 17:06:59 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <kb9tmp@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9sjo4t$l3h$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 23468

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3bed425b.3280398@news.mindspring.com...
> Hans,
>
> Your truncated posts were also on the mark...the full post
> below really states it all quite well.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I second that motion! All those in favor say I,
all those opposed tap out .- -. -.-- on your key.
The I's have it! :)

--

'73' From KB9TMP

"there is no rule against being stupid"
-Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com
_____

522. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 18:46:37 UTC
From: Daniel Jeswald <w4nti@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9sjsls$9u3$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 23469
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Finally a man with a brain. Just like special forces used in the Jungles of NAM.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dave Moorman" <dmoorman4@home.com> wrote in message news:dmoorman4-E273B9.20451309112001@news1.elmhst1.il.home.com...
> In article
> <bafb68618bb2b55efa7de1f684fa9ecb.12989@mygate.mailgate.org>,
> "Lloyd Davies" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
>
> > I am wondering if Mr. Hollingsworth is paying more attention to some of our
> > maritime and traffic nets since Sept 11th?
> >
> > Am I the only one who sees a connection? I mean I think that some of these
> > terrorists could have valid ham tickets and use these nets to pass traffic
> > related to thier acts of terror. Should we exmaine the ranks of the nets and
> > see who is middle-eastern and be on the look-out? I think its time we did.
>
> It would be easier to make short, encrypted transmissions from
> unlicensed stations. Why bother to get a license when you don't need
> one? You're a terrorist after all, with no compunction to follow the
> rules.
>
> Dave
>
> --
> Dave Moorman
> Downers Grove,
> Illinois USA
>
> Some men dream of fortunes, others dream of cookies.

523. Re: Dropping the code. (Third msg attempt!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 19:05:46 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011110140546.28836.00001932@mb-bk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 23470

```
>I second that motion! All those in favor say I,
>all those opposed tap out .- -. -.-- on your key.
>The I's have it! :)

Isn't that -. .- -.-- ?

73 de Bert
KC2HMN
```

524. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 21:10:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BED976E.11364C4D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23471

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> On Sat, 10 Nov 2001 01:43:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >CAM wrote:
> >> They are both social engineering programs, Dave. In that way,
> >> they are entirely similar. Not enough blacks on the police force.
> >> Not enough Morse code operators. Why do you attempt to deny reality?
> >> Morse code seems to some not to have enough merit to survive in a
> >> free market of modes. That's exactly like Affirmative Action.
> > >
> > >Chevettes and Volvos are both cars too. The current reduction in morse
> > >testing standards for HF access more closely resembles Affirmative
> > >Action than your Chevette scenario. You, my backwoods philosopher,
> > >still have it backwards.
>
> Nope..CAM got it right. The elimination of a requirement that
> can not be justified is nothing like affirmative action because
> the reason for eliminating the requirment is simply that it should
> not be tested for anymore. Not because there is a desire to
> attract any under epresented class of people, but rather because
> it can't be justified. The same could be said for SOME changes
> in requirements under affirmative action. There were, in fact,
> some jobs that had artificially high requirements where some
> of those requirements had no bearing at all on the ability
> of an individual to do the job,

Bill, While I don't recognize you as the final authority any more than
I do Cecil, I point to the fact that you've made MY case, not Cecil's.

Dave K8MN

525. Re: Dropping the code. (Third msg attempt!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 21:11:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BED97BE.805F262A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23472

WW - KB9TMP wrote:
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3bed425b.3280398@news.mindspring.com...
> > Hans,
> >
> > Your truncated posts were also on the mark...the full post
> > below really states it all quite well.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> I second that motion! All those in favor say I,
> all those opposed tap out .- -. -.-- on your key.
> The I's have it! :)

How appropriate that you feel on your "I". The term is "aye".

Dave K8MN

526. Re: Dropping the code. (Third msg attempt!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-10 21:12:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BED980E.C0938AF4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23473

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >I second that motion! All those in favor say I,
> >all those opposed tap out .- -. -.-- on your key.
> >The I's have it! :)
>
> Isn't that -. .- -.-- ?
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

Geez! He screwed up BOTH parts of it.

Dave K8MN

527. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 00:55:46 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <m0kH7.181842$W8.6256869@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23474

Bill Sohl, K2UNK posted:

> Nope..CAM got it right. The elimination of a requirement that
> can not be justified is nothing like affirmative action because
> the reason for eliminating the requirment is simply that it should
> not be tested for anymore. Not because there is a desire to
> attract any under epresented class of people, but rather because
> it can't be justified. The same could be said for SOME changes
> in requirements under affirmative action. There were, in fact,
> some jobs that had artificially high requirements where some
> of those requirements had no bearing at all on the ability
> of an individual to do the job,

I always thought the model for retaining the code-testing
requirement in amateur radio licensing was more akin to
the labor union practice of 'featherbedding'. In both
cases, the current employees, or practitioners, get a
governmental agency to legislatively protect certain
inefficient job practices because it preserves the power
bases of those involved. A classic example of this was
the federal requirement for a fireman on all railroad trains,
even those powered by diesel-electric locomotives.
In the case of amateur radio, it was a reaction against
increasing radiotelephone operation back in the 1930's.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

528. Re: Dropping the code. (Third msg attempt!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 01:03:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011110200326.23334.00000462@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 23475

In article <b87371eb0c84bab04378b743ba750e9c.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>, "K0HB"
<k0hb@qwest.net> writes:

>"Commitment" has nothing to do with it.
>
>Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write
>something like:
>
> " A really tough written test would surely separate those
> who really have an interest in the hobby.", or..
>
> " Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's
> dedication to the service.", or..
>
> " I think it is effective at minimizing the undesireables.",
> or..
>
> " ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming is
> making it something to work for.", or..
> .
> "My opinion is that any obstacle you put in the way to any
> achievement guarantees that only those with dedication and
> strong interest will get there."
>
>All of the above quotations, gathered from RRAP threads, were
>made by serious and well-intentioned licensees who want the best
>for the Amateur Radio Service.
>
>All of the above quotations also completely miss the mark, in
>that they suggest that the examination process is the key to
>ensuring that "the right kind of people" (those who are
>"worthy") become licensed and, by extension, that "the wrong
>kind of people" get filtered out.
>
>First, the testing procedure is an "entrance" exam, not a
>"graduation" exam.
>
>Second, while "interest", "dedication", and "hard work" are
>certainly hallmarks of good amateurs, the FCC and ITU regulations
>do not specify levels of interest, dedication, hard work or other
>measures of "worthiness" as requisites for a license. Therefor it
>is not the function of the examination process to determine (even
>if it could) if an applicant is "worthy" but rather to determine
>if he/she is QUALIFIED to use the spectrum assigned. There should

>be no "dumbing down", but neither can there be a requirement that
>the examination process screens out applicants who lack
>"commitment".
>
>Don't get me wrong here, folks. I believe that the examination
>process ought to be rigorous enough to determine proper knowledge
>and skills so that a new licensee does not inadvertently trash
>the bands, hurt themselves, or harm other users/uses of the
>spectrum. I am not even suggesting that Morse testing is a
>"good thing" or a "poor idea". But I have no expectation that
>ANY examination can filter out "unworthy" applicants who lack
>the proper "commitment", "dedication" or "motivation".
>
>Even if it could, who then would become the arbiter of "worthy"?
>
Like a good wine, that post only improves with age, Hans.Was 1996 so long ago?

73 de Jim, N2EY

529. "...one step closer to extinction..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 02:15:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmlxx11.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23476

On Thu, 08 Nov 2001 13:29:18 -0600, CAM wrote:

>Good! That's a mature attitude. I think you are beginning to
>understand. Obscenity is in the eyes of the beholder.

As we have seen with the attempts of Jesse Helms to impose
absolute censorship over broadcast material, obscenity is in the
eyes of the ob-Senator.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

530. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 02:18:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011110211827.28714.00000415@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23477

In article <3BEADD0E.D93CDE51@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Not until you get rid of "Whacking Five Dirty eX Prostitutes,"
>> which *I* find offensive in the extreme.
>
>Good! That's a mature attitude. I think you are beginning to
>understand. Obscenity is in the eyes of the beholder.

Cecil:

Kwitcherblabbering and change that disgusting call sign of yours!

73 de Larry, K3LT

531. Re: To all the veterans.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 02:18:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011110211827.28714.00000414@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23478

In article <20011109203703.17946.00001919@mb-fg.aol.com>, radiohead11m@aol.com (Mark Pearsal) writes:

>
>Thank you. Although we may disagree on some issues, I appreciate what you've
>gone through to allow me the freedom to post my thoughts on those issues.
>Take
>care and 73.
>
>Mark

Thank you, Mark. And to my fellow veterans, I extend both my warmest wishes and personal thanks for the sacrifices they have made to ensure the freedoms we all enjoy in this great country. God bless you all!

73 de Larry, K3LT
MSgt, USAF (Ret.)

532. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 02:18:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011110211828.28714.00000416@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23479

In article <3BEAE90E.2385C89@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
>> inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.
>
>Don't you ever feel like a ninny for saying that kinda stuff?
>
>Maybe you should wash the callbook out with soap. :-)

Jim:

I tried that, but the pages got too soggy. My new callbook CD seems
to tolerate being washed with lukewarm water a tiny amount of
dish detergent, but for some odd reason, it doesn't change Kim's dirty
call sign! Why is that?

73 de Larry, K3LT

533. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 02:18:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011110211828.28714.00000417@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23480

In article <3BEAA0D4.B506B737@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> By the way, the fact that I don't champion those concepts does not
>mean that I have no tolerance for diversity. What it means is that I
>want that tolerance to be expanded to include ALL Americans.
>

Dwight:

I definitely "get it" when you're talking about such horribly misused
government programs such as Affirmative Action. AA is nothing more
than a transfer of discrimination from one group to another, without
doing anything to eliminate the underlying problems it was created to
solve. The only way to put an end to discrimination, once and for all,
is for us to finally accept the fact that *all* Americans are true equals.
I just hope I live to see the day!

73 de Larry, K3LT

534. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 03:03:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011110220331.23850.00000397@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 23481

In article <m0kH7.181842$W8.6256869@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>A classic example of this was
>the federal requirement for a fireman on all railroad trains,
>even those powered by diesel-electric locomotives.

A poor example. Driving a ten thousand ton train almost two miles long is not anything like driving a car or truck.

Many of the early diesel-electric locomotives required a fireman to operate them. They were also relatively unreliable and quirky to operate. As the technology advanced, the fireman requirement was eliminated.

It was only "featherbedding" to some of those who didn't actually have to do it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

535. Help !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 06:05:35 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9sl4ff0lhs@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23482

I can't understand CW,can I blow a VE for the upgrade ?

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

536. Re: How big is the amateur radio industry? (fast food)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 06:26:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEE19F3.C73523FC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23483

Krell wrote:
>
> I know how newsgroups work, and I
> also know how people twist words
> around to suit their own ends. I
> don't mind editing, but when I feel
> that something I posted has been
> edited in a way as to misrepresent
> what I said, I'm not going to sit
> back and ignore it.

And nobody twisted your words, Krell. You said you had not read the book and then speculated on the character of it's contents. In response, without commenting on your speculation, I simply suggested you read the book (which would provide you with the answer to your speculation). So which of your words were twisted?

> I originally pointed out that some
> people do research, and tehy only use
> that which supports their own agendas.
> They ignore anything to the contrary.

And I ignored that comment. In other words, I didn't agree or disagree. I simply let your comments stand without response. Why would you be upset about that? Do you expect all of us to publicly state whether agree or disagree with each sentence you write in this newsgroup? I certainly hope not, because it's not going to happen.

Anyway, none of this is adding anything to anything, so I'll let it drop at this point. Take care, Krell.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

537. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 07:40:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BEE2B5E.3269DA6E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23484

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> It's true, I think, that police
> officers have "always been
> there." However, I hav never
> experienced a police officer as
> commonly as I do today (post
> 9-11). I also don't think that
> bags, purses, etc., are
> routinely searched as such
> places, are they? (snip)

It's true they've stepped up their presence at the mall (and so forth), but I don't really have a problem with that. And, no, they haven't started searching belongings yet, but some Senator was urging that on a talk show a few weeks ago (so I mentioned it). However, so far, I haven't seen any move to actually do it (thankfully).

> Hmmm, on that one I'd have to
> disagree. The National Guard have
> experience for "escalated" law
> enforcement conditions--which is
> their intended primary purpose
> (unless that's changed over the
> past years). It is my understanding
> that the National Guard are for
> heightened law enforcement required
> during times of disaster, emergency,
> etc. (snip)

They do receive some training for enforcement during conditions of Martial Law. Otherwise, during emergency deployments (disasters), they are trained to leave law enforcement to civilian law enforcement agencies. In other words, they are trained to just observe and call when they see something out of the ordinary. In fact, they're specifically instructed to not get directly involved because they're not armed (they carry empty weapons), which could lead to a bad situation for themselves if they actually did run into a crime. And, without extensive training, I'd like to see that balance remain. Sadly, some people are urging their expanded use for routine law enforcement (in effect, a new federal police force).

> Well, neither do I, I assure you.
> *However* I am willing to "concede"
> under current circumstances that

> the needs of the many outweigh the
> needs of the few (love Spock) (snip)

However, an equal theme in that particular movie, and in the following one, was that the needs of the many cannot override the needs of the one - the needs of the one are equally important (it's the concept behind our individual rights in the Constitution).

> in places like airports and areas
> where my actions (traveling on an
> airplane for example) put me out of
> control to (snip)

I think we've already agreed on that.

> I wasn't aware that the National
> Guardsmen are doing anything but
> patrolling the airports. What are
> they doing besides that? (snip)

As stated above, nothing so far. There is only talk about that so far, but that was enough for me to add it in.

> I don't have a problem with
> National Guardsmen, say, even
> going through bags and luggage.

That I would strongly disagree with. Based on the relatively recent experiences I've had, I simply wouldn't trust the kids in today's military with my personal belongings. I know that sounds horrible, but I've been around the military for most of my life (dependent, active duty, civilian employee, and civilian contractor), and I've never seen the crime problems like they have to today's military.

> DITTO. And, I don't want
> government doing any of that
> *any* time--war or no war. (It's
> never--that I know of--been done
> before even in a time of war and
> I don't think that needs to
> change now).

Not so far (that I'm aware of also). During WWW II, phones were relatively rare so the government paid little attention to them. Plus phone lines were less centralized, so it was much harder to monitor anyway. During more recent incidents, the U.S. itself was never directly involved.

However, they've been monitoring international calls for many years (computerized "key" word monitoring). In fact, if you're overseas and call the U.S., you can experience this for yourself. During your call, simply mention a word you think the government might be interested in (the name of a current conflict, a branch of the military, the

president's name, or whatever) and often you'll immediately hear the clicks in the background as the various switching and monitoring devices kick in. What is equally interesting is that you don't hear the same clicks when placing a call from here to an overseas location. I guess they've figured out a way to filter the noise here, but not on all overseas phone systems.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

538. Re: Help !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 10:56:05 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <9PsH7.165813$3d2.6569414@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23485

"Leland KC8LD0" <Leland_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:9sl4ff0lhs@drn.newsguy.com...
> I can't understand CW,can I blow a VE for the upgrade ?
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>

Noop, takes three.

539. Re: Help !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 11:57:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011111065750.16891.00002201@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23486

>Subject: Re: Help !!
>From: "Richard McCollum" rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 11/11/2001 4:56 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9PsH7.165813$3d2.6569414@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>

>Noop, takes three.

I can see now I am on the wrong VE team!

=(

540. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 14:32:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bee8af5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23487

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BEE2B5E.3269DA6E@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > It's true, I think, that police
> > officers have "always been
> > there." However, I hav never
> > experienced a police officer as
> > commonly as I do today (post
> > 9-11). I also don't think that
> > bags, purses, etc., are
> > routinely searched as such
> > places, are they? (snip)
>
>
> It's true they've stepped up their presence at the mall (and so
> forth), but I don't really have a problem with that. And, no, they
> haven't started searching belongings yet, but some Senator was urging
> that on a talk show a few weeks ago (so I mentioned it). However, so
> far, I haven't seen any move to actually do it (thankfully).
>

Believe it or not, it seems to me that most US Citizens are pretty tired of
all the "security" issues and it is has always been the media and government
that almost seem to take peace in proliferating a fear response in people.

>
> > Hmmm, on that one I'd have to
> > disagree. The National Guard have
> > experience for "escalated" law
> > enforcement conditions--which is
> > their intended primary purpose
> > (unless that's changed over the
> > past years). It is my understanding
> > that the National Guard are for
> > heightened law enforcement required
> > during times of disaster, emergency,
> > etc. (snip)
>
> They do receive some training for enforcement during conditions of
> Martial Law. Otherwise, during emergency deployments (disasters), they
> are trained to leave law enforcement to civilian law enforcement
> agencies. In other words, they are trained to just observe and call
> when they see something out of the ordinary. In fact, they're
> specifically instructed to not get directly involved because they're

> not armed (they carry empty weapons), which could lead to a bad
> situation for themselves if they actually did run into a crime. And,
> without extensive training, I'd like to see that balance remain.
> Sadly, some people are urging their expanded use for routine law
> enforcement (in effect, a new federal police force).
>

Whoa!!! When did that happen [the unarmed National Guard]? I clearly
remember Kent State. That was not an unarmed rifle that killed!!!

>
> > Well, neither do I, I assure you.
> > *However* I am willing to "concede"
> > under current circumstances that
> > the needs of the many outweigh the
> > needs of the few (love Spock) (snip)
>
> However, an equal theme in that particular movie, and in the
> following one, was that the needs of the many cannot override the
> needs of the one - the needs of the one are equally important (it's
> the concept behind our individual rights in the Constitution).
>

And, I agree with the corresponding philosophy. That is why individual
decisions that may have an impact on many need to be made with as much
caution as possible. I don't consider it much sacrifice for policing action
to be taking place in public places--because *I* can personally choose
whether I wish to conform to the particular policies at public places.

>
> > in places like airports and areas
> > where my actions (traveling on an
> > airplane for example) put me out of
> > control to (snip)
>
> I think we've already agreed on that.
>
> > I wasn't aware that the National
> > Guardsmen are doing anything but
> > patrolling the airports. What are
> > they doing besides that? (snip)
>
> As stated above, nothing so far. There is only talk about that so
> far, but that was enough for me to add it in.
>

Oh, OK. Say, for instance the National-Guard-at-airports idea stayed with
us now from here on. I wouldn't mind at all having one or two guardsmen at
each security scanning station. I also think that the guardsmen should be
behind bullet proof glass (small guard shacks) at airports. I think that
sight is far more imposing than "just a soldier."

>
> > I don't have a problem with
> > National Guardsmen, say, even
> > going through bags and luggage.
>
>
> That I would strongly disagree with. Based on the relatively recent
> experiences I've had, I simply wouldn't trust the kids in today's
> military with my personal belongings. I know that sounds horrible, but
> I've been around the military for most of my life (dependent, active
> duty, civilian employee, and civilian contractor), and I've never seen
> the crime problems like they have to today's military.
>

Well, I can certainly agree with you on your assessment of crime in the
military. I have "heard" such stories from friends, etc. And, I have even
seen some soldiers whom I cannot believe this Nation might have to rely on
for safety. However, all kidding aside, they are all we got. I think I'd
feel the same way about *anyone* going through my things: whether they'd be
careful, steal, etc.

>
> > DITTO. And, I don't want
> > government doing any of that
> > *any* time--war or no war. (It's
> > never--that I know of--been done
> > before even in a time of war and
> > I don't think that needs to
> > change now).
>
>
> Not so far (that I'm aware of also). During WWW II, phones were
> relatively rare so the government paid little attention to them. Plus
> phone lines were less centralized, so it was much harder to monitor
> anyway. During more recent incidents, the U.S. itself was never
> directly involved.
>
> However, they've been monitoring international calls for many years
> (computerized "key" word monitoring). In fact, if you're overseas and
> call the U.S., you can experience this for yourself. During your call,
> simply mention a word you think the government might be interested in
> (the name of a current conflict, a branch of the military, the
> president's name, or whatever) and often you'll immediately hear the
> clicks in the background as the various switching and monitoring
> devices kick in. What is equally interesting is that you don't hear
> the same clicks when placing a call from here to an overseas location.
> I guess they've figured out a way to filter the noise here, but not on
> all overseas phone systems.
>

Well, as disgruntled as you may be about this--remember that I am a former
peacenik activist. Your observations of above don't surprise (and the

reason you don't hear them from this side going in is because it has not been allowed until now--I think now it is allowed). At any rate, I have friends who have traveled to places like Central America and had *PRINTED MATERIALS* they have not been allowed to bring back. I mean things like books, journals, etc.!!! They got to the Honduras border where all was confiscated. Some of this stuff was from the church--but were theological books on things such as liberation theology, etc.--and were *not allowed* to be brought back here.

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Kim W5TIT

541. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 15:43:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011111104318.12427.00001964@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 23489

In article <20011109080328.24612.00000472@nso-cr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>How about this idea:
>
>Divide the bands into three segments: CW, digital, analog voice. Separate
>licenses for each moce - if a prospective ham wants access to the parts of
>the
>bands used for certain modes, they have to pass tests on just those modes.
>All
>hams have to pass a basic test on safety and general regs.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

I'll have to jump on the Brakob Bandwagon and say that this idea
should be shot from a cannon into a solid concrete block wall. For
one thing, the FCC wants to simplify the amateur licensing process --
not triple it's complexity. It'll never fly with the Feds.

73 de Larry, K3LT

542. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 15:43:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011111104320.12427.00001966@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 23490

In article <3BEAD683.3C73E26D@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> Doesn't that make you feel sorta stupid? Such a genius and you still had
>> to wait for the Big Dumbdown to make it to Extra.....

Bob:

Hey, it's not Cecil's fault if he managed to outlive the 20 WPM code
testing requirement for Extra. At least he took full advantage of
TBD and got his Extra; I know a lot of no-code Techs who are still
there, and will never progress to General or Extra because of the *5*
WPM code test! They are now consigned to wait for TEBD (The Even
Bigger Dumbdown). But, as long as they aren't carrying 210 lbs of
fat on a 5' 5" frame, they might even be around for that!

>Never had the time to learn 20wpm. Appears the FCC decided it wasn't
>worth my time either.

That's funny. I didn't "learn" 20 WPM, I just got there by making QSO's
at 5 WPM, then 6 WPM, then 10 WPM, etc. until I eventually, and in
very little time, naturally got up to 20 WPM. In fact, I passed the 20 WPM
code test at a time when I thought I was only ready for 13. Makes me
wonder just how many hams have gone around, resenting Extra-class
hams and whining about the 20 WPM code test, when they were
perfectly capable of passing same all along? From my very first day as
a licensed radio amateur, I never had any doubt that I'd get my Extra.

73 de Larry, K3LT

543. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 15:43:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011111104320.12427.00001965@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 23491

In article <3beb59c5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>To me, testing a mode "singles" out a mode and creates the very situation
>which exists today in the huge debate of CW vs. no-CW.

Kim:

I recall having to answer a lot of questions about repeaters when I
took my written exams for Tech, General, Advanced, and Extra. I
also had to answer a lot of questions about SSB, RTTY, and FM.
Why were these modes being "singled out?" All the code tests I
took proved was my basic ability to copy Morse code at a certain
speed. There was never any more expectation that I would use
CW than there was that I would use FM, RTTY, SSTV, SSB, or any
other mode that was "singled out" in the testing. However, without
the code tests, I never would have been able to use the Morse/CW
mode, a mode which has produced over 85% of my HF operating
achievements, and 99.999% of my overall enjoyment of ham radio.
The difference is, once I lost my childish, self-serving objections to
code testing -- based mainly on an immature fear of failure -- I saw
the code tests as just as useful and necessary as the testing on
any other mode. It's all about having the right attutude.

>To leave CW as a testing phase of licensing does not prove (or disprove in
>the case of failure) one's aptitude for anything related to ham radio--other
>than CW use.

That's exactly right. However, most hams who give it a proper try, with
the right attitude, succeed anyway -- in spite of their objections and
fears.

>It does not prove credibility in the area of operation,
>ability to properly operate, or anything to do with safety.

Now, except for the safety part, you'd be wrong. Code testing *does*
reinforce good operating technique, because you are tested in exactly
the same way you operate in CW and a variety of other modes.

>If a "construction" project of some sort were to be brought into the testing
>arena, it at least proves that the ham is aware of FCC specifications,
>rules, regulations, and guidelines.

How so? I was able to cobble together a lot of functional "homebrew"
radio projects long before I studied any specific FCC regulations. I dare
say any other experienced ham could say the same thing. However,
I still like the idea of a construction project being part of the licensing
process, if for no other reason, it results in the prospective licensee

learning some very practical, basic electronic theory.

>While it is not required that I build
>anything once I am a ham--a successful building project that meets
>specifications of the FCC will assure the FCC--and *should* assure
>hams--that the new licensee at least knows something about the R&R.

Just exactly which "R&R's" is a ham "learning" by building a simple regen receiver or one-chip, crystal-controlled transmitter? I can do both without knowing a damn thing about the R&R's other than which frequencies the devices I build need to operate on -- and that's something that even the most technically-uninvolved appliance operator needs to know!

>PLUS I think getting rid of CW testing without something to take its place
>will really piss off a bunch of people.

I don't think so, Kim. Eliminating code testing, and replacing it with a practical demonstration of technical knowledge wouldn't necessarily "piss" me off. The simple fact is, that the best projects for such a test would be simple CW transmitters/receivers. And what would a ham so tested need to know to use his creations on-the-air? You guessed it -- the Morse code!

>I'm willing to have CW testing
>ousted, and feel that a building project is a more favorable way to "test"
>one's commitment to ham radio.

Fine. Shall we co-author a Petition for Rule Making to the FCC?

>Hence, I would be out--because I truly just
>want to know the R&R, buy what I need to operate, aren't the slightest bit
>interested in why things work, and so would not really expend the effort to
>build anything for a license, either.

Ooops, sorry -- in other words, you're just another typical dumbed-down wanna-be ham. Never mind.

>CW, to me, was a piece of cake
>compared to having to learn anything related to getting RF power from Point
>A to Point B without blowing anything up.

Yeah, you managed to master that mean 'ole 5 WPM code test. But what I'd like to know is -- why haven't you since upgraded to General or Extra, since you're already at the top of the current code-testing heap? Don't tell me, let me guess -- you don't have enough time in your busy schedule to study for those additional written tests! I thought so!

73 de Larry, K3LT

544. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 15:43:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011111104321.12427.00001967@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 23488

In article <3bec98e1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>There are two peoples' posts I don't read, and one
>person's posts I don't read if they are responses to Len (sorry Steve
>Robeson--gotta luv ya): Len Anderson and Larry Roll. I know exactly what
>both are going to say, know it is going to drag on and on, and know that
>there will be no sense made of any of it by the time I've just wasted all
>the time...LOL...so I don't bother.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Hmmm. Kim doesn't read my posts, but manages to reply to virtually
each and every one of them. Truly amazing. But then, that's our Kim
for you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

545. Re: Liberty Net on 3947.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 17:53:24 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9smkqp$ve6$4@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 23494
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberal.comzz> wrote in message
news:9sl2auesu0@dosa.alt.net...
> Get a load of the conspiracy theorists! Vic and his co-conspirators
are
> having a field day this evening. They must be reading from the John Birch
> Bible again. I can almost hear the theme song from The Twilight Zone
playing
> in the background though perhaps the Dueling Banjo instrumental would be
> better fitted.
> Next thing you know they will be reporting that those mysterious black
> helicopters are hovering over their homes....that makes it difficult for
> them to bury their rifles in their hermetically sealed containers.
> The sky is falling! The sky is falling! The sky is falling! The sky is
> falling! The sky is falling!

And more prominently, you could've heard "Arf! Arf!" jamming the net with
music and white noise.

546. The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 19:11:52 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23492

Let's focus on JUST ONE aspect of the Morse Code testing controversy. (Remember: The testing requirement is the controversy, not Morse Code itself.)

There is one important difference between Morse Code and other topics tested. I hope I can avoid all the other arguments that have been beaten to death 100 times per day every day. (I apologize if this argument has also been beaten to death. I have only sporadically read this newsgroup.)

ONLY Morse Code has UNILATERAL pass/fail power under the current system of licensing HF operators. If you are completely ignorant about antennas and feedlines, you can still pass your written exams if you answer enough of the other questions correctly to earn a passing grade. For example, the Amateur Extra exam has 5 questions on this topic. If you only answer one question correctly (due to sheer blind luck), you can still pass if you answer 36 of the remaining 45 questions correctly. The same applies for other sub-topics like receiver components, band privileges, operating practices, propagation, emergency communications, test equipment, and other areas.

On the other hand, one MUST pass the Morse Code exam in order to upgrade to General and Amateur Extra, regardless of one's knowledge of other topics or performance on the written exams. Thus, Morse Code has the unilateral pass/fail power that NO other topic has.

QUESTION: Does Morse Code testing deserve its unilateral pass/fail authority that no other topic has? If so, why?

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
jason_hsu_802701@@@yahoo.com
http://www.jasonhsu.com/ham_radio.html

547. Where's KT4TR?????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 19:13:11 UTC
From: herbiebabykv4fz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011111141311.16499.00001616@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 23493

Where is that Sawed Off, Pot Bellied, Drunken, Lying Asshole.

He stole ALL of my legal defense fund money and drank it up!

And, what happened to his orange grove?

Herbie Baby KV4FZ

548. Re: Amateur Service Withers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 20:26:42 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0111111226.5bacbfec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23495

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

> Perhaps the bands could be divided into subbands by mode - CW only,
> digital only, and analog voice/image only. The Basic would grant
> limited access to parts of these subbands, and higher class
> endorseements (say, "Telegraph", "Digital", and "Phone") would grant
> full privileges on their respective segments. The tests for these
> endorsements would be specific to those modes.

The notion of a "Basic" amateur radio license with "endorsements" after passing tests for various modes is, IMNSHO, a really bad idea.

After all is said and done, the one underlying difference between the amateur radio service and the other personal radio services (CB, FRS, etc.) is the fact that we are licensed to build our own station and put it on the air. We alone are licensed to build a 1.5KW transmitter and put it on the air, without any "inspection" of that transmitter by the FCC before we stroke up on our favorite band.

This "permission to experiment", unique to our hobby both in the equipment *and* the modes we use, is what sets us apart. Restricting our operation and experimentation to only those modes or equipment types we have 'endorsements' for, such as is done in aviation for example, would be the end of the Amateur Radio Service.

Since we couldn't tinker with anything new until we had studied and tested for the endorsement, experimentation and tinkering would come to an immediate halt. There is little enough of it now, and the idea of qualifying for endorsements before we could tinker with a new mode or technology would end experimentation within the framework of amateur radio for all time.

The only legimimate function of testing in the context of amateur radio licensing is to ensure that the licensee has a basic familiarity of technical concepts, such that they can ensure that their experimenting and operation does not trash the electromatic spectrum for other users, and that they stay within the bands allocated to them.

I firmly believe that the amateur rules ought be simplified to:

97.1 To get an Amateur Radio license, you are required to pass a technical test to show that you understand how to build simple equipment which meets spectral purity specifications of (.....blah, blah, blah). You will be issued a license and callsign when you

pass the test. Transmit your call sign once every 10 minutes when on the air.

97.2 Your power limit is 1.5KW to the antenna.

97.3 Here are your bands. Stay inside of them.

97.4 Your are encouraged to tinker and experiment and communicate and do public service and talk to strangers in far away lands and launch communications satellites into space and any other cool technical "radio stuff" you may think up. The government doesn't care what mode you use for any of this. (See 97.3)

97.5 Play nice. We'll try to keep the CBers out of your hair. Deliberate interference, unresolved dirty signals, or other asinine behavior on your part will cause Riley Hollingsworth to come and permanently kick your ass off the playground. Have fun.

Love always,
/signed/ FCC

73, de Hans, K0HB

549. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 21:59:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BEEF4C6.DF7F4898@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23496

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> I don't think so, Kim. Eliminating code testing, and replacing it with a
> practical demonstration of technical knowledge wouldn't necessarily
> "piss" me off. The simple fact is, that the best projects for such a
> test would be simple CW transmitters/receivers. And what would
> a ham so tested need to know to use his creations on-the-air? You
> guessed it -- the Morse code!
>

Ever notice that there are two CW subbands nocode hams can
operate on? There's 50.0 to 50.1, and 144.0 to 144.1

Also, maybe a way of making CW practice more fun is to
gather everyone in the same room, give everyone a code
practice osc and key, and pretend that you're all on the
air on the same frequency all trying to operate some rare
DX (ie, pileup). Or do a kind of WAS CW net, like those
the Century net does on 3905 SSB. Each operator is told
that he is in suchandsuch state, etc.

550. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 22:20:15 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BEEEAB4.8E8B7311@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23497

It is a matter of class and taste, some people never acquire
either.

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
> inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.
> I don't recall ever calling it "obscene."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

551. Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 22:46:53 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <dpvtut4b835hon3qtln5scq9ds2e1ig13d@4ax.com>
Source record: 23498

Ed...

Get ahold of QST, Jun 01, page 75, upper right hand corner.

By my eyeball, the RF starts about half a millisecond before the key closes, and stops a good 10 milliseconds before the key opens.

Do you think you could get Ten-Tec to publish the pulse anticipation circuit they must have used to create this miracle?

{;-)

Jim

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

552. Re: Where's KT4TR?????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-11 23:56:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111111556.293c3918@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23499

herbiebabykv4fz@aol.com (Herb St. Croix) wrote in message
news:<20011111141311.16499.00001616@mb-de.aol.com>...
> Where is that Sawed Off, Pot Bellied, Drunken, Lying Asshole.
>
> He stole ALL of my legal defense fund money and drank it up!
>
> And, what happened to his orange grove?
>
> Herbie Baby KV4FZ
>
>
Dontcha mean EX kv4fz Herbie Baby?
>
>
dit-dit.
>
>
w3rv

553. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 00:02:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111111602.e21689c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23500

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com>...
> upgrade to General and Amateur Extra, regardless of one's knowledge of
> other topics or performance on the written exams. Thus, Morse Code
> has the unilateral pass/fail power that NO other topic has.
>
> QUESTION: Does Morse Code testing deserve its unilateral pass/fail
> authority that no other topic has? If so, why?
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
>
It's very simple. If ya flunk the writtens ya flunk the exam. If ya
flunk the code test ya flunk the exam. (Not counting the CSCEs thing)
>
w3rv

554. Re: Dropping the code. (Third msg attempt!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 00:16:17 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <kb9tmp@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9sn5lm$s1t$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 23551

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:3BED980E.C0938AF4@earthlink.net...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > >I second that motion! All those in favor say I,
> > >all those opposed tap out .- -. -.-- on your key.
> > >The I's have it! :)
> >
> > Isn't that -. .- -.-- ?
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > KC2HMN
>
>
> Geez! He screwed up BOTH parts of it.
>
> Dave K8MN

What did you expect on a _AMATEUR_ ng, perfection maybe?
I'm just not up to speed on parliamentary procedures or code.

BTW thanks for not making it a personal attack
like I've seen others do around here! :o
--

'73' From KB9TMP

"there is no rule against being stupid"
-Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com

555. Re: Dropping the code. (Third msg attempt!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 01:01:11 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011111200111.23881.00002214@mb-fp.news.cs.com>
Source record: 23552

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:3BED980E.C0938AF4@earthlink.net...
>> Bert Craig wrote:
>> >
>> > >I second that motion! All those in favor say I,
>> > >all those opposed tap out .- -. -.-- on your key.
>> > >The I's have it! :)
>> >
>> > Isn't that -. .- -.-- ?
>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > KC2HMN
>>
>>
>> Geez! He screwed up BOTH parts of it.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>What did you expect on a _AMATEUR_ ng, perfection maybe?
>I'm just not up to speed on parliamentary procedures or code.
>
>BTW thanks for not making it a personal attack
>like I've seen others do around here! :o
>--
>
>'73' From KB9TMP

No thanks necessary, personal attacks are not my style. :-) Besides, I've just memorized the required 43 charcters so it's fresh in my head. Take it easy.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

556. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 01:20:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011111202037.08355.00002017@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 23553

In article <3beb59bf_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>I live in "county" out here--outside city or town limits. However, in town,
>I thought it was very interesting that the usual 30mph applies *until* the
>first house on the black side, then the speed increases to 40mph.

Kim:

Maybe the black people in your town are a lot busier than the white people, and can't waste their time parading around town at a stately 30 MPH.

>Another
>interesting thing is the cemetery(ies). One is at one end of town and I am
>told that no black person is buried there; the "blacks" are buried in their
>own cemetery, which is on the "black" side of town.

What self-respecting black person would want to have some mean-spirited, racist, violent, pickup truck-driving, robe-and-hood wearing, white trailer trash buried in their cemetaries? Has it ever occurred to you that segregation exists because the allegedly "segregated" people want it that way?

>Now all this "stuff" is
>what I've been told by some very mean and weird acting people.

Yeah -- mean and weird acting *white* people.

>I don't ask questions.

I see. So, then -- you're not interested in the problem, and in possibly being a part of the solution? Well, at least, that's consistent with the selfish motives of a person who keeps a ham radio callsign which is demeaning to women, and damaging to the image of the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

557. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 02:18:22 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <OjGH7.166754$3d2.6649732@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23554

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011111202037.08355.00002017@nso-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3beb59bf_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >I live in "county" out here--outside city or town limits. However, in
town,
> >I thought it was very interesting that the usual 30mph applies *until*
the
> >first house on the black side, then the speed increases to 40mph.
>
> Kim:
>
> Maybe the black people in your town are a lot busier than the white
> people, and can't waste their time parading around town at a stately
> 30 MPH.
>
> >Another
> >interesting thing is the cemetery(ies). One is at one end of town and I
am
> >told that no black person is buried there; the "blacks" are buried in
their
> >own cemetery, which is on the "black" side of town.
>
> What self-respecting black person would want to have some mean-spirited,
> racist, violent, pickup truck-driving, robe-and-hood wearing, white
trailer
> trash buried in their cemetaries? Has it ever occurred to you that
> segregation exists because the allegedly "segregated" people want it
> that way?
>
> >Now all this "stuff" is
> >what I've been told by some very mean and weird acting people.
>
> Yeah -- mean and weird acting *white* people.
>
> >I don't ask questions.
>
> I see. So, then -- you're not interested in the problem, and in possibly
> being a part of the solution? Well, at least, that's consistent with the
> selfish motives of a person who keeps a ham radio callsign which is
> demeaning to women, and damaging to the image of the ARS.
>

> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
Cheap shot, Larry or at the very least a swivel gun on a sitting duck.

In this part of the planet, no one does 30 so the issue is moot. As far as cemetaries, these have been being done thru black churches for eons; the church may own a cemetary and provide its membership with a decent burial regardless of what are likely to be trying financial circumstances. Part of the Baptist tradition that the SBC long since forgot. Incidentally, the grave sites of my parents when the day comes border on a block owned by a local black church for precisely that reason. Take me when I'm gone to Forest Lawn.

There is also the matter of the funeral trade, perhaps the last bastion of racial, financial, and religious segregation in the old U. S. of A.

I live in the local version of the U.N. General Assembly although our Muslim population has declined. Damn, I really liked Uzbek rice pilaf. With the Latino invasion of the Omaha area we now have a pretty good representation. It is fun to polka with a 70+ year-old black lady to Mexican music on the lawn. Fakes the living daylites out of the Latinos but they are a fun-loving bunch; perhaps soon we can teach them to polka to Who Stole the Kishka if it doesn't snow. The prospect of a yard party featuring Frankie Yankovich and the Yanks (no relation to Wierd Al) and the Six Fat Dutchmen is almost too delicious to contemplate. Diversity is like being a grandpa, enjoy it then send them home.

Mad Richard's Immigration Policy: if they can cook, let 'em in. When I lived in WI, I regularly ate at an Albanian place (one of four in a very small SMSA) and miss it terribly. The Macedonian who ran the place swore that the Albanians taught the Greeks who taught the Italians who taught the French to cook. Might have been believable if the cook hadn't been named Jose. One of the major downers of living in the mid-Continent is that it is the land of the bland; vegetables consist of steam table peas, corn, carrots, and mixtures thereof cooked to oblivion. Anyone who can produce a decent steamed cauliflower should be granted immediate citizenship and kissed on all four cheeks by the INS.

Given the level of road maintenance in the poorer ends of town, and for that matter the total lack of hill-leveling when the roads were built, I strongly doubt anyone but the terminally fearful actually speed up in these neighborhoods. Nothing in the world like blasting down a brick street on a major incline in a B-350 trying like hell to hold it under 45.

Dick NBK

558. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 07:29:03 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <8B65D5AD7F1C73B6.6D76961EA0737690.26F43D10978AC4AA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23555

On Tue, 06 Nov 2001 13:57:54 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Robert Casey wrote:
>> I figure the extra ham license is equivalent to a 3 to
>> 6 credit hour college class.
>
>I figure maybe freshman level EE classes (minus English,
>History, etc).

Certainly beats the snot out of anything I had to answer for first
year EET.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

559. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 07:49:05 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <CB1E8EC234BC5AFA.4F72361530F884CB.48AFF8903EE06204@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23556

On Wed, 7 Nov 2001 21:20:38 +0000 (UTC), "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net>
wrote:

> The Quarter Century Appliance Operators was founded in the
>early 1950's by a small group of Amateur Radio operators from
>the Pacific Northwest. They had been active in their hobby for
>over 25 years, yet still lacked the basic knowledge of radio
>electronics and had no idea of how their equipment worked.

Well, I have no idea how a lot of my equipment works, but I know how a much more basic pile o' electronics doing a small subset of their functions would work. Does that count?

If I take the cover off my D7A, I can't even make a guess at what some parts are for, but give me a sufficiently well-stocked junk box, and I should be able to assemble a rudimentary FM receiver, maybe even a TNC. OTOH, I haven't been able to find a good explanation of what AIP actually is, let alone how to implement it. (If anyone can point me to a worthwhile description of how it works, please do. The manuals are decidedly vague, and I can't find anything better on the web) I just know it helps cut down on the intermod. Most of the features, beyond turning RF into audio and vice versa, are beyond my current knowledge.

Am I an appliance operator, a 'real ham,' or some strange, undefined creature in between?

> When faced with insults and dreision,

You face me with dreision, buddy, and I'll have to figure out what the hell it is so I'll know what to do about it.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

560. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 07:57:21 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <6E4D6814161D43D3.9DE418F6DF5B8EE6.AC5E2812EF947AAD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23557

On Thu, 8 Nov 2001 22:19:24 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>If a "construction" project of some sort were to be brought into the testing
>arena, it at least proves that the ham is aware of FCC specifications,
>rules, regulations, and guidelines.

How about just handing them the appropriate test equipment, then
turning them loose in a half-dozen or so stations (assembled specially
for the test, of course) and telling them to find the ones which:
a) violate the regs
b) are improperly set up with regard to normal operating practices
(i.e. antenna on entirely wrong band for the rig, FM rig and
horizontally polarized antenna, etc)
c) should, theoretically work best for their stated purpose

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

561. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 08:03:09 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <95142EFB443B78A7.EE09CD4A4EAF45BD.095B75D8D6803ABF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23558

On Tue, 06 Nov 2001 22:37:30 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>It doesn't matter. CW is not a proper tool for misbehaving.

It is if the key is wired to your car horn for use in heavy traffic.

Sometimes it's satisfying to know they heard your choice comment on
their ancestry, even if they obviously didn't understand it.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

562. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 08:04:12 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <10C9FC906E1830C6.8AD561BBAAE7EF71.B99F2285A81D2F33@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23559

On Fri, 09 Nov 2001 15:59:56 GMT, Nonya Bidniz <no_email@all.gov>
wrote:

>The only "proper tool for misbehaving" is a CB rig.

Hmm...and all this time I thought it was a family size bottle of
Hershey's Syrup.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

563. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 15:12:00 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <4FRH7.183258$W8.6436016@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23560

I originally posted:

>>A classic example of this (featherbedding) was
>>the federal requirement for a fireman on all railroad trains,
>>even those powered by diesel-electric locomotives

Jim, N2EY, responded:

> A poor example. Driving a ten thousand ton train almost two miles long is not
> anything like driving a car or truck.

> Many of the early diesel-electric locomotives required a fireman to operate
> them. They were also relatively unreliable and quirky to operate. As the
> technology advanced, the fireman requirement was eliminated.

Well, it *was* a while ago, so my memory of this isn't perfect. And it
wasn't quite cut and dried. My recollection is that the 'firemen' couldn't
be reclassified as 'assistant engineers' or 'crewmen' because this would
have gutted the firemen's union of membership. So a real knock-down,
drag-out labor dispute ensued that threatened to shut down the nation's
railway system.

My point was that union power and federal regulations conspired to
maintain a status quo that prevented railroad management from crafting
a more modern, cost-effective... and safe... working system.

> It was only "featherbedding" to some of those who didn't actually
> have to do it.

Like a lot of other terms that came out of the labor disputes
of the twentieth century (yellow-dog contract, scab, goon),
it is a term we are stuck with to describe a certain set of
circumstances.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

564. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 15:55:21 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <JhSH7.21742$xS6.33159@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23561

Joe Bramblett says:

>Well, I have no idea how a lot of my equipment works, but I know how a
>much more basic pile o' electronics doing a small subset of their
>functions would work.

Sorry, but that pretty much disqualifies you from membership in QCAO.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

RF propagation is *not* magic. There are perfectly
good technical reasons for sacrificing a goat in
your antenna field every once in awhile.

565. i wanto become a ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 18:20:55 UTC
From: Don Zimmer <dz2390@smicer.biz>
Message-ID: <3BF01307.3BEDE058@smicer.biz>
Source record: 23562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mr. Wiseman whois call is kc8jbo said that any can becoem a ham if they realy want to. He said you can do real good if you get theright vE like he did becaues all it costs is a little moeny. Where can I find a VE so I can be an extra rite away near Glen Dale, wv? I am in school so I cant take exams during weekday affternoons.

Thank you
Don

566. Re: i wanto become a ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 19:00:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF01C65.EB035E6D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23563
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This comes in at around S8 on my trollmeter.

Don Zimmer wrote:

> Mr. Wiseman whois call is kc8jbo said that any can becoem a ham if they
> realy want to. He said you can do real good if you get theright vE like
> he did becaues all it costs is a little moeny. Where can I find a VE so
> I can be an extra rite away near Glen Dale, wv? I am in school so I
> cant take exams during weekday affternoons.

VE sessions are usually on weekends....

Old saying: Man with hole in pocket feel cocky!

567. Re: i wanto become a ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 19:14:11 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF01F84.5D603BBC@psu.edu>
Source record: 23564
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

he, he. If you have to be a troll, you might as well be funny about it.
You gave me a good laugh there Don!

- Mike -

Don Zimmer wrote:
>
> Mr. Wiseman whois call is kc8jbo said that any can becoem a ham if they
> realy want to. He said you can do real good if you get theright vE like
> he did becaues all it costs is a little moeny. Where can I find a VE so
> I can be an extra rite away near Glen Dale, wv? I am in school so I
> cant take exams during weekday affternoons.
>
> Thank you
> Don

568. Re: i wanto become a ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 19:14:41 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9spd6c$p5c$3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 23565
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Don Zimmer" <dz2390@smicer.biz> wrote in message
news:3BF01307.3BEDE058@smicer.biz...
> Mr. Wiseman whois call is kc8jbo said that any can becoem a ham if they
> realy want to. He said you can do real good if you get theright vE like
> he did becaues all it costs is a little moeny. Where can I find a VE so
> I can be an extra rite away near Glen Dale, wv? I am in school so I
> cant take exams during weekday affternoons.
>
> Thank you
> Don

You have to be able to read and write first, Don. Maybe your parole officer can get you into that adult education programs for the mentally handicapped that you so richly need. With all the spirit of giving since Sept. 11, hell, you might get a "Don Zimmer brain transplant fund" telethon to help you along.

569. Re: i wanto become a ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-12 22:32:17 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <R5YH7.22298$xS6.34913@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23566
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Don Zimmer said:

>Mr. Wiseman whois call is kc8jbo said that any can becoem a ham if they
>realy want to. He said you can do real good if you get theright vE like
>he did becaues all it costs is a little moeny. Where can I find a VE so
>I can be an extra rite away near Glen Dale, wv? I am in school so I
>cant take exams during weekday affternoons.
>
>Thank you
>Don

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
1.4.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious.
It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly
lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful
troll. Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the
premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their
hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform
the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

570. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 01:29:33 UTC
From: stewartx@sccoast.net
Message-ID: <6be98d7d.0111121729.45ab4f0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23567

"Kim-W5TIT" wrote...
>
> Whoa!!! When did that happen
> [the unarmed National Guard]?
> I clearly remember Kent State.
> That was not an unarmed rifle
> that killed!!!

True. However, if I remember correctly, I believe Kent State was declared a martial law situation (civil unrest) by the governor. Anyway, it is exactly because of that incident (and a similar, but less well known, incident in Florida) Guard members don't carry loaded weapons in similar situations today. Of course, I haven't been to the local airport recently, so I don't know if the Guard personnel there now are carrying ammo. The WTC attack was an unusual incident, so that may have led to a change in that policy.

> Oh, OK. Say, for instance the
> National-Guard-at-airports idea
> stayed with us now from here on.
> I wouldn't mind at all having
> one or two guardsmen at each
> security scanning station. I
> also think that the guardsmen
> should be behind bullet proof
> glass (small guard shacks) at
> airports. I think that sight
> is far more imposing than "just
> a soldier."

I suppose that makes sense at larger, international airports, but let's look at the other extreme. At the small airport here, with it's no international flights and only two or three flights coming in from around the country each day, it does seems a little silly to have 65 (yes, I heard it on a recent news broadcast) National Guard personnel sitting around that airport 24 hrs a day collecting full active duty pay. Remember, this is in addition to the airport's own security personnal and the local law enforcement personnel that routinely patrol the airport. To me, that seems to be some mighty expensive window dressing just to make people feel better.

Well, I'm going to cut this short, Kim. Since my news server is down again, I'm posting this from Google.com (which I find very distractingly unfamiliar).

571. Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 01:37:14 UTC
From: thehirts@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011112203714.17119.00002157@mb-fh.aol.com>
Source record: 23568

My husband and I are picking up a ham radio broadcast on our computer, our radio, and our telephone. Can anyone tell me if this is legal and if not, who I contact to stop it? Please email us at TheHirts@aol.com with any suggestions. Thank you!!!

572. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 01:55:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011112205540.18926.00001971@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 23569

In article <3BE8387C.F481BE3D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>The Affirmative Action program was necessitated because racists
>violated the 1964 Civil Rights Law. Racists had their chance to
>comply and the Affirmative Action program was the predictable
>result of their non-compliance. The racists have only themselves
>to blame for the swinging of the pendulum.

Cecil:

Incorrect. The Affirmative Action program was instituted in order for
liberal Democrat politicians to be able to cement the votes of the
minority population, primarily blacks. Just another wagon on the
political gravy train, intended to keep certain groups of people
dependent on big government and keep Democrats in power forever.

The usual Moorecrap about the Morse Code being a "creed" snipped
to prevent further stinking up of the newsgroup.

73 de Larry, K3LT

573. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 01:55:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011112205541.18926.00001972@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 23570

In article <f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>
>ONLY Morse Code has UNILATERAL pass/fail power under the current
>system of licensing HF operators.

Jason:

Not only has the above argument been beaten to death many times
over, it is one of the classics among the empty, meaningless whines
of the NCTA.

>If you are completely ignorant about antennas and feedlines,

You should not get a ham license, either -- but, unfortunately, the written
tests are not structured that way. Were I in charge, they would be!

SNIP

>On the other hand, one MUST pass the Morse Code exam in order to
>upgrade to General and Amateur Extra, regardless of one's knowledge of
>other topics or performance on the written exams. Thus, Morse Code
>has the unilateral pass/fail power that NO other topic has.

Precisely. And this is one thing I would NEVER change.

>QUESTION: Does Morse Code testing deserve its unilateral pass/fail
>authority that no other topic has?

Yes, it does.

>If so, why?

Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
amateurs -- and this mode has many unique functional characterists which
cannot be exploited without operators trained in the use of the Morse Code.
History has proven that it is code *testing* which ultimately results in the
vast majority of code *usage* on the amateur bands. Without the testing, the
ability
to exploit the many benefits and advantages of this mode will eventually be
lost within the ARS. Therefore, this mode deserves special consideration in
the
license testing process. And a mere 5 WPM doesn't cut it. A minimum of a 12
WPM code test should be required for full amateur HF operating privileges.

73 de Larry, K3LT

574. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 02:13:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011112211307.25429.00002129@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 23571

In article <20011112203714.17119.00002157@mb-fh.aol.com>, thehirts@aol.com (TheHirts) writes:

>
>My husband and I are picking up a ham radio broadcast on our computer, our
>radio, and our telephone. Can anyone tell me if this is legal and if not,
>who
>I contact to stop it? Please email us at TheHirts@aol.com with any
>suggestions.
>Thank you!!!
>

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Hirt:

Yes, it is perfectly legal for you to receive amateur radio "broadcasts" on your computer, radio, and telephone. Enjoy it at your leisure!

73 de Larry, K3LT

575. Re: i wanto become a ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 02:13:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011112211308.25429.00002130@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 23572

In article <R5YH7.22298$xS6.34913@www.newsranger.com>, K0HB<K0HB@QWEST.NET>
writes:

>
>The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!
>
>It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious.
>It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly
>lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful
>troll. Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the
>premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their
>hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform
>the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!
>

And here's the recount:

*** .08 ***

I had to break out my special K3LT Expanded Scale Trollometer
in order to get a reading on this one!

73 de Larry, K3LT

576. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 02:31:40 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmpj7u9.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23573

On Mon, 12 Nov 2001 15:12:00 GMT, Jim Bromley, K7JEB wrote:

>> Many of the early diesel-electric locomotives required a fireman to operate
>> them. They were also relatively unreliable and quirky to operate. As the
>> technology advanced, the fireman requirement was eliminated.
>
>Well, it *was* a while ago, so my memory of this isn't perfect. And it
>wasn't quite cut and dried. My recollection is that the 'firemen' couldn't
>be reclassified as 'assistant engineers' or 'crewmen' because this would
>have gutted the firemen's union of membership. So a real knock-down,
>drag-out labor dispute ensued that threatened to shut down the nation's
>railway system.

All "firemen" today have qualified as "engineers" and the position
is now "assistant engineer". Regardless of seniority, the two trade
off as to who "drives" the train and who is the "assistant" for any
specififc run. Certain runs such as the Capitol Corridor passenger
runs in California now operate with a single cab engineer.

>My point was that union power and federal regulations conspired to
>maintain a status quo that prevented railroad management from crafting
>a more modern, cost-effective... and safe... working system.

Interesting to note that last week the Brotherhood of Locomotive
Engineers and the United Transportation Union combined as a single
union that now includes all train and engine crew titles.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

577. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 02:48:18 UTC
From: thehirts@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011112214818.24658.00002540@mb-fn.aol.com>
Source record: 23574

Actually, I was referring to thr fact that these tranmissions are coming in uninvited and we can't seem to turn them off.
My question really involved figuring out who is transmitting them on the ham radio, and if they are obligated to do something so the tranmissions are not heard, or if it is our obligation to buy some sort of equipment that will filter them out for us.

578. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 03:17:32 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3bf08f4f.1132252@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 23575

On 13 Nov 2001 02:48:18 GMT, thehirts@aol.com (TheHirts) wrote:

>Actually, I was referring to thr fact that these tranmissions are coming in
>uninvited and we can't seem to turn them off.
>My question really involved figuring out who is transmitting them on the ham
>radio, and if they are obligated to do something so the tranmissions are not
>heard, or if it is our obligation to buy some sort of equipment that will
>filter them out for us.

The answer is...it depends.

First - Are you positive as to the person being a ham? Do you
have the person's call sign (e.g. could be like K2UNK, WN4C,
KB6XYZ, etc.)

Second - IF you have a call sign, you can look it up on
a database published by the FCC.

Third - IF you have a valid identity, the ham, if you
contact his/her could have a technical problem with his
or her station equipment....however....

Fourth - It may well be the case that the consumer equipment
you have is not tolerant of certain legal signal conditions and
the ham is operating within allowed legal operation.

Did the "problem" start suddenly? Recently?

Anyway, just some info to help you.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

579. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 03:57:02 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sq5l102job@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23576

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011112211307.25429.00002129@nso-fc.aol.com...
> In article <20011112203714.17119.00002157@mb-fh.aol.com>, thehirts@aol.com
> (TheHirts) writes:
>
> >
> >My husband and I are picking up a ham radio broadcast on our computer,
our
> >radio, and our telephone. Can anyone tell me if this is legal and if
not,
> >who
> >I contact to stop it? Please email us at TheHirts@aol.com with any
> >suggestions.
> >Thank you!!!
> >
>
> Dear Mr. & Mrs. Hirt:
>
> Yes, it is perfectly legal for you to receive amateur radio "broadcasts"
> on your computer, radio, and telephone. Enjoy it at your leisure!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Don't you mean, "at your peril?"

580. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 04:08:33 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sq6ak02l1j@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23577

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011112205541.18926.00001972@nso-fi.aol.com...
> Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
> efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio

Walking is a universal and efficient form of transportation, but one doesn't have to prove they can walk in order to get a driver's license. Nor should one have to show high-speed code skills in order to use a microphone.

> amateurs -- and this mode has many unique functional characterists which
> cannot be exploited without operators trained in the use of the Morse
Code.
> History has proven that it is code *testing* which ultimately results in
the

Most of the hams I know were just damn glad to get the test out of the way so that they'd never have to listen to so much as another "dit" again.

> vast majority of code *usage* on the amateur bands. Without the testing,
the
> ability
> to exploit the many benefits and advantages of this mode will eventually
be
> lost within the ARS. Therefore, this mode deserves special consideration
in
> the

IOW, welfare support of code.

> license testing process. And a mere 5 WPM doesn't cut it. A minimum of a
12
> WPM code test should be required for full amateur HF operating privileges.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

The last time I checked, 5 WPM met the treaty requirements.

581. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 04:39:00 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Et1I7.168021$3d2.6790404@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23578

Larry, I will point out that Morse - up until the downgrading of everything to 5 WPM - did not necessarily have that total effect either. If you failed the 20 WPM test, you might well have still upgraded to advanced (or general). At 5 WPM, you either know the code or don't. Slowing to 1 WPM won't help at this point (unless during that 1 minute they happen not to hit one of the many letters or numbers someone doesn't know). Then again, I wouldn't know the difference between an E and a T at that speed. Kinda like measuring a 1/100 Hz signal with a counter with 1 second max timebase.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011112205541.18926.00001972@nso-fi.aol.com...
> In article <f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com>,
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>
> >
> >ONLY Morse Code has UNILATERAL pass/fail power under the current
> >system of licensing HF operators.
>
> Jason:
>
> Not only has the above argument been beaten to death many times
> over, it is one of the classics among the empty, meaningless whines
> of the NCTA.
>
> >If you are completely ignorant about antennas and feedlines,
>
> You should not get a ham license, either -- but, unfortunately, the written
> tests are not structured that way. Were I in charge, they would be!
>
> SNIP
>
> >On the other hand, one MUST pass the Morse Code exam in order to
> >upgrade to General and Amateur Extra, regardless of one's knowledge of
> >other topics or performance on the written exams. Thus, Morse Code
> >has the unilateral pass/fail power that NO other topic has.
>
> Precisely. And this is one thing I would NEVER change.
>
> >QUESTION: Does Morse Code testing deserve its unilateral pass/fail
> >authority that no other topic has?
>

> Yes, it does.
>
> >If so, why?
>
> Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
> efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
> amateurs -- and this mode has many unique functional characterists which
> cannot be exploited without operators trained in the use of the Morse
Code.
> History has proven that it is code *testing* which ultimately results in
the
> vast majority of code *usage* on the amateur bands. Without the testing,
the
> ability
> to exploit the many benefits and advantages of this mode will eventually
be
> lost within the ARS. Therefore, this mode deserves special consideration
in
> the
> license testing process. And a mere 5 WPM doesn't cut it. A minimum of a
12
> WPM code test should be required for full amateur HF operating privileges.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

582. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 06:14:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF0BA49.D6353F15@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23579

In general the ham radio community would like to avoid annoying
neighbors. What you may be having is called RFI (radio frequency
interference). A local RFI committee (a branch of the ARRL,
a national ham radio club) may be able to help. Look at
http://www.arrl.org
Odds are it's your equipment not successfully ignoring
legal ham radio transmissions. The ham doesn't *have*
to fix it, but odds are, with the RFI committee, would
want to fix it so you don't have the problem.

TheHirts wrote:

> Actually, I was referring to thr fact that these tranmissions are coming in
> uninvited and we can't seem to turn them off.
> My question really involved figuring out who is transmitting them on the ham
> radio, and if they are obligated to do something so the tranmissions are not
> heard, or if it is our obligation to buy some sort of equipment that will
> filter them out for us.

583. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 06:23:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011113012341.25429.00002149@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 23580

In article <20011110220331.23850.00000397@nso-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>A poor example. Driving a ten thousand ton train almost two miles long is not
>anything like driving a car or truck.
>
>Many of the early diesel-electric locomotives required a fireman to operate
>them. They were also relatively unreliable and quirky to operate. As the
>technology advanced, the fireman requirement was eliminated.
>
>It was only "featherbedding" to some of those who didn't actually have to do
>it.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

Considering all the stuff on a diesel-electric locomotive that could possibly catch fire (2200 gal. of diesel fuel, and wiring carrying 4700 amps of current, among others), one would think that having a fireman aboard wouldn't be such a bad idea! (Naturally, I'm talking about the type of "fireman" that puts fires out, not ignites and feeds them, as on a steam locomotive!)

http://www.howstuffworks.com/diesel-locomotive.htm

73 de Larry, K3LT

584. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 06:40:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011113014036.25429.00002150@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 23581

In article <9sq6ak02l1j@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20011112205541.18926.00001972@nso-fi.aol.com...
>> Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
>> efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
>
>Walking is a universal and efficient form of transportation, but one doesn't
>have to prove they can walk in order to get a driver's license. Nor should
>one have to show high-speed code skills in order to use a microphone.

Typical no-coder response: Compare the Morse code testing requirements
to something with no comparable characteristics; i.e. driver's licensing
requirements. However, I'm sure you've seen this argument used
before, and re-using a stale, old, useless argument is a lot easier than
coming up with something original. And, *ease* is what this is all about,
from your point-of-view.

>Most of the hams I know were just damn glad to get the test out of the way
>so that they'd never have to listen to so much as another "dit" again.

Of this, I have absolutely no doubt. As stated above, it is a lot easier,
less challenging both mentally and physically, to pick up a microphone
and talk, than it is to learn a useful communications skill.

>> vast majority of code *usage* on the amateur bands. Without the testing,
>the
>> ability
>> to exploit the many benefits and advantages of this mode will eventually
>be
>> lost within the ARS. Therefore, this mode deserves special consideration
>in
>> the
>
>IOW, welfare support of code.

No, the "Welfare" program is Restructuring.

>> license testing process. And a mere 5 WPM doesn't cut it. A minimum of a
>12
>> WPM code test should be required for full amateur HF operating privileges.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

>The last time I checked, 5 WPM met the treaty requirements.

Well, at least you got one thing right. And, BTW, I don't recall ever saying that it didn't!

73 de Larry, K3LT

585. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 07:06:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113020635.16795.00002712@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23582

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: stewartx@sccoast.net (Dwight Stewart)
>Date: 11/12/2001 7:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <6be98d7d.0111121729.45ab4f0a@posting.google.com>

> True. However, if I remember correctly, I believe Kent State was
>declared a martial law situation (civil unrest) by the governor.

Yours truly has special insight to KSU and the events of May 4th, 1970.

Several of the "protesters" encouraged the crowd to disregard the Riot Act warning read to them by a KSU police sergeant and told them the Guard's weapons were not loaded.

Please notice that none of the figures of the "leadership" of the protesters was hit. They were not only NOT at the front of the crowd, they weren'a anywhere near the events themselves.

Thier sole purpose at KSU was to create a riot situation and incite the crowd to unrest, however unmotivated they may have initially been.

It succeeded. Unfortunately for them, the NatGuard had just come off the Independent Truckers strike and they were tired...TOO tired to put up with a bunch of snot nosed kids loking to enliven thier week by destroying brand new dorms and libraries. AND....they were armed.

>Anyway, it is exactly because of that incident (and a similar, but
>less well known, incident in Florida) Guard members don't carry loaded
>weapons in similar situations today.

Oh?

True, the Guard does train in non-lethal riot control techniques, but you can bet, Sir, that if you see a firearm brandished, it HAS ammunition in it.

>The WTC attack was an unusual incident, so that
>may have led to a change in that policy.

If you see a magazine in the well, it's loaded.

73

Steve, K4YZ

586. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 07:18:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113021804.16859.00002807@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23583

>Subject: Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone
>From: thehirts@aol.com (TheHirts)
>Date: 11/12/2001 8:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011112214818.24658.00002540@mb-fn.aol.com>

>Actually, I was referring to thr fact that these tranmissions are coming in
>uninvited and we can't seem to turn them off.
>My question really involved figuring out who is transmitting them on the ham
>radio, and if they are obligated to do something so the tranmissions are not
>heard, or if it is our obligation to buy some sort of equipment that will
>filter them out for us.

Every electronic device that is capable of either radiating or being interfered with by an RF radiator (intentional or otherwise) usually has a "Part 15" caveat on the back.

Unfortunately most people do not know what this means...In brief, it means your UNlicensed device may be subject to interference from LICENSED services, and that there is no recourse available.

The good thing is that if this problem IS originating from an Amateur Radio operator, he/she will probably be morem than glad to assist you in getting the problem fixed.

Unfortunately, too many people refer to any kind of "errant" electronic interference as "ham" radio in nature. That's as foolish as calling every small airplane you see a "Piper Cub".

You might refer your problem to the American Radio Relay League in Newington, CT. They have an extrememly talented gentleman there who specializes in rectifying this kind of problem. <w1rfi@arrl.org>

Good Luck

Steve Robeson, LPN
Amateur Radio Station K4YZ
Winchester, TN

587. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 07:48:47 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <zf4I7.110314$WW.6629498@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23584

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message >
> The answer is...it depends.
>

I have had a very cordial e-mail QSO with them covering essentially the same ground that has been covered here. The case is a bit more complex than what has shown up here but my best guess is that they have a CBer pumping some AM heat thru an Antron 99 or somesuch. Part of the problem is that there is no antenna in sight.

Good people, be nice.

Dick N&#65533;BK

588. ARNewsline 1265 - Nov 9 2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 09:26:11 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113042611.23572.00002833@mb-fw.aol.com>
Source record: 23585

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1265 – NOV. 9, 2001

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1265 with a release date of Friday, November 9th, 2001 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Ham radio leads the way at the New York City Marathon. This story is first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1265 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO AND SPORTS: - THE NEW YORK CITY MARATHON

Ham radio was once again at the start and finish -- and all along the route of this years 32nd running of the New York City Marathon. This years event was held Sunday November 4th and was dedicated to victims of September 11th terrorist attacks. Its theme -- “United We Run.”

The starting line was at the Staten Island Side of the Verrazano Narrows Bridge. According to Stew Seit, WA2JNF, who was assigned there, it was a moment of total patriotism:

--

WA2JNF: “On the bridge waiting for the cannon to go off, everyone began singing patriotic songs. It would brng a tear to your eye. There were 30,000 people singing. It was something to be seen.”
--

But Seit and almost 500 other hams were there to provide communications for the event. And according to WA2JNF, even though there were lots of cellular phones, it was ham radio that was the communications backbone once again:

--
WA2JNF: “Everyone was running around with digital radios, Nextel’s, cellular phones. But when the need came to get the message through they turned to us hams. Regardless of how many cell-phones or trunked radios they have tied around their necks, when the message was of priority nature, and they wanted to make sure it got through, they spoke to one of the hams who was handling the communications and we got the message through”
--

The crowd lining the route was estimated at more than two million. Many were waving small American flags in memory of the thousands killed in the terrorist attacks.

ARRL Hudson Division Vice Director Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML, heads up the the ham radio communications for the Marathon. In fact, he has been organizing the ham radio effort ever since Amateur Radio became a part of the event many years ago. He says that for him, for the group of Amateur Radio volunteer communicators and for the people of the Big Apple, this years New York City Marathon was like none ever before:

--
W2ML: ”It was truly a celebration of life. It was a way of saying to the terrorists: ‘look -- we are going on with our lives. You didn’t stop us. On the contrary, you united us.’ “
--

Tesfaye Jifar of Ethiopia set a record in winning the mens catagory. He ran the 26.2 mile course in 2 hours, 7 minutes, 43 seconds. The old record of 2 hours, 8 minutes and 1 second was set in 1989. And as Jifar broke the record it was a corps of ham radio operators that guided him -- and the 30,000 other competitors in the New York City Marathon -- to a safe completion of this years run.

More on the Marathon is on the web at www.nyrrc.org. Our complete interview with Steve Mendelsohn W2ML can be downloaded from our FTP page by clicking on the newscast number at the top of the www.arnewsline.org home page. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RADIO AND SPORTS: THE SANTA CLARITA MARATHON

Sunday November 4th also saw another Marathon where ham radio played an important role. This one took place in Amateur Radio Newslines’s own back yard. It was the Santa Clarita 5 K Marathon and featured ham radio as it primary communications. Take a listen:

--
Audio Here
--

About three dozen hams from the Los Angeles County Disaster Communications Service and the Santa Clarita Valley Amateur Radio Club provided this years communications support. Most of it was on two meter F-M using the 146.79 MHz W6JW club repeater.

--
Audio here
--

The Santa Clarita Marathon may take place in a Los Angeles suburb, but it is by no means a small event. Several thousand runners take part and its course is USA Track and Field certified. In fact, this event is a qualifying race for the famed Boston Marathon.

More information on the event is at www.scmarathon.org. The Santa Clarita Amateur Radio club’s home in cyberspace is www.w6jw.org. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

TECHNOLOGY AND RADIO RULES: FCC PUTS KENWOOD "SKY COMMAND" PETITION ON PUBLIC NOTICE

Turning to regulatory matters, the FCC has put a rulemaking petition from Kenwood Communications Corporation requesting that the government relax restrictions on Amateur Radio auxiliary station operation on public notice. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bruce Tennant K6PZW has the details:

--
The FCC assigned the rulemaking number RM-10313 to the petition in which Kenwood asks the government to permit hams to use control methods like its own Sky Command radio remote system.

According to the ARRL Letter, Kenwood’s Sky Command lets a user control a fixed location High Frequency station using a pair of dual-band VHf/UHF transceivers on frequencies in the 70-cm and 2 meter bands. Kenwood wants a change in Part 97 rules that would expand permission to operate an auxiliary station on all 2-meter frequencies above 144.5 Mhz, except on 145.8 to 146.0 MHz.

And while not mentioning Sky Command by name, Kenwood says that the proposed rule change would allow the development and use by amateurs of new technology devices and increase the utility of the limited amateur allocations. Current FCC rules limit auxiliary operation to certain frequencies above 222.15 MHz.

In July 2000, the FCC declared that use of the Sky Command did not comply with Amateur Service rules--specifically Section 97.201(b). It also declined to grant a waiver make it legal. The ARRL commented in opposition to Kenwood's earlier efforts to have the system eclared to be in compliance, and it refused to permit Sky Command advertisements to be published in its QST magazine.

In its Petition for Rule Making, Kenwood asserts that auxiliary operation is poorly defined and significantly overregulated in the FCC rules. Kenwood also argues that present limitations on auxiliary operation no longer are appropriate in today's amateur environment and should be withdrawn.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW.

--

Again, the Commission has assigned the rulemaking number RM-10313 to the petition from Kenwood. Those interested may view and comment on it via the FCC's Electronic Comment Filing System. (ARRL)

**

BREAK 1

This is ham radio news coming to you from the United States of America. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world, including the New Orleans VHF Amateur Radio Club Net on the W5MCC 146.85 repeater serving my home town -- New Orleans, Louisiana.

(5 sec pause here)

**

TECHNOLOGY AND RADIO RULES: DIGITAL WIRELINE REMOTE BASE OPERATION BEING TRIED IN THE UK

A British ham radio operator has been granted permission to experiment with a digital wireline multi-band remote-base system. The experimental station was made possible by combining a popular H-F transceiver, the support of the national ham radio society and a cooperative government regulatory agency. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, reports from Nottingham in the U-K:

--

Dave Gould, G3UEG, has received a Notice of Variation as a Special Research Permit to set up an HF station that is remotely controlled over the telephone network. This has come after 16 months effort liaising with the RSGB Licensing Advisory Committee and the Radiocommunications Agency and has been finally approved after a site inspection. The system is based on a Kachina 505DSP transceiver and Kachina's own specially-designed remote control system. The audio is digitised and then multiplexed with the control signals. The resulting single data stream is encoded and then passed over the telephone network using standard modems. At the remote end the data is decoded and the audio is split from the control signals and passed to the transceiver. The system will operate at a line speed of 28K or better and includes strong security, failsafe and shut-down measures.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH
--

While we in North America take wireline and radio remote-base operations for granted its new to many other parts of the world. Anyone interested in receiving further information or with ideas to assist Dave Gould, G3UEG, may contact him by e-mail at david.gould@btinternet.com (RSGB)

**

ATTACK ON AMERICA: COMANDO SOLO DOES NOT WANT RECEPTION REPORTS NOW

If you are an SWL or ham who listens to shortwave -- and -- if you are planning to send a confirmation card to Radio Solo, the word right now is -- dont! This as the United States forces 193rd Special Operations Wing asks that reception reports and cassette tapes of its Commando Solo flying radio station broadcasts over Afghanistan not mailed to them at this time.

According to the Media Network e-newsletter there are two reasons. Obviously, they are involved in operations over a theater of war and need to lessen their peripheral workload. Also, due to the Anthrax scare in the United States, the U.S. mail system is overloaded with new safety procedures. In other words, your report may be indefinitely delayed or never opened. (Media Network E-Newsletter)

**

ATTACK ON AMERICA: NYC TELEVISION SEEKS NEW HOME

Seven weeks after a terrorist attack caused the collapse of the World Trade Center, hundreds of thousands of homes in the New York City area remain unable to receive more than four television stations. Because the main antennas atop the north tower came down, all the local stations, except Channels 2 and 41, which had backup antennas on the Empire State Building, had lost a significant part of their audiences. The situation improved last week when two more of the stations that lost their main transmitters began broadcasting from the Empire State Building site. Amateur Radio Newsline's Henry Feinberg has more:

--
On Thursday morninng, October 31st, Tribune-owned WPIX-TV channel 11 switched on a transmitter giving it an over-the-air signal said to be similar to what it was prior to the terrorist attacks. WNBC-TV channel 4 -- which in the late 1940's was the first to broadcast from the Empire site -- made a triumphant return later the same day when it flipped the switch on its new Empire located transmitter.

As an interim step to get back on the air, most local broadcasters had opted to use the old Armstrong Tower located in Alpine New Jersey. But the Alpine tower is not high enough and is to far away from the majority of the New York City demographic audience to provide clear reception throughout the metropolitan region.

The Empire State Building was the home to almost all New York City television broadcasters before the World Trade Center was built. Many broadcasters want to return to it but the New York Times says that Empire has to little space and not enough electrical power to accommodate the demands of all the stations. So a coalition of 11 broadcasters in and around New York are exploring options that include sharing management of a broadcast tower built to their specifications and needs.

The Times says that the long-term situation may be the construction of an enormous stand-alone broadcast tower. One that is perhaps 2,000 feet high and preferably be somewhere near the World Trade Center twin towers site.

But broadcasters will face a large number of issues if they persue the stand alone tower idea. Chief among them are the wants and desires of the residents of New York City. Many of them have made it clear that the area where the twin towers once stood be rebuilt a both a new trade center and also as a lasting monument to those who died in the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001.

Not far from the Armostrong Tower in Alpine New Jersey, I'm Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Aside from the political issues mentioned in Henry's report there will be numerous other technical roadblocks. First is that of protecting the Philadelphia and Boston demographic television markets from interference. And if such a project is approved by the city at a different location, the Federal Aviation Administration will likely demand that it be built where it will avoid established flight patterns for local airports. And there are not very many of those in and around the metro New York City area. (ARNewsline(tm) from various published news reports.)

**

ATTACK ON AMERICA: VERTEX STANDARD / YAESU DONATES GEAR

According to a recent story in the ARRL Letter, Vertex Standard, which manufacturers Yaesu brand gear, has donated several pieces of equipment to Virginia ARES. The manufacturer had arranged to loan an FT-7100 transceiver and three of it's VX-5 hand-held's during the response to assist the Salvation Army at the Pentagon terrorist attack site. When the work concluded, Virginia Section Emergency Coordinator Tom Gregory, N4NW, e-mailed to thank the company and to inquire about returning the equipment. Vertex Standard Executive Vice President Mikio Maruya, WA6F told him that Virginia ARES was welcome to keep it on hand for future emergencies. The Woodbridge, Virginia, Ham Radio Outlet store cooperated in providing the Virginia ARES team with the needed equipment on September 13th. (ARRL)

**

REPEATER COORDINATION NEWS: NFCB AND NFCC ELECTION RESULTS

The National Frequency Coordination Council -- or NFCC -- has elected Nels Harvey, WA9JOB as its new President. Harvey replaces Owen Wormser, K6LEW. Wormser had served as Chairman of the original drafting group that resulted in creation of the NFCC back in mid 1990's and as several terms as President.

Also elected to office are Dave Baughn, K4XI as NFCC Vice President, Dick Isely, W9GIG as Secretary and Clay Freinwald, K7CR as the organizations Treasurer. Meantime, Clay Freinwald, K7CR, and Nels Harvey, WA9JOB, have also been elected for two year terms on the National Frequency Coordinators' Board of Directors. Both ran unopposed. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

REPEATER COORDINATION NEWS: SERA DROPS UNKNOWN CATEGORY

The South Eastern Repeater Association says that it has dropped use of the term 'unknown' for listing repeaters that it has little or no information on. According to the organizations publication Repeater Journal, the listing of about 150 repeaters as 'unknown' was intended to prod their owners to file delinquent updates or help clear the groups records of repeaters that are no longer on the air.

It did neither, but it did cause confusion for ham radio enforcement efforts. This occurred earlier this year when FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth cited the South Eastern Repeater Association's Unknown Repeater List as grounds for dismissing a complaint against an uncoordinated West Virginia repeater that had been accused of interfering with a coordinated system in Kentucky. The coordination counsel's FCC Liaison is reportedly working with Hollingsworth's office to clear up the confusion. (SERA Repeater Journal)

**

HANDI-HAMS: WINTER RADIO CAMP IN MALIBU IN MARCH 2002

The next Handiham Radio Camp session will take place the first week of March, 2002, at Camp Joan Mier in Malibu, California. That camp will be offering classes in Technician, General, Extra, Operating Skills, and JAWS computing.

There is no tuition charge for West Coast or D-X members aside from the $45 registration and insurance fee. If you want to receive a camp application packet, please e-mail handiham@courage.org or call 1-866-426-3442 -- days -- Central Standard Time. The most current camp information is available on the Handiham website located in cyberspace at www.mtn.org/handiham. (Handihams)

**

INTERNATIONAL – BAHAMAS: FEES GOING UP

The annual fee for those holding a Bahamian Amateur Radio license has increased to $25. According to the ARRL news, The new fee applies for licenses renewed after August 1. The cost to "catch up" on past renewal fees prior to 2002 is $6 per year. Some US amateurs with Bahamian tickets were surprised to get letters requesting the back renewal fees and threatening fines and revocation. According to Dick Long, C6AKE, the Bahamian Public Utilities Commission--which handles licensing there--collects $6 a year for the years your license has been expired--this has always been its policy, he says. If you don't plan to use your license anytime soon, Long advises returning it to the P-U-C or sending a letter stating that you won't be using it again. "If, at some future time, you want to return to the Bahamas, you can always apply for a new license," he added. The P-U-C e-mail address is puc@batelnet.bs. (ARRL)

**

INTERNATIONAL - BELGIUM: A BLESSED EVENT

Hams in Belgium are getting to take part in a truly blessed event. This, as John Devoldere ON4UN who is the President of the Belgian national Amateur Radio society announces that nations radio amateurs can use the special prefix OQ instead of their usual ON or OT prefixes.

According to Devoldere, Belgian telecom authorities issued this special prefix on the occasion of the birth of Princess Elisabeth. The permission to use the OQ prefix began on October 26th, runs until December 31st. (RSGB)

**

INTERNATIONAL - NEW ZEALAND: THE NATIONS HAM-STATS

The New Zealand Ministry of Economic Development reports that as of November 1st that nation has 3,295 General Class license holders, 1717 Limited license class, 24 Limited Novice and 25 Novice class operators. These hams share 205 voice repeaters, 19 television repeaters, 29 digipeters, and 42 beacon operations. Mix in two fixed licenses and the grand total is 5358 licenses issued. (NZART)

**

BREAK 2

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website - www.arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**
HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ISS TALKS TO NEW YORK CITY SCHOOL

Ten elementary school students from New York City had some very specific questions about current events for International Space Station Commander Frank Culbertson. To the question, "What did it look like in New York on September 11," Culbertson responded that he could see the smoke rising from the World Trade Center site and drifting south.

--
Culbertson: “On September 11th we happened to be coming over a few hours after the attack and I could see a large column of smoke coming out of the World Trade Center and floating off to the South and a kind of a fog of smoke all over the Southern part of the city.”
--

Culbertson went on to explain that he took pictures of the tragedy from space. He further related that he found out about the event while talking to his doctor during a scheduled medical conference.

Another youngster wanted to know, "What does Afghanistan look like from space?" Culbertson answered that it appeared to be very desolate and rugged.

The questions could be expected. The children are students at P.S. 234, with its regular campus only two blocks from the site of the World Trade Center.

On September 11, all 650 students at the school and their teachers evacuated their building without a single casualty. The school community has stayed together despite the turmoil, and is now housed in temporary quarters elsewhere in Manhattan. Culbertson told the students that he admired them for their courage, and told them to continue to study.

--
Culbertson: “ I want you to know that the whole world is very proud of you. Its to bad that you had to move from school to school, but we are very proud that you are continuing to work and take your education seriously. Things will be alright. Don’t worry.”
--

The students asked a total of twenty questions during the ten-minute contact. Some thirty teachers and parents and reporters were also on hand as were reporters from the New York Post and New York Daily News newspapers.

The ham radio contact was made through the Amateur Radio on the International Space Station project, an international coalition and was carried live by MSNBC on its website. Former NBC science editor and Newsline anchorman Roy Neal, K6DUE, moderated the event. Communication was handled through W6SRJ, a club station at Santa Rosa Community College in California, with Herb Sullivan at the controls.

P.S. 234 has its own website. Its in cyberspace at www.ps234.org/about.html (ARISS via K5YFL)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT-OSCAR 40 UPDATE

AMSAT's Peter Guezlow, DB2OS, reports magnetorquing of the OSCAR 40 ham radio satellite is again in progress. Guezlow also says that operational periods for the RUDAK system have been extended recently. This, to allow downloading of several important RUDAK G-P-S files.

AO-40 is currently in a long period during which the Earth eclipses the sun near the satellite's perigee. This actually began about August 28th, and will rapidly increase in length. The eclipses will continue well into June 2002. (AMSAT-NA)

**

SPACE AND SCIENCE: A LOT OF BIRDS UP THERE

SpaceDaily reports a new survey by the Teal Group has identified some 600 active satellites in Earth orbit or in deep space. The survey factored in all satellites launched since 1980, and, after a process of elimination, arrived at an estimate of 600 to 610 for satellites that remain active today. (AMSAT-NA)

**

DX

In D-X, you may recall that shortly after the September 11th terrorist attacks on New York City and the Pentagon, the government of Kuwait permitted its ham radio operators to the call sign 9K2USA. Now Bob Furzer, 9K2ZZ, reports a very positive response to the use of 9K2USA.

9K2USA was used by all Kuwaiti hams through September 30th as a token of the sympathy and support for the people of the United States from the citizens of Kuwait. It was also meant to be a statement of deep condolence.

Furzer now tells the Ohio Penn D-X Newsletter that the Kuwait Amateur Radio Society wants to thank all of those radio amateurs who e-mailed their support of the use of this special call. 9K2ZZ also says that the design of an official commemorative 9K2USA Q-S-L card has been finalized and is now posted on the website at www.k4cy.com. (OPDX)

From the U-K comes word of a new microwave D-X record. At least a new record for that nation. On Sunday October 21st the UK distance record for the 47 GHz band was raised from 163 to 203 kilometres. This happened when G7MRF and G0HNW, from Cambret Hill in grid I-O-74 had a two-way CW contact with G0IVA in gridsquare I-O-73 in North Wales. This distance comfortably exceeds the former record of 161 kilometres set in September 1999 by the same group. Reports of RST 519 and 419 were exchanged. (RSGB)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: A MESSAGE TO REPEATER OWNERS FROM THE FCC

And finally this week, a word about repeater communications responsibility. It comes from the FCC's chief ham radio rules enforcer Riley Hollingsworth, and was included in a recent RAIN Enforcement Log Question and Answer session. If you own and operate a repeater, the next few minutes will be very important to you:

--

First of all, no licensee is required by the [FCC] rules to set up a repeater. When you do so, you do have certain responsibilities.

First, assuming that you have applied for and received coordination from your local repeater coordinating body -- if there is one -- and in a lot of areas there are not and in which case you would skip that step. As long as you are not interfering with a coordinated repeater, everything is all-right.

Once you start a repeater, you have to keep a few things in mind. First of all, if it is using your call sign -- it is your station -- and you are responsible for it. You do have a few alternatives as far as controlling it, but essentially it is your station and your responsibility.

The rule that states that you are not responsible for inadvertent transmissions I am afraid is often misunderstood. It only applies to inadvertent transmissions. [These are] transmissions that you let through on the repeater -- and I think it was designed for [modes like] packet anyway that you let through on the repeater before you realized what was happening.

Now, rules violations that occur by your users on a day-in and day-out basis or rule violations that go on for several hours are your responsibility as well as that of the users that are committing the violations. No dictionary in the world would define those types of situations as "inadvertent," and I am afraid that a lot of people just do not understand that.

If you put a repeater on [the air] you are responsible for its proper operation. Now, if you can't do that, or you do not have the time or the inclination [to properly control it], then your choice is to shut if off and to do something else. This is very important in these times because Amateurs are being listened to more than ever before.

Everyone seems to be buying scanners and short-wave radios. Very often a repeater is new person's first exposure to Amateur Radio -- and a potential recruit -- I might add. And, very often, it is the news media's first exposure to Amateur Radio.

If your repeater is an embarrassment to Amateur Radio, then you should shut it down and seriously examine your motives for wanting a repeater. You will be held responsible for regularly occurring rules violations, as well as the people committing the violations.

I would hope that more and more Amateurs would understand this. I think that the rule that you are not responsible for inadvertent transmissions has been misinterpreted by a number of people.

--

What Hollingsworth really seems to be saying is that your repeater is kind of like your house and your surrounding property. Yes, you have responsibility to make your home secure for you and your family. You also have a responsibility to keep it and its surroundings neat and clean so that your neighbors will also enjoy the view. (FCC, RAIN)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address
is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA, saying God Bless America, 73, and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2001. All rights reserved.

589. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 12:24:50 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <FC67A0D4608DE886.16421E49A04C8225.A5C99D62057B1607@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23586

On 13 Nov 2001 01:37:14 GMT, thehirts@aol.com (TheHirts) wrote:

>My husband and I are picking up a ham radio broadcast on our computer, our
>radio, and our telephone. Can anyone tell me if this is legal and if not, who
>I contact to stop it? Please email us at TheHirts@aol.com with any suggestions.
>
One easy way to tell; can you understand it?

If so, it's AM, and almost certainly coming from a CBer, rather than a
ham. If it sounds garbled, it's SSB, and could be from either.

Grab a cheap CB and check through the channels until you find him,
then listen until he gives away his location. Once you have that, go
to the FCC.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

590. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 12:56:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF11862.A4DA2AC9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23587

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> True, the Guard does train in non-
> lethal riot control techniques, but
> you can bet, Sir, that if you see a
> firearm brandished, it HAS ammunition
> in it.
>
> If you see a magazine in the well,
> it's loaded.

I'm sorry, Steve, but you're wrong about that. Remember we're talking about civil actions in non-combat areas. In those situations, the military, including the National Guard, does not allow a bunch of enlisted personnel to run around with live ammunition in their weapons that might endanger civilians or other military personnel in the area. In many cases, there is no magazine in the weapon, and, when there is, there is often no ammunition in the magazine. When involved in a routine situation (force protection, civil duties, etc), the ammunition is kept in a secure location and cannot be issued without the specific orders of a senior officer. Those orders will not be given unless the situation truly warrants it (an immediate threat) and there is sufficient supervision of each armed person. Until those orders are received, personnel are instructed to observe and to allow local law enforcement personnel, or the military police (if on a military facility), to handle the situation.

Now, as I said earlier, I do not know for certain if National Guard personnel at airports following the WTC attack have access to live ammunition (if the attack constitutes an immediate threat), but I doubt it. In fact, if I thought they were actually armed with live ammunition, I would be even more concerned (they are more likely to accidentally shoot themselves, or a civilian in the area, than any terrorist).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

591. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 13:03:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113080315.23850.00000448@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 23588

In article <20011113012341.25429.00002149@nso-fc.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20011110220331.23850.00000397@nso-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>
>>A poor example. Driving a ten thousand ton train almost two miles long is
>not
>>anything like driving a car or truck.
>>
>>Many of the early diesel-electric locomotives required a fireman to operate
>>them. They were also relatively unreliable and quirky to operate. As the
>>technology advanced, the fireman requirement was eliminated.
>>
>>It was only "featherbedding" to some of those who didn't actually have to do
>>it.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim:
>
>Considering all the stuff on a diesel-electric locomotive that could
>possibly catch fire (2200 gal. of diesel fuel, and wiring carrying
>4700 amps of current, among others), one would think that having
>a fireman aboard wouldn't be such a bad idea! (Naturally, I'm talking
>about the type of "fireman" that puts fires out, not ignites and feeds
>them, as on a steam locomotive!)

Exactly the point, Larry! Thank you for stating it so succintly.

If "fireman" is defined as "one who controls fires", we're all set.

btw, 2200 gal fo fuel and 4700 A are numbers applicable to a single, small
diesel-electric locomotive.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

592. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 13:03:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113080316.23850.00000449@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 23589

In article <f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>Let's focus on JUST ONE aspect of the Morse Code testing controversy.
>(Remember: The testing requirement is the controversy, not Morse Code
>itself.)

OK

>ONLY Morse Code has UNILATERAL pass/fail power under the current
>system of licensing HF operators.

That's true. And it's been that way since 1912

>If you are completely ignorant
>about antennas and feedlines, you can still pass your written exams if
>you answer enough of the other questions correctly to earn a passing
>grade. For example, the Amateur Extra exam has 5 questions on this
>topic. If you only answer one question correctly (due to sheer blind
>luck), you can still pass if you answer 36 of the remaining 45
>questions correctly. The same applies for other sub-topics like
>receiver components, band privileges, operating practices,
>propagation, emergency communications, test equipment, and other
>areas.

Yup. That's a problem with the written test. People with big hoes in their
knowledge can still pass the writtens.
>
>On the other hand, one MUST pass the Morse Code exam in order to
>upgrade to General and Amateur Extra, regardless of one's knowledge of
>other topics or performance on the written exams. Thus, Morse Code
>has the unilateral pass/fail power that NO other topic has.

Depends what you consider a "topic". If you subdivide the topic "theory" into
things like "antennas", "DC Ohm's Law", "symbols" etc., etc., that is true. If
you consider "theory" as a single topic, it's not true.
>
>QUESTION: Does Morse Code testing deserve its unilateral pass/fail
>authority that no other topic has? If so, why?

You miss a ery important fact, Jason. The separate, unilateral Morse test is
there because international treaty requires it. The FCC has made it clear that
the treaty requirement is the ONLY reason the test is being retained. It cannot
be made part of another test for that reason.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

593. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 14:38:46 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <WfaI7.184893$W8.6556430@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23590

I've also sent an e-mail - along with pointers helping to identify if ham or CB. It could be someone nearby with an antenna in the attic, but if it's nowhere in sight nearby, someone is likely running some serious power.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:zf4I7.110314$WW.6629498@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message >
> > The answer is...it depends.
> >
>
> I have had a very cordial e-mail QSO with them covering essentially the same
> ground that has been covered here. The case is a bit more complex than what
> has shown up here but my best guess is that they have a CBer pumping some AM
> heat thru an Antron 99 or somesuch. Part of the problem is that there is no
> antenna in sight.
>
> Good people, be nice.
>
> Dick N�BK
>
>

594. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 15:11:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113101114.16755.00002992@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 23591

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/13/2001 6:56 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF11862.A4DA2AC9@sccoast.net>

>I'm sorry, Steve, but you're wrong about that. Remember we're
>talking about civil actions in non-combat areas. In those situations,
>the military, including the National Guard, does not allow a bunch of
>enlisted personnel to run around with live ammunition in their weapons
>that might endanger civilians or other military personnel in the area.

I have never read a more arrogant and ignorant piece of tripe about
current policy and procedure for the carrying of automatic or personal sidearms
in the Armed Forces, Dwight. And insulting, to boot.....

Where are you getting this tripe? From Lennie the Clueless? Do you
really believe this crap or are you just TRYING to be foolish in public? If
you are, you have succeeded.

>In many cases, there is no magazine in the weapon, and, when there is,
>there is often no ammunition in the magazine.

(1) Show me a RECENT picture of a Guardsman carying an M-16 that DIDN'T
have a magazine in the well.

(2) PROVE (by reference to current NGB Directive or Flag Officer order)
that says they are to "pretend" these weapons are loaded.

I'll quote an acitve NG MP Officer...."They won't order us to carry a
weapon that we do not have the resources to use. There are criminal elements
that would mob every Guardsman they saw if they thought that they (the
Guardsman) didn't have the werewithall to defend themselves and that weapon. If
we are ordered to carry our firearms, we are locked and loaded. The only
occassion where you will see us in public carrying an unloaded weapon is
ceremonial sitautions".

>When involved in a
>routine situation (force protection, civil duties, etc), the
>ammunition is kept in a secure location and cannot be issued without
>the specific orders of a senior officer. Those orders will not be
>given unless the situation truly warrants it (an immediate threat) and
>there is sufficient supervision of each armed person.

We learned a looooooong time ago (Lebanon, to be specific) that you DON'T
carry an automatic weapon and NOT have the ammunition to USE it. If the weapon
is being carried, the person carrying it has the ammunition, the orders and the
TRAINING to use it...

And by "training" I do not mean just the skills of how to manipulate the weapon, Dwight.

Todays Guardsman are, without fear of contradiction, the finest trained and EDUCATED that the United States has ever fielded. They undergo HUNDREDS of hours of classes on riot control, including the use of deadly force.

WHEN was the last time you saw a National Guardsman unsling his weapon, let alone aim it at anyone, Dwight?

>Until those
>orders are received, personnel are instructed to observe and to allow
>local law enforcement personnel, or the military police (if on a
>military facility), to handle the situation.

This is as close to the truth as you come, and with good reason. The Guard does NOT want to be in the position of being the regular police force...They WANT local law enforcement to handle it. And that's the way the laws and military policy are written. >>I<< wouldn't want it any other way.

>Now, as I said earlier, I do not know for certain if National Guard
>personnel at airports following the WTC attack have access to live
>ammunition (if the attack constitutes an immediate threat), but I
>doubt it. In fact, if I thought they were actually armed with live
>ammunition, I would be even more concerned (they are more likely to
>accidentally shoot themselves, or a civilian in the area, than any
>terrorist).

This is nothing less than insulting and ignorant, Dwight. And not necessarily in that order. The last wrongfully wounded civilians at the hands of the National Guard died in May, 1970.

Now...please TRY to post something that has some semblence of factual substance to it, please.....

595. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 15:15:06 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <_NaI7.23039$xS6.35716@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23592

Larry Roll K3LT says:

>Considering all the stuff on a diesel-electric locomotive that could
>possibly catch fire (2200 gal. of diesel fuel, and wiring carrying
>4700 amps of current, among others), one would think that having
>a fireman aboard wouldn't be such a bad idea! (Naturally, I'm talking
>about the type of "fireman" that puts fires out, not ignites and feeds
>them, as on a steam locomotive!)

Details, details, details......

The real question, which no-one here has even touched on, is
whether or not anyone in that locomotive knows Morse code.

73, Hans, K0HB

596. Kenwood TS-50 New In Box $550

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 15:23:25 UTC
From: n2pzk@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113102325.21717.00002724@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 23593

Never opened with manufacturers warranty. Great mobile or base $550 +S/H
N2PZK@aol.com

597. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 16:01:31 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <vtbI7.23101$xS6.35997@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23594

Steve Robeson K4YZ says:

> Do you really believe this crap or are you just TRYING
> to be foolish in public?

Steve,

Ignore Dwight. He makes vast pronouncements based on half-vast knowledge, then tries to find wiggle-room when his ignorance is exposed.

Incredibly, he claims to be presently serving on the National Staff of the USCG Auxiliary as a member of the Marketing & Public Affairs Department with responsibility to provide the general public with information about the Coast Guard Auxiliary.

Do you think they'd endorse his apparent disdain for our men and women in uniform?

Hans
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

598. Re: i wanto become a ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 17:01:41 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <vdk2vt0u04fpnrp76pb5tki6pvmdkkaci4@4ax.com>
Source record: 23595

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->I
->I had to break out my special K3LT Expanded Scale Trollometer
->in order to get a reading on this one!

Gee, Larry, why don't we just do it in dB?

(dumb Bastards)

{;-)

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

599. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 17:55:53 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <J8dI7.185039$W8.6569393@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23596

Could also be something like an Antron that does not, like a beam or ground plane would, light up and say antenna. Might be hidden in a flagpole or somesuch as well. It will be interesting to see what a survey of the neighbors turns up.

With any luck they live in a burg with the ordinances in place and our friendly neighborhood illegal gets a visit from Officer Grumpy.

Dick

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:WfaI7.184893$W8.6556430@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> I've also sent an e-mail - along with pointers helping to identify if ham
or
> CB. It could be someone nearby with an antenna in the attic, but if it's
> nowhere in sight nearby, someone is likely running some serious power.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:zf4I7.110314$WW.6629498@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message >
> > > The answer is...it depends.
> > >
> >
> > I have had a very cordial e-mail QSO with them covering essentially the
> same
> > ground that has been covered here. The case is a bit more complex than
> what
> > has shown up here but my best guess is that they have a CBer pumping
some
> AM
> > heat thru an Antron 99 or somesuch. Part of the problem is that there
is
> no
> > antenna in sight.
> >
> > Good people, be nice.
> >
> > Dick N�BK
> >

> >
>
>

600. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 18:09:53 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9srnk801b0s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23597

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011113020635.16795.00002712@mb-fm.aol.com...
> Several of the "protesters" encouraged the crowd to disregard the
Riot Act
> warning read to them by a KSU police sergeant and told them the Guard's
weapons
> were not loaded.
>
> Please notice that none of the figures of the "leadership" of the
> protesters was hit. They were not only NOT at the front of the crowd,
they
> weren'a anywhere near the events themselves.

Alan Canfora tells a different story from yours, and he most certainly was one of the legitimate leaders who was wounded. Go to www.alancanfora.com You must be talking about Terry Norman, an FBI rat who was chased from the scene after pistol whipping another student with a .38 revolver. Strange how he showed up at an anti-war rally with a gas mask, camera, and was packing heat. All of this happened before the rally even started, and before the guard showed up ordering the crowd to dispearse

601. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 19:14:29 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <pieI7.185131$W8.6577197@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23598

Absolutely. I mentioned looking for a LARGE version of something that looks like a rotatable TV antenna and also described a ground plane. You are correct, of course, that not everything advertises 'antenna'. The only question is one of proximity. I have a Hammond X-66 organ which is bothered by CB radios (albeit infrequently) when on the job. Once in a while you hear a CB getting louder then softer as the car drives by the club. Twice, however, the thing kept getting MUCH LOUDER (to the point I killed the power to the equipment). Those two birds were obviously running illegal amps. In any case, the normal ones I've heard (perhaps a dozen over the years) were only picked up from perhaps a hundred feet or less to the road and for perhaps a hundred feet either way down the road. Normal 5 watts would unlikely cause problems as described from much more than a couple of hundred feet (at best). Illegal powered CB or amateur would of course affect the stuff farther away, but it is still likely comming from a fairly close location.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:J8dI7.185039$W8.6569393@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Could also be something like an Antron that does not, like a beam or
ground
> plane would, light up and say antenna. Might be hidden in a flagpole or
> somesuch as well. It will be interesting to see what a survey of the
> neighbors turns up.
>
> With any luck they live in a burg with the ordinances in place and our
> friendly neighborhood illegal gets a visit from Officer Grumpy.
>
> Dick
>
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:WfaI7.184893$W8.6556430@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > I've also sent an e-mail - along with pointers helping to identify if
ham
> or
> > CB. It could be someone nearby with an antenna in the attic, but if
it's
> > nowhere in sight nearby, someone is likely running some serious power.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim
> >
> >

> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:zf4I7.110314$WW.6629498@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message >
> > > > The answer is...it depends.
> > > >
> > >
> > > I have had a very cordial e-mail QSO with them covering essentially
the
> > same
> > > ground that has been covered here. The case is a bit more complex
than
> > what
> > > has shown up here but my best guess is that they have a CBer pumping
> some
> > AM
> > > heat thru an Antron 99 or somesuch. Part of the problem is that there
> is
> > no
> > > antenna in sight.
> > >
> > > Good people, be nice.
> > >
> > > Dick NBK
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

602. Re: i wanto become a ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 20:04:35 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <n1fl7.110822$WW.6675652@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23599

Larry Roll, K3LT, posted:

>->I
>->I had to break out my special K3LT Expanded Scale Trollometer
>->in order to get a reading on this one!

Jim Weir, WX6RST, replied:

> Gee, Larry, why don't we just do it in dB?
>
> (dumb Bastards)
>
> {;-)

OK! Here it is! Back by Popular Demand!!

S9 +20 +40 +60 +80 +100 dB
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
TROLL-O-METER

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

603. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 20:43:30 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF185F2.D0C31807@psu.edu>
Source record: 23600

I think as a bare minimum, it should be 25 wpm, a Ph.D. in physics, and successful passing of a background check for the privileges. I'm pro Morse code, but if we are going to be elitist, we might as well be really elitist.

5 wpm is just fine for starting out. Why would it not be?

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
> efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
> amateurs -- and this mode has many unique functional characterists which
> cannot be exploited without operators trained in the use of the Morse Code.
> History has proven that it is code *testing* which ultimately results in the
> vast majority of code *usage* on the amateur bands. Without the testing, the
> ability
> to exploit the many benefits and advantages of this mode will eventually be
> lost within the ARS. Therefore, this mode deserves special consideration in
> the
> license testing process. And a mere 5 WPM doesn't cut it. A minimum of a 12
> WPM code test should be required for full amateur HF operating privileges.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

604. Antarctic qsl research

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 20:54:25 UTC
From: f.bergez@laposte.net
Message-ID: <77749554.0111131254.231b041f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23601

Dear OM,

My name is Franï¿½ois.
I am a member of a french logistic team going to Geographic North Pole each april. We establish a drifting base at 89 North Latitude, wich name Borneo, for scientistific researchs.

When I was student, my hobby was HAM, with the call sign FE4834.
Actually, I dont have a station, because I have 2 young children. But I hope I will have a new one in some years!!

My hobby actually is collecting polar QSL cards from North or South Pole.
So, can I ask you if you can help me ?
Do you have any spare QSL from Antarctica?

I can send you letters and post cards I have cancelled at the North Pole station with the official post office cachet during my past expeditions.

I'll send you also a SASE with IRC.

I hope we can do good exchanges!
I send you all my best regards and 73's,

SWL Franï¿½ois.
Franï¿½ois BERGEZ
6, rue de la Libertï¿½
F - 71000 MACON
FRANCE

E-mail f.bergez@laposte.net

605. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 21:33:25 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10111132126230.6837-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 23602

[Response posted AND e-mailed:]

On 13 Nov 2001, TheHirts wrote:
>My husband and I are picking up a ham radio broadcast on our computer, our
>radio, and our telephone. Can anyone tell me if this is legal and if not, who
>I contact to stop it? Please email us at TheHirts@aol.com with any suggestions.
>Thank you!!!

In addition to the other responses:

If you have a cordless phone, note also:

Both the 900 MHz band and the 2.4 GHz band are also amateur radio
bands, and that your phone, as a part 15 unlicensed device, MUST ACCEPT
interference from any properly operating licensed station (amateur, broadcast,
public safety, or other). A 49MHz cordless phone does not overlap an amateur
radio band, but may be sufficiently close to the 6m amateur band that it could
be "overloaded" by a strong signal.

If your computer is relatively new, note this:

The 1.2 GHz band (1240-1300 MHz) is an amateur radio band as well. If
your CPU clock speed falls in this range, this may explain why you're receiving
this through your computer.

For your television:

The amateur 6m band (50-54MHz) is just below channel 2.
The amateur 2m band (144-148Mhz) is the same as CABLE TV channel 18.
The amateur 1.25 band is the same as CABLE TV channel 24.
The amateur 70cm band covers CABLE TV channels 57-61.

If you are hearing the signals ONLY on those channels, and except for 6m, you
have cable TV, then you need to call your cable company. It is legally their
problem to fix.

606. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 22:07:34 UTC
From: thehirts@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113170734.23552.00003048@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 23603

Could also be something like an Antron that does not, like a beam or ground plane would, light up and say antenna. Might be hidden in a flagpole or somesuch as well. It will be interesting to see what a survey of the neighbors turns up.

I found an antennae about 3 houses away, but upon asking them nicely if they were using a CB, it turns out it is a woman using it. (The voice we a re picking up is a male)
There is a TV antenna next door, I will ask ever-so-nicely if they happen to have a CB or ham.

<<With any luck they live in a burg with the ordinances in place and our friendly neighborhood illegal gets a visit from Officer Grumpy>>
LOL We live in Spokane, WA
I'm not looking to get anyone in trouble here. I just want to be on my computer without a man's voice calling out loudly to someone in Alaska. (When I am alone at night his voice makes me jump about 3 feet in the air!)

Thank you for your help!
~Tracey

607. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-13 22:10:26 UTC
From: thehirts@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113171026.23552.00003049@mb-cf.aol.com>
Source record: 23604

Did the "problem" start suddenly? Recently?

It started in the last week or so. The first time we heard him he was telling someone in Nebraska (We are in Washington State) that he got some new equipment.

608. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 00:05:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011113190525.16784.00002675@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 23605

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: K0HB K0HB@QWEST.NET
>Date: 11/13/2001 10:01 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <vtbI7.23101$xS6.35997@www.newsranger.com>

>Do you think they'd endorse his apparent disdain for our men
>and women in uniform?

Being in one of the two authorized Auxiliaries myself, I'd hope not!
(CAP)!

Steve

609. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 00:13:43 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <XGiI7.18$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 23606

> Why don't you'all shut up about Kim's call sign. You'all sound like a
> bunch of "CB'ERS. If she wants that call, that is her right.

Agreed, although I would have stated it a little different. If Kims callsign is *so wrong*, then the FCC should not have issued it. Since they have issued it, just grow up and get over it everyone! Shift the blame where it belongs..... the issuing agency.

610. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 00:13:44 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <YGiI7.19$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 23607

Then direct your efforts where they belong..... The FCC. They were the ones
that issued it and they are the ones to blame.... (in your eyes at least)

All the bandwith and server space wasted on a childish debate over a legally
issued callsign.
Wow.... if that isn't a statement in and of itself regarding the {Re:
"...one step closer to extinction."} debate. (yes, and of course I am
adding to it too.....)

Ryan

> I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
> inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.
> I don't recall ever calling it "obscene."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

611. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 00:13:47 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <%GiI7.20$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 23608

>
>
> Is that why you got rid of Rotten Crotch Anyone?
>
>

Gee... then is mine KC8Pussy Muncher eXtroadinaire????

Darn... gotta apply for a new callsign.

Ryan

612. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 00:39:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF1AE80.9A8F526E@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23609

If you can understand the transmission then they are transmitting
AM and that pretty well narrows it down to some CBer who is
probably running illegal power levels (that is probably his new
equipment, an illegal high power amplifier). Ham operators operate
SSB (single side band) and you would not be able to understand the
transmission (would sound very garbled) unless you were receiving
them on a receiver capable of SSB reception. When you think you
have located him, call the FCC.

TheHirts wrote:
>
> Did the "problem" start suddenly? Recently?
>
> It started in the last week or so. The first time we heard him he was telling
> someone in Nebraska (We are in Washington State) that he got some new
> equipment.

613. Re: i wanto become a ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 01:12:38 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ssm00$556$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 23610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.2600

Fuckwit and low i.q.ed "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> slobbered in
message news:pd6c$p5c$4@houston-hunks.com...
>
> On Mon, 12 Nov 2001 14:14:41 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> :
> : You have to be able to read and write first, Don. Maybe your parole
officer

Unmarked deletion = SPANK!

> Go, baby! Go! Go! Go!

Isn't that what your momma tells you when you fuck her up the ass?

> Tell him all about his comma placement while you're at it.

Tell him all about how your IDIOT father took 7 fucking years to complete a
4 year degree.
MwhaHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!

614. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 03:26:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf1e4be_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23613

Good idea. That sounds the most feasible of all, so far. In fact, that could be accomplished with clearly presented photos--maybe even schematics--that could be rotated and changed out every few months.

Kim W5TIT

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message news:6E4D6814161D43D3.9DE418F6DF5B8EE6.AC5E2812EF947AAD@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 8 Nov 2001 22:19:24 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
>
> >If a "construction" project of some sort were to be brought into the testing
> >arena, it at least proves that the ham is aware of FCC specifications,
> >rules, regulations, and guidelines.
>
> How about just handing them the appropriate test equipment, then
> turning them loose in a half-dozen or so stations (assembled specially
> for the test, of course) and telling them to find the ones which:
> a) violate the regs
> b) are improperly set up with regard to normal operating practices
> (i.e. antenna on entirely wrong band for the rig, FM rig and
> horizontally polarized antenna, etc)
> c) should, theoretically work best for their stated purpose
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

615. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 03:31:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf1e5f3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23614

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011112205540.18926.00001971@nso-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3BE8387C.F481BE3D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >The Affirmative Action program was necessitated because racists
> >violated the 1964 Civil Rights Law. Racists had their chance to
> >comply and the Affirmative Action program was the predictable
> >result of their non-compliance. The racists have only themselves
> >to blame for the swinging of the pendulum.
>
> Cecil:
>
> Incorrect. The Affirmative Action program was instituted in order for
> liberal Democrat politicians to be able to cement the votes of the
> minority population, primarily blacks. Just another wagon on the
> political gravy train, intended to keep certain groups of people
> dependent on big government and keep Democrats in power forever.
>

That is as much political jargon as the idea that the WTC incident was
created and carried out so that the Republican party could quicken the pace
of their big government invasion against US Citizens. You're as crazy as
those who say that, Larry...sheesh

> The usual Moorecrap about the Morse Code being a "creed" snipped
> to prevent further stinking up of the newsgroup.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Kim W5TI and a T

616. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 04:17:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ssr8b$h5q$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 23611

K0HB wrote:
> Details, details, details......
>
> The real question, which no-one here has even touched on, is
> whether or not anyone in that locomotive knows Morse code.
>

Yep. K0DG does.

617. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 05:03:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011114000355.24612.00000600@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 23612

In article <XGiI7.18$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

> If Kims
>callsign is *so wrong*, then the FCC should not have issued it.

I disagree. By that logic, all decisions about "right" and "wrong" are to be
left up to the government.

> Since they
>have issued it, just grow up and get over it everyone!

Sounds like you don't like the idea that there is a difference of opinion about
it, and that people can express their opinions here.

>Shift the blame
>where it belongs..... the issuing agency.

Why? Cobsider the following:

The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign. It is only
available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that particular
callsign.

Yet you say it's all the FCC's fault. As if it's governments job to "save us
from ourselves".

Sorry, I don't buy it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

618. Re: Traffic Nets and Terrorism?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 07:54:11 UTC
From: Ken Tough <ken@objectech.co.uk>
Message-ID: <EILyu5BjMi87EwU$@artslink.co.za>
Source record: 23616
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>"Lloyd Davies" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote
>> I am wondering if Mr. Hollingsworth is paying more attention
>> to some of our maritime and traffic nets since Sept 11th?
>> Am I the only one who sees a connection? I mean I think that
>> some of these terrorists could have valid ham tickets and use
>> these nets to pass traffic related to thier acts of terror.

>I can't help but believe the use of unencrypted radio communications would
>be about the bottom of the list of choices for this. Using a hidden
>spred-spectrum might make more sense, except that if it IS detected, you
>know who will be really watching - and not running in to make a bust over an
>unlicensed radio.
[...]
>One possibility is the use of a pager. A lot of
>people have them. Certain calling numbers (rather, the numeric message sent
>to the pager) could be looked up against a key. One finishes his aircraft
>training and dials a pager and enters a telephone number. This number may
>actually mean 'I finished my training'. Someone calls his pager and the
>number means 'acknowleged'. Once something starts, the key is destroyed and
>off they go. This may not be what has happened, but it makes much more
>sense than using a radio that anyone can listen to.

What a palaver. They would just buy a cell phone for cash
from the street, then buy a pre-paid card under a fake name,
again with cash, exchange phone numbers by word-of-mouth
or buried in some other info, and chat to each other as much
as they like. The way to hide a drop of water is to pour it
anonymously into the ocean of telecoms.
--
Ken Tough

619. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 08:04:57 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0111140004.6dc13d55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23615

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<zf4I7.110314$WW.6629498@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> my best guess is that they have a CBer pumping some AM
> heat thru an Antron 99 or somesuch.

Check out rec.radio.cb. That's where Cbers get daily help and
encouragement in creating such problems.

-Aaron-

>From: explorer1175@aol.com (Explorer 1175)
>Group: rec.radio.cb
>Date: Wed, Nov 14, 2001 7:44 AM
>Message-id: <20011114024427.22838.00002662@mb-mm.aol.com>
>
>How much power can the Solorcon A-99 take?I was thinking of buying a
>amp that will deadkey 900-swing too 1600. Will the Solarcon A-99
>handle it?
>
>73, 1175

620. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 11:55:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf25ada_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23617

One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who position themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground with me--in terms of morals and behavior.

I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having such a callsign. Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air; acting meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who can't even defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham; participating in a political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other people; refusing to support someone for club membership because of some protected class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.); how many of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the air under cover of a disguised voice?

Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground than me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign, simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made about it, nor received about it, save occasionally. While I disagree with you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham radio before you appoint yourself as judge! Because with your behaviors on this newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act in the manner you expect others to.

So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've matched your own demands.

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011114000355.24612.00000600@nso-cr.aol.com...
> In article <XGiI7.18$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@tm.net>
> writes:
>
> > If Kims
> >callsign is *so wrong*, then the FCC should not have issued it.
>
> I disagree. By that logic, all decisions about "right" and "wrong" are to
be
> left up to the government.
>
> > Since they

> >have issued it, just grow up and get over it everyone!
>
> Sounds like you don't like the idea that there is a difference of opinion
about
> it, and that people can express their opinions here.
>
> >Shift the blame
> >where it belongs..... the issuing agency.
>
> Why? Cobsider the following:
>
> The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign. It is
only
> available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that particular
> callsign.
>
> Yet you say it's all the FCC's fault. As if it's governments job to "save
us
> from ourselves".
>
> Sorry, I don't buy it.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

621. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 11:55:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf25b27_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23618

One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who position themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground with me--in terms of morals and behavior.

I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having such a callsign. Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air; acting meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who can't even defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham; participating in a political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other people; refusing to support someone for club membership because of some protected class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.); how many of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the air under cover of a disguised voice?

Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground than me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign, simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made about it, nor received about it, save occasionally. While I disagree with you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham radio before you appoint yourself as judge! Because with your behaviors on this newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act in the manner you expect others to.

So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've matched your own demands.

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011114000355.24612.00000600@nso-cr.aol.com...
> In article <XGiI7.18$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@tm.net>
> writes:
>
> > If Kims
> >callsign is *so wrong*, then the FCC should not have issued it.
>
> I disagree. By that logic, all decisions about "right" and "wrong" are to
be
> left up to the government.
>
> > Since they

> >have issued it, just grow up and get over it everyone!
>
> Sounds like you don't like the idea that there is a difference of opinion
about
> it, and that people can express their opinions here.
>
> >Shift the blame
> >where it belongs..... the issuing agency.
>
> Why? Cobsider the following:
>
> The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign. It is
only
> available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that particular
> callsign.
>
> Yet you say it's all the FCC's fault. As if it's governments job to "save
us
> from ourselves".
>
> Sorry, I don't buy it.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

622. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 12:22:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011114072258.09202.00002856@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 23619

From: Jim Weir jim@rst-engr.com

>Get ahold of QST, Jun 01, page 75, upper right hand corner.

>By my eyeball, the RF starts about half a millisecond before the key closes,
>and stops a good 10 milliseconds before the key opens.

Hi, Jim,

I was told that one of the threads had my name on it, so I had to take a look.

The on and off delay in that photo are int he order of tens of milliseconds. In a key line in virtually every solid-state transceiver that I know of, key closure is represented by a logic 0, so the very left of the upper trace going from positive to negative is the time the key is closed. The positive transition on the key signal represents the key being released, so the radio unkeys tens of milliseconds later.

Perhaps it would be helpful if we put a bar over the word "key" in the caption to indicate that the key signal is actually a "key not" signal, indicating that the key line is active on a logic low. That way, those who are not fully versed in circuit and station design won't be confused.

>Do you think you could get Ten-Tec to publish the pulse anticipation circuit
>they must have used to create this miracle?
>{;-)

I realize you said all of this tongue in cheek, but I would hate to see your joke be misinterpreted by those who are less technically astute than you and I.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

623. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 14:32:39 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9stva70h0m@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23620

Leland KC8LDO
>
>"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
>news:<zf4I7.110314$WW.6629498@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
>> my best guess is that they have a CBer pumping some AM
>> heat thru an Antron 99 or somesuch.
>
>Check out rec.radio.cb. That's where Cbers get daily help and
>encouragement in creating such problems.
>
>-Aaron-
>
That's right,I hate CB too !

No code Tech's RULE!!!!!!

I love you Aaron xoxoxo

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

624. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 15:26:57 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0111140726.32ce5cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23621

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20011113080316.23850.00000449@nso-fy.aol.com>...
>
> You miss a ery important fact, Jason. The separate, unilateral Morse test is
> there because international treaty requires it.

True, but this element in the treaty may be struck down in 2003.

625. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 16:40:35 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF28FA6.26739037@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23622

It is a matter of class and taste, some people never acquire
either.

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who position
> themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
> with me--in terms of morals and behavior.
>
> I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly
> pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having
> such a callsign. Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
> the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air; acting
> meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who can't even
> defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham; participating in a
> political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other people;
> refusing to support someone for club membership because of some protected
> class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.); how many
> of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the air
> under cover of a disguised voice?
>
> Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground than
> me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign,
> simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made
> about it, nor received about it, save occasionally. While I disagree with
> you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my
> callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham radio
> before you appoint yourself as judge! Because with your behaviors on this
> newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have
> neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act in
> the manner you expect others to.
>
> So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've matched
> your own demands.
>

626. Re: Amateur Service Withers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 17:33:43 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0111140933.36560d56@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23623

k0hb@qwest.net (K0HB) wrote in message
news:<b7c5262e.0111111226.5bacbfec@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> > Perhaps the bands could be divided into subbands by mode - CW only,
> > digital only, and analog voice/image only. The Basic would grant
> > limited access to parts of these subbands, and higher class
> > endorseements (say, "Telegraph", "Digital", and "Phone") would grant
> > full privileges on their respective segments. The tests for these
> > endorsements would be specific to those modes.
>
> The notion of a "Basic" amateur radio license with "endorsements" after
> passing tests for various modes is, IMNSHO, a really bad idea.

Why? The idea is to have a license with limited but useful privileges
to get new folks started, then full privileges for those who want
them. No learning stuff that one isn't interested in so as to get
privs for the stuff one IS interested in.

> After all is said and done, the one underlying difference between
> the amateur radio service and the other personal radio services (CB,
> FRS, etc.) is the fact that we are licensed to build our own station
> and put it on the air.

There is also the strict non-commercial nature of the ARS.

The concept of "radio operator" is rapidly vanishing from other
services. I understand that the US Navy no longer has the "Radioman"
specialty at all. From what I read, the GROL is more of a license to
adjust and repair equipment than it is to operate.

>We alone are licensed to build a 1.5KW
> transmitter and put it on the air, without any "inspection" of that
> transmitter by the FCC before we stroke up on our favorite band.

Yup. But how many hams actually design and build stations from scratch
and put them on the air? I have done exactly that, and they were not
simple stations, either.
>
> This "permission to experiment", unique to our hobby both in
> the equipment *and* the modes we use, is what sets us apart.

It's not the only thing.

> Restricting our operation and experimentation to only those modes
> or equipment types we have 'endorsements' for, such as is done
> in aviation for example, would be the end of the Amateur Radio

> Service.

How so? The "Basic" license would give some access, in the form of limited power and frequencies. Full privileges would be earned by learning more about the modes and methods used.

Nowhere is type acceptance mentioned in my posts on this.

If a potential ham wants to tinker with 20 meter HF gear, at least a General class license is needed. For tinkering on the low end of 20 meters, an Extra is needed. Does this really stop anyone with a technical interest? Not that I can see.

Not having to learn lots of stuff that is of no interest would increase access, not decrease it.
>
> Since we couldn't tinker with anything new until we had studied
> and tested for the endorsement, experimentation and tinkering would
> come to an immediate halt.

Nonsense. You don't understand the idea, that's all.

>There is little enough of it now, and
> the idea of qualifying for endorsements before we could tinker with
> a new mode or technology would end experimentation within the framework
> of amateur radio for all time.

The reason there is "little enough of that now" has nothing to do with license tests being too hard or limiting people's interest. It has to do with factors like the more non-technical people becoming hams, the constant reduction in real-dollar cost of really good equipment, time constraints, and the increased complexity of typical amateur gear. Plus the fact that most new hams enter via the VHF/UHF route rather than the HF route of years ago.

The new Novice of 1951, 1961 or 1971 was quite likely to build a simple HF CW transmitter to get on the air. Relatively few new Technicians of 2001 are building VHF/UHF FM transmitters to get on the air - not because they are "bad", but because they have so many inexpensive options of manufactured gear.
>
> The only legimimate function of testing in the context of amateur
> radio licensing is to ensure that the licensee has a basic familiarity
> of technical concepts, such that they can ensure that their experimenting
> and operation does not trash the electromatic spectrum for other users,
> and that they stay within the bands allocated to them.

I disagree. There is also the function of promoting the bases and purposes of the ARS.
>
> I firmly believe that the amateur rules ought be simplified to:
>
> ----------

>
> 97.1 To get an Amateur Radio license, you are required to pass
> a technical test to show that you understand how to build simple
> equipment which meets spectral purity specifications of (.....blah,
> blah, blah).

It won't be "a simple test" if it really tests whether a person knows
how to build equipment that meets the spectral purity specifications.

> You will be issued a license and callsign when you
> pass the test. Transmit your call sign once every 10 minutes when
> on the air.
>
> 97.2 Your power limit is 1.5KW to the antenna.

No RF exposure questions?
>
> 97.3 Here are your bands. Stay inside of them.
>
> 97.4 Your are encouraged to tinker and experiment and communicate
> and do public service and talk to strangers in far away lands and
> launch communications satellites into space and any other cool
> technical "radio stuff" you may think up. The government doesn't
> care what mode you use for any of this. (See 97.3)

FCC's gotta be able to monitor the transmission.
>
> 97.5 Play nice. We'll try to keep the CBers out of your hair.
> Deliberate interference, unresolved dirty signals, or other asinine
> behavior on your part will cause Riley Hollingsworth to come and
> permanently kick your ass off the playground. Have fun.
>
> Love always,
> /signed/ FCC
>
It's been tried, Hans. They called it CB. The result isn't pretty.

Nothing in the ideas I presented would reduce or restrict
experimentation by hams. You're assuming stuff that isn't there.

73 de Jim, N2EY

627. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 17:47:45 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0111140947.39b7bd8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23624

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:<3bf25b27_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who position
> themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
> with me--in terms of morals and behavior.

Based on what evidence, Kim? Have you worked or heard anyone on this
NG on the air? I have.
>
> I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly
> pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having
> such a callsign.

I think it's an inappropriate callsign, but I don't think I've
pronounced you as "inhuman" or some such.

> Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
> the hobby in many ways:

> having an off-color conversation on the air;

Not me.

> acting meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who can't even
> defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham;

Leaves me out.

> participating in a
> political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other people;

uh-uh

> refusing to support someone for club membership because of some protected
> class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.);

Never even heard of that one. Try it around here and the club will
kick out the person trying it.

> how many
> of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the air
> under cover of a disguised voice?

Not me. Not ever.
>
> Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground than
> me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign,
> simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made
> about it, nor received about it, save occasionally.

Bull. You got that particular callsign for its giggle factor, Kim.
You've said so yourself. At least be honest about the motivation for
that particular choice of letters. It wasn't about birdwatching.

> While I disagree with
> you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my
> callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham radio
> before you appoint yourself as judge!

> Because with your behaviors on this
> newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have
> neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act in
> the manner you expect others to.

On the air or off?
>
> So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've matched
> your own demands.

Let s/he who is without sin cast the first stone, in other words.

73 de Jim, N2EY

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011114000355.24612.00000600@nso-cr.aol.com...
> > In article <XGiI7.18$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@tm.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > > If Kims
> > >callsign is *so wrong*, then the FCC should not have issued it.
> >
> > I disagree. By that logic, all decisions about "right" and "wrong" are to
> be
> > left up to the government.
> >
> > > Since they
> > >have issued it, just grow up and get over it everyone!
> >
> > Sounds like you don't like the idea that there is a difference of opinion
> about
> > it, and that people can express their opinions here.
> >
> > >Shift the blame
> > >where it belongs..... the issuing agency.
> >
> > Why? Cobsider the following:
> >
> > The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign. It is
> only
> > available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that particular
> > callsign.
> >

> > Yet you say it's all the FCC's fault. As if it's governments job to "save
> us
> > from ourselves".
> >
> > Sorry, I don't buy it.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

628. Re: Amateur Service Withers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 18:12:48 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF2B420.B5BE8D02@psu.edu>
Source record: 23625

N2EY wrote:
>
> k0hb@qwest.net (K0HB) wrote in message
news:<b7c5262e.0111111226.5bacbfec@posting.google.com>...

> > The notion of a "Basic" amateur radio license with "endorsements" after
> > passing tests for various modes is, IMNSHO, a really bad idea.
>
> Why? The idea is to have a license with limited but useful privileges
> to get new folks started, then full privileges for those who want
> them. No learning stuff that one isn't interested in so as to get
> privs for the stuff one IS interested in.

I sure don't want to have to take a new test every time I get
interested in a different mode. Since I've been a licensed General in
June, I've gotten into PSK, Slow Scan TV, and am casting an eye at
meteor work. If I had to take a new test for any of these modes, it
would slow me down a lot.

What would be a good reason to have an amateur have to test for any of
the above, beyond what is already in the tests we take now? For PSK. I
made up the equipment I needed, "listened" in for a couple days to get a
feel for how people operated, and then started in myself. Simple and neat.

> > Restricting our operation and experimentation to only those modes
> > or equipment types we have 'endorsements' for, such as is done
> > in aviation for example, would be the end of the Amateur Radio
> > Service.
>
> How so? The "Basic" license would give some access, in the form of
> limited power and frequencies. Full privileges would be earned by
> learning more about the modes and methods used.

Sounds like an administrative nightmare.

> Not having to learn lots of stuff that is of no interest would
> increase access, not decrease it.

From a nice narrow viewpoint, maybe. Sounds almost like saying, "I
never plan to parallel park my car, so I want that taken out of the
driving test for me. People who want to parallel park should be the only
ones required to study that".

> >
> > Since we couldn't tinker with anything new until we had studied
> > and tested for the endorsement, experimentation and tinkering would
> > come to an immediate halt.

>
> Nonsense. You don't understand the idea, that's all.

Me either, I guess. I decided to try PSK31, and looked up a few schematics, talked to some local hams, and watched one operating his station. Then I went to buy the parts, and in a weekend I was using the mode (didn't transmit for a while though) If I had to take a test in the mode, it probably would just have been put off. Not to mention I'm going to have to give up a Saturday and another ten bucks every time I want to try a new mode. Major drain on enthusiasm after a while.

Now tell me what this "testing" will improve?

Besides, enforcement would be a nightmare. I can see it now, FCC reports about the dirty low down they caught doing unendorsed meteor scatter work.

- mike -

629. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 18:55:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF2BE1A.D379A555@uci.edu>
Source record: 23626

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Well, that's certainly true Jim. It's a damned if you do/damned if you
> don't situation to be sure.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Yes, so maybe under the circumstances we should lighten up on the
'damning' just a bit.

630. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 19:03:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF2BFF6.6B9CA8BC@uci.edu>
Source record: 23627

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3BEAE90E.2385C89@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

> >Maybe you should wash the callbook out with soap. :-)

> Jim:
>
> I tried that, but the pages got too soggy. My new callbook CD seems
> to tolerate being washed with lukewarm water a tiny amount of
> dish detergent, but for some odd reason, it doesn't change Kim's dirty
> call sign! Why is that?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Well, maybe it's kinda like when your mom washed your mouth out with
soap. It never really changed the fact that you said what you said. It
just made your mom feel that she had done something about it.

I remember the nuns in CCD class telling us that saying gee and darn was
just as bad as saying Jesus and damn. Guess you can find filth where
ever you want to find it Larry.

631. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 19:26:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF2C4F7.88E07BC4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23628

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who position
> themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
> with me--in terms of morals and behavior.

I think that is a bet that you'd likely lose, Kim.

> I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly
> pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having
> such a callsign.

On the contrary, I think your callsign expresses humanity at some base
level and you lack of respect for those who might find it objectionable.

> Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
> the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air; acting
> meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who can't even
> defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham; participating in a
> political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other people;
> refusing to support someone for club membership because of some protected
> class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.); how many
> of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the air
> under cover of a disguised voice?
>
> Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground than
> me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign,
> simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made
> about it, nor received about it, save occasionally. While I disagree with
> you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my
> callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham radio
> before you appoint yourself as judge! Because with your behaviors on this
> newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have
> neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act in
> the manner you expect others to.
>
> So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've matched
> your own demands.
>
> Kim W5TIT

It looks like the above is an example of "everyone else is as bad as I
am" and that sentiment does not have any basis in fact. It is simply a
guess on your part.

Dave K8MN

632. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 19:37:46 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <hlh5vtsvaknm4m1urb1hiflu92vdti0jdp@4ax.com>
Source record: 23629

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->The on and off delay in that photo are int he order of tens of milliseconds.

The horizontal sweep speed was listed as 10 ms/div.

In
->a key line in virtually every solid-state transceiver that I know of, key
->closure is represented by a logic 0, so the very left of the upper trace going
->from positive to negative is the time the key is closed. The positive
->transition on the key signal represents the key being released, so the radio
->unkeys tens of milliseconds later.

Then we've got a more serious problem YET. Are you saying that the transceiver RF turns OFF with key closure and ON with key opening? If so, that is exactly what that photo is showing.

One way or the other, I believe that the photo is honked, unless there is something I'm just not understanding.

->
->>Do you think you could get Ten-Tec to publish the pulse anticipation circuit
->>they must have used to create this miracle?
->>{;-)
->
->I realize you said all of this tongue in cheek, but I would hate to see your
->joke be misinterpreted by those who are less technically astute than you and
I.

I swear to the Lord High Budda that I put a smileyface above my sigline -- it's still there on your cut and paste. See?

Actually, if you will go back into the QST archives from the early 1950s, one April (fool's) issue had a long series of articles of things that were desirable...a key anticipation circuit was one of them...along with a new design vacuum tube that took no filament power (they don't when the filament burns out, y'know).

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

633. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 19:47:10 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF2CA3E.896992B4@uci.edu>
Source record: 23631

N2EY wrote:
> I think it's an inappropriate callsign, but I don't think I've
> pronounced you as "inhuman" or some such.

I think it's a funny callsign. I always thought it was a funny name for
a bird. As a female anatomical part, they're one of my favorites. :-)

634. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 19:47:20 UTC
From: Sir Circumference <myname@this.net>
Message-ID: <3BF2BB6A.162DED12@this.net>
Source record: 23630

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
> the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air;

There you go, assuming everyone comes down to your level.

635. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 20:43:25 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9sukv109vg@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23632

"Sir Circumference" <myname@this.net> wrote in message
news:3BF2BB6A.162DED12@this.net...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
> > the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air;
>
> There you go, assuming everyone comes down to your level.

Really? I think it's off-color and disgusting that some of these old coots
on 20m talk about their medical problems on the air in graphic detail.

As you see, everyone has something which they're offended by.

636. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 21:03:27 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF2DC1F.9D46A98D@uci.edu>
Source record: 23633

Jim Weir wrote:

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
> ->The on and off delay in that photo are int he order of tens of milliseconds.
>
> The horizontal sweep speed was listed as 10 ms/div.
>
> In
> ->a key line in virtually every solid-state transceiver that I know of, key
> ->closure is represented by a logic 0, so the very left of the upper trace going
> ->from positive to negative is the time the key is closed. The positive
> ->transition on the key signal represents the key being released, so the radio
> ->unkeys tens of milliseconds later.

> Then we've got a more serious problem YET. Are you saying that the transceiver
> RF turns OFF with key closure and ON with key opening? If so, that is exactly
> what that photo is showing.

If Ed is correct about the logic levels, then it looks like there's
about an 18 msec turn-on delay, and about a 10 msec turn-off delay.

There's a few things that look kinda weird there. Methinks the radio
doesn't like to be keyed that rapidly. Notice the second burst isn't
the same as the first, which isn't unusual necessarily, but there's even
a longer turn-on delay - apparently due to turn-on shaping. At that
keying rate (20 msec pulse width), the RF burst is virtually 180 degrees
out of phase with the key.

Maybe Ed is just being polite about how poor the performance appears to
be.

637. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 21:32:27 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <LpBI7.24866$xS6.40177@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23634

Kim-W5TIT says:

>One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who position
>themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
>with me--in terms of morals and behavior.

I've steered clear of this thread (because I think it's inane), but you
keep flogging it, so here are my thoughts.

First, I don't have a clue about your "morals and behavior" and I'm not
interested at.

>I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly
>pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having
>such a callsign.

Second, don't flatter yourself. Nobody has called you inhuman that I know
about. Nobody has called you immoral that I know about. You're just too
low on the radar screen to rate such sort of serious labels.

I just think your choice of callsign is really, really tacky (as in low
class trash).

Third, I've never engaged in any of the other trashy behavior you listed
in your jeremiad.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

638. Re: FCC Busting Truck Stops For "Exports"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 21:41:46 UTC
From: CapoDeSimone@Italia.net
Message-ID: <uyBI7.24885$xS6.40441@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23635

> poor bambino leland >
> genitalia microscopis
afflictis >
>
> radio Luppo de Italia
>
> amerigos cb b'toneau de leland c. scott >

639. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 21:55:32 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <vhp5vt4e6ujg2nbppn6p6b23guaamhhiv7@4ax.com>
Source record: 23636

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->
->If Ed is correct about the logic levels, then it looks like there's
->about an 18 msec turn-on delay, and about a 10 msec turn-off delay.

Oh, I think I see what you are saying...but that doesn't make any sense either.

The upper trace is key closure, and I'm presuming the standard "up is positive" orientation. That means that the key is closed when the upper trace is at the fifth graticle line up, and the key is open when the trace is at the seventh line. The transmitter is "on" when the bottom waveform is "fat" and "off" with a straight line.

Now look at the picture. The first thing we see at the first vertical graticle line from the left is the start of the trace. Evidently the key is "on" (low), but at this time the transmitter is "off". When the key is high ("off") the transmitter turns on.

Now if we presume opposite logic for the key trace (up is on, down is off) then we still have the original pulse anticipation problem.

Either way, I don't understand how this picture was taken. And it's not the traditional "printer's goof" of printing the picture in mirror because the numbers on the screen (the 90-10 risetime ticks) at the left side of the screen is clearly right-reading.

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

640. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 22:01:09 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF2E9A5.BE301C9F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23637

This is getting to be "Tit for tat". :-)

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who position
> themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
> with me--in terms of morals and behavior.
>

641. Re: Amateur Service Withers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 22:14:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF2ECDF.3D304C69@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23638

>
>
> >We alone are licensed to build a 1.5KW
> > transmitter and put it on the air, without any "inspection" of that
> > transmitter by the FCC before we stroke up on our favorite band.
>
> Yup. But how many hams actually design and build stations from scratch
> and put them on the air? I have done exactly that, and they were not
> simple stations, either.

Depends on what level one starts with when you "build" a station.
One could use components defined as: transceiver, power supply,
coax, linear, dedicated 230VAC circuit, more coax and antenna.
And a code key and/or mic. Or do you want to build your own
vacuum tubes, wind coils, smelt silicon and make your own ICs? :-)

>
> >
> > This "permission to experiment", unique to our hobby both in
> > the equipment *and* the modes we use, is what sets us apart.
>
> It's not the only thing.
>
> > Restricting our operation and experimentation to only those modes
> > or equipment types we have 'endorsements' for, such as is done
> > in aviation for example, would be the end of the Amateur Radio
> > Service.
>
> How so? The "Basic" license would give some access, in the form of
> limited power and frequencies. Full privileges would be earned by
> learning more about the modes and methods used.
>
> Nowhere is type acceptance mentioned in my posts on this.
>
> If a potential ham wants to tinker with 20 meter HF gear, at least a
> General class license is needed. For tinkering on the low end of 20
> meters, an Extra is needed. Does this really stop anyone with a
> technical interest? Not that I can see.
>
> Not having to learn lots of stuff that is of no interest would
> increase access, not decrease it.
> >
> > Since we couldn't tinker with anything new until we had studied
> > and tested for the endorsement, experimentation and tinkering would
> > come to an immediate halt.

>
> Nonsense. You don't understand the idea, that's all.
>
> >There is little enough of it now, and
> > the idea of qualifying for endorsements before we could tinker with
> > a new mode or technology would end experimentation within the framework
> > of amateur radio for all time.
>
> The reason there is "little enough of that now" has nothing to do with
> license tests being too hard or limiting people's interest. It has to
> do with factors like the more non-technical people becoming hams, the
> constant reduction in real-dollar cost of really good equipment, time
> constraints, and the increased complexity of typical amateur gear.
> Plus the fact that most new hams enter via the VHF/UHF route rather
> than the HF route of years ago.
>
> The new Novice of 1951, 1961 or 1971 was quite likely to build a
> simple HF CW transmitter to get on the air. Relatively few new
> Technicians of 2001 are building VHF/UHF FM transmitters to get on the
> air - not because they are "bad", but because they have so many
> inexpensive options of manufactured gear.
> >
> > The only legimimate function of testing in the context of amateur
> > radio licensing is to ensure that the licensee has a basic familiarity
> > of technical concepts, such that they can ensure that their experimenting
> > and operation does not trash the electromatic spectrum for other users,
> > and that they stay within the bands allocated to them.
>

Remember the purpose of any and all modes is to communicate
with other hams with equipment set up for that particular mode.
If you don't do it right, you don't achieve communications. Seems
enough of a "test" or "endorsement" to me.

642. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 22:53:06 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF2F5D2.EAF9BBA4@uci.edu>
Source record: 23640

Jim Weir wrote:

> The upper trace is key closure, and I'm presuming the standard "up is positive"
> orientation. That means that the key is closed when the upper trace is at the
> fifth graticle line up, and the key is open when the trace is at the seventh
> line.

Talk about not making sense. :-) According to Ed (and common sense),
the trace is low when the key is closed.

> The transmitter is "on" when the bottom waveform is "fat" and "off" with
> a straight line.

I believe you have that correct. :-)

> Now look at the picture. The first thing we see at the first vertical graticle
> line from the left is the start of the trace. Evidently the key is "on" (low),
> but at this time the transmitter is "off". When the key is high ("off") the
> transmitter turns on.

That is consistent with my observations (and my comments).

> Now if we presume opposite logic for the key trace (up is on, down is off) then
> we still have the original pulse anticipation problem.

I wouldn't bother with that presumption (unless you believe in
anticipation circuits). ;-)

> Either way, I don't understand how this picture was taken. And it's not the
> traditional "printer's goof" of printing the picture in mirror because the
> numbers on the screen (the 90-10 risetime ticks) at the left side of the screen
> is clearly right-reading.

The pictures indicate that there is about an 18 msec turn-on delay, and
about a 10 msec turn-off delay. Whether there is a printers goof or not
is unknown to me. Interestingly, the ARRL lab measured receive-transmit
turnaround time (tx delay) for SSB as being 20 msec in their written
specs. Also note that Ten Tec did not supply any CW keying
specifications in their literature for this radio.

643. Re: Amateur Service Withers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 22:56:00 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <4ECI7.170100$3d2.6994079@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23639

Jim, N2EY, posted:

> The concept of "radio operator" is rapidly vanishing from other
> services. I understand that the US Navy no longer has the "Radioman"
> specialty at all. From what I read, the GROL is more of a license to
> adjust and repair equipment than it is to operate.

Sad, but true. I think it started when broadcasting management
questioned the necessity for having to hire licensed operators when,
in fact, it was the station licensee who was ultimately responsible
for station operation in any case. The other commercial services'
lobbyists piled on and my First 'Phone became history.

In light of this history, I have wondered, like Hans, whether
the 'operator' part of the combined amateur operator/station
license is obsolete. Perhaps he's right -- all you do is sign
a form saying you are cognizant of the relevant rules and regs
and are not a convicted felon or previous radio miscreant -- and
back comes a *STATION* license. Screw up and the FCC jerks
the STATION license. Strict accountablility, but no a-priori,
operating-skill qualifications.

Jim, N2EY, responded to Hans' proposal with:

> It's been tried, Hans. They called it CB. The result isn't pretty.

That's been hashed over -- a lot. Other factors, like very poor
frequency selection for a "local" service, play in there too.
But a lot of the opinion I see is that a corner was definitely
turned when the FCC transitioned it to a completely licenseless
service and gave up on enforcement. I don't think that is what
Hans was proposing.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

644. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 23:07:25 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf2f95c$0$35623$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 23641

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
news:LpBI7.24866$xS6.40177@www.newsranger.com...
> Kim-W5TIT says:
>
> I just think your choice of callsign is really, really tacky (as in low
> class trash).
>
> Third, I've never engaged in any of the other trashy behavior you listed
> in your jeremiad.

Till now, you just call her low class trash. A callsign is a sequence
of letters and numbers assign by the FCC to identify a station/operator.
You the one that assigns another meaning to her callsign.

W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.

Larry

645. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-14 23:28:34 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <nsu5vtc9a3ucp2rb8ebfrmbqn4ierrfgd3@4ax.com>
Source record: 23642

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->The pictures indicate that there is about an 18 msec turn-on delay, and
->about a 10 msec turn-off delay. Whether there is a printers goof or not
->is unknown to me. Interestingly, the ARRL lab measured receive-transmit
->turnaround time (tx delay) for SSB as being 20 msec in their written
->specs. Also note that Ten Tec did not supply any CW keying
->specifications in their literature for this radio.

Ah, no, one of the Jims in this exchange isn't getting it. Right now I'm not sure which one it is. {;-)

OK, let's start with the key pulses going from left to right, just like a normal oscilloscope sweep.

Are you saying that the key pulses and the transmit pulses are almost 180 degrees out of phase because of DELAY????

That is, at the far left side of the screen we just barely see the fall of the key line, supposedly turning the transmitter on. Twenty milliseconds later (see further comment) the transmitter turns on. Then the key turns off and ....

AHA. Hoist on my own petard. See how the center of the oscilloscope screen all of a sudden has a twofer graticle change? That is, what is one graticle on the outside of the screen is actually two divisions on the center? Which one do you suppose the boys in the lab meant when they said 10 ms/div? The outer? Or the inner? I was seeing 4 divisions between the center-screen off-on key pulse (comes down right exactly on the center graticle) and the transmitter turn-on. You can argue that this is either 20 or 40 milliseconds, depending on your interpretation of "ms/div".

So what you are really saying is that the pulses are really 180 out because of turn on / turn off delay? Sheesh. Bit in the butt again.

Thanks for the interchange...

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

646. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 00:51:45 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <BkEI7.25127$xS6.41032@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23643

The opinion of Larry Klose seems to be......

>
>W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.
>

Trashy is trashy and only trashy, nothing else.

For more detail, point your browser at http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

647. Re: 11 Meters L.O.T.A. (Lighthouses On The Air)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 00:53:32 UTC
From: Dave <please@nospam.org>
Message-ID: <e446vt8q8jtbd66g1umoeel3btro33dl95@4ax.com>
Source record: 23644
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

I don't see the paralell ,not even a vague one. all I see is a
reference to a group of people who needlessly killed thousands that
were abiding by their own "rules", You on the otherhand obviously
can't think for your self, you need laws to tell you right from wrong
. Its easy, "thou shal not kill", not thou shall not operate LSB on
27.565....
Free association is a dangerous thing...

73

On Sat, 27 Oct 2001 17:59:01 +0000 (UTC), "Leland C. Scott "
<kc8ldo@valkcom.net> wrote:

>Good luck you guys, I'm trying my best to work all of these great 11 meter
>LOTAS. Leave it to the freebanders to come up with another great idea!
>
>Leland C. Scott
>KC8LDO
>
>ARRL Member
>NCI Member
>
>"That's easy to explain. As another poster a short time back said about
>Part 95 rules "I don't care", well you see what happens when that mind
>set gets applied in a different context. It is very apparent they,=20
>the terrorists, didn't care about human life either,=20
>including their own. "
>
>Regarding the WTC attack on 9/11/01

648. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 01:26:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf31a34_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23645

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0111140947.39b7bd8b@posting.google.com...
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:<3bf25b27_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who
position
> > themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
> > with me--in terms of morals and behavior.
>
> Based on what evidence, Kim? Have you worked or heard anyone on this
> NG on the air? I have.

No, I am basing my comments on "behaviors" I have seen displayed on the
newsgroup. The comments certainly are not directed toward you. Those who
feel the comments fit, well, what is the proverbial saying: If the shoe
fits, wear it.

> >
> > I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they
boldly
> > pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for
having
> > such a callsign.
>
> I think it's an inappropriate callsign, but I don't think I've
> pronounced you as "inhuman" or some such.
>

Even though the post was marked as an RE: to your post...it certainly wasn't
intended for you.

> > Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
> > the hobby in many ways:
>
> > having an off-color conversation on the air;
>
> Not me.
>
> > acting meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who
can't even
> > defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham;
>
> Leaves me out.
>
> > participating in a

> > political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other
people;
>
> uh-uh
>
> > refusing to support someone for club membership because of some
protected
> > class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.);
>
> Never even heard of that one. Try it around here and the club will
> kick out the person trying it.
>
> > how many
> > of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the
air
> > under cover of a disguised voice?
>
> Not me. Not ever.
> >
> > Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground
than
> > me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign,
> > simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made
> > about it, nor received about it, save occasionally.
>
> Bull. You got that particular callsign for its giggle factor, Kim.
> You've said so yourself. At least be honest about the motivation for
> that particular choice of letters. It wasn't about birdwatching.
>

And, where does the paragraph above deny that fact?

> > While I disagree with
> > you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my
> > callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham
radio
> > before you appoint yourself as judge!
>
> > Because with your behaviors on this
> > newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have
> > neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act
in
> > the manner you expect others to.
>
> On the air or off?

The "you" in the comments are those who fit the description, not *you*. :)

> >
> > So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've
matched

> > your own demands.
>
> Let s/he who is without sin cast the first stone, in other words.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Absolutely!

Kim W5TIT

> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011114000355.24612.00000600@nso-cr.aol.com...
> > > In article <XGiI7.18$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
> > <kc8pmx@tm.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > > If Kims
> > > >callsign is *so wrong*, then the FCC should not have issued it.
> > >
> > > I disagree. By that logic, all decisions about "right" and "wrong" are
to
> > be
> > > left up to the government.
> > >
> > > > Since they
> > > >have issued it, just grow up and get over it everyone!
> > >
> > > Sounds like you don't like the idea that there is a difference of
opinion
> > about
> > > it, and that people can express their opinions here.
> > >
> > > >Shift the blame
> > > >where it belongs..... the issuing agency.
> > >
> > > Why? Cobsider the following:
> > >
> > > The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign.
It is
> > only
> > > available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that
particular
> > > callsign.
> > >
> > > Yet you say it's all the FCC's fault. As if it's governments job to
"save
> > us
> > > from ourselves".
> > >
> > > Sorry, I don't buy it.

> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY

649. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 01:28:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf31abd$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23646

Who says "down"? I say everyone is pretty much up here at my level.

Kim W5TIT

"Sir Circumference" <myname@this.net> wrote in message
news:3BF2BB6A.162DED12@this.net...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
> > the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air;
>
> There you go, assuming everyone comes down to your level.

650. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 01:32:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf31b9f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23647

Oh, yeah...now there's some (*choke*) class for ya... Yeah, Hans...real class. ROFLMAO.

Kim W5TIT

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message news:BkEI7.25127$xS6.41032@www.newsranger.com...
> The opinion of Larry Klose seems to be......
>
> >
> >W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.
> >
>
> Trashy is trashy and only trashy, nothing else.
>
> For more detail, point your browser at http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --
>
> Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

651. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 01:33:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf31bec_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23648

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3BF2BE1A.D379A555@uci.edu...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Well, that's certainly true Jim. It's a damned if you do/damned if you
> > don't situation to be sure.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Yes, so maybe under the circumstances we should lighten up on the
> 'damning' just a bit.

Hmmmm, which damning? The do or the don't? LOL

Kim W5TIT

652. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 02:00:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF32126.BF3B7F26@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23649

Larry Klose wrote:
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> news:LpBI7.24866$xS6.40177@www.newsranger.com...
> > Kim-W5TIT says:
> >
> > I just think your choice of callsign is really, really tacky (as in low
> > class trash).
> >
> > Third, I've never engaged in any of the other trashy behavior you listed
> > in your jeremiad.
>
> Till now, you just call her low class trash. A callsign is a sequence
> of letters and numbers assign by the FCC to identify a station/operator.
> You the one that assigns another meaning to her callsign.
>
> W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.
>
> Larry

It's been a long time since we've heard from Larry the homemade lawyer.
If you've followed this thread, you'll note *why* Kim chose the call.
It wasn't randomly chosen. It was chosen so Tugboat Annie...er, Kim
could have fun with the boys.

Try to keep up.

Dave K8MN

653. Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 02:07:29 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <BrFI7.25177$xS6.41064@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23650

Just in time for Christmas giving, check it out!

http://westid.com/amateur.htm

What all the well dressed Radio Kops will be wanting.
Be the first on your repeater to own one.

(If I see someone actually wearing one of these, I
think I'll have to barf.)

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

654. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 02:34:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011114213410.27773.00002307@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 23801

In article <20011113080315.23850.00000448@nso-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>btw, 2200 gal fo fuel and 4700 A are numbers applicable to a single, small
>diesel-electric locomotive.

Jim:

You mean, they make bigger ones? I'd like to see the numbers on them! I thought that they just ganged several similar locomotives together in order to pull longer, heavier freight trains.

I've also wondered why the diesel-electric hybrid scheme hasn't been applied to other vehicles, like over-the-road trucks, busses, even passenger cars? Seems like that using the right combination of engine, generator, and traction motors, a great deal of efficiency could be achieved. Present day hybrid cars persist in making a direct mechanical connection between the small gasoline engine and the drivetrain through a transmission; eliminating that step, and going to direct traction motors would seem to take a lot of slack out of the system. While stationed in Germany and England, I rode a lot of Inter-city trains and trolley cars. I was always impressed by the smooth, responsive delivery of power by those traction motors. From a standing start, they generated almost neck-snapping torque; then smoothly and quickly accelerated a very heavy vehicle to very impressive speeds, never seeming to labor at any part of the acceleration curve. Then, to stop, they are put in generator-braking mode, and actually create more electricity as they decelerate. What an extraordinarily efficient system!

I have a feeling that the only reason we're not using more hybrid vehicles is because the oil companies would see all their profits go out the window -- and they'd have to be selling fuel at 50 cents a gallon to consumers with vehicles that got 75 MPG. Where is the outrage?

73 de Larry, K3LT

655. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 03:15:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF33326.90A82AC8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23802

> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> I have never read a more arrogant and
> ignorant piece of tripe about current
> policy and procedure for the carrying of
> automatic or personal sidearms in the
> Armed Forces, Dwight. And insulting,
> to boot...

Lets bring everyone reading up to date on the discussion so far. While talking about the National Guard in domestic situations, you made the statement, "...you can bet, Sir, that if you see a firearm brandished, it HAS ammunition in it." You followed that up with, "If you see a magazine in the well, it's loaded." I responded with, "I'm sorry, Steve, but you're wrong about that."

You responded with the garbage at the top of this message and then later challenged me to prove it (by reference to current NGB Directive or Flag Officer order). Okay, I'll be glad to. Take a scroll over the the Michigan National Guard's home page, look under the JAG's (Judge Advocate General) directory, and take a careful look at the document; "Command Legal Issues, Domestic Operations: Support of Civil Authorities.

http://www.michguard.com/jag/domestic%20operations.htm

Towards the bottom of that document, you will see a sample ROE (Rules of Engagement) for domestic operations. This one is the Los Angeles Civil Disturbance ROE prepared by the Joint Task Force LA. About half way down that document, you will see a chart describing the various types of arming orders - six arming orders to be specific.

Notice that four (4) of those arming orders describe weapons carried with no ammunition in them. The fifth one describes a weapon with the magazine in the weapon, but no ammunition in the chamber. And, finally, only the sixth describes a weapon fully loaded. Notice also that only the officer in charge can issue the sixth arming order, and, if you look back through the document above that, you will see that he can only issue that order under the situation described in my previous message (an immediate threat).

Now, after reading that, do you still want to claim that "if you see a firearm brandished, it has ammunition in it," Steve? Before you continue to attack me over an issue you know so little about, I suggest you read up on the subject first. When you're through reading the document above, pop on over to the Army's Training and Doctrine Digital Library and look at Field Manual 100-19 (Domestic Support Operations)...

http://www.adtdl.army.mil/cgi-bin/atdl.dll/fm/100-19/fm10019.htm

...and Field Manual 27-100 (Legal Support to Operations)...

http://www.adtdl.army.mil/cgi-bin/atdl.dll/fm/27-100/toc.htm

Both of these manuals contain material about the use of military personnel in domestic situations. Both contain material about the role of the National Guard in domestic operations. And, finally, both contain material about the use of weapons, and other force, in domestic operations.

> I'll quote an acitve NG MP Officer....

Don't try to change the subject, Steve. Of course the military police are armed. Nobody has disputed that. But, we're not talking about the military police. We were talking about National Guard personnel at airports or other civilian facilities around the country. Now, certainly some of those may indeed be military police officers, but the overwhelming majority are not (the National Guard simply does not have enough military police officers to patrol the facilities currently being patrolled).

> We learned a looooooong time ago (Lebanon,
> to be specific) that you DON'T carry an
> automatic weapon and NOT have the
> ammunition to USE it. If the weapon is being
> carried, the person carrying it has the
> ammunition, the orders and the TRAINING
> to use it...

The United States is not Lebanon, Steve. There are very different policies concerning weapons in a possible hostile situations overseas and weapons used in domestic operations right here in the United States.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

656. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 03:35:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF337ED.27B03EFC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23803

K0HB wrote:
>
> Incredibly, he claims to be presently
> serving on the National Staff of the
> USCG Auxiliary as a member of the
> Marketing & Public Affairs Department
> with responsibility to provide the
> general public with information about
> the Coast Guard Auxiliary.

My association with the Coast Guard Auxiliary has absolutely nothing to do with this discussion, Hans. The opinions expressed are solely my own (based on information found through public news sources). They do not represent the views of the U.S. Coast Guard or Auxiliary, nor do they represent a statement of my position as a member or representative of either organization. This is further underlined by the fact that I did not attempt to identify any association with either organization when I made those statements.

> Do you think they'd endorse his apparent
> disdain for our men and women in uniform?

And I have no disdain for the men and women in uniform. I made a statement about military policy concerning weapons in domestic situations, which I have backed up with military documentation (read my message to Steve). I also made a statement about personnel with loaded weapons in a domestic situations, which also does not differ from current military policy. If the military was not also worried about accidental shootings, why else would they have arming orders for weapons without live ammunition?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

657. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 03:53:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF33C2B.52513EDF@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23804

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote...
>
> > Do you think they'd endorse his
> > apparent disdain for our men
> > and women in uniform?
>
> Being in one of the two authorized
> Auxiliaries myself, I'd hope not!
> (CAP)!

So, since you appear to endorse his reference to my membership in the Auxiliary when I made no mention of it, are we to assume from this point on that everything you say is an official statement made by you as a member of the Civil Air Patrol, Steve?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

658. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 04:09:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF33FED.8FC5E0A4@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23805

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" wrote...
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Well, that's certainly true Jim.
> > > It's a damned if you do/damned if
> > > you don't situation to be sure.
> >
> > Yes, so maybe under the circumstances
> > we should lighten up on the 'damning'
> > just a bit.
>
> Hmmmm, which damning? The do or the
> don't? LOL

Hey, HEY! Both of you watch the language. What are you trying to do
- corrupt my vastly superior, extremely high, even lofty, morals? And
I heard that "oh, brother" from both of you. Knock that stuff off. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

659. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 04:19:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011114231947.14773.00001166@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23806

In article <3bf1e5f3_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Kim W5TI and a T

Kim:

I'll be that's exactly the same way you say your callsign on the air.
It's always amazed me how many people were issued callsigns
with the words "and a" before the last letter. Of course, in the case
of your call, it's almost an improvement!

73 de Larry, K3L and no steenking "and a" T

660. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 04:19:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011114231948.14773.00001167@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23807

In article <3bf25b27_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who position
>themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
>with me--in terms of morals and behavior.
>
>I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly
>pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having
>such a callsign.

Kim:

Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is *patently*
objectionable!

>Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
>the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air; acting
>meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who can't even
>defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham; participating in a
>political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other people;
>refusing to support someone for club membership because of some protected
>class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.); how many
>of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the air
>under cover of a disguised voice?

I'm sure that kind of thing happens, but since I know how to use CW and a
handful of digital modes, I generally don't run into that type of on-the-air
behavior.

>Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground than
>me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign,
>simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made
>about it, nor received about it, save occasionally.

So…which is it, Kim? *No* overt comments, or only *occasional* overt
comments? I suggest that it is exactly this type of confusion which caused you
to make the poor choice of selecting that callsign in the first place!

>While I disagree with
>you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my
>callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham radio
>before you appoint yourself as judge!

I think that before you do that, you'd better take a close look at who
decided to choose a sexually provocative callsign which is demeaning to
hams in general, and female hams in particular!

>Because with your behaviors on this
>newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have
>neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act in
>the manner you expect others to.

Kim dear, you're the last one who would be qualified to make judgements about other people's "respect" for themselves or others. If you had any, you wouldn't have selected your callsign in the first place, or, at the very least, would endeavor to change it with all due dispatch.

>So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've matched
>your own demands.

Again, you are not the one to be making such statements. In case you haven't noticed, *you* are the Captain of a burning, sinking ship. If I were you, I'd be looking for a life raft! I'm sure you can find one at the ULS web site!

73 de Larry, K3LT

661. Re: Amateur Service Withers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 05:15:42 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <f94e8a807be8c668ee7340041761b088.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 23808

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message

> Why? The idea is to have a license with limited but useful privileges
> to get new folks started, then full privileges for those who want
> them. No learning stuff that one isn't interested in so as to get
> privs for the stuff one IS interested in.

Don't look just now, Jim, but I hear the FCC is planning such a
license. They're going to call it "Technician", have a quick and
easy test (no Morse test), and new folks can immediately operate
any mode they want, up to 1.5KW, on any frequency above 30MHz.

> The concept of "radio operator" is rapidly vanishing from other
> services. I understand that the US Navy no longer has the "Radioman"
> specialty at all. From what I read, the GROL is more of a license to
> adjust and repair equipment than it is to operate.

We are not "other services". BTW, the Navy "Radioman" rating has
it's name changed to "Information Technician" and their range of
duties and skill increased (still includes radio), and they still
wear sparks on their sleeve.

> > --
> >
> > 97.1 To get an Amateur Radio license, you are required to pass
> > a technical test to show that you understand how to build simple
> > equipment which meets spectral purity specifications of (.....blah,
> > blah, blah).
>
> It won't be "a simple test" if it really tests whether a person knows
> how to build equipment that meets the spectral purity specifications.

Nope. And it shouldn't be simple. If you want to play with powerful
toys, you better understand how to keep them from trashing the
playground.

> Nothing in the ideas I presented would reduce or restrict
> experimentation by hams. You're assuming stuff that isn't there.

Of course it would restrict experimentation! Under your plan,
no new mode could ever be developed by experimentation, since
you must first take a test to use a new mode. Kinda Catch-22'ish,
huh?

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from 1cust198.tnt3.minneapolis3.mn.da.uu.net [63.22.92.198]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

662. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 05:38:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF354BD.50E9D2AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23809

Dave Heil wrote:
> So the Affirmative Action as set up in your home town is different than
> that set up in other towns in America?

The local Affirmative Action program set up in my home town allowed
qualified blacks to obtain the jobs that had been going to
unqualified whites. That condition probably didn't exist nation-
wide but it certainly existed in Small Southern Town, USA.

> Morse testing is a dead issue yet you continue to flog the same horse.

Huh????? I gave up on that dead horse last year. Methinks you don't
know the horse is dead.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

663. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 05:40:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF35536.107BF558@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23811

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > There were, in fact,
> > some jobs that had artificially high requirements where some
> > of those requirements had no bearing at all on the ability
> > of an individual to do the job,
>
> Bill, While I don't recognize you as the final authority any more than
> I do Cecil, I point to the fact that you've made MY case, not Cecil's.

Not if those artificially high requirements were related to
skin color.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

664. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 05:40:18 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF35542.F4FEA4FF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23810

K0HB wrote:

> Just in time for Christmas giving, check it out!
>
> http://westid.com/amateur.htm
>
> What all the well dressed Radio Kops will be wanting.
> Be the first on your repeater to own one.
>
> (If I see someone actually wearing one of these, I
> think I'll have to barf.)
>
>

Wait until they start selling a CB radio operator's
badge! :-)

Man with hole in pocket feel cocky.

665. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 05:46:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF356AA.181BDD4C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23812

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3BE8387C.F481BE3D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >
> >The Affirmative Action program was necessitated because racists
> >violated the 1964 Civil Rights Law. Racists had their chance to
> >comply and the Affirmative Action program was the predictable
> >result of their non-compliance. The racists have only themselves
> >to blame for the swinging of the pendulum.
>
> Incorrect.

BS, Larry. I'm telling you that if it had not been for Affirmative
Action, there never would have been a black teacher teaching a
white child in Madison County, Texas. The Madison County school
board was ordered to find qualified black teachers and hire them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

666. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 05:49:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF35767.1F96E264@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23813

Dick Carroll wrote:
> CW *will* get through when SSB won't.

There are many many times when SSB won't get through and CW
won't either so your statement continues to be a lie.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

667. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 05:54:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF35899.D07E87B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23814

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> It's all about having the right attutude.

And, of course, anyone who has an attitude different from yours
has the wrong attitude.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

668. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 05:59:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF359B6.EE1B2A26@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23815

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >It doesn't matter. CW is not a proper tool for misbehaving.
>
> It is if the key is wired to your car horn for use in heavy traffic.
>
> Sometimes it's satisfying to know they heard your choice comment on
> their ancestry, even if they obviously didn't understand it.

like ... --- -... ? Isn't a single digit more effective?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

669. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 06:09:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF35C2A.31403497@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23816

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> And I certainly agree with this. I do not want to live my life with
> government employees watching my every move - listening to my phone
> calls, watching my bank transactions, video cameras on street corners,
> and so forth.

I heard a scary one today. Detained suspected terrorists who have
not even been charged with anything will be denied lawyer/client
confidentiality privilege because all of their conversations
will be monitored. Say, Morse code might be useful after all. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

670. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 06:14:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF35D4E.B68153DE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23817

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> It's true they've stepped up their presence at the mall (and so
> forth), but I don't really have a problem with that.

I flew to California for a few days. I'm wondering what good is
an M-16 in a crowded airport? How many people can an M-16 steel
jacketed .223 round penetrate before it is spent?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

671. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 06:22:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF35F1F.B3EFC7FE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23818

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Kwitcherblabbering and change that disgusting call sign of yours!

Larry, you're like the guy taking the ink blot test who kept seeing
dirty pictures in every one of them. The psychologist told the guy
he had a problem. The guy said, "I don't have a problem. Those are
your dirty pictures."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

672. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 06:26:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF36000.2A5DC04D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23819

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is *patently*
> objectionable!

Still seeing dirty pictures in those ink blots, Larry?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

673. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 06:28:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF360A8.98A4E9A8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23820

Brian Kelly wrote:
> It's very simple. If ya flunk the writtens ya flunk the exam. If ya
> flunk the code test ya flunk the exam. (Not counting the CSCEs thing)

So the code test is considered equal in importance to everything else
in amateur radio combined?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

674. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 06:34:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF3620A.FF20A8A1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23821

Jim Weir wrote:
> Do you think you could get Ten-Tec to publish the pulse anticipation circuit
> they must have used to create this miracle?

I saw that circuit demoed on TV the other day. It's a faster-than-light
solid state tunneling technique.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

675. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 08:33:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011115033315.23275.00003285@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23822

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/14/2001 9:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF33326.90A82AC8@sccoast.net>

Self righteous ranting snipped.

Nice copy from regs, but not current in recent applications.

>> I'll quote an acitve NG MP Officer....

> Don't try to change the subject, Steve.

A recital of CURRENT policy and procedure is "changing the subject"..?!?!
Just like Lennie.

>We were talking about National Guard
>personnel at airports or other civilian facilities around the country.

Yes we are. If there's a magazine in the weapon, the weapon is loaded.
Period.

>The United States is not Lebanon, Steve.

No screaming Eagle doodo, huh Dwight? That's not what I said.

We got our butt's waxed by rag-tag militia because they saw us "patrolling"
in war-torn streets with M-16's that didn't even have a magazine in the well.
They knew we were not loaded and ready to fire. That's how that suicide bomber
got by the gate. By the time the sentry could react and get a round off, it
was too late.

>There are very different
>policies concerning weapons in a possible hostile situations overseas
>and weapons used in domestic operations right here in the United States.

Hot flash, hot rod...the use of deadly force is authorized. And it's
authorized right here at home.

Now, unless you can show me a regulation that says "carry a weapon with a
blank magazine and fake it", the rest of your rant is trashed.

Adios.

Steve

676. Re: Picking up broadcasts on my computer and telephone

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 08:34:17 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0111150034.45292a85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23823

Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:<9stva70h0m@drn.newsguy.com>...
> Leland KC8LDO
> >
> >"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> >news:<zf4I7.110314$WW.6629498@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> >> my best guess is that they have a CBer pumping some AM
> >> heat thru an Antron 99 or somesuch.
> >
> >Check out rec.radio.cb. That's where Cbers get daily help and
> >encouragement in creating such problems.
> >
> >-Aaron-
> >
> That's right,I hate CB too !
>
> No code Tech's RULE!!!!!!
>
> I love you Aaron xoxoxo

I didn't say I hate CB. I really dislike *illegal* CB though. (By
the way, you're not Leland. I guess the fake newsguy account will
have to be closed due to abuse. (PS: How come illegal CBers hate
no-code techs? Also how come whenever they come up with a scheme
[such as forging posts] to defend their rulebreaking ways, it
invariably violates more rules?)

-Aaron-

677. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 08:43:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011115034355.23275.00003286@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23824

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/14/2001 9:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF337ED.27B03EFC@sccoast.net>

>And I have no disdain for the men and women in uniform. I made a
>statement about military policy concerning weapons in domestic
>situations, which I have backed up with military documentation (read
>my message to Steve).

Your message to me was from policy manuals all dated before 1 September
2001.

It's a new game, Dwight, and you obviously don't know the rules.

And your "comments" were derogatory and snide about the professionalism
and character of the Armed Forces, especially the enlisted personnel.

>I also made a statement about personnel with
>loaded weapons in a domestic situations, which also does not differ
>from current military policy. If the military was not also worried
>about accidental shootings, why else would they have arming orders for
>weapons without live ammunition?

If there's a magazine in the well, the weapon is loaded. Never once in
almost 20 years in the Armed Forces did I ever carry a weapon that had an empty
magazine in it.

If there's a magazine in the well, it's a loaded weapon. Period. Or
perhaps YOU would like to run past some of those guardsmen brandishing a weapon
of your own and find out if they ARE loaded or not....?!?!?

678. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 08:45:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011115034517.23275.00003288@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 23825

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/14/2001 9:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF33C2B.52513EDF@sccoast.net>

>So, since you appear to endorse his reference to my membership in
>the Auxiliary when I made no mention of it, are we to assume from this
>point on that everything you say is an official statement made by you
>as a member of the Civil Air Patrol, Steve?

If you care to look even MORE foolish than you already do, be my guest,
Dwight.

679. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 10:28:24 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <cNMI7.187044$W8.6764533@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23826

"K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
news:BrFI7.25177$xS6.41064@www.newsranger.com...
> Just in time for Christmas giving, check it out!
>
> http://westid.com/amateur.htm
>
> What all the well dressed Radio Kops will be wanting.
> Be the first on your repeater to own one.
>
> (If I see someone actually wearing one of these, I
> think I'll have to barf.)
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --

Just be sure you hit the wearer.

680. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 11:04:08 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <liNI7.187048$W8.6766152@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23827

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011114213410.27773.00002307@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article <20011113080315.23850.00000448@nso-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >
> >btw, 2200 gal fo fuel and 4700 A are numbers applicable to a single,
small
> >diesel-electric locomotive.
>
> Jim:
>
> You mean, they make bigger ones? I'd like to see the numbers on
> them! I thought that they just ganged several similar locomotives
> together in order to pull longer, heavier freight trains.
>
> I've also wondered why the diesel-electric hybrid scheme hasn't been
> applied to other vehicles, like over-the-road trucks, busses, even
> passenger cars? Seems like that using the right combination of
> engine, generator, and traction motors, a great deal of efficiency could
> be achieved. Present day hybrid cars persist in making a direct
> mechanical connection between the small gasoline engine and the
> drivetrain through a transmission; eliminating that step, and going
> to direct traction motors would seem to take a lot of slack out of
> the system. While stationed in Germany and England, I rode a lot
> of Inter-city trains and trolley cars. I was always impressed by the
> smooth, responsive delivery of power by those traction motors.
> From a standing start, they generated almost neck-snapping torque;
> then smoothly and quickly accelerated a very heavy vehicle to very
> impressive speeds, never seeming to labor at any part of the
> acceleration curve. Then, to stop, they are put in generator-braking
> mode, and actually create more electricity as they decelerate. What
> an extraordinarily efficient system!
>
> I have a feeling that the only reason we're not using more hybrid
> vehicles is because the oil companies would see all their profits go
> out the window -- and they'd have to be selling fuel at 50 cents a
> gallon to consumers with vehicles that got 75 MPG. Where is the
> outrage?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

The biggest problem is getting service capabilities in place before letting them loose. Similar problems arose with both the disc brake and the alternator when they were introduced. When Mopar brought out the alternator the urban legends were rife. Automatic trannies were terra incognita at the time they were brought out, the Hydra-matic from the Sherman tank.

The series motor is an admirable device, maximum torque and minimum efficiency at stall and all that but like any DC motor it cannot be sealed. The early diesel-electric locos had some real problems with flooded track and snow. In fact the economics didn't really work over steam until the guy figured out how to allow one engineer to run multiple units; in and of itself steam is cheaper but getting rid of the supporting cast was what tipped the balance toward diesel. The Union Pacific until fairly recently ran moose steam locos on the snow blowers in the Wyoming passes -- and the UP had some real meese in the steam days.

The only good reason the hybrid works, and it is a far better idea at $4 gas BTW, is that it does allow the killing of the engine in urban areas and allows the engine to essentially run at a constant efficient RPM to get its MPG. This is done at the price of what is really a really poor transmission. Another trick that has been tried and is coming out on some Saturns soon is the continuously variable transmission, a neat name that boils down to two cones and a shitpot of belts or chains. First one I ever saw was on a Zenith Cobramatic record changer but they were used on Harley motor scooters and a Dutch car called a DAF. Driving one is an experience if you drive on engine sound.

While I think the energy guys are capable of all sorts of shenanigans this is not their doing but that of building a product that can be repaired by nincompoops and bought by yoyos that buy an SUV to whip granny down to the pool hall.

Dick N BK

681. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 11:24:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf3a4f1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23828

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF32126.BF3B7F26@earthlink.net...
> Larry Klose wrote:
> >
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> > news:LpBI7.24866$xS6.40177@www.newsranger.com...
> > > Kim-W5TIT says:
> > >
> > > I just think your choice of callsign is really, really tacky (as in
low
> > > class trash).
> > >
> > > Third, I've never engaged in any of the other trashy behavior you
listed
> > > in your jeremiad.
> >
> > Till now, you just call her low class trash. A callsign is a sequence
> > of letters and numbers assign by the FCC to identify a station/operator.
> > You the one that assigns another meaning to her callsign.
> >
> > W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.
> >
> > Larry
>
> It's been a long time since we've heard from Larry the homemade lawyer.
> If you've followed this thread, you'll note *why* Kim chose the call.
> It wasn't randomly chosen. It was chosen so Tugboat Annie...er, Kim
> could have fun with the boys.
>
> Try to keep up.
>
> Dave K8MN

Aw, I shoulda guessed a long time ago, Davey. *That's* what you're all
jealous about--I don't choose to have fun with *YOU*. I don't think I'll
even apologize and feel bad for ya...

Kim W5TIT

682. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 11:29:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011115062924.06323.00000001@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 23829

From: Jim Weir jim@rst-engr.com

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

>>The on and off delay in that photo are in the order of tens of milliseconds.

>The horizontal sweep speed was listed as 10 ms/div.

I guess I had assumed that an on delay of 18 milliseconds for the first dit and about 22 milliseconds for the second dit were close enough to "in the order of tens of milliseconds." I didn't have the photo in front of me when I offered that approximation. I am pleased, however, to share more exact figures with you if it will help you through this confusion.

> Then we've got a more serious problem YET. Are you saying that the
> transceiver RF turns OFF with key closure and ON with key opening? If so,
> that is exactly what that photo is showing.

Not at all, Jim. Perhaps a more detailed explaination to you will make it more clear.

If you look at the photo, the upper trace represents the key line. The key line sits at a level of about 12 volts until the radio is keyed. We do it this way so that the photo can represent the first dit and second dits when the radio is first keyed. This is necessary because different radios can have different characterisitics for the first character after being unkeyed for a while, as the T/R circuitry inside the radio does its things.

To measure the RF delay between the key line going low and RF appearing, we set up the 'scope to trigger on the trigger signal from the keying generator. The result is that only a fraction of a millisecond of key "up" is visible, in the upper left corner of the scope photo. The low level visible immediately following represents the key closure. It stays low for 20 milliseconds, then goes high for 20 milliseconds, then low for 20 milliseconds, then high for 20 milliseconds. Test over.

Now, if you look at the photo, the RF envelope to the left on the lower trace is the first keyed dit after the key closure on the upper trace. At 10 milliseconds per division, that is about 18 milliseconds by my eye, looking at the .pdf on the ARRL members-only web page. The scope sweeps from left to right, so if you start with the key closure on the very left of the screen, as the key line goes from the very briefly shown logic high to logic low, you can easily use the graticule to measure the approximately 18 milliseconds to the appearance of the RF envelope shown to the right of the keying event.

>One way or the other, I believe that the photo is honked, unless there is
>something I'm just not understanding.

Did my more detailed explanation help, Jim? I will talk to the ARRL test engineer to see if we can add about 5 milliseconds of delay between the external trigger output of the keying test generator and the actual key line solid-state-switch closure that keys the rig. That way, about 5 milliseconds of unkeyed signal will appear in the upper trace to help ensure that those who don't know much about keying-circuit desing, use and testing will not misunderstand what they are seeing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

683. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 11:37:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf3a81e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23830

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011114231947.14773.00001166@nso-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3bf1e5f3_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Kim W5TI and a T
>
> Kim:
>
> I'll be that's exactly the same way you say your callsign on the air.
> It's always amazed me how many people were issued callsigns
> with the words "and a" before the last letter. Of course, in the case
> of your call, it's almost an improvement!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3L and no steenking "and a" T
>
>

Nope, I sure don't say my callsign like that on the air. It would be
illegal. Since you didn't caution me on that, I presume that you didn't
know that. Many others don't know that, either. So, I suppose I should
guess--as you did with me--that you talk on the air just like you do in your
posts?

Kim W5TIT

684. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 11:39:35 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf3a885_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23831

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF35899.D07E87B2@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > It's all about having the right attutude.
>
> And, of course, anyone who has an attitude different from yours
> has the wrong attitude.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

ROFLMAO....!!!!! Larry always tries to be so witty! And, he always fails
so miserably...

Kim W5TIT

685. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 11:57:20 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf3acb3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23832

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011114231948.14773.00001167@nso-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3bf25b27_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who
position
> >themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
> >with me--in terms of morals and behavior.
> >
> >I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they
boldly
> >pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having
> >such a callsign.
>
> Kim:
>
> Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is
patently
> objectionable!
>

To you, Larry, to you. And, I might add, to very *few* who agree with you.

> >
> >Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
> >the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air;
acting
> >meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who can't even
> >defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham; participating in a
> >political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other people;
> >refusing to support someone for club membership because of some protected
> >class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.); how
many
> >of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the
air
> >under cover of a disguised voice?
>
> I'm sure that kind of thing happens, but since I know how to use CW and a
> handful of digital modes, I generally don't run into that type of
on-the-air
> behavior.
>

Are you this predictable in bed? You need to mix it up a little, Larry, step outside your box--do some creative thinking!

> >
> >Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground than
> >me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign,
> >simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made
> >about it, nor received about it, save occasionally.
>
> So.which is it, Kim? *No* overt comments, or only *occasional* overt
> comments? I suggest that it is exactly this type of confusion which caused you
> to make the poor choice of selecting that callsign in the first place!
>

Let's see...can you read? It is *NO*, save occasionally. Maybe you don't understand. That means that the incidence of times that anything is ever overtly said on the air about my callsign is negligible in terms of statistics. Oh, I had no confusion at all when I picked my callsign. That it was a poor choice--as I've said many times--is your opinion. (And I hardly care about your opinion).

> >
> >While I disagree with
> >you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my
> >callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham radio
> >before you appoint yourself as judge!
>
> I think that before you do that, you'd better take a close look at who
> decided to choose a sexually provocative callsign which is demeaning to
> hams in general, and female hams in particular!
>

Ya keep thinking that you're thinking is my thinking (and everyone else's), Larry. And, if you'll take a look, the very first sentence of this post places my "judgement" of others at the *same* level as me. I don't believe anyone is lower or higher than me. I am reminding people like yourself (yeah, you) that you're no different than me; no better than me; and that you've got lots of fixing you could do yourself before you cock your hat every morning.

> >
> >Because with your behaviors on this
> >newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have
> >neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act in
> >the manner you expect others to.
>
> Kim dear, you're the last one who would be qualified to make judgements
> about other people's "respect" for themselves or others. If you had any, you

> wouldn't have selected your callsign in the first place, or, at the very least,
> would endeavor to change it with all due dispatch.
>

I disagree. I am quite qualified to "make judgements" about other peoples' respect for themselves or others. Your opinion of me is yours, as mine of you is mine. And, unfortunately for you, I respect myself highly. And, I can assure you that the behavior you display on this newsgroup *does not* gain the respect of me or many others. And, I can assure you that you *don't* act in a manner you expect others to. See? That's *my* opinion. And, I'm sorry--but you just can't have it or mold it.

> >
> >So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've matched
> >your own demands.
>
> Again, you are not the one to be making such statements. In case you haven't
> noticed, *you* are the Captain of a burning, sinking ship. If I were you, I'd
> be looking for a life raft! I'm sure you can find one at the ULS web site!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

What burning, sinking ship? Are you talking about the ARS? You're so wrong. Ham radio is growing, more and more people are entering the hobby, and even lots of new hams are experimenting with electronics. If you'd get down off your high horse (that's really nothing more than one of those cute little burros) you'd realize that, Larry. I know it would please you to no end to have the ARS just "go away" but it won't, Larry. One can only hope that maybe you will.

Also, I assure you that I am not as attached to my callsign as you are, Larry. Not at all. I'll concentrate on seeing how long I can keep this thread alive. Bet it goes to about...let's see, March? That's about how long you last every year.

Kim W5TIT

686. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 12:34:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF3B667.43E4ADA4@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23833

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> Nice copy from regs, but not
> current in recent applications.

That document describes the current policies on the arming of National Guard personnel in domestic operations.

> Now, unless you can show me a
> regulation that says "carry a
> weapon with a blank magazine
> and fake it", the rest of your
> rant is trashed.

Again, I offered an official National Guard document concerning the arming of National Guard personnel in domestic situations. In that document, it described four arming orders where a weapon is carried with no ammunition. That directly contradicts what you said before and directly backs up what I said. Now, lets see if you have the integrity to admit you were wrong.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

687. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 12:53:27 UTC
From: Jerry Castle <dpinc@dpinczx.org>
Message-ID: <9t0dpj$607$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 23834

ha ha ha, add one of those beanie caps with a propeller
on the top and "FCC" printed on the front. It would be the
perfect Christmas gift for Phil Kane. He could relive the old
days by busting kids with overpowered walkie-talkies.

Jerry

688. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 13:03:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011115080316.24612.00000632@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 23835

In article <20011114213410.27773.00002307@nso-fo.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20011113080315.23850.00000448@nso-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>
>>btw, 2200 gal fo fuel and 4700 A are numbers applicable to a single, small
>>diesel-electric locomotive.
>
>Jim:
>
>You mean, they make bigger ones?

Oh yes. The biggest current production model I know of is the SD-90MAC freight locomotive.

> I'd like to see the numbers on
>them!

6000 hp, 6000 gallon sectionalized fuel tank, AC traction motors, top speed 75 mph with stock gearing, microprocessor control, all sorts of innovations. There's a link to the EMD website on the site you gave. Or search "SD-90MAC" on your favorite search engine.

> I thought that they just ganged several similar locomotives
>together in order to pull longer, heavier freight trains.

That is still done, of course, but it is more efficient and more economical in most cases to have a few big locos rather than several small ones.
>
>I've also wondered why the diesel-electric hybrid scheme hasn't been
>applied to other vehicles, like over-the-road trucks, busses, even
>passenger cars? Seems like that using the right combination of
>engine, generator, and traction motors, a great deal of efficiency could
>be achieved.

Probably the weight, cost and complexity considerations make it impractical. There's also the imbedded idea of how those vehicles are supposed to work. Look how long it took for the idea of transverse-engine front-wheel drive cars to replace the longitudinal-engine rear-wheel drive concept.

>Present day hybrid cars persist in making a direct
>mechanical connection between the small gasoline engine and the
>drivetrain through a transmission; eliminating that step, and going
>to direct traction motors would seem to take a lot of slack out of

>the system.

Only if the weight and cost of the motors is less than that of the transmission it replaces.

> While stationed in Germany and England, I rode a lot
>of Inter-city trains and trolley cars. I was always impressed by the
>smooth, responsive delivery of power by those traction motors.
>From a standing start, they generated almost neck-snapping torque;
>then smoothly and quickly accelerated a very heavy vehicle to very
>impressive speeds, never seeming to labor at any part of the
>acceleration curve.

Yup. Electric vehicles that are powered by third rail or overhead wire have a BIG advantage: Their energy source is not on the vehicle, so it can be very powerful without adding to the vehicle weight. In addition, electric motors can be designed to deliver very high horsepower for short periods.

> Then, to stop, they are put in generator-braking
>mode, and actually create more electricity as they decelerate. What
>an extraordinarily efficient system!

Yup. Plus they use electricity generated by any method available - coal, oil, hydro, nuclear, etc. Reduces/eliminates dependence on imported oil.

What was the price of gasoline in those countries?
>
>I have a feeling that the only reason we're not using more hybrid
>vehicles is because the oil companies would see all their profits go
>out the window -- and they'd have to be selling fuel at 50 cents a
>gallon to consumers with vehicles that got 75 MPG. Where is the
>outrage?

Hybrid drive is not the answer to that problem. The efficiency of road vehicles will not be tripled or quadrupled by it. Vehicles like the Insight also use batteries and every weight-reducing trick available.

Look up the Volkswagen TDI and see what kind of efficieny is available today in midsized production cars.

The real problem in this country is that the market has long demanded big heavy inefficient vehicles and all but ignored smaller, more efficient ones. Even at $1.50/gallon, the cost of fuel is not a major consideration to most new car buyers. A car that gets 15 MPG and is driven 15,000 miles/yr costs $1500 to fuel at $1.50/gallon. Doubling the MPG to 30 saves only $750/yr.

How many SUVs do you see on the road being used as commuting vehicles, with just one person in each? How many of them NEVER go off-road? Where is the outrage?

The USA could reduce or even eliminate our dependence on imported oil by adopting more efficient transportation. We could have efficient surface transportation systems that would make the Euros look shabby. But it's not fashionable here yet.

73 de Jim, N2EY

689. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 13:04:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111150504.5c08f0d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23836

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0111140726.32ce5cf@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20011113080316.23850.00000449@nso-fy.aol.com>...
> >
> > You miss a ery important fact, Jason. The separate, unilateral Morse test is
> > there because international treaty requires it.
>
> True, but this element in the treaty may be struck down in 2003.

And if/when that happens, how long do you think the Morse test will
last? I say the FCC will simply issue an executive order eliminating
the requirement for Element 1. If the FCC doesn't do that right away,
rest assured that there will be at least one petition for it on their
desk within a business day.

73 de Jim, N2EY

690. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 13:08:46 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf3be8e$0$37105$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 23837

```
----- Original Message -----
From: "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2001 9:00 PM
Subject: Re: "one step closer...."

> Larry Klose wrote:
> >
> > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> > news:LpBI7.24866$xS6.40177@www.newsranger.com...
> > > Kim-W5TIT says:
> > >
> > > I just think your choice of callsign is really, really tacky (as in
low
> > > class trash).
> > >
> > > Third, I've never engaged in any of the other trashy behavior you
listed
> > > in your jeremiad.
> >
> > Till now, you just call her low class trash. A callsign is a sequence
> > of letters and numbers assign by the FCC to identify a station/operator.
> > You the one that assigns another meaning to her callsign.
> >
> > W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.
> >
> > Larry
>
> It's been a long time since we've heard from Larry the homemade lawyer.
> If you've followed this thread, you'll note *why* Kim chose the call.
> It wasn't randomly chosen.

FCC assigns callsign sequential or allows the license to
pick their own. However, FCC assigns no meaning to
the letter. Only you waste you time with this non-sense.

> It was chosen so Tugboat Annie...er, Kim
> could have fun with the boys.

Appears she got your goat, since you been carrying-on
about this for years.

Larry
```

691. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 14:00:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF3CA5E.AFF8E776@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23838

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> Your message to me was from policy
> manuals all dated before 1 September
> 2001.

The document describes the current policies on the arming of National Guard personnel in domestic operations (if you follow the links I gave you, you will see that the document also applies to domestic terrorist operations). I've seen no document dated after September 1st that would contradict that document.

> And your "comments" were derogatory
> and snide about the professionalism
> and character of the Armed Forces,
> especially the enlisted personnel.

BS, Steve. My comments were accurate and fully in agreement with official military policy. The military does not want to see civilians, or other military personnel, harmed by accidental weapons fire and neither do I. Yet there are several hundred military personnel killed or injured each year by accidental weapons fire. Therefore, if they are armed with live ammunition, it is true that those personnel at the airports are more likely to accidentally shoot themselves, or a civilian in the area, than any terrorist (just like a home owner is more likely to shoot a family member, or themselves, than any robber).

> If there's a magazine in the well,
> the weapon is loaded.

You're changing your story, Steve. You originally said, "...if you see a firearm brandished, it HAS ammunition in it." Now that I've shown that statement to be false, you now change your claim to a "magazine in the well."

Of course, that is equally false. Unless you've figured out a way to fire a weapon without a round in the chamber, a weapon is not loaded until a round is in the chamber. The document I offered also describes an arming order for a weapon with a magazine in the well with no round in the chamber.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

692. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 16:00:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011115110001.08692.00000015@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 23839

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/15/2001 6:34 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF3B667.43E4ADA4@sccoast.net>

>That document describes the current policies on the arming of
>National Guard personnel in domestic operations.

But it does not refect current PRACTICE, Dwight.

>Now, lets see if you have the integrity
>to admit you were wrong.

In this case I am not wrong. If there's a magazine in the well, the weapon
is armed.

Period.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve

693. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 16:13:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011115111325.08692.00000016@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 23840

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/15/2001 8:00 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF3CA5E.AFF8E776@sccoast.net>

>I've seen no document dated after
>September 1st that would contradict that document.

It doesn't have to be a "document", Dwight...just an order from competent authority.

They are armed, Dwight, and capable and trained to use that option. Live with it.

>> And your "comments" were derogatory
>> and snide about the professionalism
>> and character of the Armed Forces,
>> especially the enlisted personnel.
>
>
> BS, Steve. My comments were accurate and fully in agreement with
>official military policy.

No...YOU'RE the "BS" Dwight. NONE of the Armed Forces treats their personnel as Barney Fife, which is exactly what you described.

The weapons are loaded, Dwight, Live with it.

>The military does not want to see civilians,
>or other military personnel, harmed by accidental weapons fire and
>neither do I.

And I am sure that in your rush to believe that there will be no such incidents, you have deluded yourself into believeing that those weapons are empty.

What's empty is your rant.

If there's a magazine in the well of the weapon, it's armed.

>Yet there are several hundred military personnel killed
>or injured each year by accidental weapons fire.

Name me ONE incident where a Guradsman or Soldier, walking a post, has had "accidental fire" that killed or injured anyone.

Those incidents usually occur on the rifle range or in live fire training incidents. Not walking a post.

>Therefore, if they
>are armed with live ammunition, it is true that those personnel at the
>airports are more likely to accidentally shoot themselves, or a
>civilian in the area, than any terrorist (just like a home owner is
>more likely to shoot a family member, or themselves, than any robber).

So by your analogy, all cops carry blank weapons?

Dwight, you are again showing your arrogance against the Armed Forces. Those guys are not Rambo...They are not John Wayne...they are TRAINED, PROFESSIONAL, and RESPONSIBLE soldiers of the Armed Forces of the United States.

>You're changing your story, Steve. You originally said, "...if you
>see a firearm brandished, it HAS ammunition in it." Now that I've
>shown that statement to be false, you now change your claim to a
>"magazine in the well."

Be nit picky, Dwight. The bottom line is that if there is a magazine in the well, it is armed. SO FAR...I ahve yet to see a picture of a Guradsman carrying a weapon that did not have a magazine in.

>Of course, that is equally false. Unless you've figured out a way to
>fire a weapon without a round in the chamber, a weapon is not loaded
>until a round is in the chamber.

Now YOU are changing stories.

If there is a magazine in the well, it is armed.

>The document I offered also describes
>an arming order for a weapon with a magazine in the well with no round
>in the chamber.

If there is a magazine in the well, the weapon is loaded.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve

694. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 16:37:01 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF3F019.7010503@att.net>
Source record: 23841

Jim Kelley wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
>
>>I think it's an inappropriate callsign, but I don't think I've
>>pronounced you as "inhuman" or some such.
>>
>
> I think it's a funny callsign. I always thought it was a funny name for
> a bird. As a female anatomical part, they're one of my favorites. :-)
>

I think the callsign is fine... and you're partly right Jim... the name
for a bird is actually names for many bird species...

The following are all commonly referred to as TITS...

Titmice is the family Paridae...

TUFTED TITMOUSE
BLACK-CRESTED TITMOUSE
PLAIN TITMOUSE
BRIDLED TITOMOUSE
SIBERIAN TIT

also...

WRENTITS are in the family Muscicapidae

BUSHTITS (ahem) are in the family Aegithalidae

And then there's my personal favorite... the red-breated sapsuck....

errr..... never mind ;-)

Rich

695. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 16:48:53 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <27423C51EA52E7FE.BF6C11E6D88BA3B4.0543016771B05990@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23842

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 02:07:29 GMT, K0HB<K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote:

>http://westid.com/amateur.htm
>
>(If I see someone actually wearing one of these, I
>think I'll have to barf.)

I can just see it pinned on one of those "If it's not CW, it's just CB" t-shirts.

Crap like this is why I favor coordinating ARES/RACES/REACT clothing with local emergency services; you want to look professional, (unlike the blaze orange REACT t-shirts) but at the same time, you want the color scheme and insignia to be hard to mistake for any of the other services that might be around.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

696. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 17:01:12 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF3F5C4.5000202@att.net>
Source record: 23843

Jim Kelley wrote:

> I wouldn't bother with that presumption (unless you believe in
> anticipation circuits). ;-)

It's not an aticipation circuit... per se...

> The pictures indicate that there is about an 18 msec turn-on delay, and
> about a 10 msec turn-off delay. Whether there is a printers goof or not
> is unknown to me. Interestingly, the ARRL lab measured receive-transmit
> turnaround time (tx delay) for SSB as being 20 msec in their written
> specs. Also note that Ten Tec did not supply any CW keying
> specifications in their literature for this radio.

I haven't been able to look ;at the picture in question but...

The truth is a key does NOT close instantaneously. in fact, well before what would be presumed to be 'closure' there is an exchange of photons between the plates when they are in close proximity to each other. Remember these are not two separate and distinct plates but are (in reality) two collections (bundles) of electromotive force so there is an exchange on a sub-atomic level which can and does intigate current flow and changes in signal level well before the perceived (assumed) closure time.

It probably, because of the high impedance nature of the circuit, takes very little of the initial charge to 'snap' the circuit on.

While working in the lab one day a 'newby' engineer was trying to clock his counter circuit with a common switch he was expecting one clock per finger press. In reality he was getting two orders of magnitude more clocks than he expected. ;-)

I had him look at the output of the switch and the scope indicated that his switch flailed btween one and zero about a hundred or so times before it stabilized at closed. When I told him to use a Hall Effect switch his problem went away.

Rich

Hmmm.... I wonder if Hall Effect switches have been tried as keyers...

697. Re: 11 Meters L.O.T.A. (Lighthouses On The Air)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 17:07:26 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9t0seu$fg5$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 23844
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Dave" <please@nospam.org> wrote in message
news:e446vt8q8jtbd66g1umoeel3btro33dl95@4ax.com...
> I don't see the paralell ,not even a vague one.

That is easy to answer, and welcome to "rec.radio.cb" where you just fell victim to a forged news group message. You'll find that is a VERY common occurrence here, and when the CB pirates get mad enough they pull the stunt in other newsgroups as well. Sooner or later if you like me and several others voice your opinion against illegal CBer's you'll find yourself a victim sooner or later too.

By the way any post from me will NEVER contain a valid return E-mail address, to me, as an anti Spam measure. The forged messages contain them as a sorry attempt at harassment. In fact when the forged messages do contain a valid E-mail address to me it saves me the trouble of looking for the forged messages. I don't ever bother to look for them anyway. Others find them and contact me instead, and I just pass along the message with headers to the forger's ISP, which then either blocks their access or cans the account. Takes about 2 minutes using a saved boiler plate message I send to the ISP involved.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

698. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 17:16:46 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <bqt7vts3hi0o0mpvdnhvg734ujlnnoam15@4ax.com>
Source record: 23845

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->Did my more detailed explanation help, Jim? I will talk to the ARRL test
->engineer to see if we can add about 5 milliseconds of delay between the
->external trigger output of the keying test generator and the actual key line
->solid-state-switch closure that keys the rig. That way, about 5 milliseconds
->of unkeyed signal will appear in the upper trace to help ensure that those who
->don't know much about keying-circuit desing, use and testing will not
->misunderstand what they are seeing.

No, I misinterpreted two things about the picture. One, I couldn't get it through my head that the RF pulse could be so coincident with the "key off" pulse as to be totally misunderstood. Two, if you look at the center of the oscilloscope face (where I generally make my measurements, as it is considered the most linear part of the screen) you will see "divisions" that are half as wide as the outer divisions. This caused a 2:1 misinterpretation in the data. When you say 10 ms/div, you really ought to say 10 ms/cm and there wouldn't have been the problem.

I don't think giving the test engineer the direction that more or less of the trigger ought to be shown. The easiest way to clear up confusion like this is to make the on/off keying pulse asymmetrical. That is, twice as long off as on, or some other ratio so that there can be no confusion about what waveforms go together.

Just my 8% of two bits worth...

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

699. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 17:18:43 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <TNSI7.25911$xS6.42163@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23846

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH says>

>Crap like this is why I favor coordinating ARES/RACES/REACT clothing
>with local emergency services; you want to look professional.....

Actually, I get a bit uneasy about the motives of amateurs who
"want to look professional". They mostly seem to have a 'wannabe
official' attitude, rather than just pitch in and help with the
emergency. After many local incidents (floods, tornadoes, etc.)
I have learned to steer clear of "amateurs in uniform" who more
often than not have no expertise other than wearing blue jumpsuits
with lots of embroidered patches.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

700. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 17:24:38 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <B0B09D21E2C6C2C9.0252E4CAAD0D24E7.9F5387C6FAC6DCAE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23847

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 16:37:01 GMT, Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
wrote:

> SIBERIAN TIT

Sounds like a really perky bird :)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

701. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 17:44:07 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <D8C54E734CFD934B.5825B6A0C3C1919A.020F3B19C2FA9D5B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23848

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 17:18:43 GMT, K0HB<K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote:

>Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH says>
>
>>Crap like this is why I favor coordinating ARES/RACES/REACT clothing
>>with local emergency services; you want to look professional.....
>
>Actually, I get a bit uneasy about the motives of amateurs who
>"want to look professional".

Maybe I didn't word that quite as well as I should...I want to be identifiable, but at the same time, I don't want to be associated with the guy in the bermuda shorts, knee socks, cowboy boots, "Beer Man" baseball cap, and stained white T-shirt with an ARES patch on his vest. Besides, nobody wants a bunch of sloppy looking guys hanging around, regardless of who they're helping.

I *primarily* don't want a victim or bystander, etc mistaking me for a medic, law officer, or anything other than the radio guy. Brass badges, therefore, would be way over the line.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

702. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 18:13:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF405B4.4C104B8E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23849

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> If there is a magazine in the well, the weapon is loaded.

Does the M-16 automatically eject an empty magazine?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

703. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 18:16:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF4066A.47EFC1B4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23850

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
> Brass badges, therefore, would be way over the line.

Guess Brass Balls will have to do. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

704. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 18:41:31 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <7E6E9437D3BB63AC.687EF1EABEA4A717.3311C3ED5CC2D415@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23701

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 12:16:10 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" wrote:
>> Brass badges, therefore, would be way over the line.
>
>Guess Brass Balls will have to do. :-)

I dunno...I think they'd get awfully cold during those ice storms :(

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

705. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 19:00:37 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF410D5.733F25C5@uci.edu>
Source record: 23702

Richard Plourde wrote:

> The following are all commonly referred to as TITS...
>
> Titmice is the family Paridae...
>
> TUFTED TITMOUSE
> BLACK-CRESTED TITMOUSE
> PLAIN TITMOUSE
> BRIDLED TITOMOUSE
> SIBERIAN TIT
>
> also...
>
> WRENTITS are in the family Muscicapidae
>
> BUSHTITS (ahem) are in the family Aegithalidae

:-) All fine.

There's even the Allan Sherman Titwillow, as I recall. Sounds like a kind of tree, but from what I understand it's actually a species of mouse. :-)

706. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 19:05:51 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF412FB.2010505@att.net>
Source record: 23703

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

> On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 16:37:01 GMT, Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>> SIBERIAN TIT
>>
>
> Sounds like a really perky bird :)
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
>

Only found on the 'Left' Coast... ;-)

Rich

707. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 19:08:19 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <ii48vtkp5o2c3qj2t4emu32qhnnu6qpsln@4ax.com>
Source record: 23704

Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->
->The truth is a key does NOT close instantaneously. in fact, well before
->what would be presumed to be 'closure' there is an exchange of photons
->between the plates when they are in close proximity to each other.

That's an interesting heresy.

->
->I had him look at the output of the switch and the scope indicated that
->his switch flailed btween one and zero about a hundred or so times
->before it stabilized at closed. When I told him to use a Hall Effect
->switch his problem went away.

Did you teach him anything about switch bounce at the same time? If not, he
learned nothing.

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

708. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 19:25:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF41690.38A4B4DA@uci.edu>
Source record: 23705

Jim Weir wrote:
> So what you are really saying is that the pulses are really 180 out because of
> turn on / turn off delay?

Yes sir. That's what the traces show. They noted that they were
testing at a 60 WPM rate. But just doing some napkin figuring, 60 WPM
*5 CPW = 300 CPM. 300 CPM / 60 SPM = 5 CPS. That's 200 msec per
character. At a period of 40 msec, it looks like they're really testing
at a rate more like 300 WPM.

> Thanks for the interchange...

Best 73, OM.

AC6XG

709. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 19:40:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmuoci6.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23706

On 15 Nov 2001 02:34:10 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>>btw, 2200 gal fo fuel and 4700 A are numbers applicable to a single, small
>>diesel-electric locomotive.

>You mean, they make bigger ones? I'd like to see the numbers on
>them! I thought that they just ganged several similar locomotives
>together in order to pull longer, heavier freight trains.

Small switch engines generate 1500 hp. Modern freight diesels
generate 3000 hp and upwards.

>While stationed in Germany and England, I rode a lot
>of Inter-city trains and trolley cars. I was always impressed by the
>smooth, responsive delivery of power by those traction motors.
>From a standing start, they generated almost neck-snapping torque;

Only a "cowboy driver" would start a train like that......

>then smoothly and quickly accelerated a very heavy vehicle to very
>impressive speeds, never seeming to labor at any part of the
>acceleration curve. Then, to stop, they are put in generator-braking
>mode, and actually create more electricity as they decelerate. What
>an extraordinarily efficient system!

An all-electric system owes its efficiency to feeding the electric
power created by "regenerative braking" back into the system to be
used by other traction vehicles on the system. A diesel-electric or
gas-electric vehicle, however, is a stand-alone vehicle and has no
place to ship said energy other than to dissipate it in resistor
banks. This is known as "dynamic braking". There is a mechanical
equivalent on large over-the-road diesel trucks known as "Jakes
brakes".

These schemes work pretty well with large engines and large
vehicles. We wouldn't be happy with the handling characteristics
of a passenger vehicle with such a system.

>I have a feeling that the only reason we're not using more hybrid
>vehicles is because the oil companies would see all their profits go
>out the window

Consider that the most efficient vehicular battery storage is with a
silver-sodium cell, where an otherwise $20,000 vehicle will have
$100,000 worth of silver in the battery.

Are you going to park that in YOUR driveway?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

710. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 19:46:59 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t16150icb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23708

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:D8C54E734CFD934B.5825B6A0C3C1919A.020F3B19C2FA9D5B@lp.airnews.net...
> Maybe I didn't word that quite as well as I should...I want to be
> identifiable, but at the same time, I don't want to be associated with
> the guy in the bermuda shorts, knee socks, cowboy boots, "Beer Man"
> baseball cap, and stained white T-shirt with an ARES patch on his
> vest. Besides, nobody wants a bunch of sloppy looking guys hanging
> around, regardless of who they're helping.
>
> I *primarily* don't want a victim or bystander, etc mistaking me for a
> medic, law officer, or anything other than the radio guy. Brass
> badges, therefore, would be way over the line.

IOW, you don't want to look like a typical Dayton Hamvention antendee.

711. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 19:52:29 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t16bi0ilq@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23710

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF35C2A.31403497@IEEE.org...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > And I certainly agree with this. I do not want to live my life with
> > government employees watching my every move - listening to my phone
> > calls, watching my bank transactions, video cameras on street corners,
> > and so forth.
>
> I heard a scary one today. Detained suspected terrorists who have
> not even been charged with anything will be denied lawyer/client
> confidentiality privilege because all of their conversations
> will be monitored. Say, Morse code might be useful after all. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I don't have a problem with this if they're in this country illegally.

712. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 19:58:10 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t16m40j03@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23711

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011114231947.14773.00001166@nso-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3bf1e5f3_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Kim W5TI and a T
>
> Kim:
>
> I'll be that's exactly the same way you say your callsign on the air.
> It's always amazed me how many people were issued callsigns
> with the words "and a" before the last letter. Of course, in the case
> of your call, it's almost an improvement!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3L and no steenking "and a" T

Here's something I agree on with Larry. Putting an "and a" before the last
letter of one's callsign sounds as stupid as those hams who say "hi hi" on
phone to indicate something humorous.

713. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 20:06:27 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF42043.4790D11A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23707

N2EY wrote:

> Why? Cobsider the following:
>
> The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign. It is only
> available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that particular
> callsign.
>

Wouldn't the reason that the FCC didn't routinely issue that call also
stop them from granting it as a vanity call? I doubt that I could
get "foxtrot uniform charlie" or "foxtrot uniform kilowatt" as a
vanity call suffix.

714. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 20:14:52 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C16804890B463D02.200CB93DA2C480C5.0A7E898C8E2C0B78@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23709

On 15 Nov 2001 04:19:48 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is *patently*
>objectionable!

No, Larry, it is only objectionable to _some_ people.

Personally, I don't find it the least offensive--on the other
hand, I'm not a prude.

>I'm sure that kind of thing happens, but since I know how to use CW and a
>handful of digital modes, I generally don't run into that type of on-the-air
>behavior.

Are you _seriously_ claiming that people who use digital modes
don't use obscenities?

We must be members of two different amateur radio services!

>Soï¿½which is it, Kim? *No* overt comments, or only *occasional* overt
>comments? I suggest that it is exactly this type of confusion which caused you
>to make the poor choice of selecting that callsign in the first place!

She isn't confused Larry--just tired of self-appointed censors
and prudes telling her she is offensive to THEM!

>I think that before you do that, you'd better take a close look at who
>decided to choose a sexually provocative callsign which is demeaning to
>hams in general, and female hams in particular!

Demeaning to hams in general, Larry?

I find being associated with self-righteous prudes FAR more
demeaning to me than the existence of any "risque" call sign could
ever make me feel.

>Kim dear, you're the last one who would be qualified to make judgements
>about other people's "respect" for themselves or others. If you had any, you
>wouldn't have selected your callsign in the first place, or, at the very least,
>would endeavor to change it with all due dispatch.

Why--because it doesn't meet YOUR standards?

So what?

>Again, you are not the one to be making such statements. In case you haven't
>noticed, *you* are the Captain of a burning, sinking ship. If I were you, I'd
>be looking for a life raft! I'm sure you can find one at the ULS web site!

She's not sinking, Larry. She's demonstrating
independence--something the morality police fear more than anything
else (except, perhaps, the elimination of cw testing!).

Rick <KE8HH>

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

715. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 20:33:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <493AD4347896C716.503D4D997FA3A6D5.67AC6E812A6018D8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23712

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 05:57:20 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Are you this predictable in bed?

Imagine the scene:

Completely dark room (of course).

Nightshirt.

Missionary position only, under the covers.

Larry, tapping on the headboard:

"--- --- --- - - - - --- --- - --- --- --- --- - -
--- --- - - --- --- - - --- --- . . . . ."

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

716. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 21:58:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111151358.34f7ac75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23713

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<IiNI7.187048$W8.6766152@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011114213410.27773.00002307@nso-fo.aol.com...
> > In article <20011113080315.23850.00000448@nso-fy.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >
> > >btw, 2200 gal fo fuel and 4700 A are numbers applicable to a single,
> small
> > >diesel-electric locomotive.
> >
> > Jim:
> >
> > You mean, they make bigger ones? I'd like to see the numbers on
> > them! I thought that they just ganged several similar locomotives
> > together in order to pull longer, heavier freight trains.
> >
> > I've also wondered why the diesel-electric hybrid scheme hasn't been
> > applied to other vehicles, like over-the-road trucks, busses, even
> > passenger cars? Seems like that using the right combination of
> > engine, generator, and traction motors, a great deal of efficiency could
> > be achieved. Present day hybrid cars persist in making a direct
> > mechanical connection between the small gasoline engine and the
> > drivetrain through a transmission; eliminating that step, and going
> > to direct traction motors would seem to take a lot of slack out of
> > the system. While stationed in Germany and England, I rode a lot
> > of Inter-city trains and trolley cars. I was always impressed by the
> > smooth, responsive delivery of power by those traction motors.
> > From a standing start, they generated almost neck-snapping torque;
> > then smoothly and quickly accelerated a very heavy vehicle to very
> > impressive speeds, never seeming to labor at any part of the
> > acceleration curve. Then, to stop, they are put in generator-braking
> > mode, and actually create more electricity as they decelerate. What
> > an extraordinarily efficient system!
> >
> > I have a feeling that the only reason we're not using more hybrid
> > vehicles is because the oil companies would see all their profits go
> > out the window -- and they'd have to be selling fuel at 50 cents a
> > gallon to consumers with vehicles that got 75 MPG. Where is the
> > outrage?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT

> >
>
> The biggest problem is getting service capabilities in place before letting
> them loose. Similar problems arose with both the disc brake and the
> alternator when they were introduced. When Mopar brought out the alternator
> the urban legends were rife. Automatic trannies were terra incognita at the
> time they were brought out, the Hydra-matic from the Sherman tank.
>
> The series motor is an admirable device, maximum torque and minimum
> efficiency at stall and all that but like any DC motor it cannot be sealed.

Which is why the most advanced diesel-electric locomotives now have AC
traction motors. No brushes, more HP, greater reliability.

> The early diesel-electric locos had some real problems with flooded track
> and snow. In fact the economics didn't really work over steam until the guy
> figured out how to allow one engineer to run multiple units; in and of
> itself steam is cheaper but getting rid of the supporting cast was what
> tipped the balance toward diesel.

Not really. Diesels cost more to buy but less to run, particularly
back in the days of really cheap diesel fuel. MU'ing was well
developed on electric locos by 1930.

The real economy of diesels over steam, besides lower fuel cost, was
indeed the reduction in the supporting cast, in the form of no more
water tanks or pans, simplified fueling, no more ash disposal, no need
for turntables, and many other simplifications. Crew cost was but a
small part of the cost of operation.

> The Union Pacific until fairly recently
> ran moose steam locos on the snow blowers in the Wyoming passes -- and the
> UP had some real meese in the steam days.

The rotary plows were steam driven.
>
> The only good reason the hybrid works, and it is a far better idea at $4 gas
> BTW, is that it does allow the killing of the engine in urban areas and
> allows the engine to essentially run at a constant efficient RPM to get its
> MPG.

Yup. Plus the layout of the vehicle can be whatever is convenient for
maximum use of space and weight.

> This is done at the price of what is really a really poor
> transmission.

What! I disagree!

Look at WW2 diesel submarines for an example. Their technology wound
up in locomotives.

> Another trick that has been tried and is coming out on some
> Saturns soon is the continuously variable transmission, a neat name that

> boils down to two cones and a shitpot of belts or chains. First one I ever
> saw was on a Zenith Cobramatic record changer but they were used on Harley
> motor scooters and a Dutch car called a DAF. Driving one is an experience
> if you drive on engine sound.

Subaru made one some years back, too. "CV" or some such.
>
> While I think the energy guys are capable of all sorts of shenanigans this
> is not their doing but that of building a product that can be repaired by
> nincompoops and bought by yoyos that buy an SUV to whip granny down to the
> pool hall.

Bingo. 20 or so years ago VW demonstrated an improved diesel Rabbit
that got 75+ MPG. Used a turbocharged three-cylinder engine, lots of
aluminum for weight reduction, and was so efficient that the only
cooling system was the lube oil. But the market simply wasn't there,
so it was never mass produced.

Look around America's highways and see how many high-mpg cars are on
the road, compared to SUVs and other guzzlers. It ain't pretty.

73 de Jim, N2EY

717. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 22:02:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111151402.386da7a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23714

"Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:<3bf3be8e$0$37105$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>...
>
> FCC assigns callsign sequential or allows the license to
> pick their own. However, FCC assigns no meaning to
> the letter.

Not true, Larry.

FCC assigns callsigns sequentially but skips over certain callsigns
because some people might not like them. The skipped calls can be
bought via the vanity call program. That's what Kim did. Her callsign
suffix is not sequentially issued by the FCC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

718. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 22:34:44 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <9t1fu4$2v8j$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 23715

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>Jim Weir wrote:
>> So what you are really saying is that the pulses are really 180 out because of
>> turn on / turn off delay?
>
>Yes sir. That's what the traces show. They noted that they were
>testing at a 60 WPM rate. But just doing some napkin figuring, 60 WPM
>*5 CPW = 300 CPM. 300 CPM / 60 SPM = 5 CPS. That's 200 msec per
>character. At a period of 40 msec, it looks like they're really testing
>at a rate more like 300 WPM.

Note that the period would be that for a "dit", not a whole character.
40 msec "dits" would let you send 5 Hs or Rs per second, so if the
"average" character is about the length of an H or R then 40 msec dits
are about right for 60 WPM. That's pretty quick.

Dennis Ferguson

719. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 23:02:31 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 23716

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0111151402.386da7a2@posting.google.com...
> "Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:<3bf3be8e$0$37105$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>...
> >
> > FCC assigns callsign sequential or allows the license to
> > pick their own. However, FCC assigns no meaning to
> > the letter.
>
> Not true, Larry.
>
> FCC assigns callsigns sequentially but skips over certain callsigns
> because some people might not like them. The skipped calls can be
> bought via the vanity call program. That's what Kim did. Her callsign
> suffix is not sequentially issued by the FCC.

I knew the FCC had certain callsign they would not issue. I am also
aware that if a licensee object to their callsign they request the
issuance another. But the fact remains, the FCC issued W5TIT
and are apparently they satisfied, but some still object.

Larry

720. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 23:15:18 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <a0YI7.113611$WW.6915102@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23717

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0111151358.34f7ac75@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<IiNI7.187048$W8.6766152@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20011114213410.27773.00002307@nso-fo.aol.com...
> > > In article <20011113080315.23850.00000448@nso-fy.aol.com>,
n2ey@aol.com
> > (N2EY)
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >btw, 2200 gal fo fuel and 4700 A are numbers applicable to a single,
> > small
> > > >diesel-electric locomotive.
> > >
> > > Jim:
> > >
> > > You mean, they make bigger ones? I'd like to see the numbers on
> > > them! I thought that they just ganged several similar locomotives
> > > together in order to pull longer, heavier freight trains.
> > >
> > > I've also wondered why the diesel-electric hybrid scheme hasn't been
> > > applied to other vehicles, like over-the-road trucks, busses, even
> > > passenger cars? Seems like that using the right combination of
> > > engine, generator, and traction motors, a great deal of efficiency
could
> > > be achieved. Present day hybrid cars persist in making a direct
> > > mechanical connection between the small gasoline engine and the
> > > drivetrain through a transmission; eliminating that step, and going
> > > to direct traction motors would seem to take a lot of slack out of
> > > the system. While stationed in Germany and England, I rode a lot
> > > of Inter-city trains and trolley cars. I was always impressed by the
> > > smooth, responsive delivery of power by those traction motors.
> > > From a standing start, they generated almost neck-snapping torque;
> > > then smoothly and quickly accelerated a very heavy vehicle to very
> > > impressive speeds, never seeming to labor at any part of the
> > > acceleration curve. Then, to stop, they are put in generator-braking
> > > mode, and actually create more electricity as they decelerate. What
> > > an extraordinarily efficient system!
> > >
> > > I have a feeling that the only reason we're not using more hybrid
> > > vehicles is because the oil companies would see all their profits go
> > > out the window -- and they'd have to be selling fuel at 50 cents a

> > > gallon to consumers with vehicles that got 75 MPG. Where is the
> > > outrage?
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> > The biggest problem is getting service capabilities in place before
letting
> > them loose. Similar problems arose with both the disc brake and the
> > alternator when they were introduced. When Mopar brought out the
alternator
> > the urban legends were rife. Automatic trannies were terra incognita at
the
> > time they were brought out, the Hydra-matic from the Sherman tank.
> >
> > The series motor is an admirable device, maximum torque and minimum
> > efficiency at stall and all that but like any DC motor it cannot be
sealed.
>
> Which is why the most advanced diesel-electric locomotives now have AC
> traction motors. No brushes, more HP, greater reliability.
>
> > The early diesel-electric locos had some real problems with flooded
track
> > and snow. In fact the economics didn't really work over steam until the
guy
> > figured out how to allow one engineer to run multiple units; in and of
> > itself steam is cheaper but getting rid of the supporting cast was what
> > tipped the balance toward diesel.
>
> Not really. Diesels cost more to buy but less to run, particularly
> back in the days of really cheap diesel fuel. MU'ing was well
> developed on electric locos by 1930.
>
> The real economy of diesels over steam, besides lower fuel cost, was
> indeed the reduction in the supporting cast, in the form of no more
> water tanks or pans, simplified fueling, no more ash disposal, no need
> for turntables, and many other simplifications. Crew cost was but a
> small part of the cost of operation.
>
> > The Union Pacific until fairly recently
> > ran moose steam locos on the snow blowers in the Wyoming passes -- and
the
> > UP had some real meese in the steam days.
>
> The rotary plows were steam driven.
> >
> > The only good reason the hybrid works, and it is a far better idea at $4
gas
> > BTW, is that it does allow the killing of the engine in urban areas and

> > allows the engine to essentially run at a constant efficient RPM to get
its
> > MPG.
>
> Yup. Plus the layout of the vehicle can be whatever is convenient for
> maximum use of space and weight.
>
> > This is done at the price of what is really a really poor
> > transmission.
>
> What! I disagree!
>
> Look at WW2 diesel submarines for an example. Their technology wound
> up in locomotives.
>
> > Another trick that has been tried and is coming out on some
> > Saturns soon is the continuously variable transmission, a neat name that
> > boils down to two cones and a shitpot of belts or chains. First one I
ever
> > saw was on a Zenith Cobramatic record changer but they were used on
Harley
> > motor scooters and a Dutch car called a DAF. Driving one is an
experience
> > if you drive on engine sound.
>
> Subaru made one some years back, too. "CV" or some such.
> >
> > While I think the energy guys are capable of all sorts of shenanigans
this
> > is not their doing but that of building a product that can be repaired
by
> > nincompoops and bought by yoyos that buy an SUV to whip granny down to
the
> > pool hall.
>
> Bingo. 20 or so years ago VW demonstrated an improved diesel Rabbit
> that got 75+ MPG. Used a turbocharged three-cylinder engine, lots of
> aluminum for weight reduction, and was so efficient that the only
> cooling system was the lube oil. But the market simply wasn't there,
> so it was never mass produced.
>
> Look around America's highways and see how many high-mpg cars are on
> the road, compared to SUVs and other guzzlers. It ain't pretty.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

The tramcars or whatever Larry refers to date from the days when no one wanted steamers in the cities so they were electrified. When they got out beyond the third rail or overheads on came Dr. Diesel's wonderous engine. The hybrid design is somewhat accidental. Electric drive does make more

sense in that the series motor does have a torque curve more related to the problem and the thought of Big Hans slipping the clutch is terrifying.

And I will stand on the system being a really crummy automatic transmission for efficiency alone. It is covered by the vastly increased efficiency of a gasoline engine running at a constant rpm with no changes but a direct coupling, like the continuously variable, is in theory at least a far superior solution. The hybrid, however, does allow a smaller engine so long as one is ready to blow the battery charge to top up the gasoline moxie.

The big advance of the US subs was to be able to charge the batts on the move.

And no matter what advance you make, you still gots to get it fixed.

Dick

721. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 23:46:43 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF454D0.7060800@att.net>
Source record: 23718

> Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net

> ->The truth is a key does NOT close instantaneously. in fact, well before
> ->what would be presumed to be 'closure' there is an exchange of photons
> ->between the plates when they are in close proximity to each other.

Jim Weir wrote:

> That's an interesting heresy.

Not heresy... physics...

> ->I had him look at the output of the switch and the scope indicated that
> ->his switch flailed btween one and zero about a hundred or so times
> ->before it stabilized at closed. When I told him to use a Hall Effect
> ->switch his problem went away.
>
> Did you teach him anything about switch bounce at the same time? If not, he
> learned nothing.

I wouldn't call it 'switch bounce' since that's not really what's going
on. It's an exchange of charge across the gap when the plates are close
enough for the flashover to occur.

>
> Jim
> Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup
>

Rich

722. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-15 23:48:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF45464.A3537C43@uci.edu>
Source record: 23719

Dennis Ferguson wrote:
> Note that the period would be that for a "dit", not a whole character.
> 40 msec "dits" would let you send 5 Hs or Rs per second, so if the
> "average" character is about the length of an H or R then 40 msec dits
> are about right for 60 WPM. That's pretty quick.

I stand corrected. The switching rate (if we neglect proper Morse spacing) is indeed equivalent to 60 words per minute.

It's apparent that higher rates would be best sent in SSB mode using a sound card, rather than by keying the rig in CW mode in order to avoid shortening the character elements.

73, ac6xg

723. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 00:31:43 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <P7ZI7.20$jX1.5460@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 23720

Kim.... I wanna know what may be *THE* most offensive 3 letter word that could be used for a suffix and I am gonna pursue that as a vanity call sign in support of you! (Provided with the fact that it is available first of course! :)

Ryan

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:3bf25b27_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who position
> themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
> with me--in terms of morals and behavior.
>
> I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly
> pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having
> such a callsign. Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have trashed
> the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air; acting
> meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who can't even
> defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham; participating in a
> political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other people;
> refusing to support someone for club membership because of some protected
> class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.); how many
> of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the air
> under cover of a disguised voice?
>
> Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground than
> me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign,
> simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made
> about it, nor received about it, save occasionally. While I disagree with
> you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my
> callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham radio
> before you appoint yourself as judge! Because with your behaviors on this
> newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have
> neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act in
> the manner you expect others to.
>
> So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've matched
> your own demands.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

>
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011114000355.24612.00000600@nso-cr.aol.com...
> > In article <XGiI7.18$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@tm.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > > If Kims
> > >callsign is *so wrong*, then the FCC should not have issued it.
> >
> > I disagree. By that logic, all decisions about "right" and "wrong" are
to
> be
> > left up to the government.
> >
> > > Since they
> > >have issued it, just grow up and get over it everyone!
> >
> > Sounds like you don't like the idea that there is a difference of
opinion
> about
> > it, and that people can express their opinions here.
> >
> > >Shift the blame
> > >where it belongs...... the issuing agency.
> >
> > Why? Cobsider the following:
> >
> > The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign. It
is
> only
> > available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that particular
> > callsign.
> >
> > Yet you say it's all the FCC's fault. As if it's governments job to
"save
> us
> > from ourselves".
> >
> > Sorry, I don't buy it.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

724. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 00:31:45 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <R7ZI7.21$jX1.5460@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 23721

>
> Really? I think it's off-color and disgusting that some of these old coots
> on 20m talk about their medical problems on the air in graphic detail.
>
> As you see, everyone has something which they're offended by.
>
>

Yepper.... last thing I wanna hear about is somebodys colostomy bag or
prostrate problems etc. Anything fecal related is just gross.......

725. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 01:04:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011115200425.22754.00000497@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 23722

In article <3BF42043.4790D11A@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Why? Cobsider the following:
>>
>> The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign. It is
>only
>> available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that particular
>> callsign.
>>
>
>Wouldn't the reason that the FCC didn't routinely issue that call also
>stop them from granting it as a vanity call?

Nope. Not at all. The concept is that they don't sequentially issue certain calls because the recipient might not like them. The result would be a paperwork headache.

I remember years ago a ham got the suffix LID and complained to the FCC. They issued a different call.

But if a ham specifically requests a call on the non-sequential-issue list, and is willing to pay the vanity fee for it, that person is obviously not offended by the proposed call. Refusing to issue it would put the FCC in the position of having to explain why the desired callsign was offensive, what other callsigns were offensive, which ones were not offensive, why and how the decision was made, yada, yada, yada. No way FCC wants that sort of mess. Result is what we have today: certain calls not issued sequentially but available under vanity.

>I doubt that I could
>get "foxtrot uniform charlie" or "foxtrot uniform kilowatt" as a
>vanity call suffix.
>
I dunno. Check the callsign database.

http://www.qrz.com

You may be surprised.

73 de Jim, N2EY

726. Re: Trashy call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 01:41:56 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <E9_I7.26545$xS6.43962@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23723

N2EY says:

>I dunno. Check the callsign database.
>
>http://www.qrz.com
>
>You may be surprised.

True story. At the beginning of vanity calls a few years ago, the callsign K0TEX was issued to the Red River Radio Club (in Texas?). Ponder that club name a moment. The call was pulled out of circulation (I seem to recall Riley was involved). A local lady was issued the call N0OKY directly in rotation. KF7UCK is another vanity call which was around for a few months, issued to "Mustang Ranch Radio Club" in Nevada.

Trash no longer surprises me.

73, Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

727. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 01:52:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF47179.65A3D289@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23724

KC8PMX wrote:

> Kim.... I wanna know what may be *THE* most offensive 3 letter word that
> could be used for a suffix and I am gonna pursue that as a vanity call sign
> in support of you! (Provided with the fact that it is available first of
> course! :)

Foxtrot uniform kilowatt
foxtrot uniform charlie
Kilowatt (any number) uniform november tango
Kilowatt uniform (any number) november tango
Kilowatt zero charlie kilowatt
November zero oscar kilowatt yankee
Kilowatt tango one tango
November tango one tango
whiskey tango one tango

728. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 02:14:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf475a8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23725

To each his own, Krell. I absolutely can't STAND people talking about traffic on the air--that is about as CBish as it can get--in *my* opinion. I can't stand it when people key up on an empty repeater with the sole purpose of making an announcement about the traffic (totally illegal--one way transmission) or weather. I can't stand it when, on one of our local Dallas repeaters the under-sexed bubbas take off with conversations totally inappropriate--in *MY* opinion--for ham radio.

To each his own...

Kim W5TIT (but IDing with the "and a" would be illegal I do believe)

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9t16m40j03@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011114231947.14773.00001166@nso-dh.aol.com...
> > In article <3bf1e5f3_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Kim W5TI and a T
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > I'll be that's exactly the same way you say your callsign on the air.
> > It's always amazed me how many people were issued callsigns
> > with the words "and a" before the last letter. Of course, in the case
> > of your call, it's almost an improvement!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3L and no steenking "and a" T
>
>
> Here's something I agree on with Larry. Putting an "and a" before the last
> letter of one's callsign sounds as stupid as those hams who say "hi hi" on
> phone to indicate something humorous.
>
>

729. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 02:15:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf475e3$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23726

It's out there, Robert; that is, callsigns with FUC and FUK in them--at least it seems to me that I've seen them.

Kim W5TIT

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3BF42043.4790D11A@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Why? Cobsider the following:
> >
> > The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign. It is only
> > available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that particular
> > callsign.
> >
>
> Wouldn't the reason that the FCC didn't routinely issue that call also
> stop them from granting it as a vanity call? I doubt that I could
> get "foxtrot uniform charlie" or "foxtrot uniform kilowatt" as a
> vanity call suffix.
>

730. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 02:23:17 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf477a3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23727

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:C16804890B463D02.200CB93DA2C480C5.0A7E898C8E2C0B78@lp.airnews.net...
> On 15 Nov 2001 04:19:48 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is
patently
> >objectionable!
>
> No, Larry, it is only objectionable to _some_ people.
>
> Personally, I don't find it the least offensive--on the other
> hand, I'm not a prude.
>
> >I'm sure that kind of thing happens, but since I know how to use CW and a
> >handful of digital modes, I generally don't run into that type of
on-the-air
> >behavior.
>
> Are you _seriously_ claiming that people who use digital modes
> don't use obscenities?
>

Yep, he is! ;)

>
> We must be members of two different amateur radio services!
>

heh heh heh, I can almost guarantee you that Larry has his own amateur radio
service going--the rest of us are a part of the majority. ;)

> >So.which is it, Kim? *No* overt comments, or only *occasional* overt
> >comments? I suggest that it is exactly this type of confusion which
caused you
> >to make the poor choice of selecting that callsign in the first place!
>
> She isn't confused Larry--just tired of self-appointed censors
> and prudes telling her she is offensive to THEM!
>

Oh, no, not at all. I don't mind a bit someone telling me I am offensive to
them. What really bothers me is the presumption that their morality must be
everyone else's! Larry has the perfect right to his opinion, and perfect it
is (the right). He really does even have the right to say all the things he
says. He *thinks* he has some kind of empowerment over me to make me mad or

feel guilt, or feel something, anything over the things he says directed at me. Again, I feel nothing other than contempt for someone who believes his morality should be everyone else's.

> >I think that before you do that, you'd better take a close look at who
> >decided to choose a sexually provocative callsign which is demeaning to
> >hams in general, and female hams in particular!
>
> Demeaning to hams in general, Larry?
>
> I find being associated with self-righteous prudes FAR more
> demeaning to me than the existence of any "risque" call sign could
> ever make me feel.
>
> >Kim dear, you're the last one who would be qualified to make judgements
> >about other people's "respect" for themselves or others. If you had any,
you
> >wouldn't have selected your callsign in the first place, or, at the very
least,
> >would endeavor to change it with all due dispatch.
>
> Why--because it doesn't meet YOUR standards?
>
> So what?
>
> >Again, you are not the one to be making such statements. In case you
haven't
> >noticed, *you* are the Captain of a burning, sinking ship. If I were
you, I'd
> >be looking for a life raft! I'm sure you can find one at the ULS web
site!
>
> She's not sinking, Larry. She's demonstrating
> independence--something the morality police fear more than anything
> else (except, perhaps, the elimination of cw testing!).
>
> Rick <KE8HH>
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>

Kim W5TIT

731. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 02:24:57 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf47803_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23728

ROFLMAO...ohmygawd!!!

This is da best I've ever seen! I'll be laughing into tomorrow!

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:493AD4347896C716.503D4D997FA3A6D5.67AC6E812A6018D8@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 05:57:20 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Are you this predictable in bed?
>
> Imagine the scene:
>
> Completely dark room (of course).
>
> Nightshirt.
>
> Missionary position only, under the covers.
>
> Larry, tapping on the headboard:
>
> "--- --- --- - - - - --- --- - --- --- --- --- - -
> --- --- - - --- --- - - --- --- . . . . ."
>
> 73 de KE8HH, Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

732. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 02:36:04 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf47aa5_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23729

Ryan:

Please do nothing in support of me--do what you will for your own satisfaction, enjoyment, and conversation. Not knowing you, I wouldn't be able to even give you out some funny ones that would match your personality. Also, please remember that I really didn't choose my callsign based on its obscenity (I don't believe it is obscene)--I chose my callsign because it is the closest thing to *my* vanity (get it...vanity callsign?) that I could get.

I have a friend who's a ham and has the callsign N5BIG--celebrating his quite large shadow he casts (I think he's probably 6' 2-3" maybe taller, and I bet near or a little over 400 pounds).

As to *THE* most offensive 3-letter suffix? I just really don't know. We don't call each other by our suffixes around here, I am still called Kim on the air. But, I heartell of areas where hams call each other by their suffixes. I doubt I'd be offended by much--I am a fairly liberal person. I don't "get" the brotherhood of ham radio...so you'd really have to discuss this with your friends, other older hams, etc. Maybe someday you'll buy into the "brotherhood" of ham radio thing--something I don't think I'll ever identify with. Tradition, to me, is a rather meaningless issue to get involved with when the topic is a hobby. Put me in charge of family tradition, national tradition, holiday tradition, etc. But leave me out of the hobby tradition stuff.

Good luck on your contemplation for a vanity callsign. But part of the whole vanity callsign thing is to make it uniquely yours.

Kim W5TIT

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:P7ZI7.20$jX1.5460@newshog.newsread.com...
> Kim.... I wanna know what may be *THE* most offensive 3 letter word that
> could be used for a suffix and I am gonna pursue that as a vanity call
sign
> in support of you! (Provided with the fact that it is available first of
> course! :)
>
>
> Ryan
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3bf25b27_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who
> position

> > themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
> > with me--in terms of morals and behavior.
> >
> > I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they
boldly
> > pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for
having
> > such a callsign. Yet, I'll bet that many of those same people have
> trashed
> > the hobby in many ways: having an off-color conversation on the air;
> acting
> > meanly on the air toward either another amateur or someone who can't
even
> > defend theirself on the air because they aren't a ham; participating in
a
> > political discussion as you express inhuman thoughts toward other
people;
> > refusing to support someone for club membership because of some
protected
> > class under other circumstances (race, color, nationality...etc.); how
> many
> > of you have keyed up illegally and made some disgusting comment on the
air
> > under cover of a disguised voice?
> >
> > Don't posture yourself--at least to me--as having higher moral ground
than
> > me, because you're nothing but a thief of emotion. Mine is a callsign,
> > simply pronounced on the air as W-5-T-I-T, with *NO* overt comments made
> > about it, nor received about it, save occasionally. While I disagree
with
> > you that there is even call for any kind of pause on the morality of my
> > callsign--I surely call you to task about your own activities in ham
radio
> > before you appoint yourself as judge! Because with your behaviors on
this
> > newsgroup and your comments and sneering, I can assure you that you have
> > neither the respect of myself nor many others; and you surely don't act
in
> > the manner you expect others to.
> >
> > So, save your definition of morality for another time when you've
matched
> > your own demands.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message

> > news:20011114000355.24612.00000600@nso-cr.aol.com...
> > > In article <XGiI7.18$aJ.4352@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX"
> > <kc8pmx@tm.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > > If Kims
> > > >callsign is *so wrong*, then the FCC should not have issued it.
> > >
> > > I disagree. By that logic, all decisions about "right" and "wrong" are
> to
> > be
> > > left up to the government.
> > >
> > > > Since they
> > > >have issued it, just grow up and get over it everyone!
> > >
> > > Sounds like you don't like the idea that there is a difference of
> opinion
> > about
> > > it, and that people can express their opinions here.
> > >
> > > >Shift the blame
> > > >where it belongs..... the issuing agency.
> > >
> > > Why? Cobsider the following:
> > >
> > > The FCC does not routinely issue the suffix found in Kim's callsign.
It
> is
> > only
> > > available as a vanity call. She asked for, and paid for, that
particular
> > > callsign.
> > >
> > > Yet you say it's all the FCC's fault. As if it's governments job to
> "save
> > us
> > > from ourselves".
> > >
> > > Sorry, I don't buy it.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
>
>

733. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 04:03:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF48F50.53C41943@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23730

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > So the Affirmative Action as set up in your home town is different than
> > that set up in other towns in America?
>
> The local Affirmative Action program set up in my home town allowed
> qualified blacks to obtain the jobs that had been going to
> unqualified whites. That condition probably didn't exist nation-
> wide but it certainly existed in Small Southern Town, USA.

I give up. You are, apparently, never wrong even when confronted by
fact.

> > Morse testing is a dead issue yet you continue to flog the same horse.
>
> Huh????? I gave up on that dead horse last year. Methinks you don't
> know the horse is dead.

If you know it, why the feeble attempt at comparing morse testing with
affirmative action? In what way have you given up the issue when you
make frequent references to it?

Dave K8MN

734. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 04:06:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF48FFF.D5A10906@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23731

CAM wrote:
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > It's very simple. If ya flunk the writtens ya flunk the exam. If ya
> > flunk the code test ya flunk the exam. (Not counting the CSCEs thing)
>
> So the code test is considered equal in importance to everything else
> in amateur radio combined?

Thought you gave up on that dead horse last year...

Dave K8MN

735. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 04:09:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF49091.E7383EBC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23732

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF32126.BF3B7F26@earthlink.net...
> > Larry Klose wrote:
> > >
> > > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> > > news:LpBI7.24866$xS6.40177@www.newsranger.com...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT says:
> > > >
> > > > I just think your choice of callsign is really, really tacky (as in
> low
> > > > class trash).
> > > >
> > > > Third, I've never engaged in any of the other trashy behavior you
> listed
> > > > in your jeremiad.
> > >
> > > Till now, you just call her low class trash. A callsign is a sequence
> > > of letters and numbers assign by the FCC to identify a station/operator.
> > > You the one that assigns another meaning to her callsign.
> > >
> > > W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.
> > >
> > > Larry
> >
> > It's been a long time since we've heard from Larry the homemade lawyer.
> > If you've followed this thread, you'll note *why* Kim chose the call.
> > It wasn't randomly chosen. It was chosen so Tugboat Annie...er, Kim
> > could have fun with the boys.
> >
> > Try to keep up.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Aw, I shoulda guessed a long time ago, Davey. *That's* what you're all
> jealous about--I don't choose to have fun with *YOU*. I don't think I'll
> even apologize and feel bad for ya...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Your chances of having fun with me wouldn't have been good even a couple
of decades back.

Dave K8MN

736. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 04:13:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF49186.D7BCB4FB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23733

```
Larry Klose wrote:
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2001 9:00 PM
> Subject: Re: "one step closer...."
>
> > Larry Klose wrote:
> > >
> > > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> > > news:LpBI7.24866$xS6.40177@www.newsranger.com...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT says:
> > > >
> > > > I just think your choice of callsign is really, really tacky (as in
> low
> > > > class trash).
> > > >
> > > > Third, I've never engaged in any of the other trashy behavior you
> listed
> > > > in your jeremiad.
> > > >
> > > Till now, you just call her low class trash. A callsign is a sequence
> > > of letters and numbers assign by the FCC to identify a station/operator.
> > > You the one that assigns another meaning to her callsign.
> > >
> > > W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.
> > >
> > > Larry
> >
> > It's been a long time since we've heard from Larry the homemade lawyer.
> > If you've followed this thread, you'll note *why* Kim chose the call.
> > It wasn't randomly chosen.
>
> FCC assigns callsign sequential or allows the license to
> pick their own. However, FCC assigns no meaning to
> the letter. Only you waste you time with this non-sense.

No one at any point in this thread has ever claimed that the FCC assigns
meanings to callsigns. It is also not true that I am the only one
wasting time with this. Numerous others, with views pro and con, have
contributed to the discussion. You are among them.

> > It was chosen so Tugboat Annie...er, Kim
> > could have fun with the boys.
```

>
> Appears she got your goat, since you been carrying-on
> about this for years.

You are as poor a homemade detective as you are a homemade lawyer.

Dave K8MN

737. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 04:37:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF49816.157442E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23734

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The local Affirmative Action program set up in my home town allowed
> > qualified blacks to obtain the jobs that had been going to
> > unqualified whites. That condition probably didn't exist nation-
> > wide but it certainly existed in Small Southern Town, USA.
>
> I give up. You are, apparently, never wrong even when confronted by
> fact.

The above statement is a fact. How often have you been to Madison
County, Texas or are you using ESP?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

738. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 04:44:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF499B9.D1F4395A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23735

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > It's very simple. If ya flunk the writtens ya flunk the exam. If ya
> > > flunk the code test ya flunk the exam. (Not counting the CSCEs thing)
> > >
> > So the code test is considered equal in importance to everything else
> > in amateur radio combined?
>
> Thought you gave up on that dead horse last year...

I'll never give up my questioning nature, Dave. Are my questions
too embarrassing for you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

739. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 05:02:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmven60.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23736

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 23:15:18 GMT, Richard McCollum wrote:

>The tramcars or whatever Larry refers to date from the days when no one
>wanted steamers in the cities so they were electrified. When they got out
>beyond the third rail or overheads on came Dr. Diesel's wonderous engine.
>The hybrid design is somewhat accidental. Electric drive does make more
>sense in that the series motor does have a torque curve more related to the
>problem and the thought of Big Hans slipping the clutch is terrifying.

In the '50s the New Haven had some hybrid locomotives built for
passenger service into/out of Grand Central Terminal in New York by
EMD/General Motors. They drew power from electric third rail
(nominally 750 V DC) until White Plains whereupon they used the
diesel engine to generate the DC. They are still in use, as are
several modern General Electric-built Genesis locomotives (same
scheme) used by AMTRAK on the Albany-Penn Station (NY) portion
of the Lake Shore Limited.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

740. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 05:03:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011116000328.23850.00000503@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 23737

In article <BrFI7.25177$xS6.41064@www.newsranger.com>, K0HB<K0HB@QWEST.NET>
writes:

>Just in time for Christmas giving, check it out!
>
>http://westid.com/amateur.htm
>
And they want FIFTY NINE DOLLARS!

But there's a trivia question here.....

The badge shows a ham station. Can anyone besides me identify the equipment
depicted on the badge?

73 de Jim, N2EY

741. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 05:03:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011116000328.23850.00000502@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 23738

In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry Klose"
<lklose@net-link.net> writes:

(N2EY wrote):

>> FCC assigns callsigns sequentially but skips over certain callsigns
>> because some people might not like them. The skipped calls can be
>> bought via the vanity call program. That's what Kim did. Her callsign
>> suffix is not sequentially issued by the FCC.
>
>I knew the FCC had certain callsign they would not issue.

Yup.

> I am also
>aware that if a licensee object to their callsign they request the
>issuance another. But the fact remains, the FCC issued W5TIT
>and are apparently they satisfied, but some still object.

All it really means is that the FCC isn't going to be the guardian of good
taste in the choice of amateur callsigns.

There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a society.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

742. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 05:53:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <24DCDE4CBB093CFA.72FD6546C8203157.C7B724D8E6CA04B4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23739

On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 00:31:43 GMT, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote:

>Kim.... I wanna know what may be *THE* most offensive 3 letter word that
>could be used for a suffix and I am gonna pursue that as a vanity call sign
>in support of you! (Provided with the fact that it is available first of
>course! :)

Try "__ __ GOD"

I _guarantee_ there isn't a fundamentalist in the country that
won't find your use of THAT call sign offensive!

"__ __ PLO," "__ __ ASS," or "__ __ DIK" would be right up
there as well, of course. And, best of all, "N0SHT!"

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

743. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 06:00:37 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <054887328A3151F4.4BD87C0166CADD95.0EB1FD8D4CC1F139@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23740

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 20:23:17 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Oh, no, not at all. I don't mind a bit someone telling me I am offensive to
>them. What really bothers me is the presumption that their morality must be
>everyone else's! Larry has the perfect right to his opinion, and perfect it
>is (the right). He really does even have the right to say all the things he
>says. He *thinks* he has some kind of empowerment over me to make me mad or
>feel guilt, or feel something, anything over the things he says directed at
>me. Again, I feel nothing other than contempt for someone who believes his
>morality should be everyone else's.

There are _far_ too many such people in our country. I'm one
of those odd-balls who believe that morality is a personal
decision--if your actions don't harm the person or property of a
non-consenting individual (or, of course, a child), it's no one's
business to judge you or your values.

Isn't it funny how some hams seem to be committed to policing
the ars to insure that all of us adhere to THEIR personal values? I'll
bet it cooks Larry to know that "Nudenet" exists on HF and is composed
of nudist/naturist hams who choose to share their interests on the
air--and, of course, in group get-togethers. If it bothers him to see
the "TIT" in your call sign, imagine how he'd feel if . . .

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

744. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 07:32:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF4C0E8.1C116D28@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23741

CAM wrote:
>
> Does the M-16 automatically eject an
> empty magazine?

No, it doesn't. Magazines are manually inserted and removed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

745. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 08:52:14 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <jmk9vtovrio88ibule5t4h5sh4i54kge74@4ax.com>
Source record: 23742

Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->> Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net
->
->
->> ->The truth is a key does NOT close instantaneously. in fact, well before
->> ->what would be presumed to be 'closure' there is an exchange of photons
->> ->between the plates when they are in close proximity to each other.
->
->
->Jim Weir wrote:
->
->> That's an interesting heresy.
->
->
->Not heresy... physics...

Well, since my degrees are in physics (count 'em, one, two, three, count'em
again) and I only choose to make my living as an engineer, I will respond this
way once, and once only...

bullshit to your hypotheses

Jim

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

746. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 11:33:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf4f887_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23743

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF49091.E7383EBC@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BF32126.BF3B7F26@earthlink.net...
> > > Larry Klose wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> > > > news:LpBI7.24866$xS6.40177@www.newsranger.com...
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT says:
> > > > > >
> > > > > I just think your choice of callsign is really, really tacky (as
in
> > low
> > > > > class trash).
> > > > > >
> > > > > Third, I've never engaged in any of the other trashy behavior you
> > listed
> > > > > in your jeremiad.
> > > > >
> > > > Till now, you just call her low class trash. A callsign is a
sequence
> > > > of letters and numbers assign by the FCC to identify a
station/operator.
> > > > You the one that assigns another meaning to her callsign.
> > > >
> > > > W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.
> > > >
> > > > Larry
> > >
> > > It's been a long time since we've heard from Larry the homemade
lawyer.
> > > If you've followed this thread, you'll note *why* Kim chose the call.
> > > It wasn't randomly chosen. It was chosen so Tugboat Annie...er, Kim
> > > could have fun with the boys.
> > >
> > > Try to keep up.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Aw, I shoulda guessed a long time ago, Davey. *That's* what you're all
> > jealous about--I don't choose to have fun with *YOU*. I don't think
I'll
```

> > even apologize and feel bad for ya...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Your chances of having fun with me wouldn't have been good even a couple
> of decades back.
>
> Dave K8MN

Likewise, dear. Your character is everything I find unattractive in a person. And, I am sure that our definitions of "fun" are diametrically opposed. For instance, I would hardly take pleasure in being a kept woman.

Kim W5TIT

747. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 11:35:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf4f905$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23744

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011116000328.23850.00000502@nso-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry Klose"
> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
>
> (N2EY wrote):
>
> >> FCC assigns callsigns sequentially but skips over certain callsigns
> >> because some people might not like them. The skipped calls can be
> >> bought via the vanity call program. That's what Kim did. Her callsign
> >> suffix is not sequentially issued by the FCC.
> >
> >I knew the FCC had certain callsign they would not issue.
>
> Yup.
>
> > I am also
> >aware that if a licensee object to their callsign they request the
> >issuance another. But the fact remains, the FCC issued W5TIT
> >and are apparently they satisfied, but some still object.
>
> All it really means is that the FCC isn't going to be the guardian of good
> taste in the choice of amateur callsigns.
>
> There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a
society.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
>

DEFINITELY!! We could get into a good satirical go 'round on that, but few
people understand satire any more...

Kim W5TIT

748. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 11:38:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf4f9a9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23745

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:054887328A3151F4.4BD87C0166CADD95.0EB1FD8D4CC1F139@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 20:23:17 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Oh, no, not at all. I don't mind a bit someone telling me I am offensive
to
> >them. What really bothers me is the presumption that their morality must
be
> >everyone else's! Larry has the perfect right to his opinion, and perfect
it
> >is (the right). He really does even have the right to say all the things
he
> >says. He *thinks* he has some kind of empowerment over me to make me mad
or
> >feel guilt, or feel something, anything over the things he says directed
at
> >me. Again, I feel nothing other than contempt for someone who believes
his
> >morality should be everyone else's.
>
> There are _far_ too many such people in our country. I'm one
> of those odd-balls who believe that morality is a personal
> decision--if your actions don't harm the person or property of a
> non-consenting individual (or, of course, a child), it's no one's
> business to judge you or your values.
>
> Isn't it funny how some hams seem to be committed to policing
> the ars to insure that all of us adhere to THEIR personal values? I'll
> bet it cooks Larry to know that "Nudenet" exists on HF and is composed
> of nudist/naturist hams who choose to share their interests on the
> air--and, of course, in group get-togethers. If it bothers him to see
> the "TIT" in your call sign, imagine how he'd feel if . . .
>
> 73 de KE8HH, Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>

> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

REALLY! (Said as Tom Leykus[sp]) would say it. A nudenet!? OK, now I am convinced that there is a net for every- and anything! LOL

Kim W5TIT

749. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 11:42:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf4fac4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23746

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:jmk9vtovrio88ibule5t4h5sh4i54kge74@4ax.com...
> Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
> shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
> ->> Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net
> ->
> ->
> ->> ->The truth is a key does NOT close instantaneously. in fact, well
before
> ->> ->what would be presumed to be 'closure' there is an exchange of
photons
> ->> ->between the plates when they are in close proximity to each other.
> ->
> ->
> ->Jim Weir wrote:
> ->
> ->> That's an interesting heresy.
> ->
> ->
> ->Not heresy... physics...
>
> Well, since my degrees are in physics (count 'em, one, two, three,
count'em
> again) and I only choose to make my living as an engineer, I will respond
this
> way once, and once only...
>
> bullshit to your hypotheses
>
>
> Jim
>
> Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

Jim, not that Richard is right or wrong--but your response makes it sound as though your degree means more than the knowledge or intellect on the subject. Not that it matters to you...but a whole lot of people wouldn't get past that and give you half a minute of time...

In other words, I am certainly unimpressed with your attitude; and I'll bet a whole bunch of people would be (based on casual observations and prior experience with humans, N2EY :>). An attitude such as the one you express above would have me "respecting" you much less than I would have otherwise.

I'll bet the less degreed Richard puts forth a much more dignified response.

Kim W5TIT

750. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 11:46:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf4fb93_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23747

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF48F50.53C41943@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > So the Affirmative Action as set up in your home town is different
than
> > > that set up in other towns in America?
> >
> > The local Affirmative Action program set up in my home town allowed
> > qualified blacks to obtain the jobs that had been going to
> > unqualified whites. That condition probably didn't exist nation-
> > wide but it certainly existed in Small Southern Town, USA.
>
> I give up. You are, apparently, never wrong even when confronted by
> fact.
>
> > > Morse testing is a dead issue yet you continue to flog the same horse.
> >
> > Huh????? I gave up on that dead horse last year. Methinks you don't
> > know the horse is dead.
>
> If you know it, why the feeble attempt at comparing morse testing with
> affirmative action? In what way have you given up the issue when you
> make frequent references to it?
>
> Dave K8MN

heh heh heh, now he's going to tell you, Cecil, that *he* was *not*
discussing CW with respect to its similarity to a affirmative action
situation.

Yawn Off to Harry Potter soon...

Kim W5TIT

751. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 14:18:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF51FE0.95BC593C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23748

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> It doesn't have to be a "document",
> Dwight...just an order from competent
> authority.

So you don't consider the Judge Advocate General (JAG) Corps of the Michigan National Guard to be a competent authority? Okay, I see where you're coming from - you're not going to accept anyone as a competent authority unless they agree with you.

> So by your analogy, all cops carry
> blank weapons?

National Guard personal are not law enforcement officers ("cops," as you call them), so there is no possible analogy to be made.

> Dwight, you are again showing your
> arrogance against the Armed Forces.
> Those guys are not Rambo...They are
> not John Wayne...they are TRAINED,
> PROFESSIONAL, and RESPONSIBLE soldiers
> of the Armed Forces of the United
> States.

Yes, they are well trained, professional, responsible, soldiers, who are excellent at doing what they were trained to do - fight wars. But we're not talking about their ability to fight a war - we're talking about carrying loaded weapons in a civilian environment here in the Unites States.

> If there is a magazine in the well, the
> weapon is loaded.
>
>It really is THAT simple.

Yes, I guess things would be simple to a person who blindly holds to a position in spite of clear evidence opposing that position.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

752. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 14:19:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF51F6C.E8695C99@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23750

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The local Affirmative Action program set up in my home town allowed
> > > qualified blacks to obtain the jobs that had been going to
> > > unqualified whites. That condition probably didn't exist nation-
> > > wide but it certainly existed in Small Southern Town, USA.
> >
> > I give up. You are, apparently, never wrong even when confronted by
> > fact.
>
> The above statement is a fact. How often have you been to Madison
> County, Texas or are you using ESP?

Now you'd have us believe that your area is the whole South or the whole U.S. How much of the Affirmative Action era did you spend there? Do you know anything about other parts of the country? Can you come up with any verifiable facts to support your claim or are you just blowing smoke?

Dave K8MN

753. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 14:19:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF52023.786B4497@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23749

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
> >
> > That document describes the current policies
> > on the arming of National Guard personnel
> > in domestic operations.
>
> But it does not refect current PRACTICE, Dwight.

Steve, you have no idea what you're talking about. It is clear that you know very little about military policy, so lets see some evidence that you know more about current practice than anyone else reading this thread. The military works hard to establish policies for situations like this (they don't like to be caught off guard), and I've seen nothing to even suggest they have deviated from those policies in this situation.

By the way, have you noticed the recent change in this situation? Just within the last week or so, the National Guard personnel at the airports have begun to wear holstered pistols instead of carrying M-16 rifles. Seems someone was bothered by the spectacle of soldiers walking through crowded airports with rifles haphazardly slung over the shoulder (the haphazard handling is what made me suspect the weapons weren't actually loaded).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

754. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 14:20:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF51FD9.4C5040F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23651

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > > It's very simple. If ya flunk the writtens ya flunk the exam. If ya
> > > > flunk the code test ya flunk the exam. (Not counting the CSCEs thing)
> > >
> > > So the code test is considered equal in importance to everything else
> > > in amateur radio combined?
> >
> > Thought you gave up on that dead horse last year...
>
> I'll never give up my questioning nature, Dave. Are my questions
> too embarrassing for you?

I'd think the contradictions in what you write in one post and what you write in a subsequent post would be embarrassing to you. Your about face doesn't bother me.

Dave K8MN

755. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 14:30:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF52207.953F8E90@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23652

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 20:23:17 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Oh, no, not at all. I don't mind a bit someone telling me I am offensive to
> >them. What really bothers me is the presumption that their morality must be
> >everyone else's! Larry has the perfect right to his opinion, and perfect it
> >is (the right). He really does even have the right to say all the things he
> >says. He *thinks* he has some kind of empowerment over me to make me mad or
> >feel guilt, or feel something, anything over the things he says directed at
> >me. Again, I feel nothing other than contempt for someone who believes his
> >morality should be everyone else's.
>
> There are _far_ too many such people in our country. I'm one
> of those odd-balls who believe that morality is a personal
> decision--if your actions don't harm the person or property of a
> non-consenting individual (or, of course, a child), it's no one's
> business to judge you or your values.

Sez you. How about your actions offending the sensibilities of another?
What you do in the privacy of your domain is one thing. Anything you do
in public is...public. If you'd like to assign yourself a secret
callsign, known only to you, it is fine with me.

> Isn't it funny how some hams seem to be committed to policing
> the ars to insure that all of us adhere to THEIR personal values? I'll
> bet it cooks Larry to know that "Nudenet" exists on HF and is composed
> of nudist/naturist hams who choose to share their interests on the
> air--and, of course, in group get-togethers. If it bothers him to see
> the "TIT" in your call sign, imagine how he'd feel if . . .

Isn't it funny that some will go to great lengths to offend in order to
prove a point that they "have a right" even while others have a right
not to be offended. Your lack of judgement or taste is only protected
to a point.

Dave K8MN

756. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 14:37:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF523CA.7D551E27@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23653

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF49091.E7383EBC@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BF32126.BF3B7F26@earthlink.net...
> > > > Larry Klose wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "K0HB" <K0HB@QWEST.NET> wrote in message
> > > > > news:LpBI7.24866$xS6.40177@www.newsranger.com...
> > > > > > Kim-W5TIT says:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I just think your choice of callsign is really, really tacky (as
> in
> > > low
> > > > > > class trash).
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Third, I've never engaged in any of the other trashy behavior you
> > > listed
> > > > > > in your jeremiad.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Till now, you just call her low class trash. A callsign is a
> sequence
> > > > > of letters and numbers assign by the FCC to identify a
> station/operator.
> > > > > You the one that assigns another meaning to her callsign.
> > > > >
> > > > > W5TIT mean W5TIT and only W5TIT, nothing else.
> > > > >
> > > > > Larry
> > > >
> > > > It's been a long time since we've heard from Larry the homemade
> lawyer.
> > > > If you've followed this thread, you'll note *why* Kim chose the call.
> > > > It wasn't randomly chosen. It was chosen so Tugboat Annie...er, Kim
> > > > could have fun with the boys.
> > > >
> > > > Try to keep up.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Aw, I shoulda guessed a long time ago, Davey. *That's* what you're all
```

> > > jealous about--I don't choose to have fun with *YOU*. I don't think
> I'll
> > > even apologize and feel bad for ya...
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Your chances of having fun with me wouldn't have been good even a couple
> > of decades back.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Likewise, dear. Your character is everything I find unattractive in a
> person. And, I am sure that our definitions of "fun" are diametrically
> opposed. For instance, I would hardly take pleasure in being a kept woman.

This is certainly beginning to sound Freudian, Kim. You made the comment, not I. Now you've added this "kept woman" thing. I've certainly not mentioned, thought or written at any time, anything about wanting you or making you into a kept woman. I like my women taller, thinner and less "in your face". I'm married to the only woman who interests me. I will accept your disdain for my type to be a compliment and you comment about the differences in our concepts of fun to reflect upon my good judgement. You'll also note that I don't refer to you as "dear".

Dave K8MN

757. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 14:38:33 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <3BBF8B2E1E21EBF9.42E4E19303F4AA76.87407198867B6A0A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23654

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 20:14:55 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>To each his own, Krell. I absolutely can't STAND people talking about
>traffic on the air--that is about as CBish as it can get--

No...it could get a lot more fucking CBish if the fuckheads were
jacking their motherfucking jaws about the goddamned traffic, 10-4?

OTOH, since 2m FM is primarily used mobile around here, traffic is
relevant to most of its users. In Dallas, it's pretty much the only
reliable source, too.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

758. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 14:41:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF524A1.F356302F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23655

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF48F50.53C41943@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > So the Affirmative Action as set up in your home town is different
> than
> > > > that set up in other towns in America?
> > >
> > > The local Affirmative Action program set up in my home town allowed
> > > qualified blacks to obtain the jobs that had been going to
> > > unqualified whites. That condition probably didn't exist nation-
> > > wide but it certainly existed in Small Southern Town, USA.
> >
> > I give up. You are, apparently, never wrong even when confronted by
> > fact.
> >
> > > > Morse testing is a dead issue yet you continue to flog the same horse.
> > >
> > > Huh????? I gave up on that dead horse last year. Methinks you don't
> > > know the horse is dead.
> >
> > If you know it, why the feeble attempt at comparing morse testing with
> > affirmative action? In what way have you given up the issue when you
> > make frequent references to it?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> heh heh heh, now he's going to tell you, Cecil, that *he* was *not*
> discussing CW with respect to its similarity to a affirmative action
> situation.
>
> *Yawn* Off to Harry Potter soon...
>
> Kim W5TIT

If your yawn indicates boredom, you needn't bother yourself with
responses to thread. If it indicates lack of sleep, perhaps that's why
you have trouble following along. Cecil is the person who made the
comparison between morse testing and Affirmative Action. He was, as he
is frequently, wrong.

Dave K8MN

759. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 14:44:54 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <5B1B800944878DDE.5F53337215D5978B.CBC2CE2B0F9879C8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23656

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 20:52:57 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>Foxtrot uniform kilowatt
>foxtrot uniform charlie
>Kilowatt (any number) uniform november tango
>Kilowatt uniform (any number) november tango
>Kilowatt zero charlie kilowatt
>November zero oscar kilowatt yankee
>Kilowatt tango one tango
>November tango one tango
>whiskey tango one tango

_B1TCH
_P1SSY

Though for raw un-PC-ness, November One Golf Golf Romeo would probably
do it.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

760. Re: 11 Meters L.O.T.A. (Lighthouses On The Air)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 15:07:33 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0111160707.5c1347b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23657
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<9t0seu$fg5$1@news.bignet.net>...
> "Dave" <please@nospam.org> wrote in message
> news:e446vt8q8jtbd66g1umoeel3btro33dl95@4ax.com...
> > I don't see the paralell ,not even a vague one.
>
> That is easy to answer, and welcome to "rec.radio.cb" where you just fell
> victim to a forged news group message. You'll find that is a VERY common
> occurrence here, and when the CB pirates get mad enough they pull the stunt
> in other newsgroups as well. Sooner or later if you like me and several
> others voice your opinion against illegal CBer's you'll find yourself a
> victim sooner or later too.
>
> By the way any post from me will NEVER contain a valid return E-mail
> address, to me, as an anti Spam measure. The forged messages contain them as
> a sorry attempt at harassment. In fact when the forged messages do contain a
> valid E-mail address to me it saves me the trouble of looking for the forged
> messages. I don't ever bother to look for them anyway. Others find them and
> contact me instead, and I just pass along the message with headers to the
> forger's ISP, which then either blocks their access or cans the account.
> Takes about 2 minutes using a saved boiler plate message I send to the ISP
> involved.

leland, why is it you always cross post this shit to other
newsgroups...man these people don't want to hear your incessant
whining.......the only thing i can figure is that you are trolling for
little allies......

761. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 15:53:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5368D.CCE74D00@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23658

Dave Heil wrote:
> Now you'd have us believe that your area is the whole South or the whole
> U.S.

On the contrary, I said I don't know how it was except in Small Southern Town, USA. If you would read my postings instead of just emoting, you wouldn't embarrass yourself like that. You know absolutely nothing about what happened in my home town yet you present yourself as an expert on my home town. You can start to redeem yourself by telling me how many traffic lights we have.

> Can you come up with any verifiable facts to support your claim or are you
> just blowing smoke?

I commuted to Sam Houston State Teacher's College with a black lady while I was obtaining my Texas Teaching Certificate. She was getting one also along with a Master's Degree. She was a superior person with a high IQ. She could not get a teaching job in Madison County so she got one in Harris County. Affirmative Action later allowed her to move back to her home town and teach. Incompetent white teachers were let go and competent black teachers were hired. Left to the tyranny of the white majority, that would not have happened even with the civil rights law in place. My low-IQ cousin, who had flunked out of Texas A&M, was one of the teachers who was let go. He was teaching his students that transistors were made out of geranium.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

762. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 15:57:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF53780.9ABB4A35@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23659

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'd think the contradictions in what you write in one post and what you
> write in a subsequent post would be embarrassing to you.

I keep an open mind and sometimes change it. I understand that the
concept
of correcting mental mistakes and acquiring new knowledge is entirely
foreign to you.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

763. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 15:59:31 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0111160759.367cb87b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23660

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011114231948.14773.00001167@nso-dh.aol.com>...
> In article <3bf25b27_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
> >I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly
> >pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having
> >such a callsign.
>
> Kim:
>
> Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is *patently*
> objectionable!

To you, perhaps. It is *not* objectionable to everyone, as evidenced by
other postings in this newsgroup. And it isn't objectionable to me.

I don't understand why there's a big fuss about this. Sheesh. If Kim were
male, I'd at least have an idea why some found it objectionable -- but
she's not. Would people have the same objection for 'W5TEAT'? (You do know
the correct pronounciation of 'teat' is 'tit', right?)

Sean.
KC8SIK

764. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 16:03:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF538DF.B05CAF50@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23661

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm married to the only woman who interests me.

You find all other women in the world uninteresting? Do you cull
out the books you read depending on the sex of the person who
wrote them? Do you refuse to attend classes taught by women?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

765. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 16:09:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF53A36.E6BCF46A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23662

Dave Heil wrote:
> Cecil is the person who made the
> comparison between morse testing and Affirmative Action. He was, as he
> is frequently, wrong.

Opinions are like a$$holes, Dave, and it looks like that's where some
of yours come from. I find it interesting that you profess to know more
about my home town than I do. Someday you need to demonstrate your
crystal
ball for us (after wiping it off, of course).
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

766. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 17:03:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111160903.19d091d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23663

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:<3bf4f905$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011116000328.23850.00000502@nso-fy.aol.com...
> > In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry Klose"
> > <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
> >
> > (N2EY wrote):
> >
> > >> FCC assigns callsigns sequentially but skips over certain callsigns
> > >> because some people might not like them. The skipped calls can be
> > >> bought via the vanity call program. That's what Kim did. Her callsign
> > >> suffix is not sequentially issued by the FCC.
> > >
> > >I knew the FCC had certain callsign they would not issue.
> >
> > Yup.
> >
> > > I am also
> > >aware that if a licensee object to their callsign they request the
> > >issuance another. But the fact remains, the FCC issued W5TIT
> > >and are apparently they satisfied, but some still object.
> >
> > All it really means is that the FCC isn't going to be the guardian of good
> > taste in the choice of amateur callsigns.
> >
> > There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a
> society.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

> DEFINITELY!!

We agree, then.

> We could get into a good satirical go 'round on that, but few
> people understand satire any more...

Yup.

73 de Jim, N2EY

767. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 18:15:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF557D5.C2AE17E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23664

>
> >
> > Isn't it funny how some hams seem to be committed to policing
> > the ars to insure that all of us adhere to THEIR personal values? I'll
> > bet it cooks Larry to know that "Nudenet" exists on HF and is composed
> > of nudist/naturist hams who choose to share their interests on the
> > air--and, of course, in group get-togethers. If it bothers him to see
> > the "TIT" in your call sign, imagine how he'd feel if . . .
> >
> > 73 de KE8HH, Rick
> >
>
>
> REALLY! (Said as Tom Leykus[sp]) would say it. A nudenet!? OK, now I am
> convinced that there is a net for every- and anything! LOL
>
> Kim W5TIT

Do they operate SSTV (slow scan television)? :-)

768. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 18:28:46 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <3jmavto4obfionsmbrcvu84u84d035ipq9@4ax.com>
Source record: 23665

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->Jim, not that Richard is right or wrong--but your response makes it sound as
->though your degree means more than the knowledge or intellect on the
->subject. Not that it matters to you...but a whole lot of people wouldn't
->get past that and give you half a minute of time...

Kim --

You are precisely correct. Rather than counter with a learned discussion, I took the frustration of putting 5 sixteen hour days back to back and took the easy way out.

My apologies. The answer should have come from intellect and not from emotion.

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

769. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 19:22:32 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BF56865.2060403@att.net>
Source record: 23666

N2EY wrote:

> All it really means is that the FCC isn't going to be the guardian of good
> taste in the choice of amateur callsigns.

Hi Jim...

That's true and if it did it would have to make hams NOT wear strips and plaids
together at hamfests... ;-)

> There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a society.

And... a BIG difference between what's in bad taste and what's bad for a
society... witness $50.00 'Ham Radio Badge' that someone is flogging. ;-)

Rich

(I'd use my nickname but I might offend Larry) ;-)

770. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 20:06:07 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <005998E0F57273C6.A309FDFFEA985559.9A07640D262507F7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23667

On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 13:15:49 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>Do they operate SSTV (slow scan television)? :-)

(Why did I know someone was going to ask that?)

Actually, as far as I know, no they don't. I don't participate
in the net (from a personal perspective, _talking_ about nude
activities just doesn't interest me that much--and it would seem kind
of silly to strip to operate my station :-).

73 de KE8HH, Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

771. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 20:18:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF5747C.4F20E44E@uci.edu>
Source record: 23668

N2EY wrote:
> The badge shows a ham station. Can anyone besides me identify the equipment
> depicted on the badge?

"They're all dead, Jim."

772. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 20:19:39 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t3sac0ar4@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23670

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF538DF.B05CAF50@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm married to the only woman who interests me.
>
> You find all other women in the world uninteresting? Do you cull
> out the books you read depending on the sex of the person who
> wrote them? Do you refuse to attend classes taught by women?
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

Aren't you taking that a tad too literally?

773. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 20:34:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF57870.A2E8D19D@uci.edu>
Source record: 23672

CAM wrote:
> > > So the code test is considered equal in importance to everything else
> > > in amateur radio combined?

> > Thought you gave up on that dead horse last year...

> I'll never give up my questioning nature, Dave.

The Morse code is not equal in importance to everything else in nature combined. Hope that settles things for you. But go ahead and ask again next week. Maybe things will have changed by then. (Not)

774. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 20:35:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <41E70F5BED997191.E27ECE6B7248A9A0.E7B8A5DC7500B0C9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23669

On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 14:30:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Sez you. How about your actions offending the sensibilities of another?

I'll make you a deal. If you agree not to offend MY
sensibilities, I'll agree not to offend yours.

BTW, mine include the public practice or promotion of
Christian religion, prejudice, hypocrisy, and voting Republican! :-)

Since you believe my actions should not offend your
sensibilities, I assume you are willing to avoid ALL of these offenses
to MY sensibilities, right?

Or are YOUR values somehow more relevant than mine?

>What you do in the privacy of your domain is one thing.

Tell that to the morality cops! In many states consensual
sexual activities between MARRIED couples are illegal, in 37 states
homosexual activities between consenting adults in private are
illegal, and in every state the government bans nudity on PRIVATE
property (i.e., nudist clubs, etc.). "Swing clubs" which involve
activities only concerning consenting adults in a private setting are
illegal (and commonly raided), many communities ban adult businesses
which are frequented only by consenting adults. Obviously, these are
only a few of the many possible examples.

Given that the state insists that it has the right to tell
people what is or is not moral for us to do, it's unreasonable to
expect anyone to avoid doing something (such as choosing a call sign
that you don't personally like) that is NOT illegal. It isn't our
responsibility to investigate the sensibilities of others if the state
has chosen to make those decisions for us.

More importantly, we live in a free society, at least
theoretically, if not in fact. That means, basically, that we all have
to agree to accept the differences that exist between us and to
tolerate behaviors that _may_ offend our sensibilities. To paraphrase
Peter McWilliams, it's rather like two children playing with their
toys. You may not like watching Johnny playing with his toy soldiers,
but unless you are willing to tolerate his doing so, you have no right
to offend HIS sensibilities by playing with your dolls. In short, if
you want the right to live by your own moral standards you must, by
necessity, allow others to do so as well.

> Anything you do in public is...public.

Ok, stop attending church. I find the position of the
Christian Churches offensive in that they oppose freedom of choice and
they attempt to influence laws that restrict my rights as a
non-Christian who doesn't share their particular moral values. Since
churches offend my sensibilities, either move them to places where I
needn't see them or be exposed in any way to their influence, or
eliminate them completely.

How does the shoe fit now?

> If you'd like to assign yourself a secret
>callsign, known only to you, it is fine with me.

Really?

I didn't know you supported freebanders (who do precisely
that).

Amazing!

>Isn't it funny that some will go to great lengths to offend in order to
>prove a point that they "have a right" even while others have a right
>not to be offended. Your lack of judgement or taste is only protected
>to a point.

As is your narrow minded attitude toward humor, sex, or the
nature of human beings. Sorry, but to take Kim's call sign as anything
other than what it is--light and innocent humor--is the mark of a sick
mind.

Kim isn't the one who is going out of their way to be
offensive--the people who set themselves up as judges of the morality
of others are the ones doing that.

KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

775. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 20:37:58 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <07A94D50CE876B08.36D0CF3C84B376C7.47FD60454789C6EB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23671

On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 05:33:13 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Likewise, dear. Your character is everything I find unattractive in a
>person. And, I am sure that our definitions of "fun" are diametrically
>opposed. For instance, I would hardly take pleasure in being a kept woman.

That's it, Kim, spoil all our illusions! :-(

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

776. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 22:06:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0111161406.7c6ef4e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23673

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gmven60.pminews@or.news.verio.net>...
> On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 23:15:18 GMT, Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> >The tramcars or whatever Larry refers to date from the days when no one
> >wanted steamers in the cities so they were electrified. When they got out
> >beyond the third rail or overheads on came Dr. Diesel's wonderous engine.
> >The hybrid design is somewhat accidental. Electric drive does make more
> >sense in that the series motor does have a torque curve more related to the
> >problem and the thought of Big Hans slipping the clutch is terrifying.
>
> In the '50s the New Haven had some hybrid locomotives built for
> passenger service into/out of Grand Central Terminal in New York by
> EMD/General Motors.

FL-9s. Looked like E-8s with third rail shoes.

> They drew power from electric third rail
> (nominally 750 V DC) until White Plains whereupon they used the
> diesel engine to generate the DC. They are still in use, as are
> several modern General Electric-built Genesis locomotives (same
> scheme) used by AMTRAK on the Albany-Penn Station (NY) portion
> of the Lake Shore Limited.

The Turboliners have third rail shoes, too.

When Grand Central was built at the turn of the century, the New York
Central tried to run steamers in the tunnels. A fire convinced the
city fathers to enact an ordinance forbidding the use of steam engines
underground, so the
railroad electrified as far north as Harmon and used electric locos.
The Harlem and some other lines were eventually electrified, too. Now
it all belongs to Metro-North.

73 de Jim, N2EY

777. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 22:26:15 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuffj@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF4DBEF.8AF4130B@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23674

Rick Adams wrote:

> As is your narrow minded attitude toward humor, sex, or the
> nature of human beings. Sorry, but to take Kim's call sign as anything
> other than what it is--light and innocent humor--is the mark of a sick
> mind.
>
> Kim isn't the one who is going out of their way to be
> offensive--the people who set themselves up as judges of the morality
> of others are the ones doing that.

It is a matter of class and taste, some seem to never acquire
either.

778. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 22:32:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011116173222.09700.00000238@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23675

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/16/2001 8:18 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF51FE0.95BC593C@sccoast.net>

>
>Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>
>> It doesn't have to be a "document",
>> Dwight...just an order from competent
>> authority.
>
>
> So you don't consider the Judge Advocate General (JAG) Corps of the
>Michigan National Guard to be a competent authority? Okay, I see where
>you're coming from - you're not going to accept anyone as a competent
>authority unless they agree with you.

No, Dwight, I am going to accept the word of a man who is out there right now, in uniform, carrying an M16 that has a loaded magazine in the well and four extra magazine on his belt, "patrolling" Chattanooga's airport.

"Orders" change as the mission neccessitates. The mission changed on 11 September 2001.

Or do YOU have a problem with reality?

>National Guard personal are not law enforcement officers ("cops," as
>you call them), so there is no possible analogy to be made.

No, they are not "law enforcement"...But they ARE consatbulatory when under the direction of the governor who CAN impose THIER authority in a given area that HE declares as an emergency or disaster area....Which, by the way, is exactly what has occured.

Dwight, I am sorry that you, like Lennie the Loser, insist on believeing ONLY what you can find on websites, but I am a realist and the REALITY of this situation is that National Guard troops are patrolling American territory with loaded weapons against possible foreign terrorists.

It really is THAT simple. Maybe in Michigan or somewhere else someone is pretending to have a loaded weapon, but in Tennessee they are taking this seriously. The Guard's commanders are NOT allowing thier troops to go into harm's way unprepared or incapable of defending themselves or thier assigned posts. This includes the training to know what to do and the tools to do it with.

>Yes, they are well trained, professional, responsible, soldiers, who
>are excellent at doing what they were trained to do - fight wars. But
>we're not talking about their ability to fight a war - we're talking
>about carrying loaded weapons in a civilian environment here in the
>Unites States.

Your GROSS ignorance is showing again, Dwight. The NATIONAL Guard (NOT the Army or Army Reserve) is SPECIFICALLY trained to act and react to CIVILIAN distrubances, using a wide range of weapons and techniques, including the use of deadly force IN ADDITION to thier "warfighting" skills.

That is why the Governor calls out the National Guard....That's thier job...That's what they are trained for.

Live with it.

>Yes, I guess things would be simple to a person who blindly holds to
>a position in spite of clear evidence opposing that position.

The "evidence", Dwight, is a REAL Guardsman carying a REAL M-16 with REAL ammunition...IN the magazine, IN the well of the weapon, READY to fire the weapon if necessity mandates.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve

779. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 22:42:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011116174257.09700.00000239@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 23676

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/16/2001 8:19 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF52023.786B4497@sccoast.net>

>Steve, you have no idea what you're talking about.

And you are lying.

>By the way, have you noticed the recent change in this situation?
>Just within the last week or so, the National Guard personnel at the
>airports have begun to wear holstered pistols instead of carrying M-16
>rifles.

Do you know why? The 9MM pistol is NOT supplied in the same quantities as the pistol is, Dwight. The standard persoanl weapon for enlisted personnel is the M-16. Staff NCO's and Officers carry the pistol. IF the situation changes that EVERYONE has to cary thier TO weapon again, you will see lot's of "junior" troops carrying rifles WITHOUT pistols, and lot's of SNCO's and Officers with sidearms.

Furthermore, the M-16 is inappropriate for close quarters combat in which collateral damage is of the highest concern. Even standard ammunition from an M-16 will penetrate several walls in that enviroment, causing death and harm to persons no where near the incident.

>Seems someone was bothered by the spectacle of soldiers
>walking through crowded airports with rifles haphazardly slung over
>the shoulder (the haphazard handling is what made me suspect the
>weapons weren't actually loaded).

"Haphazardly"...sounds awfully liberalish to me...

The sight of armed soldiers carrying armed weapons intimidates even me, and well it should. We have foolishly allowed ourselves to believe that warfare and terorism canot happen here.

Well, it has. And there will continue to BE armed troopps, with one weapon or another, to one degree or another, for the near future to come.

As for what you "suspect", it has no basis in FACT.

Is it also your contention that those sidearms are also empty?

Steve

780. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-16 23:18:42 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <m9hJ7.188781$W8.6928282@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23677

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0111161406.7c6ef4e9@posting.google.com...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gmven60.pminews@or.news.verio.net>...
> > On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 23:15:18 GMT, Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > >The tramcars or whatever Larry refers to date from the days when no one
> > >wanted steamers in the cities so they were electrified. When they got
out
> > >beyond the third rail or overheads on came Dr. Diesel's wonderous
engine.
> > >The hybrid design is somewhat accidental. Electric drive does make
more
> > >sense in that the series motor does have a torque curve more related to
the
> > >problem and the thought of Big Hans slipping the clutch is terrifying.
> >
> > In the '50s the New Haven had some hybrid locomotives built for
> > passenger service into/out of Grand Central Terminal in New York by
> > EMD/General Motors.
>
> FL-9s. Looked like E-8s with third rail shoes.
>
> > They drew power from electric third rail
> > (nominally 750 V DC) until White Plains whereupon they used the
> > diesel engine to generate the DC. They are still in use, as are
> > several modern General Electric-built Genesis locomotives (same
> > scheme) used by AMTRAK on the Albany-Penn Station (NY) portion
> > of the Lake Shore Limited.
>
> The Turboliners have third rail shoes, too.
>
> When Grand Central was built at the turn of the century, the New York
> Central tried to run steamers in the tunnels. A fire convinced the
> city fathers to enact an ordinance forbidding the use of steam engines
> underground, so the
> railroad electrified as far north as Harmon and used electric locos.
> The Harlem and some other lines were eventually electrified, too. Now
> it all belongs to Metro-North.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

The main Post Office in St. Louis is built along a tunnel that runs from
Eads Bridge to (old) Union Station. The tunnel is equipped with some mighty

ventilation stacks along 8th St. But when the door to the PO was opened in the 1880's for the first and only time, the loco smoke went right into the PO causing its evacuation. They get the mail on trucks.

I remember the old C&NW beltline in OMA. The Northwestern was one of the last to convert to diesel. I have no clue where they got their coal but it smelled like every two-holer I have ever been in.

Dick

781. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 00:43:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23678

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Now you'd have us believe that your area is the whole South or the whole
> > U.S.
>
> On the contrary, I said I don't know how it was except in Small Southern
> Town, USA. If you would read my postings instead of just emoting, you
> wouldn't
> embarrass yourself like that. You know absolutely nothing about what
> happened
> in my home town yet you present yourself as an expert on my home town.
> You
> can start to redeem yourself by telling me how many traffic lights we
> have.

You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
Town, USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the
status of expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition,
I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.

> > Can you come up with any verifiable facts to support your claim or are you
> > just blowing smoke?
>
> I commuted to Sam Houston State Teacher's College with a black lady
> while
> I was obtaining my Texas Teaching Certificate. She was getting one also
> along with a Master's Degree. She was a superior person with a high IQ.
> She could not get a teaching job in Madison County so she got one in
> Harris
> County. Affirmative Action later allowed her to move back to her home
> town
> and teach. Incompetent white teachers were let go and competent black
> teachers
> were hired. Left to the tyranny of the white majority, that would not
> have
> happened even with the civil rights law in place. My low-IQ cousin, who
> had
> flunked out of Texas A&M, was one of the teachers who was let go. He was
> teaching his students that transistors were made out of geranium.

So we have only your wild tales as proof. Tyranny of the white majority
indeed. Perhaps you can entertain us with tales of your cousin's work
in seminole conductors.

Dave K8MN

782. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 00:46:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5B21C.C9469760@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23679

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'd think the contradictions in what you write in one post and what you
> > write in a subsequent post would be embarrassing to you.
>
> I keep an open mind and sometimes change it. I understand that the
> concept
> of correcting mental mistakes and acquiring new knowledge is entirely
> foreign to you.

You seemingly change your mind and correct your mistakes over the span of ten or fifteen minutes here. You also attempt to make your 180 degree swivel appear as if it were a virtue. If changing your mind is the key to knowledge, you must be the smartest guy I've ever run into.

I certainly wish I could take you seriously.

Dave K8MN

783. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 00:55:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5B461.6867E631@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23680

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Cecil is the person who made the
> > comparison between morse testing and Affirmative Action. He was, as he
> > is frequently, wrong.
>
> Opinions are like a$$holes, Dave, and it looks like that's where some
> of yours come from. I find it interesting that you profess to know more
> about my home town than I do. Someday you need to demonstrate your
> crystal
> ball for us (after wiping it off, of course).

Well, Mr. Backwoods philosopher, I've made no attempt to discuss your town. You've tried to discuss only the place where you currently live. I'm not buying into your diversion from your original erroneous claim comparing morse testing and Affirmative Action.

I guess my knowledge base is larger, Cecil. I've lived in the Midwest, and the South along with some of Europe and much of Africa. You talk about what you can from your limited perspective.

If you choose to believe that Affirmative Action lowered no standards and did not cost more qualified whites jobs, stay with your pet theory. Maybe you'll be able to find a way to rationalize why the program was dismantled.

In the mean time, your analogy between Affirmative Action and morse testing is just as poor as it was when first stated by you.

Dave K8MN

784. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 00:58:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5B4FB.450E1A18@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23681

Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BF538DF.B05CAF50@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I'm married to the only woman who interests me.
> >
> > You find all other women in the world uninteresting? Do you cull
> > out the books you read depending on the sex of the person who
> > wrote them? Do you refuse to attend classes taught by women?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
> Aren't you taking that a tad too literally?

That's what Cecil does. It is also why I simply ignored his response.

Dave K8MN

785. Re: Amateur Service Withers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 01:03:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011116200325.20950.00000506@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 23683

In article <4ECI7.170100$3d2.6994079@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Jim, N2EY, posted:
>
>> The concept of "radio operator" is rapidly vanishing from other
>> services. I understand that the US Navy no longer has the "Radioman"
>> specialty at all. From what I read, the GROL is more of a license to
>> adjust and repair equipment than it is to operate.
>
>Sad, but true. I think it started when broadcasting management
>questioned the necessity for having to hire licensed operators when,
>in fact, it was the station licensee who was ultimately responsible
>for station operation in any case. The other commercial services'
>lobbyists piled on and my First 'Phone became history.

Yep. I'm old enough to remember a time when a First 'Phone opened doors to good jobs for many people. I'm sure employers would argue that it was "featherbedding" to require operator licenses, though!

>In light of this history, I have wondered, like Hans, whether
>the 'operator' part of the combined amateur operator/station
>license is obsolete. Perhaps he's right -- all you do is sign
>a form saying you are cognizant of the relevant rules and regs
>and are not a convicted felon or previous radio miscreant -- and
>back comes a *STATION* license. Screw up and the FCC jerks
>the STATION license. Strict accountablility, but no a-priori,
>operating-skill qualifications.
>
This would not be a good thing. The unique thing about the ARS, and one of the bases and purposes of its very existence, is that hams are technically knowledgeable AND operationally skilled. And in 99% of cases, the amateur is both station owner and operator.

>Jim, N2EY, responded to Hans' proposal with:
>
>> It's been tried, Hans. They called it CB. The result isn't pretty.
>
>That's been hashed over -- a lot.

But the comparison is still valid.

>Other factors, like very poor
>frequency selection for a "local" service, play in there too.
>But a lot of the opinion I see is that a corner was definitely
>turned when the FCC transitioned it to a completely licenseless

>service and gave up on enforcement. I don't think that is what
>Hans was proposing.
>
Let's look at what happened to the CB service.

The first CB service (1948?) called "Class A" and "Class B" was in the 460 MHz region. Unpopular because of the cost of decent equipment for those frequencies.

1958 saw the Class C and D CB, at 27 MHz or so. The band was chosen because equipment cost was far less. Overtone xtals could be used for a MOPA transmitter, and a single-conversion 455 kc. IF receiver would work OK. Common tubes and parts could be used throughout, and total cost kept below $100.

For the first couple of years things were relatively sane, but by the mid 1960s there were over a million CBs and the FCC couldn't enforce the rules. There were simply too many violators. The end of licensing came about because so few were bothering to be licensed in the first place.

The FCC had egg on its face big time when an AP story with picture showed "First Mama" Betty Ford, mike in hand, joining the CB craze of the '70s. License? What license?
>
The problem was that from the beginning the FCC had never imagined that huge numbers of Americans would buy CB radios and proceed to violate virtually every rule in the book, with impunity. Things were further complicated by a legal loophole involving unlicensed persons.

In the mid '70s the EIA proposed reallocating 220 for a new "Class E" CB service. Fortunately that was shot down.

The BIG question is this: Why did CB go so rotten so quick, but ham radio stay so well behaved, even though both lacked adequate FCC enforcement? The answer is simple: Hams had developed a culture of playing by the rules, while CB had developed a culture of ignoring the rules. The culture of playing by the rules is ingrained in newcomers in part by the licensing process.

73 de Jim, N2EY

786. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 01:03:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011116200326.20950.00000507@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 23682

In article <3BF5747C.4F20E44E@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> The badge shows a ham station. Can anyone besides me identify the equipment
>> depicted on the badge?
>
>"They're all dead, Jim."

HAW!! That's a good one!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

787. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 01:19:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5BB07.344E4249@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23684

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> Do you know why? The 9MM pistol
> is NOT supplied in the same quantities
> as the pistol is, Dwight. The standard
> persoanl weapon for enlisted personnel
> is the M-16. (snip)
>
> (snip) We have foolishly allowed ourselves
> to believe that warfare and terorism canot
> happen here.
>
> Well, it has. (snip)

Well, you certainly have the gift of stating the obvious and saying
absolutely nothing.

Take care, Steve.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

788. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 01:22:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5BAB0.6E744F99@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23685

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 14:30:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Sez you. How about your actions offending the sensibilities of another?
>
> I'll make you a deal. If you agree not to offend MY
> sensibilities, I'll agree not to offend yours.
>
> BTW, mine include the public practice or promotion of
> Christian religion, prejudice, hypocrisy, and voting Republican! :-)
>
> Since you believe my actions should not offend your
> sensibilities, I assume you are willing to avoid ALL of these offenses
> to MY sensibilities, right?
>
> Or are YOUR values somehow more relevant than mine?
>
> >What you do in the privacy of your domain is one thing.
>
> Tell that to the morality cops! In many states consensual
> sexual activities between MARRIED couples are illegal, in 37 states
> homosexual activities between consenting adults in private are
> illegal, and in every state the government bans nudity on PRIVATE
> property (i.e., nudist clubs, etc.). "Swing clubs" which involve
> activities only concerning consenting adults in a private setting are
> illegal (and commonly raided), many communities ban adult businesses
> which are frequented only by consenting adults. Obviously, these are
> only a few of the many possible examples.

In your practice of homosexual activity in your home, how many times
have you been arrested? There are numerous nudist clubs in a number of
states which are legal and which are not raided. Your information is
false. I do not have to attend them and they are not in plain view.
I don't have a problem with them. I don't feel the need to participate
in a "swing club".

> Given that the state insists that it has the right to tell
> people what is or is not moral for us to do, it's unreasonable to
> expect anyone to avoid doing something (such as choosing a call sign
> that you don't personally like) that is NOT illegal. It isn't our
> responsibility to investigate the sensibilities of others if the state
> has chosen to make those decisions for us.

It is not necessary to do everything not prohibited by law just to prove a point. The "state" is not some faceless and nameless entity. It is us. If you can convince enough of your neighbors that we should have porn palaces, nude dancing, nudist camps and the like on every corner, perhaps you can get some laws changed.

> More importantly, we live in a free society, at least
> theoretically, if not in fact. That means, basically, that we all have
> to agree to accept the differences that exist between us and to
> tolerate behaviors that _may_ offend our sensibilities. To paraphrase
> Peter McWilliams, it's rather like two children playing with their
> toys. You may not like watching Johnny playing with his toy soldiers,
> but unless you are willing to tolerate his doing so, you have no right
> to offend HIS sensibilities by playing with your dolls. In short, if
> you want the right to live by your own moral standards you must, by
> necessity, allow others to do so as well.

I don't care if Johnny plays with his toy soldiers. I care if ham radio is ruined by obscenity, racism and even Kim's *wink-wink* humorous attempt at adverstising her sagging assets.

Freedom in our society has limits. That you don't like the limits imposed by the society is too bad. We are not an anarchic state.

> > Anything you do in public is...public.
>
> Ok, stop attending church. I find the position of the
> Christian Churches offensive in that they oppose freedom of choice and
> they attempt to influence laws that restrict my rights as a
> non-Christian who doesn't share their particular moral values. Since
> churches offend my sensibilities, either move them to places where I
> needn't see them or be exposed in any way to their influence, or
> eliminate them completely.
>
> How does the shoe fit now?

Your premise is ridiculous.

I don't attend church in the public square. I attend church in a church building. Don't like it? Don't show up. No fair peeking in the windows either.

> > If you'd like to assign yourself a secret
> >callsign, known only to you, it is fine with me.
>
> Really?
>
> I didn't know you supported freebanders (who do precisely
> that).
>
> Amazing!

Nope. You misundertand. If you actually use your secret callsign, it won't be a secret anymore. It'll be just for you. Enjoy it in private.

> >Isn't it funny that some will go to great lengths to offend in order to
> >prove a point that they "have a right" even while others have a right
> >not to be offended. Your lack of judgement or taste is only protected
> >to a point.
>
> As is your narrow minded attitude toward humor, sex, or the
> nature of human beings. Sorry, but to take Kim's call sign as anything
> other than what it is--light and innocent humor--is the mark of a sick
> mind.

The fact that I'm responding to your post demonstrates my sense of
humor. Not all humor is written on a restroom wall.

> Kim isn't the one who is going out of their way to be
> offensive--the people who set themselves up as judges of the morality
> of others are the ones doing that.

Trashy is as trashy does. Water seeks its own level.

Dave K8MN

789. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 01:34:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4eq9$h1t$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 23686

JJ wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
>
> > As is your narrow minded attitude toward humor, sex, or the
> > nature of human beings. Sorry, but to take Kim's call sign as anything
> > other than what it is--light and innocent humor--is the mark of a sick
> > mind.
> >
> > Kim isn't the one who is going out of their way to be
> > offensive--the people who set themselves up as judges of the morality
> > of others are the ones doing that.
>
> It is a matter of class and taste, some seem to never acquire
> either.

Right on the head.

790. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 01:36:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011116203656.06336.00000321@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 23687

>From: Jim Weir jim@rst-engr.com

>No, I misinterpreted two things about the picture. One, I couldn't get it
>through my head that the RF pulse could be so coincident with the "key off"
>pulse as to be totally misunderstood.
We actually had one other inquiry from a fellow who made the same mistake. In actuality, though, the on and off delays are only several milliseconds longer than typical rigs and they do not affect the on-the-air performance in any way I can picture. Keep in mind that they keying speed is about 60 wpm, chosen to represent a speed that allows us to show the rise and fall times and two dits on the screen.

> Two, if you look at the center of the oscilloscope face (where I generally make
> my measurements, as it is considered the most linear part of the screen) you will
> see "divisions" that are half as wide as the outer divisions.

Now I am really confused. The graticule markings on the screen are the same across the entire screen and the linearity is about 2% or so, if I remember Tektronix's spec. I feel quite comformable assuming the screen to be perfectly linear and making measurements at any point on the oscilloscope screen. Am I mis sunderstanding what you are saying?

>This caused a 2:1 misinterpretation in the data.

In what way? The screen is linear?

>When you say 10 ms/div, you really ought to say 10 ms/cm and there wouldn't
>have been the problem.

What are you calling a "division?" I was referring to the graticule markings on the screen, which correspond to 10 ms/cm or 10 ms/div, if one means "division" to mean the graticule markings that divide the scope screen into easily-read divisions.

>I don't think giving the test engineer the direction that more or less of the
>trigger ought to be shown. The easiest way to clear up confusion like this
>is to make the on/off keying pulse asymmetrical. That is, twice as long off as
>on, or some other ratio so that there can be no confusion about what waveforms go
>together.

I think that doing so would really confuse the issue, not help it. The way it is done now, one can draw quite a bit of visual conclusion just by looking at the dits -- if they are occupying about 50% of the time, one knows the rig

won't sound "choppy" on CW. If they are, as some rigs are, less than 25% keyed, one knows that the weighting will be weak at higher speeds, etc. The actual on and off times are secondary, so I would rather have the on/off time the same.

If you have any difficulty figuring out that the initial key closure corresponds to the first dit and the second key closure corresponds to the second dit, feel free to email me and I will be glad to help you interpret the published data.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

791. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 01:49:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4fnk$h1t$1@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 23688

Stagger Lee wrote:
>
> On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 00:52:14 -0800, Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote:
> : Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
> : shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
> :
> : ->> Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net
> : ->
> : ->
> : ->> ->The truth is a key does NOT close instantaneously. in fact, well before
> : ->> ->what would be presumed to be 'closure' there is an exchange of photons
> : ->> ->between the plates when they are in close proximity to each other.
> : ->
> : ->
> : ->Jim Weir wrote:
> : ->
> : ->> That's an interesting heresy.
> : ->
> : ->
> : ->Not heresy... physics...
> :
> : Well, since my degrees are in physics (count 'em, one, two, three, count'em
> : again) and I only choose to make my living as an engineer, I will respond this
> : way once, and once only...
> :
>
> As a matter of fact, simple electrodynamics will tell you that the
> electron density in each plate of the switch changes as the switch
> closes but still has no physical contact. Stated in simpler terms, the
> capacitance of the switch increases as its contacts approach one another,
> and that has a measurable effect on the circuit's electrons.
>
> Another way to look at it is in terms of a conduction band electron
> density shift, and such shifts can be explained in terms of particle
> exchange (e.g., phonons, magnetons, photons, etc.) depending upon the
> amount of energy involved.
>

None of which means didly beside the REAL effects of switch bounce.

> You'd better go back and get a refund from that degree mill ...

Youse guys can play around all you wish in theories and hypotheses, but
your keyboard is loaded with debouncing circuitry. No hall effect switch
to be found.

792. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:11:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4h0s$p51$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 23689

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 05:33:13 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Likewise, dear. Your character is everything I find unattractive in a
> >person. And, I am sure that our definitions of "fun" are diametrically
> >opposed. For instance, I would hardly take pleasure in being a kept woman.
>
> That's it, Kim, spoil all our illusions! :-(

Kim is practically all illusion.

793. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:13:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4h4h$p51$1@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 23690

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry Klose"
> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
>
> (N2EY wrote):
>
> >> FCC assigns callsigns sequentially but skips over certain callsigns
> >> because some people might not like them. The skipped calls can be
> >> bought via the vanity call program. That's what Kim did. Her callsign
> >> suffix is not sequentially issued by the FCC.
> > >
> > >I knew the FCC had certain callsign they would not issue.
> >
> > Yup.
> >
> > > I am also
> > >aware that if a licensee object to their callsign they request the
> > >issuance another. But the fact remains, the FCC issued W5TIT
> > >and are apparently they satisfied, but some still object.
> >
> > All it really means is that the FCC isn't going to be the guardian of good
> > taste in the choice of amateur callsigns.
> >
> > There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a society.

Yes, the issue of class and taste aside.

794. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:17:24 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5ca88$0$30976$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 23691

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com...
> Let's focus on JUST ONE aspect of the Morse Code testing controversy.
> (Remember: The testing requirement is the controversy, not Morse Code
> itself.)
>
> There is one important difference between Morse Code and other topics
> tested. I hope I can avoid all the other arguments that have been
> beaten to death 100 times per day every day. (I apologize if this
> argument has also been beaten to death. I have only sporadically read
> this newsgroup.)
>
> ONLY Morse Code has UNILATERAL pass/fail power under the current
> system of licensing HF operators. If you are completely ignorant
> about antennas and feedlines, you can still pass your written exams if
> you answer enough of the other questions correctly to earn a passing
> grade. For example, the Amateur Extra exam has 5 questions on this
> topic. If you only answer one question correctly (due to sheer blind
> luck), you can still pass if you answer 36 of the remaining 45
> questions correctly. The same applies for other sub-topics like
> receiver components, band privileges, operating practices,
> propagation, emergency communications, test equipment, and other
> areas.
>
> On the other hand, one MUST pass the Morse Code exam in order to
> upgrade to General and Amateur Extra, regardless of one's knowledge of
> other topics or performance on the written exams. Thus, Morse Code
> has the unilateral pass/fail power that NO other topic has.
>
> QUESTION: Does Morse Code testing deserve its unilateral pass/fail
> authority that no other topic has? If so, why?

No. The higher speed (13 & 20 wpm) code tests were unnecessary,
bad public policy and not in conformity 5 USC 706(2)(A). The FCC
dropped the 13 & 20 wpm tests in its 1999 License Restructuring
Decision, but retained the 5wpm test because of ITU rule S25.5.

ITU WRC 2003 meeting will delete rule S25.5, and national
administration will follow by deleting their domestic code test rules.

Larry KC8EPO

795. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:22:53 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuffj@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF51366.6ECE1AD9@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23692

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> And... a BIG difference between what's in bad taste and what's bad for a
> society... witness $50.00 'Ham Radio Badge' that someone is flogging.

Yeah, for just $59.95 you too can get your ham radio badge be the
envy of every 12 year old.

796. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:30:17 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5cd8f$0$30971$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 23693

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011112205541.18926.00001972@nso-fi.aol.com...
> In article <f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com>,
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>
> >QUESTION: Does Morse Code testing deserve its unilateral pass/fail
> >authority that no other topic has?
>
> Yes, it does.
>
> >If so, why?
>
> Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
> efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
> amateurs -- and this mode has many unique functional characterists which
> cannot be exploited without operators trained in the use of the Morse
Code.
> History has proven that it is code *testing* which ultimately results in
the
> vast majority of code *usage* on the amateur bands. Without the testing,
the
> ability
> to exploit the many benefits and advantages of this mode will eventually
be
> lost within the ARS. Therefore, this mode deserves special consideration
in
> the
> license testing process. And a mere 5 WPM doesn't cut it. A minimum of a
12
> WPM code test should be required for full amateur HF operating privileges.

Not only has the above argument been beaten to death many times
over, it is one of the classics among the empty, meaningless whines
of the PCTA (Pro-Code Test Advocates). The FCC rejected all of the
PCTA's arguments in its 1999 License Restucturing Decision.

Larry KC8EPO

797. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:37:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmx26r4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23695

On 16 Nov 2001 14:06:10 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>> In the '50s the New Haven had some hybrid locomotives built for
>> passenger service into/out of Grand Central Terminal in New York by
>> EMD/General Motors.
>
>FL-9s. Looked like E-8s with third rail shoes.

'Cept that they had 2-axle leading trucks and 3-axle trailing
trucks.

>> They drew power from electric third rail
>> (nominally 750 V DC) until White Plains whereupon they used the
>> diesel engine to generate the DC. They are still in use, as are
>> several modern General Electric-built Genesis locomotives (same
>> scheme) used by AMTRAK on the Albany-Penn Station (NY) portion
>> of the Lake Shore Limited.
>
>The Turboliners have third rail shoes, too.

It's good to see that they somehow solved the problem of switching
on the fly, which the FL-9s could never do without tearing something
up.
>
>When Grand Central was built at the turn of the century, the New York
>Central tried to run steamers in the tunnels. A fire convinced the
>city fathers to enact an ordinance forbidding the use of steam engines
>underground, so the
>railroad electrified as far north as Harmon and used electric locos.

IIRC when the FL-9s were pretty well worn out (1980s) the engine
crews would keep the diesel running all the way down into the
hole in fear that they wouldn't restart and the air in GCT was
the highest smog zone in the US.....

OnTopic - when I rode the Lake Shore Limited from CHI to NYP in the
summer of 2000, there were two other hams working 2-m railroad
mobile as well. It is rare that I ride an AMTRAK run that does not
have another ham as well.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

798. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:37:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmx2mc5.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23694

On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 23:18:42 GMT, Richard McCollum wrote:

>The main Post Office in St. Louis is built along a tunnel that runs from
>Eads Bridge to (old) Union Station.

In 1988 I had the opportunity to make an inspection of the AMTRAK
trackside area west of NY's Penn Station and saw that the chutes
which dumped mail sacks from the Main Post Office across the street
to trackside where the Railroad Post Office cars used to stand are
still there. Mail sacks from the RPOs to the PO went up by a
screw-conveyor system, long since removed.

That area has been electrified for most of the 20th Century.

> I remember the old C&NW beltline in OMA. The Northwestern was one of the
>last to convert to diesel. I have no clue where they got their coal but it
>smelled like every two-holer I have ever been in.

High-sulfur bituminous. I wonder whether there is a market for that
in the US any more.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

799. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:40:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4imm$2ti$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 23696

N2EY wrote:
>
Can anyone besides me identify the equipment
> depicted on the badge?

That's a Hallicrafters SX71 receiver on the left. The rest don't look
very specific to me.

Dick

800. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:40:28 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <w6kJ7.189144$W8.6947795@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23697

"Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:3bf5ca88$0$30976$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net...
>
> "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com...
> > Let's focus on JUST ONE aspect of the Morse Code testing controversy.
> > (Remember: The testing requirement is the controversy, not Morse Code
> > itself.)
> >
>
> ITU WRC 2003 meeting will delete rule S25.5, and national
> administration will follow by deleting their domestic code test rules.
>
> Larry KC8EPO
>

Snip liberally applied.

Larry, Jason, get off your sophomoric kiesters and get it done. Get your pride out of the way, get your gonads out of the way, get it done. It is not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get to do something you do not believe makes any sense.

We all recognize this discussion for what it is, the whining of two brats wanting it handed to them. You might be right, you might be wrong but adults do their bitching when they have earned the right to do so.

I suspect you will get to wait another decade. It is not even on the discussion agenda for 2003.

Dick N&#65533;BK

801. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:49:33 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d216$0$30970$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 23699

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011113014036.25429.00002150@nso-fc.aol.com...
> In article <9sq6ak02l1j@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20011112205541.18926.00001972@nso-fi.aol.com...
> >> Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
> >> efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
> >
> >Walking is a universal and efficient form of transportation, but one
doesn't
> >have to prove they can walk in order to get a driver's license. Nor
should
> >one have to show high-speed code skills in order to use a microphone.
>
> Typical no-coder response: Compare the Morse code testing requirements
> to something with no comparable characteristics; i.e. driver's licensing
> requirements. However, I'm sure you've seen this argument used
> before, and re-using a stale, old, useless argument is a lot easier than
> coming up with something original. And, *ease* is what this is all about,
> from your point-of-view.

FCC did not agree in its 1999 License Restructuring Decision. To wit:

25. Decision. We have considered the comments on this issue and conclude
that the public interest will best be served by reducing the telegraphy
examination requirement to the minimum requirement that we have found that
meets the Radio Regulations and that has been accepted as proving that the
control operator of a station can ensure the proper operation of that
station. To achieve this result, we will amend Section 97.501 of our Rules
to eliminate the requirement that an individual demonstrate 13 wpm and 20
wpm proficiency in telegraphy before qualifying for any amateur radio
operator license. In reaching this decision, we note that one of the
fundamental purposes underlying our Part 97 rules is to accommodate the
amateur radio operator's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of
the radio art. We believe that an individual's ability to demonstrate
increased Morse code proficiency is not necessarily indicative of that
individual's ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art. As
a result, we find that such a license qualification rule is not in
furtherance of the purpose of the amateur service and we do not believe that
it continues to serve a regulatory purpose. Consistent with our decision to
eliminate 13 wpm and 20 wpm Morse code proficiency as licensing
requirements, we also are streamlining Section 97.503(b) of our Rules to

reduce the number of telegraphy examination elements from three to one -- specifically, a 5 wpm telegraphy examination. We also conclude that, due to the Radio Regulations, we can not grant the request of the ARRL that we authorize privilege on all amateur service bands below 30 MHz to Technician Class licensees who have not passed a telegraphy examination. While we do not disagree with the ARRL's belief that the best way to learn telegraphy is to use it on-the-air, and that actual use of telegraphy to communicate is proof of the ability to send and receive telegraphic texts, the Radio Regulations provide that the telegraphy requirement may be waived only for an operator of a station transmitting exclusively on frequencies above 30 MHz. In this regard, we also note, as the ARRL states, that the Radio Regulations remain an obligation of the Commission that can not be waived.

26. When considering the issue of telegraphy as an examination requirement to obtain an amateur radio operator license, we begin with a number of general principles. First, the Radio Regulations contain certain requirements that an applicant for an amateur radio license must satisfy. With regard to the telegraphy requirement specifically, the Radio Regulations require that persons seeking a license to operate an amateur radio station must prove that they have the ability to send correctly by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in Morse code telegraphy signals. The Radio Regulations also provide that this requirement may be waived only for an operator of a station transmitting exclusively on frequencies above 30 MHz. In order to comply with the Radio Regulations, our rules require that every class of amateur radio operator license that authorizes privileges below 30 MHz has, as one of the examination elements that an applicant is required to pass or otherwise receive credit for, a telegraphy examination element. The other principles that we consider relevant to examination requirements are that those requirements pertain to the privileges the operator license authorizes and that they constitute the minimum requirements necessary to demonstrate that the control operator of a station can ensure the proper operation of that station.

27. Few issues coming before us present such a clear dichotomy of viewpoints as does the issue of the appropriate telegraphy examination requirements for an individual to qualify for an amateur radio license. Many of the comments we have received, including comments from groups of amateur radio operators and individual amateur radio operators, support reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a license qualification requirement. Other comments contend that any significant reduction of telegraphy examination requirements will be detrimental to the amateur service while providing no long term benefits. In fact, some commenters suggest that a reservoir of operators proficient at the higher Morse code speeds is a public interest benefit and should be encouraged through our Rules.

28. As mentioned above, in the Notice, we asked whether, in the context of the amateur radio operator licensing system and in view of the technologies that amateur radio operators use to communicate today, three telegraphy proficiency levels remain relevant to today's communications practices. We also asked whether we should add elements to the written examination to

ensure a working knowledge of the newer digital technologies, were we to reduce the required Morse code elements. Some commenters state that the current licensing structure overemphasizes the importance of manual telegraphy. Similarly, the ARRL states, "... the current examination structure places a strong emphasis on demonstrating Morse code proficiency, while not requiring demonstrated proficiency in more technically advanced communications techniques". Further, the ARRL states that "telegraphy should not be overemphasized to the exclusion of other operating modes [in the examination system]". Mr. Samuels notes that communications has divided into many different modes, and each one has its own technology and technical requirements. NCVECs and others agree with our assessment that the role of Morse code is decreasing in modern communications. Kenwood states that licensing of persons because they are proficient in Morse code is inconsistent with encouraging those interested in modern telecommunications to join the ranks of amateurs and become skilled in the technical sciences. Another commenter states that potential recruits to the Amateur Radio Service consider the telegraphy requirement archaic and quickly lose interest in becoming amateur radio operators. Many individual commenters also agree that Morse code proficiency is not relevant to modern communications practices and technologies. Other commenters state that the Morse code requirement exists only as a roadblock to prevent current and possible amateur operators from obtaining worldwide frequency privileges or have been used to control access to the HF amateur radio bands. Mr. Robert H. Stephens states that although he passed the 5 wpm examination, he uses telegraphy less than five percent of the time.

29. On the other hand, several commenters equate passing a telegraphy examination to the type of on-the-air operator a licensee will be, proof of skill level, or emergency communication capabilities. Kenwood, however, states that Morse code telecommunications is not a skill used often in emergency communications or disaster relief any longer. Other comments express a personal preference for exchanging messages with other amateur radio stations using telegraphy. While Kenwood agrees with these observations, it states, however, they are not a sufficient justification for keeping Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement. Courage HANDI-HAM System agrees that while Morse code is fun to use and retains a following in the amateur community, it is no longer essential to HF communications.

30. Based on our review of the record, we are not persuaded by the arguments of those commenters opposing reduction or elimination of the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a license requirement in the amateur service. To the extent that these commenters put forth arguments premised on personal preference or concerns regarding on-the-air etiquette amongst amateur radio operators, we reiterate pronouncements made in the Codeless Technician Decision. In that decision, the Commission stated that passing a telegraphy examination, for regulatory purposes, is no more and no less than proof of the examinee's ability to send and receive text in Morse code at some specified rate. Additionally, it addressed the issue of personal preference for telegraphy and claims that passing a Morse code examination would make for a better operator by stating:

We do not concur with the comments alleging that the passing of a telegraphy examination is an indication of the examinee's good character, high intelligence, cooperative demeanor, or willingness to comply with our rules. These traits are also found in individuals who have not passed a telegraphy examination rather that being exclusive to those who have passed such a test. With respect to comments that make claims for the superiority of telegraphy over other types of communications, we do not consider these arguments as germane to this proceeding. The Notice did not propose to discontinue the authorization of telegraphy CW emission types on any amateur service frequency. The amateur service in the future, as it has in the past, can provide to those who personally desire to do so the opportunity to communicate by telegraphy.

We are persuaded that because the amateur service is fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service. We note, moreover, that the design of modern communications systems, including personal communication services, satellite, fiber optic, and high definition television systems, are based on digital communication technologies. We also note that no communication system has been designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast, modern communication systems are designed to be automated systems. Given the changes that have occurred in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise.

31. We also find unconvincing the argument that telegraphy proficiency is one way to keep amateur radio operators ready to be of service in an emergency. In this regard, we note that most emergency communication today is performed using either voice, data, or video modes. We also note that most amateur radio operators who choose to provide emergency communication do so, according to the amateur radio press, using voice or digital modes of communication, in part, because information can be exchanged much faster using these other modes of communication. Further, we note that in traditional emergency services, such as police, fire, and rescue, there is no requirement that emergency service personnel hold amateur radio licenses or any other license that requires telegraphy proficiency. We conclude, therefore, that telegraphy proficiency is not a significant factor in determining an individual's ability to provide or be prepared to provide emergency communications.

32. The Notice also asked whether we should continue to have three different telegraphy examination standards or whether the telegraphy standard should be reduced to one or two telegraphy examination elements -- and, if so, what the required speed(s) should be. Numerous commenters support a reduction in the number of telegraphy elements from three to one. These commenters disagree, however, regarding what the required telegraphy speed should be. Some commenters state that the only telegraphy speed should be 5 wpm. Other commenters express a preference for a speed of

seven wpm, or the lowest speed allowed by international agreement. Mr. Holton E. Harris states, however, that reducing the Morse code element to a single 5 wpm examination trivializes it to the point that there is no longer a meaningful examination requirement and, thus, it might as well be eliminated.

33. Some commenters support retaining the present 5, 13, and 20 wpm telegraphy examination requirements or increasing the telegraphy requirements for obtaining a FCC-issued amateur service license. Other commenters suggest that we revise the telegraphy examination requirements so that they sunset if the Radio Regulations are revised in year 2001 to eliminate the requirement that an amateur radio operator demonstrate the ability to send by hand and receive by ear texts in the Morse code. Another option advanced in the comments is to reduce the number of telegraphy examination elements from three to two. The American Radio Relay League suggests that we substitute a 12 wpm telegraphy examination for both the 20 wpm telegraphy examination currently required for the Amateur Extra Class operator license and the 13 wpm telegraphy examination currently required for the Advanced Class operator licenses. It also suggests that we reduce the telegraphy requirement for a General Class operator license to 5 wpm, and requests that we authorize privilege below 30 MHz to Technician Class licensees who have not passed a telegraphy examination. Numerous other comments agree that the telegraphy requirement for the General Class operator license should be only a 5 wpm telegraphy examination, while others suggest other proficiency requirements for telegraphy examination elements.

34. We have considered the comments on this issue and conclude that the required speed for the telegraphy examination element should be 5 wpm. In this connection, we note that this is the minimum telegraphy speed that has been required for the Novice Class operator license since 1951, and is the minimum telegraphy proficiency that must be demonstrated by a Technician Class licensee to be authorized HF privileges. Because both of these classes of operator licenses authorizes HF privileges, 5 wpm is a speed that the Commission has found sufficient to meet the requirement of the Radio Regulations, and the slowest telegraphy speed in the amateur service examination system. We believe that, consistent with our decision to reduce the number of telegraphy elements from three to one, we also should use the least burdensome requirement, the 5 wpm requirement, as the standard for that element.

35. Likewise, we will not revise the rules so that the telegraphy examination requirement automatically sunsets if the Radio Regulations are revised to eliminate a mandatory telegraphy proficiency requirement. In this regard, we do not believe that it would be prudent, at this time, to premise the resolution of this issue on decisions to be made at the next World Radio Conference (WRC), particularly given that it is uncertain whether the WRC will actually address this issue. We also note that the International Amateur Radio Union Administrative Council has stated that it opposes changing the Radio Regulations to reduce the minimum international qualifications for an amateur radio license, making the potential changes to

this Radio Regulation even more uncertain.

802. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:49:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmx3ee6.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23698

On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 02:22:53 GMT, JJ wrote:

>Yeah, for just $59.95 you too can get your ham radio badge be the
>envy of every 12 year old.

But it doesn't have the Secret Decoder Wheel nor glow in the dark
like my Captain Midnight badge did when I was 10 years old.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

803. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:56:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d277_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23700

I have a passion for honesty, forthrightness, and sincerity. Your apology
is graciously accepted and my respect for you returns as it was.

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:3jmavto4obfionsmbrcvu84u84d035ipq9@4ax.com...
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
> ->Jim, not that Richard is right or wrong--but your response makes it
sound as
> ->though your degree means more than the knowledge or intellect on the
> ->subject. Not that it matters to you...but a whole lot of people
wouldn't
> ->get past that and give you half a minute of time...
>
> Kim --
>
> You are precisely correct. Rather than counter with a learned discussion,
I
> took the frustration of putting 5 sixteen hour days back to back and took
the
> easy way out.
>
> My apologies. The answer should have come from intellect and not from
emotion.
>
> Jim
> Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

804. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 02:58:54 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d447$0$30976$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 23752

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0111140726.32ce5cf@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20011113080316.23850.00000449@nso-fy.aol.com>...
> >
> > You miss a ery important fact, Jason. The separate, unilateral Morse
test is
> > there because international treaty requires it.
>
> True, but this element in the treaty may be struck down in 2003.

Correct. Both IARU and ARRL have changed their positions, and now
support the deletion of the ITU S25.5 rule. It is general agreed that
WRC 2003 will delete the rule.

Jason, if you would like more information, go to No-Code International
web site at http://www.nocode.org/

Larry KC8EPO

805. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:00:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d336_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23751

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF52207.953F8E90@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 20:23:17 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Oh, no, not at all. I don't mind a bit someone telling me I am
offensive to
> > >them. What really bothers me is the presumption that their morality
must be
> > >everyone else's! Larry has the perfect right to his opinion, and
perfect it
> > >is (the right). He really does even have the right to say all the
things he
> > >says. He *thinks* he has some kind of empowerment over me to make me
mad or
> > >feel guilt, or feel something, anything over the things he says
directed at
> > >me. Again, I feel nothing other than contempt for someone who believes
his
> > >morality should be everyone else's.
> >
> > There are _far_ too many such people in our country. I'm one
> > of those odd-balls who believe that morality is a personal
> > decision--if your actions don't harm the person or property of a
> > non-consenting individual (or, of course, a child), it's no one's
> > business to judge you or your values.
>
> Sez you. How about your actions offending the sensibilities of another?
> What you do in the privacy of your domain is one thing. Anything you do
> in public is...public. If you'd like to assign yourself a secret
> callsign, known only to you, it is fine with me.
>
> > Isn't it funny how some hams seem to be committed to policing
> > the ars to insure that all of us adhere to THEIR personal values? I'll
> > bet it cooks Larry to know that "Nudenet" exists on HF and is composed
> > of nudist/naturist hams who choose to share their interests on the
> > air--and, of course, in group get-togethers. If it bothers him to see
> > the "TIT" in your call sign, imagine how he'd feel if . . .
>
> Isn't it funny that some will go to great lengths to offend in order to
> prove a point that they "have a right" even while others have a right
> not to be offended. Your lack of judgement or taste is only protected

> to a point.
>
> Dave K8MN

Sometimes one ends up on the wrong side of freedom (rights). That is its gift.

Kim W5TIT

806. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:02:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d3d1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23753

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF523CA.7D551E27@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Likewise, dear. Your character is everything I find unattractive in a
> > person. And, I am sure that our definitions of "fun" are diametrically
> > opposed. For instance, I would hardly take pleasure in being a kept
woman.
>
> This is certainly beginning to sound Freudian, Kim. You made the
> comment, not I. Now you've added this "kept woman" thing. I've
> certainly not mentioned, thought or written at any time, anything about
> wanting you or making you into a kept woman. I like my women taller,
> thinner and less "in your face". I'm married to the only woman who
> interests me. I will accept your disdain for my type to be a compliment
> and you comment about the differences in our concepts of fun to reflect
> upon my good judgement. You'll also note that I don't refer to you as
> "dear".
>
> Dave K8MN

You strike as a man who "keeps" women, Dave...what can I say? You are
absolutely correct, though. You did not refer to me as "dear." I just get
real nervous about calling you Tugboat...as I don't wish to give you any
impressions of what I might tug on. You'd quite believe what goes on in my
mind as you type "Tugboat" to me... ;)

Kim W5TIT

807. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:04:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d44a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23754

I assure you, Joe, there are many, and more, reliable sources for traffic information in Dallas. One is CB. And, on CB it is OK to "key up" and make those one way transmissions...

Kim W5TIT

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message news:3BBF8B2E1E21EBF9.42E4E19303F4AA76.87407198867B6A0A@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 20:14:55 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >To each his own, Krell. I absolutely can't STAND people talking about
> >traffic on the air--that is about as CBish as it can get--
>
> No...it could get a lot more fucking CBish if the fuckheads were
> jacking their motherfucking jaws about the goddamned traffic, 10-4?
>
> OTOH, since 2m FM is primarily used mobile around here, traffic is
> relevant to most of its users. In Dallas, it's pretty much the only
> reliable source, too.
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

808. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:06:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d4a3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23755

Wow, Joe. How grown up. You fit right in on the '88 machine, I bet...

Kim W5TIT

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:5B1B800944878DDE.5F53337215D5978B.CBC2CE2B0F9879C8@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 20:52:57 -0500, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>
> >Foxtrot uniform kilowatt
> >foxtrot uniform charlie
> >Kilowatt (any number) uniform november tango
> >Kilowatt uniform (any number) november tango
> >Kilowatt zero charlie kilowatt
> >November zero oscar kilowatt yankee
> >Kilowatt tango one tango
> >November tango one tango
> >whiskey tango one tango
>
> _B1TCH
> _P1SSY
>
> Though for raw un-PC-ness, November One Golf Golf Romeo would probably
> do it.
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

809. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:11:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d5f0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23756

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:005998E0F57273C6.A309FDFFEA985559.9A07640D262507F7@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 13:15:49 -0500, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>
> >Do they operate SSTV (slow scan television)? :-)
>
> (Why did I know someone was going to ask that?)
>
> Actually, as far as I know, no they don't. I don't participate
> in the net (from a personal perspective, _talking_ about nude
> activities just doesn't interest me that much--and it would seem kind
> of silly to strip to operate my station :-).
>
> 73 de KE8HH, Rick
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

All right, all right...one more innuendo and then I am out...LOL

Your comment above re: stripping to operate your station? That would give a whole new meaning to the "sticky key" concept, eh? (Just watch out for an open mic).

Ok, gahbye,

Kim W5TIT :o

810. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:17:05 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <REkJ7.189341$W8.6950818@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23757

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gmx3ee6.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 02:22:53 GMT, JJ wrote:
>
> >Yeah, for just $59.95 you too can get your ham radio badge be the
> >envy of every 12 year old.
>
> But it doesn't have the Secret Decoder Wheel nor glow in the dark
> like my Captain Midnight badge did when I was 10 years old.....
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

But the secret message on the badge is not 'Drink more Ovaltine'

811. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:17:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d752_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23758

WOW!!! Not just because of the source for the subject, Well said, Rick.
Tell ya what, you get whatever vanity callsign you think sounds good for you
and what you'd have fun with and, if you ever run for political office, I'll
vote for ya--given that I'm able!

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:41E70F5BED997191.E27ECE6B7248A9A0.E7B8A5DC7500B0C9@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 14:30:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Sez you. How about your actions offending the sensibilities of another?
>
> I'll make you a deal. If you agree not to offend MY
> sensibilities, I'll agree not to offend yours.
>
> BTW, mine include the public practice or promotion of
> Christian religion, prejudice, hypocrisy, and voting Republican! :-)
>
> Since you believe my actions should not offend your
> sensibilities, I assume you are willing to avoid ALL of these offenses
> to MY sensibilities, right?
>
> Or are YOUR values somehow more relevant than mine?
>
> >What you do in the privacy of your domain is one thing.
>
> Tell that to the morality cops! In many states consensual
> sexual activities between MARRIED couples are illegal, in 37 states
> homosexual activities between consenting adults in private are
> illegal, and in every state the government bans nudity on PRIVATE
> property (i.e., nudist clubs, etc.). "Swing clubs" which involve
> activities only concerning consenting adults in a private setting are
> illegal (and commonly raided), many communities ban adult businesses
> which are frequented only by consenting adults. Obviously, these are
> only a few of the many possible examples.
>
> Given that the state insists that it has the right to tell
> people what is or is not moral for us to do, it's unreasonable to
> expect anyone to avoid doing something (such as choosing a call sign
> that you don't personally like) that is NOT illegal. It isn't our
> responsibility to investigate the sensibilities of others if the state
> has chosen to make those decisions for us.
>

> More importantly, we live in a free society, at least
> theoretically, if not in fact. That means, basically, that we all have
> to agree to accept the differences that exist between us and to
> tolerate behaviors that _may_ offend our sensibilities. To paraphrase
> Peter McWilliams, it's rather like two children playing with their
> toys. You may not like watching Johnny playing with his toy soldiers,
> but unless you are willing to tolerate his doing so, you have no right
> to offend HIS sensibilities by playing with your dolls. In short, if
> you want the right to live by your own moral standards you must, by
> necessity, allow others to do so as well.
>
> > Anything you do in public is...public.
>
> Ok, stop attending church. I find the position of the
> Christian Churches offensive in that they oppose freedom of choice and
> they attempt to influence laws that restrict my rights as a
> non-Christian who doesn't share their particular moral values. Since
> churches offend my sensibilities, either move them to places where I
> needn't see them or be exposed in any way to their influence, or
> eliminate them completely.
>
> How does the shoe fit now?
>
> > If you'd like to assign yourself a secret
> >callsign, known only to you, it is fine with me.
>
> Really?
>
> I didn't know you supported freebanders (who do precisely
> that).
>
> Amazing!
>
> >Isn't it funny that some will go to great lengths to offend in order to
> >prove a point that they "have a right" even while others have a right
> >not to be offended. Your lack of judgement or taste is only protected
> >to a point.
>
> As is your narrow minded attitude toward humor, sex, or the
> nature of human beings. Sorry, but to take Kim's call sign as anything
> other than what it is--light and innocent humor--is the mark of a sick
> mind.
>
> Kim isn't the one who is going out of their way to be
> offensive--the people who set themselves up as judges of the morality
> of others are the ones doing that.
>
> KE8HH, Rick
>
> --

>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

812. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:18:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d77b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23759

Echo? De ja vu? JJ seems to be trying to make a point...

Kim W5TIT

"JJ" <radiobuffj@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3BF4DBEF.8AF4130B@mailcity.net...
>
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
>
>
> > As is your narrow minded attitude toward humor, sex, or the
> > nature of human beings. Sorry, but to take Kim's call sign as anything
> > other than what it is--light and innocent humor--is the mark of a sick
> > mind.
> >
> > Kim isn't the one who is going out of their way to be
> > offensive--the people who set themselves up as judges of the morality
> > of others are the ones doing that.
>
> It is a matter of class and taste, some seem to never acquire
> either.

813. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:19:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d7bc_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23760

Cec...is that Len using Dave's name? ;o

Kim W5TIT

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Now you'd have us believe that your area is the whole South or the
whole
> > > U.S.
> >
> > On the contrary, I said I don't know how it was except in Small Southern
> > Town, USA. If you would read my postings instead of just emoting, you
> > wouldn't
> > embarrass yourself like that. You know absolutely nothing about what
> > happened
> > in my home town yet you present yourself as an expert on my home town.
> > You
> > can start to redeem yourself by telling me how many traffic lights we
> > have.
>
> You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
> Town, USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the
> status of expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition,
> I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
>
> > > Can you come up with any verifiable facts to support your claim or are
you
> > > just blowing smoke?
> >
> > I commuted to Sam Houston State Teacher's College with a black lady
> > while
> > I was obtaining my Texas Teaching Certificate. She was getting one also
> > along with a Master's Degree. She was a superior person with a high IQ.
> > She could not get a teaching job in Madison County so she got one in
> > Harris
> > County. Affirmative Action later allowed her to move back to her home
> > town
> > and teach. Incompetent white teachers were let go and competent black
> > teachers
> > were hired. Left to the tyranny of the white majority, that would not
> > have

> > happened even with the civil rights law in place. My low-IQ cousin, who
> > had
> > flunked out of Texas A&M, was one of the teachers who was let go. He was
> > teaching his students that transistors were made out of geranium.
>
> So we have only your wild tales as proof. Tyranny of the white majority
> indeed. Perhaps you can entertain us with tales of your cousin's work
> in seminole conductors.
>
> Dave K8MN

814. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:28:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5d9f2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23761

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF5B461.6867E631@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Opinions are like a$$holes, Dave, and it looks like that's where some
> > of yours come from. I find it interesting that you profess to know more
> > about my home town than I do. Someday you need to demonstrate your
> > crystal
> > ball for us (after wiping it off, of course).
>
>
> I guess my knowledge base is larger, Cecil. I've lived in the Midwest,
> and the South along with some of Europe and much of Africa. You talk
> about what you can from your limited perspective.
>

Hmmm, two of the three geographical locations you mention about, Davey Dear, are not under the jurisdiction of the Affirmative Action laws of the United States. So, exactly in what way is two of the three locations you mention above (i.e., 66% of your submission) relevant to the discussion?

>
> If you choose to believe that Affirmative Action lowered no standards
> and did not cost more qualified whites jobs,
>

Wouldn't *some* level of balance be desirable. You point up that Affirmative Action did not cost more qualified whites' jobs (apostrophe added), yet--what happens when there is *no* affirmative action? More qualified blacks, hispanics, etc., are not even *considered* for the job.

>
> stay with your pet theory.
> Maybe you'll be able to find a way to rationalize why the program was
> dismantled.
>

Davey Dear...please think of something other than slanted comments to efficiently argue your case. You are making Cecil's point (at least to affirmative action), i.e., you demonstrate the irony of the whole situation.

>
> In the mean time, your analogy between Affirmative Action and morse
> testing is just as poor as it was when first stated by you.
>
> Dave K8MN

Things that happen in real life across different disciplines aren't just analogies, Dave, they are real examples of *attitudes* that proliferate and begin to affect the ways in which we approach many things. Getting burnt on the stove top doesn't preclude my making the same assumption about heat from *any* source.

Kim W5TIT

PS--next thing ya know we'll be arguing now over campfires

815. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:32:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011116223232.14773.00001317@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23763

In article <3BF56865.2060403@att.net>, Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
writes:

>
>Rich
>
>(I'd use my nickname but I might offend Larry) ;-)

Rich:

Hey, I'm not here to tell you which nickname to use! As long as
your last name isn't "Head," you shouldn't get too many snickers!

73 de Larry, K3LT
As opposed to Snickers

816. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:32:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011116223232.14773.00001318@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23764

In article <3bf3a81e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Nope, I sure don't say my callsign like that on the air. It would be
>illegal. Since you didn't caution me on that, I presume that you didn't
>know that. Many others don't know that, either. So, I suppose I should
>guess--as you did with me--that you talk on the air just like you do in your
>posts?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Not really, Kim. I hardly "talk" on-the-air at all. On Tuesday night, I had my first QSO on the local repeater in over two months -- and that was just because I was on my way to the radio club meeting! Last time I "talked" on HF was during Field Day '99. I was control op for a SSB station during JOTA '98 and '99, but then, a bunch of kids were doing all the "talking." If it wern't for that type of thing, I'd probably just sell my HF microphone.

73 de Larry, K3LT

817. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:32:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011116223234.14773.00001320@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23762

In article <3BF36000.2A5DC04D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is *patently*
>> objectionable!
>
>Still seeing dirty pictures in those ink blots, Larry?

Still seeing pink elephants, Cecil?

73 de Larry, K3LT

818. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:32:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011116223234.14773.00001319@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23766

In article <20011115080316.24612.00000632@nso-cr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>> Then, to stop, they are put in generator-braking
>>mode, and actually create more electricity as they decelerate. What
>>an extraordinarily efficient system!
>
>Yup. Plus they use electricity generated by any method available - coal, oil,
>hydro, nuclear, etc. Reduces/eliminates dependence on imported oil.
>
>What was the price of gasoline in those countries?

When I was stationed in Germany and England in the mid-'80's
to early '90's, a liter of gasoline averaged a buck and change…
roughly $5/gal.

>>I have a feeling that the only reason we're not using more hybrid
>>vehicles is because the oil companies would see all their profits go
>>out the window -- and they'd have to be selling fuel at 50 cents a
>>gallon to consumers with vehicles that got 75 MPG. Where is the
>>outrage?
>
>Hybrid drive is not the answer to that problem. The efficiency of road
>vehicles
>will not be tripled or quadrupled by it. Vehicles like the Insight also use
>batteries and every weight-reducing trick available.
>
>Look up the Volkswagen TDI and see what kind of efficieny is available today
>in
>midsized production cars.

Oh, I'm a big believer in diesel engines, I make my living driving vehicles
powered by the Ford Powerstroke Diesel and whatever diesel they're
using in '97 GMC full-sized vans. As big and heavy as our Paratransit
busses are, they'll walk away from 95% of the vehicles sitting next to
them when the light goes green!

>The real problem in this country is that the market has long demanded big
>heavy
>inefficient vehicles and all but ignored smaller, more efficient ones. Even
>at
>$1.50/gallon, the cost of fuel is not a major consideration to most new car
>buyers. A car that gets 15 MPG and is driven 15,000 miles/yr costs $1500 to
>fuel at $1.50/gallon. Doubling the MPG to 30 saves only $750/yr.

Well, since September of 2000, I've been driving a vehicle that gets up to 40 MPG -- city and highway *average!* I, for one, am perfectly happy to not be shelling out twice the gas money my old '91 Taurus was consuming!

>How many SUVs do you see on the road being used as commuting vehicles, with >just one person in each? How many of them NEVER go off-road? Where is the >outrage?
>
>The USA could reduce or even eliminate our dependence on imported oil by >adopting more efficient transportation. We could have efficient surface >transportation systems that would make the Euros look shabby. But it's not >fashionable here yet.

Ordinarily, I'm against taxing things for the sake of taxing them, but I think I
could make an exception for the smartly-dressed woman driving all by her lonesome in a Lincoln Navigator I saw today. I think that she, and others like her, should have to swipe her credit card in a slot just to open the door of the damn thing! She wasn't getting anywhere any faster or with any more safety or comfort than she could in a Lexus sedan which costs the same money and gets twice the fuel economy! When people make stupid choices, they should pay out the nose for the privilege!

73 de Larry, K3LT

819. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:32:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011116223236.14773.00001321@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23767

In article <C16804890B463D02.200CB93DA2C480C5.0A7E898C8E2C0B78@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is *patently*
>>objectionable!
>
> No, Larry, it is only objectionable to _some_ people.

Rick:

It would be interesting if the ARRL would conduct a poll, in QST and/or
their website, to find out just what hams really *do* think of the
availability of callsigns that spell out certain words of a sexually or
scatologically implicit nature.

> Personally, I don't find it the least offensive--on the other
>hand, I'm not a prude.

Then fear not -- your liberal credentials are fully intact. I'm sure
nobody will accuse of being "closed minded." Just remember --
an open mind is usually caused by an inability to think
independently of the crowd you wish to follow.

>>I'm sure that kind of thing happens, but since I know how to use CW and a
>>handful of digital modes, I generally don't run into that type of on-the-air
>>behavior.
>
> Are you _seriously_ claiming that people who use digital modes
>don't use obscenities?

Not in my own personal experience.

> We must be members of two different amateur radio services!

Could be. The one I belong to is regulated by the FCC, and represented
in the United States by the American Radio Relay League. To which one
do you belong?

>>So…which is it, Kim? *No* overt comments, or only *occasional* overt
>>comments? I suggest that it is exactly this type of confusion which caused
>you
>>to make the poor choice of selecting that callsign in the first place!
>
> She isn't confused Larry--just tired of self-appointed censors
>and prudes telling her she is offensive to THEM!

I thought it was my right to do so! Are you now saying that it isn't? If so, are you trying to control my speech just because I'm saying something with which you don't agree? Perhaps, then, I should refer to you as "Comrade Rick?"

>>I think that before you do that, you'd better take a close look at who
>>decided to choose a sexually provocative callsign which is demeaning to
>>hams in general, and female hams in particular!
>
> Demeaning to hams in general, Larry?
>
> I find being associated with self-righteous prudes FAR more
>demeaning to me than the existence of any "risque" call sign could
>ever make me feel.

So, my objection to Kim's callsign, which is my right, makes me a "self-righteous prude?" Hmmm. Well, I guess I've been called worse things!

>>Kim dear, you're the last one who would be qualified to make judgements
>>about other people's "respect" for themselves or others. If you had any,
>you
>>wouldn't have selected your callsign in the first place, or, at the very
>least,
>>would endeavor to change it with all due dispatch.
>
> Why--because it doesn't meet YOUR standards?

No, because her callsign, and the attitude it represents, offends the standards of behavior characteristic of a society based on politeness, consideration, and respect for ourselves and others.

> So what?

If you have to ask that particular question, you would never understand the answer.

>>Again, you are not the one to be making such statements. In case you
>haven't
>>noticed, *you* are the Captain of a burning, sinking ship. If I were you,
>I'd
>>be looking for a life raft! I'm sure you can find one at the ULS web site!
>
> She's not sinking, Larry. She's demonstrating
>independence--something the morality police fear more than anything
>else (except, perhaps, the elimination of cw testing!).

Hmmm -- the "morality police" vs. the "immorality Taliban." Now, that would make for an interesting battle, indeed!

73 de Larry, K3LT

820. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:32:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011116223237.14773.00001322@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23765

In article <3BF52207.953F8E90@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>> Isn't it funny how some hams seem to be committed to policing
>> the ars to insure that all of us adhere to THEIR personal values? I'll
>> bet it cooks Larry to know that "Nudenet" exists on HF and is composed
>> of nudist/naturist hams who choose to share their interests on the
>> air--and, of course, in group get-togethers. If it bothers him to see
>> the "TIT" in your call sign, imagine how he'd feel if . . .
>
>Isn't it funny that some will go to great lengths to offend in order to
>prove a point that they "have a right" even while others have a right
>not to be offended. Your lack of judgement or taste is only protected
>to a point.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Precisely, and that point is reached when our behavior as hams causes
potential newcomers to be turned off by people who choose to exercise
their "right" to offend others. This permissive attitude has brought us a
generation of young people who don't possess the words "please," "thank
you," "Sir," or "Ma'am" in their vocabularies, who assail our ears with
loud, thumping noises emanating from their automobiles, and who
believe that the hard working people of the world owe them a living
while they suckle at the "teats" of the Welfare State. Kim's callsign is
nothing more than another example of the social degradation brought
about by so-called "liberal" thought…but I don't call it that. I just call
it selfish, wrong-minded thinking.

73 de Larry, K3LT

821. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:32:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011116223240.14773.00001323@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 23768

In article <ff37aa44.0111160759.367cb87b@posting.google.com>,
uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org (Sean G Gilley) writes:

>
>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20011114231948.14773.00001167@nso-dh.aol.com>...
>> In article <3bf25b27_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
>writes:
>> >I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some as they boldly
>> >pronounce my inhumanity and insults to the amateur radio hobby for having
>> >such a callsign.
>>
>> Kim:
>>
>> Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is *patently*
>> objectionable!
>
>To you, perhaps. It is *not* objectionable to everyone, as evidenced by
>other postings in this newsgroup. And it isn't objectionable to me.
>
>I don't understand why there's a big fuss about this. Sheesh. If Kim were
>male, I'd at least have an idea why some found it objectionable -- but
>she's not. Would people have the same objection for 'W5TEAT'? (You do know
>the correct pronounciation of 'teat' is 'tit', right?)
>
>Sean.
>KC8SIK

Sean:

We've already been through the "teat" vs. "tit" evolution in this thread,
so there is no need to bring *that* up again!

The "big fuss" is exactly as stated in Riley Hollingsworth's original
commentary on Kim's call sign -- occasioned by her attempt to get him
to endorse it. For those who have not seen it yet, or lately, here it is:

(start of quoted message)

Subject: Riley sez Kim taking the ARS "One step closer to extinction"
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
Date: 08 Jun 2000 14:37:47 GMT

In article <59B7203A07395FF0.50F2CC864D4ED7FE.54A4CB093D32584C@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:

>
>Probably more a thoughtful wish of the prefix I wish I'd been able to get.

Kim:

Huh? This was even harder to decipher than your usually indecipherable writing. Anyone who has survived elementary school grammar should know it's best not to use a word like "wish" more than once in a sentence -- particularly if it can be used as either a noun or a verb. This causes confusion. However, since confusion seems to be your normal state, I guess you think you can get away with it!

>Speaking of callsigns, here's Riley's response after I wrote and told him I
>was sorry for bothering him, since the FCC had already spoken on callsigns
>at the Dayton Hamfest (the rest of the email is also with it):
>
>While that's true, just because a person has a right to do something doesn't
>mean it's right to do it on every occasion. While the call sign may fit the
>constitution, for every instance where a parent or uncle or grandparent
>doesn't want a young person to get involved in Ham Radio because of
>something they hear on the bands, then you have taken the ARS one step
>closer to extinction. Then we can sit around and debate what happened to
>all those Amateur frequencies that industry bought at auction---debating, of
>course, on the internet and cellular because that'll be all we have left.
>The first amendment will still be alive and well, just as it is now, tho, if
>that's any consolation.

Interesting. Sooo, Kim -- are you going to change your call sign voluntarily, or are you going to, as Riley said, continue to take the ARS "one step closer to extinction?" Think about it!

Years ago, I would have fought tooth and nail to preserve every single kiloHertz of ham radio spectrum. However, because of the proliferation of so-called "hams" like you, Kim, I now support the concept of wholesale re-allocation of amateur radio spectrum to commercial broadcasting and utility communications services which can make much more productive, profitable, and socially beneficial use of it! As hams, we've blown it -- big time -- and you, your attitude, and your callsign are the best and most readily available example of every bad thing ham radio has become!

Sooo -- enjoy your callsign. The FCC won't force you to change it -- that is something that can only come from you -- should you decide to become a Real Ham and stop giving the rest of us a bad image! I have complete confidence that you can change if you want to -- but the action to do so must come out of your decision to do what's right for people other than yourself.

73 de Larry, K3LT

(end of quoted message)

So, as you can see, the problem with Kim's callsign is the fact that it deliberately detracts from the overall good, positive image of radio

amateurs -- and degrades it's intended nature as a family-oriented activity suitable for young children as well as mature adults.

Don't get me wrong -- I'm certainly not any kind of Victorian prude. I know that there are certain nets on ham radio which are best left to mature participants, but again, like Kim's callsign, to the extent that the existence of these nets cause people to retreat from the amateur radio service, they are also taking the ARS "…one step closer to extinction." To paraphrase Mr. Hollingsworth, we need to decide whether we, as radio amateurs, have the maturity to conduct ourselves as hams in a conventionally dignified manner, or whether we are going to indulge our need to attract attention to ourselves in the manner Kim has chosen with her callsign. The former gives a positive, attractive image of ourselves as hams and of the ARS in general. The other is quite often found to be repugnant, and discourages participation by otherwise interested people, whose participation could have benefited themselves and the ARS as a whole. What we lose through such actions cannot be known for certain, but the potential for that loss would not exist if people like Kim would comport themselves in a more responsible manner.

73 de Larry, K3LT

822. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:34:00 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5db2b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23769

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t4h0s$p51$0@208.206.142.70...
>
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 05:33:13 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Likewise, dear. Your character is everything I find unattractive in a
> > >person. And, I am sure that our definitions of "fun" are diametrically
> > >opposed. For instance, I would hardly take pleasure in being a kept
woman.
> >
> > That's it, Kim, spoil all our illusions! :-(
>
>
> Kim is practically all illusion.
>

So's that grin on your face, right?

Kim W5TIT

823. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:50:10 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5deef_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23770

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011116223240.14773.00001323@nso-dh.aol.com...
>
> What we lose through such actions cannot
> be known for certain, but the potential for that loss would not
> exist if people like Kim would comport themselves in a more
> responsible manner.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

GADS...he's hilarious. "Comport"? You mean as in act the way *you* want someone to act, Larry? When you agree that you are an abrasive, demeaning, bigoted individual, I might begin to consider that my "behavior" is damaging to ham radio.

Tell ya what...if you'd even get *half* serious about your statement that a callsign is going to be the end of ham radio; get the list of all people with objectionable callsigns and go on a crusade, I'll consider changing mine. Just *half* serious, Larry. 'Cause, see, I figure that your dislike of my callsign is a smokescreen for your real distaste of a woman who can think for herself and gets right in there with the best of you to shoot from the hip...so to speak.

I don't think you have half as much problem with my callsign, Larry, as you do with me. And, since you don't know me other than what you have read here, and what some dilapidated dick from Dallas might have told you, then your assumption doesn't make much sense, does it?

By the way...you're going to respond with how wrong I am about your distaste being more for me than for my callsign. OH, no you won't. What you'll respond with is that I am right, but on both counts--you don't like me *or* my callsign. Well, guess what? I don't believe it now, haven't believed it for over a year, and won't ever believe it.

I am pretty sure that most of the folks in here who have a problem with me, have a problem with any woman who can talk at your level.

Kim W5TIT

824. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 03:59:47 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5e291$0$30970$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 23772

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:w6kJ7.189144$W8.6947795@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
> news:3bf5ca88$0$30976$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net...
> >
> > "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> > news:f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com...
> > > Let's focus on JUST ONE aspect of the Morse Code testing controversy.
> > > (Remember: The testing requirement is the controversy, not Morse Code
> > > itself.)
> > >
> >
> > ITU WRC 2003 meeting will delete rule S25.5, and national
> > administration will follow by deleting their domestic code test rules.
>
> Snip liberally applied.
>
> Larry, Jason, get off your sophomoric kiesters and get it done. Get your
> pride out of the way, get your gonads out of the way, get it done.

Get what done? File petition/comment to delete the code test
requirement - done it. Read and summarize 2,000 NPRM 98-143
comments and prepare a report for an ex-parte presentation - done it.
Serve as a director of No-Code International - done it.

> It is
> not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get to do
> something you do not believe makes any sense.

True, but it is one of the rare time when I can can act to make things
right.

> We all recognize this discussion for what it is, the whining of two brats
> wanting it handed to them. You might be right, you might be wrong but
> adults do their bitching when they have earned the right to do so.

In this country, one does not need to "earn" ones constitutional right
to petition the government to delete a stupid rule like 47 CFR 97.503(a).

> I suspect you will get to wait another decade. It is not even on the
> discussion agenda for 2003.

Wrong. ITU rule S25.5 is on the agenda and will be deleted.

Larry KC8EPO

825. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 04:00:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4nck$he0$0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 23771

N2EY wrote:

> The biggest current production model I know of is the SD-90MAC freight
> locomotive.

A few days ago, driving toward home across I-40 well east of Flagstaff, AZ in a region where the BNSF double track parallels the highway, I noticed several long freights sitting, waiting, along the way. I thought that was odd, given that eliminating waiting on sidings was the primary reason for the huge expense of the second set of tracks.
Before long we came upon the reason for the delay: A huge new-looking diesel engine, I'm pretty sure a SD90, was sitting, alone, on the westbound track in a remote area with a service truck pulled up to it. Dead in the water, or on the main line, as it was. Evidently the rest of the train had cut him loose and continued on its way.
Then I remembered something I had read in "Trains" magazine some time back, confirmed by a Salt Lake City UP locomotive driver I know, to the effect that one of the big newer engines, I believe it was the SD90, had been experiencing some technical difficulties. Wasn't it a software problem? Those things are "fly by wire" too, now.
I imagine a dispatcher somewhere was pulling his hair with all the switching and jockeying he was forced to try to manage in attempting to unstack things. Got to keep those hotshots rolling, if you can.

Dick W0EX

826. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 04:02:26 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf5e331$0$30964$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 23773

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011116000328.23850.00000502@nso-fy.aol.com...
> In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry Klose"
> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
>
> There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a
society.

You are now deciding what good for society?

827. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 04:06:10 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@p1k.arrl.org>
Message-ID: <20011116230610.38bed556.jbloom@p1k.arrl.org>
Source record: 23774

On 17 Nov 2001 01:36:56 GMT
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> We actually had one other inquiry from a fellow who made the same mistake. In
> actuality, though, the on and off delays are only several milliseconds longer
> than typical rigs

Evidence of which can be found on p. 77 of the July '01 issue, where the 'scope photo of TS-2000 keying shows the same effect with slightly less delay.

> > Two, if you look at the center of the oscilloscope face (where I generally
> make
> > my measurements, as it is considered the most linear part of the screen) you
> will
> > see "divisions" that are half as wide as the outer divisions.
>
> Now I am really confused. The graticule markings on the screen are the same
> across the entire screen

Uh, you can't see those smaller boxes in the center part of the screen? Time to get a new pair of specs, Ed!

Jon

828. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 04:10:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4nuujff0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 23775

Larry Klose wrote:
>
> ITU WRC 2003 meeting will delete rule S25.5, and national
> administration will follow by deleting their domestic code test rules.

Maybe. Maybe not. Maybe W5YI won't be able to bulldoze the ITU into adding it to an already full agenda-they aren't all that enthused over ham radio, you know, and maybe Larry et al won't be able to bluff their way onto HF until 2013.

Golly, it looks like someof you folks would find it much less hassle to just do it. Most of us did. And not at a measly 5wpm.

829. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 04:21:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4ok1$ld7$0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 23776

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
> news:3bf5ca88$0$30976$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net...
> >
> > "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> > news:f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com...
> > > Let's focus on JUST ONE aspect of the Morse Code testing controversy.
> > > (Remember: The testing requirement is the controversy, not Morse Code
> > > itself.)
> > >
> >
> > ITU WRC 2003 meeting will delete rule S25.5, and national
> > administration will follow by deleting their domestic code test rules.
> >
> > Larry KC8EPO
> >
>
> Snip liberally applied.
>
> Larry, Jason, get off your sophomoric kiesters and get it done. Get your
> pride out of the way, get your gonads out of the way, get it done. It is
> not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get to do
> something you do not believe makes any sense.
>
> We all recognize this discussion for what it is, the whining of two brats
> wanting it handed to them. You might be right, you might be wrong but
> adults do their bitching when they have earned the right to do so.
>
> I suspect you will get to wait another decade. It is not even on the
> discussion agenda for 2003.

It -and they- are truly a lost cause. Hams without meat.(Where's the
beef???) And still, Larry & co. persist.
ITU couldn't be even modestly interested in such a non-issue (on any
true scale of importance) as a 5wpm code test for hams. Especially when
literally millions of licensees over the past century have quickly and
quietly, without comment, learned code and passed whatever level of test
their interest led them to pass, most much higher and more difficult
than the current single SLOW speed required.
It would seem to most uninvolved observers that it truly is a tempest
in a teapot. One that is most likely to brew for another decade.

Dick W0EX

830. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 04:30:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4p5nmnt0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 23777

Phil Kane wrote:
> The Northwestern was one of the
> >last to convert to diesel. I have no clue where they got their coal but it
> >smelled like every two-holer I have ever been in.
>
> High-sulfur bituminous. I wonder whether there is a market for that
> in the US any more.

The answer is doubtlessly no. If you note all the coal trains that transverse the area from Utah and Wyoming as far east as the customers are located, you soon realize that fully half of all train traffic across the nation's midsection seems to be in coal, full loads eastbound, empties headed back west.
The Thomas Hill mine in north Missouri was closed several years ago (they had built a huge power plant at the mine site) and now it burns Wyoming low sulphur coal, as does the rest of the plants in these parts.

Somebody said that taking out a railroad or two at a couple of strategic locations could sure put a lot of people in the dark and cold for a long time...

Dick W0EX

831. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 04:38:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4pl2mnt1@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 23778

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9t4h0s$p51$0@208.206.142.70...
> >
> >
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > >
> > > On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 05:33:13 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >Likewise, dear. Your character is everything I find unattractive in a
> > > >person. And, I am sure that our definitions of "fun" are diametrically
> > > >opposed. For instance, I would hardly take pleasure in being a kept
> woman.
> > >
> > > That's it, Kim, spoil all our illusions! :-(
> >
> >
> > Kim is practically all illusion.
> >
>
> So's that grin on your face, right?

Yeah, actually, the mental picture of them unharnassed might bring on a
burst of laughter at what you're so proud of...
```

832. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 04:41:57 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@p1k.arrl.org>
Message-ID: <20011116234157.52ea6574.jbloom@p1k.arrl.org>
Source record: 23779

On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 02:40:28 GMT
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> I suspect you will get to wait another decade. It is not even on the
> discussion agenda for 2003.

RESOLUTION 1156 (approved at the fourth and ninth Plenary Meetings)
Agenda for the World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-03)
...
1.7 to consider issues concerning the amateur and amateur-satellite services:

1.7.1 possible revision of Article S25;

1.7.2 review of the provisions of Article S19 concerning the formation of call signs in the amateur services in order to provide flexibility for administrations;

1.7.3 review of the terms an ddefinitions of Article S1 to the extent required as a consequence of changes made in Article S25;
...

Jon

833. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 04:57:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t4qo7rfs0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 23780

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>

I figure that your dislike
> of my callsign is a smokescreen for your real distaste of a woman who can
> think for herself and gets right in there with the best of you to shoot from
> the hip...so to speak.
>

Every post she just shows how much further wrong she can be. I greatly
respect a female such as the one she just described. FOR SURE there are
none to be found on rrap.

834. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:04:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011117000402.23850.00000550@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 23781

In article <m9hJ7.188781$W8.6928282@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>The main Post Office in St. Louis is built along a tunnel that runs from
>Eads Bridge to (old) Union Station. The tunnel is equipped with some mighty
>ventilation stacks along 8th St. But when the door to the PO was opened in
>the 1880's for the first and only time, the loco smoke went right into the
>PO causing its evacuation. They get the mail on trucks.

Great story!
>
> I remember the old C&NW beltline in OMA. The Northwestern was one of the
>last to convert to diesel. I have no clue where they got their coal but it
>smelled like every two-holer I have ever been in.
>
They don't call it "brown coal" for nothing....

Diesel electric locos have toilets (usually chemical ones) aboard. Steamers had
the coal pile.

73 de Jim, N2EY

835. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:05:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5F015.44BB5B76@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23782

Dave Heil wrote:
> You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
> Town, USA.

Sorry, my mistake. I assumed you were capable of abstractions.

> I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.

I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
you know what that makes you.

Morse code testing and Affirmative Action are similar examples of
social engineering, i.e. governmental requirements attempting
to get some people to do what they wouldn't normally choose to do.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

836. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:07:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5F08F.25B34887@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23783

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> heh heh heh, now he's going to tell you, Cecil, that *he* was *not*
> discussing CW with respect to its similarity to a affirmative action
> situation.

Nope, he turned around and accused me of comparting them and that
is simply a bold-faced lie. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

837. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:23:23 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <fvmJ7.28079$xS6.47245@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 23784

Larry Klose asks

>
>You are now deciding what good for society?
>

No, I gathered that he was expressing his opinion
on the subject. Do you have a problem with free
expression of opinion?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what I believe. -K0HB

838. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:24:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5F487.42AD64A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23785

Dave Heil wrote:
> Well, Mr. Backwoods philosopher, I've made no attempt to discuss your
> town.

Of course you did, Dave. You implied that you know better than I what
happened in my home town. So how many traffic lights are here, genius?

> If you choose to believe that Affirmative Action lowered no standards
> and did not cost more qualified whites jobs, stay with your pet theory.

You are obviously blowing smoke because I never said any such thing
nor do I believe it. I simply related the facts of what happened in
my home town and I realize and have stated before that the pendulum swing
went too far in many parts of the country. What you are attempting is mind
fornication, Dave, which seems to be the only action of which you are
ultimately capable. When you can't win an argument fairly using your
crystal ball and ESP, put the other person on the defensive by lying
about what he said. That's one approach but it is pretty obvious.

> In the mean time, your analogy between Affirmative Action and morse
> testing is just as poor as it was when first stated by you.

Actually, it is your inability to recognize Affirmative Action
and Morse code testing as similar attempts at forced social
engineering. But I would expect that from someone unable to
conceptualize "Small Southern Town, USA".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

839. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:28:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5F592.FE03A116@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23786

```
Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I'm married to the only woman who interests me.
> >
> > You find all other women in the world uninteresting? Do you cull
> > out the books you read depending on the sex of the person who
> > wrote them? Do you refuse to attend classes taught by women?
>
> Aren't you taking that a tad too literally?

Of course. :-) I'm giving Dave a dose of his own medicine.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```


```
-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

840. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:31:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5F619.6CA54D07@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23788

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I'm married to the only woman who interests me.
> > >
> > > You find all other women in the world uninteresting? Do you cull
> > > out the books you read depending on the sex of the person who
> > > wrote them? Do you refuse to attend classes taught by women?
> > >
> > Aren't you taking that a tad too literally?
>
> That's what Cecil does.

Just giving you a dose of your own medicine, Dave. How
does it feel to have your words twisted and interpreted
in the worst possible light?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

841. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:31:33 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <452E19D5BCE675F4.3CCE41C21E3AFE0C.D8E36C64B48745A6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23787

On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 22:26:15 GMT, JJ <radiobuffj@mailcity.net> wrote:

>> Kim isn't the one who is going out of their way to be
>> offensive--the people who set themselves up as judges of the morality
>> of others are the ones doing that.
>
>It is a matter of class and taste, some seem to never acquire
>either.

I know.

Unfortunately, the people who _don't_ have class or taste end
up attacking people like Kim who have both class and the sense of
humor they obviously lack.

Glad others agree with me that the people who are attacking
Kim for exercising her freedom of choice have no class or taste--it's
obvious, but you don't often see people willing to acknowledge it as
you did! :-)

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

842. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:36:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5F5F2.5FC75FB8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23789

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF523CA.7D551E27@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Likewise, dear. Your character is everything I find unattractive in a
> > > person. And, I am sure that our definitions of "fun" are diametrically
> > > opposed. For instance, I would hardly take pleasure in being a kept
> woman.
> >
> > This is certainly beginning to sound Freudian, Kim. You made the
> > comment, not I. Now you've added this "kept woman" thing. I've
> > certainly not mentioned, thought or written at any time, anything about
> > wanting you or making you into a kept woman. I like my women taller,
> > thinner and less "in your face". I'm married to the only woman who
> > interests me. I will accept your disdain for my type to be a compliment
> > and you comment about the differences in our concepts of fun to reflect
> > upon my good judgement. You'll also note that I don't refer to you as
> > "dear".
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You strike as a man who "keeps" women, Dave...what can I say?

My wife will love that one. Trying to "keep" a Finnish woman is like
trying to "keep" a cat.

>You are
> absolutely correct, though. You did not refer to me as "dear." I just get
> real nervous about calling you Tugboat...as I don't wish to give you any
> impressions of what I might tug on. You'd quite believe what goes on in my
> mind as you type "Tugboat" to me... ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT

I take it that you've never read a "Tugboat Annie" article.

Dave K8MN

843. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:42:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5F8AB.605ABE7E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23790

Dave Heil wrote:
> I care if ham radio
> is ruined by obscenity, racism and even Kim's *wink-wink* humorous
> attempt at adverstising her sagging assets.
>
> Freedom in our society has limits. That you don't like the limits
> imposed by the society is too bad.

But society doesn't impose legal limits on Kim's callsign.
Her freedom to possess 'W5TIT' as a callsign is unlimited
as long as she honors the rules.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

844. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:47:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5F9DF.B5A733B5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23791

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Precisely, and that point is reached when our behavior as hams causes
> potential newcomers to be turned off by people who choose to exercise
> their "right" to offend others.

Larry, I don't know of any newsgroup poster who has exercised his
"right" to offend others more often than you have.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

845. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:50:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5FA92.58FC60EB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23792

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Just remember --
> an open mind is usually caused by an inability to think
> independently of the crowd you wish to follow.

Larry, you are in a perfect position to appreciate the
merits of a closed mind.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```


```
-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

846. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:52:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5F9B5.151218AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23793

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF5B461.6867E631@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Opinions are like a$$holes, Dave, and it looks like that's where some
> > > of yours come from. I find it interesting that you profess to know more
> > > about my home town than I do. Someday you need to demonstrate your
> > > crystal
> > > ball for us (after wiping it off, of course).
> >
> >
> > I guess my knowledge base is larger, Cecil. I've lived in the Midwest,
> > and the South along with some of Europe and much of Africa. You talk
> > about what you can from your limited perspective.
> >
>
> Hmmm, two of the three geographical locations you mention about, Davey Dear,
> are not under the jurisdiction of the Affirmative Action laws of the United
> States. So, exactly in what way is two of the three locations you mention
> above (i.e., 66% of your submission) relevant to the discussion?

Hmmm...The Midwest (1), the South (2), Europe (3) and Africa (4).
You seem to have a problem with your math. At no point did I claim U.S.
jurisdiction of the United States exists in Europe or Africa. Europe
and Africa are permitted to contribute to one's knowledge though.
Have a problem with that?

> >
> > If you choose to believe that Affirmative Action lowered no standards
> > and did not cost more qualified whites jobs,
> >
>
> Wouldn't *some* level of balance be desirable. You point up that
> Affirmative Action did not cost more qualified whites' jobs (apostrophe
> added), yet--what happens when there is *no* affirmative action? More
> qualified blacks, hispanics, etc., are not even *considered* for the job.

For what purpose was an apostrophe added. My sentence conveys what I
meant it to convey.

I'm sorry but I disagree with your use of the term "qualified blacks,
hispanics, etc..." If you lower the standards for jobs, you are not
looking for qualified individuals. Your search is for bodies to put

into a job regardless of qualifications. Lowered standards say, "This guy is almost good enough for the job".

> > stay with your pet theory.
> > Maybe you'll be able to find a way to rationalize why the program was
> > dismantled.
> >
>
> Davey Dear...please think of something other than slanted comments to
> efficiently argue your case. You are making Cecil's point (at least to
> affirmative action), i.e., you demonstrate the irony of the whole situation.

You believe that a matter of fact statement of actuality is slanted?
Am I not being politically correct enough for your tastes, Kimmy?

> >
> > In the mean time, your analogy between Affirmative Action and morse
> > testing is just as poor as it was when first stated by you.

> Things that happen in real life across different disciplines aren't just
> analogies, Dave, they are real examples of *attitudes* that proliferate and
> begin to affect the ways in which we approach many things. Getting burnt on
> the stove top doesn't preclude my making the same assumption about heat from
> *any* source.

1. Cecil tried to claim that morse testing is like Affirmative Action.

2. I pointed out that the reduction of morse speed in testing is akin to Affirmative Action.

3. Cecil is wrong.

4. You aren't really sure of what has been said but you like to make a comment based on your feelings.

> Kim W5TIT
>
> PS--next thing ya know we'll be arguing now over campfires

You start.

Dave K8MN

847. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:58:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5FB3E.D3073460@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23794

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3BF52207.953F8E90@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >> Isn't it funny how some hams seem to be committed to policing
> >> the ars to insure that all of us adhere to THEIR personal values? I'll
> >> bet it cooks Larry to know that "Nudenet" exists on HF and is composed
> >> of nudist/naturist hams who choose to share their interests on the
> >> air--and, of course, in group get-togethers. If it bothers him to see
> >> the "TIT" in your call sign, imagine how he'd feel if . . .
> >
> >Isn't it funny that some will go to great lengths to offend in order to
> >prove a point that they "have a right" even while others have a right
> >not to be offended. Your lack of judgement or taste is only protected
> >to a point.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> Precisely, and that point is reached when our behavior as hams causes
> potential newcomers to be turned off by people who choose to exercise
> their "right" to offend others. This permissive attitude has brought us a
> generation of young people who don't possess the words "please," "thank
> you," "Sir," or "Ma'am" in their vocabularies, who assail our ears with
> loud, thumping noises emanating from their automobiles, and who
> believe that the hard working people of the world owe them a living
> while they suckle at the "teats" of the Welfare State. Kim's callsign is
> nothing more than another example of the social degradation brought
> about by so-called "liberal" thoughtâ□¦but I don't call it that. I just call
> it selfish, wrong-minded thinking.

I wouldn't want my daughter listening to certain QSOs on 75m nor would I want her to to read the filth on the rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup. One of the several posters of such garbage was one of the first to take me task for my comments on Kim's call.

Dave K8MN

848. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 05:59:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5FCD9.36C96F34@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23795

Dave Heil wrote:
> You seemingly change your mind and correct your mistakes over the span
> of ten or fifteen minutes here.

I relate something that happened in my hometown. You accuse me of
relating something that happened world wide. That's obviously
your problem, not mine.

Has it dawned upon you yet that Affirmative Action and Morse code
testing are both governmental requirements aimed at achieving
a certain level of social engineering?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

849. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:00:54 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B5B1F5B248239B81.4CBBCDE552AF2A36.3225EA66FEECA657@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23796

On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 01:22:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>In your practice of homosexual activity in your home, how many times
>have you been arrested? There are numerous nudist clubs in a number of
>states which are legal and which are not raided. Your information is
>false. I do not have to attend them and they are not in plain view.
>I don't have a problem with them. I don't feel the need to participate
>in a "swing club".

A few corrections to your comments:

1. I don't "practice homosexual activities." It's not that I
have anything at all against those practices, I simply happen to be
heterosexual.

2. Nudist clubs are _regularly_ raided by state agents who
claim that the mere act of being nude in the company of others is
"lewd behavior." In addition, widely acknowledged nude beaches (or do
you insist that YOUR moral values be imposed to the extent that
naturists should not be permitted to have consensually nude beaches
outside of organized nudist resorts?) are frequently subject to police
harassment and arrests for indecent exposure--even though no one is
likely to stumble over such a beach (usually very private in location)
accidently, and all participants consent to the nudity freely. My
information is far from false, unfortunately.

3. There are approximately 4,000,000 swingers in the USA
(defined as members of a married couple who voluntarily participate in
recreational sex with other couples) NONE of whom is permitted to
practice his/her lifestyle w/o fear of arrest and persecution. It's no
more necessary to participate in swing clubs to feel that these
individuals are victims of institutionalized morality than it is
necessary to be homosexual to recognize that laws discriminate against
individuals with that sexual orientation.

>It is not necessary to do everything not prohibited by law just to prove
>a point. The "state" is not some faceless and nameless entity. It is
>us. If you can convince enough of your neighbors that we should have
>porn palaces, nude dancing, nudist camps and the like on every corner,
>perhaps you can get some laws changed.

Again, two points to answer:

1. No, it isn't necessary to do everything not prohibited by
law. On the other hand, if something is not prohibited, people have
the _right_ to do it if they choose. Example: I don't smoke. That it

is permitted by law isn't relevant to me--I don't choose to do it. On the other hand, some of my best friends DO smoke, and I acknowledge their rights to do so just as they acknowledge my right not to do so. That's what _choice_ is about.

2. What your neighbors want is relevant to neither the state or the law. Frankly, I don't CARE if everyone in my neighborhood opposes a given behavior--if that behavior occurs behind closed doors they simply don't have a voice in the matter from any rational perspective. For example, I don't happen to care for pornographic movies--it isn't that they offend me, but I simply don't enjoy them (I don't enjoy horror films either, for that matter). But the fact that I could care less if another porn movie is ever made or not is irrelevant to YOUR right to enjoy that form of entertainment. Unfortunately, far too many self-appointed moral judges in our society insist that they have the right to decide that NEITHER of us has the right to view such films. But even if they DID support our right to do so, it wouldn't matter to the state. For example, in California medical marijuana is legal. It doesn't matter whether you believe it to be beneficial or not--it happens to be the law, a law passed by popular vote (the method you suggest above). Despite the "will of the people" however, the Federal government refuses to recognize that law as valid and continues to prosecute people who violate marijuana statutes in California, regardless of whether they do so to "get high" or because they are receiving chemo-therapy and need it to control the nausea.

>I don't care if Johnny plays with his toy soldiers. I care if ham radio
>is ruined by obscenity, racism and even Kim's *wink-wink* humorous
>attempt at adverstising her sagging assets.

That put-down directed at Kim was both uncalled for and demonstrated a total lack of class. For someone who opposes even a hint of sexual humor in amateur radio, you're remarkably willing to bring both offensive insults and your own brand of sexual humor to an amateur radio newsgroup. Care to explain why something offensive on the air isn't equally offensive to the vastly LARGER audience of a Usenet newsgroup?

If you're concerned with cleaning up ham radio, start with the racist groups on 80m and follow that with the garbage that periodically surfaces in the lower end of 10m and on 2m instead of wasting your resources picking on a woman whose only "sin" is to have a far better sense of humor then you yourself demonstrate.

BTW, what makes you think Kim's assets are "sagging?" The economy is quite "perky" lately, if you haven't noticed.

>Freedom in our society has limits. That you don't like the limits
>imposed by the society is too bad. We are not an anarchic state.

No, FREEDOM does NOT have limits. By definition, freedom is
the ABSENSE of externally imposed limits.

The limit is very simple to find in practical life, however.
Ask yourself if a given act directly harms the person or property of a
non-consenting individual. If it does, it should not be permitted. If
it doesn't, it simply isn't the concern of society. Perhaps that would
lead to some offensive behavior--but if you can identify a single
consensual behavior more offensive than the self-righteous attitude of
America's moralists you're doing a lot better than I can do.

>Your premise is ridiculous.

No, my premise is realistic.

>I don't attend church in the public square. I attend church in a church
>building. Don't like it? Don't show up. No fair peeking in the
>windows either.

Ok.

Now tear down those public displays of a nativity, stop
printing "In God we Trust" on my money (my religion doesn't BELIEVE in
a god), don't teach my children to sing Christmas carols in public
schools, stop trying to take freedom of choice from women by imposing
your religious views of abortion on the law, insist that your church
pay taxes (including property taxes) like the rest of us have to do,
and stop handing out bibles on public school property, among other
actions. You claim your church doesn't force itself on me--tell that
to someone who believes it.

>Nope. You misundertand. If you actually use your secret callsign, it
>won't be a secret anymore. It'll be just for you. Enjoy it in private.

Brilliant.

I'll bet in private you have some really neat names for
yourself, too.

Come to think of it--I'll bet that in private a LOT of people
in this newsgroup have really neat names for you, too.

>The fact that I'm responding to your post demonstrates my sense of
>humor. Not all humor is written on a restroom wall.

Funny--some of the insults being made about Kim's call sign
certainly sound like they belong there to me.

>Trashy is as trashy does. Water seeks its own level.

So drown. We'll wave from the shore.

Rick, KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

850. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:01:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5FBFC.DFC50D21@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23797

Larry Klose wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011116000328.23850.00000502@nso-fy.aol.com...
> > In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry Klose"
> > <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
> >
> > There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a
> society.
>
> You are now deciding what good for society?

Wait a minute, chum. What precisely would you call your efforts to do away with morse testing in amateur radio? Are you deciding what is good for society?

Dave K8MN

851. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:03:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF5FDC9.2080F08B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23798

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > > > So the code test is considered equal in importance to everything else
> > > > in amateur radio combined?
>
> > > Thought you gave up on that dead horse last year...
>
> > I'll never give up my questioning nature, Dave.
>
> The Morse code is not equal in importance to everything else in nature
> combined.

Nobody said it was, Jim. But if test A and test B have to be passed
for a license, then they are logically equal in importance.
A AND B = one AND one = one = license
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

852. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:06:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5FD2A.B4074920@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23799

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
> > Town, USA.
>
> Sorry, my mistake. I assumed you were capable of abstractions.

You would have us assume that your town is representative of every place
in the South.

> > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
>
> I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> you know what that makes you.

You have indeed. Do you know what your disavowal of your own statement
makes you?

> Morse code testing and Affirmative Action are similar examples of
> social engineering, i.e. governmental requirements attempting
> to get some people to do what they wouldn't normally choose to do.

A typical Cecilian swerve on the road to truth...

Dave K8MN

853. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:14:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF6003E.96A55496@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23851

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Youse guys can play around all you wish in theories and hypotheses, but
> your keyboard is loaded with debouncing circuitry. No hall effect switch
> to be found.

Actually, the debouncing is done virtually 100% in software.
I wrote a lot of that original 8049 software.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

854. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:14:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF5FEF7.B24D009@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23800

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Well, Mr. Backwoods philosopher, I've made no attempt to discuss your
> > town.
>
> Of course you did, Dave. You implied that you know better than I what
> happened in my home town. So how many traffic lights are here, genius?

Of course I did not. Further, I could care less how many traffic lights
or how many more cracker philosophers are to be found there.

> > If you choose to believe that Affirmative Action lowered no standards
> > and did not cost more qualified whites jobs, stay with your pet theory.
>
> You are obviously blowing smoke because I never said any such thing
> nor do I believe it. I simply related the facts of what happened in
> my home town and I realize and have stated before that the pendulum swing
> went too far in many parts of the country. What you are attempting is mind
> fornication, Dave, which seems to be the only action of which you are
> ultimately capable. When you can't win an argument fairly using your
> crystal ball and ESP, put the other person on the defensive by lying
> about what he said. That's one approach but it is pretty obvious.

When the other person changes his tale so often in order to attempt a
win at an argument, that person's tales become suspect. You've been
guilty of it in the past and you are guilty of it now. It's all the
more peculiar because the issue was not what was accomplished by
Affirmative Action. It is your faulty comparison of morse testing to
the Affirmative Action program.

> > In the mean time, your analogy between Affirmative Action and morse
> > testing is just as poor as it was when first stated by you.
>
> Actually, it is your inability to recognize Affirmative Action
> and Morse code testing as similar attempts at forced social
> engineering. But I would expect that from someone unable to
> conceptualize "Small Southern Town, USA".

Cecil. Get a grip on yourself. If you are speaking of your town
because it is the only place you really know, say so. If you are
attempting to tell us that your Texas town is like every place in the
South, I would say you don't have a large enough statistical base.
That aside, this is simply a diversion from your original faulty claim.

Dave K8MN

855. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:20:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF6006D.23C7C017@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23852

CAM wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > heh heh heh, now he's going to tell you, Cecil, that *he* was *not*
> > discussing CW with respect to its similarity to a affirmative action
> > situation.
>
> Nope, he turned around and accused me of comparting them and that
> is simply a bold-faced lie. :-)

Here's your bold-faced lie from Google:

"The Great Society was filled with affirmative action programs.
Morse code testing is an affirmative action program."

You may now eat your words.

Dave K8MN

856. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:24:58 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E8AE3B5334323A05.9493654F80196D09.159ACA41CA5348C1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23853

On 17 Nov 2001 03:32:36 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>It would be interesting if the ARRL would conduct a poll, in QST and/or
>their website, to find out just what hams really *do* think of the
>availability of callsigns that spell out certain words of a sexually or
>scatologically implicit nature.

Why?

If we conducted a poll that showed the majority of the hams
believe that racism is acceptable, would that make it any less
offensive or inappropriate?

Sorry, Larry, but "majority rule" often turns into the tyranny
of the majority instead.

>Then fear not -- your liberal credentials are fully intact. I'm sure
>nobody will accuse of being "closed minded." Just remember --
>an open mind is usually caused by an inability to think
>independently of the crowd you wish to follow.

Was that supposed to make sense?

Are you _seriously_ suggesting that holding an open mind means
you are following the lead of others while having a closed mind means
you are impervious to that effect?

No WONDER you prefer cw--it's easier to disguise the fact that
you don't know how to use the English language in a meaningful manner.

>Not in my own personal experience.

I suppose even on cw people are choosey about who they
associate with. I guess that pretty much limits you to exchanging
signal reports and discussing equipment, doesn't it?

>Could be. The one I belong to is regulated by the FCC, and represented
>in the United States by the American Radio Relay League. To which one
>do you belong?

The one run by a nation with a Constitution that guarantees
freedom of speech. Sorry that yours doesn't.

>I thought it was my right to do so! Are you now saying that it isn't? If so,
>are you trying to control my speech just because I'm saying something
>with which you don't agree? Perhaps, then, I should refer to you as
>"Comrade Rick?"

You have every right to say what you like Larry--even though what you are essentially saying is that Kim should NOT have the right to say what SHE chooses.

Must be confusing to be so hypocritical!

BTW, forget the "Comrade Rick," I'm a libertarian, not a communist--I believe in personal liberty not "sacrifice of rights for the betterment of society."

Hmmmm . . . sure sounds a lot more like your credo than mine.

>So, my objection to Kim's callsign, which is my right, makes me a
>"self-righteous prude?" Hmmm. Well, I guess I've been called
>worse things!

And probably deserved them, too.

But--clearly--if you feel as innocuous a thing as her sign is offensive and shouldn't be permitted, you are demonstrating prudery in no uncertain terms. You have a right to do so, of course, just as I have the right to ridicule your treatment of a lady on this list (you talk about the image of amateur radio she creates with her sign--what about the image you give prospective hams here in rrap???), but then again I _do_ support your rights to free speech--it's too bad you don't share that value when it comes to Kim's rights as well as your own.

>No, because her callsign, and the attitude it represents, offends the
>standards of behavior characteristic of a society based on politeness,
>consideration, and respect for ourselves and others.

What country is that?

Our standards in this nation emphasize freedom of speech, freedom of choice, freedom of association, . . . Get the picture? Not restraints imposed by society--FREEDOMS expected by it.

Kim exercised her freedom of choice. That's her right. You exercise yours when you oppose that choice. But don't pretend you represent the values of today's society--you don't.

>If you have to ask that particular question, you would never understand
>the answer.

Why--couldn't you present it in an understandable manner?

I copy cw at a reasonable speed, Larry, why not try answering it in that if written English is too difficult for you.

>Hmmm -- the "morality police" vs. the "immorality Taliban." Now, that
>would make for an interesting battle, indeed!

Sorry, Larry, but one of the worst things ABOUT the Taliban is its extreme commitment to religious morality. Women in Taliban governed Afghanistan were not permitted medical treatment, to appear

with their faces exposed, rights, citizenship, etc. BECAUSE their religious beliefs taught that such behaviors are immoral. To me, you and the fundamentalist Christians have a LOT more in common with the Taliban or the Iranians than you do with civilized societies.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

857. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:30:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF60418.62C8FEE7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23854

Dave Heil wrote:
> You would have us assume that your town is representative of every place
> in the South.

Not every place, but it is pretty typical of small towns in the Old South
from Georgia to East Texas. When the students were integrated, by and
large, the teachers were not.

> > > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> >
> > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > you know what that makes you.
>
> You have indeed. Do you know what your disavowal of your own statement
> makes you?

Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I. the definition of "compart"
is "to subdivide". I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse
testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.

> > Morse code testing and Affirmative Action are similar examples of
> > social engineering, i.e. governmental requirements attempting
> > to get some people to do what they wouldn't normally choose to do.
>
> A typical Cecilian swerve on the road to truth...

How you can deny reality is beyond belief. Why even have a
governmental requirement for something that doesn't need to be
social engineered?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

858. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:35:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF6054A.42E49D8E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23855

Dave Heil wrote:
> 1. Cecil tried to claim that morse testing is like Affirmative Action.
>
> 2. I pointed out that the reduction of morse speed in testing is akin
> to Affirmative Action.
>
> 3. Cecil is wrong.

So you deny that Morse code testing is an attempt at social engineering?
Dave, virtually all governmental requirements are an attempt at social
engineering. Last time I checked, Affirmative Action and Morse code testing
are governmental requirements.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

859. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:39:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF60634.52E7FCBF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23856

Take a look at the item offered at:
http://cgi.ebay.com/aw-cgi/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1034480528

Somehow, in a silly way, it seems related to this thread....

860. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 06:55:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF609DE.3E13C362@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23857

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Well, Mr. Backwoods philosopher, I've made no attempt to discuss your
> > > town.
> >
> > Of course you did, Dave. You implied that you know better than I what
> > happened in my home town.
>
> Of course I did not.

Of course you did, Dave. Otherwise, you wouldn't still be arguing
about it.

> When the other person changes his tale so often in order to attempt a
> win at an argument, that person's tales become suspect. You've been
> guilty of it in the past and you are guilty of it now.

You're absolutely wrong if you think I've "changed my tale". The truth
is that you didn't comprehend what I was saying at first. Now it
has finally started to soak into your concrete brain and you are
trying to blame me for your lack of comprehension.

> If you are speaking of your town
> because it is the only place you really know, say so.

I said so, Dave, and you accused me of lying. You just were not paying
attention as usual. But my home town is typical of small towns from
Georgia to East Texas. When the students were integrated, the teachers
were not. Forced integration of the faculty caused a lot of competent
black teachers to obtain positions at the expense of incompetent
white teachers. The average quality of teachers improved. After all,
my black teacher friend had a 3.8 GPR but you apparently agree with the
white majority around here that her skin color lowered the standards.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

861. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 07:08:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF60CE6.7551F912@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23858

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > heh heh heh, now he's going to tell you, Cecil, that *he* was *not*
> > > discussing CW with respect to its similarity to a affirmative action
> > > situation.
> >
> > Nope, he turned around and accused me of comparting them and that
> > is simply a bold-faced lie. :-)
>
> Here's your bold-faced lie from Google:
>
> "The Great Society was filled with affirmative action programs.
> Morse code testing is an affirmative action program."
>
> You may now eat your words.

The word you want me to eat is "compart", which is your word,
not mine. "Compart" means to subdivide. You said I was "comparting"
Affirmative Action and Morse code testing. You are lying!!! I defy
you to prove that I subdivided Affirmative Action and Morse code
testing. There is absolutely NO subdividing in my statement above.
Now exactly who do you think should eat your word?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

862. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 12:15:16 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <oxsJ7.190125$W8.6995134@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23859

```
"Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:3bf5e291$0$30970$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:w6kJ7.189144$W8.6947795@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > "Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
> > news:3bf5ca88$0$30976$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net...
> > >
> > > "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f7d9a152.0111111111.525af6f5@posting.google.com...
> > > > Let's focus on JUST ONE aspect of the Morse Code testing
controversy.
> > > > (Remember: The testing requirement is the controversy, not Morse
Code
> > > > itself.)
> > > >
> > >
> > > ITU WRC 2003 meeting will delete rule S25.5, and national
> > > administration will follow by deleting their domestic code test rules.
> >
> > Snip liberally applied.
> >
> > Larry, Jason, get off your sophomoric kiesters and get it done. Get
your
> > pride out of the way, get your gonads out of the way, get it done.
>
> Get what done? File petition/comment to delete the code test
> requirement - done it. Read and summarize 2,000 NPRM 98-143
> comments and prepare a report for an ex-parte presentation - done it.
> Serve as a director of No-Code International - done it.
>
> > It is
> > not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get to
do
> > something you do not believe makes any sense.
>
> True, but it is one of the rare time when I can can act to make things
> right.
>
> > We all recognize this discussion for what it is, the whining of two
brats
> > wanting it handed to them. You might be right, you might be wrong but
> > adults do their bitching when they have earned the right to do so.
```

>
> In this country, one does not need to "earn" ones constitutional right
> to petition the government to delete a stupid rule like 47 CFR 97.503(a).
>
> > I suspect you will get to wait another decade. It is not even on the
> > discussion agenda for 2003.
>
> Wrong. ITU rule S25.5 is on the agenda and will be deleted.
>
> Larry KC8EPO
>

By all means do your citizen thing. Just don't try to deceive others and far more importantly yourselves about what it is you are doing. Unless and until 25.5 disappears bleating on the newsgroups -- as you note we are not the ones to sell -- merely exposes two sophomoric twits.

Beer Keg

863. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 12:25:04 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <AGsJ7.190138$W8.6998394@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23860

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@p1k.arrl.org> wrote in message
news:20011116234157.52ea6574.jbloom@p1k.arrl.org...
> On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 02:40:28 GMT
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> >
> > I suspect you will get to wait another decade. It is not even on the
> > discussion agenda for 2003.
>
> RESOLUTION 1156 (approved at the fourth and ninth Plenary Meetings)
> Agenda for the World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-03)
> ...
> 1.7 to consider issues concerning the amateur and amateur-satellite
services:
>
> 1.7.1 possible revision of Article S25;
>
> 1.7.2 review of the provisions of Article S19 concerning the formation of
call signs in the amateur services in order to provide flexibility for
administrations;
>
> 1.7.3 review of the terms an ddefinitions of Article S1 to the extent
required as a consequence of changes made in Article S25;
> ...
>
> Jon

Well Glorioski.

864. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:13:54 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t5no607tb@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23866

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:w6kJ7.189144$W8.6947795@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Larry, Jason, get off your sophomoric kiesters and get it done. Get your
> pride out of the way, get your gonads out of the way, get it done. It is
> not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get to do
> something you do not believe makes any sense.

...and Larry talks about *my* worn out response.

> We all recognize this discussion for what it is, the whining of two brats

We? Since when do you speak for everyone on the newsgroup?

> wanting it handed to them. You might be right, you might be wrong but
> adults do their bitching when they have earned the right to do so.

Really? Then what's your excuse?

865. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:20:57 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t5o5e08h3@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23868

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t4ok1$ld7$0@208.206.142.105...
> It -and they- are truly a lost cause. Hams without meat.(Where's the
> beef???) And still, Larry & co. persist.
> ITU couldn't be even modestly interested in such a non-issue (on any
> true scale of importance) as a 5wpm code test for hams. Especially when
> literally millions of licensees over the past century have quickly and
> quietly, without comment, learned code and passed whatever level of test

Yes, sheep usually follow the heard without comment.

866. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:22:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf66523$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23861

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t4ok1$ld7$0@208.206.142.105...
>
>
> It -and they- are truly a lost cause. Hams without meat.(Where's the
> beef???) And still, Larry & co. persist.
> ITU couldn't be even modestly interested in such a non-issue (on any
> true scale of importance) as a 5wpm code test for hams. Especially when
> literally millions of licensees over the past century have quickly and
> quietly, without comment, learned code and passed whatever level of test
> their interest led them to pass, most much higher and more difficult
> than the current single SLOW speed required.
> It would seem to most uninvolved observers that it truly is a tempest
> in a teapot. One that is most likely to brew for another decade.
>
> Dick W0EX

How 'bout research is conducted on just one important facet of amateur
radio; that of emergency communication. My money is on the idea that there
are at least 50% of hams who are in emergency communication that are "hams
without meat" as you say.

Why don't you tell *them* and the public they serve that they are "hams
without meat?"

Kim W5TIT

867. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:24:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf6657b$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23862

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t4pl2mnt1@208.206.142.105...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > >
> >
> > So's that grin on your face, right?
>
>
> Yeah, actually, the mental picture of them unharnassed might bring on a
> burst of laughter at what you're so proud of...
>

Gosh, and "they" weren't even mentioned in my response to you. Who is it is
so proud of 'em?

Kim W5TIT

868. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:25:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf665c6$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23863

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t4qo7rfs0@208.206.142.105...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
>
> I figure that your dislike
> > of my callsign is a smokescreen for your real distaste of a woman who
can
> > think for herself and gets right in there with the best of you to shoot
from
> > the hip...so to speak.
> >
>
>
> Every post she just shows how much further wrong she can be. I greatly
> respect a female such as the one she just described. FOR SURE there are
> none to be found on rrap.
>

You respect nothing but your image in the mirror, Dick. And ya sure as all
hell wouldn't recognize a good woman if you saw one.

Kim W5TIT

869. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:26:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf66605_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23864

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF5F08F.25B34887@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > heh heh heh, now he's going to tell you, Cecil, that *he* was *not*
> > discussing CW with respect to its similarity to a affirmative action
> > situation.
>
> Nope, he turned around and accused me of comparting them and that
> is simply a bold-faced lie. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

<Psssttt> If you tell 'em what they are going to say next--they'll
everything but! LOL

Kim W5TIT

870. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:30:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf666e6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23865

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF5F8AB.605ABE7E@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I care if ham radio
> > is ruined by obscenity, racism and even Kim's *wink-wink* humorous
> > attempt at adverstising her sagging assets.
> >
> > Freedom in our society has limits. That you don't like the limits
> > imposed by the society is too bad.
>
> But society doesn't impose legal limits on Kim's callsign.
> Her freedom to possess 'W5TIT' as a callsign is unlimited
> as long as she honors the rules.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Some zealots just don't realize what makes up our society, Cecil. How many times have I degraded the KKK and other such groups on this newsgroup and not one word of agreement or acknowledgement has ever been expressed? In what way should I take that lack of response? That my tits are more of a danger to society than thoughts such as promulgated by groups like that?

Kim W5TIT

871. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:31:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf6672c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23867

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF5F9DF.B5A733B5@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Precisely, and that point is reached when our behavior as hams causes
> > potential newcomers to be turned off by people who choose to exercise
> > their "right" to offend others.
>
> Larry, I don't know of any newsgroup poster who has exercised his
> "right" to offend others more often than you have.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Larry doesn't think there's anyone who is offended by what he
says...although it is darned hard to take someone like him seriously...

Kim W5TIT

872. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:32:11 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t5oqg09jh@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23869

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3bf5d336_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > Isn't it funny that some will go to great lengths to offend in order to
> > prove a point that they "have a right" even while others have a right
> > not to be offended. Your lack of judgement or taste is only protected
> > to a point.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Sometimes one ends up on the wrong side of freedom (rights). That is its
> gift.
>
> Kim W5TIT

I'd like to know where in the constitution that it says that one has a right
not to be offended.

873. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:43:03 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t5pes0ak0@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23875

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011116223237.14773.00001322@nso-dh.aol.com...
> Precisely, and that point is reached when our behavior as hams causes
> potential newcomers to be turned off by people who choose to exercise

You, and a few others of minority opinion, are the only ones who are turned
off.

> their "right" to offend others. This permissive attitude has brought us a
> generation of young people who don't possess the words "please," "thank
> you," "Sir," or "Ma'am" in their vocabularies, who assail our ears with
> loud, thumping noises emanating from their automobiles, and who

They said the same thing about Elvis and the Beatles. That argument is more
worn than your pro-code rants.

> believe that the hard working people of the world owe them a living
> while they suckle at the "teats" of the Welfare State. Kim's callsign is
> nothing more than another example of the social degradation brought
> about by so-called "liberal" thought.but I don't call it that. I just
call
> it selfish, wrong-minded thinking.

Who are you to decide what's right or wrong-minded?

874. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:50:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf66b9b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23870

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF5F9B5.151218AC@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BF5B461.6867E631@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Opinions are like a$$holes, Dave, and it looks like that's where
some
> > > > of yours come from. I find it interesting that you profess to know
more
> > > > about my home town than I do. Someday you need to demonstrate your
> > > > crystal
> > > > ball for us (after wiping it off, of course).
> > >
> > >
> > > I guess my knowledge base is larger, Cecil. I've lived in the
Midwest,
> > > and the South along with some of Europe and much of Africa. You talk
> > > about what you can from your limited perspective.
> > >
> >
> > Hmmm, two of the three geographical locations you mention about, Davey
Dear,
> > are not under the jurisdiction of the Affirmative Action laws of the
United
> > States. So, exactly in what way is two of the three locations you
mention
> > above (i.e., 66% of your submission) relevant to the discussion?
>
> Hmmm...The Midwest (1), the South (2), Europe (3) and Africa (4).
> You seem to have a problem with your math. At no point did I claim U.S.
> jurisdiction of the United States exists in Europe or Africa. Europe
> and Africa are permitted to contribute to one's knowledge though.
> Have a problem with that?
>

No, Dave, something isn't wrong with my math. I correct that to 50% now
that you have caused me to realize that you mention two areas within the
United States.

> > >
> > > If you choose to believe that Affirmative Action lowered no standards
> > > and did not cost more qualified whites jobs,

> > >
> >
> > Wouldn't *some* level of balance be desirable. You point up that
> > Affirmative Action did not cost more qualified whites' jobs (apostrophe
> > added), yet--what happens when there is *no* affirmative action? More
> > qualified blacks, hispanics, etc., are not even *considered* for the
job.
>
> For what purpose was an apostrophe added. My sentence conveys what I
> meant it to convey.
>
> I'm sorry but I disagree with your use of the term "qualified blacks,
> hispanics, etc..." If you lower the standards for jobs, you are not
> looking for qualified individuals. Your search is for bodies to put
> into a job regardless of qualifications. Lowered standards say, "This
> guy is almost good enough for the job".
>

And, I disagree with your premise. And here's my direct correlation between your concept above that the Affirmative Action "lowers standards for jobs" and the idea that relaxed CW testing lowers the standards in ham radio. You believe that without Affirmative Action in place, there is an even playing field among all participants for a job. You probably also figure that with strict CW testing for ham radio, there is an even playing field among participants for ham radio. Conversely, without either, you believe there will be a predominance of people who are not qualified for their jobs, and you believe there will be a predominance of hams who are not qualified to be hams, respectively.

I disagree with your assessment. I believe that without Affirmative Action, there is *nothing* in place that evens the playing field and there is *nothing* in place that keeps an employer from making decisions based on the protected classes. Every day, I witness lazy blacks, whites, hispanics, etc., that aren't doing their job while other blacks, whites, hispanics, etc., bend over to do double the duty to make up for them. However, I believe that without Affirmative Action, I'd be looking at mostly whites doing the same thing.

Likewise, in ham radio, everday I witness hams all the way up to Extra Class hams that have no business in the hobby, while I can hear new hams who are disgustingly more "profeesional" at their hobby than many. And, that was the case prior to and post- CW testing relaxation.

> > > stay with your pet theory.
> > > Maybe you'll be able to find a way to rationalize why the program was
> > > dismantled.
> > >
> >
> > Davey Dear...please think of something other than slanted comments to
> > efficiently argue your case. You are making Cecil's point (at least to
> > affirmative action), i.e., you demonstrate the irony of the whole

situation.
>
> You believe that a matter of fact statement of actuality is slanted?
> Am I not being politically correct enough for your tastes, Kimmy?
>

I don't get into political correctness, Dave. Couldn't tell you the
indifference with which I approach it.

> > >
> > > In the mean time, your analogy between Affirmative Action and morse
> > > testing is just as poor as it was when first stated by you.
>
> > Things that happen in real life across different disciplines aren't just
> > analogies, Dave, they are real examples of *attitudes* that proliferate
and
> > begin to affect the ways in which we approach many things. Getting
burnt on
> > the stove top doesn't preclude my making the same assumption about heat
from
> > *any* source.
>
> 1. Cecil tried to claim that morse testing is like Affirmative Action.
>

I think the analogy is quite obvious.

> 2. I pointed out that the reduction of morse speed in testing is akin
> to Affirmative Action.
>

Well, I approach it from either way, whether you believe to strictly test is
the Affirmative Action or to relax tests is the Affirmative Action, you both
believe that the CW testing issue is akin to Affirmative Action.

> 3. Cecil is wrong.
>

I am with Cecil's train of thought. There are others who are on your train
of thought.

> 4. You aren't really sure of what has been said but you like to make a
> comment based on your feelings.
>

Is that directed at me? Dave, maybe you run around like a geek with all
kinds of figures in your head (though, I'd find that hard to believe). In
my opinion, *MOST* people make comments based way more on feeling and
observation than anything else. Additionally, I can find research to debunk
any claim to research you find and vice versa.

> > Kim W5TIT
> >

> > PS--next thing ya know we'll be arguing now over campfires
>
> You start.
>
> Dave K8MN

Since you may have some facts and figures, Dave, just how many whites--as opposed to other ethnicities--*were* sent to Viet Nam? I don't think Affirmative Action was in place back then, was it?

Kim W5TIT

875. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:54:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf66ca1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23873

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF5FB3E.D3073460@earthlink.net...
>
> I wouldn't want my daughter listening to certain QSOs on 75m nor would I
> want her to to read the filth on the rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.
> One of the several posters of such garbage was one of the first to take
> me task for my comments on Kim's call.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Did you take *that* person to task for his/her actions? Why do you make *me* the target of your anger for that person's actions? That person was the same prior to hearing or seeing my callsign. Kids who "understand" my callsign must *know* what tits are before they hear my callsign.

Here's an analogy for you: if you are angry at me for my callsign because of some nitwit who acts like an idiot but supports my callsign; would you also make the same differentiation between someone who is Muslim and that it is *their* fault for the WTC?

Kim W5TIT

876. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:56:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011117085635.14529.00000178@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 23871

>> Now I am really confused. The graticule markings on the screen are the
>same
>> across the entire screen

>Uh, you can't see those smaller boxes in the center part of the screen? Time
>to get a new pair of specs, Ed!

Oh, those. I guess I didn't consider them as contributing to the
misunderstanding at hand or capable of causing a 2:1 error in reading the
results. :-)

73,
Ed, W1RFI

877. Re: Poignant Piece - torture??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:56:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011117085648.09918.00000370@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 23872

>Subject: Re: Poignant Piece - torture??
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/16/2001 7:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF5BB07.344E4249@sccoast.net>

> Well, you certainly have the gift of stating the obvious and saying
>absolutely nothing.

I guess that's your way of saying that you've had your nose rubbed in your own foolishness enough, eh Dwight...?!?!

>Take care, Steve.

I always do.

K4YZ

878. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 13:59:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf66dda_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23874

A man after my own heart! I especially appreciate this:

>
> "For someone who opposes even a
> hint of sexual humor in amateur radio, you're remarkably willing to
> bring both offensive insults and your own brand of sexual humor to an
> amateur radio newsgroup. Care to explain why something offensive on
> the air isn't equally offensive to the vastly LARGER audience of a
> Usenet newsgroup?
>

I'd never even thought about that, Rick. But you're absolutely right.

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:B5B1F5B248239B81.4CBBCDE552AF2A36.3225EA66FEECA657@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 01:22:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >In your practice of homosexual activity in your home, how many times
> >have you been arrested? There are numerous nudist clubs in a number of
> >states which are legal and which are not raided. Your information is
> >false. I do not have to attend them and they are not in plain view.
> >I don't have a problem with them. I don't feel the need to participate
> >in a "swing club".
>
> A few corrections to your comments:
>
> 1. I don't "practice homosexual activities." It's not that I
> have anything at all against those practices, I simply happen to be
> heterosexual.
>
> 2. Nudist clubs are _regularly_ raided by state agents who
> claim that the mere act of being nude in the company of others is
> "lewd behavior." In addition, widely acknowledged nude beaches (or do
> you insist that YOUR moral values be imposed to the extent that
> naturists should not be permitted to have consensually nude beaches
> outside of organized nudist resorts?) are frequently subject to police
> harassment and arrests for indecent exposure--even though no one is
> likely to stumble over such a beach (usually very private in location)
> accidently, and all participants consent to the nudity freely. My
> information is far from false, unfortunately.
>
> 3. There are approximately 4,000,000 swingers in the USA

> (defined as members of a married couple who voluntarily participate in
> recreational sex with other couples) NONE of whom is permitted to
> practice his/her lifestyle w/o fear of arrest and persecution. It's no
> more necessary to participate in swing clubs to feel that these
> individuals are victims of institutionalized morality than it is
> necessary to be homosexual to recognize that laws discriminate against
> individuals with that sexual orientation.
>
> >It is not necessary to do everything not prohibited by law just to prove
> >a point. The "state" is not some faceless and nameless entity. It is
> >us. If you can convince enough of your neighbors that we should have
> >porn palaces, nude dancing, nudist camps and the like on every corner,
> >perhaps you can get some laws changed.
>
> Again, two points to answer:
>
> 1. No, it isn't necessary to do everything not prohibited by
> law. On the other hand, if something is not prohibited, people have
> the _right_ to do it if they choose. Example: I don't smoke. That it
> is permitted by law isn't relevant to me--I don't choose to do it. On
> the other hand, some of my best friends DO smoke, and I acknowledge
> their rights to do so just as they acknowledge my right not to do so.
> That's what _choice_ is about.
>
> 2. What your neighbors want is relevant to neither the state
> or the law. Frankly, I don't CARE if everyone in my neighborhood
> opposes a given behavior--if that behavior occurs behind closed doors
> they simply don't have a voice in the matter from any rational
> perspective. For example, I don't happen to care for pornographic
> movies--it isn't that they offend me, but I simply don't enjoy them (I
> don't enjoy horror films either, for that matter). But the fact that I
> could care less if another porn movie is ever made or not is
> irrelevant to YOUR right to enjoy that form of entertainment.
> Unfortunately, far too many self-appointed moral judges in our society
> insist that they have the right to decide that NEITHER of us has the
> right to view such films. But even if they DID support our right to do
> so, it wouldn't matter to the state. For example, in California
> medical marijuana is legal. It doesn't matter whether you believe it
> to be beneficial or not--it happens to be the law, a law passed by
> popular vote (the method you suggest above). Despite the "will of the
> people" however, the Federal government refuses to recognize that law
> as valid and continues to prosecute people who violate marijuana
> statutes in California, regardless of whether they do so to "get high"
> or because they are receiving chemo-therapy and need it to control the
> nausea.
>
> >I don't care if Johnny plays with his toy soldiers. I care if ham radio
> >is ruined by obscenity, racism and even Kim's *wink-wink* humorous
> >attempt at adverstising her sagging assets.
>

> That put-down directed at Kim was both uncalled for and
> demonstrated a total lack of class. For someone who opposes even a
> hint of sexual humor in amateur radio, you're remarkably willing to
> bring both offensive insults and your own brand of sexual humor to an
> amateur radio newsgroup. Care to explain why something offensive on
> the air isn't equally offensive to the vastly LARGER audience of a
> Usenet newsgroup?
>
> If you're concerned with cleaning up ham radio, start with the
> racist groups on 80m and follow that with the garbage that
> periodically surfaces in the lower end of 10m and on 2m instead of
> wasting your resources picking on a woman whose only "sin" is to have
> a far better sense of humor then you yourself demonstrate.
>
> BTW, what makes you think Kim's assets are "sagging?" The
> economy is quite "perky" lately, if you haven't noticed.
>
> >Freedom in our society has limits. That you don't like the limits
> >imposed by the society is too bad. We are not an anarchic state.
>
> No, FREEDOM does NOT have limits. By definition, freedom is
> the ABSENSE of externally imposed limits.
>
> The limit is very simple to find in practical life, however.
> Ask yourself if a given act directly harms the person or property of a
> non-consenting individual. If it does, it should not be permitted. If
> it doesn't, it simply isn't the concern of society. Perhaps that would
> lead to some offensive behavior--but if you can identify a single
> consensual behavior more offensive than the self-righteous attitude of
> America's moralists you're doing a lot better than I can do.
>
> >Your premise is ridiculous.
>
> No, my premise is realistic.
>
> >I don't attend church in the public square. I attend church in a church
> >building. Don't like it? Don't show up. No fair peeking in the
> >windows either.
>
> Ok.
>
> Now tear down those public displays of a nativity, stop
> printing "In God we Trust" on my money (my religion doesn't BELIEVE in
> a god), don't teach my children to sing Christmas carols in public
> schools, stop trying to take freedom of choice from women by imposing
> your religious views of abortion on the law, insist that your church
> pay taxes (including property taxes) like the rest of us have to do,
> and stop handing out bibles on public school property, among other
> actions. You claim your church doesn't force itself on me--tell that
> to someone who believes it.

>
> >Nope. You misundertand. If you actually use your secret callsign, it
> >won't be a secret anymore. It'll be just for you. Enjoy it in private.
>
> Brilliant.
>
> I'll bet in private you have some really neat names for
> yourself, too.
>
> Come to think of it--I'll bet that in private a LOT of people
> in this newsgroup have really neat names for you, too.
>
> >The fact that I'm responding to your post demonstrates my sense of
> >humor. Not all humor is written on a restroom wall.
>
> Funny--some of the insults being made about Kim's call sign
> certainly sound like they belong there to me.
>
> >Trashy is as trashy does. Water seeks its own level.
>
> So drown. We'll wave from the shore.
>
> Rick, KE8HH
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

879. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 14:01:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf66e52_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23876

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF5FBFC.DFC50D21@earthlink.net...
> Larry Klose wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011116000328.23850.00000502@nso-fy.aol.com...
> > > In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry
Klose"
> > > <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
> > >
> > > There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a
> > society.
> >
> > You are now deciding what good for society?
>
> Wait a minute, chum. What precisely would you call your efforts to do
> away with morse testing in amateur radio? Are you deciding what is good
> for society?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Two wrongs don't make a right, Dave. You make it sound like it's OK for
your interpretation of what is good for society, but it is not OK for what
Larry K's interpretation might be.

Kim W5TIT

880. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 14:09:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf67028_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23877

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:E8AE3B5334323A05.9493654F80196D09.159ACA41CA5348C1@lp.airnews.net...
> On 17 Nov 2001 03:32:36 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> [SNIP]
> >Hmmm -- the "morality police" vs. the "immorality Taliban." Now, that
> >would make for an interesting battle, indeed!
>
> [SNIP]
> To me, you
> and the fundamentalist Christians have a LOT more in common with the
> Taliban or the Iranians than you do with civilized societies.
>
> Rick--KE8HH
>
>

Point well made. And one that I was never brave enough to mention.

Kim W5TIT

881. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 14:12:35 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf670d1$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23878

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3BF60634.52E7FCBF@ix.netcom.com...
>
> Take a look at the item offered at:
> http://cgi.ebay.com/aw-cgi/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1034480528
>
> Somehow, in a silly way, it seems related to this thread....
>

<BIG EVIL GRIN> My husband asked me if my "off" knob works... Sheesh...

Kim W5TIT

882. Hey Aaron Voobner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 16:18:55 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9t62lf01m5l@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23879

Hello Aaron,e-mail me asap.N8wwm and i are gettng a circle jerk together again...didn't want to leave you out(remember how good the last one was)?

"You ask w

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

883. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 17:03:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011117120359.22754.00000570@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 23880

In article <3BF56865.2060403@att.net>, Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
> > All it really means is that the FCC isn't going to be the guardian of good
> > taste in the choice of amateur callsigns.
>
>Hi Jim...
>
>That's true and if it did it would have to make hams NOT wear strips and
>plaids
>together at hamfests... ;-)

AAHHHHH!!! MY EYES!!!!!

Maybe we need some fashion questions on the exam....
>
> > There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a
>society.
>
>And... a BIG difference between what's in bad taste and what's bad for a
>society... witness $50.00 'Ham Radio Badge' that someone is flogging. ;-)

Agreed! The badge thingie is both.

73 de Jim, N2EY

884. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 17:03:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011117120359.22754.00000571@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 23881

In article <3bf5e331$0$30964$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry Klose"
<lklose@net-link.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011116000328.23850.00000502@nso-fy.aol.com...
>> In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry Klose"
>> <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
>>
>> There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a
>society.
>
>You are now deciding what good for society?

Just stating an observation, Larry. Do you think that what's legal is always
good for society? How about the opposite - is what's illegal always bad for
society?
>
I have opinions about what is good and bad for society. Is having those
opinions, and expressing them, bad for society?

73 de Jim, N2EY

885. Re: Ed Hare -- Anticipation Circuit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 17:15:33 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <fj6dvt4krvj2ekub8qt5rrc6j9g3plaku3@4ax.com>
Source record: 23882

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->>> Now I am really confused. The graticule markings on the screen are the
->>same
->>> across the entire screen
->
->>Uh, you can't see those smaller boxes in the center part of the screen? Time
->>to get a new pair of specs, Ed!
->
->Oh, those. I guess I didn't consider them as contributing to the
->misunderstanding at hand or capable of causing a 2:1 error in reading the
->results. :-)

Well, Ed, those are every bit as much a "division" as the outer "divisions". If you are looking at center-screen to figure out the illustration, then those are your reference lines and a source of misinterpretation. I maintain "ms/cm" would have probably been a bit more informative.

And I maintain that asymmetric on-off keying times would aid the situation greatly.

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

886. Re: Hey Aaron Voobner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 18:42:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5cyJ7.173626$3d2.7328660@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23883

"Leland KC8LD0" <Leland_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:9t62lf01m5l@drn.newsguy.com...
> Hello Aaron,e-mail me asap.N8wwm and i are gettng a circle jerk together
> again...didn't want to leave you out(remember how good the last one was)?
>
>

OOOH, a mighty blow is struck for CB freedom by some 12-year old.

887. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 18:42:20 UTC
From: K0HB@QWEST.NET
Message-ID: <8f678a0e.0111171042.367adb4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 23884

Kim-W5TIT asks:

>
>Since you may have some facts and figures, Dave, just how many whites--as
>opposed to other ethnicities--*were* sent to Viet Nam? I don't think
>Affirmative Action was in place back then, was it?
>

Obviously you don't remember SecDef Bob McNamara's "Project 100,000"!
Affirmative Action at it's ridiculous finest -- just about wrecked the
entire US Uniformed Services.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

888. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 18:53:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF6B226.60DF0E20@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23885

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> Some zealots just don't realize what makes up our society, Cecil. How many
> times have I degraded the KKK and other such groups on this newsgroup and
> not one word of agreement or acknowledgement has ever been expressed? In
> what way should I take that lack of response? That my tits are more of a
> danger to society than thoughts such as promulgated by groups like that?

Guess you need to keep them restrained, Kim, to protect society.
Reminds me of a KFAT song called "Oh S--t, Would You Look At Them Tits".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

889. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 18:57:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF6B2FE.C95CE41B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23886

Krell wrote:
> I'd like to know where in the constitution that it says that one has a right
> not to be offended.

It's not needed. Being offended is a personal choice. Every person
uses his/her free will to choose to be offended or to choose not
to be offended. Proof of this can be seen if something "offensive"
is spoken in a language that the "victim" doesn't understand.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

890. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 19:00:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF6B3E4.BE4FBFF6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23887

Richard McCollum wrote:
> By all means do your citizen thing. Just don't try to deceive others and
> far more importantly yourselves about what it is you are doing. Unless and
> until 25.5 disappears bleating on the newsgroups -- as you note we are not
> the ones to sell -- merely exposes two sophomoric twits.

You don't seriously think that the disappearance of S25.5 and Morse
code testing is going to eliminate the PCTA, do you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

891. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 19:02:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF6B449.8C90CB6D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23888

Krell wrote:
> Yes, sheep usually follow the heard without comment.

Sheep are good listeners?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

892. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 19:04:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF6B4C6.A3ACE06E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23889

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> How 'bout research is conducted on just one important facet of amateur
> radio; that of emergency communication. My money is on the idea that there
> are at least 50% of hams who are in emergency communication that are "hams
> without meat" as you say.
>
> Why don't you tell *them* and the public they serve that they are "hams
> without meat?"

Dick has so much meat he has to haul them around in a wheelbarrow. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

893. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 19:32:01 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t6dt801ar6@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23890

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF6B2FE.C95CE41B@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> > I'd like to know where in the constitution that it says that one has a
right
> > not to be offended.
>
> It's not needed. Being offended is a personal choice. Every person
> uses his/her free will to choose to be offended or to choose not
> to be offended. Proof of this can be seen if something "offensive"
> is spoken in a language that the "victim" doesn't understand.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Exactly my point! Some people toss around the word "rights" without knowing
what they're talking about.

894. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 20:02:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <YmzJ7.173683$3d2.7336258@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23891

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF6B3E4.BE4FBFF6@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > By all means do your citizen thing. Just don't try to deceive others
and
> > far more importantly yourselves about what it is you are doing. Unless
and
> > until 25.5 disappears bleating on the newsgroups -- as you note we are
not
> > the ones to sell -- merely exposes two sophomoric twits.
>
> You don't seriously think that the disappearance of S25.5 and Morse
> code testing is going to eliminate the PCTA, do you?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Well, let us see. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis changed its name to the March of Dimes and because it would be a shame to dismantle a successful organization and took on birth defects which even if they could be defined are not likely to be conquered in the lifetime of the people drawing paychecks. When the planning for the Bi-Centennial in 1976 began it was found that the Centennial Commission from 1876 was still in business. Hell it took until 1848 to put the Holy Roman Empire to sleep.

I don't seriously believe that any organization can be eliminated except by its creditors.

Dick NBK

895. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 20:28:48 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A36F0AB7393EBE40.5AB862648133D8E8.11F3487092E41E2E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23892

On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 07:30:16 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Some zealots just don't realize what makes up our society, Cecil. How many
>times have I degraded the KKK and other such groups on this newsgroup and
>not one word of agreement or acknowledgement has ever been expressed? In
>what way should I take that lack of response? That my tits are more of a
>danger to society than thoughts such as promulgated by groups like that?

Is that really so surprising in a society that prohibits teens
from seeing consensual acts of love but inundates them with warm,
caring, movies such as the Texas Chainsaw Massacre?

Our culture is terrified of pleasure--it keeps them from
wallowing in pain and punishment instead.

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

896. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 20:46:35 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D8C1AF653593A665.194BB400D1856208.4821AC985C83E673@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23893

On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 07:25:29 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>You respect nothing but your image in the mirror, Dick. And ya sure as all
>hell wouldn't recognize a good woman if you saw one.

Now be nice, Kim.

It isn't Dick's fault that he wouldn't recognize a good woman
if he saw one.

It's pretty hard to recognize someone when all you see is
their back as they're running for their lives from you!

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

897. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 20:52:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF6CE2A.BACC4EE3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23894

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> You respect nothing but your image in the mirror, Dick. And ya sure as all
> hell wouldn't recognize a good woman if you saw one.

Dick's wife's theme song is probably:
"She's A Good-Hearted Woman In Love With A Good-Timing Man".
Hey Kim, I've got a tape for you. Is your address on QRZ.com
still correct?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

898. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 22:32:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF6E586.BD3DC80E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 23895

>
>
> It is
> not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get to do
> something you do not believe makes any sense.
>

Hell, I did stuff that didn't make any sense when I was in
grammar school. Like what was the point in memorizing
poems? Made me hate poetry.

899. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 22:38:21 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf6e780_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23896

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF6CE2A.BACC4EE3@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > You respect nothing but your image in the mirror, Dick. And ya sure as
all
> > hell wouldn't recognize a good woman if you saw one.
>
> Dick's wife's theme song is probably:
> "She's A Good-Hearted Woman In Love With A Good-Timing Man".
> Hey Kim, I've got a tape for you. Is your address on QRZ.com
> still correct?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Yes, Cecil, it's all good.

Kim W5TIT

900. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-17 23:35:31 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7vCJ7.115835$WW.7168777@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23897

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3BF6E586.BD3DC80E@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> >
> >
> > It is
> > not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get to
do
> > something you do not believe makes any sense.
> >
>
> Hell, I did stuff that didn't make any sense when I was in
> grammar school. Like what was the point in memorizing
> poems? Made me hate poetry.
>

No, it means you never overcame bad teaching. We have produced gazillions of poor readers by making kids read out loud; but how else is Teach going to know? I remember nothing of some of the grammar school stuff, mostly Longfellow as I recall. But I will quote you a lot of Kipling whom I discovered in the Nam era. There isn't an Engineering student alive who cannot relate to McAndrews Hymn, everyone should really read the White Man's Burden (Take on the White Man's Burden, send forth the best ye breed, go bind your sons to exile, to serve your captive's need), nor a soldier who might not remember "And it all goes into the laundry, and never comes out in the wash, how we're sugared about by the old men, - heavy-sterned amateur old men-, that hamper and hinder and scold men, for fear of Stellenbosch'. Just as Schwartzkopf sent yo-yos coming to Saudi to get their combat tickets punched to a ship in the Indian Ocean, the Brits sent incompetant officers to Stellenbosch during the Boer War.

Now I aren't no hand with the ladies,
For, taking them all along,
You never can say til you you've tried em,
And then you are like to be wrong.
There's times when you'll thing that you mightn't,
There's times when you'll know that you might;
But the things you will learn from the Yellow and Brown,
They'll help you a lot with the White.

I've taken my fun where I found it,
And now I must pay for my fun,
For the more you have known of the others,
the less you will settle to one.

And the end of it's sitting and thinking,
and dreaming of Hell's fires to see;
So be warned by my lot (which I know you will not)
And learn about women from me.

What did the Colonel's Lady think?
Nobody never knew.
Somebody asked the Sergeant's Wife
and she told them true.
When you get to a man in the case,
They're like as a row of pins --
For the Colonel's Lady and Judy O'Grady
Are sisters under their skins.

Your loss, Mr. Casey. Be an uncultured clod if you wish but don't blame
your grammar school teacher for making the effort.

Dick, N&#65533;BK

901. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 00:20:57 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t6ut0025iv@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23898

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3BF6E586.BD3DC80E@ix.netcom.com...
> Hell, I did stuff that didn't make any sense when I was in
> grammar school. Like what was the point in memorizing
> poems? Made me hate poetry.

In my days of high school, one year of Latin was a prerequisite for taking any other foreign language, even if you wanted to take German. Pro-coders won't see this parallel, but those things are hard to see when you have tunnel vision.

902. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 02:32:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t76k2lvk0@208.207.71.133>
Source record: 23899

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9t4pl2$mnt$1@208.206.142.105...
> >
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > So's that grin on your face, right?
> >
> >
> > Yeah, actually, the mental picture of them unharnassed might bring on a
> > burst of laughter at what you're so proud of...
> >
>
> Gosh, and "they" weren't even mentioned in my response to you. Who is it is
> so proud of 'em?

I can't imagine, bit it sure is not me.
```

903. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 02:33:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t76mblvk1@208.207.71.133>
Source record: 23900

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9t4pl2$mnt$1@208.206.142.105...
> >
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > So's that grin on your face, right?
> >
> >
> > Yeah, actually, the mental picture of them unharnassed might bring on a
> > burst of laughter at what you're so proud of...
> >
>
> Gosh, and "they" weren't even mentioned in my response to you.

Thea't the "thing" about your asinine callsign- you don't have to
mention it, it's always already there in your face....or bouncing off
the floor...
```

904. Re: Hey Aaron Voobner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 02:39:30 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <CbFJ7.190848$W8.7071155@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23901

Or a 30 year old with a 12 year old mentality. Didn't even deflect my
troll-o-meter (despite having a 10:1 SWR on my phone line).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:5cyJ7.173626$3d2.7328660@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Leland KC8LD0" <Leland_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
> news:9t62lf01m5l@drn.newsguy.com...
> > Hello Aaron,e-mail me asap.N8wwm and i are gettng a circle jerk together
> > again...didn't want to leave you out(remember how good the last one
was)?
> >
> >
>
> OOOH, a mighty blow is struck for CB freedom by some 12-year old.
>
>

905. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 03:15:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t7940$1i6$0@208.207.71.176>
Source record: 23902

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9t4ok1$ld7$0@208.206.142.105...
> > It -and they- are truly a lost cause. Hams without meat.(Where's the
> > beef???) And still, Larry & co. persist.
> > ITU couldn't be even modestly interested in such a non-issue (on any
> > true scale of importance) as a 5wpm code test for hams. Especially when
> > literally millions of licensees over the past century have quickly and
> > quietly, without comment, learned code and passed whatever level of test
>
> Yes, sheep usually follow the heard without comment.

Little Freuduan slip there, hey Krell?? We 'heard' the word and just
did it. You CW phobics scattered, fleeing the herd.

906. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 03:17:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t797v$1iq$0@208.207.71.176>
Source record: 23903

Krell wrote:
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3BF6E586.BD3DC80E@ix.netcom.com...
> > Hell, I did stuff that didn't make any sense when I was in
> > grammar school. Like what was the point in memorizing
> > poems? Made me hate poetry.
>
> In my days of high school, one year of Latin was a prerequisite for taking
> any other foreign language, even if you wanted to take German. Pro-coders
> won't see this parallel

That's about right, for there IS NO parallel.

CW phobics never understand that radiotelegraphy is the most basic of
all radiocommunications modes, eminently useful even in the high tech
age. Just ask any moonbounce or coherent operator.

I didn't invent any of this, I just tell it like it is.

907. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 03:34:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF72C37.94795870@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23904

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You would have us assume that
> > your town is representative of
> > every place in the South.
>
> Not every place, but it is pretty
> typical of small towns in the Old
> South from Georgia to East Texas.
> When the students were integrated,
> by and large, the teachers were
> not.

Blaming that on some kind of racial conspiracy is ignoring the reality of the situation at the time, Cecil. The teachers of the time (black and white) had homes near their schools and had little desire to be bused around like students were. Likewise, there were not enough teachers available to just start firing teachers in a given area to replace them with the "proper" racial mix. Of course, none of that really mattered because the stated goal was to integrate students, not teachers. In time, the teachers would become just as integrated through attrition and new hiring. And, indeed, in most areas of the south today, the teachers are just as integrated as the students.

However, that is certainly no defense of affirmative action today. Affirmative action is now causing more problems than it is solving. Few school boards are willing to end affirmative action hiring when it results in accusations of racism. Because of that, affirmative action hiring continues in spite of a disproportionate representation of minority teachers in many schools. In the end, it appears affirmative action hiring will continue, never ending, until there is not a single non-minority teacher in the entire school system.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

908. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 03:58:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gmz1bz8.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 23905

On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 22:34:38 -0500, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>In the end, it appears affirmative
>action hiring will continue, never ending, until there is not a single
>non-minority teacher in the entire school system.

When the balance exceeds 50%, the "white" teachers become the
minority.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

909. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 03:58:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF731F3.4F39E3E9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23906

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You would have us assume that your town is representative of every place
> > in the South.
>
> Not every place, but it is pretty typical of small towns in the Old South
> from Georgia to East Texas. When the students were integrated, by and
> large, the teachers were not.

If you mean your area, say it. Don't presume to speak for the entire
South.

> > > > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > > > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> > >
> > > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > > you know what that makes you.
> >
> > You have indeed. Do you know what your disavowal of your own statement
> > makes you?
>
> Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I. the definition of "compart"
> is "to subdivide".

You have lost your few brain cells. I never used such a term.

I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse
> testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.

You'll get none from me. I never accused you of subdividing anything.
What you did was say that morse testing was an Affirmative Action
program.

> > > Morse code testing and Affirmative Action are similar examples of
> > > social engineering, i.e. governmental requirements attempting
> > > to get some people to do what they wouldn't normally choose to do.
> >
> > A typical Cecilian swerve on the road to truth...
>
> How you can deny reality is beyond belief. Why even have a
> governmental requirement for something that doesn't need to be
> social engineered?

It dawns on me that you wouldn't know reality if you tripped over it.

Dave K8MN

910. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:00:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF7324E.53AA8833@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23907

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > 1. Cecil tried to claim that morse testing is like Affirmative Action.
> >
> > 2. I pointed out that the reduction of morse speed in testing is akin
> > to Affirmative Action.
> >
> > 3. Cecil is wrong.
>
> So you deny that Morse code testing is an attempt at social engineering?
> Dave, virtually all governmental requirements are an attempt at social
> engineering. Last time I checked, Affirmative Action and Morse code testing
> are governmental requirements.

So is paying your taxes, Cecil. I never spoke of social engineering.
What I said is that morse testing is certainly not like Affirmative
Action...and it isn't.

Dave K8MN

911. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:05:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF733A3.FD4D947A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23908

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Well, Mr. Backwoods philosopher, I've made no attempt to discuss your
> > > > town.
> > >
> > > Of course you did, Dave. You implied that you know better than I what
> > > happened in my home town.
> >
> > Of course I did not.
>
> Of course you did, Dave. Otherwise, you wouldn't still be arguing
> about it.

Your muddled statement is preposterous.

> > When the other person changes his tale so often in order to attempt a
> > win at an argument, that person's tales become suspect. You've been
> > guilty of it in the past and you are guilty of it now.
>
> You're absolutely wrong if you think I've "changed my tale". The truth
> is that you didn't comprehend what I was saying at first. Now it
> has finally started to soak into your concrete brain and you are
> trying to blame me for your lack of comprehension.

The truth is that *YOU* didn't understand what you were saying.

> > If you are speaking of your town
> > because it is the only place you really know, say so.
>
> I said so, Dave, and you accused me of lying.

You do not live in a place called "Small Southern Town, USA".
Maybe you'll pass along some additional yarns featuring your cousin.

> You just were not paying
> attention as usual. But my home town is typical of small towns from
> Georgia to East Texas. When the students were integrated, the teachers
> were not. Forced integration of the faculty caused a lot of competent
> black teachers to obtain positions at the expense of incompetent
> white teachers. The average quality of teachers improved. After all,
> my black teacher friend had a 3.8 GPR but you apparently agree with the

> white majority around here that her skin color lowered the standards.

I don't even know that you had a black teacher friend, Cecil. I've grown accustomed to your tales. Skin color lowered no standards. White law makers legislated lowering of standards in order to meet racial quotas. I'm surprised you hadn't heard. It made all the papers.

Dave K8MN

912. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:07:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF73400.D3BF9132@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23909

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > heh heh heh, now he's going to tell you, Cecil, that *he* was *not*
> > > > discussing CW with respect to its similarity to a affirmative action
> > > > situation.
> > >
> > > Nope, he turned around and accused me of comparting them and that
> > > is simply a bold-faced lie. :-)
> >
> > Here's your bold-faced lie from Google:
> >
> > "The Great Society was filled with affirmative action programs.
> > Morse code testing is an affirmative action program."
> >
> > You may now eat your words.
>
> The word you want me to eat is "compart", which is your word,
> not mine. "Compart" means to subdivide. You said I was "comparting"
> Affirmative Action and Morse code testing. You are lying!!! I defy
> you to prove that I subdivided Affirmative Action and Morse code
> testing. There is absolutely NO subdividing in my statement above.
> Now exactly who do you think should eat your word?

I said you were "comparing" not "comparting". I provided the quote in
which you made the comparison. Munch away!

Dave K8MN

913. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:23:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF737AD.86D54B90@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23910

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > When the students were integrated, by and large, the teachers were
> > not.
>
> Blaming that on some kind of racial conspiracy is ignoring the
> reality of the situation at the time, Cecil. The teachers of the time
> (black and white) had homes near their schools and had little desire
> to be bused around like students were.

I'm talking about Madisonville, Texas, Dwight. The whole town is
only four square miles. From anywhere in town to any school is
five minutes or less. The 100% white school board would have
never hired a black teacher for white students if they could
have gotten away with it. If it were legal, they would happily
go back to segregation tomorrow.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

914. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:27:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF73892.5826F5B1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23911

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF5F9B5.151218AC@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BF5B461.6867E631@earthlink.net...
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Opinions are like a$$holes, Dave, and it looks like that's where
> some
> > > > > of yours come from. I find it interesting that you profess to know
> more
> > > > > about my home town than I do. Someday you need to demonstrate your
> > > > > crystal
> > > > > ball for us (after wiping it off, of course).
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > I guess my knowledge base is larger, Cecil. I've lived in the
> Midwest,
> > > > and the South along with some of Europe and much of Africa. You talk
> > > > about what you can from your limited perspective.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Hmmm, two of the three geographical locations you mention about, Davey
> Dear,
> > > are not under the jurisdiction of the Affirmative Action laws of the
> United
> > > States. So, exactly in what way is two of the three locations you
> mention
> > > above (i.e., 66% of your submission) relevant to the discussion?
> >
> > Hmmm...The Midwest (1), the South (2), Europe (3) and Africa (4).
> > You seem to have a problem with your math. At no point did I claim U.S.
> > jurisdiction of the United States exists in Europe or Africa. Europe
> > and Africa are permitted to contribute to one's knowledge though.
> > Have a problem with that?
> >
>
> No, Dave, something isn't wrong with my math. I correct that to 50% now
> that you have caused me to realize that you mention two areas within the
> United States.

Maybe the problem lies not with your math but with your thinking
processes themselves.

> > > >
> > > > If you choose to believe that Affirmative Action lowered no standards
> > > > and did not cost more qualified whites jobs,
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Wouldn't *some* level of balance be desirable. You point up that
> > > > Affirmative Action did not cost more qualified whites' jobs (apostrophe
> > > > added), yet--what happens when there is *no* affirmative action? More
> > > > qualified blacks, hispanics, etc., are not even *considered* for the
> job.
> > >
> > > For what purpose was an apostrophe added. My sentence conveys what I
> > > meant it to convey.
> > >
> > > I'm sorry but I disagree with your use of the term "qualified blacks,
> > > hispanics, etc..." If you lower the standards for jobs, you are not
> > > looking for qualified individuals. Your search is for bodies to put
> > > into a job regardless of qualifications. Lowered standards say, "This
> > > guy is almost good enough for the job".
> > >
> >
> > And, I disagree with your premise. And here's my direct correlation between
> > your concept above that the Affirmative Action "lowers standards for jobs"
> > and the idea that relaxed CW testing lowers the standards in ham radio. You
> > believe that without Affirmative Action in place, there is an even playing
> > field among all participants for a job. You probably also figure that with
> > strict CW testing for ham radio, there is an even playing field among
> > participants for ham radio. Conversely, without either, you believe there
> > will be a predominance of people who are not qualified for their jobs, and
> > you believe there will be a predominance of hams who are not qualified to be
> > hams, respectively.
> >
> > I disagree with your assessment. I believe that without Affirmative Action,
> > there is *nothing* in place that evens the playing field and there is
> > *nothing* in place that keeps an employer from making decisions based on the
> > protected classes. Every day, I witness lazy blacks, whites, hispanics,
> > etc., that aren't doing their job while other blacks, whites, hispanics,
> > etc., bend over to do double the duty to make up for them. However, I
> > believe that without Affirmative Action, I'd be looking at mostly whites
> > doing the same thing.

So your "touchy-feely" idea is that not only white people should be free
to goof off?

> > Likewise, in ham radio, everday I witness hams all the way up to Extra Class
> > hams that have no business in the hobby, while I can hear new hams who are
> > disgustingly more "profeesional" at their hobby than many. And, that was
> > the case prior to and post- CW testing relaxation.

Hams who sound "digustingly more profeesional"? Gee, this entire time,
I believed I was a participant in *amateur* radio. If you wanna go pro,
hit broadcast school or become a police or taxi dispatcher. Your
statements are predictably subjective and completely unsubstantiated.

> > > > stay with your pet theory.
> > > > Maybe you'll be able to find a way to rationalize why the program was
> > > > dismantled.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Davey Dear...please think of something other than slanted comments to
> > > > efficiently argue your case. You are making Cecil's point (at least to
> > > > affirmative action), i.e., you demonstrate the irony of the whole
> situation.
> > >
> > > You believe that a matter of fact statement of actuality is slanted?
> > > Am I not being politically correct enough for your tastes, Kimmy?
> > >
> >
> > I don't get into political correctness, Dave. Couldn't tell you the
> > indifference with which I approach it.
> >
> > > > > >
> > > > > In the mean time, your analogy between Affirmative Action and morse
> > > > > testing is just as poor as it was when first stated by you.
> > >
> > > > Things that happen in real life across different disciplines aren't just
> > > > analogies, Dave, they are real examples of *attitudes* that proliferate
> and
> > > > begin to affect the ways in which we approach many things. Getting
> burnt on
> > > > the stove top doesn't preclude my making the same assumption about heat
> from
> > > > *any* source.
> > >
> > > 1. Cecil tried to claim that morse testing is like Affirmative Action.
> > >
> >
> > I think the analogy is quite obvious.

Try to pull the scales from your eyes and see that reducing code speed
in morse testing is really like Affirmative Action. It lowers the
standards.

> > 2. I pointed out that the reduction of morse speed in testing is akin
> > to Affirmative Action.
> >
> >
> > Well, I approach it from either way, whether you believe to strictly test is
> > the Affirmative Action or to relax tests is the Affirmative Action, you both
> > believe that the CW testing issue is akin to Affirmative Action.

We certainly do not both believe that morse testing is akin to
Affirmative Action. If you'd bothered to read previous posts, it would
have been quite clear to you. As to "I approach it from either way":
Phew!

> > 3. Cecil is wrong.
> >
>
> I am with Cecil's train of thought. There are others who are on your train
> of thought.

Cecil's train derailed. I hope neither of your were badly injured.

> > 4. You aren't really sure of what has been said but you like to make a
> > comment based on your feelings.
> >
>
> Is that directed at me? Dave, maybe you run around like a geek with all
> kinds of figures in your head (though, I'd find that hard to believe). In
> my opinion, *MOST* people make comments based way more on feeling and
> observation than anything else. Additionally, I can find research to debunk
> any claim to research you find and vice versa.

I won't bother with a reasoned reply to this, Kim. It'd only honk you
off.

> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > PS--next thing ya know we'll be arguing now over campfires
> >
> > You start.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Since you may have some facts and figures, Dave, just how many whites--as
> opposed to other ethnicities--*were* sent to Viet Nam? I don't think
> Affirmative Action was in place back then, was it?

I went. I'm white. I remember seein' a lot of black folks there but we
outnumbered 'em. Maybe if we had Affirmative Action back then, their
numbers could have been increased. You and Cecil would have been
pleased at the increased job opportunities this would have provided.

Perhaps you care to indicate what possible effect any of this will have
on amateur radio. Before Cecil's diversion factory cranked up, all we
had going is my disagreement with him over his comparison of morse
testing and Affirmative Action.

Dave K8MN

915. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:33:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF73A1B.9CC4869B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23912

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF5FB3E.D3073460@earthlink.net...
> >
> > I wouldn't want my daughter listening to certain QSOs on 75m nor would I
> > want her to to read the filth on the rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.
> > One of the several posters of such garbage was one of the first to take
> > me task for my comments on Kim's call.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Did you take *that* person to task for his/her actions?

Yes. Did you miss me response to him here?

> Why do you make
> *me* the target of your anger for that person's actions? That person was
> the same prior to hearing or seeing my callsign.

I'm not angry with you, Kim. I'm unhappy with your lack of class and
decorum. I was unhappy with your choice before the other fellow made
his comments. You hav the cart before the horse.

> Kids who "understand" my
> callsign must *know* what tits are before they hear my callsign.

And your point there is that once you've heard a word and understand
what it means, its frequent use becomes permissable?

> Here's an analogy for you: if you are angry at me for my callsign because of
> some nitwit who acts like an idiot but supports my callsign; would you also
> make the same differentiation between someone who is Muslim and that it is
> *their* fault for the WTC?

Here's an answer for you: We're not talking about Muslims or the WTC.
We're talking about your unfortunate decision. I wouldn't elevate your
situation to the status of current world events. We're dealing with
terror, not tackiness.

Dave K8MN

916. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:34:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF73A47.798B3EE1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23914

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:

> If you mean your area, say it. Don't presume to speak for the entire
> South.

I would be stupid to try to speak for the entire South, Dave. I know what
my area is like and it is my personal opinion that it is typical of small
southern towns from Georgia to East Texas. I have seen no evidence otherwise.

You posting the following sentence. You are a bold-faced liar when
you say you didn't use the word "compart" which means to subdivide.

> > > > > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > > > > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
^^^^^^^^^^
> > Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I. the definition of "compart"
> > is "to subdivide".
>
> You have lost your few brain cells. I never used such a term.

How can you possibly deny using such a term when it is marked in evidence
in your earlier posting above? It's just one more of your attempts to deny
reality. How can you give yourself permission to lie when it is obvious
to everyone who sees your earlier posting above that you are lying?

> I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse
> > testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.
>
> You'll get none from me. I never accused you of subdividing anything.

That's a lie, as proved by your posting above. "Compart" means to
subdivide. Are you so far gone that you cannot tell the truth?

> > How you can deny reality is beyond belief. Why even have a
> > governmental requirement for something that doesn't need to be
> > social engineered?
>
> It dawns on me that you wouldn't know reality if you tripped over it.

Deny reality and then mount an ad hominem attack, eh?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!

Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

917. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:35:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C18B7975A8290316.1833EBCB5FDAC5A2.8E675915F51E48D8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23913

On 18 Nov 2001 02:33:47 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Thea't the "thing" about your asinine callsign- you don't have to
>mention it, it's always already there in your face....or bouncing off
>the floor...

Dick, you keep criticizing Kim for her choice of call signs.
Did you ever consider YOUR choice of nick names for Richard???

Sounds like the war of the body parts to me!

Rick (a _non-offensive_ nick name for Richard), KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

918. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:37:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF73B14.292B0C66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23917

Dave Heil wrote:
> I never spoke of social engineering.
> What I said is that morse testing is certainly not like Affirmative
> Action...and it isn't.

Is Affirmative Action social engineering? Obviously yes!
Is Morse Code Testing social engineering? Obviously yes!
Things similar to the same thing are similar to each other.
Are you also going to deny the validity of logic?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

919. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:38:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF73B37.ED168F65@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23915

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF5FBFC.DFC50D21@earthlink.net...
> > Larry Klose wrote:
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20011116000328.23850.00000502@nso-fy.aol.com...
> > > > In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry
> Klose"
> > > > <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
> > > > >
> > > > There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for a
> > > society.
> > > >
> > > You are now deciding what good for society?
> > >
> > Wait a minute, chum. What precisely would you call your efforts to do
> > away with morse testing in amateur radio? Are you deciding what is good
> > for society?
> > >
> > Dave K8MN
> > >
>
> Two wrongs don't make a right, Dave. You make it sound like it's OK for
> *your* interpretation of what is good for society, but it is not OK for what
> Larry K's interpretation might be.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Larry is the one who accused another of doing what he himself is
attempting. I just pointed it out to him. I didn't make it sound like
anything except that which it is.

Dave K8MN

920. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:39:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF73B58.E4B83E59@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23916

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Since you may have some facts
> and figures, Dave, just how
> many whites--as opposed to
> other ethnicities--*were*
> sent to Viet Nam? (snip)

Pick up a good Almanac, Kim. They are perfect for this type of thing.

Anyway, during the Vietnam War (Aug 64 - Jan 73), 8,752,000 Americans served in the armed forces, with 58,193 deaths. Of those numbers, 247,937 were African Americans, with 5,681 deaths. In other words, only slightly more than 2.8 percent of the soldiers serving during the Vietnam War were African American, with those accounting for slightly less than 9.8 percent of the deaths.

During the same time period (Aug 64 - Jan 73), African Americans accounted for about 11.1 percent of the U.S. population. In other words, African Americans served, and died, in numbers far less than their proportion to the total population.

By the way, the other two major minority groups at the time (Asians and Hispanics) each accounted for less than one percent of those serving, and of the deaths.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

921. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:45:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF73CD8.ED04F360@earthlink.net>
Source record: 23918

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 07:30:16 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Some zealots just don't realize what makes up our society, Cecil. How many
> >times have I degraded the KKK and other such groups on this newsgroup and
> >not one word of agreement or acknowledgement has ever been expressed? In
> >what way should I take that lack of response? That my tits are more of a
> >danger to society than thoughts such as promulgated by groups like that?
>
> Is that really so surprising in a society that prohibits teens
> from seeing consensual acts of love but inundates them with warm,
> caring, movies such as the Texas Chainsaw Massacre?

Izzat what you call porn movies--"consensual acts of love"? You should
be defending the public's right to view The Texas Chainsaw Massacre
types of film. After all, they aren't illegal and no one is forced to
watch them.

> Our culture is terrified of pleasure--it keeps them from
> wallowing in pain and punishment instead.

Or so one would gather from reading the past "morse testing as torture"
postings seen here in recent years.

Dave K8MN

922. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:53:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF73ED7.AD483068@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23919

Dave Heil wrote:
> The truth is that *YOU* didn't understand what you were saying.

Of course, you never make a mistake, are always right, and the
rest of the world is always wrong. You are omniscient so you
always understand everything. OTOH, I am a mere mortal but I
indeed do understand what I am saying which is that Affirmative
Action was not all bad and did allow competent black teachers
to replace incompetent white teachers in this area of the USA.

> You do not live in a place called "Small Southern Town, USA".

Madisonville, Texas is indeed a small southern town in the USA
typical of small towns all across the South. That you are incapable
of conceiving of such an abstraction is your problem, not mine.

> I don't even know that you had a black teacher friend, Cecil.

OH!!!!?????? Admitting that you are not omniscient? Up until now,
you have implied that you know everything about me and my home town
and I am wrong about it even though I live here. Truth is, you don't
know a whole lot about me, my home town, and what happened in Small
Southern Town, USA.

My black teacher friend's name is Viola Taylor. She and I graduated
from high school in Madisonville in 1955 but we didn't know each
other until we went to Sam Houston State Teacher's College
together. I could get a teaching job in Madisonville but
she couldn't in spite of being more qualified than I.

Incidentally, I was glad to see the incompetent white teachers
go. The Madisonville school system is now top rated among
schools in its league. Reckon how that happened?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

923. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 04:55:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t7evs$l2f$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 23920

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 18 Nov 2001 02:33:47 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Thea't the "thing" about your asinine callsign- you don't have to
> >mention it, it's always already there in your face....or bouncing off
> >the floor...
>
> Dick, you keep criticizing Kim for her choice of call signs.
> Did you ever consider YOUR choice of nick names for Richard???
>
> Sounds like the war of the body parts to me!
>

It would, to you. That's because you want to see it that way. On the other hand, I didn't choose that Dick is the most commonly used nickname for Richard. And Kim *DID* choose to advertise her grossly overly ample anatomy via her titillating callusing.
Yes, that's right - some people-in fact many people, regard all that as unpleasantly excessive, especially when the bearer flaunts it, and it's not really that attractive that it should be flaunted in the first place.
Anyone with sufficient behind-the-scenes experience will already know that. It's illusory.

924. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:05:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t7fim$n1l$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 23921

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF5FB3E.D3073460@earthlink.net...
> >
> > I wouldn't want my daughter listening to certain QSOs on 75m nor would I
> > want her to to read the filth on the rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.
> > One of the several posters of such garbage was one of the first to take
> > me task for my comments on Kim's call.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Did you take *that* person to task for his/her actions? Why do you make
> *me* the target of your anger for that person's actions? That person was
> the same prior to hearing or seeing my callsign. Kids who "understand" my
> callsign must *know* what tits are before they hear my callsign.
>
> Here's an analogy for you: if you are angry at me for my callsign because of
> some nitwit who acts like an idiot but supports my callsign; would you also
> make the same differentiation between someone who is Muslim and that it is
> *their* fault for the WTC?
>

Yep- Read all about it right here...Something I posted on another venue
I'll repeat here.

September 11 will prove
to be a turning point, the point at which I believe Western civilization
will have begun to back away from the concept of "freedom of religion".

I say this after doing a bit of study on the basics of the religion
of Islam. Those basic tenants include *total* lack of tolerance for
other
beliefs. Islam is both "THE" religion and the functional government. The
superiority of Islam is fundamental. There is no room for any other
belief system, anywhere on earth. All others are to be treated in one of
three ways -

They must be (1). Converted to Islam, or they must be
(2). Subjugated, (enslaved) or they must be
(3). Eliminated - That means killed,(except for women,
children and slaves).

Islamic law (which is at once the religious *and* civil law) dictates these actions to all who believe in Islam. These actions are *not* optional, they are divinely ordered to *all* who will follow Islam. "Jihad" is the term often used, but it is an all-out holy war on non-believers, nonstop, forever, or for whatever length of time it takes for it to be won. For Islam. Believers are obligated to offer their own lives to the cause without reservation. This is for real. Delays, of whatever length, are only temporary. The war WILL go on, till it is won. Allah says so. As a Believer, you have no choice.

So how, then, does a civilization (ours) which in basis depends on freedom of religion and separation of religion from government, begin to deal with a religion whose principles dictate the destruction of the very system which promotes tolerance of it? How can that "religion" be allowed to prosper and spread, without causing the complete destruction of the free system that nourished it? Is "religous freedom" to include a religion which dictates the destruction of all other forms of religious belief?

Here is an interesting and very revealing book on the subject:

"America, Oil and the Islamic Mind", by Michael Youssef, Ph.D, Zondervan Publishing House (Division of Harper-Collins) 1983,1991. ISBN 0-310-75521-2 (135 pages, available in paperback)

Youssef, a Christian, grew up in the Middle East and has many valued Islamic friends. His review of the relationship between the Islamic and non-Islamic worlds is very revealing, and I must say in light of Sept 11 and
subsequent events, also very chilling. (Note that the book was written long before these current events).

Youssef writes as a devout practicing Christian who believes that Christianity can overcome the sinister Islamic point of view, but I found the book to be striking for its descriptions of the basics of the Moslem viewpoint and the makeup of the Islamic world both historically and in this era. And I must say that I cannot share his optimism. I wonder if he retains it himself in view of recent events.

We'd better get used to some dramatic changes in the way we think about the world around us. There are half as many Islamics in the world as Christians. They are taught from infancy to generally hate and despise us, that we are wholly inferior, and to either change us or else eliminate
us, while we preach tolerance of them and their beliefs.
It may prove to be quite a contest. Especially since a great many Islamics view their huge oil reserves as divine proof of the rightousness
of their cause, and they have also invested huge amounts of surplus oil cash in the West, particularly the USA.

Dick W0EX

925. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:08:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF74269.3926A77D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23922

Dave Heil wrote:
> I said you were "comparing" not "comparting". I provided the quote in
> which you made the comparison. Munch away!

You are such a liar, Dave. Here's *YOUR* posting. Read it and weep.
The posting is still on most of the news servers so anyone can
verify your lying ways. You accused me of "comparting" and I
expect an apology.
****
> Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
> From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2001 00:43:24 GMT
>
> I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
^^^^^^^^^^
****
Do you lie to your employer like that? Do you lie to your wife like that?
How do you give yourself permission to lie in public when the truth is
there for all to see?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

926. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:16:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF74427.5D8A0C1A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23923

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I didn't invent any of this, I just tell it like it is.

As a matter of fact, you do invent what is in your mind,
Dick. We all do and those inventions are all filtered
through different gray matter resulting in a multitude
of different views of reality. All you are capable of
is relating your opinion, which may or may not be
"like it is".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

927. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:24:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t7glm$qd6$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 23924

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BF5F9DF.B5A733B5@IEEE.org...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > Precisely, and that point is reached when our behavior as hams causes
> > > potential newcomers to be turned off by people who choose to exercise
> > > their "right" to offend others.
> >
> > Larry, I don't know of any newsgroup poster who has exercised his
> > "right" to offend others more often than you have.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >
>
> Larry doesn't think there's anyone who is offended by what he
> says...although it is darned hard to take someone like him seriously...
>

Someone who chooses a callsign of W5TIT finds it hard to take anyone
else seriously? Whatta gas! That's a part of what you did - trivialize
the entire ARS system. I sure hope you don't expect to be taken
seriously in ham radio circles, any of them.

928. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:26:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t7gqd$qd6$1@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 23925

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 22:34:38 -0500, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> >In the end, it appears affirmative
> >action hiring will continue, never ending, until there is not a single
> >non-minority teacher in the entire school system.
>
> When the balance exceeds 50%, the "white" teachers become the
> minority.

No, because they view it on percentage of total population, not teacher numbers. That is the gross inequity of affirmative action, it never is satisfied.

929. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:32:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF747D9.F6529907@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23926

Rick Adams wrote:
> Dick, you keep criticizing Kim for her choice of call signs.
> Did you ever consider YOUR choice of nick names for Richard???

Seems entirely appropriate to me. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

930. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:35:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF7488F.3D4932C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23927

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Someone who chooses a callsign of W5TIT finds it hard to take anyone
> else seriously? Whatta gas! That's a part of what you did - trivialize
> the entire ARS system. I sure hope you don't expect to be taken
> seriously in ham radio circles, any of them.

Dick, if a single cute call sign can "trivialize the entire ARS
system" then the ARS was trivial before the call was issued.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

931. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:37:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF74936.464EE538@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23929

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm not angry with you, Kim. I'm unhappy with your lack of class and
> decorum.

Too bad the Taliban has been routed. You could have gotten a job
with their Department of Vice and Virtue.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

932. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:38:54 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <OPHJ7.174222$3d2.7392843@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23928

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t7fim$n1l$0@208.206.142.92...
>
>
> September 11 will prove
> to be a turning point, the point at which I believe Western civilization
> will have begun to back away from the concept of "freedom of religion".
>
> I say this after doing a bit of study on the basics of the religion
> of Islam. Those basic tenants include *total* lack of tolerance for
> other
> beliefs. Islam is both "THE" religion and the functional government. The
> superiority of Islam is fundamental. There is no room for any other
> belief system, anywhere on earth. All others are to be treated in one of
> three ways -
>
> They must be (1). Converted to Islam, or they must be
> (2). Subjugated, (enslaved) or they must be
> (3). Eliminated - That means killed,(except for women,
> children and slaves).
>
> Islamic law (which is at once the religious *and* civil law) dictates
> these actions to all who believe in Islam. These actions are *not*
> optional, they are divinely ordered to *all* who will follow Islam.
> "Jihad" is the term often used, but it is an all-out holy war on
> non-believers, nonstop, forever, or for whatever length of time it takes
> for it to be won. For Islam. Believers are obligated to offer their own
> lives to the cause without reservation. This is for real. Delays, of
> whatever length, are only temporary. The war WILL go on, till it is won.
> Allah says so. As a Believer, you have no choice.
>
> Dick W0EX

With all due respect, Dick, bullshit. Islam created the greatest single civilization this world has ever seen from the southern Philippines and the Indo-Chinese border area to Spain from about 800 to about 1300 AD. Most of the major stars in astronomy are Arabic-named, our number system is a theft from the Persians who stole it from the Hindus. Members of other religions including Christians, Jews, and many others including honest-to-goodness Samaritans lived quite peacefully in Islamic-ruled areas for centuries including Orthodox monasteries and the Christian shrines in Nazareth and Bethlehem among others.

There is a pretty good argument that Saladin & Co were the only civilized people at the Crusades but the western kings dragged home such things as

business law - equity - from Islam that as it did for them made the English-speaking world the commercial masters of the planet. They also took home the Greek manuscripts that started the Renaissance and later the Protestant Reformation. Spain hasn't been worth a shit since expelling both Jews and Moors in 1492 while bankrolling a self-serving nincompoop named Columbus.

It started to come unglued with the Marmalukes and two waves of Turks who, among other things, outlawed printing. European colonization didn't help a bit and the establishment of Israel was in a lot of ways the last straw. So yes, the extremists are in control and as Mohammet was a bit of an anarchist as well as a bathing fiend there is no central authority to call the various offshoots of Wahabbism wrong. The Islamic law is no more binding than the rabbinical one in Leviticus is on Israel. But yes, they have their troubles with the God Squad as well.

Far from leading to some sort of culture war, it is more likely that Islam is about to go into something resembling a reformation to get a handle on its more extreme interpretations. Remember please we have Southern Baptists over the slavery issue, we have churches with more interpretations than preachers. By subdividing the territory beyond the Shia-Sunni split which resembles the SLC-Independence split in the LDS BTW it can be made more certain that no one speaks for God and secularization can take place. This is really what the Reformation did for the Christian world.

And with any luck, a follower of Islam will make the necessary acts his faith requires by himself and in small congregations while life continues. I give them far more chance of pulling it off than the Israelis have of dealing with the Hassidim.

Dick BK

933. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:52:50 UTC
From: "Larry Roll, K3LT" <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <9t7ibi$3p0$0@216.155.33.106>
Source record: 23930

>You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
>Town, USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the
>status of expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition,
>I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
>comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
>
>> > Can you come up with any verifiable facts to support your claim or are
you
>> > just blowing smoke?
>>
>> I commuted to Sam Houston State Teacher's College with a black lady
>> while
>> I was obtaining my Texas Teaching Certificate. She was getting one also
>> along with a Master's Degree. She was a superior person with a high IQ.
>> She could not get a teaching job in Madison County so she got one in
>> Harris
>> County. Affirmative Action later allowed her to move back to her home
>> town
>> and teach. Incompetent white teachers were let go and competent black
>> teachers
>> were hired. Left to the tyranny of the white majority, that would not
>> have
>> happened even with the civil rights law in place. My low-IQ cousin, who
>> had
>> flunked out of Texas A&M, was one of the teachers who was let go. He was
>> teaching his students that transistors were made out of geranium.
>
>So we have only your wild tales as proof. Tyranny of the white majority
>indeed. Perhaps you can entertain us with tales of your cousin's work
>in seminole conductors.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Soooo...now Cecil is a "minority wannabe?" Or does he just think he can win
friends and influence liberal people by "anti-white man" stories? I'm sure
Cecil
thinks that white men are the worst evil ever inflicted upon the face of the
Earth,
and is dreadfully sorry he was born one himself. Never a mention of how
Affirmative Action has been used as a legalized form of reverse
discrimination,
and has ruined the careers of untold numbers of qualified non-minority
professionals in order to make opportunities for people who merely show up

for the interview, but later on, hardly ever show up for work!

I believe in Equal Opportunity, not equalized outcomes. Affirmative Action is nothing more than another way liberal, socialist politicians keep themselves
in power by pandering to the lowest common denominator.

73 de Larry, K3LT

934. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:53:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF74CD7.E418F006@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23931

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I say this after doing a bit of study on the basics of the religion
> of Islam. Those basic tenants include *total* lack of tolerance for other
> beliefs. Islam is both "THE" religion and the functional government. The
> superiority of Islam is fundamental. There is no room for any other
> belief system, anywhere on earth.

You can replace "Islam" with "Southern Baptist" and the same thing is
true. Southern Baptists believe that Catholics and Mormons are going
to hell along with all other religions. Catholics are the terrorists
in Northern Ireland. The terrorists who bomb abortion clinics and
murder abortion doctors are invariably fundamentalist Christians.
Their crimes differ only in magnitude, not in kind, from the
Muslim terrorists.

The great majority of Muslims are no more lunatic fringe than the
great majority of Southern Baptists. They are just another
fundamentalist religion in the US. By condemning all followers
of Islam, you are just another biased collectivist, filled with
and spreading evil and hate, i.e. a psychological terrorist.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

935. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 05:56:43 UTC
From: "Larry Roll, K3LT" <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <9t7iir$4ir$0@216.155.33.106>
Source record: 23932

Phil Kane wrote in message ...
>On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 22:34:38 -0500, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>>In the end, it appears affirmative
>>action hiring will continue, never ending, until there is not a single
>>non-minority teacher in the entire school system.
>
> When the balance exceeds 50%, the "white" teachers become the
> minority.
>
>--
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil:

Yeah, and when that happens, how much do you wanna bet that white teachers (and any other white person seeking professional employment) are suddenly going to find the rules changed to keep them from being considered a legitimate "minority" for AA purposes?

73 de Larry, K3LT

936. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 06:01:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF74E9F.9CF82C39@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23933

"Larry Roll, K3LT" wrote:
> I believe in Equal Opportunity, not equalized outcomes.

That's exactly what I believe in, Larry. I believe the most
qualified person should get the job even if he/she is black.
Unfortunately, teeth had to be put into the law to force that
to happen and we are still paying the price for racism.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

937. ARNewsline 1266 - Nov 16 2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 06:29:30 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011118012930.19304.00000936@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 23934

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1266 – NOV. 16, 2001

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1266 with a release date of Friday, November 16th, 2001 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio operators respond to a plane crash in New York City and Russia says “No” to No-Code. These stories are first on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1266 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAMS HELP IN AFTERMATH OF NYC JETLINER CRASH

Ham radio operators in New York City, still weary from the aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attacks were called out once again. This, after an American Airlines jetliner in route to the Dominican Republic broke up in flight shortly after takeoff from Kennedy Airport. The Airbus A-300 had 265 passangers and crew. It crashed moments after takeoff setting homes ablaze on thrr Rockaway penninsulia. There were no known survivors. We have more in this report:

--

When American Airlines Flight 587 crashed just minutes after takeoff from Kennedy Airport in New York City on November 12th, the Salvation Army was one of the first groups to arrive at the disaster scene. It brought in several mobile canteens to help feed rescue workers and residents whose houses had been damaged or destroyed.

The Salvation Army regularly uses ham radio operators in its SATERN network to maintain communications between its units at a disaster site. This being the second disaster to hit New York in two months' time, the Salvation Army Incident Commander asked the SATERN disaster command operator, Carlos Varon, K2LCV,to request additional ham volunteers. Operators were needed to staff the canteens and a mobile command post.

Initially up to a half dozen ham stations were to be set up at various locations near the crash site and another at Salvation Army Headquarters in Manhattan. It was anticipated that the communications mission would last three to four days.

Also, according to ARRL New York City and Long Island Section Manager George Tranos, N2GA, the League's Amateur Radio Emergency Service was on standby for the American Red Cross. Hams were later reported as providing communications support to the Red Cross for its operations.

But getting to any assignment was not easy. New York officials initially feared this was another terror attack and put the city into a near lock-down, closing all airports, bridges and tunnels for several hours after the crash. In addition, the crash site itself was on an island, and access to the area was severely restricted. All this made it difficult for ham volunteers to reach their assignments. Finally, they were all told to gather in one place where they would be escorted in by a Salvation Army command vehicle.

Among those who helped organize the ham radio response was Mark Phillips, KC2ENI, the ARR Emergency Coordinator for Queens County. The Rockaway Command station was Joseph Albertus KB2QLE and Net Control on the 147.090 MHz repeater was Michael Lunetta W2MPL.

From the offices of CQ Magazine, I'm Rich Moseson, W2VU.

--

Authorities who found the flight data recorder said it contains information leading to an initial conclusion that mechanical failure of the Airbus jet was the cause of the crash. (W2VU, WB2FXN, K2VMR, N2GA, and communications monitored on the 147.09 repeater)
**

RESTRUCTURING: RUSSIA SAYS NYET TO NO-CODE

The Russian Federation has said ‘nyet’ to no-code. According to the W.I.A. Victoria News, the Federation says that there are good reasons for the Amateur Service to continue with Morse as a license requirement for operation below 30MHz. It also says that it has no plans to make any changes to its domestic licence conditions. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Roy Neal. K6DUE, takes a look at the surprise Russian position:

--

"Keep the Morse Code." That's the position of The Russian Federation. It was revealed by the International Telecommunications Union on the 12th of October, when that organization released a position document for the World Radio Conference of 2003..

The Russian Federation told the ITU that it supports most changes to International Radio Regulation S-25, which sets forth qualifications for radio amateurs. But, says the Federation, keep the Morse code. Reasons? First a strong belief that Morse testing is the big difference between Amateur Radio and the Russian version of Citizen's Radio Services. The Russian Federation also points out that lowering the code requirement in many other nations has not led to a significant increase in the number of hams in those countries.

The Federation says that it surveyed Russian radio operators and found overwhelming support for retention of the code and the Russians say Morse is one of the most effective means of communication in emergencies with clear benefits in reducing interference on the high frequency bands.

What does it mean to the rest of the world, this decision to retain Morse testing? Jim Linton, VK3PC, is the author of Australia's "Morse Code Watch."

He says the Russian Federation's position can be accomodated easily. This because any new I-T-U Radio Regulation S-25 to come out of the World Radio Conference in 2003 will set only a minimum qualification standard for radio amateurs. It will not force that standard on any country.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Roy Neal, K6DUE

--

As previously reported, the IARU Administrative Council voted on October 8th to support dropping Morse as a qualifying criterion for high frequency access. It says that Morse testing is no longer relevant to the healthy future of amateur radio. (W.I.A. Victoria, W5YI Report)

**

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARCONI'S HISTORIC TRANS-ATLANTIC RADIO TRANSMISSION

I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in Los Angeles, with a late breaking bit of radio history.

December 12th will mark the 100th anniversary of the first Trans-Atlantic radio transmission by Guglielmo Marconi. To commemorate the event, The Marconi Radio Club and The Falmouth Amateur Radio Association radio operators are making plans to celebrate this important historical event from December 11th to the 16th. And in this very rare recorded interview supplied by Q-News, Marconi himself commented on the his first contact across the Atrlantic pond. Take a listen:

--
Audio of Marconi commentary here. No text available. Please listen to audio newscast. Links are at http://www.arnewsline.org.
--

The signal Marconi referred to was a series of the letter S transmitted using CW across the Atlantic from Poldhu, Cornwall England to St John's, Newfoundland. For this 100th anniversary, the Marconi Radio Club will be using the call sign W1AA slash CC and will be operating from Cape Cod, Massachusetts, U.S.A.. This was the location of Marconi's 1903 Trans-Atlantic radio station. Marconi's 1903 call sign back then was "C C"

For exact times, frequencies and modes of operation for W1AA slash CC go to www.qrz.com/database?callsign=w1aa) (K1VV, Marconi Radio Club W1AA. Marconi audio supplied by Q-News)

**

BREAK 1

This is ham radio news coming to you from the United States of America. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world, including the X-Warn repeater serving Green County Ohio.

(5 Sec Pause Here)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: G3 MAY HAVE TO WAIT

It now appears very unlikely that new G 3 personal communications technology will share the same spectrum worldwide. Amateur Radio Newsline’sa Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, tells us the U-S military has other ideas:

--

While Europe and Asia have reached accord on commen frequencies for the introduction of G 3, the September 11th terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington have convinced the Departrment of Defense to take a different position. The DoD now says that it is not in the national interest to relinquist spectrum in the 1710 to 1850 Mhz band just because that happens to be the same spectrum to be used commercially overseas.

According to the latest issue of the W5YI Report the Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association says that the Department of Defense will encounter interference from 3 G wireless devices but the DoD disagrees. It says that whatever equipment it has is far more powerful. The DoD adds that it may interfere with 3 G cellular telephones oversaeas but that the cellphones will not adversly impact on the military or its operations.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ.

--

In other words, over here in the United States, if G 3 wants 1710 to 1850 Mhz -- its going to have to wait. (W5YI Report)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: EMERGENCY CELLULAR TELEPHONE PLAN

Verizon Wireless and the United States government are in the final stages of a deal that would give some emergency officials priority access to the company's cellular network. Under the agreement, about 2,000 federal, state and local officials would be given a code that allows them priority over others trying to make calls.

The system, intended to be used only in times of crisis, would be operational in New York, Washington and Salt Lake City, the site of the 2002 Winter Olympics. Verizon has submitted a request to the Federal Communications Commission, which must review and approve some elements of the plan. According to a government official who spoke on condition of anonymity, others trying to make calls could get busy signals because of the plan. (Published news reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC TO CB OPERATOR – TIME TO PAY THE FINE

The FCC has told a mid-West C-B operator that he has to pay the price of breaking the rules. This after the agency affirms a $9500 Monetary Forfeiture issued last summer to Klaus D. Kramer of Oklahoma City Oklahoma.

--
The Klaus Kramer story goes back to last February. This is when the FCC received several complaints of a CB radio station operating with excessive power in Oklahoma City. The Dallas office sent agents to locate the source of the transmissions. In the course of the two day investigation the agents traced transmissions to three locations including Mikes Cycle Shop. The latter is a business owned by Klaus Kramer.
The agents conducted inspections that revealed that Mr. Kramer violated Section 301 of the Communications Act by operating radio transmitters without authorization. Kramer admitted to making the transmissions and voluntarily relinquished the equipment. On March 12th the Dallas office issued two Notices of Violation to Kramer. In response to the Notice's of Violation, Kramer acknowledged the violations and indicated that he would discontinue operation of the station. On July 13th, the Commission's Dallas Texas field office issued the Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture in the amount of $9500 to Kramer for the noted violations. Kramer filed a response to the NAL on August 14th claiming that the amount was excessive.
In denying Kramers appeal, the FCC's November 8th order says that its Dallas office has complaints regarding similar operations on two separate occasions in March 1998 and October 1999. In both of those instances, Kramer also voluntarily the offending equipment and on at least one occasion stated that the violations would not be repeated. None the less, the FCC says that its investigation has revealed that Mr. Kramer again: "...violated our rules" in February 2001. Thus says the government, imposition of the $9500 is not excessive and is proper in this case.
For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA, reporting.
--
Kramer was given the usual thirty days to pay the fine. He also has the option of further appeals. (FCC)
**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC TO STATION OWNER - YOU ARE OFF THE AIR

Hams are not the only ones feeling the pinch of the Federal Communications Commission action. Five Midwestern radio stations have gone off the air after the agency denies an appeal by their owner who the FCC says was found unfit to continue to operate them.

Back in 1994 the owner was convicted of crimes involving minors. He was sentenced to an eight-year term and was released in 1999 after serving five. Last July he was told by the FCC that he no longer held the minimum requisite requirements to remain a Commission license. Also, that he would lose his licenses to operate the stations within 90 days.

Last month he petitioned the FCC to allow him to continue operating the stations. The FCC denied his request on October 3rd and the stations stopped broadcasting just after midnight October 4th. The FCC says it plans to auction off the station licenses. The owner is reportedly considering an appeal. (FCC, other published reports)

**

FCC NEWS: MASS MEDIA BUREAU APPOINTMENT

Nina Shafran has been named Deputy Chief of the FCC’s Mass Media Bureau Audio Division. Shafran joins the Commission from the staff of the Dow, Lohnes & Albertson communications group where she specialized in broadcast matters. (FCC)

**

HAMVENTION UPDATE 2002: DISPELLING RUMORS

If you are one of those who heard a rumor that the Dayton Hamvention is leraving its longtime home at the HARA Arena, then forget it. Its nothing more than the normally irresponsible Internet rumor mill working overtime. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--
According to planners posting to the official Hamvention website, the erroneous rumor began the week of Hamvention 2001. This, after it was was allegedly printed in a Chicago newspaper that the HARA Arena had been sold. It had not been.

The Hamvention Committee spent the weekend of the 2001 event reassuring its vendors and attendees that HARA had not been sold. Also, that Hamvention's contract had not been "bought out" and that it would be back at HARA.

But that’s not all. The HARA Arena management issued its own formal statement. It also satated that the HARA had not been sold, and that it will not be razed. We at Amateur Radio Newsline were there. We heard it first hand.

Most important the HARA folks reitterated what the Dayton Amateur Radio Association has stated. The Hamvention will be there as promised. And as those of you who received last months mass mailing already know, the dates are May 17th, 18th and 19th, 2002. We will see you there.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bill Pasternak WA6ITF in Los Angeles.

--

So much for the rumors on the Newsgroups and other internet gossip spots. The real story is always at www.hamvention.org. (DARA)

**

BREAK 2

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website - www.arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: DTV ROLLOUT UPDATE

Roughly two-thirds of commercial television stations plan to broadcast a digital signal by a federal government deadline of May 1, 2002. This, according to the National Association of Broadcasters.

In a report to the Federal Communications Commission, the industry group said that many of those that won't make the deadline are waiting for equipment to be delivered and expect to have digital broadcasts on the air in the months afterward. But some stations in smaller markets are having a hard time paying for the upgrade, the association says.

Right now, most home television sets in use receive only analog signals. But congress has mandated that broadcasters must give up their analog channels to the government by 2006. As a result, there are concerns that consumers won't have made the costly upgrade to
televisions that can receive digital signals by that date. (News release)

**
HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ISS TALKS TO WISCONSIN SCHOOL

Students at Tremper High School in Kenosha, Wisconsin, asked questions the morning of November 6th of the International Space Station Expedition Three Commander Frank Culbertson that got some very personal responses. Culbertson told the teens that he certainly did not expect as much to be happening on Earth during his stay at the orbital outpost, in obvious reference to terrorist attacks. He said that he wished that he could have been with his family during the most stressful times, but he took comfort in knowing that they were strong, and could get by.

On a brighter note, Culbertson said that his current mission is the high point of his space career. He added that he hoped some of students at Tremper High can do the same thing some day.

In response to another question, Culbertson said that he hoped to see cheaper access to space, and hoped for a manned Mars mission and a permanent lunar base during his lifetime.

The contact was an event facilitated through the Amateur Radio on the International Space Station project, sponsored by AMSAT, ARRL and NASA. In all, fourteen students asked one question each during the contact. About 60 other students and a few teachers witnessed the event in person, while M-S-N-B-C carried the audio portion of the contact live over its website. (ARISS release by Gene Chapline, K5YFL)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: NEW ANTENNAS HEADING TOWARD THE ISS

The International Space Station could have a new set of ham band antennas by early in 2002. The antennas are expected to be trtansported to te ISS this month and installed around the perimeter of the Service Module. This will give the I-S-S ham station high frequency, VHF, UHF and microwave capabilities.

The most interesting of all the new antennas is the high frequency array. Its made up of a two and one half meter long flexable tape that will definately work on 10 meters and holds posibilities on 15 and 20 as well. This particular antenna was a joint effort of the Italian, Russian and United States ARISS design team. (ARISS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: STARSHINE NEEDS TELEMETRY REPORTS

Ground controllers of the Starshine-3 ham radio satellite are seeking volunteer amateur radio operators and others worldwide to monitor and report telemetry from the recently-launched satellite. Starshine 3 transmits 9600 bit per second AX-25 protocol packet telemetry every 2 minutes on 145.825 MHz.

The satellite’s primary mission is to involve school children from around the world in space and radio sciences. Students should be able visually track the satellite during morning and evening passes by recording its telltale mirror flashes and reporting their observations to Project Starshine. To report Starshine 3 telemetry or to learn more about it, please visit http://epulation.com/starshine/starshine3. More information about Project Starshine is available at www.azinet.com/starshine. (STARSHINE vis AMSAT-NA)

**

CONTESTS: THE PSK-31 DEATH MATCH

Call it a truly different kind of contest. This, as the Michigan DX Association announces that it will sponsor the PSK-31 Death Match. The dates are December 7th through the 9th and a trophy will be awarded to the highest overall score. Just what is the PSK-31 Death Match and what are its rules? You can find out on the web at www.geocities.com/mdxa1/death match.html (Internet release)

**

DX

In DX, a big surprise for 6 meter enthuiasts. Jeramy boot, G4NJH, has the details:

--

A combination of high solar flux and low magnetic activity provided world-wide F-layer propagation on 50MHz during the week up to the 4th of November. Strong backscatter and the occasional Sporadic E openings meant that all continents were worked from the UK on 50MHz during the course of the week.

On Tuesday, the 6th of November, a solar coronal mass ejection hit the earth's magnetic field at 0150UTC and triggered widespread auroras. Observers as far south as central California reported seeing vivid displays of the Northern Lights, although we had no reports of visible auroras in the UK at the time of compiling this bulletin.

--

As we go to air 6 meters remains a worldwide D-X paradise. More information is on the web at www.rsgb.org and on the subscription VHF reflector. (G4NJH)

In other D-X news word that two Spanish operators will be in Cameroon between the 11th and 23rd of November. The pair will be working on the installation of HF and VHF stations in hospitals and missions. In their spare time they will be on the air as TJ2RSF on the High Frequenvcy bands. Activity will be mainly SSB, with some RTTY and CW. (VHF Reflector)

And Chris Post, N3SIG, who is a Firefighter and EMT in the United States Antarctic Program at the McMurdo Station on Ross Island is now active as KC4/N3SIG until March 2002. Post told the Ohio Penn D-X newsletter that he will be active every other day starting around 2000-2100 Eastern U.S. time primerally using SSB on 20, 18 and 15 meters. All QSL cards go to AI3D and be sure to include an S-A-S-E. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: HAM RADIO IN LEBANON

And finally this week, a look at how ham radio is able to survive in Lebanon. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, looks at the nation, its licensing system and its Amateur Radio Community:

--
Wireless communication was first introduced in Lebanon by French soldiers during the French mandate; consequently, a number of curious and interested Lebanese took on this hobby and started operating under a permit and a call sign provided by the French Authorities.

With Lebanon gaining its independence in 1943, the Ministry of Post and Telecommunications become the issuer of the license to own and operate an Amateur station.

In 2000, there were 230 licensed ham operators in Lebanon, and anyone over 18 years is eligible to acquire a radio amateur license.

Maximum authorised transmitting power is 1,000 watts. The exam is prepared by RAL and is supervised by governmental officials. It comes in three separate parts, which involve multiple choice questions which include theoretical questions on electronics, antennas, and other technical information. Also rules and regulations of amateur radio, and the laws of communication. Also, a test on how to establish a vocal contact over the air.

Their Society is the RAL-- the Radio Amateurs of Lebanon which, like ours represent him or her before the Local authorities and the IARU

From Q-News Australia, I’m Graham Kemp, VK4BB, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Truly an amazing story of how ham radio can survive even in the midst of geo-political problems that have plagued the Middle East for as long as man can remember. (Q-News)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website

located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Mert Garlick, N6AWE, saying Happy Thanksgiving, God Bless America, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2001. All rights reserved.

938. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 09:12:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t7u1k$gr4$0@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 23935

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I say this after doing a bit of study on the basics of the religion
> > of Islam. Those basic tenants include *total* lack of tolerance for other
> > beliefs. Islam is both "THE" religion and the functional government. The
> > superiority of Islam is fundamental. There is no room for any other
> > belief system, anywhere on earth.
>
> You can replace "Islam" with "Southern Baptist" and the same thing is
> true. Southern Baptists believe that Catholics and Mormons are going
> to hell along with all other religions. Catholics are the terrorists
> in Northern Ireland. The terrorists who bomb abortion clinics and
> murder abortion doctors are invariably fundamentalist Christians.
> Their crimes differ only in magnitude, not in kind, from the
> Muslim terrorists.
>
> The great majority of Muslims are no more lunatic fringe than the
> great majority of Southern Baptists. They are just another
> fundamentalist religion in the US. By condemning all followers
> of Islam, you are just another biased collectivist, filled with
> and spreading evil and hate, i.e. a psychological terrorist.

There's more.....Name deleted for his privacy, of course

___--------------_____________-----------

....
> > We'd better get used to some dramatic changes in the way we think about
> >the world around us. There are half as many Islamics in the world as
> >Christians. They are taught from infancy to generally hate and despise
> >us, and to either change us or else eliminate us, while we preach
> >tolerance of them and their beliefs.

> If you are talking about a Christian versus the World viewpoint this might
> make sense. However, the United States never really was and certainly isn't
> now a Christian state. You can't say "us" about Americans and mean
> Christians.

Precisely the point. If Islam is fundamentally and totally intolerant
of any other belief system, and considers any other as evil and Infidel,
then it is immaterial whether the "other" is Christian, Buddhist or
Hindu. They do seem to hate us Americans more, though, evidently for our
secularism and success at accomplishing such a free nation. Islam is
clearly a very restrictive doctrine that abhors freedom of choice in
almost all facets of life. Your life is to be lived for Allah and not

much else. How in the world does such a belief system garner such a large following? One can only assume that all those believers know nothing else.

Please understand that I don't approach this as a contest between Islam and Christianity, I see it as an assault by Islam on every other belief system, as dictated by basic Islamic religious precepts. How else can one view it given the events of the past few months, coupled with all the earlier Islamic terrorist acts? The intent of the radical wing of Islam couldn't be more clear. And that wing is not trivial, clearly the opposite. Any Moslem must be considered to be a potential Believer who has, perhaps secretly, sworn Allah's vengeance on any infidel, whenever and wherever the opportunity presents, until proven otherwise. And one then doesn't know how that same Moslem will act next time. See the point? It appears that Islamic "religious" training basically leads to an unstable personal state where individual Moslems may decide at any time that they are, after all, and after many years of resisting, obligated to do Allah's will, and commit what amounts to a terrorist act. Indications are that on Sept 11 there were other hijackers on other planes, in the air enroute, who did not carry out their mission, perhaps deciding they were not ready to die, after all- at least not right then. So when?

> I've had the pleasure to work with and/or to know Muslims from
> many different countries. The outlook of these various people has been as
> broad as there are Christian views and denominations.

Agreed, but with the huge numbers of Moslems, it has become clear there will always be far more than enough radical strict constructionists to do a pretty good job of carrying out Mohammed's directives as instructed by basic Islamic teachings. Unless we defend ourselves. How to do that is problematic.

> And obviously, the
> United States is also a nation of peoples of the Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu,
> and many other faiths. That is what makes the United States "great", as it
> were. Ours is a country that is unified by the belief in liberty and freedom
> of thought, no matter your faith, race or ancestry.

And as I tried to point out, this becomes the very root of our peril when faced with a religion, which we characteristically must tolerate, which is intent on destruction of every other belief system, including (y)ours.

>
> I think that it is also easy to mistake political policy with religious
> opinion.

That, again, is the root of the problem. Under Islam the two cannot be separated. So we wind up tolerating a form of government that intends to kill us off as evil infidels just because we MUST tolerate it as a religion! A quandary and total paradox if one ever existed.

> Probably a lot of the "Muslim world" looks at the U.S. as a
> "Christian state" but sees that it does not behave like one, neither in
> foreign policy nor in domestic policy (and probably many Christians would
> agree).

But the vast numbers of radical Moslems -and there ARE vast numbers of them, despite the also large numbers of Islamic moderates- see all that as just more reason to destroy us, as dictated by their strict religious beliefs. We are a sinful nation which doesn't even adhere to our own religious standards in their view, although they would destroy us as infidels anyway.

> On the other hand, I have been to Iran (in 1995. My wife is Iranian)
> and can attest to the general irreligious nature (i.e. not prone to
> following rituals, praying, attending mosque, etc.) of the average Iranian
> despite the government's claim to be an "Islamic republic".

Part of the problem is that Islamic radical fundamentalism is cyclical. Look at what happened in Iran in 1979. And now bin Laden, Al Queda and the rest. It is clear from Sept 11 that this is a particularly vicious cycle, one which could conceivably accomplish Allah's assigned mission -our destruction- if we fail to defend against it.

> I don't mean to
> denigrate anyone but it appears to me that there are extremists in any faith
> and that they are usually a small minority.

Certainly very true, but the difference is that Islam is the only totally intolerant belief which preaches and demands the eradication of all other belief systems. That alone places it into a totally different category when it comes to our response. We drop our guard at our peril. Basically Islam is different from any other religion in that regard, and can, maybe even must, be viewed as something other than a religion. Religions don't teach mass murder and utter destruction based simply on a differing point of view regarding the characteristics and wishes of a deity.

> Probably most of the truly
> religious (as opposed to religio-politically fundamentalist) in Iran resent
> the government for giving the religion a bad name. If there was any hatred
> of Americans in Iran (other than slogans propagated by the government) I did
> not see it. Actually, those who learned that I was American insisted to
> engage me in conversation, no matter whether I was with my wife or others or
> whether I was out alone. One man, a government employee, insisted to pay my
> entrance fee to the museum where he worked.

I agree that many Islamics are moderates and that the group which demands our extinction is a minority, at best. But when there are so many that minority, strident and ruthless as it is, and clearly they ruthlessly hold the upper hand and maintain power over the moderates, -moderates avoid a nasty fight, the radicals do not, so the radicals generally win out over moderates- as the Taliban has done in Afghanistan. It behooves all Islamic moderates to control their radical

elements instead of supporting them as so many clearly do. Examples abound, as the wealthy Saudi prince who tried to give New York a $10 million check along with a lecture on how wrong we are in our Mideast policies. Where do you think he would stand in a all-out contest? One cannot assume anything friendly about them when you know they are trained in the basics of Islam from infancy, and it is clear what those basics are.

>
> Anyway, I guess that what I am saying is that religion is not the key to the
> present problem. If "we" set up this conflict along religious lines we will
> fail.

It is difficult to avoid when Islam, the religion, is also Islam, the radical dictatorial government supporting our destruction, and Islam, our sworn enemy to-the-death, by the dictates of their most basic teachings, just as freedom of expression and tolerance of religious beliefs is ours. Given those basic teachings it is difficult to understand how any Moslem can reconcile his religion with friendship toward nonbelievers. It is in fact strictly forbidden in the Koran. There is a built in conflict that is always there, waiting to surface.

Oh- And "we" didn't set this up this conflict at all, on religious grounds or any other. THEY set it up - on religious grounds!!! If we attempt to avoid it as it presents, we fail.

> If we align ourselves according to our strengths,
> ... liberty, freedom and unity

Do you *Really* think it is possible to truly align ourselves with anything that is Islamic after September 11, and all the Islamic terrorism that has gone before, knowing what basic Islamic law and doctrine are? It is one thing for some splinter group to go off on a tangent, but this is clearly not the case here, as shown in basic Islamic teachings.

>... then we will crush the enemy and scatter
> his friends.

So then, just WHO is the enemy and WHO is friend, within the Islamic community - a LARGE community of Believers who have been taught since birth that we -all nonbelievers- are their mortal enemy??? How will we tell them apart? I know, many of them would rather not face up to the internal conflict involved, but what will they think when decision time comes? Will personal wishes for a peaceful existence prevail over lifelong religious training and ingrained obligation, and guilt feelings because of their lifetime spent in avoidance of that obligation?

I truly wish that I could see some light at the end of the tunnel, but this one is a real thorny puzzler. To say that it leaves many Americans, as well as many others, uneasy about the future is an considerable understatement. I and a great many others believe the President is right- this won't be a short term scrap.

73, Dick W0EX

939. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 09:37:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF7814C.C6054998@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23936

CAM wrote:
>
> I'm talking about Madisonville,
> Texas, Dwight. The whole town is
> only four square miles. From
> anywhere in town to any school is
> five minutes or less. The 100%
> white school board would have
> never hired a black teacher for
> white students if they could
> have gotten away with it. If it
> were legal, they would happily
> go back to segregation tomorrow.

Well, I can't speak about Madisonville, Texas. And I'm certainly not going to be presumptuous enough to speak about the whole South. However, based on the relatively limited exposure I've had to schools in various parts of the South (Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Alabama), most schools I've seen appear to fairly well integrated today (students and teachers).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

940. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 10:05:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF787E1.F9BA067C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23937

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> When the balance exceeds 50%,
> the "white" teachers become the
> minority.

Well, you're certainly right, Phil. However, African Americans (the only significant minority population in this area) are not 50% of the overall population in this country. And they're most certainly not 50% of the local community. Yet, even ignoring the concept of disproportionate representation, affirmative action doesn't even seem to kick in to benefit "white" teachers when that 50% level is reached. For example, I'm fairly certain minority teachers outnumber "white" teachers at the local high school, yet the students come from an area where minorities are less than 5% of the population. And local parents are not thrilled about that fact (they're fed up with their kids celebrating Kwanzaa in school but not christmas).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

941. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 11:46:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF79F4F.A57AA2AF@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23938

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> I say this after doing a bit of
> study on the basics of the religion
> of Islam. Those basic tenants
> include *total* lack of tolerance
> for other beliefs. Islam is both
> "THE" religion and the functional
> government. The superiority of Islam
> is fundamental. There is no room
> for any other belief system,
> anywhere on earth. All others are
> to be treated in one of three ways -
>
> They must be (1). Converted to
> Islam, or they must be
> (2). Subjugated,
> (enslaved) or they must
> be
> (3). Eliminated -
> That means killed,(except
> for women, children and
> slaves).

That is simply not true, Dick. I lived in the Middle East for two years, in the heart of an strongly Islamic country, and obviously lived to tell about it - never converted, subjugated, or eliminated. Instead, the people were open, friendly, and as curious about life in America as we were about life in their country. We were invited into a number of their homes, where we compared countries, talked about world affairs, played card games, and just generally enjoyed each other's company. At no time did any of those people exhibit a hatred towards us, towards the West, or towards America. I have since visited that region twice over the years (extended vacations) and have not seen any change in the people's attitudes towards us.

The people in that region with a dislike, or hatred, of Americans (or the west) are clearly a minority. The majority are like those I just described in the paragraph above. And people like you describe in your message simply don't exist in my mind - I never saw anyone like that during my visits. And, in the end, if what you say is really true about the Islamic people, I should not be here - I should be dead. There were certainly many opportunities for those people to kill me during my long visits, and extensive travels in the area, if they wanted to. But they didn't - and that makes what you say totally false.

By the way, while we're discussing myths about the Middle East, lets also address the myth spread by many women in this country about men there forcing women to wear veils. Based on what we've seen, women in those countries are far more fanatical about women wearing veils than the men are. On several occasions, my wife was mistaken for a local and was reprimanded by another woman for not wearing a veil, or for wearing "provocative" western clothing. This even happened to my mother once years ago. Of course, as soon as the mistake was realized, sincere apologies followed (along with attempts to make amends - we ended up with a large crate of tangerines at a bazaar once because of that). At the same time, never once did a man ever say anything about my wife (or mother) not wearing a veil, nor did they even seem to notice it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

942. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 12:11:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011118071129.07331.00000493@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 23939

>Subject: Re: "...one step closer to extinction."
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/18/2001 5:46 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF79F4F.A57AA2AF@sccoast.net>

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> I say this after doing a bit of
>> study on the basics of the religion
>> of Islam. Those basic tenants
>> include *total* lack of tolerance
>> for other beliefs. Islam is both
>> "THE" religion and the functional
>> government.

You may be refring to Islamic FUNDAMENTALISTS, who believe this, but this
is NOT what Islam supports.

>That is simply not true, Dick. I lived in the Middle East for two
>years, in the heart of an strongly Islamic country, and obviously
>lived to tell about it - never converted, subjugated, or eliminated.

I have to agree with Dwight, altho my experiences in the Middle East
theater were far more brief. Most Muslims are like most Americans...left alone
to thier own beliefs, they could care less about how others pray, believe, etc.

The Fun-d-less-mentalists are, unfortunately, the squekiest wheels.

>The people in that region with a dislike, or hatred, of Americans
>(or the west) are clearly a minority. The majority are like those I
>just described in the paragraph above

Even those who "like" America have problems with seeing American-made
warplanes lobbing TOW missles and rocket propelled grenades into thier towns.
If those planes were Brazillian, for example, I think a lot of the rhetoric
would be focused there, not here.

73

Steve, K4YZ

943. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 13:10:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF7B30B.C45B5FCF@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23940

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> (snip) when faced with a
> religion (snip) which is intent
> on destruction of every other
> belief system, including
> (y)ours. (snip)
>
> (snip) But the vast numbers of
> radical Moslems (snip) see all
> that as just more reason to destroy
> us, as dictated by their strict
> religious beliefs. (snip)
>
> (snip) Allah's assigned mission
> -our destruction (snip)
>
> (snip) Islam is the only totally
> intolerant belief which preaches
> and demands the eradication of all
> other belief systems. (snip)

Dick, I'll repeat my question again - if Moslems are so intent on our destruction, our deaths, then why am I still here? As I said before, I've lived in the Middle East and have visited the Middle East for extended vocations. If, as you claim, Moslems are so determined to kill Americans, why am I still alive?

You say that Islamic law, and indeed Allah (god) himself, demands our death and destruction. I've never seen any such nonsense in the Koran (their Bible). In fact, from what I've seen, the only possible way to come to that conclusion would be to twist vague passages in that book to fit your agenda.

The Islamic people are not the horrible monsters you're making them out to be, Dick. Only a small percentage of the Islamic people dislike Americans, and even fewer see us as the enemy (mainly because of our support of Israel). To say anything more than that would be a total lie based ignorance and/or hatred.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

944. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 13:46:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t8e0h01gp4@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23944

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t797v$1iq$0@208.207.71.176...
> > In my days of high school, one year of Latin was a prerequisite for
taking
> > any other foreign language, even if you wanted to take German.
Pro-coders
> > won't see this parallel
>
>
> That's about right, for there IS NO parallel.

Tunnel vision proven again.

> CW phobics never understand that radiotelegraphy is the most basic of
> all radiocommunications modes, eminently useful even in the high tech
> age. Just ask any moonbounce or coherent operator.

Then it should be able to stand on its own merits, without welfare support
in the form of testing.

945. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 13:46:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF7BB56.B3B041D8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 23941

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> The Fun-d-less-mentalists are,
> unfortunately, the squekiest
> wheels.
>
> (snip) If those planes were
> Brazillian, for example, I think
> a lot of the rhetoric would be
> focused there, not here.

You're right, Steve. It is the extreme right wing that causes so many problems. And much of that comes from their embarrassment over the loss of the lands now called Israel. In their minds, they saw the creation of Israel as lands taken away from them, which they were not able to stop. The immediate result was a series of wars (as much to regain face as to regain the lands). When that failed (which many there believe was caused by our military aid to Israel), they resorted to the only option available to them - terrorism. That is not an attempt to excuse the situation - it's simply an explanation. But, to some extent, it also suggests a possible solution. Perhaps if we can find a way to help the Islamic people regain face, and still allow Israel to exist, this whole conflict might be brought to an end. Of course, that is much easier to say than to do.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

946. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 13:56:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7bea4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23942

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF731F3.4F39E3E9@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You would have us assume that your town is representative of every
place
> > > in the South.
> >
> > Not every place, but it is pretty typical of small towns in the Old
South
> > from Georgia to East Texas. When the students were integrated, by and
> > large, the teachers were not.
>
> If you mean your area, say it. Don't presume to speak for the entire
> South.
>

You mean in the same way you did, Dave, with your: "I guess my knowledge base is larger, Cecil. I've lived in the Midwest, and the South along with some of Europe and much of Africa. You talk about what you can from your limited perspective"? (From news:3BF5B461.6867E631@earthlink.net... on Nov 16 at 6:55PM).

Should we presume you were speaking for the entire Midwest, South, Europe and Africa (though those two latter areas didn't even have anything to do with the topic)?

> > > > > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous
comment
> > > > > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> > > > >
> > > > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > > > you know what that makes you.
> > >
> > > You have indeed. Do you know what your disavowal of your own
statement
> > > makes you?
> >
> > Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I. the definition of "compart"
> > is "to subdivide".
>
> You have lost your few brain cells. I never used such a term.
>

You mean like when you said (emphasis at word c-o-m-p-a-r-t-i-n-g added):
"You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern Town,
USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the status of
expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition, I'm calling you
on this diversion from your original erroneous comment ***comparting***
Affirmative Action and morse testing"?
(From news:3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net... on Nov 16 at 6:43PM)

>
> I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse
> > testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.
>
> You'll get none from me. I never accused you of subdividing anything.
>

You mean like when you said "In addition, I'm calling you on this diversion
from your original erroneous comment comparting Affirmative Action and morse
testing"?

>
> What you did was say that morse testing was an Affirmative Action
> program.
>
> > > > Morse code testing and Affirmative Action are similar examples of
> > > > social engineering, i.e. governmental requirements attempting
> > > > to get some people to do what they wouldn't normally choose to do.
> > >
> > > A typical Cecilian swerve on the road to truth...
> >
> > How you can deny reality is beyond belief. Why even have a
> > governmental requirement for something that doesn't need to be
> > social engineered?
>
> It dawns on me that you wouldn't know reality if you tripped over it.
>
> Dave K8MN

Well, the same could be said for what you understood yourself to be saying
at some given point. I think a long, long time ago I called you a
charlaton. In my humble opinion, I reiterate that now.

Kim W5TIT

947. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:00:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7bf6f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23943

ROFLMAO....and Cecil even provides you with what you really said, Dave...oh good grief.

Kim W5TIT

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3BF73A47.798B3EE1@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
>
> > If you mean your area, say it. Don't presume to speak for the entire
> > South.
>
> I would be stupid to try to speak for the entire South, Dave. I know what
> my area is like and it is my personal opinion that it is typical of small
> southern towns from Georgia to East Texas. I have seen no evidence otherwise.
>
> You posting the following sentence. You are a bold-faced liar when
> you say you didn't use the word "compart" which means to subdivide.
>
> > > > > > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > > > > > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> ^^^^^^^^^^
> > > Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I. the definition of "compart"
> > > is "to subdivide".
> >
> > You have lost your few brain cells. I never used such a term.
>
> How can you possibly deny using such a term when it is marked in evidence
> in your earlier posting above? It's just one more of your attempts to deny
> reality. How can you give yourself permission to lie when it is obvious
> to everyone who sees your earlier posting above that you are lying?
>
> > I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse
> > > testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.
> >
> > You'll get none from me. I never accused you of subdividing anything.
>
> That's a lie, as proved by your posting above. "Compart" means to
> subdivide. Are you so far gone that you cannot tell the truth?
>

> > > How you can deny reality is beyond belief. Why even have a
> > > governmental requirement for something that doesn't need to be
> > > social engineered?
> >
> > It dawns on me that you wouldn't know reality if you tripped over it.
>
> Deny reality and then mount an ad hominem attack, eh?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

948. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:02:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7c00d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23945

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF74269.3926A77D@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I said you were "comparing" not "comparting". I provided the quote in
> > which you made the comparison. Munch away!
>

GASP!! OK, that's it. I am going to reply to the post in which Dave Heil used the word comparting. **THEN** I am going to completely ignore that this jerk even habitats the planet Earth.

> You are such a liar, Dave. Here's *YOUR* posting. Read it and weep.
> The posting is still on most of the news servers so anyone can
> verify your lying ways. You accused me of "comparting" and I
> expect an apology.
> **
> > Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
> > From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> > Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2001 00:43:24 GMT
> >
> > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> ^^^^^^^^^^
> **
> Do you lie to your employer like that? Do you lie to your wife like that?
> How do you give yourself permission to lie in public when the truth is
> there for all to see?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

949. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:03:16 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t8f0o01i7q@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 23947

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t7940$1i6$0@208.207.71.176...
> > > It -and they- are truly a lost cause. Hams without meat.(Where's the
> > > beef???) And still, Larry & co. persist.
> > > ITU couldn't be even modestly interested in such a non-issue (on any
> > > true scale of importance) as a 5wpm code test for hams. Especially
when
> > > literally millions of licensees over the past century have quickly and
> > > quietly, without comment, learned code and passed whatever level of
test
> >
> > Yes, sheep usually follow the heard without comment.
>
>
> Little Freuduan slip there, hey Krell?? We 'heard' the word and just
> did it. You CW phobics scattered, fleeing the herd.

I admit the improper use of a homonym. Even best-selling authors are tripped up by them. It's interesting, however, that you chose to point this out, yet I've never seen you post any response at all to Bruce's (WA8ULX) incoherent ramblings. I would think that if you were going to attack spelling and grammar errors, you would do it for all postings. Could it be that you only respond this way to people you disagree with?

950. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:05:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7c0c4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23946

This is nothing more than a "Reply" to this original post from Dave Heil to submit to him evidence that he used the word c-o-m-p-a-r-t-i-n-g in that post, which he keeps denying.

Good grief, Dave, are you celebrating the holidays early?

Kim W5TIT

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Now you'd have us believe that your area is the whole South or the whole
> > > U.S.
> >
> > On the contrary, I said I don't know how it was except in Small Southern
> > Town, USA. If you would read my postings instead of just emoting, you
> > wouldn't
> > embarrass yourself like that. You know absolutely nothing about what
> > happened
> > in my home town yet you present yourself as an expert on my home town.
> > You
> > can start to redeem yourself by telling me how many traffic lights we
> > have.
>
> You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
> Town, USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the
> status of expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition,
> I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
>
> > > Can you come up with any verifiable facts to support your claim or are you
> > > just blowing smoke?
> >
> > I commuted to Sam Houston State Teacher's College with a black lady
> > while
> > I was obtaining my Texas Teaching Certificate. She was getting one also
> > along with a Master's Degree. She was a superior person with a high IQ.
> > She could not get a teaching job in Madison County so she got one in
> > Harris
> > County. Affirmative Action later allowed her to move back to her home
> > town

> > and teach. Incompetent white teachers were let go and competent black
> > teachers
> > were hired. Left to the tyranny of the white majority, that would not
> > have
> > happened even with the civil rights law in place. My low-IQ cousin, who
> > had
> > flunked out of Texas A&M, was one of the teachers who was let go. He was
> > teaching his students that transistors were made out of geranium.
>
> So we have only your wild tales as proof. Tyranny of the white majority
> indeed. Perhaps you can entertain us with tales of your cousin's work
> in seminole conductors.
>
> Dave K8MN

951. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:17:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7c38f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23948

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t7glm$qd6$0@208.206.142.85...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3BF5F9DF.B5A733B5@IEEE.org...
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > Precisely, and that point is reached when our behavior as hams
causes
> > > > potential newcomers to be turned off by people who choose to
exercise
> > > > their "right" to offend others.
> > >
> > > Larry, I don't know of any newsgroup poster who has exercised his
> > > "right" to offend others more often than you have.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Larry doesn't think there's anyone who is offended by what he
> > says...although it is darned hard to take someone like him seriously...
> >
>
>
> Someone who chooses a callsign of W5TIT finds it hard to take anyone
> else seriously? Whatta gas! That's a part of what you did - trivialize
> the entire ARS system. I sure hope you don't expect to be taken
> seriously in ham radio circles, any of them.

Oh gosh, Dick. I hate to burst your bubble but I am taken seriously, quite seriously in many ham radio circles. I have just resigned my position as Hunt County ARES EC; I have mentored each and every level of the ARRL's ARECC Courses on Emergency Communications; I was part of the team for development of Level II and Level III of those courses; and continue as a mentor for each and every Level. I am a former MARS member (NNN0YCD), Navy MARS; I provide mentoring and guidance to many new hams on emergency communication; want me to go on?

The fact is, some people are adult enough to ignore the humor of my callsign during inappropriate times, and have fun with at other times. Some adults continue to trivialize the ARS by acting like children looking at a their first dirty picture when they hear my callsign...such as yourself.

By the way, why I am responding to a man whose posts I have just seen this morning on the subject of the Islam Faith and his paranoid translation of same, goes beyond me. Would you have the same opinion of the Baptist faith, Dick? And, I choose the Baptist faith because, Dick, if you ain't Baptist you are going to Hell as far as they are concerned. *ANY* zealousness (even yours) is intolerable. The people you describe are zealots with their religion and they are hiding behind a shield of religious translations they have come up with. Louis Farrakhan(sp) is a religious zealot, in my opinion. Why don't you go track him down, Dick? He's on our soil. In fact...gosh, I think he's a US Citizen.

Kim W5TIT

952. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:31:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF7C65F.F6522576@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23949

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I'm talking about Madisonville, Texas, Dwight. The whole town is
> > only four square miles. From anywhere in town to any school is
> > five minutes or less. The 100% white school board would have
> > never hired a black teacher for white students if they could
> > have gotten away with it. If it were legal, they would happily
> > go back to segregation tomorrow.
>
> Well, I can't speak about Madisonville, Texas. And I'm certainly not
> going to be presumptuous enough to speak about the whole South.
> However, based on the relatively limited exposure I've had to schools
> in various parts of the South (Florida, South Carolina, North
> Carolina, and Alabama), most schools I've seen appear to fairly well
> integrated today (students and teachers).

That's exactly the point, Dwight. It would never have happened without
Affirmative Action.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

953. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:36:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF7C786.38A0D1C3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23950

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> *GASP*!! OK, that's it. I am going
> to reply to the post in which Dave Heil used the word comparting. **THEN**
> I am going to completely ignore that this jerk even habitats the planet
> Earth.

What? And miss all the fun of having a battle of wits with an
unarmed opponent?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

954. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:51:35 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7cb79_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23951

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t7u1k$gr4$0@208.206.142.76...
>
> Please understand that I don't approach this as a contest between Islam
> and Christianity, I see it as an assault by Islam on every other belief
> system, as dictated by basic Islamic religious precepts.
>

Oh, how comforting. Dick supports the above belief, making him just as
crazy as the power he fears...LOL

>
> Agreed, but with the huge numbers of Moslems, it has become clear there
> will always be far more than enough radical strict constructionists to
> do a pretty good job of carrying out Mohammed's directives as instructed
> by basic Islamic teachings. Unless we defend ourselves. How to do
> that is problematic.
>

Yeah, they're breeding like rabits for crying out loud. Good grief, how
much more could someone *not* understand the religion? Maybe it's easy to
become a zealot. In the above example, we have someone who claims to have
read and learned the religion of Islam, yet translates it exactly as a
fundamentalist Muslim would, or, wait, even as someone who can't read would!

> >
> > I think that it is also easy to mistake political policy with religious
> > opinion.
>
> That, again, is the root of the problem. Under Islam the two cannot be
> separated. So we wind up tolerating a form of government that intends to
> kill us off as evil infidels just because we MUST tolerate it as a
> religion! A quandary and total paradox if one ever existed.
>

So, when a Catholic becomes a senator or representative, I can count on that
he won't vote with his/her religious convictions, say, on abortion? Yeah,
right. C'mon people, wake up. That Muslims subscribe to their religion in
all walks of life--personal and political--is no different than *any* other
religious tennet (and I am *not* talking about zealots and
fundamentalists--I am talking to the example above, used to illustrate that
it's ba-a-a-a-ad to make political decisions using religious judgement).

For most religious people, those who truly do love and believe in their
religion, one (personal) is not separated from the other (religious). Nor
should they be. Either you believe or you don't. If you believe, you know

that your decisions in all circumstances will be guided by the goodness and fairmindedness of your God.

> > Probably a lot of the "Muslim world" looks at the U.S. as a
> > "Christian state" but sees that it does not behave like one, neither in
> > foreign policy nor in domestic policy (and probably many Christians would
> > agree).

Absolutely.

> But the vast numbers of radical Moslems -and there ARE vast numbers of
> them,

there are vast numbers of radicals in *any* religion

> despite the also large numbers of Islamic moderates- see all that
> as just more reason to destroy us, as dictated by their strict religious
> beliefs.

I remember an encounter with a Jimmy Swaggart follower several years back. When he found out that my friend standing next to me was a Catholic, I mean it was like he was looking at Satan him/herself!!! He pronounced her to Hell immediately. Yeah, right...like Jesus would ever have acted like that. This guy's jugulars were about ready to explode, his hate was so mighty.

> We are a sinful nation which doesn't even adhere to our own
> religious standards in their view, although they would destroy us as
> infidels anyway.

While I know darned little of the Islam faith, I would say that most Muslims are more distracted/concerned by the fact that we Americans are as materialistic as we are. I don't think they care what "religion" we are. They care that we are quite distracted and absorbed by material things in life, rather than spiritual.

[snip]

> > I don't mean to
> > denigrate anyone but it appears to me that there are extremists in any faith
> > and that they are usually a small minority.

> Certainly very true, but the difference is that Islam is the only
> totally intolerant belief which preaches and demands the eradication of

> all other belief systems.

That is pure-D ***BULLSHIT*** In each and every religion and/or church I have been in, the very principles described above are either alluded to or outrightly spoken and believed!!! The Jehova's Witness faith I observed (never joined but went to "retreat" with my girlfriend and her family) was the worst. I remember by the time I got out of that gathering I felt like running home and protecting my family.

Good grief, to ignore that each and every faith believes it is "the one" is to ignore what most of us who don't attend church see every day.

>
> That alone places it into a totally different
> category when it comes to our response. We drop our guard at our peril.
> Basically Islam is different from any other religion in that regard,
> and can, maybe even must, be viewed as something other than a religion.
> Religions don't teach mass murder and utter destruction based simply on
> a differing point of view regarding the characteristics and wishes of a
> deity.
>

Yeah, the Christians learned that during the crusades, didn't they? This person, I don't think it's Dick Carroll because the author is much too eloquent to be Dick Carroll, is a fluke. The author of these words is psychotic.

[snip]
>
> It behooves all Islamic moderates to control their radical
> elements instead of supporting them as so many clearly do.
>

Just as the right-wing Religious extremist elements in our political arena are often put "in check" by their moderate counterparts.

>
> Examples
> abound, as the wealthy Saudi prince who tried to give New York a $10
> million check along with a lecture on how wrong we are in our Mideast
> policies. Where do you think he would stand in a all-out contest?
> One cannot assume anything friendly about them when you know they are
> trained in the basics of Islam from infancy, and it is clear what those
> basics are.
>

Paranoia will destroy ya...

>
> >
> > Anyway, I guess that what I am saying is that religion is not the key to
the
> > present problem. If "we" set up this conflict along religious lines we

will
> > fail.
>
>
> It is difficult to avoid when Islam, the religion, is also Islam, the
> radical dictatorial government supporting our destruction, and Islam,
> our sworn enemy to-the-death, by the dictates of their most basic
> teachings, just as freedom of expression and tolerance of religious
> beliefs is ours. Given those basic teachings it is difficult to
> understand how any Moslem can reconcile his religion with friendship
> toward nonbelievers. It is in fact strictly forbidden in the Koran.
> There is a built in conflict that is always there, waiting to surface.
>

I can assure you that, while it would be an extreme to have anyone express it, each and every church of this world would love for the world's citizens to be "them." If one does not believe that, certainly as a Christian, then why would anyone have the desire to "correct" a wrong belief--why would there be differences in dogmatic approaches to the Heavenly Gates of our Father who Art in Heaven? And no one could convince me of a spiritual Christian (one who truly believes and acts on Christian principles) who is a politician and does not include their faith in their decision making. I surely hope they do, because if they don't they are a fake.

>
> Oh- And "we" didn't set this up this conflict at all, on religious
> grounds or any other. THEY set it up - on religious grounds!!! If we
> attempt to avoid it as it presents, we fail.
>

That's about as psychotic as it gets.

> > If we align ourselves according to our strengths,
> > ... liberty, freedom and unity
>
> Do you *Really* think it is possible to truly align ourselves with
> anything that is Islamic after September 11, and all the Islamic
> terrorism that has gone before, knowing what basic Islamic law and
> doctrine are? It is one thing for some splinter group to go off on a
> tangent, but this is clearly not the case here, as shown in basic
> Islamic teachings.
>

Yep, psychosis runs deep in this one.

>
> >... then we will crush the enemy and scatter
> > his friends.
>
> So then, just WHO is the enemy and WHO is friend, within the Islamic
> community - a LARGE community of Believers who have been taught since
> birth that we -all nonbelievers- are their mortal enemy??? How will we

> tell them apart? I know, many of them would rather not face up to the
> internal conflict involved, but what will they think when decision time
> comes? Will personal wishes for a peaceful existence prevail over
> lifelong religious training and ingrained obligation, and guilt feelings
> because of their lifetime spent in avoidance of that obligation?
>
> I truly wish that I could see some light at the end of the tunnel, but
> this one is a real thorny puzzler. To say that it leaves many Americans,
> as well as many others, uneasy about the future is an considerable
> understatement. I and a great many others believe the President is
> right- this won't be a short term scrap.
>
> 73, Dick W0EX

Yep, psychosis... You go on living in your terror...I am off to enjoy life.

Kim W5TIT

955. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:56:48 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7ccba_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23952

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BF7814C.C6054998@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > I'm talking about Madisonville,
> > Texas, Dwight. The whole town is
> > only four square miles. From
> > anywhere in town to any school is
> > five minutes or less. The 100%
> > white school board would have
> > never hired a black teacher for
> > white students if they could
> > have gotten away with it. If it
> > were legal, they would happily
> > go back to segregation tomorrow.
>
>
> Well, I can't speak about Madisonville, Texas. And I'm certainly not
> going to be presumptuous enough to speak about the whole South.
> However, based on the relatively limited exposure I've had to schools
> in various parts of the South (Florida, South Carolina, North
> Carolina, and Alabama), most schools I've seen appear to fairly well
> integrated today (students and teachers).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

The great divide in diversity here in the south has been what shocks me the most, having come from the north. It is hard for me to assess, though, because I went from small-town (a place Dave Heil doesn't believe in) USA in the northeast to big-city USA here in the south...well, Texas. I know that inner-city schools seem to be populated greater by blacks, while the suburbs are fairly diverse. Now, here in Forney, TX USA, the schools seemed to be predominantly black. BUT, I add that I am not certain about percentage of population. I don't know. I am talking sitting in a car as a mom picking up her kids and watching the flood of students coming out the doors--most were black.

Very few people I know down here are without prejudice. It is quite saddening to hear. And, I shun people who have been friends the instant I learn of their crap. I cannot stand it...

Kim W5TIT

956. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 14:59:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7cd4d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23953

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BF787E1.F9BA067C@sccoast.net...
> Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > When the balance exceeds 50%,
> > the "white" teachers become the
> > minority.
>
>
> Well, you're certainly right, Phil. However, African Americans (the
> only significant minority population in this area) are not 50% of the
> overall population in this country. And they're most certainly not 50%
> of the local community. Yet, even ignoring the concept of
> disproportionate representation, affirmative action doesn't even seem
> to kick in to benefit "white" teachers when that 50% level is reached.
> For example, I'm fairly certain minority teachers outnumber "white"
> teachers at the local high school, yet the students come from an area
> where minorities are less than 5% of the population. And local parents
> are not thrilled about that fact (they're fed up with their kids
> celebrating Kwanzaa in school but not christmas).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

I wonder if it's due to the fact that Affirmative Action was established and
implemented to address disparity in hiring practices *for blacks* (mostly),
that it doesn't seem to work across the board? I mean, it's kind of like
the whole concept of "reverse discrimination." It just doesn't sound right.
So, would it "feel" right to apply Affirmative Action to Whites?

Kim W5TIT

957. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 15:01:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7cdd2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23954

Well, we now all know how prone *you* are to flying off the handle, Dick.
No surprise there. As I said, you go live your little paranoic life...most
of the rest of us are here to enjoy life.

I wish you knew how mental you look by posting that stuff.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t7fim$n1l$0@208.206.142.92...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BF5FB3E.D3073460@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > I wouldn't want my daughter listening to certain QSOs on 75m nor would
I
> > > want her to to read the filth on the rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.
> > > One of the several posters of such garbage was one of the first to
take
> > > me task for my comments on Kim's call.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Did you take *that* person to task for his/her actions? Why do you make
> > *me* the target of your anger for that person's actions? That person
was
> > the same prior to hearing or seeing my callsign. Kids who "understand"
my
> > callsign must *know* what tits are before they hear my callsign.
> >
> > Here's an analogy for you: if you are angry at me for my callsign
because of
> > some nitwit who acts like an idiot but supports my callsign; would you
also
> > make the same differentiation between someone who is Muslim and that it
is
> > *their* fault for the WTC?
> >
>
>
>

> Yep- Read all about it right here...Something I posted on another venue
> I'll repeat here.
> ------------------------
>
> September 11 will prove
> to be a turning point, the point at which I believe Western civilization
> will have begun to back away from the concept of "freedom of religion".
>
> I say this after doing a bit of study on the basics of the religion
> of Islam. Those basic tenants include *total* lack of tolerance for
> other
> beliefs. Islam is both "THE" religion and the functional government. The
> superiority of Islam is fundamental. There is no room for any other
> belief system, anywhere on earth. All others are to be treated in one of
> three ways -
>
> They must be (1). Converted to Islam, or they must be
> (2). Subjugated, (enslaved) or they must be
> (3). Eliminated - That means killed,(except for women,
> children and slaves).
>
> Islamic law (which is at once the religious *and* civil law) dictates
> these actions to all who believe in Islam. These actions are *not*
> optional, they are divinely ordered to *all* who will follow Islam.
> "Jihad" is the term often used, but it is an all-out holy war on
> non-believers, nonstop, forever, or for whatever length of time it takes
> for it to be won. For Islam. Believers are obligated to offer their own
> lives to the cause without reservation. This is for real. Delays, of
> whatever length, are only temporary. The war WILL go on, till it is won.
> Allah says so. As a Believer, you have no choice.
>
> So how, then, does a civilization (ours) which in basis depends on
> freedom of religion and separation of religion from government, begin to
> deal with a religion whose principles dictate the destruction of the
> very system which promotes tolerance of it? How can that "religion" be
> allowed to prosper and spread, without causing the complete destruction
> of the free system that nourished it? Is "religous freedom" to include a
> religion which dictates the destruction of all other forms of religious
> belief?
>
> Here is an interesting and very revealing book on the subject:
>
> "America, Oil and the Islamic Mind", by Michael Youssef, Ph.D, Zondervan
> Publishing House (Division of Harper-Collins) 1983,1991. ISBN
> 0-310-75521-2 (135 pages, available in paperback)
>
> Youssef, a Christian, grew up in the Middle East and has many valued
> Islamic friends. His review of the relationship between the Islamic and
> non-Islamic worlds is very revealing, and I must say in light of Sept 11
> and

> subsequent events, also very chilling. (Note that the book was written
> long before these current events).
>
> Youssef writes as a devout practicing Christian who believes that
> Christianity can overcome the sinister Islamic point of view, but I
> found the book to be striking for its descriptions of the basics of the
> Moslem viewpoint and the makeup of the Islamic world both historically
> and in this era. And I must say that I cannot share his optimism. I
> wonder if he retains it himself in view of recent events.
>
> We'd better get used to some dramatic changes in the way we think about
> the world around us. There are half as many Islamics in the world as
> Christians. They are taught from infancy to generally hate and despise
> us, that we are wholly inferior, and to either change us or else
> eliminate
> us, while we preach tolerance of them and their beliefs.
> It may prove to be quite a contest. Especially since a great many
> Islamics view their huge oil reserves as divine proof of the
> rightousness
> of their cause, and they have also invested huge amounts of surplus oil
> cash in the West, particularly the USA.
>
> Dick W0EX

958. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 15:02:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7ce27_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23955

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t7evs$l2f$0@208.206.142.92...
>
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On 18 Nov 2001 02:33:47 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> > > Thea't the "thing" about your asinine callsign- you don't have to
> > >mention it, it's always already there in your face....or bouncing off
> > >the floor...
> >
> > Dick, you keep criticizing Kim for her choice of call signs.
> > Did you ever consider YOUR choice of nick names for Richard???
> >
> > Sounds like the war of the body parts to me!
> >
>
> It would, to you. That's because you want to see it that way. On the
> other hand, I didn't choose that Dick is the most commonly used nickname
> for Richard. And Kim *DID* choose to advertise her grossly overly ample
> anatomy via her titillating callusing.
> Yes, that's right - some people-in fact many people, regard all that as
> unpleasantly excessive, especially when the bearer flaunts it, and it's
> not really that attractive that it should be flaunted in the first
> place.
> Anyone with sufficient behind-the-scenes experience will already know
> that. It's illusory.

Illusory???!!! Such large words, Dick! LOL...your hysteria is setting
in nice and deep now, are you on medication yet?

Kim W5TIT

959. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 15:04:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7ce8b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23956

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF73B37.ED168F65@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BF5FBFC.DFC50D21@earthlink.net...
> > > Larry Klose wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20011116000328.23850.00000502@nso-fy.aol.com...
> > > > > In article <3bf44b4e$0$30965$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>, "Larry
> > Klose"
> > > > > <lklose@net-link.net> writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > There's a BIG difference between what's legal and what's good for
a
> > > > society.
> > > >
> > > > You are now deciding what good for society?
> > >
> > > Wait a minute, chum. What precisely would you call your efforts to do
> > > away with morse testing in amateur radio? Are you deciding what is
good
> > > for society?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Two wrongs don't make a right, Dave. You make it sound like it's OK for
> > *your* interpretation of what is good for society, but it is not OK for
what
> > Larry K's interpretation might be.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Larry is the one who accused another of doing what he himself is
> attempting. I just pointed it out to him. I didn't make it sound like
> anything except that which it is.
>
> Dave K8MN

Don't be going and thinking about pink elephants, now, OK? You and Dick are
dipping from the same well I think.

Kim W5TIT

960. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 15:06:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7cefb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23957

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BF73A1B.9CC4869B@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BF5FB3E.D3073460@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > I wouldn't want my daughter listening to certain QSOs on 75m nor would
I
> > > want her to to read the filth on the rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.
> > > One of the several posters of such garbage was one of the first to
take
> > > me task for my comments on Kim's call.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Did you take *that* person to task for his/her actions?
>
> Yes. Did you miss me response to him here?
>
> > Why do you make
> > *me* the target of your anger for that person's actions? That person
was
> > the same prior to hearing or seeing my callsign.
>
> I'm not angry with you, Kim. I'm unhappy with your lack of class and
> decorum. I was unhappy with your choice before the other fellow made
> his comments. You hav the cart before the horse.
>
> > Kids who "understand" my
> > callsign must *know* what tits are before they hear my callsign.
>
> And your point there is that once you've heard a word and understand
> what it means, its frequent use becomes permissable?
>
> > Here's an analogy for you: if you are angry at me for my callsign
because of
> > some nitwit who acts like an idiot but supports my callsign; would you
also
> > make the same differentiation between someone who is Muslim and that it
is
> > *their* fault for the WTC?
>

> Here's an answer for you: We're not talking about Muslims or the WTC.
> We're talking about your unfortunate decision. I wouldn't elevate your
> situation to the status of current world events. We're dealing with
> terror, not tackiness.
>
> Dave K8MN

Your evasion of the question is typical. I could say I didn't mean to make it so challenging. But I did.

Kim W5TIT

961. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 15:13:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7d0a1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23958

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF7488F.3D4932C6@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Someone who chooses a callsign of W5TIT finds it hard to take anyone
> > else seriously? Whatta gas! That's a part of what you did - trivialize
> > the entire ARS system. I sure hope you don't expect to be taken
> > seriously in ham radio circles, any of them.
>
> Dick, if a single cute call sign can "trivialize the entire ARS
> system" then the ARS was trivial before the call was issued.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Well, but see Cecil--the way I see it here is that Dick C. and Dave H. are thinking alike here. They both have lots to say, Dick especially on how evil the Taliban are, and both of them especially on how evil my callsign is...I mean, after all, evil is what could destroy the ARS, right?

Well, maybe, just maybe they have a point. It isn't the Taliban's dogma and fanaticism we must face here in this newsgroup and in amateur radio. It is theirs. But, theirs is OK.

Kim W5TIT

962. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 15:17:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF7D101.75B4A81F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23959

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The intent of the radical wing of Islam couldn't be more clear.

The intent of the radical wing of Christianity couldn't be more clear.
Do you think it is acceptable to bomb abortion clinics and murder
abortion doctors? That murdered abortion doctor is just as dead
as any individual who died in the WTC. You seem incapable of
conceptualizing quality Vs quantity.

> Any Moslem must be considered to be a potential Believer who
> has, perhaps secretly, sworn Allah's vengeance on any infidel, whenever
> and wherever the opportunity presents, until proven otherwise.

You are mentally ill, Dick. It's called paranoia. Consider what you
are saying. You will consider any Moslem as guilty until proven
innocent. That's the same warped concept that you accuse them of
following. You are no better than they. If you cannot prove that
you are not a rapist, I think you should be hanged from the
nearest tree. How does that sound? That's what you are advocating.

> And as I tried to point out, this becomes the very root of our peril
> when faced with a religion, which we characteristically must tolerate,
> which is intent on destruction of every other belief system, including
> (y)ours.

The Christian religion is intent on destruction of every other belief
system. Our Southern Baptist preacher reiterates that principle virtually
every Sunday. He emotes psychological terrorism trying to scare people
into adopting the Southern Baptist brand of Christianity to avoid going
to hell.

> But the vast numbers of radical Moslems -and there ARE vast numbers of
> them, despite the also large numbers of Islamic moderates- see all that
> as just more reason to destroy us, as dictated by their strict religious
> beliefs. We are a sinful nation which doesn't even adhere to our own
> religious standards in their view, although they would destroy us as
> infidels anyway.

Virtually every Sunday, our Southern Baptist Preacher says that if the
US doesn't turn back to God it will be destroyed. Said preacher believes
that terrorism is God's punishment for being a sinful nation, i.e. the
terrorists are doing God's will.

> It is clear from Sept 11 that this is a particularly vicious
> cycle, one which could conceivably accomplish Allah's assigned mission
> -our destruction- if we fail to defend against it.

Remember Allah, Jehovah, and Yahweh are all the same God. Some Moslems
have perverted their religion. Some Christians have perverted their
religion. Some Jews have perverted their religion. Incidentally,
according to the Bible, I should be punished for uttering God's
name.

> Certainly very true, but the difference is that Islam is the only
> totally intolerant belief which preaches and demands the eradication of
> all other belief systems.

Don't know much about the Bible, do you, Dick? What do you think is
the purpose of missionaries? What do you think is the purpose of hell?

> I agree that many Islamics are moderates and that the group which
> demands our extinction is a minority, at best.

And the group who *acts* toward our extinction is an even smaller
minority. The individuals committing the criminal *acts* should
be prosecuted. The individuals who do not put their beliefs into
action are exercising their freedom to *think* whatever they
wish to think and should not be persecuted. You, OTOH, want to
punish people for what they think. Tsk, tsk, Dick, shades of
"1984". Our government is doing the right thing - going after
the criminal activists and leaving the law-abiding majority
alone as best they can under the circumstances.

May I point out that you have many, many evil thoughts. Should
you be punished for them?

> Given those basic teachings it is difficult to
> understand how any Moslem can reconcile his religion with friendship
> toward nonbelievers.

It is exactly the same with Christianity. The rational people seem
to have no problem. The irrational people who perform criminal
actions are the problem no matter what their religion. In condemning
an entire religion, you are failing to condemn the real criminals,
i.e. the people who plan and perform criminal actions no matter what
their religion.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

963. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 16:25:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118112530.28714.00001288@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23961

In article <7vCJ7.115835$WW.7168777@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Just as Schwartzkopf sent yo-yos coming to Saudi to get their combat tickets
>punched to a ship in the Indian Ocean, the Brits sent incompetant officers
>to Stellenbosch during the Boer War.

Dick:

This kind of makes me wonder how many Majors and Light Kernals are
scrambling to get orders to Afganistan!

73 de Larry, K3LT

964. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 16:25:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118112531.28714.00001289@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23965

In article <3bf5deef_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> What we lose through such actions cannot
>> be known for certain, but the potential for that loss would not
>> exist if people like Kim would comport themselves in a more
>> responsible manner.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>GADS...he's hilarious. "Comport"? You mean as in act the way *you* want
>someone to act, Larry? When you agree that you are an abrasive, demeaning,
>bigoted individual,

Why would I agree to that, Kim? It isn't the truth.

>I might begin to consider that my "behavior" is damaging
>to ham radio.

Now -- THAT is the truth!

>Tell ya what...if you'd even get *half* serious about your statement that a
>callsign is going to be the end of ham radio; get the list of all people
>with objectionable callsigns and go on a crusade, I'll consider changing
>mine.

This newsgroup is my venue, Kim. You bring 'em here, and they'll find
that I am perfectly willing to give them the same treatment.

>Just *half* serious, Larry. 'Cause, see, I figure that your dislike
>of my callsign is a smokescreen for your real distaste of a woman who can
>think for herself

Actually, Kim, I have plenty of respect for women who can think for
themselves. However, you spend most of your time on this newsgroup
saying "here, here" to what others have said, instead of formulating
and expressing original ideas of your own.

>and gets right in there with the best of you to shoot from
>the hip...so to speak.

And you're shooting from -- where? Your chest?

>I don't think you have half as much problem with my callsign, Larry, as you
>do with me.

It's the other way around, Kim. If you didn't have that callsign, I wouldn't
have any problem with you whatsoever!

>And, since you don't know me other than what you have read
>here,

What else do I need to know about you? You have made your
personality and character perfectly obvious to everyone who participates
in this newsgroup.

>and what some dilapidated dick from Dallas might have told you, then
>your assumption doesn't make much sense, does it?

Hey, Dick -- are you dilapidated? I never noticed…

>By the way...you're going to respond with how wrong I am about your distaste
>being more for me than for my callsign. OH, no you won't. What you'll
>respond with is that I am right, but on both counts--you don't like me *or*
>my callsign. Well, guess what? I don't believe it now, haven't believed it
>for over a year, and won't ever believe it.

I'll give you one thing, Kim -- you sure do know how to write a perfectly
confused, illogical statement.

>I am pretty sure that most of the folks in here who have a problem with me,
>have a problem with any woman who can talk at your level.

You're talking at my level, Kim? I think not. I've looked around my
"level," as it were, and don't see you anywhere around!

73 de Larry, K3LT

965. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 16:25:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118112532.28714.00001291@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23962

In article <3BF5FB3E.D3073460@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I wouldn't want my daughter listening to certain QSOs on 75m nor would I
>want her to to read the filth on the rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.
>One of the several posters of such garbage was one of the first to take
>me task for my comments on Kim's call.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Concur. I gave up on .misc right after Eric Annoyin' found his way
there from Fidonet!

73 de Larry, K3LT

966. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 16:25:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118112532.28714.00001290@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23963

In article <3BF5F8AB.605ABE7E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> I care if ham radio
>> is ruined by obscenity, racism and even Kim's *wink-wink* humorous
>> attempt at adverstising her sagging assets.
>>
>> Freedom in our society has limits. That you don't like the limits
>> imposed by the society is too bad.
>
>But society doesn't impose legal limits on Kim's callsign.
>Her freedom to possess 'W5TIT' as a callsign is unlimited
>as long as she honors the rules.

Cecil:

Sado-Masochism clubs are also "legal" in most states -- does that make
them moral, right, and socially acceptable? If you think so, then it's
obvious why you think it's perfectly OK for Kim to practice self-degradation
with her callsign.

73 de Larry, K3LT

967. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 16:25:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118112533.28714.00001293@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23960

In article <9t5pes0ak0@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>Who are you to decide what's right or wrong-minded?
>

Someone who knows the difference, that's who!

73 de Larry, K3LT

968. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 16:25:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118112533.28714.00001292@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23964

In article <3bf6672c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3BF5F9DF.B5A733B5@IEEE.org...
>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> > Precisely, and that point is reached when our behavior as hams causes
>> > potential newcomers to be turned off by people who choose to exercise
>> > their "right" to offend others.

Aw, c'mon, Cecil -- you know Kim! I can understand why you'd try to
deny it, but you certainly know her, therefore you do know someone
who chooses to exercise her "right" to offend more than I do!

>> Larry, I don't know of any newsgroup poster who has exercised his
>> "right" to offend others more often than you have.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

>Larry doesn't think there's anyone who is offended by what he
>says...although it is darned hard to take someone like him seriously...
>
>Kim W5TIT

See, Cecil, there she is -- all 210 lbs. of her packed onto that 5' 5"
frame! Of course, it may easily be 220 by now! How could you
miss her?

BTW, Kim -- you should know all about being "...darned hard to
[be taken] seriously!" The only thing I take seriously about you is
how your poor choice in a callsign is taking the ARS "...one step
closer to extinction."

73 de Larry, K3LT

969. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 17:04:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011118120439.03527.00000257@nso-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 23966

In article <3bec9704_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011109080328.24612.00000472@nso-cr.aol.com...
>> In article <3beb59c5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
>writes:
>>
>> >To me, testing a mode "singles" out a mode and creates the very situation
>> >which exists today in the huge debate of CW vs. no-CW.
>>
>> It's not even a debate to most hams. And the FCC has made it clear where
>they
>> stand on it.
>
>Yeah, that's true. CW doesn't seem to be a major concern for the majority
>of hams.

Yup. Most hams, if they want HF, just learn the code and pass the test. If they like it they use it on the air. No big deal to most hams.

>I think for the most part, the hobby is just that--a hobby.

To you, maybe, but not to a lot of others. Nowhere in Part 97 does the word "hobby" appear.

>> Your proposal to test a packet setup singles out a mode, too.
>
>I will challenge that only with the statement that I didn't intend to have
>the "mode" tested. The testing objective would be to grade one's ability to
>understand how to put things together to make them work. It could be a
>packet station, APRS tracker, PSK, etc.

Or a CW station.

There are at least three problems with this approach:

1) The VEs would be burdened with providing the equipment and the time for the tests. Unless they provide a mountain of equipment, testees could complain that the test is about things they have no interest in. Example: "I don't want to use PSK31, I'm only interested in PACTOR!!" And consider the needs of the disabled....

2) The objectivity of the tests would be questionable. One of the main reasons for multiple-choice written tests is that for every question there is a unique right answer, and it's publicly available. No judgement involved - either the testee put down the right choice or he/she didn't. Practical and essay exams of any type require that someone subjectively decide if the testee has

demonstrated adequate knowledge. Sooner or later, any amateur radio test based on subjective judgement by a volunteer examiner will be legally attacked by someone who flunked. Since the writtens have been multiple choice only for about 40 years, it will be hard to defend practical or essay tests.

>> >To leave CW as a testing phase of licensing does not prove (or disprove
>in
>> >the case of failure) one's aptitude for anything related to ham
>radio--other
>> >than CW use.
>>
>> A CW test is only needed for access to the HF/MF ham bands. CW use is VERY
>> related to ham radio in those bands.

>Only in terms of using the mode.

And the mode is widely used on the HF/MF ham bands. It is second only to SSB on those bands. An HF-licensed ham with a complete ignorance of Morse has a great big hole in their amateur radio knowledge.

>It does nothing to prove a darned thing
>amateur related other than the knowledge of the language of CW.

Not true. It proves that the person who passes the test was willing and able to learn enough Morse to pass the test, whether or not they ever intend to use it on the air.

Many folks thing it unreasonable to expect anyone to "ante up" for a ham license, though, particularly if they don't intend to play that particular game.

>> The test determines whether the person being tested has a very minimal
>skill
>> level, too.
>>
>> > It does not prove credibility in the area of operation,
>> >ability to properly operate, or anything to do with safety.
>>
>> Neither do the current written tests.
>
>Ewww-boy. Don't even get me going on that. I wholeheartedly agree.

Did you let the FCC know? I did - much of my comments to them on 98-143 was about the written tests and how to improve them. I posted my comments here way back when (1999)

>One of
>my most emotional responses to the CW debate is if the people who want to
>use CW skill as a measurement of someone's genuine interest in the hobby of
>ham radio--spend as much energy changing what we can about the current
>written tests!

I did. See the comments.

> What a joke.
>
It must be understood that the FCC is not very interested in doing what's best for ham radio's future. Their interest is an orderly service at the minimum expenditure of limited FCC resources.

Once upon a time the biggest ham radio enforcement headache the FCC had was ham signals that wandered outside the bands and messed up other services, or ham signals that were below-par in quality. Hams on the air back then were a very well-behaved lot. Look at the enforcement actions today - they are not for technical troubles.

The FCC philosophy of testing is really all about solving demonstrated troubles. The old tests were full of stuff about how to radiate a clean signal and keep it in the bands because that was what hams had the most trouble doing back then.

I have some old License Manuals, and the study guides for a General class license contain all sorts of stuff about harmonic filters, crystal tolerances, frequency meter use, where the band edges were, etc. But not a word on antennas!

>> >If a "construction" project of some sort were to be brought into the
>testing
>> >arena, it at least proves that the ham is aware of FCC specifications,
>> >rules, regulations, and guidelines.
>>
>> How?
>
>Because the pass/fail score would be based on if the transmitting is within
>regulatory constraints; if the test provides for the building of an antenna
>that will transmit cleanly between a couple of bands--then the design would
>have to based on things like will a tuner be used, will it be a long-wire,
>inverted, etc. Not only would the project have to be built, it would have
>to be explained why it would work.

And the pass-fail would be a subjective decision by the VEs. Plus all of the other problems listed above.

What would you say to the prospective ham who says he intends to buy a manufactured antenna and follow the directions? Or to only operate one band? Why does that ham have to demonstrate antenna knowledge if he never intends to be in the scenario you describe?

The arguments against code testing all apply to your proposal.

> Or, have the FCC exam present on paper a
>scenario with an embedded problem and the test is a full disclosure of what
>to do to resolve the problem.
>
Essay questions. That was done back before 1951. In fact, before 1940 or so the written exam was all essays. A typical question might be something like: "Explain what precautions should be taken to reduce harmonic radiation from an AM voice amateur radio transmitter using a plate-modulated Class C final

amplifier. Draw schematic diagrams where applicable". A correct answer would fill a couple of blue book pages. And that was just ONE question. A written test could easily take a few hours. The grading time alone caused the FCC to go to multiple choice - first partially, then totally.

>> >While it is not required that I build
>> >anything once I am a ham--a successful building project that meets
>> >specifications of the FCC will assure the FCC--and *should* assure
>> >hams--that the new licensee at least knows something about the R&R.
>>
>> Maybe - but the simple tests you propose don't do that.
>
>Heh heh. Maybe that should be clue number one to you.

Clue of what?

>I can guarantee you
>that you are far more "into" the hobby than I am.

So? I've been at this game for almost 35 years.

> While I am not saying
>*you* are like this, many believe people like me should not be in the hobby.

Anyone can have an opinion.

>People like me don't see the above as "simple tests" :).

Which is a triple whammy on them.

1) They don't prove that the person being tested really knows the stuff
2) They are not objective measures of things hams need to know
3) Those being tested see them as difficult.

>> >PLUS I think getting rid of CW testing without something to take its
>place
>> >will really piss off a bunch of people. I'm willing to have CW testing
>> >ousted, and feel that a building project is a more favorable way to
>"test"
>> >one's commitment to ham radio. Hence, I would be out--because I truly
>just
>> >want to know the R&R, buy what I need to operate, aren't the slightest
>bit
>> >interested in why things work, and so would not really expend the effort
>to
>> >build anything for a license, either.
>>
>> The only way folks would be out would be if mandatory retesting were
>> instituted. Not gonna happen.
>>
>> >CW, to me, was a piece of cake
>> >compared to having to learn anything related to getting RF power from
>Point

>> >A to Point B without blowing anything up.
>> >
>> That's what transmission lines are for.
>>
>> On top of all this, such testing would be too dependent on the subjective
>> judgement of the VEs. These days such tests simply wouldn't get through
>federal
>> regs.

This last is the real killer. Unless a test is objective and unvarying across testing sessions, you're gonna have a tough time selling it to the FCC. What they would go for is a license test that resulted in better on-air behavior.
>> --
>>
>> How about this idea:
>>
>> Divide the bands into three segments: CW, digital, analog voice. Separate
>> licenses for each mode - if a prospective ham wants access to the parts of
>the
>> bands used for certain modes, they have to pass tests on just those modes.
>All
>> hams have to pass a basic test on safety and general regs.
>>
>
>Hmmmm, I like it.
>
It's an idea for the future.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

970. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 17:45:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7f452_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23967

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011118112531.28714.00001289@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3bf5deef_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >> What we lose through such actions cannot
> >> be known for certain, but the potential for that loss would not
> >> exist if people like Kim would comport themselves in a more
> >> responsible manner.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >GADS...he's hilarious. "Comport"? You mean as in act the way *you* want
> >someone to act, Larry? When you agree that you are an abrasive,
demeaning,
> >bigoted individual,
>
> Why would I agree to that, Kim? It isn't the truth.
>

In my eyes, it's a much the truth as your belief that someone's callsign is
going to bring the ARS "one step closer to extinction." In fact, in my
eyes, that you are an abrasive, demeaning, bigoted individual is *more* the
truth.

> >
> >I might begin to consider that my "behavior" is damaging
> >to ham radio.
>
> Now -- THAT is the truth!
>

And you are entitled to your belief that it's the truth. I say it is not.
Evidence that the ARS has grown even since I got this callsign is a direct
submission of support to my belief, Larry. Where's *your* proof? At least
I can back my defense up with numbers and statistics.

> >
> >Tell ya what...if you'd even get *half* serious about your statement that
a
> >callsign is going to be the end of ham radio; get the list of all people
> >with objectionable callsigns and go on a crusade, I'll consider changing
> >mine.
>

> This newsgroup is my venue, Kim. You bring 'em here, and they'll find
> that I am perfectly willing to give them the same treatment.
>

That's because, essentially, this newsgroup is a one-way "transmission,"
Larry. On the air or in a group of people outside the venue of the
internet, you would be a laughing stock and avoided at all cost.

> >
> >Just *half* serious, Larry. 'Cause, see, I figure that your dislike
> >of my callsign is a smokescreen for your real distaste of a woman who can
> >think for herself
>
> Actually, Kim, I have plenty of respect for women who can think for
> themselves. However, you spend most of your time on this newsgroup
> saying "here, here" to what others have said, instead of formulating
> and expressing original ideas of your own.
>

Once again, do you wish to get into a game of statistics. Let's count the
number of times I submit my own thoughts, as opposed to the number of times
I simply use a meaningful, practical, efficient way to agree with someone.
After all, Larry, you almost more than anyone, should appreciate, rather
than condemn, meaningful, practical, efficient methods of communication.

> >
> >and gets right in there with the best of you to shoot from
> >the hip...so to speak.
>
> And you're shooting from -- where? Your chest?
>

Could be. Would you pay more attention if I did? I think so.

> >
> >I don't think you have half as much problem with my callsign, Larry, as
you
> >do with me.
>
> It's the other way around, Kim. If you didn't have that callsign, I
wouldn't
> have any problem with you whatsoever!
>

Wow, I'll take that as a scarey compliment from you. Scarey because I'd
hate to be considered other than a pariah on society by someone like you. I
also think you wrote with forked fingers.

> >
> >And, since you don't know me other than what you have read
> >here,
>
> What else do I need to know about you? You have made your

> personality and character perfectly obvious to everyone who participates
> in this newsgroup.
>

Ah, so many times you have told us here in this newsgroup that your behavior outside this newsgroup is quite different. It's one way or the other, Larry. If you believe that my personality and character are known by things I say here in the newsgroup--then yours is exactly as you display here.

> >
> >and what some dilapidated dick from Dallas might have told you, then
> >your assumption doesn't make much sense, does it?
>
> Hey, Dick -- are you dilapidated? I never noticed.
>

Looking at dicks, are you?

> >
> >By the way...you're going to respond with how wrong I am about your distaste
> >being more for me than for my callsign. OH, no you won't. What you'll
> >respond with is that I am right, but on both counts--you don't like me *or*
> >my callsign. Well, guess what? I don't believe it now, haven't believed it
> >for over a year, and won't ever believe it.
>
> I'll give you one thing, Kim -- you sure do know how to write a perfectly
> confused, illogical statement.
>

Ya played right into it...but you never noticed.

> >
> >I am pretty sure that most of the folks in here who have a problem with me,
> >have a problem with any woman who can talk at your level.
>
> You're talking at my level, Kim? I think not. I've looked around my
> "level," as it were, and don't see you anywhere around!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Try looking up, considerably.

Kim W5TIT

971. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 17:50:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7f57f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23968

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011118112533.28714.00001292@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3bf6672c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >news:3BF5F9DF.B5A733B5@IEEE.org...
> >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> > Precisely, and that point is reached when our behavior as hams causes
> >> > potential newcomers to be turned off by people who choose to exercise
> >> > their "right" to offend others.
>
> Aw, c'mon, Cecil -- you know Kim! I can understand why you'd try to
> deny it, but you certainly know her, therefore you do know someone
> who chooses to exercise her "right" to offend more than I do!
>

How much ignorance you display, Larry. How is that you believe Cecil knows
me? I bet you and I have "communicated" more on this newsgroup than he and
I. By the way, let's get real. I am on the air with my callsign, on 2M,
MAYBE an hour a month. And that is a serious *MAYBE.* For instance, the
past two months I have probably been on the air about 15 minutes or less.
You have been on this newsgroup--*AND* however much you have been on the
air--lots. If we are to believe, as you've said, that what "we" do here on
the internet is not to be taken as actions that have anything to do with ham
radio--then I've offended much less than you, Larry.

> >>
> >> Larry, I don't know of any newsgroup poster who has exercised his
> >> "right" to offend others more often than you have.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> >Larry doesn't think there's anyone who is offended by what he
> >says...although it is darned hard to take someone like him seriously...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> See, Cecil, there she is -- all 210 lbs. of her packed onto that 5' 5"
> frame! Of course, it may easily be 220 by now! How could you
> miss her?
>
> BTW, Kim -- you should know all about being "...darned hard to
> [be taken] seriously!" The only thing I take seriously about you is

> how your poor choice in a callsign is taking the ARS "...one step
> closer to extinction."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Did I say ignorant earlier? Yes, I did. I rest my case.

Kim W5TIT

972. Re: Hey Aaron Voobner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 18:08:25 UTC
From: "Mr. Middle Finger" <middlefinger4@home.coms>
Message-ID: <tOSJ7.233402$5A3.86165359@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 23969

Dick, you know they are forged posts !

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:5cyJ7.173626$3d2.7328660@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Leland KC8LD0" <Leland_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
> news:9t62lf01m5l@drn.newsguy.com...
> > Hello Aaron,e-mail me asap.N8wwm and i are gettng a circle jerk together
> > again...didn't want to leave you out(remember how good the last one
was)?
> >
> >
>
> OOOH, a mighty blow is struck for CB freedom by some 12-year old.
>
>

973. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 18:24:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7fd77_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23972

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011118120439.03527.00000257@nso-mj.aol.com...
> In article <3bec9704_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20011109080328.24612.00000472@nso-cr.aol.com...
> >> In article <3beb59c5_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> >writes:
> >>
> >> >To me, testing a mode "singles" out a mode and creates the very
situation
> >> >which exists today in the huge debate of CW vs. no-CW.
> >>
> >> It's not even a debate to most hams. And the FCC has made it clear
where
> >they
> >> stand on it.
> >
> >Yeah, that's true. CW doesn't seem to be a major concern for the
majority
> >of hams.
>
> Yup. Most hams, if they want HF, just learn the code and pass the test. If
they
> like it they use it on the air. No big deal to most hams.
>

As it should not be.

> >
> >I think for the most part, the hobby is just that--a hobby.
>
> To you, maybe, but not to a lot of others. Nowhere in Part 97 does the
word
> "hobby" appear.
>

And, no where does it say that CW testing proves anything about technical
aptitude, seriuosness of one's committment to the hobby, etc. All the
"measures" that many disgruntled on both sides seem to argue about.

> >>
> >> Your proposal to test a packet setup singles out a mode, too.
> >

> >I will challenge that only with the statement that I didn't intend to
have
> >the "mode" tested. The testing objective would be to grade one's ability
to
> >understand how to put things together to make them work. It could be a
> >packet station, APRS tracker, PSK, etc.
>
> Or a CW station.
>

Absolutely.

>
> There are at least three problems with this approach:
>
> 1) The VEs would be burdened with providing the equipment and the time for
the
> tests. Unless they provide a mountain of equipment, testees could complain
that
> the test is about things they have no interest in. Example: "I don't want
to
> use PSK31, I'm only interested in PACTOR!!" And consider the needs of the
> disabled....
>
> 2) The objectivity of the tests would be questionable. One of the main
reasons
> for multiple-choice written tests is that for every question there is a
unique
> right answer, and it's publicly available. No judgement involved - either
the
> testee put down the right choice or he/she didn't. Practical and essay
exams of
> any type require that someone subjectively decide if the testee has
> demonstrated adequate knowledge. Sooner or later, any amateur radio test
based
> on subjective judgement by a volunteer examiner will be legally attacked
by
> someone who flunked. Since the writtens have been multiple choice only for
> about 40 years, it will be hard to defend practical or essay tests.
>

Well, seriously, there is a problem with the dialogue on the topic, then :)
Because--in my opinion--there is no way that CW will continue to be a
testing requirement and--in my opinion--*nothing* will be brought forth to
take its place.

However, to entertain the topic of discussion, on your 1), above, a) if the
VEs would have to provide the equipment, so be it. Either they take their
VE status seriously and meet whatever requirements there are or they "get
out of the business." Now, PLEASE VEs reading this, don't think I am
slamming you--I am not. I am sure that most of you take yourselves quite

seriously; and, b) the testees complain now and will always complain. On your 2), above, a) in my opinion the objectivity of VEs is in question; maybe not on a majority basis, but certainly one-to-one. I know of stories of people getting their tickets who shouldn't have; b) I would support a return of the FCC examiner. While I know that will never happen, I believe several things would be accomplished: there could/would be less claim of favoritism (such as I have just mentioned in 2a), the objectivity would be less questionable; and the result of having less "dumbed-down" would be achieved.

I fully support getting rid of the question pool and having essay questions. I would *really* like to see something like that. I actually took no pleasure whatsoever in getting my ham license. The same as I take absolutely no pleasure in getting the huge bonus I get every year from work. I believe the formula for the bonus is flawed and I have been on the measurement side--it's definitely bogus. Why would I feel any sense of accomplishment or pride in getting my ham license when *all* it took was memorization--both on the written *and* for the CW. I couldn't do a bit of CW today...at least I don't think I could. I can't answer half the old questions.

Contrary to the thoughts on both sides of the argument: I *don't* believe I learned anything through memorization of the questions, and I *don't* believe I learned CW by memorizing characters. If I'd learned anything, I would be able to recall the information. Either I have Alzheimer's or I didn't learn.

> >> >To leave CW as a testing phase of licensing does not prove (or disprove
> >in
> >> >the case of failure) one's aptitude for anything related to ham
> >radio--other
> >> >than CW use.
> >>
> >> A CW test is only needed for access to the HF/MF ham bands. CW use is VERY
> >> related to ham radio in those bands.
> >
> >Only in terms of using the mode.
>
> And the mode is widely used on the HF/MF ham bands. It is second only to SSB on
> those bands. An HF-licensed ham with a complete ignorance of Morse has a great
> big hole in their amateur radio knowledge.
>

Well, in my opinion, most hams--new and old--licensed have a great big hole in their amateur radio knowledge. It is only the expertise from people such as yourself that we "gain" any inspiration.

> >It does nothing to prove a darned thing
> >amateur related other than the knowledge of the language of CW.
>
> Not true. It proves that the person who passes the test was willing and
able to
> learn enough Morse to pass the test, whether or not they ever intend to
use it
> on the air.
>

OK, I concede. Yes, they learn enough to pass the test.

> Many folks thing it unreasonable to expect anyone to "ante up" for a ham
> license, though, particularly if they don't intend to play that particular
> game.
>
> >> The test determines whether the person being tested has a very minimal
> >skill
> >> level, too.
> >>
> >> > It does not prove credibility in the area of operation,
> >> >ability to properly operate, or anything to do with safety.
> >>
> >> Neither do the current written tests.
> >
> >Ewww-boy. Don't even get me going on that. I wholeheartedly agree.
>
> Did you let the FCC know? I did - much of my comments to them on 98-143
was
> about the written tests and how to improve them. I posted my comments here
way
> back when (1999)
>

I've shouted that from every high mountain I could get on. Yes, I've
written to the FCC...not recently, but they got the same opinion from me. I
truly don't remember now if I made any submission to the 98-143 situation.
I think I did.

> >One of
> >my most emotional responses to the CW debate is if the people who want to
> >use CW skill as a measurement of someone's genuine interest in the hobby
of
> >ham radio--spend as much energy changing what we can about the current
> >written tests!
>
> I did. See the comments.
>

You are in the minority. It is my belief that most people just like to
bitch.

> > What a joke.
> >
> It must be understood that the FCC is not very interested in doing what's
best
> for ham radio's future. Their interest is an orderly service at the
minimum
> expenditure of limited FCC resources.
>

As it should be.

> Once upon a time the biggest ham radio enforcement headache the FCC had
was ham
> signals that wandered outside the bands and messed up other services, or
ham
> signals that were below-par in quality. Hams on the air back then were a
very
> well-behaved lot. Look at the enforcement actions today - they are not for
> technical troubles.
>

I accept the changes in society for what they are. And, with those changes
will come creeps.

> The FCC philosophy of testing is really all about solving demonstrated
> troubles. The old tests were full of stuff about how to radiate a clean
signal
> and keep it in the bands because that was what hams had the most trouble
doing
> back then.
>
> I have some old License Manuals, and the study guides for a General class
> license contain all sorts of stuff about harmonic filters, crystal
tolerances,
> frequency meter use, where the band edges were, etc. But not a word on
> antennas!
>
> >> >If a "construction" project of some sort were to be brought into the
> >testing
> >> >arena, it at least proves that the ham is aware of FCC specifications,
> >> >rules, regulations, and guidelines.
> >>
> >> How?
> >
> >Because the pass/fail score would be based on if the transmitting is
within
> >regulatory constraints; if the test provides for the building of an
antenna
> >that will transmit cleanly between a couple of bands--then the design
would
> >have to based on things like will a tuner be used, will it be a
long-wire,

> >inverted, etc. Not only would the project have to be built, it would
have
> >to be explained why it would work.
>
> And the pass-fail would be a subjective decision by the VEs. Plus all of
the
> other problems listed above.
>

I still think that's OK. I remember testing up in Gainesville, TX, before the restructuring was over. I tried for my CW test for General class license. Now, mind you--I'd not studied a bit. What my intention was was just to see if I "happened" to pass the CW by guessing the answers. The VE walked up to me with a piece of paper and pencil and I told him I wouldn't be needing it. He insisted that I *must* submit that piece of paper--with notation--or they would not pass me, even if I passed the CW test questions. I had tested one other time in the same manner (think it was in Greenville, TX--but not sure), and those VEs said no such thing. How subjective is that?

> What would you say to the prospective ham who says he intends to buy a
> manufactured antenna and follow the directions? Or to only operate one
band?
> Why does that ham have to demonstrate antenna knowledge if he never
intends to
> be in the scenario you describe?
>

Well, actually I agree. While I concede to those who feel there must be *something* in addition to written testing; my ultimate belief is that *all* that is needed is written--and *HARD* written at that (essay questions would be a good start to a debate).

> The arguments against code testing all apply to your proposal.
>
> > Or, have the FCC exam present on paper a
> >scenario with an embedded problem and the test is a full disclosure of
what
> >to do to resolve the problem.
> >
> Essay questions. That was done back before 1951. In fact, before 1940 or
so the
> written exam was all essays. A typical question might be something like:
> "Explain what precautions should be taken to reduce harmonic radiation
from an
> AM voice amateur radio transmitter using a plate-modulated Class C final
> amplifier. Draw schematic diagrams where applicable". A correct answer
would
> fill a couple of blue book pages. And that was just ONE question. A
written
> test could easily take a few hours. The grading time alone caused the FCC

to go
> to multiple choice - first partially, then totally.
>

Now, *if* (and I assure I wouldn't) I were to expend the thought it would take to answer such a question and get my license under the scenario you describe above, I would be *very* proud of my license.

> >> >While it is not required that I build
> >> >anything once I am a ham--a successful building project that meets
> >> >specifications of the FCC will assure the FCC--and *should* assure
> >> >hams--that the new licensee at least knows something about the R&R.
> >>
> >> Maybe - but the simple tests you propose don't do that.
> >
> >Heh heh. Maybe that should be clue number one to you.
>
> Clue of what?
>

That the tests should *NOT* be simple.

> >I can guarantee you
> >that you are far more "into" the hobby than I am.
>
> So? I've been at this game for almost 35 years.
>
> > While I am not saying
> >*you* are like this, many believe people like me should not be in the hobby.
>
> Anyone can have an opinion.
>
> >People like me don't see the above as "simple tests" :).
>
> Which is a triple whammy on them.
>
> 1) They don't prove that the person being tested really knows the stuff
> 2) They are not objective measures of things hams need to know
> 3) Those being tested see them as difficult.
>

Kind of as I see it today.

> >> >PLUS I think getting rid of CW testing without something to take its
> >place
> >> >will really piss off a bunch of people. I'm willing to have CW testing
> >> >ousted, and feel that a building project is a more favorable way to
> >"test"
> >> >one's commitment to ham radio. Hence, I would be out--because I truly
> >just

> >> >want to know the R&R, buy what I need to operate, aren't the slightest
> >bit
> >> >interested in why things work, and so would not really expend the
effort
> >to
> >> >build anything for a license, either.
> >>
> >> The only way folks would be out would be if mandatory retesting were
> >> instituted. Not gonna happen.
> >>
> >> >CW, to me, was a piece of cake
> >> >compared to having to learn anything related to getting RF power from
> >Point
> >> >A to Point B without blowing anything up.
> >> >
> >> That's what transmission lines are for.
> >>
> >> On top of all this, such testing would be too dependent on the
subjective
> >> judgement of the VEs. These days such tests simply wouldn't get through
> >federal
> >> regs.
>
> This last is the real killer. Unless a test is objective and unvarying
across
> testing sessions, you're gonna have a tough time selling it to the FCC.
What
> they would go for is a license test that resulted in better on-air
behavior.
> >> --
> >>
> >> How about this idea:
> >>
> >> Divide the bands into three segments: CW, digital, analog voice.
Separate
> >> licenses for each mode - if a prospective ham wants access to the parts
of
> >the
> >> bands used for certain modes, they have to pass tests on just those
modes.
> >All
> >> hams have to pass a basic test on safety and general regs.
> >>
> >>
> >Hmmmm, I like it.
> >
> It's an idea for the future.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >

>
>

I like the Jim/N2EY here in this discussion. I used to feel quite trapped by you when you'd ask me a question, I'd answer it and you would chew it all to pieces (I think knowing full well that was the answer I was going to have--you just wanted me to say it before you chewed it all up) :).

I didn't answer any of the post on my philosophical stuff, because here is not the place to even *try* to discuss such things. Those kinds of conversations, to me, are much better in person.

Kim W5TIT

974. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 18:26:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118132649.28714.00001305@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23970

In article <3BF7488F.3D4932C6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> Someone who chooses a callsign of W5TIT finds it hard to take anyone
>> else seriously? Whatta gas! That's a part of what you did - trivialize
>> the entire ARS system. I sure hope you don't expect to be taken
>> seriously in ham radio circles, any of them.
>
>Dick, if a single cute call sign can "trivialize the entire ARS
>system" then the ARS was trivial before the call was issued.

Cecil:

The problem with Kim's "single, cute callsign" is that it is seen and heard by potentially thousands of people who do not view the ARS as a forum for sexually-oriented, libertine behavior. The ARS is always touted as a "family oriented" service, which seeks to attract young people in order to ensure it's future. When the parents of these young people see a ham such as Kim, flaunting a callsign designed to call attention to her secondary sexual characteristics in an allegedly humorous way, they are not likely to get the joke. Therefore, the joke is on Kim -- and the ARS suffers yet another indignity, and is thus taken "...one step closer to extinction."

I value freedom of expression just as much as you or anyone else in this newsgroup -- but I choose to use that freedom in a responsible manner. Kim has not shown us that level of responsibility; she has chosen instead to act in a notably irresponsible manner, to the detriment of all of us who value the positive image of the ARS. Moreover, she had the nature of the damage she was doing explained to her by no less an authority than Riley Hollingsworth, yet she chooses not to take corrective action. This bespeaks the true nature of her selfish motives. By defending her, all you do is bring your own credibility into question.

73 de Larry, K3LT

975. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 18:26:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118132651.28714.00001306@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 23971

In article <3bf7c38f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Oh gosh, Dick. I hate to burst your bubble but I am taken seriously, quite
>seriously in many ham radio circles. I have just resigned my position as
>Hunt County ARES EC; I have mentored each and every level of the ARRL's
>ARECC Courses on Emergency Communications; I was part of the team for
>development of Level II and Level III of those courses; and continue as a
>mentor for each and every Level. I am a former MARS member (NNN0YCD), Navy
>MARS; I provide mentoring and guidance to many new hams on emergency
>communication; want me to go on?

Kim:

All throughout my life, I've had one concept very thoroughly drilled into
me: No matter how much good you do, a single bad act wipes out the
entire image. I have always worked longer and harder than anyone
else, took more responsibility, and accepted greater risks to my career
than anyone else around me, wherever I'd been during my military career.
I've saved the U.S. taxpayers millions of dollars by exercising intelligent
management of resources. Yet, many times, I had to face serious
problems due to relatively insignificant errors -- errors which did not even
result in any degradation of the ability to accomplish the unit mission…
and, errors which others have made, repeatedly, but were usually ignored.
One of the reasons why I was severely affected by those errors is because
I was always working rings around everyone else who was competing for
the same promotions I was -- and I was showing them off for the slackers
they truly were. *I* was the one who deserved the maximum performance
ratings, and I usually got them. *They* needed them, but couldn't be
given them, so they "got even" with me by causing trouble. Well, all of
that is behind me, and I ended up coming out on top in spite of my
detractors. You, OTOH, are not in the same position.

Your selection of an offensive, demeaning callsign singles you out as a
fool, possibly as an idiot -- by fellow hams and prospective hams, who
recognize your callsign for the childish attention-getter that it is.
Therefore,
no matter what good works you perform as a ham, you, THROUGH YOUR
OWN CHOICE, persist in destroying any good opinion of yourself as a
ham or as a person.

>The fact is, some people are adult enough to ignore the humor of my callsign
>during inappropriate times, and have fun with at other times. Some adults
>continue to trivialize the ARS by acting like children looking at a their
>first dirty picture when they hear my callsign...such as yourself.

Kim, that is precisely the effect you desire from your choice of callsign, and it gives you some sort of juvenile pleasure when it happens. However, your selfish, self-satisfaction aside, you ignore the ill effect of your call when
it is seen or heard by prospective newcomers to ham radio, especially, as Mr. Hollingsworth said, parents or grandparents of young children who were thinking of the ARS as a wholesome, family-oriented activity to pursue. You don't see the potential damage, and because you do not, those of us who do have no choice but to judge you in a negative light.

73 de Larry, K3LT

976. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 18:27:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7fe28_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23973

As I said, Larry, the figures prove otherwise on statistics as to whether my callsign brings the ARS "one step closer to extinction."

Where's *your* proof? If it's just your opinion, as I believe it is, that's fine. But, if you believe what you say is a truthful reflection of reality, then prove it...that's all I'm asking. Prove it.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011118132649.28714.00001305@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3BF7488F.3D4932C6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> Someone who chooses a callsign of W5TIT finds it hard to take anyone
> >> else seriously? Whatta gas! That's a part of what you did - trivialize
> >> the entire ARS system. I sure hope you don't expect to be taken
> >> seriously in ham radio circles, any of them.
> >
> >Dick, if a single cute call sign can "trivialize the entire ARS
> >system" then the ARS was trivial before the call was issued.
>
> Cecil:
>
> The problem with Kim's "single, cute callsign" is that it is seen and
> heard by potentially thousands of people who do not view the ARS as
> a forum for sexually-oriented, libertine behavior. The ARS is always
> touted as a "family oriented" service, which seeks to attract young
> people in order to ensure it's future. When the parents of these
> young people see a ham such as Kim, flaunting a callsign designed
> to call attention to her secondary sexual characteristics in an allegedly
> humorous way, they are not likely to get the joke. Therefore, the joke
> is on Kim -- and the ARS suffers yet another indignity, and is thus
> taken "...one step closer to extinction."
>
> I value freedom of expression just as much as you or anyone else
> in this newsgroup -- but I choose to use that freedom in a responsible
> manner. Kim has not shown us that level of responsibility; she has
> chosen instead to act in a notably irresponsible manner, to the detriment
> of all of us who value the positive image of the ARS. Moreover, she had
> the nature of the damage she was doing explained to her by no less an
> authority than Riley Hollingsworth, yet she chooses not to take corrective
> action. This bespeaks the true nature of her selfish motives. By
> defending her, all you do is bring your own credibility into question.

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

977. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 18:28:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7fe5c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23974

Prove it, Larry. Prove it...that's all you gotta do.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011118132651.28714.00001306@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3bf7c38f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Oh gosh, Dick. I hate to burst your bubble but I am taken seriously,
quite
> >seriously in many ham radio circles. I have just resigned my position as
> >Hunt County ARES EC; I have mentored each and every level of the ARRL's
> >ARECC Courses on Emergency Communications; I was part of the team for
> >development of Level II and Level III of those courses; and continue as a
> >mentor for each and every Level. I am a former MARS member (NNN0YCD),
Navy
> >MARS; I provide mentoring and guidance to many new hams on emergency
> >communication; want me to go on?
>
> Kim:
>
> All throughout my life, I've had one concept very thoroughly drilled into
> me: No matter how much good you do, a single bad act wipes out the
> entire image. I have always worked longer and harder than anyone
> else, took more responsibility, and accepted greater risks to my career
> than anyone else around me, wherever I'd been during my military career.
> I've saved the U.S. taxpayers millions of dollars by exercising
intelligent
> management of resources. Yet, many times, I had to face serious
> problems due to relatively insignificant errors -- errors which did not
even
> result in any degradation of the ability to accomplish the unit mission.
> and, errors which others have made, repeatedly, but were usually ignored.
> One of the reasons why I was severely affected by those errors is because
> I was always working rings around everyone else who was competing for
> the same promotions I was -- and I was showing them off for the slackers
> they truly were. *I* was the one who deserved the maximum performance
> ratings, and I usually got them. *They* needed them, but couldn't be
> given them, so they "got even" with me by causing trouble. Well, all of
> that is behind me, and I ended up coming out on top in spite of my
> detractors. You, OTOH, are not in the same position.
>
> Your selection of an offensive, demeaning callsign singles you out as a

> fool, possibly as an idiot -- by fellow hams and prospective hams, who
> recognize your callsign for the childish attention-getter that it is.
> Therefore,
> no matter what good works you perform as a ham, you, THROUGH YOUR
> OWN CHOICE, persist in destroying any good opinion of yourself as a
> ham or as a person.
>
> >The fact is, some people are adult enough to ignore the humor of my
callsign
> >during inappropriate times, and have fun with at other times. Some
adults
> >continue to trivialize the ARS by acting like children looking at a their
> >first dirty picture when they hear my callsign...such as yourself.
>
> Kim, that is precisely the effect you desire from your choice of callsign,
and
> it gives you some sort of juvenile pleasure when it happens. However,
> your selfish, self-satisfaction aside, you ignore the ill effect of your
call
> when
> it is seen or heard by prospective newcomers to ham radio, especially, as
> Mr. Hollingsworth said, parents or grandparents of young children who
> were thinking of the ARS as a wholesome, family-oriented activity to
> pursue. You don't see the potential damage, and because you do not,
> those of us who do have no choice but to judge you in a negative light.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

978. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 18:35:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf7ffe8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 23975

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011118132651.28714.00001306@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3bf7c38f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Oh gosh, Dick. I hate to burst your bubble but I am taken seriously,
quite
> >seriously in many ham radio circles. I have just resigned my position as
> >Hunt County ARES EC; I have mentored each and every level of the ARRL's
> >ARECC Courses on Emergency Communications; I was part of the team for
> >development of Level II and Level III of those courses; and continue as a
> >mentor for each and every Level. I am a former MARS member (NNN0YCD),
Navy
> >MARS; I provide mentoring and guidance to many new hams on emergency
> >communication; want me to go on?
>
> Kim:
>
> All throughout my life, I've had one concept very thoroughly drilled into
> me: No matter how much good you do, a single bad act wipes out the
> entire image. I have always worked longer and harder than anyone
> else, took more responsibility, and accepted greater risks to my career
> than anyone else around me, wherever I'd been during my military career.
> I've saved the U.S. taxpayers millions of dollars by exercising
intelligent
> management of resources. Yet, many times, I had to face serious
> problems due to relatively insignificant errors -- errors which did not
even
> result in any degradation of the ability to accomplish the unit mission.
> and, errors which others have made, repeatedly, but were usually ignored.
> One of the reasons why I was severely affected by those errors is because
> I was always working rings around everyone else who was competing for
> the same promotions I was -- and I was showing them off for the slackers
> they truly were. *I* was the one who deserved the maximum performance
> ratings, and I usually got them. *They* needed them, but couldn't be
> given them, so they "got even" with me by causing trouble. Well, all of
> that is behind me, and I ended up coming out on top in spite of my
> detractors. You, OTOH, are not in the same position.
>

If you are/were so good, Larry, then why were they able to cause trouble for
you? You know...most people who end up on top--I am sorry to say--are those
who have done nothing more than kiss the most ass, Larry. Nothing more,

nothing less. Most people on top are just bigger ass kissers. Doesn't say that's the case with you. However--somehow your personality just doesn't strike me as that of a leader at all, Larry--a character true on-top people would generally have.

>
> Your selection of an offensive, demeaning callsign singles you out as a
> fool, possibly as an idiot -- by fellow hams and prospective hams, who
> recognize your callsign for the childish attention-getter that it is.
> Therefore,
> no matter what good works you perform as a ham, you, THROUGH YOUR
> OWN CHOICE, persist in destroying any good opinion of yourself as a
> ham or as a person.
>

Sorry, my opinion of myself is as high as it can possibly get. And, unlike you, I don't seek the aproval of doting idiots for my "feel good." I *know* I am a good person.

> >The fact is, some people are adult enough to ignore the humor of my
callsign
> >during inappropriate times, and have fun with at other times. Some
adults
> >continue to trivialize the ARS by acting like children looking at a their
> >first dirty picture when they hear my callsign...such as yourself.
>
> Kim, that is precisely the effect you desire from your choice of callsign,
and
> it gives you some sort of juvenile pleasure when it happens. However,
> your selfish, self-satisfaction aside, you ignore the ill effect of your
call
> when
> it is seen or heard by prospective newcomers to ham radio, especially, as
> Mr. Hollingsworth said, parents or grandparents of young children who
> were thinking of the ARS as a wholesome, family-oriented activity to
> pursue. You don't see the potential damage, and because you do not,
> those of us who do have no choice but to judge you in a negative light.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Well, as I've said...the new challenge to you, Larry, is to put up or shut up. Tell me where you are getting your numbers/statistics that prove my callsign is putting the ARS "one step closer to extinction."

Put up...shut up. Lead, follow, or get out of the way.

Kim W5TIT
A damned good person with high moral character.

979. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 18:59:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t90ensqk0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 23976

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9t7fim$n11$0@208.206.142.92...
> > >
> > >
> > > September 11 will prove
> > > to be a turning point, the point at which I believe Western civilization
> > > will have begun to back away from the concept of "freedom of religion".
> > >
> > > I say this after doing a bit of study on the basics of the religion
> > > of Islam. Those basic tenants include *total* lack of tolerance for
> > > other
> > > beliefs. Islam is both "THE" religion and the functional government. The
> > > superiority of Islam is fundamental. There is no room for any other
> > > belief system, anywhere on earth. All others are to be treated in one of
> > > three ways -
> > >
> > > They must be (1). Converted to Islam, or they must be
> > > (2). Subjugated, (enslaved) or they must be
> > > (3). Eliminated - That means killed,(except for women,
> > > children and slaves).
> > >
> > > Islamic law (which is at once the religious *and* civil law) dictates
> > > these actions to all who believe in Islam. These actions are *not*
> > > optional, they are divinely ordered to *all* who will follow Islam.
> > > "Jihad" is the term often used, but it is an all-out holy war on
> > > non-believers, nonstop, forever, or for whatever length of time it takes
> > > for it to be won. For Islam. Believers are obligated to offer their own
> > > lives to the cause without reservation. This is for real. Delays, of
> > > whatever length, are only temporary. The war WILL go on, till it is won.
> > > Allah says so. As a Believer, you have no choice.
> > >
> > > Dick W0EX
>
> With all due respect, Dick, bullshit. Islam created the greatest single
> civilization this world has ever seen from the southern Philippines and the
> Indo-Chinese border area to Spain from about 800 to about 1300 AD.

So, to cut right to the point, how many generations of radical
terrorist zealots do the radical fundamentalists -whose creed is well
described in their writings and the fundamentals of Islam, regardless of
its enlightened distant past- need to indoctrinate before you can
finally believe what has happened in the past couple decades, capped by

September 11?

We know that the Al Queda terrorist organization has passed more than 12,000 of these mostly illiterate youths through their terror schools in Afghanistan alone in the past few years, and Pakistan is not without intimate implicitly in it all, whatever their present official stance. How many more there are that we don't know about we can only speculate.

I'm without the benefit of your extensive education, although I did minor in history at the regional state university and am not ignorant of the enlightened background of Islam in its distant past, nor of the atrocities of the Christian Crusades, and other similar situations.

But all that was then. September 11, and all it ominously implies, are NOW. A significant number of those people *are* out to get us, any way they can. Reading their fundamental beliefs only heighten the knowledge that their numbers can easily grow very fast, given that all Moslems are at least nominally obligated to their fundamental beliefs, and we know that what it takes to convert a moderate to something much more sinister is circumstances, persuasion and "the times". We have been suckerpunched and kicked into a corner and by the radical Islamics and we now have come out swinging, hard.

It is clear from observing many interviews of so-called moderate Islamics that almost universally they are at least sympathetic to the Radical wing, and at worst downright happy about their Sept 11 success, as witnessed by all the Arabic cheering shortly thereafter.The Saudi prince who tried to give New York the $10 mil check along with a lecture is a single but ubiquitous example.
You may view all this as you see fit but there is no doubt we have a very serious problem that isn't going to be solved by downplaying the current players based on ancient history. It isn't going to just go away if we act nice. We've already tried that and the results are obvious. And when it is all described in the root document governing both Islamic religion and at once Islamic civil law, I tend to take it seriously.

To equate radical Islam with Southern Baptist doctrine or activity as Cecil has done is ludicrous on its face. So far (the Atlanta Olympic bombing aside) I haven't noticed any deathdealaing terrorists issuing from the Southern Baptist Convention.

Dick W0EX

980. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:05:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t90pusqk1@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 23977

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I didn't invent any of this, I just tell it like it is.
>
> As a matter of fact, you do invent what is in your mind,
> Dick. We all do and those inventions are all filtered
> through different gray matter resulting in a multitude
> of different views of reality. All you are capable of
> is relating your opinion, which may or may not be
> "like it is".

As always, you avoid the facts and go after the messenger when you
don't like the message.

981. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:15:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF808B4.73A3793A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23978

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Sado-Masochism clubs are also "legal" in most states -- does that make
> them moral, right, and socially acceptable?

Morality is generally based on religion. The Moslem terrorists
think they are doing the moral thing. It's too bad the Taliban
has been routed. You and Dave could apply for a job in their
Dept. of Vice and Virtue.

As long as Sado-Masochistic clubs are made up of consenting
adults, there are no victims and I don't see anything "wrong"
with them. I wouldn't participate but I also don't like chocolate
ice cream. It would be surprising if female bondage doesn't turn
you on given your basic personality traits.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

982. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:18:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t91ib$2u0$0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 23979

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The intent of the radical wing of Islam couldn't be more clear.
>
> The intent of the radical wing of Christianity couldn't be more clear.
> Do you think it is acceptable to bomb abortion clinics and murder
> abortion doctors? That murdered abortion doctor is just as dead
> as any individual who died in the WTC. You seem incapable of
> conceptualizing quality Vs quantity.
>
> > Any Moslem must be considered to be a potential Believer who
> > has, perhaps secretly, sworn Allah's vengeance on any infidel, whenever
> > and wherever the opportunity presents, until proven otherwise.
>
> You are mentally ill, Dick. It's called paranoia.

Tell it to New York and the survivors at the Pentagon.

Consider what you
> are saying. You will consider any Moslem as guilty until proven
> innocent.

Read it again, dolt. I said that anyone who subscribes to Islam is
obligated to follow its teachings. Nothing more. The extent fealty is of
course up to the individual. You should know that people instinctively
adhere to their training. If a Moslem is trained to believe that his
belief sytem is ultimaterly destined to rule over the world and it also
happens to order death and distruction to all who oppose that rule, what
should he then do? Training from infancy is not easily overcome in most
people. Not all are "higher order thinkers" you know. Don't you???

That's the same warped concept that you accuse them of
> following. You are no better than they. If you cannot prove that
> you are not a rapist, I think you should be hanged from the
> nearest tree. How does that sound? That's what you are advocating.
>

And you, sir are a Damfool.

You can make things foolproof, but you can't make 'em damfoolproof.

983. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:19:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <XQTJ7.116966$WW.7271019@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23980

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011118112530.28714.00001288@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <7vCJ7.115835$WW.7168777@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Just as Schwartzkopf sent yo-yos coming to Saudi to get their combat
tickets
> >punched to a ship in the Indian Ocean, the Brits sent incompetant
officers
> >to Stellenbosch during the Boer War.
>
> Dick:
>
> This kind of makes me wonder how many Majors and Light Kernals are
> scrambling to get orders to Afganistan!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

If it is like last time they are more than likely Commanders and Lite
Commanders. The five highest decorations out of Desert Storm went to the
Bloomin Naivee and they all did their time on the famous ship anchored 200
nm out in the Indian Ocean.

984. Re: Hey Aaron Voobner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:22:22 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <OTTJ7.116972$WW.7272060@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23981

<Leland C. Scott@cotse.net (KC8LDO)> wrote in message
news:ogTJ7.29417$xS6.47553@www.newsranger.com...
> Yes Dick it is forges of me. Everyone knows me well enough that I don't
have a
> problem with anyone except hams who use cb and think a tech is half a ham.
I
> don't have a problem with being a technician. I forgot more about radio
and
> computers than any cb loving ham will ever learn. Perhaps you have become
jaded
> giving so much illegal cb advice.
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
> ARRL Member
> NRI
> Member
>

Find me one post where I ever advised anyone to do or how to do anything
illegal. As far as Techs being half a ham, that is because the FCC says you
is and the ITU says you ain't.

985. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:22:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF80A7A.78210C8B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23982

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The problem with Kim's "single, cute callsign" is that it is seen and
> heard by potentially thousands of people who do not view the ARS as
> a forum for sexually-oriented, libertine behavior.

Kim's callsign is like pi$$ing in the ocean or farting in a hurricane.
Don't you have bigger things in your life about which to worry?

> Kim has not shown us that level of responsibility; she has
> chosen instead to act in a notably irresponsible manner, to the detriment
> of all of us who value the positive image of the ARS.

That is certainly your opinion, ad infinitum. My opinion differs
from yours and is equally valid and valuable. Methinks thou
protesteth too much, Larry. I suspect there is a sadistic
side of you yearning to be free so you take it out on others.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

986. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:31:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF80C96.87E6301A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23983

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> All throughout my life, I've had one concept very thoroughly drilled into
> me: No matter how much good you do, a single bad act wipes out the
> entire image.

Well Larry, then you wipe out your entire image ten times a day on this
newsgroup. I find your postings about "welfare mothers of color", for
instance, to be racist, ignorant, obnoxious, demeaning, profane, immoral,
offensive, and evil. You engage in your own brand of terrorism.

> Your selection of an offensive, demeaning callsign singles you out as a
> fool, possibly as an idiot --

Burned any witches at the stake lately, Larry? Are you reincarnated
from a Spanish Inquisition judge? What is wrong with live and let live?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

987. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:34:17 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Z2UJ7.116979$WW.7272763@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23984

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t90ensqk0@208.207.71.165...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:9t7fim$n1l$0@208.206.142.92...
> > >
> > >
> > > September 11 will prove
> > > to be a turning point, the point at which I believe Western
civilization
> > > will have begun to back away from the concept of "freedom of
religion".
> > >
> > > I say this after doing a bit of study on the basics of the religion
> > > of Islam. Those basic tenants include *total* lack of tolerance for
> > > other
> > > beliefs. Islam is both "THE" religion and the functional government.
The
> > > superiority of Islam is fundamental. There is no room for any other
> > > belief system, anywhere on earth. All others are to be treated in one
of
> > > three ways -
> > >
> > > They must be (1). Converted to Islam, or they must be
> > > (2). Subjugated, (enslaved) or they must be
> > > (3). Eliminated - That means killed,(except for women,
> > > children and slaves).
> > >
> > > Islamic law (which is at once the religious *and* civil law) dictates
> > > these actions to all who believe in Islam. These actions are *not*
> > > optional, they are divinely ordered to *all* who will follow Islam.
> > > "Jihad" is the term often used, but it is an all-out holy war on
> > > non-believers, nonstop, forever, or for whatever length of time it
takes
> > > for it to be won. For Islam. Believers are obligated to offer their
own
> > > lives to the cause without reservation. This is for real. Delays, of
> > > whatever length, are only temporary. The war WILL go on, till it is
won.
> > > Allah says so. As a Believer, you have no choice.
> > >

> > > Dick W0EX
> >
> > With all due respect, Dick, bullshit. Islam created the greatest single
> > civilization this world has ever seen from the southern Philippines and
the
> > Indo-Chinese border area to Spain from about 800 to about 1300 AD.
>
>
> So, to cut right to the point, how many generations of radical
> terrorist zealots do the radical fundamentalists -whose creed is well
> described in their writings and the fundamentals of Islam, regardless of
> its enlightened distant past- need to indoctrinate before you can
> finally believe what has happened in the past couple decades, capped by
> September 11?
>
> We know that the Al Queda terrorist organization has passed more than
> 12,000 of these mostly illiterate youths through their terror schools in
> Afghanistan alone in the past few years, and Pakistan is not without
> intimate implicitly in it all, whatever their present official stance.
> How many more there are that we don't know about we can only speculate.
>
> I'm without the benefit of your extensive education, although I did
> minor in history at the regional state university and am not ignorant of
> the enlightened background of Islam in its distant past, nor of the
> atrocities of the Christian Crusades, and other similar situations.
>
> But all that was then. September 11, and all it ominously implies, are
> NOW. A significant number of those people *are* out to get us, any way
> they can. Reading their fundamental beliefs only heighten the knowledge
> that their numbers can easily grow very fast, given that all Moslems are
> at least nominally obligated to their fundamental beliefs, and we know
> that what it takes to convert a moderate to something much more sinister
> is circumstances, persuasion and "the times". We have been suckerpunched
> and kicked into a corner and by the radical Islamics and we now have
> come out swinging, hard.
>
> It is clear from observing many interviews of so-called moderate
> Islamics that almost universally they are at least sympathetic to the
> Radical wing, and at worst downright happy about their Sept 11 success,
> as witnessed by all the Arabic cheering shortly thereafter.The Saudi
> prince who tried to give New York the $10 mil check along with a lecture
> is a single but ubiquitous example.
> You may view all this as you see fit but there is no doubt we have a
> very serious problem that isn't going to be solved by downplaying the
> current players based on ancient history. It isn't going to just go away
> if we act nice. We've already tried that and the results are obvious.
> And when it is all described in the root document governing both Islamic
> religion and at once Islamic civil law, I tend to take it seriously.
>
> To equate radical Islam with Southern Baptist doctrine or activity as

> Cecil has done is ludicrous on its face. So far (the Atlanta Olympic
> bombing aside) I haven't noticed any deathdealaing terrorists issuing
> from the Southern Baptist Convention.
>
> Dick W0EX

Ain't no doubt that there are terrorists afloat. For far too many years there has been a corrupt bargain between the Warlord and the Witchdoctor in Islamic countries: the goon stays in power and the mullah owns the education system among other things. And we will live thru it just as when the rest of the de-Ottomanization of everywhere they ever were takes place in Southern Europe. There is nothing all that unique about the Middle East.

But in the Emirates and some other places the wind is blowing toward more Western-style secularization and a revulsion about mullahs whose only advice is how to go back a thousand years. The ability of religion to be twisted by uneducated clergy is well known within Christianity and Islam is probably more prone to it given its organization or lack thereof.

That more of this sort of lucky bullshit will happen is a given: the IRA has been a major bore as well as thoroughly irrelevant for years. But in the long run of things, the mullahs have overplayed their hand and it is about to get burnt.

Dick BK

988. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:38:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF80E4F.9A6E6F53@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23985

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message

> Aw, c'mon, Cecil -- you know Kim! I can understand why you'd try to
> deny it, but you certainly know her, therefore you do know someone
> who chooses to exercise her "right" to offend more than I do!
>
> >> Larry, I don't know of any newsgroup poster who has exercised his
> >> "right" to offend others more often than you have.

You've got to be kidding, Larry. You have made obscene statements
about virtually every minority group. I doubt there is a single
person reading this newsgroup who has not been offended by your
evil immoral poison postings. I am not easily offended and you
have offended me more times than I can count. I am ashamed to
be a member of the same organization as you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

989. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:41:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF80EE7.3499C283@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23986

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > BTW, Kim -- you should know all about being "...darned hard to
> > [be taken] seriously!" The only thing I take seriously about you is
> > how your poor choice in a callsign is taking the ARS "...one step
> > closer to extinction."
>
> Did I say ignorant earlier? Yes, I did. I rest my case.

IMO, pathological would be a better description. Your callsign
is negligible compared to the poison that Larry has penned in
this newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

990. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:52:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF75ABD.19E79A3F@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23987

People who lack class and taste tend to make choices like Kim did
with her call sign. It simply reflects her social standing among
the trail park mentality.

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> Someone who chooses a callsign of W5TIT finds it hard to take anyone
> else seriously? Whatta gas! That's a part of what you did - trivialize
> the entire ARS system. I sure hope you don't expect to be taken
> seriously in ham radio circles, any of them.

991. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:55:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF81223.86C6550D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23989

Dick Carroll wrote:
> To equate radical Islam with Southern Baptist doctrine or activity as
> Cecil has done is ludicrous on its face. So far (the Atlanta Olympic
> bombing aside) I haven't noticed any deathdealaing terrorists issuing
> from the Southern Baptist Convention.

Apples and oranges, Dick. I equated radical Islam with radical
Christianity, not with the Christian mainstream. I would be
willing to bet that the majority of KKK terrorists were/are
Southern Baptists. It's a sure bet that the abortion clinic
bombers and abortion doctor murderers are Christians. As I
understand it, allegiance to Christianity is a requirement
for membership in the Aryan Nations.

What do Christian terrorists, Jewish terrorists, Muslim
terrorists, and atheist terrorists have in common? If that
question is beyond your comprehension, I will explain further.
You want simply to scapegoat an entire religious group rather
than deal rationally with the problem. That indicates the
depth of your intelligence and your hankering for a retreat
from civilized society and a return to a caveman-like tribalism.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

992. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 19:55:30 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF75B83.66626748@mailcity.net>
Source record: 23988

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> And, I choose the Baptist faith because, Dick, if you ain't Baptist
> you are going to Hell as far as they are concerned.

Shows how little you know about the Baptist.

993. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:01:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF81380.3CFFDBB9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23990

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> writes:
> >Who are you to decide what's right or wrong-minded?
>
> Someone who knows the difference, that's who!

"Judge not, that ye be not judged. ... And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?" Matthew 7:1,3

Looks like you are NOT a good Christian, Larry, as you obviously don't follow the teachings of Jesus. That beam is a bitch to remove. Let me know if you need help lifting it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

994. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:02:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF813EB.6A7A2130@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23991

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
> >GADS...he's hilarious. "Comport"? You mean as in act the way *you* want
> >When you agree that you are an abrasive, demeaning, bigoted individual,
>
> Why would I agree to that, Kim? It isn't the truth.

The reason you can't see the truth, Larry, are those beams in
your eyes. See Matthew 7:3
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

995. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:06:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF814A9.74D44A8A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23992

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I didn't invent any of this, I just tell it like it is.
> >
> > As a matter of fact, you do invent what is in your mind,
> > Dick. We all do and those inventions are all filtered
> > through different gray matter resulting in a multitude
> > of different views of reality. All you are capable of
> > is relating your opinion, which may or may not be
> > "like it is".
>
> As always, you avoid the facts and go after the messenger when you
> don't like the message.

Nothing personal in my posting, Dick. Just a statement of the
facts of human psychology. All I am capable of is relating
my opinion, which may or may not be "like it is". In this
case, the messenger is I. Comprende?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

996. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:09:34 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <kb9tmp@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9t94hecu1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 24000

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3BF6E586.BD3DC80E@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> >
> >
> > It is
> > not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get to do
> > something you do not believe makes any sense.
> >
>
> Hell, I did stuff that didn't make any sense when I was in
> grammar school. Like what was the point in memorizing
> poems? Made me hate poetry.
>

Right on!!! (You can't tell I'm from the 60's generation, can you?)

--

'73' From KB9TMP

"the best way to kill a good book is to put it on the required reading list."
Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, speaking about Morse Code

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com
---

997. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:13:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF81659.E2E48A44@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23993

JJ wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > And, I choose the Baptist faith because, Dick, if you ain't Baptist
> > you are going to Hell as far as they are concerned.
>
> Shows how little you know about the Baptist.

Well, not far from the truth. Southern Baptists believe that Catholics
are going to hell. Our Southern Baptist preacher said the other Sunday
that Buddah went straight to hell. Can you explain why a good man who
died 300 years before Jesus was born would go straight to hell?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

998. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:17:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF81768.4505684F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23994

JJ wrote:
> People who lack class and taste tend to make choices like Kim did
> with her call sign.

Class and taste are value judgments. I find intolerance
of Kim's callsign to be typically low class and tasteless.
Intelligent, well-educated people tend to possess tolerance.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

999. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:21:58 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <GLUJ7.117042$WW.7277272@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 23995

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF81659.E2E48A44@IEEE.org...
> JJ wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > And, I choose the Baptist faith because, Dick, if you ain't Baptist
> > > you are going to Hell as far as they are concerned.
> >
> > Shows how little you know about the Baptist.
>
> Well, not far from the truth. Southern Baptists believe that Catholics
> are going to hell. Our Southern Baptist preacher said the other Sunday
> that Buddah went straight to hell. Can you explain why a good man who
> died 300 years before Jesus was born would go straight to hell?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cause he never knew Jaysus.

1000. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:33:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF81B15.F839A6A0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23996

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You are mentally ill, Dick. It's called paranoia.
>
> Tell it to New York and the survivors at the Pentagon.

Are you paranoid about the automobiles that kill ten times as many
people per year as died in the WTC terrorist attack? If you are
consistent with your paranoia, you will be condemning ALL drivers
of vehicles instead of the bad and/or drunk/drugged drivers.

I think we should find out if the 19 terrorists were coders or
nocoders. Then we would really know what to blame.

> I said that anyone who subscribes to Islam is obligated to follow
> its teachings. Nothing more.

Then anyone who subscribes to Christianity is obligated to follow
its teachings? Has your right eye ever offended you, Dick? Did you
pluck it out? You, yourself, are not following Jesus' words in
Matthew 7. The teachings of Islam are no more literal than the
teachings of Christianity or Judism. Islam is NOT a violent
religion. There are Islamic extremists just like there are
Christian extremists who blow up abortion clinics thus killing
the unborn they allegedly want to protect.

> You can make things foolproof, but you can't make 'em damfoolproof.

Dick, you are the best example I know of that fact. You want
to give up on civilization and return to tribal warfare.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1001. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:39:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF81C82.877A400@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23997

```
Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > Our Southern Baptist preacher said the other Sunday
> > that Buddah went straight to hell. Can you explain why a good man who
> > died 300 years before Jesus was born would go straight to hell?
>
> Cause he never knew Jaysus.

Neither did Adam, Noah, Moses, David, and Abraham.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

1002. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:49:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2BE33E0A3F26836D.6E3065AB329D75DE.0633E6C3A87ECD41@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23998

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 04:45:16 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Izzat what you call porn movies--"consensual acts of love"? You should
>be defending the public's right to view The Texas Chainsaw Massacre
>types of film. After all, they aren't illegal and no one is forced to
>watch them.

I defend the right of people to watch BOTH! That I personally
care for neither is irrelevant.

On the other hand, if we are going to ban either, I would far
rather it was the senseless violence of a "Texas Chainsaw Massacre," a
form of entertainment that has been _clearly_ demonstrated in research
to encourage violence and acceptance of violence instead of
non-violent porn, which--if it inspires behavior at all (something
research states pretty clearly it does NOT do), inspires activities
that are of harm to no one.

>Or so one would gather from reading the past "morse testing as torture"
>postings seen here in recent years.

Well since I passed my own 20WPM test, I really can't argue
that testing is "torture." I don't happen to see any need for
it--today cw is far from the only reliable mode of communications as
it was when the requirement was created--but neither do I see it as
torture, just out-of-date.

On the other hand, it _does_ seem that the pro-coders are
enjoying their torture quite a bit. It's been over a year since
testing changed and they're _still_ sniveling about code testing! I
guess self-flagellation becomes habit forming after long enough.

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1003. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 20:57:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9A693B093C5351B3.CBEA8E0B8C8AC83D.7C08F07BCCD3B6FC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 23999

On 18 Nov 2001 16:25:32 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Sado-Masochism clubs are also "legal" in most states -- does that make
>them moral, right, and socially acceptable?

Why not?

Simply because you (and I, for that matter) don't happen to be
attracted to S&M, why should OUR personal sexual preferences have
anything to do with acceptability?

It's totally unreasonable to argue that someone's sexual
preference is "immoral" or "wrong" simply because you don't personally
share it--that's the mark of the bigot, not of someone with any
integrity.

It IS interesting, though, to note that in our society it's
perfectly ok to pay someone to cause you pain, but not pleasure. It
sort of typifies the sick "morality" that permeates our culture thanks
to those who believe that THEIR moral values are the only legitimate
ones and that people must be protected from themselves. It's a sick
concept, but one very common to US culture.

> If you think so, then it's
>obvious why you think it's perfectly OK for Kim to practice self-degradation
>with her callsign.

And the fact that you believe that others should NOT have
their preferences recognized as just as moral as your own (after all,
they involve only adults and only consensual behavior) demonstrates
why you would find Kim's call sign objectionable--it defines you as a
self-righteous bigot in no uncertain terms.

Try living your own life and recognizing that others have the
right to live THEIRS w/o your judgement or self-righteousness, Larry.
It's FAR more offensive to any rational person to see amateur radio
"represented" by bigots than by people with a sense of humor!

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1004. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:01:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A43346ABC5663476.3944E407ED05E6AE.C79B6922AF642242@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24001

On 18 Nov 2001 05:24:06 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Someone who chooses a callsign of W5TIT finds it hard to take anyone
>else seriously? Whatta gas! That's a part of what you did - trivialize
>the entire ARS system. I sure hope you don't expect to be taken
>seriously in ham radio circles, any of them.

Dick, when the ham world decides to elect you and Larry as our "guardians of virtue," that kind of comment will be appropriate. On the other hand, if you and Larry had that role, there are a LOT of us who would find ham radio had no interest for us at all.

Frankly, I doubt anyone would be HALF as offended by encountering Kim's call sign as they would be encountering your own self-righteous bigotry. You can play "Mr. Morality" all you want, but we all know that's just a way of denying that fact that you're small minded and a self-righteous prude who is so rigid in his thinking that he can't accept that others have as much right to THEIR opinions and values as you have.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1005. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:04:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011118160403.23334.00000648@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 24002

In article <3BF5FCD9.36C96F34@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Has it dawned upon you yet that Affirmative Action and Morse code
>testing are both governmental requirements aimed at achieving
>a certain level of social engineering?

Is social engineering a bad thing?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1006. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:04:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011118160404.23334.00000649@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 24003

In article <9sq6ak02l1j@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20011112205541.18926.00001972@nso-fi.aol.com...
>> Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
>> efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
>
>Walking is a universal and efficient form of transportation, but one doesn't
>have to prove they can walk in order to get a driver's license.

That's because practically all humans who have the ability to walk learn to do
so before their second birthday.

>Nor should
>one have to show high-speed code skills in order to use a microphone.

20 wpm is not "high speed".
>
>> amateurs -- and this mode has many unique functional characterists which
>> cannot be exploited without operators trained in the use of the Morse
>Code.
>> History has proven that it is code *testing* which ultimately results in
>the
>
>Most of the hams I know were just damn glad to get the test out of the way
>so that they'd never have to listen to so much as another "dit" again.

Most of the hams I know who are actually active on the HF amateur bands use
Morse on the air at least some of the time.
>
>> vast majority of code *usage* on the amateur bands. Without the testing,
>the
>> ability
>> to exploit the many benefits and advantages of this mode will eventually
>be
>> lost within the ARS. Therefore, this mode deserves special consideration
>in
>> the
>
>IOW, welfare support of code.

All of the US elementary schools I know continue to require that children learn
how to add, subtract, multiply and divide, even though inexpensive calculators
which can do the job have been available for many years now. Is this "welfare
support of basic math"?

>
>> license testing process. And a mere 5 WPM doesn't cut it. A minimum of a
>12
>> WPM code test should be required for full amateur HF operating privileges.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>The last time I checked, 5 WPM met the treaty requirements.
>
Bingo. And without the treaty, no code test at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1007. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:28:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF77136.2E5543C7@mailcity.net>
Source record: 24004

CAM wrote:
>
> Class and taste are value judgments.

And it is obvious some have no value in their judgments.

>I find intolerance
> of Kim's callsign to be typically low class and tasteless.
> Intelligent, well-educated people tend to possess tolerance.

And a criminal could say the same thing of others who are
intolerant of his criminal activities. Intelligent, well-educated
people do not have to approve of low class and bad taste.

1008. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:28:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1C295197AC23A048.52E382D29DD514C8.B7D5A2EAF8E8803C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24005

On 18 Nov 2001 18:26:49 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>The problem with Kim's "single, cute callsign" is that it is seen and
>heard by potentially thousands of people who do not view the ARS as
>a forum for sexually-oriented, libertine behavior.

No, it's touted as a communications medium, a hobby where
people can learn about communications, contribute to their community
in times of emergency, and enjoy a variety of interesting and often
challenging activities including both technical ones and casual ones
such as rag-chewing.

What it is NOT touted as is a haven for conservatives who are
unwilling to acknowledge that society is constantly changing and what
was appropriate fifty years ago may not be today.

Whether you consider "TIT" offensive or not depends on your
personal values. On the other hand the racism, hate speech, and
bigotry (including religious bigotry and prejudice against Islamic
people) I hear on the air IS offensive to any rational person. If you
and Dick would spend one-tenth as much time opposing racism and
bigotry as you do preaching religious morality (which has no more role
in ham radio than explicit pornography would have), you'd both do a
LOT more to further the hobby.

You find yourself offended when you think of Kim's call being
use on the air. I find myself offended when I hear the nut cases on
3950, or the religious zealots with their fundamentalist hypocrisy
discussing the "evil" of sex or the "evil" of Islam on their nets.
Somehow, I can't help but feel that the hatred I listen to has a lot
more potential to harm ham radio than does the light humor of Kim's
call sign.

> The ARS is always
>touted as a "family oriented" service, which seeks to attract young
>people in order to ensure it's future.

Partially true.

Ham radio DOES seek to attract young people. But until "Family
oriented" became a popular political buzz word used to further the
agenda of the Religious Right, ham radio was never defined as "Family
oriented."

> When the parents of these
>young people see a ham such as Kim, flaunting a callsign designed

>to call attention to her secondary sexual characteristics in an allegedly
>humorous way, they are not likely to get the joke.

Nonsense. Every time you turn on a TV set you hear FAR worse
than that--and very few Americans are calling for censorship there
(some are--but they are the extremists). No one but a prude would be
even mildly offended by that call--and no one but an idiot could fail
to see it as humorous.

> Therefore, the joke
>is on Kim -- and the ARS suffers yet another indignity, and is thus
>taken "...one step closer to extinction."

To be frank, if people with attitudes like yours and Dicks
represent the "right" view of ham radio, the ARS is past due for
extinction!

Grow up, Larry! This is the 21st Century--not the Victorian
era. Women have breasts and legs in our society, not "bosoms and
limbs." And it isn't going to hurt the little children one bit to be
aware of that fact--nor would it hurt ham radio if the moralists would
stop trying to dictate personal values to everyone and would, instead,
concentrate on acting like responsible people themselves.

And again, since you ignored my comment before, I'll make it
again: Precisely what makes it ok for you, Dick, and others to be
offensive here in rrap while simultaneously pretending you are
protecting the image of ham radio by slamming those who have done FAR
less to create a negative image of hams than either of you has done.
FAR more people interested in exploring ham radio are likely to turn
to the Internet for their initial impressions than to spend the money
to buy a receiver before knowing whether or not they'll find the
people interesting. And this newsgroup without question will reach a
LOT more potential hams than any conversation Kim might have on the
air. Why is the impression she gives (of a fun-loving, light-hearted,
humorous person who can laugh at herself playfully) harmful to ham
radio, while the impression you and Dick give (of inflexible,
old-fashioned, cranky, self-righteous, dour, moralists) "right?"
Frankly, I know which of those two impressions would be more likely to
attract ME to ham radio--and it isn't the latter one.

>I value freedom of expression just as much as you or anyone else
>in this newsgroup -- but I choose to use that freedom in a responsible
>manner.

By putting down a woman for having a sense of humor, by
insulting anyone who doesn't share your moral values, by offending
everyone who opposes cw testing, or by pontificating as though you
spoke for the ARS instead of just for yourself?

> Kim has not shown us that level of responsibility; she has
>chosen instead to act in a notably irresponsible manner, to the detriment
>of all of us who value the positive image of the ARS.

See what I mean?

You are claiming that anyone who doesn't agree with your
narrow-minded assessment of Kim's call sign and actions doesn't value
the "positive image of the ARS." Who elected YOU god?

> Moreover, she had
>the nature of the damage she was doing explained to her by no less an
>authority than Riley Hollingsworth, yet she chooses not to take corrective
>action.

Riley Hollingsworth is an authority on the FCC rules and
regulation. He is no more an authority on morality or human behavior
than are the group who meet on 3950 Saturday nights!

Simply because Hollingsworth feels something has the potential
to convey a negative image doesn't mean that it's a fact--only that
it's his PERSONAL impression. Many people, myself included, feel that
if Hollingworth wants to clean up the image of radio, he'd do a lot
better enforcing the rules concerning CB operations and freebanding
than concerning himself with issues that involve moral
judgement--something he is neither more nor less qualified to make
than any other person with a ham ticket.

> This bespeaks the true nature of her selfish motives. By
>defending her, all you do is bring your own credibility into question.

And by condemning her, all you do is bring your own
intolerance into the public view.

Rick -- KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1009. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:30:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EEC86938A7F91833.AAB86A793A26F536.72F528C232EE85AA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24006

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 13:22:34 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>That is certainly your opinion, ad infinitum. My opinion differs
>from yours and is equally valid and valuable. Methinks thou
>protesteth too much, Larry. I suspect there is a sadistic
>side of you yearning to be free so you take it out on others.

Naw!

He just can't stop thinking about Kim's "TIT!"

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1010. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:39:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF773C5.4AFBF8F8@mailcity.net>
Source record: 24007

CAM wrote:
>
> Well, not far from the truth. Southern Baptists believe that Catholics
> are going to hell. Our Southern Baptist preacher said the other Sunday
> that Buddah went straight to hell.

Although I no longer consider myself Southern Baptist, I was raised going to Southern Baptist church and I never heard any SB preacher state that Catholics were going to hell just for being Catholic.

>Our Southern Baptist preacher said the other Sunday
> that Buddah went straight to hell. Can you explain why a good man who
> died 300 years before Jesus was born would go straight to hell?

I would ask your preacher to attempt to explain that, and like any preacher, he can't. Religion today has gotten so far off course that it has become mostly smoke and mirrors and big business. Most of the wars throughout time have been fought over religious beliefs, millions have died in the name of religion, the current terrorism and war is about radical religious beliefs. Maybe religion isn't such a good thing.

1011. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:47:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <078E67142B4652AA.712E57BAB8BA60E1.982BEEA472F42594@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24008

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 19:52:06 GMT, JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote:

>People who lack class and taste tend to make choices like Kim did
>with her call sign. It simply reflects her social standing among
>the trail park mentality.

Spoken like a true American bigot.

You must make Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson proud!

BTW, how do you manage to get past the "riff-raff" that jam
your kind of hams on 3950?

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1012. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:49:44 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Y1WJ7.192367$W8.7170475@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24009

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF81C82.877A400@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > Our Southern Baptist preacher said the other Sunday
> > > that Buddah went straight to hell. Can you explain why a good man who
> > > died 300 years before Jesus was born would go straight to hell?
> >
> > Cause he never knew Jaysus.
>
> Neither did Adam, Noah, Moses, David, and Abraham.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

When did logic enter into the discussion? They didn't know Jaysus.
```

1013. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:50:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8CF623715AB6645A.03FDEAD8DD85449D.F6828D35B45B137C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24010

On 18 Nov 2001 16:25:33 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>See, Cecil, there she is -- all 210 lbs. of her packed onto that 5' 5"
>frame! Of course, it may easily be 220 by now! How could you
>miss her?

Gee, nothing at all offensive to potential hams about putting
people down for their weight, is there Larry? That was right up there
with racism, religious intolerance, homophobia, and sexism--i.e., it
was another excellent example of your bigotry and lack of class.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1014. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 21:52:24 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <s4WJ7.192371$W8.7170122@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24011

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:078E67142B4652AA.712E57BAB8BA60E1.982BEEA472F42594@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 19:52:06 GMT, JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote:
>
> >People who lack class and taste tend to make choices like Kim did
> >with her call sign. It simply reflects her social standing among
> >the trail park mentality.
>
> Spoken like a true American bigot.
>
> You must make Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson proud!
>
> BTW, how do you manage to get past the "riff-raff" that jam
> your kind of hams on 3950?
>
> Rick--KE8HH
>

Rick, with all due respect it sounds as if the real crime to you is making a
judgment at all.

Dick N&#65533;BK
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1015. Scenes we'd like to see dept.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 22:05:41 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <VgWJ7.192383$W8.7172860@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24012

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011118112530.28714.00001288@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <7vCJ7.115835$WW.7168777@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Just as Schwartzkopf sent yo-yos coming to Saudi to get their combat
tickets
> >punched to a ship in the Indian Ocean, the Brits sent incompetant
officers
> >to Stellenbosch during the Boer War.
>
> Dick:
>
> This kind of makes me wonder how many Majors and Light Kernals are
> scrambling to get orders to Afganistan!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

One of Bill Mauldin's famous Willie and Joe cartoons for Stars and Stripes had them beholding a supply sergeant decked out in paratroop boots, a proper 50-mission crush on his new hat, and pilot sunglasses -- the haute couture of the Italian Campaign. Caption comes later.

I have often envisioned getting these characters together, staging the obligatory parade, and awarding them the BSC with fig leaf clusters. The medal weighs about 8 lbs from being cast in lead and has this cartoon on it with the lettering ORDER OF THE BASE-SECTION COMMANDO. The back side simply says, 'Promotion Proof'. I can see these bozos for the rest of their days at the Pentagon wandering around with paratroop boots, sunglasses, a 50-mission crush, and a medal that looks like a pie plate.

Dick BK
'

1016. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 22:22:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <51916C0E1837D148.1229E47C378FB54E.45B75D53D56F683E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24013

On 18 Nov 2001 05:05:26 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Yep- Read all about it right here...Something I posted on another venue
>I'll repeat here.

Spread your intolerance to a wider audience, Dick. After all
there might be a new, potential, ham reading this group who doesn't
yet know that the ARS is filled with bigots like you and Larry.

> September 11 will prove
>to be a turning point, the point at which I believe Western civilization
>will have begun to back away from the concept of "freedom of religion".

If you had it you way, the only religious tolerance you would
practice would be to allow people to choose which Christian church
they wished to attend.

> I say this after doing a bit of study on the basics of the religion
>of Islam. Those basic tenants include *total* lack of tolerance for
>other beliefs. Islam is both "THE" religion and the functional government.

Dick, if you studied for your ham ticket as thoroughly as you
"studied" the Islamic faith, you would have failed your Novice test in
the first place.

Islam DOES believe that its practitioners should live by the
tenets of their faith. So what? The religion is prominent in nations
where freedom of religion is NOT a Constitutional guarantee, and where
the population is far more homogeneous with respect to religious
variation.

You don't want to see religion mixed with government? Fine,
neither do I. So keep your OWN religious values (including your
so-called morality, etc.) out of OUR government here in the USA
instead of concerning yourself with the religious choices of other
nations.

> The
>superiority of Islam is fundamental. There is no room for any other
>belief system, anywhere on earth.

And Christianity grants equal status to other religions? Since
when are Christians any more tolerant of non-Christian religions than
Islam is of non-Islamic ones?

> All others are to be treated in one of
>three ways -
>

> They must be (1). Converted to Islam, or they must be
> (2). Subjugated, (enslaved) or they must be
> (3). Eliminated - That means killed,(except for women,
> children and slaves).

What a load of rubbish!

Read the Christian bible for examples of religious intolerance (i.e., kill whole populations because they don't accept their particular interpretation of a deity, etc.). Read the OT, the history of the crusades, or the history of the Inquisition and tell us some more about how _Islamic_ religions view others.

For the record, btw, only the Shi'te version of Islam (equivalent to the Fundamentalist Christian religions) practice religious intolerance. The far larger Sunni version (the religion practiced in most Islamic nations, including Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, etc.) believes that there are "many paths to Allah (God)" and that the path of Muhammed is the appropriate one for THEM to follow.

Your religion teaches tolerance, Dick. Perhaps you should start practicing your OWN beliefs before you attack those of others.

> Islamic law (which is at once the religious *and* civil law) dictates
>these actions to all who believe in Islam. These actions are *not*
>optional, they are divinely ordered to *all* who will follow Islam.

Bunk!

Read the Koran and you would know better than that.

Islamic law requires that Moslems practice the tenets of their religion, not that the force others to do so or kill them if they don't.

What a load of ignorant nonsense!

>"Jihad" is the term often used, but it is an all-out holy war on
>non-believers, nonstop, forever, or for whatever length of time it takes
>for it to be won.

Jihad is, specifically, a war against those who would seek to attack or subjugate Islam, Dick. The concept isn't really so out-of-line for a religion that was originally the target of Christian expansionism during the Crusades. And don't even TRY to pretend that the Christian religion doesn't feel just as strongly about defending ITS existence. If one is bad, so are both.

>For Islam. Believers are obligated to offer their own
>lives to the cause without reservation.

Read the Koran.

> This is for real. Delays, of
>whatever length, are only temporary. The war WILL go on, till it is won.

>Allah says so. As a Believer, you have no choice.

More crap.

Christianity is based on the concept that all religions but
Christianity must be wiped off the earth by war, right? What, you
disagree? But there's a LOT more support for that view in the bible
than there is for your absurd claims in the Koran.

Have you READ the Koran, Dick? Or is it easier for you to
accept second hand input about it' content? At least I've read the
bible that I take issue with (19 versions, as a matter of fact--and
five versions of the Koran)--something most CHRISTIANS haven't done
even once!

> So how, then, does a civilization (ours) which in basis depends on
>freedom of religion and separation of religion from government, begin to
>deal with a religion whose principles dictate the destruction of the
>very system which promotes tolerance of it?

Jail Jerry Falwell and Pat Robinson on hate crime charges?

Oh, sorry, I thought you were talking about OUR pet religions.

> How can that "religion" be
>allowed to prosper and spread, without causing the complete destruction
>of the free system that nourished it?

How can you call for suppression of a religion and even
remotely claim you support freedom?

Fascism was offensive in Nazi Germany, Dick. And it's just as
offensive when it's Americans calling for it.

>Is "religous freedom" to include a
>religion which dictates the destruction of all other forms of religious
>belief?

Of course not--so let's ban Christianity, ok?

> Here is an interesting and very revealing book on the subject:

> Youssef writes as a devout practicing Christian who believes that
>Christianity can overcome the sinister Islamic point of view, but I
>found the book to be striking for its descriptions of the basics of the
>Moslem viewpoint and the makeup of the Islamic world both historically
>and in this era. And I must say that I cannot share his optimism. I
>wonder if he retains it himself in view of recent events.

Let me get this straight. You are taking your information
about Islam from the writings of a self-professed Christian religious
zealot who views Islam as "evil" and "sinister" and as something that
must be overcome?

Yeah, he's REALLY an unbiased source, isn't he?

> We'd better get used to some dramatic changes in the way we think about
>the world around us. There are half as many Islamics in the world as
>Christians.

I know--and it must scare the hell out of them knowing that
Christians like you outnumber them. Talk about a justified persecution
complex!

> They are taught from infancy to generally hate and despise
>us, that we are wholly inferior, and to either change us or else
>eliminate us, while we preach tolerance of them and their beliefs.

Yup. You sure sound tolerant, alright.

> It may prove to be quite a contest. Especially since a great many
>Islamics view their huge oil reserves as divine proof of the
>rightousness of their cause, and they have also invested huge
> amounts of surplus oil cash in the West, particularly the USA.

I see. So we should steal all their property so we can protect
ourselves, right?

Gee, Dick, George W. Bush & Dynasty have enormous investments
in the oil industry, too. Do you suppose they're really closet
Muslims? Perhaps we should seize THEIR resources, too.

Dick, people like you and Larry almost make me ashamed to
admit I'm a ham!

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1017. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 22:25:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BB558CB38C6CC75F.DBB5AEA3392BA9BE.E2A2E8CA480EAA85@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24014

On 18 Nov 2001 18:59:35 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> To equate radical Islam with Southern Baptist doctrine or activity as
>Cecil has done is ludicrous on its face. So far (the Atlanta Olympic
>bombing aside) I haven't noticed any deathdealaing terrorists issuing
>from the Southern Baptist Convention.

I guess murdering physicians at family planning clinics isn't
terrorism in your eyes, right Dick?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1018. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 22:40:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF83871.6F1A11EF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24015

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > The truth is that *YOU* didn't understand what you were saying.
>
> Of course, you never make a mistake, are always right, and the
> rest of the world is always wrong. You are omniscient so you
> always understand everything. OTOH, I am a mere mortal but I
> indeed do understand what I am saying which is that Affirmative
> Action was not all bad and did allow competent black teachers
> to replace incompetent white teachers in this area of the USA.

Naw Cecil, what you were doing is comparing morse testing to Affirmative Action. The rest of this crap is simply diversion. Your inclusion of the word "incompetent" in front of the words "white teachers" makes your view quite clear if not necessarily true.

> > You do not live in a place called "Small Southern Town, USA".
>
> Madisonville, Texas is indeed a small southern town in the USA
> typical of small towns all across the South. That you are incapable
> of conceiving of such an abstraction is your problem, not mine.

I attempted to get you to speak about the one area you know rather than leading us to believe that you speak for what happened everywhere. What, by the way, is the zip code for "Small Southern Town, U.S.A."?

> > I don't even know that you had a black teacher friend, Cecil.
>
> OH!!!!?????? Admitting that you are not omniscient? Up until now,
> you have implied that you know everything about me and my home town
> and I am wrong about it even though I live here. Truth is, you don't
> know a whole lot about me, my home town, and what happened in Small
> Southern Town, USA.

What I'm doing is acknowledging that you have manufactured items for posting here previously.

> My black teacher friend's name is Viola Taylor. She and I graduated
> from high school in Madisonville in 1955 but we didn't know each
> other until we went to Sam Houston State Teacher's College
> together. I could get a teaching job in Madisonville but
> she couldn't in spite of being more qualified than I.
>
> Incidentally, I was glad to see the incompetent white teachers
> go. The Madisonville school system is now top rated among

> schools in its league. Reckon how that happened?

You can tell someone who is interested. My statement went to your faulty comparison.

Dave K8MN

1019. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 22:43:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF83922.ED921D93@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24016

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I said you were "comparing" not "comparting". I provided the quote in
> > which you made the comparison. Munch away!
>
> You are such a liar, Dave. Here's *YOUR* posting. Read it and weep.
> The posting is still on most of the news servers so anyone can
> verify your lying ways. You accused me of "comparting" and I
> expect an apology.
> **********
> > Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
> > From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> > Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2001 00:43:24 GMT
> >
> > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> ^^^^^^^^^^
> **********
> Do you lie to your employer like that? Do you lie to your wife like that?
> How do you give yourself permission to lie in public when the truth is
> there for all to see?

You are perhaps the only individual here who would attempt to twist a typo into a lie. Feel free to trot out any of my other posts on the subject. I'm certain that you'd find the words "compare" or "comparing".

You're still stuck with the faulty analogy.

Dave K8MN

1020. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 22:45:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF8397A.7A403063@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24017

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm not angry with you, Kim. I'm unhappy with your lack of class and
> > decorum.
>
> Too bad the Taliban has been routed. You could have gotten a job
> with their Department of Vice and Virtue.

Too bad that Carl isn't here to refer to me as a Nazi. Your
"Libertarian" views at work?

Dave K8MN

1021. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 22:47:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF839EF.78F2E637@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24018

Larry Roll, K3LT wrote:
>
> >You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
> >Town, USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the
> >status of expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition,
> >I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> >comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> >
> >> > Can you come up with any verifiable facts to support your claim or are
> you
> >> > just blowing smoke?
> >>
> >> I commuted to Sam Houston State Teacher's College with a black lady
> >> while
> >> I was obtaining my Texas Teaching Certificate. She was getting one also
> >> along with a Master's Degree. She was a superior person with a high IQ.
> >> She could not get a teaching job in Madison County so she got one in
> >> Harris
> >> County. Affirmative Action later allowed her to move back to her home
> >> town
> >> and teach. Incompetent white teachers were let go and competent black
> >> teachers
> >> were hired. Left to the tyranny of the white majority, that would not
> >> have
> >> happened even with the civil rights law in place. My low-IQ cousin, who
> >> had
> >> flunked out of Texas A&M, was one of the teachers who was let go. He was
> >> teaching his students that transistors were made out of geranium.
> >
> >So we have only your wild tales as proof. Tyranny of the white majority
> >indeed. Perhaps you can entertain us with tales of your cousin's work
> >in seminole conductors.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> Soooo...now Cecil is a "minority wannabe?" Or does he just think he can win
> friends and influence liberal people by "anti-white man" stories? I'm sure
> Cecil
> thinks that white men are the worst evil ever inflicted upon the face of the
> Earth,
> and is dreadfully sorry he was born one himself. Never a mention of how
> Affirmative Action has been used as a legalized form of reverse

> discrimination,
> and has ruined the careers of untold numbers of qualified non-minority
> professionals in order to make opportunities for people who merely show up
> for the interview, but later on, hardly ever show up for work!
>
> I believe in Equal Opportunity, not equalized outcomes. Affirmative Action
> is nothing more than another way liberal, socialist politicians keep
> themselves
> in power by pandering to the lowest common denominator.

You'll note that Cecil did not do the right thing and give up his job
for a minority. He didn't stand up for his convictions.

Dave K8MN

1022. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 22:53:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF83B67.20407CD7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24019

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF731F3.4F39E3E9@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > You would have us assume that your town is representative of every
> place
> > > > in the South.
> > >
> > > Not every place, but it is pretty typical of small towns in the Old
> South
> > > from Georgia to East Texas. When the students were integrated, by and
> > > large, the teachers were not.
> >
> > If you mean your area, say it. Don't presume to speak for the entire
> > South.
> >
>
> You mean in the same way you did, Dave, with your: "I guess my knowledge
> base is larger, Cecil. I've lived in the Midwest, and the South along with
> some of Europe and much of Africa. You talk about what you can from your
> limited perspective"? (From news:3BF5B461.6867E631@earthlink.net... on Nov
> 16 at 6:55PM).
>
> Should we presume you were speaking for the entire Midwest, South, Europe
> and Africa (though those two latter areas didn't even have anything to do
> with the topic)?

You should not assume anything not stated (but you often do).

> > > > > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous
> comment
> > > > > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> > > > >
> > > > > I have never comparted Affirmative Action and Morse testing so
> > > > > you know what that makes you.
> > > >
> > > > You have indeed. Do you know what your disavowal of your own
> statement
> > > > makes you?
> > >
> > > Dave, you used the word "comparting", not I. the definition of "compart"
> > > is "to subdivide".

> >
> > You have lost your few brain cells. I never used such a term.
> >
>
> You mean like when you said (emphasis at word c-o-m-p-a-r-t-i-n-g added):
> "You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern Town,
> USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the status of
> expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition, I'm calling you
> on this diversion from your original erroneous comment ***comparting***
> Affirmative Action and morse testing"?
> (From news:3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net... on Nov 16 at 6:43PM)

My answer to you is the same as the answer I gave Cecil. You take a
typo to twist my statement? Look up any of my other posts on the
subject. Tell me what you come up with.

> >
> > I did *NOT* subdivide Affirmative Action and Morse
> > > testing so you are just lying through your teeth. I expect an apology.
> >
> > You'll get none from me. I never accused you of subdividing anything.
> >
>
> You mean like when you said "In addition, I'm calling you on this diversion
> from your original erroneous comment comparting Affirmative Action and morse
> testing"?
>
> >
> > What you did was say that morse testing was an Affirmative Action
> > program.
> >
> > > > > Morse code testing and Affirmative Action are similar examples of
> > > > > social engineering, i.e. governmental requirements attempting
> > > > > to get some people to do what they wouldn't normally choose to do.
> > > >
> > > > A typical Cecilian swerve on the road to truth...
> > >
> > > How you can deny reality is beyond belief. Why even have a
> > > governmental requirement for something that doesn't need to be
> > > social engineered?
> >
> > It dawns on me that you wouldn't know reality if you tripped over it.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Well, the same could be said for what you understood yourself to be saying
> at some given point. I think a long, long time ago I called you a
> charlaton. In my humble opinion, I reiterate that now.

I think that, in the past, I've refered to you as "Tugboat Annie".
I'm still comfortable with the term.

Dave K8MN

1023. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 22:56:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF83C09.A8A1C9AA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24020

CAM wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > *GASP*!! OK, that's it. I am going
> > to reply to the post in which Dave Heil used the word comparting. **THEN**
> > I am going to completely ignore that this jerk even habitats the planet
> > Earth.
>
> What? And miss all the fun of having a battle of wits with an
> unarmed opponent?

You certainly flatter yourself--and that only with the help of someone
else's worn out saying.

Dave K8MN

1024. WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:00:18 UTC
From: bman@niagara.com
Message-ID: <3bf83a37.693070113@news.niagara.com>
Source record: 24021

I've got my basic qualification as an amateur radio operator but I have yet to grab hold of any gear or even a call sign as of yet.

What I stopped here to say is that I am absolutely amazed at the level of conversation in this newsgroup. I had kind of always thought that everyone who had the perseverance and knowledge to become an amateur radio operator was someone with a bit more je ne sais quois over the average folk.

I mean, in days gone by before the Internet was a household word you might have been online with one or more bulletin board systems. And indeed there, and on the Internet, anyone with the sense enough to turn on their computer and have it dial another could post anything they wanted for all to see and show whoever would read how immature and petty and feeble they really are.

Now I see that there is no higher intellect even in the world of amateur radio where you're supposed to be qualified and probably should know the Morse code and obey a few basic rules of civility, that anyone can encounter just as many children on the airwaves as they can on any other public forum.

So here's my two cents for y'all to digest and fight over for the next century until your hobby dies - screw the Morse code requirement and let everybody on the air regardless - it doesn't raise anybody's level of intelligence or maturity and it certainly doesn't force anyone to be civil in a public forum, and as for a good means of communicating, it stinks!

I know it has its uses, but as most of the posts (hundreds in just a couple days) here seem to indicate, many of the people here haven't any uses for the common man. Just one more good reason why I shouldn't even bother spending the money, I guess. Probably was a really interesting hobby in the days when it was really about the interest and not about the inane and utterly useless banter seen around here.

Congratulations, you may now turn over your licences and become a normal moron like everyone else.

Byron

1025. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:01:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF83D37.F2708919@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24022

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF73A1B.9CC4869B@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BF5FB3E.D3073460@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > I wouldn't want my daughter listening to certain QSOs on 75m nor would
> I
> > > > want her to to read the filth on the rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup.
> > > > One of the several posters of such garbage was one of the first to
> take
> > > > me task for my comments on Kim's call.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > >
> > > Did you take *that* person to task for his/her actions?
> >
> > Yes. Did you miss me response to him here?
> >
> > > Why do you make
> > > *me* the target of your anger for that person's actions? That person
> was
> > > the same prior to hearing or seeing my callsign.
> >
> > I'm not angry with you, Kim. I'm unhappy with your lack of class and
> > decorum. I was unhappy with your choice before the other fellow made
> > his comments. You hav the cart before the horse.
> >
> > > Kids who "understand" my
> > > callsign must *know* what tits are before they hear my callsign.
> >
> > And your point there is that once you've heard a word and understand
> > what it means, its frequent use becomes permissable?
> >
> > > Here's an analogy for you: if you are angry at me for my callsign
> because of
> > > some nitwit who acts like an idiot but supports my callsign; would you
> also
> > > make the same differentiation between someone who is Muslim and that it
> is
```

> > > *their* fault for the WTC?
> >
> > Here's an answer for you: We're not talking about Muslims or the WTC.
> > We're talking about your unfortunate decision. I wouldn't elevate your
> > situation to the status of current world events. We're dealing with
> > terror, not tackiness.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Your evasion of the question is typical. I could say I didn't mean to make
> it so challenging. But I did.

It isn't evasion, Kim. Your tacky choice in calls has absolutely naught
to do with Muslims or the WTC. You've made nothing challenging. If you
want to defend your lack of decorum, don't attempt to link it to a
disparate topic.

Dave K8MN

1026. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:05:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D8598616F940A795.7F71EEB8E9502427.30292379FD589845@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24023

On 18 Nov 2001 09:12:20 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Precisely the point. If Islam is fundamentally and totally intolerant
>of any other belief system, and considers any other as evil and Infidel,
>then it is immaterial whether the "other" is Christian, Buddhist or
>Hindu.

Gee, Dick, aren't you the same person who refers to Islam as
evil or sinister?

Are you Islamic or do Christians practice the same intolerance
you accuse Muslims of practicing?

Incidently, few Muslims have any problem with Buddhists--and
the only prejudice against Hindus comes from internal stresses between
Pakistan and India--stresses that are political not just religious.

>They do seem to hate us Americans more, though, evidently for our
>secularism and success at accomplishing such a free nation.

Or, perhaps, it's because we keep interfering in the Middle
East, providing weapons to their enemies, and using their nations for
pawns in our political games.

In case you don't remember the fact, WE--not some
fundamentalist Islamic nation--trained Osama bin Laden and his
followers. We trained them, funded them, and ARMED them as a way to
oppose the USSR in Afghanistan. Now, of course, when our own actions
come back to haunt us (as they have done in other nations including
Somalia, etc.), we blame the religion of the region instead of our own
actions. If it weren't for the US, the Taliban would NEVER have
achieved power in Afghanistan in the first place so if you want to
point a finger at anyone, point it at US, where it belongs!

>Islam is
>clearly a very restrictive doctrine that abhors freedom of choice in
>almost all facets of life.

Hmmmmm . . .

Does that mean you're "pro-choice" Dick, or does a limitation
on freedom of choice only abhorrent to you when it is YOUR choices
that are being limited?

> Your life is to be lived for Allah and not
>much else.

And to a Christian, your life is to be lived for "God." What's
new?

> How in the world does such a belief system garner such a
>large following?

Ask Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, Oral Roberts, Jimmy
Swaggart, and Jim Baker. They were pretty good at doing so.

> One can only assume that all those believers know
>nothing else.

Dick, the only individual we can COUNT on knowing nothing else
is you. You're so narrow minded, self-righteous, and bigoted that you
couldn't possibly view any other religion as anything but a threat to
you personally.

> Please understand that I don't approach this as a contest between Islam
>and Christianity, I see it as an assault by Islam on every other belief
>system, as dictated by basic Islamic religious precepts. How else can
>one view it given the events of the past few months, coupled with all
>the earlier Islamic terrorist acts?

As terrorism, how do you THINK we should view them?

I suppose that since it was Islamic terrorists that performed
the acts we have to stamp out Islam in self-defense.

Of course, since Timothy McVeigh was a Christian (Southern
Baptist to be precise), we obviously need to wipe out Christianity in
self-defense as well.

Better get ready, Dick, once they're through with Afghanistan,
you're next.

>The intent of the radical wing of
>Islam couldn't be more clear. And that wing is not trivial, clearly the
>opposite. Any Moslem must be considered to be a potential Believer who
>has, perhaps secretly, sworn Allah's vengeance on any infidel, whenever
>and wherever the opportunity presents, until proven otherwise. And one
>then doesn't know how that same Moslem will act next time. See the
>point? It appears that Islamic "religious" training basically leads to
>an unstable personal state where individual Moslems may decide at any
>time that they are, after all, and after many years of resisting,
>obligated to do Allah's will, and commit what amounts to a terrorist
>act. Indications are that on Sept 11 there were other hijackers on other
>planes, in the air enroute, who did not carry out their mission, perhaps
>deciding they were not ready to die, after all- at least not right then.
>So when?

All this does is demonstrate your intense racism and religious
intolerance.

For someone who criticizes Kim for her call sign, claiming it
gives a bad image to the ARS, you certainly manage to give a vastly

worse one yourself. I would be _ashamed_ to voice such ignorant and bigoted views myself, but then again I've come to expect them from you.

> Agreed, but with the huge numbers of Moslems, it has become clear there
>will always be far more than enough radical strict constructionists to
>do a pretty good job of carrying out Mohammed's directives as instructed
>by basic Islamic teachings. Unless we defend ourselves. How to do
>that is problematic.

Let's just leave the middle east alone. That way they won't have any reason to attack us, and they can succeed or fail on their own. Pull our troops out after we finish what we've begun in Afghanistan, stop sending them weapons, giving them money, and training their troops, and use severe economic sanctions to force them to deal fairly with us in trade so they won't artificially raise oil prices too high.

Better yet, let's just make it clear that the US doesn't support ANY religion over any other (INCLUDING Christianity), eliminate any laws we have that are based on religious beliefs (blue laws, morality laws, etc.) and stop being the world's police force.

> And as I tried to point out, this becomes the very root of our peril
>when faced with a religion, which we characteristically must tolerate,
>which is intent on destruction of every other belief system, including
>(y)ours.

No problem, Dick. They'll always be intolerant people such as yourself around to "protect" us from the evil of open minds.

> That, again, is the root of the problem. Under Islam the two cannot be
>separated. So we wind up tolerating a form of government that intends to
>kill us off as evil infidels just because we MUST tolerate it as a
>religion! A quandary and total paradox if one ever existed.

You keep arguing that we shouldn't "tolerate" other forms of government. What does tolerance for religion have to do with tolerance for terrorism? That's like saying that because the US "tolerates" Christians we must tolerate the murder of doctors and bombing of abortion clinics!

Maybe if you would PRACTICE a bit of tolerance, you might see just how much of an offensive bigot you come across as in this ng.

> But the vast numbers of radical Moslems -and there ARE vast numbers of
>them, despite the also large numbers of Islamic moderates- see all that
>as just more reason to destroy us, as dictated by their strict religious
>beliefs. We are a sinful nation which doesn't even adhere to our own
>religious standards in their view, although they would destroy us as
>infidels anyway.

Have you thought about getting help for your paranoia, Dick?
You certainly sound as though you need it.

> Part of the problem is that Islamic radical fundamentalism is cyclical.
>Look at what happened in Iran in 1979. And now bin Laden, Al Queda and
>the rest. It is clear from Sept 11 that this is a particularly vicious
>cycle, one which could conceivably accomplish Allah's assigned mission
>-our destruction- if we fail to defend against it.

There IS no such "assigned mission," Dick. Read the Koran, not
the ramblings of a religious bigot like yourself.

> Certainly very true, but the difference is that Islam is the only
>totally intolerant belief which preaches and demands the eradication of
>all other belief systems.

Christianity doesn't?

What planet are YOU from?

>That alone places it into a totally different
>category when it comes to our response. We drop our guard at our peril.
> Basically Islam is different from any other religion in that regard,
>and can, maybe even must, be viewed as something other than a religion.
>Religions don't teach mass murder and utter destruction based simply on
>a differing point of view regarding the characteristics and wishes of a
>deity.

Crusades.

Inquisition.

Hitler's death camps for non-Christians.

Salem witch trials.

No, Dick, no religion except Islam teaches mass murder based
on a differing point of view of a deity. None at all.

Except, of course, your own!

> I agree that many Islamics are moderates and that the group which
>demands our extinction is a minority, at best. But when there are so
>many that minority, strident and ruthless as it is, and clearly they
>ruthlessly hold the upper hand and maintain power over the moderates,
>-moderates avoid a nasty fight, the radicals do not, so the radicals
>generally win out over moderates- as the Taliban has done in
>Afghanistan. It behooves all Islamic moderates to control their radical
>elements instead of supporting them as so many clearly do. Examples
>abound, as the wealthy Saudi prince who tried to give New York a $10
>million check along with a lecture on how wrong we are in our Mideast
>policies. Where do you think he would stand in a all-out contest?

Depends on the contest. You certainly see him siding with us
about the Taliban.

What is so outrageous about his statements that we are "wrong"
in our Mideast policies? Do you honestly believe that WE know more
about the needs of the middle east than the RESIDENTS of that region?
Who elected the US as God? We act from national interests in the
middle east--not from any interest in actually _helping_ the nations
there. What's so strange about having a representative of one of those
nations say that publicly?

At least he offered $10M to help. How much do WE give other
nations when they suffer tragedies? How much did YOU give to help
survivors of the last earthquake in Asia--an earthquake that took ten
TIMES as many lives as the WTC attack?

Hypocrite!

> One cannot assume anything friendly about them when you know they are
>trained in the basics of Islam from infancy, and it is clear what those
>basics are.

And people wonder why the rest of the world fears our
thinking. Dick, if you were typical of our citizens it would make me
ashamed to be an American and to have worn our nation's uniform!

> It is difficult to avoid when Islam, the religion, is also Islam, the
>radical dictatorial government supporting our destruction, and Islam,
>our sworn enemy to-the-death, by the dictates of their most basic
>teachings, just as freedom of expression and tolerance of religious
>beliefs is ours. Given those basic teachings it is difficult to
>understand how any Moslem can reconcile his religion with friendship
>toward nonbelievers. It is in fact strictly forbidden in the Koran.
>There is a built in conflict that is always there, waiting to surface.

Read the Koran if you intend to talk about it. Otherwise you
just come off as ignorant.

> Oh- And "we" didn't set this up this conflict at all, on religious
>grounds or any other. THEY set it up - on religious grounds!!! If we
>attempt to avoid it as it presents, we fail.

No--one terrorist with money (most of which came from contacts
WE provided him years ago, along with his training as a terrorist) set
it up. VERY few middle eastern nations are siding with the Taliban
instead of with us DESPITE the fact that they are Islamic. Doesn't
that tell you ANYTHING? Or is your prejudice so ingrained that you're
incapable of objective thought at all?

> Do you *Really* think it is possible to truly align ourselves with
>anything that is Islamic after September 11, and all the Islamic
>terrorism that has gone before, knowing what basic Islamic law and
>doctrine are? It is one thing for some splinter group to go off on a
>tangent, but this is clearly not the case here, as shown in basic
>Islamic teachings.

More bull.

Provide quotes from the original sources to support your
claims, Dick, or stop pretending you understand the Koran.

I'll make you a deal. For every quote from the Koran that
teaches intolerance or violence against other religions, I'll provide
one from the Christian Bible (KJV). If you come up with the most, I'll
side with you about Islam. And if I do so, you'll stop posting your
religious bigotry in public where innocent people can see it. Fair
enough?

> So then, just WHO is the enemy and WHO is friend, within the Islamic
>community - a LARGE community of Believers who have been taught since
>birth that we -all nonbelievers- are their mortal enemy??? How will we
>tell them apart? I know, many of them would rather not face up to the
>internal conflict involved, but what will they think when decision time
>comes? Will personal wishes for a peaceful existence prevail over
>lifelong religious training and ingrained obligation, and guilt feelings
>because of their lifetime spent in avoidance of that obligation?

More bigotry.

Your hatred of others is getting really old Dick. Go back to
cw where we don't all have to be exposed to your offensive behavior.

> I truly wish that I could see some light at the end of the tunnel, but
>this one is a real thorny puzzler. To say that it leaves many Americans,
>as well as many others, uneasy about the future is an considerable
>understatement. I and a great many others believe the President is
>right- this won't be a short term scrap.

Of course not--he'd never be reelected unless he stretches it
out a lot longer than that.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1027. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:07:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf84081_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24025

The Christian bible, in many places, alludes to the lesson that we should not tie ourselves to the distractions of a material concern. We should be ever vigilant for evil that will try to divide our attentions away from God, and distract us from what is good and pure.

Adhering to the principle above, by what measure should one decide "enough is enough"? If I am to adhered to the principle above, would I not also condemn the beliefs of other religions--forsaking them to the Hell they create by virtue of their beliefs? Would that not mean that I must choose to ignore them in a time of need, in times of disaster, etc. For wouldn't it be the evil doing of Satan to create a circumstance in which I would be distracted from all that is good and pure in order to help those that are evil and sin?

I could go on and on. Read the bible. And, adhere firmly to what it teaches; you'll find yourself thinking some pretty evil things about a lot of human beings.

We westerners don't handle religious wars very well, Dick. You demonstrate why, quite obviously.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9t91ib$2u0$0@208.207.71.165...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > The intent of the radical wing of Islam couldn't be more clear.
> >
> > The intent of the radical wing of Christianity couldn't be more clear.
> > Do you think it is acceptable to bomb abortion clinics and murder
> > abortion doctors? That murdered abortion doctor is just as dead
> > as any individual who died in the WTC. You seem incapable of
> > conceptualizing quality Vs quantity.
> >
> > > Any Moslem must be considered to be a potential Believer who
> > > has, perhaps secretly, sworn Allah's vengeance on any infidel,
whenever
> > > and wherever the opportunity presents, until proven otherwise.
> >
> > You are mentally ill, Dick. It's called paranoia.
>
>

> Tell it to New York and the survivors at the Pentagon.
>
>
> Consider what you
> > are saying. You will consider any Moslem as guilty until proven
> > innocent.
>
>
> Read it again, dolt. I said that anyone who subscribes to Islam is
> obligated to follow its teachings. Nothing more. The extent fealty is of
> course up to the individual. You should know that people instinctively
> adhere to their training. If a Moslem is trained to believe that his
> belief sytem is ultimaterly destined to rule over the world and it also
> happens to order death and distruction to all who oppose that rule, what
> should he then do? Training from infancy is not easily overcome in most
> people. Not all are "higher order thinkers" you know. Don't you???
>
> That's the same warped concept that you accuse them of
> > following. You are no better than they. If you cannot prove that
> > you are not a rapist, I think you should be hanged from the
> > nearest tree. How does that sound? That's what you are advocating.
> >
>
> And you, sir are a Damfool.
>
> You can make things foolproof, but you can't make 'em damfoolproof.

1028. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:09:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf84082_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24026

By the way, in your quick review of the Islam faith, you seem to have completely missed that "moslem" is the place of faith, "muslim" is the person of faith.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:9t91ib$2u0$0@208.207.71.165...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > The intent of the radical wing of Islam couldn't be more clear.
> >
> > The intent of the radical wing of Christianity couldn't be more clear.
> > Do you think it is acceptable to bomb abortion clinics and murder
> > abortion doctors? That murdered abortion doctor is just as dead
> > as any individual who died in the WTC. You seem incapable of
> > conceptualizing quality Vs quantity.
> >
> > > Any Moslem must be considered to be a potential Believer who
> > > has, perhaps secretly, sworn Allah's vengeance on any infidel, whenever
> > > and wherever the opportunity presents, until proven otherwise.
> >
> > You are mentally ill, Dick. It's called paranoia.
>
>
> Tell it to New York and the survivors at the Pentagon.
>
>
> Consider what you
> > are saying. You will consider any Moslem as guilty until proven
> > innocent.
>
>
> Read it again, dolt. I said that anyone who subscribes to Islam is
> obligated to follow its teachings. Nothing more. The extent fealty is of
> course up to the individual. You should know that people instinctively
> adhere to their training. If a Moslem is trained to believe that his
> belief sytem is ultimaterly destined to rule over the world and it also
> happens to order death and distruction to all who oppose that rule, what
> should he then do? Training from infancy is not easily overcome in most
> people. Not all are "higher order thinkers" you know. Don't you???

>
> That's the same warped concept that you accuse them of
> > following. You are no better than they. If you cannot prove that
> > you are not a rapist, I think you should be hanged from the
> > nearest tree. How does that sound? That's what you are advocating.
> >
>
> And you, sir are a Damfool.
>
> You can make things foolproof, but you can't make 'em damfoolproof.

1029. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:14:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF8404F.EFF5C4EC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24024

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 04:45:16 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Izzat what you call porn movies--"consensual acts of love"? You should
> >be defending the public's right to view The Texas Chainsaw Massacre
> >types of film. After all, they aren't illegal and no one is forced to
> >watch them.
>
> I defend the right of people to watch BOTH! That I personally
> care for neither is irrelevant.
>
> On the other hand, if we are going to ban either, I would far
> rather it was the senseless violence of a "Texas Chainsaw Massacre," a
> form of entertainment that has been _clearly_ demonstrated in research
> to encourage violence and acceptance of violence instead of
> non-violent porn, which--if it inspires behavior at all (something
> research states pretty clearly it does NOT do), inspires activities
> that are of harm to no one.

That you defend porn as harmless comes as no real surprise to me. I am surprised that you are gullible even to believe that one type of movie inspires behavior and that the other doesn't.

> >Or so one would gather from reading the past "morse testing as torture"
> >postings seen here in recent years.
>
> Well since I passed my own 20WPM test, I really can't argue
> that testing is "torture." I don't happen to see any need for
> it--today cw is far from the only reliable mode of communications as
> it was when the requirement was created--but neither do I see it as
> torture, just out-of-date.
>
> On the other hand, it _does_ seem that the pro-coders are
> enjoying their torture quite a bit. It's been over a year since
> testing changed and they're _still_ sniveling about code testing! I
> guess self-flagellation becomes habit forming after long enough.

I guess you've missed the postings of Lenny-The-Licenseless and Larry-The-Homemade-Lawyer. The testing changes have been pointed out to both numerous times and they're still whining.

Dave K8MN

1030. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:17:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <5418434F58E8E23C.996B9411E38265BE.A699F9E47F81DB21@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24027

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 09:17:21 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>You are mentally ill, Dick. It's called paranoia. Consider what you
>are saying. You will consider any Moslem as guilty until proven
>innocent. That's the same warped concept that you accuse them of
>following. You are no better than they. If you cannot prove that
>you are not a rapist, I think you should be hanged from the
>nearest tree. How does that sound? That's what you are advocating.

Naw.

He can't be a rapist, Cecil.

His attitude toward women's breasts makes it clear he's not
interested in women.

Of course his comments about encouraging children to
participate in his activities . . .

>Virtually every Sunday, our Southern Baptist Preacher says that if the
>US doesn't turn back to God it will be destroyed. Said preacher believes
>that terrorism is God's punishment for being a sinful nation, i.e. the
>terrorists are doing God's will.

I'll never forget Jerry Falwell's quote in the 1980s. He
stated:

"AIDS isn't God's punishment to homosexuals. It's God's
punishment to a society that would TOLERATE homosexuals."

Good, solid, Christian value, isn't it?

It's no wonder Dick thinks like he does, with his "leaders"
teaching that intolerance is a virtue.

> Incidentally,
>according to the Bible, I should be punished for uttering God's
>name.

Blame it on eating pork or not buying your spouse a dove to
sacrifice after her last menstrual period. If you avoided such simple
injunctions, how could you be expected not to use a name?

>Don't know much about the Bible, do you, Dick? What do you think is
>the purpose of missionaries? What do you think is the purpose of hell?

It's a place to tell people to go????

>May I point out that you have many, many evil thoughts. Should
>you be punished for them?

Why not--he expects others to be punished for theirs.

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1031. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:18:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf84701_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24033

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:GLUJ7.117042$WW.7277272@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BF81659.E2E48A44@IEEE.org...
> > JJ wrote:
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > And, I choose the Baptist faith because, Dick, if you ain't Baptist
> > > > you are going to Hell as far as they are concerned.
> > >
> > > Shows how little you know about the Baptist.
> >
> > Well, not far from the truth. Southern Baptists believe that Catholics
> > are going to hell. Our Southern Baptist preacher said the other Sunday
> > that Buddah went straight to hell. Can you explain why a good man who
> > died 300 years before Jesus was born would go straight to hell?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Cause he never knew Jaysus.
>
>

Well, psssstttt, neither did any of the folks in the Old Testament?! Huh?
Huh?

Kim W5TIT

1032. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:21:35 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E06EC2F9332C1735.4447AC7439FBB10C.DEFF2C8289F9C80B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24028

On 18 Nov 2001 19:18:35 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Read it again, dolt. I said that anyone who subscribes to Islam is
>obligated to follow its teachings. Nothing more. The extent fealty is of
>course up to the individual. You should know that people instinctively
>adhere to their training. If a Moslem is trained to believe that his
>belief sytem is ultimaterly destined to rule over the world and it also
>happens to order death and distruction to all who oppose that rule, what
>should he then do? Training from infancy is not easily overcome in most
>people. Not all are "higher order thinkers" you know. Don't you???

Then, by the same standard, anyone who subscribes to
Christianity is obligated to follow ITS teachings. And if you've
bothered to read the bible, you know that includes killing people for
adultery, or for showing disrespect to their parents, sacrificing a
dove to "purify" a woman after her period, totally destroying any
nation of people who don't accept the Judeo-Christian God as their
deity, requiring women to "submit" to their husband's will and
religious teaching, and any number of other wonderful actions.

What--you don't obey such rules? Then I guess you just aren't
as sincere about your religion as you accuse Muslims of being.

> And you, sir are a Damfool.

>You can make things foolproof, but you can't make 'em damfoolproof.

Or bigot proof, unfortunately.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1033. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:27:06 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf84716_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24034

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:D8598616F940A795.7F71EEB8E9502427.30292379FD589845@lp.airnews.net...
>
>

[GOOD PEOPLE...close your eyes: this is a tongue-in-cheek post]

>
> I suppose that since it was Islamic terrorists that performed
> the acts we have to stamp out Islam in self-defense.
>

Likewise, Rick, maybe all Christians should just go ahead and commit suicide
so that they can apologize for the Crusades. ;)

Ducking that bolt coming down from the sky.... :o

Kim W5TIT

1034. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:28:46 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <68EB5FAB9790686A.3C27C8476802BAE1.3B498F23AAAD999F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24029

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 06:46:02 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> By the way, while we're discussing myths about the Middle East, lets
>also address the myth spread by many women in this country about men
>there forcing women to wear veils. Based on what we've seen, women in
>those countries are far more fanatical about women wearing veils than
>the men are. On several occasions, my wife was mistaken for a local
>and was reprimanded by another woman for not wearing a veil, or for
>wearing "provocative" western clothing. This even happened to my
>mother once years ago. Of course, as soon as the mistake was realized,
>sincere apologies followed (along with attempts to make amends - we
>ended up with a large crate of tangerines at a bazaar once because of
>that). At the same time, never once did a man ever say anything about
>my wife (or mother) not wearing a veil, nor did they even seem to
>notice it.

For the record (as you probably already know--but Dick
doesn't, I'm sure) the reason women are expected to wear veils by the
Shi'te sect (Sunni nations don't require a veil), as well as the
reason women are required to be _behind_ men in a mosque instead of in
front of them isn't based on a view that women are inferior. Instead
it is based on the belief that a woman is so pure that she can look at
a man and still keep her thoughts on Allah (God), while a man is so
naturally base that if he looks at a woman he will be distracted from
his contemplation of Allah!

Hmmmm . . .

If they're right, Dick and Larry are responding to Kim's call
sign in a _very_ predictable manner. They can't keep their minds on
spiritual matters when they are exposed to Kim's "TIT."

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1035. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:31:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <74C7FCEAAD62A6E9.93F2053F7C172860.72ADA3B4E8124E3A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24030

On 18 Nov 2001 16:25:33 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Someone who knows the difference, that's who!

Gee, Hitler felt that way, too!

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1036. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:33:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <07F0400A85F6DBCC.7513AA9E968A1BFD.42275649DAB6C632@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24031

On 18 Nov 2001 16:25:31 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>You're talking at my level, Kim? I think not. I've looked around my
>"level," as it were, and don't see you anywhere around!

That I can believe.

Next time, look up.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1037. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:40:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7B7AD26FA1EAC32E.CE69B7B3A94E159A.4E11D6B91232A9B3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24032

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 11:45:26 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>After all, Larry, you almost more than anyone, should appreciate, rather
>than condemn, meaningful, practical, efficient methods of communication.

You mean he's finally given up cw?

>> What else do I need to know about you? You have made your
>> personality and character perfectly obvious to everyone who participates
>> in this newsgroup.
>
>Ah, so many times you have told us here in this newsgroup that your behavior
>outside this newsgroup is quite different. It's one way or the other,
>Larry. If you believe that my personality and character are known by things
>I say here in the newsgroup--then yours is exactly as you display here.

In a sense, he's probably partly right, Kim. Your personality
and character DO come out in the newsgroup. You demonstrate
self-confidence, self-respect, a sense of humor, lack of intolerance,
honesty and integrity here--and I would expect those qualities would
be equally manifest in the real world.

Of course, Larry and Dick aren't willing to acknowledge that,
like yourself, their personality and integrity come out here as well.
On the other hand, given the model they present, I don't think I would
want to admit it if I were them, either.

>Looking at dicks, are you?

Only dilapidated ones--sounds a bit kinky to me!

>Try looking up, considerably.

Gee--I just told him that too! :-)

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1038. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:47:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf8491d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24035

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:1C295197AC23A048.52E382D29DD514C8.B7D5A2EAF8E8803C@lp.airnews.net...
>
> And this newsgroup without question will reach a
> LOT more potential hams than any conversation Kim might have on the
> air.
>

Man, you have that right! You would not believe the number of hams I have met at hamfests who walk up to me with a big 'ol grin and tell me that they've read my posts on this newsgroup! It surprised the hell out of me the first few times it happened.

>
> Why is the impression she gives (of a fun-loving, light-hearted,
> humorous person who can laugh at herself playfully) harmful to ham
> radio, while the impression you and Dick give (of inflexible,
> old-fashioned, cranky, self-righteous, dour, moralists) "right?"
> Frankly, I know which of those two impressions would be more likely to
> attract ME to ham radio--and it isn't the latter one.
>

You'd find most people who know me as a friend, even those who know me casually, would say that I have a huge heart--and I do. I just believe very seriously in the "hard love" concepts. I don't believe in being an enabler; and I'm very hardnosed about people who I think are mean: bigots, racists, liars, etc. I don't care if the keep taking the next step as they get to the edge of the Earth. I would stand silently as they walk off. I have a son who is a racist. He's very close to being disowned; and I certainly have no pride in him whatsoever. Love? I don't know...I really don't. I think when I think of loving him--it is a reflection of when he was little and cuddleable. Now, I fear the day we'd confront each other in the race war he feels certain will come up some day.

At any rate, yes, I am a fun-loving gal, and laugh hysterically at myself all the time. I'll tell you just as quick as someone else about some mistake I made--and I'll generally be laughing about it (because it's usually pretty damned stupid!). My callsign, and me, bring laughs to a serious life and I am proud to do it.

Kim W5TIT

1039. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 23:50:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf849e4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24036

"JJ" <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3BF773C5.4AFBF8F8@mailcity.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Well, not far from the truth. Southern Baptists believe that Catholics
> > are going to hell. Our Southern Baptist preacher said the other Sunday
> > that Buddah went straight to hell.
>
>
> Although I no longer consider myself Southern Baptist, I was
> raised going to Southern Baptist church and I never heard any SB
> preacher state that Catholics were going to hell just for being
> Catholic.
>

Middle- and Upper-class churches hide their intentions well. You could say, in a more dignified manner. Since you love to slam me as "trailer park trash" I presume you view yourself as at the level of Middle- or Upper-class. In fact, churches with parishoners at that economic level generally prosteltize about being lily white and pure in their sermons.

I've been to both. I prefer neither.

Kim W5TIT

1040. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 00:10:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf84e9e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24040

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:7B7AD26FA1EAC32E.CE69B7B3A94E159A.4E11D6B91232A9B3@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 11:45:26 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >After all, Larry, you almost more than anyone, should appreciate, rather
> >than condemn, meaningful, practical, efficient methods of communication.
>
> You mean he's finally given up cw?
>
> >> What else do I need to know about you? You have made your
> >> personality and character perfectly obvious to everyone who
participates
> >> in this newsgroup.
> >
> >Ah, so many times you have told us here in this newsgroup that your
behavior
> >outside this newsgroup is quite different. It's one way or the other,
> >Larry. If you believe that my personality and character are known by
things
> >I say here in the newsgroup--then yours is exactly as you display here.
>
> In a sense, he's probably partly right, Kim. Your personality
> and character DO come out in the newsgroup. You demonstrate
> self-confidence, self-respect, a sense of humor, lack of intolerance,
> honesty and integrity here--and I would expect those qualities would
> be equally manifest in the real world.
>

As do you. I bet that if we ever got together for coffee (we'd have to
leave my darlin' hubby behind--as he doesn't really enjoy philosophical
discussions) at Starbucks, we'd have to meet at opening and decide we were
going to be there until closing. LOL

> Of course, Larry and Dick aren't willing to acknowledge that,
> like yourself, their personality and integrity come out here as well.
> On the other hand, given the model they present, I don't think I would
> want to admit it if I were them, either.
>
> >Looking at dicks, are you?
>
> Only dilapidated ones--sounds a bit kinky to me!
>
> >Try looking up, considerably.
>

> Gee--I just told him that too! :-)
>

Yeah, I just forgot to tell him to keep from falling over backwards as he
did.

> 73 de KE8HH, Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Kim W5TIT

1041. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 00:12:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011118191207.08696.00000568@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 24037

>Subject: WOW! - That's all I can say
>From: bman@niagara.com (Bman)
>Date: 11/18/2001 5:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3bf83a37.693070113@news.niagara.com>

>Congratulations, you may now turn over your licences and become a
>normal moron like everyone else.

Another anonymous troll on a mission from God...or at least the voices he HEARS making him THINK he hears God.

This newsgroups is comprised mostly of licensed Amauteurs, however it is NOT Amateur Radio, nor is it governed by 47CFR Part 97 in it's conduct nor content.

Now run along like a nice troll and eat some prunes...maybe it will clear up that retention problem you seem to be suffering.

Steve, K4YZ

1042. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 00:12:58 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DB4997D290BFD6C8.D5139DDE28E0DC43.9E5B427516D3772D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24038

On 18 Nov 2001 04:55:24 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> It would, to you.

It would to any unbiased reader.

> That's because you want to see it that way.

You mean that I choose to see you as narrow minded and fixated
on "TIT" s?

Yup!

> On the
>other hand, I didn't choose that Dick is the most commonly used nickname
>for Richard.

Actually, it isn't. Rick is.

But even if it was, knowing the connotations associated with
the word and holding your extremely conservative views about any hint
of sexual content, real or imagined, in ham radio, I would expect you
to stop using such an obscene nick name and start calling yourself
Rich or Richard instead.

> And Kim *DID* choose to advertise her grossly overly ample
>anatomy via her titillating callusing.

Sure like attacking people over their weight, don't you?

There's a popular term for larger women, Dickie. It's "BBW,"
for Big Beautiful Woman. I don't know if Kim is overweight or not
(simply because you keep accusing her of being "grossly overly ample"
and other offensive insults doesn't make it true, obviously, since
that would require that YOU be an honest person, and we all know
better than that), but if she is her personality alone makes it very
clear that BBW would apply to her perfectly.

On the other hand, I can just as easily think of a suitable
target for TOM (Thin Offensive Man) . . .

> Yes, that's right - some people-in fact many people, regard all that as
>unpleasantly excessive, especially when the bearer flaunts it, and it's
>not really that attractive that it should be flaunted in the first
>place. Anyone with sufficient behind-the-scenes experience wil
>l already know that. It's illusory.

So now you're claiming to be an expert on Kim's breasts, Dick?

Somehow I doubt that. She gives every indication of having far
too much class to have an interest in you.

Must be just wishful thinking on your part.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1043. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 00:13:54 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CEBB1FC7EE780C29.F93E6A334AA17C8D.A5CE2BC50DEAB160@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24039

On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 23:32:09 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> Dick, you keep criticizing Kim for her choice of call signs.
>> Did you ever consider YOUR choice of nick names for Richard???
>
>Seems entirely appropriate to me. :-)

Why, is his last name "Head?"

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1044. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 00:41:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn0mvmb.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24041

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 19:26:35 -0500, Rick Adams wrote:

> It's one thing for hams not to support or condone the use of
>illegal amps by cbers--but not freely providing information goes
>contrary to a central principle of amateur radio--that of the free
>exchange of information and the education of others in radio
>technology. Sure the information is being misused--but it isn't the
>responsibility of a ham to determine HOW information is going to be
>use, only to insure that his/her information is accurate and honest.

Reflect on "aiding and abetting".

> If I tell a cber how to build an amp for 10m, for example
>(which, btw, I don't do), I'm not doing anything a good book on
>electronics theory--or an early version of the ARH for that
>matter--wouldn't tell him or her. It's the cber's responsibility not
>to use that information illegally by operating on 11m with more than
>5w of power--it isn't my responsibility not to communicate factual
>information to prevent him/her from doing so.

Reflect on "aiding and abetting".

> In this nation we often end up blaming people for teaching
>others things that they later use illegally. It's time we stopped
>blaming the teacher and started putting the responsibility squarely
>where it belongs--on the learner who misuses the information.

Reflect on "aiding and abetting".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1045. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 00:56:30 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <2NYJ7.117397$WW.7301880@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24042

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:BB558CB38C6CC75F.DBB5AEA3392BA9BE.E2A2E8CA480EAA85@lp.airnews.net...
> On 18 Nov 2001 18:59:35 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > To equate radical Islam with Southern Baptist doctrine or activity as
> >Cecil has done is ludicrous on its face. So far (the Atlanta Olympic
> >bombing aside) I haven't noticed any deathdealaing terrorists issuing
> >from the Southern Baptist Convention.
>
> I guess murdering physicians at family planning clinics isn't
> terrorism in your eyes, right Dick?
>
> Rick
>

I'll give you this: you found the most likely source of the anthrax scare,

1046. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 00:57:49 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <hOYJ7.117408$WW.7302691@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24043

"Bman" <bman@niagara.com> wrote in message
news:3bf83a37.693070113@news.niagara.com...
> I've got my basic qualification as an amateur radio operator but I
> have yet to grab hold of any gear or even a call sign as of yet.
>
> What I stopped here to say is that I am absolutely amazed at the level
> of conversation in this newsgroup. I had kind of always thought that
> everyone who had the perseverance and knowledge to become an amateur
> radio operator was someone with a bit more je ne sais quois over the
> average folk.
>
> I mean, in days gone by before the Internet was a household word you
> might have been online with one or more bulletin board systems. And
> indeed there, and on the Internet, anyone with the sense enough to
> turn on their computer and have it dial another could post anything
> they wanted for all to see and show whoever would read how immature
> and petty and feeble they really are.
>
> Now I see that there is no higher intellect even in the world of
> amateur radio where you're supposed to be qualified and probably
> should know the Morse code and obey a few basic rules of civility,
> that anyone can encounter just as many children on the airwaves as
> they can on any other public forum.
>
> So here's my two cents for y'all to digest and fight over for the next
> century until your hobby dies - screw the Morse code requirement and
> let everybody on the air regardless - it doesn't raise anybody's level
> of intelligence or maturity and it certainly doesn't force anyone to
> be civil in a public forum, and as for a good means of communicating,
> it stinks!
>
> I know it has its uses, but as most of the posts (hundreds in just a
> couple days) here seem to indicate, many of the people here haven't
> any uses for the common man. Just one more good reason why I shouldn't
> even bother spending the money, I guess. Probably was a really
> interesting hobby in the days when it was really about the interest
> and not about the inane and utterly useless banter seen around here.
>
> Congratulations, you may now turn over your licences and become a
> normal moron like everyone else.
>
> Byron
>

If you confuse this with real radio there is some question just who the moron might be.

1047. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 00:58:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF7A276.645D6EC3@mailcity.net>
Source record: 24050

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Spoken like a true American bigot.
>
> You must make Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson proud!
>
> BTW, how do you manage to get past the "riff-raff" that jam
> your kind of hams on 3950?
>
> Rick--KE8HH

Simple, I stay away from the Jerry Falwells, Pat Robertsons, the 'riff-raff' on 3950 and your type as well.

1048. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:03:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011118200356.03527.00000268@nso-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 24044

In article <REkJ7.189341$W8.6950818@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.gmx3ee6.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
>> On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 02:22:53 GMT, JJ wrote:
>>
>> >Yeah, for just $59.95 you too can get your ham radio badge be the
>> >envy of every 12 year old.
>>
>> But it doesn't have the Secret Decoder Wheel nor glow in the dark
>> like my Captain Midnight badge did when I was 10 years old.....
>>
>> --
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>>
>>
>
>But the secret message on the badge is not 'Drink more Ovaltine'
>
No, the secret message is:

"Be sure to drink your Ovaltine"

73 de Jim, N2EY

1049. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:13:02 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <y0ZJ7.117438$WW.7304200@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24045

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011118200356.03527.00000268@nso-mj.aol.com...
> In article <REkJ7.189341$W8.6950818@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> >news:cuvyxnansvbet.gmx3ee6.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> >> On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 02:22:53 GMT, JJ wrote:
> >>
> >> >Yeah, for just $59.95 you too can get your ham radio badge be the
> >> >envy of every 12 year old.
> >>
> >> But it doesn't have the Secret Decoder Wheel nor glow in the dark
> >> like my Captain Midnight badge did when I was 10 years old.....
> >>
> >> --
> >> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > >But the secret message on the badge is not 'Drink more Ovaltine'
> > >
> > No, the secret message is:
> >
> > "Be sure to drink your Ovaltine"
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

Helps build strong bodies 8 or 12 ways!
>

1050. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:23:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t9mtmqjq0@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 24046

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>

They both have lots to say, Dick especially on how
> evil the Taliban are, and both of them especially on how evil my callsign
> is...

PLEASE go take a reading comprehension course if you expect to be taken seriously. I said, repeatedly that your call is ASSININE. Evil would laugh you out of the building.

1051. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:24:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF85F5F.28C0BA67@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24047

Dave Heil wrote:
> You'll note that Cecil did not do the right thing and give up his job
> for a minority. He didn't stand up for his convictions.

Not true, Dave. I didn't accept the job in my home town. I went
for a higher paying job in Baytown, TX. My black friend still
wasn't hired and took a job in Houston.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1052. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:27:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF85FF5.F7984B0B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24048

Dave Heil wrote:
> What, by the way, is the zip code for "Small Southern Town, U.S.A."?

I see that you are still incapable of conceptualizing abstract
levels higher than a "rock" or a "tree". That's a pity, Dave.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1053. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:32:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF86139.81442695@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24049

Dave Heil wrote:
> You are perhaps the only individual here who would attempt to twist a
> typo into a lie.

I didn't do that at first, Dave. I simply pointed out your choice
of words. It was a real English word so it wasn't readily apparent
that it was a typo. After you denied using that word for about a
dozen times, it was obvious that you had decided to lie about it.
I'm sorry I had to embarrass you by digging up your original
posting. Threaded newsreaders are a bitch, huh?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1054. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:36:17 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf86242$0$35613$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 24051

Jon,

Please, don't confuse these guys with fact.
This RRAP, where the procoders can live
out their delusions.

If Richard believes the code matter will not
be addressed until 2011, then let him keep
is dream.

Larry

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@p1k.arrl.org> wrote in message
news:20011116234157.52ea6574.jbloom@p1k.arrl.org...
> On Sat, 17 Nov 2001 02:40:28 GMT
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> >
> > I suspect you will get to wait another decade. It is not even on the
> > discussion agenda for 2003.
>
> RESOLUTION 1156 (approved at the fourth and ninth Plenary Meetings)
> Agenda for the World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-03)
> ...
> 1.7 to consider issues concerning the amateur and amateur-satellite
services:
>
> 1.7.1 possible revision of Article S25;
>
> 1.7.2 review of the provisions of Article S19 concerning the formation of
call signs in the amateur services in order to provide flexibility for
administrations;
>
> 1.7.3 review of the terms an ddefinitions of Article S1 to the extent
required as a consequence of changes made in Article S25;
> ...
>
> Jon

1055. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:42:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t9o31$1r9$0@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 24052

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 18 Nov 2001 05:24:06 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Someone who chooses a callsign of W5TIT finds it hard to take anyone
> >else seriously? Whatta gas! That's a part of what you did - trivialize
> >the entire ARS system. I sure hope you don't expect to be taken
> >seriously in ham radio circles, any of them.
>
> Dick, when the ham world decides to elect you and Larry as our
> "guardians of virtue," that kind of comment will be appropriate. On
> the other hand, if you and Larry had that role, there are a LOT of us
> who would find ham radio had no interest for us at all.
>
> Frankly, I doubt anyone would be HALF as offended by
> encountering Kim's call sign as they would be encountering your own
> self-righteous bigotry. You can play "Mr. Morality" all you want, but
> we all know that's just a way of denying that fact that you're small
> minded and a self-righteous prude who is so rigid in his thinking that
> he can't accept that others have as much right to THEIR opinions and
> values as you have.
>

Hey, Professor NumbNuts, wake up! Remove your head from your die-rear
and listen up! And while you're getting your orientation, read it all
again!!!

NOWHERE did I say or even suggest anything about morality - the entire
objection to Kims "Tittys" callsign is that it is TACKY and TASTELESS.
Sorta like you and Cecil, too. You have no CLASS. Got that? NO CLASS.
Trailer trash.
The ARS can and should do better. I'm sorry you all can't.

1056. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:48:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EF7B01CB6309FC04.9434A79844352598.68AC7B541DEF600E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24053

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 23:14:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>That you defend porn as harmless comes as no real surprise to me. I am
>surprised that you are gullible even to believe that one type of movie
>inspires behavior and that the other doesn't.

Thanks--I'm glad it doesn't surprise you that I believe in
free speech--too bad more people in this NG don't.

It isn't gullibility, it's a willingness to accept research
evidence that demonstrates it.

I happen to TEACH psychology and sociology at the University
level--and both fields have made it VERY clear that it is the presence
of violence--not sex--that leads to antisocial actions (meaning acts
that violate the rights of others--not ones that offend their
religious morality but don't affect them directly).

Do I defend porn as harmless? No I don't. Thanks to the sick
"let 'em see blood and violence but not sex and love" mentality of the
American moralists, our adult films are limited to those that are the
most sexually objectifying of any made in the world. We don't even
attempt to make sensitive, caring, women-centered, erotic films
because the moralists would just demand that they be censored anyway.

There is inherently NOTHING wrong with human sexual behavior
between consenting adults. Those that see those behaviors as immoral
merely demonstrate their desire to impose their own outdated,
superstitious, beliefs on others.

>I guess you've missed the postings of Lenny-The-Licenseless and
>Larry-The-Homemade-Lawyer. The testing changes have been pointed out to
>both numerous times and they're still whining.

And the pro-code group aren't?

Which Usenet newsgroup are YOU reading? In rrap the concept of
code testing is as strongly argued by the pro-code group today as it
was over a year ago when it was still an issue.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1057. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:49:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF86541.50009DBA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24054

JJ wrote:
> Although I no longer consider myself Southern Baptist, I was
> raised going to Southern Baptist church and I never heard any SB
> preacher state that Catholics were going to hell just for being
> Catholic.

How many have you polled? Catholics worship graven images of
the Virgin Mary, a cardinal sin which can only be forgiven by
becoming a Protestant.

> I would ask your preacher to attempt to explain that, and like any
> preacher, he can't.

My preacher has an explanation for everything and recently forced
a change from the Texas SB Convention because some people there
believe that the Bible may not be 100% literally true. For instance,
the dinosaurs could never have lived because man was created on
the seventh day. God laid down the dinosaur fossils during that
week of creation. The preacher doesn't know why God did that but
he says it is a sin to question God's motives.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1058. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:56:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF866CB.BE919F0E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24055

JJ wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >I find intolerance
> > of Kim's callsign to be typically low class and tasteless.
> > Intelligent, well-educated people tend to possess tolerance.
>
> And a criminal could say the same thing of others who are
> intolerant of his criminal activities. Intelligent, well-educated
> people do not have to approve of low class and bad taste.

He could but he would be wrong assuming there's a victim of
his crime. People who use force or threat of force are violating
a basic right of man. OTOH, there is no crime or victims
surrounding Kim's cutesie call. One human being's idea
of bad taste is another's idea of fun. To each his own.
What is wrong with live and let live? How would you like
someone attempting to change your way of life because
they consider you low class and tasteless?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1059. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 01:57:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF86721.DC7B3673@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24056

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Rick, with all due respect it sounds as if the real crime to you is making a
> judgment at all.

"Judge not, that ye be not judged." You think Jesus was wrong?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1060. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:01:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF867F9.DB86F02D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24058

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I'm not angry with you, Kim. I'm unhappy with your lack of class and
> > > decorum.
> >
> > Too bad the Taliban has been routed. You could have gotten a job
> > with their Department of Vice and Virtue.
>
> Too bad that Carl isn't here to refer to me as a Nazi. Your
> "Libertarian" views at work?

Yep, I'm a Libertarian and believe Kim has a perfect right to her legal
callsign. Care to explain how you differ from the Taliban's Dept. of
Vice and Virtue?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

1061. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:01:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF867F4.501F624@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24057

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I wonder if it's due to the fact that
> Affirmative Action was established and
> implemented to address disparity in
> hiring practices *for blacks* (mostly),
> that it doesn't seem to work across the
> board? I mean, it's kind of like the
> whole concept of "reverse discrimination."
> It just doesn't sound right. So, would
> it "feel" right to apply Affirmative
> Action to Whites?

I don't know about that. I suspect it is something much more simple - the local school board, and even the state board of schools, are simply afraid to bring up the issue. Every time the issue was raised in the past, a fire storm broke out (screams of racism, with the resulting inquires from the feds who oversee federal money to schools). Since the federal money received is dependent on affirmative action hiring, and protests from parents over an out of control affirmative action program has no real consequences, they have simply taken a hands off attitude. The result is that it goes on forever.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1062. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:01:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <FE0F0CA02CD85A76.12D66AA31334CC8B.E0375A0A100F3474@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24059

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 21:28:32 GMT, JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote:

>And it is obvious some have no value in their judgments.

Very true. All you have to do is look at the posts by Dick,
Larry Roll, and yourself to know that.

>And a criminal could say the same thing of others who are
>intolerant of his criminal activities.

Depends on how you define "criminal." If you define it to mean
"in violation of the law," I agree with the criminal. Of course, since
I spent two back-to-back 90 day sentences in Selma AL in the 1960s for
drinking from "Colored only" water fountains (the second one as I was
being processed out in the court house), I'm obviously one of those
criminals, so my opinion is somewhat biased.

> Intelligent, well-educated
>people do not have to approve of low class and bad taste.

Intelligent, well-educated people don't BELIEVE in
discriminating on the basis of class in the first place. More
importantly, your bias isn't based on education in the first
place--that invariably leads to tolerance. It is based on your
religious beliefs--as represented by your moral values--which are
purely subjective and have no more validity in dealing with the
behavior of others than do your bedroom habits!

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1063. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:04:07 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9A0A3617456B3A19.402B354642DBDA07.48CDADBA31233812@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24060

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 21:52:24 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>Rick, with all due respect it sounds as if the real crime to you is making a
>judgment at all.

There's a world of difference between "making a judgement" and
"judging others." We all make personal judgements--but none of us has
the right to judge others and claim that our judgement is valid
because in some way our moral values are superior to their own.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1064. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:06:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C682E6C1D7B94573.B20089F50AD70597.1D366D41766D911C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24061

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 23:01:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>> Your evasion of the question is typical. I could say I didn't mean to make
>> it so challenging. But I did.
>
>It isn't evasion, Kim. Your tacky choice in calls has absolutely naught
>to do with Muslims or the WTC. You've made nothing challenging. If you
>want to defend your lack of decorum, don't attempt to link it to a
>disparate topic.

Translation, Kim: He can't answer your question in any way
that doesn't make him look like an idiot, so he'll pretend it isn't
relevant and attack you on a personal level as usual.

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1065. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:14:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF86AED.D0D98DAB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24063

Rick Adams wrote:
> For the record (as you probably already know--but Dick
> doesn't, I'm sure) the reason women are expected to wear veils by the
> Shi'te sect (Sunni nations don't require a veil), as well as the
> reason women are required to be _behind_ men in a mosque instead of in
> front of them isn't based on a view that women are inferior. Instead
> it is based on the belief that a woman is so pure that she can look at
> a man and still keep her thoughts on Allah (God), while a man is so
> naturally base that if he looks at a woman he will be distracted from
> his contemplation of Allah!
>
> Hmmmm . . .

They have a point, Rick. I would have trouble thinking about God
if a good looking female in a miniskirt in front of me had her
forehead on the floor.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1066. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:14:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EF071703FBE27E83.E6A2EEAB12B9D3EE.B2D4DBC3DD2935C3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24062

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 18:10:55 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>As do you. I bet that if we ever got together for coffee (we'd have to
>leave my darlin' hubby behind--as he doesn't really enjoy philosophical
>discussions) at Starbucks, we'd have to meet at opening and decide we were
>going to be there until closing. LOL

That's ok, we could take my wife along as a chaperon (can't
let Dick and Jane, er Larry, think there's something immoral about
having coffee, right?)--we've been married for 21 years and we STILL
talk philosophy a great deal of the time.

I'll tell you what--make it to Dayton for the annual
convention, and I'll drive down from Michigan and buy the coffee
(Cincinnati has a Starbucks if Dayton doesn't)! :-)

>Yeah, I just forgot to tell him to keep from falling over backwards as he
>did.

I wouldn't worry about it. He'd probably just land on his head
anyway, and that certainly wouldn't hurt him.

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1067. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:18:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF86BEB.3D26EDD9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24064

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> The great divide in diversity here in
> the south has been what shocks me the
> most, having come from the north. It
> is hard for me to assess, (snip)

Actually, I think the attitude adopted by both groups ("blacks" and "whites") here in the deep south (central southern states - NC to GA, GA to TX, TX to MO, MO to NC) is fairly healthy. Basically, by what seems to be mutual agreement, both groups have taken a hands off approach to the matter. Both groups may run their mouths when not in "mixed" company, but get along fairly well when together. Whatever the case, there are a lot less racial problems here then elsewhere in the country - you don't see the race riots, for example, of Florida, California, or the Northeast, here (yet minorities are a larger percent of the population here).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1068. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:20:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF86C6B.A7D24B5B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24066

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3BF5FCD9.36C96F34@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Has it dawned upon you yet that Affirmative Action and Morse code
> >testing are both governmental requirements aimed at achieving
> >a certain level of social engineering?
>
> Is social engineering a bad thing?

Like any other function of government, some is good and some is bad.
Some evolve over time from being good to being bad. IMO, that applies
both to Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1069. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:21:24 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C75DC22399F1018E.5074BFA3CE17AD3F.19727104CDDB9B82@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24065

On 19 Nov 2001 00:12:07 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

> Another anonymous troll on a mission from God...or at least the voices he
>HEARS making him THINK he hears God.
>
> This newsgroups is comprised mostly of licensed Amauteurs, however it is NOT
>Amateur Radio, nor is it governed by 47CFR Part 97 in it's conduct nor content.
>
> Now run along like a nice troll and eat some prunes...maybe it will clear
>up that retention problem you seem to be suffering.

What's the matter, Steve?

Don't like hearing that the conversations in this newsgroup
have an influence on new (and potential) hams?

You're right--this ISN'T governed by part 97. But if the hams
who participate here and delight in demonstrating bigotry and a
holier-than-thou attitude sincerely believe they aren't influencing
newcomers far more than, for example, Kim's call sign, messages such
as the one you just flamed do a pretty good job of demonstrating the
fallacy of their beliefs.

I hope you're a _little_ more considerate with new hams on the
air than you are here. From my perspective, I think he had some pretty
good points and certainly didn't deserve to be flamed for voicing
them.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1070. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:22:02 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <e1_J7.117519$WW.7310752@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24067

"Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:3bf86242$0$35613$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net...
> Jon,
>
> Please, don't confuse these guys with fact.
> This RRAP, where the procoders can live
> out their delusions.
>
> If Richard believes the code matter will not
> be addressed until 2011, then let him keep
> is dream.
>
> Larry
>
>

I for one am quite adjusted to the demise of code testing. When I did my twenty in the seventies I thought before and after that there was no excuse then for anything over 12 but waited until after the fateful Tuesday to shoot off the old bazoo. As a testing criterion it is long obsolete but its value in stirring up the court eunuchs and bawling children is priceless.

1071. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:22:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF86D03.6EA572F8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24068

N2EY wrote:
>
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >The last time I checked, 5 WPM met the treaty requirements.
> >
> Bingo. And without the treaty, no code test at all.

Personally, I'm not so sure.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1072. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:29:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B468AC3B1F132AF0.718F65F991364464.344AEABB7C27ED40@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24069

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 00:41:11 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

> Reflect on "aiding and abetting".
> Reflect on "aiding and abetting".
> Reflect on "aiding and abetting".

Then by all means lets shut down our colleges and
universities. After all, in those "corrupt" establishments ANYONE can
learn how to build an amplifier for 11m--or to DESIGN one for that
matter.

The simplistic solution is to conceal information. The
intelligent one is to make information freely available and only
punish those who misuse it.

Fortunately, despite the influence of the right wing
extremists in recent years, our Constitution still supports the
intelligent decision instead of the simple one.

If it's "aiding and abetting" to provide publicly accessible
information to cbers, then someone managed to turn the Constitution
into a roll of toilet paper and a democracy into a fascist state while
I was sleeping. Sorry, but I'll take my chances on openness and
honesty instead of secrecy and distrust.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1073. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:30:20 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <09_J7.117528$WW.7312490@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24070

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF86721.DC7B3673@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Rick, with all due respect it sounds as if the real crime to you is
making a
> > judgment at all.
>
> "Judge not, that ye be not judged." You think Jesus was wrong?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day. By some
definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but is a cast iron SOB
about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those juvenile, tee hee
giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so common it is like
stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is one thing, being
judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the wind whistles thru
and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being judgemental.

1074. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:31:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CF644545008C8A37.4A7F7FB3EEFD3DB9.BA74216BF88D4FEA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24071

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 00:57:49 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>If you confuse this with real radio there is some question just who the
>moron might be.

Been on "The Great Liberty Net" lately?

THAT is on "real radio" and it makes what goes on in this NG
look like a mutual admiration society by comparison.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1075. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:38:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF870B5.6F80BF91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24072

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Sorta like you and Cecil, too. You have no CLASS. Got that? NO CLASS.

Dick, I am ashamed to be a member of any organization to
which you belong. You and a few others should form a
new organization called the Society Of Bigots. (SOBs)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1076. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:45:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t9ro1$bf6$0@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 24074

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > To equate radical Islam with Southern Baptist doctrine or activity as
> > Cecil has done is ludicrous on its face. So far (the Atlanta Olympic
> > bombing aside) I haven't noticed any deathdealaing terrorists issuing
> > from the Southern Baptist Convention.
>
> Apples and oranges, Dick. I equated radical Islam with radical
> Christianity, not with the Christian mainstream.

And of course the critical point flew right past you, as I knew would,
as many times as I repeated it in those several posts.
That point, repeated yet one more time for the slow witted:

**Islam is the ONLY religion which dictates that all people under other
belief systems are to be either converted, subjugated (enslaved) or
eliminated (Killed).**

What is it about this simple statement that so difficult for you to
grasp?
Souithern Baptists exhibit no less zealotry in their efforts to convert
others but nowhere in their governing documentation do I find anything
about enslaving nor killing the recalcitrant.

I would be
> willing to bet that the majority of KKK terrorists were/are
> Southern Baptists.

Entirely possible, of course, since they are all in the South and so is
the Southern Baptist church. Your point?(with relation to my above
statements)

It's a sure bet that the abortion clinic
> bombers and abortion doctor murderers are Christians. As I
> understand it, allegiance to Christianity is a requirement
> for membership in the Aryan Nations.

Wouldn't be a bit surprised. How exactly does this play into the
singular difference that is Islam, to wit: Convert 'em, Enslave 'em or
Kill 'em??

> What do Christian terrorists, Jewish terrorists, Muslim
> terrorists, and atheist terrorists have in common? If that
> question is beyond your comprehension, I will explain further.

I already explained, yet one more time, the difference of note. If you still don't understand I can always try again, somehow I might find the right combination to turn on your light.

> You want simply to scapegoat an entire religious group rather
> than deal rationally with the problem. That indicates the
> depth of your intelligence and your hankering for a retreat
> from civilized society and a return to a caveman-like tribalism.

You are simply the king of all dumbasses.

1077. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:46:08 UTC
From: Hi Ya Phil <ScrewUkane@ScrewUKane.org>
Message-ID: <9t9rmb$20n$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 24073

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> sat down at his little
worn out keyboard and spewed out the following
useless shit:
> Reflect on "aiding <<remaining drivel snipped>>

HEY KANE,,, reflect on this"

Fuck You Kane
Fuck You Kane
Fuck You Kane

1078. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:49:03 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <498DAAE058718CDD.AC2D0C02B6D41FA4.2F9C7C41A99EDB70@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24075

On 19 Nov 2001 01:42:57 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Hey, Professor NumbNuts, wake up! Remove your head from your die-rear
>and listen up! And while you're getting your orientation, read it all
>again!!!

Naw--reading the kind of infantile nonsense you write once is
plenty--twice is FAR too much!

> NOWHERE did I say or even suggest anything about morality - the entire
>objection to Kims "Tittys" callsign is that it is TACKY and TASTELESS.

Er, not to burst your bubble, Dickie, but where did your
definition of "tasteless" or "tacky" come from in the first place if
not from your moral values?

Unless you are arguing that Kim's call sign has no flavor (and
if you are, I'll agree with that), then calling it "tasteless" must
mean you have some standard of reference to compare it to. In your
case, you equate the presence of a very mildly suggestive term, "TIT,"
in her call with being tasteless and tacky. Thus, by necessity, you
find reference to sexuality tasteless and tacky. That HAS to come from
SOME source besides pure speculation, and since it deals with a sexual
topic, that source is, again by necessity, your moral values.

>Sorta like you and Cecil, too. You have no CLASS. Got that? NO CLASS.

Gee, Dick, I guess you don't know what that word means,
either.

Class refers to one of two things; station of birth or station
in life.

I was born into an upper-middle class household--so that can't
be what you're referring to.

And since I have two PhDs, an MBA, and employment as a college
professor and therapist, by any stretch of the imagination I represent
upper-middle class today.

Hmmm . . .

I guess _we're_ not the ones who lack class after all.

>Trailer trash.

As often as you use that term, you must really have a thing
for people who live in mobile homes. Any particular reason, or do they
just typify those who are "beneath" you economically?

Not to burst another of your bubbles, but there are people living in mobile homes who are millionaires (I know several who do just that) and who prefer the security and convenience of having a mobile (or, more commonly, multiple mobiles in different areas) instead of a high-upkeep house.

Even those who buy inexpensive mobiles don't deserve your viciousness, however. Not everyone starts out with a decent income--many young couples have the choice of renting an apartment or buying a mobile--and it certainly doesn't make them "low class" to make the choice to be home owners instead of renters.

>The ARS can and should do better. I'm sorry you all can't.

We are too, but we're stuck with you.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1079. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:50:20 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t9rv30rrd@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24082

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:74C7FCEAAD62A6E9.93F2053F7C172860.72ADA3B4E8124E3A@lp.airnews.net...
> On 18 Nov 2001 16:25:33 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >Someone who knows the difference, that's who!
>
> Gee, Hitler felt that way, too!
>
> Rick--KE8HH

Goodwin's Law. Game over.

1080. Re: Hey Aaron Voobner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:52:52 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0111181852.12613119@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24076

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<OTTJ7.116972$WW.7272060@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> <Leland C. Scott@cotse.net (KC8LDO)> wrote in message
> news:ogTJ7.29417$xS6.47553@www.newsranger.com...
> > Yes Dick it is forges of me. Everyone knows me well enough that I don't
> have a
> > problem with anyone except hams who use cb and think a tech is half a ham.
> I
> > don't have a problem with being a technician. I forgot more about radio
> and
> > computers than any cb loving ham will ever learn. Perhaps you have become
> jaded
> > giving so much illegal cb advice.
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
> > KC8LDO
> > ARRL Member
> > NRI
> > Member
> >
>
> Find me one post where I ever advised anyone to do or how to do anything
> illegal.

From: Richard McCollum (rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net)
Subject: Re: KLV 350
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-09-09 18:17:46 PST

"Rick Wilcox" <rwilcox3@cfl.rr.com> wrote in message
news:49Um7.63956$aZ.17074868@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com...
> Hi group, I am looking for the mod. for a KLV 350 amp to operate on the
> 11 meter band. It ships setup for operation on the 10 meter band. Can
> respond to my e-mail (rwilcox3@cfl.rr.com) or the group. Thanks in advance
> for any help you can give me..............."Porky"
>
>

I would strongly advise finding a good source for EL 509 and 519
tubes.
When you see what it is going to cost you when you drive this beast
beyond
about 150 watts on Antique Modulation you may well rethink the
purchase.

This may well be a fairly clean amp as they go but as with any
broadbanded
tube amp, you are well advised to run it with a good lo-pass filter in
the
output.

As you get the schematic and parts list, in European nomenclature, it
should
not take much to figure out how to mod it.

You might want to find out exactly where it was built. For $170 it
may well
have been Outer Mongolia.

Dick Nï¿½BK

From: Richard McCollum (rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net)
Subject: Re: Linear Amp Question please:
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-10-13 21:30:59 PST

"Jay in the Mojave" <jay123a@qnet.com> wrote in message
news:3BC90AE4.A319B373@qnet.com...
> Hello All: Need a little help here.
>
> Did the Pride DX300 or Pride DX-1000, or any other type models have 2
> each 4CX250 or 4CX350 Tetrote Tubes.
>
> I am of the opinion one of the models had 2 of the Ceramic tubes, yes /
> no.
> Or was there a mod that installed the secong 4CX250 or 4CX350 tube?????
>
> Thanks for any help. Big discussion going on locally.
>
> Jay in the Mojave

Damfino but there is no good reason it couldn't be done. There is
enough
drive available for two in parallel in AB1.

From: Richard McCollum (rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net)
Subject: Re: Linear Amp Question please:
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-10-15 21:07:37 PST

Without reference handy, the 4CX250 should have a current draw on the
order
of 2-3 amps so a .3 drop should take about .1 to .2 ohms at something
over 1
watt.

Curious to see how you solve the problem.

From: Richard McCollum (rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net)
Subject: Re: the question is: can a dc box get in there with a a/c box???? that is the question.....
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-09-28 02:50:40 PST

"Jay in the Mojave" <jay123a@qnet.com> wrote in message news:3BB40D65.BBFBDBBD@qnet.com...
> Hello Dick: Its a real kick to see all the trucks and different
> systems at a keydown. I remembering seeing a guy that ran his diodes for
> his large alternator outside the alternator, mounted on a large piece of
> aluminum sheet metal, with the large gage wiring coming and going. I
> believe he even had a thermocouple attached to the middle of the sheet
> metal for monitoring the temperature.
>
> What will they think of next!
>
> Jay in the Mojave
>

Liquid sodium cooling maybe??? Running outside makes some sense but it
ain't going to happen with sheet metal. For no better reason than the
press-fit diodes would be in trouble when the aluminum expands and the
holes get bigger. Talk about a really catastrophic failure.

1081. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:54:13 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CFD32414A0FCD802.7D64323B3EE95865.DB02E2CF28F7E9C2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24077

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day. By some
>definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but is a cast iron SOB
>about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those juvenile, tee hee
>giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so common it is like
>stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is one thing, being
>judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the wind whistles thru
>and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being judgemental.

With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose any
behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_ open-minded and
willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of judging
others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the same
behaviors they themselves prefer.

On the other hand, I don't happen to view open-mindedness as a
flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded person
who demonstrates a serious character flaw.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1082. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 02:55:02 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <aw_J7.117560$WW.7305077@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24078

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:CF644545008C8A37.4A7F7FB3EEFD3DB9.BA74216BF88D4FEA@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 00:57:49 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >If you confuse this with real radio there is some question just who the
> >moron might be.
>
> Been on "The Great Liberty Net" lately?
>
> THAT is on "real radio" and it makes what goes on in this NG
> look like a mutual admiration society by comparison.
>
> Rick--KE8HH
>

Oooh, emotion. Rick the two of us together are neither old enough or insane
enough for 75 meters let alone the 3900+ cesspool.

1083. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:01:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF87608.70E58415@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24079

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> For the record (as you probably already
> know--but Dick doesn't, I'm sure) the
> reason women are expected to wear veils by
> the Shi'te sect (Sunni nations don't
> require a veil), as well as the reason
> women are required to be _behind_ men in
> a mosque instead of in front of them isn't
> based on a view that women are inferior.
> Instead it is based on the belief that
> a woman is so pure that she can look at
> a man and still keep her thoughts on
> Allah (God), while a man is so naturally
> base that if he looks at a woman he will
> be distracted from his contemplation of
> Allah!

I'm will place tongue firmly in cheek to respond. Of course, you're absolutely right about the above, but you need to understand the American feminist mentality. From their perspective, since men are so weak (as described above), it is indeed the men who are forcing women to wear veils. If men were stronger, the women there wouldn't have to wear veils. So, in the end, it is the men's fault (everything perceived as bad is). At this point, feminist usually drift off into their common fantasy of a world without men - a world where women run around naked in a tropical paradise, have sharing sex with each other (not like the "rape sex" between men and women), and so forth.

I know that paragraph probably doesn't make much sense, but you try to explain the feminist mentality better. I haven't taken the advanced course in feminism yet (a subscription to Cosmo).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1084. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:02:46 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <40BEBC787DC139CA.ACADF89E54A99E2E.EF417077D3EF9790@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24080

On 19 Nov 2001 02:45:21 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>**Islam is the ONLY religion which dictates that all people under other
>belief systems are to be either converted, subjugated (enslaved) or
>eliminated (Killed).**

False.

It not only does NOT dictate that, but a religion exists which
DOES do so--Christianity. Read the Old Testament, if you disagree.

> What is it about this simple statement that so difficult for you to
>grasp?

It's complete lack of accuracy, probably.

> Souithern Baptists exhibit no less zealotry in their efforts to convert
>others but nowhere in their governing documentation do I find anything
>about enslaving nor killing the recalcitrant.

No one is talking about the "governing documentation" of a
religious sect, Dick. You refer to "Islam," not to "a radical sect of
Islam," a very different thing.

It isn't the "governing documentation" that counts--it's the
direct source of the religion. In the case of the Southern Baptists,
that's the Protestant version of the bible and in the Islamic faith
it's the Koran.

Cite the KORAN, not the opinions of a biased Christian, if you
claim to present the views of Islam instead of just your own
prejudices. But be prepared for the Christian bible to be thrown back
in your face when you do so.

> Wouldn't be a bit surprised. How exactly does this play into the
>singular difference that is Islam, to wit: Convert 'em, Enslave 'em or
>Kill 'em??

Well, the concept that if someone disagrees with your moral
values with respect to abortion, you have the right to kill them for
it sounds a LOT like the kind of things you're accusing Muslims of to
me.

> I already explained, yet one more time, the difference of note. If you
>still don't understand I can always try again, somehow I might find the
>right combination to turn on your light.

The only difference is that you personally identify with the
Christian terrorists but not with the Islamic ones. Face it, Dick,
you're a religious bigot as well as a racial and sexual one.

> You are simply the king of all dumbasses.

What an "astute" observation. Dick, you are _really_
demonstrating your "class" clearly in this discussion--now everyone
can see why you feel as you do about Kim's call sign.

Not condone, you understand, but see the cause.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1085. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:03:53 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <tE_J7.117573$WW.7316057@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24081

"Hi Ya Phil" <ScrewUkane@ScrewUKane.org> wrote in message
news:9t9rmb$20n$0@pita.alt.net...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> sat down at his little
> worn out keyboard and spewed out the following
> useless shit:
> > Reflect on "aiding <<remaining drivel snipped>>
>
> HEY KANE,,, reflect on this"
>
> Fuck You Kane
> Fuck You Kane
> Fuck You Kane
>

Al Davis, MGP of the Oakland Raiders, had so convinced the league that he had all sorts of information sources that one owner accused him of knowing the serial number of the Unknown Soldier.

At one Super Bowl, the opposing team's head coach -- convinced the locker room was bugged -- spent halftime on a ladder talking into the sprinkler heads, "Fuck you, Al Davis. Fuck you, Al Davis." His team, of course, got creamed.

Phil, you have earned an enemy, and a classless one at that, but rest assured you are in good company.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1086. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:08:59 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9t9t220u1n@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24095

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011118160404.23334.00000649@nso-da.aol.com...
> >Walking is a universal and efficient form of transportation, but one
doesn't
> >have to prove they can walk in order to get a driver's license.
>
> That's because practically all humans who have the ability to walk learn
to do
> so before their second birthday.

So what's your point? You're still not required to show you can walk in
order to get a driver's license.

> >Nor should
> >one have to show high-speed code skills in order to use a microphone.
>
> 20 wpm is not "high speed".

...in your opinion, which isn't shared by everyone.

> >Most of the hams I know were just damn glad to get the test out of the
way
> >so that they'd never have to listen to so much as another "dit" again.
>
> Most of the hams I know who are actually active on the HF amateur bands
use
> Morse on the air at least some of the time.

That's a stretch. I said most hams. Not most hams, active on HF, (on the
lower 50 KHz of 40 meters, on Sunday mornings, after 10:00am
brunch...yada...yada.)

> >IOW, welfare support of code.
>
> All of the US elementary schools I know continue to require that children
learn
> how to add, subtract, multiply and divide, even though inexpensive
calculators
> which can do the job have been available for many years now. Is this
"welfare
> support of basic math"?

Poor comparison. Basic math is not an outmoded, outdated, worthless skill
that only serves for recreational purposes.

> >> license testing process. And a mere 5 WPM doesn't cut it. A minimum
of a

> >12
> >> WPM code test should be required for full amateur HF operating
privileges.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >The last time I checked, 5 WPM met the treaty requirements.
> >
> Bingo. And without the treaty, no code test at all.

Again, what's your point, other than stating the obvious?

1087. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222652.12427.00002603@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24085

In article <ABD3D4AA00AD9F44.7B7BF488D34A1588.D30BB60EE817971B@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 19:00:10 GMT, Leland C. Scott@cotse.net (KC8LDO)
>wrote:
>
>>An aquaintance of mine has been in the employ of the FCC satellite office in
>>Dearborn since the beginning of the month. The busts are coming down on
>illegal
>>cb and equipment manufactures. Hams should not be encouraging this type
>behavior
>>by freely giving mod information just to show off.(you know who you are)
>This is
>>the type behavior that ruined cb by messing it up for all of us law abiding
>>citizens.
>
> Sorry Larry, but I disagree here.

Huh? Please don't confuse me with Leland, even if he is right!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1088. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222652.12427.00002602@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24092

In article <3bf83a37.693070113@news.niagara.com>, bman@niagara.com (Bman)
writes:

>
>I've got my basic qualification as an amateur radio operator but I
>have yet to grab hold of any gear or even a call sign as of yet.
>
>What I stopped here to say is that I am absolutely amazed at the level
>of conversation in this newsgroup. I had kind of always thought that
>everyone who had the perseverance and knowledge to become an amateur
>radio operator was someone with a bit more je ne sais quois over the
>average folk.
>
>I mean, in days gone by before the Internet was a household word you
>might have been online with one or more bulletin board systems. And
>indeed there, and on the Internet, anyone with the sense enough to
>turn on their computer and have it dial another could post anything
>they wanted for all to see and show whoever would read how immature
>and petty and feeble they really are.
>
>Now I see that there is no higher intellect even in the world of
>amateur radio where you're supposed to be qualified and probably
>should know the Morse code and obey a few basic rules of civility,
>that anyone can encounter just as many children on the airwaves as
>they can on any other public forum.
>
>So here's my two cents for y'all to digest and fight over for the next
>century until your hobby dies - screw the Morse code requirement and
>let everybody on the air regardless - it doesn't raise anybody's level
>of intelligence or maturity and it certainly doesn't force anyone to
>be civil in a public forum, and as for a good means of communicating,
>it stinks!
>
>I know it has its uses, but as most of the posts (hundreds in just a
>couple days) here seem to indicate, many of the people here haven't
>any uses for the common man. Just one more good reason why I shouldn't
>even bother spending the money, I guess. Probably was a really
>interesting hobby in the days when it was really about the interest
>and not about the inane and utterly useless banter seen around here.
>
>Congratulations, you may now turn over your licences and become a
>normal moron like everyone else.
>
>Byron

And...the K3LT LCD Digital Troll-O-Meter says...

```
||||||||||||||||
1 3 5 7 9 +20 +40 +60
```

Good effort, but not quite up to full power output! Hansl, can we please have a ruling from the Armenian Judges?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1089. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222653.12427.00002605@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24083

In article <3bf7fe5c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Prove it, Larry. Prove it...that's all you gotta do.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Prove what, Kim? The potential damage your callsign can do to the ARS is self-apparent. I have nothing to prove; however, you'd have an insurmountable task if required to prove that your callsign is harmless to the positive image of the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1090. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222653.12427.00002604@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24089

In article <3bf7fe28_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>As I said, Larry, the figures prove otherwise on statistics as to whether my
>callsign brings the ARS "one step closer to extinction."
>
>Where's *your* proof? If it's just your opinion, as I believe it is, that's
>fine. But, if you believe what you say is a truthful reflection of reality,
>then prove it...that's all I'm asking. Prove it.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Yet another futile demand for me to "prove" something. I have *nothing*
to prove, Kim, because I did not choose to select a Vanity call sign that
was assessed by Riley Hollingsworth as capable of taking the ARS
"...one step closer to extinction." In case you haven't noticed, this
thread is about you and your callsign -- not me. If you truly believe your
callsign is harmless to the positive image of the ARS, then YOU prove
it. However, be warned -- Mr. Hollingsworth's words will always be there
to haunt you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1091. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222654.12427.00002606@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24090

In article <3BF80C96.87E6301A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> All throughout my life, I've had one concept very thoroughly drilled into
>> me: No matter how much good you do, a single bad act wipes out the
>> entire image.
>
>Well Larry, then you wipe out your entire image ten times a day on this
>newsgroup. I find your postings about "welfare mothers of color", for
>instance, to be racist, ignorant, obnoxious, demeaning, profane, immoral,
>offensive, and evil. You engage in your own brand of terrorism.

Cecil:

Actually, I engage in a simple expression of the truth. However, it's
not the trendy, liberal, touchy-feely, politically-correct version that you
prefer. However, I can live with your disagreement, and have no axe
to grind that makes me desperate to seen as "open minded" in today's
twisted, liberal, PC definition of the term. I am a truly independent
thinker -- something you obviously don't feel you have the freedom to
be. I can understand your discomfort, but don't feel any need to
relieve it.

>> Your selection of an offensive, demeaning callsign singles you out as a
>> fool, possibly as an idiot --
>
>Burned any witches at the stake lately, Larry? Are you reincarnated
>from a Spanish Inquisition judge? What is wrong with live and let live?

Chant your libertine (note that I didn't say "libertarian") mantra all you
want, Cecil. You have no control over my thought processes, although
it is apparent that others have plenty of control over yours!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1092. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222655.12427.00002608@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24084

In article <3BF81380.3CFFDBB9@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>"Judge not, that ye be not judged. ... And why beholdest thou the
>mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam
>that is in thine own eye?" Matthew 7:1,3
>
>Looks like you are NOT a good Christian, Larry, as you obviously
>don't follow the teachings of Jesus. That beam is a bitch to
>remove. Let me know if you need help lifting it.

This is hilarious! First Cecil tells me to "Judge not, that ye not be
judged..."
and then, he *judges* me by saying I'm "NOT (sic) a good Christian."

Which is it, Cecil? And before you answer, I don't recall saying anyone
here in this newsgroup (or anywhere else, for that matter) was going to
go to Hell for not believing the same way I do. And *that* is what
Matthew was talking about!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1093. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222655.12427.00002607@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24091

In article <3BF80E4F.9A6E6F53@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>You've got to be kidding, Larry. You have made obscene statements
>about virtually every minority group.

Cecil:

I see. Care to provide some quotations? I'd like to see for myself
just how "obscene" I've been!

>I doubt there is a single
>person reading this newsgroup who has not been offended by your
>evil immoral poison postings.

Well, if you can get Messrs. McCollum, Carroll, Heil, or Robeson to
say the same, I'd certainly be willing to take that under advisement.

>I am not easily offended and you
>have offended me more times than I can count.

Cecil, you are a prototypical liberal offense-taker. Only now, you
also call your credibility into question. I'm starting to think that you,
like Rick "Junior" Adams, have some kind of personal axe you'd
like to "grind" with Kim!

>I am ashamed to
>be a member of the same organization as you.

If you're referring to the ARRL, I'm sure they'd gladly accept your
resignation. If you are referring to ham radio in general, I'm sure
the FCC would gladly cancel your license upon it's return. In
either case, feel free to tell them why.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1094. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222656.12427.00002609@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24093

In article <9A693B093C5351B3.CBEA8E0B8C8AC83D.7C08F07BCCD3B6FC@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>Sado-Masochism clubs are also "legal" in most states -- does that make
>>them moral, right, and socially acceptable?
>
> Why not?
>
> Simply because you (and I, for that matter) don't happen to be
>attracted to S&M, why should OUR personal sexual preferences have
>anything to do with acceptability?

Well, speaking only for myself, my values are based on traditional,
conventional morality -- which doesn't allow for the "acceptance" of
deviant sexual behavior. Therefore, I feel fully justified in making a
negative "judgment" of such perversion. You see, I don't belong to this
New Age cult of people who don't think it is right to be judgmental. I'm
judgmental as all get out, and damn proud of it! If you can't see your way
clear to judge people for their negative, anti-social behavior, then don't
worry -- I'm more than capable of doing it for you!

> It's totally unreasonable to argue that someone's sexual
>preference is "immoral" or "wrong" simply because you don't personally
>share it--that's the mark of the bigot, not of someone with any
>integrity.

Actually, it's the other way around, but you seem to lack the maturity
or intellectual integrity to understand the difference.

> It IS interesting, though, to note that in our society it's
>perfectly ok to pay someone to cause you pain, but not pleasure. It
>sort of typifies the sick "morality" that permeates our culture thanks
>to those who believe that THEIR moral values are the only legitimate
>ones and that people must be protected from themselves. It's a sick
>concept, but one very common to US culture.

And after having said all that, you can't see your way clear to condemn
it? Well, Junior, maybe when you grow up, and don't think you need
to follow the crowd in order to gain acceptance, you'll develop some
independent thought. Until then, you'll continue to sound like the
weak-willed wanker you are now.

>> If you think so, then it's
>>obvious why you think it's perfectly OK for Kim to practice self-degradation
>>with her callsign.

>
> And the fact that you believe that others should NOT have
>their preferences recognized as just as moral as your own (after all,
>they involve only adults and only consensual behavior) demonstrates
>why you would find Kim's call sign objectionable--it defines you as a
>self-righteous bigot in no uncertain terms.

Well, Junior, I can live with being thought of as a self-righteous bigot
by the likes of you, because what you think of me doesn't mean a damn
thing to me in the first place!

> Try living your own life and recognizing that others have the
>right to live THEIRS w/o your judgement or self-righteousness, Larry.
>It's FAR more offensive to any rational person to see amateur radio
>"represented" by bigots than by people with a sense of humor!

Tell you what, Junior -- you worry about yourself, and don't worry about
me! I don't stay awake at night worrying about what people like you
think about me. I don't expect that to make you stop whining, but at least
you now know that you have the option of making better use of your time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1095. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222657.12427.00002611@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24086

In article <8CF623715AB6645A.03FDEAD8DD85449D.F6828D35B45B137C@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>See, Cecil, there she is -- all 210 lbs. of her packed onto that 5' 5"
>>frame! Of course, it may easily be 220 by now! How could you
>>miss her?
>
> Gee, nothing at all offensive to potential hams about putting
>people down for their weight, is there Larry? That was right up there
>with racism, religious intolerance, homophobia, and sexism--i.e., it
>was another excellent example of your bigotry and lack of class.
>
> Rick--KE8HH

I just figured it out. Rick must be around 5' 7" and over 300 lbs.
himself -- and sees Kim as a fine figure of a woman! Thus his
total, hardly disguised inFATuation with her, and his manly defense
of her honor here on this newsgroup! That, or he's just another
no-code wanker! Oh, well!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1096. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222657.12427.00002610@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24087

In article <A43346ABC5663476.3944E407ED05E6AE.C79B6922AF642242@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

> Dick, when the ham world decides to elect you and Larry as our
>"guardians of virtue," that kind of comment will be appropriate. On
>the other hand, if you and Larry had that role, there are a LOT of us
>who would find ham radio had no interest for us at all.
>
> Frankly, I doubt anyone would be HALF as offended by
>encountering Kim's call sign as they would be encountering your own
>self-righteous bigotry. You can play "Mr. Morality" all you want, but
>we all know that's just a way of denying that fact that you're small
>minded and a self-righteous prude who is so rigid in his thinking that
>he can't accept that others have as much right to THEIR opinions and
>values as you have.

Hey Dick -- is this guy in L-O-V-E with Kim or what?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1097. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:26:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011118222658.12427.00002612@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24088

In article <07F0400A85F6DBCC.7513AA9E968A1BFD.42275649DAB6C632@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>You're talking at my level, Kim? I think not. I've looked around my
>>"level," as it were, and don't see you anywhere around!
>
> That I can believe.
>
> Next time, look up.
>
> Rick--KE8HH

Rick:

Boy, do you ever have the hots for Kim! After reading the last few new posts in this thread, I think that the two of you need to be left alone -- and not at Starbucks! BTW -- I wonder how Kim's OM would feel about hearing that his XYL would want to meet another man at Starbucks for a day-long session of "philosophical discussion?" I know one for damn sure -- if I were married, my XYL wouldn't have to worry about me ever doing that with another woman -- unless she was there as well! I think we've just seen another example of Kim's character -- or lack thereof -- which makes her a perfect match for you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1098. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:28:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9t9u8h$f67$0@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 24094

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Sorta like you and Cecil, too. You have no CLASS. Got that? NO CLASS.
>
> Dick, I am ashamed to be a member of any organization to
> which you belong. You and a few others should form a
> new organization called the Society Of Bigots. (SOBs)

Sorry to say, you've got that acronym all sewed up with your Society Of Bullshitters.

1099. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:57:12 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf883f9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24097

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:C682E6C1D7B94573.B20089F50AD70597.1D366D41766D911C@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 23:01:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> >> Your evasion of the question is typical. I could say I didn't mean to
make
> >> it so challenging. But I did.
> >
> >It isn't evasion, Kim. Your tacky choice in calls has absolutely naught
> >to do with Muslims or the WTC. You've made nothing challenging. If you
> >want to defend your lack of decorum, don't attempt to link it to a
> >disparate topic.
>
> Translation, Kim: He can't answer your question in any way
> that doesn't make him look like an idiot, so he'll pretend it isn't
> relevant and attack you on a personal level as usual.
>
> 73 de KE8HH, Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Yep. After a while it's like batting around a damp, limp, ragged mouse. ;)

Kim W5TIT

1100. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:58:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf883fa_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24098

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF86AED.D0D98DAB@IEEE.org...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > For the record (as you probably already know--but Dick
> > doesn't, I'm sure) the reason women are expected to wear veils by the
> > Shi'te sect (Sunni nations don't require a veil), as well as the
> > reason women are required to be _behind_ men in a mosque instead of in
> > front of them isn't based on a view that women are inferior. Instead
> > it is based on the belief that a woman is so pure that she can look at
> > a man and still keep her thoughts on Allah (God), while a man is so
> > naturally base that if he looks at a woman he will be distracted from
> > his contemplation of Allah!
> >
> > Hmmmm . . .
>
> They have a point, Rick. I would have trouble thinking about God
> if a good looking female in a miniskirt in front of me had her
> forehead on the floor.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Ahem You mean you'd really need the mini-skirt? :>

Kim W5TIT

1101. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 03:59:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF88383.4147C460@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24096

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > "Krell" writes:
> > > Who are you to decide what's
> > > right or wrong-minded?
> >
> > Someone who knows the difference,
> > that's who!
>
> "Judge not, that ye be not judged.
> ... And why beholdest thou the
> mote that is in thy brother's eye,
> but considerest not the beam
> that is in thine own eye?"
> Matthew 7:1,3
>
> Looks like you are NOT a good
> Christian, Larry, (snip)

Actually, you're applying those passages wrong, Cecil. You're ignoring the bible passages about knowing sin, knowing the sinner, and separating from that. The difference is between action and thought. Obviously, the christian has to know what sin is if he is to avoid it (a judgment). Likewise, the christian has to judge whether another person is sinning if he is to avoid participating in that person's sin (another judgment). However, that doesn't mean the christian condemns that person by actions (you passage above). Instead, he is to seek out that person and help the person to understand the consequences of those actions. The first step in that is making the person aware of his own sin.

The popular story of the woman being stoned for prostitution is a good example of this concept. Jesus stopped the stoning and told those in the mob to let the person without sin cast the first stone (a variation of your "Judge not, that ye be not judged"). In other words, he stopped the ACTION of the mob. However, after the mob went away, he turned to the woman and told her to go and sin no more. He could not have said that without making a judgment that she had indeed sinned.

So, as you can see, you can judge whether a person is sinning (in fact, it is almost impossible not to). But the key is what you do about it - the actions. The passages you quote above refer to actions, not to thoughts or simple statements.

By the way, please don't ask me for the bible passages - it has been a very long time since I've had anything to do with religion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1102. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:01:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf884c4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24099

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:EF071703FBE27E83.E6A2EEAB12B9D3EE.B2D4DBC3DD2935C3@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 18:10:55 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >As do you. I bet that if we ever got together for coffee (we'd have to
> >leave my darlin' hubby behind--as he doesn't really enjoy philosophical
> >discussions) at Starbucks, we'd have to meet at opening and decide we
were
> >going to be there until closing. LOL
>
> That's ok, we could take my wife along as a chaperon (can't
> let Dick and Jane, er Larry, think there's something immoral about
> having coffee, right?)--we've been married for 21 years and we STILL
> talk philosophy a great deal of the time.
>

Oh, now that would be way cool! There's few women I get to play off with
ideas and concepts.

>
> I'll tell you what--make it to Dayton for the annual
> convention, and I'll drive down from Michigan and buy the coffee
> (Cincinnati has a Starbucks if Dayton doesn't)! :-)
>

I've never yet made it to Dayton. I hear it's not to be missed!

>
> >Yeah, I just forgot to tell him to keep from falling over backwards as he
> >did.
>
> I wouldn't worry about it. He'd probably just land on his head
> anyway, and that certainly wouldn't hurt him.
>
> 73 de KE8HH, Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>

> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Heh heh...maybe it'd do 'im some good.

Kim W5TIT

1103. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:08:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf8896c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24100

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BF86BEB.3D26EDD9@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > The great divide in diversity here in
> > the south has been what shocks me the
> > most, having come from the north. It
> > is hard for me to assess, (snip)
>
> Actually, I think the attitude adopted by both groups ("blacks" and
> "whites") here in the deep south (central southern states - NC to GA,
> GA to TX, TX to MO, MO to NC) is fairly healthy. Basically, by what
> seems to be mutual agreement, both groups have taken a hands off
> approach to the matter.
>

Ewwww, I don't think that's healthy at all. I really don't. That each
"side" would ignore the other's differences can only lead to trouble in the
end. While I don't think confrontational attitudes are healthy, either, I
would hope that people argue out their differences and explore their
similarities with each other.

>
> Both groups may run their mouths when not in
> "mixed" company, but get along fairly well when together.
>

That almost sounds scarey. "Pack mentality" is just that, and I would
wonder about anyone not truthful enough with their beliefs that they "hide"
them from me.

>
> Whatever the
> case, there are a lot less racial problems here then elsewhere in the
> country - you don't see the race riots, for example, of Florida,
> California, or the Northeast, here (yet minorities are a larger
> percent of the population here).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

My son claims there will be an all-out race war--one that affects the entire
nation. I don't believe him. My stomach turns every time we speak and he

rambles on about it. I always try to reason with him by asking him what he would do in a war situation to know that I don't share his beliefs. He's never directly answered that question for me. I like to believe it is because he cannot confront that he is not as "bad" as he thinks he is, and doesn't want to admit to himself.

Yep, I think that I'd rather see challenging dialogue. It will lead to much more understanding (if everyone is adult and unlearns bad habits).

Kim W5TIT

1104. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:21:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf8896e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24101

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011118222653.12427.00002604@nso-cg.aol.com...
> In article <3bf7fe28_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >As I said, Larry, the figures prove otherwise on statistics as to whether
my
> >callsign brings the ARS "one step closer to extinction."
> >
> >Where's *your* proof? If it's just your opinion, as I believe it is,
that's
> >fine. But, if you believe what you say is a truthful reflection of
reality,
> >then prove it...that's all I'm asking. Prove it.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Yet another futile demand for me to "prove" something. I have *nothing*
> to prove, Kim, because I did not choose to select a Vanity call sign that
> was assessed by Riley Hollingsworth as capable of taking the ARS
> "...one step closer to extinction." In case you haven't noticed, this
> thread is about you and your callsign -- not me. If you truly believe
your
> callsign is harmless to the positive image of the ARS, then YOU prove
> it. However, be warned -- Mr. Hollingsworth's words will always be there
> to haunt you!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Gawd, how far up Riley's ass *are* your lips? At any rate, since the
figures, the statistics, the math, the numbers, the whatever, absolutely
prove you wrong, then you're the one blowing smoke.

I rest my case...and before March, imagine.

Kim W5TIT

1105. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:29:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf88b4d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24103

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011118222658.12427.00002612@nso-cg.aol.com...
> In article
<07F0400A85F6DBCC.7513AA9E968A1BFD.42275649DAB6C632@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> >>You're talking at my level, Kim? I think not. I've looked around my
> >>"level," as it were, and don't see you anywhere around!
> >
> > That I can believe.
> >
> > Next time, look up.
> >
> > Rick--KE8HH
>
> Rick:
>
> Boy, do you ever have the hots for Kim! After reading the last few new
> posts in this thread, I think that the two of you need to be left alone --
> and not at Starbucks! BTW -- I wonder how Kim's OM would feel about
> hearing that his XYL would want to meet another man at Starbucks for
> a day-long session of "philosophical discussion?" I know one for damn
> sure -- if I were married, my XYL wouldn't have to worry about me ever
> doing that with another woman -- unless she was there as well! I think
> we've just seen another example of Kim's character -- or lack thereof --
> which makes her a perfect match for you!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh good grief, Larry. Haven't you ever wondered why you can't keep a woman around? You are so prudential. My husband sits not 5' away from me, in our office, together. I occasionally read posts to him; he is well aware that I would meet Rick, any other man, any other woman, or a whole host of people, at a Starbucks or otherwise.

I don't "ask" my husband for permission to do anything, Larry. We don't treat each other as children. Apparently, you like your women brainless and they like men who run their lives.

Kim W5TIT

1106. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:31:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf88bce_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24104

Cecil, gotta say this. That is so far above Larry's head that he'll never get it.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3BF88383.4147C460@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Krell" writes:
> > > > Who are you to decide what's
> > > > right or wrong-minded?
> > >
> > > Someone who knows the difference,
> > > that's who!
> >
> > "Judge not, that ye be not judged.
> > ... And why beholdest thou the
> > mote that is in thy brother's eye,
> > but considerest not the beam
> > that is in thine own eye?"
> > Matthew 7:1,3
> >
> > Looks like you are NOT a good
> > Christian, Larry, (snip)
>
>
> Actually, you're applying those passages wrong, Cecil. You're
> ignoring the bible passages about knowing sin, knowing the sinner, and
> separating from that. The difference is between action and thought.
> Obviously, the christian has to know what sin is if he is to avoid it
> (a judgment). Likewise, the christian has to judge whether another
> person is sinning if he is to avoid participating in that person's sin
> (another judgment). However, that doesn't mean the christian condemns
> that person by actions (you passage above). Instead, he is to seek out
> that person and help the person to understand the consequences of
> those actions. The first step in that is making the person aware of
> his own sin.
>
> The popular story of the woman being stoned for prostitution is a
> good example of this concept. Jesus stopped the stoning and told those
> in the mob to let the person without sin cast the first stone (a
> variation of your "Judge not, that ye be not judged"). In other words,

> he stopped the ACTION of the mob. However, after the mob went away, he
> turned to the woman and told her to go and sin no more. He could not
> have said that without making a judgment that she had indeed sinned.
>
> So, as you can see, you can judge whether a person is sinning (in
> fact, it is almost impossible not to). But the key is what you do
> about it - the actions. The passages you quote above refer to actions,
> not to thoughts or simple statements.
>
> By the way, please don't ask me for the bible passages - it has been
> a very long time since I've had anything to do with religion.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1107. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:32:12 UTC
From: Robert Hartung <rhartung@hartungpress.com>
Message-ID: <gX%J7.107383$zK1.26739045@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>
Source record: 24102

I have to say, he has a point... For the truth is, some HAMs are still cbers and use the information to use on CB Radio. One case in point, KD4MMM Robert who never talks on HAM bands really got it to buy amps from HAMS to sell at a higher price to cbers mostly the blacks that run channel 6 here in Lakeland, FL. He runs Channel 34 by the name of King Kong most of the time running a 500 or 1000 watt amp to show and soon sell to some would be CBer with the right amount of cash...

Another, WD4HFD John, Big John on the CB. He buys, sells, and repairs Ham gear to be used on CB Radio.. Radios, Amps, ect.. he also will repair CB as well....

So what you said, would be nice but will never happen....

--

Robert Hartung - Publisher
publisher@hartungpress.com

Hartung Press, is a Non-Profit Online Public Affairs Magazine.
http://www.hartungpress.com

KE4JCD Web Page
http://www.ke4jcd.org

Support Anti-Spam Legislation.
Join the fight http://www.cauce.org/

<Leland C. Scott@cotse.net (KC8LDO)> wrote in message news:_yTJ7.29436$xS6.47461@www.newsranger.com...
> An aquaintance of mine has been in the employ of the FCC satellite office in
> Dearborn since the beginning of the month. The busts are coming down on illegal
> cb and equipment manufactures. Hams should not be encouraging this type behavior
> by freely giving mod information just to show off.(you know who you are) This is
> the type behavior that ruined cb by messing it up for all of us law abiding
> citizens.
> --
> Leland C Scott
> KC8LDO
> ARRL Member

> NRI Member
> --
>
> "We often are
> judged not by ourselves, but by our peers who we often mistakenly think,
think
> like us."
> -Robert Louis Stevenson
>
>
>

1108. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:36:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF88C6A.7D45C397@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24105

Nothing like a good old fashioned flame war.....

Dave Heil wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > *GASP*!! OK, that's it. I am going
> > > to reply to the post in which Dave Heil used the word comparting. **THEN**
> > > I am going to completely ignore that this jerk even habitats the planet
> > > Earth.
> >
> > What? And miss all the fun of having a battle of wits with an
> > unarmed opponent?
>
> You certainly flatter yourself--and that only with the help of someone
> else's worn out saying.
>
> Dave K8MN

1109. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:41:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF88D94.19FA791@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24106

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
> efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
> amateurs -- and this mode has many unique functional characterists which
> cannot be exploited without operators trained in the use of the Morse Code.

Ask NASA's JPL what they use to communicate with their space probes.
It's not morse code. JPL's system gets thru when Morse or anything
else would not.

1110. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:49:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF88F76.6E7FDA84@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24107

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
>
> CW phobics never understand that radiotelegraphy is the most basic of
> all radiocommunications modes, eminently useful even in the high tech
> age. Just ask any moonbounce or coherent operator.
>
>

We should ask NASA and JPL what modes they use to communicate with
deep space planetary probes. It's not morse code. Maybe we should
(if we haven't already) adopt a version suitable for HF for DXing when
even morse code CW doesn't get thru. You may need a specially designed
for the purpose HF radio, but special transmitters existed for CW use.

1111. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:57:04 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF7D91C.CF49072A@mailcity.net>
Source record: 24108

CAM wrote:

>
> Yep, I'm a Libertarian

Now I know why I pay no attention to what you say.

1112. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:57:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF8914F.C4149627@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24110

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3BF6E586.BD3DC80E@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > It is
> > > not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get to
> do
> > > something you do not believe makes any sense.
> > >
> >
> > Hell, I did stuff that didn't make any sense when I was in
> > grammar school. Like what was the point in memorizing
> > poems? Made me hate poetry.
> >
>
> No, it means you never overcame bad teaching. We have produced gazillions
> of poor readers by making kids read out loud; but how else is Teach going to
> know? I remember nothing of some of the grammar school stuff, mostly
> Longfellow as I recall.
>
> Your loss, Mr. Casey. Be an uncultured clod if you wish but don't blame
> your grammar school teacher for making the effort.
>
>

I suppose it is my loss, but the teacher just said "memorize this
poem". Next day we parroted it back. Then we moved on to
another topic. *NO* explanation or analysis of said poem.
As if it was just a mental test pattern.

From what I can remember of grammar school, most
teaching was aimed at getting us to score higher on
the yearly achievement tests.

Not to worry, I did get some culture in high school and
college. Not a lot, but some....

1113. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 04:58:08 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF7D95B.6A647261@mailcity.net>
Source record: 24109

And another cber speaks up.

Hi Ya Phil wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> sat down at his little
> worn out keyboard and spewed out the following
> useless shit:
> > Reflect on "aiding <<remaining drivel snipped>>
>
> HEY KANE,,, reflect on this"
>
> Fuck You Kane
> Fuck You Kane
> Fuck You Kane

1114. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:05:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF892FF.B4199CC3@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24111

Rick Adams wrote:

> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 00:41:11 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
> wrote:
>
> > Reflect on "aiding and abetting".
> > Reflect on "aiding and abetting".
> > Reflect on "aiding and abetting".
>
> Then by all means lets shut down our colleges and
> universities.

I remember the press having a field day reporting on the
guys who tried to blow up the WTC back in '93 having
taken classes in college on explosives. Hell, anyone
who took Chem 101 freshman year gets that.

> The simplistic solution is to conceal information. The
> intelligent one is to make information freely available and only
> punish those who misuse it.
>
> Fortunately, despite the influence of the right wing
> extremists in recent years, our Constitution still supports the
> intelligent decision instead of the simple one.
>
> If it's "aiding and abetting" to provide publicly accessible
> information to cbers, then someone managed to turn the Constitution
> into a roll of toilet paper and a democracy into a fascist state while
> I was sleeping. Sorry, but I'll take my chances on openness and
> honesty instead of secrecy and distrust.

I'd still mention to the CBer that the amp would not be legal to
use.

1115. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:09:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF8940D.A8156E7F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24112

Ignore this newsgroup. It's mostly arguements and flames
over Kim's call and Mores Code.

1116. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:23:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF89754.4B456B4@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24113

Rick Adams wrote:

>
>
> Grow up, Larry! This is the 21st Century--not the Victorian
> era. Women have breasts and legs in our society, not "bosoms and
> limbs." And it isn't going to hurt the little children one bit to be
> aware of that fact--nor would it hurt ham radio if the moralists would
> stop trying to dictate personal values to everyone and would, instead,
> concentrate on acting like responsible people themselves.
>
>

I've known about breasts when I was a very young child.
I was breast fed. And I don't think I became morally
corrupt....

1117. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:29:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF897C7.C116784F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24114

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > What, by the way, is the zip code for "Small Southern Town, U.S.A."?
>
> I see that you are still incapable of conceptualizing abstract
> levels higher than a "rock" or a "tree". That's a pity, Dave.

I see that you are still intent on speaking for an area larger than the
one you know. That's typical, Cecil.

Dave K8MN

1118. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:32:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF8987A.221D830C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24115

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You are perhaps the only individual here who would attempt to twist a
> > typo into a lie.
>
> I didn't do that at first, Dave. I simply pointed out your choice
> of words. It was a real English word so it wasn't readily apparent
> that it was a typo. After you denied using that word for about a
> dozen times, it was obvious that you had decided to lie about it.
> I'm sorry I had to embarrass you by digging up your original
> posting. Threaded newsreaders are a bitch, huh?

What's a bitch is that I suggested that you look over my other posts in the thread and see that I used the words, "compare" and "comparing" in all of them. Now you'd like to play stupid. I've already posted the one where you made the comparison after denying that you did so.

Dave K8MN

1119. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:35:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF89A37.72824922@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24116

CAM wrote:

> JJ wrote:
> > Although I no longer consider myself Southern Baptist, I was
> > raised going to Southern Baptist church and I never heard any SB
> > preacher state that Catholics were going to hell just for being
> > Catholic.
>
> How many have you polled? Catholics worship graven images of
> the Virgin Mary, a cardinal sin which can only be forgiven by
> becoming a Protestant.

Only the old hard core Catholics do that sh_t anymore. Most of us just pray to God (includes Jesus) and leave it at that. And the Catholic Church has been admitting that past errors like Crusades and inquisitions and such were in fact wrong.

1120. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:37:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF89AA5.7CC9F47D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24117

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > What, by the way, is the zip code for "Small Southern Town, U.S.A."?
> >
> > I see that you are still incapable of conceptualizing abstract
> > levels higher than a "rock" or a "tree". That's a pity, Dave.
>
> I see that you are still intent on speaking for an area larger than the
> one you know. That's typical, Cecil.

I have already said I don't speak for a large area and that it is
simply my opinion based on my experiences. Show me some evidence
otherwise and I might change that opinion.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1121. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:38:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF89AF2.2BBA2A98@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24118

Dave Heil wrote:
> You certainly flatter yourself--and that only with the help of someone
> else's worn out saying.

I see you are using someone else's words. Why don't you invent your
own?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1122. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:41:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF89A8D.156AEB54@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24119

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 23:14:42 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >That you defend porn as harmless comes as no real surprise to me. I am
> >surprised that you are gullible even to believe that one type of movie
> >inspires behavior and that the other doesn't.
>
> Thanks--I'm glad it doesn't surprise you that I believe in
> free speech--too bad more people in this NG don't.
>
> It isn't gullibility, it's a willingness to accept research
> evidence that demonstrates it.
>
> I happen to TEACH psychology and sociology at the University
> level--and both fields have made it VERY clear that it is the presence
> of violence--not sex--that leads to antisocial actions (meaning acts
> that violate the rights of others--not ones that offend their
> religious morality but don't affect them directly).

Neat. There's a prof up east who teaches that blacks designed and built
the pyramids and invented the airplane. Hotep! (Kids--don't believe
everything you're taught in college).

> Do I defend porn as harmless? No I don't. Thanks to the sick
> "let 'em see blood and violence but not sex and love" mentality of the
> American moralists, our adult films are limited to those that are the
> most sexually objectifying of any made in the world. We don't even
> attempt to make sensitive, caring, women-centered, erotic films
> because the moralists would just demand that they be censored anyway.

Yeah, that's why we don't have them.

> There is inherently NOTHING wrong with human sexual behavior
> between consenting adults. Those that see those behaviors as immoral
> merely demonstrate their desire to impose their own outdated,
> superstitious, beliefs on others.

Certainly depends upon one's actions in that adult sexual behavior.
Watching it in a porn film lowers the viewer to the level of voyeur.
As to some of the acts depicted, I guess it sometimes depends on whether
you're kicking off or receiving, huh?

> >I guess you've missed the postings of Lenny-The-Licenseless and
> >Larry-The-Homemade-Lawyer. The testing changes have been pointed out to

> >both numerous times and they're still whining.
>
> And the pro-code group aren't?
>
> Which Usenet newsgroup are YOU reading? In rrap the concept of
> code testing is as strongly argued by the pro-code group today as it
> was over a year ago when it was still an issue.

Well, one-sided Rick, it would appear that the opposition hasn't let up a lick either. Me, I've learned to live with it having realized that most things degenerate toward chaos. Ham radio isn't any different.

Dave K8MN

1123. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:43:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF89C03.496ED782@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24120

Dave Heil wrote:
> What's a bitch is that I suggested that you look over my other posts in
> the thread and see that I used the words, "compare" and "comparing" in
> all of them. Now you'd like to play stupid. I've already posted the
> one where you made the comparison after denying that you did so.

I did not deny comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
They are certainly comparable. I denied comparting Affirmative Action
and Morse code testing of which you accused me and then lied about
doing it. I'm still waiting for an apology. I have never in my entire
life comparted Affirmative Action and Morse code. If you have any
proof whatsoever that I have ever comparted those subjects, please
present it. If you cannot, we all will assume that you were lying
through your teeth when you accused me of comparting.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1124. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:45:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF89C79.DD72B953@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24122

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm judgmental as all get out, and damn proud of it!

Then you are violating the teachings of Jesus. Why am
I not surprised?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1125. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:46:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF89B89.80DDC6F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24121

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I'm not angry with you, Kim. I'm unhappy with your lack of class and
> > > > decorum.
> > >
> > > Too bad the Taliban has been routed. You could have gotten a job
> > > with their Department of Vice and Virtue.
> >
> > Too bad that Carl isn't here to refer to me as a Nazi. Your
> > "Libertarian" views at work?
>
> Yep, I'm a Libertarian and believe Kim has a perfect right to her legal
> callsign. Care to explain how you differ from the Taliban's Dept. of
> Vice and Virtue?

...in the same manner that I'm not like a Nazi. Because I'm not a Nazi
nor am I member of the Taliban. I'm not Muslim, not an Afghani and I
don't live in Afghanistan. I can't remember the last time I executed a
woman for anything and I don't wear a turban. Care to explain how you
came to defend Kim's lack of class and a number of other lost causes?

Dave K8MN
```

1126. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:49:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF89C56.9E8B4212@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24123

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 23:01:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> >> Your evasion of the question is typical. I could say I didn't mean to make
> >> it so challenging. But I did.
> >
> >It isn't evasion, Kim. Your tacky choice in calls has absolutely naught
> >to do with Muslims or the WTC. You've made nothing challenging. If you
> >want to defend your lack of decorum, don't attempt to link it to a
> >disparate topic.
>
> Translation, Kim: He can't answer your question in any way
> that doesn't make him look like an idiot, so he'll pretend it isn't
> relevant and attack you on a personal level as usual.

Here's your translation, Rick. The question has absolutely no bearing
on the discussion at hand. There is no pretense because there is no
relevance. You don't strike me as particularly bright for a university
prof.

Dave K8MN

1127. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:51:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF89DD1.DB97E01D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24124

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> If you truly believe your
> callsign is harmless to the positive image of the ARS, then YOU prove it.

You sure don't learn very fast, Larry. The onus of proof is upon
the person who asserts the positive premise. That's you. Here's
the premise: 'Kim's callsign is harmful to the ARS.' Hop on that
onus and show us your proof. Just as it is impossible for you
to prove that you are not a rapist, it is logically impossible
to prove that Kim's callsign is not harmful to the ARS.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1128. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:55:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF89DBA.E1FFF364@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24125

Krell wrote:
>
> "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> news:74C7FCEAAD62A6E9.93F2053F7C172860.72ADA3B4E8124E3A@lp.airnews.net...
> > On 18 Nov 2001 16:25:33 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Someone who knows the difference, that's who!
> >
> > Gee, Hitler felt that way, too!
> >
> > Rick--KE8HH
>
> Goodwin's Law. Game over.

Dontcha know? Rick doesn't care for those who make judgements!

Dave K8MN

1129. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:57:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF89E3B.9A310597@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24126

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day. By some
> >definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but is a cast iron SOB
> >about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those juvenile, tee hee
> >giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so common it is like
> >stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is one thing, being
> >judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the wind whistles thru
> >and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being judgemental.
>
> With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose any
> behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
> non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_ open-minded and
> willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of judging
> others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the same
> behaviors they themselves prefer.

You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and called me and
idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.

> On the other hand, I don't happen to view open-mindedness as a
> flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded person
> who demonstrates a serious character flaw.

Damn! Another judgement.

Dave K8MN

1130. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:58:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF89F7F.DADCCC95@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24128

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Prove what, Kim? The potential damage your callsign can do to the ARS is
> self-apparent.

For shame, Larry, petitio principii is not allowed.
You are the one making the assertion. The onus is upon you
to prove your assertion. If you cannot offer any proof, we
will be forced to conclude that you are full of it. Exactly
what damage is being done to the ARS by Kim's callsign?

Here's your argument applied to you, Larry. If you cannot
prove that you are not a rapist, then that you are one is
self-apparent. Don't you ever learn?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1131. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:59:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF89FB3.EC28DE9C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24127

Dick Carroll wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > To equate radical Islam with Southern Baptist doctrine or activity as
> > > Cecil has done is ludicrous on its face. So far (the Atlanta Olympic
> > > bombing aside) I haven't noticed any deathdealaing terrorists issuing
> > > from the Southern Baptist Convention.
> >
> > Apples and oranges, Dick. I equated radical Islam with radical
> > Christianity, not with the Christian mainstream.
>
> And of course the critical point flew right past you, as I knew would,
> as many times as I repeated it in those several posts.
> That point, repeated yet one more time for the slow witted:
>
> **Islam is the ONLY religion which dictates that all people under other
> belief systems are to be either converted, subjugated (enslaved) or
> eliminated (Killed).**
>
> What is it about this simple statement that so difficult for you to
> grasp?

Do you have references you can cite for your assertion?

I've known and worked with people from that religion and
they got along with us Americans just fine. And they
practiced their religion just like Christians do, like fasting
during the daytime during their Ramadon(sp) holy
month, similar to Catholic Lent, etc.

1132. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 05:59:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF89FCC.AC4E7EB3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24129

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Actually, I engage in a simple expression of the truth.

Just like Hitler did, Larry, just like Hitler did.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1133. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:02:39 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10111190601080.16761-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 24131

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001, Bman wrote:
>...
>Now I see that there is no higher intellect even in the world of
>amateur radio where you're supposed to be qualified and probably
>should know the Morse code and obey a few basic rules of civility,
>that anyone can encounter just as many children on the airwaves as
>they can on any other public forum.
>...

I agree in this limited extent: Just because one has mastered certain skills to communicate with others in ways that most people can't doesn't mean that such a person has anything worthy to say. Skill does not equate to content.

1134. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:02:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF89F5A.D4E82B1C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24130

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> news:C682E6C1D7B94573.B20089F50AD70597.1D366D41766D911C@lp.airnews.net...
> > On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 23:01:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > >> Your evasion of the question is typical. I could say I didn't mean to
> make
> > >> it so challenging. But I did.
> > >
> > >It isn't evasion, Kim. Your tacky choice in calls has absolutely naught
> > >to do with Muslims or the WTC. You've made nothing challenging. If you
> > >want to defend your lack of decorum, don't attempt to link it to a
> > >disparate topic.
> >
> > Translation, Kim: He can't answer your question in any way
> > that doesn't make him look like an idiot, so he'll pretend it isn't
> > relevant and attack you on a personal level as usual.
> >
> > 73 de KE8HH, Rick
"
>
> Yep. After a while it's like batting around a damp, limp, ragged mouse. ;)

What is?

Dave K8MN

1135. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:06:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF8A150.E8FA4BF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24133

Rick Adams wrote:

> On 18 Nov 2001 09:12:20 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>
> In case you don't remember the fact, WE--not some
> fundamentalist Islamic nation--trained Osama bin Laden and his
> followers. We trained them, funded them, and ARMED them as a way to
> oppose the USSR in Afghanistan. Now, of course, when our own actions
> come back to haunt us (as they have done in other nations including
> Somalia, etc.), we blame the religion of the region instead of our own
> actions. If it weren't for the US, the Taliban would NEVER have
> achieved power in Afghanistan in the first place so if you want to
> point a finger at anyone, point it at US, where it belongs!
>

Hopefully, now that we have nearly won the war there, we
can win the peace. That we don't f_ck it up again. That
we can give them just enough help (and not more) so that
they can build their nation themselves that turns out to be a
good place for all of them. Whether or not it can actually
happen, well....

1136. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:06:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF8A033.70CCA970@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24132

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
> > efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
> > amateurs -- and this mode has many unique functional characterists which
> > cannot be exploited without operators trained in the use of the Morse Code.
>
> Ask NASA's JPL what they use to communicate with their space probes.
> It's not morse code. JPL's system gets thru when Morse or anything
> else would not.

Now if they could just get those probes to stop cratering into the
surface of the planets they visit, we could see all of this great
communication in action!

Dave K8MN

1137. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:28:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF8A69D.D159F363@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24134

Dick Carroll wrote:
> **Islam is the ONLY religion which dictates that all people under other
> belief systems are to be either converted, subjugated (enslaved) or
> eliminated (Killed).**

That is absolutely absurd, Dick. Your own religion dictates that all
people under other belief systems are to be either converted, subjugated
(enslaved) or eliminated (Killed). It is all right there in the Bible.
There is no more reason to believe that civilized Muslims follow the
literal orders in the Koran any more than civilized Christians follow
the literal orders in the Bible.

> What is it about this simple statement that so difficult for you to
> grasp?

It is an absolute lie, that's what. Your very own Bible advocates
in reverse virtually the same thing that the Koran advocates - killing
and conquering in the name of Jehovah.

> Souithern Baptists exhibit no less zealotry in their efforts to convert
> others but nowhere in their governing documentation do I find anything
> about enslaving nor killing the recalcitrant.

Read the Bible, Dick, read the Bible. It's all there. The Israelites
sacked Jericho for no other reason than conquest of non-Israelites.

> How exactly does this play into the
> singular difference that is Islam, to wit: Convert 'em, Enslave 'em or
> Kill 'em??

Dick, that's exactly what Christians have been doing for 2000 years
and what the Bible tells Christians to do. That we don't do it anymore
is a tribute to civilization which had its birth in the Middle East.
The Toran reflects the invasion and rape of the Muslim lands at the
hands of the Christians. Civilized Muslims recognize that the Crusades
are over even if you don't possess the intelligence to realize it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1138. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:35:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF8A843.D518263B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24135

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> This is hilarious! First Cecil tells me to "Judge not, that ye not be
> judged..." and then, he *judges* me by saying I'm "NOT (sic) a good Christian."

Oh, I admit to being only an ethnic Christian, Larry. I don't believe
in a supernatural so I am definitely not a good Christian. You, OTOH,
profess to be a Christian and you are obviously not a good one since
you violate nearly every teaching of Jesus. Need any help with those
beams in your eyes?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1139. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:43:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF8A9FD.B2AC2598@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24136

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> BTW -- I wonder how Kim's OM would feel about
> hearing that his XYL would want to meet another man at Starbucks for
> a day-long session of "philosophical discussion?" I know one for damn
> sure -- if I were married, my XYL wouldn't have to worry about me ever
> doing that with another woman -- unless she was there as well!

Larry, you are undoubtedly a throwback to Neanderthal days. You're
not married because no woman likes to be hit over the head with a
club. Exactly what is wrong with coffee and conversation?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1140. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:45:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF8AA90.6F47D3B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24137

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> Apparently, you like your women brainless and
> they like men who run their lives.

No they don't, Kim. That's why Larry is not married.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1141. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:48:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF8AB38.121DBD26@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24138

Robert Casey wrote:
> We should ask NASA and JPL what modes they use to communicate with
> deep space planetary probes. It's not morse code.

Maybe we should enlighten JPL as to the merits of Morse code.
No matter where a probe goes in the entire universe, Morse code
gets through when other modes won't.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1142. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 06:58:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF8AD81.35152BE2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24139

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Yep, I'm a Libertarian and believe Kim has a perfect right to her legal
> > callsign. Care to explain how you differ from the Taliban's Dept. of
> > Vice and Virtue?
>
> ...in the same manner that I'm not like a Nazi. Because I'm not a Nazi
> nor am I member of the Taliban. I'm not Muslim, not an Afghani and I
> don't live in Afghanistan. I can't remember the last time I executed a
> woman for anything and I don't wear a turban.

Well, those are minor differences. Is there any major difference between
you and the Taliban's Dept. of Vice and Virtue?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1143. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 07:00:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF8ADFF.4C29DF69@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24140

Dave Heil wrote:
> Here's your translation, Rick. The question has absolutely no bearing
> on the discussion at hand. There is no pretense because there is no
> relevance.

That's the best job of diverting the issue that I have ever seen.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1144. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 09:15:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BF8CD80.4601E361@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24141

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Ewwww, I don't think that's healthy
> at all. (snip) I would hope that
> people argue out their differences
> and explore their similarities with
> each other.

The last time people tried to "argue out" their differences here, there was almost a war in the area (remember the images of NG troops, riots, and so forth). Compared to that, what exists now is downright healthy. Besides, I think it allows each group to explore the other without bringing anything to a head - it's more gradual and less threatening.

> My son claims there will be an all-
> out race war--one that affects the
> entire nation. (snip)

It's a possibility, Kim. We're the first country, in the history of mankind, that has been successful (so far) at bringing so many nationalities together in one place without breaking up into endless civil wars. However, many believe it's only a matter of time and we're quickly approaching it. So, while I won't say it is going to happen, based on history, I'm certainly not going to dismiss the possibility either.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1145. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 10:43:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <En5K7.117779$WW.7357875@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24142

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3BF8914F.C4149627@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3BF6E586.BD3DC80E@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > It is
> > > > not the first and it will not be the last time in your life you get
to
> > do
> > > > something you do not believe makes any sense.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Hell, I did stuff that didn't make any sense when I was in
> > > grammar school. Like what was the point in memorizing
> > > poems? Made me hate poetry.
> > >
> >
> > No, it means you never overcame bad teaching. We have produced
gazillions
> > of poor readers by making kids read out loud; but how else is Teach
going to
> > know? I remember nothing of some of the grammar school stuff, mostly
> > Longfellow as I recall.
> >
> > Your loss, Mr. Casey. Be an uncultured clod if you wish but don't blame
> > your grammar school teacher for making the effort.
> >
> >
>
> I suppose it is my loss, but the teacher just said "memorize this
> poem". Next day we parroted it back. Then we moved on to
> another topic. *NO* explanation or analysis of said poem.
> As if it was just a mental test pattern.
>
> From what I can remember of grammar school, most
> teaching was aimed at getting us to score higher on
> the yearly achievement tests.

>
> Not to worry, I did get some culture in high school and
> college. Not a lot, but some....
>

But you must admit we sure short-circuited Chapter 2 -- if the teach had not stuffed poetry down my throat I might have learned to love it and if you stopped shoving Morse I could learn to love that, too

Think of the bandwidth we saved.

1146. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 11:43:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf8f0e7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24143

Oh no...not at all. We just start the Kim's callsign arguments usually sometime around this time of year. :)

Kim W5TIT

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3BF8940D.A8156E7F@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Ignore this newsgroup. It's mostly arguements and flames
> over Kim's call and Mores Code.
>

1147. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 11:47:10 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf8f1c8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24144

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF89DD1.DB97E01D@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > If you truly believe your
> > callsign is harmless to the positive image of the ARS, then YOU prove
it.
>
> You sure don't learn very fast, Larry. The onus of proof is upon
> the person who asserts the positive premise. That's you. Here's
> the premise: 'Kim's callsign is harmful to the ARS.' Hop on that
> onus and show us your proof. Just as it is impossible for you
> to prove that you are not a rapist, it is logically impossible
> to prove that Kim's callsign is not harmful to the ARS.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Especially when the science and fact of numbers proves otherwise...LOL

Kim W5TIT

1148. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 11:48:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf8f214_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24145

Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was pretty born with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...

Kim W5TIT

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:3BF89E3B.9A310597@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> > <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> >
> > >You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day. By some
> > >definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but is a cast iron SOB
> > >about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those juvenile, tee hee
> > >giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so common it is like
> > >stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is one thing, being
> > >judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the wind whistles thru
> > >and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being judgemental.
> >
> > With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose any
> > behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
> > non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_ open-minded and
> > willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of judging
> > others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the same
> > behaviors they themselves prefer.
>
> You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and called me and
> idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.
>
> > On the other hand, I don't happen to view open-mindedness as a
> > flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded person
> > who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
>
> Damn! Another judgement.
>
> Dave K8MN

1149. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 11:52:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf8f2ec$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24146

Anyone who thinks "we have won" anything over there is sadly mistaken. We (Americans and many other nations) don't believe, fight, and defend with the same passion and commitment that those fanatics over there do. We are more civilized than that. It is our very nature of civility that will keep us from winning anything from them that is more than brief.

Kim W5TIT

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3BF8A150.E8FA4BF@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
>
> > On 18 Nov 2001 09:12:20 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> >
> > In case you don't remember the fact, WE--not some
> > fundamentalist Islamic nation--trained Osama bin Laden and his
> > followers. We trained them, funded them, and ARMED them as a way to
> > oppose the USSR in Afghanistan. Now, of course, when our own actions
> > come back to haunt us (as they have done in other nations including
> > Somalia, etc.), we blame the religion of the region instead of our own
> > actions. If it weren't for the US, the Taliban would NEVER have
> > achieved power in Afghanistan in the first place so if you want to
> > point a finger at anyone, point it at US, where it belongs!
> >
>
> Hopefully, now that we have nearly won the war there, we
> can win the peace. That we don't f_ck it up again. That
> we can give them just enough help (and not more) so that
> they can build their nation themselves that turns out to be a
> good place for all of them. Whether or not it can actually
> happen, well....
>

1150. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 12:49:42 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Gd7K7.755$m%.185845@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 24148

>
> Please do nothing in support of me--do what you will for your own
> satisfaction, enjoyment, and conversation. Not knowing you, I wouldn't be
> able to even give you out some funny ones that would match your
personality.
> Also, please remember that I really didn't choose my callsign based on its
> obscenity (I don't believe it is obscene)--I chose my callsign because it
is
> the closest thing to *my* vanity (get it...vanity callsign?) that I could
> get.

I was only kidding actually..... don't know what callsign I would really choose if given the choice..... I just can't stand to see normal people preyed upon by these self-righteous self-virtuous people who think they have the right to control others......

>
> I have a friend who's a ham and has the callsign N5BIG--celebrating his
> quite large shadow he casts (I think he's probably 6' 2-3" maybe taller,
and
> I bet near or a little over 400 pounds).
>

That might also work for me..... 6'4" and about 250lbs myself. Hmmm.... how about something like KT8ALL or something similar.

Ryan

1151. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 12:49:43 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Hd7K7.756$m%.185681@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 24147

Have ya seen the custom-screen-printed pocket protectors that are now the rage with the socially inept-anal-retentive ham??? Goes well with the tape on the black horned-rim glasses too.....

"JJ" <radiobuffj@mailcity.net> wrote in message news:3BF51366.6ECE1AD9@mailcity.net...
>
>
> Richard Plourde wrote:
> >
> > And... a BIG difference between what's in bad taste and what's bad for a
> > society... witness $50.00 'Ham Radio Badge' that someone is flogging.
>
> Yeah, for just $59.95 you too can get your ham radio badge be the
> envy of every 12 year old.

1152. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 13:03:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011119080344.24612.00000734@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 24149

In article <3BF86D03.6EA572F8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
>> >The last time I checked, 5 WPM met the treaty requirements.
>> >
>> Bingo. And without the treaty, no code test at all.
>
>Personally, I'm not so sure.

Why not? FCC has made it VERY clear that the treaty is the one and only reason they kept 5 wpm. They specifically addressed all of the other reasons for code testing and said, in effect: "That's nice, but it's not sufficient reason for us to keep the code test". Only the treaty requirement was identified as sufficient reason.

Take away that reason, and by the FCC's own statements, there is NO reason. End of story. Unless the FCC changes their mind or acts illogically.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1153. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 13:03:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011119080346.24612.00000735@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 24150

In article <ABD3D4AA00AD9F44.7B7BF488D34A1588.D30BB60EE817971B@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>It's one thing for hams not to support or condone the use of
>illegal amps by cbers--but not freely providing information goes
>contrary to a central principle of amateur radio--that of the free
>exchange of information and the education of others in radio
>technology. Sure the information is being misused--but it isn't the
>responsibility of a ham to determine HOW information is going to be
>use, only to insure that his/her information is accurate and honest.

What you're saying, Rick, is that a person giving out information bears no
responsibility for what is done with the information. That idea misses a key
point: does the information-giver have any expectation that the information
will be misused?
>
> If I tell a cber how to build an amp for 10m, for example
>(which, btw, I don't do), I'm not doing anything a good book on
>electronics theory--or an early version of the ARH for that
>matter--wouldn't tell him or her.

You are doing something VERY different if you have any reason to suspect that
the cber will use the amp illegally.

>It's the cber's responsibility not
>to use that information illegally by operating on 11m with more than
>5w of power--it isn't my responsibility not to communicate factual
>information to prevent him/her from doing so.

Yes, it is - IF you have reason to believe that the information will be
misused.

The Sept. 11 hijackers learned to fly airliners at flight schools in this
country. Let me say up front that the flying schools had no idea what the
hijackers would do with their flying skills.

Apply your concept of "it isn't my responsibility not to communicate factual
information to prevent him/her from doing so" to flying schools today, in the
wake of Sept. 11 You are saying that a flying school should bear no
responsibility for what the students do after graduation even if the school
knows there is a chance they will repeat the actions of Sept. 11.
>
>In this nation we often end up blaming people for teaching
>others things that they later use illegally. It's time we stopped
>blaming the teacher and started putting the responsibility squarely
>where it belongs--on the learner who misuses the information.

No. Wrong. It all depends on whether the teacher had reason to suspect that the information would be misused. In most cases the teacher has no clue.

If representatives of Saddam or OBL seek information about how to make and use chemical, biological or nuclear weapons, should they simply be given the information with no concern for how they might use it?
>
> Besides--if we refuse to share our knowledge, how can we ever
>expect to encourage cbers and freebanders to take the time to become
>hams and operate legally instead?

By demonstrating what hams do LEGALLY, not by helping them break the law.

>I regularly demonstrate my station
>to friends who are cbers (and at least one I strongly suspect is a
>freebander)--including the operation of an amplifier. I then
>demonstrate how efficient ham radio is compared to cb or freeband--by
>making contacts using my preferred mode--100mw ssb--and transmitting
>through my flag pole. The contrast makes a LOT more of an impression
>than just telling them that amps are illegal on 11m and therefore I
>won't show them how they work would ever do.

>More than one person I've
>demonstrated that to is now a qrp operator who enjoys seeing how LOW
>s/he can reduce the power and still make international contacts
>instead of trying to pump out a couple KW to talk to someone across
>town.

That's great, Rick, but it's not the same thing as showing someone how to build an amplifier suitable for cb use. Not the same thing at all. In fact, what you're doing is discouraging amplifier use by demonstrating what can be done legally without one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1154. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 13:03:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011119080347.24612.00000737@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 24251

In article <9t9rv30rrd@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
>news:74C7FCEAAD62A6E9.93F2053F7C172860.72ADA3B4E8124E3A@lp.airnews.net...
>> On 18 Nov 2001 16:25:33 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Someone who knows the difference, that's who!
>>
>> Gee, Hitler felt that way, too!
>>
>> Rick--KE8HH
>
>Goodwin's Law. Game over.
>
Yup.

Goodwin's Law need's to be amended to include references to "Taliban" and
"terrorism". Shall we call the amended version Krell's Law?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1155. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 13:03:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011119080347.24612.00000736@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 24253

In article <3BF89F7F.DADCCC95@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Exactly
>what damage is being done to the ARS by Kim's callsign?

That's easy, Cecil.

Callsigns like Kim's make the ARS a little less G-rated. Many prospective hams and the parents of prospective hams will have a less-positive impression of ham radio after encountering such callsigns. It would be better for the ARS if hams did not pick such vanity calls because they are inappropriate for the ARS.

It should be noted that not only did Kim pick out that callsign, but she recommended similar callsigns to others as vanity calls.

It is perfectly clear from reading Kim's posts that she chose that callsign for its attention and giggle factors, and doesn't see the harm in it. The only way she would give it up is if the FCC revoked it. That's probably not gonna happen, because the FCC doesn't forbid such callsigns, and Kim doesn't change her mind very often.

So the operative question is: Which is the lesser of two evils - callsigns like Kim's, or having the FCC enact and enforce a list of forbidden ARS callsigns?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1156. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 13:03:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011119080348.24612.00000738@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 24252

In article <3BF86541.50009DBA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>JJ wrote:
>> Although I no longer consider myself Southern Baptist, I was
>> raised going to Southern Baptist church and I never heard any SB
>> preacher state that Catholics were going to hell just for being
>> Catholic.
>
>How many have you polled? Catholics worship graven images of
>the Virgin Mary, a cardinal sin which can only be forgiven by
>becoming a Protestant.

You are mistaken, Cecil. Catholics don't worship graven images.

The purpose of statues and pictures in the Catholic faith is to remind the faithful of the person depicted and what they did. Nothing more.

Most Protestant churches I've have pictures and statues, too.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1157. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 13:38:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011119083817.22696.00000744@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 24254

>Subject: Re: WOW! - That's all I can say
>From: Rick Adams adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>Date: 11/18/2001 8:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id:
><C75DC22399F1018E.5074BFA3CE17AD3F.19727104CDDB9B82@lp.airnews.net>

>What's the matter, Steve?

>Don't like hearing that the conversations in this newsgroup
>have an influence on new (and potential) hams?

What I don't like "hearing" is some Anonymous Troll who pops in and lays an egg like that one, Rick. It's the knee jerk reaction to something that HE didn't agree with, and then he makes a sweeping statement that would "condem" all of Amateur Radio because of what transpires here.

By the way, I think it was Jim Rosenthal who did the math and figured that the "population" or RRAP (at least the regulars) represented about 0.017% of the Amateur community...hardly representitive, now is it?

>I hope you're a _little_ more considerate with new hams on the
>air than you are here. From my perspective, I think he had some pretty
>good points and certainly didn't deserve to be flamed for voicing
>them.

How I represent myself on the air and in person is far different from this forum. I am just following the leader here.

And his "points" could have been made without his own flaming. He got what he deserved.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1158. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:07:32 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <D34D5803DEAAAB91.2833FAEC0B7956B4.E229F165036EB935@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24255

On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 21:04:45 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>I assure you, Joe, there are many, and more, reliable sources for traffic
>information in Dallas. One is CB. And, on CB it is OK to "key up" and make
>those one way transmissions...

Except that on the fucking CB you can't fucking hear the fucking
traffic reports over the fucking bullshit, goddammit motherfucker.

Granted, the QRM on some of the local repeaters has gotten that bad at
times, but only until the problem is DF'd and 'fixed.'

At least on the ham bands, you can get traffic from a halfway
intelligent source without the extraneous commentary, or some bozo
deadkeying his 1kW rig. Even what little usefulness the broadcast
stations had is pretty much gone now that their helicopters are
grounded.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

1159. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:27:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF924D0.12FE01A1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24256

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Yep, I'm a Libertarian and believe Kim has a perfect right to her legal
> > > callsign. Care to explain how you differ from the Taliban's Dept. of
> > > Vice and Virtue?
> >
> > ...in the same manner that I'm not like a Nazi. Because I'm not a Nazi
> > nor am I member of the Taliban. I'm not Muslim, not an Afghani and I
> > don't live in Afghanistan. I can't remember the last time I executed a
> > woman for anything and I don't wear a turban.
>
> Well, those are minor differences. Is there any major difference between
> you and the Taliban's Dept. of Vice and Virtue?

A couple. I haven't been bombed by the U.S. Air Force and I have to put
up with your cracker games.

Dave K8MN

1160. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:28:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF92517.2552A040@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24257

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Here's your translation, Rick. The question has absolutely no bearing
> > on the discussion at hand. There is no pretense because there is no
> > relevance.
>
> That's the best job of diverting the issue that I have ever seen.

I'd be immodest if I didn't direct folks to go through your past
ramblings to see a true master at work.

Dave K8MN

1161. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:38:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF92766.46B8BF0D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24258

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was pretty born
> with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...
>
> Kim W5TIT

You couldn't be more off the beam than you are with this post, Tugboat.
Some of us rise above our beginnings. It helps to have parents who are
loving and involved in our upbringing and who provide guidance during
our formative years. My dad, for instance would never have permitted me
to choose a suggestive callsign back in the days when I first entered
amateur radio. I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of the
present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
involvement at all.

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF89E3B.9A310597@earthlink.net...
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > >
> > > On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> > > <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > >You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day. By some
> > > >definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but is a cast
> iron SOB
> > > >about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those juvenile,
> tee hee
> > > >giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so common it is
> like
> > > >stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is one thing,
> being
> > > >judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the wind whistles
> thru
> > > >and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being judgemental.
> > >
> > > With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose any
> > > behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
> > > non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_ open-minded and
> > > willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of judging
> > > others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the same
> > > behaviors they themselves prefer.
> >
> > You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and called me and
> > idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.

> >
> > > On the other hand, I don't happen to view open-mindedness as a
> > > flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded person
> > > who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
> >
> > Damn! Another judgement.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

1162. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:38:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF92769.206BFE8C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24259

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > Exactly what damage is being done to the ARS by Kim's callsign?
>
> That's easy, Cecil.
>
> Callsigns like Kim's make the ARS a little less G-rated. Many prospective hams
> and the parents of prospective hams will have a less-positive impression of ham
> radio after encountering such callsigns.

Seems to me we already have an over-abundance of prudish narrow-
minded holier-than-thou people in ham radio. :-) Do you have
any proof of your assertion?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1163. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:40:32 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tb931011po@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24263

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011119080347.24612.00000736@nso-cr.aol.com...
> In article <3BF89F7F.DADCCC95@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >Exactly
> >what damage is being done to the ARS by Kim's callsign?
>
> That's easy, Cecil.
>
> Callsigns like Kim's make the ARS a little less G-rated. Many prospective
hams

Since when is amateur radio subject to a rating system? The FCC certainly
didn't think so when they issued the callsign.

> and the parents of prospective hams will have a less-positive impression
of ham
> radio after encountering such callsigns. It would be better for the ARS if
hams
> did not pick such vanity calls because they are inappropriate for the ARS.

Like professional atheletes, it is not mandatory for hams to be role models.

> It should be noted that not only did Kim pick out that callsign, but she
> recommended similar callsigns to others as vanity calls.

The FCC is the final arbiter as to their offensiveness.

> It is perfectly clear from reading Kim's posts that she chose that
callsign for
> its attention and giggle factors, and doesn't see the harm in it. The only
way
> she would give it up is if the FCC revoked it. That's probably not gonna
> happen, because the FCC doesn't forbid such callsigns, and Kim doesn't
change
> her mind very often.
>
> So the operative question is: Which is the lesser of two evils - callsigns
like
> Kim's, or having the FCC enact and enforce a list of forbidden ARS
callsigns?

I don't see anything "evil" about the callsign, so the answer is obvious.

1164. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:41:21 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tb94g011sh@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24264

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF89FCC.AC4E7EB3@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Actually, I engage in a simple expression of the truth.
>
> Just like Hitler did, Larry, just like Hitler did.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Goodwin's Law. Game over.

1165. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:43:47 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tb9930124r@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24265

"JJ" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3BF7D91C.CF49072A@mailcity.net...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> >
> > Yep, I'm a Libertarian
>
> Now I know why I pay no attention to what you say.

Like you did when you typed the above response?

1166. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:44:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF928E3.AFCE8191@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24260

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Catholics worship graven images of
> >the Virgin Mary, a cardinal sin which can only be forgiven by
> >becoming a Protestant.
>
> You are mistaken, Cecil. Catholics don't worship graven images.

I know that, Jim, but it doesn't matter. What matters is my
Southern Baptist preacher, and a host of others, often state
from their pulpits that Catholics worship graven images and
are going to hell. I, personally, don't believe there is such
a place as hell (or heaven for that matter). I was just (tongue
in cheek) repeating the Southern Baptist party line above.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1167. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:50:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tb9ln012vv@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24267

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BF88383.4147C460@sccoast.net...
> Actually, you're applying those passages wrong, Cecil. You're
> ignoring the bible passages about knowing sin, knowing the sinner, and
> separating from that. The difference is between action and thought.
> Obviously, the christian has to know what sin is if he is to avoid it
> (a judgment). Likewise, the christian has to judge whether another
> person is sinning if he is to avoid participating in that person's sin
> (another judgment). However, that doesn't mean the christian condemns
> that person by actions (you passage above). Instead, he is to seek out
> that person and help the person to understand the consequences of
> those actions. The first step in that is making the person aware of
> his own sin.

That's as may be, but Larry certainly isn't doing that.

> The popular story of the woman being stoned for prostitution is a
> good example of this concept. Jesus stopped the stoning and told those
> in the mob to let the person without sin cast the first stone (a
> variation of your "Judge not, that ye be not judged"). In other words,
> he stopped the ACTION of the mob. However, after the mob went away, he
> turned to the woman and told her to go and sin no more. He could not
> have said that without making a judgment that she had indeed sinned.

Actually, what happened was that Jesus said, "Let he who is without sin cast
the first stone." He gets whacked in the side of the head with a big rock,
and says "Ouch! Knock it off, Mom!"

1168. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:50:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF92A52.53CA1E9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24261

N2EY wrote:
> Take away that reason, and by the FCC's own statements, there is NO reason. End
> of story. Unless the FCC changes their mind or acts illogically.

A governmental bureaucracy acting illogically?????? :-) :-) :-)
They gave that reason to defend their decision, a decision
with which they may be perfectly happy. Time will tell.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1169. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:53:45 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tb9ro013cc@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24266

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011119080347.24612.00000737@nso-cr.aol.com...
> >Goodwin's Law. Game over.
> >
> Yup.
>
> Goodwin's Law need's to be amended to include references to "Taliban" and
> "terrorism". Shall we call the amended version Krell's Law?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Only if I get the copyrights.

1170. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 15:56:12 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tba0b013lm@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24268

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3BF8940D.A8156E7F@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Ignore this newsgroup. It's mostly arguements and flames
> over Kim's call and Mores Code.

Like you just did?

1171. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 16:04:00 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0111190803.111c2e8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24262

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011116223240.14773.00001323@nso-dh.aol.com>...
> We've already been through the "teat" vs. "tit" evolution in this thread,
> so there is no need to bring *that* up again!

Sorry. I'm coming into this late, and with over 250 postings, I can't
claim to have read each one.. Sigh.

> The "big fuss" is exactly as stated in Riley Hollingsworth's original
> commentary on Kim's call sign -- occasioned by her attempt to get him
> to endorse it. For those who have not seen it yet, or lately, here it is:

> >While that's true, just because a person has a right to do something doesn't
> >mean it's right to do it on every occasion. While the call sign may fit the
> >constitution, for every instance where a parent or uncle or grandparent
> >doesn't want a young person to get involved in Ham Radio because of
> >something they hear on the bands, then you have taken the ARS one step
> >closer to extinction. Then we can sit around and debate what happened to
> >all those Amateur frequencies that industry bought at auction---debating, of
> >course, on the internet and cellular because that'll be all we have left.
> >The first amendment will still be alive and well, just as it is now, tho, if
> >that's any consolation.

This is a very difficult problem. I don't agree that Kim's callsign is
patently offensive. Further, I seriously doubt that many people would
really keep their sons, daughters, grandchildren from entering amateur radio
because of it. Is my call sign -- KC8SIK -- offensive? I can imagine
what some people might think about -- I really can, because I'm not real
fond of being 'sik' myself. Yet that callsign was given to me out of
a normal rotation. (And is in the process of being changed as part of
my upgrade to AE.)

Is 'k1ll' offensive? It looks like the person who received it believed
so -- from the record, it looks like he had it changed. Is 'n0sex'
offensive? I find it amusing. (If someone signed N-0-S-E-X I'd
probably be lol!)

Finally, it really is an issue of free speech. I don't believe the government
has an obilgation -- or a right -- to try to protect us from ourselves.
In this case limiting what amateurs could have as call signs would do exactly
that. Do we take out *every* potentially offensive sign? Who decides
which are potentially offensive? Your ideas and mine would almost certainly
be very different.

And how likely is it that one of those potential candidates will come into
contact with the few callsigns that person finds offensive? I doubt that

it's extremely likely that one person will come into contact with one of the six or seven callsigns that he or she finds offensive.

> Years ago, I would have fought tooth and nail to preserve every single
> kiloHertz of ham radio spectrum. However, because of the proliferation of
> so-called "hams" like you, Kim, I now support the concept of wholesale
> re-allocation of amateur radio spectrum to commercial broadcasting
> and utility communications services which can make much more
> productive, profitable, and socially beneficial use of it! As hams, we've
> blown it -- big time -- and you, your attitude, and your callsign are the
> best and most readily available example of every bad thing ham radio
> has become!

That seems a bit harsh.

I'm a really a newcomer to amateur radio. I listened a lot 20 years ago, though. My dad was/is a ham, and I spent a lot of time listening to his conversations. Didn't get my first license until about six weeks ago, though.

But I've done a lot of listening in the past two months. I normally scan the 2m/440 repeaters while I'm driving around town. In that time, I've never once heard anyone acting in a way that I felt was contrary to good and considerate practices. Not once. I've heard none of the 'CB' type stuff I keep hearing is on 2 meters. Whatever that may be. And I've had a couple of pleasant conversations with people when I had something to say.

The real point I'm trying to get at is this: A callsign is such a small part of an amateur radio contact under normal circumstances, that I don't think it matters a whole lot what it is. On the other hand, the actual content of the contacts *is* important. If newcomers hear contacts that don't consist of profanity, that are consistant with good practices, *thats* what will be remembered. Think about it: you usually need to listen for quite a while to actually *hear* a person's call sign. I listened so long this morning that I began to wonder if the two *had* callsigns -- but when the repeater ID'd, they did as well.

> So, as you can see, the problem with Kim's callsign is the fact that it
> deliberately detracts from the overall good, positive image of radio
> amateurs -- and degrades it's intended nature as a family-oriented
> activity suitable for young children as well as mature adults.

As I said above, I really believe that how we conduct ourselves throughout the non-identification portions of our contacts are what most people will really remember. Do those well, and most won't even notice when operator IDs as k-6-t-i-t (or whatever her sign really is).

> To paraphrase Mr. Hollingsworth, we need
> to decide whether we, as radio amateurs, have the maturity to
> conduct ourselves as hams in a conventionally dignified manner,
> or whether we are going to indulge our need to attract attention
> to ourselves in the manner Kim has chosen with her callsign.

With complete honesty, I really don't believe I'd even notice her
call sign if I heard it on the air. I can tell you what the conversation
I listened to this morning was about, I can tell you what the two
people did for a living, and can tell you a bunch of other things
about them, but callsigns? Well, they were 6 char callsigns, beginning
with 'K', and from area '8'.

> The
> former gives a positive, attractive image of ourselves as hams and
> of the ARS in general. The other is quite often found to be
> repugnant, and discourages participation by otherwise interested
> people, whose participation could have benefited themselves and
> the ARS as a whole. What we lose through such actions cannot
> be known for certain, but the potential for that loss would not
> exist if people like Kim would comport themselves in a more
> responsible manner.

I can't emphasize enough that the way we present ourselves while on-air
is, I strongly believe, *much* more important than any particular callsign.
That will make the difference to people much more than a few perhaps
offensive callsigns.

The way we present ourselves in person is even more important. Come across
as responsible, knowledgable, and polite, both on-air and off, and
people will have respect and a positive opinion of amateur radio.

Sean.

1172. Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 17:09:06 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9tdkvcnef1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 24154
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<Leland C. Scott@cotse.net (KC8LDO)> wrote in message
news:_yTJ7.29436$xS6.47461@www.newsranger.com...
> An aquaintance of mine has been in the employ of the FCC satellite office
in
> Dearborn since the beginning of the month. The busts are coming down on
illegal
> cb and equipment manufactures. Hams should not be encouraging this type
behavior
> by freely giving mod information just to show off.(you know who you are)
This is
> the type behavior that ruined cb by messing it up for all of us law
abiding
> citizens.
> --
> Leland C Scott
> KC8LDO
> ARRL Member
> NRI Member
> --
>
> "We often are
> judged not by ourselves, but by our peers who we often mistakenly think,
think
> like us."
> -Robert Louis Stevenson

You know if some really dumb moron is going to forge a post from me at least
get the location of the Detroit FCC field office right. I can tell you for a
fact it's not in Dearborn. Oh, the sig file is all wrong too. The CBers in
the "rec.radio.cb" news group are really beginning to lose it.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

--
"I will not be frowned upon or be looked down upon
or be made to keep silent because I have these
beliefs and opinions. I thought this country allowed
me that right. I will not conform or compromise just
to keep from hurting somebody's feelings. "

Ted Nugent

1173. Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 17:09:06 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9tbe1a$ac9$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 24269
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<Leland C. Scott@cotse.net (KC8LDO)> wrote in message
news:_yTJ7.29436$xS6.47461@www.newsranger.com...
> An aquaintance of mine has been in the employ of the FCC satellite office
in
> Dearborn since the beginning of the month. The busts are coming down on
illegal
> cb and equipment manufactures. Hams should not be encouraging this type
behavior
> by freely giving mod information just to show off.(you know who you are)
This is
> the type behavior that ruined cb by messing it up for all of us law
abiding
> citizens.
> --
> Leland C Scott
> KC8LDO
> ARRL Member
> NRI Member
> --
>
> "We often are
> judged not by ourselves, but by our peers who we often mistakenly think,
think
> like us."
> -Robert Louis Stevenson

You know if some really dumb moron is going to forge a post from me at least
get the location of the Detroit FCC field office right. I can tell you for a
fact it's not in Dearborn. Oh, the sig file is all wrong too. The CBers in
the "rec.radio.cb" news group are really beginning to lose it.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

--
"I will not be frowned upon or be looked down upon
or be made to keep silent because I have these
beliefs and opinions. I thought this country allowed
me that right. I will not conform or compromise just
to keep from hurting somebody's feelings. "

Ted Nugent

1174. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 17:39:54 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0111190939.7a9487c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24270

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3BF88383.4147C460@sccoast.net>...
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Krell" writes:
> > > > Who are you to decide what's
> > > > right or wrong-minded?
> > >
> > > Someone who knows the difference,
> > > that's who!
> > >
> > "Judge not, that ye be not judged.
> > ... And why beholdest thou the
> > mote that is in thy brother's eye,
> > but considerest not the beam
> > that is in thine own eye?"
> > Matthew 7:1,3
> >
> > Looks like you are NOT a good
> > Christian, Larry, (snip)
>
>
> Actually, you're applying those passages wrong, Cecil. You're
> ignoring the bible passages about knowing sin, knowing the sinner, and
> separating from that. The difference is between action and thought.
> Obviously, the christian has to know what sin is if he is to avoid it
> (a judgment). Likewise, the christian has to judge whether another
> person is sinning if he is to avoid participating in that person's sin
> (another judgment). However, that doesn't mean the christian condemns
> that person by actions (you passage above). Instead, he is to seek out
> that person and help the person to understand the consequences of
> those actions. The first step in that is making the person aware of
> his own sin.
>
> The popular story of the woman being stoned for prostitution is a
> good example of this concept. Jesus stopped the stoning and told those
> in the mob to let the person without sin cast the first stone (a
> variation of your "Judge not, that ye be not judged"). In other words,
> he stopped the ACTION of the mob. However, after the mob went away, he
> turned to the woman and told her to go and sin no more. He could not
> have said that without making a judgment that she had indeed sinned.
>

> So, as you can see, you can judge whether a person is sinning (in
> fact, it is almost impossible not to). But the key is what you do
> about it - the actions. The passages you quote above refer to actions,
> not to thoughts or simple statements.

Dwight,

Thank you for a clear, logical and concise explanation of those oft-misunderstood Bible stories. I would add just one thing: Some people say that Jesus knew that some of those who wanted to stone the woman had sinned with her. (They had used her services, so to speak, and were covering up their own sin by killing the only witness). He showed them that He knew what their real motives were. I think in this Bible story there is a description of how Jesus began to write in the dust and those who would have stoned the woman drifted away until none were left. The Bible does not record what He wrote, but many say it was a description of the sins of those with the stones in their hands.

Great job, Dwight. Thanks again.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1175. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 18:50:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn218rc.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24271

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 19:00:10 GMT, KC8LDO wrote:

>An aquaintance of mine has been in the employ of the FCC satellite office in
>Dearborn since the beginning of the month.

The FCC Regional Director has assured me in direct private e-mail
that the FCC is not hiring any private inmvestigators to do
enforcement work, and that the FCC does not have any "satellite"
office in Dearborn. (The Detroit office is in Farmington Hills.)

Either your acquaintance is falsehooding you or you are doing it to us.

Which is it?
--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
West Coast Chapter President
FCC Survivors and Alumni Association

1176. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 19:41:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn22mge.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24272

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 01:13:02 GMT, Richard McCollum wrote:

>> No, the secret message is:
>>
>> "Be sure to drink your Ovaltine"

>Helps build strong bodies 8 or 12 ways!

That was/is Wonder Bread, known around this household as Balloon
Bread.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1177. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 20:08:22 UTC
From: DJ <kb5ylg@attglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3bf96957_2@news1.prserv.net>
Source record: 24273

Well, a couple of responses for you.

First keep in mind that quite a few members of the Amateur Radio Service are getting to be elderly. That doesn't excuse bad behavior. But as a general rule, the older we get, the more ailments we succumb to. And the more medicine we take. And some of the medicines and ailments most assuredly can make us grouchy and generally impolite. Bear in mind that the same fellow who comes across as immature, emotional, and very rude may have once made very significant contributions to the world community with his technical achievements or many services to the public. That's not to absolve any individual of the responsibility to maintain courtesy. But it does absolve the entire amateur radio service from bearing the blame for the problems of a few individuals.

Bear in mind also the fact of the purposes of the Amateur Radio Service. Technical proficiency and public service and international good will, to summarize. I have found some of the noisiest mean old codgers to also be very experienced and knowledgable and helpful, if your skin is thick enough to put up with their weird senses of humor and poor manners.

Maybe a person's lack of tolerance for a Ham is more of a testament to his own maturity and flexibility than it is of the Ham who has led a long life of service.

Go figure.

David KB5YLG

"Bman" <bman@niagara.com> wrote in message
news:3bf83a37.693070113@news.niagara.com...
> I've got my basic qualification as an amateur radio operator but I
> have yet to grab hold of any gear or even a call sign as of yet.
>
> What I stopped here to say is that I am absolutely amazed at the level
> of conversation in this newsgroup. I had kind of always thought that
> everyone who had the perseverance and knowledge to become an amateur
> radio operator was someone with a bit more je ne sais quois over the
> average folk.
>
> I mean, in days gone by before the Internet was a household word you
> might have been online with one or more bulletin board systems. And
> indeed there, and on the Internet, anyone with the sense enough to
> turn on their computer and have it dial another could post anything
> they wanted for all to see and show whoever would read how immature
> and petty and feeble they really are.
>

> Now I see that there is no higher intellect even in the world of
> amateur radio where you're supposed to be qualified and probably
> should know the Morse code and obey a few basic rules of civility,
> that anyone can encounter just as many children on the airwaves as
> they can on any other public forum.
>
> So here's my two cents for y'all to digest and fight over for the next
> century until your hobby dies - screw the Morse code requirement and
> let everybody on the air regardless - it doesn't raise anybody's level
> of intelligence or maturity and it certainly doesn't force anyone to
> be civil in a public forum, and as for a good means of communicating,
> it stinks!
>
> I know it has its uses, but as most of the posts (hundreds in just a
> couple days) here seem to indicate, many of the people here haven't
> any uses for the common man. Just one more good reason why I shouldn't
> even bother spending the money, I guess. Probably was a really
> interesting hobby in the days when it was really about the interest
> and not about the inane and utterly useless banter seen around here.
>
> Congratulations, you may now turn over your licences and become a
> normal moron like everyone else.
>
> Byron
>

1178. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 20:10:39 UTC
From: "Mr. Know-it-all" <rs@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <01c17135$c0b9ec20$82878685@clip>
Source record: 24274
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Leland C. Scott <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in article
<9tbe1a$ac9$1@news.bignet.net>...
>
> <Leland C. Scott@cotse.net (KC8LDO)> wrote in message
> news:_yTJ7.29436$xS6.47461@www.newsranger.com...
An aquaintance of mine has been in the employ of the FCC satellite office
in Dearborn since the beginning of the month. The busts are coming down
on illegal cb and equipment manufactures.

Oh no, I don't know if I can sleep at night now after hearing this. I
better
go home and hide all my shit.

Hams should not be encouraging this type behavior
by freely giving mod information just to show off.(you know who you are)
This is the type behavior that ruined cb by messing it up for all of us law

abiding citizens.

Oh yes.....the Hams freely giving mod information ruined CB. Unfuckingreal.
I never met a ham yet that would freely give mod info on CB equipment
unless he was a Cb'er too. Most would sooner cut their left nut off than
help a Cb'er do anything.
Furthermore....I fail to see how mod information "ruined" CB. If anything
it
is better/quieter now than in the past 30 years I can recall. You can
actually
carry on a decent conversation pretty much anywhere you want with
a few exceptions where you get the music, incessant blabbering etc., and
I guarantee you will find all that same garbage going on right on 20 & 75m.
And.....I would sooner see a ham giving out useful information, rather
than that wonderful representative of hamdom N8WWM and other
garabagemiesters (is that a word?) in here posting
under more names than you can count on both hands and feet with
totally usless shit.
Mr. K

1179. Heads up folks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 20:31:32 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net>
Message-ID: <E_dK7.15$q46.1221@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 24275

Hey Richard,

Heads up. You enjoying the new rash of forged posts? I must be getting under somebody's skin in the other group. This always seems to happen when they can't rationally debate their arguments anymore. I'll bet it's either Twistedhed and or Moparholic up to their dirty tricks. I'll also wager the Aaron post is a forge as well.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

--
"It is difficult to make a man miserable while
he feels worthy of himself and claims
kindred to the great God who made
him."

Abraham Lincoln

1180. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 20:40:08 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net>
Message-ID: <I6eK7.16$q46.1158@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 24276
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011119124228.775$vE@newsreader.com...
> What the hell is this crap Leland ?

You tell me Mopar. Somebody is going spastic at the keyboard posting messages with my name. I know you guys in the CB news group like to fight dirty so don't complain when your name gets mentioned. If you don't like it then there is one sure way to stop it, and that's to quit playing silly games. I can assure you I have ZERO intentions of ever stopping from posting messages to the news group.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

--
"A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin
of little minds."

Ralph Waldo Emerson

1181. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 20:49:33 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B952C594E223D106.37224116CAC9CE71.23FA8DA2F71FF67F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24277

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 05:41:53 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Neat. There's a prof up east who teaches that blacks designed and built
>the pyramids and invented the airplane. Hotep! (Kids--don't believe
>everything you're taught in college).

Black slave labor undoubtedly DID contribute to the
construction of the pyramids--and the airplane was actually invented
by Leonardo DaVinci quite some time before the Wright Brothers.

I assume the "prof up east" you are referring to is Leonard
Jefferies at CCNY. Jefferies is rather well known as an
African-American extremist, despite being an excellent scholar in
other areas.

Don't, btw, confuse what a professor may _claim_ in such
outrageous cases with what he can demonstrate by reference to
legitimate research--that's like confusing a ham's claims concerning a
given transceiver with the manufacturer's specifications--one
represents opinion the other represents scientific information.

It's a shame you don't accept the evidence of research, or
that you can't clearly see the difference between a reference to
research and an unsupported claim. Obviously, one of the things you
didn't believe when you were taught it in college was the difference
between science and belief.

>> Do I defend porn as harmless? No I don't. Thanks to the sick
>> "let 'em see blood and violence but not sex and love" mentality of the
>> American moralists, our adult films are limited to those that are the
>> most sexually objectifying of any made in the world. We don't even
>> attempt to make sensitive, caring, women-centered, erotic films
>> because the moralists would just demand that they be censored anyway.
>
>Yeah, that's why we don't have them.

Dave, you agreed with me. Are you feeling well today?

>Certainly depends upon one's actions in that adult sexual behavior.
>Watching it in a porn film lowers the viewer to the level of voyeur.
>As to some of the acts depicted, I guess it sometimes depends on whether
>you're kicking off or receiving, huh?

I would argue that it does NOT depend on one's actions in that
behavior. So long as all participants are adults and freely consent to
the activity, there is no legitimate reason anyone should judge the

"Morality" of that behavior except the participants.

As far as porn goes. I disagree that it lowers the viewer to
the level of voyeur. While I don't personally enjoy porn, that's
strictly a matter of individual taste (I don't like a lot of very
excellent films in other genres either). From a psychological
standpoint, vision is one of our most direct forms of sexual
stimulation--seeing a sexually desirable partner engaged in sexual
behavior is arousing for most normal people. That hardly makes the
majority of society voyeurs.

Porn, particularly in the US (some of the European work is
much better--and has much better acting and scripting), does a very
poor job of representing real human sexual behavior. For that reason,
it is a fairly poor introduction to sexual activities. It isn't
harmful, it just doesn't communicate accurately. As a logical result,
the acts depicted don't realistically represent real-world experience.

>> Which Usenet newsgroup are YOU reading? In rrap the concept of
>> code testing is as strongly argued by the pro-code group today as it
>> was over a year ago when it was still an issue.
>
>Well, one-sided Rick, it would appear that the opposition hasn't let up
>a lick either. Me, I've learned to live with it having realized that
>most things degenerate toward chaos. Ham radio isn't any different.

The opposition DOES have one difference from the pro-code
group, however, they are arguing that the current status demonstrates
that loss of the code didn't bring an "end" to ham radio--as the
pro-code group STILL argue it will do.

Frankly, BOTH sides of the argument are pretty pointless.
Right now a 5WPM test is required. After 2003 it's pretty likely that
no code test at all will be required. The only way we'll know if the
doom-and-gloom squad are right will be to watch and see what happens
then.

Rick--KE8HH

>
>
>Dave K8MN

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1182. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 20:54:54 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net>
Message-ID: <ykeK7.19$q46.1396@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 24278
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn218rc.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> Either your acquaintance is falsehooding you or you are doing it to us.
>
> Which is it?

Neither one Phil. Seems like there is a CBer, who goes by the Handle of "Twistedhed", on the "rec.radio.cb" news group. He made some comments about freebanding etc., and I suggested that he contact you since you had in fact worked for the FCC doing some enforcement activity, and could give him the straight deal right from somebody who has done it. Needless to say he wiggled every which way he could to avoid the issue that he does not have to courage to contact you to ask some questions. In fact he's mad as heck about be branded a chicken on the group for not contacting you. So he spends hours forging messages from me (there are several on this group alone right now), or several others, as a means to get even, and hopefully to discredit the "framed" individual with obvious crazy comments in the messages. However it seems like he can't even get his facts straight for something as simple as the location of the Detroit FCC field office.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

--
"I care about truth not for truth's sake
but for my own."

Samuel Butler

1183. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 21:03:36 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF8BB6B.D4242924@mailcity.net>
Source record: 24279

Krell wrote:

>

> I don't see anything "evil" about the callsign, so the answer is obvious.

There is nothing 'evil' or illegal about the call sign, just show
a lack of class and taste...the trailer park mentality.

1184. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 21:11:52 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4D9BA1F26068ED76.EA204CDD32ACC361.3EF1D552487D2E55@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24280

On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:56 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Well, speaking only for myself, my values are based on traditional,
>conventional morality -- which doesn't allow for the "acceptance" of
>deviant sexual behavior. Therefore, I feel fully justified in making a
>negative "judgment" of such perversion. You see, I don't belong to this
>New Age cult of people who don't think it is right to be judgmental. I'm
>judgmental as all get out, and damn proud of it! If you can't see your way
>clear to judge people for their negative, anti-social behavior, then don't
>worry -- I'm more than capable of doing it for you!

Larry, you and everyone else are perfectly within your rights
to decide for yourself whether a given behavior is "Moral" or not.
What neither you nor others have the right to do, however, is to treat
those who don't share your personal values as being in any way
inferior to you or as demonstrating lower moral values.

You state that you have every right to be judgemental--and
that it is a New Age view that you shouldn't. No, Larry, actually it's
one of your CONSERVATIVE values that states you shouldn't.
Christianity DEMANDS that its adherents not judge others (read that
bible so many of you right wing reactionaries insist on thumping).

Obviously, one very great difference exists between our
personal moral values. I believe it wrong to judge others on the basis
of whether they adhere to my personal values or not. You believe it
appropriate to do so. My moral values do NOT contradict my beliefs in
this area. Your's (assuming you claim to be a Christian--perhaps you
aren't in which case that don't apply) DO contradict your beliefs in
this area. Thus I adhere to my moral values while you violate your
own.

Gee, Larry, I guess that makes YOU the immoral person in the
discussion, doesn't it?

BTW, I'm not a New Ager. I'm a Buddhist. They aren't the same
thing, even though they share the principle of not judging others.

>> It's totally unreasonable to argue that someone's sexual
>>preference is "immoral" or "wrong" simply because you don't personally
>>share it--that's the mark of the bigot, not of someone with any
>>integrity.
>
>Actually, it's the other way around, but you seem to lack the maturity
>or intellectual integrity to understand the difference.

In other words, it is totally REASONABLE to argue that someone
is immoral or wrong because you personally don't share his/her
preferences?

Here:

KKKKQQQQJJJJ1010101099998888777766665555444433332222AAAAJoJo

Help yourself--you're obviously not playing with a full deck,
so I thought I'd provide you the cards to fill in the blanks.

>> It IS interesting, though, to note that in our society it's
>>perfectly ok to pay someone to cause you pain, but not pleasure. It
>>sort of typifies the sick "morality" that permeates our culture thanks
>>to those who believe that THEIR moral values are the only legitimate
>>ones and that people must be protected from themselves. It's a sick
>>concept, but one very common to US culture.
>
>And after having said all that, you can't see your way clear to condemn
>it? Well, Junior, maybe when you grow up, and don't think you need
>to follow the crowd in order to gain acceptance, you'll develop some
>independent thought. Until then, you'll continue to sound like the
>weak-willed wanker you are now.

Junior, Larry?

I'm 56 years old.

Perhaps that's junior to you--but not to most people.

I'm totally confused by what you are trying to say here.

Are you saying that I should condemn _society_ for having sick
moral values? I'll agree with that--but I doubt that it's what you
meant.

Are you saying that I should condemn actions that cause pain
because society permits them? That's idiotic. I don't _personally_
happen to enjoy either giving or receiving pain, but that doesn't mean
I have the right or reason to condemn those who DO enjoy doing so (in
a consensual setting, of course).

Are you saying that I should condemn acts that give pleasure
because the majority of my culture does so? Why should I? That would
imply that society is the legitimate authority on what is "moral," a
rather absurd concept, given the nature of our system of government.

Sorry Larry, but you really need to make yourself clear when
you make accusations or statements like that.

You claim I follow the crowd, yet my _criticism_ is of the
crowd mentality that condemns those who DON'T follow their dictates.
That doesn't sound like I'm "following the crowd" to me.

>Well, Junior, I can live with being thought of as a self-righteous bigot
>by the likes of you, because what you think of me doesn't mean a damn

>thing to me in the first place!

Well, Fuddy-Duddy, I can understand that completely. After all
those who are self-righteous and bigoted seldom DO care what others
think--they're too busy hating everyone to listen.

>Tell you what, Junior -- you worry about yourself, and don't worry about
>me! I don't stay awake at night worrying about what people like you
>think about me. I don't expect that to make you stop whining, but at least
>you now know that you have the option of making better use of your time.

I don't worry about you Larry, you're so busy condemning
others who disagree with your narrow-minded bigotry that you don't
deserve it.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1185. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 21:23:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6F3AD7A696002CDC.5F95A8D7C9F86E8A.55CE06A960A4ACA4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24281

On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:53 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Yet another futile demand for me to "prove" something. I have *nothing*
>to prove, Kim, because I did not choose to select a Vanity call sign that
>was assessed by Riley Hollingsworth as capable of taking the ARS
>"...one step closer to extinction." In case you haven't noticed, this
>thread is about you and your callsign -- not me. If you truly believe your
>callsign is harmless to the positive image of the ARS, then YOU prove
>it. However, be warned -- Mr. Hollingsworth's words will always be there
>to haunt you!

Give it up, Kim.

Larry is only capable of making CLAIMS--he isn't capable of
PROVING them--that would require that he be correct in the first place
and he never is.

As far as Hollingsworth goes, I really wasn't aware that the
FCC employed psychics--because that's EXACTLY what it would take to
make such a claim with any basis greater than personal opinion. And
while I'm sure Hollingsworth is an intelligent and capable individual,
his personal opinion is of no greater value than mine or anyone elses.

It isn't up to Kim to prove she is NOT hurting ham radio--it's
up to those who accuse her of doing so to prove she IS. Even a bigot
like yourself should be able to recognize that a person is innocent
until proven guilty, at least in the US. You made the accusation. You
demonstrate its accuracy.

Better yet, since you believe that it is Kim's responsibility
to "prove" that she isn't hurting ham radio, let's turn the accusation
around. I honestly believe that the kind of bigotry and racism you
commonly display in this newsgroup--which is read by many prospective
hams--is VERY harmful to ham radio. Since you believe the accused
should prove that the accusation is false, it is now YOUR turn to
prove that YOU are not harming the ARS!

Take you pick, Larry. Prove Kim IS harming ham radio, or prove
you are NOT doing so. But if you do neither, all you do is prove that
your claims are totally groundless and aimed at harming Kim, not
serving the amateur community.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1186. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 21:28:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6FE5FE7DCE258B31.FA6E6A4F558CEC0F.664B0425CE649FAB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24282

On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:53 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Prove what, Kim? The potential damage your callsign can do to the ARS is
>self-apparent. I have nothing to prove; however, you'd have an insurmountable
>task if required to prove that your callsign is harmless to the positive image
>of the ARS.

There's nothing "self-apparent" about it, Larry. It's purely a
matter of personal opinion.

If you want to pick on something that IS harmful to amateur
radio's image--why not get on a tirade about the "Liberty Net"
instead? Or is the fact that you agree with their racism and bigotry
enough to make you think they aren't at all harmful?

Clean up your OWN act before you start trying to criticize
others.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1187. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 21:30:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <357943AB32F68A4F.B3EBADC422C4EF3B.43E6070CED258E0F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24283

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 23:58:23 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Here's your argument applied to you, Larry. If you cannot
>prove that you are not a rapist, then that you are one is
>self-apparent. Don't you ever learn?

He's not a rapist, Cecil.

Rapists don't have to take Viagra to perform.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1188. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 21:35:57 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net>
Message-ID: <1XeK7.28$q46.2311@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 24284
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011119154545.217$Tg@newsreader.com...

> Aftrall, you have forged people yourself.

You would be suprised to find out that I don't. And since I don't in over 2 years on this group NOBODY has ever PROVED I have done so, even you can't prove it. Several others on this group have had their accounts canned and no longer post through their orignal ISP, however I do. That's becasue anyone silly enough to send a complaint to my ISP gets the complaint canned becasue they have the posting logs and know for a fact what everyone on this group can only guess about, incorrectly that is.

However on the other hand you seem to like making late night phones calls until you discovered the calls you made got traced back to you. The phone company will and does prosecute people for that crap Mopar.

Given that bit of B.S. Mopar I would not put it passed you to take the same route like Twisted, and several others, by posting forged messages in various news groups. You can't intelligently debate the issues can you? And you don't have the guts to post your real name here either. You and Twisted look good together taking turns sitting on the same clutch of eggs.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

ARRL Member
NCI Member

--
"That's easy to explain. As another poster a short time back said about
Part 95 rules "I don't care", well you see what happens when that mind
set gets applied in a different context. It is very apparent they,
the terrorists, didn't care about human life either,
including their own. "

Regarding the WTC attack on 9/11/01

1189. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 21:50:56 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <95D117631083AE03.0B5DE3947118C352.5F8C2CC703B840D9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24285

On 19 Nov 2001 13:03:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Callsigns like Kim's make the ARS a little less G-rated. Many prospective hams
>and the parents of prospective hams will have a less-positive impression of ham
>radio after encountering such callsigns. It would be better for the ARS if hams
>did not pick such vanity calls because they are inappropriate for the ARS.

Jim, have you listened on 75m recently--or on a 2m repeater in
the average city?

If you're concerned with the image the parents of prospective
hams will have, consider the filth, bigotry, racism, hate speech, and
deliberate jamming activities you COMMONLY hear in those bands.

If you, Larry, and others want to clean up ham radio, the
place to start is with the Liberty Net and other racist groups, not
with the mildly risque call Kim selected.

Talk to the average parent of a child old enough (and mature
enough) to become a ham. Ask him or her if it would trouble them to
know that a woman has the call sign W5TIT. Then ask them if it would
trouble them to know that a group of hams meat on 75m on Saturday
nights to discuss issues of interest to them as white power advocates.
Perhaps elderly bigots like Larry who grew up in environments where
racism was acceptable but sex wasn't would say the call sign was a
problem--but most modern parents would rather quickly tell you that
the call wasn't a problem--but that they would NEVER expose their
children to that kind of bigotry and hate.

We don't live in the 1940s anymore. Today "TIT" is a common
word on prime time TV, and no one is offended in the slightest. Hate
and bigotry, such as Larry and Dick often display in this group, on
the other hand, very definitely DO offend today's society.

>It should be noted that not only did Kim pick out that callsign, but she
>recommended similar callsigns to others as vanity calls.

Ok, I'll tell you what. To "offset" Kim's call, I'll get my
own vanity call (I've been thinking of getting one anyway) that will
compensate for the "TIT" in hers.

How would W8GOD be? No one could ever claim THAT call had an
offensive sexual connotation to it--and it IS available.

Besides, that way when people call me by my suffix (as someone
claimed people would call Kim), they certainly won't be offending
anyone else by calling "Hey, God, what about . . ."

Of course, I'll have to avoid being on the air Sundays or
everyone will be calling me, but . . .

>It is perfectly clear from reading Kim's posts that she chose that callsign for
>its attention and giggle factors, and doesn't see the harm in it.

Probably because there ISN'T any harm in it!

> The only way
>she would give it up is if the FCC revoked it.

Would you give up YOUR call if people here demanded you do so?

> That's probably not gonna
>happen, because the FCC doesn't forbid such callsigns, and Kim doesn't change
>her mind very often.

Sounds to me as though the people here feel the call sign is a
lot more harmful than the FCC does. Of course, what would they know,
they just regulate the radio spectrum.

>So the operative question is: Which is the lesser of two evils - callsigns like
>Kim's, or having the FCC enact and enforce a list of forbidden ARS callsigns?

How about a third choice: Learn to tolerate that which offends
you personally but doesn't hurt others and concentrate on stopping
behaviors that do?

Call signs like Kim's hurt no one. If the FCC enacts a list of
forbidden call signs all they are doing is capitulating to the
pressure of a religion that teaches it's followers that the human body
is evil and sinful and cannot be mentioned in public. If they're going
to make such terms forbidden, then by all means calls that end in
"LEG," "ARM," "TOE," "EAR," or "EYE" have to go as well. After all,
the FCC has no right legally to restrict anything based on religious
values, so the only legal basis for forbidding calls such as Kim's
would be to restrict anything that had to do with the body at all.

Rick--KE8HH <--who may soon be GOD!

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1190. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:09:13 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <85F5F56A510FBDC1.89C2716D93C1DA39.8C652644BD0E6BC7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24286

On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:54 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Actually, I engage in a simple expression of the truth.

As you perceive it to be, not as it actually is.

> However, it's
>not the trendy, liberal, touchy-feely, politically-correct version that you
>prefer.

Translation: Your views are racist and bigoted and you're
proud of it!

> However, I can live with your disagreement, and have no axe
>to grind that makes me desperate to seen as "open minded" in today's
>twisted, liberal, PC definition of the term.

Open minded means being willing to look at other views than
your own without prejudging them. I can well understand that you
wouldn't want to be seen as open-minded. It would imply that you
weren't prejudiced.

> I am a truly independent
>thinker --

You are a bigot who follows the lead of other bigots.
Independent thought would require you to at least investigate the
roots of your beliefs and to try to determine if they accurately
reflect reality (hint: they don't!), something you are unwilling to
do.

> something you obviously don't feel you have the freedom to
>be. I can understand your discomfort, but don't feel any need to
>relieve it.

As uptight as you normally present yourself to be, I doubt you
would allow yourself to feel any need to relieve yourself, let alone
others.

>Chant your libertine (note that I didn't say "libertarian") mantra all you
>want, Cecil. You have no control over my thought processes, although
>it is apparent that others have plenty of control over yours!

What an absurd accusation. You adhere to out-of-date
stereotypes and prejudices, argue that we have to live up to a moral
standard set by your religion, and have the gaul to accuse OTHERS of
letting others control their thought processes?

What a twerp!

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1191. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:09:44 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C1D2462668A30844.A63842FF04CBFA77.B7D40738FAD54C99@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24287

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 23:59:40 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Actually, I engage in a simple expression of the truth.
>
>Just like Hitler did, Larry, just like Hitler did.

What a nasty thing to say about Hitler!

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1192. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:15:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A7DC1D58988C15F8.8073995EE0C1C2D5.5A584B4430D4EA6B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24288

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 05:57:51 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and called me and
>idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.

What has one to do with the other?

A comparison is NOT a closed minded presentation--I'm only
going by what I see demonstrated. If a person doesn't want to be
compared to Hitler, s/he need only stop acting like Hitler.

As far as calling you an idiot--that isn't a question of
closed mindedness, it's a simple statement of fact.

>> On the other hand, I don't happen to view open-mindedness as a
>> flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded person
>> who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
>
>Damn! Another judgement.

No, Dave, it's an OPINION. Read the very clear statement that
it represents my perception only. Show me a closed-minded person who
does NOT demonstrate a serious character flaw by his/her
closed-mindedness and I'll be more than willing to change my opinion.

Rick--KE8HH
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1193. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:17:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <579449DA77FEBEE4.8A2DD780D80BD59F.ED8071C1E1FF7BDD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24289

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 05:48:31 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was pretty born
>with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...

Not new--I just dropped out of it for a year or so when the
code/no-code wars got too ridiculous (not that they've stopped yet!).

Feel sorry for Dave. If he was born with a silver spoon, no
wonder everything seems to leave a bitter taste in his mouth.

Perhaps he should shove that spoon somewhere else . . .

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1194. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:22:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CB9BB036330A99B2.C352721E3C2B54B3.0C6161BCA4687727@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24290

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 15:38:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>You couldn't be more off the beam than you are with this post, Tugboat.

Don't mind him, Kim.

He can't help but refer to you as tugboat. He connects your
"TIT" to his favorite reading material--Little Annie Fannie--and
Tugboat Annie just leaps into his mind.

>Some of us rise above our beginnings.

Sort of bubbled to the top of the cess pool, huh?

> It helps to have parents who are
>loving and involved in our upbringing and who provide guidance during
>our formative years.

True.

> My dad, for instance would never have permitted me
>to choose a suggestive callsign back in the days when I first entered
>amateur radio.

Sorry to hear that your father wasn't willing to let you make
your own decisions. I can see why you envy those with loving and
involved parents.

> I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of the
>present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
>involvement at all.

Really?

That's a shame.

A good parent would have shared the experience with you and
used the opportunity to teach you about racism and bigotry. Sorry
yours was oppressive instead, but I'm sure you could work to overcome
that if you tried.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1195. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:23:37 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <774AFDCCED62CF31.AD6AE53DF562B00C.84A95EFEA22341F2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24291

On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:57 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Hey Dick -- is this guy in L-O-V-E with Kim or what?

Never met or talked to her, Larry, sorry. I just oppose bigots
on principle, not because I have a hidden agenda to fulfil.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1196. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:27:26 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F4B7DC0CE34E4891.A90E94792693726E.D88632A29CE6A5CC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24292

On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:55 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Cecil, you are a prototypical liberal offense-taker. Only now, you
>also call your credibility into question. I'm starting to think that you,
>like Rick "Junior" Adams, have some kind of personal axe you'd
>like to "grind" with Kim!

An axe to grind, Larry? If you meant that literally, it's
absurd since I've been arguing on HER side throughout this thread. If
that was meant to be a sexual innuendo, then it's pretty obvious that
the "morality" you pretend to adhere to has a lot of very flexible
aspects--or at least you treat it as though it did.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1197. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:32:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011119173207.09691.00000571@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 24293

>On 19 Nov 2001 13:03:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Callsigns like Kim's make the ARS a little less G-rated.

That they do, but there are others out there.....

KC4UNT (a sequentially issued callsign), KD1CK, W5ASS and others....

Can we try something other than callsigns again? I thought this thing
about Kim's call died it's natural death a few months ago.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1198. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:32:33 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF98881.FBD96940@uci.edu>
Source record: 24298

Rick Adams wrote:

> A comparison is NOT a closed minded presentation--I'm only
> going by what I see demonstrated. If a person doesn't want to be
> compared to Hitler, s/he need only stop acting like Hitler.

> As far as calling you an idiot--that isn't a question of
> closed mindedness, it's a simple statement of fact.

Actually Rick, it's just more namecalling. Try to come up with
something original. Calling somone a name proves nothing, and
accomplishes nothing
other than to show that the namecaller ran out of cogent arguments.

1199. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:34:46 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C8D4623C8997F9A1.84DB8FE90DC3AB53.7F805C1D34A75AC3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24294

On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:57 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I just figured it out. Rick must be around 5' 7" and over 300 lbs.
>himself -- and sees Kim as a fine figure of a woman! Thus his
>total, hardly disguised inFATuation with her, and his manly defense
>of her honor here on this newsgroup! That, or he's just another
>no-code wanker! Oh, well!

Nice try Larry.

1. I'm 6'3" and weigh 205.

2. I don't happen to judge women on their weight--I judge them
on their personality. Whether Kim is a size 6 or a size 24 is totally
irrelevant to me--from everything I've seen of her here in the NG she
appears to be a great person and one I would enjoy having as a friend.

Sorry to hear you're so prejudiced against those who are
overweight (if, in fact, Kim IS overweight)--it really marks you as
even more of a cretin than you formerly seemed. I know a number of
fantastic women who are overweight--some by quite a considerable
amount--and I'm sure they have to put up with obnoxious people like
you all the time.

For someone who CLAIMS not to want anyone to create a bad
image of hams, you certainly delight in demonstrating that some hams
are offensive, racist, bigoted, and sexist. You may not have "TIT" in
your call sign--but you have ASSHOLE written all over your face
instead.

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1200. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:35:29 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AADAC89D02997631.51680143E68C833F.E556D415D09B72F4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24295

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 04:57:04 GMT, JJ <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote:

>
>
>CAM wrote:
>
>>
>> Yep, I'm a Libertarian
>
>Now I know why I pay no attention to what you say.

Why? Is Libertarian philosophy too sophisticated for you to
understand?

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1201. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:36:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7E8DE06779D149EB.BA1F64B5331C102D.C68694ADCF84F62B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24296

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 00:58:09 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Well, those are minor differences. Is there any major difference between
>you and the Taliban's Dept. of Vice and Virtue?

The Taliban practice what they preach?

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1202. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:38:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4C71FC74554F1058.93BE79F0505EDCC4.13198EBF596376FA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24297

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 21:57:12 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Yep. After a while it's like batting around a damp, limp, ragged mouse. ;)

I'll have to ask one of my cats about that one--I never tried
it! :-)

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1203. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:40:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <72FA2BF11272114E.452979A34A354C60.ACEE97AFDD93A963@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24299

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 05:49:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Here's your translation, Rick. The question has absolutely no bearing
>on the discussion at hand. There is no pretense because there is no
>relevance. You don't strike me as particularly bright for a university
>prof.

Really?

I've got you, Larry, and Dick on the defensive, don't I?

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1204. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:48:37 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <Twistedhed@wettv.net>
Message-ID: <9%fK7.172$q46.3094@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 24203
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011119170437.580$Fw@newsreader.com...
> What in thr hell are you babbling about now ?
> I've NEVER called you !

So why are you so worried about my comment then? Funny how the phone rings, then I post a message a minute later after the call, then you call ragging about my comment a minute after that, then a message appears on the news group (from you) with the same comment only in written form. I next post a message about the calls being traced, and guess what Mopar, no more calls. Gee, and you are going to tell me it's not you? Then considering all the nice offers you made to come up here to meet me after the phone deal, even Twisted is a better liar than that!

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

--
"We cannot tell what may happen to us in the
strange medley of life. But we can decide
what happens in us - how we take it,
what we do with it - and that is what
really counts in the end."

Joseph Fort Newton

1205. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:49:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1325EE9A9ECEF453.32AC3A039046B4C8.AB4F243DB9EB3606@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24300

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 01:06:08 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>Hopefully, now that we have nearly won the war there, we
>can win the peace. That we don't f_ck it up again. That
>we can give them just enough help (and not more) so that
>they can build their nation themselves that turns out to be a
>good place for all of them. Whether or not it can actually
>happen, well....

I agree with you completely.

While I oppose war on principle (and, yes, I know that makes
me a hypocrite since I pulled two tours in Vietnam voluntarily), there
are times when I can see the need for it. Right now, we are
effectively correcting the mistakes we made when we assisted the
terrorists in Afghanistan in the first place. If we stop at the point
of restoring a government of the people to Afghanistan and then leave
them alone, we'll have actually done some good.

Of course, I don't actually expect us to do that--after all,
the US isn't exactly known for keeping its nose out of other nations
affairs, but it's a nice fantasy.

One thing I _hope_ we are intelligent enough to do is to
restore the Northern Alliance to power and allow THEM to try Osama bin
Laden (for treason, murder--he DID kill Northern Alliance leaders, and
other charges) instead of arresting him and trying him ourselves. Not
only will that send a clear message that we respect the rights of
sovereign nations to try their own criminals, but it will eliminate
the obvious terrorist threat that will come if we attempt to try him
in the US. Besides, given the nature of Islamic law, it's pretty
likely he'd receive the same punishment--death--from the Afghanis that
he would receive from a "military tribunal" in the US--and the
sentence would be carried out with typical arab speed.

73 de KE8HH--Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1206. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:51:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0C50646C8D8CA452.45A248CB0C330813.8C615552B8B79462@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24201

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 21:58:33 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>> They have a point, Rick. I would have trouble thinking about God
>> if a good looking female in a miniskirt in front of me had her
>> forehead on the floor.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>>
>>
>
>*Ahem* You mean you'd really need the mini-skirt? :>

I'm sure his reaction would be the same if she took off the
mini skirt, too! ;-)

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1207. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 22:56:01 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EACEC58F643D440A.58763F9AE113C41F.BD31D43D47A4CF4E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24202

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 22:01:57 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> I'm will place tongue firmly in cheek to respond. Of course, you're
>absolutely right about the above, but you need to understand the
>American feminist mentality. From their perspective, since men are so
>weak (as described above), it is indeed the men who are forcing women
>to wear veils. If men were stronger, the women there wouldn't have to
>wear veils. So, in the end, it is the men's fault (everything
>perceived as bad is). At this point, feminist usually drift off into
>their common fantasy of a world without men - a world where women run
>around naked in a tropical paradise, have sharing sex with each other
>(not like the "rape sex" between men and women), and so forth.

It's not all that far from radical feminist theory, actually.

According to Andrea Dworkin, for example, "All acts of
intercourse are rapes." Why? Because women have been oppressed for so
long in our society that they don't have the ability to make a
decision as to whether to have sex or not!

> I know that paragraph probably doesn't make much sense, but you try
>to explain the feminist mentality better. I haven't taken the advanced
>course in feminism yet (a subscription to Cosmo).

Bear in mind that the view you expressed above is only valid
for _radical_ feminists--not for other, less extremist, feminists who
are simply trying to secure equal rights, treatment, and wages for
women, something any rational person would consider both reasonable
and desirable.

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1208. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-19 23:41:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BF9989C.97C4619F@uci.edu>
Source record: 24204

Rick Adams wrote:
> 2. I don't happen to judge women on their weight--I judge them
> on their personality. Whether Kim is a size 6 or a size 24 is totally
> irrelevant to me--from everything I've seen of her here in the NG she
> appears to be a great person and one I would enjoy having as a friend.

The funny thing is Rick, the same would probably be true of most of the folks here - believe it or not. If we had met on the air, or at a club meeting, we'd probably get along just fine. We all share the same interest after all. The internet does funny things to people. We don't seem to behave in as socially-acceptable a manner here as we would in person, or on the air. True?

1209. airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 00:27:37 UTC
From: spam@nospam.com
Message-ID: <3bf9a36f.484181896@news.toad.net>
Source record: 24205

f anyone out there is interested in airmobile ham radio, I have started a mailing listr for it. To sign up, email

cqairmobile-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

Joe Della Barba
comm-sel-mel-ia-agi
N3HGB

1210. airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 00:31:03 UTC
From: spam@nospam.com
Message-ID: <3bf9a43b.484386470@news.toad.net>
Source record: 24206

If anyone out there is interested in airmobile ham radio, I have started a mailing listr for it. To sign up, email

cqairmobile-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

Joe Della Barba
comm-sel-mel-ia-agi
N3HGB

1211. Re: Heads up folks

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 00:54:41 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <lRhK7.194573$W8.7299257@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24207

"Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net> wrote in message
news:E_dK7.15$q46.1221@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net...
Hey Richard,

Heads up. You enjoying the new rash of forged posts? I must be getting under somebody's skin in the other group. This always seems to happen when they can't rationally debate their arguments anymore. I'll bet it's either Twistedhed and or Moparholic up to their dirty tricks. I'll also wager the Aaron post is a forge as well.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

Big or small I trash them all. Looks like Aaron is forging Leland these days as well.

1212. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 01:15:49 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bf9b116$0$37108$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 24208

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:e1_J7.117519$WW.7310752@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> I for one am quite adjusted to the demise of code testing. When I did my
> twenty in the seventies I thought before and after that there was no
excuse
> then for anything over 12 but waited until after the fateful Tuesday to
> shoot off the old bazoo. As a testing criterion it is long obsolete but
its
> value in stirring up the court eunuchs and bawling children is priceless.

The seventies were twenty or thirty years ago, and the FCC is not listening
anymore excuses. You may make think its priceless, but I think it a good
way for amateur radio community to lose all its frequencies to others
that make a better case for representing the public interest.
This is not a game.

Larry

1213. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 01:32:32 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tcbq601m40@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24209

"JJ" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3BF8BB6B.D4242924@mailcity.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> >
>
> > I don't see anything "evil" about the callsign, so the answer is
obvious.
>
> There is nothing 'evil' or illegal about the call sign, just show
> a lack of class and taste...the trailer park mentality.

Class and taste are a matter of personal preference. The "trailer park"
mentality is one of religious bias, intolerance, and intellectual
shallowness.

1214. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 01:58:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <IMiK7.176702$3d2.7616743@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24210

"Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:3bf9b116$0$37108$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:e1_J7.117519$WW.7310752@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > I for one am quite adjusted to the demise of code testing. When I did
my
> > twenty in the seventies I thought before and after that there was no
> excuse
> > then for anything over 12 but waited until after the fateful Tuesday to
> > shoot off the old bazoo. As a testing criterion it is long obsolete but
> its
> > value in stirring up the court eunuchs and bawling children is
priceless.
>
> The seventies were twenty or thirty years ago, and the FCC is not
listening
> anymore excuses. You may make think its priceless, but I think it a good
> way for amateur radio community to lose all its frequencies to others
> that make a better case for representing the public interest.
> This is not a game.
>
> Larry
>

There, there. Stomping your foot and holding your breath accomplishes
nothing, Junior.

Why, oh why, do you pubescent creeps feel called upon to recruit us coded
types? It sure as hell cannot be because we could do your 'cause' any good;
that is firmly in the hands of Geneva in 2003. Our opinion, while always
interesting and now and then important, is not and cannot be decisive. So
are we not justified in questioning the motives just a tad?

Sure as hell looks like some sort of mind game to me.

Dick, NBK

1215. Dick McCollum Knows It Will Be Misused..and Doesn't Care

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 02:02:00 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0111191802.7c75dd58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24211

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20011119080346.24612.00000735@nso-cr.aol.com>...
> In article <ABD3D4AA00AD9F44.7B7BF488D34A1588.D30BB60EE817971B@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >It's one thing for hams not to support or condone the use of
> >illegal amps by cbers--but not freely providing information goes
> >contrary to a central principle of amateur radio--that of the free
> >exchange of information and the education of others in radio
> >technology. Sure the information is being misused--but it isn't the
> >responsibility of a ham to determine HOW information is going to be
> >use, only to insure that his/her information is accurate and honest.
>
> What you're saying, Rick, is that a person giving out information bears no
> responsibility for what is done with the information. That idea misses a key
> point: does the information-giver have any expectation that the information
> will be misused?

==========
Subject: Re: Hey Aaron Voobner
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-18 18:52:52 PST
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<OTTJ7.116972$WW.7272060@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> <Leland C. Scott@cotse.net (KC8LDO)> wrote in message
> news:ogTJ7.29417$xS6.47553@www.newsranger.com...
> > Yes Dick it is forges of me. Everyone knows me well enough that
> > I don't have a
> > problem with anyone except hams who use cb and think a tech is half a ham. I
> > don't have a problem with being a technician. I forgot more about radio and
> > computers than any cb loving ham will ever learn. Perhaps you have become jaded
> > giving so much illegal cb advice.
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
> > KC8LDO
> > ARRL Member
> > NRI
> > Member
> >
>
> Find me one post where I ever advised anyone to do or how to do anything
> illegal.

From: Richard McCollum (rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net)

Subject: Re: KLV 350
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-09-09 18:17:46 PST

"Rick Wilcox" <rwilcox3@cfl.rr.com> wrote in message
news:49Um7.63956$aZ.17074868@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com...
> Hi group, I am looking for the mod. for a KLV 350 amp to operate on the
> 11 meter band. It ships setup for operation on the 10 meter band. Can
> respond to my e-mail (rwilcox3@cfl.rr.com) or the group. Thanks in advance
> for any help you can give me....."Porky"
>
>

I would strongly advise finding a good source for EL 509 and 519
tubes.
When you see what it is going to cost you when you drive this beast
beyond
about 150 watts on Antique Modulation you may well rethink the
purchase.
This may well be a fairly clean amp as they go but as with any
broadbanded
tube amp, you are well advised to run it with a good lo-pass filter in
the
output.

As you get the schematic and parts list, in European nomenclature, it
should
not take much to figure out how to mod it.

You might want to find out exactly where it was built. For $170 it
may well
have been Outer Mongolia.

Dick Nï¿½BK

From: Richard McCollum (rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net)
Subject: Re: Linear Amp Question please:
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-10-13 21:30:59 PST

"Jay in the Mojave" <jay123a@qnet.com> wrote in message
news:3BC90AE4.A319B373@qnet.com...
> Hello All: Need a little help here.
>
> Did the Pride DX300 or Pride DX-1000, or any other type models have 2
> each 4CX250 or 4CX350 Tetrote Tubes.
>
> I am of the opinion one of the models had 2 of the Ceramic tubes, yes /
> no.
> Or was there a mod that installed the secong 4CX250 or 4CX350 tube?????
>

> Thanks for any help. Big discussion going on locally.
>
> Jay in the Mojave

Damfino but there is no good reason it couldn't be done. There is
enough
drive available for two in parallel in AB1.

From: Richard McCollum (rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net)
Subject: Re: Linear Amp Question please:
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-10-15 21:07:37 PST

Without reference handy, the 4CX250 should have a current draw on the
order
of 2-3 amps so a .3 drop should take about .1 to .2 ohms at something
over 1
watt.

Curious to see how you solve the problem.

From: Richard McCollum (rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net)
Subject: Re: the question is: can a dc box get in there with a a/c
box???? that is the question.....
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-09-28 02:50:40 PST

"Jay in the Mojave" <jay123a@qnet.com> wrote in message
news:3BB40D65.BBFBDBBD@qnet.com...
> Hello Dick: Its a real kick to see all the trucks and different
> systems at a keydown. I remembering seeing a guy that ran his diodes for
> his large alternator outside the alternator, mounted on a large piece of
> aluminum sheet metal, with the large gage wiring coming and going. I
> believe he even had a thermocouple attached to the middle of the sheet
> metal for monitoring the temperature.
>
> What will they think of next!
>
> Jay in the Mojave
>

Liquid sodium cooling maybe??? Running outside makes some sense but
it
ain't going to happen with sheet metal. For no better reason than the
press-fit diodes would be in trouble when the aluminum expands and the
holes get bigger. Talk about a really catastrophic failure.

1216. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 02:25:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BF906BF.CE4110E9@mailcity.net>
Source record: 24212

Krell wrote:

> Class and taste are a matter of personal preference. The "trailer park"
> mentality is one of religious bias, intolerance, and intellectual
> shallowness.

And some personal preferences are low class and no taste.

1217. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 02:33:42 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <aijK7.60$9d.25581@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24213

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3bf25ada_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> One comment on this subject. I would lay odds that most people who
position
> themselves as high and mighty on morals are on no more than equal ground
> with me--in terms of morals and behavior.
>
> I have a callsign which "seems" to be objectionable to some

As for me, I've seen many a call sign that some would find objectionable...I
could care less.
As long as the individual doesn't use the call with obnoxious
overtones...Let me rephrase that...I only care about how an individual
behaves and relates to others. If I don't like the way they act I can
usually find another frequency.

I usually find that those who make a "mountain out of a mole hill" don't
have a lot to say that is worth hearing.

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

1218. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 03:06:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf9c93a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24214

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:Gd7K7.755$m%.185845@monger.newsread.com...
> >
> > Please do nothing in support of me--do what you will for your own
> > satisfaction, enjoyment, and conversation. Not knowing you, I wouldn't
be
> > able to even give you out some funny ones that would match your
> personality.
> > Also, please remember that I really didn't choose my callsign based on
its
> > obscenity (I don't believe it is obscene)--I chose my callsign because
it
> is
> > the closest thing to *my* vanity (get it...vanity callsign?) that I
could
> > get.
>
> I was only kidding actually..... don't know what callsign I would really
> choose if given the choice..... I just can't stand to see normal people
> preyed upon by these self-righteous self-virtuous people who think they
have
> the right to control others......
>
> >
> > I have a friend who's a ham and has the callsign N5BIG--celebrating his
> > quite large shadow he casts (I think he's probably 6' 2-3" maybe taller,
> and
> > I bet near or a little over 400 pounds).
> >
>
> That might also work for me..... 6'4" and about 250lbs myself. Hmmm....
how
> about something like KT8ALL or something similar.
>
>
> Ryan
>

WOW!!!! I like it!! Hey, you probably didn't think of it this way, but
that's actually a double vanity call: KT8ALL=T_ALL, *AND* KT8ALL=8ALL (ate
all)!!! That'd be neat!

Oh, and on the "preying" concept. Those folks have to have something to do,
right? Better me than someone who couldn't handle it...LOL

Have a wonderful holiday!

Kim W5TIT

1219. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 03:14:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf9cb28_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24215

I've never had such bad experiences on CB. Sorry you have. I have actually had worse experiences on amateur radio than I ever did on CB. I don't think at any time on CB I ever heard a racial slur; turn it on to the '88 machine almost any given weekday morning (especially during the election) and you can hear some of the most hateful, degrading comments I've ever heard on any radio--and that is amateur radio. Most of the time I spent on CB here was on LSB, though. As I understand it, there's a whole other culture on SB. In fact, we didn't even have "handles." We used our names, didn't use the CB lingo, etc. And, no one ever tried to play radio kop.

Heck, one time when the FCC was talking about having a law that any tower over a certain number of feet would have to be painted red and white, one of the gang on '88 keyed up and said if he painted anything on his tower it would be a great big FU. I about drove off the road on that one.

Kim W5TIT

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message news:D34D5803DEAAAB91.2833FAEC0B7956B4.E229F165036EB935@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 16 Nov 2001 21:04:45 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I assure you, Joe, there are many, and more, reliable sources for traffic
> >information in Dallas. One is CB. And, on CB it is OK to "key up" and
make
> >those one way transmissions...
>
> Except that on the fucking CB you can't fucking hear the fucking
> traffic reports over the fucking bullshit, goddammit motherfucker.
>
> Granted, the QRM on some of the local repeaters has gotten that bad at
> times, but only until the problem is DF'd and 'fixed.'
>
> At least on the ham bands, you can get traffic from a halfway
> intelligent source without the extraneous commentary, or some bozo
> deadkeying his 1kW rig. Even what little usefulness the broadcast
> stations had is pretty much gone now that their helicopters are
> grounded.
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

1220. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 03:16:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf9cbcb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24216

Oh? A preppie, then, eh. My dad realizes that I am now an adult and that I make my own decisions.

Kim W5TIT

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:3BF92766.46B8BF0D@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was pretty born
> > with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> You couldn't be more off the beam than you are with this post, Tugboat.
> Some of us rise above our beginnings. It helps to have parents who are
> loving and involved in our upbringing and who provide guidance during
> our formative years. My dad, for instance would never have permitted me
> to choose a suggestive callsign back in the days when I first entered
> amateur radio. I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of the
> present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
> involvement at all.
>
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BF89E3B.9A310597@earthlink.net...
> > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > >
> > > > On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> > > > <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day. By some
> > > > >definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but is a cast
> > iron SOB
> > > > >about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those juvenile,
> > tee hee
> > > > >giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so common it is
> > like
> > > > >stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is one thing,
> > being
> > > > >judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the wind whistles

> > thru
> > > > >and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being
judgemental.
> > > >
> > > > With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose any
> > > > behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
> > > > non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_ open-minded
and
> > > > willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of judging
> > > > others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the same
> > > > behaviors they themselves prefer.
> > >
> > > You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and called me
and
> > > idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.
> > >
> > > > On the other hand, I don't happen to view open-mindedness as
a
> > > > flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded person
> > > > who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
> > >
> > > Damn! Another judgement.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN

1221. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 03:36:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf9d04b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24217

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:95D117631083AE03.0B5DE3947118C352.5F8C2CC703B840D9@lp.airnews.net...
>
[SNIP]
> If they're going
> to make such terms forbidden, then by all means calls that end in
> "LEG," "ARM," "TOE," "EAR," or "EYE" have to go as well.

Oh, stop! You're bringing visions to mind...yes, there they are; all
tangled up...gulp. :)

>
> Rick--KE8HH <--who may soon be GOD!
>

You already are.

>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Kim W5TIT

1222. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 03:42:00 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf9d18f$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24218

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011119173207.09691.00000571@mb-fm.aol.com...
> >On 19 Nov 2001 13:03:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> >>Callsigns like Kim's make the ARS a little less G-rated.
>
> That they do, but there are others out there.....
>
> KC4UNT (a sequentially issued callsign), KD1CK, W5ASS and others....
>
> Can we try something other than callsigns again? I thought this
thing
> about Kim's call died it's natural death a few months ago.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve!!! Dammit...hush. Larry's brought the subject up again--nearly right on time for the holidays, and I am wondering how long he'll run with it this time. I've added the aspect of mathematics to the mix and he's having a difficult time coming up with an effective dodge. I told him to prove that my callsign is a detriment to the ARS, since the numbers indicate he's wrong; membership's up.

So, quiet....shhhhhhh ;)

Kim W5TIT

1223. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 03:47:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf9d2c4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24219

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:C8D4623C8997F9A1.84DB8FE90DC3AB53.7F805C1D34A75AC3@lp.airnews.net...
> On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:57 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >I just figured it out. Rick must be around 5' 7" and over 300 lbs.
> >himself -- and sees Kim as a fine figure of a woman! Thus his
> >total, hardly disguised inFATuation with her, and his manly defense
> >of her honor here on this newsgroup! That, or he's just another
> >no-code wanker! Oh, well!
>
> Nice try Larry.
>
> 1. I'm 6'3" and weigh 205.
>
> 2. I don't happen to judge women on their weight--I judge them
> on their personality. Whether Kim is a size 6 or a size 24 is totally
> irrelevant to me

A 20, actually a 19 but no one makes a 19...LOL Larry just doesn't realize
the gift he misses in being so prejudicial about people. His
loss...certainly not ours.

>
> --from everything I've seen of her here in the NG she
> appears to be a great person and one I would enjoy having as a friend.
>

Thanks. Likewise.

>
> Sorry to hear you're so prejudiced against those who are
> overweight (if, in fact, Kim IS overweight)--it really marks you as
> even more of a cretin than you formerly seemed. I know a number of
> fantastic women who are overweight--some by quite a considerable
> amount--and I'm sure they have to put up with obnoxious people like
> you all the time.
>

Aw, Lar's just jealous...last time I saw his photo (which happened to show
him from a bit higher than waist up...he had lots of cute little rolls
himself. I think Larry practices some form of self-denegration.

>
> For someone who CLAIMS not to want anyone to create a bad
> image of hams, you certainly delight in demonstrating that some hams

> are offensive, racist, bigoted, and sexist. You may not have "TIT" in
> your call sign--but you have ASSHOLE written all over your face
> instead.
>
> Rick--KE8HH
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Kim W5TIT

1224. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 03:48:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf9d301_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24220

Uh huh. ;)

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:4C71FC74554F1058.93BE79F0505EDCC4.13198EBF596376FA@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 21:57:12 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Yep. After a while it's like batting around a damp, limp, ragged mouse.
;)
>
> I'll have to ask one of my cats about that one--I never tried
> it! :-)
>
> 73 de KE8HH, Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1225. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 03:52:00 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bf9d3ee_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24221

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:0C50646C8D8CA452.45A248CB0C330813.8C615552B8B79462@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 21:58:33 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> They have a point, Rick. I would have trouble thinking about God
> >> if a good looking female in a miniskirt in front of me had her
> >> forehead on the floor.
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >>
> >>
> > >*Ahem* You mean you'd really need the mini-skirt? :>
>
> I'm sure his reaction would be the same if she took off the
> mini skirt, too! ;-)
>
> 73 de KE8HH, Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

I'll bet his reaction would be the same if she were robed in several layers.
I mean, it's all just a matter of imagination, right, Cecil? Uh,
Cecil...oh, Cecil...could ya get back over here into the conversation?
Cecil? Cecil?

LOL, Kim W5TIT

1226. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 04:13:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tcl8u$6c$0@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 24222

Rick Adams wrote:
>

To "offset" Kim's call, I'll get my
> own vanity call (I've been thinking of getting one anyway) that will
> compensate for the "TIT" in hers.
>
> How would W8GOD be? No one could ever claim THAT call had an
> offensive sexual connotation to it--and it IS available.
>

Naw.... they'll be glad to issue you W8ANUS though

1227. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 04:40:18 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF9DEB2.AEA90C63@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24223

>
> > > > > What, by the way, is the zip code for "Small Southern Town, U.S.A."?
>

14313? :-)

1228. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 04:43:47 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tcmvl0248p@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24229

"JJ" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3BF906BF.CE4110E9@mailcity.net...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > Class and taste are a matter of personal preference. The "trailer park"
> > mentality is one of religious bias, intolerance, and intellectual
> > shallowness.
>
> And some personal preferences are low class and no taste.

That is a subjective view, and not for you to decide for someone else.

1229. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 04:44:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF9DFC9.807D5187@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24225

Dave Heil wrote:

> Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > Because the Morse/CW mode is the most uniquely practical, effective,
> > > efficient, and universal communications modes available to radio
> > > amateurs -- and this mode has many unique functional characterists which
> > > cannot be exploited without operators trained in the use of the Morse Code.
> >
> > Ask NASA's JPL what they use to communicate with their space probes.
> > It's not morse code. JPL's system gets thru when Morse or anything
> > else would not.
>
> Now if they could just get those probes to stop cratering into the
> surface of the planets they visit, we could see all of this great
> communication in action!

Well, they got that last Mars probe into Mars orbit without hitting Mars.

1230. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 04:57:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3BF9E2C7.D03E0FB5@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24224

I once worked a ham who was a pilot in a 747
operating air moble. Do they use the wings like
a dipole? :-)

Joe Della Barba N3HGB wrote:

> f anyone out there is interested in airmobile ham radio, I have
> started a mailing listr for it. To sign up, email
>
> cqairmobile-subscribe@yahoogroups.com
>
> Joe Della Barba
> comm-sel-mel-ia-agi
> N3HGB

1231. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 04:59:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF9E318.5CD12510@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24226

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 05:57:51 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and called me and
> >idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.
>
> What has one to do with the other?

You are the fellow who arrives with the condesending attitude toward
those you perceive as judgemental. Then you proceed to make judgements.
What am I to believe?

> A comparison is NOT a closed minded presentation--I'm only
> going by what I see demonstrated. If a person doesn't want to be
> compared to Hitler, s/he need only stop acting like Hitler.

...and if you don't wish to be compared to a left leaning 60's,
everything-is-okay kind of guy, quit talking the talk.

> As far as calling you an idiot--that isn't a question of
> closed mindedness, it's a simple statement of fact. You'll note that I haven't resorted
to calling you an idiot. I just think you're naive and misguided.

I don't depend upon you for validation. In fact, I rather think that if
a guy like you thinks I'm an idiot, I must be doing something right.

> >> On the other hand, I don't happen to view open-mindedness as a
> >> flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded person
> >> who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
> >
> >Damn! Another judgement.
>
> No, Dave, it's an OPINION. Read the very clear statement that
> it represents my perception only. Show me a closed-minded person who
> does NOT demonstrate a serious character flaw by his/her
> closed-mindedness and I'll be more than willing to change my opinion.
>
> Rick--KE8HH

We all make judgements in forming opinions, Rick. Being an open-minded
individual does not necessarily mean that one accepts everything as
being good or acceptable. Yet I feel that if I don't agree with your
views, you'd think me close-minded. Is it your belief that someone who
hears your ideas and rejects them after hearing them is close-minded?

Do your views on Christianity represent open-mindedness or close-mindedness?

Dave K8MN

1232. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 05:00:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tco1pakj0@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 24227

Larry Klose wrote:
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:e1_J7.117519$WW.7310752@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > I for one am quite adjusted to the demise of code testing. When I did my
> > twenty in the seventies I thought before and after that there was no
> excuse
> > then for anything over 12 but waited until after the fateful Tuesday to
> > shoot off the old bazoo. As a testing criterion it is long obsolete but
> its
> > value in stirring up the court eunuchs and bawling children is priceless.
>
> The seventies were twenty or thirty years ago, and the FCC is not listening
> anymore excuses. You may make think its priceless, but I think it a good
> way for amateur radio community to lose all its frequencies to others
> that make a better case for representing the public interest.
> This is not a game.

Sure it's a game. You either play or you sit on the sidelinea and carp.

1233. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 05:02:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF9E3E4.50AAA7C4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24228

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 05:48:31 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was pretty born
> >with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...
>
> Not new--I just dropped out of it for a year or so when the
> code/no-code wars got too ridiculous (not that they've stopped yet!).
>
> Feel sorry for Dave. If he was born with a silver spoon, no
> wonder everything seems to leave a bitter taste in his mouth.
>
> Perhaps he should shove that spoon somewhere else . . .

Rick, You've just demonstrated your own lack of class.

Dave K8MN

1234. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 05:09:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF9E578.538BC962@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24230

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 15:38:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >You couldn't be more off the beam than you are with this post, Tugboat.
>
> Don't mind him, Kim.
>
> He can't help but refer to you as tugboat. He connects your
> "TIT" to his favorite reading material--Little Annie Fannie--and
> Tugboat Annie just leaps into his mind.

It would appear that you've never heard of Tugboat Annie either.

> >Some of us rise above our beginnings.
>
> Sort of bubbled to the top of the cess pool, huh?

More of your classiness?

> > It helps to have parents who are
> >loving and involved in our upbringing and who provide guidance during
> >our formative years.
>
> True.
>
> > My dad, for instance would never have permitted me
> >to choose a suggestive callsign back in the days when I first entered
> >amateur radio.
>
> Sorry to hear that your father wasn't willing to let you make
> your own decisions. I can see why you envy those with loving and
> involved parents.

I'd think that someone with your academic credentials would realize that
a child's thought processes are not fully formed. Kids often do stupid
things or things that are wrong. Parents who let their children make
all their own decisions are simply shirking their responsibility toward
the child and society. Nice cheap shot about my parents. My dad was a
succesfuly newsman who became an Episcopal priest.

> > I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of the
> >present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
> >involvement at all.
>

> Really?
>
> That's a shame.
>
> A good parent would have shared the experience with you and
> used the opportunity to teach you about racism and bigotry. Sorry
> yours was oppressive instead, but I'm sure you could work to overcome
> that if you tried.

I'm sure that your kids are super, Rick. What a role model you are.

Dave K8MN

1235. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 05:11:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF9E60F.5BD584C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24231

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 05:49:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Here's your translation, Rick. The question has absolutely no bearing
> >on the discussion at hand. There is no pretense because there is no
> >relevance. You don't strike me as particularly bright for a university
> >prof.
>
> Really?
>
> I've got you, Larry, and Dick on the defensive, don't I?

Is that your overinflated view of your power?

Dave K8MN

1236. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 05:14:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF9E6B1.CD38F2D4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24232

Larry Klose wrote:
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:e1_J7.117519$WW.7310752@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > I for one am quite adjusted to the demise of code testing. When I did my
> > twenty in the seventies I thought before and after that there was no
> excuse
> > then for anything over 12 but waited until after the fateful Tuesday to
> > shoot off the old bazoo. As a testing criterion it is long obsolete but
> its
> > value in stirring up the court eunuchs and bawling children is priceless.
>
> The seventies were twenty or thirty years ago, and the FCC is not listening
> anymore excuses. You may make think its priceless, but I think it a good
> way for amateur radio community to lose all its frequencies to others
> that make a better case for representing the public interest.
> This is not a game.

It is the way you play it, Larry.

Dave K8MN

1237. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 05:19:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BF9E7F4.DCD2A7E7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24233

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Oh? A preppie, then, eh. My dad realizes that I am now an adult and that I
> make my own decisions.
>
> Kim W5TIT

You really don't have a clue, do you, Kim? A preppie? My age group
didn't qualify me. I too am an adult and make my own decisions. Some
of us mature at a faster rate than others. Maybe your decision making
processes will improve as you mature.

Dave K8MN

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF92766.46B8BF0D@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was pretty
> born
> > > with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > You couldn't be more off the beam than you are with this post, Tugboat.
> > Some of us rise above our beginnings. It helps to have parents who are
> > loving and involved in our upbringing and who provide guidance during
> > our formative years. My dad, for instance would never have permitted me
> > to choose a suggestive callsign back in the days when I first entered
> > amateur radio. I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of the
> > present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
> > involvement at all.
> >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BF89E3B.9A310597@earthlink.net...
> > > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> > > > > <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day. By some
> > > > > >definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but is a cast
> > > iron SOB
> > > > > >about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those
> juvenile,

> > > tee hee
> > > > > >giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so common
> it is
> > > like
> > > > > >stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is one
> thing,
> > > being
> > > > > >judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the wind
> whistles
> > > thru
> > > > > >and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being
> judgemental.
> > > > >
> > > > > With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose any
> > > > > behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
> > > > > non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_ open-minded
> and
> > > > > willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of judging
> > > > > others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the same
> > > > > behaviors they themselves prefer.
> > > >
> > > > You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and called me
> and
> > > > idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.
> > > >
> > > > > On the other hand, I don't happen to view open-mindedness as
> a
> > > > > flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded person
> > > > > who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
> > > >
> > > > Damn! Another judgement.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN

1238. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 06:03:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF9F227.39851DD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24234

Roger Halstead wrote:
> As for me, I've seen many a call sign that some would find objectionable...I
> could care less.

How about W5BM? (Sorry, Louis)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1239. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 06:06:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF9F2F6.E27AC095@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24235

Rick Adams wrote:
> As far as porn goes. I disagree that it lowers the viewer to
> the level of voyeur.

Did you hear the FCC is unhappy with Victoria's Secret for
their recent fashion show on TV? What's the world coming
to when the most beautiful thing in the whole world
causes objections?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1240. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 06:14:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF9F4B4.C34773C0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24236

JJ wrote:
> And some personal preferences are low class and no taste.

Care to provide a reference for that statement? Is there
published a dictionary of class and taste?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1241. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 06:19:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF9F60B.A7300972@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24237

Dave Heil wrote:
> It would appear that you've never heard of Tugboat Annie either.

Is she any kin to Poke Salad Annie?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1242. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 06:31:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BF9F8AD.ADEBF1CA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24238

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> I'll bet his reaction would be the same if she were robed in several layers.
> I mean, it's all just a matter of imagination, right, Cecil? Uh,
> Cecil...oh, Cecil...could ya get back over here into the conversation?
> Cecil? Cecil?

Sorry, I've had my eyes rolled back for awhile.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1243. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 06:44:01 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <RYmK7.892$m%.234341@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 24239

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3bf47aa5_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> Ryan:
>
> Please do nothing in support of me--do what you will for your own
> satisfaction, enjoyment, and conversation. Not knowing you, I wouldn't be
> able to even give you out some funny ones that would match your
personality.

Hey! What do you want to know about him? Ryan lives about a mile and a half
from me and I've known him since he was a teenager.

He even helped me a couple of times, pulling on the rope to get the new
tower and antennas up.

Now as to satisfaction, enjoyment, and conversation...I could probably get a
couple hours of satisfaction out of telling stories about him.... What I
don't know for sure I can always make up!

Course, I'd have to add that I know few people whose first 6-meter contact
was Alaska.
Take a bow Ryan!

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

1244. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 06:45:19 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <3_mK7.893$m%.234367@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 24240

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BF9F227.39851DD@IEEE.org...
> Roger Halstead wrote:
> > As for me, I've seen many a call sign that some would find
objectionable...I
> > could care less.
>
> How about W5BM? (Sorry, Louis)
> --
I knew a nurse who had those for initials. <:-))

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1245. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 06:58:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tcuup$1hr$0@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 24241

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > CW phobics never understand that radiotelegraphy is the most basic of
> > all radiocommunications modes, eminently useful even in the high tech
> > age. Just ask any moonbounce or coherent operator.
> >
> >
>
> We should ask NASA and JPL what modes they use to communicate with
> deep space planetary probes. It's not morse code.

Don't need to, we already know that, among many other advanced
concepts.

Maybe we should
> (if we haven't already) adopt a version suitable for HF for DXing when
> even morse code CW doesn't get thru.

Already have -and have used- plenty of that, too.

You may need a specially designed
> for the purpose HF radio, but special transmitters existed for CW use.

You can make a single active device both transmit and receive
radiotelegraphy. Try that with any other mode.

1246. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 07:15:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011120021542.09449.00000802@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 24242

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 11/19/2001 10:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BF9DEB2.AEA90C63@ix.netcom.com>

>> > > > What, by the way, is the zip code for "Small Southern Town, U.S.A."?
>>
>
>14313

37327

1247. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 07:54:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A8D5AF48DB2CB029.401E51F3CF761E40.775151BAE787A06E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24243

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 22:59:44 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Actually, you're applying those passages wrong, Cecil. You're
>ignoring the bible passages about knowing sin, knowing the sinner, and
>separating from that. The difference is between action and thought.
>Obviously, the christian has to know what sin is if he is to avoid it
>(a judgment). Likewise, the christian has to judge whether another
>person is sinning if he is to avoid participating in that person's sin
>(another judgment). However, that doesn't mean the christian condemns
>that person by actions (you passage above). Instead, he is to seek out
>that person and help the person to understand the consequences of
>those actions. The first step in that is making the person aware of
>his own sin.

But doesn't this simply state that the Christian religion is
necessarily _better_ than the beliefs of the person seen (by the
Christian, not necessarily by him/her-self) as "sinning?"

Perhaps a Christian "judges" on this basis theoretically
(although we ALL know that most people who are
judgemental--particularly those such as Dick & Larry in this NG aren't
basing their judgements on the standards you list above), but that's
irrelevant in the long run. The fact remains that by the very act of
assuming the person is committing a "sin" and needs to be made aware
of that fact, they are in fact judging the person as not being as
"enlightened" as themselves, and therefore automatically assume that
simply because their religion teaches them something is a "sin" or
"evil," that is the end of the matter and no debate as to the accuracy
of that claim is necessary or desirable.

> The popular story of the woman being stoned for prostitution is a
>good example of this concept. Jesus stopped the stoning and told those
>in the mob to let the person without sin cast the first stone (a
>variation of your "Judge not, that ye be not judged"). In other words,
>he stopped the ACTION of the mob. However, after the mob went away, he
>turned to the woman and told her to go and sin no more. He could not
>have said that without making a judgment that she had indeed sinned.

From his perspective (assuming you believe in him in the first
place, of course)--but that does NOT make his judgement any more or
less valid than her own. From a Christian perspective, prostitution is
"evil." But not all religions share that belief--nor is it necessary
for someone to be religious at all to hold a valid set of morals he or
she lives by.

Bear in mind, also, the even if the entire story you refer to above (including the divinity of Jesus) were true it _still_ would not have contradicted the concept that a Christian should not judge others. He states in that story that "he who is without sin" should cast the first stone--in other words, that only those who have not themselves "sinned" have the right to judge the sins of others. But that would simply mean that he was the ONLY one qualified to do so, since the bible states that he is the only one "without sin!"

> So, as you can see, you can judge whether a person is sinning (in
>fact, it is almost impossible not to). But the key is what you do
>about it - the actions. The passages you quote above refer to actions,
>not to thoughts or simple statements.

But, of course, it still ends in the same result--the Christian ends up judging people based on his or her personal beliefs not on any unbiased or impartial basis. Simply because the Christian bible states something is wrong does not make it so--except to the person who BELIEVES in that faith, who should--if he or she sincerely believes in Christianity, restrict his or her judgement and actions to others who subscribe to that religion as well.

> By the way, please don't ask me for the bible passages - it has been
>a very long time since I've had anything to do with religion.

I've read it recently--and I've _never_ been a Christian. I just don't feel it's rational for me to argue against principles of a religion unless I know what they believe in the first place (even though, since most Christians haven't read the bible, _they_ don't know what they believe in anyway).

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1248. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 07:56:32 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <69E45488B6EDF54D.F9062EEC5E5AAD60.18FD5091D74DE154@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24244

On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 21:50:20 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>Goodwin's Law. Game over.

Sorry, Krell, I don't quit when I'm ahead.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1249. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 08:11:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <07672E5C83F60245.4FDD35AA942157C0.7C6DC31DF9D8A911@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24245

On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:58 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Boy, do you ever have the hots for Kim! After reading the last few new
>posts in this thread, I think that the two of you need to be left alone --
>and not at Starbucks! BTW -- I wonder how Kim's OM would feel about
>hearing that his XYL would want to meet another man at Starbucks for
>a day-long session of "philosophical discussion?" I know one for damn
>sure -- if I were married, my XYL wouldn't have to worry about me ever
>doing that with another woman -- unless she was there as well! I think
>we've just seen another example of Kim's character -- or lack thereof --
>which makes her a perfect match for you!

Gee Larry, don't you ever wash that mind?

You mean you honestly can't sit down with a woman and have an
intelligent--and EQUAL conversation with her w/o sex being part of the
interactions? How sad. Personally, MANY of my friends are women--just
as many of my wife's friends are men--and neither of us has the
slightest reason to distrust the other. That you don't trust your wife
alone with another male--and that you assume any married woman who
WOULD meet a man for coffee w/o her husband must have poor character
says a world about your personal integrity. After all, if you wouldn't
meet a woman for conversation alone either you have no respect for
women and don't believe you can have an intellectual friendship with
one or you can't be trusted out of your wife's sight and both of you
know it. Either way, it is YOUR character--not Kim's--that was just
demonstrated to be deficient.

I don't "have the hots" for Kim, Larry. If I wanted to get
laid outside my marriage I wouldn't have to chase a monogamous married
woman in over 1000 miles from me Texas to do so. From what I've seen
of her, I happen to like Kim as a person, and respect her integrity
and intelligence--three very good reasons to correspond with someone,
none of which have the slightest thing to do with sex.

Sorry, Larry, but maybe you can't be trusted out of your
spouse's sight--that doesn't surprise me at all--but that doesn't mean
that Kim can't or that her husband wouldn't trust HER to enjoy a
conversation with a man when it involved an area not of interest to
him as well.

You really stretch to find something "immoral" about Kim (and
about me, for that matter), don't you Larry? Could that be because you
know what an ass you're making out of yourself about her call sign and
you're just hoping to find some justification for your offensive and

sexist attitude toward her?

Rick--KE8HH

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1250. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 08:25:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8C979F353A79AC62.BFA4DCF99807BDF1.3AFAE9CBC75FAC40@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24246

On 19 Nov 2001 08:04:00 -0800, uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org (Sean G Gilley)
wrote:

>Finally, it really is an issue of free speech. I don't believe the government
>has an obilgation -- or a right -- to try to protect us from ourselves.
>In this case limiting what amateurs could have as call signs would do exactly
>that. Do we take out *every* potentially offensive sign? Who decides
>which are potentially offensive? Your ideas and mine would almost certainly
>be very different.

While you make several other relevant points in your message,
it is _this_ point that is most important.

Free speech is the cornerstone of our society. Without it we
are in a pure dictatorship, regardless of how benevolent that dictator
might be. But free speech, by necessity, carries with it the risk of
offense. This is something that as Americans we simply have to accept
as a cost of BEING Americans. As I pointed out in an earlier message
to this thread, it's the same as two children playing with their toys;
if one of those children wants the right to play with his/her toys
without being limited by the other, that child must tolerate the same
behavior as well. If we value the exercise of our own free speech, we
must permit others to exercise their own--and before Larry or Dick
claims I don't allow them to exercise theirs, that's inaccurate--I DO
support their right to speak out. I simply reserve the right to point
out the flaws or bias in their statements as I chose.

Welcome to ham radio, Sean. We're not usually as obnoxious on
the air as we are in this group--although a few are (mostly on 75m).
Unlike the discussions here, most of what you'll find on the air is
pretty "vanilla" in nature instead of controversial.

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1251. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 08:29:21 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120032921.05353.00000643@mb-bj.news.cs.com>
Source record: 24247

>> > > > What, by the way, is the zip code for "Small Southern Town, U.S.A."?

Would that be the home of Rio Dio Radio?

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

1252. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 12:08:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfa486b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24248

Process management is my chief responsibility at work, Dave. I would shudder to think that I become so "adult" that I act like people such as you. Now, for you it may work. For me, it would not. I bet that between the two of us, I make up for your lack of willingness to step outside the box.

Kim W5TIT

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:3BF9E7F4.DCD2A7E7@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Oh? A preppie, then, eh. My dad realizes that I am now an adult and that I
> > make my own decisions.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> You really don't have a clue, do you, Kim? A preppie? My age group
> didn't qualify me. I too am an adult and make my own decisions. Some
> of us mature at a faster rate than others. Maybe your decision making
> processes will improve as you mature.
>
> Dave K8MN
>
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BF92766.46B8BF0D@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was pretty
> > born
> > > > with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > You couldn't be more off the beam than you are with this post, Tugboat.
> > > Some of us rise above our beginnings. It helps to have parents who are
> > > loving and involved in our upbringing and who provide guidance during
> > > our formative years. My dad, for instance would never have permitted me
> > > to choose a suggestive callsign back in the days when I first entered
> > > amateur radio. I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of the

> > > present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
> > > involvement at all.
> > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3BF89E3B.9A310597@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> > > > > > <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day. By
some
> > > > > > >definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but is a
cast
> > > > iron SOB
> > > > > > >about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those
> > juvenile,
> > > > tee hee
> > > > > > >giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so
common
> > it is
> > > > like
> > > > > > >stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is one
> > thing,
> > > > being
> > > > > > >judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the wind
> > whistles
> > > > thru
> > > > > > >and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being
> > judgemental.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose any
> > > > > > behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
> > > > > > non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_
open-minded
> > and
> > > > > > willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of
judging
> > > > > > others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the
same
> > > > > > behaviors they themselves prefer.
> > > > > >
> > > > > You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and called
me
> > and
> > > > > idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > On the other hand, I don't happen to view
open-mindedness as
> > a

> > > > > > flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded
person
> > > > > > who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Damn! Another judgement.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN

1253. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 12:11:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfa4916_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24249

You'd think Davey would get the hint. When one keeps throwing insults that no one understands because they're not at others' level, well... Kinda has the same affect as using the English language in a group of people that speak nothing but Spanish.

Kim W5TIT

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3BF9F60B.A7300972@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > It would appear that you've never heard of Tugboat Annie either.
>
> Is she any kin to Poke Salad Annie?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1254. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 12:14:04 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfa4996_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24250

Hmmmm, maybe we need to know some stories about Ryan that we could "nudge" him about? LOL

I've just begun installation of all my radio equipment into my new truck. Soon, I plan to get back on 10M mobile.

Kim W5TIT

"Roger Halstead" <rdhalste@tm.net> wrote in message news:RYmK7.892$m%.234341@monger.newsread.com...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3bf47aa5_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > Ryan:
> >
> > Please do nothing in support of me--do what you will for your own
> > satisfaction, enjoyment, and conversation. Not knowing you, I wouldn't be
> > able to even give you out some funny ones that would match your
> personality.
>
> Hey! What do you want to know about him? Ryan lives about a mile and a half
> from me and I've known him since he was a teenager.
>
> He even helped me a couple of times, pulling on the rope to get the new
> tower and antennas up.
>
> Now as to satisfaction, enjoyment, and conversation...I could probably get a
> couple hours of satisfaction out of telling stories about him.... What I
> don't know for sure I can always make up!
>
> Course, I'd have to add that I know few people whose first 6-meter contact
> was Alaska.
> Take a bow Ryan!
>
> --
> Roger Halstead (K8RI)
> WWW.RogerHalstead.com
> N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
>
>

1255. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 12:41:21 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfa500d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24151

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:07672E5C83F60245.4FDD35AA942157C0.7C6DC31DF9D8A911@lp.airnews.net...
> On 19 Nov 2001 03:26:58 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >Boy, do you ever have the hots for Kim! After reading the last few new
> >posts in this thread, I think that the two of you need to be left
alone --
> >and not at Starbucks! BTW -- I wonder how Kim's OM would feel about
> >hearing that his XYL would want to meet another man at Starbucks for
> >a day-long session of "philosophical discussion?" I know one for damn
> >sure -- if I were married, my XYL wouldn't have to worry about me ever
> >doing that with another woman -- unless she was there as well! I think
> >we've just seen another example of Kim's character -- or lack thereof --
> >which makes her a perfect match for you!
>
> Gee Larry, don't you ever wash that mind?
>

What a concept! Larry washing his mind. The mind is a terrible thing to
waste, especially when there's little of it left!

>
> You mean you honestly can't sit down with a woman and have an
> intelligent--and EQUAL conversation with her w/o sex being part of the
> interactions?
>

Uh, 'scuse me for the observation, Rick. But, er, do you think Larry could
have an intelligent conversation at all--*with or without sex*? (I'll leave
EQUAL out in the interest of possibilities)

>
> How sad. Personally, MANY of my friends are women--just
> as many of my wife's friends are men--and neither of us has the
> slightest reason to distrust the other.
>

I have a feeling Larry is friendship challenged.

>
> That you don't trust your wife
> alone with another male--and that you assume any married woman who
> WOULD meet a man for coffee w/o her husband must have poor character
> says a world about your personal integrity.
>

Well, again, 'scuse me. We must leave integrity out of the realm of this discussion. Leaving that aside, Larry can't keep a woman around long enough to call her a wife.

> After all, if you wouldn't
> meet a woman for conversation alone
>

Ummm, a woman probably wouldn't meet Larry alone, for conversation or otherwise. I sure know I wouldn't. I might toss a couple 'o cents into his cup as I walked by, but that would be about it.

> either you have no respect for
> women and don't believe you can have an intellectual friendship with
> one or you can't be trusted out of your wife's sight and both of you
> know it. Either way, it is YOUR character--not Kim's--that was just
> demonstrated to be deficient.
>

Yeah. Uh. Since Larry doesn't have a wife... And, since Larry can't have an intellectual *anything*... And, I'm not so sure about trust. The one thing you can trust about Larry is his consistency--not physically though that also--but personality-wise.

> I don't "have the hots" for Kim, Larry. If I wanted to get
> laid outside my marriage I wouldn't have to chase a monogamous married
> woman in over 1000 miles from me Texas to do so. From what I've seen
> of her, I happen to like Kim as a person, and respect her integrity
> and intelligence--three very good reasons to correspond with someone,
> none of which have the slightest thing to do with sex.
>
> Sorry, Larry, but maybe you can't be trusted out of your
> spouse's sight--that doesn't surprise me at all--but that doesn't mean
> that Kim can't or that her husband wouldn't trust HER to enjoy a
> conversation with a man when it involved an area not of interest to
> him as well.
>

First lesson after I met my traditional Southern Gentleman. He thought it was natural and normal for a man to "direct" a woman's life, etc. Two/three weeks after we got to knowing each other, he told me I was "not going out with any of my girlfriends." I put my little shakey finger up and centered to him that the kind of behavior (insecurity) that he just displayed would not be something I agreed with nor would accept. It took about a year of dialogue and reasoning, but he realized that my concept of jealousy--insecurity at its ugliest--is both unjustifiable and unreasonable to me. In a strong, healthy relationship (friendship, love, or marriage--any of them), implicit trust is what I demand and what I offer. If my implicit trust in a man or a friend is violated--shame on *my* bad judgement, not theirs. That's the way I see it. When implicit trust is

attained, *anything* else that makes relationship successful is there.

>
> You really stretch to find something "immoral" about Kim (and
> about me, for that matter), don't you Larry?
>

Well, I think Larry needs stimulation for any kind of stretch...*DID I SAY THAT*?

>
> Could that be because you
> know what an ass you're making out of yourself about her call sign and
> you're just hoping to find some justification for your offensive and
> sexist attitude toward her?
>
> Rick--KE8HH
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Naw. I think Larry actually believes he is avenging the "evilness" in this world and sees me as one of those evils. When someone is as judgmental and condemning as he is, it is often (IMHO) due to quite a lack of personal dignity in their own life. If you'll read his many posts on having been rejected for promotions, etc., even when he was in the military--in the *face* of the perfectness with which he served but went unrecognized--you'll capture a lot of Larry's grasp to be of value to *someone--anyone* in his life. What he doesn't realize and probably never will is that once he realizes that he is of perfect value to himself, or that he needs to change values to achieve it, then he no longer needs anyone else's approval, or honor.

Kim W5TIT

PS--By the way, Larry (I think) claims to have a degree in Human Relations. That just goes to show that book sense often has nothing to do with common sense or applicability. Larry would epitomize the 'evil HR Director'.

1256. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 13:03:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011120080339.20853.00000750@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 24153

In article <9t4imm$2ti$0@208.206.142.70>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
> Can anyone besides me identify the equipment
>> depicted on the badge?
>
>
>
>That's a Hallicrafters SX71 receiver on the left. The rest don't look
>very specific to me.
>
Ya get half credit, Dick.

The setup pictured is from QST for January, 1956. The transmitter on the left is a homebrew setup built by W6TZZ. Runs a 6AQ5 VFO feeding a 5763 multiplier with a pair of 6146s in the final. Really nice job, mechanically. The builder was in the 11th grade at the time, and won a prize in the Ford Motor Company Industrial Arts competiton. (Prize was $150 and a trip to Detroit, which was a big deal in 1956).

73 de Jim, N2EY

1257. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 13:03:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011120080340.20853.00000751@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 24152

In article <3BF9F2F6.E27AC095@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Did you hear the FCC is unhappy with Victoria's Secret for
>their recent fashion show on TV?

Maybe they're mad because they weren't invited.

>What's the world coming
>to when the most beautiful thing in the whole world
>causes objections?

They found a way to televise love on that show?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1258. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 13:27:24 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9tdld1nmj1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 24155
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011119182026.306$HX@newsreader.com...
> Ramble on !

The phone company records don't lie. Next time you shouldn't get drunk, to avoid those black outs, when pulling your BS so that you can remember what happen the next day Mopar.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0
--
"1500Kbs cable modem
MediaOne Roadrunner."

1259. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 14:29:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFA68CC.D5C6CA3A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24156

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Did you hear the FCC is unhappy with Victoria's Secret for
> >their recent fashion show on TV?
>
> Maybe they're mad because they weren't invited.
>
> >What's the world coming
> >to when the most beautiful thing in the whole world
> >causes objections?
>
> They found a way to televise love on that show?

The thing I am talking about is not an abstraction, Jim.
It's the real thing (converted to electrons/photons).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1260. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 14:33:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFA69BC.A5F2E2FF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24157

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> You'd think Davey would get the hint.

"Getting the hint" requires a functioning input system.
Dave is all output. :-) I had to tell him a dozen
times about his typo before it finally soaked in.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1261. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 14:42:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFA6BEA.3948122F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24158

Rick Adams wrote:
> Gee Larry, don't you ever wash that mind?

In the years he's been on this newsgroup, he's been
consistently obsessive/compulsive about sex.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1262. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 14:50:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFA6DBB.F5B6BF10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24159

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You can make a single active device both transmit and receive
> radiotelegraphy. Try that with any other mode.

How many single active device transceivers are in operation,
Dick? Wonder why so few? Maybe because one can buy a complete
FM transceiver on a single chip nowadays?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1263. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 15:21:15 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <LxuK7.8$ER1.6364303@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 24161
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Careful Mopar, he knows someone, somewhere
so he can find out anything. Wait, as Frank love's to
say..... Did Miss Cleo tell him with a
callback?

Landshark

--
"SOME GET STRONG, SOME GET STRANGE,
SOONER OR LATER IT ALL GETS REAL,
WALK ON, WALK ON.
Neal Young

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011120083539.898$XX@newsreader.com...
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011119182026.306$HX@newsreader.com...
> > > Ramble on !
> >
> > The phone company records don't lie. Next time you shouldn't get drunk,
> > to avoid those black outs, when pulling your BS so that you can remember
> > what happen the next day Mopar.
> >
> It's really entertaining to watch you squirm Leland.
>
> How about meeting me somwehere half way between us ?
>
> I'm sure I can adjust your delusional viewpoint for you.
>
> BTW,if the "phone co records don't lie",why are you continuing your
> paranoid rant ???
>
> Do you think I'm the only one who doesn't like you here ?
>
> Go play with your handheld !
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

1264. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 15:21:16 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <MxuK7.10$PR1.6375466@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 24160
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

You know Leland, I always thought you
were just trolling here for jollies, but I see
that this is real serious stuff to you LOL.
The phone company traced the call? you
found out it was Mopar? The phone Co.
will only ask you if you know someone
at this #, they can not give you the name
of the person who has that # it's against
the law. But don't tell me, you know
someone there too, FBI, FCC, CIA,
NSA, ASPCA boy you have all the
connections.....LOL.

Landshark

--
"SOME GET STRONG, SOME GET STRANGE,
SOONER OR LATER IT ALL GETS REAL,
WALK ON, WALK ON.
Neal Young

"Leland C. Scott" <Twistedhed@wettv.net> wrote in message
news:9%fK7.172$q46.3094@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net...

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011119170437.580$Fw@newsreader.com...
> What in thr hell are you babbling about now ?
> I've NEVER called you !

I next post a message about the calls being traced, and guess what Mopar,
no more calls. Gee, and you are going to tell me it's not you? Then
considering all the nice offers you made to come up here to meet me after
the phone deal, even Twisted is a better liar than that!

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

--
"We cannot tell what may happen to us in the
strange medley of life. But we can decide

what happens in us - how we take it,
what we do with it - and that is what
really counts in the end."

Joseph Fort Newton

1265. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:06:10 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BFA8065.9030205@att.net>
Source record: 24162

Jim Kelley wrote:

> We don't
> seem to behave in as socially-acceptable a manner here as we would in
> person, or on the air. True?

Hey Jim...

Where can I get my lobomotomy, so I can join in the 'festivities' too... ;-)

Rich

1266. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:18:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFA8245.DEC86321@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24163

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Process management is my chief responsibility at work, Dave. I would
> shudder to think that I become so "adult" that I act like people such as
> you. Now, for you it may work. For me, it would not. I bet that between
> the two of us, I make up for your lack of willingness to step outside the
> box.
>
> Kim W5TIT

It is certainly odd that one who so often makes incorrect character and
background judgements about people is employed in a field where she
needs skill in using logical thought. Of course, being employed in a
field and being any good at it don't automatically go hand in hand.

Dave K8MN

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BF9E7F4.DCD2A7E7@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Oh? A preppie, then, eh. My dad realizes that I am now an adult and
> that I
> > > make my own decisions.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > You really don't have a clue, do you, Kim? A preppie? My age group
> > didn't qualify me. I too am an adult and make my own decisions. Some
> > of us mature at a faster rate than others. Maybe your decision making
> > processes will improve as you mature.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BF92766.46B8BF0D@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was
> pretty
> > > born
> > > > > with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >

> > > > You couldn't be more off the beam than you are with this post,
> Tugboat.
> > > > Some of us rise above our beginnings. It helps to have parents who
> are
> > > > loving and involved in our upbringing and who provide guidance during
> > > > our formative years. My dad, for instance would never have permitted
> me
> > > > to choose a suggestive callsign back in the days when I first entered
> > > > amateur radio. I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of the
> > > > present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
> > > > involvement at all.
> > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3BF89E3B.9A310597@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> > > > > > > <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day. By
> some
> > > > > > > >definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but is a
> cast
> > > > > iron SOB
> > > > > > > >about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those
> > > juvenile,
> > > > > > tee hee
> > > > > > > > >giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so
> common
> > > it is
> > > > > like
> > > > > > > > >stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is one
> > > thing,
> > > > > being
> > > > > > > > >judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the wind
> > > whistles
> > > > > thru
> > > > > > > > >and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being
> > > judgemental.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose any
> > > > > > > > behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
> > > > > > > > non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_
> open-minded
> > > and
> > > > > > willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of
> judging
> > > > > > > > others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the
> same
> > > > > > > > behaviors they themselves prefer.

> > > > > >
> > > > > > You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and called
> me
> > > and
> > > > > > idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > On the other hand, I don't happen to view
> open-mindedness as
> > > a
> > > > > > > flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the CLOSED-minded
> person
> > > > > > > who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Damn! Another judgement.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN

1267. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:21:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFA830E.F540F9A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24164

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> You'd think Davey would get the hint. When one keeps throwing insults that
> no one understands because they're not at others' level, well... Kinda has
> the same affect as using the English language in a group of people that
> speak nothing but Spanish.
>
> Kim W5TIT

If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means, you
might want to find out what it means. It isn't my lack of knowledge
which is the problem.

Dave K8MN

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BF9F60B.A7300972@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > It would appear that you've never heard of Tugboat Annie either.
> >
> > Is she any kin to Poke Salad Annie?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >
> > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1268. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:24:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFA83D6.38CD1D12@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24165

CAM wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > You'd think Davey would get the hint.
>
> "Getting the hint" requires a functioning input system.
> Dave is all output. :-) I had to tell him a dozen
> times about his typo before it finally soaked in.

You mean sort like the way I had to repost what your said about morse testing and Affirmative Action in order to shut up your silly denials?

Dave K8MN

1269. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:48:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120114853.25459.00002512@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 24171

In article <3bf88b4d_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Oh good grief, Larry. Haven't you ever wondered why you can't keep a woman
>around? You are so prudential.

Kim:

Actually, I insure with Nationwide.

>My husband sits not 5' away from me, in our
>office, together.

He has my eternal sympathy.

>I occasionally read posts to him; he is well aware that I
>would meet Rick, any other man, any other woman, or a whole host of people,
>at a Starbucks or otherwise.

Well, fortunately, the woman in my life doesn't have to worry about *me* doing
anything like that!

>I don't "ask" my husband for permission to do anything, Larry. We don't
>treat each other as children. Apparently, you like your women brainless and
>they like men who run their lives.

Now, see here! Comrade Natasha doesn't run my life. Now, if you'll excuse me,
I have to go and get her a bowl of Borscht.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1270. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:48:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120114854.25459.00002514@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 24166

In article <3BF89DBA.E1FFF364@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>Dontcha know? Rick doesn't care for those who make judgements!
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Yup. He's a university professor, and, as such, has a professional
mandate to comply with the edicts of liberal, politically-correct mind
control at all times. People who make judgements are independent
thinkers -- and, as such, are a threat to the creation of the One World
Order.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1271. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:48:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120114854.25459.00002513@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 24168

In article <3bf88bce_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Cecil, gotta say this. That is so far above Larry's head that he'll never
>get it.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

That's where you'd be wrong. I was in Safeway the other day, and there was a bottle of Tobasco sauce on a shelf, several inches over my head! Somehow, I managed to "get it." In reality, I get lots of things that are over my head.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1272. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:48:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120114855.25459.00002515@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 24172

In article <3BF89F7F.DADCCC95@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>For shame, Larry, petitio principii is not allowed.
>You are the one making the assertion. The onus is upon you
>to prove your assertion. If you cannot offer any proof, we
>will be forced to conclude that you are full of it. Exactly
>what damage is being done to the ARS by Kim's callsign?

Cecil:

Yawn! I don't recall ever stating that Kim's callsign is doing quantifiable "damage" to the ARS, only that the potential for such damage certainly exists -- as pointed out by no less an authority than Riley Hollingsworth. Do you disagree with Mr. Hollingsworth's statement that Kim's choice of a callsign has the potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction?"

>Here's your argument applied to you, Larry. If you cannot
>prove that you are not a rapist, then that you are one is
>self-apparent. Don't you ever learn?

Asked and answered. Can't you come up with anything original?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1273. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:48:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120114856.25459.00002516@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 24169

In article <3BF8A843.D518263B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> This is hilarious! First Cecil tells me to "Judge not, that ye not be
>> judged..." and then, he *judges* me by saying I'm "NOT (sic) a good
>Christian."
>
>Oh, I admit to being only an ethnic Christian, Larry. I don't believe
>in a supernatural so I am definitely not a good Christian. You, OTOH,
>profess to be a Christian and you are obviously not a good one since
>you violate nearly every teaching of Jesus. Need any help with those
>beams in your eyes?

Cecil:

I, too, have a long way to go before I could be considered a "good"
Christian. However, my life is still in Christ's hands -- He is my
Savior. I have faith, not "religion."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1274. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:48:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120114856.25459.00002517@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 24170

In article <3BF8A9FD.B2AC2598@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> BTW -- I wonder how Kim's OM would feel about
>> hearing that his XYL would want to meet another man at Starbucks for
>> a day-long session of "philosophical discussion?" I know one for damn
>> sure -- if I were married, my XYL wouldn't have to worry about me ever
>> doing that with another woman -- unless she was there as well!
>
>Larry, you are undoubtedly a throwback to Neanderthal days. You're
>not married because no woman likes to be hit over the head with a
>club. Exactly what is wrong with coffee and conversation?

Cecil:

I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
to be able to grasp this simple concept.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1275. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:48:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120114857.25459.00002518@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 24167

In article <357943AB32F68A4F.B3EBADC422C4EF3B.43E6070CED258E0F@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>Here's your argument applied to you, Larry. If you cannot
>>prove that you are not a rapist, then that you are one is
>>self-apparent. Don't you ever learn?

Cecil:

I can't prove that I'm not a rapist, so if you want to believe I am one,
go ahead and do whatever amuses you.

> He's not a rapist, Cecil.
>
> Rapists don't have to take Viagra to perform.
>
> Rick

I guess Junior knows this from personal experience!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1276. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:48:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120114857.25459.00002519@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 24173

In article <C8D4623C8997F9A1.84DB8FE90DC3AB53.7F805C1D34A75AC3@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> For someone who CLAIMS not to want anyone to create a bad
>image of hams, you certainly delight in demonstrating that some hams
>are offensive, racist, bigoted, and sexist. You may not have "TIT" in
>your call sign--but you have ASSHOLE written all over your face
>instead.

Ouch! I really *was* "rolling on the floor, laughing my head off" after
reading that! Banged my noggin' on my computer's mini-tower on the
way back up! All I can say, Rick, is that if you want to do some
moonlighting after a hard day filling young, impressionable skulls full
of liberal mush, check out one of the local comedy clubs!

BTW -- I can just see Kim now --- swooning over your picture (you
have exchanged photos by now, I assume!). In order to avoid revolting
my own self, I won't bother trying to describe her response any further
than that! Just one word of advice, however. She's married, and
she's from Texas -- and that means her OM is probably packing heat!
Since you're a double Post Hole Digger, I hope I can count on you
not to do anything stupid!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1277. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 16:54:44 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BFA8BC7.4080205@att.net>
Source record: 24174

Krell wrote:

> Class and taste are a matter of personal preference. The "trailer park"
> mentality is one of religious bias, intolerance, and intellectual
> shallowness.

There must be room for the pendulum to swing if society is to work.

Radical extremism, in ANY form (from the right or left), accompanied with a closed mind insures their downfall. and that's true at any level.

If anyone, or ANY institution, takes the position that they're the final arbiter of the absolute truth (of what's good or evil) they're, happily, contributing to their own extinction.

Rich

Arbitrary power is most easily established on the ruins of liberty abused to licentiousness.

- George Washington

1278. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 17:19:48 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BFA91A8.60105@att.net>
Source record: 24175

Dick Carroll wrote:

> You can make a single active device both transmit and receive
> radiotelegraphy. Try that with any other mode.

Oh, I get it... of all the simplistic modes there are... only one can be the SIMPLEST mode... great... a true revelation.

"makes contact when no simpler mode can" ;-)

Rich

1279. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 17:44:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111200944.66c45076@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24176

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:<3bf7fd77_1@newsa.ev1.net>...

(old headers removed)
(N2EY previously wrote):
> > >> It's not even a debate to most hams. And the FCC has made it clear
> where
> they
> > >> stand on it.
> > >
> > >Yeah, that's true. CW doesn't seem to be a major concern for the
> majority
> > >of hams.
> >
> > Yup. Most hams, if they want HF, just learn the code and pass the test. If
> they
> > like it they use it on the air. No big deal to most hams.
>
> As it should not be.

I'm not sure what you mean by this, Kim. What is "as it should not
be"?

> > >I think for the most part, the hobby is just that--a hobby.
> >
> > To you, maybe, but not to a lot of others. Nowhere in Part 97 does the
> word
> > "hobby" appear.

> And, no where does it say that CW testing proves anything about technical
> aptitude, seriuosness of one's committment to the hobby, etc. All the
> "measures" that many disgruntled on both sides seem to argue about.

Yup. And the FCC has ruled that CW testing is being retained only
because of the treaty requirement.
>
> > >> Your proposal to test a packet setup singles out a mode, too.
> > >
> > >I will challenge that only with the statement that I didn't intend to
> have
> > >the "mode" tested. The testing objective would be to grade one's ability
> to
> > >understand how to put things together to make them work. It could be a
> > >packet station, APRS tracker, PSK, etc.
> >
> > Or a CW station.

> Absolutely.

Works for me.
>
> > There are at least three problems with this approach:
> >
> > 1) The VEs would be burdened with providing the equipment and the time for
> the
> > tests. Unless they provide a mountain of equipment, testees could complain
> that
> > the test is about things they have no interest in. Example: "I don't want
> to
> > use PSK31, I'm only interested in PACTOR!!" And consider the needs of the
> > disabled....
> >
> > 2) The objectivity of the tests would be questionable. One of the main
> reasons
> > for multiple-choice written tests is that for every question there is a
> unique
> > right answer, and it's publicly available. No judgement involved - either
> the
> > testee put down the right choice or he/she didn't. Practical and essay
> exams of
> > any type require that someone subjectively decide if the testee has
> > demonstrated adequate knowledge. Sooner or later, any amateur radio test
> based
> > on subjective judgement by a volunteer examiner will be legally attacked
> by
> > someone who flunked. Since the writtens have been multiple choice only for
> > about 40 years, it will be hard to defend practical or essay tests.
> >
>
> Well, seriously, there is a problem with the dialogue on the topic, then :)

The problem is that the FCC is looking for minimum testing, and has
been for years. To them, every test requirement has to prove itself
necessary to their satisfaction.

> Because--in my opinion--there is no way that CW will continue to be a
> testing requirement and--in my opinion--*nothing* will be brought forth to
> take its place.
>
Unless the FCC changes their tune radically, anyway. FCC reduced both
code and written testing with the restructuring.

> However, to entertain the topic of discussion, on your 1), above, a) if the
> VEs would have to provide the equipment, so be it. Either they take their
> VE status seriously and meet whatever requirements there are or they "get
> out of the business."

That's easy to say when it's not you that has to provide the setups.

> Now, PLEASE VEs reading this, don't think I am
> slamming you--I am not. I am sure that most of you take yourselves quite
> seriously; and, b) the testees complain now and will always complain.

The problem is that unless the existing system can be shown to have
serious problems, the FCC won't go for a new one that is a lot more
work.

> On
> your 2), above, a) in my opinion the objectivity of VEs is in question;
> maybe not on a majority basis, but certainly one-to-one. I know of stories
> of people getting their tickets who shouldn't have;

We have all heard the stories. That simply means that some VEs don't
follow the rules. The test system itself, however, is objective in
that no judgement on the part of the VE is necessary if the rules are
followed.

> b) I would support a
> return of the FCC examiner. While I know that will never happen, I believe
> several things would be accomplished: there could/would be less claim of
> favoritism (such as I have just mentioned in 2a), the objectivity would be
> less questionable; and the result of having less "dumbed-down" would be
> achieved.

I agree 100%. Plus, with FCC examiners, the Q&A could be secret again.
>
> I fully support getting rid of the question pool and having essay questions.
> I would *really* like to see something like that.

Same here - but it's got little chance of happening.

> I actually took no
> pleasure whatsoever in getting my ham license. The same as I take
> absolutely no pleasure in getting the huge bonus I get every year from work.
> I believe the formula for the bonus is flawed and I have been on the
> measurement side--it's definitely bogus. Why would I feel any sense of
> accomplishment or pride in getting my ham license when *all* it took was
> memorization--both on the written *and* for the CW. I couldn't do a bit of
> CW today...at least I don't think I could. I can't answer half the old
> questions.

Now you begin to see what the Ancient Ones like me are talking about.

Although my ham exams were multiple choice, I had no idea what they
would be like other than the general topics covered (like "Ohm's Law
for DC", "where are the band edges for the license you want to get",
"how does a transmitter work" etc.) So I learned enough to be able to
answer essay questions, because the ARRL License Manuals of that time
presented the questions that way. I never really studied for the test
- I just learned some radio stuff.
>
> Contrary to the thoughts on both sides of the argument: I *don't* believe I
> learned anything through memorization of the questions, and I *don't*

> believe I learned CW by memorizing characters. If I'd learned anything, I
> would be able to recall the information. Either I have Alzheimer's or I
> didn't learn.

Maybe you learned and then forgot. Not everything we learned is
retained forever, even if we have good memories.
>
> > >> >To leave CW as a testing phase of licensing does not prove (or
> disprove
> in
> > >> >the case of failure) one's aptitude for anything related to ham
> radio--other
> > >> >than CW use.
> > >>
> > >> A CW test is only needed for access to the HF/MF ham bands. CW use is
> VERY
> > >> related to ham radio in those bands.
>
> > >Only in terms of using the mode.
> >
> > And the mode is widely used on the HF/MF ham bands. It is second only to
> SSB on
> > those bands. An HF-licensed ham with a complete ignorance of Morse has a
> great
> > big hole in their amateur radio knowledge.

> Well, in my opinion, most hams--new and old--licensed have a great big hole
> in their amateur radio knowledge.

It all depends which hams you hang out with, Kim. Most of the hams I
hang out with have more ham radio knowledge than me.

> It is only the expertise from people such
> as yourself that we "gain" any inspiration.

Thanks! But there are lots of hams like me around. One only has to
look.
>
> > >It does nothing to prove a darned thing
> > >amateur related other than the knowledge of the language of CW.
> >
> > Not true. It proves that the person who passes the test was willing and
> able to
> > learn enough Morse to pass the test, whether or not they ever intend to
> use it
> > on the air.
>
> OK, I concede. Yes, they learn enough to pass the test.

The point I was trying to make was the willingness part.
>
> > Many folks thing it unreasonable to expect anyone to "ante up" for a ham

> > license, though, particularly if they don't intend to play that particular
> > game.
> >
> > >> The test determines whether the person being tested has a very minimal
> skill
> > >> level, too.
> > >>
> > >> > It does not prove credibility in the area of operation,
> > >> >ability to properly operate, or anything to do with safety.
> > >>
> > >> Neither do the current written tests.
> > >
> > >Ewww-boy. Don't even get me going on that. I wholeheartedly agree.
> >
> > Did you let the FCC know? I did - much of my comments to them on 98-143
> was
> > about the written tests and how to improve them. I posted my comments here
> way
> > back when (1999)
>
> I've shouted that from every high mountain I could get on. Yes, I've
> written to the FCC...not recently, but they got the same opinion from me. I
> truly don't remember now if I made any submission to the 98-143 situation.
> I think I did.

I checked the comments database on the FCC website and there are no
98-143 comments on file with your name on them, Kim. Too bad.

> > >One of
> > >my most emotional responses to the CW debate is if the people who want to
> > >use CW skill as a measurement of someone's genuine interest in the hobby
> of
> > >ham radio--spend as much energy changing what we can about the current
> > >written tests!
> >
> > I did. See the comments.

> You are in the minority.

There were over 2000 of us who commented - out of almost 700,000 US
hams and 250 million or so US citizens. Sad, really.

I suggest you look up my comments. You might be surprised. They were
posted here and are still in the FCC ECFS system.

> It is my belief that most people just like to bitch.

It all depends who you hang out with.

> > > What a joke.
> > >
> > It must be understood that the FCC is not very interested in doing what's

> best
> > for ham radio's future. Their interest is an orderly service at the
> minimum
> > expenditure of limited FCC resources.
>
> As it should be.

Which is why you won't see practical or essay tests any time soon. Too
many resources required.
>
> > Once upon a time the biggest ham radio enforcement headache the FCC had
> was ham
> > signals that wandered outside the bands and messed up other services, or
> ham
> > signals that were below-par in quality. Hams on the air back then were a
> very
> > well-behaved lot. Look at the enforcement actions today - they are not for
> > technical troubles.
>
> I accept the changes in society for what they are.

I don't accept some of them. Look at how Mayor Giuliani changed NYC by
not accepting some things.

> And, with those changes will come creeps.

Sounds pretty judgemental, Kim. Don't let KE8HH see that!

I think people's behavior can be greatly influenced by their
environment. The approval or disapproval of others is part of that
environment.
>
> > The FCC philosophy of testing is really all about solving demonstrated
> > troubles. The old tests were full of stuff about how to radiate a clean
> signal
> > and keep it in the bands because that was what hams had the most trouble
> doing
> > back then.
> >
> > I have some old License Manuals, and the study guides for a General class
> > license contain all sorts of stuff about harmonic filters, crystal
> tolerances,
> > frequency meter use, where the band edges were, etc. But not a word on
> > antennas!
> >
> > >> >If a "construction" project of some sort were to be brought into the
> testing
> > >> >arena, it at least proves that the ham is aware of FCC specifications,
> > >> >rules, regulations, and guidelines.
> > >>
> > >> How?
> > >

> > >Because the pass/fail score would be based on if the transmitting is
> within
> > >regulatory constraints; if the test provides for the building of an
> antenna
> > >that will transmit cleanly between a couple of bands--then the design
> would
> > >have to based on things like will a tuner be used, will it be a
> long-wire,
> > >inverted, etc. Not only would the project have to be built, it would
> have
> > >to be explained why it would work.
> >
> > And the pass-fail would be a subjective decision by the VEs. Plus all of
> the
> > other problems listed above.
>
> I still think that's OK.

The FCC doesn't, though. That's the problem.

> I remember testing up in Gainesville, TX, before
> the restructuring was over. I tried for my CW test for General class
> license. Now, mind you--I'd not studied a bit. What my intention was was
> just to see if I "happened" to pass the CW by guessing the answers. The VE
> walked up to me with a piece of paper and pencil and I told him I wouldn't
> be needing it. He insisted that I *must* submit that piece of paper--with
> notation--or they would not pass me, even if I passed the CW test questions.
> I had tested one other time in the same manner (think it was in Greenville,
> TX--but not sure), and those VEs said no such thing. How subjective is
> that?

The procedure changed, that's all. The VEs are now required by FCC
rules to provide and retain all test papers.

The procedure is totally objective because everyone has the same test
opportunities and there is no judgement on the part of the VEs. Essay
or practical questions would require judgement on their part.
>
> > What would you say to the prospective ham who says he intends to buy a
> > manufactured antenna and follow the directions? Or to only operate one
> band?
> > Why does that ham have to demonstrate antenna knowledge if he never
> intends to
> > be in the scenario you describe?
>
> Well, actually I agree. While I concede to those who feel there must be
> *something* in addition to written testing; my ultimate belief is that *all*
> that is needed is written--and *HARD* written at that (essay questions would
> be a good start to a debate).

Essays are about the most practical of the ideas we've discussed.
>

> > The arguments against code testing all apply to your proposal.
> >
> > > Or, have the FCC exam present on paper a
> > >scenario with an embedded problem and the test is a full disclosure of
> what
> > >to do to resolve the problem.
> > >
> > Essay questions. That was done back before 1951. In fact, before 1940 or
> so the
> > written exam was all essays. A typical question might be something like:
> > "Explain what precautions should be taken to reduce harmonic radiation
> from an
> > AM voice amateur radio transmitter using a plate-modulated Class C final
> > amplifier. Draw schematic diagrams where applicable". A correct answer
> would
> > fill a couple of blue book pages. And that was just ONE question. A
> written
> > test could easily take a few hours. The grading time alone caused the FCC
> to go
> > to multiple choice - first partially, then totally.
>
> Now, *if* (and I assure I wouldn't) I were to expend the thought it would
> take to answer such a question and get my license under the scenario you
> describe above, I would be *very* proud of my license.

Which is why many of us feel the way we do about are licenses.
Although my tests were multiple-choice, my preparation for those tests
was more than adequate for me to pass equivalent essay questions.

> > >> >While it is not required that I build
> > >> >anything once I am a ham--a successful building project that meets
> > >> >specifications of the FCC will assure the FCC--and *should* assure
> > >> >hams--that the new licensee at least knows something about the R&R.
> > >>
> > >> Maybe - but the simple tests you propose don't do that.
> > >
> > >Heh heh. Maybe that should be clue number one to you.
> >
> > Clue of what?
>
> That the tests should *NOT* be simple.

Ah - understood now.

The end result of your method of thinking is to have a series of
license classes, with progressively tougher tests, linked to more
operating privileges. But that sort of thing is becoming
electropolitically incorrect.
>
> > >I can guarantee you
> > >that you are far more "into" the hobby than I am.

> >
> > So? I've been at this game for almost 35 years.

We are about the same age but have somewhat different experiences.....
> >
> > > While I am not saying
> > >*you* are like this, many believe people like me should not be in the
> hobby.
> >
> > Anyone can have an opinion.
> >
> > >People like me don't see the above as "simple tests" :).
> >
> > Which is a triple whammy on them.
> >
> > 1) They don't prove that the person being tested really knows the stuff
> > 2) They are not objective measures of things hams need to know
> > 3) Those being tested see them as difficult.
>
> Kind of as I see it today.

Trick is to get the FCC to see it. They think the current tests and
test methods are adequate.

(old stuff removed)

> > >> --
> > >>
> > >> How about this idea:
> > >>
> > >> Divide the bands into three segments: CW, digital, analog voice.
> Separate
> > >> licenses for each mode - if a prospective ham wants access to the parts
> of
> the
> > >> bands used for certain modes, they have to pass tests on just those
> modes.
> All
> > >> hams have to pass a basic test on safety and general regs.
> > >>
> > >
> > >Hmmmm, I like it.
> > >
> > It's an idea for the future.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

> I like the Jim/N2EY here in this discussion.

The online persona is in constant development.

> I used to feel quite trapped
> by you when you'd ask me a question, I'd answer it and you would chew it all
> to pieces (I think knowing full well that was the answer I was going to
> have--you just wanted me to say it before you chewed it all up) :).

Just shining the light of logic....;-)
>
> I didn't answer any of the post on my philosophical stuff, because here is
> not the place to even *try* to discuss such things.

We oughta try anyway, just to stir things up. Or use e-mail.

> Those kinds of
> conversations, to me, are much better in person.

Agreed, but I doubt we will be in the same neighborhood anytime soon.
Besides, these ARE philosophical discussions - the philosophy of
amateur radio license testing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1280. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 17:48:35 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9te4o0$128$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 24178

Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:3BFA8065.9030205@att.net...
> Hey Jim...
>
> Where can I get my lobomotomy, so I can join in the 'festivities' too...
;-)

Is that an operation where a wolf is surgically removed from someone? ;-)

1281. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 17:52:29 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9te4ve$12s$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 24177

KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:Hd7K7.756$m%.185681@monger.newsread.com...
> Have ya seen the custom-screen-printed pocket protectors that are now the
> rage with the socially inept-anal-retentive ham???

I wasn't looking for one. Guess they caught your eye though.

1282. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 18:49:58 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9te8ib02n7c@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24179

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120114855.25459.00002515@nso-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3BF89F7F.DADCCC95@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
> Yawn! I don't recall ever stating that Kim's callsign is doing
> quantifiable "damage" to the ARS, only that the potential for
> such damage certainly exists -- as pointed out by no less an
> authority than Riley Hollingsworth. Do you disagree with Mr.
> Hollingsworth's statement that Kim's choice of a callsign has
> the potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction?"
>

Potential is a rather broad and ambiguous term. Gun-control advocates use it
quite often to further their cause. (I.E. "A gun in the house has the
pontential of killing someone.") It's interesting that you use a tactic of
Liberals to justify your opinions.

1283. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 18:55:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9te8t002ns1@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24180

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120114856.25459.00002517@nso-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3BF8A9FD.B2AC2598@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
> Cecil:
>
> I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
> married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
> me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
> why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
> to be able to grasp this simple concept.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

How about if he was gay?

1284. XMAS present for that special 75M and 20M goofball !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 19:32:02 UTC
From: souptonutz <copperpans3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <ScyK7.701$5X4.80261@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 24181
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Hey you XYL's out there! Are you sick and tired of your OM who can't get
away from lookin at dirty pics on the internet or talking trash dirty
with "the boys"on the Net on that stinking ham radio ??

Here IS your answer !
It's 100% Guaranteed or your money back!

http://free.freespeech.org/shockingtruth/

Note: Click the word "Merchandise" on the link above when U get there....

1285. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 19:54:47 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0111201154.3478baf2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24182
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<9tdld1nmj1@news.bignet.net>...
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20011119182026.306$HX@newsreader.com...
> > Ramble on !
>
> The phone company records don't lie. Next time you shouldn't get drunk, to
> avoid those black outs, when pulling your BS so that you can remember what
> happen the next day Mopar.
>
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0

aw geez....is somebody phone phucking leland???? that is a cotton
picken shame.....tell me richard mccollum , does this sound like real
radio?????

1286. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:05:44 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0111201205.10866626@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24183
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net> wrote in message
news:<1XeK7.28$q46.2311@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>...
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20011119154545.217$Tg@newsreader.com...
>
> > Aftrall, you have forged people yourself.
>
> You would be suprised to find out that I don't. And since I don't in
> over 2 years on this group NOBODY has ever PROVED I have done so, even
> you can't prove it. Several others on this group have had their accounts
> canned and no longer post through their orignal ISP, however I do.
> That's becasue anyone silly enough to send a complaint to my ISP gets
> the complaint canned becasue they have the posting logs and know for a
> fact what everyone on this group can only guess about, incorrectly that
> is.
>
> However on the other hand you seem to like making late night phones
> calls until you discovered the calls you made got traced back to you.
> The phone company will and does prosecute people for that crap Mopar.
>
> Given that bit of B.S. Mopar I would not put it passed you to take the
> same route like Twisted, and several others, by posting forged messages
> in various news groups. You can't intelligently debate the issues can
> you? And you don't have the guts to post your real name here either. You
> and Twisted look good together taking turns sitting on the same clutch
> of eggs.
>
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>
> ARRL Member
> NCI Member

leland,...the phone company will not do shit about that crap. as soon
as they find out the facts on the situation they will laugh your ass
out of the co....good buddy.....so take if from someone who
knows....having been a witness to countless vendettas spawned on the
cb radio over the last twenty five years....sir.....i think the best
thing for you to do is leave your phone off the hook or change your
number. leland, you sir are a agitator who walks a fine line between

legality and illegality and for this crap that you do, you get your just rewards........your whining about these phone calls, falls, i am sorry to say, on deaf ears........

1287. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:13:44 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0111201213.6c3ff656@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24184
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net> wrote in message
news:<ykeK7.19$q46.1396@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn218rc.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> > Either your acquaintance is falsehooding you or you are doing it to
> us.
> >
> > Which is it?
>
> Neither one Phil. Seems like there is a CBer, who goes by the Handle of
> "Twistedhed", on the "rec.radio.cb" news group. He made some comments
> about freebanding etc., and I suggested that he contact you since you
> had in fact worked for the FCC doing some enforcement activity, and
> could give him the straight deal right from somebody who has done it.
> Needless to say he wiggled every which way he could to avoid the issue
> that he does not have to courage to contact you to ask some questions.
> In fact he's mad as heck about be branded a chicken on the group for not
> contacting you. So he spends hours forging messages from me (there are
> several on this group alone right now), or several others, as a means to
> get even, and hopefully to discredit the "framed" individual with
> obvious crazy comments in the messages. However it seems like he can't
> even get his facts straight for something as simple as the location of
> the Detroit FCC field office.
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>
> ARRL Member
> NCI Member

leland will you please quit cross posting to the rec.radio.cb and
rec.radio.amateur.policy newsgroups....???? i am quite sure these
fine people on rec.radio.amateur.policy do not want to listen to your
incessant whining about any cber running over 4 watts
pep.......leland....please give it a rest.......

1288. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:35:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <82A0028CA83184AE.BD7E1CBFDA4C1F41.8C3514A332FFCDC0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24185

On 19 Nov 2001 13:38:17 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

> What I don't like "hearing" is some Anonymous Troll who pops in and lays an
>egg like that one, Rick. It's the knee jerk reaction to something that HE
>didn't agree with, and then he makes a sweeping statement that would "condem"
>all of Amateur Radio because of what transpires here.

Actually, I don't think he _was_ a troll. If you read his
message exactly as it was written, it sounds a lot more like someone
who was honestly expressing his views. Whether any of us agrees with
those views or not, of course, is personal opinion--but I doubt he had
any intention of "trolling" with his post.

> By the way, I think it was Jim Rosenthal who did the math and figured that
>the "population" or RRAP (at least the regulars) represented about 0.017% of
>the Amateur community...hardly representitive, now is it?

The same could probably be said of many groups with respect to
Usenet representation (although I have no idea how Jim could possibly
get an accurate figure as to the number of _readers_ rrap has--only
the number of posters from which any projection is purely an
estimate), yet such groups can be inordinately powerful in influencing
opinion.

Unlike the amateur bands, it doesn't take any investment at
all in new equipment for someone with an interest in amateur radio to
subscribe to this group. Most people, logically, prefer to know a bit
about a hobby before investing a considerable sum of money in it (yes,
I know, you can set up a station very inexpensively--but that assumes
you know what to buy, and where to buy it, which many prospective hams
don't), and reading Usenet newsgroups where people who are part of
that hobby discuss it is a _very_ logical and obvious way to explore
it with no investment. Needless to say, the impression a potential ham
would get from this group--or from rram--isn't exactly one that would
encourage him or her to start studying for a license--these groups are
often less respectful and more argumentative than rec.radio.cb!

> How I represent myself on the air and in person is far different from this
>forum. I am just following the leader here.

A lot of us are different on the air than we are on the
Usenet. Hopefully, all of us can at least consider the obvious fact
that potential hams ARE reading what we write here, and try to give
them an impression that at least some of the time we can be rational
and communicate w/o flames (after all, ham radio IS a hobby based on
communications!).

> And his "points" could have been made without his own flaming. He got
>what he deserved.

Perhaps--but many of the threads in rrap DO inspire a "heated
entry" as you well know.

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1289. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:36:56 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B8F65B14C5D7EC97.DC7A12C3D4D6C9BA.DEB0668D195F51E0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24186

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:55:02 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>Oooh, emotion. Rick the two of us together are neither old enough or insane
>enough for 75 meters let alone the 3900+ cesspool.

Oh, I don't know.

I certainly FEEL old enough lately and there's plenty of
people in this NG that would be more than happy to argue that I'm
definitely insane enough for it! :-)

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1290. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:38:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8CDB3479DCC3138C.4195E60F928C35DE.D97C0BB66CB446EC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24187

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 00:09:33 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>Ignore this newsgroup. It's mostly arguements and flames
>over Kim's call and Mores Code.

Or the mores of the code fans! ;-)

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1291. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:39:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFABF73.30F1EE80@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24188

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>> CAM wrote:
> >>Here's your argument applied to you, Larry. If you cannot
> >>prove that you are not a rapist, then that you are one is
> >>self-apparent. Don't you ever learn?
>
> I can't prove that I'm not a rapist ...

And, for the same reason, Kim cannot prove that her choice
of callsign is not damaging the ARS. The onus of proof is upon
you. Hop on that onus and tell us how it feels.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1292. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:47:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAC166.1DFF5C3B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24189

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Yawn! I don't recall ever stating that Kim's callsign is doing
> quantifiable "damage" to the ARS, only that the potential for
> such damage certainly exists -- as pointed out by no less an
> authority than Riley Hollingsworth. Do you disagree with Mr.
> Hollingsworth's statement that Kim's choice of a callsign has
> the potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction?"

Yes, I do, Larry. Kim's callsign obviously has a negligible effect
on the ARS. Riley is not omniscient. However, I suspect that if
we sent your hate-filled postings to Riley, he would say *you* are
a magnitude better at bringing the ARS to extinction than is Kim.

> Asked and answered. Can't you come up with anything original?

As a certified teacher, I was taught to repeat the lesson until
the student has learned it. You apparently haven't learned it yet.
You continue to demand that people prove negative premises. When
are you going to learn that is impossible (except in exclusive
binary logic conditions which this isn't).
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1293. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:57:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAC3BE.843F1AA4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24190

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > You'd think Davey would get the hint.
> >
> > "Getting the hint" requires a functioning input system.
> > Dave is all output. :-) I had to tell him a dozen
> > times about his typo before it finally soaked in.
>
> You mean sort like the way I had to repost what your said about morse
> testing and Affirmative Action in order to shut up your silly denials?

There you go lying again, Dave. I *only* denied comparting the issues
and if you check the past postings you will see that is a fact. You
accused me of comparting the issues and I denied it. You continued
to insist that I was comparting the issues and therefore showed
yourself to be lying about it. I NEVER *comparted* the issues.

I have always freely admitted that I compared Affirmative Action to
Morse code testing and will continue to do so. You haven't shut me
up about that. Both Affirmative Action and Morse code testing are
attempts at social engineering. Things similar to the same thing
are similar to each other. Therefore, Affirmative Action and Morse
code are similar. You are similar to a snake because you share
about 75% of your DNA with a snake.

What is more interesting are your numerous lies about not introducing
the word "comparting" which proves that you just don't pay attention.
But that was already obvious to the most casual observer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1294. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:58:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAC408.F44BA285@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24192

Dave Heil wrote:
> If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means, you
> might want to find out what it means.

You mean like "comparting"? You apparently used a word for which
you were ignorant of the meaning.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1295. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 20:59:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <95F72CB7D9A054F5.05DA764AF9184C92.10E3D5B136FB0074@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24191

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 21:03:36 GMT, JJ <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote:

>There is nothing 'evil' or illegal about the call sign, just show
>a lack of class and taste...the trailer park mentality.

I'm sure the hams who live in mobile homes and read this group
love the wonderful welcome they keep receiving from people such as
yourself.

Why is there an automatic assumption that "trailer park" is
synonymous with "trash?" Is it just that some people feel that because
they paid $100K+ for their homes anyone who didn't is trash--or do the
stereotypes seem so irresistible that you just can't help slamming
people who live in mobiles as your inferiors?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1296. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:03:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAC507.CFB58E88@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24194

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I, too, have a long way to go before I could be considered a "good"
> Christian. However, my life is still in Christ's hands -- He is my
> Savior. I have faith, not "religion."

Right now, Larry, you are going to hell because you don't possess
enough waking hours to ask forgiveness for all your sins. My advice
would be to cut back on your sinning to a level that can be forgiven
with less than 24 hours of prayer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1297. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:03:11 UTC
From: fgillil@tincan.org
Message-ID: <e182e02.0111201303.161b1eb7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24193
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<9tdld1nmj1@news.bignet.net>...
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20011119182026.306$HX@newsreader.com...
> > Ramble on !
>
> The phone company records don't lie. Next time you shouldn't get drunk, to
> avoid those black outs, when pulling your BS so that you can remember what
> happen the next day Mopar.
>
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0

He's still trying to compensate for his cowardice when I called him
on his bullshit a few months ago. He hides behind a radio and a ng,
and now he's trying to hide behind a telephone. Don't be suprised
if he hides behind the US mail, too -- he isn't enough of a man to
dish out his shit to your face. Unfortunately, sharkie defends his
cowardly acts. They are cut from the same mold, no doubt.

1298. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:06:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1C9A2D4FBD09866F.9213F3B427841B90.91ABC6E07C96665B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24195

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 21:36:25 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Oh, stop! You're bringing visions to mind...yes, there they are; all
>tangled up...gulp. :)

You've got your LEG and your EAR tangled up?

Can I watch?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1299. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:08:28 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFAC64C.90810103@uci.edu>
Source record: 24200

CAM wrote:
> Both Affirmative Action and Morse code testing are
> attempts at social engineering.

Well, one of them is. The other one is a vestige from an earlier time
in radio.

1300. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:10:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AC86BAC717C9639C.6E69131D3620798D.44B77E6EA54B4265@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24196

On 20 Nov 2001 04:13:18 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Naw.... they'll be glad to issue you W8ANUS though

Gee, Dick, I'll be sure to let them know you told me that when
I apply!

Gosh! The ONLY 1x4 vanity call in the US! And Dick Carroll,
who makes it very clear that HE is an expert on amateur radio, told me
I could get one!

I'll bet his knowledge of how Kim's call sign is "damaging the
ARS" is almost as accurate as his knowledge of the vanity signs
available!

Hmmmmmm . . .

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1301. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:11:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAC6ED.81982D52@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24197

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
> married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
> me being with them, unless he were her brother or father.

And exactly how would you enforce that rule? Oh yeah, I forgot.
You have that crystal ball that makes you omniscient. How about
step-brother? How about first cousin? How about fifth cousin?
It's easy to see how you have driven yourself crazy.

It's more than obvious that you don't trust women, Larry.
Lasting relationships are based on trust. Therefore, do the
females of the world a favor and remain a bachelor.

> One reason
> why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
> to be able to grasp this simple concept.

There are no female slaves left in the US, Larry. That's why you
don't meet any females who meet your specs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1302. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:12:31 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D45E1BD8C3F0892B.ABCFB2A940B7342F.BF850FAA26831A65@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24198

On 20 Nov 2001 16:48:57 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I guess Junior knows this from personal experience!

How could I, old man? I'm not your therapist or your keeper so
I haven't read your psychiatric record.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1303. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:17:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAC87B.EF327464@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24199

Rick Adams wrote:
> How could I, old man? I'm not your therapist or your keeper so
> I haven't read your psychiatric record.

If you do, Rick, be sure to set aside an entire weekend. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1304. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:27:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <22714020968DF113.D317E10C11D1A847.1F86216ACB998408@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24301

On 20 Nov 2001 16:48:55 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Yawn! I don't recall ever stating that Kim's callsign is doing
>quantifiable "damage" to the ARS, only that the potential for
>such damage certainly exists -- as pointed out by no less an
>authority than Riley Hollingsworth.

Potential, Larry?

That's like saying I shouldn't go to work tonight because
driving to campus has the _potential_ of causing the last member of an
endangered species of frog to swallow its tongue in fear of my car and
suffocate. Should I stay home and apply for welfare so I won't risk
causing the extinction of a species?

Many things have the "potential" to "bring ham radio closer to
extinction." Improvements in communications capabilities on the
Internet (i.e., video conferencing, etc.) could do so. New attitudes
toward radio as a hobby could do so. A new personal radio service that
met more needs than vhf does now could do so. New, restrictive,
legislation supposedly aimed at countering terrorism could do so. Even
a climatic change that influenced propagation adversely could do so.
Why single out something as inconsequential as Kim's call sign? Are
you really so bored--or crochety--that you can't simply mind your own
business about an innocuous call sign that you personally don't care
for?

> Do you disagree with Mr.
>Hollingsworth's statement that Kim's choice of a callsign has
>the potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction?"

I do.

Riley Hollingsworth is an authority on FCC regulatory
enforcement. He is NOT an authority on trend analysis, nor is he a
psychic who can predict the result of an apparently very minor event.
His _personal_ opinion, while worthwhile, carries absolutely no more
value or weight than that of any other licensed amateur.

There are a great many things that are likely to contribute to
a decline in the ARS--including the racism, hate speech, rudeness, and
"cb-like" obscenities and arguments (which, of course, is a stereotype
that doesn't apply to the majority of cb users). ALL of these, and
other similar behaviors, have a real potential to harm amateur radio.
Until Hollingsworth starts eliminating THOSE problems (and telling us
to "self-police" isn't eliminating them), he has a lot more to concern

himself with than Kim's call sign.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1305. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:28:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFACAFF.F0C1DF31@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24302

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Both Affirmative Action and Morse code testing are
> > attempts at social engineering.
>
> Well, one of them is. The other one is a vestige from an earlier time
> in radio.

Morse code testing has always been an attempt at social engineering.
I cannot think of any governmental requirement that is not an
attempt at social engineering. Why would there be a governmental
requirement not aimed at social engineering. What would be the purpose?

Morse code testing has simply evolved with time from being necessary
social engineering to unnecessary social engineering to illogical
social engineering.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1306. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:39:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFACD81.483A1A2C@uci.edu>
Source record: 24303

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Both Affirmative Action and Morse code testing are
> > > attempts at social engineering.
> >
> > Well, one of them is. The other one is a vestige from an earlier time
> > in radio.
>
> Morse code testing has always been an attempt at social engineering.

I guess maybe it's social engineering in the same way a PAP smear is
social engineering.
```

1307. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 21:51:21 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFAD059.BDA2315F@uci.edu>
Source record: 24304

SD SpecialDelivery Jones wrote:
> leland will you please quit cross posting to the rec.radio.cb and
> rec.radio.amateur.policy newsgroups....???? i am quite sure these
> fine people on rec.radio.amateur.policy do not want to listen to your
> incessant whining about any cber running over 4 watts
> pep.......leland....please give it a rest.......

Yes Leland, please make up your mind whether you're a ham or a CBer, and
then post to the appropriate group. thanks

1308. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 22:03:20 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9tejkbeqm1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 24305
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
news:MxuK7.10$PR1.6375466@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
> You know Leland, I always thought you
> were just trolling here for jollies,

I am serious with most of my comments.

> but I see
> that this is real serious stuff to you LOL.

> The phone company traced the call? you
> found out it was Mopar?

The phone company maintains the records until either I tell them to go ahead and prosecute the person(s) responsible or decide to drop it.

> The phone Co.
> will only ask you if you know someone
> at this #, they can not give you the name
> of the person who has that # it's against
> the law.

It's very coincidental that the phone calls occurred within 1 to 2 minutes after I made my posts to Mopar in the middle of a rather long thread. Also very strange that after I posted a message to Mopar that the last call, the previous minute ago, was traced it, the calls, stopped right away. Also remember this all took place around 2:00 to 2:30 AM in the morning too, so I don't expect too many people to be up reading off topic material in a long thread where the replies are directed to Mopar, who at the time was extremly mad about my WTC vs. Part 95 tag line. His anger got the better of him and now all he wants to do is drop it, which I will be willing to do so long as he admits he was behind it. Twisted by the way doesn't have the balls to admit to anything including the many forged posts he placed on the group and else where. He's been caught in so many lies it isn't even funny any more.

>But don't tell me, you know
> someone there too, FBI, FCC, CIA,
> NSA, ASPCA boy you have all the

Let me set you straight about the FBI deal. I don't know anybody who works for the FBI. What I did say is I had a friend who was a "Federal Investigator", which could be anyone working for the federal government whose job involves any kind of investigative duties. I VERY deliberately did not mention which agency he works for. The FBI BS started with Twisted once

again doing his thing by spreading lies, and I am frankly shocked by how many stupid people there is on this group who realy believe him when it's been shown time and again where he gets caught in his own lies. I though the people on this group where smarter than that, looks like I'm wrong on that point.

Of course there is the point about all the so-called forged messages I made to the group. Why after 2 years there is still no convincing proof? Also why would I continue to post messages using my real name when I could so easly adopt a fake name, and hotmail account, to make my posts from. I certinaly would not have to put up with the likes of Twisted, Mopar and his late night phones calls, nor the rash of forged messages in other groups as well. I know very well how to do it, but I made a moral decision not to do so, unlike some of the cowards on this group who are posting the bogus messages. All the claims I posted forged messages come fom those who have run out of logic to debate the issues. I never needed to hide behind fake names to make my point and I never will.

--

__
73 de,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction functions."

1309. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 22:03:48 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <66D3DE0AF2133AE2.D8100472804462D8.F134E4F115AE3C28@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24306

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:09:06 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>It would appear that you've never heard of Tugboat Annie either.

Of course I've heard of Tugboat Annie--I just referred to her
in the message you responded to, remember?

>More of your classiness?

Nope--I don't have a cesspool, sorry.

>I'd think that someone with your academic credentials would realize that
>a child's thought processes are not fully formed. Kids often do stupid
>things or things that are wrong. Parents who let their children make
>all their own decisions are simply shirking their responsibility toward
>the child and society. Nice cheap shot about my parents. My dad was a
>succesfuly newsman who became an Episcopal priest.

Try to remember your own posts. You were the one who brought
your parents into it and make a slur that Kim _didn't_ have as good of
upbringing, not me.

I _do_ recognize that parents shape the values and beliefs of
their children (which is where most--but not all--bigotry comes from,
of course), my disagreement is with your assumption that good
parents==protective parents who would not have let you be exposed to a
hobby with call signs such as Kim's. It isn't the restrictive parent
who is universally viewed by the social sciences as being the best
parent--it is the one who allows their children to experience the
world and provides support not regimentation.

>> > I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of the
>> >present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
>> >involvement at all.

Here's a perfect example of that. Certainly, 75m is offensive,
but someone who has demonstrated the maturity to earn a ham ticket
with a high enough class to permit operations on 75m should also be
mature enough to understand that the kind of behavior he or she hears
there is patently offensive to any rational person. Certainly the
parent of a youth listening to the garbage should discuss the content
with the child--just as the parent of a child watching a violent movie
should discuss THAT content with him or her. But to prohibit him or
her from exposure doesn't help the child to mature, it only stiffles
his or her sense of exploration and prevents them from learning about
views that are very different from those of his/her parents.

In an ideal ARS the racist garbage on 3950 wouldn't exist. But this isn't an ideal world, and not only does the racism exist but the jamming and other immature responses to it exist as well (realistically, if everyone ignored them completely, the Liberty Net group would rather quickly shrink in both size and influence). They are a part of ham radio--not a good part--but a part. So long as they DO exist, hams are going to encounter them--and the wise parent will insure that when his or her children do so they have a solid understanding of what is _wrong_ with racism and why the claims of racists are easily proven to be false. That way the child learns not only to oppose racism, but to discern between fact and opinion as well.

>I'm sure that your kids are super, Rick. What a role model you are.

As it happens, I have one son who turned 18 two weeks ago. He was home schooled and started college at 14 at a community college (he'll receive his AA degree--with a 3.92 GPA--this spring and start his Junior year at a University in the Fall). Last year he was one of Parade Magazine's 52 top newspaper carriers in the USA and won a trip to Europe for his efforts. In addition, he donates a great deal of his time to designing web pages for non-profit community agencies that help the homeless and battered women, and is very publicly opposed to racism, sexism, and laws that restrict the rights of individuals. He has no interest in drugs at all (not a guess-a fact) and he doesn't care for alcohol.

Yup. I think my wife and I did ok there--don't you?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1310. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 22:07:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F45EA58841072B45.DE307347948B4136.52FE3C732D8E2891@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24307

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:02:22 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick, You've just demonstrated your own lack of class.

Well, since everyone who disagrees with you demonstrates a
"lack of class" according to you, at least I'm in good company.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1311. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 22:13:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFAD57E.E5D28FB6@uci.edu>
Source record: 24308

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
> married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
> me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
> why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
> to be able to grasp this simple concept.

Nor are you likely to. What they would likely "grasp" is that you're
unable to distinguish between having coffee and having sex.

1312. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 22:22:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6E7CB5206C407DAC.6C69CB529CE5FFDE.6C76144B85563A98@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24309

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 04:59:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>...and if you don't wish to be compared to a left leaning 60's,
>everything-is-okay kind of guy, quit talking the talk.

Except for the fact that I'm a libertarian instead of left
leaning and my "everything-is-okay" has a rider that states "if it
involves only consenting adults," I'll be more than glad to accept
that description.

>I don't depend upon you for validation. In fact, I rather think that if
>a guy like you thinks I'm an idiot, I must be doing something right.

Practice makes perfect!

>We all make judgements in forming opinions, Rick. Being an open-minded
>individual does not necessarily mean that one accepts everything as
>being good or acceptable. Yet I feel that if I don't agree with your
>views, you'd think me close-minded. Is it your belief that someone who
>hears your ideas and rejects them after hearing them is close-minded?

Not at all. I don't even marginally claim to be
infallible--MANY open minded people disagree with my views or ideas
and I've had quite a few interesting--and positive--discussions with
such individuals. AND, more than once, they have convinced me to
change my own views as a result of the information they provided.

Being closed minded doesn't mean someone disagrees--it means
they are unwilling to look at an issue from any perspective but their
own. Example: There is nothing wrong with someone viewing Kim's call
sign as personally offensive to them, based on their personal moral
values. But to accuse her of lacking class or threatening amateur
radio, then ignoring the statements of others that they simply don't
perceive it in the same manner--arguing in fact that if we don't agree
with their assessment, we have no class either--CLEARLY demonstrates
that their minds are closed. An open minded person is willing to
acknowledge that others can disagree with his or her views and values
yet still be just as sincere and honest as themselves. When that view
is taken, disagreements take the form of debates or discussions, not
flame wars and accusations. When, however, a closed minded "if you
disagree with me you have to be wrong" attitude (synonymous with "My
mind is made up--don't confuse me with the facts.") prevails, the
result is inevitably the type of flames that are part of this thread.

>Do your views on Christianity represent open-mindedness or
>close-mindedness?

Don't confuse my views on Christianity with my views of Christians, they aren't the same. While I don't happen to believe in the tenets of the Christian religion, it _does_ offer many rather strongly positive philosophical principles. Unfortunately, as Christianity is _practiced_ the only thing that comes through is "selective oppression." Oppression because modern Christians seek to restrict behavior their religion teaches is "immoral" instead of permitting people freedom of choice, and selective because there are just as many injunctions in the bible against behaviors that virtually ALL Christians practice (i.e., eating pork and shellfish, masturbation, etc.) as there are against the ones they arbitrarily choose to oppress.

I have a great deal of respect for the sincerely religious person--whether that person is a Christian, a Buddhist, or a Muslim. What I have no respect for, whatever, is the person who demands that OTHERS live by the rules of his or her religion, a very different matter.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1313. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 22:27:51 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1FD61FC61CC50007.99C166CFE67B7EE0.79082E1366505E99@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24310

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 15:41:16 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>The funny thing is Rick, the same would probably be true of most of the
>folks here - believe it or not. If we had met on the air, or at a club
>meeting, we'd probably get along just fine. We all share the same
>interest after all. The internet does funny things to people. We don't
>seem to behave in as socially-acceptable a manner here as we would in
>person, or on the air. True?

Absolutely true, Jim.

In person we can see the immediate effect of our
statements--and can modify our conversation to correct erroneous
impressions. Here the best we have are emoticons to show emotional
response, and we lack the nuances of conversation possible in person,
or even on the air where you can at least HEAR the other person's
vocal inflections.

On the Usenet there is less opportunity for people to get to
know the "whole person," and impressions are often formed on the basis
of one or two posts on specific topics. That simply doesn't permit a
reader to have an overall picture of the person they are responding
to, and as a result they view the person in far more black & white
terms (moral/immoral, racist/non-prejudiced, high-class/low-class,
etc.) than they would ever do in person. I do it, you do it, we all do
it to a greater or lesser degree--and it makes it inevitable that the
social rules for polite conversation will break down when that
happens.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1314. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 22:34:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFADA90.BADB2400@uci.edu>
Source record: 24311

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 15:41:16 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >The funny thing is Rick, the same would probably be true of most of the
> >folks here - believe it or not. If we had met on the air, or at a club
> >meeting, we'd probably get along just fine. We all share the same
> >interest after all. The internet does funny things to people. We don't
> >seem to behave in as socially-acceptable a manner here as we would in
> >person, or on the air. True?
>
> Absolutely true, Jim.
>
> In person we can see the immediate effect of our
> statements--and can modify our conversation to correct erroneous
> impressions. Here the best we have are emoticons to show emotional
> response, and we lack the nuances of conversation possible in person,
> or even on the air where you can at least HEAR the other person's
> vocal inflections.
>
> On the Usenet there is less opportunity for people to get to
> know the "whole person," and impressions are often formed on the basis
> of one or two posts on specific topics. That simply doesn't permit a
> reader to have an overall picture of the person they are responding
> to, and as a result they view the person in far more black & white
> terms (moral/immoral, racist/non-prejudiced, high-class/low-class,
> etc.) than they would ever do in person. I do it, you do it, we all do
> it to a greater or lesser degree--and it makes it inevitable that the
> social rules for polite conversation will break down when that
> happens.
>
> Rick

That's part of it. I think you overlooked the biggest part though.

1315. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 23:12:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFAE352.8BE02194@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24312

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > You'd think Davey would get the hint.
> > >
> > > "Getting the hint" requires a functioning input system.
> > > Dave is all output. :-) I had to tell him a dozen
> > > times about his typo before it finally soaked in.
> >
> > You mean sort like the way I had to repost what your said about morse
> > testing and Affirmative Action in order to shut up your silly denials?
>
> There you go lying again, Dave. I *only* denied comparting the issues
> and if you check the past postings you will see that is a fact. You
> accused me of comparting the issues and I denied it. You continued
> to insist that I was comparting the issues and therefore showed
> yourself to be lying about it. I NEVER *comparted* the issues.

Your denials predated my typo by a substantial margin.

> I have always freely admitted that I compared Affirmative Action to
> Morse code testing and will continue to do so. You haven't shut me
> up about that. Both Affirmative Action and Morse code testing are
> attempts at social engineering. Things similar to the same thing
> are similar to each other. Therefore, Affirmative Action and Morse
> code are similar. You are similar to a snake because you share
> about 75% of your DNA with a snake.

What you neglected to state was that morse testing and Affirmative
Action are social engineering 180 degrees out of phase. According to
your current view, the Halocaust and Affirmative Action are similar.
They were both attempts at social engineering.

> What is more interesting are your numerous lies about not introducing
> the word "comparting" which proves that you just don't pay attention.
> But that was already obvious to the most casual observer.

This is simply another example of your game playing with words and you
had to use a typo to make your case. That is also obvious to any
observer.

Dave K8MN

1316. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 23:13:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFAE399.D231CFA8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24313

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means, you
> > might want to find out what it means.
>
> You mean like "comparting"? You apparently used a word for which
> you were ignorant of the meaning.

You know better and that makes your continuation of the lie all the
worse.

Dave K8MN

1317. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 23:15:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFAE410.222FC6E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24314

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I, too, have a long way to go before I could be considered a "good"
> > Christian. However, my life is still in Christ's hands -- He is my
> > Savior. I have faith, not "religion."
>
> Right now, Larry, you are going to hell because you don't possess
> enough waking hours to ask forgiveness for all your sins. My advice
> would be to cut back on your sinning to a level that can be forgiven
> with less than 24 hours of prayer.

I wouldn't sweat it too much, Larry. You are now getting religious
advice from a man who says he prays to his inner self. As we have long
konwn, nothing he says here can be taken seriously.

Dave K8MN

1318. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 23:22:04 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9teogi015e4@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24316

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3BFAD57E.E5D28FB6@uci.edu...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
> > married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
> > me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
> > why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
> > to be able to grasp this simple concept.
>
> Nor are you likely to. What they would likely "grasp" is that you're
> unable to distinguish between having coffee and having sex.

When I was in college, a group of us would go out to eat after a night class. A young lady in our group would always meet her husband at whatever restaurant we went to. He seemed nice enough. However, one night he didn't meet us. His wife wanted to make sure she sat beside only women at whatever table we were at. She said that the reason she did this was that her husband often spied on her when she was out by herself. Sounds like something Larry would do if he were married.

1319. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 23:38:09 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9teph10u1h@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24317

Leland KC8LDO
>
>"Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net> wrote in message
>news:<ykeK7.19$q46.1396@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>...
>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
>> news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn218rc.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
>> > Either your acquaintance is falsehooding you or you are doing it to
>> us.
>> >
>> > Which is it?
>>
>> Neither one Phil. Seems like there is a CBer, who goes by the Handle of
>> "Twistedhed", on the "rec.radio.cb" news group. He made some comments
>> about freebanding etc., and I suggested that he contact you since you
>> had in fact worked for the FCC doing some enforcement activity, and
>> could give him the straight deal right from somebody who has done it.
>> Needless to say he wiggled every which way he could to avoid the issue
>> that he does not have to courage to contact you to ask some questions.
>> In fact he's mad as heck about be branded a chicken on the group for not
>> contacting you. So he spends hours forging messages from me (there are
>> several on this group alone right now), or several others, as a means to
>> get even, and hopefully to discredit the "framed" individual with
>> obvious crazy comments in the messages. However it seems like he can't
>> even get his facts straight for something as simple as the location of
>> the Detroit FCC field office.
>>
>> --
>> Leland C. Scott
>> KC8LDO
>>
>> ARRL Member
>> NCI Member
>
>leland will you please quit cross posting to the rec.radio.cb and
>rec.radio.amateur.policy newsgroups....???? i am quite sure these
>fine people on rec.radio.amateur.policy do not want to listen to your
>incessant whining about any cber running over 4 watts
>pep.......leland....please give it a rest.......
>
I'm simply trying to show my fellow amateur operators what I have to put up with
in rec.radio.cb. ;-))

"You ask w

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

1320. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-20 23:38:31 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <Twistedhed@wettv.net>
Message-ID: <XPBK7.170$rU3.6664@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 24315
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in message >

>leland,...the phone company will not do shit about that crap.

That all depends on the frequency and time of the calls.

> as soon as they find out the facts on the situation

They realy don't have much choice in the matter.

> think the best
> thing for you to do is leave your phone off the hook or change your
> number.

I have an answering machine which I use to screen all my calls. I have never answered the phone until I know who it is. I would just assume to let the telmarketers waste their time for two or three minutes talking to my mcahine tha takes me all of 2 seconds to hit the delete button later.

>leland, you sir are a agitator

Being an "agitator" depends on your point of view. You are either for sane operation where people go by the rules so that all may enjoy the benefits that come of it, or you have the spectrum thieves who will take over whatever frequency seems to be unoccupied, which of course means the authorized user no longer has use of the spectrum whenever they choose to use it, the spectrum thief is using it. Same goes with amplifier use on 11m.

>who walks a fine line between legality and illegality

So if I did something illegal then jump right in here and point it out. In the past 2 years nobody else could find anything, and some have tried real hard too. LOL

--

--
--

73's de,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic

Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
functions."

1321. Re: XMAS present for that special 75M and 20M goofball !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:05:26 UTC
From: radiosigs <radiosigs@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9ter5bssr1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 24318
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

If you are ticked off by this spam nonsense on your newsgroups, please do what I did. Send the entire message, including headers, to abuse@uu.net and lodge complaints. Don't buy this having posted through YAHOO stuff. It was NOT!
Doc,AF2Y

"souptonutz" <copperpans3@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:ScyK7.701$5X4.80261@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Hey you XYL's out there! Are you sick and tired of your OM who can't get
> away from lookin at dirty pics on the internet or talking trash dirty
> with "the boys"on the Net on that stinking ham radio ??
>
> Here IS your answer !
> It's 100% Guaranteed or your money back!
>
> http://free.freespeech.org/shockingtruth/
>
> Note: Click the word "Merchandise" on the link above when U get there....
>
>

1322. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:12:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn45okn.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24319

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 23:57:43 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:

>I once worked a ham who was a pilot in a 747
>operating air moble. Do they use the wings like
>a dipole? :-)

If he was piloting a 747 at the time I sure hope that it was a privately-owned aircraft, not an air carrier, if there are any 747s in private ownership. I do know a retired broadcast station owner who owns a 727 which he pilots himself, notwithstanding the requirement to have at least two qualified pilots in the cockpit.

I'll let the pilots here quote the FARs about making non-essential communications while on an air carrier flight.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1323. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:12:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn458km.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24321

On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 21:14:40 -0600, Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>Heck, one time when the FCC was talking about having a law that any tower
>over a certain number of feet would have to be painted red and white,

Just for the record, there always has been such a requirement. It's
now in the FAA regs, enforced by the FCC under Part 17 of FCC Rules.

Fortunately, the vast majority of amateur radio towers fall under
provisions of the regs that exempt them from marking (painting) and
lighting.

>one of
>the gang on '88 keyed up and said if he painted anything on his tower it
>would be a great big FU. I about drove off the road on that one.

Rest assured, though, that if the tower does require marking and
lighting and the tower owner refuses, the FCC will come after said
owner with five-figure monetary penalties and court orders to
either mark/light it or it will be torn down at the owners' expense
as a hazard to air navigation.

That's one area that the FCC does not play pussycat about.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1324. Re: Special for Radio Kops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:12:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn4664o.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24320

On 20 Nov 2001 13:03:39 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>The setup pictured is from QST for January, 1956. The transmitter on
>the left is a homebrew setup built by W6TZZ. Runs a 6AQ5 VFO feeding a
>5763 multiplier with a pair of 6146s in the final. Really nice job,

Be still, my beating heart. Every young ham's desire then ... even
us Techs who did not have HF privileges.

>The builder was in the 11th grade at the time,

When I was in the 11th grade (not too many years before that) I
should've been chasing girls instead of DX.

Oh well.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1325. Re: XMAS present for that special 75M and 20M goofball !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:15:51 UTC
From: bpnjensen@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <37af7e1c.0111201615.68a782fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24322
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"souptonutz" <copperpans3@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<ScyK7.701$5X4.80261@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...
> Hey you XYL's out there! Are you sick and tired of your OM who can't get
> away from lookin at dirty pics on the internet or talking trash dirty
> with "the boys"on the Net on that stinking ham radio ??
>
> Here IS your answer !
> It's 100% Guaranteed or your money back!
>
> http://free.freespeech.org/shockingtruth/
>
> Note: Click the word "Merchandise" on the link above when U get there....

The merchandise is wonderfully twisted - but look at the articles too - what a hoot!

Bruce Jensen

1326. Re: XMAS present for that special 75M and 20M goofball !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:20:35 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3BFAF340.32F6494E@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 24323
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

radiosigs wrote:
>
> If you are ticked off by this spam nonsense on your newsgroups, please do
> what I did. Send the entire message, including headers, to abuse@uu.net and
> lodge complaints. Don't buy this having posted through YAHOO stuff. It was
> NOT!

I thought it was funny. Click on
http://www.fu-fme.com/
for another well thought out website.

1327. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:23:07 UTC
From: BH <radioguyx@texxas.net>
Message-ID: <3BFA3BAC.4FDD5F31@texxas.net>
Source record: 24324

I used to talk on a regular basis to a Delta airline pilot (yes he
was a licensed ham) who lived near me. He flew between SF and
Hawaii and after takeoff from Honolulu he would get on 15 meters
and we would have a nice contact while he was out over the
Pacific.
Phil Kane wrote:

>
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 23:57:43 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >I once worked a ham who was a pilot in a 747
> >operating air moble. Do they use the wings like
> >a dipole? :-)
>
> If he was piloting a 747 at the time I sure hope that it was a
> privately-owned aircraft, not an air carrier, if there are any 747s
> in private ownership. I do know a retired broadcast station owner
> who owns a 727 which he pilots himself, notwithstanding the
> requirement to have at least two qualified pilots in the cockpit.
>
> I'll let the pilots here quote the FARs about making non-essential
> communications while on an air carrier flight.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1328. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:32:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAF624.C0AE19E3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24325

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Morse code testing has always been an attempt at social engineering.
>
> I guess maybe it's social engineering in the same way a PAP smear is
> social engineering.

Nope, it's social engineering in the same way a driver's license
is social engineering. We are talking about government requirements
not elective procedures.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1329. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:45:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAF92D.E64BF0D7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24326

Dave Heil wrote:
> Your denials predated my typo by a substantial margin.

Your typo occurred on Nov. 17 at 00:43 GMT. I dare you to produce
a posting of mine before that time where I denied comparing
Affirmative Action and Morse code testing. I continue to compare
Affirmative Action and Morse code testing to this very day. I
have never stopped comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code
testing. I do believe you are still lying. What I denied was
comparting (your word) Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.

> What you neglected to state was that morse testing and Affirmative
> Action are social engineering 180 degrees out of phase.

That's just your opinion and doesn't necessarily bear any resemblance
to the real truth. Morse testing and Affirmative Action are both
attempts to get citizens to do things that they may not want to do.
In that way, they are entirely similar and in phase.

> This is simply another example of your game playing with words and you
> had to use a typo to make your case.

What case? In front of God and all the readers here, you used the
word "comparting" and then lied about using it for days and days.
How can you bring yourself to lie about something that is in
plain view for everyone to see?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1330. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:51:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAFA90.123888B5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24327

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> > > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means, you
> > > might want to find out what it means.
> >
> > You mean like "comparting"? You apparently used a word for which
> > you were ignorant of the meaning.
>
> You know better and that makes your continuation of the lie all the
> worse.

You're the one who's lying, Dave, and here's the proof yet once again.
********************************************************************************
Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: Re: Radio Policy
Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2001 00:43:24 GMT

> You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
> Town, USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the
> status of expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition,
> I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> ^^^^^^^^^^
********************************************************************************
You introduced the word "comparting" and then lied about doing so for
days and days. How you can deny your documented archived postings is
unbelievable.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

1331. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:55:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAFB80.9B86D9AE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24328

Rick Adams wrote:
> I have a great deal of respect for the sincerely religious
> person--whether that person is a Christian, a Buddhist, or a Muslim.
> What I have no respect for, whatever, is the person who demands that
> OTHERS live by the rules of his or her religion, a very different
> matter.

Like Dave and Larry's Dept. of Vice and Virtue? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1332. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:57:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAFBE0.B23EEEF1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24329

Dave Heil wrote:
> I wouldn't sweat it too much, Larry. You are now getting religious
> advice from a man who says he prays to his inner self. As we have long
> konwn, nothing he says here can be taken seriously.

Then why do you take my postings about "comparting" so seriously?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1333. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 00:58:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFAFC41.FA9EC72E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24330

Krell wrote:
> When I was in college, a group of us would go out to eat after a night
> class. A young lady in our group would always meet her husband at whatever
> restaurant we went to. He seemed nice enough. However, one night he didn't
> meet us. His wife wanted to make sure she sat beside only women at whatever
> table we were at. She said that the reason she did this was that her husband
> often spied on her when she was out by herself. Sounds like something Larry
> would do if he were married.

That lady is Larry's ex-wife. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1334. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 01:03:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011120200345.22754.00000629@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 24331

In article <3BFA68CC.D5C6CA3A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Did you hear the FCC is unhappy with Victoria's Secret for
>> >their recent fashion show on TV?
>>
>> Maybe they're mad because they weren't invited.
>>
>> >What's the world coming
>> >to when the most beautiful thing in the whole world
>> >causes objections?
>>
>> They found a way to televise love on that show?
>
>The thing I am talking about is not an abstraction, Jim.

Beauty is an abstraction. Therefore, for a thing to be beautiful, abstraction
must be involved.

>It's the real thing (converted to electrons/photons).

You mean Heidi Klum?

--

FCC received about 50 emails complaining about that show. Perhaps supportive
emails should be sent.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1335. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 01:29:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFB0362.D0090F68@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24332

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 04:59:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >...and if you don't wish to be compared to a left leaning 60's,
> >everything-is-okay kind of guy, quit talking the talk.
>
> Except for the fact that I'm a libertarian instead of left
> leaning and my "everything-is-okay" has a rider that states "if it
> involves only consenting adults," I'll be more than glad to accept
> that description.

Ahhh, a libertarian. I've discarded that view as completely unworkable.
So if your wife chooses to start sleeping with another man and he
consents, it is fine with you? Do you have any say? Do you see any
immorality in the act? After all, what consenting adults do...

> >I don't depend upon you for validation. In fact, I rather think that if
> >a guy like you thinks I'm an idiot, I must be doing something right.
>
> Practice makes perfect!

As I said above...

> >We all make judgements in forming opinions, Rick. Being an open-minded
> >individual does not necessarily mean that one accepts everything as
> >being good or acceptable. Yet I feel that if I don't agree with your
> >views, you'd think me close-minded. Is it your belief that someone who
> >hears your ideas and rejects them after hearing them is close-minded?
>
> Not at all. I don't even marginally claim to be
> infallible--MANY open minded people disagree with my views or ideas
> and I've had quite a few interesting--and positive--discussions with
> such individuals. AND, more than once, they have convinced me to
> change my own views as a result of the information they provided.
>
> Being closed minded doesn't mean someone disagrees--it means
> they are unwilling to look at an issue from any perspective but their
> own.

But if someone looks at both sides of an issue and rejects the other's
view after examining it, is it your view that the person is
close-minded?

> Example: There is nothing wrong with someone viewing Kim's call
> sign as personally offensive to them, based on their personal moral
> values. But to accuse her of lacking class or threatening amateur
> radio, then ignoring the statements of others that they simply don't
> perceive it in the same manner--arguing in fact that if we don't agree
> with their assessment, we have no class either--CLEARLY demonstrates
> that their minds are closed.

That's simply a judgement one arrives at after examing the issue. I've looked at the issue of Kim's call and I've come to believe that her actions lack decorum. That is my sincer and honest view.

An open minded person is willing to
> acknowledge that others can disagree with his or her views and values
> yet still be just as sincere and honest as themselves. When that view
> is taken, disagreements take the form of debates or discussions, not
> flame wars and accusations. When, however, a closed minded "if you
> disagree with me you have to be wrong" attitude (synonymous with "My
> mind is made up--don't confuse me with the facts.") prevails, the
> result is inevitably the type of flames that are part of this thread.

It would be interesting if your "no wrong, no right" world existed. How about: "I have the facts. I have examined them and believe your actions to not be in the best interests of amateur radio or even of your own human dignity."?

> >Do your views on Christianity represent open-mindedness or
> >close-mindedness?
>
> Don't confuse my views on Christianity with my views of
> Christians, they aren't the same. While I don't happen to believe in
> the tenets of the Christian religion, it _does_ offer many rather
> strongly positive philosophical principles. Unfortunately, as
> Christianity is _practiced_ the only thing that comes through is
> "selective oppression."

That's an extremely subjective and close minded statement, Rick. It is obvious that you do not know how all people practice Christianity and you are apparently ignorant of denominational differences. I've never been oppressed by my Church.

> Oppression because modern Christians seek to
> restrict behavior their religion teaches is "immoral" instead of
> permitting people freedom of choice, and selective because there are
> just as many injunctions in the bible against behaviors that virtually
> ALL Christians practice (i.e., eating pork and shellfish,
> masturbation, etc.) as there are against the ones they arbitrarily
> choose to oppress.

I don't recall one of the sayings of Jesus being that anything consenting adults do is fine. In fact, I don't recall any religion which has anything like that as one of its tenets.

> I have a great deal of respect for the sincerely religious
> person--whether that person is a Christian, a Buddhist, or a Muslim.
> What I have no respect for, whatever, is the person who demands that
> OTHERS live by the rules of his or her religion, a very different
> matter.

Lack of taste and decorum are dictated more by society than by religion. We live in a nation of laws and regulation. Those laws and regulations not only protect your rights but protect me from you. By and large, you are free to practice whatever you like within the confines of your home or place of worship. That doesn't always hold true in public venues. The airwaves are a public venue.

We not only have freedoms which come to us by birth as citizens of the U.S., we have the responsibilities which go with that citizenship. I don't think Kim is being a responsible citizen.

Dave K8MN

1336. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 01:30:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFB03A4.761B49DC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24333

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:02:22 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick, You've just demonstrated your own lack of class.
>
> Well, since everyone who disagrees with you demonstrates a
> "lack of class" according to you, at least I'm in good company.

Let's see. There's Kim and...uh....there's you. How is that everyone
who diagrees with me?

Dave K8MN

1337. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 01:48:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn4enyw.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24334

On 21 Nov 2001 01:03:45 GMT, N2EY wrote:

> >Did you hear the FCC is unhappy with Victoria's Secret for
> >their recent fashion show on TV?

>FCC received about 50 emails complaining about that show. Perhaps
>supportive emails should be sent.

When is the re-run scheduled? Sure beats old "Law and Order".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1338. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 01:48:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn4esyx.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24335

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 00:23:07 GMT, BH wrote:

>I used to talk on a regular basis to a Delta airline pilot (yes he
>was a licensed ham) who lived near me. He flew between SF and
>Hawaii and after takeoff from Honolulu he would get on 15 meters
>and we would have a nice contact while he was out over the
>Pacific.

Did the company know that he was doing that?

Did the company's LAWYERS know that he was doing that?

Section 97.11 of the FCC Rules puts some very specific
restrictions on operation from an aircraft.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1339. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 01:51:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFB089B.F3465139@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24336

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:09:06 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >It would appear that you've never heard of Tugboat Annie either.

Not in any way that would have identified the character. It just didn't
seem like you understood who the literary Tugboat Annie is.

> Of course I've heard of Tugboat Annie--I just referred to her
> in the message you responded to, remember?
>
> >More of your classiness?
>
> Nope--I don't have a cesspool, sorry.

I'm sorry. Maybe you can save your money and purchase one.

> >I'd think that someone with your academic credentials would realize that
> >a child's thought processes are not fully formed. Kids often do stupid
> >things or things that are wrong. Parents who let their children make
> >all their own decisions are simply shirking their responsibility toward
> >the child and society. Nice cheap shot about my parents. My dad was a
> >succesfuly newsman who became an Episcopal priest.
>
> Try to remember your own posts. You were the one who brought
> your parents into it and make a slur that Kim _didn't_ have as good of
> upbringing, not me.

That isn't what I said at all. I believe that responsible parents
monitor and control what their as yet immature offspring do. While
Kim's deliberately suggestive callsign isn't at the top of the heap, it
contributes to the decline.

> I _do_ recognize that parents shape the values and beliefs of
> their children (which is where most--but not all--bigotry comes from,
> of course), my disagreement is with your assumption that good
> parents==protective parents who would not have let you be exposed to a
> hobby with call signs such as Kim's. It isn't the restrictive parent
> who is universally viewed by the social sciences as being the best
> parent--it is the one who allows their children to experience the
> world and provides support not regimentation.

It isn't the social sciences who determine what makes a good parent,
Rick.

> >> > I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of the
> >> >present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
> >> >involvement at all.
>
> Here's a perfect example of that. Certainly, 75m is offensive,
> but someone who has demonstrated the maturity to earn a ham ticket
> with a high enough class to permit operations on 75m should also be
> mature enough to understand that the kind of behavior he or she hears
> there is patently offensive to any rational person. Certainly the
> parent of a youth listening to the garbage should discuss the content
> with the child--just as the parent of a child watching a violent movie
> should discuss THAT content with him or her. But to prohibit him or
> her from exposure doesn't help the child to mature, it only stiffles
> his or her sense of exploration and prevents them from learning about
> views that are very different from those of his/her parents.

I wish I could agree with your touchy-feely scenario. My parents might say, "We dont' use that kind of vulgar language" Of course, 75m wasn't the sewer in my days as a beginner in amateur radio that it is now. Keep in mind that no one is required to obtain a license to *listen* to 75m or 2m. Even Novices in my day listened to the action on phone on all of the bands.

As to violent movies, there simply weren't as many. The ones which existed had such cheesy special effects that they were transparent. There were some films my parents drew the line at. I'm curious to know if you've simply ignored today's motion picture ratings and allowed your kids to view whatever they wanted to see.

> In an ideal ARS the racist garbage on 3950 wouldn't exist. But
> this isn't an ideal world, and not only does the racism exist but the
> jamming and other immature responses to it exist as well
> (realistically, if everyone ignored them completely, the Liberty Net
> group would rather quickly shrink in both size and influence). They
> are a part of ham radio--not a good part--but a part. So long as they
> DO exist, hams are going to encounter them--and the wise parent will
> insure that when his or her children do so they have a solid
> understanding of what is _wrong_ with racism and why the claims of
> racists are easily proven to be false. That way the child learns not
> only to oppose racism, but to discern between fact and opinion as
> well.

I'm in agreement with your statement. I do my part in ignoring the Liberty Net and much of the rest of the crud on 75.

> >I'm sure that your kids are super, Rick. What a role model you are.
>
> As it happens, I have one son who turned 18 two weeks ago. He
> was home schooled and started college at 14 at a community college
> (he'll receive his AA degree--with a 3.92 GPA--this spring and start
> his Junior year at a University in the Fall). Last year he was one of
> Parade Magazine's 52 top newspaper carriers in the USA and won a trip
> to Europe for his efforts. In addition, he donates a great deal of his

> time to designing web pages for non-profit community agencies that
> help the homeless and battered women, and is very publicly opposed to
> racism, sexism, and laws that restrict the rights of individuals. He
> has no interest in drugs at all (not a guess-a fact) and he doesn't
> care for alcohol.
>
> Yup. I think my wife and I did ok there--don't you?

I'd say that he has. Be careful not to take too much of the credit for
yourselves.

Dave K8MN

1340. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 01:58:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFB0A38.856776BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24337

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Your denials predated my typo by a substantial margin.
>
> Your typo occurred on Nov. 17 at 00:43 GMT. I dare you to produce
> a posting of mine before that time where I denied comparing
> Affirmative Action and Morse code testing. I continue to compare
> Affirmative Action and Morse code testing to this very day. I
> have never stopped comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code
> testing. I do believe you are still lying. What I denied was
> *comparting* (your word) Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
>
> > What you neglected to state was that morse testing and Affirmative
> > Action are social engineering 180 degrees out of phase.
>
> That's just your opinion and doesn't necessarily bear any resemblance
> to the real truth. Morse testing and Affirmative Action are both
> attempts to get citizens to do things that they may not want to do.
> In that way, they are entirely similar and in phase.
>
> > This is simply another example of your game playing with words and you
> > had to use a typo to make your case.
>
> What case? In front of God and all the readers here, you used the
> word "comparting" and then lied about using it for days and days.
> How can you bring yourself to lie about something that is in
> plain view for everyone to see?

I guess in the same way that you can continue to post this drivel about
me telling a lie when it is quite clear that is was a typo. I guess in
the same way that you continue to play the word game even now.
I'd say there is some truth to the old saw about there being more
horse's asses than horses in Texas.

Dave K8MN

1341. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:01:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFB0AE8.156635BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24338

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> > > > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means, you
> > > > might want to find out what it means.
> > >
> > > You mean like "comparting"? You apparently used a word for which
> > > you were ignorant of the meaning.
> >
> > You know better and that makes your continuation of the lie all the
> > worse.
>
> You're the one who's lying, Dave, and here's the proof yet once again.
> **
> Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
> From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2001 00:43:24 GMT
>
> > You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
> > Town, USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the
> > status of expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition,
> > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> > ^^^^^^^^^^
> **
> You introduced the word "comparting" and then lied about doing so for
> days and days. How you can deny your documented archived postings is
> unbelievable.

...and you introduced the "Big Lie" technique. How long is "days and days", Cecil? How long will you ignore the fact that my earlier and later posts on the matter say "compare" or "comparing"? You are not only a liar, but you stand on the rooftops and proclaim it.

Dave K8MN

1342. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:02:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFB0B33.5A077533@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24339

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I wouldn't sweat it too much, Larry. You are now getting religious
> > advice from a man who says he prays to his inner self. As we have long
> > konwn, nothing he says here can be taken seriously.
>
> Then why do you take my postings about "comparting" so seriously?

I don't take them seriously, Cecil. Nothing you say here can be taken seriously. It is simply a refill from your endless supply of BS.

Dave K8MN

1343. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:05:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFB0BCC.2AB2D321@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24340

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 00:23:07 GMT, BH wrote:
>
> >I used to talk on a regular basis to a Delta airline pilot (yes he
> >was a licensed ham) who lived near me. He flew between SF and
> >Hawaii and after takeoff from Honolulu he would get on 15 meters
> >and we would have a nice contact while he was out over the
> >Pacific.
>
> Did the company know that he was doing that?
>
> Did the company's LAWYERS know that he was doing that?
>
> Section 97.11 of the FCC Rules puts some very specific
> restrictions on operation from an aircraft.

I haven't heard much of it going on in recent years, Phil. In the past,
I'd run into guys from Delta or United operating on 20m fairly often.
There was also an SAS pilot with an SM0 call who was quite active.

Dave K8MN

1344. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:31:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb1283_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24341

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFA830E.F540F9A@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > You'd think Davey would get the hint. When one keeps throwing insults
that
> > no one understands because they're not at others' level, well... Kinda
has
> > the same affect as using the English language in a group of people that
> > speak nothing but Spanish.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means, you
> might want to find out what it means. It isn't my lack of knowledge
> which is the problem.
>

Uh, Dave. I would find it interesting, at best, for me to undertake
learning from you in any way constructive... Oh, and I'm not sure what you
mean by if I want to participate...I don't think I do...

Kim W5TIT

> Dave K8MN
>
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3BF9F60B.A7300972@IEEE.org...
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > It would appear that you've never heard of Tugboat Annie either.
> > >
> > > Is she any kin to Poke Salad Annie?
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > >
> > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > > Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> > > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1345. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:32:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb12bd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24342

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFA8245.DEC86321@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Process management is my chief responsibility at work, Dave. I would
> > shudder to think that I become so "adult" that I act like people such as
> > you. Now, for you it may work. For me, it would not. I bet that
between
> > the two of us, I make up for your lack of willingness to step outside
the
> > box.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> It is certainly odd that one who so often makes incorrect character and
> background judgements about people is employed in a field where she
> needs skill in using logical thought. Of course, being employed in a
> field and being any good at it don't automatically go hand in hand.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

You'd know, right? You have the lead on that example.

Kim W5TIT

> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BF9E7F4.DCD2A7E7@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Oh? A preppie, then, eh. My dad realizes that I am now an adult
and
> > that I
> > > > make my own decisions.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > You really don't have a clue, do you, Kim? A preppie? My age group
> > > didn't qualify me. I too am an adult and make my own decisions. Some
> > > of us mature at a faster rate than others. Maybe your decision making
> > > processes will improve as you mature.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message

> > > > news:3BF92766.46B8BF0D@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was
> > pretty
> > > > > born
> > > > > > with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > You couldn't be more off the beam than you are with this post,
> > Tugboat.
> > > > > Some of us rise above our beginnings. It helps to have parents
who
> > are
> > > > > loving and involved in our upbringing and who provide guidance
during
> > > > > our formative years. My dad, for instance would never have
permitted
> > me
> > > > > to choose a suggestive callsign back in the days when I first
entered
> > > > > amateur radio. I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of
the
> > > > > present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
> > > > > involvement at all.
> > > > >
> > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:3BF89E3B.9A310597@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> > > > > > > > <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day.
By
> > some
> > > > > > > > >definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but
is a
> > cast
> > > > > > iron SOB
> > > > > > > > >about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those
> > > > > juvenile,
> > > > > > > > tee hee
> > > > > > > > >giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so
> > common
> > > > > it is
> > > > > > > like
> > > > > > > > >stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is
one

> > > > thing,
> > > > > > being
> > > > > > > > > >judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the
wind
> > > > whistles
> > > > > > thru
> > > > > > > > > >and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being
> > > > judgemental.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose
any
> > > > > > > > > behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
> > > > > > > > > non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_
> > open-minded
> > > > and
> > > > > > > > > willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of
> > judging
> > > > > > > > > others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the
> > same
> > > > > > > > > behaviors they themselves prefer.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and
called
> > me
> > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > On the other hand, I don't happen to view
> > open-mindedness as
> > > > > a
> > > > > > > > > > flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the
CLOSED-minded
> > person
> > > > > > > > > > who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Damn! Another judgement.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave K8MN

1346. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:34:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb134b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24343

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120114853.25459.00002512@nso-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3bf88b4d_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Oh good grief, Larry. Haven't you ever wondered why you can't keep a
woman
> >around? You are so prudential.
>
> Kim:
>
> Actually, I insure with Nationwide.
>
> >My husband sits not 5' away from me, in our
> >office, together.
>
> He has my eternal sympathy.
>

After 14 years of love, we still hold hands, Larry. What's your excuse?

> >I occasionally read posts to him; he is well aware that I
> >would meet Rick, any other man, any other woman, or a whole host of
people,
> >at a Starbucks or otherwise.
>
> Well, fortunately, the woman in my life doesn't have to worry about *me*
doing
> anything like that!
>

WHY would she worry? Exactly *what* do you have in mind when you're
outside her sights? Can't you behave like an adult without her constantly
nagging at you to do so?

> >I don't "ask" my husband for permission to do anything, Larry. We don't
> >treat each other as children. Apparently, you like your women brainless
and
> >they like men who run their lives.
>
> Now, see here! Comrade Natasha doesn't run my life. Now, if you'll
excuse me,
> I have to go and get her a bowl of Borscht.
>

> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Uh huh...yeah, bondage is about your speed. It'd be the only way to keep someone around you.

Kim W5TIT

1347. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:36:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb139f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24344

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120114854.25459.00002514@nso-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3BF89DBA.E1FFF364@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Dontcha know? Rick doesn't care for those who make judgements!
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> Yup. He's a university professor, and, as such, has a professional
> mandate to comply with the edicts of liberal, politically-correct mind
> control at all times. People who make judgements are independent
> thinkers -- and, as such, are a threat to the creation of the One World
> Order.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

So, you're saying your degrees are had from the teachings of liberal,
politically-correct mind control freaks? Maybe if you'd taken the time to
get a quality education, you would have been able to apply it...

Kim W5TIT

1348. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:37:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb13eb$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24345

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120114855.25459.00002515@nso-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3BF89F7F.DADCCC95@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >For shame, Larry, petitio principii is not allowed.
> >You are the one making the assertion. The onus is upon you
> >to prove your assertion. If you cannot offer any proof, we
> >will be forced to conclude that you are full of it. Exactly
> >what damage is being done to the ARS by Kim's callsign?
>
> Cecil:
>
> Yawn! I don't recall ever stating that Kim's callsign is doing
> quantifiable "damage" to the ARS, only that the potential for
> such damage certainly exists -- as pointed out by no less an
> authority than Riley Hollingsworth. Do you disagree with Mr.
> Hollingsworth's statement that Kim's choice of a callsign has
> the potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction?"
>

I can't tell if that's penis envy or just plain envy.

> >Here's your argument applied to you, Larry. If you cannot
> >prove that you are not a rapist, then that you are one is
> >self-apparent. Don't you ever learn?
>
> Asked and answered. Can't you come up with anything original?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Kim W5TIT

1349. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:39:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb146e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24346

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120114856.25459.00002517@nso-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3BF8A9FD.B2AC2598@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> BTW -- I wonder how Kim's OM would feel about
> >> hearing that his XYL would want to meet another man at Starbucks for
> >> a day-long session of "philosophical discussion?" I know one for damn
> >> sure -- if I were married, my XYL wouldn't have to worry about me ever
> >> doing that with another woman -- unless she was there as well!
> >
> >Larry, you are undoubtedly a throwback to Neanderthal days. You're
> >not married because no woman likes to be hit over the head with a
> >club. Exactly what is wrong with coffee and conversation?
>
> Cecil:
>
> I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
> married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
> me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
> why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
> to be able to grasp this simple concept.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Earth to Larry: you never got promoted because it was someone else's fault;
you never got noticed by the boss because it was someone else's fault; blab
blab blab. Now, you never got married because it is someone else's fault.
See a pattern here?

Kim W5TIT

1350. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:41:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb14cc_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24347

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120114857.25459.00002519@nso-ch.aol.com...
> In article
<C8D4623C8997F9A1.84DB8FE90DC3AB53.7F805C1D34A75AC3@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> > For someone who CLAIMS not to want anyone to create a bad
> >image of hams, you certainly delight in demonstrating that some hams
> >are offensive, racist, bigoted, and sexist. You may not have "TIT" in
> >your call sign--but you have ASSHOLE written all over your face
> >instead.
>
> Ouch! I really *was* "rolling on the floor, laughing my head off" after
> reading that! Banged my noggin' on my computer's mini-tower on the
> way back up! All I can say, Rick, is that if you want to do some
> moonlighting after a hard day filling young, impressionable skulls full
> of liberal mush, check out one of the local comedy clubs!
>
> BTW -- I can just see Kim now --- swooning over your picture (you
> have exchanged photos by now, I assume!). In order to avoid revolting
> my own self, I won't bother trying to describe her response any further
> than that! Just one word of advice, however. She's married, and
> she's from Texas -- and that means her OM is probably packing heat!
> Since you're a double Post Hole Digger, I hope I can count on you
> not to do anything stupid!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Yeah, Rick. It's university profs, such as yourself, that are the reason
Larry's never been able to do a darned thing with his "education." ;)

Kim W5TIT

1351. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:48:48 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb16a2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24348

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:95F72CB7D9A054F5.05DA764AF9184C92.10E3D5B136FB0074@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 21:03:36 GMT, JJ <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote:
>
> >There is nothing 'evil' or illegal about the call sign, just show
> >a lack of class and taste...the trailer park mentality.
>
> I'm sure the hams who live in mobile homes and read this group
> love the wonderful welcome they keep receiving from people such as
> yourself.
>
> Why is there an automatic assumption that "trailer park" is
> synonymous with "trash?" Is it just that some people feel that because
> they paid $100K+ for their homes anyone who didn't is trash--or do the
> stereotypes seem so irresistible that you just can't help slamming
> people who live in mobiles as your inferiors?
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Have you priced a manufactured home lately, Rick?! That's the beauty of those folks who still use an antiquated term. Most recent home I looked at, double-wide, think it was a Palm Harbor or Redman, but not sure I remember--$93,000!!!!!! For those who seek value in life by the cost of ownership, that'll about put anyone in a mobile on a much higher value level than, say, most people in standard neighborhoods...LOL, plus most people with manufactured homes (trailers as they used to be called) have lots of property to go with them.

Kim W5TIT

1352. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:49:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb16e2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24349

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:1C9A2D4FBD09866F.9213F3B427841B90.91ABC6E07C96665B@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 21:36:25 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Oh, stop! You're bringing visions to mind...yes, there they are; all
> >tangled up...gulp. :)
>
> You've got your LEG and your EAR tangled up?
>
> Can I watch?
>
> Rick
>
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

What was that? I can't hear you...

Kim W5TIT

1353. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:52:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb1775$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24350

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFAC87B.EF327464@IEEE.org...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > How could I, old man? I'm not your therapist or your keeper so
> > I haven't read your psychiatric record.
>
> If you do, Rick, be sure to set aside an entire weekend. :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

With lots of beer to numb the pain, and loads of Ex-lax for...well, the
cleansing you'll need from being so full...

Kim W5TIT

1354. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:58:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb18d8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24356

OH GAWD!!!! Jim Kelley---touche! What a laugh!!!

Kim W5TIT

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3BFAD57E.E5D28FB6@uci.edu...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
> > married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
> > me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
> > why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
> > to be able to grasp this simple concept.
>
> Nor are you likely to. What they would likely "grasp" is that you're
> unable to distinguish between having coffee and having sex.

1355. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:59:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120215924.27773.00002959@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24353

In article <3bf9d18f$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>Steve!!! Dammit...hush. Larry's brought the subject up again--nearly right
>on time for the holidays, and I am wondering how long he'll run with it this
>time. I've added the aspect of mathematics to the mix and he's having a
>difficult time coming up with an effective dodge. I told him to prove that
>my callsign is a detriment to the ARS, since the numbers indicate he's
>wrong; membership's up.
>
>So, quiet....shhhhhhh ;)

Kim:

As stated previously, I never claimed that your call sign has done
any quantifiable damage to the ARS. It is more likely to affect
prospective hams in ones and twos -- perhaps discouraging another
future Edison to take up some other hobby. The potential harm of
your callsign will never be reflected in the numbers of licesnees, only
in the negative image it projects to those who never bother to
become licensed. Therefore, we'll never know just how many
steps closer to extinction you've taken us. If the number of U.S.
hams doubles in the next five years, that doesn't eliminate the
negative impact of your callsign on the positive, family-oriented
image of the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1356. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:59:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120215925.27773.00002960@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24351

In article <3bf9d2c4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Aw, Lar's just jealous...last time I saw his photo (which happened to show
>him from a bit higher than waist up...he had lots of cute little rolls
>himself.

Kim:

I'm 181.6 cm. tall, and weigh 80.9 kg. bone dry and in my birthday attire.
If you'd like to see a full-length photo of me taken a few years ago
(when I was about 1.5 kg. heavier), I'll send it to you or anyone who provides
a
servicable e-mail address.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1357. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:59:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120215926.27773.00002961@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24354

In article <07672E5C83F60245.4FDD35AA942157C0.7C6DC31DF9D8A911@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

> Gee Larry, don't you ever wash that mind?
>
> You mean you honestly can't sit down with a woman and have an
>intelligent--and EQUAL conversation with her w/o sex being part of the
>interactions?

Rick:

Of course I can. Fully half the people I work with are women, and
within the confines of the workplace, I have many interesting
conversations with them. However, these are not exclusive, one-on-
one meetings at Starbucks or anywhere else. That would not be
appropriate behavior, since most of these women are married, and
I am engaged in an exclusive, monogamous relationship with a
woman myself. Such meetings are inherently inappropriate unless
the mates of both parties are physically present and mutually
involved. I don't believe that the kind of loyalty and commitment
to such a relationship has any room in it for "friendly" intimate
meetings such as that. If one has such commitment, then he or
she must not take any action which would even give the appearance
of an outside relationship.

>How sad. Personally, MANY of my friends are women--just
>as many of my wife's friends are men--and neither of us has the
>slightest reason to distrust the other. That you don't trust your wife
>alone with another male--and that you assume any married woman who
>WOULD meet a man for coffee w/o her husband must have poor character
>says a world about your personal integrity.

Again, I am not married, but if I were, my wife would have no reason
to have suspicions about my behavior, because there would not be
any action on my part to arouse them. This is the true meaning of
loyalty to a spouse, or one's partner in a mutually exclusive
relationship.

>After all, if you wouldn't
>meet a woman for conversation alone either you have no respect for
>women and don't believe you can have an intellectual friendship with
>one or you can't be trusted out of your wife's sight and both of you
>know it. Either way, it is YOUR character--not Kim's--that was just
>demonstrated to be deficient.

I would not meet a married woman for a private, "intellectual"
conversation because I would not want my own wife or partner to
have any reason to question my loyalty to her. She can trust me
because that trust is demonstrated in practical, tangible action.

> I don't "have the hots" for Kim, Larry. If I wanted to get
>laid outside my marriage I wouldn't have to chase a monogamous married
>woman in over 1000 miles from me Texas to do so. From what I've seen
>of her, I happen to like Kim as a person, and respect her integrity
>and intelligence--three very good reasons to correspond with someone,
>none of which have the slightest thing to do with sex.

That comment was simply an observation based on your willingness
to support Kim's unsupportable position with regard to her selection
of a callsign. Since I have no respect for Kim on that basis, I choose
to ridicule your defense of her in that manner. In view of the fact
that you state that you are a committed family man, I apologize for
any offense taken.

> Sorry, Larry, but maybe you can't be trusted out of your
>spouse's sight--that doesn't surprise me at all--but that doesn't mean
>that Kim can't or that her husband wouldn't trust HER to enjoy a
>conversation with a man when it involved an area not of interest to
>him as well.

Such "trust" doesn't need to be tested within the context of a committed
relationship.

> You really stretch to find something "immoral" about Kim (and
>about me, for that matter), don't you Larry? Could that be because you
>know what an ass you're making out of yourself about her call sign and
>you're just hoping to find some justification for your offensive and
>sexist attitude toward her?

Quite the contrary. It is Kim's offensive and sexist behavior to which
I object. Her callsign has the effect of sexualizing her identity as a
radio amateur, in a manner which is unsuitable to the family-
oriented nature of the ARS. Kim's lack of good taste and personal
judgment is the issue of this thread -- not her morality. However, it
is not difficult to make a connection between the two, and any such
confusion is Kim's responsibility.

Kim has had the potential negative effect of her callsign explained
to her by Riley Hollingsworth. She knows what action to take to
rectify the situation. If she chooses not to, then this thread will
continue. If she chooses to change her callsign to one which no
longer creates such controversy, she will be praised for that action,
and this thread will cease. It is her choice, and no one can
force that choice upon her. She gets the credit -- or the criticism --
for whatever she chooses to do.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1358. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:59:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120215928.27773.00002962@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24355

In article <8C979F353A79AC62.BFA4DCF99807BDF1.3AFAE9CBC75FAC40@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

> Free speech is the cornerstone of our society. Without it we
>are in a pure dictatorship, regardless of how benevolent that dictator
>might be. But free speech, by necessity, carries with it the risk of
>offense. This is something that as Americans we simply have to accept
>as a cost of BEING Americans. As I pointed out in an earlier message
>to this thread, it's the same as two children playing with their toys;
>if one of those children wants the right to play with his/her toys
>without being limited by the other, that child must tolerate the same
>behavior as well. If we value the exercise of our own free speech, we
>must permit others to exercise their own--and before Larry or Dick
>claims I don't allow them to exercise theirs, that's inaccurate--I DO
>support their right to speak out. I simply reserve the right to point
>out the flaws or bias in their statements as I chose.

Rick:

I don't believe anyone in this newsgroup, with the possible exception
of Kim, disagrees with the above. I don't think the FCC should limit
the issuance of callsigns which could, as in Kim's case, spell out
words which could be construed as having a sexual innuendo, and
thus being in bad taste. I believe it is totally the responsibility of the
ham who requests such a call sign to live with the outcome of their
actions. It just so happens that Kim is now, in this thread, getting
her just deserts, as a result of her inappropriate choice.

I'm sure Kim would like nothing better than to "shut me up," as it
were, but that will never happen. I created this thread, and it will be
a recurring, if not permanent, feature of this newsgroup. For years,
we've had the concept of the "family-oriented" nature of the ARS
touted as one of it's most attractive features. I happen to strongly
agree with this, and believe that Mr. Riley Hollingsworth has done
all of us who value the positive, family-oriented image of the ARS
a great service when he stated that Kim's callsign had the potential
to bring it "…one step closer to extinction." Kim's choice to flaunt
a vulgar and demeaning callsign does not make her a champion
for free-speech "rights." It only makes her a spectacle of poor
judgement.

> Welcome to ham radio, Sean. We're not usually as obnoxious on
>the air as we are in this group--although a few are (mostly on 75m).
>Unlike the discussions here, most of what you'll find on the air is
>pretty "vanilla" in nature instead of controversial.

On the contrary, there are many controversial discussions to be found on-the-air. The chaos common to the HF phone bands is not the only on-the-air activity available to radio amateurs. The CW and digital bands are full of interesting, stimulating conversations. Since Restructuring has virtually eliminated any effort involved in gaining access to the HF bands, I would think that the digital modes would gain greater popularity and higher utilization. Let's hope that this is so.

This newsgroup exists for the express purpose of discussing "controversial" topics related to amateur-radio policymaking. It is the specific, intended home of the debate on code testing as a licensing requirement. If you have personal objections as to the nature of the colloquy inherent to this newsgroup, I suggest that there are many other newsgroups which may serve your needs better than this one can.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1359. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 02:59:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120215929.27773.00002963@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24352

In article <3BFA6BEA.3948122F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Rick Adams wrote:
>> Gee Larry, don't you ever wash that mind?
>
>In the years he's been on this newsgroup, he's been
>consistently obsessive/compulsive about sex.

Cecil:

For exactly the same number of years, you've been attempting to
assign the behavioral attributes you possess to others -- obviously
to divert attention from your own obsessive/compulsive proclivities.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1360. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:12:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb1c20_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24357

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFB089B.F3465139@earthlink.net...
>
> > As it happens, I have one son who turned 18 two weeks ago. He
> > was home schooled and started college at 14 at a community college
> > (he'll receive his AA degree--with a 3.92 GPA--this spring and start
> > his Junior year at a University in the Fall). Last year he was one of
> > Parade Magazine's 52 top newspaper carriers in the USA and won a trip
> > to Europe for his efforts. In addition, he donates a great deal of his
> > time to designing web pages for non-profit community agencies that
> > help the homeless and battered women, and is very publicly opposed to
> > racism, sexism, and laws that restrict the rights of individuals. He
> > has no interest in drugs at all (not a guess-a fact) and he doesn't
> > care for alcohol.
> >
> > Yup. I think my wife and I did ok there--don't you?
>
> I'd say that he has. Be careful not to take too much of the credit for
> yourselves.
>
> Dave K8MN

First Davey wishes to make an observation of one's character built upon the
way they were raised, then wants to depart from that observation and
cautions against close association with credit for raising a kid well.

You *are* a contrast in design, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

1361. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:19:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb1db7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24358

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120215924.27773.00002959@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3bf9d18f$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >Steve!!! Dammit...hush. Larry's brought the subject up again--nearly
right
> >on time for the holidays, and I am wondering how long he'll run with it
this
> >time. I've added the aspect of mathematics to the mix and he's having a
> >difficult time coming up with an effective dodge. I told him to prove
that
> >my callsign is a detriment to the ARS, since the numbers indicate he's
> >wrong; membership's up.
> >
> >So, quiet....shhhhhhh ;)
>
> Kim:
>
> As stated previously, I never claimed that your call sign has done
> any quantifiable damage to the ARS. It is more likely to affect
> prospective hams in ones and twos -- perhaps discouraging another
> future Edison to take up some other hobby. The potential harm of
> your callsign will never be reflected in the numbers of licesnees, only
> in the negative image it projects to those who never bother to
> become licensed. Therefore, we'll never know just how many
> steps closer to extinction you've taken us. If the number of U.S.
> hams doubles in the next five years, that doesn't eliminate the
> negative impact of your callsign on the positive, family-oriented
> image of the ARS.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Oh, Larry. Don't get too lost in your delusion, OK? Ham radio, from the
perspective of "those who never bother to become licensed", is about as
invisible as air. Most non-licensees, save families, are even aware of ham
radio. Most people are far more aware of CB than ham radio.

But, I forgot that you have that habit of blaming everyone else but yourself
for your failures. If you'd like to make me your patsy because you can't
change your deplorable behavior and quit chasing people from the hobby just
by opening your mouth or setting finger to keyboard--then I am happy to be
at your service.

Kim W5TIT

1362. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:23:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb1eb2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24359

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120215926.27773.00002961@nso-fo.aol.com...
>
>
> Again, I am not married, but if I were, my wife would have no reason
> to have suspicions about my behavior, because there would not be
> any action on my part to arouse them. This is the true meaning of
> loyalty to a spouse, or one's partner in a mutually exclusive
> relationship.
>

I'd much rather have such faith in my husband, as I do, that he can go anywhere, in the company of anyone, and I think nothing of it. Same from him to me. Our commitment to each other as man and woman, to each other as best friends, and to each other as trusted companions, is there regardless of where one or the other is.

Maybe someday you'll get that lucky, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

1363. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:28:47 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb1ffc_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24360

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120215928.27773.00002962@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article > Rick:
>
> It just so happens that Kim is now, in this thread, getting
> her just deserts, as a result of her inappropriate choice.
>

I *l-o-v-e* it when Larry thinks he giving me desert...LOL I love it when
he thinks he's actually bothering me.

> I'm sure Kim would like nothing better than to "shut me up," as it
> were, but that will never happen.

Heavens, no!! You're quite the hoot, Larry. I had no idea there were even
men like you around any more.

> I created this thread, and it will be
> a recurring, if not permanent, feature of this newsgroup.

Did you?

> For years,
> we've had the concept of the "family-oriented" nature of the ARS
> touted as one of it's most attractive features. I happen to strongly
> agree with this, and believe that Mr. Riley Hollingsworth has done
> all of us who value the positive, family-oriented image of the ARS
> a great service when he stated that Kim's callsign had the potential
> to bring it ".one step closer to extinction." Kim's choice to flaunt
> a vulgar and demeaning callsign does not make her a champion
> for free-speech "rights." It only makes her a spectacle of poor
> judgement.
>

Yep, I think that answers my earlier question in another post. Yep, penis
envy is what ya got, there, Larry.

> This newsgroup exists for the express purpose of discussing
> "controversial" topics related to amateur-radio policymaking. It
> is the specific, intended home of the debate on code testing as
> a licensing requirement. If you have personal objections as to
> the nature of the colloquy inherent to this newsgroup, I suggest
> that there are many other newsgroups which may serve your
> needs better than this one can.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

>

W5TIT - Kim (callsign first for your enjoyment, Larry)

1364. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:42:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB228E.7684A824@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24361

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> As stated previously, I never claimed that your call sign has done
> any quantifiable damage to the ARS. ... Therefore, we'll never know
> just how many steps closer to extinction you've taken us.

In other words, you have declared Kim innocent until proven guilty.
Have you forgotten what country you're in Larry?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1365. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:43:18 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tf7sk016e7@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24382

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFB0362.D0090F68@earthlink.net...
> Ahhh, a libertarian. I've discarded that view as completely unworkable.
> So if your wife chooses to start sleeping with another man and he
> consents, it is fine with you? Do you have any say? Do you see any
> immorality in the act? After all, what consenting adults do...

No. I should hope so. Yes.
...none of which is the government's damn business. That's how Libertarians
think

1366. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:43:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120224349.27773.00002965@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24366

In article <9te8t002ns1@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Cecil:
>>
>> I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
>> married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
>> me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
>> why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
>> to be able to grasp this simple concept.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>How about if he was gay?

Krell:

Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
To do so would be just as much a challenge to my trust as if he
were a normal, heterosexual male.

People who truly love and respect each other do not impose such
challenges to the trust their loved ones have in them. It's as simple
as that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1367. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:43:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120224350.27773.00002966@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24365

In article <3BFAC507.CFB58E88@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I, too, have a long way to go before I could be considered a "good"
>> Christian. However, my life is still in Christ's hands -- He is my
>> Savior. I have faith, not "religion."
>
>Right now, Larry, you are going to hell because you don't possess
>enough waking hours to ask forgiveness for all your sins. My advice
>would be to cut back on your sinning to a level that can be forgiven
>with less than 24 hours of prayer.

Well, you've got one thing right, Cecil -- I'm endlessly asking for
forgiveness of my sins. I am also praying for those who don't see
the need to ask forgiveness. That's as much as I can do, save for
trying *not* to be a sinner.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1368. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:43:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120224351.27773.00002969@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24362

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gn4enyw.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>
> When is the re-run scheduled? Sure beats old "Law and Order".

Objection, Your Honor! I like the old "Law and Order" re-runs --
especially since I've not seen many of them from when they were
"All-New Episodes" in prime time!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1369. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:43:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120224351.27773.00002968@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24363

In article <3BFAE410.222FC6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Right now, Larry, you are going to hell because you don't possess
>> enough waking hours to ask forgiveness for all your sins. My advice
>> would be to cut back on your sinning to a level that can be forgiven
>> with less than 24 hours of prayer.
>
>I wouldn't sweat it too much, Larry. You are now getting religious
>advice from a man who says he prays to his inner self. As we have long
>konwn, nothing he says here can be taken seriously.

No sweat, Dave. One reason why I know I'm not going to Hell is
because I've never told anyone else that they're going to!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1370. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:43:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120224351.27773.00002967@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24367

In article <22714020968DF113.D317E10C11D1A847.1F86216ACB998408@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> There are a great many things that are likely to contribute to
>a decline in the ARS--including the racism, hate speech, rudeness, and
>"cb-like" obscenities and arguments (which, of course, is a stereotype
>that doesn't apply to the majority of cb users). ALL of these, and
>other similar behaviors, have a real potential to harm amateur radio.
>Until Hollingsworth starts eliminating THOSE problems (and telling us
>to "self-police" isn't eliminating them), he has a lot more to concern
>himself with than Kim's call sign.
>
> Rick

I don't disagree with any of the above, Rick, but Mr. Hollingsworth
did take the time to respond to Kim with the words which now
title this thread. Moreover, I certainly believe him to be a much
better authority to judge what could possibly take the ARS "...one
step closer to extinction" than anyone in this newsgroup, myself
included. However, as your mileage obviously varies, all I can say
is I'm glad we have the freedom to disagree, and to express that
disagreement in a public forum without fear of censorship!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1371. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:43:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120224352.27773.00002970@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24368

In article <3bfb139f_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> Yup. He's a university professor, and, as such, has a professional
>> mandate to comply with the edicts of liberal, politically-correct mind
>> control at all times. People who make judgements are independent
>> thinkers -- and, as such, are a threat to the creation of the One World
>> Order.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>So, you're saying your degrees are had from the teachings of liberal,
>politically-correct mind control freaks? Maybe if you'd taken the time to
>get a quality education, you would have been able to apply it...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I spent the best years of my adult life defending your First Amendment
right to make a fool of yourself. I got my B.S. after I retired from the
USAF, mainly because I wanted it for myself. I love my job, it pays
well, and has full State benefits, and lets me do something that really
helps people less fortunate than myself. I'd have to take a 10 kilobuck
per year pay cut to take an entry-level job in the career field in which
I have my degree, but I am now being strongly lobbied by one of my
old professors to get my M.S. and do some part-time teaching as
adjunct faculty. Maybe, someday, but for now I am working my way
out of the economic impact of 3 years of going to school and working
a low-paying job while doing so. So, before you attempt to chide me
for not being able to apply my degree to my professional life, please
explain all the truck drivers out there with Masters and Doctorate
degrees! Some people do what they want to do in spite of their
education -- even when they actually have one!

What is *your* educational level -- and what do you do for a living?

(Anyone want to take any bets as to whether we'll get an answer?)

73 de Larry, K3LT

1372. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:43:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120224353.27773.00002971@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24364

In article <3bfb146e_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Earth to Larry: you never got promoted because it was someone else's fault;
>you never got noticed by the boss because it was someone else's fault; blab
>blab blab. Now, you never got married because it is someone else's fault.
>See a pattern here?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Earth to Kim:

Where did you get the idea that I "never got promoted?" I got promoted
at a rate which was way above average for my career field. I opted for
early retirement as a Master Sergeant in spite of a virtually guaranteed
promotion to Senior Master Sergeant. I think you'd best avoid topics
you know nothing about.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1373. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:44:37 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C1F3BA4A8C3D04CC.E0937DD15328380A.00D5A875679723B2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24369

On 20 Nov 2001 16:48:57 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Ouch! I really *was* "rolling on the floor, laughing my head off" after
>reading that!

If a flame can't be funny, why post it? ;-)

> Banged my noggin' on my computer's mini-tower on the
>way back up!

That's it, Larry. Take it out on your computer!

>All I can say, Rick, is that if you want to do some
>moonlighting after a hard day filling young, impressionable skulls full
>of liberal mush, check out one of the local comedy clubs!

Libertarian, Larry, not liberal--please!

And most of the heads I'm teaching THIS term could use some
filling with philosophical thought--I'm teaching CJ Psychology courses
to Police Academy grads who are joining various police departments. If
I can influence THAT kind of rigid group-think, converting you and
Dick to devout no-coders should be a breeze!

I don't need the comedy club though, I get plenty of time to
do a stand up routine when I lecture--and I have a captive audience to
boot!

>BTW -- I can just see Kim now --- swooning over your picture (you
>have exchanged photos by now, I assume!).

Larry, anyone who would "swoon" over MY picture needs therapy!

I invariably describe myself totally honestly--as being at
least a handsome as a great American statesman (Abraham Lincoln,
unfortunately).

And, no, we haven't "exchanged pictures." We haven't even
exchanged QSL cards (although, after all the discussion about her
card, I _would_ like to add Kim's card to my collection to add a touch
of "spice" :-).

> In order to avoid revolting
>my own self, I won't bother trying to describe her response any further
>than that!

Hysterical laughter revolts you?

Why?

> Just one word of advice, however. She's married, and
>she's from Texas -- and that means her OM is probably packing heat!

So?

I'm married myself (for 21 years), is that supposed to mean I
can't have female friends? Why not?

You might want to consider just how sexist such assumptions
sound, Larry. This is the 21st Century--not the 19th. The assumption
that the only reason a man would be friendly to a woman is for sex is
both very demeaning to women (and to men) and completely inaccurate.

As it happens, I have a number of very good friends who are
women. By your standards, that should mean I have a harem. While the
concept may be flattering to me, I'll have to pass--I'm just too old
to handle more than two or three women at a time and that would exceed
my limit. Heck, if I tried that I'd have to borrow some Viagra from
you just to make it through the first couple weeks!

>Since you're a double Post Hole Digger, I hope I can count on you
>not to do anything stupid!

Yup! Not that a graduate degree makes a person any less stupid
than everyone else--but it DOES tend to provide a better vocabulary to
use in debates! :-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1374. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:46:03 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <079866FFCA9AB185.2A94343A7D802CA1.E99F87C35EA92373@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24370

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:11:37 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> I've got you, Larry, and Dick on the defensive, don't I?
>
>Is that your overinflated view of your power?

Curiosity or self-defense?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1375. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:46:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB23A7.FD7757E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24372

Dave Heil wrote:
> I guess in the same way that you can continue to post this drivel about
> me telling a lie when it is quite clear that is was a typo.

It was a typo but then you lied for days about making the typo. If
you had just admitted the typo I wouldn't have had the pleasure
of showing you up as a liar AND a fool. You not only misinterpret
what I write, you misinterpret what *you* write.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1376. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:47:45 UTC
From: BH <radioguyx@texxas.net>
Message-ID: <3BFA6B90.FD38CEB9@texxas.net>
Source record: 24371

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 00:23:07 GMT, BH wrote:
>
> >I used to talk on a regular basis to a Delta airline pilot (yes he
> >was a licensed ham) who lived near me. He flew between SF and
> >Hawaii and after takeoff from Honolulu he would get on 15 meters
> >and we would have a nice contact while he was out over the
> >Pacific.
>
> Did the company know that he was doing that?
>
> Did the company's LAWYERS know that he was doing that?
>
> Section 97.11 of the FCC Rules puts some very specific
> restrictions on operation from an aircraft.

Have no idea but we had some nice contacts which relieved some
boredom on his part. Do you know if the aircraft being out of US
airspace makes any difference as far as the FCC is concerned. AS
far as any company rules, I would assume they would apply anytime

BH

1377. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:50:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <81556E28351A1A56.42166A57A58FAD72.308E90AEA500DABC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24373

On 20 Nov 2001 16:48:54 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>That's where you'd be wrong. I was in Safeway the other day, and there
>was a bottle of Tobasco sauce on a shelf, several inches over my head!
>Somehow, I managed to "get it." In reality, I get lots of things that are
>over my head.

Larry!

You're demonstrating a sense of humor!

Shame on you--you're destroying all our images of you!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1378. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:52:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011120225232.27773.00002972@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 24374

In article <3bfb1c20_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>First Davey wishes to make an observation of one's character built upon the
>way they were raised, then wants to depart from that observation and
>cautions against close association with credit for raising a kid well.
>
>You *are* a contrast in design, Dave.
>
>Kim W5TIT

That's funny, Kim. I, and most other people, would call Dave an example of a fine, upstanding citizen -- and his son is proof thereof, in addition to being one in his own right. I don't know what you mean by a "contrast in design," and I have strong doubts that you do, either.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1379. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:54:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB2564.9899CF5C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24375

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> > > > > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means, you
> > > > > might want to find out what it means.
> > > >
> > > > You mean like "comparting"? You apparently used a word for which
> > > > you were ignorant of the meaning.
> > >
> > > You know better and that makes your continuation of the lie all the
> > > worse.
> >
> > You're the one who's lying, Dave, and here's the proof yet once again.
> > ************************************************************************
> > Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
> > From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> > Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2001 00:43:24 GMT
> >
> > > You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
> > > Town, USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the
> > > status of expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition,
> > > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> > > ^^^^^^^^^^
> > ************************************************************************
> > You introduced the word "comparting" and then lied about doing so for
> > days and days. How you can deny your documented archived postings is
> > unbelievable.
>
> ...and you introduced the "Big Lie" technique. How long is "days and
> days", Cecil?

Four days now, Dave. I've been keeping track to see exactly when
you are going to show a hint of integrity and issue an apology.
```

> How long will you ignore the fact that my earlier and
> later posts on the matter say "compare" or "comparing"?

I'm not ignoring that fact. I compared Affirmative Action
and Morse code testing. I haven't stopped comparing Affirmative
Action and Morse code testing. I will continue to compare
Affirmative Action and Morse code testing. I have NEVER
denied comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.

I denied comparting Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
I will continue to deny comparting Affirmative Action and Morse
code testing. It was a lie when you first posted it and it
continues to be a lie for all to see.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1380. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:56:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6C55D1F9CA0D9BDE.D7CDCCB30AE46DE6.E6F60A264A937861@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24376

On 20 Nov 2001 16:48:54 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Yup. He's a university professor, and, as such, has a professional
>mandate to comply with the edicts of liberal, politically-correct mind
>control at all times. People who make judgements are independent
>thinkers -- and, as such, are a threat to the creation of the One World
>Order.

Oh Brother. Here come the "One World'ers!"

Seen any black helicopters lately, Larry? Maybe some UN troops
taking over your neighborhood?

Sorry, Larry, but I'm neither a liberal nor politically
correct. On the contrary, I'm an outspoken critic of PC double speak
on both our campus and the Internet. I simply don't judge people based
on their race, their religion, their sex, or their sexual orientation.
To me that isn't being PC, it's demonstrating intelligence and a
willingness to accept people at face value.

I'm still not sure why on earth you would equate being
judgmental as being an independent thinker. The independent thinker
takes each situation as an individual event, not as a "proof" that a
stereotype is true--and the independent thinker is intelligent enough
to recognize that simply because he or she believes something does NOT
mean that others are wrong for not believing it--only that they are
different in their perspective.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1381. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 03:56:51 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb2634$0$35618$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 24377

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:IMiK7.176702$3d2.7616743@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Sure as hell looks like some sort of mind game to me.

Why you so upset, it is just a public debate of radio amateur (regulatory)
policy.

Larry

1382. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:00:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <99590C2BB72352E9.215B94F29C04A2D8.F5DF0AF167458A57@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24378

On 20 Nov 2001 16:48:56 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
>married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
>me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
>why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
>to be able to grasp this simple concept.

If you want to find a woman who agrees with THAT concept,
you'll need a time machine that will take you back at least 100 years!

Larry, wake up! All that such an attitude tells your partner
is that you don't trust her. Is that a message you would really want
to send to a woman you claimed to care about? This is the 21st
Century--today women aren't the property of their spouses, they are
their partners!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1383. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:00:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB26EB.BA0A80CF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24380

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Then why do you take my postings about "comparting" so seriously?
>
> I don't take them seriously, Cecil.

So how many replies have you posted regarding "comparting"?
I've been leading you down the primrose path for four days now.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1384. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:01:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <85731B0E5E217B66.0F23E6FE85718F1C.57669B07DFC1D87F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24379

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 13:55:38 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>How about if he was gay?

Then Larry would be even MORE determined that his spouse not
meet him--he'd be convinced that if she spoke to a homosexual man
she'd catch AIDS from the conversation and infect him!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1385. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:04:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB27CD.3948D8E3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24381

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> For exactly the same number of years, you've been attempting to
> assign the behavioral attributes you possess to others -- obviously
> to divert attention from your own obsessive/compulsive proclivities.

No diversion necessary, Larry. I'm bipolar with obsessive/compulsive
traits. That's how I can so easily recognize them in others.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1386. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:09:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB28E7.73A6CE1B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24383

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Fully half the people I work with are women, and
> within the confines of the workplace, I have many interesting
> conversations with them. However, these are not exclusive, one-on-
> one meetings at Starbucks or anywhere else. That would not be
> appropriate behavior, since most of these women are married, and
> I am engaged in an exclusive, monogamous relationship with a
> woman myself. Such meetings are inherently inappropriate unless
> the mates of both parties are physically present and mutually
> involved.

Larry, I'm convinced you are pulling our legs. If not, you are
farther gone than I thought. One of your think-alikes hits
Afghani women with a stick because she shows her face in
public.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1387. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:19:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111202019.5dbad10c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24384

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote in message
news:<20011118191207.08696.00000568@mb-cs.aol.com>...

> Now run along like a nice troll and eat some prunes...maybe it will clear
> up that retention problem you seem to be suffering.
>
>
Hey Teebie Sweetums I just done the prostrate Roto-Rooter thing,
lemmee tellya abt the joys of "retention" . . OK so I'm a tad
oversensitive, fhut the wuck.
>
>
I can recoomend a great urologist who can fix this idiot's brain.
>
>
Dit.
>
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
w3rv

1388. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:19:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB2B66.FC277BED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24385

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > Ahhh, a libertarian. I've discarded that view as completely unworkable.
> > So if your wife chooses to start sleeping with another man and he
> > consents, it is fine with you? Do you have any say? Do you see any
> > immorality in the act? After all, what consenting adults do...
>
> No. I should hope so. Yes.
> ...none of which is the government's damn business. That's how Libertarians
> think

Adultery is indeed none of the government's damn business.
No enlightened state has laws against adultery.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1389. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:22:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB2C09.714F5A2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24386

Rick Adams wrote:
> As it happens, I have a number of very good friends who are
> women. By your standards, that should mean I have a harem.

What it means is that Larry cannot look at a female without
thinking about sex - any female except his sister or mother.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1390. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:24:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB2C88.9FC1C774@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24387

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Well, you've got one thing right, Cecil -- I'm endlessly asking for
> forgiveness of my sins. I am also praying for those who don't see
> the need to ask forgiveness. That's as much as I can do, save for
> trying *not* to be a sinner.

From your postings, I would say your attempt at not sinning
is pretty feeble.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1391. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:28:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB2D51.2379D5B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24388

Rick Adams wrote:
> Seen any black helicopters lately, Larry? Maybe some UN troops
> taking over your neighborhood?

Something was interfering with CNN on my TV. I called the
cable company and they said it was the AWACs. Does that count?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1392. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:29:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFB2DA5.67728B4F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24389

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.

Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1393. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 04:39:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <zeGK7.178116$3d2.7751338@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24390

"Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:3bfb2634$0$35618$bbae4d71@news.net-link.net...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:IMiK7.176702$3d2.7616743@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Sure as hell looks like some sort of mind game to me.
>
> Why you so upset, it is just a public debate of radio amateur (regulatory)
> policy.
>
> Larry
>

Upset is not the word, weary and bored stiff come closer. This horse has been ridden into the ground.

Some yoyo gets his codeless Tech and for whatever reason decides he will never take a simple-minded code test. OK, fine. Certainly his right. He then procedes to become a member of everything, goes to Dayton and visits HP Maxim's grave, becomes the resident genius on everything from the regs to 160 meter gray line propagation with special emphasis on emergency ops. We then get to hear about digital everything. At some point, anyone who ever passed a code test becomes fair game for assorted potshots. The mode is attacked by someone who has never run it and things degenerate from there.

There is also an ethical issue. I really do not enjoy being asked to enable basically silly behavior. What you are suggesting, a debate on regulatory policy, is right up there with the late nite bull sessions I once got into to avoid facing my homework. And at bottom that is the issue and will be until 2003 or whenever -- I want to debate, I don't want to learn code. Ok, fine, take it to the chaplain; he is paid to listen. I won't help you in your juvenile behavior.

And what in the world would we debate? I am not about to justify code testing because it really cannot be justified in 2001 and never could be at anything over 12. But it is the law at the moment so there are exactly two choices, study code or wait, neither of which require my participation. What makes me so blessed important? You want me to recognize you as my equal? When pink pigs fly. Do you seriously need my approval? Not bloody likely.

From my point of view I see a cat in need of a scratching post. Lacking one to give the cat I am not about to volunteer my left leg. Lost a lot of cats that way.

Dick N&#65533;BK

1394. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 05:23:58 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2EEE83A720255921.470F75856E758565.24B18CF6647676A9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24391

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 20:49:33 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>What was that? I can't hear you...

Sure you can--you're just pulling my LEG.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1395. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 05:30:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4440E418D7E4271C.5A1F63EFDB72CCAC.CED57F94847B28BE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24392

On 21 Nov 2001 03:43:51 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I don't disagree with any of the above, Rick, but Mr. Hollingsworth
>*did* take the time to respond to Kim with the words which now
>title this thread. Moreover, I certainly believe him to be a much
>better authority to judge what could possibly take the ARS "...one
>step closer to extinction" than anyone in this newsgroup, myself
>included. However, as your mileage obviously varies, all I can say
>is I'm glad we have the freedom to disagree, and to express that
>disagreement in a public forum without fear of censorship!

This is scary, Larry. I happen to agree with you (although I
don't necessarily share your view as to Hollingsworth's accuracy in
his predictions, but that's a personal difference not an issue based
one). Either you're mellowing out or the argument is beginning to lose
its fun for you and you're not posting for effect for a change.

Or, of course, I've been working too hard and it's beginning
to cloud my judgement . . . ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1396. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 05:32:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2C417BA006FB358B.64865A660512ACC7.E7EC661B8180E44F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24393

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 20:37:19 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>I can't tell if that's penis envy or just plain envy.

Kim, if talking about your call sign causes Larry to
experience penis envy, he's a LOT more confused than any of us
realize! :-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1397. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 05:56:12 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0111202156.70423a34@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24394
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Leland C. Scott" <Twistedhed@wettv.net> wrote in message
news:<XPBK7.170$rU3.6664@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>...
> "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote
> in message >
>
> >leland,...the phone company will not do shit about that crap.
>
> That all depends on the frequency and time of the calls.
>
> > as soon as they find out the facts on the situation
>
> They realy don't have much choice in the matter.
>
> > think the best
> > thing for you to do is leave your phone off the hook or change your
> > number.
>
> I have an answering machine which I use to screen all my calls. I have
> never answered the phone until I know who it is. I would just assume to
> let the telmarketers waste their time for two or three minutes talking
> to my mcahine tha takes me all of 2 seconds to hit the delete button
> later.
>
> >leland, you sir are a agitator
>
> Being an "agitator" depends on your point of view. You are either for
> sane operation where people go by the rules so that all may enjoy the
> benefits that come of it, or you have the spectrum thieves who will take
> over whatever frequency seems to be unoccupied, which of course means
> the authorized user no longer has use of the spectrum whenever they
> choose to use it, the spectrum thief is using it. Same goes with
> amplifier use on 11m.
>
> >who walks a fine line between legality and illegality
>
> So if I did something illegal then jump right in here and point it out.
> In the past 2 years nobody else could find anything, and some have tried
> real hard too. LOL
>
>
> --
>

>
>
> 73's de,
>
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>
> ARRL member
> NCI member
>
> "You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
> Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
> communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic
> Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
> Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
> transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
> functions."

so let me get this straight......you have no intention,... as you put it, to quit doing what you are doing.........is that correct???????

1398. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 06:10:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C69184E54F155A8B.3CF85435036D2954.A9EA953BEA288A9B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24395

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 01:51:29 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Not in any way that would have identified the character. It just didn't
>seem like you understood who the literary Tugboat Annie is.

Sure I do--I'm approaching "Fuddy-Duddy-hood" fairly quickly.
But the juxtaposition of "Annie" with both Tugboat and Little Annie
Fannie was simply too obvious (in the light of the thread topic--Kim's
"TIT") to miss!

>I'm sorry. Maybe you can save your money and purchase one.

Nah! Plenty of them on the Usenet if I want one--or I can
record one on 3950 any Saturday.

>That isn't what I said at all. I believe that responsible parents
>monitor and control what their as yet immature offspring do. While
>Kim's deliberately suggestive callsign isn't at the top of the heap, it
>contributes to the decline.

But it likewise implies that a "responsible" parent would take
offense at her call sign, something that is purely a matter of
opinion. I feel myself to be a "responsible" parent, and I can
guarantee that if Kim's call sign was the worst thing my son was ever
exposed to I'd be rather happy!

>It isn't the social sciences who determine what makes a good parent,
>Rick.

No, it is the end result that determines that. Social sciences
can, however, provide research that demonstrates the kinds of parental
behavior that most frequently result in positive development and the
ones that result in negative development.

>I wish I could agree with your touchy-feely scenario. My parents might
>say, "We dont' use that kind of vulgar language" Of course, 75m wasn't
>the sewer in my days as a beginner in amateur radio that it is now.
>Keep in mind that no one is required to obtain a license to *listen* to
>75m or 2m. Even Novices in my day listened to the action on phone on
>all of the bands.

True. But I will still argue that the best parent isn't the
one who forbids their children to listen to offensive speech--it's the
one who permits it but insures that he or she takes the time to
discuss the content with the child and help the child to understand
why the speech IS offensive instead.

>As to violent movies, there simply weren't as many. The ones which
>existed had such cheesy special effects that they were transparent.

True.

The problem with violence in movies (and television, of
course) came when the violence stopped being the "bang-you're-dead"
variety and became very realistic. Simply put, it inures a person to
actual violence and makes it seem less horrifying or unacceptable than
it actually is.

>There were some films my parents drew the line at. I'm curious to know
>if you've simply ignored today's motion picture ratings and allowed your
>kids to view whatever they wanted to see.

Within reason, yes. While my child was pre-pubescent we set
some limits--and insisted that some of the movies he wanted to see
were viewed with one of us, not alone. After he became a teen, of
course, we stopped setting any content limits at all--frankly, if a
parent hasn't instilled a set of values by the age of 12, that parent
has already failed anyway and if he or she HAS instilled the values, a
movie isn't going to change them.

>I'm in agreement with your statement. I do my part in ignoring the
>Liberty Net and much of the rest of the crud on 75.

The people who jam it, etc., are just egging the participants
on and creating enough noise that they attract others who would
otherwise never have heard the Liberty Net in the first place.

If a group of narrow-minded people want to discuss topics that
demonstrate their nature clearly I feel we should let them do just
that--listening to bigotry is the best possible way to develop a real
distaste for it.

>I'd say that he has. Be careful not to take too much of the credit for
>yourselves.

I don't take any credit for his accomplishments at all (with
the exception of his writing skills, which I've spent a lot of time
helping him develop). He worked for every reward he achieved.

On the other hand, I _do_ take credit for having provided the
kind of home in which his abilities could development--through trying
to be a good parent. NONE of us is perfect--we all make mistakes
raising kids, all we can do is minimize the negatives and learn from
our mistakes--and I _do_ believe we were successful in doing that.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1399. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 06:13:24 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <915E2FEC9C5E6F28.0AE14CE32F6B05BF.FEB59C4C36B03815@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24396

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 01:30:12 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:02:22 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Rick, You've just demonstrated your own lack of class.
>>
>> Well, since everyone who disagrees with you demonstrates a
>> "lack of class" according to you, at least I'm in good company.
>
>Let's see. There's Kim and...uh....there's you. How is that everyone
>who diagrees with me?
>

Ok. Then _some_ of the people who disagree with you are
arbitrarily identified by you as demonstrating a "lack of class" and
presumably the substantial number of others who do so are not so
identified.

Better?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1400. Re: WOW! - That's all I can say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 06:33:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011121013356.09510.00000863@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 24397

>Subject: Re: WOW! - That's all I can say
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 11/20/2001 10:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0111202019.5dbad10c@posting.google.com>

>I can recoomend a great urologist who can fix this idiot's brain.

I think a proctologist would be more appropriate...! ! !

73

Steve

1401. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 07:25:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1C904F71B898FB29.F21DCEFA4F655B2B.9DA225EE776C8AE4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24398

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 01:29:11 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Ahhh, a libertarian. I've discarded that view as completely unworkable.

Please bear in mind that I said "libertarian," (small "l"),
not "Libertarian," (large "L"). While I feel the Libertarian party has
some very good points--particularly concerning personal freedom--I
tend to break from them when it comes to basic support for social
programs such as medical assistance for the poor or elderly,
unemployment benefits, etc. On the other hand, libertarianism (small
"l") addresses only the issues of freedom and responsibility (which,
by necessity, comes with freedom), not political issues of government
support for social needs. John Stuart Mill, for example, was a perfect
example of a libertarian thinker, as were John Locke and Thomas
Jefferson.

>So if your wife chooses to start sleeping with another man and he
>consents, it is fine with you?

Of course it is. I married her, I didn't purchase her at
auction!

Look at it this way: If you care about someone, you want them
to be happy and to enjoy their lives, right? Well if it would give her
pleasure to sleep with someone else, I would certainly not be
demonstrating very much love for her if I refused her that
pleasure--or failed to trust her to keep her marriage separate from
her recreation.

>Do you have any say?

The only things I have the right to expect, if she chooses to
sleep with someone outside the home is that she will take steps to
insure that her actions don't harm anyone. She is perfectly free to
have sex with such an individual, for example, but she has an absolute
obligation to insure she doesn't bring an STD home as a result. In the
same vein, I have the right to expect her to hold up her end of our
marital partnership by doing her share of the work at home (she
doesn't work outside the home, so she accepts responsibility for a
larger share of the work at home than I do) and I have the right to
expect that she will not allow her recreational activities to
interfere with our relationship. Beyond that, any decisions would, by
any logic, be her's to make not mine.

> Do you see any immorality in the act?

Under conditions where both partners are aware of the
activities? None what-so-ever. Why should engaging in an activity that
gives (and results in) pleasure and involves no one who doesn't
consent to participate be "immoral?"

If one partner is acting in that manner behind the back of the
other then the situation is very different. In that case, clearly, he
or she is breaking their word to their partner and thus knowingly
harming their relationship. That, clearly, is immoral behavior.

Note that I define morality on the basis of harm to others.
Since I'm not a Christian, I'm not "locked" into a mindset that
defines sexual activities as immoral actions. Instead, I see sex as an
expression of love, of joy, or of shear happiness in life. NONE of
that is--or can be demonstrated to be--immoral in any reasonable use
of the word.

> After all, what consenting adults do...

We agree.

>> Being closed minded doesn't mean someone disagrees--it means
>> they are unwilling to look at an issue from any perspective but their
>> own.
>
>But if someone looks at both sides of an issue and rejects the other's
>view after examining it, is it your view that the person is
>close-minded?

Only if they refuse to listen to new evidence that may change
their view in the future, or if they insist that their view is the
ONLY correct one instead of simply viewing it as the correct one for
THEM.

>> Example: There is nothing wrong with someone viewing Kim's call
>> sign as personally offensive to them, based on their personal moral
>> values. But to accuse her of lacking class or threatening amateur
>> radio, then ignoring the statements of others that they simply don't
>> perceive it in the same manner--arguing in fact that if we don't agree
>> with their assessment, we have no class either--CLEARLY demonstrates
>> that their minds are closed.
>
>That's simply a judgement one arrives at after examing the issue. I've
>looked at the issue of Kim's call and I've come to believe that her
>actions lack decorum. That is my sincer and honest view.

And you have a right to it.

What neither you nor anyone else has a right to do, however,
is to ridicule or attack Kim about her sign. To tell someone that he
or she lacks class because in your opinion they have done something
you find inappropriate--but which is NOT a clear violation of
society's rules (and since Kim's sign is LEGAL, clearly it isn't a
violation) is clearly stepping across a line between your rights to

your opinion and her rights to be free of insult and ridicule. It's one thing to simply state that you don't care for her vanity call personally--that's simply expressing your opinion and, if she is interested in knowing why, a conversation may develop--particularly if it is informational instead of confrontational in nature. But it's another thing altogether to tell her that because you, personally, disapprove of her call it proves that she lacks class or decorum. That isn't communications, it's an attack.

>It would be interesting if your "no wrong, no right" world existed.
>How about: "I have the facts. I have examined them and believe your
>actions to not be in the best interests of amateur radio or even of your
>own human dignity."?

So long as you are willing to stop at the point where the person you are addressing states that they disagree with your assessment, fine. You are certainly well within your rights to state your opinions--the key is in identifying them AS your opinions instead of treating them as though they were absolute statements of universal truth--which seems to be the common response to her call here among those who oppose it.

>> Don't confuse my views on Christianity with my views of
>> Christians, they aren't the same. While I don't happen to believe in
>> the tenets of the Christian religion, it _does_ offer many rather
>> strongly positive philosophical principles. Unfortunately, as
>> Christianity is _practiced_ the only thing that comes through is
>> "selective oppression."
>
>That's an extremely subjective and close minded statement, Rick. It is
>obvious that you do not know how all people practice Christianity and
>you are apparently ignorant of denominational differences. I've never
>been oppressed by my Church.

But I'm not claiming that adherents are oppressed--I'm claiming that non-believers are, a very different concept.

If you can honestly state that you don't believe Christianity as it is commonly practiced today (and yes I know there are those who DON'T practice it in that manner--but they are a small minority) doesn't oppress the rights or freedoms of non-believers, I'll be more than happy to support my claim with as much evidence as you would like to see. Even the simplest examples should demonstrate that concept. For example, "Blue Laws" prohibit conducting some/all business on Sunday and are based directly on the biblical concept of a "day of rest" but result in oppressing both Jews and Muslims who are required by their religions not to work on Friday night through Saturday and by the laws enacted by Christians not to work on Sunday--thus creating an unfair competitive environment for them when compared to Christian businessmen; other examples include prohibition of adultery [a matter of personal choice], homosexual activities [illegal in 37 states], masturbation [a FELONY in several states, btw], and bigamy [which

oppresses both Muslims--who by their religion may have up to four wives if they can support them].

You may not personally feel that you have been oppressed by Christianity--but the lack of freedom of choice demonstrated by the laws I listed above HAS effectively limited your freedom to choose, and thus has oppressed you as well, even if you would not have made the choices it forbids.

>I don't recall one of the sayings of Jesus being that anything
>consenting adults do is fine. In fact, I don't recall any religion
>which has anything like that as one of its tenets.

So?

If anything, that's a clear demonstration of precisely the kind of thinking I'm addressing. You assume that because Jesus didn't say anything about consenting adults that not all consensual behavior is acceptable. But why should what Jesus said or didn't say have the slightest influence on anyone who doesn't practice Christianity? I don't happen to view Jesus, assuming he existed in the first place, as anything but a wandering rabbi trying to teach a philosophy of self-denial and non-violence. Perhaps some good principles, but even that assumes they were quoted accurately--unlikely given the time that passed between the year of his reported death and the time the gospels were written down, but theoretically possible. Whether he did or did not say something is, however, irrelevant for anyone other than those who follow the religion personally. It is reasonable, therefore, to judge the morality of acts performed by those who adhere to the same set of values you adhere to on the basis of biblical injunction--it is NOT reasonable to judge--or legislate--the morality or legality of acts performed by others on that basis.

>Lack of taste and decorum are dictated more by society than by religion.

Lack of taste can mean anything from a lack of appreciation for a fine wine or a Beluga Caviar or well-made sushi to wearing a long dress with lavender stripes on a pea green background mixed with pink polka-dots. Clearly, these are totally matters of personal taste, not issues of relevance to others. You may not care for the fact that I wear a diamond in my ear lobe; someone else may not care for the fact that I wear a suit and tie the majority of the time. Neither of you would have any objective basis for a conclusion that I lacked taste--only that my taste disagreed with your own.

In Kim's case, some people find that her choice of call signs is not something they find in the best of taste personally. That's fine. There are others of us--seemingly the majority--who either don't have any feelings one way or the other or who see that choice as NOT representing poor taste, it's all a matter of perspective.

As far as the role of religion in the controversy. Can you honestly say that there is ANY possible reason for feeling the use of

"TIT" in a call sign is in poor taste beyond the religious views on sex? In many religions (i.e., Tantric Buddhism, etc.) the human body is NOT seen as immoral, and thus her call would be no more likely to be accused of representing poor taste than it would if she had chosen, for example, "W5ARM" instead. THAT is an example of how religion dictates taste to society.

>We live in a nation of laws and regulation. Those laws and regulations
>not only protect your rights but protect me from you.

And that is the precise point at which they should stop.

> By and large, you
>are free to practice whatever you like within the confines of your home
>or place of worship.

On the contrary--even the few examples I cited earlier make it clear that this is not the case.

> That doesn't always hold true in public venues.

Within reason, I agree. However, before agreeing to that it's necessary to agree on the meaning of "public venue." To me, it is perfectly reasonable to restrict behavior which is patently offensive to the majority of people when it is conducted in a place where others are forced to either see it or avoid a location they wish to visit. On the other hand, many people see "Public" as any setting not enclosed by the walls of a private home (and even there see it as public if more than the residents are present). Obviously, if you are engaging in consensual activities in a setting where only those who agree to those behaviors (whether it is an indoor setting or an outdoor one is irrelevant) are present it should be none of society's business what-so-ever. Unfortunately, that is not the case in the United States.

>The airwaves are a public venue.

And one clearly regulated by the government who do NOT view Kim's actions as being a violation. Since the governing body does not do so, it's completely inappropriate for anyone else to take her to task for them.

>We not only have freedoms which come to us by birth as citizens of the
>U.S., we have the responsibilities which go with that citizenship. I
>don't think Kim is being a responsible citizen.

Which, of course, is the point with which many of us disagree. And considering the FCC itself does not officially define her acts as inappropriate, clearly there is no standard by which to judge them as anything but a matter of personal choice.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1402. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 07:27:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6665D6D7EAEF91E9.B17C8600CDB04E33.7C9C09D1B88BA031@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24399

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 22:43:18 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>> Ahhh, a libertarian. I've discarded that view as completely unworkable.
>> So if your wife chooses to start sleeping with another man and he
>> consents, it is fine with you? Do you have any say? Do you see any
>> immorality in the act? After all, what consenting adults do...
>
>No. I should hope so. Yes.
>...none of which is the government's damn business. That's how Libertarians
>think

I'm not sure which parts of the question you are answering
with the "No. I should hope so. Yes" but if you are saying that as a
libertarian I should have no objection to such an action, I agree with
you completely.

I don't.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1403. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 07:29:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3AC9AEC1A9C8F266.8C85F60B83DD568B.C11346D4F45DF714@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24400

On 21 Nov 2001 02:59:25 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I'm 181.6 cm. tall, and weigh 80.9 kg. bone dry and in my birthday attire.
>If you'd like to see a full-length photo of me taken a few years ago
>(when I was about 1.5 kg. heavier), I'll send it to you or anyone who provides
>a servicable e-mail address.

I'd like to see it, Larry. I always like to know what the
people I debate with look like.

My "real world" email address is adamsr@voyager.net

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1404. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 11:43:24 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tg3ul02bvb@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24501

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120224349.27773.00002965@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article <9te8t002ns1@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
> Krell:
>
> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
> To do so would be just as much a challenge to my trust as if he
> were a normal, heterosexual male.
>
> People who truly love and respect each other do not impose such
> challenges to the trust their loved ones have in them. It's as simple
> as that.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

If you consider having coffee a challenge to your trust, your more paranoid
than I thought.

1405. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 12:07:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb99ae_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24502

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120224349.27773.00002965@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article <9te8t002ns1@enews1.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Cecil:
> >>
> >> I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
> >> married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
> >> me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
> >> why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
> >> to be able to grasp this simple concept.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >How about if he was gay?
>
> Krell:
>
> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
> To do so would be just as much a challenge to my trust as if he
> were a normal, heterosexual male.
>
> People who truly love and respect each other do not impose such
> challenges to the trust their loved ones have in them. It's as simple
> as that.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Who said anything about private, Larry? Each and every time I have ever had dinner, coffee, etc., with friends, my husband is cordially invited. Sometimes he joins us, sometimes he doesn't. Sometimes I am with one male friend, sometimes I am with a bunch of male friends. Most of the time, these impromptu get-togethers are created on the spur of the moment over the air on ham radio. Do you forget the hobby we are in here? Most hams are males. Would you have women stay out of the hobby? Would have women refrain from the hobby for fear that they'd be invited to join a bunch of folks for meeting and greeting? Oh, I get it...the woman can be in the hobby as long as she never agrees to meet most of the people she talks to; or as long as her husband is willing to go with her most of the time. You *do* envision an oppressive society, don't you. My my.

Let me give you a clue: you'll never have anyone worth having if you're forever afraid that you can't trust them. If you cannot respect someone enough to be involved in a mutually trusting relationship, then you deserve no respect yourself.

Kim W5TIT

1406. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 12:10:20 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb9a40_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24503

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120224351.27773.00002967@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article
<22714020968DF113.D317E10C11D1A847.1F86216ACB998408@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> > There are a great many things that are likely to contribute to
> >a decline in the ARS--including the racism, hate speech, rudeness, and
> >"cb-like" obscenities and arguments (which, of course, is a stereotype
> >that doesn't apply to the majority of cb users). ALL of these, and
> >other similar behaviors, have a real potential to harm amateur radio.
> >Until Hollingsworth starts eliminating THOSE problems (and telling us
> >to "self-police" isn't eliminating them), he has a lot more to concern
> >himself with than Kim's call sign.
> >
> > Rick
>
> I don't disagree with any of the above, Rick, but Mr. Hollingsworth
> *did* take the time to respond to Kim with the words which now
> title this thread. Moreover, I certainly believe him to be a much
> better authority to judge what could possibly take the ARS "...one
> step closer to extinction" than anyone in this newsgroup, myself
> included. However, as your mileage obviously varies, all I can say
> is I'm glad we have the freedom to disagree, and to express that
> disagreement in a public forum without fear of censorship!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, you're such a fake. Riley Hollingsworth said exactly what I had
thought he would say in response to my question to him. Moreover, *if*
Riley Hollingsworth had said anything but what he did, then you'd be
declaring that he's no authority and was of questionable character....LOL

You're such a pussy.

Kim W5TIT

1407. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 12:22:11 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb9d03_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24504

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120224352.27773.00002970@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3bfb139f_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >> Yup. He's a university professor, and, as such, has a professional
> >> mandate to comply with the edicts of liberal, politically-correct mind
> >> control at all times. People who make judgements are independent
> >> thinkers -- and, as such, are a threat to the creation of the One World
> >> Order.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >So, you're saying your degrees are had from the teachings of liberal,
> >politically-correct mind control freaks? Maybe if you'd taken the time
to
> >get a quality education, you would have been able to apply it...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I spent the best years of my adult life defending your First Amendment
> right to make a fool of yourself.
>

With soldiers like you, who needs enemies, Larry? I'd say your closer to
having defended my First Amendment rights so that you could claim mutually
exclusive rights to feeling superior yourself. That is not defending,
Larry.

>
> I got my B.S. after I retired from the
> USAF, mainly because I wanted it for myself. I love my job, it pays
> well, and has full State benefits, and lets me do something that really
> helps people less fortunate than myself. I'd have to take a 10 kilobuck
> per year pay cut to take an entry-level job in the career field in which
> I have my degree, but I am now being strongly lobbied by one of my
> old professors to get my M.S. and do some part-time teaching as
> adjunct faculty.

So, you're going to be assaulting yourself with even more liberal,
politically-correct mind control freaks at some university or college
somewhere?

>
> Maybe, someday, but for now I am working my way
> out of the economic impact of 3 years of going to school and working
> a low-paying job while doing so.
>

Well, at least you are not blaming it on someone else.

>
> So, before you attempt to chide me
> for not being able to apply my degree to my professional life, please
> explain all the truck drivers out there with Masters and Doctorate
> degrees! Some people do what they want to do in spite of their
> education -- even when they actually have one!
>

The observation here, Larry, has absolutely nothing to do with truck drivers. It has everything to do with the fact that you claim someone who teaches at a university is a liberal, politically-correct mind control freak. Now, I'll step out on a limb and make the next guess that because you think so little of people who teach at our universities and colleges, then surely you match that with the fact that the people who learn from them are of little value also. However, if I am wrong, certainly correct me.

>
> What is *your* educational level -- and what do you do for a living?
>
> (Anyone want to take any bets as to whether we'll get an answer?)
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

We're not discussing my educational level, or yours, Larry. Except for the fact that you must believe you were educated by a liberal, politically-correct mind control freak. Your words, not mine. If you had made better choices about where you were educated you may have been able to apply it. Simple. Although, I am not sure that someone who was educated by a liberal, politically-correct mind control freak will get it.

Perhaps you could give us an example of where you think a respectable person should get educated.

Kim W5TIT

1408. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 12:23:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfb9d69$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24505

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120224353.27773.00002971@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3bfb146e_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Earth to Larry: you never got promoted because it was someone else's
fault;
> >you never got noticed by the boss because it was someone else's fault;
blab
> >blab blab. Now, you never got married because it is someone else's
fault.
> >See a pattern here?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Earth to Kim:
>
> Where did you get the idea that I "never got promoted?" I got promoted
> at a rate which was way above average for my career field. I opted for
> early retirement as a Master Sergeant in spite of a virtually guaranteed
> promotion to Senior Master Sergeant. I think you'd best avoid topics
> you know nothing about.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I could have sworn I saw whinings from you about how your peers have never
accepted you and, you're right...I think you did say you got promoted.
However, I believe that your posts along those lines have always been
laments about generally not having been "accepted."

Kim W5TIT

1409. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 12:38:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfba134_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24506

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:C1F3BA4A8C3D04CC.E0937DD15328380A.00D5A875679723B2@lp.airnews.net...
> On 20 Nov 2001 16:48:57 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >Ouch! I really *was* "rolling on the floor, laughing my head off" after
> >reading that!
>
> If a flame can't be funny, why post it? ;-)
>
> > Banged my noggin' on my computer's mini-tower on the
> >way back up!
>
> That's it, Larry. Take it out on your computer!
>
> >All I can say, Rick, is that if you want to do some
> >moonlighting after a hard day filling young, impressionable skulls full
> >of liberal mush, check out one of the local comedy clubs!
>

Larry apparently self-hates his education as much as everything else. What
a pity. No wonder he whines about having low-paying jobs.

>
> Libertarian, Larry, not liberal--please!
>
> And most of the heads I'm teaching THIS term could use some
> filling with philosophical thought--I'm teaching CJ Psychology courses
> to Police Academy grads who are joining various police departments. If
> I can influence THAT kind of rigid group-think, converting you and
> Dick to devout no-coders should be a breeze!
>
> I don't need the comedy club though, I get plenty of time to
> do a stand up routine when I lecture--and I have a captive audience to
> boot!
>
> >BTW -- I can just see Kim now --- swooning over your picture (you
> >have exchanged photos by now, I assume!).
>
> Larry, anyone who would "swoon" over MY picture needs therapy!
>

Oh good grief...I don't think I've ever "swooned." Among my friends, women
and men, it is well known that I don't have an "eye" on men for their
bodies. I have never been like that. Now, have a man walk up and start

talking intellectually and he's got my attention. I've known many very good looking men in my life and, just as with women, nearly every time there's good looks there's quite a nasty personality to go with them.

> I invariably describe myself totally honestly--as being at
> least a handsome as a great American statesman (Abraham Lincoln,
> unfortunately).
>
> And, no, we haven't "exchanged pictures." We haven't even
> exchanged QSL cards (although, after all the discussion about her
> card, I _would_ like to add Kim's card to my collection to add a touch
> of "spice" :-).
>

What discussin of my QSL card? I've never done one yet...LOL. I've designed plenty but never have completed mine. Which, by the way, will have a wolf theme. ;)

> > In order to avoid revolting
> >my own self, I won't bother trying to describe her response any further
> >than that!
>
> Hysterical laughter revolts you?
>
> Why?
>

No, no, no, Rick. What revolts Larry is the image of himself with hysterical laughter. Er, well, what revolts Larry is the image of himself.

> > Just one word of advice, however. She's married, and
> >she's from Texas -- and that means her OM is probably packing heat!
>
> So?
>
> I'm married myself (for 21 years), is that supposed to mean I
> can't have female friends? Why not?
>
> You might want to consider just how sexist such assumptions
> sound, Larry. This is the 21st Century--not the 19th. The assumption
> that the only reason a man would be friendly to a woman is for sex is
> both very demeaning to women (and to men) and completely inaccurate.
>
> As it happens, I have a number of very good friends who are
> women. By your standards, that should mean I have a harem. While the
> concept may be flattering to me, I'll have to pass--I'm just too old
> to handle more than two or three women at a time and that would exceed
> my limit. Heck, if I tried that I'd have to borrow some Viagra from
> you just to make it through the first couple weeks!

>
> >Since you're a double Post Hole Digger, I hope I can count on you
> >not to do anything stupid!
>
> Yup! Not that a graduate degree makes a person any less stupid
> than everyone else--but it DOES tend to provide a better vocabulary to
> use in debates! :-)
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Any time Larry starts feeling pretty silly over the issue of a callsign, as he usually does begin around this time (closer to Christmas actually), he begins attacking the people who seem to pick sides...his idea being that they have picked "me" rather than that they are on the side of freedom of choice, etc.

Larry gets very jealous over me. In fact, he gets just as jealous as if we were in a real relationship--which is never going to happen and that makes him even more desperate.

So, *sigh*, you'll have to make the choice, Rick. Keep defending the rights of others and having Larry translate that to your never-ending love and desire for me--putting up with jealous fits of rage from him now and then, or...well, the alternative is just unspeakable... ;) But the part where Larry has his jealous fits of rage are a lot, lot more fun. (Besides, you ought to see my husband act Larry out). LOL

Kim W5TIT

1410. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 12:40:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfba135_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24507

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFB23A7.FD7757E7@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I guess in the same way that you can continue to post this drivel about
> > me telling a lie when it is quite clear that is was a typo.
>
> It was a typo but then you lied for days about making the typo. If
> you had just admitted the typo I wouldn't have had the pleasure
> of showing you up as a liar AND a fool. You not only misinterpret
> what I write, you misinterpret what *you* write.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Absolutely! I'd write more just to make Larry happy (he gets so mad when I only do one-liners)...but I think you said it, Cecil...

Kim W5TIT

1411. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 12:42:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfba1d5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24508

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011120225232.27773.00002972@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article <3bfb1c20_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >First Davey wishes to make an observation of one's character built upon
the
> >way they were raised, then wants to depart from that observation and
> >cautions against close association with credit for raising a kid well.
> >
> >You *are* a contrast in design, Dave.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> That's funny, Kim. I, and most other people, would call Dave an
> example of a fine, upstanding citizen -- and his son is proof thereof,
> in addition to being one in his own right. I don't know what you
> mean by a "contrast in design," and I have strong doubts that you
> do, either.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Aw, isn't that cute? Larry with an affliction for a man. Have you guys
traded pictures yet, Larry? Oh, and just a few in the closet with you,
Larry, don't make up a "most." There is no "most" when it comes to you.

Dave is a much finer example of a gentleman than yourself.

Kim W5TIT

1412. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 12:45:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfba292_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24510

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFB2C09.714F5A2@IEEE.org...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > As it happens, I have a number of very good friends who are
> > women. By your standards, that should mean I have a harem.
>
> What it means is that Larry cannot look at a female without
> thinking about sex - any female except his sister or mother.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Are you *SURE* about that? :>

Kim W5TIT

1413. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 12:49:35 UTC
From: PipeDreams <pipedreams@hotmail.comspam>
Message-ID: <20011121074954.137$CZ@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 24509
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in message
> so let me get this straight......you have no intention,... >as you put it, to quit doing what you are doing.........is >that correct???????

What do you care if he quits what he is doin or not. Are you going to stop acting like a jackass PinHead? are you going to stop posting as Anthrax and other make belive names?

1414. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 14:27:33 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <307F6917B92349A1.4754E7A5255F03C5.A16266A34D0A12E0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24511

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 01:48:34 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

> Section 97.11 of the FCC Rules puts some very specific
> restrictions on operation from an aircraft.

Which part?

(a): if he was PIC, it's fairly safe to assume he had his own
permission.
(b): pretty much the same thing we're required to make sure of on the
ground.
(c): where are the applicable FAR's?

Flying a 747 from leveling off at cruise altitude to preparing to land
is not exactly a thrill ride. Most pilots would call any
communications essential to staying awake.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

1415. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 14:40:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFBBCD4.CCE42DE1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24512

Rick Adams wrote:
> But I will still argue that the best parent isn't the
> one who forbids their children to listen to offensive speech--it's the
> one who permits it but insures that he or she takes the time to
> discuss the content with the child and help the child to understand
> why the speech IS offensive instead.

In general, IMO, parents who believe that knowledge is evil are
bad parents.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1416. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 14:51:18 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0111210651.1d3fdf60@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24513

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011120215928.27773.00002962@nso-fo.aol.com>...
> In article <8C979F353A79AC62.BFA4DCF99807BDF1.3AFAE9CBC75FAC40@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> > Free speech is the cornerstone of our society. Without it we
> >are in a pure dictatorship, regardless of how benevolent that dictator
> >might be. But free speech, by necessity, carries with it the risk of
> >offense.
>
> I don't believe anyone in this newsgroup, with the possible exception
> of Kim, disagrees with the above. I don't think the FCC should limit
> the issuance of callsigns which could, as in Kim's case, spell out
> words which could be construed as having a sexual innuendo, and
> thus being in bad taste.

Larry, if this were true, then you wouldn't be arguing so much against
her call sign. You have said repeatedly that you believe the callsign
is offensive, you have said repeatedly that you believe it should be
changed to something that is not offensive. If you *really* believed
what you wrote in the above paragraph, you would *not* be arguing that
it should be changed. You wouldn't be saying that this thread would be
a permanent fixture in the newsgroup. You'ld simply note that you find
it offensive and you'ld ignore it from then on.

Anyone who argues that her callsign should change is arguing that some
callsigns should never be issued.

(And didn't you say in an earlier message that you *had* complained to
the FCC that the callsign was offensive and ask that it be taken
from her? I'm not sure on this, but it seems I read that you had done
this.)

> I believe it is totally the responsibility of the
> ham who requests such a call sign to live with the outcome of their
> actions. It just so happens that Kim is now, in this thread, getting
> her just deserts, as a result of her inappropriate choice.

If you believe that the FCC should not limit callsigns, why are *you*
trying to censor them afterwords? By what right?

Here's what it boils down to. Either you support the FCC and their
issuance of callsigns, or you don't. If you support it, I don't see that
you have any right to complain that a callsign you feel is offensive has
been issued. If you don't support it, then Kim shouldn't be your target,
the FCC should. It's silly to argue with Kim. If she changes her call,

someone else will grab it or someone else will take a call you find
offensive. Arguing with Kim is like treating a symptom, not the cause.
Until the root cause has been fixed, the symptoms will keep appearing.
And in this case, it seems you feel the root cause is the FCC issuing
callsigns you feel are offensive.

> I'm sure Kim would like nothing better than to "shut me up," as it
> were, but that will never happen. I created this thread, and it will be
> a recurring, if not permanent, feature of this newsgroup. For years,
> we've had the concept of the "family-oriented" nature of the ARS
> touted as one of it's most attractive features. I happen to strongly
> agree with this, and believe that Mr. Riley Hollingsworth has done
> all of us who value the positive, family-oriented image of the ARS
> a great service when he stated that Kim's callsign had the potential
> to bring it "?one step closer to extinction." Kim's choice to flaunt
> a vulgar and demeaning callsign does not make her a champion
> for free-speech "rights." It only makes her a spectacle of poor
> judgement.

Poor judgement or not, it is her *right*. If you don't like it, then work
to change the system. If you don't believe the system needs changing, then
stop arguing about it.

> This newsgroup exists for the express purpose of discussing
> "controversial" topics related to amateur-radio policymaking. It
> is the specific, intended home of the debate on code testing as
> a licensing requirement. If you have personal objections as to
> the nature of the colloquy inherent to this newsgroup, I suggest
> that there are many other newsgroups which may serve your
> needs better than this one can.

I don't have any problem with debate. I thrive on written debate.

But it seems to me you're wasting a lot of bandwidth trying to prove
that Kim's callsign is demeaning, insulting, and offensive.

Let's say I agree with you. Let's say that you finally convince
everyone, including Kim, that she should change her callsign.
Let's say she does.

And the day after, the FCC issues the call sign N0CNT.

Are you going to spend another few months arguing with that person?
And when that person changes his call sign and the FCC issues K1llU?

Every single person who reads this group could agree with you, and it
still wouldn't matter. The FCC will continue to issue calls you find
offensive, and the problem you see will still exist.

As I said above, you're fighting the wrong fight.

Sean.

1417. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 15:59:11 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9tgimvalt1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 24514

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFAF624.C0AE19E3@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Morse code testing has always been an attempt at social engineering.
> >
> > I guess maybe it's social engineering in the same way a PAP smear is
> > social engineering.
>
> Nope, it's social engineering in the same way a driver's license
> is social engineering. We are talking about government requirements
> not elective procedures.

You're wrong. Obtaining an amateur radio license is an elective procedure.
You're forgetting the conditional statment 'if'. If one wants to determine
the presence of cervical cancer, one must take a PAP test. So if a testing
requirment is social engineering (which it is not), then PAP testing is
social engineering - irrespective of who sets the 'requirments'. Where does
it say that only governments may engineer a society?

1418. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 16:09:54 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mlQK7.199452$W8.7485753@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24515

Phil Kane asks (about the Victoria's Secret "fashion show"):

> > When is the re-run scheduled? Sure beats old "Law and Order".

Larry Roll K3LT sez:

> Objection, Your Honor! I like the old "Law and Order" re-runs --
> especially since I've not seen many of them from when they were
> "All-New Episodes" in prime time!

You'll notice they always had a real babe as Assistant DA.
I always thought Jill Hennesey was the best one. Just
when my eyes were glazing over she would appear on-screen
for a classy 'eye candy' fix.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1419. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 16:18:36 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wtQK7.199461$W8.7486424@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24516

Kim-W5TIT posted:

> Have you priced a manufactured home lately, Rick?! That's the beauty of
> those folks who still use an antiquated term. Most recent home I looked at,
> double-wide, think it was a Palm Harbor or Redman, but not sure I
> remember--$93,000!!!!!!! For those who seek value in life by the cost of
> ownership, that'll about put anyone in a mobile on a much higher value level
> than, say, most people in standard neighborhoods...LOL, plus most people
> with manufactured homes (trailers as they used to be called) have lots of
> property to go with them.

Yeah, no kidding! I'll trade my urban ranch-style sitting
cheek-by-jowl to neighbors with light dimmers, computer
monitors, susceptible telephones, TV's and boom boxes for
a nice little used Palm Harbor sitting on 5 acres with
buried power and telephone lines and no CC&R's.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1420. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 16:20:12 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9tgjvj$bb6$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 24517

Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3bfb18d8_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> OH GAWD!!!! Jim Kelley---touche! What a laugh!!!
>
> Kim W5TIT

Well, it's not all that funny really. It's sad. I've known couples like that, and it's never a happy situation. It's about respect for, and confidence and trust in another person, and a relationship. A relationship without that respect is precarious and weak Strength and confidence are much more alluring traits in a person, I think.

> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3BFAD57E.E5D28FB6@uci.edu...
> > Nor are you likely to. What they would likely "grasp" is that you're
> > unable to distinguish between having coffee and having sex.
>
>

1421. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 16:44:44 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <0SQK7.120117$WW.7607709@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24518

"Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:mlQK7.199452$W8.7485753@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> You'll notice they always had a real babe as Assistant DA.
> I always thought Jill Hennesey was the best one. Just
> when my eyes were glazing over she would appear on-screen
> for a classy 'eye candy' fix.
>
>
> --
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net

Jill was indeed a fine-looking woman although almost too delicate. As one led thru puberty by Dame Diana Rigg as M-Appeal I sure has hell know what you mean tho.

Dick NBK

1422. Re: Reply to -> Twistedhed@webtv.net or Moparholic@hotmail.com care of the CB news group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 17:21:05 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9tgnf1$o98$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 24519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
message news:d9f7b76c.0111202156.70423a34@posting.google.com...
> so let me get this straight......you have no intention,... as you put
> it, to quit doing what you are doing.........is that correct???????

That's correct. I'll post my views whenever I feel like it, the same as
anyone else in this group is free to do.

As far as the bogus posting, porn etc. goes you'll have to take that up with
the responsible party. I don't have any control over that nonsense and never
did. That's why nobody has ever proved I did any of it because I never did.
Twisted, Mopar and Tim are the exception because the last two, Mopar and
Tim, don't have half a brain between them because they eat up Twisted's BS
without question. So when you consider that Twisted is the group's punch
clown with his crazy talk of a "jock strap" collection on his wall and
talking to "saucer men" you have to wonder where he gets his information.

==========
Subject: More Twistedhed's Blathering
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Author: twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed)
Date: 2001-03-26 17:20:06 PST

in 3741-3A87F5A4-23@storefull-122.iap.bryant.webtv.net
twistedhed@webtv.net wrote:
>nice forgery Dougie but the headers don't lie.
>Undoubtedly you don't understand how the Usenet
>works so I will explain it to you, my anonymous
>acolyte
>what do you know of my life? The jockstrap you sent
>in the mail is a trophy of your docile worship of
>me and it hangs proudly above my mantle
>I will never cease pirate CB activity as long as it irks
>you or someone like you. However, as a consolation
>and to ease your suffering, I will stay within the
>confines of the freeband for now. The saucer men tell
>me I have a good signal in the pile
==========

He's a real fruit cake, and anybody dumb enough to believe what he says gets
what they have coming from the rest of the group.

--
--

73 de,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction functions."

1423. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 17:30:39 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F89C3480A193D08D.3EA2BF8FE5E3FB92.60CE20EF0373D95C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24524

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 20:41:03 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Yeah, Rick. It's university profs, such as yourself, that are the reason
>Larry's never been able to do a darned thing with his "education." ;)

Flunked him in too many classes, huh?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1424. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 17:30:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9FE7B434F8596741.FEB42A26218804C6.3261551286675824@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24523

On 21 Nov 2001 03:43:52 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>(Anyone want to take any bets as to whether we'll get an answer?)

You're on.

The loser has to treat the winner with complete respect in
this newsgroup for one month. Fair enough?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1425. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 17:30:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D6C6FEF3588AAE15.BC7485051CF556AD.6959BE995B3CE0DB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24521

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 14:13:18 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>
>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I have nothing against coffee and conversation. However, If I were
>> married, my XYL would not be having either with another man without
>> me being with them, unless he were her brother or father. One reason
>> why I'm not married is because I've yet to meet a woman who seems
>> to be able to grasp this simple concept.
>
>Nor are you likely to. What they would likely "grasp" is that you're
>unable to distinguish between having coffee and having sex.

YUCK!

Remind me NEVER to have coffee with Larry!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1426. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 17:30:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6F6BF0096D551420.515C9FC4AA5DE7A9.CC032105E711CAB9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24522

On 21 Nov 2001 03:43:49 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior.

No, Larry, Homosexuality is a lifestyle that is NOT considered
"deviant." The definition of deviant behavior is made by sociology and
by psychology--and BOTH consider homosexuality normal.

> I
>do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women;

Of course not. They are male.

> therefore, I would
>not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.

Don't even trust "your woman" with a gay man, huh?

I'm sure the women you know appreciate knowing how much you
trust them!

>To do so would be just as much a challenge to my trust as if he
>were a normal, heterosexual male.

Then perhaps you should learn to challenge your
trust--otherwise it isn't trust in the first place, it's control.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1427. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 17:30:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1862B0C813CE1051.AF5F8432240A8BBF.FC32725346072779@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24520

On 21 Nov 2001 02:59:29 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>For exactly the same number of years, you've been attempting to
>assign the behavioral attributes you possess to others -- obviously
>to divert attention from your own obsessive/compulsive proclivities.

Er, Larry.

Nothing Cecil has said in this newsgroup would even remotely
lead to a diagnosis of obsessive/compulsive--and I _am_ a
diagnostician!

Go take some more psychology classes--intro to psychology just
isn't enough to qualify you to make a diagnosis--or even to understand
the nature of a disorder.

I wouldn't attempt to design a complex electronic circuit--I
don't have the training as an engineer and would only make an idiot
out of myself if I tried (a simple one sure, but not a complex one).
You do the same when you try to "diagnose" members of this NG. I'm
sure you could accurately recognize a raving paranoid schizophrenic,
but don't try for anything more subtle, you don't have the education
for it.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1428. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 17:37:17 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <hDRK7.120186$WW.7611419@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24525

Kim-W5TIT posted:

> What discussin of my QSL card? I've never done one yet...LOL.
> I've designed plenty but never have completed mine. Which, by
> the way, will have a wolf theme. ;)

You know what leaped into my mind when I read this --
that statue of Romulus and Remus being suckled by
a she-wolf. They're right, Kim, your callsign is
damaging my psyche. ;-)

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1429. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 18:29:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BA1FE2DC83A1AA09.23E959E667F4E60F.B764FB6885B66F29@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24526

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 22:29:25 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
>> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
>> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
>
>Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?

Wouldn't that depend on where she was eating?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1430. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 18:43:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFBF5BD.9FA67680@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24527

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Morse code testing has always been an attempt at social engineering.
> > >
> > > I guess maybe it's social engineering in the same way a PAP smear is
> > > social engineering.
> >
> > Nope, it's social engineering in the same way a driver's license
> > is social engineering. We are talking about government requirements
> > not elective procedures.
>
> You're wrong. Obtaining an amateur radio license is an elective procedure.

Not for licensed ham radio operators it isn't. Licensed ham radio operators
have no choice except to meet the governmental requirements. Licensed driver's
have no choice except to meet the governmental requirements. Licensed pilots
have no choice except to meet the governmental requirements. Those minimum
requirements for a license are *social engineering by the government*.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1431. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:08:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFBFBAD.96498FBA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24528

"Jim Bromley, K7JEB" wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT posted:
> > What discussin of my QSL card? I've never done one yet...LOL.
> > I've designed plenty but never have completed mine. Which, by
> > the way, will have a wolf theme. ;)
>
> You know what leaped into my mind when I read this --
> that statue of Romulus and Remus being suckled by
> a she-wolf. They're right, Kim, your callsign is
> damaging my psyche. ;-)

The effects of Kim's callsign are making my sides hurt.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1432. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:11:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFBFC7B.7DB27758@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24529

```
Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
> >> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
> >> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
> > >
> > >Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?
> >
> > Wouldn't that depend on where she was eating?

Hmmmmmm, is that a double meaning? I'm wondering if Larry doesn't
see "gay" men as the equivalent of women, does he see lesbian
women as the equivalent of men, or not?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

1433. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:17:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFBFDAD.BD39D754@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24531

Rick Adams wrote:
> No, Larry, Homosexuality is a lifestyle that is NOT considered
> "deviant." The definition of deviant behavior is made by sociology and
> by psychology--and BOTH consider homosexuality normal.

As a matter of fact, the only mental illness involving homosexuality
listed in my DSM-III is a homosexual trying too hard to act like a
heterosexual. :-) 302.00 Ego-dystonic Homosexuality

> Don't even trust "your woman" with a gay man, huh?

Talk about low self-esteem.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1434. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:18:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <07CAA049537B5649.57E2F3E780E752A1.B48402A196885899@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24530

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 06:41:21 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>What a concept! Larry washing his mind. The mind is a terrible thing to
>waste, especially when there's little of it left!

To quote what has to be one of Larry's favorite political
leaders, Dan Qayle: "What a terrible thing it is to have lost one's
mind; or never to have had one at all."

>Uh, 'scuse me for the observation, Rick. But, er, do you think Larry could
>have an intelligent conversation at all--*with or without sex*? (I'll leave
>EQUAL out in the interest of possibilities)

Sure.

Ask him to discuss electronic theory, propagation, or cw
techniques and the conversation, while limited, will be as intelligent
as any other.

Just don't ask him to discuss rights, freedom of choice,
minorities, gay rights, or women's issues.

>I have a feeling Larry is friendship challenged.

Naw. He has friends. Look at Dick.

Oops. That line gives Larry entirely too much to play with,
doesn't it?

>Ummm, a woman probably wouldn't meet Larry alone, for conversation or
>otherwise. I sure know I wouldn't. I might toss a couple 'o cents into his
>cup as I walked by, but that would be about it.

Cheapskate!

At least give him enough for a bottle of Thunderbird!

>Yeah. Uh. Since Larry doesn't have a wife... And, since Larry can't have
>an intellectual *anything*... And, I'm not so sure about trust. The one
>thing you can trust about Larry is his consistency--not physically though
>that also--but personality-wise.

In a way I feel sorry for Larry. This is honestly not meant as
a joke or put-down, but he's essentially a 1940s man who can't come to
grips with the cultural norms of the 21st Century. In Larry's mind,
women are weaker than men and must be protected and guided through
life by a man. For a married woman to meet a man alone for
conversation would, to Larry, cheapen her and thus reduce her

husband's own image and self respect. It's a view best left to the past, and one that no matter how well intentioned has the net result of treating women as inferiors and oppressing them in society, but it's one that _can_ be sincerely held by very conservative men in our society who have too many internal conflicts to permit them to view women as their equals (just as most of them can't view African-Americans, Muslims, Gays, Asians, or Hispanics as their equals either). In Larry's case the fact that you are obviously an independent woman, and one whose views and decisions he can't affect, has made him place a disproportionate emphasis on his reaction to your call sign and to assume that the call is offensive to everyone instead of just to him. He has two choices: hold fast to his view that you are "low class" and have no moral values or face the fact that his stereotypes of women are wrong and that you are proof of that fact (if a woman can successfully make independent decisions, voice her opinion, engage in "risque" humor, and refuse to recognize his moral authority his stereotype _can't_ be accurate and he knows can't deal with that). Don't expect him to change those views, it would be easier to convince him to change his sexual orientation (wouldn't THAT be a gas--Larry talking about his new boyfriend--a cw nut, of course--in rrap!).

>First lesson after I met my traditional Southern Gentleman. He thought it
>was natural and normal for a man to "direct" a woman's life, etc. Two/three
>weeks after we got to knowing each other, he told me I was "not going out
>with any of my girlfriends." I put my little shakey finger up

Shall we guess which finger? ;-)

>and centered
>to him that the kind of behavior (insecurity) that he just displayed would
>not be something I agreed with nor would accept. It took about a year of
>dialogue and reasoning, but he realized that my concept of
>jealousy--insecurity at its ugliest--is both unjustifiable and unreasonable
>to me.

Jealousy is one of the most damaging emotions a human being can experience. While some try to justify it as "caring" for a person, all it really boils down to is a child's playground cry of "It's MINE and you can't touch it!).

>In a strong, healthy relationship (friendship, love, or
>marriage--any of them), implicit trust is what I demand and what I offer.
>If my implicit trust in a man or a friend is violated--shame on *my* bad
>judgement, not theirs. That's the way I see it. When implicit trust is
>attained, *anything* else that makes relationship successful is there.

For the most part I agree--although it does (as you know) take more than trust alone to make a marriage. You also need mutual respect, friendship, and communications.

>Well, I think Larry needs stimulation for any kind of stretch...*DID I SAY
>THAT*?

They sell that kind of stimulation in a little blue pill . . .
;-)

>Naw. I think Larry actually believes he is avenging the "evilness" in this
>world and sees me as one of those evils.

I don't know if he sees himself as actually avenging
evilness--but he certainly does see himself as having a responsibility
to protect the public (or at least the ARS) from what he considers
"undesirable" behavior.

> When someone is as judgmental and
>condemning as he is, it is often (IMHO) due to quite a lack of personal
>dignity in their own life.

Very true. The technical term is "Scapegoating."

> If you'll read his many posts on having been
>rejected for promotions, etc., even when he was in the military--in the
>*face* of the perfectness with which he served but went unrecognized--you'll
>capture a lot of Larry's grasp to be of value to *someone--anyone* in his
>life. What he doesn't realize and probably never will is that once he
>realizes that he is of perfect value to himself, or that he needs to change
>values to achieve it, then he no longer needs anyone else's approval, or
>honor.

We agree here as well. Once a person "accepts" him or her-self
completely, it becomes pretty irrelevant to them whether or not others
do so as well. Larry needs to sit back and laugh at himself once in a
while--If you can't laugh at yourself you either don't like yourself
very much or you don't get the joke!

>PS--By the way, Larry (I think) claims to have a degree in Human Relations.
>That just goes to show that book sense often has nothing to do with common
>sense or applicability. Larry would epitomize the 'evil HR Director'.

Fortunately, HR is a business degree, not a psychological one.
I'd hate to think that a trained psychologist--even one with only a
bachelors in the field--could misinterpret human behavior as badly as
he does.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1435. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:20:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFBFE8A.C81BE8BA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24532

Rick Adams wrote:
> Nothing Cecil has said in this newsgroup would even remotely
> lead to a diagnosis of obsessive/compulsive--and I _am_ a
> diagnostician!

Long-time readers of this newsgroup have witnessed me obsessing
over Morse code testing. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1436. Re: The difference between Morse Code and other tested topics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:26:42 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFBFFF2.B8CC9F05@uci.edu>
Source record: 24535

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > > > > So the code test is considered equal in importance to everything else
> > > > > > in amateur radio combined?
> > >
> > > > > Thought you gave up on that dead horse last year...
> > >
> > > > I'll never give up my questioning nature, Dave.

> > The Morse code is not equal in importance to everything else in nature
> > combined.

> Nobody said it was, Jim.

Nobody said that anybody said it was either. I was simply stating a
truism that I see as being roughly equivalent to the one you gave. They
are equally profound, (i.e., not very).

1437. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:35:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC01E9.9868BB77@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24533

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFA830E.F540F9A@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > You'd think Davey would get the hint. When one keeps throwing insults
> that
> > > no one understands because they're not at others' level, well... Kinda
> has
> > > the same affect as using the English language in a group of people that
> > > speak nothing but Spanish.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means, you
> > might want to find out what it means. It isn't my lack of knowledge
> > which is the problem.
> >
>
> Uh, Dave. I would find it interesting, at best, for me to undertake
> learning from you in any way constructive... Oh, and I'm not sure what you
> mean by if I want to participate...I don't think I do...
>
> Kim W5TIT

I'm sure that you would find it interesting, Kim. My time is, however,
extremely limited. If you don't care to participate, what keeps you
participating?

Dave K8MN
> > Dave K8MN
> >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3BF9F60B.A7300972@IEEE.org...
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > It would appear that you've never heard of Tugboat Annie either.
> > > >
> > > > Is she any kin to Poke Salad Annie?
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > >
> > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----

> > > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > > > Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
> > > > -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1438. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:37:10 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFC0266.E1A5E8DF@uci.edu>
Source record: 24538

Rick Adams wrote:
> Nothing Cecil has said in this newsgroup would even remotely
> lead to a diagnosis of obsessive/compulsive--and I _am_ a
> diagnostician!

Doh!

;-)

1439. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:39:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC02CF.C40752AA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24534

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFA8245.DEC86321@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Process management is my chief responsibility at work, Dave. I would
> > > shudder to think that I become so "adult" that I act like people such as
> > > you. Now, for you it may work. For me, it would not. I bet that
> between
> > > the two of us, I make up for your lack of willingness to step outside
> the
> > > box.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > It is certainly odd that one who so often makes incorrect character and
> > background judgements about people is employed in a field where she
> > needs skill in using logical thought. Of course, being employed in a
> > field and being any good at it don't automatically go hand in hand.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> You'd know, right? You have the lead on that example.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Uh, Kim? I'm not employed at all. I'm retired. I marinate steaks,
pilot a lawn tractor and put up large antennae at altitude. I work the
pileups, participate in the local ARES net, rag chew any time I feel
like it and take part in numerous radio contests. *poof* There goes
your supposed point.

Dave K8MN

> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BF9E7F4.DCD2A7E7@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh? A preppie, then, eh. My dad realizes that I am now an adult
> and
> > > that I
> > > > > make my own decisions.
> > > > >

> > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > > You really don't have a clue, do you, Kim? A preppie? My age group
> > > > didn't qualify me. I too am an adult and make my own decisions. Some
> > > > of us mature at a faster rate than others. Maybe your decision making
> > > > processes will improve as you mature.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3BF92766.46B8BF0D@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Maybe you're new enough to this newsgroup, Rick...Davey here was
> > > pretty
> > > > > born
> > > > > > > with a silver spoon in his mouth. He's never known real life...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You couldn't be more off the beam than you are with this post,
> > > Tugboat.
> > > > > > Some of us rise above our beginnings. It helps to have parents
> who
> > > are
> > > > > > loving and involved in our upbringing and who provide guidance
> during
> > > > > > our formative years. My dad, for instance would never have
> permitted
> > > me
> > > > > > to choose a suggestive callsign back in the days when I first
> entered
> > > > > > amateur radio. I'm also pretty certain that, had he heard some of
> the
> > > > > > present goings on in the 75m band, he'd not have permitted my
> > > > > > involvement at all.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:3BF89E3B.9A310597@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 02:30:20 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> > > > > > > > > <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >You mean Jaysus don't you? We make judgements every day.
> By
> > > some
> > > > > > > > > >definitions a gentleman is he who ignores the trivial but
> is a
> > > cast

> > > > > > > iron SOB
> > > > > > > > > >about things that matter. Kim's call sign is one of those
> > > > > juvenile,
> > > > > > > tee hee
> > > > > > > > > > >giggle things most of us outgrew years ago but they are so
> > > common
> > > > > it is
> > > > > > > like
> > > > > > > > > > > >stepping on ants so I leave it alone. Making judgements is
> one
> > > > > thing,
> > > > > > > being
> > > > > > > > > > > >judgmental is quite another. Rick is so open-minded the
> wind
> > > > > whistles
> > > > > > > thru
> > > > > > > > > > > >and his only judgement is on those he perceives as being
> > > > > judgemental.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > With the exception of the fact that I _also_ oppose
> any
> > > > > > > > > behavior that directly harms the person or property of a
> > > > > > > > > non-consenting individual, I agree completely. I _am_
> > > open-minded
> > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > willing to look at everything with an open mind instead of
> > > judging
> > > > > > > > > others because I don't, personally, choose to indulge in the
> > > same
> > > > > > > > > behaviors they themselves prefer.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You're a hoot, Rick. You've made a Hitler comparison and
> called
> > > me
> > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > idiot. So much for your open mind and not making judgements.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > On the other hand, I don't happen to view
> > > open-mindedness as
> > > > > a
> > > > > > > > > flaw as you appear to view it. To me, it is the
> CLOSED-minded
> > > person
> > > > > > > > > who demonstrates a serious character flaw.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Damn! Another judgement.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave K8MN

1440. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:41:00 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4C6C0154672C62F4.94A893BAF5DB9B8B.914EF3B218CE63F8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24536

On 21 Nov 2001 02:59:26 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Of course I can. Fully half the people I work with are women, and
>within the confines of the workplace, I have many interesting
>conversations with them. However, these are not exclusive, one-on-
>one meetings at Starbucks or anywhere else. That would not be
>appropriate behavior, since most of these women are married, and
>I am engaged in an exclusive, monogamous relationship with a
>woman myself.

But what does one have to do with the other?

A meeting over coffee is just that--a meeting over coffee.
Whether a person is married or single, committed or uncommitted, or
for that matter whether that person is gay or straight is completely
irrelevant. If the question was whether it is appropriate to meet a
married person for _sex_ behind their spouse's back, I could
understand your perspective. But to meet someone publicly and talk
about topics that have nothing to do with sex or a relationship? What
on earth is wrong with that?

>Such meetings are inherently inappropriate unless
>the mates of both parties are physically present and mutually
>involved.

Nonsense. That implies that marriage is a form of mutual
ownership!

If you can trust your partner not to violate the agreements
you made concerning fidelity (whether those agreements are to adhere
to monogamy or to have an open marriage, is totally irrelevant), why
on earth would you object to that partner carrying on a conversation
with someone on a topic not of interest to you? I could see a problem
if you were constantly excluded from your spouse's social
life--unless, of course, you have an equally active social life in an
area (i.e., ham radio) that doesn't interest your spouse--but that's a
question of exclusion not one of free association.

> I don't believe that the kind of loyalty and commitment
>to such a relationship has any room in it for "friendly" intimate
>meetings such as that.

Then you don't believe that a relationship can survive without
the sacrifice of personal freedom and openness.

Larry, a relationship that permits each partner to express his
or her interests and recognizes that each has the right to make
his/her own decisions is the one that will survive and grow--not the
relationship in which the partners are restricted.

> If one has such commitment, then he or
>she must not take any action which would even give the appearance
>of an outside relationship.

Why?

That's meant as a serious question, not a throw-away. Why
shouldn't they perform actions that would give an appearance of an
outside relationship? Either one exists or one does not. If it does
(and, so long as both partners agree to it, I see nothing wrong with
that either), then pretending it doesn't is dishonest and pointless.
If it does not, why on earth should the appearance matter? Do you base
your life on what others may think about you--or do you base it on
what you, personally, know to be true?

If someone wants to assume that you are having an affair when
all you are doing is, for example, Elmering a woman who is interested
in ham radio, why should that trouble you? It's THEIR character flaw
that makes them see your actions as something they are not, why let
that prevent you from acting in a manner you find positive?

>Again, I am not married, but if I were, my wife would have no reason
>to have suspicions about my behavior, because there would not be
>any action on my part to arouse them. This is the true meaning of
>loyalty to a spouse, or one's partner in a mutually exclusive
>relationship.

No, Larry, the true meaning of loyalty is honesty and trust.
It has nothing to do with having outside friendships--or sexual
encounters, for that matter, if both spouses agree. It has everything
to do with knowing that your partner will NOT do anything to hurt you
knowingly, and that he or she will respect any agreements you have
made together.

Loyalty isn't preventing things from occurring that could
inspire suspicion---it's knowing that you partner deserves your
unconditional trust--and giving it to them!

>I would not meet a married woman for a private, "intellectual"
>conversation because I would not want my own wife or partner to
>have any reason to question my loyalty to her. She can trust me
>because that trust is demonstrated in practical, tangible action.

Is that it, Larry. Or is it that you wouldn't do so because it
would mean your wife could do so as well and you wouldn't be
comfortable with that?

Learn to trust others, Larry. It's a much more healthy way to
live.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1441. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:46:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC0456.7C5F392@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24537

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFB089B.F3465139@earthlink.net...
> >
> > > As it happens, I have one son who turned 18 two weeks ago. He
> > > was home schooled and started college at 14 at a community college
> > > (he'll receive his AA degree--with a 3.92 GPA--this spring and start
> > > his Junior year at a University in the Fall). Last year he was one of
> > > Parade Magazine's 52 top newspaper carriers in the USA and won a trip
> > > to Europe for his efforts. In addition, he donates a great deal of his
> > > time to designing web pages for non-profit community agencies that
> > > help the homeless and battered women, and is very publicly opposed to
> > > racism, sexism, and laws that restrict the rights of individuals. He
> > > has no interest in drugs at all (not a guess-a fact) and he doesn't
> > > care for alcohol.
> > >
> > > Yup. I think my wife and I did ok there--don't you?
> >
> > I'd say that he has. Be careful not to take too much of the credit for
> > yourselves.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> First Davey wishes to make an observation of one's character built upon the
> way they were raised, then wants to depart from that observation and
> cautions against close association with credit for raising a kid well.
>
> You *are* a contrast in design, Dave.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Whaddya want, Kim. He has described a pretty good kid. We don't yet
know whether Rick is responsible for that or whether the kid made good
despite his father's views on life. Maybe the kid is a rebel...

Dave K8MN

1442. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:53:33 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <gg1ovtskkgi2eetunrhqpdf2l586mpuaba@4ax.com>
Source record: 24539

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

-
->
-> I'll let the pilots here quote the FARs about making non-essential
-> communications while on an air carrier flight.

No restrictions on the aircraft commander or PIC that I'm aware of.

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1443. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 19:58:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC0743.9647694F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24540

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:11:37 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> I've got you, Larry, and Dick on the defensive, don't I?
> > >
> > >Is that your overinflated view of your power?
>
> Curiosity or self-defense?
>
> Rick

I'm just curious, Rick, but I note that you didn't respond. Do you see yourself as Sir Lancelot coming to the rescue or as some "I've got them in my power!" type wizard? I'm trying to imagine us attempting to close the breach before another sweeping onslaught from your mighty keyboard.

Dave K8MN

1444. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 20:01:00 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <ik1ovtgof9etiveklua0tjhv1n3qc244m1@4ax.com>
Source record: 24541

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->
-> Did the company know that he was doing that?

Probably not. So what?

->
-> Did the company's LAWYERS know that he was doing that?

Probably not. So what?

->
-> Section 97.11 of the FCC Rules puts some very specific
-> restrictions on operation from an aircraft.

You been into the holiday giggle water a little early there, Kane? 47CFR 97.11 provides two short paragraphs about applying for license to Gettysburg.

On the other hand, in several dozen places in the FAR we find the reference that the PILOT IN COMMAND has the ultimate authority for the operation of the aircraft. No regulation I'm aware of prohibits the PIC from operating air mobile if (s)he wishes.

Company rules are another matter, but having seen my fair share of them, I've never run across a prohibition against operating air mobile.

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1445. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 20:02:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC0838.800F6696@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24542

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I guess in the same way that you can continue to post this drivel about
> > me telling a lie when it is quite clear that is was a typo.
>
> It was a typo but then you lied for days about making the typo. If
> you had just admitted the typo I wouldn't have had the pleasure
> of showing you up as a liar AND a fool. You not only misinterpret
> what I write, you misinterpret what *you* write.

Gee, that'd be another lie on your part, wouldn't it, Cecil? To my knowledge, you've never had the opportunity to show up anyone here. Your word games are simply another opportunity for me to point out that nothing you write here can be taken seriously. In this case, that would include your original comparison and the ridiculous charade you are carrying on in the aftermath.

Dave K8MN

1446. More government "profiling"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 20:07:19 UTC
From: K0HB <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <Ow0dWgscBHA.1196@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 24544

Glacier
In response to press coverage of recent anthrax incidents, the powder cocaine lobby has released a statement condemning what they call the media's "profiling" of all white powders.

"The media is using the very few actual incidents where white powder was found to be Anthrax in order to boost their ratings at a time when it's Americans who really need a boost," says Scott Sniffley of the PCL. "Everyone from Alan Greenspan to the club kids agree that this country is jonesing for a stimulus package now more than ever," he said.

Echoing the calls from Washington to stand up to terror with their wallets, an industry spokesman declared; "Unlike the fear mongerers in the media, we in the cocaine importer community will not let the terrorists win. Along with Mayor Guliani, and President Bush, we are saying to America; 'Go about your normal business and get this economy back on its feet, make those drug purchases - whether it's cocaine, heroin, or even crystal meth." "Look, this is about the whole powder drug economy - not just coke," sniffed Sniffley.

1447. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 20:07:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC093A.CF3ACA5A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24543

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> > > > > > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means, you
> > > > > > might want to find out what it means.
> > > > >
> > > > > You mean like "comparting"? You apparently used a word for which
> > > > > you were ignorant of the meaning.
> > > >
> > > > You know better and that makes your continuation of the lie all the
> > > > worse.
> > >
> > > You're the one who's lying, Dave, and here's the proof yet once again.
> > > ****************************************************************************
> > > Message-ID: <3BF5B180.79E0FAAD@earthlink.net>
> > > From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > Subject: Re: Radio Policy
> > > Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2001 00:43:24 GMT
> > >
> > > > You do not, nor have you ever, lived in a place called Small Southern
> > > > Town, USA. I do not recognize your elevation of Cecil Moore to the
> > > > status of expert on the South or on Affirmative Action. In addition,
> > > > I'm calling you on this diversion from your original erroneous comment
> > > > comparting Affirmative Action and morse testing.
> > > > ^^^^^^^^^^
> > > ****************************************************************************
> > > You introduced the word "comparting" and then lied about doing so for
> > > days and days. How you can deny your documented archived postings is
> > > unbelievable.
> >
> > ...and you introduced the "Big Lie" technique. How long is "days and
> > days", Cecil?
>
> Four days now, Dave. I've been keeping track to see exactly when
```

> you are going to show a hint of integrity and issue an apology.

...about the time you win your section in the ARRL DX CW 'test. Do you have any idea how long I expect that to take?

> > How long will you ignore the fact that my earlier and
> > later posts on the matter say "compare" or "comparing"?
>
> I'm not ignoring that fact. I compared Affirmative Action
> and Morse code testing. I haven't stopped comparing Affirmative
> Action and Morse code testing. I will continue to compare
> Affirmative Action and Morse code testing. I have NEVER
> denied comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.

You most assuredly *are* ignoring the fact. That's what makes this latest cartoon such a hoot.

> I denied comparting Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
> I will continue to deny comparting Affirmative Action and Morse
> code testing. It was a lie when you first posted it and it
> continues to be a lie for all to see.

Yep, continue to deny that (save for a typo) of which you were never accused. I suppose you have to pass that idle time some way.
Sure wish I could take you seriously.

Dave K8MN

1448. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 20:09:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC09B2.8183B342@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24545

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Then why do you take my postings about "comparting" so seriously?
> >
> > I don't take them seriously, Cecil.
>
> So how many replies have you posted regarding "comparting"?
> I've been leading you down the primrose path for four days now.

Oh? Do you fancy yourself a leader these days? Of course I'd have to
take you seriously to believe that.

Dave K8MN

1449. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 20:12:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC0A87.125ABD1E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24546

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > For exactly the same number of years, you've been attempting to
> > assign the behavioral attributes you possess to others -- obviously
> > to divert attention from your own obsessive/compulsive proclivities.
>
> No diversion necessary, Larry. I'm bipolar with obsessive/compulsive
> traits. That's how I can so easily recognize them in others.

Larry, he is a 300,000 foot tall bipolar, obsessive/compulsive alien who can dunk basketballs and who has babies in the back of the bus. Perhaps this is a man who, in some aspects, should be taken seriously!

Dave K8MN

1450. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 20:16:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC0B54.6886703A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24547

CAM wrote:
>
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > Ahhh, a libertarian. I've discarded that view as completely unworkable.
> > > So if your wife chooses to start sleeping with another man and he
> > > consents, it is fine with you? Do you have any say? Do you see any
> > > immorality in the act? After all, what consenting adults do...
> >
> > No. I should hope so. Yes.
> > ...none of which is the government's damn business. That's how Libertarians
> > think
>
> Adultery is indeed none of the government's damn business.
> No enlightened state has laws against adultery.

I get it! Another Cecil joke! He knew all along we weren't discussing whether or not it was the government's business. He was wise to the fact that it was morality and Rick's view of anything goes between consenting adults. You're such a card, Cecil (or should we call your cEcIlLy?)

Dave K8MN

1451. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 20:25:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC0D5C.6A3B771B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24548

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 01:30:12 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >>
> >> On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:02:22 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Rick, You've just demonstrated your own lack of class.
> >>
> >> Well, since everyone who disagrees with you demonstrates a
> >> "lack of class" according to you, at least I'm in good company.
> >>
> >Let's see. There's Kim and...uh....there's you. How is that everyone
> >who diagrees with me?
> >>
>
> Ok. Then _some_ of the people who disagree with you are
> arbitrarily identified by you as demonstrating a "lack of class" and
> presumably the substantial number of others who do so are not so
> identified.
>
> Better?
>
> Rick

Yeah, it is better but you still don't quite have it down. Try leaving out the word "arbitrarily" since I didn't come to my conclusion arbitrarily. Then try leaving out everything after "lack of class" since I didn't make that statement--you did. Now I think you have my view.

Dave K8MN

1452. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 21:13:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn5qs13.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24549

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 03:47:45 GMT, BH wrote:

>> Section 97.11 of the FCC Rules puts some very specific
>> restrictions on operation from an aircraft.
>
>Have no idea but we had some nice contacts which relieved some
>boredom on his part.

Don't let the company's lawyers hear that....if he's the pilot on
duty, boredom is not an option.

>Do you know if the aircraft being out of US
>airspace makes any difference as far as the FCC is concerned.

A US-registered aircraft in international airspace is fully subject
to FCC regulations.

>AS
>far as any company rules, I would assume they would apply anytime

Yup.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1453. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 21:13:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn5r3x4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24550

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 08:27:33 -0600, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>(a): if he was PIC, it's fairly safe to assume he had his own
>permission.

Company rules most probably require that upper management approves
of such before he as the PIC can grant that permission even to
himself.

>(b): pretty much the same thing we're required to make sure of on the
>ground.

But WAS he using the installed aircraft HF radio and antenna for
hamming?

>(c): where are the applicable FAR's?

See the FAA for those.

>Flying a 747 from leveling off at cruise altitude to preparing to land
>is not exactly a thrill ride. Most pilots would call any
>communications essential to staying awake.

Don't ever tell the company lawyers that one is anything but alert
and attending to duties of control and monitoring of aircraft
performance at all times.

Such is the stuff of eight-figure negligence settlements.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1454. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 21:14:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn5rri6.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24452

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 16:18:36 GMT, Jim Bromley, K7JEB wrote:

>Yeah, no kidding! I'll trade my urban ranch-style sitting
>cheek-by-jowl to neighbors with light dimmers, computer
>monitors, susceptible telephones, TV's and boom boxes for
>a nice little used Palm Harbor sitting on 5 acres with
>buried power and telephone lines and no CC&R's.

Palm Harbor homes are made just down the freeway from here, and they
do look gorgeous.

My wife and I have discussed such a move, and this is not the right
time for us to make it, though.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1455. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 21:14:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn5x4u8.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24451

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 16:09:54 GMT, Jim Bromley, K7JEB wrote:

>Phil Kane asks (about the Victoria's Secret "fashion show"):
>
>> > When is the re-run scheduled? Sure beats old "Law and Order".
>
>Larry Roll K3LT sez:
>
>> Objection, Your Honor! I like the old "Law and Order" re-runs --
>> especially since I've not seen many of them from when they were
>> "All-New Episodes" in prime time!

I always watch the 1 pm local time rerun on A&E when I am home for
lunch. Ditto the 8 pm TNT rerun when nothing better is at hand.
By now I've seen most of the episodes several times.

>You'll notice they always had a real babe as Assistant DA.

Not always - the first one was a black male "Paul Robinette"
(Richard Brooks).

I've seen at least one episode that took place before "Adam Schiff"
(Steven Hill) was the DA.

And there was one episode when Jerry Orbach, who plays "Lennie
Briscoe", played defense attorney "Frank Lehrman". My wife and I
concocted a scenario wherein "Lennie Briscoe" is really the
half-brother of "Frank Lehrman".

>I always thought Jill Hennesey was the best one. Just
>when my eyes were glazing over she would appear on-screen
>for a classy 'eye candy' fix.

She sure does a fine job on "Crossing Jordan". Note, however,
that the writer(s) seem to work some inquiry by a male character
to the color of her underwear into every episode of that program.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1456. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 21:15:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC1907.21F4DBFA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24453

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 01:29:11 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Ahhh, a libertarian. I've discarded that view as completely unworkable.
>
> Please bear in mind that I said "libertarian," (small "l"),
> not "Libertarian," (large "L"). While I feel the Libertarian party has
> some very good points--particularly concerning personal freedom--I
> tend to break from them when it comes to basic support for social
> programs such as medical assistance for the poor or elderly,
> unemployment benefits, etc. On the other hand, libertarianism (small
> "l") addresses only the issues of freedom and responsibility (which,
> by necessity, comes with freedom), not political issues of government
> support for social needs. John Stuart Mill, for example, was a perfect
> example of a libertarian thinker, as were John Locke and Thomas
> Jefferson.

I've discarded both upper and lower case libertarianism. I would take
issue that my great-great-great-great-great Uncle Thomas was a
libertarian.

> >So if your wife chooses to start sleeping with another man and he
> >consents, it is fine with you?
>
> Of course it is. I married her, I didn't purchase her at
> auction!

No you didn't. I assume you made some vows.

> Look at it this way: If you care about someone, you want them
> to be happy and to enjoy their lives, right? Well if it would give her
> pleasure to sleep with someone else, I would certainly not be
> demonstrating very much love for her if I refused her that
> pleasure--or failed to trust her to keep her marriage separate from
> her recreation.

Bully for you.

> >Do you have any say?
>
> The only things I have the right to expect, if she chooses to
> sleep with someone outside the home is that she will take steps to
> insure that her actions don't harm anyone. She is perfectly free to
> have sex with such an individual, for example, but she has an absolute

> obligation to insure she doesn't bring an STD home as a result. In the
> same vein, I have the right to expect her to hold up her end of our
> marital partnership by doing her share of the work at home (she
> doesn't work outside the home, so she accepts responsibility for a
> larger share of the work at home than I do) and I have the right to
> expect that she will not allow her recreational activities to
> interfere with our relationship. Beyond that, any decisions would, by
> any logic, be her's to make not mine.

Again, bully for you!

> > Do you see any immorality in the act?
>
> Under conditions where both partners are aware of the
> activities? None what-so-ever. Why should engaging in an activity that
> gives (and results in) pleasure and involves no one who doesn't
> consent to participate be "immoral?"

> If one partner is acting in that manner behind the back of the
> other then the situation is very different. In that case, clearly, he
> or she is breaking their word to their partner and thus knowingly
> harming their relationship. That, clearly, is immoral behavior.

But you said that anything consenting adults do is okay. You mean if
your wife is a consenting adult and other man is a consenting adult and
they choose to sleep together without informing you, that *isn't okay*?

> Note that I define morality on the basis of harm to others.
> Since I'm not a Christian, I'm not "locked" into a mindset that
> defines sexual activities as immoral actions. Instead, I see sex as an
> expression of love, of joy, or of shear happiness in life. NONE of
> that is--or can be demonstrated to be--immoral in any reasonable use
> of the word.

Well, it certainly lends new meaning to phrases such as "going out into
the world and spreading love". I'd say that there's a large group of
Theologians would would strongly disagree with your last sentence.

> > After all, what consenting adults do...
>
> We agree.

No we don't.

> >> Being closed minded doesn't mean someone disagrees--it means
> >> they are unwilling to look at an issue from any perspective but their
> >> own.
> >
> >But if someone looks at both sides of an issue and rejects the other's
> >view after examining it, is it your view that the person is
> >close-minded?
>
> Only if they refuse to listen to new evidence that may change

> their view in the future, or if they insist that their view is the
> ONLY correct one instead of simply viewing it as the correct one for
> THEM.

In that case, I've never met anyone who is close-minded. I've met some
pretty bull-headed folks though.

> >> Example: There is nothing wrong with someone viewing Kim's call
> >> sign as personally offensive to them, based on their personal moral
> >> values. But to accuse her of lacking class or threatening amateur
> >> radio, then ignoring the statements of others that they simply don't
> >> perceive it in the same manner--arguing in fact that if we don't agree
> >> with their assessment, we have no class either--CLEARLY demonstrates
> >> that their minds are closed.
> >
> >That's simply a judgement one arrives at after examing the issue. I've
> >looked at the issue of Kim's call and I've come to believe that her
> >actions lack decorum. That is my sincer and honest view.
>
> And you have a right to it.

That's sort of like a net MC prounouncing "Good Contact" after someone
has worked a DX station on the net frequency. I don't need the
validation.

> What neither you nor anyone else has a right to do, however,
> is to ridicule or attack Kim about her sign. To tell someone that he
> or she lacks class because in your opinion they have done something
> you find inappropriate--but which is NOT a clear violation of
> society's rules (and since Kim's sign is LEGAL, clearly it isn't a
> violation) is clearly stepping across a line between your rights to
> your opinion and her rights to be free of insult and ridicule. It's
> one thing to simply state that you don't care for her vanity call
> personally--that's simply expressing your opinion and, if she is
> interested in knowing why, a conversation may develop--particularly if
> it is informational instead of confrontational in nature. But it's
> another thing altogether to tell her that because you, personally,
> disapprove of her call it proves that she lacks class or decorum. That
> isn't communications, it's an attack.

I've certainly communicated my opinion. For you to tell me that I don't
have a right to communicate it is ridiculous. You aren't the final
arbiter. If folks had a right to be free of insult and ridicule,
Letterman and Leo would be out of work. Please show me where I can find
these new rights spelled out.

> >It would be interesting if your "no wrong, no right" world existed.
> >How about: "I have the facts. I have examined them and believe your
> >actions to not be in the best interests of amateur radio or even of your
> >own human dignity."?
>
> So long as you are willing to stop at the point where the

> person you are addressing states that they disagree with your
> assessment, fine. You are certainly well within your rights to state
> your opinions--the key is in identifying them AS your opinions instead
> of treating them as though they were absolute statements of universal
> truth--which seems to be the common response to her call here among
> those who oppose it.

What else is to found on this newsgroup except opinion?

> >> Don't confuse my views on Christianity with my views of
> >> Christians, they aren't the same. While I don't happen to believe in
> >> the tenets of the Christian religion, it _does_ offer many rather
> >> strongly positive philosophical principles. Unfortunately, as
> >> Christianity is _practiced_ the only thing that comes through is
> >> "selective oppression."
> >
> >That's an extremely subjective and close minded statement, Rick. It is
> >obvious that you do not know how all people practice Christianity and
> >you are apparently ignorant of denominational differences. I've never
> >been oppressed by my Church.
>
> But I'm not claiming that adherents are oppressed--I'm
> claiming that non-believers are, a very different concept.

It is still obvious that you do not know how all people practice
Christianity and you are apparently ignorant of denominational
differences.

> If you can honestly state that you don't believe Christianity
> as it is commonly practiced today (and yes I know there are those who
> DON'T practice it in that manner--but they are a small minority)

That's just so much subjective crap.

> doesn't oppress the rights or freedoms of non-believers, I'll be more
> than happy to support my claim with as much evidence as you would like
> to see. Even the simplest examples should demonstrate that concept.
> For example, "Blue Laws" prohibit conducting some/all business on
> Sunday and are based directly on the biblical concept of a "day of
> rest" but result in oppressing both Jews and Muslims who are required
> by their religions not to work on Friday night through Saturday and by
> the laws enacted by Christians not to work on Sunday--thus creating an
> unfair competitive environment for them when compared to Christian
> businessmen; other examples include prohibition of adultery [a matter
> of personal choice], homosexual activities [illegal in 37 states],
> masturbation [a FELONY in several states, btw], and bigamy [which
> oppresses both Muslims--who by their religion may have up to four
> wives if they can support them].

While you are coming up with the proof, better dredge some up on how
many of our laws are put into effect by the Church. I'm fairly sure
that our state legislature is responsible for laws being passed

hereabouts.

> You may not personally feel that you have been oppressed by
> Christianity--but the lack of freedom of choice demonstrated by the
> laws I listed above HAS effectively limited your freedom to choose,
> and thus has oppressed you as well, even if you would not have made
> the choices it forbids.

So it is now your intent to tell me my freedom has been limited? Tell me, Rick. Have you ever lived anywhere else--I mean outside the U.S.? Ever lived in a country with a state church? Ever lived in a third world country. I could show you limited freedom and various states of oppression. You now live in the place which offer more freedom than any place on the earth.

> >I don't recall one of the sayings of Jesus being that anything
> >consenting adults do is fine. In fact, I don't recall any religion
> >which has anything like that as one of its tenets.
>
> So?

So where does your expertise in these matters come from. I gather it doesn't come from Buddhism.

> If anything, that's a clear demonstration of precisely the
> kind of thinking I'm addressing. You assume that because Jesus didn't
> say anything about consenting adults that not all consensual behavior
> is acceptable. But why should what Jesus said or didn't say have the
> slightest influence on anyone who doesn't practice Christianity?

Jesus didn't know he was a Christian. He was a Jew and thought of himself as such. He didn't say that he came to save Jews or Romans or Christians. He came to save the world. That's pretty all-inclusive.

> I
> don't happen to view Jesus, assuming he existed in the first place, as
> anything but a wandering rabbi trying to teach a philosophy of
> self-denial and non-violence. Perhaps some good principles, but even
> that assumes they were quoted accurately--unlikely given the time that
> passed between the year of his reported death and the time the gospels
> were written down, but theoretically possible. Whether he did or did
> not say something is, however, irrelevant for anyone other than those
> who follow the religion personally. It is reasonable, therefore, to
> judge the morality of acts performed by those who adhere to the same
> set of values you adhere to on the basis of biblical injunction--it is
> NOT reasonable to judge--or legislate--the morality or legality of
> acts performed by others on that basis.
>
> >Lack of taste and decorum are dictated more by society than by religion.
>
> Lack of taste can mean anything from a lack of appreciation
> for a fine wine or a Beluga Caviar or well-made sushi to wearing a

> long dress with lavender stripes on a pea green background mixed with
> pink polka-dots.

Is that what you assumed when I said Kim's action exhibited a lack of
taste?

Clearly, these are totally matters of personal taste,
> not issues of relevance to others. You may not care for the fact that
> I wear a diamond in my ear lobe; someone else may not care for the
> fact that I wear a suit and tie the majority of the time. Neither of
> you would have any objective basis for a conclusion that I lacked
> taste--only that my taste disagreed with your own.

I really don't care one way or the other about your suit or your
diamond. Just seems like the waste of a perfectly good diamond.

> In Kim's case, some people find that her choice of call signs
> is not something they find in the best of taste personally. That's
> fine. There are others of us--seemingly the majority--who either don't
> have any feelings one way or the other or who see that choice as NOT
> representing poor taste, it's all a matter of perspective.

You keep adding these little "unprovens" to your statements. Why insert
"seemingly the majority" when you have no inkling that this is the case?
As to perspective: It is MY PERSPECTIVE that Kim exhibits a lack of
good taste and decorum.*
(*Legal note: The above not binding on those who are not aware
that they have bad taste and a lack of decorum. This view extends
only to the callsign issue but is subject to change should Kim care
to reveal other information about herself.)

> As far as the role of religion in the controversy. Can you
> honestly say that there is ANY possible reason for feeling the use of
> "TIT" in a call sign is in poor taste beyond the religious views on
> sex? In many religions (i.e., Tantric Buddhism, etc.) the human body
> is NOT seen as immoral, and thus her call would be no more likely to
> be accused of representing poor taste than it would if she had chosen,
> for example, "W5ARM" instead. THAT is an example of how religion
> dictates taste to society.

As distasteful as you may find it, Rick; in a republic, the majority
sets the rules. If the majority is mostly Christian, you'll find
yourself in a land where a lot of the laws are based in the
Judeo-Christian Ethic. I don't see any way around that except to sit
around rooting for one of the religious minorities to outnumber American
Christians. Apparently you don't see the constitutional protections for
the minorities as doing quite enough. Maybe you could launch a
movement. The trouble with movements is: drumming up followers can be a
real struggle.

> >We live in a nation of laws and regulation. Those laws and regulations
> >not only protect your rights but protect me from you.
>

> And that is the precise point at which they should stop.

See my point in the paragraph above.

> > By and large, you
> >are free to practice whatever you like within the confines of your home
> >or place of worship.
>
> On the contrary--even the few examples I cited earlier make it
> clear that this is not the case.

If nobody is prosecuted for the things you trot out, I fail to see the problem. Most folks don't participate in most of your examples anyway. What freedom are you personally being denied?

> > That doesn't always hold true in public venues.
>
> Within reason, I agree. However, before agreeing to that it's
> necessary to agree on the meaning of "public venue." To me, it is
> perfectly reasonable to restrict behavior which is patently offensive
> to the majority of people when it is conducted in a place where others
> are forced to either see it or avoid a location they wish to visit. On
> the other hand, many people see "Public" as any setting not enclosed
> by the walls of a private home (and even there see it as public if
> more than the residents are present). Obviously, if you are engaging
> in consensual activities in a setting where only those who agree to
> those behaviors (whether it is an indoor setting or an outdoor one is
> irrelevant) are present it should be none of society's business
> what-so-ever. Unfortunately, that is not the case in the United
> States.

Put a fence around Max Yazgur's farm and have at it.

> >The airwaves are a public venue.
>
> And one clearly regulated by the government who do NOT view
> Kim's actions as being a violation. Since the governing body does not
> do so, it's completely inappropriate for anyone else to take her to
> task for them.

For decades, the commission has not issued such calls sequentially. Most States do not permit similar things on vanity license plates (I don't really know of ANY which permit it--this is simply protection from the Cecils of this world). The issue has not been brought to a court of law. We really don't know about the legality at this time.

> >We not only have freedoms which come to us by birth as citizens of the
> >U.S., we have the responsibilities which go with that citizenship. I
> >don't think Kim is being a responsible citizen.
>
> Which, of course, is the point with which many of us disagree.
> And considering the FCC itself does not officially define her acts as
> inappropriate, clearly there is no standard by which to judge them as

> anything but a matter of personal choice.

As pointed out, the legality of the issue has not been decided. As things stand, her choice is simply tacky.

Dave K8MN

1457. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 21:18:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC19EC.645BCA61@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24454

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> You're such a pussy.
>
> Kim W5TIT

It would be unkind of me to make any statements regarding Kim's lack of class or tackiness.

Dave K8MN

1458. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 21:50:26 UTC
From: K0HB <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <uqpr9ZtcBHA.1732@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 24455

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote:

> Until Hollingsworth starts eliminating THOSE problems (and telling us
> to "self-police" isn't eliminating them), he has a lot more to concern
> himself with than Kim's call sign.

Riley didn't "concern himself" -- his opinion was solicited.

Like most of us, he thinks her vanity call sign is legal and trashy.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
Reality doesn't care what you believe.

1459. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 22:16:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111211416.67d43f22@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24456

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:<95D117631083AE03.0B5DE3947118C352.5F8C2CC703B840D9@lp.airnews.net>...
> On 19 Nov 2001 13:03:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Callsigns like Kim's make the ARS a little less G-rated. Many prospective hams
> >and the parents of prospective hams will have a less-positive impression of ham
> >radio after encountering such callsigns. It would be better for the ARS if hams
> >did not pick such vanity calls because they are inappropriate for the ARS.
>
> Jim, have you listened on 75m recently--or on a 2m repeater in
> the average city?

I listen to 75 meters occasionally. I use 2 meters here in the
Philadelphia area. There are a few troublemakers on both bands, which
is one of the reasons I operate almost all CW. For some reason,
"filth, bigotry, racism, hate speech, and deliberate jamming
activities" are practically unknown on CW.

>
> If you're concerned with the image the parents of prospective
> hams will have, consider the filth, bigotry, racism, hate speech, and
> deliberate jamming activities you COMMONLY hear in those bands.

I don't hear any such thing COMMONLY on 2 meters in this area. Your
mileage may vary.

We have had a few "bananas" here on 2 meters, but only a few. The 2
meter amateur community here is mostly made up of folks who don't
tolerate such behavior. Any "filth, bigotry, racism, hate speech, and
deliberate jamming activities" and the control op shuts down the
repeater. If that's not effective, the offender soon finds that nobody
answers his/her calls.
>
> If you, Larry, and others want to clean up ham radio, the
> place to start is with the Liberty Net and other racist groups, not
> with the mildly risque call Kim selected.

That's NOT the issue, Rick.

The question is whether calls like Kim's are appropriate for ham
radio, and whether they are in the best interest of the ARS. I say
they are not, and so does Riley.
>
> Talk to the average parent of a child old enough (and mature
> enough) to become a ham. Ask him or her if it would trouble them to
> know that a woman has the call sign W5TIT.

The "average parents" I know would say that such callsigns are not a
good advertisement for ham radio.

btw, at what age do you think a child is old enough to become a ham? I
got my license at age 13, and that was nowhere near a record back
then. Do you think there should be an age limit for a license?

> Then ask them if it would
> trouble them to know that a group of hams meat on 75m on Saturday
> nights to discuss issues of interest to them as white power advocates.

Nice try at diversion, but BOTH things are bad advertisements for ham
radio. Of course the second (Liberty Net) is far worse than the first
(Kim's call).

> Perhaps elderly bigots like Larry who grew up in environments where
> racism was acceptable but sex wasn't would say the call sign was a
> problem

Interesting that you describe Larry that way.

>--but most modern parents would rather quickly tell you that
> the call wasn't a problem--but that they would NEVER expose their
> children to that kind of bigotry and hate.

I'm a "modern parent", and I disagree with that statement. The call is
a problem and the bigotry and hate are problems. Of course the bigotry
and hate are far worse problems, but that's obvious.
>
> We don't live in the 1940s anymore.

So? Must we accept any and all callsigns as "modern"?

>Today "TIT" is a common
> word on prime time TV, and no one is offended in the slightest.

Nope. That word is NOT common on broadcast TV at all. And people ARE
offended.

> Hate
> and bigotry, such as Larry and Dick often display in this group, on
> the other hand, very definitely DO offend today's society.

They don't seem to offend the folks on the Liberty net.

But it sounds as if societal acceptance, or "community standards", is
your measure of what should be on the air.
>
> >It should be noted that not only did Kim pick out that callsign, but she
> >recommended similar callsigns to others as vanity calls.
>
> Ok, I'll tell you what. To "offset" Kim's call, I'll get my
> own vanity call (I've been thinking of getting one anyway) that will
> compensate for the "TIT" in hers.

Doesn't work that way, Rick.
>
> How would W8GOD be? No one could ever claim THAT call had an
> offensive sexual connotation to it--and it IS available.

Some folks might be offended. Not me, but some folks. However, it
doesn;t make up for other calls.
>
> Besides, that way when people call me by my suffix (as someone
> claimed people would call Kim), they certainly won't be offending
> anyone else by calling "Hey, God, what about . . ."

Nobody would call you that...;-)
>
> Of course, I'll have to avoid being on the air Sundays or
> everyone will be calling me, but . . .
>
> >It is perfectly clear from reading Kim's posts that she chose that callsign for
> >its attention and giggle factors, and doesn't see the harm in it.
>
> Probably because there ISN'T any harm in it!

Sure there's harm in it. Not much, but some. You don't see it, and she
doesn't see it, but other hams do. Just a matter of opinion. Is it
wrong for me to have such electro-politically incorrect opinions? I've
got lots of them.
>
> > The only way
> >she would give it up is if the FCC revoked it.
>
> Would you give up YOUR call if people here demanded you do so?

If they could show how my call could give people a bad impression of
ham radio, I would think about it. Might even do it if "community
standards" showed it was not a good choice for the image of the ARS.

But my call was not chosen for its attention-getting and giggle-factor
components. It's not even a real vanity call - it was sequentially
issued in 1977.

By the way, both W5KIM and W5MKW (Kim's initials) are unassigned. But
Kim doesn't want a call like that. Her choice, of course. I don't
think Kim is an evil person just because she chose that callsign. But
I don't think it's harmless, either.
>
> > That's probably not gonna
> >happen, because the FCC doesn't forbid such callsigns, and Kim doesn't change
> >her mind very often.
>
> Sounds to me as though the people here feel the call sign is a
> lot more harmful than the FCC does.

Is that wrong? Must our opinions agree with those of the govt.? Do you
think that if something is legal, it is therefore OK to do, no matter
what?

> Of course, what would they know, they just regulate the radio spectrum.

Uh-huh. This is the same FCC that, until recently, required a 20 wpm
code test for all amateur privileges unless a relevant permanent
medical disability could be documented. Were they right or wrong in
requiring that test until April 14, 2000?
>
> >So the operative question is: Which is the lesser of two evils - callsigns like
> >Kim's, or having the FCC enact and enforce a list of forbidden ARS callsigns?
>
> How about a third choice: Learn to tolerate that which offends
> you personally but doesn't hurt others and concentrate on stopping
> behaviors that do?

You avoided the queston, but I'll answer it. The greater evil is
having a list of forbidden callsigns enforced by the FCC.

The folks who run the "Liberty net" might say that you and I should
learn to tolerate THEIR behavior because it doesn't hurt anyone.
They'd cite "free speech" and some such.
>
> Call signs like Kim's hurt no one.

They hurt the image of the ARS. Which means they hurt hams who want
the best for the ARS' future.

> If the FCC enacts a list of
> forbidden call signs all they are doing is capitulating to the
> pressure of a religion that teaches it's followers that the human body
> is evil and sinful and cannot be mentioned in public.

Nope. Religion has nothing to do with it. And please note that I have
NOT called for the FCC to ban calls like Kim's.

> If they're going
> to make such terms forbidden, then by all means calls that end in
> "LEG," "ARM," "TOE," "EAR," or "EYE" have to go as well. After all,
> the FCC has no right legally to restrict anything based on religious
> values, so the only legal basis for forbidding calls such as Kim's
> would be to restrict anything that had to do with the body at all.

Nice try but no cookie.

Consider this: When Mayor Giuliani took office in NYC several years
back, one of the things he did was aggressively pursue "quality of
life" or "community standards" issues. Like not tolerating graffiti,
trash, aggressive panhandling, etc. He also went after bigger crime,
but the "little things" got resources too. Some said he should
concentrate only on the big stuff like murders and not bother the
three card monte operators and gypsy cab drivers, etc.

But a funny thing happened: the rate of ALL crime began to drop in the city, and New Yorkers began to feel better about their town.

There's a lesson in that for ham radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1460. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 22:36:35 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFC2C73.2375778@uci.edu>
Source record: 24460

CAM wrote:
> > You're wrong. Obtaining an amateur radio license is an elective procedure.

> Not for licensed ham radio operators it isn't.

That's a silly thing to say, Cecil. Amateur radio operators already
have a license. Obviously they've already elected to obtain one.
Sheesh.

1461. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 22:37:55 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFC2CC3.FD5A3E5@uci.edu>
Source record: 24461

CAM wrote:
> You're the one who's lying, Dave, and here's the proof yet once again.

You boys settle down and quit fighting!

1462. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 22:45:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFC2E8A.4F8C813B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24459

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Four days now, Dave. I've been keeping track to see exactly when
> > you are going to show a hint of integrity and issue an apology.
>
> ...about the time you win your section in the ARRL DX CW 'test. Do you
> have any idea how long I expect that to take?

I personally find contesting to be a juvenile-like waste of time.
I also find your attempts at diversion amusing.

> > I have NEVER
> > denied comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
>
> You most assuredly *are* ignoring the fact.

Since you have produced absolutely no proof, everyone can assume
you are still lying about it. Where's the beef, Dave?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1463. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 22:48:42 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFC2F4A.EF3E67F5@uci.edu>
Source record: 24457

CAM wrote:
> I personally find contesting to be a juvenile-like waste of time.
> I also find your attempts at diversion amusing.

Isn't it also true that you find _your_ attempts at diversion amusing?
:-)

1464. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 22:49:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFC2F7C.69E864CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24462

Dave Heil wrote:
> You're such a card, Cecil (or should we call your cEcIlLy?)

Cecilia will do. I'm a lesbian.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1465. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 23:00:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3BFC31F5.D3D72437@uci.edu>
Source record: 24458

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 16:18:36 GMT, Jim Bromley, K7JEB wrote:
>
> >Yeah, no kidding! I'll trade my urban ranch-style sitting
> >cheek-by-jowl to neighbors with light dimmers, computer
> >monitors, susceptible telephones, TV's and boom boxes for
> >a nice little used Palm Harbor sitting on 5 acres with
> >buried power and telephone lines and no CC&R's.
>
> Palm Harbor homes are made just down the freeway from here, and they
> do look gorgeous.
>
> My wife and I have discussed such a move, and this is not the right
> time for us to make it, though.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Don't get one. Tornados always seem to head straight for them! ;-)

1466. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-21 23:07:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFC33BD.CE43678D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24482

Dave Heil wrote:
> But you said that anything consenting adults do is okay. You mean if
> your wife is a consenting adult and other man is a consenting adult and
> they choose to sleep together without informing you, that *isn't okay*?

By OK, I'm assuming he means that it is none of the government's
business just as Kim's choice of callsign is none of the government's
business.

> As distasteful as you may find it, Rick; in a republic, the majority
> sets the rules.

Nope, that's a democracy. In a republic the elected representatives
set the rules or follow the rules set forth in The Constitution.
Inalienable rights are protected from the tyranny of the majority in
a democracy. Do you think if a majority of voters voted for Bush to
drink hemlock that he would do it?

> For decades, the commission has not issued such calls sequentially.
> Most States do not permit similar things on vanity license plates (I
> don't really know of ANY which permit it--this is simply protection from
> the Cecils of this world). The issue has not been brought to a court of
> law. We really don't know about the legality at this time.

Whatever happened to the concept of innocent until proven guilty?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1467. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 00:08:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFC41EC.2A86F5D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24483

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Then why do you take my postings about "comparting" so seriously?
> > >
> > > I don't take them seriously, Cecil.
> >
> > So how many replies have you posted regarding "comparting"?
> > I've been leading you down the primrose path for four days now.
>
> Oh? Do you fancy yourself a leader these days?

Oh, not for everything. Only for the primrose path. Can't be
everywhere at once, you know.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1468. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 00:11:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFC42BE.3045B63F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24484

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > > Ahhh, a libertarian. I've discarded that view as completely unworkable.
> > > > So if your wife chooses to start sleeping with another man and he
> > > > consents, it is fine with you? Do you have any say? Do you see any
> > > > immorality in the act? After all, what consenting adults do...
> > >
> > > No. I should hope so. Yes.
> > > ...none of which is the government's damn business. That's how Libertarians
> > > think
> >
> > Adultery is indeed none of the government's damn business.
> > No enlightened state has laws against adultery.
>
> I get it! Another Cecil joke! He knew all along we weren't discussing
> whether or not it was the government's business.

On the contrary, when someone says something is OK, he/she usually
means that it's none of the government's business. It is obviously
someone's business, just not the government's. I've know couples
with open marriages where adultery was not only OK but anticipated
with gusto.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1469. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 00:25:33 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <1CXK7.222$9d.80640@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24487

Oh no!! You found me Roger! I thought I could hide here!! (Just kidding)
It is kinda funny that we live so damned close and making a contact through
this medium. Feel free to participate in this newsgroup more often.
Overall there is a great bunch of people who you can get to know through
messages here. There are a few *WACKO'S* but overall it is a great bunch of
people. It is nice, within a few exceptions, to be able to debate a large
variety of topics and actually have a decent debate.

For the rest of the group, I also have known Roger K8RI for years and he is
the closest person that I know that I could call my Elmer. Between him and
John WB8RCR I have learned more than I normally ever would.

Thanks again for all your help there Roger!

Ryan KC8PMX

> Hey! What do you want to know about him? Ryan lives about a mile and a
half
> from me and I've known him since he was a teenager.
>
> He even helped me a couple of times, pulling on the rope to get the new
> tower and antennas up.
>
> Now as to satisfaction, enjoyment, and conversation...I could probably get
a
> couple hours of satisfaction out of telling stories about him.... What I
> don't know for sure I can always make up!
>
> Course, I'd have to add that I know few people whose first 6-meter contact
> was Alaska.
> Take a bow Ryan!
>
> --
> Roger Halstead (K8RI)
> WWW.RogerHalstead.com
> N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
>
>

1470. Re: "one step closer...."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 00:25:35 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <3CXK7.223$9d.80640@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24486

Seen them at few hamfests..... along with the multiple buttonage etc.

Ryan

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:9te4ve$12s$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> news:Hd7K7.756$m%.185681@monger.newsread.com...
> > Have ya seen the custom-screen-printed pocket protectors that are now
the
> > rage with the socially inept-anal-retentive ham???
>
> I wasn't looking for one. Guess they caught your eye though.
>
>

1471. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:23:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <5ECA7CFB6A00554E.2EA5E5D6A4E55FF5.10A436E11BA0E6B8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24489

On 21 Nov 2001 02:59:28 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I don't believe anyone in this newsgroup, with the possible exception
>of Kim, disagrees with the above. I don't think the FCC should limit
>the issuance of callsigns which could, as in Kim's case, spell out
>words which could be construed as having a sexual innuendo, and
>thus being in bad taste. I believe it is totally the responsibility of the
>ham who requests such a call sign to live with the outcome of their
>actions.

Then by the same logic, there is no legitimate reason to
harass or criticize that ham for exercising his or her freedom of
choice. If a call sign is legal, it is up to the holder to decide if
it is offensive--it's not up to others to force him/her to change that
call sign. That's just replacing government censorship with private
censorship and is just as unreasonable.

>It just so happens that Kim is now, in this thread, getting
>her just deserts, as a result of her inappropriate choice.

No, Larry, she isn't.

If other hams find her call sign offensive, then they are
certainly free to decide not to talk to her on the air--or on the
Usenet for that matter. And if a sufficient number of hams acted in
that manner--by their OWN choice--it would only make sense for Kim to
change her sign if she wanted to communicate with those individuals.
THAT would be a fair and reasonable response to her sign--and one that
leaves her with freedom of choice (of course, I doubt that very many
hams would BE offended by her sign or elect not to talk with her
because of it--but it's possible I'm wrong, in which case the response
would be one she would have to accept responsibility for
personally--as she would).

On the other hand, insisting on continuing a thread on the
topic of her call sign for the sole purpose of harassing her,
attempting to force her to change her sign, or "punishing" her choice
of signs is a very different matter. All you are trying to do is force
someone to do something YOU, not the FCC, feel is appropriate for the
ARS. That's a deliberate attempt to oppress her speech, Larry, and
it's offensive to any rational person.

Larry, you mention serving in the military. So did I. Not as
long as you, admittedly (I lost a lung in Vietnam toward the end of my
second tour of duty there and received a medical discharge), but long

enough to feel I contributed to my nation. And what I was defending (if you consider a non-combatant--I was a corpsman with a recon Marine unit in SE Asia, not a "shooter"--as "defending" our country) wasn't the politicians or the economic interests, it was the very freedoms I'm arguing for here. My Navy Cross may not have been for standing up for free speech--but I would be far prouder of it if it were for that than for what I _did_ earn it for. To me, the ONLY area in which our nation is "superior" (a term I hate, btw) to some other nations in is in our respect for and protection of freedoms. And when you--as a veteran--attack Kim for exercising that freedom, you essentially rub that service--and our Constitution--in the dirt. You may not mean to do that (I _do_ believe you view yourself as a patriot), but the effect is the same regardless.

>I'm sure Kim would like nothing better than to "shut me up," as it
>were, but that will never happen. I created this thread, and it will be
>a recurring, if not permanent, feature of this newsgroup.

Ok--then it's only fair that someone else create one that targets others in this newsgroup as well. I plan to start a new thread in a few minutes titled "Bigotry in the ARS" that will focus on hams who claim to represent the best of American amateurs, but who make it clear that they believe in or practice discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, or sexual orientation--which, of course, is a very UN-American behavior. The thread won't be specifically aimed at you, Dick, or any other individual (well, maybe the 3950 crowd :-), but I will be VERY surprised if you and some of the others who are riding Kim about her call sign aren't singled out in that thread for special attention by many participants in the NG.

> For years,
>we've had the concept of the "family-oriented" nature of the ARS
>touted as one of it's most attractive features.

Larry, the term "Family oriented" wasn't even in use until Ronald Reagan was President and it became a trendy political slogan to beat the left over the head with. The LAST thing I would do is to tie the ARS to anything Reagan and his supporters (particularly Jerry Falwell, the bigoted, self-righteous, hypocrite who coined the phrase "Family Oriented") used to boost their political ratings.

I could care less if you--or anyone else--view amateur radio as "family oriented" or not--family orientation simply means that you don't regard it as reasonable for activities that are too mature for children to participate in them to occur. To me, that's FAR too limiting a definition for amateur radio. When is the last time you saw an experimental station set up and run by a child? When was the last time you saw a family ham group on a dx-pedition? For that matter, when was the last time you saw a child participate in MARS, RACES, a traffic net, or ARES? How many young children are permitted to serve as VEs, ECs, or net control on a traffic net? If the service is "Family oriented," (as Hollingsworth claims) by necessity ALL those

should be immediately eliminated or children should be permitted to assume equal roles with adults who hold the same class of license.

Isn't it better to view the ARS as it is--a hobby with room for MANY different groups and interests? Some of us are interested only in communications (I admit it--when not chasing dx with an inferior station I'm a rag chewer <blush>), others are interested in electronics or communications experimentation, still others are interested in public service, traffic handling or social contacts. Some areas are suited to family use--some are not. If Kim wanted to participate exclusively in youth groups I would _personally_ question her choice of calls (not because I feel kids shouldn't be exposed to free information about human sexuality but because anyone who would choose a "risque" call sign deliberately to use with children would elicit question as to their motives). But the fact of the matter is, Kim DIDN'T obtain her call to participate in youth groups--she did so to communicate with adults, and there's a great difference between the two.

> I happen to strongly
>agree with this, and believe that Mr. Riley Hollingsworth has done
>all of us who value the positive, family-oriented image of the ARS
>a great service when he stated that Kim's callsign had the potential
>to bring it "ï¿½one step closer to extinction."

He'd do us a heck of a lot MORE good if he'd start really enforcing the regs and leave the psychic predictions to Jeannie Dixon and Nostradamus. So far as I can see, 75m & 2m aren't exactly shining examples of good radio practice and create a LOT worse image of ham radio than ten thousand "racy" call signs could ever cause--and so far as I can tell, Hollingsworth's response that THAT is to tell us to be self policing!

> Kim's choice to flaunt
>a vulgar and demeaning callsign does not make her a champion
>for free-speech "rights." It only makes her a spectacle of poor
>judgement.

But the concept of "vulgar" and "demeaning" implies that she _recognizes_ her sign as fitting those definitions. I don't. Cecil doesn't. A lot of other hams don't. And there's absolutely no reason for anyone to think that Kim does.

What you are doing, Larry, is expecting Kim to share your personal values--and that from ANY perspective isn't reasonable. Kim (and I, and others) see absolutely nothing offensive about her call. Yet you are insisting that she is demonstrating poor judgement by using it and that it is vulgar and demeaning.

Be totally honest (and not sarcastic), Larry. Which would offend you _personally_ more--Kim using W5TIT or me obtaining W8GOD? Why?

>On the contrary, there are many controversial discussions to be
>found on-the-air. The chaos common to the HF phone bands is not
>the only on-the-air activity available to radio amateurs. The CW
>and digital bands are full of interesting, stimulating conversations.

Bingo Larry.

You made one of my points without meaning to. There ARE many
varying activities on the air--some are "family oriented" but other's
aren't. Perhaps (only perhaps, bear in mind, since I don't believe in
sheltering children from reality) Kim's call wouldn't be appropriate
for participation in, as an example, a cub scout net--but to the best
of my knowledge she has no interest in _participating_ in that type of
activities. Instead, she communicates with other adults on the air,
and in that setting her call is totally acceptable and, in fact, a
nice break from the norm.

Imagine being on a dx'pedition with hundreds of hams calling
you for a contact (sounds good to me--but then again, I'm a dx 'er :),
and having someone with "TIT," someone with "HH," and someone with
"LT" as their suffix call you. Can you guess which call would be
easier to recall and respond to?

Hmmmm . . .

I think I _will_ apply for W8GOD--considering I work qrp
mobile by preference (try getting through a pile-up with THAT
combination), it might help. :-)

>Since Restructuring has virtually eliminated any effort involved in
>gaining access to the HF bands, I would think that the digital
>modes would gain greater popularity and higher utilization. Let's
>hope that this is so.

Then why argue in favor of cw?

As it happens, I _do_ work cw some of the time--anyone who
enjoys dxing has to do that. But I vastly prefer voice or other
digital modes instead. The increase in popularity is definitely a
positive from my perspective. What that has to do with Kim's call,
however, I have no idea. To the best of my knowledge she prefers
voice--but even if she works digital modes I doubt SERIOUSLY that she
sends a "graphic" image of her call sign (if she does I'll bet she's
popular on SSTV on 20m!) :-)

>This newsgroup exists for the express purpose of discussing
>"controversial" topics related to amateur-radio policymaking. It
>is the specific, intended home of the debate on code testing as
>a licensing requirement. If you have personal objections as to
>the nature of the colloquy inherent to this newsgroup, I suggest
>that there are many other newsgroups which may serve your
>needs better than this one can.

I have no objection at all. I just feel that beating a dead horse is unproductive. The newsgroup exists to discuss amateur radio policy--not just code and Kim's call sign. The elimination of the code requirement is a done deal--right now it's 5WPM and after next year it will probably go away altogether. My feelings in that area are irrelevant--I use cw, I can easily send with my paddles at 30+ (more than most hams can copy anyway) and I use a computer to receive & decode cw (I only have 15% hearing--with no high-range at all--thanks to Vietnam and I can't hear the breaks between elements at greater than 15 WPM or so--I "lucked out" on my 20 WPM exam), and I enjoy cw on occasion. But it's the FCC, not me, who will make that decision, and I don't personally believe that others should be required to learn a mode they may not enjoy anyway.

With respect to Kim's call sign, the same holds true. While I personally don't have a problem with her sign--and see nothing whatever offensive about it (actually, I like it--it's a refreshing change to talk to someone whose call is easy to remember [names and calls are NOT my strong point] and I don't see it as at all inappropriate), the fact remains that carrying on an extended debate about it is unproductive. Kim is NOT going to change her call because a few people here tell her to do so. Thus the conversation, like the code/no code debate, is an exercise in futility and serves only to alienate potential hams who read this newsgroup and waste bandwidth.

Larry, you've probably noticed that in this message--and other recent ones--I'm not putting you down, flaming you, or treating you like an idiot. There's a simple reason. While a "recreational" online flame war is fun, and doesn't hurt anyone, at the same time I'd like to be able to communicate with you w/o the assumption that I'm trying to insult you. Despite our differences, and there are many, I respect your experience in ham radio and your commitment to the ARS. I simply disagree with your views on what is best for the service and see no reason for you to attack others who feel the same. Perhaps communicating on a mutually-respectful basis can eliminate the attacks and create an environment where real communications can take place (ham radio IS about communications, after all) and the matter can be resolved. Of course, I'm perfectly willing to "play" if people prefer a flame war (and I'm pretty good at it, too! :-), but it's nice once in a while to simply communicate instead.

Frankly, I'd like to see this thread go away. Not because it isn't an interesting place to "play" (it is) but because of the poor impression of ham radio it's giving to prospective hams who read the thread. Kim isn't going to change her call--heck, I'd have no respect for her if she DID do so because others told her to (if she does so because SHE doesn't care for it anymore, that's different--I don't happen to care for KE8HH very much either--although it DOES represent a "pre-change" Advanced class call, which a new one wouldn't)! But if Kim isn't going to change her call--and if many (most?) of us see nothing wrong with it anyway, continuing the thread as you threaten to do becomes just a petty way of attacking and ridiculing a person who,

from all indications, simply doesn't deserve that kind of treatment.

Give some thought to it, Larry, it isn't helping the ARS, it's only creating more poor images--and the Liberty Net is very capable of doing THAT without any help from us.

Incidently, if you're going to Dayton this year the coffee is on me--and my wife (KB8AGW, btw, if it matters) won't even mind my meeting you w/o her if she's at one of the Cincinnati museums at the time! :-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1472. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:26:52 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <54CDB62CFD335DD9.7C2C58E2A74A9546.EED2F98A45744C6C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24490

On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 22:28:01 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> Seen any black helicopters lately, Larry? Maybe some UN troops
>> taking over your neighborhood?
>
>Something was interfering with CNN on my TV. I called the
>cable company and they said it was the AWACs. Does that count?

Cecil, if you're getting interference from AWAC flights, you
better complain to the government rather quickly. AWAC radar is
capable of putting out 5 MEGAWatts of power--enough to guarantee
"unique" looking, multi-headed babies in THAT frequency band!

Even Navy and Air Force pilots are careful about being exposed
to that kind of radiation from an AWACs flight or an E2 Sentry!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1473. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:29:08 UTC
From: K0HB <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <O$xL6VvcBHA.1212@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 24491

What the hell has this to do with Larry?

The owner of the call K3LD is Dianne.

What is it that K3LD lacks, in your opinion?

With all kind regards,

de Hans, K0HB

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3be48a54_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> Let's put it this way: the lacking is nothing that a person with the
gender
> name of Dianne would be carrying around. Then again, Larry doesn't carry
> much of one around either (at least not from what I can tell).
>
> Nighty night.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:a88a634ee9063c28c93f35aff160ea22.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> >
> > "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote:
> >
> > > Yeah, something like maybe K3LD. (The L=Lacking).
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > And what is that Dianne is lacking (in your humble opinion)?
> >
> > (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
>
>
>

1474. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:29:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfc56b7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24493

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:9tgjvj$bb6$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3bfb18d8_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > OH GAWD!!!! Jim Kelley---touche! What a laugh!!!
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Well, it's not all that funny really. It's sad. I've known couples like
> that, and it's never a happy situation. It's about respect for, and
> confidence and trust in another person, and a relationship. A
relationship
> without that respect is precarious and weak Strength and confidence are
> much more alluring traits in a person, I think.
>

Well, you're right. And it is sad... I hadn't taken the time to read the
"context" of the message. (But I did giggle most of the way to the office).
Say, I just saw a couple while I was in the grocery store with my husband
last night. This poor guy had drooping shoulders and rocked back and forth
as he walked. No kidding--his wife kept telling him exactly where to stand,
when to move, and what to get her off the shelves! My husband looked at me,
I looked at him, and shook our heads.

Kim W5TIT

> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3BFAD57E.E5D28FB6@uci.edu...
> > > Nor are you likely to. What they would likely "grasp" is that you're
> > > unable to distinguish between having coffee and having sex.
> >
> >
>
>

1475. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:34:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfc590a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24495

ho ho ho ho....oh no....LOL

Hmmm, maybe I better get to work on that QSL card and put all these rumors
to rest...er, sleep, er...

Kim W5TIT

"Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:hDRK7.120186$WW.7611419@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> Kim-W5TIT posted:
>
> > What discussin of my QSL card? I've never done one yet...LOL.
> > I've designed plenty but never have completed mine. Which, by
> > the way, will have a wolf theme. ;)
>
> You know what leaped into my mind when I read this --
> that statue of Romulus and Remus being suckled by
> a she-wolf. They're right, Kim, your callsign is
> damaging my psyche. ;-)
>
> --
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona
>
>
>

1476. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:35:13 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <49269F46403F14E9.0728CD9E71AF3668.88EA2DC3382F414E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24492

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 06:38:22 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Oh good grief...I don't think I've ever "swooned." Among my friends, women
>and men, it is well known that I don't have an "eye" on men for their
>bodies. I have never been like that. Now, have a man walk up and start
>talking intellectually and he's got my attention. I've known many very good
>looking men in my life and, just as with women, nearly every time there's
>good looks there's quite a nasty personality to go with them.

Why is it the women attracted to intellectual men are
thousands of mile away and the ones attracted to macho redneck types
are local?

Talk about living in the wrong area . . . ;-)

>What discussin of my QSL card? I've never done one yet...LOL. I've
>designed plenty but never have completed mine. Which, by the way, will have
>a wolf theme. ;)

Typo, Kim. I meant your call, not your card.

If you _do_ need a card designed, btw, let me know--graphics
design and art are a side interest of mine (a profitable one!!!) and
I'd be more than glad to design one. Actually, I like the idea someone
suggested of Romulus & Remus nursing from a wolf--particularly if you
eliminate Romulus--it just seems to fit your call! :-)

No charge for creating it--but I want a card if you print
them!

>No, no, no, Rick. What revolts Larry is the image of himself with
>hysterical laughter. Er, well, what revolts Larry is the image of himself.

He hasn't sent me that pic yet (God, I hope it's not a
nude!!!!!) so I can't respond to that one! ;-)

>Any time Larry starts feeling pretty silly over the issue of a callsign, as
>he usually does begin around this time (closer to Christmas actually), he
>begins attacking the people who seem to pick sides...his idea being that
>they have picked "me" rather than that they are on the side of freedom of
>choice, etc.

Christmas?

Do you have any idea how he--and the other conservatives in
the group--would respond if I change my call to W8GOD around
Christmas?

Hehehehehe . . .

>Larry gets very jealous over me. In fact, he gets just as jealous as if we
>were in a real relationship--which is never going to happen and that makes
>him even more desperate.

Blow him a kiss and tell him good night!

>So, *sigh*, you'll have to make the choice, Rick. Keep defending the rights
>of others and having Larry translate that to your never-ending love and
>desire for me--putting up with jealous fits of rage from him now and then,
>or...well, the alternative is just unspeakable... ;) But the part where
>Larry has his jealous fits of rage are a lot, lot more fun. (Besides, you
>ought to see my husband act Larry out). LOL

Kim, it's too bad you're monogamously married--can you imagine
the fun we could have with Larry & Dick in this group if you weren't?
;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1477. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:41:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfc59aa_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24496

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFBFBAD.96498FBA@IEEE.org...
> "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT posted:
> > > What discussin of my QSL card? I've never done one yet...LOL.
> > > I've designed plenty but never have completed mine. Which, by
> > > the way, will have a wolf theme. ;)
> >
> > You know what leaped into my mind when I read this --
> > that statue of Romulus and Remus being suckled by
> > a she-wolf. They're right, Kim, your callsign is
> > damaging my psyche. ;-)
>
> The effects of Kim's callsign are making my sides hurt.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

Mmmmm, *trying to hold this back but cannot* which sides? :o

Kim W5TIT

1478. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:42:01 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <60C246D7C6064ACE.230ACDAFCE7A8DB9.E361368284D5F1AA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24494

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:14:09 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

> My wife and I have discussed such a move, and this is not the right
> time for us to make it, though.

Talk about an opposite move--my wife and I are considering
going full time as RVers next year when I retire from teaching (at 57
YEA!!!!)--which should be interesting considering we have 6000+ books,
4000+CDs and six computer systems! :-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1479. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:49:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfc5a3d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24497

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:07CAA049537B5649.57E2F3E780E752A1.B48402A196885899@lp.airnews.net...
> On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 06:41:21 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I have a feeling Larry is friendship challenged.
>
> Naw. He has friends. Look at Dick.
>
> Oops. That line gives Larry entirely too much to play with,
> doesn't it?
>

Ummmm, yeah. See Jane run!

Kim W5TIT

1480. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:52:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfc5aee_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24498

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC01E9.9868BB77@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BFA830E.F540F9A@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > You'd think Davey would get the hint. When one keeps throwing
insults
> > that
> > > > no one understands because they're not at others' level, well...
Kinda
> > has
> > > > the same affect as using the English language in a group of people
that
> > > > speak nothing but Spanish.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> > > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means,
you
> > > might want to find out what it means. It isn't my lack of knowledge
> > > which is the problem.
> > >
> >
> > Uh, Dave. I would find it interesting, at best, for me to undertake
> > learning from you in any way constructive... Oh, and I'm not sure what
you
> > mean by if I want to participate...I don't think I do...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> I'm sure that you would find it interesting, Kim. My time is, however,
> extremely limited. If you don't care to participate, what keeps you
> participating?
>
> Dave K8MN

Well, that's quite simple, Dave. I am so surprised you have to ask. I keep participating because I love to amuse the simply amused! No challenge, easy work, gets my stress out from the day's activities and, in some cases, allows me to enjoy some real interesting go 'rounds.

Kim W5TI and a T

1481. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 01:56:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfc5c3b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24499

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC02CF.C40752AA@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BFA8245.DEC86321@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Process management is my chief responsibility at work, Dave. I
would
> > > > shudder to think that I become so "adult" that I act like people
such as
> > > > you. Now, for you it may work. For me, it would not. I bet that
> > between
> > > > the two of us, I make up for your lack of willingness to step
outside
> > the
> > > > box.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > It is certainly odd that one who so often makes incorrect character
and
> > > background judgements about people is employed in a field where she
> > > needs skill in using logical thought. Of course, being employed in a
> > > field and being any good at it don't automatically go hand in hand.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > You'd know, right? You have the lead on that example.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Uh, Kim? I'm not employed at all. I'm retired. I marinate steaks,
> pilot a lawn tractor and put up large antennae at altitude.

Well, at least you can get something large up at high altitude--even if it
is outdoors.

> I work the
> pileups, participate in the local ARES net, rag chew any time I feel
> like it and take part in numerous radio contests. *poof* There goes
> your supposed point.
>

> Dave K8MN
>

'Smatta, Dave? Didn't like what I had to say? Is the above an attempt to excite me, or did you need to remind yourself of something?

Kim W5TIT

1482. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 02:12:30 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9thmuh0j5s@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24402

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC19EC.645BCA61@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > You're such a pussy.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> It would be unkind of me to make any statements regarding Kim's lack of
> class or tackiness.
>
> Dave K8MN

It looks to me like you just did.

1483. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 02:19:21 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9thn970k43@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24403

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFC2F7C.69E864CB@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You're such a card, Cecil (or should we call your cEcIlLy?)
>
> Cecilia will do. I'm a lesbian.

Hey! If you're a young, shapely, attractive, fem, and are attracted to such,
I'd like to watch some time. (But *NOT* if you're a stocky, overweight,
gravel-voiced, butch dyke.)

1484. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 02:19:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfc6196_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24500

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn5rri6.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 16:18:36 GMT, Jim Bromley, K7JEB wrote:
>
> >Yeah, no kidding! I'll trade my urban ranch-style sitting
> >cheek-by-jowl to neighbors with light dimmers, computer
> >monitors, susceptible telephones, TV's and boom boxes for
> >a nice little used Palm Harbor sitting on 5 acres with
> >buried power and telephone lines and no CC&R's.
>
> Palm Harbor homes are made just down the freeway from here, and they
> do look gorgeous.
>
> My wife and I have discussed such a move, and this is not the right
> time for us to make it, though.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

It used to be that "mobile" or, manufactured homes (trailers) were really made like toothpicks...I lived in one when I was 19 and first married. Now, my husband and I live on 5 acres, 3 wooded, surrounded by pasture land with no neighbors on either side or back and the closest from the front is about 150 yards away. We are, give or take, 27-30 miles away from downtown Dallas and when we first moved out here, we were pretty much it. (Now, there's more homes). It's dark, I can see the stars and meteor showers nearly any night there's no cloud deck, and I get to hear nature's wonderful coyote song nearly every night.

The home I have now is a Remington, nearly 10 years old. I've remodeled some parts of it, will remodel the rest of it, and this year we'll put up new canvas awnings all 'round, and add shutters to the windows (although they won't be wood). It was priced in the 30's when we bought it at a year old, has three bedrooms, two full baths, much larger kitchen than I'd like and even a darned large living room.

I mention all that detail because a few years ago my husband and I, and two friends (another couple), rented a Jaguar convertible and took a run up to a new development in far NW Plano, TX. There was open house homes that weekend, and these homes priced in the 1/2 Million area. Needless to say

the first 3-4 we looked at, I was mightily impressed and found myself on the long side of yearning just a little for a home like it. Then, for whatever reason, I happened to walk up to the paneling in the family room of one of these homes. I tapped on the wood--which turned out not to be wood!!! Closer inspection revealed a high-grade vinyl coating over some kind of paper material (had a gray compressed look to it). Then, I investigated nearly all of the building materials in these homes. You can guess what I encountered.

Now, not saying I wouldn't build a home just like it if I had the money. But only just like it in design. For, my home...my trailer, is made of better materials than any I saw in those homes that day. I could not believe it! My home, if and whenever I build one here, will be of solid real materials, or I won't have one. I used to think that the only *real* difference between my home and "those" homes was protection from tornadoes. HA! Not likely.

Kim W5TIT

1485. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 02:25:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfc62ce_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24401

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC19EC.645BCA61@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > You're such a pussy.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> It would be unkind of me to make any statements regarding Kim's lack of
> class or tackiness.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you are unkind...very, very unkind.

Kim W5TIT

1486. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 03:03:49 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CA2FD982177B45E6.9FB5FD7F5F805E9A.D3F919013E2C67C3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24404

On 21 Nov 2001 14:16:58 -0800, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>> Jim, have you listened on 75m recently--or on a 2m repeater in
>> the average city?
>
>I listen to 75 meters occasionally. I use 2 meters here in the
>Philadelphia area. There are a few troublemakers on both bands, which
>is one of the reasons I operate almost all CW. For some reason,
>"filth, bigotry, racism, hate speech, and deliberate jamming
>activities" are practically unknown on CW.

True--but if that isn't the mode you prefer (it isn't in my
case except for some dx because of my hearing), then you're stuck with
either a "keyboard" oriented mode, sstv, or voice.

I can use a keyboard on the Internet FAR more effectively (and
more quickly--I have a T1 connection) than on the air so that mode
doesn't have a lot to attract me. SSTV is one of the modes I use most,
but it's limited in scope. Voice, otoh, allows conversation on a
variety of subjects, the opportunity to work in various modes (I
prefer qrp ssb personally), and the chance to talk to people
worldwide. Unfortunately, there _are_ a number of "losers" on the hf
voice segments that reduce the pleasure the mode offers.

>I don't hear any such thing COMMONLY on 2 meters in this area. Your
>mileage may vary.

Where I live I don't either (relatively small community). But
I've visited a number of metro areas where I very quickly learned that
if I didn't want to listen to "cb" at its worst, I had to switch to
70cm instead of 2m on the mobile.

>We have had a few "bananas" here on 2 meters, but only a few. The 2
>meter amateur community here is mostly made up of folks who don't
>tolerate such behavior. Any "filth, bigotry, racism, hate speech, and
>deliberate jamming activities" and the control op shuts down the
>repeater. If that's not effective, the offender soon finds that nobody
>answers his/her calls.

Sounds good--unfortunately that isn't the norm in the US.

>> If you, Larry, and others want to clean up ham radio, the
>> place to start is with the Liberty Net and other racist groups, not
>> with the mildly risque call Kim selected.
>
>That's NOT the issue, Rick.
>

>The question is whether calls like Kim's are appropriate for ham
>radio, and whether they are in the best interest of the ARS. I say
>they are not, and so does Riley.

No he doesn't. If he did, it would be an FCC regulation. He
says in his OPINION it could contribute to negative effects on the
ARS. Sorry, Jim. But Hollingsworth's opinions on topics other than FCC
regulations are no more valid than anyone elses. Personally, I don't
see her call as offensive or as contributing to any problems in ham
radio--if anything I see the current discussion as being FAR more
negative from the perspective of potential new hams than her call
could ever be.

>The "average parents" I know would say that such callsigns are not a
>good advertisement for ham radio.

Call signs aren't an advertisement in the first place. They
are station identifications in fact, and personal identifications in
reality. Kim's call is neither good nor bad for ham radio--it simply
identifies her as a licensed amateur.

>btw, at what age do you think a child is old enough to become a ham? I
>got my license at age 13, and that was nowhere near a record back
>then. Do you think there should be an age limit for a license?

Nope. If a child is old enough to UNDERSTAND ham regulations
and electronics theory, s/he is old enough to obtain a license. What I
think is "too young" is the child who is pushed through the licensing
process by a parent who feels that he or she will profit from the
hobby so he or she must become a ham.

But on the other hand, anyone who is old enough to understand
both the principles of radio communications and the underlying
concepts of the FCC regs (and if they DON'T understand those subjects,
they SHOULDN'T have a license--child or adult) is also old enough to
deal with the world as it really is instead of as we want it to be. A
child that can understand radio propagation is plenty old enough to
understand the mild humor present in Kim's call sign.

>> Then ask them if it would
>> trouble them to know that a group of hams meat on 75m on Saturday
>> nights to discuss issues of interest to them as white power advocates.
>
>Nice try at diversion, but BOTH things are bad advertisements for ham
>radio. Of course the second (Liberty Net) is far worse than the first
>(Kim's call).

Yet no one has bothered to start a "life long" thread about
THAT problem here as Larry has stated the thread about Kim's sign to
be!

Why not?

>> Perhaps elderly bigots like Larry who grew up in environments where
>> racism was acceptable but sex wasn't would say the call sign was a
>> problem
>
>Interesting that you describe Larry that way.

Based on his posts, it's the impression I have of him. If it's
wrong, I'm more than willing to apologize for it--but not unless I see
some evidence that it IS wrong.

I've seen Larry put down minorities in this group, if that was
out-of-context then I'm not aware of it. Personally, I see Larry as a
dedicated ham who is probably much more advanced technically than I am
in most areas of ham radio, and who is devoted to the ARS--but who is
very old fashioned, ultra-conservative, prejudiced, and judge mental.
If those impressions are wrong, I haven't seen any evidence of it.

>I'm a "modern parent", and I disagree with that statement. The call is
>a problem and the bigotry and hate are problems. Of course the bigotry
>and hate are far worse problems, but that's obvious.

Ok--that's one parent who sees a problem with the call sign.
I'm, likewise, a parent and I don't see one. Any other parents in the
group willing to contribute their feelings as well (not that it makes
any difference--the call IS legal and it IS Kim's call, so it's not a
question of any of us deciding if it should be used or not).

>> We don't live in the 1940s anymore.
>
>So? Must we accept any and all callsigns as "modern"?

No--but we DO have to accept the fact that social standards
change. It's perfectly "ok" to use the word "Tit" on prime time
network tv--which most kids are exposed to daily. If it's ok in THAT
part of the radio spectrum, why not in ours as well?

>Nope. That word is NOT common on broadcast TV at all. And people ARE
>offended.

Since I don't watch network tv (Enterprise excepted, I'm a
trekie at heart) I can't speak from experience. But I _did_ take the
time to ask several friends who ARE network watchers--and ALL stated
they heard the word with regularity on prime time tv. I can only go by
the word of others there.

As far as offense goes--I honestly don't understand what is
offensive about it. Either it's a simple call sign (in which case it
CAN'T be offensive) or it's a reference to a part of the normal human
body. Does it offend you if the word "leg" or "arm" is used around
children? If not, why should "Tit" (or any popular term, for that
matter) offend you?

I get very tired of people who claim that sex and the human
body are "evil" or "sinful" or that frank discussion of these topics

needs to be hidden from children. All that implies is that sex is evil. What a load of garbage. Sex is--and should be--an expression of caring, if not of love, and is as natural a part of life as breathing or eating. I would no more want to hide that from children than I would want to hide the existence of oceans or snow! Yet, if sex and the body are normal and healthy, what on earth justification exists for being offended by Kim's call sign?

>They don't seem to offend the folks on the Liberty net.

No--minorities offend them. On the other hand, they don't share the same values most of us hold.

>But it sounds as if societal acceptance, or "community standards", is
>your measure of what should be on the air.

Nope--that's the standard set by the people who oppose Kim's call sign. I don't believe limits SHOULD exist on the content of communications (limits on commercial use of amateur bands or the use of ham radio to solicit interactions with children excluded, obviously). If a person communicates in a way that offends others he or she should be subject to peer pressure (in the form of not communicating with him or her, not by attacking him or her publicly) but that's the limit. If there is any principle I support completely it's that of freedom of speech. It isn't the role of the FCC to insure that the airways are "safe" for children--it's up to their parents to insure that they understand what they're being exposed to.

>Doesn't work that way, Rick.

Neither does flaming her for exercising her freedom of choice in this newsgroup!

>Some folks might be offended. Not me, but some folks. However, it
>doesn;t make up for other calls.

But I'll bet it would get through a pile up with most dx stations! :-)

>Nobody would call you that...;-)

What makes you think they don't do so now? ;-)

>Sure there's harm in it. Not much, but some. You don't see it, and she
>doesn't see it, but other hams do. Just a matter of opinion. Is it
>wrong for me to have such electro-politically incorrect opinions? I've
>got lots of them.

What's wrong with it--OR with your non-pc opinions? Just as she has a right to choose her sign, you have a right to be non-pc.

>> Would you give up YOUR call if people here demanded you do so?
>
>If they could show how my call could give people a bad impression of

>ham radio, I would think about it. Might even do it if "community
>standards" showed it was not a good choice for the image of the ARS.

Why?

Simply because other people don't care for it is no legitimate reason for changing a call you like. It isn't their business, it's yours. And if a call can contribute to the "collapse" of the ARS, then it has so many problems that it DESERVES to collapse.

I was kidding about getting W8GOD (which, btw, IS available)--but the more I follow this thread, the more I'm becoming convinced that a controversial call would be a good choice--it might contrast with the overly conservative nature of the ARS and encourage potential hams who share my belief in free speech to join our hobby. I'm just not sure if I should apply for W8GOD, W8LSD, or W8POT--all of which would undoubtedly create more controversy then Kim's call. Any suggestions?

>But my call was not chosen for its attention-getting and giggle-factor
>components. It's not even a real vanity call - it was sequentially
>issued in 1977.

As is mine (my third call--issued in 1985 as I recalll--the first two being N7AVF and KA6POP). Of course, the phonetics you use for it (and if you use standard phonetics you are--as you well know--in the minority) can make a difference. For instance, mine can be presented as:

Kilo Echo Eight Hotel Hotel

Kindly Eat Eight Hairy Hamburgers

King Edward Eight Harried Housewives

etc.

Some of those are very reasonable, some "silly," but innocuous, and some a bit more "risque" than Kim's sign ever thought of being.

>By the way, both W5KIM and W5MKW (Kim's initials) are unassigned. But
>Kim doesn't want a call like that. Her choice, of course. I don't
>think Kim is an evil person just because she chose that callsign. But
>I don't think it's harmless, either.

W8RAA is unassigned as well--yet despite the fact that it includes my initials (RAA), I don't particularly want the call. In my case--as in Kim's--it's a matter of personal preference.

And while you don't see it as harmless, you DO have to agree that is a personal opinion, something not necessarily binding on Kim or anyone else.

>> Sounds to me as though the people here feel the call sign is a
>> lot more harmful than the FCC does.
>
>Is that wrong? Must our opinions agree with those of the govt.? Do you
>think that if something is legal, it is therefore OK to do, no matter
>what?

Nope. But I DO think that if something is legal, and someone chooses to do it, it's totally inappropriate to slam them in public for their choice or to create a never-ending thread designed to make them change their behavior (or, in this case, their call sign), don't you?

>Uh-huh. This is the same FCC that, until recently, required a 20 wpm
>code test for all amateur privileges unless a relevant permanent
>medical disability could be documented. Were they right or wrong in
>requiring that test until April 14, 2000?

I have no problem with it--I passed my 20WPM in March of 2000, despite having an 85% hearing loss.

On the other hand, I ALSO don't have any problem with the elimination of that requirement. The FCC invited comments on the issues and because it really didn't make that much difference to me, I chose not to submit one. As a result, I tacitly accepted the ruling they made.

>> How about a third choice: Learn to tolerate that which offends
>> you personally but doesn't hurt others and concentrate on stopping
>> behaviors that do?
>
>You avoided the queston, but I'll answer it. The greater evil is
>having a list of forbidden callsigns enforced by the FCC.

No, the greatest evil is censorship. Whether that censorship comes from FCC actions or from the pressure of a minority of licensed amateurs is irrelevant.

>The folks who run the "Liberty net" might say that you and I should
>learn to tolerate THEIR behavior because it doesn't hurt anyone.
>They'd cite "free speech" and some such.

I DO tolerate their behavior.

In fact, if the jammers would stop interrupting the band, I'd be perfectly willing to DEBATE their views on the air. They might not like my views (I happen to be adamantly opposed to ANY form of prejudice or discrimination), but if their arguments were stronger than my own they would be completely free to present them and win the debate.

Free speech is an absolute. I don't have to like or respect what a person is saying to support his or her right to say it. All I have to do is look to see if that speech is designed to cause direct

harm to others (i.e., a speech calling for the killing of Blacks, etc.), and if not I support their right to be heard.

>> Call signs like Kim's hurt no one.
>
>They hurt the image of the ARS. Which means they hurt hams who want
>the best for the ARS' future.

Be realistic. This IS the 21st Century. Unless you want the ARS to appear to be a dinosaur in our society you have to come into the modern era--and in the modern era a call sign like Kim's is NOT something that would damage the image of anything.

>> If the FCC enacts a list of
>> forbidden call signs all they are doing is capitulating to the
>> pressure of a religion that teaches it's followers that the human body
>> is evil and sinful and cannot be mentioned in public.
>
>Nope. Religion has nothing to do with it. And please note that I have
>NOT called for the FCC to ban calls like Kim's.

Really?

In that case, provide ANY rational basis for prohibition of any form of sexual content at all. It doesn't defame, slander, or otherwise harm non-consenting individuals. It doesn't call for violence or prejudice against any group. It simply refers to natural human body parts or functions. ONLY religious prejudice makes frank sexual terms and discussion into anything "offensive" and THAT should be restricted to religion, not to government policy.

>Consider this: When Mayor Giuliani took office in NYC several years
>back, one of the things he did was aggressively pursue "quality of
>life" or "community standards" issues. Like not tolerating graffiti,
>trash, aggressive panhandling, etc. He also went after bigger crime,
>but the "little things" got resources too. Some said he should
>concentrate only on the big stuff like murders and not bother the
>three card monte operators and gypsy cab drivers, etc.

Let's look at each of those:

1. Graffiti: Legitimate opposition; graffiti defaces private property, thus harming the person or property of a nonconsenting individual.

2. Trash. Creates a health hazard for non-consenting individuals. Of course, trash removal is a function of government, not individual action.

3. Aggressive panhandling. Depends on your definition of aggressive. If that refers to those who demand you give them money and are threatening in nature, I agree--it violates the rights of a person to be free of intimidation. IF you mean ANY panhandling, it's little

more than an attempt to "legislate" homelessness out of the community. Example: In San Francisco there's an organization called "Food Not Bombs" who collect food donations and use church kitchens to cook hot meals to serve the homeless and hungry. The city has decided to prosecute those individuals for not having a restaurant health permit for their kitchens (despite the fact that the churches are NOT required to have one) and regularly arrests the volunteers who dispense the food to the hungry. THAT is far more "evil" than any form of panhandling could ever be--and it's proof that simply because a governmental agency finds something wrong doesn't make it a fact.

4. Gypsy cab drivers, three card monte, etc. are ALL either forms of fraud (3 card monte) or attempts to avoid legitimate licensure requirements (as is freebanding). Those are legitimate concerns.

>But a funny thing happened: the rate of ALL crime began to drop in the >city, and New Yorkers began to feel better about their town.

Really?

That's great for New York--but it has nothing to do with Kim's call sign.

>There's a lesson in that for ham radio.

Sure--prosecute those who violate the rules and concentrate on cleaning up the airways. But that has nothing to do with her call and everything to do with the jamming, illegal operations, and other legal violations occurring daily on the air.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1487. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 03:30:29 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A83F3995F409C23B.F919EFCAA70A87D5.93B741F57283B1EF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24405

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:50:26 -0000, "K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
wrote:

>Riley didn't "concern himself" -- his opinion was solicited.
>
>Like most of us, he thinks her vanity call sign is legal and trashy.

No, Hans, like SOME hams--not "most of us."

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1488. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 03:36:23 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8E33D3FF7142B725.0C53954CEE8CFF78.C851EC672075B414@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24406

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 20:25:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Yeah, it is better but you still don't quite have it down. Try leaving
>out the word "arbitrarily" since I didn't come to my conclusion
>arbitrarily. Then try leaving out everything after "lack of class"
>since I didn't make that statement--you did. Now I think you have my
>view.

Ok--since you state your decision wasn't arbitrary, I'm sure
you won't have any problem providing a scientifically FACTUAL basis
for your statement. Don't use "popular moral values" that has no
bearing and IS arbitrary. Use provable facts.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1489. Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 03:39:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn6ech0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24407

Jim Weir wrote:

-> Section 97.11 of the FCC Rules puts some very specific
-> restrictions on operation from an aircraft.

> You been into the holiday giggle water a little early there, Kane?
> 47CFR 97.11 provides two short paragraphs about applying for license
> to Gettysburg.

For the record:

Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.

(a) The installation and operation of an amateur station on a ship or aircraft must be approved by the master of the ship or pilot in command of the aircraft.

(b) The station must be separate from and independent of all other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio installation. The station's transmissions must not cause interference to any other apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft.

(c) The station must not constitute a hazard to the safety of life or property. For a station aboard an aircraft, the apparatus shall not be operated while the aircraft is operating under Instrument Flight Rules, as defined by the FAA, unless the station has been found to comply with all applicable FAA Rules.

47 C.F.R. 97.11 [P&F] as of October 30, 2001

Revision history shows that the above section number and wording was effective since at least September 1, 1989 when Part 97 was revised in its entirety and the stuff in subsection (c) concerning IFR operation was added.

The advantage of having a Rules Service that costs $3000 a year is that one gets up-to-date Rules as well as the revision history, digest, and case citations all in one place.

Note the first sentence of subsection (b). Wanna bet that they weren't using a separate antenna and transceiver? And who is going to find that the amateur station equipment complies with all applicable FAA rules for radio equipment, especially certification, which as you know are far more stringent than FCC rules for same?

The "absolute authority" of the PIC is really limited to what the company lawyers say it is....if the PIC wants to retain his/her job.

However, I do bow to your experience in the industry.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1490. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 04:15:49 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@QWEST.NET>
Message-ID: <VZ_K7.33844$xS6.58628@www.newsranger.com>
Source record: 24408

Jim Weir asks:

> You been into the holiday giggle water a little early there, Kane?
> 47CFR 97.11 provides two short paragraphs about applying for license
> to Gettysburg.

Jim,

My copy, admittedly over a year old, has some pretty restrictive language about shipboard and airborne installations at 97.11. Maybe changed in a later revisions, but I doubt it.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

1491. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 04:33:08 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <35453A6CBE0B3796.D487F79D3540B96C.517BBBD0DE7EDF7E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24409

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:15:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I've discarded both upper and lower case libertarianism. I would take
>issue that my great-great-great-great-great Uncle Thomas was a
>libertarian.

"Life, Liberty, and property" John Locke

"Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" Thomas
Jefferson.

Read some of Jefferson's writings--he was not only a staunch
libertarian (in the sense of Locke and Mill), he was a deist, not a
Christian.

>No you didn't. I assume you made some vows.

Yup.

To respect, honor, and care for. Our vows were NOT taken in a
Christian ceremony and did NOT include "cleave only unto . . ." or
"obey."

>> Look at it this way: If you care about someone, you want them
>> to be happy and to enjoy their lives, right? Well if it would give her
>> pleasure to sleep with someone else, I would certainly not be
>> demonstrating very much love for her if I refused her that
>> pleasure--or failed to trust her to keep her marriage separate from
>> her recreation.
>
>Bully for you.

Just doing my job as a (hopefully) good husband! ;-)

>> The only things I have the right to expect, if she chooses to
>> sleep with someone outside the home is that she will take steps to
>> insure that her actions don't harm anyone. She is perfectly free to
>> have sex with such an individual, for example, but she has an absolute
>> obligation to insure she doesn't bring an STD home as a result. In the
>> same vein, I have the right to expect her to hold up her end of our
>> marital partnership by doing her share of the work at home (she
>> doesn't work outside the home, so she accepts responsibility for a
>> larger share of the work at home than I do) and I have the right to
>> expect that she will not allow her recreational activities to
>> interfere with our relationship. Beyond that, any decisions would, by
>> any logic, be her's to make not mine.

>
>Again, bully for you!

Gee, I didn't think you'd agree so willingly. Common sense got
through the religious programming, huh?

>> If one partner is acting in that manner behind the back of the
>> other then the situation is very different. In that case, clearly, he
>> or she is breaking their word to their partner and thus knowingly
>> harming their relationship. That, clearly, is immoral behavior.
>
>But you said that anything consenting adults do is okay. You mean if
>your wife is a consenting adult and other man is a consenting adult and
>they choose to sleep together without informing you, that *isn't okay*?

No, I said that anything consenting adults do that does not
harm the person or property of other non-consenting individuals is ok.
Clearly, by violating agreements with someone, you harm them.

As it happens, I _wouldn't_ be bothered if my wife decided to
have sex with someone w/o informing me ("sleep together" is pretty
inaccurate in this discussion, isn't it?)--on the other hand, it WOULD
disturb me that she didn't feel comfortable telling me about it and
would indicate that we needed to work on our communications.

>> Note that I define morality on the basis of harm to others.
>> Since I'm not a Christian, I'm not "locked" into a mindset that
>> defines sexual activities as immoral actions. Instead, I see sex as an
>> expression of love, of joy, or of shear happiness in life. NONE of
>> that is--or can be demonstrated to be--immoral in any reasonable use
>> of the word.
>
>Well, it certainly lends new meaning to phrases such as "going out into
>the world and spreading love". I'd say that there's a large group of
>Theologians would would strongly disagree with your last sentence.

Sure--but they would be basing their disagreement on religion
(you DID say theologians, right?). So what? If I'm not part of that
religion why should I care at all what the opinions of it's proponents
are with respect to my private behavior?

Personally, I sincerely believe that if we spent less time
telling our kids lies about sex and protecting them from reality, and
more time telling our kids about racism and violence and teaching them
to be "color-blind" we'd have a LOT better world than if we followed
the guidelines of ANY religion's theologians.

>I've certainly communicated my opinion. For you to tell me that I don't
>have a right to communicate it is ridiculous. You aren't the final
>arbiter. If folks had a right to be free of insult and ridicule,
>Letterman and Leo would be out of work. Please show me where I can find
>these new rights spelled out.

I didn't say you don't have a right to communicate. I stated
that no one has a right to ridicule or attack Kim for her choice. If
you can't state your opinion without attacking or ridiculing someone,
then I DO feel your communications are inappropriate.

>> So long as you are willing to stop at the point where the
>> person you are addressing states that they disagree with your
>> assessment, fine. You are certainly well within your rights to state
>> your opinions--the key is in identifying them AS your opinions instead
>> of treating them as though they were absolute statements of universal
>> truth--which seems to be the common response to her call here among
>> those who oppose it.
>
>What else is to found on this newsgroup except opinion?

Ridicule, hate posts, insults, put-down, . . .

Shall I continue?

>It is still obvious that you do not know how all people practice
>Christianity and you are apparently ignorant of denominational
>differences.

Ok, name a single denomination that takes a public position
that the actions of non-members of their religion are NOT subject to
their "rules" or censure.

Demonstrate that a single Christian denomination believes in
freedom of religion--including freedom to live by the MORAL STANDARDS
of a different religion--is appropriate and teaches its adherents that
Christian morality and belief does NOT apply to non-Christians, and
I'll apologize for my statement.

Of course you can't do that--ALL Christian groups teach that
Christianity is the only "right" religion and that Christian moral
values are the "right" values for everyone--but that's the reason I
find most Christian groups so offensive.

>> If you can honestly state that you don't believe Christianity
>> as it is commonly practiced today (and yes I know there are those who
>> DON'T practice it in that manner--but they are a small minority)
>
>That's just so much subjective crap.

I see you didn't claim that you honestly don't believe it,
however.

>> doesn't oppress the rights or freedoms of non-believers, I'll be more
>> than happy to support my claim with as much evidence as you would like
>> to see. Even the simplest examples should demonstrate that concept.
>> For example, "Blue Laws" prohibit conducting some/all business on
>> Sunday and are based directly on the biblical concept of a "day of
>> rest" but result in oppressing both Jews and Muslims who are required
>> by their religions not to work on Friday night through Saturday and by

>> the laws enacted by Christians not to work on Sunday--thus creating an
>> unfair competitive environment for them when compared to Christian
>> businessmen; other examples include prohibition of adultery [a matter
>> of personal choice], homosexual activities [illegal in 37 states],
>> masturbation [a FELONY in several states, btw], and bigamy [which
>> oppresses both Muslims--who by their religion may have up to four
>> wives if they can support them].
>
>While you are coming up with the proof, better dredge some up on how
>many of our laws are put into effect by the Church. I'm fairly sure
>that our state legislature is responsible for laws being passed
>hereabouts.

Fact: There isn't an elected official in this country that
could win re-election if s/he didn't support the desires of the
Christian Churches in his/her district.

Fact: There is absolutely NO basis for morals or "blue" laws
except for the prejudice Christianity demonstrates toward those who
don't share their repressive views on these subjects.

Fact: Local churches in every area, despite a claim that they
support a separation of church and state (probably only to the extent
that they get away without paying taxes like everyone else, but ...),
present political issues to their parishioners (i.e., abortion, gay
rights and gay adoption, bans on prostitution, adult businesses and
other sexually related activities, etc.) as subjects that a "good
Christian" MUST take a stand on. Thus they deliberately attempt to
influence law in those areas--and are usually successful.

Want proof? Consider the case of the church in Seattle
Washington that was challenged in court as to its tax exempt status
due to its political activities. The minister--with approval of his
church board--circulated petitions opposing gay rights laws during
church services in a manner that many of his parishioners felt
compelled them to sign the petition or "stand out" in their peer
group. The minister stated that anyone who wouldn't oppose gay rights
"wasn't a good Christian."

Sorry, but from this perspective, the Christian church has FAR
too much voice in government.

>So it is now your intent to tell me my freedom has been limited? Tell
>me, Rick. Have you ever lived anywhere else--I mean outside the U.S.?

Yup.

In the Netherlands. Which is a MUCH freer nation than the USA.

>Ever lived in a country with a state church? Ever lived in a third
>world country. I could show you limited freedom and various states of
>oppression. You now live in the place which offer more freedom than any
>place on the earth.

Bull.

Learn something about the world from a political perspective
before you make jingoistic statements like that one. There are SEVERAL
nations (The Netherlands, Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, etc.) that
are CLEARLY freer than the US. We _used_ to have more freedom than any
other nation (The Netherlands excepted), but not since the religious
right managed to become part of our political system and influence the
creation and implementation of repressive laws--and not since we
started seeing our rights taken away by phoney "save us from
terrorists" bills that do nothing but restrict legitimate citizens.

>> >I don't recall one of the sayings of Jesus being that anything
>> >consenting adults do is fine. In fact, I don't recall any religion
>> >which has anything like that as one of its tenets.
>>
>> So?
>
>So where does your expertise in these matters come from. I gather it
>doesn't come from Buddhism.

My expertise on which matters?

Human behavior? From PhDs in Psychology and Sociology and an
MA in Political Science.

Religion: Years of study. I've read, and seriously considered,
at least 19 versions of the Christian bible, several versions of the
Koran, the Buddhist Sutras, the Upanishads, and the religious works of
several other major and minor religions. I'm not a minister--but I
would argue that I have at least as much knowledge of the root beliefs
of Christianity and Buddhism as most ministers you're likely to
encounter.

If you're referring to another area of "expertise" you'll have
to be more specific.

>Jesus didn't know he was a Christian. He was a Jew and thought of
>himself as such. He didn't say that he came to save Jews or Romans or
>Christians. He came to save the world. That's pretty all-inclusive.

Only if you believe in his divinity!

HITLER said he came to build a better world, too. Does that
mean I have to accept HIS values?

And don't tell me there's no comparison between the
two--followers of Jesus have killed FAR more innocent people in his
name than followers of Hitler did in his own.

>> >Lack of taste and decorum are dictated more by society than by religion.

I'll buy that.

Of course, in our society, attacking someone for their
exercise of free choice, or putting down women, minorities, or any
other group are ALL considered to demonstrate lack of good taste and
low class values, so I guess it's you, Dick, and the others who are
attacking Kim who are defined that way here--not her.

>> Lack of taste can mean anything from a lack of appreciation
>> for a fine wine or a Beluga Caviar or well-made sushi to wearing a
>> long dress with lavender stripes on a pea green background mixed with
>> pink polka-dots.
>
>Is that what you assumed when I said Kim's action exhibited a lack of
>taste?

No, I just assumed you were putting her down because of you
were "Programmed" by your family or religion to oppose her values,
actually.

>I really don't care one way or the other about your suit or your
>diamond. Just seems like the waste of a perfectly good diamond.

Where would you SUGGEST that I wear a 3/4 carat diamond?

Never mind--I can guess the answer.

>> In Kim's case, some people find that her choice of call signs
>> is not something they find in the best of taste personally. That's
>> fine. There are others of us--seemingly the majority--who either don't
>> have any feelings one way or the other or who see that choice as NOT
>> representing poor taste, it's all a matter of perspective.
>
>You keep adding these little "unprovens" to your statements. Why insert
>"seemingly the majority" when you have no inkling that this is the case?
>As to perspective: It is MY PERSPECTIVE that Kim exhibits a lack of
>good taste and decorum.*
> (*Legal note: The above not binding on those who are not aware
>that they have bad taste and a lack of decorum. This view extends
>only to the callsign issue but is subject to change should Kim care
>to reveal other information about herself.)

Translation: If people don't agree with your narrow-minded
view, they have no taste either, right?

Grow up!

>As distasteful as you may find it, Rick; in a republic, the majority
>sets the rules. If the majority is mostly Christian, you'll find
>yourself in a land where a lot of the laws are based in the
>Judeo-Christian Ethic. I don't see any way around that except to sit
>around rooting for one of the religious minorities to outnumber American
>Christians. Apparently you don't see the constitutional protections for
>the minorities as doing quite enough. Maybe you could launch a
>movement. The trouble with movements is: drumming up followers can be a
>real struggle.

And the trouble with majority rule is that it can lead to
tyranny of the majority--or do you consider the oppressive segregation
laws that existed in the South until the sixties to be reasonable
because the "majority" wanted them?

>If nobody is prosecuted for the things you trot out, I fail to see the
>problem. Most folks don't participate in most of your examples anyway.
>What freedom are you personally being denied?

Really?

In Georgia a man is serving 10 years in prison for having
consensual oral sex with his wife--a neighbor look in through the
closed blinds of his bedroom (from HIS yard) and called the police who
arrested him.

In Texas possession of 7 or more dildoes carries a longer
prison term than molesting a five year old child--and THAT law was
passed less than 10 years ago.

In Arkansas there are five men serving time for consensual
sexual interactions with other men in private settings--and nationwide
more than 40 individuals are doing so as well.

In Michigan, three clubs (all private and located in places
not accessible to children) were raided and the patrons arrested
because they were swing clubs and the members went there to engage in
recreational sex.

Also in Michigan (in Wayne County, to be exact) a man can have
his vehicle--even if it belongs to his firm or his spouse--seized and
sold at auction if he picks up a prostitute with that car.

Shall I continue? Or are those enough examples of ways in
which freedom IS being denied based on religious beliefs (or do you
have another reason why laws against consensual sex between adults
should be prosecuted?).

>> Within reason, I agree. However, before agreeing to that it's
>> necessary to agree on the meaning of "public venue." To me, it is
>> perfectly reasonable to restrict behavior which is patently offensive
>> to the majority of people when it is conducted in a place where others
>> are forced to either see it or avoid a location they wish to visit. On
>> the other hand, many people see "Public" as any setting not enclosed
>> by the walls of a private home (and even there see it as public if
>> more than the residents are present). Obviously, if you are engaging
>> in consensual activities in a setting where only those who agree to
>> those behaviors (whether it is an indoor setting or an outdoor one is
>> irrelevant) are present it should be none of society's business
>> what-so-ever. Unfortunately, that is not the case in the United
>> States.
>
>Put a fence around Max Yazgur's farm and have at it.

If I did, I'd be arrested under state morals laws. So much for
freedom of choice.

>> And one clearly regulated by the government who do NOT view
>> Kim's actions as being a violation. Since the governing body does not
>> do so, it's completely inappropriate for anyone else to take her to
>> task for them.
>
>For decades, the commission has not issued such calls sequentially.
>Most States do not permit similar things on vanity license plates (I
>don't really know of ANY which permit it--this is simply protection from
>the Cecils of this world). The issue has not been brought to a court of
>law. We really don't know about the legality at this time.

No, it's protection for the Churches. If sexual terms were
accepted as normal the absurd repression of sexuality in our society
would begin to erode and the churches might lose some of their
temporal power.

>As pointed out, the legality of the issue has not been decided. As
>things stand, her choice is simply tacky.

By your opinion--not by that of others.

Do you REALLY believe that your opinion is more valuable than
that of others--or is that just wishful thinking?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1492. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 04:36:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3AC19E426393B8AD.7408388105D5C711.48CC7D2EA41EB4DF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24410

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 17:07:41 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>By OK, I'm assuming he means that it is none of the government's
>business just as Kim's choice of callsign is none of the government's
>business.

Actually, I meant it literally, Cecil. If my wife wants to
sleep with someone else I have no problem with that at all. I trust
and respect her and see no reason at all to restrict her pleasures
simply to pamper my own ego.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1493. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 04:37:32 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DDEBAAE99122FD72.B4AAB2B48A026138.44070D0435DB9D78@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24411

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 19:58:52 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:11:37 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >> I've got you, Larry, and Dick on the defensive, don't I?
>> >
>> >Is that your overinflated view of your power?
>>
>> Curiosity or self-defense?
>>
>> Rick
>
>I'm just curious, Rick, but I note that you didn't respond. Do you see
>yourself as Sir Lancelot coming to the rescue or as some "I've got them
>in my power!" type wizard? I'm trying to imagine us attempting to close
>the breach before another sweeping onslaught from your mighty keyboard.

Respond to what, Dave?

That's my message you're posting.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1494. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 04:39:59 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AE9758A0B8506A75.CEE0CA19757DE1C9.34D8F81402EBF576@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24412

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 13:11:55 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>>
>> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> >> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
>> >> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
>> >> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
>> >
>> >Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?
>>
>> Wouldn't that depend on where she was eating?
>
>Hmmmmmm, is that a double meaning? I'm wondering if Larry doesn't
>see "gay" men as the equivalent of women, does he see lesbian
>women as the equivalent of men, or not?

Double meaning? Who, ME?

Actually, it doesn't matter if Larry sees lesbians as the
equivalent of men--but I know a few lesbians who would DEFINITELY
respond if he didn't see them as the EQUAL of men! ;-)

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1495. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 04:44:13 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E9360C0CAEEDB504.02705D084E06537A.D2512CAC1717006D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24413

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 13:20:42 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> Nothing Cecil has said in this newsgroup would even remotely
>> lead to a diagnosis of obsessive/compulsive--and I _am_ a
>> diagnostician!
>
>Long-time readers of this newsgroup have witnessed me obsessing
>over Morse code testing. :-)

I am a long term reader Cecil, I just dropped out for a year
or so so my eyes would stop ringing. :-)

Seriously, your attitudes toward code don't represent o/c
disorder--they represent commitment to your position. If you were an
oc, you'd probably be so busy washing your hands after reading one of
Dave's or Larry's posts that you couldn't type!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1496. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 04:45:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EB6BF09DB999EE85.5D0E0CD7F18E7568.6246A25F10AF3953@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24414

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 11:37:10 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> Nothing Cecil has said in this newsgroup would even remotely
>> lead to a diagnosis of obsessive/compulsive--and I _am_ a
>> diagnostician!
>
>Doh!

I still stick by that statement. If Cecil is an
obsessive/compulsive it does NOT show in his postings--the only way I
have of knowing his personality or behavior.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1497. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 04:55:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <496A4CD322641FAB.EB8E4EBC76936A17.FEF715637A8F270B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24415

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 19:49:13 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Ummmm, yeah. See Jane run!

Shame on you Kim.

You're not living up to the image Larry, Dave, & Dick want you
to have.

It's see DICK run!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1498. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 04:58:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFC85EA.EF21D991@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24416

Rick Adams wrote:
> Seriously, your attitudes toward code don't represent o/c
> disorder--they represent commitment to your position. If you were an
> oc, you'd probably be so busy washing your hands after reading one of
> Dave's or Larry's posts that you couldn't type!

I solved that problem, Rick. I type in latex gloves. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1499. Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:00:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <028833ADEBA69BBE.882EF94BB22E4E92.71A4EF907909FB94@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24417

A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
prevalent among may ham radio operators. This kind of attitude
(exemplified by the Liberty Net on 75m and by many of the comments
made in this NG) seems degrading to hams in general.

There have been threads in the past that addressed specific
racist problems, but so far as I know (and I'm far from an expert on
the news group) no thread has been created to discuss the concept in
general terms, and to examine the effect that kind of attitude have on
the ARS.

From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.

Comments?

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1500. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:28:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC8D00.F49A0FBC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24418

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Four days now, Dave. I've been keeping track to see exactly when
> > > you are going to show a hint of integrity and issue an apology.
> >
> > ...about the time you win your section in the ARRL DX CW 'test. Do you
> > have any idea how long I expect that to take?
>
> I personally find contesting to be a juvenile-like waste of time.
> I also find your attempts at diversion amusing.

I personally find trying to discuss anything with you to be a
juvenile-like waste of time. There was no diversion. You asked when
you could expect to see an apology. I've given you a pretty good idea
of when that will take place.

> > > I have NEVER
> > > denied comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
> >
> > You most assuredly *are* ignoring the fact.
>
> Since you have produced absolutely no proof, everyone can assume
> you are still lying about it. Where's the beef, Dave?

Beef:
#1 posted by me on Nov. 5:
Your attempt at an explanation coupling Affirmative Action and morse
testing fails as miserably as your past morse-testing-equates-to-racism
crap.

#2 posted by me on Nov. 6:
Good luck with this latest attempt to equate Morse testing with some
social injustice.

#3 posted by me on Nov. 7:
It doesn't really matter since your use of the Affirmative Action label
in comparing it to Morse testing was incorrect. You had it backwards.
This latest tangent is simply a Cecilian diversion.

#4 posted by me on Nov. 8:
By the way, are you ever going to get around to admitting that your
statement comparing Morse testing and Affirmative Action was 180 degrees
out of phase?

Those are all examples where I use words like "comparing", "equate" and "coupling". You'd have to be a fool to believe that my one typo was representative of my view on the matter. Are you a fool?

Dave K8MN

1501. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:34:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC8E76.1246EF81@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24463

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > But you said that anything consenting adults do is okay. You mean if
> > your wife is a consenting adult and other man is a consenting adult and
> > they choose to sleep together without informing you, that *isn't okay*?
>
> By OK, I'm assuming he means that it is none of the government's
> business just as Kim's choice of callsign is none of the government's
> business.

I'm not assuming that at all. We're talking about morality, Cecil, not
government intrustion. Try to stay on track.

> > As distasteful as you may find it, Rick; in a republic, the majority
> > sets the rules.
>
> Nope, that's a democracy. In a republic the elected representatives
> set the rules or follow the rules set forth in The Constitution.
> Inalienable rights are protected from the tyranny of the majority in
> a democracy. Do you think if a majority of voters voted for Bush to
> drink hemlock that he would do it?

And you, living in...what is it--Small Town, USA? don't believe that
those elected official follow the desires of the voters?

> > For decades, the commission has not issued such calls sequentially.
> > Most States do not permit similar things on vanity license plates (I
> > don't really know of ANY which permit it--this is simply protection from
> > the Cecils of this world). The issue has not been brought to a court of
> > law. We really don't know about the legality at this time.
>
> Whatever happened to the concept of innocent until proven guilty?

Whatever happened to "It has not been tested in court". There is no
legal charge. You can ask Phil about the legal question. I'm tired of
dancing the Texas Two Step with you.

Dave K8MN

1502. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:35:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC8EB2.5B1F27B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24464

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Then why do you take my postings about "comparting" so seriously?
> > > >
> > > > I don't take them seriously, Cecil.
> > >
> > > So how many replies have you posted regarding "comparting"?
> > > I've been leading you down the primrose path for four days now.
> >
> > Oh? Do you fancy yourself a leader these days?
>
> Oh, not for everything. Only for the primrose path. Can't be
> everywhere at once, you know.

You must have that as a euphemism for the trip to the privy.

Dave K8MN
```

1503. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:39:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC8FA1.8DCD9D85@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24465

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Krell wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > > > Ahhh, a libertarian. I've discarded that view as completely unworkable.
> > > > > So if your wife chooses to start sleeping with another man and he
> > > > > consents, it is fine with you? Do you have any say? Do you see any
> > > > > immorality in the act? After all, what consenting adults do...
> > > >
> > > > No. I should hope so. Yes.
> > > > ...none of which is the government's damn business. That's how Libertarians
> > > > think
> > >
> > > Adultery is indeed none of the government's damn business.
> > > No enlightened state has laws against adultery.
> >
> > I get it! Another Cecil joke! He knew all along we weren't discussing
> > whether or not it was the government's business.
>
> On the contrary, when someone says something is OK, he/she usually
> means that it's none of the government's business. It is obviously
> someone's business, just not the government's. I've know couples
> with open marriages where adultery was not only OK but anticipated
> with gusto.

I don't believe that's what someone means when he asks if something is
OK. When I ask for a milkshake and the waitress says, "OK". I do not
assume that she means it is none of the government's business. Quit
trying to mold this thing to suit your agenda. We're talking about
society's view. As to your last sentence: You've gotta find a new
group of friends.

Dave K8MN

1504. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:44:56 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <n8ie@woh.rr.com>
Message-ID: <sh0L7.40939$z55.5781598@typhoon.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 24466

Rick,
I think you need to get out more often, or at least stay away from here and Liberty Net. Neither represent the "average" ham radio operator or the ARS in general.

I read the messages here for a good laugh, sometimes it is very entertaining indeed. In fact be thankful that these people occupy a very small part of the spectrum and pretty much stay there.
Even the ARS needs a place to keep our socially retarded citizens.

EB

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message news:028833ADEBA69BBE.882EF94BB22E4E92.71A4EF907909FB94@lp.airnews.net...
> A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
> prevalent among may ham radio operators. This kind of attitude
> (exemplified by the Liberty Net on 75m and by many of the comments
> made in this NG) seems degrading to hams in general.
>
> There have been threads in the past that addressed specific
> racist problems, but so far as I know (and I'm far from an expert on
> the news group) no thread has been created to discuss the concept in
> general terms, and to examine the effect that kind of attitude have on
> the ARS.
>
> From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
> racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
> hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
> our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
> that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.
>
> Comments?
>
> Rick
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1505. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:45:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC90E3.C31B98D0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24468

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC01E9.9868BB77@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BFA830E.F540F9A@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > You'd think Davey would get the hint. When one keeps throwing
> insults
> > > that
> > > > > no one understands because they're not at others' level, well...
> Kinda
> > > has
> > > > > the same affect as using the English language in a group of people
> that
> > > > > speak nothing but Spanish.
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words of
> > > > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it means,
> you
> > > > might want to find out what it means. It isn't my lack of knowledge
> > > > which is the problem.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Uh, Dave. I would find it interesting, at best, for me to undertake
> > > learning from you in any way constructive... Oh, and I'm not sure what
> you
> > > mean by if I want to participate...I don't think I do...
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > I'm sure that you would find it interesting, Kim. My time is, however,
> > extremely limited. If you don't care to participate, what keeps you
> > participating?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Well, that's quite simple, Dave. I am so surprised you have to ask. I keep
> participating because I love to amuse the simply amused! No challenge, easy

> work, gets my stress out from the day's activities and, in some cases,
> allows me to enjoy some real interesting go 'rounds.
>
> Kim W5TI and a T

Just who is it that you believe yourself to be amusing? There'd be
Cecil and Rick and...hmmmm yourself.

Dave K8MN

1506. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:48:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC9196.87D48D3E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24467

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC02CF.C40752AA@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BFA8245.DEC86321@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Process management is my chief responsibility at work, Dave. I
> would
> > > > > shudder to think that I become so "adult" that I act like people
> such as
> > > > > you. Now, for you it may work. For me, it would not. I bet that
> > > between
> > > > > the two of us, I make up for your lack of willingness to step
> outside
> > > the
> > > > > box.
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > > It is certainly odd that one who so often makes incorrect character
> and
> > > > background judgements about people is employed in a field where she
> > > > needs skill in using logical thought. Of course, being employed in a
> > > > field and being any good at it don't automatically go hand in hand.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > >
> > > You'd know, right? You have the lead on that example.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Uh, Kim? I'm not employed at all. I'm retired. I marinate steaks,
> > pilot a lawn tractor and put up large antennae at altitude.
>
> Well, at least you can get something large up at high altitude--even if it
> is outdoors.
>
> > I work the
> > pileups, participate in the local ARES net, rag chew any time I feel

> > like it and take part in numerous radio contests. *poof* There goes
> > your supposed point.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> 'Smatta, Dave? Didn't like what I had to say? Is the above an attempt to
> excite me, or did you need to remind yourself of something?
>
> Kim W5TIT

You tried to make a point that I had the lead. I'm not even in the game. It has nothing to do with not liking what you had to say. That was only incorrect. I have no desire to excite you. Please point out the kinds of things which excite you and I'll try to avoid them. The last part is a real puzzler. I can't figure out what you were trying to convey there.

Dave K8MN

1507. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:48:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC91B5.814FC4D4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24469

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC19EC.645BCA61@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > You're such a pussy.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > It would be unkind of me to make any statements regarding Kim's lack of
> > class or tackiness.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> It looks to me like you just did.

Darn it. Caught again.

Dave K8MN

1508. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 05:52:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC92A7.7116F58E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24470

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 20:25:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Yeah, it is better but you still don't quite have it down. Try leaving
> >out the word "arbitrarily" since I didn't come to my conclusion
> >arbitrarily. Then try leaving out everything after "lack of class"
> >since I didn't make that statement--you did. Now I think you have my
> >view.
>
> Ok--since you state your decision wasn't arbitrary, I'm sure
> you won't have any problem providing a scientifically FACTUAL basis
> for your statement. Don't use "popular moral values" that has no
> bearing and IS arbitrary. Use provable facts.

No thanks.

Dave K8MN

1509. Re: XMAS present for that special 75M and 20M goofball !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 06:35:54 UTC
From: noemailedreplysplz@verizon.net
Message-ID: <9ti6ca$22rrr$4@ID-21921.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 24471
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

quoting:
>If you are ticked off by this spam nonsense on your newsgroups, please do
>what I did. Send the entire message, including headers, to abuse@uu.net and
>lodge complaints. Don't buy this having posted through YAHOO stuff. It was
>NOT!
>Doc,AF2Y

send to abuse@earthlink.net first. abuse@uu.net is the upstream for
earthlink. Only use upstreams if the ISP won't do anything to the spammer.

1510. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 06:41:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ti6me$4s3$0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 24472

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Morse code testing has always been an attempt at social engineering.
> > > >
> > > > I guess maybe it's social engineering in the same way a PAP smear is
> > > > social engineering.
> > >
> > > Nope, it's social engineering in the same way a driver's license
> > > is social engineering. We are talking about government requirements
> > > not elective procedures.
> >
> > You're wrong. Obtaining an amateur radio license is an elective procedure.
>
> Not for licensed ham radio operators it isn't. Licensed ham radio operators
> have no choice except to meet the governmental requirements. Licensed driver's
> have no choice except to meet the governmental requirements. Licensed pilots
> have no choice except to meet the governmental requirements. Those minimum
> requirements for a license are *social engineering by the government*.

All that drivalous pap is nothing more than verbal engineeering.

1511. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 06:42:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ti6p9$4s3$1@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 24473

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Your denials predated my typo by a substantial margin.
> >
> > Your typo occurred on Nov. 17 at 00:43 GMT. I dare you to produce
> > a posting of mine before that time where I denied comparing
> > Affirmative Action and Morse code testing. I continue to compare
> > Affirmative Action and Morse code testing to this very day. I
> > have never stopped comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code
> > testing. I do believe you are still lying. What I denied was
> > *comparting* (your word) Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
> >
> > > What you neglected to state was that morse testing and Affirmative
> > > Action are social engineering 180 degrees out of phase.
> >
> > That's just your opinion and doesn't necessarily bear any resemblance
> > to the real truth. Morse testing and Affirmative Action are both
> > attempts to get citizens to do things that they may not want to do.
> > In that way, they are entirely similar and in phase.
> >
> > > This is simply another example of your game playing with words and you
> > > had to use a typo to make your case.
> >
> > What case? In front of God and all the readers here, you used the
> > word "comparting" and then lied about using it for days and days.
> > How can you bring yourself to lie about something that is in
> > plain view for everyone to see?
>
> I guess in the same way that you can continue to post this drivel about
> me telling a lie when it is quite clear that is was a typo. I guess in
> the same way that you continue to play the word game even now.
> I'd say there is some truth to the old saw about there being more
> horse's asses than horses in Texas.

We certainly know that there's at least one more!

1512. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 06:46:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC9F29.554E571C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24475

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:15:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I've discarded both upper and lower case libertarianism. I would take
> >issue that my great-great-great-great-great Uncle Thomas was a
> >libertarian.
>
> "Life, Liberty, and property" John Locke
>
> "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" Thomas
> Jefferson.
>
> Read some of Jefferson's writings--he was not only a staunch
> libertarian (in the sense of Locke and Mill), he was a deist, not a
> Christian.

He was the equivalent of an old school republican. I knew he was a
deist. The man, after all, had his faults.

> >No you didn't. I assume you made some vows.
>
> Yup.
>
> To respect, honor, and care for. Our vows were NOT taken in a
> Christian ceremony and did NOT include "cleave only unto . . ." or
> "obey."

It's a lot easier if you can make up your own rules.

> >> Look at it this way: If you care about someone, you want them
> >> to be happy and to enjoy their lives, right? Well if it would give her
> >> pleasure to sleep with someone else, I would certainly not be
> >> demonstrating very much love for her if I refused her that
> >> pleasure--or failed to trust her to keep her marriage separate from
> >> her recreation.
> >
> >Bully for you.
>
> Just doing my job as a (hopefully) good husband! ;-)

I submit that going along with such would make you a man who lets
somebody else do his job as a good husband.

> >> The only things I have the right to expect, if she chooses to
> >> sleep with someone outside the home is that she will take steps to
> >> insure that her actions don't harm anyone. She is perfectly free to
> >> have sex with such an individual, for example, but she has an absolute
> >> obligation to insure she doesn't bring an STD home as a result. In the
> >> same vein, I have the right to expect her to hold up her end of our
> >> marital partnership by doing her share of the work at home (she
> >> doesn't work outside the home, so she accepts responsibility for a
> >> larger share of the work at home than I do) and I have the right to
> >> expect that she will not allow her recreational activities to
> >> interfere with our relationship. Beyond that, any decisions would, by
> >> any logic, be her's to make not mine.
> >
> >Again, bully for you!
>
> Gee, I didn't think you'd agree so willingly. Common sense got
> through the religious programming, huh?

My tongue was firmly planted in cheek.

> >> If one partner is acting in that manner behind the back of the
> >> other then the situation is very different. In that case, clearly, he
> >> or she is breaking their word to their partner and thus knowingly
> >> harming their relationship. That, clearly, is immoral behavior.
> >
> >But you said that anything consenting adults do is okay. You mean if
> >your wife is a consenting adult and other man is a consenting adult and
> >they choose to sleep together without informing you, that *isn't okay*?
>
> No, I said that anything consenting adults do that does not
> harm the person or property of other non-consenting individuals is ok.
> Clearly, by violating agreements with someone, you harm them.

What agreements. You didn't vow to each cleave only unto...
She wouldn't be harming your person, only your psyche.

> As it happens, I _wouldn't_ be bothered if my wife decided to
> have sex with someone w/o informing me ("sleep together" is pretty
> inaccurate in this discussion, isn't it?)--on the other hand, it WOULD
> disturb me that she didn't feel comfortable telling me about it and
> would indicate that we needed to work on our communications.

I'd think that'd be a considerable understatement.

> >> Note that I define morality on the basis of harm to others.
> >> Since I'm not a Christian, I'm not "locked" into a mindset that
> >> defines sexual activities as immoral actions. Instead, I see sex as an
> >> expression of love, of joy, or of shear happiness in life. NONE of
> >> that is--or can be demonstrated to be--immoral in any reasonable use
> >> of the word.
> >
> >Well, it certainly lends new meaning to phrases such as "going out into
> >the world and spreading love". I'd say that there's a large group of

> >Theologians would would strongly disagree with your last sentence.
>
> Sure--but they would be basing their disagreement on religion
> (you DID say theologians, right?). So what? If I'm not part of that
> religion why should I care at all what the opinions of it's proponents
> are with respect to my private behavior?

That's right. You've pretty much indicated that you make the rules for
yourself. Society and religion be damned.

> Personally, I sincerely believe that if we spent less time
> telling our kids lies about sex and protecting them from reality, and
> more time telling our kids about racism and violence and teaching them
> to be "color-blind" we'd have a LOT better world than if we followed
> the guidelines of ANY religion's theologians.

It would seem that teaching a kid to be color blind would be an attempt
to protect him from reality. Color is apparent. I disagree with your
last sentence.

> >I've certainly communicated my opinion. For you to tell me that I don't
> >have a right to communicate it is ridiculous. You aren't the final
> >arbiter. If folks had a right to be free of insult and ridicule,
> >Letterman and Leo would be out of work. Please show me where I can find
> >these new rights spelled out.
>
> I didn't say you don't have a right to communicate. I stated
> that no one has a right to ridicule or attack Kim for her choice. If
> you can't state your opinion without attacking or ridiculing someone,
> then I DO feel your communications are inappropriate.

> >> So long as you are willing to stop at the point where the
> >> person you are addressing states that they disagree with your
> >> assessment, fine. You are certainly well within your rights to state
> >> your opinions--the key is in identifying them AS your opinions instead
> >> of treating them as though they were absolute statements of universal
> >> truth--which seems to be the common response to her call here among
> >> those who oppose it.
> >
> >What else is to found on this newsgroup except opinion?
>
> Ridicule, hate posts, insults, put-down, . . .
>
> Shall I continue?
>
> >It is still obvious that you do not know how all people practice
> >Christianity and you are apparently ignorant of denominational
> >differences.
>
> Ok, name a single denomination that takes a public position
> that the actions of non-members of their religion are NOT subject to
> their "rules" or censure.

The Episcopal Church.

> Demonstrate that a single Christian denomination believes in
> freedom of religion--including freedom to live by the MORAL STANDARDS
> of a different religion--is appropriate and teaches its adherents that
> Christian morality and belief does NOT apply to non-Christians, and
> I'll apologize for my statement.

I offer the Episcopal Church. I can speak for no other.

> Of course you can't do that--ALL Christian groups teach that
> Christianity is the only "right" religion and that Christian moral
> values are the "right" values for everyone--but that's the reason I
> find most Christian groups so offensive.

I find a number of your ideas on morals and religion pretty offensive
too, Rick.

> >> If you can honestly state that you don't believe Christianity
> >> as it is commonly practiced today (and yes I know there are those who
> >> DON'T practice it in that manner--but they are a small minority)
> >
> >That's just so much subjective crap.
>
> I see you didn't claim that you honestly don't believe it,
> however.

I don't believe that only a small minority of Christians practice their
religion properly? You can bet that I don't accept that. That's
according to you, the final arbiter on Christianity.

> >> doesn't oppress the rights or freedoms of non-believers, I'll be more
> >> than happy to support my claim with as much evidence as you would like
> >> to see. Even the simplest examples should demonstrate that concept.
> >> For example, "Blue Laws" prohibit conducting some/all business on
> >> Sunday and are based directly on the biblical concept of a "day of
> >> rest" but result in oppressing both Jews and Muslims who are required
> >> by their religions not to work on Friday night through Saturday and by
> >> the laws enacted by Christians not to work on Sunday--thus creating an
> >> unfair competitive environment for them when compared to Christian
> >> businessmen; other examples include prohibition of adultery [a matter
> >> of personal choice], homosexual activities [illegal in 37 states],
> >> masturbation [a FELONY in several states, btw], and bigamy [which
> >> oppresses both Muslims--who by their religion may have up to four
> >> wives if they can support them].
> >
> >While you are coming up with the proof, better dredge some up on how
> >many of our laws are put into effect by the Church. I'm fairly sure
> >that our state legislature is responsible for laws being passed
> >hereabouts.
>
> Fact: There isn't an elected official in this country that
> could win re-election if s/he didn't support the desires of the

> Christian Churches in his/her district.

Subjective and unproven. I'd bet you could find exceptions to your
statement in certain areas of New York City or San Francisco alone.

> Fact: There is absolutely NO basis for morals or "blue" laws
> except for the prejudice Christianity demonstrates toward those who
> don't share their repressive views on these subjects.
>
> Fact: Local churches in every area, despite a claim that they
> support a separation of church and state (probably only to the extent
> that they get away without paying taxes like everyone else, but ...),
> present political issues to their parishioners (i.e., abortion, gay
> rights and gay adoption, bans on prostitution, adult businesses and
> other sexually related activities, etc.) as subjects that a "good
> Christian" MUST take a stand on. Thus they deliberately attempt to
> influence law in those areas--and are usually successful.

I think they'd find much agreement on most items from your list from a
group of secular citizens with no church ties at all.

> Want proof? Consider the case of the church in Seattle
> Washington that was challenged in court as to its tax exempt status
> due to its political activities. The minister--with approval of his
> church board--circulated petitions opposing gay rights laws during
> church services in a manner that many of his parishioners felt
> compelled them to sign the petition or "stand out" in their peer
> group. The minister stated that anyone who wouldn't oppose gay rights
> "wasn't a good Christian."

I suppose that is some proof...an instance.

> Sorry, but from this perspective, the Christian church has FAR
> too much voice in government.

Start you campaign to do something about it. Let me know how it works
out. Really.

> >So it is now your intent to tell me my freedom has been limited? Tell
> >me, Rick. Have you ever lived anywhere else--I mean outside the U.S.?
>
> Yup.
>
> In the Netherlands. Which is a MUCH freer nation than the USA.

Really. The Netherlands is awash in social problems and programs. The
tax rate is outrageous.

> >Ever lived in a country with a state church? Ever lived in a third
> >world country. I could show you limited freedom and various states of
> >oppression. You now live in the place which offer more freedom than any
> >place on the earth.
>

> Bull.
>
> Learn something about the world from a political perspective
> before you make jingoistic statements like that one.

What do you think I did for a living, Rick?

> There are SEVERAL
> nations (The Netherlands, Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, etc.) that
> are CLEARLY freer than the US.

Interesting that you mention Finland. I spent two years in Finland
during one assignment and three years there in the mid-90s. My wife is
a Finn. Finns have to import all oil and gas. They pay 40% of their
income in taxes. Overtime work is taxed at 50%. Gasoline sells for
about $5 per gallon. Finland has some of the strictest alcohol and drug
laws in the world. It is pretty much a homogenous society so people of
color are not normally treated with great kindness. The cheapest car
one can buy--a Russian Lada--sells for about $20,000 and my Dodge Neon
is a $44,000 car in Finland. Prostitution is banned and that is
strictly enforced (especially in light of the recent waves of Russian
women who arrived since the breakup of the Soviet Union.
Tell me all about it.

> We _used_ to have more freedom than any
> other nation (The Netherlands excepted), but not since the religious
> right managed to become part of our political system and influence the
> creation and implementation of repressive laws--and not since we
> started seeing our rights taken away by phoney "save us from
> terrorists" bills that do nothing but restrict legitimate citizens.

Please save me from this leftist rhetoric...

> >> >I don't recall one of the sayings of Jesus being that anything
> >> >consenting adults do is fine. In fact, I don't recall any religion
> >> >which has anything like that as one of its tenets.
> >>
> >> So?
> >
> >So where does your expertise in these matters come from. I gather it
> >doesn't come from Buddhism.
>
> My expertise on which matters?

The "Everything-is-Okay" matters. Did you fabricate it because you
decided you didn't like the rules society made for you?
>
> Human behavior? From PhDs in Psychology and Sociology and an
> MA in Political Science.
>
> Religion: Years of study. I've read, and seriously considered,
> at least 19 versions of the Christian bible, several versions of the

> Koran, the Buddhist Sutras, the Upanishads, and the religious works of
> several other major and minor religions. I'm not a minister--but I
> would argue that I have at least as much knowledge of the root beliefs
> of Christianity and Buddhism as most ministers you're likely to
> encounter.

Not unless you've gone through several years in seminary and a number of
years of continuing education. I'll bet that hat of yours is a tight
fit.

> If you're referring to another area of "expertise" you'll have
> to be more specific.
>
> >Jesus didn't know he was a Christian. He was a Jew and thought of
> >himself as such. He didn't say that he came to save Jews or Romans or
> >Christians. He came to save the world. That's pretty all-inclusive.
>
> Only if you believe in his divinity!

I do.

> HITLER said he came to build a better world, too. Does that
> mean I have to accept HIS values?

I'll feel free to discard this as absurd.

> And don't tell me there's no comparison between the
> two--followers of Jesus have killed FAR more innocent people in his
> name than followers of Hitler did in his own.

I think I'll toss this one too.

> >> >Lack of taste and decorum are dictated more by society than by religion.
>
> I'll buy that.
>
> Of course, in our society, attacking someone for their
> exercise of free choice, or putting down women, minorities, or any
> other group are ALL considered to demonstrate lack of good taste and
> low class values, so I guess it's you, Dick, and the others who are
> attacking Kim who are defined that way here--not her.

There are good choices and there are bad choices. Having a free choice
and using it wisely are two completely different things.

> >> Lack of taste can mean anything from a lack of appreciation
> >> for a fine wine or a Beluga Caviar or well-made sushi to wearing a
> >> long dress with lavender stripes on a pea green background mixed with
> >> pink polka-dots.
> >
> >Is that what you assumed when I said Kim's action exhibited a lack of
> >taste?
>

> No, I just assumed you were putting her down because of you
> were "Programmed" by your family or religion to oppose her values,
> actually.

You mean like I assume that you are views are poisoned by your instense
dislike of Christianity?

> >I really don't care one way or the other about your suit or your
> >diamond. Just seems like the waste of a perfectly good diamond.
>
> Where would you SUGGEST that I wear a 3/4 carat diamond?

> Never mind--I can guess the answer.

You could give it to you wife.

> >> In Kim's case, some people find that her choice of call signs
> >> is not something they find in the best of taste personally. That's
> >> fine. There are others of us--seemingly the majority--who either don't
> >> have any feelings one way or the other or who see that choice as NOT
> >> representing poor taste, it's all a matter of perspective.
> >
> >You keep adding these little "unprovens" to your statements. Why insert
> >"seemingly the majority" when you have no inkling that this is the case?
> >As to perspective: It is MY PERSPECTIVE that Kim exhibits a lack of
> >good taste and decorum.*
> > (*Legal note: The above not binding on those who are not aware
> >that they have bad taste and a lack of decorum. This view extends
> >only to the callsign issue but is subject to change should Kim care
> >to reveal other information about herself.)
>
> Translation: If people don't agree with your narrow-minded
> view, they have no taste either, right?
>
> Grow up!

I guess you told me!

I'll give you a free clue. My statement needs no translation. Accept
it as my viewpoint.

> >As distasteful as you may find it, Rick; in a republic, the majority
> >sets the rules. If the majority is mostly Christian, you'll find
> >yourself in a land where a lot of the laws are based in the
> >Judeo-Christian Ethic. I don't see any way around that except to sit
> >around rooting for one of the religious minorities to outnumber American
> >Christians. Apparently you don't see the constitutional protections for
> >the minorities as doing quite enough. Maybe you could launch a
> >movement. The trouble with movements is: drumming up followers can be a
> >real struggle.
>
> And the trouble with majority rule is that it can lead to
> tyranny of the majority--or do you consider the oppressive segregation

> laws that existed in the South until the sixties to be reasonable
> because the "majority" wanted them?

Remember the part where I mentioned Constitutional protections of the
minority. Did I sound like I agreed with segregation? Do I believe the
people in the South are or were a majority of the nation?

> >If nobody is prosecuted for the things you trot out, I fail to see the
> >problem. Most folks don't participate in most of your examples anyway.
> >What freedom are you personally being denied?
>
> Really?
>
> In Georgia a man is serving 10 years in prison for having
> consensual oral sex with his wife--a neighbor look in through the
> closed blinds of his bedroom (from HIS yard) and called the police who
> arrested him.

That is the stuff of urban myth. This tale has now been going around
for decades. Name the man. Name the town. Provide a date.
Besides, I asked about YOUR freedom.

> In Texas possession of 7 or more dildoes carries a longer
> prison term than molesting a five year old child--and THAT law was
> passed less than 10 years ago.

Urban myth.

> In Arkansas there are five men serving time for consensual
> sexual interactions with other men in private settings--and nationwide
> more than 40 individuals are doing so as well.

I don't know the particulars. Do you know anything based in fact?

> In Michigan, three clubs (all private and located in places
> not accessible to children) were raided and the patrons arrested
> because they were swing clubs and the members went there to engage in
> recreational sex.

Another one which you trotted out previously. How did this effect you?
Is this one of the freedoms you desire?

> Also in Michigan (in Wayne County, to be exact) a man can have
> his vehicle--even if it belongs to his firm or his spouse--seized and
> sold at auction if he picks up a prostitute with that car.

Has it cut down on women prostituting themselves? Are you going to tell
me that prostitution is a victimless crime?

> Shall I continue? Or are those enough examples of ways in
> which freedom IS being denied based on religious beliefs (or do you
> have another reason why laws against consensual sex between adults
> should be prosecuted?).

You needn't continue. I'd rather discuss the matter with someone who
has a concept of right and wrong.

> >> Within reason, I agree. However, before agreeing to that it's
> >> necessary to agree on the meaning of "public venue." To me, it is
> >> perfectly reasonable to restrict behavior which is patently offensive
> >> to the majority of people when it is conducted in a place where others
> >> are forced to either see it or avoid a location they wish to visit. On
> >> the other hand, many people see "Public" as any setting not enclosed
> >> by the walls of a private home (and even there see it as public if
> >> more than the residents are present). Obviously, if you are engaging
> >> in consensual activities in a setting where only those who agree to
> >> those behaviors (whether it is an indoor setting or an outdoor one is
> >> irrelevant) are present it should be none of society's business
> >> what-so-ever. Unfortunately, that is not the case in the United
> >> States.
> >
> >Put a fence around Max Yazgur's farm and have at it.
>
> If I did, I'd be arrested under state morals laws. So much for
> freedom of choice.

I've noted that a large number of your perceived "freedoms" revolve
around sex. I can see where your rights have been trampled right into
the mattress.

> >> And one clearly regulated by the government who do NOT view
> >> Kim's actions as being a violation. Since the governing body does not
> >> do so, it's completely inappropriate for anyone else to take her to
> >> task for them.
> >
> >For decades, the commission has not issued such calls sequentially.
> >Most States do not permit similar things on vanity license plates (I
> >don't really know of ANY which permit it--this is simply protection from
> >the Cecils of this world). The issue has not been brought to a court of
> >law. We really don't know about the legality at this time.
>
> No, it's protection for the Churches. If sexual terms were
> accepted as normal the absurd repression of sexuality in our society
> would begin to erode and the churches might lose some of their
> temporal power.

Yeah, but they're not accepted as normal. I don't need the stuff
invading my home through TV (I'm with N2EY, I don't accept it). Again,
I note your fixation on sexual freedom.

> >As pointed out, the legality of the issue has not been decided. As
> >things stand, her choice is simply tacky.
>
> By your opinion--not by that of others.

Others have made that same opinion known.

> Do you REALLY believe that your opinion is more valuable than
> that of others--or is that just wishful thinking?

I didn't present it on a scale of 1 to 10. I just presented it as mine.

Dave K8MN

1513. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 06:47:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFC9F67.6BF736C3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24476

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:15:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I've discarded both upper and lower case libertarianism. I would take
> >issue that my great-great-great-great-great Uncle Thomas was a
> >libertarian.
>
> "Life, Liberty, and property" John Locke
>
> "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" Thomas
> Jefferson.
>
> Read some of Jefferson's writings--he was not only a staunch
> libertarian (in the sense of Locke and Mill), he was a deist, not a
> Christian.

He was the equivalent of an old school republican. I knew he was a
deist. The man, after all, had his faults.

> >No you didn't. I assume you made some vows.
>
> Yup.
>
> To respect, honor, and care for. Our vows were NOT taken in a
> Christian ceremony and did NOT include "cleave only unto . . ." or
> "obey."

It's a lot easier if you can make up your own rules.

> >> Look at it this way: If you care about someone, you want them
> >> to be happy and to enjoy their lives, right? Well if it would give her
> >> pleasure to sleep with someone else, I would certainly not be
> >> demonstrating very much love for her if I refused her that
> >> pleasure--or failed to trust her to keep her marriage separate from
> >> her recreation.
> >
> >Bully for you.
>
> Just doing my job as a (hopefully) good husband! ;-)

I submit that going along with such would make you a man who lets
somebody else do his job as a good husband.

> >> The only things I have the right to expect, if she chooses to
> >> sleep with someone outside the home is that she will take steps to
> >> insure that her actions don't harm anyone. She is perfectly free to
> >> have sex with such an individual, for example, but she has an absolute
> >> obligation to insure she doesn't bring an STD home as a result. In the
> >> same vein, I have the right to expect her to hold up her end of our
> >> marital partnership by doing her share of the work at home (she
> >> doesn't work outside the home, so she accepts responsibility for a
> >> larger share of the work at home than I do) and I have the right to
> >> expect that she will not allow her recreational activities to
> >> interfere with our relationship. Beyond that, any decisions would, by
> >> any logic, be her's to make not mine.
> >
> >Again, bully for you!
>
> Gee, I didn't think you'd agree so willingly. Common sense got
> through the religious programming, huh?

My tongue was firmly planted in cheek.

> >> If one partner is acting in that manner behind the back of the
> >> other then the situation is very different. In that case, clearly, he
> >> or she is breaking their word to their partner and thus knowingly
> >> harming their relationship. That, clearly, is immoral behavior.
> >
> >But you said that anything consenting adults do is okay. You mean if
> >your wife is a consenting adult and other man is a consenting adult and
> >they choose to sleep together without informing you, that *isn't okay*?
>
> No, I said that anything consenting adults do that does not
> harm the person or property of other non-consenting individuals is ok.
> Clearly, by violating agreements with someone, you harm them.

What agreements. You didn't vow to each cleave only unto...
She wouldn't be harming your person, only your psyche.

> As it happens, I _wouldn't_ be bothered if my wife decided to
> have sex with someone w/o informing me ("sleep together" is pretty
> inaccurate in this discussion, isn't it?)--on the other hand, it WOULD
> disturb me that she didn't feel comfortable telling me about it and
> would indicate that we needed to work on our communications.

I'd think that'd be a considerable understatement.

> >> Note that I define morality on the basis of harm to others.
> >> Since I'm not a Christian, I'm not "locked" into a mindset that
> >> defines sexual activities as immoral actions. Instead, I see sex as an
> >> expression of love, of joy, or of shear happiness in life. NONE of
> >> that is--or can be demonstrated to be--immoral in any reasonable use
> >> of the word.
> >
> >Well, it certainly lends new meaning to phrases such as "going out into
> >the world and spreading love". I'd say that there's a large group of

> >Theologians would would strongly disagree with your last sentence.
>
> Sure--but they would be basing their disagreement on religion
> (you DID say theologians, right?). So what? If I'm not part of that
> religion why should I care at all what the opinions of it's proponents
> are with respect to my private behavior?

That's right. You've pretty much indicated that you make the rules for
yourself. Society and religion be damned.

> Personally, I sincerely believe that if we spent less time
> telling our kids lies about sex and protecting them from reality, and
> more time telling our kids about racism and violence and teaching them
> to be "color-blind" we'd have a LOT better world than if we followed
> the guidelines of ANY religion's theologians.

It would seem that teaching a kid to be color blind would be an attempt
to protect him from reality. Color is apparent. I disagree with your
last sentence.

> >I've certainly communicated my opinion. For you to tell me that I don't
> >have a right to communicate it is ridiculous. You aren't the final
> >arbiter. If folks had a right to be free of insult and ridicule,
> >Letterman and Leo would be out of work. Please show me where I can find
> >these new rights spelled out.
>
> I didn't say you don't have a right to communicate. I stated
> that no one has a right to ridicule or attack Kim for her choice. If
> you can't state your opinion without attacking or ridiculing someone,
> then I DO feel your communications are inappropriate.

> >> So long as you are willing to stop at the point where the
> >> person you are addressing states that they disagree with your
> >> assessment, fine. You are certainly well within your rights to state
> >> your opinions--the key is in identifying them AS your opinions instead
> >> of treating them as though they were absolute statements of universal
> >> truth--which seems to be the common response to her call here among
> >> those who oppose it.
> >
> >What else is to found on this newsgroup except opinion?
>
> Ridicule, hate posts, insults, put-down, . . .
>
> Shall I continue?
>
> >It is still obvious that you do not know how all people practice
> >Christianity and you are apparently ignorant of denominational
> >differences.
>
> Ok, name a single denomination that takes a public position
> that the actions of non-members of their religion are NOT subject to
> their "rules" or censure.

The Episcopal Church.

> Demonstrate that a single Christian denomination believes in
> freedom of religion--including freedom to live by the MORAL STANDARDS
> of a different religion--is appropriate and teaches its adherents that
> Christian morality and belief does NOT apply to non-Christians, and
> I'll apologize for my statement.

I offer the Episcopal Church. I can speak for no other.

> Of course you can't do that--ALL Christian groups teach that
> Christianity is the only "right" religion and that Christian moral
> values are the "right" values for everyone--but that's the reason I
> find most Christian groups so offensive.

I find a number of your ideas on morals and religion pretty offensive
too, Rick.

> >> If you can honestly state that you don't believe Christianity
> >> as it is commonly practiced today (and yes I know there are those who
> >> DON'T practice it in that manner--but they are a small minority)
> >
> >That's just so much subjective crap.
>
> I see you didn't claim that you honestly don't believe it,
> however.

I don't believe that only a small minority of Christians practice their
religion properly? You can bet that I don't accept that. That's
according to you, the final arbiter on Christianity.

> >> doesn't oppress the rights or freedoms of non-believers, I'll be more
> >> than happy to support my claim with as much evidence as you would like
> >> to see. Even the simplest examples should demonstrate that concept.
> >> For example, "Blue Laws" prohibit conducting some/all business on
> >> Sunday and are based directly on the biblical concept of a "day of
> >> rest" but result in oppressing both Jews and Muslims who are required
> >> by their religions not to work on Friday night through Saturday and by
> >> the laws enacted by Christians not to work on Sunday--thus creating an
> >> unfair competitive environment for them when compared to Christian
> >> businessmen; other examples include prohibition of adultery [a matter
> >> of personal choice], homosexual activities [illegal in 37 states],
> >> masturbation [a FELONY in several states, btw], and bigamy [which
> >> oppresses both Muslims--who by their religion may have up to four
> >> wives if they can support them].
> >
> >While you are coming up with the proof, better dredge some up on how
> >many of our laws are put into effect by the Church. I'm fairly sure
> >that our state legislature is responsible for laws being passed
> >hereabouts.
>
> Fact: There isn't an elected official in this country that
> could win re-election if s/he didn't support the desires of the

> Christian Churches in his/her district.

Subjective and unproven. I'd bet you could find exceptions to your
statement in certain areas of New York City or San Francisco alone.

> Fact: There is absolutely NO basis for morals or "blue" laws
> except for the prejudice Christianity demonstrates toward those who
> don't share their repressive views on these subjects.
>
> Fact: Local churches in every area, despite a claim that they
> support a separation of church and state (probably only to the extent
> that they get away without paying taxes like everyone else, but ...),
> present political issues to their parishioners (i.e., abortion, gay
> rights and gay adoption, bans on prostitution, adult businesses and
> other sexually related activities, etc.) as subjects that a "good
> Christian" MUST take a stand on. Thus they deliberately attempt to
> influence law in those areas--and are usually successful.

I think they'd find much agreement on most items from your list from a
group of secular citizens with no church ties at all.

> Want proof? Consider the case of the church in Seattle
> Washington that was challenged in court as to its tax exempt status
> due to its political activities. The minister--with approval of his
> church board--circulated petitions opposing gay rights laws during
> church services in a manner that many of his parishioners felt
> compelled them to sign the petition or "stand out" in their peer
> group. The minister stated that anyone who wouldn't oppose gay rights
> "wasn't a good Christian."

I suppose that is some proof...an instance.

> Sorry, but from this perspective, the Christian church has FAR
> too much voice in government.

Start you campaign to do something about it. Let me know how it works
out. Really.

> >So it is now your intent to tell me my freedom has been limited? Tell
> >me, Rick. Have you ever lived anywhere else--I mean outside the U.S.?
>
> Yup.
>
> In the Netherlands. Which is a MUCH freer nation than the USA.

Really. The Netherlands is awash in social problems and programs. The
tax rate is outrageous.

> >Ever lived in a country with a state church? Ever lived in a third
> >world country. I could show you limited freedom and various states of
> >oppression. You now live in the place which offer more freedom than any
> >place on the earth.
>

> Bull.
>
> Learn something about the world from a political perspective
> before you make jingoistic statements like that one.

What do you think I did for a living, Rick?

> There are SEVERAL
> nations (The Netherlands, Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, etc.) that
> are CLEARLY freer than the US.

Interesting that you mention Finland. I spent two years in Finland
during one assignment and three years there in the mid-90s. My wife is
a Finn. Finns have to import all oil and gas. They pay 40% of their
income in taxes. Overtime work is taxed at 50%. Gasoline sells for
about $5 per gallon. Finland has some of the strictest alcohol and drug
laws in the world. It is pretty much a homogenous society so people of
color are not normally treated with great kindness. The cheapest car
one can buy--a Russian Lada--sells for about $20,000 and my Dodge Neon
is a $44,000 car in Finland. Prostitution is banned and that is
strictly enforced (especially in light of the recent waves of Russian
women who arrived since the breakup of the Soviet Union.
Tell me all about it.

> We _used_ to have more freedom than any
> other nation (The Netherlands excepted), but not since the religious
> right managed to become part of our political system and influence the
> creation and implementation of repressive laws--and not since we
> started seeing our rights taken away by phoney "save us from
> terrorists" bills that do nothing but restrict legitimate citizens.

Please save me from this leftist rhetoric...

> >> >I don't recall one of the sayings of Jesus being that anything
> >> >consenting adults do is fine. In fact, I don't recall any religion
> >> >which has anything like that as one of its tenets.
> >>
> >> So?
> >
> >So where does your expertise in these matters come from. I gather it
> >doesn't come from Buddhism.
>
> My expertise on which matters?

The "Everything-is-Okay" matters. Did you fabricate it because you
decided you didn't like the rules society made for you?
>
> Human behavior? From PhDs in Psychology and Sociology and an
> MA in Political Science.
>
> Religion: Years of study. I've read, and seriously considered,
> at least 19 versions of the Christian bible, several versions of the

> Koran, the Buddhist Sutras, the Upanishads, and the religious works of
> several other major and minor religions. I'm not a minister--but I
> would argue that I have at least as much knowledge of the root beliefs
> of Christianity and Buddhism as most ministers you're likely to
> encounter.

Not unless you've gone through several years in seminary and a number of
years of continuing education. I'll bet that hat of yours is a tight
fit.

> If you're referring to another area of "expertise" you'll have
> to be more specific.
>
> >Jesus didn't know he was a Christian. He was a Jew and thought of
> >himself as such. He didn't say that he came to save Jews or Romans or
> >Christians. He came to save the world. That's pretty all-inclusive.
>
> Only if you believe in his divinity!

I do.

> HITLER said he came to build a better world, too. Does that
> mean I have to accept HIS values?

I'll feel free to discard this as absurd.

> And don't tell me there's no comparison between the
> two--followers of Jesus have killed FAR more innocent people in his
> name than followers of Hitler did in his own.

I think I'll toss this one too.

> >> >Lack of taste and decorum are dictated more by society than by religion.
>
> I'll buy that.
>
> Of course, in our society, attacking someone for their
> exercise of free choice, or putting down women, minorities, or any
> other group are ALL considered to demonstrate lack of good taste and
> low class values, so I guess it's you, Dick, and the others who are
> attacking Kim who are defined that way here--not her.

There are good choices and there are bad choices. Having a free choice
and using it wisely are two completely different things.

> >> Lack of taste can mean anything from a lack of appreciation
> >> for a fine wine or a Beluga Caviar or well-made sushi to wearing a
> >> long dress with lavender stripes on a pea green background mixed with
> >> pink polka-dots.
> >
> >Is that what you assumed when I said Kim's action exhibited a lack of
> >taste?
>

> No, I just assumed you were putting her down because of you
> were "Programmed" by your family or religion to oppose her values,
> actually.

You mean like I assume that you are views are poisoned by your instense
dislike of Christianity?

> >I really don't care one way or the other about your suit or your
> >diamond. Just seems like the waste of a perfectly good diamond.
>
> Where would you SUGGEST that I wear a 3/4 carat diamond?

> Never mind--I can guess the answer.

You could give it to you wife.

> >> In Kim's case, some people find that her choice of call signs
> >> is not something they find in the best of taste personally. That's
> >> fine. There are others of us--seemingly the majority--who either don't
> >> have any feelings one way or the other or who see that choice as NOT
> >> representing poor taste, it's all a matter of perspective.
> >
> >You keep adding these little "unprovens" to your statements. Why insert
> >"seemingly the majority" when you have no inkling that this is the case?
> >As to perspective: It is MY PERSPECTIVE that Kim exhibits a lack of
> >good taste and decorum.*
> > (*Legal note: The above not binding on those who are not aware
> >that they have bad taste and a lack of decorum. This view extends
> >only to the callsign issue but is subject to change should Kim care
> >to reveal other information about herself.)
>
> Translation: If people don't agree with your narrow-minded
> view, they have no taste either, right?
>
> Grow up!

I guess you told me!

I'll give you a free clue. My statement needs no translation. Accept
it as my viewpoint.

> >As distasteful as you may find it, Rick; in a republic, the majority
> >sets the rules. If the majority is mostly Christian, you'll find
> >yourself in a land where a lot of the laws are based in the
> >Judeo-Christian Ethic. I don't see any way around that except to sit
> >around rooting for one of the religious minorities to outnumber American
> >Christians. Apparently you don't see the constitutional protections for
> >the minorities as doing quite enough. Maybe you could launch a
> >movement. The trouble with movements is: drumming up followers can be a
> >real struggle.
>
> And the trouble with majority rule is that it can lead to
> tyranny of the majority--or do you consider the oppressive segregation

> laws that existed in the South until the sixties to be reasonable
> because the "majority" wanted them?

Remember the part where I mentioned Constitutional protections of the
minority. Did I sound like I agreed with segregation? Do I believe the
people in the South are or were a majority of the nation?

> >If nobody is prosecuted for the things you trot out, I fail to see the
> >problem. Most folks don't participate in most of your examples anyway.
> >What freedom are you personally being denied?
>
> Really?
>
> In Georgia a man is serving 10 years in prison for having
> consensual oral sex with his wife--a neighbor look in through the
> closed blinds of his bedroom (from HIS yard) and called the police who
> arrested him.

That is the stuff of urban myth. This tale has now been going around
for decades. Name the man. Name the town. Provide a date.
Besides, I asked about YOUR freedom.

> In Texas possession of 7 or more dildoes carries a longer
> prison term than molesting a five year old child--and THAT law was
> passed less than 10 years ago.

Urban myth.

> In Arkansas there are five men serving time for consensual
> sexual interactions with other men in private settings--and nationwide
> more than 40 individuals are doing so as well.

I don't know the particulars. Do you know anything based in fact?

> In Michigan, three clubs (all private and located in places
> not accessible to children) were raided and the patrons arrested
> because they were swing clubs and the members went there to engage in
> recreational sex.

Another one which you trotted out previously. How did this effect you?
Is this one of the freedoms you desire?

> Also in Michigan (in Wayne County, to be exact) a man can have
> his vehicle--even if it belongs to his firm or his spouse--seized and
> sold at auction if he picks up a prostitute with that car.

Has it cut down on women prostituting themselves? Are you going to tell
me that prostitution is a victimless crime?

> Shall I continue? Or are those enough examples of ways in
> which freedom IS being denied based on religious beliefs (or do you
> have another reason why laws against consensual sex between adults
> should be prosecuted?).

You needn't continue. I'd rather discuss the matter with someone who
has a concept of right and wrong.

> >> Within reason, I agree. However, before agreeing to that it's
> >> necessary to agree on the meaning of "public venue." To me, it is
> >> perfectly reasonable to restrict behavior which is patently offensive
> >> to the majority of people when it is conducted in a place where others
> >> are forced to either see it or avoid a location they wish to visit. On
> >> the other hand, many people see "Public" as any setting not enclosed
> >> by the walls of a private home (and even there see it as public if
> >> more than the residents are present). Obviously, if you are engaging
> >> in consensual activities in a setting where only those who agree to
> >> those behaviors (whether it is an indoor setting or an outdoor one is
> >> irrelevant) are present it should be none of society's business
> >> what-so-ever. Unfortunately, that is not the case in the United
> >> States.
> >
> >Put a fence around Max Yazgur's farm and have at it.
>
> If I did, I'd be arrested under state morals laws. So much for
> freedom of choice.

I've noted that a large number of your perceived "freedoms" revolve
around sex. I can see where your rights have been trampled right into
the mattress.

> >> And one clearly regulated by the government who do NOT view
> >> Kim's actions as being a violation. Since the governing body does not
> >> do so, it's completely inappropriate for anyone else to take her to
> >> task for them.
> >
> >For decades, the commission has not issued such calls sequentially.
> >Most States do not permit similar things on vanity license plates (I
> >don't really know of ANY which permit it--this is simply protection from
> >the Cecils of this world). The issue has not been brought to a court of
> >law. We really don't know about the legality at this time.
>
> No, it's protection for the Churches. If sexual terms were
> accepted as normal the absurd repression of sexuality in our society
> would begin to erode and the churches might lose some of their
> temporal power.

Yeah, but they're not accepted as normal. I don't need the stuff
invading my home through TV (I'm with N2EY, I don't accept it). Again,
I note your fixation on sexual freedom.

> >As pointed out, the legality of the issue has not been decided. As
> >things stand, her choice is simply tacky.
>
> By your opinion--not by that of others.

Others have made that same opinion known.

> Do you REALLY believe that your opinion is more valuable than
> that of others--or is that just wishful thinking?

I didn't present it on a scale of 1 to 10. I just presented it as mine.

Dave K8MN

1514. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 06:49:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFCA00D.65B7AF0C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24477

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 19:58:52 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >>
> >> On Tue, 20 Nov 2001 05:11:37 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >> I've got you, Larry, and Dick on the defensive, don't I?
> >> >
> >> >Is that your overinflated view of your power?
> >>
> >> Curiosity or self-defense?
> >>
> >> Rick
> >
> >I'm just curious, Rick, but I note that you didn't respond. Do you see
> >yourself as Sir Lancelot coming to the rescue or as some "I've got them
> >in my power!" type wizard? I'm trying to imagine us attempting to close
> >the breach before another sweeping onslaught from your mighty keyboard.
>
> Respond to what, Dave?
>
> That's my message you're posting.
>
Try to follow along, now. The question, which appears above (quoted
attributes are mine) reads: Is that your overinflated view of your
power?

Dave K8MN

1515. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 06:55:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ti7h4$4s3$2@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 24481

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
> prevalent among may ham radio operators. This kind of attitude
> (exemplified by the Liberty Net on 75m and by many of the comments
> made in this NG) seems degrading to hams in general.
>
> There have been threads in the past that addressed specific
> racist problems, but so far as I know (and I'm far from an expert on
> the news group) no thread has been created to discuss the concept in
> general terms, and to examine the effect that kind of attitude have on
> the ARS.
>
> From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
> racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
> hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
> our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
> that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.
>
> Comments?
>

Yeah. Basicaly, you're a friggin' idiot.

1516. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 08:12:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tic0mmcm0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 24474

Richard Plourde wrote:
>

> If anyone, or ANY institution, takes the position that they're the final arbiter
> of the absolute truth (of what's good or evil) they're, happily, contributing to
> their own extinction.
>

How wonderfully obtuse of you!

I'll go out on a limb here and state categorically as the absolute truth that the events of September 11 were evil in spite of their religous basis. I guess that makes me a bigot and whatever other foul adjective you PC idiots want to make it.

1517. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 08:16:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tic8tmcm1@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 24478

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC19EC.645BCA61@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > You're such a pussy.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > It would be unkind of me to make any statements regarding Kim's lack of
> > class or tackiness.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, you are unkind...very, very unkind.

But accurate.
```

1518. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 08:17:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tica3mcm2@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 24479

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:50:26 -0000, "K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
> wrote:
>
> >Riley didn't "concern himself" -- his opinion was solicited.
> >
> >Like most of us, he thinks her vanity call sign is legal and trashy.
>
> No, Hans, like SOME hams--not "most of us."
>

NO, Rick, like MOST of us.

1519. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 08:18:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ticcamcm3@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 24480

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011120114855.25459.00002515@nso-ch.aol.com...
> > In article <3BF89F7F.DADCCC95@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >For shame, Larry, petitio principii is not allowed.
> > > >You are the one making the assertion. The onus is upon you
> > > >to prove your assertion. If you cannot offer any proof, we
> > > >will be forced to conclude that you are full of it. Exactly
> > > >what damage is being done to the ARS by Kim's callsign?
> > >
> > > Cecil:
> > >
> > > Yawn! I don't recall ever stating that Kim's callsign is doing
> > > quantifiable "damage" to the ARS, only that the potential for
> > > such damage certainly exists -- as pointed out by no less an
> > > authority than Riley Hollingsworth. Do you disagree with Mr.
> > > Hollingsworth's statement that Kim's choice of a callsign has
> > > the potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction?"
> > >
>
> I can't tell if that's penis envy or just plain envy.

Oh, now its more than just TIT, huh?

1520. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 08:44:32 UTC
From: DJ <kb5ylg@attglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3bfcbd93_3@news1.prserv.net>
Source record: 24485

Keep in mind the ages span. Some of the folks were raised in an era where bigotry was not only accepted, but encouraged. Others of us weren't.

David KB5YLG

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message news:028833ADEBA69BBE.882EF94BB22E4E92.71A4EF907909FB94@lp.airnews.net...
> A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
> prevalent among may ham radio operators. This kind of attitude
> (exemplified by the Liberty Net on 75m and by many of the comments
> made in this NG) seems degrading to hams in general.
>
> There have been threads in the past that addressed specific
> racist problems, but so far as I know (and I'm far from an expert on
> the news group) no thread has been created to discuss the concept in
> general terms, and to examine the effect that kind of attitude have on
> the ARS.
>
> From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
> racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
> hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
> our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
> that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.
>
> Comments?
>
> Rick
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1521. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 08:55:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tiehu$si5$0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 24488

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > For exactly the same number of years, you've been attempting to
> > > assign the behavioral attributes you possess to others -- obviously
> > > to divert attention from your own obsessive/compulsive proclivities.
> >
> > No diversion necessary, Larry. I'm bipolar with obsessive/compulsive
> > traits. That's how I can so easily recognize them in others.
>
> Larry, he is a 300,000 foot tall bipolar, obsessive/compulsive alien who
> can dunk basketballs and who has babies in the back of the bus. Perhaps
> this is a man who, in some aspects, should be taken seriously!

But----he claimed that he is a woman in a man's body!

1522. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 11:38:20 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tio1b02g8n@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24419

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC8FA1.8DCD9D85@earthlink.net...
> I don't believe that's what someone means when he asks if something is
> OK. When I ask for a milkshake and the waitress says, "OK". I do not
> assume that she means it is none of the government's business. Quit
> trying to mold this thing to suit your agenda. We're talking about
> society's view. As to your last sentence: You've gotta find a new
> group of friends.
>
> Dave K8MN

Society's view and the government's view sometimes are the same. This has to
do with individual choices that are none of the business of either.

1523. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 12:15:11 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <j%5L7.200501$W8.7583899@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24420

"DJ" <kb5ylg@attglobal.net> wrote in message
news:3bfcbd93_3@news1.prserv.net...
> Keep in mind the ages span. Some of the folks were raised in an era where
> bigotry was not only accepted, but encouraged. Others of us weren't.
>
> David KB5YLG
>

And some of us were part of what changed it and some stood on the sidelines
and cheered.

Now go home and define another 'ism' for the cheerleaders to boo and hiss.

1524. Happy Thanksgiving Everybody!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 12:33:41 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011122073341.11110.00000939@mb-bd.news.cs.com>
Source record: 24421

Thank you all on this NG for all the laughs, discussions, (& sometimes arguments) and an overall good time. Wishing you all and your families a warm and happy Thanksgiving.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

1525. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 13:20:07 UTC
From: Tommy <tommyl@zloxz.net>
Message-ID: <9titunalv0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 24422

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> sweating profusely over
his dog-eared copy of FCC rules and babbling something
about how he can't find that exact rule, spewed out the
following drivel:

For the record:

Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.

(a) The installation and operation of an amateur station on a
ship.....<BUREAUCRATIC PSYCHO_BABBLE snipped>

Get a grip Kane! and maybe get a life too. I use
my HT all the time on airplanes. Nobody gives a shit. They
think it's a Dictaphone for business notes.

Tommy

1526. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 13:22:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfcfb4a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24424

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC90E3.C31B98D0@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BFC01E9.9868BB77@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3BFA830E.F540F9A@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You'd think Davey would get the hint. When one keeps throwing
> > insults
> > > > > that
> > > > > > no one understands because they're not at others' level, well...
> > Kinda
> > > > > has
> > > > > > the same affect as using the English language in a group of
people
> > that
> > > > > > speak nothing but Spanish.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words
of
> > > > > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it
means,
> > you
> > > > > might want to find out what it means. It isn't my lack of
knowledge
> > > > > which is the problem.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Uh, Dave. I would find it interesting, at best, for me to undertake
> > > > learning from you in any way constructive... Oh, and I'm not sure
what
> > you
> > > > mean by if I want to participate...I don't think I do...
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > I'm sure that you would find it interesting, Kim. My time is,

however,
> > > extremely limited. If you don't care to participate, what keeps you
> > > participating?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Well, that's quite simple, Dave. I am so surprised you have to ask. I
keep
> > participating because I love to amuse the simply amused! No challenge,
easy
> > work, gets my stress out from the day's activities and, in some cases,
> > allows me to enjoy some real interesting go 'rounds.
> >
> > Kim W5TI and a T
>
> Just who is it that you believe yourself to be amusing? There'd be
> Cecil and Rick and...hmmmm yourself.
>
> Dave K8MN

Well. In my opinion you should include yourself in the list you began. Of course I am amused. I certainly don't participate in this newsgroup for an education, or money, or...whatever else other than amusement.

Maybe I am assuming too much. Maybe the *real* question is: why *do* you participate, if not for amusement?

Kim W5TIT

1527. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 13:25:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfcfbdd_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24426

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC9196.87D48D3E@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BFC02CF.C40752AA@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3BFA8245.DEC86321@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Process management is my chief responsibility at work, Dave. I
> > would
> > > > > > shudder to think that I become so "adult" that I act like people
> > such as
> > > > > > you. Now, for you it may work. For me, it would not. I bet
that
> > > > between
> > > > > > the two of us, I make up for your lack of willingness to step
> > outside
> > > > the
> > > > > > box.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > >
> > > > > It is certainly odd that one who so often makes incorrect
character
> > and
> > > > > background judgements about people is employed in a field where
she
> > > > > needs skill in using logical thought. Of course, being employed
in a
> > > > > field and being any good at it don't automatically go hand in
hand.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > You'd know, right? You have the lead on that example.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > Uh, Kim? I'm not employed at all. I'm retired. I marinate steaks,

> > > pilot a lawn tractor and put up large antennae at altitude.
> >
> > Well, at least you can get something large up at high altitude--even if
it
> > is outdoors.
> >
> > > I work the
> > > pileups, participate in the local ARES net, rag chew any time I feel
> > > like it and take part in numerous radio contests. *poof* There goes
> > > your supposed point.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > 'Smatta, Dave? Didn't like what I had to say? Is the above an attempt
to
> > excite me, or did you need to remind yourself of something?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> You tried to make a point that I had the lead. I'm not even in the
> game. It has nothing to do with not liking what you had to say. That
> was only incorrect. I have no desire to excite you. Please point out
> the kinds of things which excite you and I'll try to avoid them. The
> last part is a real puzzler. I can't figure out what you were trying to
> convey there.
>
> Dave K8MN

You're getting way too easy, Dave. Let's see...OH, OK, the absolute
greatest excitement I get in this newsgroup are posts from you! I can't
wait to get up every morning and run to my computer, logon, download and see
that name "Dave Heil!" But, I beg you, please don't avoid posting to the
newsgroup just because I get so excited over it!

Kim W5TIT

1528. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 13:26:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfcfc12_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24425

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC92A7.7116F58E@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 20:25:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Yeah, it is better but you still don't quite have it down. Try leaving
> > >out the word "arbitrarily" since I didn't come to my conclusion
> > >arbitrarily. Then try leaving out everything after "lack of class"
> > >since I didn't make that statement--you did. Now I think you have my
> > >view.
> >
> > Ok--since you state your decision wasn't arbitrary, I'm sure
> > you won't have any problem providing a scientifically FACTUAL basis
> > for your statement. Don't use "popular moral values" that has no
> > bearing and IS arbitrary. Use provable facts.
>
> No thanks.
>
> Dave K8MN

Ding dong....

Kim W5TIT

1529. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 13:30:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfcfd2b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24423

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC9F29.554E571C@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
>
> > >
> > >Bully for you.
> >
> > Just doing my job as a (hopefully) good husband! ;-)
>
> I submit that going along with such would make you a man who lets
> somebody else do his job as a good husband.
>

*****HIS JOB AS A GOOD HUSBAND*****?!?!?!?!?!

Ya know what, Dave? Even with as much as you grate against my nerves, I
never would have figured for you to be thinking like that...

Good grief, you've led a protected life.

Kim W5TIT

1530. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:20:14 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd08b8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24427

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC9F29.554E571C@earthlink.net...
>
> That's right. You've pretty much indicated that you make the rules for
> yourself. Society and religion be damned.
>

Dave, no one is *that* pure. Are you saying that there is no part of life that you live *without* some kind of book of rules to go by? Either you don't think for yourself or you choose decisions every day--even that depart somewhat from society and/or religion. It is human nature to do so.

The greatest religious interpretations that are even in the Bible today, are there from interpretation of events that happened and "lessons" that were to be learned from them. There's been disagreement in *many* aspects of religious thought even before Jesus, Mohmmed, Buddha, *any* of our spiritual leaders were around.

What society are you talking about in terms of rules? Goodness, there's *many* societies. Unless you have some provincial thought that a certain religion is *the* one; and that a certain subset of a grander society is *the* one, then you surely depart and choose from the offerings of society what makes the most sense to you--*FOR YOU*--and to the way you wish to live.

The humanity of what Rick observes and says he believes is that there is absolutely nothing wrong with the way in which you believe--and he would even accommodate you in any way he could without infringement upon *his* belief system. As would I. I would even go so far as to yield to you, say, if you were so abhorred by others' differences that you just couldn't accept them.

I keep seeing these terms related to being "judgemental." I don't know if I would use the word judgemental. When you, or Dick Carroll, or Larry, or whomever else, enters into an argument with mudslinging--as though if it were legal you'd start swinging or worse--it is *that* that I find so very apalling. I don't react to the way you believe about CW testing, callsign choices, politics, religion, etc. ... at least I hope I don't. What I *do* react to is the personal slams on character because of the way someone believes. Next thing you know, the debate--or comments--are more about the way someone believes than what the topic started out to be.

We all live in a world filled with many people, living many different ways of life, and having many different ways of thought. Two examples I can think of by what I am talking about in my last paragraph would be that of some jungle person somewhere. There are cultures that will pick up live

insects, even at the larval stage, and just pop them in their mouth like it's some kind of delicacy. "Some kind of delicacy" is the differentiating statement in that last sentence and indicates that I find their behavior--from *MY* perspective--at least questionable. I do. But, do I find the *people* themselves, or their culture questionable? Absolutely not, and it would be *my* character I'd keep in check in my approach to them. Were I to have the opportunity to interface with these people, it is not my task to rescue them from themselves. Nature would have it that we never encountered each other, at least that is what I believe.

Another example, extreme as it is, is the way in which some cultures treat women. I am a woman myself--and an extremely (to a fault, probably) independent one at that--so I have a *REAL BIG* problem with any kind of male decision making to be followed by a woman (interestingly enough, feminism is a total turn-off to me--but that's another conversation). However, I don't feel that it is my right at all to change that society/culture who treats women like that--*even* if it means that women and girls are physically harmed, as I hear some societies are like. I would refrain from any kind of participation in their society, both out of fear and because I would choose to ignore them. Again, it is not my task to rescue them from themselves.

In terms of society, religion, and politics and having to live in a big world, I believe that, in both circumstances above, it is well within respectable for a world government to refrain from being involved in the societies mentioned above. A simple "we will not participate in your way of life and will not support nor choose to attempt change your way of life in any way" would be fine with me. What I find objectionable is when a world government says "not only do we find what you do in your society, awful, but we are going to cause change however we can." I don't think it is up to the world governments to change societies. Is it up to the world governments to recognize each other and try to work together? Absolutely. If there's a "kid on the block" who doesn't want to play the way the rest--*all* the rest, or a huge majority--have determined is safest and best for all, and if that kid on the block keeps interfering, then I move toward being pretty aggressive with convincing them that it is in their best interest to play in their own yard.

Can you guess what the contrast is in the two examples? *I* feel that *if* I am going to believe as I do, my beliefs *must* cut across all examples--including those I am *most* abhorred by (in fact, especially by those I am most abhorred by). But, in no case, do I feel that the people--the participants themselves--are inferior to me, or that they should be rescued from their thoughts. I am not in their society/culture, other than as an independent observer. And, since I choose not to become a part of their society or culture, then I also choose not to be affected personally enough to try to change them to my way of thinking. For that reason, I personally find the idea of missionaries distasteful.

So, people make rules for themselves every day. I know very few people--can't think of any actually--that subscribe to *every* tenet of the

religion they participate in. In fact, in most cases, people approach many of their religions' rules with disdain. I, personally, don't see a thing wrong with that. The "agreement" a person makes is with God--in my opinion--not with a minister, priest, or parishioners of a church. I'd find it pretty scary if Christians started actually living as the Bible teaches...in *every* aspect. We must adapt the teachings of religion to the conditions in which we live at the time, and hope that God finds favor with how we do so. In fact, in my opinion, *that* is the greatest test of life.

I'll close this yawn for you with the added statement that if you are a Christian, there is no lesson in the Bible that I know of, that teaches it is OK for you to have those hateful feelings you have toward other people--so you make that judgement every day to depart from what behavior you *should* demonstrate by being a Christian. I would say your behavior expressed to Rick is yet another example of "society and religion be damned"--the very thing you chide Rick for. And, PS, it doesn't matter that Rick "made you do it."

Kim W5TIT

1531. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:29:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD0BAC.542B2B52@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24428

Dave Heil wrote:
> I personally find trying to discuss anything with you to be a
> juvenile-like waste of time.

Is that why you do so much of it? It reminds you of contesting?

> > > > I have NEVER
> > > > denied comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
> > > >
> > > You most assuredly *are* ignoring the fact.
> > >
> > Since you have produced absolutely no proof, everyone can assume
> > you are still lying about it. Where's the beef, Dave?
> >
> Beef:
> #1 posted by me on Nov. 5:
> Your attempt at an explanation coupling Affirmative Action and morse
> testing fails as miserably as your past morse-testing-equates-to-racism
> crap.

That's just your opinion and I don't see any denial on my part.
You are still lying. You cannot find any of my postings where
I denied comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
If you could, you would post them. Yours is the most feeble-
minded approach to an argument that I have ever seen.

> #2 posted by me on Nov. 6:
> Good luck with this latest attempt to equate Morse testing with some
> social injustice.

I still don't see any denial on my part. You are still lying.
Don't you see how silly it is to accuse *me* of something based
on *your* posting?

> #3 posted by me on Nov. 7:
> It doesn't really matter since your use of the Affirmative Action label
> in comparing it to Morse testing was incorrect. You had it backwards.
> This latest tangent is simply a Cecilian diversion.

Again that's just your opinion. I still don't see any denial on my part.
You are still lying.

> #4 posted by me on Nov. 8:
> By the way, are you ever going to get around to admitting that your
> statement comparing Morse testing and Affirmative Action was 180 degrees
> out of phase?

I still don't see any denial on my part that I compared Affirmative
Action to Morse code testing. I did and I continue to do so. You
are still lying.

> Those are all examples where I use words like "comparing", "equate" and
> "coupling". You'd have to be a fool to believe that my one typo was
> representative of my view on the matter. Are you a fool?

No, but you obviously are. You cannot prove *anything* about what *I*
said by quoting *your* own postings. What a dumb $hit doofus. Where
are *my* postings where *I* denied comparing Affirmative Action and
Morse code testing????????? I have never denied such. I did it and
I will continue to compare Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.

You are remembering where I denied *comparting* Affirmative Action and
Morse code testing. Your attempts to cover up your typo are comical.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1532. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:30:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD0BFF.11262F0C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24429

Dick Carroll wrote:
> But----he claimed that he is a woman in a man's body!

But it's OK, I'm a lesbian.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1533. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:32:04 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd0b7d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24431

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC9F67.6BF736C3@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > >So it is now your intent to tell me my freedom has been limited? Tell
> > >me, Rick. Have you ever lived anywhere else--I mean outside the U.S.?
> >
> > Yup.
> >
> > In the Netherlands. Which is a MUCH freer nation than the USA.
>
> Really. The Netherlands is awash in social problems and programs. The
> tax rate is outrageous.
>

A) You simply asked Rick to provide an example of having lived outside the United States in the context of speaking about freedom. He provided you with a country that he says has MUCH more freedom than the US. I don't see that you dispute his claim to that affect. Instead, you:

B) Comment about the social problems and tax rate--*ignoring* that you asked for an example of having lived outside the United States in the context of freedom.

Your comments that the Netherlands is awash in social problems and programs and that the tax rate if outrageous, is what? Is it your observation that because of those things, the Netherlands is not freer than the United States? It's a given that with freedoms comes problems such as you mention. Are they freer than the United States, or not, Dave?

Kim W5TIT

1534. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:33:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD0CB4.A75282D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24430

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Use provable facts.
>
> No thanks.

OK, then I guess we will just have to acknowledge your
wild-a$$ unproven speculations.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1535. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:35:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD0D28.2E31CA2F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24432

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:50:26 -0000, "K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Riley didn't "concern himself" -- his opinion was solicited.
> > >
> > >Like most of us, he thinks her vanity call sign is legal and trashy.
> >
> > No, Hans, like SOME hams--not "most of us."
>
> NO, Rick, like MOST of us.

Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1536. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:35:37 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd0c51_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24433

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3BFC9F67.6BF736C3@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
>
> > >Ever lived in a country with a state church? Ever lived in a third
> > >world country. I could show you limited freedom and various states of
> > >oppression. You now live in the place which offer more freedom than
any
> > >place on the earth.
> >
> > Bull.
> >
> > Learn something about the world from a political perspective
> > before you make jingoistic statements like that one.
>
> What do you think I did for a living, Rick?
>

Wasn't it you who just made the observation the other day that just because someone is in a certain job is no indicator that they do it well? I'd say your tolerance as an representative of our government in foreign lands was minimal at best--given what I see of your personality on this newsgroup. I would guess that you "visited" but never chose to really live the land. Wrapping yourself up in the protection of politics is *not* learning a thing about the people and conditions of a land.

Kim W5TIT

1537. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:41:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd0df5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24434

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tic0mmcm0@208.206.142.89...
>
>
> Richard Plourde wrote:
> >
>
> > If anyone, or ANY institution, takes the position that they're the final
arbiter
> > of the absolute truth (of what's good or evil) they're, happily,
contributing to
> > their own extinction.
> >
>
> How wonderfully obtuse of you!
>
> I'll go out on a limb here and state categorically as the absolute
> truth that the events of September 11 were evil in spite of their
> religous basis. I guess that makes me a bigot and whatever other foul
> adjective you PC idiots want to make it.

Yes, the acts of Sept 11 were evil, Dick. And so is your notion that every
Muslim is now in the boat with the terrorists that did the evil. I
personally wish all of you evil people would get off the Earth and go have
it out somewhere else.

Kim W5TIT

1538. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:42:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd0e19_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24435

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tic8tmcm1@208.206.142.89...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3BFC19EC.645BCA61@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > > You're such a pussy.
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > It would be unkind of me to make any statements regarding Kim's lack
of
> > > class or tackiness.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > Dave, you are unkind...very, very unkind.
>
>
> But accurate.

This, from a man who reads a book about a religion that takes years and
lifetimes to understand, and thinks he knows all about it.

Kim W5TIT

1539. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:44:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd0e99_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24436

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tica3mcm2@208.206.142.89...
>
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:50:26 -0000, "K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Riley didn't "concern himself" -- his opinion was solicited.
> > >
> > >Like most of us, he thinks her vanity call sign is legal and trashy.
> >
> > No, Hans, like SOME hams--not "most of us."
> >
>
>
> NO, Rick, like MOST of us.

You must be the "silent majority" because the majority of people I encounter over my callsign have no problem with it at all. And, a "silent majority" is either a) a secret society, or b) useless.

Kim W5TIT

1540. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:46:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd0f14_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24438

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9ticcamcm3@208.206.142.89...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20011120114855.25459.00002515@nso-ch.aol.com...
> > > In article <3BF89F7F.DADCCC95@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> > writes:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > >For shame, Larry, petitio principii is not allowed.
> > > > >You are the one making the assertion. The onus is upon you
> > > > >to prove your assertion. If you cannot offer any proof, we
> > > > >will be forced to conclude that you are full of it. Exactly
> > > > >what damage is being done to the ARS by Kim's callsign?
> > > >
> > > > Cecil:
> > > >
> > > > Yawn! I don't recall ever stating that Kim's callsign is doing
> > > > quantifiable "damage" to the ARS, only that the potential for
> > > > such damage certainly exists -- as pointed out by no less an
> > > > authority than Riley Hollingsworth. Do you disagree with Mr.
> > > > Hollingsworth's statement that Kim's choice of a callsign has
> > > > the potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction?"
> > > >
> > >
> > > I can't tell if that's penis envy or just plain envy.
> >
> >
> > Oh, now its more than just TIT, huh?

Sorry, you'll have to explain that one, Dick. I can't get down far enough
to your level to grasp what it is you think you clearly expressed there.

Kim W5TIT

1541. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:49:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD105C.4686E798@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24437

Dave Heil wrote:
> I don't believe that only a small minority of Christians practice their
> religion properly? You can bet that I don't accept that.

That's easy to prove, Dave. I'll bet the majority of Christians
eat pork. I'll bet you eat pork in direct defiance of God's will.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1542. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:51:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD10F4.90E4E1E6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24439

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> Your comments that the Netherlands is awash in social problems and programs
> and that the tax rate if outrageous, is what? Is it your observation that
> because of those things, the Netherlands is not freer than the United
> States? It's a given that with freedoms comes problems such as you mention.
> Are they freer than the United States, or not, Dave?

I think it was Jefferson who said he would rather deal with the problems
of having too much freedom than deal with the problems of having too
little freedom. I agree with Jefferson. With freedom comes responsibility.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1543. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 14:51:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd1086_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24440

"Tommy" <tommyl@zloxz.net> wrote in message
news:9titunalv0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> sweating profusely over
> his dog-eared copy of FCC rules and babbling something
> about how he can't find that exact rule, spewed out the
> following drivel:
>
> For the record:
>
> Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.
>
> (a) The installation and operation of an amateur station on a
> ship.....<BUREAUCRATIC PSYCHO_BABBLE snipped>
>
>
> Get a grip Kane! and maybe get a life too. I use
> my HT all the time on airplanes. Nobody gives a shit. They
> think it's a Dictaphone for business notes.
>
> Tommy
>

I don't *know* what the laws are on the use of radio on airplanes. However,
I do know that just because you "get away with it" doesn't negate the laws.
I don't imagine that the people on board the planes with the terrorists were
aware that box knives would kill so many people, either.

Kim W5TIT

1544. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 15:01:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd1248_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24442

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFD0D28.2E31CA2F@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > >
> > > On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:50:26 -0000, "K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >Riley didn't "concern himself" -- his opinion was solicited.
> > > >
> > > >Like most of us, he thinks her vanity call sign is legal and trashy.
> > >
> > > No, Hans, like SOME hams--not "most of us."
> >
> > NO, Rick, like MOST of us.
>
> Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:

Larry
Dick Carroll
Richard McCollum
Hans (I am not sure though)
Dave Heil

Who else? I got to five.

For the record, ONE ham outside this newsgroup has ever expressed dissatisfaction with my callsign. He is now the North Texas Section Manager, but he waited until we were in a disagreement to tell me of his views. So, in my opinion, he was just mad at me. Although, it was dissatisfaction, nevertheless.

For the record, and I'll prove it if everyone would like, get me in a pileup and/or contesting, and I'll rack up QSL cards. Give me time to create a card, though. I've gotten in to all kinds of DXpeditions that I said I'd send a card to, shame on me. And, all of them have been on 10M. I am about to install my 10M mobile back into my vehicle.

Kim W5TIT

1545. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 15:03:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD13C9.AFA68DA9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24441

Dave Heil wrote:

Dave, my spell checker keeps wanting to change your name to "Heel".
Do you think that would be appropriate?

> CAM wrote:
> > By OK, I'm assuming he means that it is none of the government's
> > business just as Kim's choice of callsign is none of the government's
> > business.
>
> I'm not assuming that at all. We're talking about morality, Cecil, not
> government intrustion. Try to stay on track.

We cannot discuss morality without discussing government's attempt to
control morality. I couldn't care less whether you think something is
immoral or not. I'm forced to care about what the government thinks
is immoral enough to have a law against it. For instance, oral sex
between husband and wife is illegal in Louisiana. Is that the kind
of morality you support? Do you think that should be a federal law?

> And you, living in...what is it--Small Town, USA? don't believe that
> those elected official follow the desires of the voters?

Sometimes they do and sometimes they don't. The point is that they
are NOT *required* to follow the desires of the voters. We do NOT
live in a democracy. We live in a representative republic. Many
of the Southern senators went against the desires of the voters
and voted for the civil rights act.

> I'm tired of dancing the Texas Two Step with you.

That's because you shouldn't attempt to lead when you're dancing
with a 6'3" 205 lb pardner. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1546. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 15:06:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD1465.F19DD58@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24443

Dick Carroll wrote:
> All that drivalous pap is nothing more than verbal engineeering.

You possess extra class license privileges, Dick. As such, you had
no choice except to meet the governmental requirements for an extra
class licensee. Why is that so hard to comprehend?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1547. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 15:13:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD162C.DBE6DCEE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24444

Rick Adams wrote:
> From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
> racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
> hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
> our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
> that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.
>
> Comments?

That seems to be self-evident to me, Rick. Maybe we can do a survey.

1. Is racism detrimental to the ARS? _______

2. Is sexism detrimental to the ARS? _______

3. Is ageism detrimental to the ARS? _______

4. Is religious prejudice detrimental to the ARS? ______
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1548. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 15:15:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD1698.C95AFF70@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24445

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
> > racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
> > hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
> > our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
> > that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.
> >
> > Comments?
>
> Yeah. Basicaly, you're a friggin' idiot.

Is that from a racist, sexist, ageist, or religious prejudice basis?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1549. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 15:18:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD1741.DC743E19@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24446

DJ wrote:
> Keep in mind the ages span. Some of the folks were raised in an era where
> bigotry was not only accepted, but encouraged. Others of us weren't.

I was raised in a segregated, racist environment. Rational people
are not susceptible to such programming. If bigotry doesn't make
sense (and it doesn't) then discard it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1550. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 15:20:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD17D2.2AE06AB9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24447

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> This, from a man who reads a book about a religion that takes years and
> lifetimes to understand, and thinks he knows all about it.

Actually, all he did was tear off the covers. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1551. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 15:24:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24448

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
>
> Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
>
> Larry
> Dick Carroll
> Richard McCollum
> Hans (I am not sure though)
> Dave Heil
>
> Who else? I got to five.

If I had said five, someone would have come up with one more. Say
Kim, are you going to have your picture on your QSL card?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1552. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 15:54:28 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Uc9L7.200629$W8.7598117@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24449

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Larry
> > Dick Carroll
> > Richard McCollum
> > Hans (I am not sure though)
> > Dave Heil
> >

Hey, I made the list!!! Makes my day.

1553. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 16:47:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd2cce_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24450

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> >
> > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
> >
> > Larry
> > Dick Carroll
> > Richard McCollum
> > Hans (I am not sure though)
> > Dave Heil
> >
> > Who else? I got to five.
>
> If I had said five, someone would have come up with one more. Say
> Kim, are you going to have your picture on your QSL card?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Well, that's OK if there's five, or however many. I just can't think of anyone else...OH YEAH, N2EY, that thinks my callsign is detrimental to the ARS. Jim makes six.

No picture of me on my QSL card. I've got all the graphics...it's going to be a gorgeous head shot of a wolf (though it may have to go to just an ear and eye of the wolf...I am not sure yet), with the graphic large enough to have a reflection of the State of Texas in it. Yeah, I know, there's no wolves (is there) in Texas. BUT, there is coyotes. They just don't make as pretty a picture!

I got the tape!!!! Yesterday, and listened to it last night and this morning. THANKS!!! Have you ever heard of Red Peters? I'll record the only CD I've got by him onto tape for you!

Kim W5TIT with turkey roasting in the oven! Yum yum.

1554. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 16:48:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd2d00_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24551

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Uc9L7.200629$W8.7598117@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Larry
> > > Dick Carroll
> > > Richard McCollum
> > > Hans (I am not sure though)
> > > Dave Heil
> > >
>
> Hey, I made the list!!! Makes my day.
>
>

Well, I didn't wrongly place you there, did I Dick M.? If I did, just let
me know.

Kim W5TIT

1555. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 17:31:20 UTC
From: K0HB <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <ufNm1t3cBHA.1892@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 24553

GlacierThe opinion of Rick Adams seems to be......

>A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
>prevalent among may ham radio operators.

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a 1.3.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful troll. Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense lameness of the premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Hans' Second Law of Thermodenial:

"In any closed mind the amount of ignorance
remains constant or increases."

1556. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 17:31:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <PDaL7.179627$3d2.7914104@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24552

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFD1741.DC743E19@IEEE.org...
> DJ wrote:
> > Keep in mind the ages span. Some of the folks were raised in an era
where
> > bigotry was not only accepted, but encouraged. Others of us weren't.
>
> I was raised in a segregated, racist environment. Rational people
> are not susceptible to such programming. If bigotry doesn't make
> sense (and it doesn't) then discard it.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

You don't even have to be touchy-feely, just Economic Man.

In about 4 years I will be taking Social Security, contributed to by about 3.5 workers declining to somewhere about 2 when they throw dirt in my face. One will be Joe, one Willie, one Juan, and we get to share Wun Hung Lo. If Josephine, Willamina, Juanita, or Tu Hung Lo want in the act, the more the merrier. If during my lifetime I did anything to limit their economic potential I would have been a complete idiot.

A country that competes with a major portion of its population artificially retarded is not going to do well. This is a fact well-known in Islamic states BTW. With all due admiration for Rosa Parks, the Birmingham thing ended when Bethlehem Steel told the union either the plant or the segregated seniority list had just come to an end. Incidentally, MLK should have shared his glory with Andy Young and another one who just died and whose name I do not remember. After King sent in the third goon to disturb things, dealing with King or Young (and to MLKs credit he really did not care which) did not seem like such a bad idea after all. I have played the goon role in my business career more than once cause I do it so well. The usual player of Young's role (hearing confessions and absolving sinners basically) was generally done by a guy who was in fact a Deacon. The third man is the remote thinker who becomes the guy holding off the Home Office gnomes, accepting promises for improvement which largely materialize. But it does not work unless deep in his heart, the victim knows both the question and solution.
Ghandi played this role to perfection as well; he was a lawyer remember. So again, if I expect my pension fund to stay solvent, artificial restraints on people are stupeeeed.

Much like the pilots escorted by the Tuskegee Airmen thought, he can be green with six heads so long as he can keep the Luftwaffe off my case. And that, to me, is the issue: competence not self-esteem. If David's point is

that the warm center of the herd moves along with the herd, OK; the herd simply finds itself something else to be stupid about.

Back in my middle-school coaching days I consulted a psychoshrink for whom I had some respect (coming to bridge tournaments on his Yamaha and paying the fee in $2 bills may have had something to do with it) about how to deal with 12-13 year-olds and not leave permanent damage. He told me that other than a good beating that life will pass out anyway without any help from me a 13-year old lacked only two things from adulthood: the development of an identity separate from the herd and the sense that long-term goals require short-term sacrifice. Without the latter he will be a really crummy daddy. Other than that, lay it out straight.

So when I encounter someone who tells me the opinion of the herd means doodley or is not willing to make the economic risk-reward decisions adults make every day, he is going to get it laid out straight. Simple as that.

FWIW I was an undergraduate Econ major

Dick NBK

1557. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 17:41:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfd37f3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24554

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:028833ADEBA69BBE.882EF94BB22E4E92.71A4EF907909FB94@lp.airnews.net...
> A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
> prevalent among may ham radio operators. This kind of attitude
> (exemplified by the Liberty Net on 75m and by many of the comments
> made in this NG) seems degrading to hams in general.
>

The societal disgrace of the above traits don't just manifest through the participants on HF or here in this newsgroup. With respect to the amteur radio community, and here in Dallas, the above traits can be heard nearly every day on one of the most popular 2M repeaters in this area.

In fact, were it *not* for many of the discussions on that repeater having overtones of bigotry, racsim, and sexism, conversation would pretty much be limited to the perfunctory greetings, weather, and traffic!

A good example of this is that back during the election, daily discussions took place that left many peoples' mouths gaped open in disbelief of what they were hearing. The conversations swung from humorous jabs at Democrats, to all out disgusting sentiments being expressed for the leftist thugs. Yet, during the events of 9-11, people were admonished whenever discussions came up about the incident itself, or about terrorism in general, for fear of spreading "rumor, innuendo, and mistruth."!!!!!!

>
> There have been threads in the past that addressed specific
> racist problems, but so far as I know (and I'm far from an expert on
> the news group) no thread has been created to discuss the concept in
> general terms, and to examine the effect that kind of attitude have on
> the ARS.
>

I have explained to most (not the Board or Upper Management, of course) people at my company, Managers as well as co-workers, about my callsign and the debate it usually inspires. There's never been a negative reaction from anyone, either with the callsign, or my reasons for getting it. However, I was restricted from having my 2M radio on during any time other than weather nets with one group I worked with. I think it's quite evident that the conversation heard on the repeater would have violated work ethics and, in some cases, discrimination laws that companies must abide by, and must demand the same from their employees. That the discussion on amateur radio was racey enough to have it banned in the office, gave enough argument to the fact that it could not be called a "family hobby" if that happened. I could not defend it.

> From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
> racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
> hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
> our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
> that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.
>
> Comments?
>
> Rick
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

I think discussions of tolerance, politics, religion, etc., all have a place in our hobby. Some of the best and proudest conversations I have ever heard and taken part in are those that people disagreed with each others' positions, but always maintained a level of friendship and respect with each other. Many hams I know whom I affectionately call "hawks" are folks who I hold respect for. I don't agree with their political viewpoints at all...but I do agree with their serious consideration, diligence to respecting someone for thinking differently, and even--in some cases--recognizing that they think the way they do because "they always have." Yes, some have even modified their thoughts based on a real encounter with someone they would have originally thought was "just not worthy."

Amateur radio is the mixing ground for people who believe in expressing their opinion. Why would anyone be in a hobby of communication if they fear expressing themselves? Nearly as much as I disagree with someone expressing racism, bigotry, sexism on the air, I equally disagree with the person who would quash such discussion. I just don't agree with censorship in any manner.

Is it bad for amateur radio? I think anyone who doesn't take the time to realize that there are good *and* bad amateur radio operators--just as there generally is good and bad people, is focusing more on the negative than the good things that happen in amateur radio. I don't think a well-rounded individual is going to surmise that amateur radio must harbor mostly one or the other kinds of people. More, I think a well-rounded individual would realize that amateur radio is like anything else: a little bit of everything, and will decide to get involved with the good things.

Kim W5TIT

1558. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 18:15:07 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BFD41A1.1040601@att.net>
Source record: 24555

>>>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

>>>>Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
>>>Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:

>>>Larry
>>>Dick Carroll
>>>Richard McCollum
>>>Hans (I am not sure though)
>>>Dave Heil

>>>Who else? I got to five.

>>If I had said five, someone would have come up with one more. Say
>>Kim, are you going to have your picture on your QSL card?

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> Well, that's OK if there's five, or however many. I just can't think of
> anyone else...OH YEAH, N2EY, that thinks my callsign is detrimental to the
> ARS. Jim makes six.

No Kim...

The list is ignorant bigoted hams...

NE2Y doesn't belong there.

I think Hans clearly doesn't belong there either.

Rich...

1559. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 18:38:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn7k2h2.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24556

"Tommy" <tommyl@zloxz.net> wrote in message news:9titunalv0@dosa.alt.net...

> I use my HT all the time on airplanes. Nobody gives a shit. They
> think it's a Dictaphone for business notes.

And when they catch you doing that and confiscate your HT (they can)
and kick you off the flight (they can) and file a complaint with the
FCC for the violation (they can) and the FCC hits you with a
penalty and/or revokes your license (they can) what valid defense
will you offer?

"I didn't know" doesn't wash because you are 'sposed to know.

Protect yourself by complying with the regs or lead a life of
"undetcted crime". Your choice.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1560. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 20:05:00 UTC
From: Anon <Anon@yeqwbaq.net>
Message-ID: <9tjlm2edm0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 24557

Here's some good advice for your Phil, which You are
probably too arrogant to accept. Get off your sanctimonious
high-horse and join the human race. Your arrogant holier-than-
thou posts are a standing joke, here and on ham radio. Chill out.
You are not a government official anymore, despite your claims
to having a direct Bat Line to your old buddies at the commission.
None of that crap means nothing to anyone, here or anywhere
else. Riley Hollingsworth has accomplished more in a few years
with his honey and diplomacy approach than you and your type
with the 1000 lb. sledge hammer approach could hope to have
ever accomplished in your entire career. You do nothing but
piss people off. Hollingsworth gets results. You oughtta learn
something from the man. You impress nobody here with your
connections or your vast knowledge, save a handful of your
brown nosers. Go spend some time with your grandkids or
take your old lady out to a nice dinner and show. It might improve
your spiteful attitude, but I doubt it. Post a joke, smile, get a
life and laugh. It might help erase those deep scowl lines on your
face.

Jack in Dallas

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message >
> "I didn't know" doesn't wash because you are 'sposed to know.
>
> Protect yourself by complying with the regs or lead a life of
> "undetcted crime". Your choice.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

1561. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 21:03:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011122160359.23334.00000783@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 24558

In article <3BFD0BFF.11262F0C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> But----he claimed that he is a woman in a man's body!
>
>But it's OK, I'm a lesbian.

There's a song by Loudon Wainwright III called "I Wish I Were A Lesbian".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1562. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 21:04:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011122160400.23334.00000784@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 24559

In article <3bfd2cce_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
>> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>> >
>> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
>> >
>> > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
>> >
>> > Larry
>> > Dick Carroll
>> > Richard McCollum
>> > Hans (I am not sure though)
>> > Dave Heil
>> >
>> > Who else? I got to five.
>>
>> If I had said five, someone would have come up with one more. Say
>> Kim, are you going to have your picture on your QSL card?
>> --
>> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>Well, that's OK if there's five, or however many. I just can't think of
>anyone else...OH YEAH, N2EY, that thinks my callsign is detrimental to the
>ARS. Jim makes six.

Hmm - my opinion that a callsign is inappropriate makes me an "ignorant bigoted ham"? Sounds pretty judgemental.

Guess my electropolitical incorrectness rubs some folks the wrong way. Too bad.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1563. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 21:23:44 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletelZ.com>
Message-ID: <3BFD6CE0.4F40@mobiletelZ.com>
Source record: 24560

Anon wrote:
>
> Here's some good advice for your Phil, which You are
> probably too arrogant to accept. Get off your sanctimonious
> high-horse and join the human race. Your arrogant holier-than-
> thou posts are a standing joke, here and on ham radio. Chill out.
> You are not a government official anymore, despite your claims
> to having a direct Bat Line to your old buddies at the commission.
> None of that crap means nothing to anyone, here or anywhere
> else. Riley Hollingsworth has accomplished more in a few years
> with his honey and diplomacy approach than you and your type
> with the 1000 lb. sledge hammer approach could hope to have
> ever accomplished in your entire career. You do nothing but
> piss people off. Hollingsworth gets results. You oughtta learn
> something from the man. You impress nobody here with your
> connections or your vast knowledge, save a handful of your
> brown nosers. Go spend some time with your grandkids or
> take your old lady out to a nice dinner and show. It might improve
> your spiteful attitude, but I doubt it. Post a joke, smile, get a
> life and laugh. It might help erase those deep scowl lines on your
> face.
>
> Jack in Dallas
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message >
> > "I didn't know" doesn't wash because you are 'sposed to know.
> > >
> > > Protect yourself by complying with the regs or lead a life of
> > > "undetcted crime". Your choice.
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > >

Anon Jack,
I'll take Phil's advice and guidance any day, he does know his stuff.
Tha Armenian Judges have ruled you as 9.8 on the Tollo-meter. Phil
on the other hand is telling it just as it is. As a frequent flyer,
I keep my radio activities under wraps since laymen (lay persons)
who don't know didly about Amateur Radio might get suspicious after
9-11 and I don't need the hassle. BTW, where did you say you got
your law degree at? Oh, thats right, you don't have any credentials.

Putting out the Troll-Be-Gone Spray and Asbestos shields.

A Real Amateur
Martin N5PZJ

1564. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 22:47:51 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <13735FF8F0FB77DB.B13723622B7E3D02.47DEB5FEABD8E62C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24561

On 22 Nov 2001 08:17:07 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> NO, Rick, like MOST of us.

Really?

Show me the results of the survey that was conducted to allow
you to make THAT statement?

What, no survey?

Are you claiming to be a psychic, Dick (what a horrible image:
A psychic Dick!), or are you just assuming that everyone is as old
fashioned, humorless, and out-of-touch with the world as you are?

Until you provide proof to the contrary (and your opinion is
NOT proof, Dick, just opinion), I'll assume that (as usual) you are
wrong about this and it is only a minority (gee--Dick as a
minority--how fitting!) who feel that way.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1565. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 22:48:22 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BFD81AC.9080302@att.net>
Source record: 24562

> Richard Plourde wrote:

>>If anyone, or ANY institution, takes the position that they're
>> the final arbiter of the absolute truth (of what's good or evil)
>>they're, happily, contributing to their own extinction.

Dick Carroll wrote:

> How wonderfully obtuse of you!

Yes, Carroll, if you mean insentitive you're right. I feel that extreme intolerrance of Intolerant Extremism is justified (providing the targets are accurately defined). That, Carroll, is were you've failed. So, in your blind rage, you've set yourself up as a target. You don't come out of this on higher ground than the radical extremists themselves.

> I'll go out on a limb here and state categorically as the absolute
> truth that the events of September 11 were evil in spite of their
> religous basis.

True...

> I guess that makes me a bigot and whatever other foul
> adjective you PC idiots want to make it.

There you go again... picking the wrong targets again... try not to come out of this looking like a schlemiel... ;-)

Rich

1566. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 22:51:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F98B7A285F09D466.1919CA6473C3BD2A.FE70EB4321553DA9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24563

On 22 Nov 2001 08:18:18 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Oh, now its more than just TIT, huh?

Whatever you say, Dick

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1567. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 22:56:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B6B34780C4EE3350.E39F460A88FC7D9C.2BE0189CB3B9B66A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24564

On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 05:52:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 20:25:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Yeah, it is better but you still don't quite have it down. Try leaving
>> >out the word "arbitrarily" since I didn't come to my conclusion
>> >arbitrarily. Then try leaving out everything after "lack of class"
>> >since I didn't make that statement--you did. Now I think you have my
>> >view.
>>
>> Ok--since you state your decision wasn't arbitrary, I'm sure
>> you won't have any problem providing a scientifically FACTUAL basis
>> for your statement. Don't use "popular moral values" that has no
>> bearing and IS arbitrary. Use provable facts.
>
>No thanks.

In other words, your statement WAS arbitrary. That's what I
assumed in the first place. Thanks for confirming it.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1568. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 22:59:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CEFDB2A8BA0E9815.FD35E6D8F606B708.AAFF1A2EEB245613@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24565

On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 05:39:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

> As to your last sentence: You've gotta find a new
>group of friends.

Why--because his current group are too open minded for you or
because they violate your precious little narrow-minded values and you
can't accept anyone else having a different set of moral values that
are just as valid as your own?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1569. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-22 23:52:39 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <bdgL7.201088$W8.7624253@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24566

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011122160400.23334.00000784@nso-da.aol.com...
> In article <3bfd2cce_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
> >> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >> >
> >> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> >> >
> >> > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
> >> >
> >> > Larry
> >> > Dick Carroll
> >> > Richard McCollum
> >> > Hans (I am not sure though)
> >> > Dave Heil
> >> >
> >> > Who else? I got to five.
> >>
> >> If I had said five, someone would have come up with one more. Say
> >> Kim, are you going to have your picture on your QSL card?
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >Well, that's OK if there's five, or however many. I just can't think of
> >anyone else...OH YEAH, N2EY, that thinks my callsign is detrimental to
the
> >ARS. Jim makes six.
>
> Hmm - my opinion that a callsign is inappropriate makes me an "ignorant
bigoted
> ham"? Sounds pretty judgemental.
>
> Guess my electropolitical incorrectness rubs some folks the wrong way. Too
bad.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

When you of all people make a bigot list, there is some real question about both the definition and definer.

One of the great stories of WW2 had to do with rubber stamps. In the early days, people being sent to Gibraltar had their orders and files stamped TOGIB. Later when there was no good reason to send people south but Normandy was close, the stamps were re-done which led to people asking each other if they were cleared for the info by asking, "Are you a BIGOT?"

If I am not nice to Techs nipping at my heels and killfile people who cannot connect two coherent sentences so I am a bigot. Whatever cools your tootsies.

Dick N�BK

1570. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 00:24:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011122192445.07314.00001398@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 24567

>Subject: Re: Airtmobile Hams
>From: "Anon" Anon@yeqwbaq.net
>Date: 11/22/2001 2:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9tjlm2edm0@pita.alt.net>

>Here's some good advice for your Phil, which You are
>probably too arrogant to accept.

No, he's not, you Anonymous Coward.

>Hollingsworth gets results.

Yes he does...And hopefully he'll nail the idiot who is violating SEVERAL federal laws...Laws that were written to save other people's lives, but you and that jerk don't care...

>Jack in Dallas

You mena "jack-off" in Dallas, don't you? Anonymous creep.

Steve Robeson, K4YZ

1571. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 00:36:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A32AADE10D540E33.EDADCCB7BF9C2D79.F5E034F7DA0BDECD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24568

On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 06:46:57 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> To respect, honor, and care for. Our vows were NOT taken in a
>> Christian ceremony and did NOT include "cleave only unto . . ." or
>> "obey."
>
>It's a lot easier if you can make up your own rules.

I didn't have to. Since we weren't married in a Christian
ceremony, there was no reason to use the Christian form of a wedding
ceremony.

Incidently, many Christian churches DO permit the people who
are marrying to create their own ceremonies--ask any Episcopal
minister.

"Cleave only unto . . ." and "obey" are simply regulations
placed by religion, and effectively treat the couple as objects to be
possessed and controlled. I happen to view my wife as a person, not a
thing, and see no reason why she should be subject to vows which
restrict her freedom or require her obedience.

>I submit that going along with such would make you a man who lets
>somebody else do his job as a good husband.

You mean someone else is supporting my wife's and son's needs
economically, intellectually, and emotionally? Someone is taking care
of her when she's sick, cheering her up when she's down, helping her
with her tasks, providing her emotional support and encouragement,
standing up for her if she's threatened or attacked, helping her with
her research, and taking her shopping (among other things)?

Who?

Or are you referring to sex as the "job of a good husband." If
so, I have to ask: What on earth makes you think of sex as a "job" in
the first place?

>My tongue was firmly planted in cheek.

Actually, your foot was firmly planted in your mouth.

>What agreements. You didn't vow to each cleave only unto...
>She wouldn't be harming your person, only your psyche.

True. But the lack of trust that would be implicit in that
behavior WOULD clearly indicate that a problem existed that needed to

be addressed.

>> As it happens, I _wouldn't_ be bothered if my wife decided to
>> have sex with someone w/o informing me ("sleep together" is pretty
>> inaccurate in this discussion, isn't it?)--on the other hand, it WOULD
>> disturb me that she didn't feel comfortable telling me about it and
>> would indicate that we needed to work on our communications.
>
>I'd think that'd be a considerable understatement.

Not really. It seems to fit the concept rather accurately,
actually.

>> Sure--but they would be basing their disagreement on religion
>> (you DID say theologians, right?). So what? If I'm not part of that
>> religion why should I care at all what the opinions of it's proponents
>> are with respect to my private behavior?
>
>That's right. You've pretty much indicated that you make the rules for
>yourself. Society and religion be damned.

What does society OR religion have to do with my private
behavior? It would be idiotic for me to adhere to the values of a
religion I didn't believe in simply because other people do so in my
community--if everyone in your neighborhood believed their homes were
on fire would you start spraying water in your living room even though
you saw no flames or smoke? As far as "society" goes, try to remember
that society is simply an accumulation of individuals. Thus there is
no possible reason to assume that "society" has any more valid basis
for its rules than any individual who is a part of it.

So long as my actions don't harm others, it really isn't the
concern of anyone but myself--just because YOUR religion opposes a
given behavior doesn't justify banning it--only avoiding it yourself.

>> Personally, I sincerely believe that if we spent less time
>> telling our kids lies about sex and protecting them from reality, and
>> more time telling our kids about racism and violence and teaching them
>> to be "color-blind" we'd have a LOT better world than if we followed
>> the guidelines of ANY religion's theologians.
>
>It would seem that teaching a kid to be color blind would be an attempt
>to protect him from reality. Color is apparent. I disagree with your
>last sentence.

Color IS apparent. It is also irrelevant. Teaching a child to
be color blind, as you know, is simply teaching him or her that the
color of a person's skin has absolutely no relationship to that
person's personality, behavior, intelligence, or capabilities. If you
insist that color should not be ignored then it could be added that
the color of someone's skin DOES indicate the clothing colors that
will look best on them and the degree of protection from burning they

should look for in a sun block. Fair enough?

>> Ok, name a single denomination that takes a public position
>> that the actions of non-members of their religion are NOT subject to
>> their "rules" or censure.
>
>The Episcopal Church.

Really?

Are you stating that the official position of the Episcopal
church is that if you are not a Christian it is perfectly acceptable
for you to perform acts that would be considered sins if you were a
Christian? Are you arguing that the Episcopal church does not attempt
to convert non-Christians to their beliefs--and that they do not see
other religious beliefs as being "wrong" or inferior to Christianity?

>> Demonstrate that a single Christian denomination believes in
>> freedom of religion--including freedom to live by the MORAL STANDARDS
>> of a different religion--is appropriate and teaches its adherents that
>> Christian morality and belief does NOT apply to non-Christians, and
>> I'll apologize for my statement.
>
>I offer the Episcopal Church. I can speak for no other.

Are you claiming to be an Episcopal? If not, how is it that
you can speak for the Episcopal church? And if so, and your statement
above is true, then justify ANY of your comments about the morality of
my views or Kim's call sign. Since by your own statement, the
Episcopal church teaches that Christian morality and belief does NOT
apply to non-Christians how can you justify trying to apply those
moral values to me? Are you lying about the Episcopal church, or are
you simply a very poor Episcopal who doesn't live by the teachings of
his own church--but who insists others do so (in other words, are you
a liar or a hypocrite--your own statements don't leave room for a
third alternative)?

>I find a number of your ideas on morals and religion pretty offensive
>too, Rick.

On what basis?

You, yourself, state that the valid grounds for finding
something immoral are religion and society. You then state that your
religion does NOT believe it has the right to judge the morals of
non-adherants which only leaves society. After eliminating the moral
views of society that are based on religion (to stick with your own
religious principles), there ARE no moral values left that address
either sex or religion. Thus neither religion nor society are the root
of your views of my morals. But, since you, yourself, state that it is
inappropriate for someone to live by their own moral values in
opposition to those of religion and society, clearly you can't be
basing your views on your personal morals either.

Gee, Dave, I guess that means you don't really HAVE any views
on my moral values or views on religion at all--you just thought you
did. And, of course, since one of my moral views is that there is
nothing wrong with a call sign like Kim's, and since you don't have
any views on my moral values, you obviously don't have any views on
that topic either.

I guess you've just been attacking her (and me) to see
yourself in print since you don't have any values to base the attacks
on.

Sounds like a troll to me!

>I don't believe that only a small minority of Christians practice their
>religion properly? You can bet that I don't accept that. That's
>according to you, the final arbiter on Christianity.

Ok--find TEN Christians that practice the religion precisely
the way it is intended to be practiced--in other words precisely as
the bible instructs them to practice it and I'll retract that
statement.

That, of course, includes ALL the instructions in the Old
Testament as well as the principles given in the New Testament.

>> Fact: There isn't an elected official in this country that
>> could win re-election if s/he didn't support the desires of the
>> Christian Churches in his/her district.
>
>Subjective and unproven. I'd bet you could find exceptions to your
>statement in certain areas of New York City or San Francisco alone.

Let me get this straight. You are claiming I am making an
unproven statement and basing your statement on the _assumption_ that
you could find an exception in certain areas?

Turn that around, Dave. If you want to accuse me of making an
unproven statement, then prove it's wrong.

>> Fact: Local churches in every area, despite a claim that they
>> support a separation of church and state (probably only to the extent
>> that they get away without paying taxes like everyone else, but ...),
>> present political issues to their parishioners (i.e., abortion, gay
>> rights and gay adoption, bans on prostitution, adult businesses and
>> other sexually related activities, etc.) as subjects that a "good
>> Christian" MUST take a stand on. Thus they deliberately attempt to
>> influence law in those areas--and are usually successful.
>
>I think they'd find much agreement on most items from your list from a
>group of secular citizens with no church ties at all.

Based on what source of morality?

With the exception of the Judeo-Christian religions, there IS
no basis for opposition to any of those behaviors or lifestyles. Only

with the entry of religious morality is sex (in any form except rape) considered in any way inappropriate. Again you are basing your claim that I'm wrong on what you "think" would be the position of others. Sorry, Dave, but unless you have research evidence that demonstrates non-Christian (and non-religious) members of our society oppose such things as limitations on gay rights, consensual sexual behavior between adults, etc., you don't have anything but pure guesswork to base your claim on--a VERY flimsy grounds for claiming someone else is incorrect.

>I suppose that is some proof...an instance.

Would you care for a few dozen more? I can easily provide them--including court citations.

>Really. The Netherlands is awash in social problems and programs. The
>tax rate is outrageous.

You didn't state that the US had a better tax rate than other nations (it doesn't, try Monaco or Saudi Arabia)--you stated that it had more freedom. High taxes have nothing to do with that.

As far as social problems go, we have VASTLY more in the US than in any Western European nation with the possible exception of the relatively recently reunited Germany. Again, that has nothing to do with freedom--the subject of your claim.

>> Learn something about the world from a political perspective
>> before you make jingoistic statements like that one.
>
>What do you think I did for a living, Rick?

I wouldn't have the vaguest idea--but based on your statements about other nations you did NOT teach political science.

>Interesting that you mention Finland. I spent two years in Finland
>during one assignment and three years there in the mid-90s. My wife is
>a Finn. Finns have to import all oil and gas. They pay 40% of their
>income in taxes. Overtime work is taxed at 50%. Gasoline sells for
>about $5 per gallon. Finland has some of the strictest alcohol and drug
>laws in the world. It is pretty much a homogenous society so people of
>color are not normally treated with great kindness. The cheapest car
>one can buy--a Russian Lada--sells for about $20,000 and my Dodge Neon
>is a $44,000 car in Finland. Prostitution is banned and that is
>strictly enforced (especially in light of the recent waves of Russian
>women who arrived since the breakup of the Soviet Union.
>Tell me all about it.

Again, you use economic issues to defend your claim that other nations are less free than the US. Sorry, Dave, but that's a straw dog. Talk about restrictions on RIGHTS--not about the cost of gasoline.

>Please save me from this leftist rhetoric...

Translation: Yea, I know, but I won't admit it.

>> My expertise on which matters?
>
>The "Everything-is-Okay" matters. Did you fabricate it because you
>decided you didn't like the rules society made for you?

I didn't say EVERYTHING is ok--I stated that the ONLY
legitimate grounds for restricting any individual's actions are if
those actions will harm the person or property of a non-consenting
individual. That isn't "everything is ok," it's "nothing that does no
harm is the business of society" a very different statement.

>> Religion: Years of study. I've read, and seriously considered,
>> at least 19 versions of the Christian bible, several versions of the
>> Koran, the Buddhist Sutras, the Upanishads, and the religious works of
>> several other major and minor religions. I'm not a minister--but I
>> would argue that I have at least as much knowledge of the root beliefs
>> of Christianity and Buddhism as most ministers you're likely to
>> encounter.
>
>Not unless you've gone through several years in seminary and a number of
>years of continuing education. I'll bet that hat of yours is a tight
>fit.

In other words unless I've gone through a seminary and
continuing education I have no right to comment on a religion?

Ok--fair enough. Since you haven't gone through several years
of graduate education in linguistics, you have no right to comment on
Kim's call sign, which is an expression of language.

>> Only if you believe in his divinity!
>
>I do.

While I don't. Thus you are bound to follow the teachings of
the bible while I am not.

>> HITLER said he came to build a better world, too. Does that
>> mean I have to accept HIS values?
>
>I'll feel free to discard this as absurd.

Why?

Because it's true or because you can't think of a valid reason
why the two SHOULDN'T be compared?

>> And don't tell me there's no comparison between the
>> two--followers of Jesus have killed FAR more innocent people in his
>> name than followers of Hitler did in his own.
>

>I think I'll toss this one too.

It's amazing how you can ignore the areas you can't respond to
yet expect others to believe you simply don't care to respond.

It's stupid.

But amazing.

>> Of course, in our society, attacking someone for their
>> exercise of free choice, or putting down women, minorities, or any
>> other group are ALL considered to demonstrate lack of good taste and
>> low class values, so I guess it's you, Dick, and the others who are
>> attacking Kim who are defined that way here--not her.
>
>There are good choices and there are bad choices. Having a free choice
>and using it wisely are two completely different things.

Yup.

You have the free choice to attack Kim and look like a jerk or
not attack her and eliminate that perception.

You made your choice to look like a jerk.

Congratulations! You achieved your goal.

>> No, I just assumed you were putting her down because of you
>> were "Programmed" by your family or religion to oppose her values,
>> actually.
>
>You mean like I assume that you are views are poisoned by your instense
>dislike of Christianity?

Assume all you want. It isn't a dislike for Christianity--it's
an intense distaste for ANY group that limits freedom and rights on
the basis of their personal beliefs. I don't care if it's
Christianity, the Nazi party, or the "Dick, Dave, and Larry Self-love
Association," if a group chooses to try to impose its values on those
who are not members of that group they deserve nothing but contempt.

>> Where would you SUGGEST that I wear a 3/4 carat diamond?
>
> > Never mind--I can guess the answer.
>
>You could give it to you wife.

As it happens, she has its mate.

I decided to upgrade the diamonds in her engagement ring as a
twentieth anniversary gift (the original ones were pretty poor
quality--but all I could afford at the time). To replace the center
stone I bought a pair of 3/4 carat diamond earrings, had one of the
stones set in her ring along with new side diamonds, and I wear the

other earring myself. She likes the significance that resulted.

>> Translation: If people don't agree with your narrow-minded
>> view, they have no taste either, right?
>>
>> Grow up!
>
>I guess you told me!

I thought I did. Hmmmm. Yup, I must have--you responded to it.

>I'll give you a free clue. My statement needs no translation. Accept
>it as my viewpoint.

Ok. So you're narrow-minded. I can live with that.

>Remember the part where I mentioned Constitutional protections of the
>minority. Did I sound like I agreed with segregation? Do I believe the
>people in the South are or were a majority of the nation?

They were--and are--a majority in their states--where such
laws were enacted.

And your statement wasn't that the majority should rule except
when Constitutional issues are concerned--it was that the majority
should rule, period.

I'll be happy to accept the alternative version, however. Of
course, since the Constitution explicitly supports freedom of speech,
by necessity Kim's use of W5TIT is protected, and thus the majority
that you claim oppose it--yourself included--have no legitimacy in
doing so by your own statement.

>> In Georgia a man is serving 10 years in prison for having
>> consensual oral sex with his wife--a neighbor look in through the
>> closed blinds of his bedroom (from HIS yard) and called the police who
>> arrested him.
>
>That is the stuff of urban myth. This tale has now been going around
>for decades. Name the man. Name the town. Provide a date.
>Besides, I asked about YOUR freedom.

The conviction was in the Summer of 1996 (I don't know the
date, but I'll be glad to copy down the court citation at my office on
Monday and post it here then). As I recall the man's name was Matthews
and the town involved was Macon, GA.

My freedom?

Whether the limitations on rights affect me directly is
irrelevant--the key isn't whether or not my personal freedom is
restricted--it's whether anyone's is. Unlike yourself, I don't base my
values on what will profit me directly--I'm interested in rights in
general.

>> In Texas possession of 7 or more dildoes carries a longer
>> prison term than molesting a five year old child--and THAT law was
>> passed less than 10 years ago.
>
>Urban myth.

Statement of fact. Try doing your own research before you make
such claims.

>I don't know the particulars. Do you know anything based in fact?

Yes--but to the best of my knowledge this isn't an academic
forum where case citations are necessary in conversation. I'll be
happy to provide them if you'll agree to do the same for all of the
claims you've made yourself.

I maintain a rather substantial file of court decisions and
verified news reports at my office and, assuming I start seeing
citations for all your own statements here I'll make it a point to
note down the cites for you on Monday. Otherwise, if you don't feel
like troubling yourself to post your own sources, then use the
Internet and verify them yourself!

>> In Michigan, three clubs (all private and located in places
>> not accessible to children) were raided and the patrons arrested
>> because they were swing clubs and the members went there to engage in
>> recreational sex.
>
>Another one which you trotted out previously. How did this effect you?
>Is this one of the freedoms you desire?

Does it have to affect me directly to be a problem?

By your standards, since I'm white I shouldn't care if blacks
are oppressed; since I'm male I shouldn't care if women are treated
equally; since I'm heterosexual I shouldn't care if gays are deprived
of their rights; since I'm of Western European descent I shouldn't
care if asians, middle easterners, and Eastern Europeans are
discriminated against; since I'm 56 I shouldn't care if children are
repressed; since I'm . . .

Sorry, Dave, but unlike yourself I happen to care about the
rights of others, too.

You'll note that first you denied that any of these types of
influences existed then, when I demonstrated that they did, you
changed your line to "yes--but how does it affect you" instead. Give
it up--you are NOT going to twist the original points to suit your own
image.

>> Also in Michigan (in Wayne County, to be exact) a man can have
>> his vehicle--even if it belongs to his firm or his spouse--seized and
>> sold at auction if he picks up a prostitute with that car.
>

>Has it cut down on women prostituting themselves? Are you going to tell
>me that prostitution is a victimless crime?

No and yes, respectively.

No it has not cut down on prostitution--people just park first
and approach them on foot. It HAS caused an increase in muggings
however, since these customers are on foot and by necessity have cash
on them.

Is prostitution a victimless crime? Absolutely. Identify a
victim of the crime---is it the woman who voluntarily provides a
service for a fee, or is it the man who pays a fee for a service? To
me that sounds like a fair exchange with no victim. And don't claim
that "society" is harmed by it--a transaction between two adults is
none of society's business in the first place and thus CAN'T harm
them.

>You needn't continue. I'd rather discuss the matter with someone who
>has a concept of right and wrong.

I do.

I'm right.

You're wrong.

See?

>> If I did, I'd be arrested under state morals laws. So much for
>> freedom of choice.
>
>I've noted that a large number of your perceived "freedoms" revolve
>around sex. I can see where your rights have been trampled right into
>the mattress.

They involve sex because the topic of discussion is morality
not personal freedom in general. And the legislation of morality is
one of the WORST forms of oppression the State is capable of
performing.

For someone who doesn't want to discus sexual morality--you
certainly choose to do so when you attack Kim for her choice of a call
sign!

>Yeah, but they're not accepted as normal. I don't need the stuff
>invading my home through TV (I'm with N2EY, I don't accept it). Again,
>I note your fixation on sexual freedom.

And yours on avoiding issues. Nice try.

>> By your opinion--not by that of others.
>
>Others have made that same opinion known.

A few--not the "majority" that's being claimed.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1572. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 00:50:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C9381295F1678F94.5B995EFD6531059B.13C0998D143FFB17@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24569

On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 06:49:50 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Try to follow along, now. The question, which appears above (quoted
>attributes are mine) reads: Is that your overinflated view of your
>power?

Interesting phrasing to the question. Presumably you won't
settle for anything other than a "Yes" or a "No" either of which you
can use as "proof" that I either admit to having an overinflated view
of my power or I don't believe I have the power to put you on the
defensive. Ok, I'll play your game:

Yes, it is my overinflated view of my power that I have the
ability to put you on the defensive.

Now it's MY turn to ask you a yes or no question (no changing
the question--you won't let me do so):

Have you stopped abusing children yet?

Remember, Dave. Yes or no only. Anything else is just being
defensive . . .

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1573. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 00:58:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <637C0A0CDBA72D2F.1888254C50684EF0.A8658D4A1E430D89@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24570

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 22:58:18 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>I solved that problem, Rick. I type in latex gloves. :-)

Must be really inconvenient to read what you've typed. What do
you do, turn them inside out?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1574. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 00:59:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A2376A44D125911A.1FDD5339F3EB8927.48BBAB0760BBDA03@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24571

On 22 Nov 2001 06:55:32 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Yeah. Basicaly, you're a friggin' idiot.

Well, there's on vote for bigotry versus it's opposition.

Next.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1575. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 00:59:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BCFCCB8F4F987CAD.E12ADC0FF3E67F94.5971A542D1339398@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24572

On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 09:15:36 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Is that from a racist, sexist, ageist, or religious prejudice basis?

He missed his meds today.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1576. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 01:04:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <09EA13F66C62389A.89758D0353CA7C71.42FAE1B911F6D089@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24573

On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 17:31:20 -0000, "K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
wrote:

>GlacierThe opinion of Rick Adams seems to be......
>
>>A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
>>prevalent among may ham radio operators.
>
>
>The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
>they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
>1.3.
>
>The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!
>
>It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious.
>It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly
>lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful
>troll. Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense lameness of the
>premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their
>hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform
>the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!

Sorry, Hans, but it fails the critical "troll test."

The author is both identifiable and an active participant in
the newsgroup where it appeared.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1577. For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 02:03:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <H7iL7.203791$W8.7635260@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24574
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

According to the Economist for Nov 10-16 two profs have been running a three-year study of E-Bay auctions (via a bot) with the following results:

1. Items sold on a weekend sell for about 2% more.

2. Pictures were worth 5.7% in 1999. This year, it is11.3%

3. Having a decent rep is worth 6.8% and growing as experience is gained. Hey, guys win Nobel Prizes for discovering that you can get better prices from people who trust you and don't build in a margin for getting the green weenie.

4. They are testing software to detect shill bids. You probably will never hear about it on E-Bay but what better place to sell it when the time comes, with a picture on a weekend of course. Should be fun.

Dick

1578. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 02:25:28 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tkc1802akr@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24577

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFD1698.C95AFF70@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
> > > racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
> > > hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
> > > our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
> > > that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.
> > >
> > > Comments?
> >
> > Yeah. Basicaly, you're a friggin' idiot.
>
> Is that from a racist, sexist, ageist, or religious prejudice basis?

Maybe it's an idiotist basis.

1579. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 02:26:37 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tkc2a02ap3@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24578

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:BCFCCB8F4F987CAD.E12ADC0FF3E67F94.5971A542D1339398@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 09:15:36 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >Is that from a racist, sexist, ageist, or religious prejudice basis?
>
> He missed his meds today.
>
> Rick

Yes, the liquor stores are usually closed on Thanksgiving.

1580. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 02:37:10 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tkcm302bjs@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24579

"Anon" <Anon@yeqwbaq.net> wrote in message news:9tjlm2edm0@pita.alt.net...
> Here's some good advice for your Phil, which You are
> probably too arrogant to accept. Get off your sanctimonious
> high-horse and join the human race. Your arrogant holier-than-
> thou posts are a standing joke, here and on ham radio. Chill out.
> You are not a government official anymore, despite your claims
> to having a direct Bat Line to your old buddies at the commission.
> None of that crap means nothing to anyone, here or anywhere
> else. Riley Hollingsworth has accomplished more in a few years
> with his honey and diplomacy approach than you and your type
> with the 1000 lb. sledge hammer approach could hope to have

I thought Riley used a pretty big sledge hammer on some of the hams who dominated 14.313 and 3.8945. Nothing "honey and diplomacy" about. The hammer fell. They're gone. End of story.

1581. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 02:40:04 UTC
From: BH <radioguyx@texxas.net>
Message-ID: <3BFCFEAD.9EC1147@texxas.net>
Source record: 24575

Phil Kane wrote:

>
> Don't let the company's lawyers hear that....if he's the pilot on
> duty, boredom is not an option.

I have several neighbors who are airline pilots, they all say that
between take offs and landings, the time is very boring, the plane
is on auto pilot and not much to do.

1582. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 02:45:49 UTC
From: BH <radioguyx@texxas.net>
Message-ID: <3BFD0005.46E8BF33@texxas.net>
Source record: 24576

I can see this for installing non-type accepted amateur gear, but
do not see how this applies for using the installed aircraft comms
that can operate on the ham bands.

Phil Kane wrote:

>
> For the record:
>
> Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.
>
> (a) The installation and operation of an amateur station on a
> ship or aircraft must be approved by the master of the ship or
> pilot in command of the aircraft.
>
> (b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
> other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
> a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
> installation. The station's transmissions must not cause
> interference to any other apparatus installed on the ship or
> aircraft.
>
> (c) The station must not constitute a hazard to the safety of
> life or property. For a station aboard an aircraft, the
> apparatus shall not be operated while the aircraft is operating
> under Instrument Flight Rules, as defined by the FAA, unless the
> station has been found to comply with all applicable FAA Rules.
>
> 47 C.F.R. 97.11 [P&F] as of October 30, 2001
>
>

1583. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 02:53:23 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tkdkh02crs@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24583

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFD105C.4686E798@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I don't believe that only a small minority of Christians practice their
> > religion properly? You can bet that I don't accept that.
>
> That's easy to prove, Dave. I'll bet the majority of Christians
> eat pork. I'll bet you eat pork in direct defiance of God's will.

Wasn't there a prophet that negated kosher laws for Christians? I seem to remember that Isaiah, Daniel, or some other prophet had a dream in which god told him to eat what was before him. It was a feast of snakes, frogs, pigs, lizards and everything that was "unclean." God told the guy, "If I say it's OK, then it's OK."

1584. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 03:12:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tkeqc$1uo$0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 24580

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tic8t$mcm$1@208.206.142.89...
> >
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BFC19EC.645BCA61@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > You're such a pussy.
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > >
> > > > It would be unkind of me to make any statements regarding Kim's lack
> of
> > > > class or tackiness.
> > > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > Dave, you are unkind...very, very unkind.
> > >
> > >
> > But accurate.
>
> This, from a man who reads a book about a religion that takes years and
> lifetimes to understand, and thinks he knows all about it.

Don't have a need to "know all about it", just enough.
```

1585. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 03:17:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tkf4c$1uo$1@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 24581

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > All that drivalous pap is nothing more than verbal engineeering.
>
> You possess extra class license privileges, Dick. As such, you had
> no choice except to meet the governmental requirements for an extra
> class licensee. Why is that so hard to comprehend?

I CHOSE to take those tests. No one forced me to drive the 260 one way
miles to the FCC district office to do that.
What part of that is so difficult for you to comprehend.

1586. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 03:21:00 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <391170249A242EA0.DE70F89E0D1A28ED.D03B54EAEF0210BD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24582
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:03:19 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>According to the Economist for Nov 10-16 two profs have been running a
>three-year study of E-Bay auctions (via a bot) with the following results:
>
>1. Items sold on a weekend sell for about 2% more.
>
>2. Pictures were worth 5.7% in 1999. This year, it is11.3%
>
>3. Having a decent rep is worth 6.8% and growing as experience is gained.
>Hey, guys win Nobel Prizes for discovering that you can get better prices
>from people who trust you and don't build in a margin for getting the green
>weenie.
>
>4. They are testing software to detect shill bids. You probably will never
>hear about it on E-Bay but what better place to sell it when the time comes,
>with a picture on a weekend of course. Should be fun.

Sounds good to me. I have an auction running there now for a
Panasonic AG455U camcorder that ends on a Sunday and has a picture
with it--so I should do ok on it! :-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1587. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 03:44:15 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <jCjL7.206760$W8.7643144@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Richard, when they sell a Hallicrafters S-20R for close to $200.00, that's
it. I do not do E-bay anymore.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:H7iL7.203791$W8.7635260@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> According to the Economist for Nov 10-16 two profs have been running a
> three-year study of E-Bay auctions (via a bot) with the following results:
>
> 1. Items sold on a weekend sell for about 2% more.
>
> 2. Pictures were worth 5.7% in 1999. This year, it is11.3%
>
> 3. Having a decent rep is worth 6.8% and growing as experience is gained.
> Hey, guys win Nobel Prizes for discovering that you can get better prices
> from people who trust you and don't build in a margin for getting the
green
> weenie.
>
> 4. They are testing software to detect shill bids. You probably will
never
> hear about it on E-Bay but what better place to sell it when the time
comes,
> with a picture on a weekend of course. Should be fun.
>
> Dick
>
>

1588. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 03:56:32 UTC
From: Your Friend Bill <"Remove The NO In The Reply Address"@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDC8F0.4F7FDFCD@coqui.net>
Source record: 24585
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
>
> Richard, when they sell a Hallicrafters S-20R for close to $200.00, that's
> it. I do not do E-bay anymore.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim

According to hampedia, the top price realized on ebay for an S20-R is
$405.00 !!! Average has been 146.88 and lowest was 50.00.
I would like to have seen that $405 one.

-Bill

1589. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:10:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFDCC2E.90561225@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24586

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > This, from a man who reads a book about a religion that takes years and
> > lifetimes to understand, and thinks he knows all about it.
>
> Don't have a need to "know all about it", just enough.

A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1590. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:16:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFDCD9B.E0F65F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24587

Krell wrote:
> Wasn't there a prophet that negated kosher laws for Christians? I seem to
> remember that Isaiah, Daniel, or some other prophet had a dream in which god
> told him to eat what was before him. It was a feast of snakes, frogs, pigs,
> lizards and everything that was "unclean." God told the guy, "If I say it's
> OK, then it's OK."

I don't recall that prophet. Since Yahweh, Jehovah, and Allah are all the
same God, why don't the Jews and Muslims eat pork? Did Jesus eat pork?
I doubt it very seriously. He didn't want to risk trichinosis.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1591. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:20:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFDCE7E.5B7F1147@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24588

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > All that drivalous pap is nothing more than verbal engineeering.
> >
> > You possess extra class license privileges, Dick. As such, you had
> > no choice except to meet the governmental requirements for an extra
> > class licensee. Why is that so hard to comprehend?
>
> I CHOSE to take those tests. No one forced me to drive the 260 one way
> miles to the FCC district office to do that.
> What part of that is so difficult for you to comprehend.

If you had chosen not to take the tests then you wouldn't be licensed.
Therefore you were forced to take the tests in order to obtain a
ham radio license. Cheating is the only other way to get one.
You were forced to take those tests because you had no other
choice except to cheat on your way to obtaining a ham license.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1592. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:22:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDCEF5.7C0CDF34@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24589

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC8FA1.8DCD9D85@earthlink.net...
> > I don't believe that's what someone means when he asks if something is
> > OK. When I ask for a milkshake and the waitress says, "OK". I do not
> > assume that she means it is none of the government's business. Quit
> > trying to mold this thing to suit your agenda. We're talking about
> > society's view. As to your last sentence: You've gotta find a new
> > group of friends.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Society's view and the government's view sometimes are the same. This has to
> do with individual choices that are none of the business of either.

Rick already spoke to the fact that he was not discussing government.
Any valid points?

Dave K8MN

1593. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:24:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDCF98.493E019C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24590

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC90E3.C31B98D0@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BFC01E9.9868BB77@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3BFA830E.F540F9A@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You'd think Davey would get the hint. When one keeps throwing
> > > insults
> > > > > > that
> > > > > > > no one understands because they're not at others' level, well...
> > > Kinda
> > > > > > has
> > > > > > > the same affect as using the English language in a group of
> people
> > > that
> > > > > > > speak nothing but Spanish.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > If you want to participate, Kim, you may have to learn a few words
> of
> > > > > > the local idiom. If I use a term and you don't know what it
> means,
> > > you
> > > > > > might want to find out what it means. It isn't my lack of
> knowledge
> > > > > > which is the problem.
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Uh, Dave. I would find it interesting, at best, for me to undertake
> > > > > learning from you in any way constructive... Oh, and I'm not sure
> what
> > > you
> > > > > mean by if I want to participate...I don't think I do...
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT
```

> > > >
> > > > I'm sure that you would find it interesting, Kim. My time is,
> however,
> > > > extremely limited. If you don't care to participate, what keeps you
> > > > participating?
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Well, that's quite simple, Dave. I am so surprised you have to ask. I
> keep
> > > participating because I love to amuse the simply amused! No challenge,
> easy
> > > work, gets my stress out from the day's activities and, in some cases,
> > > allows me to enjoy some real interesting go 'rounds.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TI and a T
> >
> > Just who is it that you believe yourself to be amusing? There'd be
> > Cecil and Rick and...hmmmm yourself.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Well. In my opinion you should include yourself in the list you began. Of
> course I am amused. I certainly don't participate in this newsgroup for an
> education, or money, or...whatever else other than amusement.
>
> Maybe I am assuming too much. Maybe the *real* question is: why *do* you
> participate, if not for amusement?

To help balance the views, Kim. We wouldn't want things to lean too far
to the left.

Dave K8MN

1594. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:29:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD094.2149CFA5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24591

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC9196.87D48D3E@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3BFC02CF.C40752AA@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3BFA8245.DEC86321@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Process management is my chief responsibility at work, Dave. I
> > > would
> > > > > > > shudder to think that I become so "adult" that I act like people
> > > such as
> > > > > > > you. Now, for you it may work. For me, it would not. I bet
> that
> > > > > between
> > > > > > > the two of us, I make up for your lack of willingness to step
> > > outside
> > > > > > the
> > > > > > > box.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It is certainly odd that one who so often makes incorrect
> character
> > > and
> > > > > > background judgements about people is employed in a field where
> she
> > > > > > needs skill in using logical thought. Of course, being employed
> in a
> > > > > > field and being any good at it don't automatically go hand in
> hand.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > You'd know, right? You have the lead on that example.
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT
```

> > > >
> > > > Uh, Kim? I'm not employed at all. I'm retired. I marinate steaks,
> > > > pilot a lawn tractor and put up large antennae at altitude.
> > > >
> > > Well, at least you can get something large up at high altitude--even if
> it
> > > is outdoors.
> > > >
> > > > I work the
> > > > pileups, participate in the local ARES net, rag chew any time I feel
> > > > like it and take part in numerous radio contests. *poof* There goes
> > > > your supposed point.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > >
> > > 'Smatta, Dave? Didn't like what I had to say? Is the above an attempt
> to
> > > excite me, or did you need to remind yourself of something?
> > > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > You tried to make a point that I had the lead. I'm not even in the
> > game. It has nothing to do with not liking what you had to say. That
> > was only incorrect. I have no desire to excite you. Please point out
> > the kinds of things which excite you and I'll try to avoid them. The
> > last part is a real puzzler. I can't figure out what you were trying to
> > convey there.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You're getting way too easy, Dave. Let's see...OH, OK, the absolute
> greatest excitement I get in this newsgroup are posts from you! I can't
> wait to get up every morning and run to my computer, logon, download and see
> that name "Dave Heil!" But, I beg you, please don't avoid posting to the
> newsgroup just because I get so excited over it!

Pretty sophomoric stuff, Kim. You'll have to come up with better
diversions. I wasn't in the last game and I'm not playing this one.

Dave K8MN

1595. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:30:42 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ShkL7.180623$3d2.7954510@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24592
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sheesh! I had an S-20R as a kid. The thing was as wide as a barn and had almost total insensitivity above 15 meters. Tuning above 10 MHz (like for SSB) was accomplished by moving my hand closer or farther to the stupid receiver. Lousy radio.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Your Friend Bill" <"Remove The NO In The Reply Address"@coqui.net> wrote in message news:3BFDC8F0.4F7FDFCD@coqui.net...
> JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
> >
> > Richard, when they sell a Hallicrafters S-20R for close to $200.00, that's
> > it. I do not do E-bay anymore.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim
>
> According to hampedia, the top price realized on ebay for an S20-R is
> $405.00 !!! Average has been 146.88 and lowest was 50.00.
> I would like to have seen that $405 one.
>
> -Bill
>

1596. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:31:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD11D.D15E47BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24593

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC9F29.554E571C@earthlink.net...
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > > >
> > > >Bully for you.
> > >
> > > Just doing my job as a (hopefully) good husband! ;-)
> >
> > I submit that going along with such would make you a man who lets
> > somebody else do his job as a good husband.
> >
>
> *****HIS JOB AS A GOOD HUSBAND*****?!?!?!?!?!
>
> Ya know what, Dave? Even with as much as you grate against my nerves, I
> *never* would have figured for you to be thinking like that...
>
> Good grief, you've led a protected life.
>
> Kim W5TIT

I submit that after reading your response, it is clear that you have no
idea how I'm thinking.

Dave K8MN

1597. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:40:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD324.9B19C85E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24594

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I personally find trying to discuss anything with you to be a
> > juvenile-like waste of time.
>
> Is that why you do so much of it? It reminds you of contesting?
>
> > > > > I have NEVER
> > > > > denied comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
> > > >
> > > > You most assuredly *are* ignoring the fact.
> > >
> > > Since you have produced absolutely no proof, everyone can assume
> > > you are still lying about it. Where's the beef, Dave?
> >
> > Beef:
> > #1 posted by me on Nov. 5:
> > Your attempt at an explanation coupling Affirmative Action and morse
> > testing fails as miserably as your past morse-testing-equates-to-racism
> > crap.
>
> That's just your opinion and I don't see any denial on my part.
> You are still lying. You cannot find any of my postings where
> I denied comparing Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
> If you could, you would post them. Yours is the most feeble-
> minded approach to an argument that I have ever seen.
>
> > #2 posted by me on Nov. 6:
> > Good luck with this latest attempt to equate Morse testing with some
> > social injustice.
>
> I still don't see any denial on my part. You are still lying.
> Don't you see how silly it is to accuse *me* of something based
> on *your* posting?
>
> > #3 posted by me on Nov. 7:
> > It doesn't really matter since your use of the Affirmative Action label
> > in comparing it to Morse testing was incorrect. You had it backwards.
> > This latest tangent is simply a Cecilian diversion.
>
> Again that's just your opinion. I still don't see any denial on my part.
> You are still lying.
>

> > #4 posted by me on Nov. 8:
> > By the way, are you ever going to get around to admitting that your
> > statement comparing Morse testing and Affirmative Action was 180 degrees
> > out of phase?
>
> I still don't see any denial on my part that I compared Affirmative
> Action to Morse code testing. I did and I continue to do so. You
> are still lying.
>
> > Those are all examples where I use words like "comparing", "equate" and
> > "coupling". You'd have to be a fool to believe that my one typo was
> > representative of my view on the matter. Are you a fool?
>
> No, but you obviously are. You cannot prove *anything* about what *I*
> said by quoting *your* own postings. What a dumb $hit doofus. Where
> are *my* postings where *I* denied comparing Affirmative Action and
> Morse code testing????????? I have never denied such. I did it and
> I will continue to compare Affirmative Action and Morse code testing.
>
> You are remembering where I denied *comparting* Affirmative Action and
> Morse code testing. Your attempts to cover up your typo are comical.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

You continued to act as if I had posted a deliberate lie due to my typo.
It has been pointed out to you numerous times. Now I have included my
early postings as proof of my intent. You choose only to play word
games. Have fun.

Dave K8MN

1598. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:44:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD442.1AB373CA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24595

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC9F67.6BF736C3@earthlink.net...
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > >So it is now your intent to tell me my freedom has been limited? Tell
> > > >me, Rick. Have you ever lived anywhere else--I mean outside the U.S.?
> > >
> > > Yup.
> > >
> > > In the Netherlands. Which is a MUCH freer nation than the USA.
> >
> > Really. The Netherlands is awash in social problems and programs. The
> > tax rate is outrageous.
> >
>
> A) You simply asked Rick to provide an example of having lived outside the
> United States in the context of speaking about freedom. He provided you
> with a country that he says has MUCH more freedom than the US. I don't see
> that you dispute his claim to that affect.

If it wasn't clear to you: The Netherlands has less freedom than the
U.S.

Instead, you:
>
> B) Comment about the social problems and tax rate--*ignoring* that you asked
> for an example of having lived outside the United States in the context of
> freedom.

It would be an interesting rant if true. What did you think I was
talking about--lack of variety in cheeses?

> Your comments that the Netherlands is awash in social problems and programs
> and that the tax rate if outrageous, is what? Is it your observation that
> because of those things, the Netherlands is not freer than the United
> States? It's a given that with freedoms comes problems such as you mention.

That is one of my observations. It is nice that you caught on after
all.

> Are they freer than the United States, or not, Dave?

No.

> Kim W5TIT

Dave K8MN

1599. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:46:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD4A7.1524B3EA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24596

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > Use provable facts.
> >
> > No thanks.
>
> OK, then I guess we will just have to acknowledge your
> wild-a$$ unproven speculations.

You have a mouse in your pocket? Are you, in addition to your other manifestations, now Rick as well?

I explained myself and don't owe Rick a detailed explanation.

Dave K8MN

1600. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:51:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD5C5.82118CF8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24597

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3BFC9F67.6BF736C3@earthlink.net...
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > > >Ever lived in a country with a state church? Ever lived in a third
> > > >world country. I could show you limited freedom and various states of
> > > >oppression. You now live in the place which offer more freedom than
> any
> > > >place on the earth.
> > >
> > > Bull.
> > >
> > > Learn something about the world from a political perspective
> > > before you make jingoistic statements like that one.
> >
> > What do you think I did for a living, Rick?
> >
>
> Wasn't it you who just made the observation the other day that just because
> someone is in a certain job is no indicator that they do it well? I'd say
> your tolerance as an representative of our government in foreign lands was
> minimal at best--given what I see of your personality on this newsgroup.

Have you ever not made a comment about something of which you are
totally ignorant, Kim? You have absolutely no knowledge of what I did
over the course of fifteen years abroad over the course of six different
postings. From observation of your personality, I'd guess not.

I
> would guess that you "visited" but never chose to really live the land.
> Wrapping yourself up in the protection of politics is *not* learning a thing
> about the people and conditions of a land.

That makes you 0 for 2 in this posting. Next batter!

Dave K8MN

1601. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 04:53:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD647.D973DD1A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24598

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I don't believe that only a small minority of Christians practice their
> > religion properly? You can bet that I don't accept that.
>
> That's easy to prove, Dave. I'll bet the majority of Christians
> eat pork. I'll bet you eat pork in direct defiance of God's will.

It'll be a hoot watching you try to prove this one, Cecil. Good luck!

Dave K8MN

1602. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 05:00:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD7E0.72CB43B5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24599

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Dave, my spell checker keeps wanting to change your name to "Heel".
> Do you think that would be appropriate?

I don't care.

> > CAM wrote:
> > > By OK, I'm assuming he means that it is none of the government's
> > > business just as Kim's choice of callsign is none of the government's
> > > business.
> >
> > I'm not assuming that at all. We're talking about morality, Cecil, not
> > government intrustion. Try to stay on track.
>
> We cannot discuss morality without discussing government's attempt to
> control morality. I couldn't care less whether you think something is
> immoral or not. I'm forced to care about what the government thinks
> is immoral enough to have a law against it. For instance, oral sex
> between husband and wife is illegal in Louisiana. Is that the kind
> of morality you support? Do you think that should be a federal law?

I don't agree with your initial statement. I don't live in Louisiana.
It seems that if the citizens want to make that the law in their state,
those opposed can a) break the law in a defiant act of civil
disobedience, b) move to another state or c) attempt to change the law
if they can garner enough support.

> > And you, living in...what is it--Small Town, USA? don't believe that
> > those elected official follow the desires of the voters?
>
> Sometimes they do and sometimes they don't. The point is that they
> are NOT *required* to follow the desires of the voters. We do NOT
> live in a democracy. We live in a representative republic. Many
> of the Southern senators went against the desires of the voters
> and voted for the civil rights act.

You mean that they defied some of their voters. I don't have any
information that declares that all living in the South were against the
Civil Rights Act. Your fellow Texan and our President wasn't against
it.

> > I'm tired of dancing the Texas Two Step with you.
>

> That's because you shouldn't attempt to lead when you're dancing
> with a 6'3" 205 lb pardner. :-)

At 6' 3 1/2 and 240, I say you don't have a vote girlie man. :)

Dave K8MN

1603. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 05:02:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD860.4AD7B867@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24600

```
Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Larry
> > > Dick Carroll
> > > Richard McCollum
> > > Hans (I am not sure though)
> > > Dave Heil
> > >
>
> Hey, I made the list!!! Makes my day.

Ditto.

Dave K8MN
```

1604. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 05:06:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123000611.24612.00000797@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 24601

In article <CA2FD982177B45E6.9FB5FD7F5F805E9A.D3F919013E2C67C3@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 21 Nov 2001 14:16:58 -0800, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>> Jim, have you listened on 75m recently--or on a 2m repeater in
>>> the average city?
>>
>>I listen to 75 meters occasionally. I use 2 meters here in the
>>Philadelphia area. There are a few troublemakers on both bands, which
>>is one of the reasons I operate almost all CW. For some reason,
>>"filth, bigotry, racism, hate speech, and deliberate jamming
>>activities" are practically unknown on CW.
>
> True--but if that isn't the mode you prefer (it isn't in my
>case except for some dx because of my hearing), then you're stuck with
>either a "keyboard" oriented mode, sstv, or voice.

Yup. My point is that the troublemakers seem to use voice much more than any
other mode. The problems of 3950 and some repeaters are unknown on CW.
>
> I can use a keyboard on the Internet FAR more effectively (and
>more quickly--I have a T1 connection) than on the air so that mode
>doesn't have a lot to attract me.

If all someone wants to do is communicate, and doesn't care whether it is by
radio or not, there are lots of options. I can email a friend in Australia far
easier than I can work him on any ham band, using any mode.

>SSTV is one of the modes I use most,
>but it's limited in scope.

I remember looking at SSTV pictures 25+ years ago using a converted Dumont
'scope. Neat but too few stations on the air, and the resolution and gray scale
were kinda limited. Much better today but still not that popular.

>Voice, otoh, allows conversation on a
>variety of subjects, the opportunity to work in various modes (I
>prefer qrp ssb personally), and the chance to talk to people
>worldwide.

Same as CW.

> Unfortunately, there _are_ a number of "losers" on the hf
>voice segments that reduce the pleasure the mode offers.

The operative question is, what can be done about them?
>
>>I don't hear any such thing COMMONLY on 2 meters in this area. Your
>>mileage may vary.
>
> Where I live I don't either (relatively small community). But
>I've visited a number of metro areas where I very quickly learned that
>if I didn't want to listen to "cb" at its worst, I had to switch to
>70cm instead of 2m on the mobile.

Does that mean 2 meters is that bad in an average American city?
>
>>We have had a few "bananas" here on 2 meters, but only a few. The 2
>>meter amateur community here is mostly made up of folks who don't
>>tolerate such behavior. Any "filth, bigotry, racism, hate speech, and
>>deliberate jamming activities" and the control op shuts down the
>>repeater. If that's not effective, the offender soon finds that nobody
>>answers his/her calls.
>
> Sounds good--unfortunately that isn't the norm in the US.

How do you know? Have you visited that many metro areas?
>
>>> If you, Larry, and others want to clean up ham radio, the
>>> place to start is with the Liberty Net and other racist groups, not
>>> with the mildly risque call Kim selected.
>>
>>That's NOT the issue, Rick.
>>
>>The question is whether calls like Kim's are appropriate for ham
>>radio, and whether they are in the best interest of the ARS. I say
>>they are not, and so does Riley.
>
> No he doesn't.

Yes, he does. That's the meaning of "one step closer to extinction".

>If he did, it would be an FCC regulation.

Nope. Riley doesn't make the rules. Sure, he might have some influence, but he doesn't have the power to simply make up rules prohibiting things that are not in the best interest of the ARS.

>He
>says in his OPINION it could contribute to negative effects on the
>ARS.

Look up the exact quote. He's pretty clear. And I agree with him.

> Sorry, Jim. But Hollingsworth's opinions on topics other than FCC
>regulations are no more valid than anyone elses

I disagree. He's an active ham with access to lots of information about the ARS and the forces affecting it. Doesn't mean he is always "right". But the idea

that everyone's opinions are equally valid regardless of other factors is simply not true.

> Personally, I don't
>see her call as offensive or as contributing to any problems in ham
>radio-

Personally, I do. Doesn't mean Kim is a bad person.

>-if anything I see the current discussion as being FAR more
>negative from the perspective of potential new hams than her call
>could ever be.

You are saying that talking about the effects of a thing is worse than the thing itself. Sounds like you want me to shut up about this whole subject. Interesting.
>
>>The "average parents" I know would say that such callsigns are not a
>>good advertisement for ham radio.
>
> Call signs aren't an advertisement in the first place.

Yes, they are. Particularly vanity calls, which are specifically chosen for various reasons.

> They
>are station identifications in fact, and personal identifications in
>reality.

So why not W5KIM or W5MKW?

> Kim's call is neither good nor bad for ham radio--it simply
>identifies her as a licensed amateur.

If that were true, any similar call would do the same job.
>
>>btw, at what age do you think a child is old enough to become a ham? I
>>got my license at age 13, and that was nowhere near a record back
>>then. Do you think there should be an age limit for a license?
>
> Nope.

I agree.

>If a child is old enough to UNDERSTAND ham regulations
>and electronics theory, s/he is old enough to obtain a license.

The tests do not determine whether a person understands those subjects. All a person has to do is correctly answer enough questions to pass the 35 question Tech written test. That has been done by four year old children. And at least one eight year old has earned an Extra license - under the OLD rules that required 20 wpm code and five separate written tests.

>What I
>think is "too young" is the child who is pushed through the licensing
>process by a parent who feels that he or she will profit from the
>hobby so he or she must become a ham.

Agreed. Nobody should be pushed into it. But many young children are interested
on their own.

In my case, as soon as I knew what ham radio was, I wanted to be part of it.
That was about age 9 or 10.
>
> But on the other hand, anyone who is old enough to understand
>both the principles of radio communications and the underlying
>concepts of the FCC regs (and if they DON'T understand those subjects,
>they SHOULDN'T have a license--child or adult) is also old enough to
>deal with the world as it really is instead of as we want it to be.
>A
>child that can understand radio propagation is plenty old enough to
>understand the mild humor present in Kim's call sign.
>
This is erroneous in many different ways, but I will mention only a few:

- the tests do not test for understanding, just basic knowledge
- being able to understand radio principles and regs is no guarantee of
readiness for a completely "adult" environment
- the amateur bands are not the exclusive property of licensed amateurs only.
Others have every right to listen in, because the radio spectrum is public
property.

>>> Then ask them if it would
>>> trouble them to know that a group of hams meat on 75m on Saturday
>>> nights to discuss issues of interest to them as white power advocates.
>>
>>Nice try at diversion, but BOTH things are bad advertisements for ham
>>radio. Of course the second (Liberty Net) is far worse than the first
>>(Kim's call).
>
> Yet no one has bothered to start a "life long" thread about
>THAT problem here as Larry has stated the thread about Kim's sign to
>be!

Incorrect. The Liberty Net has been the subject of many threads here and
elsewhere. It has also been the subject of FCC enforcement action.

> Why not?

See above.
>
>>> Perhaps elderly bigots like Larry who grew up in environments where
>>> racism was acceptable but sex wasn't would say the call sign was a
>>> problem
>>
>>Interesting that you describe Larry that way.

>
> Based on his posts, it's the impression I have of him. If it's
>wrong, I'm more than willing to apologize for it--but not unless I see
>some evidence that it IS wrong.

How old is elderly?

>>I'm a "modern parent", and I disagree with that statement. The call is
>>a problem and the bigotry and hate are problems. Of course the bigotry
>>and hate are far worse problems, but that's obvious.
>
> Ok--that's one parent who sees a problem with the call sign.
>I'm, likewise, a parent and I don't see one. Any other parents in the
>group willing to contribute their feelings as well

You might look at the list of those described elsewhere as "ignorant bigots"...

>(not that it makes
>any difference--the call IS legal and it IS Kim's call, so it's not a
>question of any of us deciding if it should be used or not).

All I'm doing is expressing an opinion on the subject. Sounds like you think
that anything legal is automatically acceptable, and those who disagree have no
right to a different opinion. Correct me if I'm mistaken.
>
>>> We don't live in the 1940s anymore.
>>
>>So? Must we accept any and all callsigns as "modern"?
>
> No--but we DO have to accept the fact that social standards
>change.

They do not always change for the better. I do not "have to accept" social
standards that I see as being detrimental to society. No one in a free society
does.

>It's perfectly "ok" to use the word "Tit" on prime time
>network tv--which most kids are exposed to daily.

It is? Not on any network I've seen, unless the word refers to a small bird.

>If it's ok in THAT
>part of the radio spectrum, why not in ours as well?

It's not OK, from what I know of broadcast TV. I've never heard that word used
there
>
>>Nope. That word is NOT common on broadcast TV at all. And people ARE
>>offended.
>
> Since I don't watch network tv (Enterprise excepted, I'm a
>trekie at heart) I can't speak from experience. But I _did_ take the
>time to ask several friends who ARE network watchers--and ALL stated

>they heard the word with regularity on prime time tv. I can only go by
>the word of others there.

I think they are either mistaken or pulling your leg. Cite some actual uses of the word on broadcast network TV (not cable).

And there is a BIG difference between broadcasting and ham radio. The standards are very different.

Broadcasting is done according to preannounced schedules. The content of programs is published widely, so viewing/listening decisions made ahead of time. Objectionable shows can be avoided without having to watch them or listen to them.

But ham stations do not follow a program schedule, and do not announce the content of their transmissions ahead of time. So it incumbent upon them to avoid objectionable content as much as possible.

> As far as offense goes--I honestly don't understand what is
>offensive about it. Either it's a simple call sign (in which case it
>CAN'T be offensive) or it's a reference to a part of the normal human
>body. Does it offend you if the word "leg" or "arm" is used around
>children? If not, why should "Tit" (or any popular term, for that
>matter) offend you?

It's inappropriate in the amateur radio setting.
>
> I get very tired of people who claim that sex and the human
>body are "evil" or "sinful" or that frank discussion of these topics
>needs to be hidden from children. All that implies is that sex is
>evil. What a load of garbage. Sex is--and should be--an expression of
>caring, if not of love, and is as natural a part of life as breathing
>or eating. I would no more want to hide that from children than I
>would want to hide the existence of oceans or snow! Yet, if sex and
>the body are normal and healthy, what on earth justification exists
>for being offended by Kim's call sign?

I have not said they are "evil" or "sinful". Just inappropriate. Is nudity appropriate in all situations?
>
>>They don't seem to offend the folks on the Liberty net.
>
> No--minorities offend them. On the other hand, they don't
>share the same values most of us hold.
>
>>But it sounds as if societal acceptance, or "community standards", is
>>your measure of what should be on the air.
>
> Nope--that's the standard set by the people who oppose Kim's
>call sign.

Then what IS the criteria?

> I don't believe limits SHOULD exist on the content of
>communications (limits on commercial use of amateur bands or the use
>of ham radio to solicit interactions with children excluded,
>obviously).

Why "obviously"? Why should those subjects be banned but not others?

> If a person communicates in a way that offends others he
>or she should be subject to peer pressure (in the form of not
>communicating with him or her, not by attacking him or her publicly)
>but that's the limit.

That means you want to censor me. You're saying I should simply not comment on an inappropriate callsign. Nor should anyone comment negatively on the Liberty Net. After all, a negative comment could be perceived as "attacking".

For the record, please show where I have "attacked" Kim for her choice of callsign. My posts are all there in google.

>If there is any principle I support completely
>it's that of freedom of speech.

What about responsibility?

>It isn't the role of the FCC to insure
>that the airways are "safe" for children--it's up to their parents to
>insure that they understand what they're being exposed to.

Just the opposite. The radio spectrum is public property. The ham bands exist for the use of all who can pass the tests, not just "adults".
>
>>Doesn't work that way, Rick.
>
> Neither does flaming her for exercising her freedom of choice
>in this newsgroup!

Have I done that? Please produce the posts where I have done so.

>>Sure there's harm in it. Not much, but some. You don't see it, and she
>>doesn't see it, but other hams do. Just a matter of opinion. Is it
>>wrong for me to have such electro-politically incorrect opinions? I've
>>got lots of them.
>
> What's wrong with it--OR with your non-pc opinions? Just as
>she has a right to choose her sign, you have a right to be non-pc.
>
The term is "electro-politically correct".

All rights carry responsibilities. The freedom to choose one's call carries with it the responibility to do so wisely.

>>> Would you give up YOUR call if people here demanded you do so?
>>
>>If they could show how my call could give people a bad impression of
>>ham radio, I would think about it. Might even do it if "community

>>standards" showed it was not a good choice for the image of the ARS.
>
> Why?

Because I don't want my callsign to have a negative effect on the ARS. But
nobody finds N2EY to be objectionable. It has no subtext.
>
> Simply because other people don't care for it is no legitimate
>reason for changing a call you like. It isn't their business, it's
>yours.

Sorry, that's not true. The ARS is a community. Community standards matter.

> And if a call can contribute to the "collapse" of the ARS, then
>it has so many problems that it DESERVES to collapse.
>
Just the opposite.

> I was kidding about getting W8GOD (which, btw, IS
>available)--but the more I follow this thread, the more I'm becoming
>convinced that a controversial call would be a good choice--it might
>contrast with the overly conservative nature of the ARS and encourage
>potential hams who share my belief in free speech to join our hobby.
>I'm just not sure if I should apply for W8GOD, W8LSD, or W8POT--all of
>which would undoubtedly create more controversy then Kim's call. Any
>suggestions?

I don't find the ARS to be conservative at all.
>
>>But my call was not chosen for its attention-getting and giggle-factor
>>components. It's not even a real vanity call - it was sequentially
>>issued in 1977.
>
> As is mine (my third call--issued in 1985 as I recalll--the
>first two being N7AVF and KA6POP).

WN3IYC in 1967, WA3IYC in 1968. I've been around ham radio a long time. But I'm
not "elderly".

>Of course, the phonetics you use
>for it (and if you use standard phonetics you are--as you well
>know--in the minority) can make a difference.

I use the standard "November Two Echo Yankee" when the situation arises. What
survey supports your claim that I'm in the minority?

> For instance, mine can
>be presented as:
>
> Kilo Echo Eight Hotel Hotel
>
> Kindly Eat Eight Hairy Hamburgers
>

> King Edward Eight Harried Housewives
>
> etc.
>
> Some of those are very reasonable, some "silly," but
>innocuous, and some a bit more "risque" than Kim's sign ever thought
>of being.

Why not just use the first one? It's clear, concise, and does the job.
>
>>By the way, both W5KIM and W5MKW (Kim's initials) are unassigned. But
>>Kim doesn't want a call like that. Her choice, of course. I don't
>>think Kim is an evil person just because she chose that callsign. But
>>I don't think it's harmless, either.
>
> W8RAA is unassigned as well--yet despite the fact that it
>includes my initials (RAA), I don't particularly want the call. In my
>case--as in Kim's--it's a matter of personal preference.

No giggle factor.
>
> And while you don't see it as harmless, you DO have to agree
>that is a personal opinion, something not necessarily binding on Kim
>or anyone else.

Never said it was anything other than an opinion. Is it wrong to have and
express an opinion on this subject?
>
>>> Sounds to me as though the people here feel the call sign is a
>>> lot more harmful than the FCC does.
>>
>>Is that wrong? Must our opinions agree with those of the govt.? Do you
>>think that if something is legal, it is therefore OK to do, no matter
>>what?
>
> Nope. But I DO think that if something is legal, and someone
>chooses to do it, it's totally inappropriate to slam them in public
>for their choice or to create a never-ending thread designed to make
>them change their behavior (or, in this case, their call sign), don't
>you?

Please show where I have "slammed" anyone in public. And Kim is trying to keep
this thread going till March - I'm just helping out.

>>Uh-huh. This is the same FCC that, until recently, required a 20 wpm
>>code test for all amateur privileges unless a relevant permanent
>>medical disability could be documented. Were they right or wrong in
>>requiring that test until April 14, 2000?
>
> I have no problem with it--I passed my 20WPM in March of 2000,
>despite having an 85% hearing loss.

Ya missed the point. The rules changed because people expressed opinions that the status quo needed to change. FCC actually took the minority opinion and made it the rules.
>
> On the other hand, I ALSO don't have any problem with the
>elimination of that requirement. The FCC invited comments on the
>issues and because it really didn't make that much difference to me, I
>chose not to submit one. As a result, I tacitly accepted the ruling
>they made.

Those who had a strong opinion on the subject expressed it.
>
>>> How about a third choice: Learn to tolerate that which offends
>>> you personally but doesn't hurt others and concentrate on stopping
>>> behaviors that do?
>>
>>You avoided the queston, but I'll answer it. The greater evil is
>>having a list of forbidden callsigns enforced by the FCC.
>
> No, the greatest evil is censorship.

Then why do you want to censor me?

>Whether that censorship
>comes from FCC actions or from the pressure of a minority of licensed
>amateurs is irrelevant.
>
The code test changed because of the pressure of a minority of those who expressed an opinion to the FCC.

>>The folks who run the "Liberty net" might say that you and I should
>>learn to tolerate THEIR behavior because it doesn't hurt anyone.
>>They'd cite "free speech" and some such.
>
> I DO tolerate their behavior.
>
> In fact, if the jammers would stop interrupting the band, I'd
>be perfectly willing to DEBATE their views on the air. They might not
>like my views (I happen to be adamantly opposed to ANY form of
>prejudice or discrimination), but if their arguments were stronger
>than my own they would be completely free to present them and win the
>debate.

That presumes their purpose is debate. I don't think it is.
>
> Free speech is an absolute. I don't have to like or respect
>what a person is saying to support his or her right to say it. All I
>have to do is look to see if that speech is designed to cause direct
>harm to others (i.e., a speech calling for the killing of Blacks,
>etc.), and if not I support their right to be heard.

But YOU are the judge of whether speech is designed to cause harm to others. Do you extend that same freedom to judge to others?

>
>>> Call signs like Kim's hurt no one.
>>
>>They hurt the image of the ARS. Which means they hurt hams who want
>>the best for the ARS' future.
>
> Be realistic.

I am. I'm an engineer - we have to be realistic or really bad things happen.

> This IS the 21st Century.

Doesn't mean I have to accept stuff just because it's "new".

> Unless you want the
>ARS to appear to be a dinosaur in our society you have to come into
>the modern era--and in the modern era a call sign like Kim's is NOT
>something that would damage the image of anything.

You are demanding that YOUR standards of what is appropriate be accepted by
all. Doesn't work on me.
>
>>> If the FCC enacts a list of
>>> forbidden call signs all they are doing is capitulating to the
>>> pressure of a religion that teaches it's followers that the human body
>>> is evil and sinful and cannot be mentioned in public.
>>
>>Nope. Religion has nothing to do with it. And please note that I have
>>NOT called for the FCC to ban calls like Kim's.
>
> Really?

Yes, really.
>
> In that case, provide ANY rational basis for prohibition of
>any form of sexual content at all. It doesn't defame, slander, or
>otherwise harm non-consenting individuals. It doesn't call for
>violence or prejudice against any group. It simply refers to natural
>human body parts or functions.

All I've said is that it's inappropriate in the amateur radio setting.

Here's an analogy: Is it appropriate for me to comment on the "natural human
body parts or functions" of my coworkers? If not, why not?

>ONLY religious prejudice makes frank
>sexual terms and discussion into anything "offensive" and THAT should
>be restricted to religion, not to government policy.
>
Not true at all. While some religions are "hung up" on the whole subject, it is
really a matter of societal standards of behavior. In my case. religion has
nothing to do with my opinion that some callsigns are inappropriate.

>>Consider this: When Mayor Giuliani took office in NYC several years
>>back, one of the things he did was aggressively pursue "quality of
>>life" or "community standards" issues. Like not tolerating graffiti,
>>trash, aggressive panhandling, etc. He also went after bigger crime,
>>but the "little things" got resources too. Some said he should
>>concentrate only on the big stuff like murders and not bother the
>>three card monte operators and gypsy cab drivers, etc.
>
> Let's look at each of those:
>
> 1. Graffiti: Legitimate opposition; graffiti defaces private
>property, thus harming the person or property of a nonconsenting
>individual.

Some people said it was "street art" and was protected speech.
>
> 2. Trash. Creates a health hazard for non-consenting
>individuals. Of course, trash removal is a function of government, not
>individual action.

The problem was that some people put their trash out too early, or in
unapproved places.
>
> 3. Aggressive panhandling. Depends on your definition of
>aggressive. If that refers to those who demand you give them money and
>are threatening in nature, I agree--it violates the rights of a person
>to be free of intimidation.

Who defines intimidation?

>IF you mean ANY panhandling, it's little
>more than an attempt to "legislate" homelessness out of the community.
>Example: In San Francisco there's an organization called "Food Not
>Bombs" who collect food donations and use church kitchens to cook hot
>meals to serve the homeless and hungry. The city has decided to
>prosecute those individuals for not having a restaurant health permit
>for their kitchens (despite the fact that the churches are NOT
>required to have one) and regularly arrests the volunteers who
>dispense the food to the hungry. THAT is far more "evil" than any form
>of panhandling could ever be--and it's proof that simply because a
>governmental agency finds something wrong doesn't make it a fact.

More evil than ANY form of panhandling? I disagree.
>
> 4. Gypsy cab drivers, three card monte, etc. are ALL either
>forms of fraud (3 card monte) or attempts to avoid legitimate
>licensure requirements (as is freebanding). Those are legitimate
>concerns.

Everyone knows the 3 card monte is a fixed game and that the gypsy cabs are
unlicensed. Who are they harming?
>
>>But a funny thing happened: the rate of ALL crime began to drop in the

>>city, and New Yorkers began to feel better about their town.
>
> Really?
>
Really.

> That's great for New York--but it has nothing to do with Kim's
>call sign.

>>There's a lesson in that for ham radio.
>
> Sure--prosecute those who violate the rules and concentrate on
>cleaning up the airways. But that has nothing to do with her call and
>everything to do with the jamming, illegal operations, and other legal
>violations occurring daily on the air.

You missed the point. By concentrating on the little things as well as the big ones, life in NYC changed dramatically for the better. That's the lesson.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1605. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 05:09:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD9EA.713EF932@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24602

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 05:52:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >>
> >> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 20:25:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Yeah, it is better but you still don't quite have it down. Try leaving
> >> >out the word "arbitrarily" since I didn't come to my conclusion
> >> >arbitrarily. Then try leaving out everything after "lack of class"
> >> >since I didn't make that statement--you did. Now I think you have my
> >> >view.
> >>
> >> Ok--since you state your decision wasn't arbitrary, I'm sure
> >> you won't have any problem providing a scientifically FACTUAL basis
> >> for your statement. Don't use "popular moral values" that has no
> >> bearing and IS arbitrary. Use provable facts.
> >
> >No thanks.
>
> In other words, your statement WAS arbitrary. That's what I
> assumed in the first place. Thanks for confirming it.

I didn't confirm it and I didn't use other words. What I did was
decline to provide you a detailed explanation of how I arrived at my
decision. Did I miss the part where such is mandatory?

Dave K8MN

1606. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 05:12:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDDAD0.4E91E2AE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24603

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 05:39:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> > As to your last sentence: You've gotta find a new
> >group of friends.
>
> Why--because his current group are too open minded for you or
> because they violate your precious little narrow-minded values and you
> can't accept anyone else having a different set of moral values that
> are just as valid as your own?

Being open-minded and believing that there is no right and wrong are two different issues. My views aren't little though they are precious. To my knowledge you aren't in charge of deciding that they are narrow-minded. They are MY views however.

Dave K8MN

1607. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 05:14:48 UTC
From: sky444nospam@mint.net
Message-ID: <3bfddb55.343790303@news.mint.net>
Source record: 24604
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

what is a "shill bid" ??

On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:03:19 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>According to the Economist for Nov 10-16 two profs have been running a
>three-year study of E-Bay auctions (via a bot) with the following results:
>
>1. Items sold on a weekend sell for about 2% more.
>
>2. Pictures were worth 5.7% in 1999. This year, it is11.3%
>
>3. Having a decent rep is worth 6.8% and growing as experience is gained.
>Hey, guys win Nobel Prizes for discovering that you can get better prices
>from people who trust you and don't build in a margin for getting the green
>weenie.
>
>4. They are testing software to detect shill bids. You probably will never
>hear about it on E-Bay but what better place to sell it when the time comes,
>with a picture on a weekend of course. Should be fun.
>
>Dick
>
>

1608. Re: FCC hires private investigators - this is good!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 05:20:00 UTC
From: KE4JCD - Bob <ke4jcd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <40lL7.125866$zK1.33100962@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>
Source record: 24605
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I have to say, I was once in CB radio for many years, and the stories about what the FCC is doing are getting better all the time. If you like to know what the FCC is doing, just witch when they show up at your door because your running an AMP, or out of band radio, then you'll find out for sure.. :)

I still hear that the FCC rides in white van's too, but the truth is that the FCC drives unmarked cars with a small device to track you down. You'll never know till they knock on your door... We call it fox hunting, just ask a HAM. I have tracked down many CBers who have been, as you all call it, bleeding on the 10 meter ham bands...

No private investigators needed... :)

Bob - KE4JCD
http://www.ke4jcd.org

"Leland C. Scott" <abuse@cotse.net> wrote in message
news:ykeK7.19$q46.1396@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net...

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn218rc.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> Either your acquaintance is falsehooding you or you are doing it to us.
>
> Which is it?

Neither one Phil. Seems like there is a CBer, who goes by the Handle of "Twistedhed", on the "rec.radio.cb" news group. He made some comments about freebanding etc., and I suggested that he contact you since you had in fact worked for the FCC doing some enforcement activity, and could give him the straight deal right from somebody who has done it. Needless to say he wiggled every which way he could to avoid the issue that he does not have to courage to contact you to ask some questions. In fact he's mad as heck about be branded a chicken on the group for not contacting you. So he spends hours forging messages from me (there are several on this group alone right now), or several others, as a means to get even, and hopefully to discredit the "framed" individual with obvious crazy comments in the messages. However it seems like he can't even get his facts straight for something as simple as the location of the Detroit FCC field office.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

--
"I care about truth not for truth's sake
but for my own."

Samuel Butler

1609. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:03:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfde74c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24606

Ah, true, and thanks for the correction! Take McCollum off, Hans off. I
was thinking it was people who generally disagree with my callsign.

Kim W5TIT

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:3BFD41A1.1040601@att.net...
> >>>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> >>>>Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> >>>Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
>
> >>>Larry
> >>>Dick Carroll
> >>>Richard McCollum
> >>>Hans (I am not sure though)
> >>>Dave Heil
>
> >>>Who else? I got to five.
>
> >>If I had said five, someone would have come up with one more. Say
> >>Kim, are you going to have your picture on your QSL card?
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Well, that's OK if there's five, or however many. I just can't think
of
> > anyone else...OH YEAH, N2EY, that thinks my callsign is detrimental to
the
> > ARS. Jim makes six.
>
> No Kim...
>
> The list is ignorant bigoted hams...
>
> NE2Y doesn't belong there.
>
> I think Hans clearly doesn't belong there either.
>
> Rich...
>

1610. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:06:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfde819_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24609

Sorry, Jim! No, your opinion that a callsign is inappropriate does *not*
make you ignorant or bigoted. It was my mistake for not realizing the
"criteria."

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011122160400.23334.00000784@nso-da.aol.com...
> In article <3bfd2cce_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
> >> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >> >
> >> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> >> >
> >> > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
> >> >
> >> > Larry
> >> > Dick Carroll
> >> > Richard McCollum
> >> > Hans (I am not sure though)
> >> > Dave Heil
> >> >
> >> > Who else? I got to five.
> >>
> >> If I had said five, someone would have come up with one more. Say
> >> Kim, are you going to have your picture on your QSL card?
> >> --
> >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >Well, that's OK if there's five, or however many. I just can't think of
> >anyone else...OH YEAH, N2EY, that thinks my callsign is detrimental to
the
> >ARS. Jim makes six.
>
> Hmm - my opinion that a callsign is inappropriate makes me an "ignorant
bigoted
> ham"? Sounds pretty judgemental.
>
> Guess my electropolitical incorrectness rubs some folks the wrong way. Too
bad.
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

1611. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:09:23 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0111222209.4f464e5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24607
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

vhfradiobuff@aol.comspamsux (VHFRadioBuff) wrote:
>I have little faith in the FCC. I contacted them with an
intereference
>complaint. My grandparents are getting horrible interference from
their
>next door neighbor, a ham.

What's his callsign? Have they (or you) tried explaining the problem
to him? What's his response?

>It comes through everything - the phone, the stereo, the TV...

What does it sound like? Is it AM or is it SSB?

>they said they would only investigate if I had evidence of illegal
>operation.

Who did you contact at the FCC?

-Aaron-

1612. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:09:51 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@home.com>
Message-ID: <PKIL7.61961$XJ4.35919151@news1.sttln1.wa.home.com>
Source record: 24608
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Ex army?
--
CW
KC7NOD
Web Page http://www.kc7nod.20m.com

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:H7iL7.203791$W8.7635260@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> don't build in a margin for getting the green
> weenie.
>
>>
>

1613. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:12:07 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@home.com>
Message-ID: <XMIL7.61972$XJ4.35922459@news1.sttln1.wa.home.com>
Source record: 24610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Bidding on your own item (or having someone else do it) to drive up the
price.
"Skyhawk" <sky444nospam@mint.net> wrote in message
news:3bfddb55.343790303@news.mint.net...
> what is a "shill bid" ??
>
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:03:19 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >According to the Economist for Nov 10-16 two profs have been running a
> >three-year study of E-Bay auctions (via a bot) with the following
results:
> >
> >1. Items sold on a weekend sell for about 2% more.
> >
> >2. Pictures were worth 5.7% in 1999. This year, it is11.3%
> >
> >3. Having a decent rep is worth 6.8% and growing as experience is
gained.
> >Hey, guys win Nobel Prizes for discovering that you can get better prices
> >from people who trust you and don't build in a margin for getting the
green
> >weenie.
> >
> >4. They are testing software to detect shill bids. You probably will
never
> >hear about it on E-Bay but what better place to sell it when the time
comes,
> >with a picture on a weekend of course. Should be fun.
> >
> >Dick
> >
> >
>

1614. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:12:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfde94f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24611

Sigh It was a matter of my not paying attention to the criteria, Dick. I apologize to you. You nor Jim fit the bill for being ignorant or bigoted.

Kim W5TIT

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:bdgL7.201088$W8.7624253@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011122160400.23334.00000784@nso-da.aol.com...
> > In article <3bfd2cce_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > >news:3BFD1899.977E651F@IEEE.org...
> > >> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > >> > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams????????????
> > >> >
> > >> > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's
see:
> > >> >
> > >> > Larry
> > >> > Dick Carroll
> > >> > Richard McCollum
> > >> > Hans (I am not sure though)
> > >> > Dave Heil
> > >> >
> > >> > Who else? I got to five.
> > >>
> > >> If I had said five, someone would have come up with one more. Say
> > >> Kim, are you going to have your picture on your QSL card?
> > >> --
> > >> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> > >
> > >Well, that's OK if there's five, or however many. I just can't think
of
> > >anyone else...OH YEAH, N2EY, that thinks my callsign is detrimental to
> the
> > >ARS. Jim makes six.
> >
> > Hmm - my opinion that a callsign is inappropriate makes me an "ignorant
> bigoted

> > ham"? Sounds pretty judgemental.
> >
> > Guess my electropolitical incorrectness rubs some folks the wrong way. Too
> bad.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
>
> When you of all people make a bigot list, there is some real question about
> both the definition and definer.
>
> One of the great stories of WW2 had to do with rubber stamps. In the early
> days, people being sent to Gibraltar had their orders and files stamped
> TOGIB. Later when there was no good reason to send people south but
> Normandy was close, the stamps were re-done which led to people asking each
> other if they were cleared for the info by asking, "Are you a BIGOT?"
>
> If I am not nice to Techs nipping at my heels and killfile people who cannot
> connect two coherent sentences so I am a bigot. Whatever cools your
> tootsies.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
>

1615. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:24:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfdec29_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24612

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tkeqc$1uo$0@208.206.142.82...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:9tic8t$mcm$1@208.206.142.89...
> > >
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3BFC19EC.645BCA61@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You're such a pussy.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > It would be unkind of me to make any statements regarding Kim's
lack
> > of
> > > > > class or tackiness.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > Dave, you are unkind...very, very unkind.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > But accurate.
> > >
> > This, from a man who reads a book about a religion that takes years and
> > lifetimes to understand, and thinks he knows all about it.
>
>
> Don't have a need to "know all about it", just enough.

Oh, don't worry Dick. I have no intention of confusing you with facts.

Kim W5TIT
```

1616. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:29:29 UTC
From: Bob - KE4JCD <ke4jcd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <d1mL7.126096$zK1.33205545@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>
Source record: 24613

I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers with their nice habbits will come in droves. But then again, from what I been hearing on my HF Radio, it's starting to sound more and more like it each day.....

Robert Hartung
http://www.ke4jcd.org

1617. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:41:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tkr32$8nb$0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 24614

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > This, from a man who reads a book about a religion that takes years and
> > > lifetimes to understand, and thinks he knows all about it.
> >
> > Don't have a need to "know all about it", just enough.
>
> A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.

That's a good reason for acquiring more than a little.
But ass-u-me, as Kim does, that far too little is more than enough is
the mark of a fool.

1618. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:44:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tkr8i$8nb$1@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 24615

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > All that drivalous pap is nothing more than verbal engineeering.
> > >
> > > You possess extra class license privileges, Dick. As such, you had
> > > no choice except to meet the governmental requirements for an extra
> > > class licensee. Why is that so hard to comprehend?
> >
> > I CHOSE to take those tests. No one forced me to drive the 260 one way
> > miles to the FCC district office to do that.
> > What part of that is so difficult for you to comprehend.
>
> If you had chosen not to take the tests then you wouldn't be licensed.
> Therefore you were forced to take the tests in order to obtain a
> ham radio license. Cheating is the only other way to get one.
> You were forced to take those tests because you had no other
> choice except to cheat on your way to obtaining a ham license.

I will not get into another idiotic round of this with you Sir
Senseless, so you can carry on as you please. The fact remains I had
total freedom of choice. Under such circumstances only a total fool
would continue to insist that I or anyone else was forced.

1619. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 06:46:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tkrc4$8nb$2@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 24616

Dave Heil wrote:
>
>
> You continued to act as if I had posted a deliberate lie due to my typo.
> It has been pointed out to you numerous times. Now I have included my
> early postings as proof of my intent. You choose only to play word
> games. Have fun.

Careful, Dave, you're playing right into his dictionary again. The one
that says if it is a mistake it's a lie even if you don't know it nor
intend it.

1620. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 07:16:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDF792.2A78325@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24617

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 06:46:57 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> To respect, honor, and care for. Our vows were NOT taken in a
> >> Christian ceremony and did NOT include "cleave only unto . . ." or
> >> "obey."
> > >
> > >It's a lot easier if you can make up your own rules.
>
> I didn't have to. Since we weren't married in a Christian
> ceremony, there was no reason to use the Christian form of a wedding
> ceremony.
>
> Incidently, many Christian churches DO permit the people who
> are marrying to create their own ceremonies--ask any Episcopal
> minister.

I asked the one who sat at my Thanksgiving dinner table. He says you're incorrect as regards the Episcopal Church. The Church also has the say on what music is permissable or not.

> "Cleave only unto . . ." and "obey" are simply regulations
> placed by religion, and effectively treat the couple as objects to be
> possessed and controlled. I happen to view my wife as a person, not a
> thing, and see no reason why she should be subject to vows which
> restrict her freedom or require her obedience.

Yeah, I have the idea what your views are. I don't agree with 'em.

> >I submit that going along with such would make you a man who lets
> >somebody else do his job as a good husband.
>
> You mean someone else is supporting my wife's and son's needs
> economically, intellectually, and emotionally? Someone is taking care
> of her when she's sick, cheering her up when she's down, helping her
> with her tasks, providing her emotional support and encouragement,
> standing up for her if she's threatened or attacked, helping her with
> her research, and taking her shopping (among other things)?
>
> Who?

Let's see...Her dad could support her economically or she could do it herself. Her best friend could support her intellectual needs. Her sister could be her emotional support. A guard dog could ward off

attacks and she could either drive or take the bus shopping.

> Or are you referring to sex as the "job of a good husband." If
> so, I have to ask: What on earth makes you think of sex as a "job" in
> the first place?

You used the word. Was is a euphemism?

> >My tongue was firmly planted in cheek.
>
> Actually, your foot was firmly planted in your mouth.

Actually, the meaning is lost since you snipped the portion of your
statment to which I responded.

> >What agreements. You didn't vow to each cleave only unto...
> >She wouldn't be harming your person, only your psyche.
>
> True. But the lack of trust that would be implicit in that
> behavior WOULD clearly indicate that a problem existed that needed to
> be addressed.

To say the very least!

> >> As it happens, I _wouldn't_ be bothered if my wife decided to
> >> have sex with someone w/o informing me ("sleep together" is pretty
> >> inaccurate in this discussion, isn't it?)--on the other hand, it WOULD
> >> disturb me that she didn't feel comfortable telling me about it and
> >> would indicate that we needed to work on our communications.
> >
> >I'd think that'd be a considerable understatement.
>
> Not really. It seems to fit the concept rather accurately,
> actually.

I think you'd have problems whether you were informed beforehand or
found out later.

> >> Sure--but they would be basing their disagreement on religion
> >> (you DID say theologians, right?). So what? If I'm not part of that
> >> religion why should I care at all what the opinions of it's proponents
> >> are with respect to my private behavior?
> >
> >That's right. You've pretty much indicated that you make the rules for
> >yourself. Society and religion be damned.
>
> What does society OR religion have to do with my private
> behavior?

I don't believe that any of us is formed without influence from society
or religion. I don't believe that any individual brought up in a vacuum
would have a clue about right or wrong. I don't know that any such
individual exists.

>It would be idiotic for me to adhere to the values of a
> religion I didn't believe in simply because other people do so in my
> community--if everyone in your neighborhood believed their homes were
> on fire would you start spraying water in your living room even though
> you saw no flames or smoke? As far as "society" goes, try to remember
> that society is simply an accumulation of individuals. Thus there is
> no possible reason to assume that "society" has any more valid basis
> for its rules than any individual who is a part of it.

That's poppycock. All individuals don't possess the same amount of gray
matter and it only stands to reason that a society--your accumulation of
individuals--will have a sum total of experience and intellect greater
than any one individual can ever hope to have.

> So long as my actions don't harm others, it really isn't the
> concern of anyone but myself--just because YOUR religion opposes a
> given behavior doesn't justify banning it--only avoiding it yourself.

But society has always determinded which of your activities harm
others. You don't have the final say.

> >> Personally, I sincerely believe that if we spent less time
> >> telling our kids lies about sex and protecting them from reality, and
> >> more time telling our kids about racism and violence and teaching them
> >> to be "color-blind" we'd have a LOT better world than if we followed
> >> the guidelines of ANY religion's theologians.
> >
> >It would seem that teaching a kid to be color blind would be an attempt
> >to protect him from reality. Color is apparent. I disagree with your
> >last sentence.
>
> Color IS apparent. It is also irrelevant. Teaching a child to
> be color blind, as you know, is simply teaching him or her that the
> color of a person's skin has absolutely no relationship to that
> person's personality, behavior, intelligence, or capabilities. If you
> insist that color should not be ignored then it could be added that
> the color of someone's skin DOES indicate the clothing colors that
> will look best on them and the degree of protection from burning they
> should look for in a sun block. Fair enough?

Then don't use cliches like "color blind" when you mean to say that skin
color is irrelevant. That should also be fair enough.

> >> Ok, name a single denomination that takes a public position
> >> that the actions of non-members of their religion are NOT subject to
> >> their "rules" or censure.
> >
> >The Episcopal Church.
>
> Really?
>
> Are you stating that the official position of the Episcopal
> church is that if you are not a Christian it is perfectly acceptable

> for you to perform acts that would be considered sins if you were a
> Christian?

Perfectly acceptable? I wouldn't include the adjective. Let's just say
"acceptable".

> Are you arguing that the Episcopal church does not attempt
> to convert non-Christians to their beliefs--and that they do not see
> other religious beliefs as being "wrong" or inferior to Christianity?

Convert? Sure the Church attempts to convert others in order to spread
the word of the gospels. Does the Church preach that those with
different religious beliefs are wrong or inferior? No.

> >> Demonstrate that a single Christian denomination believes in
> >> freedom of religion--including freedom to live by the MORAL STANDARDS
> >> of a different religion--is appropriate and teaches its adherents that
> >> Christian morality and belief does NOT apply to non-Christians, and
> >> I'll apologize for my statement.
> >
> >I offer the Episcopal Church. I can speak for no other.
>
> Are you claiming to be an Episcopal?

No, I'm claiming to be an Episcopalian.

> If not, how is it that
> you can speak for the Episcopal church? And if so, and your statement
> above is true, then justify ANY of your comments about the morality of
> my views or Kim's call sign.

I believe that Kim is ignorant of the impropriety of her choice. Now,
am I speaking from my religious or societal perspective?

> Since by your own statement, the
> Episcopal church teaches that Christian morality and belief does NOT
> apply to non-Christians how can you justify trying to apply those
> moral values to me?

Are you asking me to attempt your conversion or are you asking whether I
am speaking from a religious or from a societal perspective?

> Are you lying about the Episcopal church, or are
> you simply a very poor Episcopal

There isn't a person who is an Episcopal. There are Episcopalians.
Why would I lie to you about being an Episcopalian? Am I perfect
Episcopalian or Christian? Not at all.

> who doesn't live by the teachings of
> his own church--but who insists others do so (in other words, are you
> a liar or a hypocrite--your own statements don't leave room for a
> third alternative)?

There are people who are totally ignorant of God's word. I've already
told you that the Church attempts "conversions" if you like that word.
The Church does not require one to be silent when it comes to right and
wrong. Being a Christian does not require one to clam up and not
express one's views. Besides, I'm not a theologian so you'll have to
consult one if you want the real skinny.

> >I find a number of your ideas on morals and religion pretty offensive
> >too, Rick.
>
> On what basis?

Perception after reading and digesting your views.

> You, yourself, state that the valid grounds for finding
> something immoral are religion and society. You then state that your
> religion does NOT believe it has the right to judge the morals of
> non-adherants which only leaves society. After eliminating the moral
> views of society that are based on religion (to stick with your own
> religious principles), there ARE no moral values left that address
> either sex or religion. Thus neither religion nor society are the root
> of your views of my morals. But, since you, yourself, state that it is
> inappropriate for someone to live by their own moral values in
> opposition to those of religion and society, clearly you can't be
> basing your views on your personal morals either.

Who gets to judge which views of society are based in religion, Rick?
Is it you? Do you deny that some of your recent statements regarding
Christianity would be offensive of any Christian? Society could find
fault with your sexual views on public health or nuisance issues.

> Gee, Dave, I guess that means you don't really HAVE any views
> on my moral values or views on religion at all--you just thought you
> did. And, of course, since one of my moral views is that there is
> nothing wrong with a call sign like Kim's, and since you don't have
> any views on my moral values, you obviously don't have any views on
> that topic either.

That's so much babbling, Rick. You just thought you had a point.

> I guess you've just been attacking her (and me) to see
> yourself in print since you don't have any values to base the attacks
> on.
>
> Sounds like a troll to me!

> >I don't believe that only a small minority of Christians practice their
> >religion properly? You can bet that I don't accept that. That's
> >according to you, the final arbiter on Christianity.
>
> Ok--find TEN Christians that practice the religion precisely
> the way it is intended to be practiced--in other words precisely as
> the bible instructs them to practice it and I'll retract that
> statement.

Any what, precisely is supposed to be my motivation for doing so?
You'll want to contact a church group in order to conduct your own
research.

> That, of course, includes ALL the instructions in the Old
> Testament as well as the principles given in the New Testament.
>
> >> Fact: There isn't an elected official in this country that
> >> could win re-election if s/he didn't support the desires of the
> >> Christian Churches in his/her district.
> >
> >Subjective and unproven. I'd bet you could find exceptions to your
> >statement in certain areas of New York City or San Francisco alone.
>
> Let me get this straight. You are claiming I am making an
> unproven statement and basing your statement on the _assumption_ that
> you could find an exception in certain areas?

You made a sweeping and unsubstantiated claim. I did not base my
statement on any assumption. I offered an anecdotal aside.

> Turn that around, Dave. If you want to accuse me of making an
> unproven statement, then prove it's wrong.

Prove a negative? Good luck with that one.

> >> Fact: Local churches in every area, despite a claim that they
> >> support a separation of church and state (probably only to the extent
> >> that they get away without paying taxes like everyone else, but ...),
> >> present political issues to their parishioners (i.e., abortion, gay
> >> rights and gay adoption, bans on prostitution, adult businesses and
> >> other sexually related activities, etc.) as subjects that a "good
> >> Christian" MUST take a stand on. Thus they deliberately attempt to
> >> influence law in those areas--and are usually successful.
> >
> >I think they'd find much agreement on most items from your list from a
> >group of secular citizens with no church ties at all.
>
> Based on what source of morality?
>
> With the exception of the Judeo-Christian religions, there IS
> no basis for opposition to any of those behaviors or lifestyles. Only
> with the entry of religious morality is sex (in any form except rape)
> considered in any way inappropriate. Again you are basing your claim
> that I'm wrong on what you "think" would be the position of others.
> Sorry, Dave, but unless you have research evidence that demonstrates
> non-Christian (and non-religious) members of our society oppose such
> things as limitations on gay rights, consensual sexual behavior
> between adults, etc., you don't have anything but pure guesswork to
> base your claim on--a VERY flimsy grounds for claiming someone else is
> incorrect.

What part of an "I think" statement don't you understand? You don't offer any proof that your statement is correct. You'd have us believe that societies not based in the Judeo-Christian ethic have no sexual taboos.

> >I suppose that is some proof...an instance.
>
> Would you care for a few dozen more? I can easily provide
> them--including court citations.

...but you didn't.

> >Really. The Netherlands is awash in social problems and programs. The
> >tax rate is outrageous.
>
> You didn't state that the US had a better tax rate than other
> nations (it doesn't, try Monaco or Saudi Arabia)--you stated that it
> had more freedom. High taxes have nothing to do with that.

Certainly they do. Would you like to enjoy the freedoms offered by Saudi Arabia? Your sexual ideas would certainly be a hit there.

> As far as social problems go, we have VASTLY more in the US
> than in any Western European nation with the possible exception of the
> relatively recently reunited Germany. Again, that has nothing to do
> with freedom--the subject of your claim.

Social problems indicate turmoil and instability and that has plenty to do with freedom. I disagree with your assessment that we have "VASTLY" or even any more social problems than in any Western European nation.

> >> Learn something about the world from a political perspective
> >> before you make jingoistic statements like that one.
> >
> >What do you think I did for a living, Rick?
>
> I wouldn't have the vaguest idea--but based on your statements
> about other nations you did NOT teach political science.

I retired from the Foreign Service a year ago.

A gifted journalist once told me that you don't go to journalism classes to learn journalism. You go to journalism classes to learn to teach journalism.

> >Interesting that you mention Finland. I spent two years in Finland
> >during one assignment and three years there in the mid-90s. My wife is
> >a Finn. Finns have to import all oil and gas. They pay 40% of their
> >income in taxes. Overtime work is taxed at 50%. Gasoline sells for
> >about $5 per gallon. Finland has some of the strictest alcohol and drug
> >laws in the world. It is pretty much a homogenous society so people of
> >color are not normally treated with great kindness. The cheapest car
> >one can buy--a Russian Lada--sells for about $20,000 and my Dodge Neon
> >is a $44,000 car in Finland. Prostitution is banned and that is

> >strictly enforced (especially in light of the recent waves of Russian
> >women who arrived since the breakup of the Soviet Union.
> >Tell me all about it.
>
> Again, you use economic issues to defend your claim that other
> nations are less free than the US. Sorry, Dave, but that's a straw
> dog. Talk about restrictions on RIGHTS--not about the cost of
> gasoline.

Economic issues have a great deal to do with what we are free to do. You'll surely note that I addressed racial problems (the 2,000 Somalis who entered Finland in 1994 have not received the red carpet treatment) and restrictive laws on the purchase and consumption of alcohol sold by the state alcohol monopoly.

If you don't have money for a car or to purchase gasoline for it, you have a restriction on your freedom. If you can't afford the nearly $1,000 for a washing machine, you have a restriction on your freedom. If you can afford to buy an expensive Salora TV but can't afford the mandatory yearly government TV viewing license, you have a restriction on your freedom. If you don't have enough money to buy decent meals because your pay is taxed to death, tough. As OH2KMF told me after asking about some aspect of American life, "Well, in Finland we have lots of nice trees and rocks".

Maybe you'd like to add the typical "dark line" of Blacks, Middle Easterners and even Italians waiting to be questioned by authorities after arriving on a ferry from Stockholm or Tallinn.

There are all sorts of niftly little regulations like the one which states that you can't bring your drink to a table because you bought it at the bar. Perhaps you'll delight in the law which bases traffic fines not on the offense but on your personal income. How'd you like to receive a $700 speeding ticket? Would it restrict your freedom?

In the end, ask yourself why there are lots more folks from foreign countries coming to the U.S. each year than Americans who move abroad.

> >Please save me from this leftist rhetoric...
>
> Translation: Yea, I know, but I won't admit it.

Correction to translation: Please save me from this leftist rhetoric...

> >> My expertise on which matters?
> >
> >The "Everything-is-Okay" matters. Did you fabricate it because you
> >decided you didn't like the rules society made for you?
>
> I didn't say EVERYTHING is ok--I stated that the ONLY
> legitimate grounds for restricting any individual's actions are if
> those actions will harm the person or property of a non-consenting

> individual. That isn't "everything is ok," it's "nothing that does no
> harm is the business of society" a very different statement.

Who gets to make the decision on what harms society?

> >> Religion: Years of study. I've read, and seriously considered,
> >> at least 19 versions of the Christian bible, several versions of the
> >> Koran, the Buddhist Sutras, the Upanishads, and the religious works of
> >> several other major and minor religions. I'm not a minister--but I
> >> would argue that I have at least as much knowledge of the root beliefs
> >> of Christianity and Buddhism as most ministers you're likely to
> >> encounter.
> >
> >Not unless you've gone through several years in seminary and a number of
> >years of continuing education. I'll bet that hat of yours is a tight
> >fit.
>
> In other words unless I've gone through a seminary and
> continuing education I have no right to comment on a religion?

Not at all what I stated. Unless you've gone through seminary and years
of continuing education, you assuredly do not know more about the root
beliefs of Christianity as an ordained minister.

> Ok--fair enough. Since you haven't gone through several years
> of graduate education in linguistics, you have no right to comment on
> Kim's call sign, which is an expression of language.

Not fair enough. I never made the silly claim like yours.

> >> Only if you believe in his divinity!
> >
> >I do.
>
> While I don't. Thus you are bound to follow the teachings of
> the bible while I am not.
>
> >> HITLER said he came to build a better world, too. Does that
> >> mean I have to accept HIS values?
> >
> >I'll feel free to discard this as absurd.
>
> Why?

Try: Because it is absurd on its face.

> Because it's true or because you can't think of a valid reason
> why the two SHOULDN'T be compared?
>
> >> And don't tell me there's no comparison between the
> >> two--followers of Jesus have killed FAR more innocent people in his
> >> name than followers of Hitler did in his own.
> >

> >I think I'll toss this one too.
>
> It's amazing how you can ignore the areas you can't respond to
> yet expect others to believe you simply don't care to respond.
>
> It's stupid.
>
> But amazing.

When you begin the comparisons of the teachings of Jesus to Hitler, I quit. When you begin to compare Christianity to Nazism, I quit.

> >> Of course, in our society, attacking someone for their
> >> exercise of free choice, or putting down women, minorities, or any
> >> other group are ALL considered to demonstrate lack of good taste and
> >> low class values, so I guess it's you, Dick, and the others who are
> >> attacking Kim who are defined that way here--not her.
> >
> >There are good choices and there are bad choices. Having a free choice
> >and using it wisely are two completely different things.
>
> Yup.
>
> You have the free choice to attack Kim and look like a jerk or
> not attack her and eliminate that perception.
>
> You made your choice to look like a jerk.
>
> Congratulations! You achieved your goal.

Kim made a deliberate choice at a *TITillating* callsign. She exercised poor judgement. I'd say that the guy typing his fingers to the bone in order to defend someone's poor judgement is the jerk.

> >> No, I just assumed you were putting her down because of you
> >> were "Programmed" by your family or religion to oppose her values,
> >> actually.
> >
> >You mean like I assume that you are views are poisoned by your instense
> >dislike of Christianity?
>
> Assume all you want. It isn't a dislike for Christianity--it's
> an intense distaste for ANY group that limits freedom and rights on
> the basis of their personal beliefs. I don't care if it's
> Christianity, the Nazi party, or the "Dick, Dave, and Larry Self-love
> Association," if a group chooses to try to impose its values on those
> who are not members of that group they deserve nothing but contempt.

We're done now Rick.

> >> Where would you SUGGEST that I wear a 3/4 carat diamond?
> >

> > > Never mind--I can guess the answer.
> > >
> >You could give it to you wife.
> >
> As it happens, she has its mate.
> >
> I decided to upgrade the diamonds in her engagement ring as a
> twentieth anniversary gift (the original ones were pretty poor
> quality--but all I could afford at the time). To replace the center
> stone I bought a pair of 3/4 carat diamond earrings, had one of the
> stones set in her ring along with new side diamonds, and I wear the
> other earring myself. She likes the significance that resulted.
> >
> >> Translation: If people don't agree with your narrow-minded
> >> view, they have no taste either, right?
> >>
> >> Grow up!
> > >
> >I guess you told me!
> >
> I thought I did. Hmmmm. Yup, I must have--you responded to it.
> >
> >I'll give you a free clue. My statement needs no translation. Accept
> >it as my viewpoint.
> >
> Ok. So you're narrow-minded. I can live with that.

What a narrow-minded thing to say. I'm surprised you can live with
yourself after making it.

> >Remember the part where I mentioned Constitutional protections of the
> >minority. Did I sound like I agreed with segregation? Do I believe the
> >people in the South are or were a majority of the nation?
> >
> They were--and are--a majority in their states--where such
> laws were enacted.

And we have your statement as proof.

> And your statement wasn't that the majority should rule except
> when Constitutional issues are concerned--it was that the majority
> should rule, period.
> >
> I'll be happy to accept the alternative version, however. Of
> course, since the Constitution explicitly supports freedom of speech,
> by necessity Kim's use of W5TIT is protected, and thus the majority
> that you claim oppose it--yourself included--have no legitimacy in
> doing so by your own statement.

I know and must assume that you know that even freedom of speech has its
limits.

> >> In Georgia a man is serving 10 years in prison for having
> >> consensual oral sex with his wife--a neighbor look in through the
> >> closed blinds of his bedroom (from HIS yard) and called the police who
> >> arrested him.
> >
> >That is the stuff of urban myth. This tale has now been going around
> >for decades. Name the man. Name the town. Provide a date.
> >Besides, I asked about YOUR freedom.
>
> The conviction was in the Summer of 1996 (I don't know the
> date, but I'll be glad to copy down the court citation at my office on
> Monday and post it here then). As I recall the man's name was Matthews
> and the town involved was Macon, GA.

Man, this guy has been convicted in the '70s, '80s, and the '90s. You'd
think he'd learn.

> My freedom?
>
> Whether the limitations on rights affect me directly is
> irrelevant--the key isn't whether or not my personal freedom is
> restricted--it's whether anyone's is. Unlike yourself, I don't base my
> values on what will profit me directly--I'm interested in rights in
> general.

Funny. I could swear I asked about *your* freedom.

> >> In Texas possession of 7 or more dildoes carries a longer
> >> prison term than molesting a five year old child--and THAT law was
> >> passed less than 10 years ago.
> >
> >Urban myth.
>
> Statement of fact. Try doing your own research before you make
> such claims.
>
> >I don't know the particulars. Do you know anything based in fact?
>
> Yes--but to the best of my knowledge this isn't an academic
> forum where case citations are necessary in conversation. I'll be
> happy to provide them if you'll agree to do the same for all of the
> claims you've made yourself.

I'll be happy to use your own tactics. You either can't or (and this is
one you've used several times) you are lying.

> I maintain a rather substantial file of court decisions and
> verified news reports at my office and, assuming I start seeing
> citations for all your own statements here I'll make it a point to
> note down the cites for you on Monday. Otherwise, if you don't feel
> like troubling yourself to post your own sources, then use the
> Internet and verify them yourself!
>

> >> In Michigan, three clubs (all private and located in places
> >> not accessible to children) were raided and the patrons arrested
> >> because they were swing clubs and the members went there to engage in
> >> recreational sex.
> >
> >Another one which you trotted out previously. How did this effect you?
> >Is this one of the freedoms you desire?
>
> Does it have to affect me directly to be a problem?

Again, you were asked about *your* freedom.

> By your standards, since I'm white I shouldn't care if blacks
> are oppressed; since I'm male I shouldn't care if women are treated
> equally; since I'm heterosexual I shouldn't care if gays are deprived
> of their rights; since I'm of Western European descent I shouldn't
> care if asians, middle easterners, and Eastern Europeans are
> discriminated against; since I'm 56 I shouldn't care if children are
> repressed; since I'm . . .
>
> Sorry, Dave, but unlike yourself I happen to care about the
> rights of others, too.

Wrap yourself in the mantle of indignity, Rick. No one made any
statement accusing you of not caring for the rights of others.

> You'll note that first you denied that any of these types of
> influences existed then, when I demonstrated that they did, you
> changed your line to "yes--but how does it affect you" instead. Give
> it up--you are NOT going to twist the original points to suit your own
> image.

Give it up yourself. There is no indication that anything you trotted
out is prosecuted frequently. I asked you what limitations you have had
imposed on your freedom. I note that you came up with none. If you'd
like to paint yourself as some kind of advocate for advancing the
freedom of others in this country which you indicate is oppressive, go
for it. Don't expect me to be standing with pom-poms cheering you on.

> >> Also in Michigan (in Wayne County, to be exact) a man can have
> >> his vehicle--even if it belongs to his firm or his spouse--seized and
> >> sold at auction if he picks up a prostitute with that car.
> >
> >Has it cut down on women prostituting themselves? Are you going to tell
> >me that prostitution is a victimless crime?
>
> No and yes, respectively.
>
> No it has not cut down on prostitution--people just park first
> and approach them on foot. It HAS caused an increase in muggings
> however, since these customers are on foot and by necessity have cash
> on them.

>
> Is prostitution a victimless crime? Absolutely. Identify a
> victim of the crime---is it the woman who voluntarily provides a
> service for a fee, or is it the man who pays a fee for a service? To
> me that sounds like a fair exchange with no victim. And don't claim
> that "society" is harmed by it--a transaction between two adults is
> none of society's business in the first place and thus CAN'T harm
> them.

You'd think that a New Age guy like yourself would welcome a reduction
in things which degrade women. If you can't accept that one, I'll raise
the public health issue and the potential for crime which YOU brought
up.

> >You needn't continue. I'd rather discuss the matter with someone who
> >has a concept of right and wrong.
>
> I do.
>
> I'm right.
>
> You're wrong.
>
> See?

No, I don't.

> >> If I did, I'd be arrested under state morals laws. So much for
> >> freedom of choice.
> >
> >I've noted that a large number of your perceived "freedoms" revolve
> >around sex. I can see where your rights have been trampled right into
> >the mattress.
>
> They involve sex because the topic of discussion is morality
> not personal freedom in general. And the legislation of morality is
> one of the WORST forms of oppression the State is capable of
> performing.
>

Damn! I thought the topic was Kim's lack of class in choosing her
vanity call.

> For someone who doesn't want to discus sexual morality--you
> certainly choose to do so when you attack Kim for her choice of a call
> sign!

I'm willing to be fair. I'd feel the same way if a man chose a tacky
callsign!

> >Yeah, but they're not accepted as normal. I don't need the stuff
> >invading my home through TV (I'm with N2EY, I don't accept it). Again,
> >I note your fixation on sexual freedom.

>
> And yours on avoiding issues. Nice try.
>
Just observation of a recurring theme.

> >> By your opinion--not by that of others.
> >
> >Others have made that same opinion known.
>
> A few--not the "majority" that's being claimed.

I could have sworn that I said, "Others have made that same opinion known".

Dave K8MN

1621. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 07:22:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDF91C.D51BBD58@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24618

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 06:49:50 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Try to follow along, now. The question, which appears above (quoted
> >attributes are mine) reads: Is that your overinflated view of your
> >power?
>
> Interesting phrasing to the question. Presumably you won't
> settle for anything other than a "Yes" or a "No" either of which you
> can use as "proof" that I either admit to having an overinflated view
> of my power or I don't believe I have the power to put you on the
> defensive. Ok, I'll play your game:
>
> Yes, it is my overinflated view of my power that I have the
> ability to put you on the defensive.
>
> Now it's MY turn to ask you a yes or no question (no changing
> the question--you won't let me do so):
>
> Have you stopped abusing children yet?
>
> Remember, Dave. Yes or no only. Anything else is just being
> defensive . . .

This one is incredibly easy. I noted only that you did not respond to my question after you indicated some confusion on your part. I did not indicate that I considered that a "yes" or "no" answer was the only acceptable response. So you presumed incorrectly.

To see it handled proplerly, witness my response to your question:

You silly goose, I've never abused a child in my life.

By the way, I don't feel as if I'm on the defensive. Better work on those powers.

Dave K8MN

1622. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 10:26:44 UTC
From: stewartx@sccoast.net
Message-ID: <6be98d7d.0111230226.3a575917@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24619

> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote...
>
> (snip) Some people say that Jesus
> knew that some of those who wanted
> to stone the woman had sinned with
> her. (They had used her services,
> so to speak, and were covering up
> their own sin by killing the only
> witness). He showed them that He
> knew what their real motives
> were. (snip)

That is interesting. It certainly adds another dimension to the story, doesn't it? I don't remember anything like that, but, after all these years, I don't really remember much beyond the basic stories themselves.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1623. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 10:47:44 UTC
From: stewartx@sccoast.net
Message-ID: <6be98d7d.0111230247.64baed17@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24620

"Larry Roll, K3LT" wrote...
>
> Yeah, and when that happens, how much
> do you wanna bet that white teachers
> (and any other white person seeking
> professional employment) are suddenly
> going to find the rules changed to
> keep them from being considered a
> legitimate "minority" for AA purposes?

Somehow, I just have a feeling you're absolutely right about that, Larry.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1624. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 10:50:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <TRpL7.193798$3d2.7980288@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

To quote the Economist," ... shilling, when a seller covertly places
so-called 'shill bids' with the aim of driving up the sale price." When
selling Dr. Schott's snake oil the huckster would plant one of his own in
the crowd to buy the first bottle -- a person known in the trade as a shill.

"Skyhawk" <sky444nospam@mint.net> wrote in message
news:3bfddb55.343790303@news.mint.net...
> what is a "shill bid" ??
>
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:03:19 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >According to the Economist for Nov 10-16 two profs have been running a
> >three-year study of E-Bay auctions (via a bot) with the following
results:
> >
> >1. Items sold on a weekend sell for about 2% more.
> >
> >2. Pictures were worth 5.7% in 1999. This year, it is11.3%
> >
> >3. Having a decent rep is worth 6.8% and growing as experience is
gained.
> >Hey, guys win Nobel Prizes for discovering that you can get better prices
> >from people who trust you and don't build in a margin for getting the
green
> >weenie.
> >
> >4. They are testing software to detect shill bids. You probably will
never
> >hear about it on E-Bay but what better place to sell it when the time
comes,
> >with a picture on a weekend of course. Should be fun.
> >
> >Dick
> >
> >
>

1625. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 10:51:49 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <9TpL7.193800$3d2.7980423@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24622
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Noop, kids in my neighborhood knew about green weenies long before we met Sam.

"CW" <clinton.magers@home.com> wrote in message
news:PKlL7.61961$XJ4.35919151@news1.sttln1.wa.home.com...
> Ex army?
> --
> CW
> KC7NOD
> Web Page http://www.kc7nod.20m.com
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:H7iL7.203791$W8.7635260@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > don't build in a margin for getting the green
> > weenie.
> >
> >>
> >
>
>

1626. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 11:09:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123060959.03411.00000792@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 24623

In article <3bfde819_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>Sorry, Jim!

No problem, Kim

>No, your opinion that a callsign is inappropriate does *not*
>make you ignorant or bigoted. It was my mistake for not realizing the
>"criteria."

No biggie, just a mistake. If I had a buck for every one I've made....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1627. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 11:22:30 UTC
From: stewartx@sccoast.net
Message-ID: <6be98d7d.0111230322.5dd13266@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24624

CAM wrote...
>
> (snip) Unfortunately, teeth had to
> be put into the law to force that
> to happen and we are still paying
> the price for racism.

Why are "we" paying the price for racism? I didn't do anything. I was a little child when blacks rode in the back of a bus or drank from separate water fountains. Certainly my dirt poor parents didn't benefit from racism, which means I didn't either. Since I can remember (going back almost 40 years), every black has went to the same schools I went to, rode in the same bus seats I rode in, and drank from the same water fountains. So, again, why must "we" pay a price when they've had everything I've had (and perhaps more thanks to AA) and I've had nothing more than them.

Perhaps more importantly, when do "we" get to share the benefits this country promised (equality, etc)? I'm in my late 40's, and affirmative action has been in place, in one form or another, for most of my adult life. Will it end before I die? Will it end before my children die? How many generations have to go by before the yoke of affirmative action is lifted from the shoulders of "whites?"

And, years from now, do you really think any of these minority groups are going to step forward to help the many "white" families who been negatively impacted by decades of affirmative action? For that matter, once minorities are no longer a minority, do you really think they'll ever end affirmative action?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1628. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 11:39:13 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <BzqL7.193822$3d2.7981725@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24625

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011123060959.03411.00000792@nso-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3bfde819_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >Sorry, Jim!
>
> No problem, Kim
>
> >No, your opinion that a callsign is inappropriate does *not*
> >make you ignorant or bigoted. It was my mistake for not realizing the
> >"criteria."
>
> No biggie, just a mistake. If I had a buck for every one I've made....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

That's not a mistake, Jim, its a gaffe.

1629. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:07:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123080727.03411.00000794@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 24626

In article <028833ADEBA69BBE.882EF94BB22E4E92.71A4EF907909FB94@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
>prevalent among may ham radio operators.

I don't agree, Rick. There are a few hams with those views, but most of the
hams I've known are none of the above. Of course, a lot depends on how the
terms are defined, and YMMV.

>This kind of attitude
>(exemplified by the Liberty Net on 75m and by many of the comments
>made in this NG) seems degrading to hams in general.

I'd say "They are bad for the image of the ARS."
>
> There have been threads in the past that addressed specific
>racist problems, but so far as I know (and I'm far from an expert on
>the news group) no thread has been created to discuss the concept in
>general terms, and to examine the effect that kind of attitude have on
>the ARS.

allrighty then...
>
> From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
>racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
>hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
>our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
>that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.

First thing ya gotta do is define what ya mean by racism, sexism, ageism, and
religious prejudice. For example, is it racist to call people who are
disturbing the peace "water buffaloes"? Is it sexist for me to say "Heidi Klum
is gorgeous?" Is it ageist when someone calls me a "dinosaur" because I use CW
on the air? Is it religious prejudice when Christianity is described as THE
cause of sexual hangups in Western civilization?
>
> Comments?

Sounds good to me but ya gotta define the terms first. One person's -ism is
another's free speech.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1630. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:27:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE4EC2.86C231CC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24627

Dave Heil wrote:
> You continued to act as if I had posted a deliberate lie due to my typo.

That is a lie. I never said anything about your lie being deliberate.
Your typo was an inadvertent lie and I pulled your leg about it.

From Webster's: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or
may not be believed true by the speaker" A typo is an inaccurate
statement especially if the typo spells a perfectly good English
word.

But you still cannot prove anything *I* said by only quoting what
you said. I have never before seen such a ridiculous approach to
an argument.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1631. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:31:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE4FCC.8A9901B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24628

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You continued to act as if I had posted a deliberate lie due to my typo.
> > It has been pointed out to you numerous times. Now I have included my
> > early postings as proof of my intent. You choose only to play word
> > games. Have fun.
>
> Careful, Dave, you're playing right into his dictionary again. The one
> that says if it is a mistake it's a lie even if you don't know it nor
> intend it.

That dictionary is "Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary", Dick.
How many copies of New Collegiate Dictionaries do you reckon are
out there? That you refuse to accept dictionaries of the English
language is your problem, Dick, not mine. Without dictionaries as
references, communications is handicapped if not impossible.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1632. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:34:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE5059.FB796C9D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24629

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > > Use provable facts.
> > >
> > > No thanks.
> >
> > OK, then I guess we will just have to acknowledge your
> > wild-a$$ unproven speculations.
>
> You have a mouse in your pocket? Are you, in addition to your other
> manifestations, now Rick as well?

It is traditional for a ham to say "we" when referring to himself.
If you had any knowledge of ham radio, you would already know that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1633. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:35:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE5090.E761E105@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24630

Dave Heil wrote:
> I didn't confirm it and I didn't use other words. What I did was
> decline to provide you a detailed explanation of how I arrived at my
> decision. Did I miss the part where such is mandatory?

It is mandatory only if you want to be believed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1634. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:36:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE50F5.F2AD069A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24631

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > This, from a man who reads a book about a religion that takes years and
> > > > lifetimes to understand, and thinks he knows all about it.
> > >
> > > Don't have a need to "know all about it", just enough.
> >
> > A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.
>
> That's a good reason for acquiring more than a little.
> But ass-u-me, as Kim does, that far too little is more than enough is
> the mark of a fool.

Too bad your knowledge doesn't extend to the English language.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1635. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:44:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE52A2.BC9AED37@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24632

Dave Heil wrote:
> To help balance the views, Kim. We wouldn't want things to lean too far
> to the left.

Leaning in the direction of freedom is definitely not leaning to
either the left or the right. The liberal left is generally for
social freedom and against economic freedom. The conservative right
is generally for economic freedom and against social freedom.
Note that both are anti-freedom is certain areas. Libertarians
are for both social and economic freedom, i.e. freedom in general.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1636. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:44:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE52D8.9C45AD3D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24633

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I don't believe that only a small minority of Christians practice their
> > > religion properly? You can bet that I don't accept that.
> >
> > That's easy to prove, Dave. I'll bet the majority of Christians
> > eat pork. I'll bet you eat pork in direct defiance of God's will.
>
> It'll be a hoot watching you try to prove this one, Cecil.

Well, let's start with you, Dave. Do you eat pork?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1637. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:52:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE54A2.886BA45F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24634

Dave Heil wrote:
> Convert? Sure the Church attempts to convert others in order to spread
> the word of the gospels. Does the Church preach that those with
> different religious beliefs are wrong or inferior? No.

Don't know about your church but Southern Baptist churches certainly
preach that "those with different religious beliefs are wrong or
inferior". I hear it almost every Sunday. Did you know that Buddha,
a good man who died 300 years before Christ was born, went straight
to hell?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1638. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:54:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE552C.F5D51146@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24635

Dave Heil wrote:
> If it wasn't clear to you: The Netherlands has less freedom than the
> U.S.

The Netherlands have more social freedom than the U.S. Libertarians
want more social freedom AND more economic freedom, i.e. more freedom
in general.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1639. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 13:59:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE5650.704E147@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24636

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > We cannot discuss morality without discussing government's attempt to
> > control morality.
>
> I don't agree with your initial statement.

So you would just put the blinders on when it comes to the government's attempt to control morality? Why am I not surprised?

> I don't have any
> information that declares that all living in the South were against the
> Civil Rights Act. Your fellow Texan and our President wasn't against
> it.

I didn't say "all" and you just proved my point. Lyndon Johnson went against the wishes of the majority of Texans.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1640. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 14:07:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE5816.F5A1FFA5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24637

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > If you had chosen not to take the tests then you wouldn't be licensed.
> > Therefore you were forced to take the tests in order to obtain a
> > ham radio license. Cheating is the only other way to get one.
> > You were forced to take those tests because you had no other
> > choice except to cheat on your way to obtaining a ham license.
>
> I will not get into another idiotic round of this with you Sir
> Senseless, so you can carry on as you please. The fact remains I had
> total freedom of choice. Under such circumstances only a total fool
> would continue to insist that I or anyone else was forced.

You only had total freedom of choice not to become a ham. Assuming
you didn't cheat, that leaves you only one way to obtain a ham license.
One way is not a choice, Dick, it's an absolute requirement. You had
absolutely no freedom of choice in getting a ham license. You had
to meet the requirements just like all the rest of us. Your choices
were limited to a single choice, and a single choice is not a "choice"
at all.

If you obtain a ham license, here are your choices.
1. meet the requirements
2. cheat

There was NO other choice in getting a ham license besides cheating.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1641. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 14:09:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE589B.210B81EB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24638

Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers with
> their nice habbits will come in droves.

It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1642. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 14:31:02 UTC
From: Wong Foo Takeout <chuggachu444@aol.com>
Message-ID: <G4tL7.72$Kc2.6572@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 24639
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I sold a *mint* condition Halicrafters S-120 on E-Bay some
time ago for $155.00 (+ shipping)

I found the S-120 at a local yard sale for $20.00 - a month earlier.

I was happy to have made a modest profit via the deal, and the seller was
happy to get it for his collection. He even sent me a Certified Bank Check
via next day mail.

I don't know about you, but I very much like E-Bay! :) :) :)

"Your Friend Bill" <"Remove The NO In The Reply Address"@coqui.net> wrote in message
news:3BFDC8F0.4F7FDFCD@coqui.net...
> JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
> >
> > Richard, when they sell a Hallicrafters S-20R for close to $200.00, that's
> > it. I do not do E-bay anymore.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim
>
> According to hampedia, the top price realized on ebay for an S20-R is
> $405.00 !!! Average has been 146.88 and lowest was 50.00.
> I would like to have seen that $405 one.
>
> -Bill
>
>

1643. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 14:38:36 UTC
From: Wong Foo Takeout <chuggachu444@aol.com>
Message-ID: <MbtL7.80$Kc2.9814@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 24640
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:TRpL7.193798$3d2.7980288@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...

> To quote the Economist," ... shilling, when a seller covertly places
> so-called 'shill bids' with the aim of driving up the sale price." When
> selling Dr. Schott's snake oil the huckster would plant one of his own in
> the crowd to buy the first bottle -- a person known in the trade as a shill.

There is a VERY SIMPLE way to not be taken in via a "shill bid".

1) KNOW the item you want. Do your research. No excuse for this unless your lazy
in which case you deserve to be sheared like a sheep.

2) KNOW the maximum price you are willing to pay --> IN ADVANCE !

3) If your maximum price is exceeded - POLITELY WALK AWAY.

4) REMEMBER ---> "There is usually another one someplace else
you just have not located it yet".

Follow these 4 rules, and you'll never get taken.

1644. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 14:43:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfe6140_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24641

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tkr32$8nb$0@208.206.142.82...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > This, from a man who reads a book about a religion that takes years
and
> > > > lifetimes to understand, and thinks he knows all about it.
> > >
> > > Don't have a need to "know all about it", just enough.
> >
> > A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.
>
>
> That's a good reason for acquiring more than a little.
> But ass-u-me, as Kim does, that far too little is more than enough is
> the mark of a fool.

Have you lived the life of a Muslim, yet? Have you been to a Moslem, yet?
Is Jesus mentioned anywhere the Muslim religion? Have you read more than
one book? Have you listened to more than one or two folks about the
religion?

Yeah, thought so.

Kim W5TIT

1645. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 15:17:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123101722.20950.00000690@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 24642

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gn4enyw.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 21 Nov 2001 01:03:45 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>> >Did you hear the FCC is unhappy with Victoria's Secret for
>> >their recent fashion show on TV?
>
>>FCC received about 50 emails complaining about that show. Perhaps
>>supportive emails should be sent.
>
> When is the re-run scheduled? Sure beats old "Law and Order".
>
I don't know, Phil. The producers were talking about making it an annual thing,
but the protests may make them think twice.

"Who Wants To Be A Millionaire" had supermodels on all this week. Their
winnings went to charities.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1646. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 15:17:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123101722.20950.00000689@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 24644

In article <3BFDC8F0.4F7FDFCD@coqui.net>, Your Friend Bill <"Remove The NO In The Reply Address"@coqui.net> writes:

>AMES HAMPTON wrote:
>>
>> Richard, when they sell a Hallicrafters S-20R for close to $200.00, that's
>> it. I do not do E-bay anymore.
>>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim
>
>According to hampedia, the top price realized on ebay for an S20-R is
>$405.00 !!! Average has been 146.88 and lowest was 50.00.
>I would like to have seen that $405 one.
>
There was a really nice SX-88 that went for over $600, an Eddystone 898 DIAL (just the dial, NIB) that went for $280, and various ARC-5 sets going for over $300. But for me, the champ was the minty still-in-the-box unbuilt-since-1956 Heathkit AT-1. Those things sold for $29.95 back then, and were really not very good transmitters. The final price was $5100. That's not a typo - fifty one hundred dollars.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1647. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 15:17:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123101723.20950.00000691@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 24643

In article <BzqL7.193822$3d2.7981725@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011123060959.03411.00000792@nso-cb.aol.com...
>> In article <3bfde819_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
>writes:
>>
>> >Sorry, Jim!
>>
>> No problem, Kim
>>
>> >No, your opinion that a callsign is inappropriate does *not*
>> >make you ignorant or bigoted. It was my mistake for not realizing the
>> >"criteria."
>>
>> No biggie, just a mistake. If I had a buck for every one I've made....
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>
>That's not a mistake, Jim, its a gaffe.
>
To quote a famous modern philosopher:

"DOH!!!"

73 de Jim, N2EY

1648. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 15:45:34 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <kb9tmp@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9tlqtt$q02$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 24646
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:H7iL7.203791$W8.7635260@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> According to the Economist for Nov 10-16 two profs have been running a
> three-year study of E-Bay auctions (via a bot) with the following results:
>
> 1. Items sold on a weekend sell for about 2% more.

Makes sense, more people on the weekend to bid just like a traditional auction.

>
> 2. Pictures were worth 5.7% in 1999. This year, it is11.3%
>

Ever heard the saying about buying a "Pig In A Poke" ?
It may just be a Hoosier saying, so I can't expect you
foreigners (non-Hoosiers) to understand. :)

> 3. Having a decent rep is worth 6.8% and growing as experience is gained.

Sure means a lot to me, that's the thing I look at next after reading about
what the sale item is and the sale info. Needless to say "shades" and
negative feedback mean a lot in this "caveat emptor" world.

> Hey, guys win Nobel Prizes for discovering that you can get better prices
> from people who trust you and don't build in a margin for getting the green
> weenie.

I used to work in a new car dealership as a mechanic. After you
have been around a few car salespeople you come to learn all about
the dreaded "Green Weenie", normally the used car buyer gets it!
And the poor service people get left holding the bag to fulfill
the promises made by the salesperson. ae "This car gets at least
75 miles to the gallon and NEVER breaks down!" On second
thought maybe it's the service dept that gets the "GW" :0

>
> 4. They are testing software to detect shill bids. You probably will never
> hear about it on E-Bay but what better place to sell it when the time comes,
> with a picture on a weekend of course. Should be fun.
>
> Dick
>
>

--

'73' From KB9TMP

"there is no rule against being stupid"
-Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com

1649. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 15:47:03 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tlqv802e79@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24647
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Skyhawk" <sky444nospam@mint.net> wrote in message
news:3bfddb55.343790303@news.mint.net...

> what is a "shill bid" ??

It's a bid that's made in an effort to run the price up. It's made by someone on behalf of the seller, who has no intention of buying the item. It's been done for years at regular auctions, but it's not as prevalent as it has been. In online auctions, a seller would probably have a second e-mail address through an ISP that he doesn't care about getting booted from.

1650. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 16:01:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3BFE72C3.90299DAF@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24645

CAM wrote:
>
> Don't know about your church but
> Southern Baptist churches certainly
> preach that "those with different
> religious beliefs are wrong or
> inferior". I hear it almost every
> Sunday. Did you know that Buddha, a
> good man who died 300 years before
> Christ was born, went straight to
> hell?

For someone who claims to hear "it" every Sunday, you demonstrate a clear lack of understanding when it comes to Christian, or even pure Southern Baptist, thinking, Cecil. Since a person can only go to hell if he does not believe in a vaguely defined god, Christ's birth had little to do with Buddha's fate (God predates Jesus - the prophetic son of...). In other words, Buddha may or may not have went to hell, but Christ had nothing to do with it.

Remember, Christianity is just another set of beliefs when it comes to God, just like Judaism, Islam, and so forth, are. Christians simply believe in the teachings of Jesus Christ when it comes to God, as opposed to the beliefs of other religions when it comes to God.

Jesus Christ's teachings can be found in the New Testament of the Bible. Jesus described those teachings as a "new covenant" with God. In other words, where there is a conflict with the Old Testament, Jesus Christ's teachings in the New Testament are to supersede that found in the Old Testament. Those conflicts (including the violence against other groups you mentioned in a previous message) remain in the Old Testament simply to provide a history of what existed before Christ's teachings.

Christ, in his teachings, commonly describes ALL men and women as the children of God, including those of other religions. So, while they may be misguided souls (in the eyes of Christians), they are not to be perceived as inferior. However, certainly some Christians, including Southern Baptist, may present that attitude. But that is not the teachings of Jesus Christ, or the beliefs of true Christians. This is all core Christian philosophy, Cecil.

One who hears "it" every Sunday should know all of this.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1651. Re: For E-Bay users

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 16:25:22 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tlt7202moq@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"WW - KB9TMP" <kb9tmp@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:9tlqtt$q02$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...

> Ever heard the saying about buying a "Pig In A Poke" ?
> It may just be a Hoosier saying, so I can't expect you
> foreigners (non-Hoosiers) to understand. :)

Hey! That's a Pennsylvania saying!

1652. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 16:26:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bfe7950_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24648

It isn't just Cecil that is hearing these things. I hear it in nearly every theological discussion, bible discussion, religious discussion I am near or a part of. I hear it "nearly" each time I have ever been in a church. I hear nearly every time the witnesses show up on my doorstep. I heard it last night at the table with my fundamentalist brother- and sister-in-law.

I agree with you, Dwight, that it was not the teaching of Jesus Christ or the attitude of true Christians. However, when I stated last night, to the same brother-in-law, that Jesus never judged and condemned people to Hell, he stated that I was wrong--that the Bible is replete with Jesus speaking of people who would burn in places, etc. (he used specific passages from the Bible, but I cannot recall them). I don't know if he (a minister himself--of a Southern Baptist church) is MIS-interpreting some things or if the things he said are really there.

I do know that I don't think I ever saw something like that. It's really difficult to "argue" a belief system, because what someone believes is very personal, in my opinion, and very subject to their perspective on so many things (social, political, metaphysical, etc.) But, suffice it to say that I have heard the same things Cecil says he's heard; yet, I choose to ignore those kinds of sentiment. Like I said last night (and my brother-in-law nearly fell out of his chair): we all worship the same god, we just have different ways of doing it. I don't care how you get to "Heaven" just that you try to get there. It's in the "trying" that makes all good things happen.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3BFE72C3.90299DAF@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Don't know about your church but
> > Southern Baptist churches certainly
> > preach that "those with different
> > religious beliefs are wrong or
> > inferior". I hear it almost every
> > Sunday. Did you know that Buddha, a
> > good man who died 300 years before
> > Christ was born, went straight to
> > hell?
> >
> > For someone who claims to hear "it" every Sunday, you
> > demonstrate a clear lack of understanding when it comes to

> Christian, or even pure Southern Baptist, thinking, Cecil.
> Since a person can only go to hell if he does not believe in
> a vaguely defined god, Christ's birth had little to do with
> Buddha's fate (God predates Jesus - the prophetic son
> of...). In other words, Buddha may or may not have went to
> hell, but Christ had nothing to do with it.
>
> Remember, Christianity is just another set of beliefs when
> it comes to God, just like Judaism, Islam, and so forth,
> are. Christians simply believe in the teachings of Jesus
> Christ when it comes to God, as opposed to the beliefs of
> other religions when it comes to God.
>
> Jesus Christ's teachings can be found in the New Testament
> of the Bible. Jesus described those teachings as a "new
> covenant" with God. In other words, where there is a
> conflict with the Old Testament, Jesus Christ's teachings in
> the New Testament are to supersede that found in the Old
> Testament. Those conflicts (including the violence against
> other groups you mentioned in a previous message) remain in
> the Old Testament simply to provide a history of what
> existed before Christ's teachings.
>
> Christ, in his teachings, commonly describes ALL men and
> women as the children of God, including those of other
> religions. So, while they may be misguided souls (in the
> eyes of Christians), they are not to be perceived as
> inferior. However, certainly some Christians, including
> Southern Baptist, may present that attitude. But that is not
> the teachings of Jesus Christ, or the beliefs of true
> Christians. This is all core Christian philosophy, Cecil.
> One who hears "it" every Sunday should know all of this.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1653. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 16:34:22 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tlto202nk5@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24651

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFDCD9B.E0F65F@IEEE.org...
> I don't recall that prophet. Since Yahweh, Jehovah, and Allah are all the
> same God, why don't the Jews and Muslims eat pork? Did Jesus eat pork?
> I doubt it very seriously. He didn't want to risk trichinosis.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

All I know is that if I go to the Second Avenue Deli and it's on the menu,
then it's kosher enough for me.

1654. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 16:38:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFE7B76.7D760EAA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24649

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Since a person can only go to hell if he does not believe in
> a vaguely defined god, Christ's birth had little to do with
> Buddha's fate (God predates Jesus - the prophetic son
> of...). In other words, Buddha may or may not have gone to
> hell, but Christ had nothing to do with it.

I see you are not up on Southern Baptist doctrine, Dwight. Jesus was with God from the beginning. When God said, "Let us make man in our image", he was talking to Jesus and the Holy Spirit. Anyone who didn't believe in Jesus/Jehovah from the beginning is going to hell. Haven't you ever heard of The Trinity? What's the matter with you, anyway?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1655. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 17:51:05 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BFDD428.2A4FBB5D@mailcity.net>
Source record: 24652

Then you should be about the least dangerous person around. ;>)

CAM wrote:

> A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1656. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 17:57:15 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <b3442bfec47c724ba9a179cf116e2257.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 24653

Rick Adams says:

> Sorry, Hans, but it fails the critical "troll test."
>
> The author is both identifiable and an active participant in
>the newsgroup where it appeared.

Trolling is trolling. You don't get excused just because we know
who you are.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from 1cust222.tnt2.minneapolis3.mn.da.uu.net [63.20.215.222]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1657. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 18:14:34 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <3f4tvtcl8s7jfufdv3d6ndmlnio529rg43@4ax.com>
Source record: 24654

"Anon" <Anon@yeqwbaq.net>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

You impress nobody here with your
->connections or your vast knowledge,

In my humble opinion, the knowledge is more like half-vast.

Jim

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1658. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 19:13:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123141357.03411.00000805@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 24655

In article <3BFE5059.FB796C9D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>It is traditional for a ham to say "we" when referring to himself.

Only in some circles.

>If you had any knowledge of ham radio, you would already know that.

Do you know where that practice comes from? How about the folks who laugh by saying "hi hi"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1659. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 19:13:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123141357.03411.00000804@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 24656

In article <3BFE54A2.886BA45F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Don't know about your church but Southern Baptist churches certainly
>preach that "those with different religious beliefs are wrong or
>inferior". I hear it almost every Sunday. Did you know that Buddha,
>a good man who died 300 years before Christ was born, went straight
>to hell?

If that is what you believe, Cecil, what's the problem? If it's not what you believe, why do you go there?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1660. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 19:13:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123141358.03411.00000806@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 24657

In article <3bfe7950_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>It isn't just Cecil that is hearing these things. I hear it in nearly every
>theological discussion, bible discussion, religious discussion I am near or
>a part of. I hear it "nearly" each time I have ever been in a church. I
>hear nearly every time the witnesses show up on my doorstep. I heard it
>last night at the table with my fundamentalist brother- and sister-in-law.

You mean how "other" religions are "wrong"? That's part of the boilerplate - if a church says other religions aren't "wrong", there's no reason for that church to exist.

If you mean "evil", then I know of some religious organizations that doesn't categorize others as "evil", just "mistaken".
>
>I agree with you, Dwight, that it was not the teaching of Jesus Christ or
>the attitude of true Christians.

Agreed.

> However, when I stated last night, to the
>same brother-in-law, that Jesus never judged and condemned people to Hell,
>he stated that I was wrong--that the Bible is replete with Jesus speaking of
>people who would burn in places, etc. (he used specific passages from the
>Bible, but I cannot recall them). I don't know if he (a minister
>himself--of a Southern Baptist church) is MIS-interpreting some things or if
>the things he said are really there.

The things I remember JC saying were that IF such-and-such a person did so-and-so and did not repent, that person would not go to heaven. He did not do the condemning, the person's actions did.

Best explanation I ever heard of this was that Jesus was actually a scientist. His job here was to explain how the "moral universe" works. For example, a chemist explains that if you mix Chemical A with Chemical B you'll get Chemical C, a big noise, and energetic disassembly of anything near the mixing site. Jesus explains that if you do Action A with Attitude B you'll get Results C in your moral life.
>
>I do know that I don't think I ever saw something like that.

The only time I recall that He got angry was when he chased the moneychangers out of the temple.

>It's really
>difficult to "argue" a belief system, because what someone believes is very
>personal, in my opinion, and very subject to their perspective on so many

>things (social, political, metaphysical, etc.) But, suffice it to say that
>I have heard the same things Cecil says he's heard; yet, I choose to ignore
>those kinds of sentiment. Like I said last night (and my brother-in-law
>nearly fell out of his chair): we all worship the same god, we just have
>different ways of doing it.

His definition of God may be very different from yours, though.

>I don't care how you get to "Heaven" just that
>you try to get there. It's in the "trying" that makes all good things
>happen.
>
Also lots of bad things. I think the Sept 11 hijackers thought they were trying to get to heaven. At least some of the Taliban probably believe that what they are doing, and what they did as rulers, is/was God's will.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1661. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 19:23:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn9g200.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24658

On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:45:49 GMT, BH wrote:

>I can see this for installing non-type accepted amateur gear, but
>do not see how this applies for using the installed aircraft comms
>that can operate on the ham bands.
>
That is covered by:

Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.

(b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
installation......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1662. Re: FCC hires private investigators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 19:23:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn9g5p1.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24659

On 22 Nov 2001 22:09:23 -0800, Aaron H. Voobner wrote:

>>they said they would only investigate if I had evidence of illegal
>>operation.
>
>Who did you contact at the FCC?

The above has been FCC policy for many years. It does not make any
difference whom one contacts at the FCC.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1663. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 19:23:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn9gnf2.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24660

On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:40:04 GMT, BH wrote:

>> Don't let the company's lawyers hear that....if he's the pilot on
>> duty, boredom is not an option.
>
>I have several neighbors who are airline pilots, they all say that
>between take offs and landings, the time is very boring, the plane
>is on auto pilot and not much to do.

My pilot friends tell me the same thing. But for legal (i.e. CYA) purposes, one better not ever give the company lawyers (or FAA investigators if it ever comes to that point) any idea that they are on duty and in command of the aircraft with anything but full alertness and attention to duty or that they are doing anything but required and official duties during that time.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1664. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 19:53:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gn9iul4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24661

On 23 Nov 2001 19:13:58 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>You mean how "other" religions are "wrong"? That's part of the
>boilerplate - if a church says other religions aren't "wrong", there's
>no reason for that church to exist.

Jewish theology teaches that ours is not the "one and only" "right"
faith and therefore all others are "wrong".

It teaches that moral living is the "right" way, no matter which
faith one adheres to in doing it.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1665. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 20:20:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFEAF8D.909C0CEE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24662

"Jim Bromley, K7JEB" wrote:
> OK, OK, I just *had* to find that image and do it.
> My apologies for posting a binary attachment.

Talk about bad taste. :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1666. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 20:22:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFEB015.CAC7B028@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24663

JR wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> > A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.

> Then you should be about the least dangerous person around. ;>)

Well, thank you JR. I didn't know you cared.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1667. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 20:26:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFEB0F5.B4F5DF1F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24665

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >It is traditional for a ham to say "we" when referring to himself.
>
> Only in some circles.
>
> >If you had any knowledge of ham radio, you would already know that.
>
> Do you know where that practice comes from? How about the folks who laugh by
> saying "hi hi"?

Actually, I don't. I suppose it comes from not being able to see
everybody over the radio. And some of my best friends say "hi hi".
I suppose it is to keep the microphone dry.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1668. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 20:29:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFEB18F.A9976DE3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24664

N2EY wrote:
> If that is what you believe, Cecil, what's the problem?

That's not what I believe.

> If it's not what you believe, why do you go there?

For God's sake, I'm lead bass in the choir.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

1669. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 21:00:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tmdb8016di@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24666

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011123141357.03411.00000805@nso-cb.aol.com...
> Do you know where that practice comes from? How about the folks who laugh
by
> saying "hi hi"?

Hearing someone say "hi hi" instead of actually laughing makes me believe
that their own jokes are so stupid, that they themselves can't even laugh at
them.

1670. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 21:54:27 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3BFE0D33.BCBF73E6@mailcity.net>
Source record: 24667

.... (hi hi) is how you express laughter in code, for some weird reason some hams use it on phone as well. Why not just laugh?

N2EY wrote:
.
>
> Do you know where that practice comes from? How about the folks who laugh by
> saying "hi hi"?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1671. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 22:03:53 UTC
From: BH <radioguyx@texxas.net>
Message-ID: <3BFE0F66.76192ABC@texxas.net>
Source record: 24668

What about on board US Navy ships? I have talked to and run phone patches for Navy personal using the ships communications that had the capability of operating on the ham bands. Even talked to one radio operator in Hawaii as they were sitting on the tarmac in a Navy sea plane, he was using the regular comms. Talked to him about 15 minutes then he had to QRT as they were getting ready for take off.

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:45:49 GMT, BH wrote:
>
> >I can see this for installing non-type accepted amateur gear, but
> >do not see how this applies for using the installed aircraft comms
> >that can operate on the ham bands.
> >
> That is covered by:
>
> Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.
>
> (b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
> other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
> a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
> installation......
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1672. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 22:16:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123171634.09533.00001139@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 24669

>Subject: Re: Airmobile Hams
>From: BH radioguyx@texxas.net
>Date: 11/23/2001 4:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3BFE0F66.76192ABC@texxas.net>

>What about on board US Navy ships?

Navy?! Hell...FORGET about the FCC! You do ANYTHING on THAT vessel
without the CO's consent...ESPECIALLY something that can hazard the vessel, and
some Part 97 infractions are your LAST worry!

Most Navy warships are built in such a way as to minimize RF hazards to
the crew AND to minimize the likelyhood that RF will give away the ships
location, type, etc. You operate a radio on board that ship that hasn't had
the ship's Comminications Officer's blessing and you might be the recipient of
an all expenses paid trip to Kansas, ToTo!

Sheeesh!

1673. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-23 23:28:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tmm1f0v02@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24670

"JR" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3BFE0D33.BCBF73E6@mailcity.net...
> .... (hi hi) is how you express laughter in code, for
> some weird reason some hams use it on phone as well. Why not just
> laugh?

Because they think that cute=funny. It's like that stupid "Dude, you're gettin' a Dell" commercial, or the Gateway commercials with the guy talking to his pet cow. People who do such things are saying, "Look at me! I'm being funny!" You can only get away with this if you're wearing red and white makeup, baggy clothes that clash, and performing in front of people whose age has not yet reached double digits. The replacement DJ in "Good Morning, Vietnam!" is a perfect example of this type of thinking.

1674. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 01:03:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011123200357.03527.00000386@nso-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 24671

In article <3BFEB0F5.B4F5DF1F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >It is traditional for a ham to say "we" when referring to himself.
>>
>> Only in some circles.
>>
>> >If you had any knowledge of ham radio, you would already know that.
>>
>> Do you know where that practice comes from? How about the folks who laugh
>by
>> saying "hi hi"?
>
>Actually, I don't. I suppose it comes from not being able to see
>everybody over the radio.

My information is that the "we" referred to "me and the rig". Dates back to when most 'phone rigs were homebrew and represented a serious investment of time, money and expertise.

> And some of my best friends say "hi hi".
>I suppose it is to keep the microphone dry.

Some of my best friends do the same. I used to think that it was an affectation derived from 'phone guys trying to sound like they use CW so much they can't stop using the abbreviations. (In this same line are the use of "kay" instead of "over" and Q signals on voice for absolutely everything, even when regular words are shorter and clearer). An alternate explanation is that, due to the simplex nature of most 'phone operation, when Op A tells Op B a joke, Op B's laughter isn't heard by Op A. So either Op B can try to fake a laugh on the next transmission, or Op B uses the "hi hi" as a standardized laugh.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1675. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 01:42:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tmtte$st9$0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 24672

CAM wrote:
>
> Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers with
> > their nice habbits will come in droves.
>
> It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?

They've been coming in droves for some time now....the droves will just
get larger.

1676. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 01:47:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tmu8c$st9$1@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 24673

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <028833ADEBA69BBE.882EF94BB22E4E92.71A4EF907909FB94@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
> >prevalent among may ham radio operators.
>
> I don't agree, Rick. There are a few hams with those views, but most of the
> hams I've known are none of the above. Of course, a lot depends on how the
> terms are defined, and YMMV.
>
> >This kind of attitude
> >(exemplified by the Liberty Net on 75m and by many of the comments
> >made in this NG) seems degrading to hams in general.
>
> I'd say "They are bad for the image of the ARS."
> >
> > There have been threads in the past that addressed specific
> >racist problems, but so far as I know (and I'm far from an expert on
> >the news group) no thread has been created to discuss the concept in
> >general terms, and to examine the effect that kind of attitude have on
> >the ARS.
>
> allrighty then...
> >
> > From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
> >racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
> >hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
> >our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
> >that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.
>
> First thing ya gotta do is define what ya mean by racism, sexism, ageism, and
> religious prejudice. For example, is it racist to call people who are
> disturbing the peace "water buffaloes"? Is it sexist for me to say "Heidi Klum
> is gorgeous?" Is it ageist when someone calls me a "dinosaur" because I use CW
> on the air? Is it religious prejudice when Christianity is described as THE
> cause of sexual hangups in Western civilization?
> >
> > Comments?
>
> Sounds good to me but ya gotta define the terms first. One person's -ism is
> another's free speech.

Rick won't be happy unless he can write all the rules for everyone else whilst maintaining his charade of "free love and everything else for all, etc"....

1677. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 01:53:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tmui5$st9$2@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 24674

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tkr32$8nb$0@208.206.142.82...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > This, from a man who reads a book about a religion that takes years
> and
> > > > > lifetimes to understand, and thinks he knows all about it.
> > > >
> > > > Don't have a need to "know all about it", just enough.
> > >
> > > A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.
> >
> >
> > That's a good reason for acquiring more than a little.
> > But ass-u-me, as Kim does, that far too little is more than enough is
> > the mark of a fool.
>
> Have you lived the life of a Muslim, yet? Have you been to a Moslem, yet?
> Is Jesus mentioned anywhere the Muslim religion? Have you read more than
> one book? Have you listened to more than one or two folks about the
> religion?
>
> Yeah, thought so.

You didn't think at all. It would only reasonable that any female would
run for her life from Islam, for obvious reasons. So you love it.
Figures.
```

1678. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 01:55:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tmult$st9$3@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 24675

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> *Sigh* It was a matter of my not paying attention

If brains were dollars you still couldn't pay attention.

1679. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 02:03:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tmv5a$41s$0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 24676

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 05:39:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> > As to your last sentence: You've gotta find a new
> >group of friends.
>
> Why--because his current group are too open minded for you or
> because they violate your precious little narrow-minded values and you
> can't accept anyone else having a different set of moral values that
> are just as valid as your own?
>
> Rick
>
>

Dick McCullom is right on - Rick is so openminded the wind blows
through.
As for Kim, she reminds me of a sign I saw on a local truck stop
that said "Topless Waitresses - Nothing Above the Neck".

1680. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 02:20:24 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BFF04D2.5020300@att.net>
Source record: 24677

Dick Carroll wrote:

> It would only reasonable that any female would
> run for her life from Islam, for obvious reasons.

There you go again, Carroll, throwing the baby out with the bath water...

You insist on being eternaly wrong, painting with those, very , very broad strokes of your's...

You're getting dangerously close to becoming a laughing stock here with your zealous attempt at being the 'top schlemiel'...

Rich

1681. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 02:59:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tn2e3dpm0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 24678

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > If that is what you believe, Cecil, what's the problem?
>
> That's not what I believe.
>
> > If it's not what you believe, why do you go there?
>
> For God's sake, I'm lead bass in the choir.

See? he's gotten himself trapped in an intolerable situation and can't figure out how to extricate himself.

1682. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 03:09:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tn31ffrh0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 24679

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: Airmobile Hams
> >From: BH radioguyx@texxas.net
> >Date: 11/23/2001 4:03 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <3BFE0F66.76192ABC@texxas.net>
>
> >What about on board US Navy ships?
>
> Navy?! Hell...FORGET about the FCC! You do ANYTHING on THAT vessel
> without the CO's consent...ESPECIALLY something that can hazard the vessel, and
> some Part 97 infractions are your LAST worry!
>

Not only that, the FCC has nothong to do with what the military does.
That authority comes from elsewhere.

1683. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 03:11:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFF0FD5.4D891AA1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24680

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > If that is what you believe, Cecil, what's the problem?
> >
> > That's not what I believe.
> >
> > > If it's not what you believe, why do you go there?
> >
> > For God's sake, I'm lead bass in the choir.
>
> See? he's gotten himself trapped in an intolerable situation and can't
> figure out how to extricate himself.

Singing in the church choir is one of my few joys in this
hick town. But my specialty is "The Rodeo Song".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1684. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 03:16:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFF1115.6B74EE08@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24682

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Rick won't be happy unless he can write all the rules for everyone else
> whilst maintaining his charade of "free love and everything else for
> all, etc"....

I (and probably Rick) don't want to "write all the rules for everyone else".
We want everyone to have the freedom to adopt his/her own rules as long
as there are no victims of force or threat of force. You, OTOH, would like
to limit the freedom of others and force them to obey your emotional whims.
Why do you want to stick your ugly nose in other people's business? What
is wrong with live and let live?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1685. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 03:16:58 UTC
From: BH <radioguyx@texxas.net>
Message-ID: <3BFE58CB.75DDFE8C@texxas.net>
Source record: 24681

Like the cbers referring to s-meter readings as pounds. "You're
puttin 20 pounds on me, you got a roger on that?"

Krell wrote:
>
> Because they think that cute=funny. It's like that stupid "Dude, you're
> gettin' a Dell" commercial, or the Gateway commercials with the guy talking
> to his pet cow. People who do such things are saying, "Look at me! I'm being
> funny!" You can only get away with this if you're wearing red and white
> makeup, baggy clothes that clash, and performing in front of people whose
> age has not yet reached double digits.

Or their IQ.

1686. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 03:20:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFF11F9.65BA4E2C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24683

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > > I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers with
> > > their nice habbits will come in droves.
> > >
> > It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?
>
> They've been coming in droves for some time now....the droves will just
> get larger.

Droves????? The ham population is virtually unchanged. Most of what has
happened is tech+'s upgrading to general and generals/advanced upgrading
to extra. Exactly where are those "droves", Dick? (FYI, the sky is not
hard and cannot fall.)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1687. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 04:01:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tn627$ok5$0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 24684

CAM wrote:
>
> Why do you want to stick your ugly nose in other people's business?

Why do you want to stick your business in other people's nose?

1688. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 04:07:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tn6e2$q30$0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 24685

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:49:17 GMT, Nonya Bidniz <no_email@all.gov>
> wrote:
>
> >Not at all fair to the kid who is then going to walk into a
> >neighborhood populated entirely by minority members and very possibly
> >get his butt kicked in, wallet stolen, car trashed, etc. because
> >nobody bothered to tell him the truth.
>
> Except that the truth happens to be that the danger of violent
> crime is inversely proportional to the income level of the
> neighborhood. It doesn't matter if the residents are black, white,
> yellow, red, or green for that matter--if they are poor there will be
> a high crime rate, if they aren't there won't.

You can blow smoke out your posterior until it's too sore to sit on,
but you can't change the fact that any kid soon learns that most of the
crime comes from and within the ghetto, and guess what the ghetto is
mostly populated with? All the touchy-feely BS you can spread like
peanut butter won't change a thing.
And it's only racist if you make it to be. Basically it's fact.
Facts are what kids are very good at determining. BS is what you are
very good at spreading.

1689. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 04:11:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tn6kv$q30$1@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 24686

```
Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > It would only reasonable that any female would
> > run for her life from Islam, for obvious reasons.
>
> There you go again, Carroll, throwing the baby out with the bath water...
>
> You insist on being eternaly wrong, painting with those, very , very broad
> strokes of your's...
>
> You're getting dangerously close to becoming a laughing stock here with your
> zealous attempt at being the 'top schlemiel'...
>

I'm a realist. You're an idiot.
```

1690. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:03:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011124000337.02880.00000824@nso-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 24687

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gn9iul4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 23 Nov 2001 19:13:58 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>You mean how "other" religions are "wrong"? That's part of the
>>boilerplate - if a church says other religions aren't "wrong", there's
>>no reason for that church to exist.
>
> Jewish theology teaches that ours is not the "one and only" "right"
> faith and therefore all others are "wrong".

I did not know that, Phil. I stand corrected on the above.

So at least one major religion does not say all other religions are "wrong".

> It teaches that moral living is the "right" way, no matter which
> faith one adheres to in doing it.

Sounds like the right approach to me.

Thanks!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1691. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:09:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFF2B8C.D842E9A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24688

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Why do you want to stick your ugly nose in other people's business?
>
> Why do you want to stick your business in other people's nose?

I don't, Dick. I won't bother them and I don't want them to
bother me. What is wrong with live and let live? I don't
want to control what you do in the privacy of your home.
Why do you want to control what I do in the privacy of mine?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1692. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:28:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <83E1B30ECFA43199.266EB1DFC5451CA8.0C2CF1C3608070DD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24689

On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 05:09:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I didn't confirm it and I didn't use other words. What I did was
>decline to provide you a detailed explanation of how I arrived at my
>decision. Did I miss the part where such is mandatory?

It isn't mandatory for scientists trying to write for a
Journal, either.

We laugh at them, too.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1693. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:29:49 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3BFF3137.2090301@att.net>
Source record: 24690

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> Richard Plourde wrote:
>
>>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> > It would only reasonable that any female would
>> > run for her life from Islam, for obvious reasons.
>>
>>There you go again, Carroll, throwing the baby out with the bath water...
>>
>>You insist on being eternaly wrong, painting with those, very , very broad
>>strokes of your's...
>>
>>You're getting dangerously close to becoming a laughing stock here with your
>>zealous attempt at being the 'top schlemiel'...
>>
>>
>
> I'm a realist. You're an idiot.
>

Well, well, well... what have we here? Carroll's attempt at repartee'????

You are soooooo predictable... you're becoming a charicature of yourself.

Have another dozen doughnuts and case of beer you'll feel better in the
morning... ;-)

Rich

1694. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:35:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A7F92F77BFA5D008.C76100A3D3400BF6.372F3EC973EF3B33@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24691

On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 05:12:51 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Being open-minded and believing that there is no right and wrong are two
>different issues.

The problem is, Dave, that you don't base your concepts of
right and wrong on harm to others, you base them on your PERSONAL
values, not values arrived at through logic.

You have every right to define right and wrong in your
personal life--but there ARE no "absolute" values for right and wrong,
thus you're values are only applicapable to you and others who share
your values.

Why is that so difficult to understand? If my actions harm
you, it is clear (by recourse to logic) that a "wrong" has occurred.
If my actions do NOT harm you, what possible grounds can exist to
claim that my actions are "wrong," unless they are defined in that
manner by my OWN moral values? It can't be your values, you aren't
involved in the action and thus aren't in a position to judge its
"rightness." It can't be society's values, for the same reason. That
leaves ONLY myself and others involved in the action. And if we don't
find it wrong, by any logic it ISN'T wrong.

> My views aren't little though they are precious. To
>my knowledge you aren't in charge of deciding that they are
>narrow-minded. They are MY views however.

Just as I'm not "in charge" of deciding that your views are
narrow-minded, you are not "in charge" of deciding that Kim's (or mine
for that matter) are "immoral" or "tasteless."

Think about it.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1695. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:39:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <887B94DC0A930298.B2CBC2526C5F8194.34139715CCB3AA35@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24692

On Thu, 22 Nov 2001 21:53:23 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>Wasn't there a prophet that negated kosher laws for Christians? I seem to
>remember that Isaiah, Daniel, or some other prophet had a dream in which god
>told him to eat what was before him. It was a feast of snakes, frogs, pigs,
>lizards and everything that was "unclean." God told the guy, "If I say it's
>OK, then it's OK."

Hey, Krell,

I just had a dream in which God told me to have all the
Christians in the NG send me all their money and ham gear. He said
that if he says it's ok, then it's ok.

I'm waiting . . .

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1696. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:45:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BD92C95E73DBA155.73F555FC34F2ECC2.7DFFDE47E648EA2F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24693

On 24 Nov 2001 04:07:30 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> You can blow smoke out your posterior until it's too sore to sit on,
>but you can't change the fact that any kid soon learns that most of the
>crime comes from and within the ghetto, and guess what the ghetto is
>mostly populated with?

Poor people, you idiot. Why do you think they CALL it a
ghetto?

Remember the Warsaw Ghetto? The Ghetto in Bucharest? The
Polish Ghetto in Chicago?

>All the touchy-feely BS you can spread like
>peanut butter won't change a thing.

No it won't. You're a bigot and nothing even approaching the
truth is likely to get through that racist barrier.

> And it's only racist if you make it to be.

No, Dick. It's racist if you make untrue statements about a
group, stereotype a group, or otherwise single that group out as your
inferiors.

> Basically it's fact.

Basically, it's bigoted nonsense that would make Archie Bunker
cringe.

> Facts are what kids are very good at determining. BS is what you are
>very good at spreading.

And hatred, racism, and bigotry are your forte. So what?
SOMEONE has to clean up after cretins like yourself and insure that
the children you pollute in your homes have a chance to learn the
truth once you get your claws out of them and they reach college.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1697. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:51:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFF3555.6FBDC943@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24694

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You continued to act as if I had posted a deliberate lie due to my typo.
>
> That is a lie. I never said anything about your lie being deliberate.
> Your typo was an inadvertent lie and I pulled your leg about it.

An inadvertant lie? You're a scream, Cecil. Yessir, that's a real
knee-slapper.

> From Webster's: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or
> may not be believed true by the speaker" A typo is an inaccurate
> statement especially if the typo spells a perfectly good English
> word.
>
> But you still cannot prove anything *I* said by only quoting what
> *you* said. I have never before seen such a ridiculous approach to
> an argument.

Sure you have, Cecil. You've penned many of 'em.

Dave K8MN

1698. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:52:05 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <74351f51ce66c5eb65293fe2012446f8.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 24695

"Kim-W5TIT" wrote:

> > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
>
> Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
>
> Larry
> Dick Carroll
> Richard McCollum
> Hans (I'm not sure though)
> Dave Heil

Kim,

I've never called you ignorant, bigoted, or any other defamatory or denigrating personal characteristic. To my knowledge I have never met you or had any opportunity to know you. Therefor, I wouldn't have the audacity to label you as such.

I am of the sincere opinion, however, that you have chosen a trashy vanity callsign. Expressing that opinion reflects on your choice, not on your character.

Your decision to label me (or any of the other four on your list, for that matter) as an "ignorant bigoted ham" based on having civilly expressed my opinion, speaks volumes about your personal integrity, however.

Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas11poolc127.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.21.127]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1699. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:56:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFF366A.810DC598@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24696

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > To help balance the views, Kim. We wouldn't want things to lean too far
> > to the left.
>
> Leaning in the direction of freedom is definitely not leaning to
> either the left or the right. The liberal left is generally for
> social freedom and against economic freedom.

I was addressing the liberal left.

>The conservative right
> is generally for economic freedom and against social freedom.
> Note that both are anti-freedom is certain areas. Libertarians
> are for both social and economic freedom, i.e. freedom in general.

I addressed the liberal left from the conservative right. I didn't
address the libertarian at all.

Dave K8MN

1700. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 05:57:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFF3698.B0428B68@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24697

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I don't believe that only a small minority of Christians practice their
> > > > religion properly? You can bet that I don't accept that.
> > >
> > > That's easy to prove, Dave. I'll bet the majority of Christians
> > > eat pork. I'll bet you eat pork in direct defiance of God's will.
> >
> > It'll be a hoot watching you try to prove this one, Cecil.
>
> Well, let's start with you, Dave. Do you eat pork?

Oh, did you think *I* was going to assist you? Try and find out.

Dave K8MN

1701. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 06:00:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFF3751.1ABBE134@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24698

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Convert? Sure the Church attempts to convert others in order to spread
> > the word of the gospels. Does the Church preach that those with
> > different religious beliefs are wrong or inferior? No.
>
> Don't know about your church but Southern Baptist churches certainly
> preach that "those with different religious beliefs are wrong or
> inferior".

Try to read the posts and you'll find the answer. I'm not a Southern
Baptist.

> I hear it almost every Sunday. Did you know that Buddha,
> a good man who died 300 years before Christ was born, went straight
> to hell?

No I didn't and neither do any of the Southern Baptists. It is my
understanding that Jesus died for the redemtion of the sins of all men.
That goes for those before and after him. It looks as if Buddha is
covered.

Dave K8MN

1702. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 06:02:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFF37CD.A5CC3532@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24699

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > We cannot discuss morality without discussing government's attempt to
> > > control morality.
> > >
> > I don't agree with your initial statement.
>
> So you would just put the blinders on when it comes to the government's
> attempt to control morality? Why am I not surprised?
>
> > I don't have any
> > information that declares that all living in the South were against the
> > Civil Rights Act. Your fellow Texan and our President wasn't against
> > it.
>
> I didn't say "all" and you just proved my point. Lyndon Johnson went
> against the wishes of the majority of Texans.

Please point us to a document which provides a percentage of southerners
opposed to passage of the Civil Rights Act.

Dave K8MN

1703. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 06:21:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3BFF3C43.9A4B4C9A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24700

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 05:12:51 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Being open-minded and believing that there is no right and wrong are two
> >different issues.
>
> The problem is, Dave, that you don't base your concepts of
> right and wrong on harm to others, you base them on your PERSONAL
> values, not values arrived at through logic.

> You have every right to define right and wrong in your
> personal life--but there ARE no "absolute" values for right and wrong,
> thus you're values are only applicapable to you and others who share
> your values.

Yeah, and it must really chafe a liberal, free love sort of guy like
you. It would seem that the society agrees that the limits stop short
of being where you'd like them to be.

> Why is that so difficult to understand? If my actions harm
> you, it is clear (by recourse to logic) that a "wrong" has occurred.
> If my actions do NOT harm you, what possible grounds can exist to
> claim that my actions are "wrong," unless they are defined in that
> manner by my OWN moral values? It can't be your values, you aren't
> involved in the action and thus aren't in a position to judge its
> "rightness." It can't be society's values, for the same reason. That
> leaves ONLY myself and others involved in the action. And if we don't
> find it wrong, by any logic it ISN'T wrong.

Sure it can be societal values, Rick. We live under societal values
even if we are not religious people at all. Society decides when harm
is done. You don't have the opportunity to decide that for yourself.

> > My views aren't little though they are precious. To
> >my knowledge you aren't in charge of deciding that they are
> >narrow-minded. They are MY views however.
>
> Just as I'm not "in charge" of deciding that your views are
> narrow-minded, you are not "in charge" of deciding that Kim's (or mine
> for that matter) are "immoral" or "tasteless."
>
> Think about it.
>
> Rick

I've done so and have said that my views are just that--my views. How many times do I need to make that statement? I thought Kim's choice tacky and still retain that view.

Dave K8MN

1704. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 06:35:37 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3BD8E2F66DBA72F6.A3286F6FEDD873F8.5EE3C9A58F439A8F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24751

On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 07:16:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I asked the one who sat at my Thanksgiving dinner table. He says you're
>incorrect as regards the Episcopal Church. The Church also has the say
>on what music is permissable or not.

I'll digitize and send you a video clip (from HBO, btw) of an
Episcopal priest conducting a marriage ceremony (using the Episcopal
rituals for all but the exchange of vows) in Washington D.C., in 1993
for approximately 5,000 gay and lesbian couples who he invited to
recite their own vows to each other then pronounced married. They may
not be married under law, but they ARE married under church law (ask
your Priest)--and the priest who did so is still ordained and serving
as pastor of his church.

Let me know where to send the clip.

>Yeah, I have the idea what your views are. I don't agree with 'em.

I doubt seriously that you do, Dave. Simply because someone
doesn't try to control the life or choices of his/her partner does NOT
mean that he or she doesn't have a good--or monogamous--relationship,
only that they respect their spouse and respect their spouse's rights
and freedom of choice.

>> You mean someone else is supporting my wife's and son's needs
>> economically, intellectually, and emotionally? Someone is taking care
>> of her when she's sick, cheering her up when she's down, helping her
>> with her tasks, providing her emotional support and encouragement,
>> standing up for her if she's threatened or attacked, helping her with
>> her research, and taking her shopping (among other things)?
>>
>> Who?
>
>Let's see...Her dad could support her economically or she could do it
>herself. Her best friend could support her intellectual needs. Her
>sister could be her emotional support. A guard dog could ward off
>attacks and she could either drive or take the bus shopping.

Her Dad lives on Social Security.

I'm her best friend.

She doesn't have a sister.

We have cats not dogs.

There are no busses where we live (her choice of location,
btw), we're 30 miles from the nearest small city.

She doesn't drive.

Note, incidently, that I asked who IS doing certain things and
you reply with who "could" do so if they chose (and existed).

Try sticking to a thread if you participate in it. You're
beginning to sound like Larry & Dick.

>> Or are you referring to sex as the "job of a good husband." If
>> so, I have to ask: What on earth makes you think of sex as a "job" in
>> the first place?
>
>You used the word. Was is a euphemism?

Go back to the original quote and re-read it.
>
>> >My tongue was firmly planted in cheek.
>>
>> Actually, your foot was firmly planted in your mouth.
>
>Actually, the meaning is lost since you snipped the portion of your
>statment to which I responded.

So put it back. You STILL ended up with your foot in your
mouth.

>I think you'd have problems whether you were informed beforehand or
>found out later.

Why?

>> What does society OR religion have to do with my private
>> behavior?
>
>I don't believe that any of us is formed without influence from society
>or religion. I don't believe that any individual brought up in a vacuum
>would have a clue about right or wrong. I don't know that any such
>individual exists.

But right or wrong are _relative_ not absolutes.

Example:

Is sexual intercourse right or wrong?

It shouldn't matter who the people involved are if it's an
absolute value--either it's "Right" or it's "Wrong."

But, of course, it ISN'T an absolute.

Is it right?

For a loving married couple, we would BOTH say yes.

If the woman is forced to do so, we would BOTH say no.

If the man and woman aren't married to each other, however, we
run into a problem--because depending on the circumstances we probably
WON'T agree in all cases.

Does that make your values right and mine wrong? Or mine right
and your's wrong? Or does it simply mean that we don't share the SAME
values in some areas and probably do in others.

It isn't how you are brought up that determines what is right
and wrong--how you are brought up determines only what YOU believe to
be right and wrong. But belief does NOT make for fact.

>>It would be idiotic for me to adhere to the values of a
>> religion I didn't believe in simply because other people do so in my
>> community--if everyone in your neighborhood believed their homes were
>> on fire would you start spraying water in your living room even though
>> you saw no flames or smoke? As far as "society" goes, try to remember
>> that society is simply an accumulation of individuals. Thus there is
>> no possible reason to assume that "society" has any more valid basis
>> for its rules than any individual who is a part of it.
>
>That's poppycock. All individuals don't possess the same amount of gray
>matter and it only stands to reason that a society--your accumulation of
>individuals--will have a sum total of experience and intellect greater
>than any one individual can ever hope to have.

Really?

It could _just_ as logically be argued that we should have a
dictatorship, since a dictator who was brilliant wouldn't have his
intellect "Dulled" by the many lower intellect members of the society
and could therefore be counted on to make the right decisions more
often than would be the case if the population were to do so.

If the population of a nation invariably have a greater amount
of experience and a higher intellect--they explain the following:

The election of the Nazis to power in Germany.

The makeup of our current congress and presidency.

Bigotry.

War.

Domestic Violence.

Hate crimes.

The Civil War.

The Vietnam War.

The popularity of the Home Shopping Network, the fact that the number ONE selling paper in the US is the Weekly World News, tobacco smoking, or the Drug War.

Go for it, Dave. If society is so smart, why do these problems exist or these absurd choices of leaders occur?

>> So long as my actions don't harm others, it really isn't the
>> concern of anyone but myself--just because YOUR religion opposes a
>> given behavior doesn't justify banning it--only avoiding it yourself.
>
>But society has always determinded which of your activities harm
>others. You don't have the final say.

Really?

So if society determines that drinking alcohol, smoking cigarettes, using ham radio, and watching movies with a rating greater than "PG" harm others, you will immediately stop doing them?

It isn't up to society to arbitrarily decide which of my activates harm others--it's up to society to PROVE that those actions harm others before prohibiting them. And when it comes to morals laws, it's pretty hard for them to do that.

>> Color IS apparent. It is also irrelevant. Teaching a child to
>> be color blind, as you know, is simply teaching him or her that the
>> color of a person's skin has absolutely no relationship to that
>> person's personality, behavior, intelligence, or capabilities. If you
>> insist that color should not be ignored then it could be added that
>> the color of someone's skin DOES indicate the clothing colors that
>> will look best on them and the degree of protection from burning they
>> should look for in a sun block. Fair enough?
>
>Then don't use cliches like "color blind" when you mean to say that skin
>color is irrelevant. That should also be fair enough.

Ok, but be sure not to sign any of your messages "73," since it's a cliche. Just say "goodbye" instead from now on.

>> Are you arguing that the Episcopal church does not attempt
>> to convert non-Christians to their beliefs--and that they do not see
>> other religious beliefs as being "wrong" or inferior to Christianity?
>
>Convert? Sure the Church attempts to convert others in order to spread
>the word of the gospels. Does the Church preach that those with
>different religious beliefs are wrong or inferior? No.

Then perhaps you can explain to me how they manage to "convert" people from their current religion, while simultaneously telling them that their current religion is as good as Christianity?

>> you can speak for the Episcopal church? And if so, and your statement
>> above is true, then justify ANY of your comments about the morality of

>> my views or Kim's call sign.
>
>I believe that Kim is ignorant of the impropriety of her choice. Now,
>am I speaking from my religious or societal perspective?

Are you stating that her call is or is not immoral?

If it is not, then there is no possible impropriety involved.
It is no more relevant that her call is W5TIT than it would be if it
were W5ITT.

If, otoh, it IS immoral (thus justifying the accusation of
impropriety) then you are either basing that view on a religious
definition of morality or on none at all (in which case, by
definition, her sign CAN'T be immoral). No non-religious (and not all
religious--outside of Christianity at least) philosophy defines
natural human sexuality or the human body as "immoral." Only religions
reserve that right.

Again, are you stating that her call is immoral (and thus
admitting that you ARE speaking from a religious perspective) or are
you stating that it is NOT immoral (and therefore not improper)?

>Who gets to judge which views of society are based in religion, Rick?
>Is it you? Do you deny that some of your recent statements regarding
>Christianity would be offensive of any Christian? Society could find
>fault with your sexual views on public health or nuisance issues.

Really?

Show me a single quote from any post I've made that would
justify a definition of fault from a strictly secular perspective.

>> Ok--find TEN Christians that practice the religion precisely
>> the way it is intended to be practiced--in other words precisely as
>> the bible instructs them to practice it and I'll retract that
>> statement.
>
>Any what, precisely is supposed to be my motivation for doing so?
>You'll want to contact a church group in order to conduct your own
>research.

Translation: You know that it's completely impossible for you
to do so, so you choose to pretend there's no reason for you to try.

>> Turn that around, Dave. If you want to accuse me of making an
>> unproven statement, then prove it's wrong.
>
>Prove a negative? Good luck with that one.

That isn't proving a negative when you are dealing with stated
facts. All you have to do is demonstrate that the facts are in
error--and provide more evidence than your statement that they are.

We do that DAILY in research, Dave. Once a hypothesis is
formed, it is the focus of research to attempt to disprove the
hypothesis and only if it can't be disproved do we state it appears to
be supported within a given range of probability.

You can't disprove a negative ACCUSATION--which is why Kim
hasn't already disproved the accusations that her call sign is
"tasteless." But you CAN disprove a negative STATEMENT.

>> >I think they'd find much agreement on most items from your list from a
>> >group of secular citizens with no church ties at all.
>>
>> Based on what source of morality?
>>
>> With the exception of the Judeo-Christian religions, there IS
>> no basis for opposition to any of those behaviors or lifestyles. Only
>> with the entry of religious morality is sex (in any form except rape)
>> considered in any way inappropriate. Again you are basing your claim
>> that I'm wrong on what you "think" would be the position of others.
>> Sorry, Dave, but unless you have research evidence that demonstrates
>> non-Christian (and non-religious) members of our society oppose such
>> things as limitations on gay rights, consensual sexual behavior
>> between adults, etc., you don't have anything but pure guesswork to
>> base your claim on--a VERY flimsy grounds for claiming someone else is
>> incorrect.
>
>What part of an "I think" statement don't you understand? You don't
>offer any proof that your statement is correct. You'd have us believe
>that societies not based in the Judeo-Christian ethic have no sexual
>taboos.

And, as usual, you are avoiding the specific question and
trying to pretend that I asked something different than I did.

>> Would you care for a few dozen more? I can easily provide
>> them--including court citations.
>
>...but you didn't.

You didn't ask for them.

>> You didn't state that the US had a better tax rate than other
>> nations (it doesn't, try Monaco or Saudi Arabia)--you stated that it
>> had more freedom. High taxes have nothing to do with that.
>
>Certainly they do. Would you like to enjoy the freedoms offered by Saudi
>Arabia? Your sexual ideas would certainly be a hit there.

Er, Dave.

My reference was to the tax rate in Saudi Arabia, not to
freedom. Read more carefully.

>> As far as social problems go, we have VASTLY more in the US
>> than in any Western European nation with the possible exception of the
>> relatively recently reunited Germany. Again, that has nothing to do
>> with freedom--the subject of your claim.
>
>Social problems indicate turmoil and instability and that has plenty to
>do with freedom. I disagree with your assessment that we have "VASTLY"
>or even any more social problems than in any Western European nation.

Take a look at the current crime statistics, rate of infant
mortality in our cities, percentage of our citizens incarcerated, rate
of teen pregnancy, cost of our drug war, AIDS infection rate, rape
rate, domestic violence rate, or the ranking of our schools, to name
just a few at random.

Now tell me again we don't have VASTLY more social problems
than Western European nations.

>> I wouldn't have the vaguest idea--but based on your statements
>> about other nations you did NOT teach political science.
>
>I retired from the Foreign Service a year ago.

Is that supposed to make you an expert on politics?

If you served in foreign posts, it's too bad you didn't take
the opportunity to absorb more of their cultures.

>A gifted journalist once told me that you don't go to journalism classes
>to learn journalism. You go to journalism classes to learn to teach
>journalism.

Yup.

I don't go to psychology, sociology, or political science
classes to LEARN those subjects, either.

Your point being?

>In the end, ask yourself why there are lots more folks from foreign
>countries coming to the U.S. each year than Americans who move abroad.

On the basis of years of education--there AREN'T.

For the first time in American history, in the last decade,
the EMMIGRATION rate for individuals with a Bachelors degree or better
has exceeded the IMMIGRATION rate for individuals with that level of
education. In other words, we're exporting our best minds.

Ask yourself why.

> Correction to translation: Please save me from this leftist
>rhetoric...

For someone who claims to know something about political
issues, you certainly don't seem to know the difference between a

leftist and a libertarian.

>> I didn't say EVERYTHING is ok--I stated that the ONLY
>> legitimate grounds for restricting any individual's actions are if
>> those actions will harm the person or property of a non-consenting
>> individual. That isn't "everything is ok," it's "nothing that does no
>> harm is the business of society" a very different statement.
>
>Who gets to make the decision on what harms society?

The people involved in the activity. If society isn't
involved, it CAN'T be harmed!

>> In other words unless I've gone through a seminary and
>> continuing education I have no right to comment on a religion?
>
>Not at all what I stated. Unless you've gone through seminary and years
>of continuing education, you assuredly do not know more about the root
>beliefs of Christianity as an ordained minister.
>
>> Ok--fair enough. Since you haven't gone through several years
>> of graduate education in linguistics, you have no right to comment on
>> Kim's call sign, which is an expression of language.
>
>Not fair enough. I never made the silly claim like yours.

Hmmmmmmmmmmm . . .

>When you begin the comparisons of the teachings of Jesus to Hitler, I
>quit. When you begin to compare Christianity to Nazism, I quit.

Why?

Can't you refute my comparisons?

>We're done now Rick.

Ok.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1705. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 07:19:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bff4aab$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24753

Man, I must be making some sense to you! Thanks!

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tmult$st9$3@208.207.71.169...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > *Sigh* It was a matter of my not paying attention
>
>
> If brains were dollars you still couldn't pay attention.

1706. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 07:19:55 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <Twistedhed@wedtv.net>
Message-ID: <vSHL7.8082$rU3.67219@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 24752

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:028833ADEBA69BBE.882EF94BB22E4E92.71A4EF907909FB94@lp.airnews.net...
> A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
> prevalent among may ham radio operators. This kind of attitude
> (exemplified by the Liberty Net on 75m and by many of the comments
> made in this NG) seems degrading to hams in general.

Riley Hollingsworth was the guest speaker at the Fort Wayne IN. Hamfest last weekend. It was a standing room only crowd as he played a tape of the Liberty Net for the assembled Hams to hear. He also mentioned he has a sizable collection of tapes of that group. His comments centered around the idea that neither he, nor the FCC can do much if anything about the on-air fights over who was on the frequency first, etc. In fact he is of the opinion that the conduct of the Hams recorded on that tape will do more to ruin Ham Radio more than anything else. His logic proceeded from the idea that the news media, and general public's, impression comes directly from monitoring our on-air conduct. As he pointed out the media is in the business of selling a product, entertainment. They don't care how many times the ARS provides valuable communications services during times of need, like in N.Y. on 9/11, but it takes only one story about the antics of a group like the Liberty Net to get the public fired up about how Hams are using, more like miss using in their eyes, billions of dollars of spectrum. He said it is up to us, the average Ham to put some pressure on the likes of the Liberty Net to clean up their act. He considers that a part of the self policing action of the ARS.

What I also found startling was his comment about who he has the most trouble with on the bands. In his words many of the complaints are about the on-air conduct of Extra and Advanced Class Hams who think "...they have a license to drive people crazy." Even more amazing was his comment that contrary to popular opinion he has had little to no trouble with the Tech Class. In fact he commented that what he does hear is most Tech Class license holders are very eager to comply with the rules, and will modify their operating practices normally without further contact. Further was his personal on-air experience where he doesn't notice much change in the operations of the ARS considering the large change, due to restructuring, that took place about a year ago, i.e. the bands have not gone to the dogs (not his words, but general idea). He considers that a very positive point.

I'm sure somebody will take exception to the comments above, and their comments should be direct to Mr. Hollingsworth. If there were any others on the group, who attented his talk, they can also testifiy as to his general comments.

--

--

--

73's de,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction functions."

1707. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 07:22:37 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bff4b58_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24754

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tn627$ok5$0@208.206.142.74...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Why do you want to stick your ugly nose in other people's business?
>
>
>
>
> Why do you want to stick your business in other people's nose?

'Dya read that in one 'o dem dar intelligent books ya been lookin' at
lately?

Kim W5TIT

1708. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 07:26:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bff4c4f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24755

"Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:74351f51ce66c5eb65293fe2012446f8.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Kim-W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> >
> > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
> >
> > Larry
> > Dick Carroll
> > Richard McCollum
> > Hans (I'm not sure though)
> > Dave Heil
>
> Kim,
>
> I've never called you ignorant, bigoted, or any other defamatory or
> denigrating personal characteristic. To my knowledge I have never met
> you or had any opportunity to know you. Therefor, I wouldn't have the
> audacity to label you as such.
>
> I am of the sincere opinion, however, that you have chosen a trashy
> vanity callsign. Expressing that opinion reflects on your choice,
> not on your character.
>
> Your decision to label me (or any of the other four on your list, for
> that matter) as an "ignorant bigoted ham" based on having civilly
> expressed my opinion, speaks volumes about your personal integrity,
> however.
>
> Hans, K0HB
>
>

The approach, with you, wasn't from the angle of my callsign. It was from
other stuff I've seen posted from you.

Kim W5TIT

1709. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 09:05:49 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <NpJL7.219944$W8.7783397@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24756

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tn2e3dpm0@208.207.71.146...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > If that is what you believe, Cecil, what's the problem?
> >
> > That's not what I believe.
> >
> > > If it's not what you believe, why do you go there?
> >
> > For God's sake, I'm lead bass in the choir.
>
>
> See? he's gotten himself trapped in an intolerable situation and can't
> figure out how to extricate himself.

Not at all, Dick. Like 90% of church members, he doesn't believe a word of it but enjoys the socialization; he just admits it. The relationship between the pastor and the choir is a rocky one anyway; both want control.

Many years ago, the Roman Church figured it out: the 6AM mass was for people who work for a living, 8 AM is for families where the kids are out of bed anyway, 10 AM is the high mass for the poobahs and the choir, and noon is for those too hung over to make it earlier. Same pattern in Protestant groups. All it means is that 11 AM, no one in the place believes a word of it.

Born Klutz

1710. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 09:28:27 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <%KJL7.434$9d.140537@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24757

Larry..... for once I will agree with you..... Also NYPD Blue and Homicide also. I also have alot of catching up to do. Fortunately my job allows me to watch (more like listen than anything) and I just tape the stuff and watch it at work.

Ryan

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011120224351.27773.00002969@nso-fo.aol.com...
> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gn4enyw.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:
>
> >
> > When is the re-run scheduled? Sure beats old "Law and Order".
>
> Objection, Your Honor! I like the old "Law and Order" re-runs --
> especially since I've not seen many of them from when they were
> "All-New Episodes" in prime time!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1711. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 09:28:28 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <0LJL7.435$9d.140537@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24759

Sounds like a storage unit is in order!

Ryan

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:60C246D7C6064ACE.230ACDAFCE7A8DB9.E361368284D5F1AA@lp.airnews.net...
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 21:14:09 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
> wrote:
>
> > My wife and I have discussed such a move, and this is not the right
> > time for us to make it, though.
>
> Talk about an opposite move--my wife and I are considering
> going full time as RVers next year when I retire from teaching (at 57
> YEA!!!!)--which should be interesting considering we have 6000+ books,
> 4000+CDs and six computer systems! :-)
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1712. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 09:28:29 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <1LJL7.436$9d.140537@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24758

Cecil..... you lied to me!! You said a while back you were a Thespian!!
(spellcheck got it wrong eh?)

Just kiddin'

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFD0BFF.11262F0C@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > But----he claimed that he is a woman in a man's body!
>
> But it's OK, I'm a lesbian.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1713. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 09:28:30 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <2LJL7.437$9d.140537@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24760

> Double meaning? Who, ME?
>
> Actually, it doesn't matter if Larry sees lesbians as the
> equivalent of men--but I know a few lesbians who would DEFINITELY
> respond if he didn't see them as the EQUAL of men! ;-)

Yeah..... me too..... have seen them at Harley Davidson shops and truck stops! And a voice deeper and more gravely than mine! Got knocked on my ass though when I said one time to one of them "Excuse me sir!"

Ryan

>
> Rick
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH

1714. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 09:28:31 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <3LJL7.438$9d.140537@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24761

Just had an interesting thought there Kim..... what if we had a bunch of people generate message traffic TO YOU (with your call obviously). Can you imagine what people might do within the NTS??? Definitely prove or disprove the alleged comments made here. Just a though I had.

Ryan KC8PMX

>
> You must be the "silent majority" because the majority of people I encounter
> over my callsign have no problem with it at all. And, a "silent majority"
> is either a) a secret society, or b) useless.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

1715. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 09:46:15 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <H%JL7.219954$W8.7785036@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24762

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:1LJL7.436$9d.140537@newshog.newsread.com...
> Cecil..... you lied to me!! You said a while back you were a Thespian!!
> (spellcheck got it wrong eh?)
>
> Just kiddin'
>
> Ryan
>

And in his youth, he openly matriculated.

1716. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 13:04:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011124080400.03411.00000825@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 24763

In article <A7F92F77BFA5D008.C76100A3D3400BF6.372F3EC973EF3B33@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 05:12:51 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Being open-minded and believing that there is no right and wrong are two
>>different issues.
>
> The problem is, Dave, that you don't base your concepts of
>right and wrong on harm to others, you base them on your PERSONAL
>values, not values arrived at through logic.

You do exactly the same thing, Rick.
>
> You have every right to define right and wrong in your
>personal life--but there ARE no "absolute" values for right and wrong,
>thus you're values are only applicapable to you and others who share
>your values.

How do you KNOW there are no absolute values for right and wrong? Besides,
making that statement is an absolute!
>
> Why is that so difficult to understand? If my actions harm
>you, it is clear (by recourse to logic) that a "wrong" has occurred.

Yup. But who gets to decide whether "harm" has occurred? The person who did
the action? The person who is supposedly harmed? Some neutral third party?
What criteria determines "harm"? That is all "personal value" stuff.

>If my actions do NOT harm you, what possible grounds can exist to
>claim that my actions are "wrong," unless they are defined in that
>manner by my OWN moral values?

There's no claim at all - that's obvious. But again the question is: who gets
to decide whether harm has occurred?

>It can't be your values, you aren't
>involved in the action and thus aren't in a position to judge its
>"rightness."

Does this mean that the "victim" has no say about whether harm has occurred?

> It can't be society's values, for the same reason. That
>leaves ONLY myself and others involved in the action.

So only the persons committing an action get to decide whether harm has occurred? I don't think you mean that!

>And if we don't
>find it wrong, by any logic it ISN'T wrong.
>
>> My views aren't little though they are precious. To
>>my knowledge you aren't in charge of deciding that they are
>>narrow-minded. They are MY views however.
>
> Just as I'm not "in charge" of deciding that your views are
>narrow-minded, you are not "in charge" of deciding that Kim's (or mine
>for that matter) are "immoral" or "tasteless."

Who gets to decide if a particular callsign causes harm or not?
>
> Think about it.
>
You're avoiding the central questions, Rick: Who decides whether harm has occurred? Who decides whether the harm is great enough to require some sort of action to remedy the situation?

Here's an example: Suppose A lets his property become a real mess. Grass isn't cut, paint is peeling, junk in the yard, etc. Nothing that is a clear health or safety hazard but the place looks awful. B, who lives right next door, wants to sell his house and move away because B doesn't like living next to such a dump. But B cannot find a buyer because of the condition of A's place. Has A harmed B? Who gets to decide? If the decision is yes, how much harm has occurred and what is the remedy?

Suppose B finds a buyer (C) who agrees to buy B's house but at a price far below fair market value because of the condition of A's place. Is A responsible for B's loss? Can C try to get A to fix up the property?

Who decides? Whose values of "harm" should be used? Think about it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1717. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 14:28:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3bffadc1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24764

Hello, Ryan. Well, I know you submitted with tongue-in-cheek, because I've always stated (and it's true) that my callsign is no distraction to responsibly-minded individuals on the air.

I have participated in NTS; have served as net control on NTS nets; have participated in public service events; have served as net control in public service events; have been the voice of training for Hunt County ARES nets and, a couple years back, nets for a group we named TRADES; and the list goes on. My callsign has been no problem--in fact never even been mentioned after the fact--on any kind of net. I am sure that those who disagree with it just leave the matter alone and disregard it, and those who do find humor or whatever, in it, know that nets are not the time.

In fact, responsibly-minded people see it as nothing more than a callsign, and one that has a great deal of "conversational value" off the air, for those eyeball get-togethers!

Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)

Kim W5TIT

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:3LJL7.438$9d.140537@newshog.newsread.com...
> Just had an interesting thought there Kim..... what if we had a bunch of
> people generate message traffic TO YOU (with your call obviously). Can
you
> imagine what people might do within the NTS??? Definitely prove or
disprove
> the alleged comments made here. Just a though I had.
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
> >
> > You must be the "silent majority" because the majority of people I
> encounter
> > over my callsign have no problem with it at all. And, a "silent
majority"
> > is either a) a secret society, or b) useless.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

1718. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 14:42:37 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tobku0ru2@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24767

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3bff4b58_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tn627$ok5$0@208.206.142.74...
> > Why do you want to stick your business in other people's nose?
>
> 'Dya read that in one 'o dem dar intelligent books ya been lookin' at
> lately?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Probably one that has ads for Charles Atlas and x-ray glasses.

1719. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 14:51:24 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9toc370t2t@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24768

"Leland C. Scott" <Twistedhed@wedtv.net> wrote in message
news:vSHL7.8082$rU3.67219@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net...

>What I also found startling was his comment about who he has the most
trouble with on the bands. >In his words many of the complaints are about
the on-air conduct of Extra and Advanced Class >Hams who think "...they have
a license to drive people crazy." Even more amazing was his >comment that
contrary to popular opinion he has had little to no trouble with the Tech
Class. In >fact he commented that what he does hear is most Tech Class
license holders are very eager to >comply with the rules, and will modify
their operating practices normally without further contact. >Further was his
personal on-air experience where he doesn't notice much change in the
>operations .of the ARS considering the large change, due to restructuring,
that took place about a >year ago, i.e. the bands have not gone to the dogs
(not his words, but general idea). He considers >that a very positive point.
>
>I'm sure somebody will take exception to the comments above, and their
comments should be >direct to Mr. Hollingsworth. If there were any others on
the group, who attented his talk, they can >also testifiy as to his general
comments.
>
>
>--
>__
>__
>
>73's de,
>
>Leland C. Scott
>KC8LDO

Interesting comments. It's also interesting to note that these Extra and
Advanced hams passed the 13 and 20 WPM code tests.

1720. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:00:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFB61C.2E4E3A6B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24765

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You continued to act as if I had posted a deliberate lie due to my typo.
> >
> > That is a lie. I never said anything about your lie being deliberate.
> > Your typo was an inadvertent lie and I pulled your leg about it.
>
> An inadvertant lie? You're a scream, Cecil. Yessir, that's a real
> knee-slapper.

If you disagree with the following definition, take it up with the
publishers of Webster's dictionaries.

> > From Webster's: "lie - an untrue or inaccurate statement that may or
> > may not be believed true by the speaker" A typo is an inaccurate
> > statement especially if the typo spells a perfectly good English
> > word.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1721. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:02:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFB681.E7BA300A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24766

```
Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> news:1LJL7.436$9d.140537@newshog.newsread.com...
> > Cecil..... you lied to me!! You said a while back you were a Thespian!!
> > (spellcheck got it wrong eh?)
> >
> > Just kiddin' Ryan
>
> And in his youth, he openly matriculated.

But I wore latex gloves.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1722. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:22:31 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3bffb955.1943218@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 24769

On 23 Nov 2001 22:16:34 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) wrote:

>>From: BH radioguyx@texxas.net
>>What about on board US Navy ships?
>
> Navy?! Hell...FORGET about the FCC! You do ANYTHING on THAT vessel
>without the CO's consent...ESPECIALLY something that can hazard the vessel, and
>some Part 97 infractions are your LAST worry!

Having spent almost 4 years on a Navy destroyer, the coments
above are pretty much on target. Bottom line, the ham operation
on board is ONLY via the permission of the captain.

> Most Navy warships are built in such a way as to minimize RF hazards to
>the crew AND to minimize the likelyhood that RF will give away the ships
>location, type, etc. You operate a radio on board that ship that hasn't had
>the ship's Comminications Officer's blessing and you might be the recipient of
>an all expenses paid trip to Kansas, ToTo!

Well maybe a Captain's mast anyway unless you do it more than
once. The reality is that any such ham operation would be for
the benefit of the crew (phone patch, etc.) and would only happen
with permission. The real problem would be how to set-up a ham
station onbaord without permission. The ham could use the
military equipment...BUT that clearly couldn't happen without
permssion from the Comm officer.

As to RF hazards...they are minimal in comparison
to the pulsed power of the radar units on board.

Cheers and hope everyone is enjoying a long Thnaksgiving
weekend.
Bill K2UNK

1723. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:22:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFBB3E.4C045790@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24770

N2EY wrote:
> Yup. But who gets to decide whether "harm" has occurred? The person who did
> the action? The person who is supposedly harmed? Some neutral third party?
> What criteria determines "harm"? That is all "personal value" stuff.

That's easy, Jim. The definition of *actual* harm should require the
use of force or threat of force. The imagined harm over Kim's callsign
is not harm at all. If I told you I experienced harm because of your
choice of callsigns, would you change it for me? Of course not!

> Who gets to decide if a particular callsign causes harm or not?

"Sticks and stones may break my bones but callsigns can never hurt me."
Anyone who allows callsigns unaccompanied by force or threat of force
to hurt them are cooperating in their own pain. The "harm" is self
imposed. Callsigns can cause no harm without the cooperation of the
"victim"(s). Think about it. Finding harm in Kim's callsign is like
finding dirty sex in ink blots.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1724. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:31:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFBD46.AB610EE8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24771

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> In fact, responsibly-minded people see it as nothing more than a callsign,
> and one that has a great deal of "conversational value" off the air, for
> those eyeball get-togethers!

Rational people know when to be serious and when to have fun. Too bad
there is not an abundance of rational people on this newsgroup. If
someone cannot perform his function due to worry about your callsign,
that is his choice that he makes using his own free will.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1725. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:36:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFBE96.597C32AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24772

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Leaning in the direction of freedom is definitely not leaning to
> > either the left or the right. The liberal left is generally for
> > social freedom and against economic freedom.
>
> I was addressing the liberal left.

From an equally invalid position called the conservative right.
If you are against freedom, it doesn't really matter what you
call yourself. The liberal left and conservative right could
unite into a political party called the Anti-Freedom League.

> >The conservative right
> > is generally for economic freedom and against social freedom.
> > Note that both are anti-freedom is certain areas. Libertarians
> > are for both social and economic freedom, i.e. freedom in general.
>
> I addressed the liberal left from the conservative right.

That's what I was pointing out, Dave. You are against social freedom,
i.e. you are anti-freedom just like the liberal left. You really need
to do something about those beams in your eyes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1726. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:40:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFBF6E.240A3398@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24773

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > Well, let's start with you, Dave. Do you eat pork?
>
> Oh, did you think *I* was going to assist you? Try and find out.

Now I don't have to - you just told me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1727. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:44:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFC074.3B86A6E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24774

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Not at all, Dick. Like 90% of church members, he doesn't believe a word of
> it but enjoys the socialization; he just admits it.

There's a fringe benefit. It's absolutely amazing what a deep male
bass voice does to some of those single (horny) choir ladies.
While I'm saying, "Thank you, God", they are probably praying
for forgiveness.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1728. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:48:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFC147.1C45C832@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24775

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Convert? Sure the Church attempts to convert others in order to spread
> > > the word of the gospels. Does the Church preach that those with
> > > different religious beliefs are wrong or inferior? No.
> >
> > Don't know about your church but Southern Baptist churches certainly
> > preach that "those with different religious beliefs are wrong or
> > inferior".
>
> Try to read the posts and you'll find the answer. I'm not a Southern
> Baptist.

Ah, but you said "the Church" above. You didn't specify any
denomination.

> > I hear it almost every Sunday. Did you know that Buddha,
> > a good man who died 300 years before Christ was born, went straight
> > to hell?
>
> No I didn't and neither do any of the Southern Baptists. It is my
> understanding that Jesus died for the redemtion of the sins of all men.
> That goes for those before and after him. It looks as if Buddha is
> covered.

Guess you had better take it up with Reverend Witcher, our Southern
Baptist preacher. Want his phone number?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1729. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 15:55:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFC2F2.EE9369EA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24776

Rick Adams wrote:
> If you served in foreign posts, it's too bad you didn't take
> the opportunity to absorb more of their cultures.

Actually, a book was written about guys like Dave,
"The Ugly American".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1730. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 16:00:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFC41B.A9365D6D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24777

Dave Heil wrote:
> Please point us to a document which provides a percentage of southerners
> opposed to passage of the Civil Rights Act.

Please point us to a document which provides a percentage of
southerns favoring the passage of the Civil Rights Act. I
live and travel in the South, Dave. Things are slowly changing
for the better but in the 1960's, when I was a traveling salesman,
I had to be quiet about my support for the Civil Rights Act or
else risk loss of sales and bodily injury.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1731. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 16:04:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3BFFC4FE.91C7411F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24778

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:
> What I also found startling was his comment about who he has the most
> trouble with on the bands. In his words many of the complaints are
> about the on-air conduct of Extra and Advanced Class Hams who think
> "...they have a license to drive people crazy."

Hmmmmmm, just like on rec.radio.amateur.policy
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1732. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 16:37:51 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <z1QL7.195218$3d2.8116514@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24779

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFFC41B.A9365D6D@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Please point us to a document which provides a percentage of southerners
> > opposed to passage of the Civil Rights Act.
>
> Please point us to a document which provides a percentage of
> southerns favoring the passage of the Civil Rights Act. I
> live and travel in the South, Dave. Things are slowly changing
> for the better but in the 1960's, when I was a traveling salesman,
> I had to be quiet about my support for the Civil Rights Act or
> else risk loss of sales and bodily injury.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

The passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was one of Lyndon Johnson's all time great 'convincing' efforts. A cartoon of the era pictured two rather obviously Southern senators meeting on the Capitol steps with their left arms twisted in a knot. One says, "See you met Lyndon, too."

1733. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 16:42:32 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Y5QL7.195234$3d2.8116681@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24780

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFFC074.3B86A6E5@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Not at all, Dick. Like 90% of church members, he doesn't believe a word
of
> > it but enjoys the socialization; he just admits it.
>
> There's a fringe benefit. It's absolutely amazing what a deep male
> bass voice does to some of those single (horny) choir ladies.
> While I'm saying, "Thank you, God", they are probably praying
> for forgiveness.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Then there is the story of the choir that decided to stop for coffee after a rehersal. One of two men going out with a dozen choir ladies asked what he was going to tell people surrounded by all of the females.

No problem, said one of the ladies, just tell 'em you're cutting back.

1734. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 17:18:43 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tokmt018gn@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24782

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tmtte$st9$0@208.207.71.169...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > > I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm...
CBers with
> > > their nice habbits will come in droves.
> >
> > It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?
>
>
> They've been coming in droves for some time now....the droves will just
> get larger.

Must be a regional phenomemon. I haven't seen such "droves" in my area.

1735. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 17:24:53 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tol2g019a0@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24784

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:887B94DC0A930298.B2CBC2526C5F8194.34139715CCB3AA35@lp.airnews.net...
> Hey, Krell,
>
> I just had a dream in which God told me to have all the
> Christians in the NG send me all their money and ham gear. He said
> that if he says it's ok, then it's ok.
>
> I'm waiting . . .
>
> Rick

I'm sure you're going to hold your breath over it.

1736. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 17:27:47 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <nMQL7.450$9d.156312@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24781

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:A8D5AF48DB2CB029.401E51F3CF761E40.775151BAE787A06E@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 18 Nov 2001 22:59:44 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > Actually, you're applying those passages wrong, Cecil. You're
> >ignoring the bible passages about knowing sin, knowing the sinner, and
> >separating from that. The difference is between action and thought.
> >Obviously, the christian has to know what sin is if he is to avoid it
> >(a judgment). Likewise, the christian has to judge whether another
> >person is sinning if he is to avoid participating in that person's sin
> >(another judgment). However, that doesn't mean the christian condemns
> >that person by actions (you passage above). Instead, he is to seek out
> >that person and help the person to understand the consequences of
> >those actions. The first step in that is making the person aware of
> >his own sin.
>
> But doesn't this simply state that the Christian religion is
> necessarily _better_ than the beliefs of the person seen (by the
> Christian, not necessarily by him/her-self) as "sinning?"
>
In General *EACH* religion teaches it is the only way.

With Christianity, (in general) each sect teaches that it is the only way
and even the other Christian sects are wrong. These are areas where the
Bible may not be quoted as each sect not only has it's own interpetation,
but customs. So, in general just being Christain is not enough, you have to
belong to the proper sect. I'd try to name them all, but I'm certain I'd
miss a few.

As each teaches it is the only way, they by default they are teaching that
their's is the superior way.

Now that's within a single religion. Add in all the other religions that
teach theirs is the only way a tremendous amount of friction is created.
One only has to look at the very bloody Crusades to see what is done in the
name of religion that is not actually part of a religion.

It only takes a tiny bit of history to find that the Crusades were not the
glorious thing we were taught in Sunday School. <:-))

Those practicing Christianity, like many other religions have at times shown
little reluctance to resort to violence to eliminate the oposition.

Almost every religion has it's extremests, or radical groups, who pervert
the teachings of the basic religion, will listen to no one, and seek to

destroy any thing different than their beliefs.

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

> Perhaps a Christian "judges" on this basis theoretically
> (although we ALL know that most people who are
> judgemental--particularly those such as Dick & Larry in this NG aren't
> basing their judgements on the standards you list above), but that's
> irrelevant in the long run. The fact remains that by the very act of
> _assuming_ the person is committing a "sin" and needs to be made aware
> of that fact, they are in fact judging the person as not being as
> "enlightened" as themselves, and therefore automatically assume that
> simply because their religion teaches them something is a "sin" or
> "evil," that is the end of the matter and no debate as to the accuracy
> of that claim is necessary or desirable.
>
> > The popular story of the woman being stoned for prostitution is a
> >good example of this concept. Jesus stopped the stoning and told those
> >in the mob to let the person without sin cast the first stone (a
> >variation of your "Judge not, that ye be not judged"). In other words,
> >he stopped the ACTION of the mob. However, after the mob went away, he
> >turned to the woman and told her to go and sin no more. He could not
> >have said that without making a judgment that she had indeed sinned.
>
> From his perspective (assuming you believe in him in the first
> place, of course)--but that does NOT make his judgement any more or
> less valid than her own. From a Christian perspective, prostitution is
> "evil." But not all religions share that belief--nor is it necessary
> for someone to be religious at all to hold a valid set of morals he or
> she lives by.
>
> Bear in mind, also, the even if the entire story you refer to
> above (including the divinity of Jesus) were true it _still_ would not
> have contradicted the concept that a Christian should not judge
> others. He states in that story that "he who is without sin" should
> cast the first stone--in other words, that only those who have not
> themselves "sinned" have the right to judge the sins of others. But
> that would simply mean that he was the ONLY one qualified to do so,
> since the bible states that he is the only one "without sin!"
>
> > So, as you can see, you can judge whether a person is sinning (in
> >fact, it is almost impossible not to). But the key is what you do
> >about it - the actions. The passages you quote above refer to actions,
> >not to thoughts or simple statements.
>
> But, of course, it still ends in the same result--the
> Christian ends up judging people based on his or her personal beliefs
> not on any unbiased or impartial basis. Simply because the Christian

> bible states something is wrong does not make it so--except to the
> person who BELIEVES in that faith, who should--if he or she sincerely
> believes in Christianity, restrict his or her judgement and actions to
> others who subscribe to that religion as well.
>
> > By the way, please don't ask me for the bible passages - it has been
> >a very long time since I've had anything to do with religion.
>
> I've read it recently--and I've _never_ been a Christian. I
> just don't feel it's rational for me to argue against principles of a
> religion unless I know what they believe in the first place (even
> though, since most Christians haven't read the bible, _they_ don't
> know what they believe in anyway).
>
> Rick--KE8HH
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1737. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 17:27:56 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tol87019n1@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24785

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tn6e2$q30$0@208.206.142.74...
> > Except that the truth happens to be that the danger of violent
> > crime is inversely proportional to the income level of the
> > neighborhood. It doesn't matter if the residents are black, white,
> > yellow, red, or green for that matter--if they are poor there will be
> > a high crime rate, if they aren't there won't.
>
>
>
> You can blow smoke out your posterior until it's too sore to sit on,
> but you can't change the fact that any kid soon learns that most of the
> crime comes from and within the ghetto, and guess what the ghetto is
> mostly populated with? All the touchy-feely BS you can spread like
> peanut butter won't change a thing.
> And it's only racist if you make it to be. Basically it's fact.
> Facts are what kids are very good at determining. BS is what you are
> very good at spreading.

Perhaps, then, you can enlighten us as to *why* the crime rate is so high in
such an area.

1738. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 17:36:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tolnh01ak8@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24788

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:3BD8E2F66DBA72F6.A3286F6FEDD873F8.5EE3C9A58F439A8F@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 07:16:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
> I'll digitize and send you a video clip (from HBO, btw) of an
> Episcopal priest conducting a marriage ceremony (using the Episcopal
> rituals for all but the exchange of vows) in Washington D.C., in 1993
> for approximately 5,000 gay and lesbian couples who he invited to
> recite their own vows to each other then pronounced married. They may
> not be married under law, but they ARE married under church law (ask
> your Priest)--and the priest who did so is still ordained and serving
> as pastor of his church.

No surprise here. The Episcopal church has long recognized same-sex
marriages. Bishop Spong even went so far as to say that the Apostle Paul may
have been homosexual. He wrote about this in his book "Rescuing the Bible
from Fundamentalism."

1739. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 17:41:00 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <MYQL7.452$9d.156736@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24783

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn45okn.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Mon, 19 Nov 2001 23:57:43 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >I once worked a ham who was a pilot in a 747
> >operating air moble. Do they use the wings like
> >a dipole? :-)
>
> If he was piloting a 747 at the time I sure hope that it was a
> privately-owned aircraft, not an air carrier, if there are any 747s
> in private ownership. I do know a retired broadcast station owner
> who owns a 727 which he pilots himself, notwithstanding the
> requirement to have at least two qualified pilots in the cockpit.
>
> I'll let the pilots here quote the FARs about making non-essential
> communications while on an air carrier flight.

The "non essential" applies to the aviation frequencies and in particular on
ATC frequencies..

However, I've been on the air-to-air frequency and shot the ..er...breeze
with a few airliners before. One called me from 35,000 between Cleveland
and Boston (much closer to Boston) while a third joined in from up near the
Maine border. This is all on 5 watt AM radios too. Me? I was climbing
through 6,000 over Michigan

It wasn't an aircarrier, but I have a QSL from a FB-111 who was headed to an
air refueling. We talked for near 10 minutes on 15 meters. His antenna was
in the dorsal fin. THAT was a *while* back. <:-))

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2).
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

1740. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 17:44:09 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tom6k01bkd@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24789

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tn6kv$q30$1@208.206.142.74...
>
>
> Richard Plourde wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > It would only reasonable that any female would
> > > run for her life from Islam, for obvious reasons.
> >
> > There you go again, Carroll, throwing the baby out with the bath
water...
> >
> > You insist on being eternaly wrong, painting with those, very , very
broad
> > strokes of your's...
> >
> > You're getting dangerously close to becoming a laughing stock here with
your
> > zealous attempt at being the 'top schlemiel'...
> >
>
> I'm a realist. You're an idiot.

Most people on this group present their arguments in a logical fashion. All you can do is post statist views with absolutely nothing to back them up other than your own opinion.

1741. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 17:52:57 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <Z7RL7.456$9d.157461@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24786

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn9gnf2.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:40:04 GMT, BH wrote:
>
> >> Don't let the company's lawyers hear that....if he's the pilot on
> >> duty, boredom is not an option.
> >
> >I have several neighbors who are airline pilots, they all say that
> >between take offs and landings, the time is very boring, the plane
> >is on auto pilot and not much to do.
>
> My pilot friends tell me the same thing. But for legal (i.e. CYA)
> purposes, one better not ever give the company lawyers (or FAA
> investigators if it ever comes to that point) any idea that they are
> on duty and in command of the aircraft with anything but full
> alertness and attention to duty or that they are doing anything but
> required and official duties during that time.

In the modern airliner, the main danger is boredom. Nearly every thing is automatic and reguardless of what some companies may say it is a well known problem. The longer the flight the bigger the problem.
A large part of the flights are just monitoring instruments and talking with ATC. When out on the transoceanic routes there is little radio traffic as well. (compared to over the US).

These problems are the subject of many safety seminars and studies.
They are also one of the reasons that so much simulator time is required in recurrency training.

As far as flying the FCC has little to say except that we do not send false signals, nor create interferrence. The FAA OTOH has a lot to say about the use of not just radios and cell phones, but electronic devices as well.
However, it really says the pilot is in charge and responsible. Less than 10 years ago, I had a Captain let me use my 2-meter HT to call my wife to meet me at the airport. (from about 200 miles out)

She was leaving the driveway with 15 miles to the airport when I called.
She was pulling in the parking lot the as we were touching down.
>

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S#1 CD-2)
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

>
>

1742. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 17:59:33 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <9eRL7.469$9d.157703@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24787

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:gg1ovtskkgi2eetunrhqpdf2l586mpuaba@4ax.com...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
> shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
> -
> ->
> -> I'll let the pilots here quote the FARs about making non-essential
> -> communications while on an air carrier flight.
>
> No restrictions on the aircraft commander or PIC that I'm aware of.

As I mentioned earlier, I had one give me permission to call my wife on the 2-meter HT when we were about 200 miles out. Albeit that was something like 10 years ago.

When "I'm flying" I often clip the 144/440 HT to the copilot/passenger side door strap with the rubber duck stuck up into the window and use a headset inside my ANRs. I hear a lot of , "Man, we sure must be having a band opening!" <:-)) Course, I'm flying a 200 MPH 4 seater instead of an airliner too.
--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
>
> Jim
> Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1743. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 18:42:02 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <_RRL7.497$9d.159530@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24790

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn6ech0.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
Jim Weir wrote:

-> Section 97.11 of the FCC Rules puts some very specific
-> restrictions on operation from an aircraft.

> You been into the holiday giggle water a little early there, Kane?
> 47CFR 97.11 provides two short paragraphs about applying for license
> to Gettysburg.

For the record:

For the Record this isn't really what it seems:

Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.

(a) The installation and operation of an amateur station on a
ship or aircraft must be approved by the master of the ship or
pilot in command of the aircraft.

The key words are installation and approved.
Anything not permanently bolted in is not an installation.
Any thing used requires the consent of the PIC.

(b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
installation. The station's transmissions must not cause
interference to any other apparatus installed on the ship or
aircraft.

If you do install a ham rig it must have it's own hookup seperate of the
breakers that power the onboard radio equipment. Said installation must not
cause any interferrence.

(c) The station must not constitute a hazard to the safety of
life or property. For a station aboard an aircraft, the
apparatus shall not be operated while the aircraft is operating
under Instrument Flight Rules, as defined by the FAA, unless the
station has been found to comply with all applicable FAA Rules.

The station must be installed in such a manner that it does not create a
fire hazard...IE, has the proper wiring and size breaker.

The next sentence is one of those that says you can't while saying you can.
IOW, You can't use such an installation when operating IFR UNLESS the
station has been properly installed and creates no interferrence.

47 C.F.R. 97.11 [P&F] as of October 30, 2001

Revision history shows that the above section number and wording
was effective since at least September 1, 1989 when Part 97 was
revised in its entirety and the stuff in subsection (c)
concerning IFR operation was added.

The advantage of having a Rules Service that costs $3000 a
year is that one gets up-to-date Rules as well as the
revision history, digest, and case citations all in one place.

Note the first sentence of subsection (b). Wanna bet that they
weren't using a separate antenna and transceiver? And who is going
to find that the amateur station equipment complies with all
applicable FAA rules for radio equipment, especially certification,
which as you know are far more stringent than FCC rules for same?

It just ain't that complicated.
Even if they have a rig velcro'd to the glare shield, it's not considered
'installed"
It only has to meet the normal certification. The type certification
pertains to FCC commercial/aviation (Jim Weir, help me on this one), not an
FAA certification. FAA certification applies to the repair stations, but
the FCC is in charge of "type" certification.

If they make a few trips and with a little testing here and there, the rig
does not bother the instruments in the airplane, it should be OK.

For
The "absolute authority" of the PIC is really limited to what the
company lawyers say it is....if the PIC wants to retain his/her job.

In most cases if you don't ask...
In the past and with only a few exceptions the authority has been left with
the PIC. It hasn't been that many years ago where it was possible for a
passenger to get permission to use an HT, but that has become nearly
impossible as the rules require that the radio be checked out in the
particular airplane, but it has been done. At least one story was published
about doing that, but I don't remember which magazine and only that it was
within the last 15 years. The article went through what the individual ham
had to do to get permission and the testing with the operation being
somewhat anticlimatic.

Prior to Sept 11th the main thing that kept the passenger from operating an
HT was that checking the HT out in the particular plane. It was just too
much bother (time and expense) so it was difficult to get permission.

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

> However, I do bow to your experience in the industry.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1744. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 19:06:55 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <jdSL7.510$9d.160637@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24791

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn9g200.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:45:49 GMT, BH wrote:
>
> >I can see this for installing non-type accepted amateur gear, but
> >do not see how this applies for using the installed aircraft comms
> >that can operate on the ham bands.
> >
> That is covered by:
>
> Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.
>
> (b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
> other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
> a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
> installation......
>
No it's not!

"IF" the aircraft radios are such that they can also cover the ham bands and
the oerator has the license they may be used on the ham bands.

IF a Ham station is installed THEN that station must be kept seperate.

The above says nothing about using the aircfraft system radios on ham bands
if they go there and there are systems that do. Those would be systems such
as the HF rigs that are required for transoceanic flights. More than likely
for the big elaborate systems there are tohse that cover the VHF and UHF
bands as well, but those are not radios most of us could afford.

I've seen more than one light plane that had a Kenwood, or Icom to use on HF
for those transoceanic flights and the FAA was quite willing to accept them.

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

1745. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 21:03:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011124160359.20950.00000696@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 24792

In article <3BFFBB3E.4C045790@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Yup. But who gets to decide whether "harm" has occurred? The person who
>did
>> the action? The person who is supposedly harmed? Some neutral third party?
>> What criteria determines "harm"? That is all "personal value" stuff.
>
>That's easy, Jim. The definition of *actual* harm should require the
>use of force or threat of force.

That's a sufficient condition but not a necessary one. And you've stretched the definition of "force" to include things like theft by stealth.

It's interesting that you avoid the example I gave about the neighbor with the run-down property. Are you saying that no is harmed in such a case?

How about if A goes around telling lies about B? Suppose B is in the business of manufacturing antennas, and A says he has bought B-brand antennas and they all turned out to be unreliable. (In fact A has no experience with B-brand antennas at all). If B loses sales because of A's lies, would you say that B was not harmed by A?

>The imagined harm over Kim's callsign
>is not harm at all.

Based on your personal values.

>If I told you I experienced harm because of your
>choice of callsigns, would you change it for me?

If you could show how that harm occurred, I might consider it.

>Of course not!
>
Don't be so sure, Cecil. Of course first you have to convince me that some harm has occurred, and that changing my callsign would end the harm. Good luck.

>> Who gets to decide if a particular callsign causes harm or not?
>
>"Sticks and stones may break my bones but callsigns can never hurt me."

Doesn't answer the question.

>Anyone who allows callsigns unaccompanied by force or threat of force
>to hurt them are cooperating in their own pain. The "harm" is self
>imposed. Callsigns can cause no harm without the cooperation of the
>"victim"(s). Think about it.

I have. I'm simply asking questions.

>Finding harm in Kim's callsign is like
>finding dirty sex in ink blots.

Nope. The inkblots are random patterns. Kim's call was not chosen at random.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1746. Contest idea, work all your own suffix

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 21:24:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C00101A.EC216778@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24793

Be the first to work your suffix in all American prefixes!
Of course if you have a call like Kim's, that's gonna
take a while. :-)

1747. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 21:41:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C001415.3B26C976@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24794

>
> >>I don't hear any such thing COMMONLY on 2 meters in this area. Your
> >>mileage may vary.
> >
> > Where I live I don't either (relatively small community). But
> >I've visited a number of metro areas where I very quickly learned that
> >if I didn't want to listen to "cb" at its worst, I had to switch to
> >70cm instead of 2m on the mobile.
>
> Does that mean 2 meters is that bad in an average American city?

Everyone on 146.79 in NNJ is well behaved. And it's an
open machine.

1748. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 21:44:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <16F1018A2DC9223E.34C5DCBC81EA6813.FB4EE02F14C8E766@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24795

On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 04:44:53 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>If it wasn't clear to you: The Netherlands has less freedom than the
>U.S.

Would you care to tell us in what AREAS you have greater
personal freedom in the United States than in the Netherlands?

Since your statement not only goes against experience, but
goes against the recently released UN study of freedom in member
nations (which listed the Netherlands as the freest nation on earth,
followed by Denmark, etc.), it would seem that you need to offer more
than a simply statement of opinion to support your claim.

>> B) Comment about the social problems and tax rate--*ignoring* that you asked
>> for an example of having lived outside the United States in the context of
>> freedom.
>
>It would be an interesting rant if true. What did you think I was
>talking about--lack of variety in cheeses?

No, economics and social problems. Neither of those addresses
the specific topic of freedom.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1749. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 21:45:40 UTC
From: Bob - KE4JCD <ke4jcd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <8yUL7.113107$Yb.28227333@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>
Source record: 24796

As you said "I haven't seen such "droves" in my area." Well the CODE TEST hasn't been dropped yet. People I talk to all say much of the same thing, The CODE is stopping them and when its gone so will HAM RADIO! CBers will come in droves and as I have on my website, BAD HABITS!

One page on my site deals with what Amateur radio is slowly becoming, the new children's band... I came to be free of such trash, but that's life. When it dose, I'll just find something ells to do. I don't use it much now, I love the internet to much and it may replace HAM for me and my wife. I use a nextell to talk around town. No Jammers, like on some of my local repeaters...

Here something sweet for your ears...
http://www.hartungpress.com/hamradio/crummyhams.htm
--

Bob - KE4JCD

KE4JCD Ham Radio Web Site.
http://www.ke4jcd.org

Hartung Press, is a Non-Profit Online Public Affairs Magazine.
http://www.hartungpress.com

Support Anti-Spam Legislation.
Join the fight http://www.cauce.org/

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9tokmt018gn@enews3.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tmtte$st9$0@208.207.71.169...
> > >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > > > > I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm...
> > CBers with
> > > > > > their nice habbits will come in droves.
> > > > >
> > > > It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?
> > >
> > >
> > > They've been coming in droves for some time now....the droves will just

> > get larger.
>
> Must be a regional phenomemon. I haven't seen such "droves" in my area.
>
>
>

1750. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 22:50:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9598F1FAEAF3CEAA.1E1CB1ECEF5BBD15.25A160AD88E7F86E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24797

On 24 Nov 2001 13:04:00 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>You do exactly the same thing, Rick.

Of course I do--everyone does. That's the entire point.

If I base my concepts of right and wrong on my own moral values, you base yours on your values, Dave does, etc.--so long as we can agree that harm to nonconsenting individuals is considered wrong by all of us, then there is no conflict involved. I may behave in a manner I find moral, you may behave in one you find moral, and neither of us will in any way affect the other.

What is so difficult for people to accept about that simple concept?

>How do you KNOW there are no absolute values for right and wrong? Besides,
>making that statement is an absolute!

But not an absolute value of right and wrong. I never said there were no absolutes in life!

How do I know there are no absolute values for right or wrong? A couple ways:

1. There has never been universal agreement among ALL sane and intelligent people (I'll leave the mentally ill and intellectually challenged out of the definition, since their perceptions would by necessity inaccurately influence their decisions) as to ANY universals that were right and wrong. If absolutes existed, there would necessarily be agreement as to their existence. Yet for ANY "right" or "wrong" you can list, I can identify at least one (or more) culture that feels the opposite.

2. There is no commonly accepted source for such absolutes to have been decided. Some people believe right and wrong are defined by a "god," others by culture, still others by the individual. Unless one, invariant, and demonstrably infallible source of such absolutes can be shown to exist (not on a basis of belief--as in a diety--but in a scientifically verifiable sense), no such absolutes can be reasonably be considered TO exist.

Why is it so difficult for people to accept that concepts of right and wrong are relative, instead of absolute? We don't live in a static, unchanging, world--we live in a dynamic, evolving, one. What is "right" today may well be "wrong" tomorrow. Some examples:

1. I would hope we all agree that killing another adult human being who does not wish to die and did not commit a capital crime is "wrong." But if that is the case, doesn't that make war (in which conscripts and civilians are routinely killed--as is happening now in Afghanistan) wrong and those who wage war evil by definition? If not, then killing is NOT an absolute "wrong." If so, then everyone in this group who ever served in uniform (as I did as well) was "wrong" as his/her role could have reasonably been expected to result in the killing of others.

2. In most early cultures (including the Egyptian and Roman cultures), prostitution was considered an act of spirituality--many temples had prostitutes who contributed their fees to the temple itself. Today, the churches define prostitution as "wrong" and immoral. Which is it? Depends a LOT on your perspective--and thus the concept of an "absolute" wrong doesn't apply here either.

Many examples could be used just as easily. The important fact is, there are NO universals concerning right and wrong (the closest is an almost--but not complete--taboo on incest throughout cultures, but of course each culture defines what incest IS in a different manner; what an American would consider incest may not be considered such in, for example, Borneo, and what a Sudanese would consider incest wouldn't be considered incest here in the USA). But lacking universals, we likewise lack absolutes.

The closest we can come to an absolute value is to limit our "Universals" to a statement that any act which harms the person or property of a non-consenting (and, in the case of criminal punishment or war, inappropriately targeted) individual is "wrong" from any reasonable perspective. Thus, if I commit murder, rape, theft, or expose myself to children at a bus stop for that matter, it can clearly be seen that harm HAS been inflicted directly on non-consenting individuals, and thus by any reasonable definition the act was "wrong."

On the other hand, if instead of acting in the manner above, I choose to attend a nude beach, smoke a joint, or attend a swing party for that matter, it is equally clear that no non-consenting person is in any way involved in the action, and thus no harm has occurred. Given such a circumstance, the ONLY valid judge of whether or not my action was "wrong" is myself--and that decision can only be based on my personal interpretation of morality, not on one being imposed on me by others.

Why is that concept so difficult for people to understand and accept? It allows EVERYONE the right to engage in any activity that does not harm others, and forbids anyone from engaging in any activity that DOES harm others. Sounds pretty logical to me.

>> Why is that so difficult to understand? If my actions harm
>>you, it is clear (by recourse to logic) that a "wrong" has occurred.
>

>Yup. But who gets to decide whether "harm" has occurred? The person who did
>the action? The person who is supposedly harmed? Some neutral third party?
>What criteria determines "harm"? That is all "personal value" stuff.

You mean moral values are NOT "personal" but the definition of
"harm" is?

That's absurd!

It's pretty easy to tell if someone has been harmed. All
that's necessary is to learn if they were directly involved in the
activity concerned, and if so if they gave their informed consent for
the activity TO occur. If--and only if--they were involved and did not
consent to the activity can we define the experience as having harmed
them.

For example, if I choose to attend a nude beach, it clearly
cannot cause you harm. If you are not at that beach, you _can_ not be
harmed in any manner by my attendance and if you ARE at the nude
beach, you have given an implied consent for others to be nude in your
presence--if you are offended by seeing nude people yet choose to go
to a nude beach, you really don't have any grounds for complaint if
people ignore your claim to be offended.

On the other hand, if instead of a clearly designated nude
beach, I choose to wander through your yard nude, then you DO have a
legitimate grounds to claim harm. Because I will have invaded your
privacy and reduced your enjoyment of your yard, by necessity my
action harmed you and you have valid grounds for a complaint.

Is that really so difficult to understand? It simply states
the same thing as the old cliche: "Your right to swing your arm ends
at the tip of my nose."

>There's no claim at all - that's obvious. But again the question is: who gets
>to decide whether harm has occurred?

Use the criteria above to determine harm. Anyone could then
recognize whether it occurred or not.

>>It can't be your values, you aren't
>>involved in the action and thus aren't in a position to judge its
>>"rightness."
>
>Does this mean that the "victim" has no say about whether harm has occurred?

No--it means that the non-victim (the person who is not
involved in the action--as stated above) has no voice in the matter.

>> It can't be society's values, for the same reason. That
>>leaves ONLY myself and others involved in the action.
>
>So only the persons committing an action get to decide whether harm has
>occurred? I don't think you mean that!

I don't think I _said_ that either!

I said that only the persons INVOLVED in an action have a
voice, not that only the persons PERFORMING an action do. If, for
example, I hold you up at gun point, we are BOTH involved in the
action. But if I place a bet on a horse race, unless you are present
and a part of the action, you are NOT involved, and therefore have no
voice in deciding whether my action (in which you can't legitimately
identify a victim who was harmed) was right or wrong in any absolute
sense.

>> Just as I'm not "in charge" of deciding that your views are
>>narrow-minded, you are not "in charge" of deciding that Kim's (or mine
>>for that matter) are "immoral" or "tasteless."
>
>Who gets to decide if a particular callsign causes harm or not?

The FCC. They set the standards for issuing call signs.

>You're avoiding the central questions, Rick: Who decides whether harm has
>occurred? Who decides whether the harm is great enough to require some sort of
>action to remedy the situation?

Answered above.

>Here's an example: Suppose A lets his property become a real mess. Grass isn't
>cut, paint is peeling, junk in the yard, etc. Nothing that is a clear health or
>safety hazard but the place looks awful. B, who lives right next door, wants to
>sell his house and move away because B doesn't like living next to such a dump.
>But B cannot find a buyer because of the condition of A's place. Has A harmed
>B? Who gets to decide? If the decision is yes, how much harm has occurred and
>what is the remedy?

It is clear that A has harmed B. Through his direct and
deliberate violation of reasonably expected standards in a residential
community he has caused B to suffer an economic loss. B, in any such
circumstances, could sell his house--however he would be forced to
accept a price below that which he would have realized had the
neighboring home not reduced his property value. Thus, the amount of
the loss (the harm suffered by B) is the amount of reduction in price
between a fair market value, given expected neighborhood values, and
the actual realized offering price. The remedy, obviously, is a legal
action against A compelling him to either repair his property and thus
restore B's property values or to compensate B for the difference in
selling prices resulting from his actions. As far as who gets to
decide, in such a case, clearly the decision would be made by a judge.

BTW, consider this. Obviously, you view A as having harmed B
(a view I agree with), and felt that way when you wrote this example.
Let's change it a bit. Suppose instead of failing to maintain his
property, A is a ham radio operator who chooses to put up an antenna
farm that, because it distracts from the visual appearance of the
neighborhood, results in the same difficulty in selling for B. Is the
situation the same or different? Why?

>Suppose B finds a buyer (C) who agrees to buy B's house but at a price far
>below fair market value because of the condition of A's place. Is A responsible
>for B's loss? Can C try to get A to fix up the property?

The answer to the first part is above. With respect to the
second part, C has NO legitimate grounds to demand that A fix up the
property (although he is certainly free to ask him to do so and to try
to convince him that it would benefit him as well). C purchased the
property at a price consistent with being next door to a property in
the condition of A's--thus he is NOT harmed by A's actions in any way
(assuming A doesn't allow his property to deteriorate even further,
thus reducing C's property value further, and placing him in the same
position B was in originally). Sounds simple to me, and requires no
recourse to any "absolute" values.

>Who decides? Whose values of "harm" should be used? Think about it.

I have--read over my examples and try to do the same yourself.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1751. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 22:51:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00248B.3BB7DFE4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24798

N2EY wrote:
> It's interesting that you avoid the example I gave about the neighbor with the
> run-down property. Are you saying that no is harmed in such a case?

I only read one screen per posting. Cuts down on the length of my reply.
If there were no zoning laws or CCRs or contracts then the guy is SOL.

> How about if A goes around telling lies about B? Suppose B is in the business
> of manufacturing antennas, and A says he has bought B-brand antennas and they
> all turned out to be unreliable.

If B can show damages, he is protected by law. If he can show damages,
by definition, a type of force was used against him. Damages don't have
to be physical but they do have to be real. All the "damages" to the ARS
from Kim's callsign are strictly imagined. There is NO damage in reality.

> >If I told you I experienced harm because of your
> >choice of callsigns, would you change it for me?
>
> If you could show how that harm occurred, I might consider it.

I can't sleep trying to make up dirty phonetics for your callsign.

> >Finding harm in Kim's callsign is like
> >finding dirty sex in ink blots.
>
> Nope. The inkblots are random patterns. Kim's call was not chosen at random.

What if someone chooses a callsign that means "tit" in Swahili? Would you
consider it obscene? It is a callsign. It is not a dirty word. People
who think it is dirty are using their free will to choose to think it
is dirty. They are free to do so but shouldn't be rewarded for *their
choice* of dirty thoughts. I think dirty thoughts in choir on Sunday
because the lady in front of me smells so good. Should she be chastised
because of the perfume she chooses to wear?

There's not a whole lot of difference in, "Her choice of callsign causes
me to want to chastise her", and, "Her choice of attire causes me to want
to rape her."

Reminds me of the C A Jones California vanity license plates.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1752. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 22:58:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00262D.8C18FF0D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24799

Krell wrote:
> No surprise here. The Episcopal church has long recognized same-sex
> marriages. Bishop Spong even went so far as to say that the Apostle Paul may
> have been homosexual. He wrote about this in his book "Rescuing the Bible
> from Fundamentalism."

Many believe that the "thorn" in Paul's side was homosexuality.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1753. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 23:01:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0026BF.87473DAF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24800

Richard McCollum wrote:
> The passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was one of Lyndon Johnson's all
> time great 'convincing' efforts. A cartoon of the era pictured two rather
> obviously Southern senators meeting on the Capitol steps with their left
> arms twisted in a knot. One says, "See you met Lyndon, too."

I suspect that Lyndon Johnson was more interested in a legacy than
he was in civil rights.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1754. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 23:06:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0027F5.207F7979@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24701

Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> One page on my site deals with what Amateur radio is slowly becoming, the
> new children's band...

I thought all the children (mentally) were on this newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1755. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-24 23:17:35 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <jUVL7.127737$WW.7954741@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24702

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C0026BF.87473DAF@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > The passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was one of Lyndon Johnson's all
> > time great 'convincing' efforts. A cartoon of the era pictured two
rather
> > obviously Southern senators meeting on the Capitol steps with their left
> > arms twisted in a knot. One says, "See you met Lyndon, too."
>
> I suspect that Lyndon Johnson was more interested in a legacy than
> he was in civil rights.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Lot of evidence for that POV

1756. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 00:13:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C00379A.10AC3378@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24703

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> It isn't just Cecil that is hearing
> these things. I hear it in nearly every
> theological discussion, bible discussion,
> religious discussion I am near or a part
> of. I hear it "nearly" each time I have
> ever been in a church. I hear nearly
> every time the witnesses show up on my
> doorstep. I heard it last night at the
> table with my fundamentalist brother-
> and sister-in-law.

You've repeatedly heard that people of other religions are inferior? Like I said, many christians do believe those of other religions are wrong, evil, going to hell, or whatever, but I've heard very few describe them as inferior. And, again, like I said before, the concept that the members of other religions are wrong, etc, is certainly not unique to christians (most religions think that of other religions).

> I agree with you, Dwight, that it was
> not the teaching of Jesus Christ or
> the attitude of true Christians. However,
> when I stated last night, to the same
> brother-in-law, that Jesus never judged
> and condemned people to Hell, he stated
> that I was wrong--that the Bible is
> replete with Jesus speaking of people
> who would burn in places, etc. (snip)

First of all, since this topic has attracted others into the discussion, let me add again that I'm certainly no expert on christian theology. I'm simply offering my opinion based on what I learned years ago. Anyway, having said that, I do think it is important to make one thing clear here - in a religious context, a christian cannot condemn a person to hell. A christian can state an opinion that a person is going to hell because of the person's behavior, attitude, or whatever, but that goes no further than an opinion. Only God has the power to condemn a person to his/her eventual spiritual fate. Likewise, Jesus does not condemn a person to hell - he simply stated the terms under which a person would be condemned. Again, only God reserves the power of ultimate judgment.

> (snip) Like I said last night (and my
> brother-in-law nearly fell out of his
> chair): we all worship the same god, we
> just have different ways of doing it. I
> don't care how you get to "Heaven" just
> that you try to get there. It's in the
> "trying" that makes all good things
> happen.

Well, while living a "good" life is certainly a worthwhile goal, many religions would argue that something more is required (an acceptance of God, avoidance of sin, reparations for past sins, etc). But, to avoid giving a "sermon," I'll let it drop with that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1757. Re: Contest idea, work all your own suffix

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 00:39:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011124193950.09887.00001790@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 24704

>Subject: Contest idea, work all your own suffix
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 11/24/2001 3:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C00101A.EC216778@ix.netcom.com>

>
>Be the first to work your suffix in all American prefixes!
>Of course if you have a call like Kim's, that's gonna
>take a while.

Great idea!

When I was KC8M, I worked/QSL'd the zero, six and three, and worked but never got a card from four and five.

So far I have about 10 "YZ" cards.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1758. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 01:36:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnbqwc0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24706

On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 22:03:53 GMT, BH wrote:

>What about on board US Navy ships? I have talked to and run phone
>patches for Navy personal using the ships communications that had
>the capability of operating on the ham bands. Even talked to one
>radio operator in Hawaii as they were sitting on the tarmac in a
>Navy sea plane, he was using the regular comms. Talked to him
>about 15 minutes then he had to QRT as they were getting ready for
>take off.

Was this on MARS?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1759. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 01:36:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnbrvd1.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24705

On Sat, 24 Nov 2001 19:06:55 GMT, Roger Halstead wrote:

>> (b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
>> other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
>> a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
>> installation......
>>
>No it's not!
>
>"IF" the aircraft radios are such that they can also cover the ham bands and
>the oerator has the license they may be used on the ham bands.

What is the legal basis for your conclusion?

" ... separate from and independent of all other radio apparatus
installed on the ship or aircraft" seems like pretty clear language.

>IF a Ham station is installed THEN that station must be kept seperate.

Any transmitting apparatus used by a licensed amateur radio operator
for transmissions on the amateur radio bands becomes a "ham station"
for regulatory purposes.

Please cite the FCC reg or case law that you claim says otherwise.

>The above says nothing about using the aircfraft system radios on ham bands
>if they go there and there are systems that do.

It covers it very plainly: " ... separate from and independent of
all other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft".

What part of the quoted reg do you not understand?

--

73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Principal Attorney (retired)
Communications Law Center

1760. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 01:36:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnbt0g2.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24707

On Sat, 24 Nov 2001 18:42:02 GMT, Roger Halstead wrote:

> The "absolute authority" of the PIC is really limited to what the
> company lawyers say it is....if the PIC wants to retain his/her job.
>
>In most cases if you don't ask...

The issue isn't what one can get away with - the issue is how one
protects one's rear end to avoid being charged with the violation.
That's the kind of law I practice.

What sort of defense do you think can be raised in the face of the
black-letter reg that says "thou shalt not....." The usual criminal
"dude" defense ("..'twasn't me, judge, it was some other dude") won't
fly (pardon the pun). Neither will "I didn't know" - the law
considers that if you have a license you know or should know.

>In the past and with only a few exceptions the authority has been left with
>the PIC. It hasn't been that many years ago where it was possible for a
>passenger to get permission to use an HT, but that has become nearly
>impossible as the rules require that the radio be checked out in the
>particular airplane, but it has been done. At least one story was published
>about doing that, but I don't remember which magazine and only that it was
>within the last 15 years. The article went through what the individual ham
>had to do to get permission and the testing with the operation being
>somewhat anticlimatic.

IIRC Delta was the only airline that permitted scanners or ham rigs
to be operated in flight, but it's been about 5 years since I flew
on that airline. My common-carrier vehicle of choice is by rail,
where there are no such restrictions.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1761. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 01:38:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C004B59.3BA60684@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24708

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > You mean how "other" religions
> > are "wrong"? That's part of the
> > boilerplate - if a church says
> > other religions aren't "wrong",
> > there's no reason for that
> > church to exist.
>
> Jewish theology teaches that ours
> is not the "one and only" "right"
> faith and therefore all others are
> "wrong".
>
> It teaches that moral living is
> the "right" way, no matter which
> faith one adheres to in doing it.

That's doublespeak, Phil. Almost any religion can say that - if a person lives a "moral" life, as defined by my religious theology, that person is okay. But, what you said hides the opposite - if a person does not live a "moral" life, as defined by Jewish theology, that person is wrong (a "sinner," as a Christian might say). The same is true for other religions (as long as they live a "moral" life as defined by Jewish theology). In other words, your religion is no more tolerant of those who live outside your concepts of morality than any other religion is of those who live outside it's concepts of morality. There is nothing wrong with that (all religions promote their own slightly different versions of morality and avoid those with conflicting morality), but hiding it behind doublespeak certainly suggests otherwise.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1762. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 01:46:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpiii$c6d$0@208.206.142.100>
Source record: 24709

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Why do you want to stick your ugly nose in other people's business?
> >
> > Why do you want to stick your business in other people's nose?
>
> I don't, Dick. I won't bother them and I don't want them to
> bother me. What is wrong with live and let live? I don't
> want to control what you do in the privacy of your home.
> Why do you want to control what I do in the privacy of mine?

Where on earth did you get that idea? Dreaming again, via some more of
your
"one hit $shit"?

1763. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 01:50:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C004E36.5C8070A5@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24710

CAM wrote:
>
> I see you are not up on Southern Baptist
> doctrine, Dwight. Jesus was with God
> from the beginning. When God said, "Let
> us make man in our image", he was
> talking to Jesus and the Holy Spirit.
> Anyone who didn't believe in Jesus/
> Jehovah from the beginning is going to
> hell. Haven't you ever heard of The
> Trinity? What's the matter with you,
> anyway?

Fine, but I've never heard that promoted by any christain religion (a person who died before Christ's birth went to hell). If that is indeed Southern Baptist doctrine, what are they basing it on?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1764. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 01:50:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpip8$c6d$1@208.206.142.100>
Source record: 24711

CAM wrote:
>
> "Leland C. Scott" wrote:
> > What I also found startling was his comment about who he has the most
> > trouble with on the bands. In his words many of the complaints are
> > about the on-air conduct of Extra and Advanced Class Hams who think
> > "...they have a license to drive people crazy."
>
> Hmmmmmm, just like on rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yeah, you *are* an Extra now aren't you?

1765. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 01:54:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C004F22.F458522@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24712

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> No I didn't and neither do any of
> the Southern Baptists. It is my
> understanding that Jesus died for
> the redemtion of the sins of all men.
> That goes for those before and
> after him. It looks as if Buddha
> is covered.

Well said, Dave. I completely forgot about that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1766. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:07:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpjph$fh6$0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 24713

CAM wrote:
>
> Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > One page on my site deals with what Amateur radio is slowly becoming, the
> > new children's band...
>
> I thought all the children (mentally) were on this newsgroup.

Speaking for yourself again, I see. Of course you act like a
pre-sophomoric 5th grader.

1767. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:07:54 UTC
From: BH <radioguyx@texxas.net>
Message-ID: <3BFF9A18.A6BA162A@texxas.net>
Source record: 24715

No, it was on 15 meters.

Phil Kane wrote:

>
> Was this on MARS?
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1768. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:08:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C005283.EA01ADBB@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24714

Krell wrote:
>
> Because they think that cute=funny.
> It's like that stupid "Dude, you're
> gettin' a Dell" commercial, (snip)

Is that commercial supposed to be funny? No wonder I never got it - I thought Dell was serious about that spokesperson - they thought he would convince me to buy a Dell. In reality, a goofball like that would only make me less interested in their products (stupid commercials tend to have that effect on me - and there are a lot of really stupid commercials out there).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1769. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:09:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpjsp$fh6$1@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 24716

CAM wrote:
>
> Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers with
> > their nice habbits will come in droves.
>
> It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?

Uh, there's still, that nasty 5wpm code test. Might as well be 30 to
them.

1770. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:19:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0054E2.364D0B72@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24717

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> (snip) Is Jesus mentioned anywhere
> the Muslim religion? (snip)

Yes, he is. Many in the Islamic faith believe he is one of
the many prophets. Some believe he even holds a higher
position (even to the point of believing in his eventual return).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1771. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:28:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpl0biac0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24718

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > > > I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers with
> > > > their nice habbits will come in droves.
> > >
> > > It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?
> >
> > They've been coming in droves for some time now....the droves will just
> > get larger.
>
> Droves????? The ham population is virtually unchanged. Most of what has
> happened is tech+'s upgrading to general and generals/advanced upgrading
> to extra. Exactly where are those "droves", Dick? (FYI, the sky is not
> hard and cannot fall.)

Evidently you were too deep into the drug culture to notice, but things changed in ham radio pretty drastically about the time we began to get large numbers of CBers -I mean the seasoned, hard core CBers- into ham radio. Before that you never heard any of the trash on HF. A single swear word was enough to get other hams down on your case as well as certainly the FCC. Ever hear of W4EGB? FCC took his license and put him off the air because every evening he'd get slowly drunker and nastier on the air. Such crap as the so-called Liberty Net wouldn't have ever been allowed to develop, much less become an ongoing cesspool.

A real, *VALID* CW test had more to do with keeping the bands clean and orderly than anything else, whatever the FCC says these days. (Of course that fact is no longer poltically correct) There were just no hams who were so mildly interested in ham radio they just didn't care. Today we're overloaded with them, largely courtesy of CB. I give you as evidence a blowsy broad who chose TIT as her "vanity" callsign, ha ha ha ha ha!

Back then most people really put out to get a ham ticket and were not about to jeopardize it by stupid behavior. Today it's all a given - tests, even the code, to say nothing of all the "It's my right" nonsense.

1772. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:29:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpl23iep0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24719

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > > > I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers with
> > > > their nice habbits will come in droves.
> > >
> > > It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?
> >
> > They've been coming in droves for some time now....the droves will just
> > get larger.
>
> Droves????? The ham population is virtually unchanged. Most of what has
> happened is tech+'s upgrading to general and generals/advanced upgrading
> to extra. Exactly where are those "droves", Dick? (FYI, the sky is not
> hard and cannot fall.)

Evidently you were too deep into the drug culture to notice, but things changed in ham radio pretty drastically about the time we began to get large numbers of CBers -I mean the seasoned, hard core CBers- into ham radio. Before that you never heard any of the trash on HF. A single swear word was enough to get other hams down on your case as well as certainly the FCC. Ever hear of W4EGB? FCC took his license and put him off the air because every evening he'd get slowly drunker and nastier on the air. Such crap as the so-called Liberty Net wouldn't have ever been allowed to develop, much less become an ongoing cesspool.

A real, *VALID* CW test had more to do with keeping the bands clean and orderly than anything else, whatever the FCC says these days. (Of course that fact is no longer poltically correct) There were just no hams who were so mildly interested in ham radio they just didn't care. Today we're overloaded with them, largely courtesy of CB. I give you as evidence a blowsy broad who chose TIT as her "vanity" callsign, ha ha ha ha ha!

Back then most people really put out to get a ham ticket and were not about to jeopardize it by stupid behavior. Today it's all a given - tests, even the code, to say nothing of all the "It's my right" nonsense.

1773. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:30:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnbvn30.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24720

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 02:07:54 GMT, BH wrote:

>> Was this on MARS?

>No, it was on 15 meters.

Well, the point that I have been tryinmg to make is what the
Rules require, not what one gets away with.

If there's no complaint, no sweat. If a complaint is made, though,
what defense can be offered?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1774. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:40:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tplml$k2r$0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24721

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> > Richard Plourde wrote:
> >
> >>Dick Carroll wrote:
> >>
> >> > It would only reasonable that any female would
> >> > run for her life from Islam, for obvious reasons.
> >>
> >>There you go again, Carroll, throwing the baby out with the bath water...
> >>
> >>You insist on being eternaly wrong, painting with those, very , very broad
> >>strokes of your's...
> >>
> >>You're getting dangerously close to becoming a laughing stock here with your
> >>zealous attempt at being the 'top schlemiel'...
> >>
> >>
> >
> > I'm a realist. You're an idiot.
> >
>
> Well, well, well... what have we here? Carroll's attempt at repartee'????
>
> You are soooooo predictable... you're becoming a charicature of yourself.
>
> Have another dozen doughnuts and case of beer you'll feel better in the
> morning... ;-)

You really are a clueless dumbass. All the evidence you need is right
under your nose and what you smell is roses. Get your head out and take
a good look around. That wasn't just another Hollywood production on
Septembe 11, you simpleton.

You've been a caricature of yourself all along.

If you like doughnuts and beer, knock yourself out. I never touch
either.

1775. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:45:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tplvd$ko2$0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24722

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tn6kv$q30$1@208.206.142.74...
> >
> >
> > Richard Plourde wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > > It would only reasonable that any female would
> > > > run for her life from Islam, for obvious reasons.
> > >
> > > There you go again, Carroll, throwing the baby out with the bath
> water...
> > >
> > > You insist on being eternaly wrong, painting with those, very , very
> broad
> > > strokes of your's...
> > >
> > > You're getting dangerously close to becoming a laughing stock here with
> your
> > > zealous attempt at being the 'top schlemiel'...
> > >
> >
> > I'm a realist. You're an idiot.
>
> Most people on this group present their arguments in a logical fashion. All
> you can do is post statist views with absolutely nothing to back them up
> other than your own opinion.

Most people will at least take a look at the available evidence before
making up their minds or before stepping on their tounge. Somehow you CW
phobic ex-CBers always predicate your choice of sides on any issue on
whether or not the opposition is a CW supporter. Or whether or not he
kisses up to you otherwise. You should at least have some idea of what
the terrorist situation is about, if you live in New York. But evidently
your hate for CW overrules your rationality.

Has ham radi0o gone to hell in the past couple decades? Without a
doubt. And it is entirely in the (poor) quality of most of those persons
entering the hobby.
There is not a valid gonad among you.

1776. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:46:15 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <XXYL7.196268$3d2.8168959@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24723

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tplml$k2r$0@208.207.71.171...
>
> If you like doughnuts and beer, knock yourself out. I never touch
> either.

I have been known to touch them both but not anywhere near each other.

Wheaties and stale beer, Dick, breakfast of ex-champions.

1777. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:46:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpm1tkqc0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24724

Give it up Kim, they just WON'T sork as brains, however hard you may try to get them to. They just want to obey the law of gravity, nothing more.

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Man, I must be making some sense to you! Thanks!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tmult$st9$3@208.207.71.169...
> > >
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > *Sigh* It was a matter of my not paying attention
> > >
> > >
> > > If brains were dollars you still couldn't pay attention.

1778. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:50:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011124215047.14773.00001905@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 24726

In article <3BFC0A87.125ABD1E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>Larry, he is a 300,000 foot tall bipolar, obsessive/compulsive alien who
>can dunk basketballs and who has babies in the back of the bus. Perhaps
>this is a man who, in some aspects, should be taken seriously!
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

My goodness! Well, at that altitude, I hope he moonlights doing tower
work! Should be able to make a fortune!

1779. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:50:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011124215047.14773.00001904@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 24727

In article <F89C3480A193D08D.3EA2BF8FE5E3FB92.60CE20EF0373D95C@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>Yeah, Rick. It's university profs, such as yourself, that are the reason
>>Larry's never been able to do a darned thing with his "education." ;)
>
> Flunked him in too many classes, huh?
>
> Rick

Not even close, Rick. I got my B.S. in Human Resources Management
Summa Cum Laude. The worst grade I got was a B+ in Organizational
and Industrial Psychology. All the rest were A's with a couple of
A minuses. Final GPA was 3.88.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1780. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:50:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011124215048.14773.00001906@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 24725

In article <20011122160400.23334.00000784@nso-da.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>Guess my electropolitical incorrectness rubs some folks the wrong way. Too
>bad.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

"Electropolitical incorrectness?" New acronym: EPIC.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1781. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:50:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011124215048.14773.00001907@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 24728

In article <81556E28351A1A56.42166A57A58FAD72.308E90AEA500DABC@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>That's where you'd be wrong. I was in Safeway the other day, and there
>>was a bottle of Tobasco sauce on a shelf, several inches over my head!
>>Somehow, I managed to "get it." In reality, I get lots of things that are
>>over my head.
>
> Larry!
>
> You're demonstrating a sense of humor!
>
> Shame on you--you're destroying all our images of you!
>
> Rick

Oooops, sorry. I'm sure it's inconvenient for you, since it makes me appear
to be just as human as anyone else! I'll keep that in mind!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1782. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 02:56:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpmlemja0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24729

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > Yup. But who gets to decide whether "harm" has occurred? The person who did
> > the action? The person who is supposedly harmed? Some neutral third party?
> > What criteria determines "harm"? That is all "personal value" stuff.
>
> That's easy, Jim. The definition of *actual* harm should require the
> use of force or threat of force.

ARE you serious??? There is such a thing as economic harm,
psychological harm, any number of types other than "force".

The imagined harm over Kim's callsign
> is not harm at all.

Sure it it. If most hams want the ARS to appear as a family oriented
service, and wish it to appear that way to younger persons, and when
they demonstrate ham radio to younger folk, there is Kim W5TIT and her
(tee hee, big gabonzas, with all the double ententre or sexual innuendo
accompanying, what is that but harm?

If I told you I experienced harm because of your
> choice of callsigns, would you change it for me? Of course not!

Just because you take no offense over W5TIT doesn't mean that a
majority of other hams do not. Is your opinion the only one that
counts???

> > Who gets to decide if a particular callsign causes harm or not?
>
> "Sticks and stones may break my bones but callsigns can never hurt me."
> Anyone who allows callsigns unaccompanied by force or threat of force
> to hurt them are cooperating in their own pain. The "harm" is self
> imposed. Callsigns can cause no harm without the cooperation of the
> "victim"(s). Think about it. Finding harm in Kim's callsign is like
> finding dirty sex in ink blots.

Total bullshit.

1783. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 03:04:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpn3fnhu0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24730

CAM wrote:
>

> What if someone chooses a callsign that means "tit" in Swahili? Would you
> consider it obscene? It is a callsign. It is not a dirty word. People
> who think it is dirty are using their free will to choose to think it
> is dirty.

So then, WHY did she choose it? Couldn't be to go with her anatomy,
could it? And the travesty is that is a sham anyway- oversized saggy
mammary glands are not attractive and are not an object of attraction,
so why does she need and want to call attention to them? Evidently she
needs the reinforcement
(literally). Did she choose it because of some basic innate insecurity
on her part? Would she be a total unknown without being W5TIT, the
titty ham? Does that callsign give her an identity that she otherwise
could never have?

All this matters not, it is simply very poor taste and an albatross on
the ARS.

1784. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 03:06:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpn87nhu1@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24731

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 24 Nov 2001 13:04:00 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >You do exactly the same thing, Rick.
>
> Of course I do--everyone does. That's the entire point.
>
> If I base my concepts of right and wrong on my own moral
> values, you base yours on your values, Dave does, etc.--so long as we
> can agree that harm to nonconsenting individuals is considered wrong
> by all of us, then there is no conflict involved. I may behave in a
> manner I find moral, you may behave in one you find moral, and neither
> of us will in any way affect the other.

But society sets the guidelines for all of us. There is a range of
acceptability. Go outside this range, and society will sanction you.

>
> What is so difficult for people to accept about that simple
> concept?
>

Yeah, why indeed?

1785. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 03:12:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpnj8nhu2@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24732

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 24 Nov 2001 04:07:30 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > You can blow smoke out your posterior until it's too sore to sit on,
> >but you can't change the fact that any kid soon learns that most of the
> >crime comes from and within the ghetto, and guess what the ghetto is
> >mostly populated with?
>
> Poor people, you idiot. Why do you think they CALL it a
> ghetto?
>
> Remember the Warsaw Ghetto? The Ghetto in Bucharest? The
> Polish Ghetto in Chicago?
>
> >All the touchy-feely BS you can spread like
> >peanut butter won't change a thing.
>
> No it won't. You're a bigot and nothing even approaching the
> truth is likely to get through that racist barrier.
>
> > And it's only racist if you make it to be.
>
> No, Dick. It's racist if you make untrue statements about a
> group, stereotype a group, or otherwise single that group out as your
> inferiors.
>
> > Basically it's fact.
>
> Basically, it's bigoted nonsense that would make Archie Bunker
> cringe.
>
> > Facts are what kids are very good at determining. BS is what you are
> >very good at spreading.
>
> And hatred, racism, and bigotry are your forte. So what?
> SOMEONE has to clean up after cretins like yourself and insure that
> the children you pollute in your homes have a chance to learn the
> truth once you get your claws out of them and they reach college.
>

And you are not only a dumbass you're a phony lying dumbass. You have
not the first clue what you're talking about.

1786. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 03:17:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpns8pmu0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24733

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tn6e2$q30$0@208.206.142.74...
> > > Except that the truth happens to be that the danger of violent
> > > crime is inversely proportional to the income level of the
> > > neighborhood. It doesn't matter if the residents are black, white,
> > > yellow, red, or green for that matter--if they are poor there will be
> > > a high crime rate, if they aren't there won't.
> >
> >
> >
> > You can blow smoke out your posterior until it's too sore to sit on,
> > but you can't change the fact that any kid soon learns that most of the
> > crime comes from and within the ghetto, and guess what the ghetto is
> > mostly populated with? All the touchy-feely BS you can spread like
> > peanut butter won't change a thing.
> > And it's only racist if you make it to be. Basically it's fact.
> > Facts are what kids are very good at determining. BS is what you are
> > very good at spreading.
>
> Perhaps, then, you can enlighten us as to *why* the crime rate is so high in
> such an area.

Sure. Basically for the same reasons the young Islamics hate us and
join the Jihad. They just don't know anything except what they're taught
from infancy. If you're told from first cognizance that all Westerners
are evil infidels who Allah dictates must be exterminated even at the
cost of your own life (but you'll get your reward of 40 virgins and all
you can eat in the afterlife) that's all you know.
If, as a black kid, you see nothing but drug deals, ubiquitous crime
and hustling, you grow up believing you're supposed to be a drug
dealing, hustling criminal.

1787. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 03:28:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tpoh5sbo0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 24734

CAM wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > If you served in foreign posts, it's too bad you didn't take
> > the opportunity to absorb more of their cultures.
>
> Actually, a book was written about guys like Dave,
> "The Ugly American".

Just another totally erroneous judgement from our resident "one hit
$hit" guy.

1788. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 04:59:52 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C007AC8.F4355CD@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24735

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> >
> > I see you are not up on Southern Baptist
> > doctrine, Dwight. Jesus was with God
> > from the beginning. When God said, "Let
> > us make man in our image", he was
> > talking to Jesus and the Holy Spirit.
> > Anyone who didn't believe in Jesus/
> > Jehovah from the beginning is going to
> > hell. Haven't you ever heard of The
> > Trinity? What's the matter with you,
> > anyway?
>
> Fine, but I've never heard that promoted by any christain
> religion (a person who died before Christ's birth went to
> hell). If that is indeed Southern Baptist doctrine, what are
> they basing it on?

In the Catholic Church, they say that they're the best church around, but they say that if someone in another faith follows it and good and stuff (including Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, etc.) they get credit for it and get into our heaven. I hope the other religions have reciprocal agreements, just in case... :-)

1789. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:02:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C007B74.6B7569F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24736

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> Not even close, Rick. I got my B.S. in Human Resources Management
> Summa Cum Laude. The worst grade I got was a B+ in Organizational
> and Industrial Psychology. All the rest were A's with a couple of
> A minuses. Final GPA was 3.88.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

And you're the one driving a bus? :-)

1790. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:06:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C007C3F.3626DBF9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24737

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
> >Larry, he is a 300,000 foot tall bipolar, obsessive/compulsive alien who
> >can dunk basketballs and who has babies in the back of the bus. Perhaps
> >this is a man who, in some aspects, should be taken seriously!
> >
> My goodness! Well, at that altitude, I hope he moonlights doing tower
> work! Should be able to make a fortune!

Unfortunately, that 300,000 foot dimension is not the same one as a tower.
It is at right angles to the other three dimensions.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1791. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:14:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C007E1E.6ACD3E1B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24738

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Did she choose it because of some basic innate insecurity
> on her part? Would she be a total unknown without being W5TIT, the
> titty ham? Does that callsign give her an identity that she otherwise
> could never have?

The reason she chose it doesn't matter. What matters to that you have not taken responsibility for considering it in poor taste. Your feelings are your responsibility, Dick. You cause them to happen. Your feelings in reaction to a particular callsign are not Kim's responsibility. You are like the rapist who pleads that the way the woman was dressed forced him to think evil thoughts and he was powerless to prevent the crime.

> All this matters not, it is simply very poor taste and an albatross on
> the ARS.

You're right - it matters not and neither does your opinion or feelings except, of course, to you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1792. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:21:46 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c007f50.1515526@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 24739

On Sat, 24 Nov 2001 19:06:55 GMT, "Roger Halstead" <rdhalste@tm.net>
wrote:

>
>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
>news:cuvyxnansvbet.gn9g200.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
>> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 02:45:49 GMT, BH wrote:
>>
>> >I can see this for installing non-type accepted amateur gear, but
>> >do not see how this applies for using the installed aircraft comms
>> >that can operate on the ham bands.
>> >
>> That is covered by:
>>
>> Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.
>>
>> (b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
>> other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
>> a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
>> installation......
>>
>No it's not!
>
>"IF" the aircraft radios are such that they can also cover the ham bands and
>the oerator has the license they may be used on the ham bands.
>
>IF a Ham station is installed THEN that station must be kept seperate.
>
>The above says nothing about using the aircfraft system radios on ham bands
>if they go there and there are systems that do. Those would be systems such
>as the HF rigs that are required for transoceanic flights. More than likely
>for the big elaborate systems there are tohse that cover the VHF and UHF
>bands as well, but those are not radios most of us could afford.
>
>I've seen more than one light plane that had a Kenwood, or Icom to use on HF
>for those transoceanic flights and the FAA was quite willing to accept them.
>Roger Halstead (K8RI)

Likewise on the Navy ships, the ham doesn't set up another station,
they just set up one of the transcievers for a ham frequency. We did
that in the 60s using AN/WRC-1 or we'd use an HF Xmitter with
a separate reciever such as R390A or R1051.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1793. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:29:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00819F.4267901@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24740

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > That's easy, Jim. The definition of *actual* harm should require the
> > use of force or threat of force.
>
> *ARE* you serious??? There is such a thing as economic harm,
> psychological harm, any number of types other than "force".

Oh ye of such limited conceptual range. Actual harm of any kind
requires force or threat of force of some kind. Have you never
heard of economic forces or psychological forces? For instance:
Economic forces beyond the control of the Federal Reserve are
drawing the US deeper into a recession. Try a web search for
"economic forces" and see what pops up. Google just found
1,390,000 hits for me. Is that enough for you?

> The imagined harm over Kim's callsign
> > is not harm at all.
>
> Sure it it. If most hams want the ARS to appear as a family oriented
> service, and wish it to appear that way to younger persons, and when
> they demonstrate ham radio to younger folk, there is Kim W5TIT and her
> (tee hee, big gabonzas, with all the double ententre or sexual innuendo
> accompanying, what is that but harm?

Every young person's mother has tits, Dick. Probably 35% of the population
has tits. You cannot simply sweep them under the rug and forget about them.
It's hard to find a TV program where they are not hanging out.

> If I told you I experienced harm because of your
> > choice of callsigns, would you change it for me? Of course not!
>
> Just because you take no offense over W5TIT doesn't mean that a
> majority of other hams do not. Is your opinion the only one that
> counts???

I seriously doubt that the majority of hams are so antisocial that
they would object to W5TIT as a callsign. But if they are, they have
a personal problem and should see a psychologist.

> Total bullshit.

When you cannot refute the logic, utter some profanity, eh? Isn't
"bullshit" a lot worse than Kim's call? After all, there are more
people reading this newsgroup in one day than Kim ever talks to

on the air.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1794. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:30:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0081FE.9B86E319@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24741

Dick Carroll wrote:
> But society sets the guidelines for all of us. There is a range of
> acceptability. Go outside this range, and society will sanction you.

This is a free country, Dick, with inalienable rights. You try to
sanction me and you might just wind up getting sanctioned.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1795. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:32:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C008267.34177C5D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24742

Richard McCollum wrote:
> I have been known to touch them both but not anywhere near each other.

Are we still talking about tits?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1796. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:37:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00838D.9DDE4665@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24743

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Has ham radi0o gone to hell in the past couple decades? Without a
> doubt. And it is entirely in the (poor) quality of most of those persons
> entering the hobby.

Yep, and Riley Hollingsworth sez those bad guys are mostly
Extras and Advanced class.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1797. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:39:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C008422.3647B2CC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24744

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Krell wrote:
> > Perhaps, then, you can enlighten us as to *why* the crime rate is so high in
> > such an area.
>
> Sure. Basically for the same reasons the young Islamics hate us and
> join the Jihad. They just don't know anything except what they're taught
> from infancy. If you're told from first cognizance that all Westerners
> are evil infidels who Allah dictates must be exterminated even at the
> cost of your own life (but you'll get your reward of 40 virgins and all
> you can eat in the afterlife) that's all you know.

It appears that you have been taught from birth that all Islamics are evil
and that's all you know.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1798. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:42:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0084DF.DB977D2C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24745

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Fine, but I've never heard that promoted by any christain
> religion (a person who died before Christ's birth went to
> hell). If that is indeed Southern Baptist doctrine, what are
> they basing it on?

That's exactly what I would like to know.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1799. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:44:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C008559.8425C09@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24746

Robert Casey wrote:
> In the Catholic Church, they say that they're the best church
> around, but they say that if someone in another faith follows
> it and good and stuff (including Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims,
> etc.) they get credit for it and get into our heaven. I hope
> the other religions have reciprocal agreements, just in case...

Southern Baptists believe that only some protestants are going
to heaven. In particular, they believe that Catholics and
Mormons are going to hell.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1800. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:47:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C008604.AEC00834@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24747

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Why do you want to stick your ugly nose in other people's business?
> > >
> > > Why do you want to stick your business in other people's nose?
> >
> > I don't, Dick. I won't bother them and I don't want them to
> > bother me. What is wrong with live and let live? I don't
> > want to control what you do in the privacy of your home.
> > Why do you want to control what I do in the privacy of mine?
>
> Where on earth did you get that idea?

From some of your previous postings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1801. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:56:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C008818.E11BC64A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24748

Dick Carroll wrote:
> ... things
> changed in ham radio pretty drastically about the time we began to get
> large numbers of CBers -I mean the seasoned, hard core CBers- into ham
> radio. Before that you never heard any of the trash on HF.

So all the extras and advanced hams that Riley talks about trashing
ham radio were previously hard core CBers???? Even the 20wpm Extras???

> Today we're overloaded with them, largely courtesy of CB.

Society has changed, Dick. CB and ham radio are merely
microcosms of society in general. Movies, Music, and TV
have had lots more effect on ham radio than have CBers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1802. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 05:58:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00886A.2835654@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24749

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Speaking for yourself again, I see. Of course you act like a
> pre-sophomoric 5th grader.

Uhhhhhhhh Dick, all 5th graders are pre-sophmoric.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1803. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:00:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0088F1.222EDC53@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24750

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > > I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers with
> > > their nice habbits will come in droves.
> > >
> > It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?
>
> Uh, there's still, that nasty 5wpm code test. Might as well be 30 to
> them.

So which is it, Dick? Are CBers coming in droves or is 5wpm keeping
them out. Methinketh thou talketh with a forked tongue. You cannot
have it both ways.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1804. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:05:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C008976.866897B5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24801

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 07:16:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I asked the one who sat at my Thanksgiving dinner table. He says you're
> >incorrect as regards the Episcopal Church. The Church also has the say
> >on what music is permissable or not.
>
> I'll digitize and send you a video clip (from HBO, btw) of an
> Episcopal priest conducting a marriage ceremony (using the Episcopal
> rituals for all but the exchange of vows) in Washington D.C., in 1993
> for approximately 5,000 gay and lesbian couples who he invited to
> recite their own vows to each other then pronounced married. They may
> not be married under law, but they ARE married under church law (ask
> your Priest)--and the priest who did so is still ordained and serving
> as pastor of his church.
>
> Let me know where to send the clip.

You mean that a priest, disregarding the canons of the church did so.
I think that'd be The Reverend Lonnie Smily of the Unioted Church of
Have A Nice Day.

You needn't bother with the clip.

> >Yeah, I have the idea what your views are. I don't agree with 'em.
>
> I doubt seriously that you do, Dave. Simply because someone
> doesn't try to control the life or choices of his/her partner does NOT
> mean that he or she doesn't have a good--or monogamous--relationship,
> only that they respect their spouse and respect their spouse's rights
> and freedom of choice.

You don't have to doubt, I've come out and said so. Also, I don't
believe that we were discussing a monogomous relationship, were we? At
no point did I advocate control of a spouse's life. You must have been
reading someone else's post.

> >> You mean someone else is supporting my wife's and son's needs
> >> economically, intellectually, and emotionally? Someone is taking care
> >> of her when she's sick, cheering her up when she's down, helping her
> >> with her tasks, providing her emotional support and encouragement,
> >> standing up for her if she's threatened or attacked, helping her with
> >> her research, and taking her shopping (among other things)?
> >>

> >> Who?
> >
> >Let's see...Her dad could support her economically or she could do it
> >herself. Her best friend could support her intellectual needs. Her
> >sister could be her emotional support. A guard dog could ward off
> >attacks and she could either drive or take the bus shopping.
>
> Her Dad lives on Social Security.
>
> I'm her best friend.
>
> She doesn't have a sister.
>
> We have cats not dogs.
>
> There are no busses where we live (her choice of location,
> btw), we're 30 miles from the nearest small city.
>
> She doesn't drive.
>
> Note, incidently, that I asked who IS doing certain things and
> you reply with who "could" do so if they chose (and existed).
>
> Try sticking to a thread if you participate in it. You're
> beginning to sound like Larry & Dick.

Try coming up with your own solutions to your own hypthetical problems.

> >> Or are you referring to sex as the "job of a good husband." If
> >> so, I have to ask: What on earth makes you think of sex as a "job" in
> >> the first place?
> >
> >You used the word. Was is a euphemism?
>
> Go back to the original quote and re-read it.

That wasn't an answer.

> >
> >> >My tongue was firmly planted in cheek.
> >>
> >> Actually, your foot was firmly planted in your mouth.
> >
> >Actually, the meaning is lost since you snipped the portion of your
> >statment to which I responded.
>
> So put it back. You STILL ended up with your foot in your
> mouth.

That simply can't be since you snipped the portion to which I was
replying.

> >I think you'd have problems whether you were informed beforehand or
> >found out later.
>
> Why?

The things which would lead a wife to consider such action in the first
place.

> >> What does society OR religion have to do with my private
> >> behavior?
> >
> >I don't believe that any of us is formed without influence from society
> >or religion. I don't believe that any individual brought up in a vacuum
> >would have a clue about right or wrong. I don't know that any such
> >individual exists.
>
> But right or wrong are _relative_ not absolutes.
>
> Example:
>
> Is sexual intercourse right or wrong?
>
> It shouldn't matter who the people involved are if it's an
> absolute value--either it's "Right" or it's "Wrong."
>
> But, of course, it ISN'T an absolute.
>
> Is it right?
>
> For a loving married couple, we would BOTH say yes.
>
> If the woman is forced to do so, we would BOTH say no.
>
> If the man and woman aren't married to each other, however, we
> run into a problem--because depending on the circumstances we probably
> WON'T agree in all cases.
>
> Does that make your values right and mine wrong? Or mine right
> and your's wrong? Or does it simply mean that we don't share the SAME
> values in some areas and probably do in others.
>
> It isn't how you are brought up that determines what is right
> and wrong--how you are brought up determines only what YOU believe to
> be right and wrong. But belief does NOT make for fact.
>
> >>It would be idiotic for me to adhere to the values of a
> >> religion I didn't believe in simply because other people do so in my
> >> community--if everyone in your neighborhood believed their homes were
> >> on fire would you start spraying water in your living room even though
> >> you saw no flames or smoke? As far as "society" goes, try to remember
> >> that society is simply an accumulation of individuals. Thus there is
> >> no possible reason to assume that "society" has any more valid basis

> >> for its rules than any individual who is a part of it.
> >
> >That's poppycock. All individuals don't possess the same amount of gray
> >matter and it only stands to reason that a society--your accumulation of
> >individuals--will have a sum total of experience and intellect greater
> >than any one individual can ever hope to have.
>
> Really?
>
> It could _just_ as logically be argued that we should have a
> dictatorship, since a dictator who was brilliant wouldn't have his
> intellect "Dulled" by the many lower intellect members of the society
> and could therefore be counted on to make the right decisions more
> often than would be the case if the population were to do so.

That simply doesn't make sense. The dictator still wouldn't have the
sum total experience or intellect of all of his subjects. Have you seen
what happens to almost every dictator?

> If the population of a nation invariably have a greater amount
> of experience and a higher intellect--they explain the following:
>
> The election of the Nazis to power in Germany.

...election? By the way, he was defeated by the sum total
intelligence and experience of the rest of the world.

> The makeup of our current congress and presidency.

What about it?

> Bigotry.

you tell us.

> War.

you tell us.

> Domestic Violence.

you tell us.

> Hate crimes.

you tell us.

> The Civil War.

you tell us.

> The Vietnam War.

you tell us.

> The popularity of the Home Shopping Network, the fact that the
> number ONE selling paper in the US is the Weekly World News, tobacco
> smoking, or the Drug War.

Which IS the number one selling paper? Is it The Weekly World News,
Tobacco or The Drug War? I always thought it was Charmin.

> Go for it, Dave. If society is so smart, why do these problems
> exist or these absurd choices of leaders occur?

Gee, Rick. I think you should tell us. After all, you seem to think
you have all the answers. I'm just a guy who doesn't buy into your idea
of nirvana.

> >> So long as my actions don't harm others, it really isn't the
> >> concern of anyone but myself--just because YOUR religion opposes a
> >> given behavior doesn't justify banning it--only avoiding it yourself.
> >
> >But society has always determinded which of your activities harm
> >others. You don't have the final say.
>
> Really?
>
> So if society determines that drinking alcohol, smoking
> cigarettes, using ham radio, and watching movies with a rating greater
> than "PG" harm others, you will immediately stop doing them?

Be assured that if society makes such a decision, I'll abide by it.
Good luck with your rant now.

> It isn't up to society to arbitrarily decide which of my
> activates harm others--it's up to society to PROVE that those actions
> harm others before prohibiting them. And when it comes to morals laws,
> it's pretty hard for them to do that.

Then explain those laws on the books with which you obviously have such
a problem.

> >> Color IS apparent. It is also irrelevant. Teaching a child to
> >> be color blind, as you know, is simply teaching him or her that the
> >> color of a person's skin has absolutely no relationship to that
> >> person's personality, behavior, intelligence, or capabilities. If you
> >> insist that color should not be ignored then it could be added that
> >> the color of someone's skin DOES indicate the clothing colors that
> >> will look best on them and the degree of protection from burning they
> >> should look for in a sun block. Fair enough?
> >
> >Then don't use cliches like "color blind" when you mean to say that skin
> >color is irrelevant. That should also be fair enough.
>
> Ok, but be sure not to sign any of your messages "73," since
> it's a cliche. Just say "goodbye" instead from now on.

I don't sign my messages with "73".

> >> Are you arguing that the Episcopal church does not attempt
> >> to convert non-Christians to their beliefs--and that they do not see
> >> other religious beliefs as being "wrong" or inferior to Christianity?
> >
> >Convert? Sure the Church attempts to convert others in order to spread
> >the word of the gospels. Does the Church preach that those with
> >different religious beliefs are wrong or inferior? No.
>
> Then perhaps you can explain to me how they manage to
> "convert" people from their current religion, while simultaneously
> telling them that their current religion is as good as Christianity?

Do you mean that you can't reveal something without condemning or
censuring something else?

> >> you can speak for the Episcopal church? And if so, and your statement
> >> above is true, then justify ANY of your comments about the morality of
> >> my views or Kim's call sign.
> >
> >I believe that Kim is ignorant of the impropriety of her choice. Now,
> >am I speaking from my religious or societal perspective?
>
> Are you stating that her call is or is not immoral?

I believe that you'll find that I've said her choice was a) tacky, b)
lacking taste and c) lacking decorum. Anything else is speculation on
your part.

> If it is not, then there is no possible impropriety involved.
> It is no more relevant that her call is W5TIT than it would be if it
> were W5ITT.

That's not true. It could still be tacky, lack decorum and exhibit a
lack of taste.

> If, otoh, it IS immoral (thus justifying the accusation of
> impropriety) then you are either basing that view on a religious
> definition of morality or on none at all (in which case, by
> definition, her sign CAN'T be immoral). No non-religious (and not all
> religious--outside of Christianity at least) philosophy defines
> natural human sexuality or the human body as "immoral." Only religions
> reserve that right.

Your rant goes waaaaaaaay beyond reality.

> Again, are you stating that her call is immoral (and thus
> admitting that you ARE speaking from a religious perspective) or are
> you stating that it is NOT immoral (and therefore not improper)?

No, I'm not stating that Kim's call is immoral and no, I'm not stating
that it is not immoral. I'm stating that it is tacky, lacks decorum
and that it exhibits lack of taste.

> >Who gets to judge which views of society are based in religion, Rick?
> >Is it you? Do you deny that some of your recent statements regarding
> >Christianity would be offensive of any Christian? Society could find
> >fault with your sexual views on public health or nuisance issues.
>
> Really?
>
> Show me a single quote from any post I've made that would
> justify a definition of fault from a strictly secular perspective.

Are we talking about the swinger parties, the wives with multiple
partners or those men who frequent prostitutes? Get real.

> >> Ok--find TEN Christians that practice the religion precisely
> >> the way it is intended to be practiced--in other words precisely as
> >> the bible instructs them to practice it and I'll retract that
> >> statement.
> >
> >Any what, precisely is supposed to be my motivation for doing so?
> >You'll want to contact a church group in order to conduct your own
> >research.
>
> Translation: You know that it's completely impossible for you
> to do so, so you choose to pretend there's no reason for you to try.
>
Damn, Rick. You've gotten it wrong again. There isn't any translation
necessary unless you'd like to consider: I don't plan to put forth the
effort because it wastes my precious time and would be highly unlikely
to change your views. I don't plan to bother with it. You don't assign
me homework.

> >> You didn't state that the US had a better tax rate than other
> >> nations (it doesn't, try Monaco or Saudi Arabia)--you stated that it
> >> had more freedom. High taxes have nothing to do with that.
> >
> >Certainly they do. Would you like to enjoy the freedoms offered by Saudi
> >Arabia? Your sexual ideas would certainly be a hit there.
>
> Er, Dave.
>
> My reference was to the tax rate in Saudi Arabia, not to
> freedom. Read more carefully.

I read what you wrote. Do you think you'd enjoy living in Saudi Arabia
with its low tax rates?

>
> >> As far as social problems go, we have VASTLY more in the US
> >> than in any Western European nation with the possible exception of the
> >> relatively recently reunited Germany. Again, that has nothing to do
> >> with freedom--the subject of your claim.
> >
> >Social problems indicate turmoil and instability and that has plenty to

> >do with freedom. I disagree with your assessment that we have "VASTLY"
> >or even any more social problems than in any Western European nation.
>
> Take a look at the current crime statistics, rate of infant
> mortality in our cities, percentage of our citizens incarcerated, rate
> of teen pregnancy, cost of our drug war, AIDS infection rate, rape
> rate, domestic violence rate, or the ranking of our schools, to name
> just a few at random.
>
> Now tell me again we don't have VASTLY more social problems
> than Western European nations.

We don't have VASTLY more social problems than in Western European nations. All western European nations are suffering the problems described. Finland in the mid-80s didn't have skinheads and graffiti defacing urban buildings and monuments. Finland in the mid-90s had those problems. Where are the American sports hooligans like the those found in European countries.

> >> I wouldn't have the vaguest idea--but based on your statements
> >> about other nations you did NOT teach political science.
> >
> >I retired from the Foreign Service a year ago.
>
> Is that supposed to make you an expert on politics?

Are you supposed to be an expert? Did someone tell you that you're important?

> If you served in foreign posts, it's too bad you didn't take
> the opportunity to absorb more of their cultures.

How would you know what I did? Your ignorance of what I did overseas has got to be at least as great as your ignorance of what I did for a living. By the way, I don't believe you can show me a Foreign Service member who does not serve in foreign posts. The people who work for the government domestically are *Civil Service*. Foreign Service members serve only periodically in the U.S. I was overseas for fifteen continuous years.

> I don't go to psychology, sociology, or political science
> classes to LEARN those subjects, either.
>
> Your point being?

See how hard it is to respond if an individual insists on snipping relevant portions? Yeah, I know; I forgot too.

> >In the end, ask yourself why there are lots more folks from foreign
> >countries coming to the U.S. each year than Americans who move abroad.
>
> On the basis of years of education--there AREN'T.

Earth to Rick: Get a clue.

> For the first time in American history, in the last decade,
> the EMMIGRATION rate for individuals with a Bachelors degree or better
> has exceeded the IMMIGRATION rate for individuals with that level of
> education. In other words, we're exporting our best minds.
>
> Ask yourself why.

Ask yourself why you'd make such an elitist statement.

> > Correction to translation: Please save me from this leftist
> >rhetoric...
>
> For someone who claims to know something about political
> issues, you certainly don't seem to know the difference between a
> leftist and a libertarian.

If it squeals like a pig, there's probably some pork in there somewhere.

Dave K8MN

1805. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:13:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C008B8E.979A72F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24802

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Leaning in the direction of freedom is definitely not leaning to
> > > either the left or the right. The liberal left is generally for
> > > social freedom and against economic freedom.
> >
> > I was addressing the liberal left.
>
> From an equally invalid position called the conservative right.
> If you are against freedom, it doesn't really matter what you
> call yourself. The liberal left and conservative right could
> unite into a political party called the Anti-Freedom League.

Gee, how undemocratic of you to make such a sweeping statement.

> > >The conservative right
> > > is generally for economic freedom and against social freedom.
> > > Note that both are anti-freedom is certain areas. Libertarians
> > > are for both social and economic freedom, i.e. freedom in general.
> >
> > I addressed the liberal left from the conservative right.
>
> That's what I was pointing out, Dave. You are against social freedom,
> i.e. you are anti-freedom just like the liberal left. You really need
> to do something about those beams in your eyes.

Anyone who would point them out would have a similar problem, eh?
You've already got me labelled and put into a box. You have a similar
box around you, Cecil.

Cecil's Mantra: "By God, if we made everything legal, there wouldn't be
any crime.

Dave K8MN

1806. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:15:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C008BFD.A32923C7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24803

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Well, let's start with you, Dave. Do you eat pork?
> >
> > Oh, did you think *I* was going to assist you? Try and find out.
>
> Now I don't have to - you just told me.

Sure you have to, Cecil. What I told you is that I do not intend to assist you. If you want to win, you have to work for it. You'll either be a *winner* or a guy who has gone to a lot of trouble for nothing. I've made no revelation. You're just seeing dirty pictures in ink blots.

Dave K8MN

1807. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:18:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C008CA9.DDD8F615@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24804

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Convert? Sure the Church attempts to convert others in order to spread
> > > > the word of the gospels. Does the Church preach that those with
> > > > different religious beliefs are wrong or inferior? No.
> > >
> > > Don't know about your church but Southern Baptist churches certainly
> > > preach that "those with different religious beliefs are wrong or
> > > inferior".
> > >
> > Try to read the posts and you'll find the answer. I'm not a Southern
> > Baptist.
>
> Ah, but you said "the Church" above. You didn't specify any
> denomination.

The Church is all of Christianity. The church is a building. The
Baptist Church is the Baptist Church.
>
> > > I hear it almost every Sunday. Did you know that Buddha,
> > > a good man who died 300 years before Christ was born, went straight
> > > to hell?
> > >
> > No I didn't and neither do any of the Southern Baptists. It is my
> > understanding that Jesus died for the redemtion of the sins of all men.
> > That goes for those before and after him. It looks as if Buddha is
> > covered.
>
> Guess you had better take it up with Reverend Witcher, our Southern
> Baptist preacher. Want his phone number?

You can pass it on for me, Cecil. You're there anyway and it'll save me
the cost of the phone call. It'll give you two something interesting to
talk about. Ask him about Kim's call while you're at it.

Dave K8MN

1808. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:19:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C008CED.A50E6B73@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24805

CAM wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > If you served in foreign posts, it's too bad you didn't take
> > the opportunity to absorb more of their cultures.
>
> Actually, a book was written about guys like Dave,
> "The Ugly American".

It is quite obvious that you either did not read it or (more likely)
that you don't remember Lederer's tome.

Dave K8MN

1809. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:22:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C008D7C.2D8D4B7B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24806

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Please point us to a document which provides a percentage of southerners
> > opposed to passage of the Civil Rights Act.
>
> Please point us to a document which provides a percentage of
> southerns favoring the passage of the Civil Rights Act. I
> live and travel in the South, Dave. Things are slowly changing
> for the better but in the 1960's, when I was a traveling salesman,
> I had to be quiet about my support for the Civil Rights Act or
> else risk loss of sales and bodily injury.

YOU are the individual who indicated that the majority of Southerners supported segregation. Proving it is only necessary if you want to be believed (I think that is the way *you* put it).

I'd think a guy like you still has to be quiet about some things in order to prevent bodily injury.

Dave K8MN

1810. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:23:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C008DCF.95F0C8E9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24807

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BFFC41B.A9365D6D@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Please point us to a document which provides a percentage of southerners
> > > opposed to passage of the Civil Rights Act.
> > >
> > Please point us to a document which provides a percentage of
> > southerns favoring the passage of the Civil Rights Act. I
> > live and travel in the South, Dave. Things are slowly changing
> > for the better but in the 1960's, when I was a traveling salesman,
> > I had to be quiet about my support for the Civil Rights Act or
> > else risk loss of sales and bodily injury.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> The passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was one of Lyndon Johnson's all
> time great 'convincing' efforts. A cartoon of the era pictured two rather
> obviously Southern senators meeting on the Capitol steps with their left
> arms twisted in a knot. One says, "See you met Lyndon, too."

A Bill Mauldin cartoon wasn't it?

Dave K8MN

1811. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:29:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C008F1D.47C38D39@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24808

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 04:44:53 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >If it wasn't clear to you: The Netherlands has less freedom than the
> >U.S.
>
> Would you care to tell us in what AREAS you have greater
> personal freedom in the United States than in the Netherlands?

Do you carry a national ID card?

> Since your statement not only goes against experience, but
> goes against the recently released UN study of freedom in member
> nations (which listed the Netherlands as the freest nation on earth,
> followed by Denmark, etc.), it would seem that you need to offer more
> than a simply statement of opinion to support your claim.

The UN? 'nuff said.

1812. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:37:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C009113.6960A44F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24809

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3BFC0A87.125ABD1E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry, he is a 300,000 foot tall bipolar, obsessive/compulsive alien who
> >can dunk basketballs and who has babies in the back of the bus. Perhaps
> >this is a man who, in some aspects, should be taken seriously!
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> My goodness! Well, at that altitude, I hope he moonlights doing tower
> work! Should be able to make a fortune!

Naw, he's busy singing in the choir at a church whose views he does not
share. That is, of course, when he isn't busy praying to his inner self.

Dave K8MN

1813. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015737.12427.00003225@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24818

In article <3BFE589B.210B81EB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers
>with
>> their nice habbits will come in droves.
>
>It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?

I dunno, Cecil, but where are the legions of smart, computer-literate, technical-savvy, eager, enthusiastic, and committed young people who were supposed to create a digital paradise on the ham bands, and save them from any thought of reallocation by commercial communications and broadcasting interests? Of all of the new people who have come into my local ham radio club since Restructuring, there isn't a single one less than 45 years old, they are all about as technically ignorant as they can be, show no demonstrable interest in overcoming even the simplest technical challenges common to radio amateurs, want their hands held every step of the way, and think that organizing the local Field Day operation is an event worthy of fame and fortune!

We may not be getting droves of CB'ers, but there is still a 5 WPM code test to contend with. When it goes, the "droves" will come -- and they will be asserting their microphone privileges with a terrible vengeance! However, for your sake, I hope that there will be a few more "blowsy broads" that select demeaning, sexualized call signs, so you can continue to play Knight In Shining Armor when you come out in their defense!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1814. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015737.12427.00003224@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24820

In article <028833ADEBA69BBE.882EF94BB22E4E92.71A4EF907909FB94@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> From a strictly personal perspective, I firmly believe that
>racism, sexism, ageism, and religious prejudice have no place in our
>hobby--and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
>our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--but
>that's purely a personal view, not a hard-and-fast fact.
>
> Comments?

Rick:

I have been railing against the overt bigotry, racism, sexism, and
religious prejudice on the ham bands for years. These are the main
reasons why I have all but abandoned any thought of using the phone
bands as an on-the-air activity. I believe that all of these things
have no place on ham radio, and every instance of them being heard
by current and prospective amateurs brings the ARS "...one step
closer to extinction," to borrow Riley Hollingsworth's words on a
different, but strongly related topic.

I don't think that the ham bands are an appropriate venue for the
full and unfettered expression of one's First Amendment "rights" to
express negative commentary about other people. I think such
speech is, in fact, protected by the Constitution, and must be
"tolerated," but the proper venue would be here on Usenet; the ham
radio bands are not.

I believe in the statement, "We live in a democracy, but we do not
work in one." Just as an employer has the right to limit the speech
of employees, in order to prevent embarrassment to the company,
the ham bands must be kept strictly "G" rated, in order to reinforce
the family-oriented nature thereof. Such subtle excursions from this
concept as selecting demeaning callsigns with sexual innuendo,
are an example of something that good hams should not do, for
the good of the service.

>and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
>our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--

"Here" is not "on the air," and that is an important distinction. I
definitely do not behave on-the-air as I do in this newsgroup. This
newsgroup is not ham radio. It is *about* ham radio, but the two
are not the same, and what hams say here can contain a bit more

of an "edge" than the can on-the-air without harming the positive image of the service -- as long the hams in question understand the difference, and are aware of where they are at the time. I know that you, among others, probably do not approve of some of the things I say here, in this newsgroup. However, I understand the difference between this and ham radio; and I'm sure you'd find my on-the-air behavior totally different -- if not boring.

Having said all this -- I doubt that much can be done about the bigoted, racist, sexist, etc. commentary which pollutes the HF phone bands, as long as the hams dishing it out are otherwise operating legally within the limits of their license privileges. It is a fortunate coincidence that the worst offenders along these lines also tend to be prone to exceeding their privileges, and are thus eligible for enforcement action. Unfortunately, we can't "enforce" the content of speech in any more meaningful way than to set a good example. Even more unfortunately, those who engage in hate speech on-the-air aren't likely to be positively affected by good examples, so all that is left is to avoid and ignore. My transceiver has one of those big round things on the front of it, and I'm not afraid to use it!

Uh oh -- now Kim's gonna think I'm talking about her again! I only said "one" Kim! Never mind -- she'll work her way into this somehow -- she usually does!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1815. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015738.12427.00003227@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24811

In article <3bf9cb28_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Heck, one time when the FCC was talking about having a law that any tower
>over a certain number of feet would have to be painted red and white, one of
>the gang on '88 keyed up and said if he painted anything on his tower it
>would be a great big FU. I about drove off the road on that one.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I'm sure that, as usual, you were ROTFLYBFUAO.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1816. Re: Contest idea, work all your own suffix

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015738.12427.00003226@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24816

In article <20011124193950.09887.00001790@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Be the first to work your suffix in all American prefixes!
>>Of course if you have a call like Kim's, that's gonna
>>take a while.
>
> Great idea!
>
> When I was KC8M, I worked/QSL'd the zero, six and three, and worked but
>never got a card from four and five.
>
> So far I have about 10 "YZ" cards.
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

This is a good idea. When I held the call WR2F, I worked about eight of the other WR2's -- and always wished I could finish them all. I'll have to check QRZ.com and see how many LT's are out there!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1817. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015739.12427.00003229@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24815

In article <887B94DC0A930298.B2CBC2526C5F8194.34139715CCB3AA35@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> I just had a dream in which God told me to have all the
>Christians in the NG send me all their money and ham gear. He said
>that if he says it's ok, then it's ok.
>
> I'm waiting . . .
>
> Rick

I just had a dream in which God told me that some nut in this
newsgroup was going to tell us that we're supposed to send him
our money and ham gear -- and that He never said any such thing!
So don't be looking for any bank transfers or UPS shipments
from Delaware...unless you ordered something from HRO!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1818. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015739.12427.00003228@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24819

In article <6be98d7d.0111230322.5dd13266@posting.google.com>,
stewartx@sccoast.net (Dwight Stewart) writes:

>
> And, years from now, do you really think any of these minority groups
>are going to step forward to help the many "white" families who been
>negatively impacted by decades of affirmative action? For that matter,
>once minorities are no longer a minority, do you really think they'll
>ever end affirmative action?

Dwight:

I doubt it. I believe that some form of Affirmative Action will exist as
long as the so-called "minority" ethnic groups continue to walk into
voting booths and pull the switch for liberal, Democrat politicians.
They've got the Gravy Train rolling full speed, and don't plan on getting
off any time soon, I'm sure. I think what this country needs is a good
old fashioned revolt of the hard-working, taxpaying citizens of *all*
races who want to see an end to the creation of dependency -- and
force the know-nothings and do-nothings to wake up and find a way
to share the wealth the good old-fashioned way -- by exercising the
human characteristics of initiative, ingenuity, and integrity. BTW --
this applies to the lazy, slack-jawed, drooling, knuckle-dragging
white trash as well as the "ethnic" minorities.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1819. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015740.12427.00003232@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24810

In article <3BFB2D51.2379D5B0@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Rick Adams wrote:
>> Seen any black helicopters lately, Larry? Maybe some UN troops
>> taking over your neighborhood?

The only helicoptors I see over my neighborhood are the two Chinook's
that are ferrying remains to/from the Dover AFB Mortuary; and the
pretty blue job owned by the Delaware State Police.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1820. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015740.12427.00003230@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24812

In article <3BFB28E7.73A6CE1B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry, I'm convinced you are pulling our legs. If not, you are
>farther gone than I thought. One of your think-alikes hits
>Afghani women with a stick because she shows her face in
>public.

You are obviously mistaken, Cecil. I've never hit a woman with
a stick for showing her face in public. I usually reserve that for
people who drive too slow.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1821. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015740.12427.00003231@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24814

In article <3BFB2C88.9FC1C774@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Well, you've got one thing right, Cecil -- I'm endlessly asking for
>> forgiveness of my sins. I am also praying for those who don't see
>> the need to ask forgiveness. That's as much as I can do, save for
>> trying *not* to be a sinner.
>
>From your postings, I would say your attempt at not sinning
>is pretty feeble.

Cecil:

All of my attempts at not sinning are feeble, compared to what they
should be. I am a sinner, of that there is no doubt. Perhaps you would
pray for me?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1822. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015741.12427.00003233@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24813

In article <3BFB2DA5.67728B4F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
>> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
>> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
>
>Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?

No, Cecil, and I wouldn't be married to any woman who wanted to!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1823. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 06:57:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125015741.12427.00003234@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24817

In article <2C417BA006FB358B.64865A660512ACC7.E7EC661B8180E44F@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>I can't tell if that's penis envy or just plain envy.
>
> Kim, if talking about your call sign causes Larry to
>experience penis envy, he's a LOT more confused than any of us
>realize! :-)
>
> Rick
>

Actually, Rick, I think it's Kim who is "Jonesing" over penisus...
penii...penises...whatever. After all, she's the one with the juvenile
obsession with secondary sexual characteristics -- whether hers
or someone else's.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1824. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:05:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125020550.12427.00003235@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 24821

In article <3C007B74.6B7569F@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> Not even close, Rick. I got my B.S. in Human Resources Management
>> Summa Cum Laude. The worst grade I got was a B+ in Organizational
>> and Industrial Psychology. All the rest were A's with a couple of
>> A minuses. Final GPA was 3.88.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>And you're the one driving a bus? :-)

Bob:

Yup -- along with a couple of guys with Master's Degrees. However,
I may not be driving much longer, I interview for a position in my company's
Reservations section on Tuesday. However, I enjoy being a Paratransit
operator, it is a very fulfilling job (most days). Since I now have the
seniority to avoid taking an Extra List position, with it's inherent
forced overtime, I may just stay "on the road." Decisions, decisions...

73 de Larry, K3LT

1825. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:07:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tq5c9amq0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 24822

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Why do you want to stick your ugly nose in other people's business?
> > > >
> > > > Why do you want to stick your business in other people's nose?
> > >
> > > I don't, Dick. I won't bother them and I don't want them to
> > > bother me. What is wrong with live and let live? I don't
> > > want to control what you do in the privacy of your home.
> > > Why do you want to control what I do in the privacy of mine?
> >
> > Where on earth did you get that idea?
>
> From some of your previous postings.

Then you misread or misinterpreted what you read. But you always have
trouble with your preconceptions.
```

1826. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:13:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tq5niamq1@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 24823

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Has ham radi0o gone to hell in the past couple decades? Without a
> > doubt. And it is entirely in the (poor) quality of most of those persons
> > entering the hobby.
>
> Yep, and Riley Hollingsworth sez those bad guys are mostly
> Extras and Advanced class.
>

Easy as the tests have been since the CB influx, that's no surprise.
Makes the Tech and Extra lites whiners look that much more pitiful and
lame.

1827. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:19:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tq627cjd0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 24824

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Did she choose it because of some basic innate insecurity
> > on her part? Would she be a total unknown without being W5TIT, the
> > titty ham? Does that callsign give her an identity that she otherwise
> > could never have?
>
> The reason she chose it doesn't matter. What matters to that you have
> not taken responsibility for considering it in poor taste. Your feelings
> are your responsibility, Dick. You cause them to happen. Your feelings
> in reaction to a particular callsign are not Kim's responsibility. You
> are like the rapist who pleads that the way the woman was dressed forced
> him to think evil thoughts and he was powerless to prevent the crime.
>

As sos often is thje case, you are full to overflowing with male bovine excrement. It is very difficult for anyone to be held responsible, at least by any rational person, for someone else's choices. You on the other hand have no problem at all with jumping to criticize my opinion. Yet I have no right to criticise yours or hers. See a dichotomy there? I thought not.

> > All this matters not, it is simply very poor taste and an albatross on
> > the ARS.
>
> You're right - it matters not and neither does your opinion or feelings
> except, of course, to you.

As always, you missed the point. The reason she chose that callsign is not important. The fact that she did, is.

1828. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:24:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tq6ajdim0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 24825

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > That's easy, Jim. The definition of *actual* harm should require the
> > > use of force or threat of force.
> >
> > *ARE* you serious??? There is such a thing as economic harm,
> > psychological harm, any number of types other than "force".
>
> Oh ye of such limited conceptual range. Actual harm of any kind
> requires force or threat of force of some kind. Have you never
> heard of economic forces or psychological forces? For instance:
> *Economic forces* beyond the control of the Federal Reserve are
> drawing the US deeper into a recession. Try a web search for
> "economic forces" and see what pops up. Google just found
> 1,390,000 hits for me. Is that enough for you?
>
> > The imagined harm over Kim's callsign
> > > is not harm at all.
> >
> > Sure it it. If most hams want the ARS to appear as a family oriented
> > service, and wish it to appear that way to younger persons, and when
> > they demonstrate ham radio to younger folk, there is Kim W5TIT and her
> > (tee hee, big gabonzas, with all the double ententre or sexual innuendo
> > accompanying, what is that but harm?
>
> Every young person's mother has tits, Dick. Probably 35% of the population
> has tits. You cannot simply sweep them under the rug and forget about them.
> It's hard to find a TV program where they are not hanging out.
>
> > If I told you I experienced harm because of your
> > > choice of callsigns, would you change it for me? Of course not!
> >
> > Just because you take no offense over W5TIT doesn't mean that a
> > majority of other hams do not. Is your opinion the only one that
> > counts???
>
> I seriously doubt that the majority of hams are so antisocial that
> they would object to W5TIT as a callsign. But if they are, they have
> a personal problem and should see a psychologist.
>
> > Total bullshit.

>
> When you cannot refute the logic, utter some profanity, eh? Isn't
> "bullshit" a lot worse than Kim's call? After all, there are more
> people reading this newsgroup in one day than Kim ever talks to
> on the air.

You are one sick sucker. If there had been any logic in it it would
have been refuted. As it was, all that was present was bullshit.

1829. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:25:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tq6dhdim1@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 24826

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > But society sets the guidelines for all of us. There is a range of
> > acceptability. Go outside this range, and society will sanction you.
>
> This is a free country, Dick, with inalienable rights. You try to
> sanction me and you might just wind up getting sanctioned.

I am not society. If you refuse to be sanctioned by society, that will ultimately be your problem and I will probably never even know of it. Societial sanctions often carry the FORCE of law.

1830. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:27:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tq6hldim2@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 24827

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> > > Perhaps, then, you can enlighten us as to *why* the crime rate is so high in
> > > such an area.
> >
> > Sure. Basically for the same reasons the young Islamics hate us and
> > join the Jihad. They just don't know anything except what they're taught
> > from infancy. If you're told from first cognizance that all Westerners
> > are evil infidels who Allah dictates must be exterminated even at the
> > cost of your own life (but you'll get your reward of 40 virgins and all
> > you can eat in the afterlife) that's all you know.
>
> It appears that you have been taught from birth that all Islamics are evil
> and that's all you know.

There you go, lying out your ass again. Read the Koran and see what
they are taught.

1831. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:40:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tq79nfpu0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 24828

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Fri, 23 Nov 2001 04:44:53 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >If it wasn't clear to you: The Netherlands has less freedom than the
> > >U.S.
> >
> > Would you care to tell us in what AREAS you have greater
> > personal freedom in the United States than in the Netherlands?
>
> Do you carry a national ID card?
>
> > Since your statement not only goes against experience, but
> > goes against the recently released UN study of freedom in member
> > nations (which listed the Netherlands as the freest nation on earth,
> > followed by Denmark, etc.), it would seem that you need to offer more
> > than a simply statement of opinion to support your claim.
>
> The UN? 'nuff said.

He he he...Dave, he hasn't a clue. The UN is the biggest threat around to freedom in America. They want to make us more unfree, like the rest of the world. I'd wager he doesn't even know that of the 52 Islamic countries in the world, non contain a free society. It's all Islamic Law, bar none except Turkey which does have a partially free society.

1832. Aero Mobile -- The Best Way (Was: Aeronautical Mobile...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:46:33 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <7q710ucb8machif88t8m31msbnedflku96@4ax.com>
Source record: 24829

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

-> The issue isn't what one can get away with - the issue is how one
-> protects one's rear end to avoid being charged with the violation.
-> That's the kind of law I practice.

Well, Kane, I'm so happy that you've had a career screwing up the works by legal manipulations.

Now take this on and do with it what you will --

In the amateur world, I'm an Extra and a long-time Elmer.
In the aviation world I'm an A&P, IA (airframe and powerplant mechanic with Inspection Authorization). Also commercial, instrument, flight instructor in airplanes and gliders.

In my airplane there is a 2-meter rig connected to the power bus by it's own breaker, but it is also connected to the airplane audio system through the aircraft's audio panel, and hence to the aircraft headphone and microphone circuits, thus "connected" to the aircraft system.

In my NSHO, this is the safest way to incorporate a ham rig in an airplane. The reasons are not important. My professional opinion is.

The aircraft number is N73CQ. The ham call is WX6RST. Come nail my ass to the grass for a violation if you wish.

Jim

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1833. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:46:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tq7l2glv0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 24830

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > ... things
> > changed in ham radio pretty drastically about the time we began to get
> > large numbers of CBers -I mean the seasoned, hard core CBers- into ham
> > radio. Before that you never heard any of the trash on HF.
>
> So all the extras and advanced hams that Riley talks about trashing
> ham radio were previously hard core CBers???? Even the 20wpm Extras???

why is it that you think 20WPM is such a big deal??? Anyone can do that
if he (or she) wants.

"Think you can, think you can't, either way you're right". -Henry Ford

>
> > Today we're overloaded with them, largely courtesy of CB.
>
> Society has changed, Dick. CB and ham radio are merely
> microcosms of society in general. Movies, Music, and TV
> have had lots more effect on ham radio than have CBers.

CB even contributed to the slide of society in general.

1834. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 07:48:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tq7ooglv1@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 24831

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
> > > > I VOTE NO! It's a BAD IDEA! So was dropping the speed to 5 wpm... CBers with
> > > > their nice habbits will come in droves.
> > >
> > > It's been a year and a half so why hasn't it happened yet?
> >
> > Uh, there's still, that nasty 5wpm code test. Might as well be 30 to
> > them.
>
> So which is it, Dick? Are CBers coming in droves or is 5wpm keeping
> them out. Methinketh thou talketh with a forked tongue. You cannot
> have it both ways.

Having yet another period of convoluted thought? Or do you really
believe the CW test is here to stay?

1835. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 08:05:17 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <1D1M7.669$9d.179502@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24832

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tpn87nhu1@208.207.71.171...
>
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On 24 Nov 2001 13:04:00 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> > >You do exactly the same thing, Rick.
> >
> > Of course I do--everyone does. That's the entire point.
> >
> > If I base my concepts of right and wrong on my own moral
> > values, you base yours on your values, Dave does, etc.--so long as we
> > can agree that harm to nonconsenting individuals is considered wrong
> > by all of us, then there is no conflict involved. I may behave in a
> > manner I find moral, you may behave in one you find moral, and neither
> > of us will in any way affect the other.
>
>
> But society sets the guidelines for all of us. There is a range of
> acceptability. Go outside this range, and society will sanction you.
>
Then you have to define society as it varies with both geographic and ethnic
make up.
Depending on the particular act, the society may be local, regional, or
national.

There are many parts of the world where we would consider their morals
barbaric and they the same for us.

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
>
> >
> > What is so difficult for people to accept about that simple
> > concept?
> >
>
>
> Yeah, why indeed?

1836. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 08:41:50 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <i92M7.670$9d.179667@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24833

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gnbrvd1.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sat, 24 Nov 2001 19:06:55 GMT, Roger Halstead wrote:
>
> >> (b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
> >> other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
> >> a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
> >> installation......
> >>
> >No it's not!
> >
> >"IF" the aircraft radios are such that they can also cover the ham bands
and
> >the oerator has the license they may be used on the ham bands.
>
> What is the legal basis for your conclusion?
>
> " ... separate from and independent of all other radio apparatus
> installed on the ship or aircraft" seems like pretty clear language.
>
> >IF a Ham station is installed THEN that station must be kept seperate.
>
> Any transmitting apparatus used by a licensed amateur radio operator
> for transmissions on the amateur radio bands becomes a "ham station"
> for regulatory purposes.
>
> Please cite the FCC reg or case law that you claim says otherwise.
>
> >The above says nothing about using the aircfraft system radios on ham
bands
> >if they go there and there are systems that do.
>
> It covers it very plainly: " ... separate from and independent of
> all other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft".
>
> What part of the quoted reg do you not understand?
>
One of us doesn't and it's not me. <LOL>

The FCC and FAA have interpeted it on many an occasion.
Can I find them no. Nor do I care to take the time. I've seen the
sanctioned use and that is all I need to see.
If you want to be sure, just call and ask them...As long as the equipment is
certified and the user properly licensed they don't care.

I've talked with aircraft over the Atlantic using Icom and Kenwoods on ferry flights where HF is required.
They won't even let you take off without one from hawii. many large aircraft also cary these, but much communications has moved to satellite. Those radios are used both on aircraft and hamband frequencies.

I've talked with military aircraft on 15 meters using their own equipment on ham frequencies. No one cared there either.
Just ask the FCC for a repeat of past interpetations and if the equipment is certified under commercial it will pass muster for the ham bands and qualify for Amateur radio use.

It's no different than Police and EOC units using their commercial radios on both the police, fire, emergency, and ham bands, where the operator is qualified to do so. The one radio is used for all those services as it meets all the requirements. If the equipment in the aircraft is such that it covers every thing from 20 meters through the aircraft and military bands and the operator is licensed to operate on all of those services he, or she may do so.

As I said, police departments as well as many other services do it with their commercial radios on a regular basis and it is sanctioned and even aplauded by the FCC, so why would aviation be any different? The answer is that it's not!
Now as to the other way around where it's ham equipment then no it may not be used on aircraft frequencies (with the exception of HF gear) as it does not meet the certification.

Now as to company policy and paranoid lawyers, that is a whole nuther ball game which in general has very little to do with reality. That is purely a case of CYA and in general is about as good as a piece of toilet paper. The courts are throwing out disclaimers where people promise not to sue if they are hurt. They in general are not willing to let people sign away their rights.

As for the rediculous extremes those useless paranoid lawyers will take a subject:... I was a system admin on a Laboratory Information management System (LIMS) for a very large corporation. One day when I went to look up some "Hazard text" it was no longer in the corporate database. I was finally told that the lawyers had recomended that it be removed so if it were put on a lable and said labe installed on a product we would be liable.

Said lawyers were not smart enough to realize that said lables are a state, federal, and sometimes FDA requirement. Also the head of the labs made the statement that any sample sent without a lable containing the Hazard text was in violation of OSHA and MIOSHA amd would be disposed of as an unknown hazardous material without testing. (THAT is very expensive in addition to preventing product from being sold, or even finished) I told them that they had a choice. They put the text back in the database, or my team wuld go ahead and make up the lables and our own Hazard text as we could not move any material without it. Or one I knew they would not accept...No testing of the product. They put the Text back in. And I got promoted, but still in charge of the systems in addition to being in charge of

implementing/installing more with FDA approval.

Either way the company was responsible.

BTW, I am an instrument rated pilot and have seen aircraft equipment used on ham bands legally and with no complaint.

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
> --
>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> Principal Attorney (retired)
> Communications Law Center
>
>

1837. Re: Aero Mobile -- The Best Way (Was: Aeronautical Mobile...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 08:43:45 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <5b2M7.671$9d.179272@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24834

Jim, he's a lawyer, we ain't gonna change his mind with facts. <LOL>
--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:7q710ucb8machif88t8m31msbnedflku96@4ax.com...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
> shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
> -> The issue isn't what one can get away with - the issue is how one
> -> protects one's rear end to avoid being charged with the violation.
> -> That's the kind of law I practice.
>
> Well, Kane, I'm so happy that you've had a career screwing up the works by
legal
> manipulations.
>
> Now take this on and do with it what you will --
>
> In the amateur world, I'm an Extra and a long-time Elmer.
> In the aviation world I'm an A&P, IA (airframe and powerplant mechanic
with
> Inspection Authorization). Also commercial, instrument, flight instructor
in
> airplanes and gliders.
>
> In my airplane there is a 2-meter rig connected to the power bus by it's
own
> breaker, but it is also connected to the airplane audio system through the
> aircraft's audio panel, and hence to the aircraft headphone and microphone
> circuits, thus "connected" to the aircraft system.
>
> In my NSHO, this is the safest way to incorporate a ham rig in an
airplane. The
> reasons are not important. My professional opinion is.
>
> The aircraft number is N73CQ. The ham call is WX6RST. Come nail my ass
to the
> grass for a violation if you wish.
>
> Jim
>

> Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1838. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 11:53:04 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <AY4M7.196949$3d2.8216511@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24835

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C007B74.6B7569F@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Not even close, Rick. I got my B.S. in Human Resources Management
> > Summa Cum Laude. The worst grade I got was a B+ in Organizational
> > and Industrial Psychology. All the rest were A's with a couple of
> > A minuses. Final GPA was 3.88.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> And you're the one driving a bus? :-)
>

Love to argue with you but I gots to fire up the old school bus and cart a bunch of Baptists around.

Where else do you get paid for six hours driving one, read the Sunday paper, drink coffee, eat bagels? The church supplies the coffee and bagels, I do have to buy the paper.

Definite help for the equipment fund and all it takes is a CDL-B, my Masters is not required.

They don't even mind when we show up at Sunday School singing Da Biggest Cow I Ever Seen. Probably a good idea if I refrain from I don't Care if it Storms or Freezes (Long as I got my plastic Jesus) tho.

It's existential, Man.

1839. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 12:37:01 UTC
From: Gene Williams <GWilliams@tispsvcs.net>
Message-ID: <9tqohl$c3o$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 24836

Hey Phil, the boys on 20 meters said to ask you how
you earned the nickname,
"The West Coast Loose Cannon."

1840. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 13:47:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C00F689.9EA12B70@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24837

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> (snip) I think what this country needs
> is a good old fashioned revolt of the
> hard-working, taxpaying citizens of
> *all* races who want to see an end to
> the creation of dependency -- and
> force the know-nothings and do-nothings
> to wake up and find a way to share the
> wealth the good old-fashioned way --
> by exercising the human characteristics
> of initiative, ingenuity, and integrity.

Agreed. There are people all around (white, black, green, pink, and purple) who are driving this contry right into the gutter. Sadly, it might be hard to find enough decent people left today to have a revolt (it might be a small revolt). Even more sadly, words like "initiative," "ingenuity," and "integrity" are almost cuss words today (assuming the person even remembers what those words mean).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1841. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:04:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C00FA4E.D6267BE6@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24838

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> In the Catholic Church, they say
> that they're the best church around,
> but they say that if someone in
> another faith follows it and good
> and stuff (including Buddhists,
> Hindus, Muslims, etc.) they get
> credit for it and get into our
> heaven. I hope the other
> religions have reciprocal
> agreements, just in case... :-)

Well, I don't know about reciprocal agreements, but most Christians I've met believe a person is going to stand alone in front of his maker (not with the church or it's members), so it is ultimately what the individual has done that really matters, not what religion he belongs to.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1842. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:06:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00FAD5.958329B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24840

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It is very difficult for anyone to be held responsible, at
> least by any rational person, for someone else's choices.

That's exactly the truth yet you are trying to hold Kim responsible
for the feelings that *you choose* to feel.

You still just don't get it. Kim is not the cause of her callsign being
objectionable to you - *you* are the cause. The objection originates with
you and is a choice that *you* make using *your* free will. You have a
perfect right to do that but you need to learn to recognize and accept the
responsibility for your feelings because they are *your* feelings, not
anyone else's.

Your feelings are your choice and your responsibility, Dick. Stop trying
to blame them on someone else. All you have to do to alleviate the
problem is to choose to change your feelings. Why should your personal
feelings rule the rest of the world?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1843. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:08:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C00FB57.92C7A86F@sccoast.net>
Source record: 24839

CAM wrote:
>
> Southern Baptists believe that only
> some protestants are going to heaven.
> In particular, they believe that
> Catholics and Mormons are going to
> hell.

Heck, I'm sure most Christians, as well as many Mormons
and Catholics, believe that more than a few self-proclaimed
Christians are going to hell too.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1844. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:11:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00FC03.2BB8AC46@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24841

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You are one sick sucker. If there had been any logic in it it would
> have been refuted. As it was, all that was present was bullshit.

Try using your internet search engine for "economic forces", Dick, and
you will change your narrow mind.

When I took psychology in college, the Prof. had us yell obscenities
at the top of our lungs in class. That alleviated all the juvenile
hangups that I had over such words as "tits". You should try it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1845. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:13:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00FCA7.F97DADDA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24842

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I am not society. If you refuse to be sanctioned by society, that will
> ultimately be your problem and I will probably never even know of it.
> Societial sanctions often carry the FORCE of law.

Yes, they often do and I usually yield to the force of law. But when the
sanctions of society don't carry the force of law, you can stuff them
up your posterior along with all the victimless crimes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1846. Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:16:22 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9tqufm01c23@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24847

I was able to get Rileys autograph at the fest,man that was great.

I wonder what I could get for it on e-bay ?

Thoughts?

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

1847. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:17:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00FD7E.382AFC0A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24843

Roger Halstead wrote:
> There are many parts of the world where we would consider their morals
> barbaric and they the same for us.

For instance, there is an area in Africa where the accepted standards
of society require a man to teach his daughter about sex by being the
first to have sex with her. Say Dick, how do you like those standards
of society?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1848. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:19:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00FDF1.DCFC0B50@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24844

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Yep, and Riley Hollingsworth sez those bad guys are mostly
> > Extras and Advanced class.
>
> Easy as the tests have been since the CB influx, that's no surprise.

Are you aware that the most worrisome of the troublemakers are
your age or older? The Liberty Net are your peers, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1849. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:27:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C00FFD4.8BEFA276@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24845

Dave Heil wrote:
> You've already got me labelled and put into a box. You have a similar
> box around you, Cecil.

Actually, I'm pretty much out of the box. Like a lot of Texans,
my favorite song is, "Don't Fence Me In".

> Cecil's Mantra: "By God, if we made everything legal, there wouldn't be
> any crime.

Nope, Cecil's Mantra: If we get rid of victimless crimes, our
penitentiaries will be half empty instead of overflowing and
will cost the taxpayers half as much. It would be a win, win
situation. We presently put so many marijuana users in jail
that we don't have room for child molesters and rapists. Is
that really what you want?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1850. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:29:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01002C.86347D41@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24846

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Well, let's start with you, Dave. Do you eat pork?
> > >
> > > Oh, did you think *I* was going to assist you? Try and find out.
> >
> > Now I don't have to - you just told me.

> I've made no revelation.

I'm surprised at how ignorant you are of human psychology.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1851. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:50:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010551.26D303E3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24848

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > It appears that you have been taught from birth that all Islamics are evil
> > and that's all you know.
>
> There you go, lying out your ass again. Read the Koran and see what
> they are taught.

Read the Bible and see what *WE* are taught. Here's one of a
multitude of passages: "I will render vengeance to mine enemies, ...
I will make mine arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour
flesh; and that with the blood of the slain and captives, from the
beginning of revenges upon the enemy." from Deuteronomy 32. The
"enemies" were peoples peacefully occupying lands that the Israelites
chose to invade and take by force of arms while allegedly following
your God's orders.

Again, rational Christians and Jews ignore God's admonition to
make our arrows drunk with blood in the process of taking lands
that don't belong to us. In like manner, rational Muslims,
who are the vast majority of Muslims, ignore Allah's war-like
admonitions in the Koran. You are guilty of spreading
psychological terrorism, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1852. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:54:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010614.193BE24A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24849

Dave Heil wrote:
> The Church is all of Christianity. The church is a building.

Pulled that one out of your posterior, eh? My unabridged dictionary
doesn't have an entry for "Church".

> Ask him about Kim's call while you're at it.

You really want to side with a Southern Baptist bigot?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1853. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 14:55:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010669.8783B1B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24850

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > If you served in foreign posts, it's too bad you didn't take
> > > the opportunity to absorb more of their cultures.
> > >
> > Actually, a book was written about guys like Dave,
> > "The Ugly American".
>
> It is quite obvious that you either did not read it or (more likely)
> that you don't remember Lederer's tome.

Sorry, I forgot that you are devoid of a sense of humor.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1854. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:02:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010811.8DDF3225@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24851

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm stating that it (Kim's call) is tacky, lacks decorum
> and that it exhibits lack of taste.

Those are your feelings, Dave, that you have used your free
will to choose to feel them. Thus, if they are a problem,
they are 100% your personal problem. The rest of the world
doesn't care what feelings you choose to experience.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1855. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:06:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr1dvlql0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24852

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Yep, and Riley Hollingsworth sez those bad guys are mostly
> > > Extras and Advanced class.
> >
> > Easy as the tests have been since the CB influx, that's no surprise.
>
> Are you aware that the most worrisome of the troublemakers are
> your age or older? The Liberty Net are your peers, Dick.

There are lots of former or current CBers in *our* age group, as you well know, Cecil. Many of whom, unable to cut the mustard before the big dumbdown, are now extra lites. But you already know that.

1856. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:08:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr1hqlql1@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24853

CAM wrote:
>
We presently put so many marijuana users in jail
> that we don't have room for child molesters and rapists. Is
> that really what you want?

That's more of your characteristic BS and you know it. We all do.

1857. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:08:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010983.A4B6DD07@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24854

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I'd wager he doesn't even know that of the 52 Islamic
> countries in the world, non contain a free society. It's all Islamic
> Law, bar none except Turkey which does have a partially free society.

Time was when the Islamic nations were more advanced than the Western
nations. Their pendulum just went backwards for awhile. It will swing back
and economics will eventually force their evolution to free market societies.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1858. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:11:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr1mklql2@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24855

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > It is very difficult for anyone to be held responsible, at
> > least by any rational person, for someone else's choices.
>
> That's exactly the truth yet you are trying to hold Kim responsible
> for the feelings that *you choose* to feel.
>
> You still just don't get it. Kim is not the cause of her callsign being
> objectionable to you - *you* are the cause. The objection originates with
> *you* and is a choice that *you* make using *your* free will. You have a
> perfect right to do that but you need to learn to recognize and accept the
> responsibility for your feelings because they are *your* feelings, not
> anyone else's.
>
> Your feelings are your choice and your responsibility, Dick. Stop trying
> to blame them on someone else. All you have to do to alleviate the
> problem is to choose to change your feelings. Why should your personal
> feelings rule the rest of the world?

So I have no right ot feel oiffended if someone else does something
very offensive. Right. Of course, *you* do.

1859. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:11:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010A2B.DD248B8C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24856

Dave Heil wrote:
> *YOU* are the individual who indicated that the majority of Southerners
> supported segregation.

Yep, that's true based on my personal experiences living and
working in the South. I have absolutely no reason to believe
otherwise. I have seen no evidence that would change my mind.
Do you have any evidence?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1860. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:15:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010B26.BDCD5772@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24857

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3BFB2DA5.67728B4F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >
> > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
> > >> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
> > >> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
> > >
> > >Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?
>
> No, Cecil, and I wouldn't be married to any woman who wanted to!

You don't see gay men as the equivalent of women but you see
lesbians as the equivalent of men?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1861. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:17:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010B7C.9113B763@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24858

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Larry, I'm convinced you are pulling our legs. If not, you are
> >farther gone than I thought. One of your think-alikes hits
> >Afghani women with a stick because she shows her face in
> >public.
>
> You are obviously mistaken, Cecil. I've never hit a woman with
> a stick for showing her face in public. I usually reserve that for
> people who drive too slow.

I didn't say it was you, Larry. I said it was someone who thinks
like you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1862. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:19:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010BFD.DB445871@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24860

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> *All* of my attempts at not sinning are feeble, compared to what they
> should be. I am a sinner, of that there is no doubt. Perhaps you would
> pray for me?

God would probably punish you if I prayed for you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1863. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:20:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr27a$o8r$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24859

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You are one sick sucker. If there had been any logic in it it would
> > have been refuted. As it was, all that was present was bullshit.
>
> Try using your internet search engine for "economic forces", Dick, and
> you will change your narrow mind.
>
> When I took psychology in college, the Prof. had us yell obscenities
> at the top of our lungs in class. That alleviated all the juvenile
> hangups that I had over such words as "tits". You should try it.

You really are a nutcasr, abd that should be no surprise. If one has dipshits for teachers, one is much more likely to become one himself.

And whatever gave you the idea I have any hangup on the word "Tits"? Nothing could be further from fact. I'm not the Suthern Baptist, tho I'm familiar enough with the concept. The point has always been that society doesn't like to have to have some blowsy broad's floppies flung in their faces all the time, on the ham bands or elsewhere. That's what this is all about. There are lots of young kids and women who are much more offended than any of us here. Have they no right to be free from such garbage just because Kim wants to be vulgar? Where's your libertarian bullshit now?

1864. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:20:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010C59.BD684F9D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24863

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > I don't, Dick. I won't bother them and I don't want them to
> > > > bother me. What is wrong with live and let live? I don't
> > > > want to control what you do in the privacy of your home.
> > > > Why do you want to control what I do in the privacy of mine?
> > >
> > > Where on earth did you get that idea?
> >
> > From some of your previous postings.
>
> Then you misread or misinterpreted what you read. But you always have
> trouble with your preconceptions.

So have you changed your mind and now don't see anything wrong with
me smoking marijuana in the privacy of my own home?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1865. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:21:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr2a2$o8r$1@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24861

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I am not society. If you refuse to be sanctioned by society, that will
> > ultimately be your problem and I will probably never even know of it.
> > Societial sanctions often carry the FORCE of law.
>
> Yes, they often do and I usually yield to the force of law. But when the
> sanctions of society don't carry the force of law, you can stuff them
> up your posterior along with all the victimless crimes.

Ah, so we finally get to the bottom line. Cecil likes to do what Cecil wants, no matter who else is negatively impacted by it.

1866. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:22:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr2br$o8r$2@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24862

Roger Halstead wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tpn87nhu1@208.207.71.171...
> >
> >
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > >
> > > On 24 Nov 2001 13:04:00 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> > >
> > > >You do exactly the same thing, Rick.
> > >
> > > Of course I do--everyone does. That's the entire point.
> > >
> > > If I base my concepts of right and wrong on my own moral
> > > values, you base yours on your values, Dave does, etc.--so long as we
> > > can agree that harm to nonconsenting individuals is considered wrong
> > > by all of us, then there is no conflict involved. I may behave in a
> > > manner I find moral, you may behave in one you find moral, and neither
> > > of us will in any way affect the other.
> >
> >
> > But society sets the guidelines for all of us. There is a range of
> > acceptability. Go outside this range, and society will sanction you.
> >
> Then you have to define society as it varies with both geographic and ethnic
> make up.
> Depending on the particular act, the society may be local, regional, or
> national.
>
> There are many parts of the world where we would consider their morals
> barbaric and they the same for us.

Precisely. But we don't live there, under their system of laws and
mores.

1867. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:24:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010D15.67F96BC4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24865

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Uh oh -- now Kim's gonna think I'm talking about her again!
> I only said "one" Kim! Never mind -- she'll work her way into this
> somehow -- she usually does!

Actually, that statement turned itself into a lie.
That makes three "Kim"'s.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1868. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:25:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr2hu$p56$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24864

CAM wrote:
>
> Roger Halstead wrote:
> > There are many parts of the world where we would consider their morals
> > barbaric and they the same for us.
>
> For instance, there is an area in Africa where the accepted standards
> of society require a man to teach his daughter about sex by being the
> first to have sex with her. Say Dick, how do you like those standards
> of society?

I have no reason to like nor dislike it since I don't live there, am
not usbject to it, and have no reason to evaluate it. Of course it is
completely foreign to anything taught by the society I live within. You
seem to want to oppose much of our society and you have daughters, so
maybe you would want to answer your own question.

1869. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:27:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr2ka$p56$1@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24866

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <887B94DC0A930298.B2CBC2526C5F8194.34139715CCB3AA35@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> > I just had a dream in which God told me to have all the
> >Christians in the NG send me all their money and ham gear. He said
> >that if he says it's ok, then it's ok.
> >
> > I'm waiting . . .
> >
> > Rick
>
> I just had a dream in which God told me that some nut in this
> newsgroup was going to tell us that we're supposed to send him
> our money and ham gear -- and that He never said any such thing!
> So don't be looking for any bank transfers or UPS shipments
> from Delaware...unless you ordered something from HRO!

I think it was totally predictable that Rick would turn out to be a
hustler, and that is NOT a mobile antenna in this instance.

1870. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:27:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010DDB.5B32AF4F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24867

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > So all the extras and advanced hams that Riley talks about trashing
> > ham radio were previously hard core CBers???? Even the 20wpm Extras???
>
> why is it that you think 20WPM is such a big deal??? Anyone can do that
> if he (or she) wants.

So why do you divert the issue?

> CB even contributed to the slide of society in general.

You are confusing cause and effect again. CB contributes to
the slide of society like guns contribute to crime. Hint:
CB radios and guns are *objects* incapable of independent
actions.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1871. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:32:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010F0F.E1A55401@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24869

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > So which is it, Dick? Are CBers coming in droves or is 5wpm keeping
> > them out. Methinketh thou talketh with a forked tongue. You cannot
> > have it both ways.
>
> Having yet another period of convoluted thought? Or do you really
> believe the CW test is here to stay?

I'll answer your question if you will answer mine above. It wouldn't
surprise me in the least for the US Morse code test to outlive the
repeal of S25.5.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1872. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:34:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr31h$p56$2@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24868

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3BFB2C88.9FC1C774@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >
> > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >> Well, you've got one thing right, Cecil -- I'm endlessly asking for
> > >> forgiveness of my sins. I am also praying for those who don't see
> > >> the need to ask forgiveness. That's as much as I can do, save for
> > >> trying *not* to be a sinner.
> > >
> > >From your postings, I would say your attempt at not sinning
> > >is pretty feeble.
>
> Cecil:
>
> *All* of my attempts at not sinning are feeble, compared to what they
> should be. I am a sinner, of that there is no doubt. Perhaps you would
> pray for me?

But who would he pray to? He is his own diety.

1873. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:36:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C010FE7.B6BD9DDD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24871

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I dunno, Cecil, but where are the legions of smart, computer-literate,
> technical-savvy, eager, enthusiastic, and committed young people
> who were supposed to create a digital paradise on the ham bands,
> and save them from any thought of reallocation by commercial
> communications and broadcasting interests?

Please furnish some evidence that someone promised a "digital
paradise". Intel contributed about 100 nocode techs with
engineering degrees to the ARS. I assume other similar
compainies did the same thing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1874. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:36:29 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <1e8M7.235842$W8.7920026@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24870

I don't know, but suggest you not put it in the CB radio section! :-)

Jim AA2QA

"Leland KC8LD0" <Leland_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:9tqufm01c23@drn.newsguy.com...
> I was able to get Rileys autograph at the fest,man that was great.
>
> I wonder what I could get for it on e-bay ?
>
> Thoughts?
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>

1875. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 15:42:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr3horho0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24872

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > (snip) I think what this country needs
> > is a good old fashioned revolt of the
> > hard-working, taxpaying citizens of
> > *all* races who want to see an end to
> > the creation of dependency -- and
> > force the know-nothings and do-nothings
> > to wake up and find a way to share the
> > wealth the good old-fashioned way --
> > by exercising the human characteristics
> > of initiative, ingenuity, and integrity.
>
> Agreed. There are people all around (white, black, green,
> pink, and purple) who are driving this contry right into the
> gutter. Sadly, it might be hard to find enough decent people
> left today to have a revolt (it might be a small revolt).
> Even more sadly, words like "initiative," "ingenuity," and
> "integrity" are almost cuss words today (assuming the person
> even remembers what those words mean).

Don't fret, Dwight. You evidently don't know that only a third of the populace of the Colonies were active participants in the Revolutionary War for Independence from Britian. Another third were Loyalists to the Crown, and the final third were "Why can't we all just get along" sorts like you, Rick, Kim and Cecil.
There are always enough freedom loving, THINKING citizens here to step up and get the job done.

1876. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:07:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr4vt$20r$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24873

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > It appears that you have been taught from birth that all Islamics are evil
> > > and that's all you know.
> >
> > There you go, lying out your ass again. Read the Koran and see what
> > they are taught.
>
> Read the Bible and see what *WE* are taught. Here's one of a
> multitude of passages: "I will render vengeance to mine enemies, ...
> I will make mine arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour
> flesh; and that with the blood of the slain and captives, from the
> beginning of revenges upon the enemy." from Deuteronomy 32. The
> "enemies" were peoples peacefully occupying lands that the Israelites
> chose to invade and take by force of arms while allegedly following
> *your* God's orders.
>

If that's the best you can do no wonder you're on the defensive all the time. You would dredge up an obscure Old Testament story and promote it as the equal of the Koran's dictates to Muslims to eradicate all on earth who refuse to be converted or enslaved. There IS NO equivalence and you know it. There is nothing whatever in modern Christian teachings which even hints at any such conclusion. On th eother hand legions of Mullahs harangue the Moslems daily exhorting them to Kill the Infidels, That means us. They have been trying pretty hard for some time now to do just that, and you still have your head in some dark, damp space.

> Again, rational Christians and Jews ignore God's admonition to
> make our arrows drunk with blood in the process of taking lands
> that don't belong to us.

Hey idiot, there was no such admonition and you know it, just choose to twist a very old biblical story to fit your current agenda. Why do you always dredge up some agenda in opposition to reality? Is it in your psyche?

In like manner, rational Muslims,
> who are the vast majority of Muslims, ignore Allah's war-like
> admonitions in the Koran.

No one ever said that each and every Muslim is a born terrorist, and many want nothing to do with it, just as many Germans wanted nothing to

do with Nazism nor the SS, but none the less they were dragged into it. Muslims are taught from infancy as an integral part of their religious training, that all other belief systems are not only inferior but that they must be wiped out and their adherents either converted, enslaved or killed. And to them, religion is also the civil law, so they don't have the option of rejecting it and getting away with it as you do. They, themselves are also subject to punishment, even death for rejecting their religious training and its dictates. There is nothing equal to that in Christianity as it has been taught since ancient times. The scriptural passage you quoted is from very ancient Jewish history, well predating Christendom, and even predating Islam.

You are guilty of spreading
> psychological terrorism, Dick.

Have you ever considered offering your services to local agricultural business entities? I'm sure there would be a great demand for a manure spreader of your capacity and efficiency.

1877. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:08:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr52c$20r$1@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24874

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > The Church is all of Christianity. The church is a building.
>
> Pulled that one out of your posterior, eh? My unabridged dictionary
> doesn't have an entry for "Church".
>
> > Ask him about Kim's call while you're at it.
>
> You really want to side with a Southern Baptist bigot?

Maybe we should email this post to Rev. Wicher. He might want to
excommunicate Cecil from the choir.

1878. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:11:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr57f$20r$2@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24875

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm stating that it (Kim's call) is tacky, lacks decorum
> > and that it exhibits lack of taste.
>
> Those are your feelings, Dave, that you have used your free
> will to choose to feel them. Thus, if they are a problem,
> they are 100% your personal problem. The rest of the world
> doesn't care what feelings you choose to experience.

That's been your story and you're still sticking to it, but it is no less wrong.
When a large percentage of society views it as wrong, it is a moral issue and thus a part of the mores of that society. If it doesn't matter to you then that's fine as far as you go. But you don't set the mores for our society, try as you will.

1879. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:15:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr5em$2vs$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24876

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I'd wager he doesn't even know that of the 52 Islamic
> > countries in the world, non contain a free society. It's all Islamic
> > Law, bar none except Turkey which does have a partially free society.
>
> Time was when the Islamic nations were more advanced than the Western
> nations. Their pendulum just went backwards for awhile. It will swing back
> and economics will eventually force their evolution to free market societies.

And how do you presume that economics can do that when Islam officially rejects all that is economic theory in favor of a religious dogma that is based on no econonimic theory at all, rather based on hatred of all other religious and particularily secular social systems, from which all advanced economic theory stems? Yoiu fail to appreciate that they gladly kill off their own kind as readily as the opposition, when they can find any valid reason. I'm amazed that the women of Islam aren't all Lorena Bobbits.

1880. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:16:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c011a16_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24879

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C00379A.10AC3378@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > It isn't just Cecil that is hearing
> > these things. I hear it in nearly every
> > theological discussion, bible discussion,
> > religious discussion I am near or a part
> > of. I hear it "nearly" each time I have
> > ever been in a church. I hear nearly
> > every time the witnesses show up on my
> > doorstep. I heard it last night at the
> > table with my fundamentalist brother-
> > and sister-in-law.
>
>
> You've repeatedly heard that people of other religions are
> inferior?
>

Yes. In the discussions there is a general expression of "flaws" in
beliefs, etc. Now, I am not sure as to the word "inferior" ever being
used--but it is certainly implied.

>
> Like I said, many christians do believe those of
> other religions are wrong, evil, going to hell, or whatever,
> but I've heard very few describe them as inferior. And,
> again, like I said before, the concept that the members of
> other religions are wrong, etc, is certainly not unique to
> christians (most religions think that of other religions).
>

Well, actually, no it's not unique to Christians, I suppose. Although, I
have seen and heard more examples of it from Christianity because that is
what I have been around the most.

>
> > I agree with you, Dwight, that it was
> > not the teaching of Jesus Christ or
> > the attitude of true Christians. However,
> > when I stated last night, to the same
> > brother-in-law, that Jesus never judged
> > and condemned people to Hell, he stated
> > that I was wrong--that the Bible is

> > replete with Jesus speaking of people
> > who would burn in places, etc. (snip)
>
>
> First of all, since this topic has attracted others into
> the discussion, let me add again that I'm certainly no
> expert on christian theology. I'm simply offering my opinion
> based on what I learned years ago. Anyway, having said that,
> I do think it is important to make one thing clear here - in
> a religious context, a christian cannot condemn a person to
> hell.
>

That's what I'm thinking.

>
> A christian can state an opinion that a person is
> going to hell because of the person's behavior, attitude, or
> whatever, but that goes no further than an opinion.
>

I think most of the people (Christian or otherwise for that matter) who say others are "going to Hell" are not saying it just as an opinion--they truly believe that because of *what* they believe, they believe God would condemn that person to Hell and they are just "repeating what they've heard."

>
> Only God
> has the power to condemn a person to his/her eventual
> spiritual fate.
>

That's what I think also.

>
> Likewise, Jesus does not condemn a person to
> hell - he simply stated the terms under which a person would
> be condemned. Again, only God reserves the power of ultimate judgment.
>

Well, I won't go diving into a Bible to find examples of what my brother-in-law is talking about, but he's a minister, preaches, and believes that there are examples where Jesus *did* do that. You and I seem to be of the same lack--not enough "off the top of my head" knowledge of the Bible to see what he's talking about, or to pronounce that he may be wrong.

>
> > (snip) Like I said last night (and my
> > brother-in-law nearly fell out of his
> > chair): we all worship the same god, we
> > just have different ways of doing it. I
> > don't care how you get to "Heaven" just
> > that you try to get there. It's in the

> > "trying" that makes all good things
> > happen.
>
>
> Well, while living a "good" life is certainly a worthwhile
> goal, many religions would argue that something more is
> required (an acceptance of God, avoidance of sin,
> reparations for past sins, etc). But, to avoid giving a
> "sermon," I'll let it drop with that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

One is not mutually exclusive of the other, though. I don't believe in any "religion" per se, but I believe in God, I believe in Jesus, I believe the 10 Commandments are the basic things that teach how to live and honor one another, and I believe that Christianity has not and cannot corner the market on getting to Heaven.

Kim W5TIT

1881. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:18:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr5lj$2vs$1@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24877

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > I don't, Dick. I won't bother them and I don't want them to
> > > > > bother me. What is wrong with live and let live? I don't
> > > > > want to control what you do in the privacy of your home.
> > > > > Why do you want to control what I do in the privacy of mine?
> > > >
> > > > Where on earth did you get that idea?
> > > >
> > > From some of your previous postings.
> > >
> > Then you misread or misinterpreted what you read. But you always have
> > trouble with your preconceptions.
>
> So have you changed your mind and now don't see anything wrong with
> me smoking marijuana in the privacy of my own home?

If you don't see anything wrong with breaking the law, knock yerself
out. Maybe you'll eventually get busted and clash with Society after
all. Hey, you gotta buy that stuff somewhere. The most available
salesmen are undercover cops.
```

1882. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:21:10 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c011b18$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24880

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C004F22.F458522@sccoast.net...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > No I didn't and neither do any of
> > the Southern Baptists. It is my
> > understanding that Jesus died for
> > the redemtion of the sins of all men.
> > That goes for those before and
> > after him. It looks as if Buddha
> > is covered.
>
>
> Well said, Dave. I completely forgot about that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Well, either that, or it is an excellent argument out of the scenario of
those in the Old Testament. :>

Kim W5TIT

1883. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:21:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tr5ps$2vs$2@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24878

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > So all the extras and advanced hams that Riley talks about trashing
> > > ham radio were previously hard core CBers???? Even the 20wpm Extras???
> > >
> > > why is it that you think 20WPM is such a big deal??? Anyone can do that
> > > if he (or she) wants.
>
> So why do you divert the issue?
>
> > CB even contributed to the slide of society in general.
>
> You are confusing cause and effect again. CB contributes to
> the slide of society like guns contribute to crime. Hint:
> CB radios and guns are *objects* incapable of independent
> actions.

You idiot. No one even mentioned the radio gear itself. It was never
the problem and we all know that. Evidently except you.

1884. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:24:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c011bc5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24881

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0054E2.364D0B72@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > (snip) Is Jesus mentioned anywhere
> > the Muslim religion? (snip)
>
>
> Yes, he is. Many in the Islamic faith believe he is one of
> the many prophets. Some believe he even holds a higher
> position (even to the point of believing in his eventual return).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

SHHHHHHhhhhhhh!!!! I was pretty certain Dick--you know the one who's read the book and now he knows all about the Muslim faith--was going to have to look that one up, and then recover from the shock that he's condemning a faith that subscribes to the thought that a Christian Jesus is regarded as a prophet. :)

Kim W5TIT

1885. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:31:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011125113125.25285.00000993@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 24882

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/25/2001 7:47 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C00F689.9EA12B70@sccoast.net>

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> (snip) I think what this country needs
>> is a good old fashioned revolt of the
>> hard-working, taxpaying citizens of
>> *all* races who want to see an end to
>> the creation of dependency --

(SNIP)

>Agreed. There are people all around (white, black, green,
>pink, and purple) who are driving this contry right into the
>gutter

And I am in agreement with both of you. I think those whining the hardest about the perceived "loss of our freedoms" as they pertain to the present state of emergency are those who would least like to be "obligated" to "pay" for their freedom...Regardless if it was to serve in the Armed Forces or simply have to endue some relatively meager inconvienience at home.

>Even more sadly, words like "initiative," "ingenuity," and
>"integrity" are almost cuss words today (assuming the person
>even remembers what those words mean).

Ditto. Well said.

K4YZ

1886. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:36:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c011eb4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24883

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tplvd$ko2$0@208.207.71.171...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:9tn6kv$q30$1@208.206.142.74...
> > >
> > >
> > > Richard Plourde wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > It would only reasonable that any female would
> > > > > run for her life from Islam, for obvious reasons.
> > > >
> > > > There you go again, Carroll, throwing the baby out with the bath
> > water...
> > > >
> > > > You insist on being eternaly wrong, painting with those, very , very
> > broad
> > > > strokes of your's...
> > > >
> > > > You're getting dangerously close to becoming a laughing stock here
with
> > your
> > > > zealous attempt at being the 'top schlemiel'...
> > > >
> > >
> > > I'm a realist. You're an idiot.
> >
> > Most people on this group present their arguments in a logical fashion.
All
> > you can do is post statist views with absolutely nothing to back them up
> > other than your own opinion.
>
>
> Most people will at least take a look at the available evidence before
> making up their minds or before stepping on their tounge. Somehow you CW
> phobic ex-CBers always predicate your choice of sides on any issue on
> whether or not the opposition is a CW supporter.
>
```

Paranoia will destroy ya, Dick. Well, it's probably because they're all a bunch of bleeding heart liberals, Dick! :^ (yeah, same generalities as you).

> Or whether or not he
> kisses up to you otherwise. You should at least have some idea of what
> the terrorist situation is about, if you live in New York. But evidently
> your hate for CW overrules your rationality.
>

Uh, so NY has the market on terrorism, eh? Oh, and could ya lose the CW-hater=liberal=Democrat routine? The *reverse* could be said about you--and what makes one more correct than the other? It appears that your Conservative=probaby-CW-Lover=Republican president couldn't keep a handle on things and now we find ourselves in this situation. :^ (yeah, same generalities as you).

> Has ham radi0o gone to hell in the past couple decades? Without a
> doubt. And it is entirely in the (poor) quality of most of those persons
> entering the hobby.
> There is not a valid gonad among you.
>

And, with people like you in the hobby, we've had no choice but to be attracted to it. It's obvious you pro-CW guys didn't do the job you thought you were, of protecting the amateur radio hobby. What's your excuse? (yeah, same generalities as you).

Yeah, those generalities make it a whole lot easier--I don't have to come up with one valid, intellectual thought if I just use generalities. Let's see what else I can learn from you, Dick. :o (yeah, same generalities as you).

Kim W5TIT

1887. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:37:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c011ef6$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24884

Watch it, Dick...you're getting as preoccupied with "them" as Larry R. is.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tpm1tkqc0@208.207.71.171...
> Give it up Kim, they just WON'T sork as brains, however hard you may
> try to get them to. They just want to obey the law of gravity, nothing
> more.
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Man, I must be making some sense to you! Thanks!
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:9tmult$st9$3@208.207.71.169...
> > >
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > *Sigh* It was a matter of my not paying attention
> > >
> > >
> > > If brains were dollars you still couldn't pay attention.

1888. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:42:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111250842.234d4ead@posting.google.com>
Source record: 24885

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<AY4M7.196949$3d2.8216511@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3C007B74.6B7569F@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > Not even close, Rick. I got my B.S. in Human Resources Management
> > > Summa Cum Laude. The worst grade I got was a B+ in Organizational
> > > and Industrial Psychology. All the rest were A's with a couple of
> > > A minuses. Final GPA was 3.88.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > And you're the one driving a bus? :-)
> >
>
> Love to argue with you but I gots to fire up the old school bus and cart a
> bunch of Baptists around.
>
> Where else do you get paid for six hours driving one, read the Sunday paper,
> drink coffee, eat bagels? The church supplies the coffee and bagels, I do
> have to buy the paper.
>
> Definite help for the equipment fund and all it takes is a CDL-B, my Masters
> is not required.
>
> They don't even mind when we show up at Sunday School singing Da Biggest Cow
> I Ever Seen. Probably a good idea if I refrain from I don't Care if it
> Storms or Freezes (Long as I got my plastic Jesus) tho.
>
> It's existential, Man.

Yea, verily.

Regale them with Tom Lehrer's "National Brotherhood Week" for a real show-stopper.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1889. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:45:41 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0120e4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24886

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tpmlemja0@208.207.71.171...
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Yup. But who gets to decide whether "harm" has occurred? The person
who did
> > > the action? The person who is supposedly harmed? Some neutral third
party?
> > > What criteria determines "harm"? That is all "personal value" stuff.
> >
> > That's easy, Jim. The definition of *actual* harm should require the
> > use of force or threat of force.
>
> *ARE* you serious??? There is such a thing as economic harm,
> psychological harm, any number of types other than "force".
>
> The imagined harm over Kim's callsign
> > is not harm at all.
>
> Sure it it. If most hams want the ARS to appear as a family oriented
> service, and wish it to appear that way to younger persons, and when
> they demonstrate ham radio to younger folk, there is Kim W5TIT and her
> (tee hee, big gabonzas, with all the double ententre or sexual innuendo
> accompanying, what is that but harm?
>

So, let me get this straight. There is *no* tee hee, big gabonzas...sexual
innuendo that happens on the air, so you must be talking about on this
newsgroup. So, it is your opinion that the actions of people in this
newsgroup should be held to be a reflection of the real amateur radio?
Well, you and whole bunch of us, had better start cleaning up.

Let me give you a list of hams you can contact--and you write to them and
ask them if they've ever heard a "lewd" reference to my callsign on the air.
Now, I'm talking beyond someone saying something like: "what was that call?"
Because that is obviously nothing lewd, and it happens all the time.

>
> If I told you I experienced harm because of your
> > choice of callsigns, would you change it for me? Of course not!
>
> Just because you take no offense over W5TIT doesn't mean that a
> majority of other hams do not. Is your opinion the only one that

> counts???
>

That a majority of other hams takes offense to my callsign is *not* the case, Dick. Prove your majority, please. Prove your belief that this callsign is harming the ARS by driving people away. Prove that your belief this callsign is keeping children from entering the hobby.

>
> > > Who gets to decide if a particular callsign causes harm or not?
> >
> > "Sticks and stones may break my bones but callsigns can never hurt me."
> > Anyone who allows callsigns unaccompanied by force or threat of force
> > to hurt them are cooperating in their own pain. The "harm" is self
> > imposed. Callsigns can cause no harm without the cooperation of the
> > "victim"(s). Think about it. Finding harm in Kim's callsign is like
> > finding dirty sex in ink blots.
>
>
> Total bullshit.

I bet you wouldn't have said that to your mommy. And, if you'd listened to her and learned from the lesson she was trying to teach you, you wouldn't upset yourself so easily.

Kim W5TIT

1890. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 16:59:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c01242c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24887

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tpn3fnhu0@208.207.71.171...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
>
> > What if someone chooses a callsign that means "tit" in Swahili? Would
you
> > consider it obscene? It is a callsign. It is not a dirty word. People
> > who think it is dirty are using their free will to choose to think it
> > is dirty.
>
> So then, WHY did she choose it?
>

Do you really want me to post the post of the story again?

>
> Couldn't be to go with her anatomy,
> could it?
>

Good grief, of *course* it is. I *bet* you that my *VANITY* callsign has
more to do with vanity than any other *VANITY* callsign. I mean, I don't
have an attraction to my initials, sorry.

>
> And the travesty is that is a sham anyway- oversized saggy
> mammary glands are not attractive and are not an object of attraction,
> so why does she need and want to call attention to them?
>

And, so your likes must the likes of everyone else? And, would you please
tell those women who've made countless huge bucks on men such as yourself
who claim not to be impressed by the size of a woman's tits? By the way,
are your balls still as nice and firm as they used to be, Dick, or do they
hang down to your knees now? And, how 'bout the little fella, there? Still
charging as always? I mean, we are bringing a discussion of the aging
process and its affects on our bodies, right? I'd like to remind you *UP
FRONT* (no pun intended) that *YOU* are the one who brought the lewd
behavior into the discussion and I am more than happy to go there with
you--if that is where you'd like to go.

>
> Evidently she

> needs the reinforcement
> (literally).
>

Uh, well, yeah, I wear a bra. Heck, A-cup women wear a bra (keeps our nipples from being so obvious, Dick).

>
> Did she choose it because of some basic innate insecurity
> on her part?
>

Does my bold comments here assure of no insecurity on my part, Dick?

>
> Would she be a total unknown without being W5TIT, the
> titty ham?
>

I can nearly guarantee you, Dick, that I am an unknown in the ARS. Well, except for those who know me. And, I don't include those who have "heard of" me as those who know me. Do you? I wouldn't even say you know me.

>
> Does that callsign give her an identity that she otherwise
> could never have?
>

:| Dick. C'mon. I am learned long ago that the only validation I need in my life is from myself. I could park my butt in the middle of a forest (gotta be a forest, though, no deserts)...without a soul around for the rest of my life and be quite content. I love myself so much that I make up for any lack of class or adoration on your behalf--believe me. ANSWER: Once you learn that same validation philosophy, you learn to love yourself, and the natural happenstance of that is that you will erode poor traits and qualities that have always provided a barrier to "being liked."

>
> All this matters not, it is simply very poor taste and an albatross on
> the ARS.

Well, you and Larry R. have a lot of work to do--because I just don't see your albatross. Prove it, and maybe I'll rethink my belief that my callsign--*anyone's callsign*--is no detriment to the ARS. My callsign is less detriment to the ARS than your general behavior here is.

Kim W5TIT

1891. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 17:03:32 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c012506_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24888

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tpns8pmu0@208.207.71.171...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > Perhaps, then, you can enlighten us as to *why* the crime rate is so
high in
> > such an area.
>
>
>
> Sure. Basically for the same reasons the young Islamics hate us and
> join the Jihad. They just don't know anything except what they're taught
> from infancy. If you're told from first cognizance that all Westerners
> are evil infidels who Allah dictates must be exterminated even at the
> cost of your own life (but you'll get your reward of 40 virgins and all
> you can eat in the afterlife) that's all you know.
> If, as a black kid, you see nothing but drug deals, ubiquitous crime
> and hustling, you grow up believing you're supposed to be a drug
> dealing, hustling criminal.

I'd take your lead and provide some generality here, but you've done such an
excellent job yourself, Dick, that I don't think I can compete.

Oh buhruther.

Kim W5TIT

1892. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 17:04:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c012549$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24889

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C007AC8.F4355CD@ix.netcom.com...
>
> In the Catholic Church, they say that they're the best church
> around, but they say that if someone in another faith follows
> it and good and stuff (including Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims,
> etc.) they get credit for it and get into our heaven. I hope
> the other religions have reciprocal agreements, just in case...
> :-)
>

Man, that's great, Robert! :) Me too!

Kim W5TIT

1893. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 17:15:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0127b7$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24890

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011125015738.12427.00003227@nso-cg.aol.com...
> In article <3bf9cb28_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Heck, one time when the FCC was talking about having a law that any tower
> >over a certain number of feet would have to be painted red and white, one
of
> >the gang on '88 keyed up and said if he painted anything on his tower it
> >would be a great big FU. I about drove off the road on that one.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I'm sure that, as usual, you were ROTFLYBFUAO.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

No, I sure wasn't Larry. I thought it was quite distasteful,
misrepresentative of the ARS I know and like, and was rather bold of the
individual. And, I tuned my radio to another frequency.

Kim W5TIT

1894. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 17:17:06 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c012834_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24891

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011125015741.12427.00003233@nso-cg.aol.com...
> In article <3BFB2DA5.67728B4F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
> >> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
> >> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
> >
> >Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?
>
> No, Cecil, and I wouldn't be married to any woman who wanted to!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

But, Larry. You probably wouldn't be married.

Kim W5TIT

1895. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 17:20:48 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c012912_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24892

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tq6hldim2@208.206.142.91...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Krell wrote:
> > > > Perhaps, then, you can enlighten us as to *why* the crime rate is so
high in
> > > > such an area.
> > >
> > > Sure. Basically for the same reasons the young Islamics hate us and
> > > join the Jihad. They just don't know anything except what they're
taught
> > > from infancy. If you're told from first cognizance that all Westerners
> > > are evil infidels who Allah dictates must be exterminated even at the
> > > cost of your own life (but you'll get your reward of 40 virgins and
all
> > > you can eat in the afterlife) that's all you know.
> >
> > It appears that you have been taught from birth that all Islamics are
evil
> > and that's all you know.
>
>
> There you go, lying out your ass again. Read the Koran and see what
> they are taught.

SO!!!! You *have* read the Koran? Is that right?! And, you must be as
susceptible to fanaticism as those who've read it and become terrorists in
the name of their god.

Kim W5TIT

1896. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 17:59:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9trbi8$2tp$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24893

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tq6hl$dim$2@208.206.142.91...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Krell wrote:
> > > > > Perhaps, then, you can enlighten us as to *why* the crime rate is so
> high in
> > > > > such an area.
> > > >
> > > > Sure. Basically for the same reasons the young Islamics hate us and
> > > > join the Jihad. They just don't know anything except what they're
> taught
> > > > from infancy. If you're told from first cognizance that all Westerners
> > > > are evil infidels who Allah dictates must be exterminated even at the
> > > > cost of your own life (but you'll get your reward of 40 virgins and
> all
> > > > you can eat in the afterlife) that's all you know.
> > >
> > > It appears that you have been taught from birth that all Islamics are
> evil
> > > and that's all you know.
> >
> >
> > There you go, lying out your ass again. Read the Koran and see what
> > they are taught.
>
> SO!!!! You *have* read the Koran? Is that right?! And, you must be as
> susceptible to fanaticism as those who've read it and become terrorists in
> the name of their god.
>

There's a huge question about whether or not you've even learned to
read. We can easily see where your level of understanding is.

Should you decide to finally bring yourself up to date on world events,
a good concise article which might help (if you can understand it) would
be the Dec 3 issue of National Review magazine, page 38, entitled
"Martyred". Written by a woman!
```

1897. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:07:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9trc1n$35b$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 24894

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011125015741.12427.00003233@nso-cg.aol.com...
> > In article <3BFB2DA5.67728B4F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
> > > >> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
> > > >> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
> > > >
> > > >Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?
> > >
> > > No, Cecil, and I wouldn't be married to any woman who wanted to!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
>
> But, Larry. You probably wouldn't be married.

If the selection was limited to the likes of you I wouldn't be, either.

1898. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:08:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C013294.8C6BA82A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24895

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You've already got me labelled and put into a box. You have a similar
> > box around you, Cecil.
>
> Actually, I'm pretty much out of the box. Like a lot of Texans,
> my favorite song is, "Don't Fence Me In".
>
> > Cecil's Mantra: "By God, if we made everything legal, there wouldn't be
> > any crime.
>
> Nope, Cecil's Mantra: If we get rid of victimless crimes, our
> penitentiaries will be half empty instead of overflowing and
> will cost the taxpayers half as much. It would be a win, win
> situation. We presently put so many marijuana users in jail
> that we don't have room for child molesters and rapists. Is
> that really what you want?

Your last sentence is completely absurd. If you need more prison space,
build it.

Dave K8MN

1899. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:09:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0132F9.2D00EEDF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24896

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > Well, let's start with you, Dave. Do you eat pork?
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh, did you think *I* was going to assist you? Try and find out.
> > > >
> > > > Now I don't have to - you just told me.
>
> > I've made no revelation.
>
> I'm surprised at how ignorant you are of human psychology.

Probably no more surprised than I am at your inability to comprehend a
simple English language sentence.

Dave K8MN

1900. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:12:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0133A4.168EE08A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24897

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > The Church is all of Christianity. The church is a building.
>
> Pulled that one out of your posterior, eh? My unabridged dictionary
> doesn't have an entry for "Church".

Let's try to iron this one out. You believe that because your
dictionary is deficient, I'm making something up?

> > Ask him about Kim's call while you're at it.
>
> You really want to side with a Southern Baptist bigot?

I'm only providing you with the opportunity for dialog with your pastor.
Perhaps you could attempt to straighten him out in the way you have
here. Tell him why you stay despite your disagreement with Southern
Baptist dogma.

Dave K8MN

1901. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:17:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C013493.4FB4F259@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24898

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > > If you served in foreign posts, it's too bad you didn't take
> > > > the opportunity to absorb more of their cultures.
> > >
> > > Actually, a book was written about guys like Dave,
> > > "The Ugly American".
> >
> > It is quite obvious that you either did not read it or (more likely)
> > that you don't remember Lederer's tome.
>
> Sorry, I forgot that you are devoid of a sense of humor.

If I didn't have a sense of humor, I'd likely not spend much time
responding to much of what you write.

Dave K8MN
```

1902. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:19:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01353D.4561D23F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24899

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm stating that it (Kim's call) is tacky, lacks decorum
> > and that it exhibits lack of taste.
>
> Those are your feelings, Dave, that you have used your free
> will to choose to feel them. Thus, if they are a problem,
> they are 100% your personal problem. The rest of the world
> doesn't care what feelings you choose to experience.

Those are *views*, Cecil and they don't pose a problem. You don't speak for the rest of the world. Others have expressed similar views.

Dave K8MN

1903. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:22:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0135D9.AE2F6DEE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24900

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > *YOU* are the individual who indicated that the majority of Southerners
> > supported segregation.
>
> Yep, that's true based on my personal experiences living and
> working in the South. I have absolutely no reason to believe
> otherwise. I have seen no evidence that would change my mind.
> Do you have any evidence?

Based on my personal experiences living and working in the South, I say
you're all wet. Do you have any evidence?

Dave K8MN

1904. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:24:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c013810_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24906

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tr1mklql2@208.206.142.68...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > It is very difficult for anyone to be held responsible, at
> > > least by any rational person, for someone else's choices.
> >
> > That's exactly the truth yet you are trying to hold Kim responsible
> > for the feelings that *you choose* to feel.
> >
> > You still just don't get it. Kim is not the cause of her callsign being
> > objectionable to you - *you* are the cause. The objection originates
with
> > *you* and is a choice that *you* make using *your* free will. You have a
> > perfect right to do that but you need to learn to recognize and accept
the
> > responsibility for your feelings because they are *your* feelings, not
> > anyone else's.
> >
> > Your feelings are your choice and your responsibility, Dick. Stop trying
> > to blame them on someone else. All you have to do to alleviate the
> > problem is to choose to change your feelings. Why should your personal
> > feelings rule the rest of the world?
>
>
> So I have no right ot feel oiffended if someone else does something
> very offensive. Right. Of course, *you* do.
>

You are countering with a very narrow-minded reaction, Dick. *YES* you have
an absolute and perfect right to feel offended by the actions of others.
You have an absolute and perfect right to express that you are offended.
But, you really don't have an absolute and perfect right to go beyond your
expression of offense and then commit the same to another (offend them).

What the argument is, is that it is "unreasonable" for you to expect no
other than an illogical reaction just as inappropriate as yours when you get
to the point where your extreme reaction becomes offensive. That is two
negatives and no good point is made through it.

You have an absolute perfect right to wake up every morning and want the
world to be however it is that you dream of perfect. You do not have the

right to begin assaulting (verbally or otherwise) everyone who is not helping make it that way.

Styles of debate:

PURE and PERFECT:

Kim: In my opinion my callsign is my personal choice. I accept that my callsign may be offensive to some, just as the actions of others in the ARS are offensive to me.

Dick: In my opinion Kim's callsign is atrocious and harms the ARS in every way. She should get rid of it.

MUDDY and UNPRODUCTIVE:

Kim: In my opinion my callsign is my personal choice and screw any half-witted, ignorant, knuckle-dragging nitwit who doesn't like it.

Dick: In my opinion Kim's callsign is atrocious and her sagging tits are of no interest to we morally righteous hams.

Which type of style do you think is going to be the most productive, Dick? You have *every* right to act in the manner that you choose to act upon something. BUT, to muddy a conversation with personal expressions of illregard for others is quite contrary to being logical (if through argument we wish to attain some form of understanding and compromise--which is usually my goal and I think the goal of most others).

Another way to look at it is, why don't we (the folks on this newsgroup) spend as much time being overzealous in our comments of admiration for things people say that we like?

Kim W5TIT

1905. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:28:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125132820.28714.00001992@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 24903

In article <3C010B26.BDCD5772@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> >Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?
>>
>> No, Cecil, and I wouldn't be married to any woman who wanted to!
>
>You don't see gay men as the equivalent of women but you see
>lesbians as the equivalent of men?

Cecil:

The only way I see gay men and lesbians is as unfortunate, confused people who need our prayers, and also need to be kept away from our children. A simple examination of human male/female anatomy will show that same-sex relationships are not what the Creator intended. The fact that this confusion is widespread does not make it normal.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1906. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:28:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125132820.28714.00001991@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 24905

In article <AY4M7.196949$3d2.8216511@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> > Not even close, Rick. I got my B.S. in Human Resources Management
>> > Summa Cum Laude. The worst grade I got was a B+ in Organizational
>> > and Industrial Psychology. All the rest were A's with a couple of
>> > A minuses. Final GPA was 3.88.
>> >
>> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>> And you're the one driving a bus? :-)
>>
>
>Love to argue with you but I gots to fire up the old school bus and cart a
>bunch of Baptists around.
>
>Where else do you get paid for six hours driving one, read the Sunday paper,
>drink coffee, eat bagels? The church supplies the coffee and bagels, I do
>have to buy the paper.
>
>Definite help for the equipment fund and all it takes is a CDL-B, my Masters
>is not required.
>
>They don't even mind when we show up at Sunday School singing Da Biggest Cow
>I Ever Seen. Probably a good idea if I refrain from I don't Care if it
>Storms or Freezes (Long as I got my plastic Jesus) tho.
>
>It's existential, Man.

Dick:

It certainly is. Even though I have a degree in Human Resources
Management, I have a lifetime of work experience in the transportation
industry. I got my degree mainly to have it; I never imposed any
requirement upon myself to become a career H.R. person, even though
I would not refuse an opportunity to do so. I enjoy being a Paratransit
operator, and if I get the job I'm interviewing for in our Development
department, I will have a huge adjustment to life back in the cubicles.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1907. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:28:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125132821.28714.00001993@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 24901

In article <3C010BFD.DB445871@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> *All* of my attempts at not sinning are feeble, compared to what they
>> should be. I am a sinner, of that there is no doubt. Perhaps you would
>> pray for me?
>
>God would probably punish you if I prayed for you.

I don't think so, Cecil. Go ahead, give it a try. I will pray for you
as well.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1908. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:28:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125132821.28714.00001994@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 24902

In article <3c011ef6$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Watch it, Dick...you're getting as preoccupied with "them" as Larry R. is.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Wrong again, as usual. I am not even remotely preoccupied with "them."
It is YOU who have the preoccupation with your own breasts, and desire
for everyone else to be preoccupied with "them" as you are; therefore your
call sign is imposed on the whole of the ARS, at the expense of any
good opinion of your personal judgment. Quit trying to throw this back
on others, Kim. You are to blame for taking the ARS "...one step
closer to extinction," not us.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1909. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:28:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125132822.28714.00001995@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 24904

In article <3c01242c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Well, you and Larry R. have a lot of work to do--because I just don't see
>your albatross. Prove it, and maybe I'll rethink my belief that my
>callsign--*anyone's callsign*--is no detriment to the ARS. My callsign is
>less detriment to the ARS than your general behavior here is.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Where do you, Rick, Cecil, and the rest of the no-coders/pro-TIT'ers
get the idea that anyone's "general behavior" on this newsgroup --
including yours -- could be detrimental to the ARS? This newsgroup
is NOT ham radio -- it is merely *about* ham radio. The same
standards of behavior which can, and rightly should, influence and
control hams on-the-air don't apply here, nor should they. On the
ham bands, we need to always present out best possible "face" to
the world, in order to justify our continued exploitation of a valuable
and limited resource. Here on Usenet, we can, and must, have the
opportunity to put a sharper edge on things, in order to express our
thoughts and feelings with the freedom we deserve as Americans.
The world is full of double standards; this is just one of them, and
a pretty reasonable one, at that. Grow up and stop whining just
because participants in this newsgroup get to call things like they
see them -- at your own self-inflicted expense.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1910. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:30:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c013962_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24907

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tr27a$o8r$0@208.206.142.68...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You are one sick sucker. If there had been any logic in it it would
> > > have been refuted. As it was, all that was present was bullshit.
> >
> > Try using your internet search engine for "economic forces", Dick, and
> > you will change your narrow mind.
> >
> > When I took psychology in college, the Prof. had us yell obscenities
> > at the top of our lungs in class. That alleviated all the juvenile
> > hangups that I had over such words as "tits". You should try it.
>
>
> You really are a nutcasr, abd that should be no surprise. If one has
> dipshits for teachers, one is much more likely to become one himself.
>
> And whatever gave you the idea I have any hangup on the word "Tits"?
> Nothing could be further from fact. I'm not the Suthern Baptist, tho I'm
> familiar enough with the concept. The point has always been that society
> doesn't like to have to have some blowsy broad's floppies flung in their
> faces all the time, on the ham bands or elsewhere. That's what this is
> all about. There are lots of young kids and women who are much more
> offended than any of us here. Have they no right to be free from such
> garbage just because Kim wants to be vulgar? Where's your libertarian
> bullshit now?
>

Sure they do! If they are that offended, and there is nothing they can do about my callsign, they can choose another hobby. And, I challenge that I want to be vulgar, and I also challenge your notion that most women would be offended by my callsign. I can't imagine a kid having the capability to be offended by a callsign. If they are aware of tits in a derogatory light, it wasn't me who taught it to them. The same could be said, I suppose, for the adults. I didn't teach you, Dick, that the word tit is a derogatory term--who did?

Kim W5TIT

1911. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:33:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c013a0e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24908

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tr31h$p56$2@208.206.142.68...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <3BFB2C88.9FC1C774@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
> >
> > > >
> > > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >> Well, you've got one thing right, Cecil -- I'm endlessly asking for
> > > >> forgiveness of my sins. I am also praying for those who don't see
> > > >> the need to ask forgiveness. That's as much as I can do, save for
> > > >> trying *not* to be a sinner.
> > > >
> > > >From your postings, I would say your attempt at not sinning
> > > >is pretty feeble.
> > >
> > > Cecil:
> > >
> > > *All* of my attempts at not sinning are feeble, compared to what they
> > > should be. I am a sinner, of that there is no doubt. Perhaps you would
> > > pray for me?
> >
> But who would he pray to? He is his own diety.

D-e-i-t-y. Maybe that is why you are so confused about Islam.

Kim W5TIT

1912. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:35:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c013aa3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24909

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tr3horho0@208.206.142.68...
>
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > (snip) I think what this country needs
> > > is a good old fashioned revolt of the
> > > hard-working, taxpaying citizens of
> > > *all* races who want to see an end to
> > > the creation of dependency -- and
> > > force the know-nothings and do-nothings
> > > to wake up and find a way to share the
> > > wealth the good old-fashioned way --
> > > by exercising the human characteristics
> > > of initiative, ingenuity, and integrity.
> >
> > Agreed. There are people all around (white, black, green,
> > pink, and purple) who are driving this contry right into the
> > gutter. Sadly, it might be hard to find enough decent people
> > left today to have a revolt (it might be a small revolt).
> > Even more sadly, words like "initiative," "ingenuity," and
> > "integrity" are almost cuss words today (assuming the person
> > even remembers what those words mean).
>
>
> Don't fret, Dwight. You evidently don't know that only a third of the
> populace of the Colonies were active participants in the Revolutionary
> War for Independence from Britian. Another third were Loyalists to the
> Crown, and the final third were "Why can't we all just get along" sorts
> like you, Rick, Kim and Cecil.
> There are always enough freedom loving, THINKING citizens here to step
> up and get the job done.

And why don't you give us just one example of what you're doing to defend freedom, Dick? While you're at it, why don't you also think about the fact that if it is *your* freedoms you are defending and claiming to do it for me, too, shove it...I'll take my chances with the known enemy.

Kim W5TIT

1913. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:43:37 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c013c7d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24911

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9trbi8$2tp$0@208.206.142.68...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:9tq6hldim2@208.206.142.91...
> > >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Krell wrote:
> > > > > > Perhaps, then, you can enlighten us as to *why* the crime rate
is so
> > high in
> > > > > > such an area.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Sure. Basically for the same reasons the young Islamics hate us
and
> > > > > join the Jihad. They just don't know anything except what they're
> > taught
> > > > > from infancy. If you're told from first cognizance that all
Westerners
> > > > > are evil infidels who Allah dictates must be exterminated even at
the
> > > > > cost of your own life (but you'll get your reward of 40 virgins
and
> > all
> > > > > you can eat in the afterlife) that's all you know.
> > > >
> > > > It appears that you have been taught from birth that all Islamics
are
> > evil
> > > > and that's all you know.
> > >
> > >
> > > There you go, lying out your ass again. Read the Koran and see what
> > > they are taught.
> >
> > SO!!!! You *have* read the Koran? Is that right?! And, you must be as
> > susceptible to fanaticism as those who've read it and become terrorists

in
> > the name of their god.
> >
>
> There's a huge question about whether or not you've even learned to
> read. We can easily see where your level of understanding is.
>
> Should you decide to finally bring yourself up to date on world events,
> a good concise article which might help (if you can understand it) would
> be the Dec 3 issue of National Review magazine, page 38, entitled
> "Martyred". Written by a woman!
>

National Review? Bwahhhahahaha, my acceptance of that as anything but conservative rhetoric would be about as probable that I am going to begin listening to Limbaugh with any regularity.

Kim W5TIT

1914. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:44:17 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c013ca4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24912

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
ews:9trc1n$35b$0@208.206.142.68...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20011125015741.12427.00003233@nso-cg.aol.com...
> > > In article <3BFB2DA5.67728B4F@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> > writes:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >> Homosexuality is a personal choice of deviant sexual behavior. I
> > > >> do not see "gay" men as the equivalent of women; therefore, I would
> > > >> not want my wife having private meetings with "gay" male friends.
> > > >
> > > >Would you allow your wife to have lunch with a lesbian?
> > >
> > > No, Cecil, and I wouldn't be married to any woman who wanted to!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> > But, Larry. You probably wouldn't be married.
>
>
>
> If the selection was limited to the likes of you I wouldn't be, either.

Oh, believe me, you have that right.

Kim W5TIT

1915. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:46:48 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <s0bM7.5$7d.2230@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24910

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tr2hu$p56$0@208.206.142.68...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Roger Halstead wrote:
> > > There are many parts of the world where we would consider their morals
> > > barbaric and they the same for us.
> >
> > For instance, there is an area in Africa where the accepted standards
> > of society require a man to teach his daughter about sex by being the
> > first to have sex with her. Say Dick, how do you like those standards
> > of society?
>
>
> I have no reason to like nor dislike it since I don't live there, am
> not usbject to it, and have no reason to evaluate it. Of course it is
> completely foreign to anything taught by the society I live within. You
> seem to want to oppose much of our society and you have daughters, so
> maybe you would want to answer your own question.

Ahhh...How did your fractured logic come up with what some one would like or dislike from the above two posts.
Just because I, or some else, point out how society differs by region and ethnic backgrounds has absolutely no bearing on what I believe, or practice. Nor would it with any one else. Had I embraced one of those societies, or condemned one, or another, then it would be an entirely different matter. I only pointed out that society is not a constant from one city to another, one state to another and one country to another. Even at the local level society is constantly changing due to the makeup of the population and their beliefs. Now does the change go one way. More often than not it tends to cycle from conservatism, to liberalism, or some where in between. The same is true for religion and the tolerance of and between different religions. As populations have a tendency to over react to many things, those swings can be rather sudden and extreme, but usually smooth out over time.

There is a huge difference between recognizing differences, pointing out differences around the world and what an individual believes and practices. Actually they are not connected except possibly for open mindedness. It's just that many are unable to distinguish between what a person believes and what that person is able to view or discuss.

One thing I've found over the years is that many believe any one who can discuss a point with which they disagree must also believe that point. I've

also found the shakier the foundations of ones beliefs the more likely they are to vehemently defend those beliefs, or attack any one who proposes something different. Those with a sound foundation can usually sit down and rationally discuss opposing views in depth.

I will always remember a good friend who passed away a good many years back. Our views on a particular religion were almost diametrically opposed. Unlike the vast majority who espouse their religion and values, yet live, shall we say a wee bit differently, this man absolutely lived what he espoused as a religion. We had, what to me were some of the most interesting discussions about religion, ethics, and morals in which I've ever had the privilege to participate.

One other thing is that each and every one of us is part of all those societies, although the farther away the less influence they have on us as individuals. Each and every one of those societies adds a bit of flavor to the next larger which dilutes it a bit, but a tiny bit of that societies flavor eventually trickles back down to local levels around the world.

The friction arises when any particular group tries to force, their beliefs onto others of different beliefs, or standards.

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

1916. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 18:55:37 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c013f4c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 24913

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011125132822.28714.00001995@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c01242c_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Well, you and Larry R. have a lot of work to do--because I just don't see
> >your albatross. Prove it, and maybe I'll rethink my belief that my
> >callsign--*anyone's callsign*--is no detriment to the ARS. My callsign
is
> >less detriment to the ARS than your general behavior here is.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Where do you, Rick, Cecil, and the rest of the no-coders/pro-TIT'ers
> get the idea that anyone's "general behavior" on this newsgroup --
> including yours -- could be detrimental to the ARS? This newsgroup
> is NOT ham radio -- it is merely *about* ham radio.
>

Then, tell me how my callsign is of such danger to the ARS. The most
communicating I do is on this newsgroup. I have been on the air with my
callsign less than 1 hour, possibly, in the last 2-3 months. I don't spend
much time talking on ham radio. I spend an inordinate amount of time here
in this newsgroup. Are *you* talking about my callsign on the air, causing
every licensed ham to become aware of it?

>
> The same
> standards of behavior which can, and rightly should, influence and
> control hams on-the-air don't apply here, nor should they.
>

Well, good then. I see that my callsign isn't the danger you thought it
was.

>
> On the
> ham bands, we need to always present out best possible "face" to
> the world, in order to justify our continued exploitation of a valuable
> and limited resource.
>

And how is it that *you* are fulfilling this responsibility you feel all hams have. You believe that good use of the bands is critical to the justification of the ARS, yet you refrain from voice modes, you refrain from using much other than HF, you refrain from the greater majority of operation in the ARS, Larry. When are you going to begin doing your part to help justify the ARS?

> Here on Usenet, we can, and must, have the
> opportunity to put a sharper edge on things, in order to express our
> thoughts and feelings with the freedom we deserve as Americans.

Good, you're beginnning to realize that we Americans have the right to expect freedom.

> The world is full of double standards; this is just one of them, and
> a pretty reasonable one, at that. Grow up and stop whining just
> because participants in this newsgroup get to call things like they
> see them -- at your own self-inflicted expense.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

heh heh heh No expense here, at all, Larry, I assure you. OH, and as to the double-standards comment? You know, the one where you *appear* to be quite willing to accept them? Accept my callsign. :)

Kim W5TIT

1917. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:06:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C014146.BDAEAF4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24914

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > It is very difficult for anyone to be held responsible, at
> > > least by any rational person, for someone else's choices.
> >
> > That's exactly the truth yet you are trying to hold Kim responsible
> > for the feelings that *you choose* to feel.
> >
> > You still just don't get it. Kim is not the cause of her callsign being
> > objectionable to you - *you* are the cause. The objection originates with
> > *you* and is a choice that *you* make using *your* free will. You have a
> > perfect right to do that but you need to learn to recognize and accept the
> > responsibility for your feelings because they are *your* feelings, not
> > anyone else's.
> >
> > Your feelings are your choice and your responsibility, Dick. Stop trying
> > to blame them on someone else. All you have to do to alleviate the
> > problem is to choose to change your feelings. Why should your personal
> > feelings rule the rest of the world?
>
> So I have no right ot feel oiffended if someone else does something
> very offensive. Right. Of course, *you* do.

You have every right to feel offended by anything in the world. But that
is something that you choose to do. The rest of the world doesn't care
about your feelings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1918. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:10:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01422C.6DE3BF71@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24915

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Where do you, Rick, Cecil, and the rest of the no-coders/pro-TIT'ers
> get the idea that anyone's "general behavior" on this newsgroup --
> including yours -- could be detrimental to the ARS? This newsgroup
> is NOT ham radio -- it is merely *about* ham radio.

More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
You, personally, have offended more potential hams than Kim will
during the rest of her life.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1919. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:12:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01429F.49FF4E36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24916

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> Then, tell me how my callsign is of such danger to the ARS.

If W5TIT is a danger to the ARS, then so is
"Kneading Three Large Tits".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1920. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:18:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0143EC.E1792AF9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24917

Dick Carroll wrote:
> There are lots of young kids and women who are much more
> offended than any of us here. Have they no right to be free from such
> garbage just because Kim wants to be vulgar? Where's your libertarian
> bullshit now?

I'm certain that you have offended more folk than Kim will during
the rest of her lifetime. Someone needs to teach those ignorant
kids to grow up and take responsibility for their own feelings.
Someone needs to teach you to grow up and take responsibility
for the consequences of your own feelings. Kim's callsign cannot
trigger any feelings in another person without that person's
cooperation and consent. If you choose to cooperate in feeling
vulgar, that's your choice, but don't blame anyone else for it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1921. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:19:00 UTC
From: vtail@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3c0143a3.28986770@news.netis.com>
Source record: 24924

On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 01:48:34 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

> Section 97.11 of the FCC Rules puts some very specific
> restrictions on operation from an aircraft.

What 97.11 does is essentially kick the issue over the fence to the
FAA where it belongs anyway.

The FAA says the pilot in command can use anything that he has
determined will not cause interference with essential airborne
navigation equipment.

Of course, the FAA doesn't bother to say how the pilot in command is
supposed to go about making that determination.

1922. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:21:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0144D6.B196E815@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24918

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ah, so we finally get to the bottom line. Cecil likes to do what Cecil
> wants, no matter who else is negatively impacted by it.

If someone uses his/her free will to choose to be negatively impacted
by my words or actions, that is their choice, Dick, and I am NOT
responsible for their choices, they are. Ultimately, every human
being is 100% selfish. I tithe to the church because I choose to,
not because it is a requirement.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1923. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:23:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01454F.79B9C485@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24919

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You seem to want to oppose much of our society ...

I oppose the lack of freedom and abuse of power within our
society. Sorry to see you support less freedom and abuse
of power.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1924. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:28:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C014641.1E06648@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24920

Dick Carroll wrote:
> There are lots of former or current CBers in *our* age group, as you
> well know, Cecil.

Former 11m CBers didn't exist when I was first licensed, Dick.
I participated in the last 11m ham contest. Please prove that
the Liberty Net troublemakers are former CBers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1925. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:31:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01471B.E91901AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24921

Dave Heil wrote:
> If you need more prison space, build it.

Prisons don't come for free. The Texas legislature will not
approve building any new prisons.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1926. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:32:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C014768.4CCDEC49@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24923

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I'm surprised at how ignorant you are of human psychology.
>
> Probably no more surprised than I am at your inability to comprehend a
> simple English language sentence.

I comprehended it much better than you realize.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1927. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:33:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wIbM7.128739$WW.8061618@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24922

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0111250842.234d4ead@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<AY4M7.196949$3d2.8216511@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C007B74.6B7569F@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Not even close, Rick. I got my B.S. in Human Resources Management
> > > > Summa Cum Laude. The worst grade I got was a B+ in Organizational
> > > > and Industrial Psychology. All the rest were A's with a couple of
> > > > A minuses. Final GPA was 3.88.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > And you're the one driving a bus? :-)
> > >
> >
> > Love to argue with you but I gots to fire up the old school bus and cart
a
> > bunch of Baptists around.
> >
> > Where else do you get paid for six hours driving one, read the Sunday
paper,
> > drink coffee, eat bagels? The church supplies the coffee and bagels, I
do
> > have to buy the paper.
> >
> > Definite help for the equipment fund and all it takes is a CDL-B, my
Masters
> > is not required.
> >
> > They don't even mind when we show up at Sunday School singing Da Biggest
Cow
> > I Ever Seen. Probably a good idea if I refrain from I don't Care if it
> > Storms or Freezes (Long as I got my plastic Jesus) tho.
> >
> > It's existential, Man.
>
> Yea, verily.

>
> Regale them with Tom Lehrer's "National Brotherhood Week" for a real show-stopper.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

We have already had the discussion about how good songs turn into hymns. What you may have been exposed to as Jesus Loves the Little Children is the tune to God Save Ireland. Our army used it in a little ditty that started out, "In this land of dopey dreams, happy peaceful Phillipines."

1928. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:38:33 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ZMbM7.128747$WW.8060759@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24925

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011125132821.28714.00001994@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c011ef6$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Watch it, Dick...you're getting as preoccupied with "them" as Larry R.
is.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Wrong again, as usual. I am not even remotely preoccupied with "them."
> It is YOU who have the preoccupation with your own breasts, and desire
> for everyone else to be preoccupied with "them" as you are; therefore your
> call sign is imposed on the whole of the ARS, at the expense of any
> good opinion of your personal judgment. Quit trying to throw this back
> on others, Kim. You are to blame for taking the ARS "...one step
> closer to extinction," not us.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

If 58 years on the planet has taught me one thing it is that the ladies are
far more pre-occupied with 'them' than we are.

I recall wandering in to the late show at a local theatre at about the age
of 17 or so into one of these floppy boob movies; was interesting for about
3.5 minutes at most. Incidentally the last X flick I went to was in Salt
Lake City.

Dick NBK

1929. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:43:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0149EA.46BE5898@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24926

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If that's the best you can do no wonder you're on the defensive all the
> time.

That's not the best I could do. That's the result of randomly
opening the Old Testament. I don't have time to list all the
atrocities that have been performed in Jehovah's name.

> You would dredge up an obscure Old Testament story and promote it
> as the equal of the Koran's dictates to Muslims to eradicate all on
> earth who refuse to be converted or enslaved.

Uh-Oh Dick, you don't believe in the Bible? God will get you for
that. If you don't believe in the Bible why do you think Muslims
believe in the Koran?

> Hey idiot, there was no such admonition and you know it, just choose to
> twist a very old biblical story to fit your current agenda.

How can you be so ignorant of the Bible, Dick? God told the Israelites
to forcibly take the promised land and slaughter all the innocent
inhabitants. That was *YOUR* God talking, Dick.

> Muslims are taught from infancy as an integral part of their religious
> training, that all other belief systems are not only inferior but that
> they must be wiped out and their adherents either converted, enslaved or
> killed.

The exact same thing is taught in *YOUR* Bible, Dick. You should crack it
open and enlighten yourself. Civilized Christians don't pay much attention
to the atrocities we are supposed to commit in the name of Jehovah.
Civilized Muslims don't pay much attention to the atrocities they
are supposed to commit in the name of Allah.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1930. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:45:56 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6883D00FE13BCA83.E7332C15E042843B.46CC26C61115D46E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24927

On 25 Nov 2001 07:13:54 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>> Yep, and Riley Hollingsworth sez those bad guys are mostly
>> Extras and Advanced class.
>>
>
> Easy as the tests have been since the CB influx, that's no surprise.
>Makes the Tech and Extra lites whiners look that much more pitiful and
>lame.

They didn't _make_ an easy test for Advanced class licenses,
Dick, remember? They eliminated the class for new licensee. And many
of us who are Extras (and were Advanced) upgraded BEFORE the tests
changed.

If Hollingsworth is claiming Advanced class hams are causing
more trouble than Techs, he is NOT talking about new licensees.

Sorry, Dick, but if you communicate on the air the way you do
on line (and if you don't all you are doing is showing disrespect for
ham radio in another venue), YOU and your cronies are the people
Hollingsworth warned us about!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1931. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:46:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C014A97.ECFED318@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24928

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> National Review? Bwahhhahahaha, my acceptance of that as anything but
> conservative rhetoric would be about as probable that I am going to begin
> listening to Limbaugh with any regularity.

Like the terrorists, Dick is determined to stir up trouble. He,
like the terrorists, would like to revive The Crusades. That is,
of course, as long as he doesn't have to do the fighting.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1932. ARNewsline 1267 - Nov 23 2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:48:23 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011125144823.24634.00001051@mb-fu.aol.com>
Source record: 24929

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1267 – NOV. 23, 2001

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1267 with a release date of Friday, November 23rd, 2001 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Six meters suprises the world and the night of the meteors are first on this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1267 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE BIG 6 METER OPENING

--
Cold Open Audio Here: N6KNW working Japan on 6 meters
--

That’s Brad Marckwardt, N6KNW, in Santa Clarita California working Japan on Saturday November 17th. No big deal you say? Well the band was 6 meters. It was the wrong time of the year for this kind of D-X. And less we forget, while Brad was working Japan, other hams were making equally amazing 6 meter D-X contacts like California to New York and Alaska to the lower 48. Take a listen:

--
Audio Here: Alaska to California, New York to California
--

The 6 meter DX was not limited to North America. Reports came in from around the world of similar single, double and even triple hop F 2 contacts.

From Costa Rica, Carlos Diez, TI5KD, reports that he started out the day working Europeans including GW4VEQ at about 13:50 UTC. Ten hours later, at 23:05 UTC Carlos crossed the Pacific with his signal, contacting JA4MBM for his first ever Costa Rica to Japan short path QSO.

The experts say that that the current solar cycle peaked in 2000 and that we are on the downside. But it appears that someone forgot to tell the VHF and UHF bands that its not time for D-X. It simply keeps rolling in on 6 meters and above and seems to get better and better with each opening.

Our thanks to Dave Booth, KC6WFS, who took time out from working some of the DX to make the recordings you heard in this report. And less we forget, the six meter band is still opening up almost every day – at least as this newscast is being prepared. (ARNewsline (tm))

**

THE ROCKS IN THE SKY: THE LEONID METEORS AND HAM RADIO

As if the 6 meter opening were not enough to bring bragging rights to many V-H-F enthusiasts, a few hours later came the light show in the sky. It was the Leonid Meteor Shower and hams who enjoy bouncing their signals off the ionized trails of meteors were not disappointed. One of them was Joe Hannigan. WL7M in Fritz Creek Alaska heard commenting during another 6 meter F2 opening:

--
Sound here
--

We do not have any of the sounds of the contacts. Much of it is high speed C-W or computerized using WSJT. But we do have some reports courtesy of the VHF Reflector.

Lets start with Sam Horton, KD4ESV of Bradenton Florida. He says that he was operating from grid square E L 87. Horton says that by 18:23 UTC he had worked twelve states including Alaska.

But that’s not all. Tim Marek, K7XC, of Fallon Nevada, operating as a Rover from grid square DM09 had one of the best meteor scatter reports. We don’t have time to cover it all, but here are a few stations that he worked starting with KB5XC in DM65, then AA7A in Arizona, K7MI in grid CN73 and W7USB in DN17. Tim added that W1IPL in grid DN62 went in the log along with K5JL in EM15 at about 03:23 AM local time.

K7XC says that all of these contacts were made mobile on 2 meters. Marek used an Icom IC 706 Mark 2 G transceiver driving a 170 watt power amplifier into a yagi antenna on his rover vehicle. Marek says that he spent the entire night chasing QSO’s on the space borne rocks. He wrote his report at about 6 a-m local time adding that he intended to crawl into bed and planned to sleep till noon. That is, if his pet cat would let him. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: HAPPY BIRTHDAY AO-40

The AMSAT Oscar 40 ham radio satellite has celebrated its first year in space. Then called Phase 3 D, the satellite was launched on November 16, 2000 aboard an Ariane 5 booster rocket from Kourou, French Guiana.

Even though the bird suffered some major damage during an orbital transfer maneuver, it has survived. After several months of work by the team at AMSAT Germany, transponder operation started last May 5th. At that time the U-band and L1-band uplinks were connected to the S-2 transmitter passband downlink via the satellites on-board Matrix switch. Since then, hams on Earth have made hundreds of contacts though the satellite.

AO-40 is currently in a long period during in which the Earth eclipses the Sun near perigee. The eclipses actually began about August 28th, and will rapidly increase in length. They will continue well into June 2002. For the current transponder operating schedule visit:

http://www.amsat-dl.org/journal/adlj-p3d.htm (AMSAT-NA)

**

BREAK 1

This is ham radio news coming to you from the United States of America. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world, and welcoming the Douglas County Amateur Radio Club’s W0UK serving Lawrence, Kansas.

(5 sec pause here)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: FCC GETTYSBURG CHANGES MAIL ADDRESS

We told you it might happen and it has. At least for package deliveries. This, as the FCC’s Gettysburg, Pennsylvania office, announces that it has moved its mail handling facilities off-site.

The reason is the same as reported for FCC in Washington and CQ Magazine. Simply a precaution in case some of the strange people that we all call terrorists decide to target the Gettysburg licensing facility.

Its all fairly simple. Effective immediately, all overnight couriers, United Parcel Service and Federal Express deliveries have to go to a new location. That address is the FCC Gettysburg, Rear entrance, 35 York Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325.

The change does not affect US Postal Service deliveries. At least not yet. They will continue to be accepted at the office's physical address on Fairfield Road and diverted to the off-site mailroom. (FCC)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: VANITY LICENSING ON HOLD

I’m Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, with late breaking news about the Amateur Radio Vanity Call Sign program which is now, effectively, on hold. This, after the recently announced changes in mail handling procedures at the FCC's Gettysburg, Pennsylvania license processing facility.

As reported, mail directed to the FCC Gettysburg office was being held pending the start of special handling precautions to address any biohazards. Now that ARRL has issued a further bulletin on the matter. It quotes the ARRL’s VEC Manager Bart Jahnke, W9JJ. He says that the FCC has processed vanity applications received through October 14. But says Jhanke, vanity applications received after that date remain on hold for now.

There is some good news. The FCC is tracking the receipt date for each piece of mail. Because the agency gives equal priority to paper and electronic applications, all vanity processing was being suspended until the mail situation is resolved. Once the FCC begins opening its backlog of mail, most applications will probably be processed in about 18 days based on date

received.

But there could still be problems for another group of filers. These are hams who waited till near the end of the two year grace period on renewing ham radio licenses. Jahnke says applications from those filing for renewal near the end of their two-year grace period will only be accepted for processing if they get to the FCC before the grace period expires.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Henry Freinberg, K2SSQ. (ARRL Bulletin, FCC)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SIDE OF RADIO

The media is not only reporting the war against terrorism. According to the Media Network e-newsletter, it has also become heavily involved.

Here in the United States, media organizations like NBC were the first to be targeted by those spreading the anthrax virus. And the e-newsletter says that in Afghanistan, silencing the Taliban's voice and putting in a replacement was one of the first aims of the US led military campaign. That plan seems to be succeeding, with the restoration of "normal" radio services in the key city of Mazar-e-Sharif and a few days later in Kabul itself.

In another development, the psychological warfare broadcasts of "Information Radio" have only been heard irregularly on shortwave. Media Network says that it has contacted those responsible for running the operation to find out its current status.

As soon as Media Network get some updated information, it will be posted at http://www.rnw.nl/realradio/features/html/afghanistan010917.html (Media Network)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC VS. RF ELECTRONICS- AN EPILOGUE

The FCC says that it is thanking the owner of R-F Electronics for his decision to stop selling non certified amplifier kits and says that its closing the matter. But the owner of the company does not appear to be ready to say “you’re welcome.” In fact, Sidney Lee Martin, KD4YBC, is using the World Wide Web to launch a verbal counter attack against the regulatory agency. Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, visited the spot in cyberspace and has the rest of the story:

--

Sidney Lee Martin ran afoul of the FCC for allegedly selling illegal power amplifiers for use on amateur HF and 6 meter frequencies. On September 19th, the Commission's Riley Hollingsworth wrote to Martin, telling him to stop the sales -- or face enforcement action.

With the threat of being taken to court and having his amateur radio license put in jeopardy, Martin shut his sales operation down September 25th. And he's

taking a few verbal shots at the Commission.

Accusing the agency of being on a jihad, Martin says the FCC attacked and destroyed his business while letting another company continue selling non-certified amplifier kits. Martin says he will use his former business website to provide updates and comments on his tangle with the Commission. He's urging amateurs to ask questions and learn the truth.

In the meantime, the FCC appears to be closing the matter, at least as far as Martin's business is concerned. In an October first letter to Martin, the FCC's Hollingsworth notes Martin's comments that he has stopped selling non-certified equipment and thanks him for his cooperation.

The letter closes with Hollingsworth saying the Commission will review information Martin supplied about other sources selling non-certified equipment.

From Birmingham Alabama, I’m David Black, KB4KCH, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

If you are interested in seeing what Martin has to say about the FCC, take your web browser over to http://members.aol.com/rfelectron/rfelect.htm (ARNewsline)

**

ENFORCEMENT DOWN UNDER: A VERY BUSY ACA

The United States is not the only place where the government has been actively enforcing its radio regulations. So has the Australian Communications Authority -- or ACA. And the figures for the past year are now in and Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has them:

--

From this years ACA Annual Report we learn that this year, 12 penalties in lieu of prosecution were issued, three are under consideration by the ACA for withdrawal, seven were paid totalling $6,270 Australian, and two went to prosecution. In addition, prosecution proceedings without issuing penalties in lieu were instigated against six other persons for a total of 22 offenses.

During the year, the ACA conducted 1,200 Radiocommunications licence investigations, resulting in the issue of 267 verbal and 557 written warnings. No licence suspensions or cancellation actions were undertaken this year.

The ACA also investigated 781 complaints of interference to Radiocommunications services, and search and rescue authorities were assisted with the location of approximately 104 emergency
position-indicating radio beacons. Although careless handling or faults caused many of these, 21 beacons had been maliciously activated with the intent of disrupting emergency services.

From Q-News Australia, I’m Graham Kemp, VK4BB, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Be it the United States, Australia or anywhere else, the same words always apply. Don’t do the crime if you cant pay the fine. (Q-News, ACA)

**

ARRL NEWS: THE BIG PROJECT EXPANDS

Some good news out of Newington. This, with word from the ARRL Schools wishing to take part in the Big Project can contact Jerry Hill, KH6HU at ARRL Headquarters, Field and Education Section, 225 Main St., Newington Connecticut, 06111. You can also find them in cyberspace at www.arrl.org. (ARRL)

**

ARRL NEWS: THE 2001 ARRL DIVISIONAL ELECTIONS

The results are in for the fall 2001 ARRL divisional elections and there are really no big surprises. In the Southeastern Division, Georgia Section Manager Sandy Donahue, W4RU, of Atlanta, Georgia, outpolled West Central Florida Assistant Section Manager Paul Toth, NA4AR, of Seminole, Florida by 478 votes. The final count was Donahue at 2783 and Toth at 2305. Both were contending for the seat being vacated by Vice Director Evelyn Gauzens, W4WYR, who decided not to seek a new term after 22 years of service.

In the Southwestern Division, San Diego Section Manager Tuck Miller, NZ6T, of National City, California, defeated Ned Stearns, AA7A, of Scottsdale, Arizona. The vote was 2485 to 2208. Miller assumes the vice director's position being vacated by Art Goddard, W6XD, who ran unopposed for director.

Last but by no means least, incumbent Pacific Division Vice Director Bob Vallio, W6RGG, of Castro Valley, California garnered 1924 votes to beat back a challenge by Gerald D. Griffin, K6MD, of Pacific Grove, California. Griffin polled 1225 votes. All those elected officially take office on January 1st, 2002. (ARRL)

**

HAM INDUSTRY NEWS: ELECRAFT IMPROVES THE K1

Elecraft's very popular K 1 compact CW transceiver has just became a four-bander. In addition to the 2-band version, the rig is now available with a single band-switched module that covers 40, 30, 20, and either 17 or 15 meters. No hardware or firmware changes are necessary to use the 4-band module and the module can also be ordered as an option to upgrade existing K 1 transceivers. For more information or to order, visit www.elecraft.com or e-mail sales@ elecraft.com. (Elecraft release)

**

BREAK 2

News never takes a vacation and neither do we. Coming to you from the United States of America, this is the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world at our only official website -- www.arnewsline.org.

**

COMMUNICATIONS BUSINESS: MORE LAYOFFS AT MOTOROLA

High tech giant Motorola has announced that it is reducing its work force by another 7,000 jobs, including an unspecified number of layoffs. The announcement came a day after the telecommunications giant reported a $1.4 billion loss for the quarter ended September 30.

Faced by a weakened economy and slower industry growth in worldwide cellphone sales, Motorola already this year had announced 32,000 job cuts to a work force that stood at 147,000 last December. That would increase the total cuts to 39,000 and trim the work force to approximately 108,000 by the end of the year - a reduction of about 26 percent. A company spokesperson indicated there could be more. (Published news reports)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: SUPERFEST 2002

The Amateur Electronic Supply 8th annual Superfest open house is now slated for April 5th and 6th 2002 at the AES store in Milwaukee Wisconsin. According to a note from Molly Schreiber of AES, manufacturer representatives will be on hand displaying their wares and several forums are being scheduled. And as in years past, ham radio clubs are being invited to participate with free display space. Information on this and more is at the AES Superfest website. Its a long URL. Its in cyberspace at /www.aesham.com/superfest/sf.html. (AES Release)

**

RADIO PUBLICATIONS: DEPARTURE MESSAGE

CW aficionados attention. This one is for you. It’s a new book called Departure Message by Charles Lunsford that tells the story of an enlisted aircrew member flying as an Airborne Radio Operator in the 1950s.

Lunsford’s book traces one of the last of the Radio Operators trained in International Morse Code and who flew in the last aircraft purchased by the United States Air Force which had a Morse key as standard equipment. The book also describes some of the radio and radar aids of the time and the first top-secret transponders for identification.

Departure Message is published on-line by greatunpublished.com and is available in paperback or for download. More information is on the web at greatunpublished.com. (Charles Lunsford)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: APPLE I-POD

Apple Computer has unveiled a revolutionary new portable music player that can hold an entire music collection. It also takes Apple outside its core computer business for the first time in eight years.

The Apple "i-Pod" is the size and shape of a deck of cards, with a small LCD screen and round dial on a white front and a stainless steel back. It holds

about 1,000 songs in the MP3 music format and has a battery life of 8to 10 hours.

The only negative. The “i-Pod” currently will only work with Apple Macintosh computers, but that may change. About 7 million existing Macintoshes have the necessary hardware and software to be compatible with iPod. Apple president Steve Jobs says the company is considering porting it to windows based machines as well. (Apple release)

**

TECHNOLOGY FAILURE: COMPUTER FAILURE AT THE CALTECH USGS EARTHQUAKE MESSAGING SITE

A 5.1 magnitude earthquake near Anza California on October 30th should have generated an almost-immediate e-mail message to all southern California Seismic Network e-mail subscribers. However, this particular message was delayed about seven hours due to a catastrophic network hardware failure that occurred minutes before the shaker. To subscribe to this free and usually reliable reporting service, see http://pasadena.wr.usgs.gov/latest/mailing_lists.html (CGC Communicator)

**

INTERNATIONAL - FRANCE: ARISS-EUROPE QSL ADDRESS

The ARISS-Europe QSL Bureau's address has changed. Effective immediately, all European requests for ARISS QSL cards are to be addressed to AMSAT - France, 14 bis, rue des Gourlis, 92500 Rueil Malmaison, France.

Those applying for a QSL should include a self addressed envelope and two International Reply Coupons to cover the handling cost. The ARISS-Europe QSL Manager is Christophe Candebat, F1MOJ. His email address is F1MOJ@aol.com. (ON1CAU)

**

INTERNATIONAL - AUSTRALIA: VK 80 METER SSB BAND TO BE EXPANDED

The Australian 80-meter SSB 'DX Window', at present limited to a 4-kHz segment around 3798 kHz, is due to be expanded - but not until 2004. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, has more:

--

The Australian 80-metre SSB 'DX Window', at present limited to a 4-kHz segment around 3798kHz, is due to be expanded - but not until 2004. In Australia, the band 3700 - 3800kHz is presently allocated to the commercial land mobile service, effectively limiting amateur SSB operation to a single frequency. Following an approach by the Wireless Institute of Australia, the Australian Communications Authority has agreed to proceed with a change in the allocation of the band 3776 - 3800kHz. The ACA's intention is to reallocate this band to the amateur service on a primary basis from the 1st of January 2004. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH.

--

Current commercial users of that spectrum won’t be left out in the cold. They will be moved to existing land mobile spectrum adjacent to the new amateur band by the end of December 2003. (RSGB)

**

SPECIAL EVENTS: K7A PEARL HARBOR DAY STATION

Pearl Harbor Day will be celebrated in the ham radio world December 7, 8 and 9, when Special Events Station K7A comes on the air from Phoenix Arizona. K7A will be operational on most High Frequency bands. More information is posted on www.aztenx.org (Superstition ARC)

**

DX

In-D-X, Jim Weidner, K2JXW, who is the founder and president of the Amateur Radio Lighthouse Society announced the groups second annual Lighthouse Christmas Lights QSO Party. The event is scheduled for December 22nd to the 23rd. For more information please visit www.arlhs.com on the world wide web. (News release)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: VK HAM RADIO IN THE AIR ON THE AIR

And finally this week, the story of the celebration of an old airplane and the part played by ham radio. It was an unusual job for hams. Again, from Australia, Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB:

--

VK4's Redcliffe & Districts Radio Club Inc. ran a radio link, at the request of Redcliffe City Councillor Ian Poyitt, from an aircraft to Redcliffe Radio Station 99.7 FM. The Link commemorated the 70th anniversary of the Tiger Moth. There was approximately 100 old aircraft participating in this rare fly-past.

--
Flight Audio Here
--

A hand held scanner's audio was fed directly into the mixing desk. A 2 meter radio using a quarter wave antenna from the aircraft, then a crossband link to take the 2 meter signal from the aircraft and retransmitted this on 70cm using the clubs new Yaesu FT-847.

The flight went off without a hitch with Steve Harris VK4HRS as the Aeronautical Mobile Announcer, having flown for the first time and enjoyed himself immensely.

--

Well done Steve and all at the Redcliffe Club. (Q-News)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address
is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the Dayton Amateur Radio Association has opened the nominating period for the 2002 Dayton Hamvention Awards. There are three awards presented each year. They are the Radio Amateur of the Year, Special Achievement, and Technical Excellence.

All amateurs Novice through Extra are eligible. Awards are decided by the Awards Committee, based partially upon the information received. Magazine articles, newsletters, newspaper clippings, videos and the like are appreciated but cannot be returned. The deadline for nominations is January 31, 2002. Nominations can be submitted by US Mail to Post Office Box 964, Dayton Ohio 45401 or by completing the convenient e-form on the web at www.hamvention.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA in New Orleans saying God Bless America, 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2001. All rights reserved.

**
**

PROMO: THIS WEEK ON THE RAINREPORT

Severe weather can happen anytime and anywhere. Thats the reason many hams belong to SKYWARN. Maybe you should too. Find out why when Hap Holly intetviews David Black KB4KCH on this weeks RAIN Report. It’s now on line at www.rainreport.com or you can hear it by telephone at 847-827-7246.

1933. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:51:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C014BC4.E884D410@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24930

Dave Heil wrote:
> Let's try to iron this one out. You believe that because your
> dictionary is deficient, I'm making something up?

Talk about delusions of grandeur. My *unabridged* dictionary
of the English language is deficient? ROTFLMBO Thanks fer
the laugh, Dave. One more word added to that dictionary
and I wouldn't be able to pick it up.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1934. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:56:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C014CEB.BFDF3963@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24931

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Those are your feelings, Dave, that you have used your free
> > will to choose to feel them. Thus, if they are a problem,
> > they are 100% your personal problem. The rest of the world
> > doesn't care what feelings you choose to experience.
>
> That's been your story and you're still sticking to it, but it is no
> less wrong.

Dick, you are not going to reach adult maturity until you take
responsibility for your own feelings. Children don't understand
such but they gain understanding as they mature. You never did.

> When a large percentage of society views it as wrong, it is a moral
> issue and thus a part of the mores of that society.

Aha, the old argumentum ad populum diversion. Can't you do any
better than a diversion, Dick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1935. Re: Aero Mobile -- The Best Way (Was: Aeronautical Mobile...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:58:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnd7y00.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 24932

On Sat, 24 Nov 2001 23:46:33 -0800, Jim Weir wrote:

>Now take this on and do with it what you will --
>
>In the amateur world, I'm an Extra and a long-time Elmer.

So am I - Amateur and commercial licensed 50 years next summer, officer of several amateur radio clubs and professional organizations. In addition to that am both a communications engineer and a communications attorney, and an "Elmer" in all three fields.

>In the aviation world I'm an A&P, IA (airframe and powerplant mechanic with
>Inspection Authorization). Also commercial, instrument, flight instructor in
>airplanes and gliders.

10 years in military airborne and ground comms (USN and USAF-SAC), 30 years with FCC doing and supervising radio compliance investigations and inspections, including amateur, aircraft and marine systems.

Now that we've roared at each other, let's get dowm to brass tacks.

>In my airplane there is a 2-meter rig connected to the power bus by it's own
>breaker, but it is also connected to the airplane audio system through the
>aircraft's audio panel, and hence to the aircraft headphone and microphone
>circuits, thus "connected" to the aircraft system.
>
>In my NSHO, this is the safest way to incorporate a ham rig in an airplane. The
>reasons are not important. My professional opinion is.

No argument there. The subject in question was whether the Rules permit a cockpit member to use radio equipment installed in the aircraft for Aircraft Radio (Part 87) purposes for amateur communications, especially in aircarrier service where the radios are installed and used to meet FAA requirements. That is the meaning and intent of Sec. 97.11(b).

>The aircraft number is N73CQ. The ham call is WX6RST. Come nail my ass
>to the grass for a violation if you wish.

I'm out of the "nailing the ass" business now (retired from the FCC as District Director 6 years ago). My business is keeping folks from being nailed by my former colleagues and picking up the pieces after they are.

Fly safely.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1936. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 19:59:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C014D98.A5807A71@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24933

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I'm stating that it (Kim's call) is tacky, lacks decorum
> > > and that it exhibits lack of taste.
> >
> > Those are your feelings, Dave, that you have used your free
> > will to choose to feel them. Thus, if they are a problem,
> > they are 100% your personal problem. The rest of the world
> > doesn't care what feelings you choose to experience.
>
> Those are *views*, Cecil and they don't pose a problem.

They are views based on unthinking feelings, Dave. That is the
least reliable way to arrive at a rational conclusion. I'm glad
your mob is not large enough to enforce your whims.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1937. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:01:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <18EAF8AD4F6892F8.F649511990A4FFBF.6F428E9C0F2B9076@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24934

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 18:08:04 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Your last sentence is completely absurd. If you need more prison space,
>build it.

Sure, why not.

After all, we ALREADY have the largest percentage of our
population incarcerated of ANY first world nation--including the
former USSR at its peak; and we surpass most third world nations as
well (don't believe it? Take a look at the Department of Justice
statistics at http://www.doj.gov). We certainly DO need new prisons if
we are going to become more of a police state than we already are!

Dave--open your eyes! If we have such a high percentage of our
population in prison doesn't that tell you there's something wrong
with our legal system? Particularly when we ALSO have more violent
crime than any other first world nation as well (same source)?

If "more prisons" are the answer, then we should have the most
peaceful, safest, nation on earth. Until the end of the cold war you
could walk down any street in Moscow safely at night. You can do so
today in Stockholm, the Hague, or Bern. Even major cities such as
Amsterdam, Munich, Madrid, and Copenhagen are vastly safer than the
average US city. CLEARLY we're doing something wrong--and the ONLY
things we're doing differently are:

1. Emphasizing victimless crime instead of violent crime. In
many of those nations prostitution is legal and marijuana is either
legal or no subject to prosecution.

2. Using a punishment model in our prisons instead of a
rehabilitation one (used by virtually all other first world nations).

3. Maintaining a death penalty (none of those nations have
one).

4. Emphasizing laws based on morality instead of rights and
protection from harm.

5. Not responding to the needs of the poor in any realistic
manner.

6. Private ownership of hand guns and no registration of other
firearms.

Take your pic, Dave, one or more of these is the root of our current prison crises. We don't need more prisons--we need an intelligent approach to criminal justice that locks up dangerous people not potheads like more modern countries have.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1938. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:04:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C014ED1.7D84C664@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24936

Dick Carroll wrote:
> And how do you presume that economics can do that when Islam officially
> rejects all that is economic theory in favor of a religious dogma that
> is based on no econonimic theory at all, rather based on hatred of all
> other religious and particularily secular social systems, from which all
> advanced economic theory stems? Yoiu fail to appreciate that they gladly
> kill off their own kind as readily as the opposition, when they can find
> any valid reason. I'm amazed that the women of Islam aren't all Lorena
> Bobbits.

You are such a bullshit artist, Dick. Many Islamic nations are, and have
been, supporters of free market forces. Islam doesn't prohibit free
economies. You have allowed a handful of extremists to get your goat.
You have allowed them to turn you into a person just as evil as they.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1939. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:05:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BB7A02FF28E1A076.1619E8136C7709BA.617006811EC36713@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24935

On Sat, 24 Nov 2001 16:51:55 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>I can't sleep trying to make up dirty phonetics for your callsign.

ROTFLMAO

THAT was great!

By the way, "Nice 2 Eat You" works. Get some sleep!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1940. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:07:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C014F8A.C42F435B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24937

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > *YOU* are the individual who indicated that the majority of Southerners
> > > supported segregation.
> >
> > Yep, that's true based on my personal experiences living and
> > working in the South. I have absolutely no reason to believe
> > otherwise. I have seen no evidence that would change my mind.
> > Do you have any evidence?
>
> Based on my personal experiences living and working in the South, I say
> you're all wet. Do you have any evidence?

I have lots of evidence based on my personal experiences in the
Southern US. What country are you talking about? It's not the US.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

1941. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:12:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0150B4.91C05889@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24938

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I will pray for you as well.

No doubt God will punish me as a result of your prayers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1942. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:14:57 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8C54853EF353DA67.D7055109B9EA471A.BF842BFF9E4B4EBE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24939

On 25 Nov 2001 03:04:15 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> So then, WHY did she choose it? Couldn't be to go with her anatomy,
>could it? And the travesty is that is a sham anyway- oversized saggy
>mammary glands are not attractive and are not an object of attraction,
>so why does she need and want to call attention to them? Evidently she
>needs the reinforcement

I see you're as prejudiced when it comes to women's bodies as
you are when it comes to race, Dickie.

Fortunately not everyone agrees with you--some of us view the
human body as naturally beautiful whether it's a petite size 4 or a
full figured size 24. Judging a woman on her figure is like judging a
man on his bank account--something no respectable person would do.

>(literally). Did she choose it because of some basic innate insecurity
>on her part? Would she be a total unknown without being W5TIT, the
>titty ham? Does that callsign give her an identity that she otherwise
>could never have?

Does demonstrating bigotry, sexism, hate, and a vile,
spiteful, nature in a public forum devoted to ham radio give YOU an
identity that you otherwise could never have?

Dick, you are an insult to the ARS and precisely the kind of
ham that would discourage any respectable person from entering the
hobby. As a parent, if I heard Kim's call on the air or saw it here in
an amateur radio oriented news group I wouldn't be the slightest
offended--I'd chuckle and continue to teach my child about ham radio.
But if I encountered views and statements such as yours in such a
setting, I'd have to come to the conclusion that ham radio was totally
unsuited for my child. So would any concerned parent. I may not
prohibit him from exploring it based on that--but I WOULD cease to
encourage his participation and would encourage him to take up a hobby
where he would be exposed to a better class of people.

>All this matters not, it is simply very poor taste and an albatross on
>the ARS.

Dick YOU are the one in poor taste and an albatross on the
ARS!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1943. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:15:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01515F.3C575DAB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24940

Dick Carroll wrote:
> But who would he pray to? He is his own diety.

Nope, God is within me so I pray to my inner self.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1944. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:20:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0152A1.11F780CD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24941

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If you don't see anything wrong with breaking the law, knock yerself
> out.

If you lived in Louisiana with your wife, would you break the
law prohibiting oral sex between a husband and wife. Are all
laws good laws?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1945. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:24:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C015372.FADA4806@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24942

Dick Carroll wrote:
> No one even mentioned the radio gear itself. It was never
> the problem and we all know that.

Well then, CB radios can't be all bad, can they? Just like
gun users, some individual humans are good and some are bad.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1946. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 20:56:56 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <681C504644C3DE49.94B8E00E697A6DF9.DD96F71F6B4B2BB2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24943

On 25 Nov 2001 02:56:46 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Sure it it. If most hams want the ARS to appear as a family oriented
>service, and wish it to appear that way to younger persons, and when
>they demonstrate ham radio to younger folk, there is Kim W5TIT and her
>(tee hee, big gabonzas, with all the double ententre or sexual innuendo
>accompanying, what is that but harm?

You know, what's interesting Dickie is that you insist you
know what "most hams want."

I think what "most hams want" is an environment where people
communicate showing each other respect and courtesy; where hams don't
jam each other because they don't want to listen to offensive ideas;
where bigotry, racism, sexism, and prejudice are not part of the
conversations; and where hams demonstrate welcome and friendship, not
bitterness, ridicule, or a sense of superiority to new hams.

THAT, not a "family oriented service" is what most of us want,
Dick, at least as far as I can tell from my conversations with other
hams.

Sorry you don't agree--maybe if you'd get your nose out of cw
once in a while and listen to the hams using voice (and, Dick, if you
claim to speak for "most hams" you BETTER listen to--and communicate
with--those of us who prefer voice, because WE represent the majority
of hams, not those who live in the cw sub-bands) you'd have a better
idea of what "most hams" really DO want from the hobby.

> Just because you take no offense over W5TIT doesn't mean that a
>majority of other hams do not. Is your opinion the only one that
>counts???

Is yours?

FAR more hams have posted here that they do NOT take offense
at her sign than have posted that they do. That makes it pretty clear
that most hams DON'T take offense at her sign. Why is YOUR opinion any
more important than ours?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1947. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:03:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011125160352.20950.00000727@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 24944

In article <3C00FB57.92C7A86F@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>CAM wrote:
>>
>> Southern Baptists believe that only
>> some protestants are going to heaven.
>> In particular, they believe that
>> Catholics and Mormons are going to
>> hell.

> Heck, I'm sure most Christians, as well as many Mormons
>and Catholics, believe that more than a few self-proclaimed
>Christians are going to hell too.

I think Cecil means that they believe ALL Catholics and Mormons are going
there, regardless of how they live their lives.

Catholics and Mormons are Christians, btw. All of them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1948. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:17:19 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <39ACD59A1A1A84AC.CA66D9F666246B14.2D38BC483A8BA7DA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24945

On 25 Nov 2001 03:06:47 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>> If I base my concepts of right and wrong on my own moral
>> values, you base yours on your values, Dave does, etc.--so long as we
>> can agree that harm to nonconsenting individuals is considered wrong
>> by all of us, then there is no conflict involved. I may behave in a
>> manner I find moral, you may behave in one you find moral, and neither
>> of us will in any way affect the other.
>
>
> But society sets the guidelines for all of us. There is a range of
>acceptability. Go outside this range, and society will sanction you.

Does that make society right?

German society decided that it was unacceptable to be a Jew, a
Gypsy, or a homosexual. The chose concentration camp internment and
death as a sanction for those "offenses."

You claim that society is the fair source of guidelines. Those
were theirs. Do you accept THEM as valid and acceptable--or do you
feel you would oppose those "guidelines" if they were imposed on you?

You can't have it both ways, Dick. If society DOES have the
legitimacy to set the guidelines for us all (as you claim) then it has
the right to set ANY guidelines for behavior it chooses--whether you
agree with them or not. On the other hand, if you believe that the
individual citizen has the right to step back and say "No--these are
unreasonable guidelines for civilized people to be subjected to--I
will not obey them," then you, yourself, contradict the statement you
made above.

>> What is so difficult for people to accept about that simple
>> concept?
>
> Yeah, why indeed?

I don't know, Dick. I really don't.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1949. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:23:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3C8BA5E9532C8ED5.94C63300D2EB0456.81CCA8B3F3AC6E35@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24946

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 08:17:34 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>For instance, there is an area in Africa where the accepted standards
>of society require a man to teach his daughter about sex by being the
>first to have sex with her. Say Dick, how do you like those standards
>of society?

There's also a substantially sized society in Africa (and
another in South America, btw) in which it is the responsibility of
the brother of the woman to initiate her SON into manhood by having
sex with him.

And there are several societies in which young girls (around
five years of age) have their clitorises cut out and their vaginas
sewed closed (usually by a village woman who uses no anesthetic) in a
rite called female circumcision.

I wonder which of those three societies Dick would have the
greatest contempt for--I know which one (the last) repells me the
most!).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1950. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:31:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C016331.C81B1080@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24947

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> There are lots of former or current CBers in *our* age group, as you
> well know, Cecil. Many of whom, unable to cut the mustard before the big
> dumbdown, are now extra lites. But you already know that.

There's been this trouble before the restructuring. And the FCC has
observed that since restructuring (aka dumbdown) it has NOT gotten
any worse. Oh sure there are newbie type errors, but most of
us general and extra lites quickly learned.

1951. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:32:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F3A34779EE34B337.263252C283FA5214.749E828457839CD2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24948

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 06:22:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>*YOU* are the individual who indicated that the majority of Southerners
>supported segregation. Proving it is only necessary if you want to be
>believed (I think that is the way *you* put it).

The proof you want should be pretty obvious, Dave. The
majority of the residents of those states either voted directly for
laws that created a segregated society or elected representatives they
knew supported and would introduce such laws.

Maybe you can claim that some of the segregation laws were
"left overs" from the post civil-war era. Some were. But what about
laws such as the use of "colored" and "white" drinking fountains,
waiting rooms at bus stations, lunch counters, or sections of a movie
theater--or support for redistricting elections that resulted in
gerrymandering (dividing districts so that all voting districts had a
white majority and no black votes would count)? Those (and many other
laws) were clearly written in the Twentieth Century; those districts
were redivided more than once in the Twentieth Century as the racial
makeup of an area changed racially. It wasn't opposition to
segregation that permitted such laws and gerrymandering, it was
SUPPORT for segregation.

>I'd think a guy like you still has to be quiet about some things in
>order to prevent bodily injury.

Why?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1952. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:34:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7AD158D0421F82C6.77B8176034BED39A.FC6785E72F2A503C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24949

On 25 Nov 2001 15:27:06 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> I think it was totally predictable that Rick would turn out to be a
>hustler, and that is NOT a mobile antenna in this instance.

Leave it to Dick to come up with something that stupid!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1953. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:36:51 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AEFA43858F5D0635.6E876CABD6A9DAB3.60EB7503256A7E60@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24950

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 06:15:36 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Sure you have to, Cecil. What I told you is that I do not intend to
>assist you. If you want to win, you have to work for it. You'll either
>be a *winner* or a guy who has gone to a lot of trouble for nothing.
>I've made no revelation. You're just seeing dirty pictures in ink
>blots.

I'll make it simple, Cecil.

He eats pork products.

Unless he specifically contradicts me and states publicly that
he does NOT eat pork products, you can take it as a given that I'm
relating a fact, and you can count it on your side of the ledger. All
he has to do is deny it, honestly, of course--but standing mute when
evidence of your guilt has been introduced _always_ results in the
presumption of guilt, even in a court of law.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1954. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:39:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A2306BFCD52B4061.DAB6BF4E6CDA2F2C.7FB82F50E7C541AA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24951

On 25 Nov 2001 03:12:40 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> And you are not only a dumbass you're a phony lying dumbass. You have
>not the first clue what you're talking about.

Anyone ever notice that when Dick has nothing he can say in
response to a statement, he turns to insults and obscenities and to
accusing his opponent of being a liar instead of demonstrating
integrity and conceding the point?

Great example of ham radio for young kids to emulate. Sort of
like teaching your children about good government by apprenticing them
to the Taliban.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1955. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:48:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F4D4003CA7855028.17F5828F294EFA59.527D5786B768612A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24952

On 25 Nov 2001 03:17:28 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> If, as a black kid, you see nothing but drug deals, ubiquitous crime
>and hustling, you grow up believing you're supposed to be a drug
>dealing, hustling criminal.

You know, Dick, in a sense you are right--provided, of course, that when you refer to a "black kid" you are referring to one who is growing up in an inner city, not one who is growing up in a middle class neighborhood. Your social environment DOES shape your behavior.

Of course, you aren't asking the next logical questions:

1. Why are there so many drugs in the inner cities in the first place? It's pretty clear that the people living there don't have the resources to import/manufacture drugs--that they have to buy them from other sources then sell them in smaller quantities. Have you thought about what the race of the people selling TO them is?

2. What common factors are present (beside race) in the description you gave above? How about poverty? Don't people turn to crime to support them if they live in poverty far more frequently than if they don't? Don't they turn to drugs such as crack or alcohol for "escape" if poverty has made life intolerable and no escape is available to them? Doesn't lack of good schools and educational opportunities contribute a great deal to the crime in our cities? Is it the fault of the residents that the schools are underfunded while the ones in the suburbs receive more funds than they need?

Dick, you blame race for something that race has no part in at all. Sure there are more black kids experiencing what you describe than white kids--that's because there's considerably more poverty among blacks than whites and it is POVERTY, not race, that leads to those results.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1956. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:50:07 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <jldM7.32$7d.7984@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 24953

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C010F0F.E1A55401@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > So which is it, Dick? Are CBers coming in droves or is 5wpm keeping
> > > them out. Methinketh thou talketh with a forked tongue. You cannot
> > > have it both ways.
> >
> > Having yet another period of convoluted thought? Or do you really
> > believe the CW test is here to stay?
>
> I'll answer your question if you will answer mine above. It wouldn't
> surprise me in the least for the US Morse code test to outlive the
> repeal of S25.5.
> --
I'll add my two cents here...

I see no real *need* for the CW test for the licenses even though I had to take it at all levels.
I do think it's a good idea to know the code, but that is a bit different than needing it.
I would like to see the speed for the Extra put back to 20 WPM as the extra is not much more than a "prestige" license. You gain almost nothing by getting it except saying you made it, so why not keep the speed in there too.

As far as the quality of people coming into the service as well as those already here, it matters not what license grade, they all have their problem children (reguardless of age or education)

Although there is a stigma associated with CB and in particular "free banders", the former are mostly straight forward folks. Freebanders are by their very nature, outlaws. They are operating illegally which indicated their ability to follow regulations and their opinion of following regulations only when it suits them.

OTOH, Amateur radio is a technical service (hobby to some) and getting people to follow technical subjects is an up hill battle. A "steep" up hill battle.

It's not just Amateur Radio, but technical subjects in college as well. Students would, in general, much rather go into the liberal arts than science. Enrolments are much higher in Liberal Arts than in the Sciences. The Sciences are thought of as being difficult, and being a "techie" has a stigma attached. Sooo...many do not want to be thought of as techies and

would also follow the much easier course with a Libera Arts Education.

Albeit, I do not say *all* liberal arts subjects are easy. It's just that the ones I was exposed to were far easier than the three terms of Calc I had to take (have math and art minors) Well, except music...I had an A in those courses too, but music theory...forget it.

Making it easier to get the ticket, or shifting the emphasis from tech plus rules and regs with CW to mainly tech whch does not make it any easier over all is not enough. IF we want more hams there has to be something to entice the newcomers into the service. Something we can offer not found easier elsewhere.

What would bring in more new people to a mainly tech hobby? I have no idea.

I really think that instead of devoting energy to the sometimes emotional debate for code Vs no code we should be debating how to bring in more quality people in the face of the general population having less and less interest in technical subjects.

--
Roger Halstead (K8RI)
WWW.RogerHalstead.com
N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1957. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:51:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <5686F89F8B662A88.45B51962E1B18E0A.A24D5525BF291BF7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24954

On 25 Nov 2001 07:27:49 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> There you go, lying out your ass again. Read the Koran and see what
>they are taught.

I've read it, Dick. And I say you are totally wrong in your
statements.

Have YOU read it--or only read ABOUT it? If you claim to have
read it, then by all means provide me citations of the statements that
back your claims so I can read them in context in the copy of the
Koran sitting five feet from me right now.

Put up or shut up, Dick. You claim to have read it--prove it.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1958. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:55:03 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <26F2F370B10910FE.317A86D5714B884C.688A0FCADB6A311F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24955

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 12:43:37 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>National Review? Bwahhhahahaha, my acceptance of that as anything but
>conservative rhetoric would be about as probable that I am going to begin
>listening to Limbaugh with any regularity.

Pity poor Dickie, Kim.

That magazine HAS to be the "bible" of his beliefs--and
several years ago it came out in no uncertain terms for the
legalization of drugs!

He must have had a heart attack over THAT issue--led off by no
less a conservative voice than William F. Buckley!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1959. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 21:58:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C016997.2E81D22F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24956

>
> Like the terrorists, Dick is determined to stir up trouble. He,
> like the terrorists, would like to revive The Crusades. That is,
> of course, as long as he doesn't have to do the fighting.

Reminds me of the spin my Catholic grammar school history
books put on the Crusades. They talked about that the
purpose was to liberate the Holy land from "someone".
Who that someone was was glossed over. And they
also glossed over the results.

And stuff like "Crusader Rabbit", though just a cartoon
show, implied that it was a Good Thing.

Just recently the Catholic church did own up to
the Crusades being a bad idea.

1960. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:11:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6FB4988D02AA8A34.1758C3159B5DA31E.C589A145F75B286C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24957

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 06:19:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> Actually, a book was written about guys like Dave,
>> "The Ugly American".
>
>It is quite obvious that you either did not read it or (more likely)
>that you don't remember Lederer's tome.

That's true, Dave.

The central character had FAR more concern for the culture he
was interacting with, and was far more open minded, than yourself.

Cecil should have known better.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1961. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:14:17 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C016D39.D8D4A14E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24958

>
>
> You don't see gay men as the equivalent of women but you see
> lesbians as the equivalent of men?

I always wondered that, if I said that I was a male lesbian, that
would mean that I'm a heterosexual man. Because lesbians
like women, and the same is true of hetrosexual men, they also
like women.

:-)

Man with hole in pocket feel cocky.

1962. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:27:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C01705A.C671A4F5@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24959

Phil Kane wrote:

>
>
> Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.
>
> (b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
> other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
> a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
> installation......

What is or was the purpose of this rule? Is it to prevent other
non ham radio operators from getting on a ham band by
mistake?

1963. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:36:21 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4B51A0DAD182D2CF.ABB1AEA7AF65AEBF.CE269D6E9AD3D21D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24960

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 06:29:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Do you carry a national ID card?

Sure--I have a social security card. My son, as required by
law, has a drift card. I am required to show picture identification to
board an aircraft in the United States and, based on the laws that
have been passed and will take effect in January, I will soon be
required to show such identification to board ANY form of
transportation that crosses a state line. That the card is issued by
the State instead by the federal government is irrelevant--in many
nations id cards are issued by their provinces not the national
government.

Incidently, in the Netherlands you are NOT required to carry a
national ID card--you are ISSUED one, but it is the equivalent of a
combination of our social security cards and a medical insurance id
card--such as a Blue Cross card in the US.

>> Since your statement not only goes against experience, but
>> goes against the recently released UN study of freedom in member
>> nations (which listed the Netherlands as the freest nation on earth,
>> followed by Denmark, etc.), it would seem that you need to offer more
>> than a simply statement of opinion to support your claim.
>
>The UN? 'nuff said.

Can't stand anything that comes from an impartial source, or
just afraid of Black Helicopter?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1964. Re: Aero Mobile -- The Best Way (Was: Aeronautical Mobile...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:36:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C01727B.7C2E3140@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24961

Jim Weir wrote:

> In my airplane there is a 2-meter rig connected to the power bus by it's own
> breaker, but it is also connected to the airplane audio system through the
> aircraft's audio panel, and hence to the aircraft headphone and microphone
> circuits, thus "connected" to the aircraft system.
>
> In my NSHO, this is the safest way to incorporate a ham rig in an airplane. The
> reasons are not important. My professional opinion is.
>
> The aircraft number is N73CQ. The ham call is WX6RST. Come nail my ass to the
> grass for a violation if you wish.

But that is a seperate rig. Think that would meet the rule Phil is
talking about. What I'd like to know is the *reason* for that
rule, not just that it's the rules and obey or else. Actually if
I understand the reason behind a rule, I'll probably would
more likely obey that rule. Like I know why you're not supposed
to drunk drive....

1965. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:40:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <53DBEC038D54B145.105008A147A893A2.91FFABC950ED1A74@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24962

On 25 Nov 2001 06:57:40 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Cecil:
>
>*All* of my attempts at not sinning are feeble, compared to what they
>should be. I am a sinner, of that there is no doubt. Perhaps you would
>pray for me?
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Better not, Cecil.

You might get what you pray for--and what on Earth would you
do with Larry Roll?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1966. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:41:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0009E5E7A8F8E94F.50BD387849A6D2C0.46F2AD1D6EF51AB5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24963

On 25 Nov 2001 02:50:48 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Oooops, sorry. I'm sure it's inconvenient for you, since it makes me appear
>to be just as human as anyone else! I'll keep that in mind!

Thanks. I'd hate to be the one to make that mistake in
identity!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1967. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:44:18 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <6veM7.128924$WW.8082339@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24964

>> Krell wrote:
>> Wasn't there a prophet that negated kosher laws for Christians? I seem to
>> remember that Isaiah, Daniel, or some other prophet had a dream in which god
>> told him to eat what was before him. It was a feast of snakes, frogs, pigs,
>> lizards and everything that was "unclean." God told the guy, "If I say it's
>> OK, then it's OK."

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3BFDCD9B.E0F65F@IEEE.org...
>
> I don't recall that prophet. Since Yahweh, Jehovah, and Allah are all the
> same God, why don't the Jews and Muslims eat pork? Did Jesus eat pork?
> I doubt it very seriously. He didn't want to risk trichinosis.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

The Lord guided my hand and eye to the Book of Acts
where it is written in the Eleventh Chapter that the
Apostle Peter falls into a trance while praying in
Joppa and is presented with a vision of " fourfooted
beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping
things, and fowls of the air". A voice tells him
to "arise...slay and eat". He protests that he has
has never allowed anything unclean to enter his mouth.
The voice answers him saying: "What God hath cleansed,
that call not thou common."

This is part of a story Peter is telling to the good
Christian Jews of Jerusalem justifying his associating
with (and eating with) the "unclean" gentiles of Joppa.
The point of the story is that not only does God have
no "unclean" animals, He also has no "unclean" peoples
and that everyone is to be welcomed into God's fellowship.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

1968. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:44:36 UTC
From: BH <radioguyx@texxas.net>
Message-ID: <3C00BBEC.79281B6@texxas.net>
Source record: 24965

I think the rule applies to amateur (non-type accepted) equipment
and not the installed comms on board the aircraft or ship. The
installed comms can be operated on the ham bands by a qualified
operator, but if amateur equipment is installed, it must be
according to the rule below.

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > Sec. 97.11 Stations aboard ships or aircraft.
> > >
> > > (b) The station must be separate from and independent of all
> > > other radio apparatus installed on the ship or aircraft, except
> > > a common antenna may be shared with a voluntary ship radio
> > > installation......
>
> What is or was the purpose of this rule? Is it to prevent other
> non ham radio operators from getting on a ham band by
> mistake?

1969. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 22:45:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <732A215917B75E22.3A6C6ED9E04EE295.A2B04360C79724DF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24966

On 25 Nov 2001 18:28:20 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>The only way I see gay men and lesbians is as unfortunate, confused
>people who need our prayers, and also need to be kept away from our
>children. A simple examination of human male/female anatomy will
>show that same-sex relationships are not what the Creator intended.
>The fact that this confusion is widespread does not make it normal.

Gee, Larry, if that's the case I wonder why homosexual
behavior is so common in the animal kingdom. I always thought animal
behavior was, by definition, "normal."

BTW, over 96% of ALL child molestation is performed by
heterosexuals (according to the Department of Justice statistics
available at http://www.doj.gov), despite the fact that between 7% and
10% of our population is homosexual. It would seem that your
insistence that we keep homosexuals away from our children would only
result in increased levels of child sexual abuse--is that what you
hope for?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1970. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 23:05:07 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E1FD64A2A03FD06C.84073B2D92AE729F.9EEFA0EB998C0BAB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24967

On 25 Nov 2001 06:57:37 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I don't think that the ham bands are an appropriate venue for the
>full and unfettered expression of one's First Amendment "rights" to
>express negative commentary about other people. I think such
>speech is, in fact, protected by the Constitution, and must be
>"tolerated," but the proper venue would be here on Usenet; the ham
>radio bands are not.

Larry, I've been active on the Usenet since it began--and on
the bbs systems (some of which I wrote) before that.

Why is it that something that is inappropriate on ham radio is
appropriate here? Either both are suitable venues for racism or
neither is. If you limited your statement to "Newsgroups specifically
created to discuss racial and ethnic issues and prejudices" I might
agree (but even then, if it's "ok" on the Internet why isn't it
equally "ok" to have such discussions on the air as a part of special
interest nets--the ham equivalent of Usenet news groups?), but you
don't. Instead, you seem to feel that the people on ham radio have to
be "sheltered" from speech that is acceptable in this medium (with a
very similar audience) instead. Why?

>I believe in the statement, "We live in a democracy, but we do not
>work in one." Just as an employer has the right to limit the speech
>of employees, in order to prevent embarrassment to the company,
>the ham bands must be kept strictly "G" rated, in order to reinforce
>the family-oriented nature thereof. Such subtle excursions from this
>concept as selecting demeaning callsigns with sexual innuendo,
>are an example of something that good hams should not do, for
>the good of the service.

Bad analogy, Larry.

A work place is NOT a public place governed by Constitutional
protections. It is private property, and the owner/manager of that
property has the right to set any limits he or she chooses on how the
employees can use their time on those premises. The ham bands, on the
other hand, are NOT private property, but instead are regulated by the
government, and thus MUST be subject to all Constitutional
protections.

More important, however, is your argument that the bands must
be kept "G" rated. Sorry, Larry, but I disagree if that means that all
conversations must be at a level and on a topic understandable by or

suitable to children. If I choose to talk with an adult, I don't expect to have my choice of subject matter dictated by Walt Disney. There are important issues that are NOT suitable for discussion with children--racism and prejudice among them--and there is absolutely no reason such discussions should not take place on the ham bands.

>>and that the actions of bigots both here and on the air damage
>>our image and reduce interest in our hobby by prospective hams--
>
>"Here" is not "on the air," and that is an important distinction.

No, Larry, it is NOT an important distinction. Either:

1. Discussions here ARE related to the ARS and thus should reflect the same values as on-the-air discussions or;

2. Discussions here are NOT related to the ARS, and thus you should respect the people who choose the Internet as their communications hobby instead of ham radio and treat THEIR space with the same respect you expect the ham bands to receive.

Take your pick--in either case, your lack of consistency between an "on the air" personality and the one you display here is completely unreasonable.

> I
>definitely do not behave on-the-air as I do in this newsgroup.

Then you have no respect for those whose primary interests are in the Internet rather than ham radio.

>This
>newsgroup is not ham radio. It is *about* ham radio, but the two
>are not the same, and what hams say here can contain a bit more
>of an "edge" than the can on-the-air without harming the positive
>image of the service -- as long the hams in question understand
>the difference, and are aware of where they are at the time.

Harming it in whose eyes, Larry?

On the air, the only people who will hear what is said are, for the most part, other hams. Here MANY potential hams are reading these messages--and are forming an impression of ham radio from their content.

Which do YOU think has the greatest negative impact on increasing the number of new hams?

> I know
>that you, among others, probably do not approve of some of the
>things I say here, in this newsgroup. However, I understand the
>difference between this and ham radio; and I'm sure you'd find my
>on-the-air behavior totally different -- if not boring.

Perhaps because you're more willing to show respect for others
in a medium where you have a large investment in equipment and time
than you are in one where you have no chance of being cited for your
behavior or losing your license?

>Having said all this -- I doubt that much can be done about the
>bigoted, racist, sexist, etc. commentary which pollutes the HF
>phone bands, as long as the hams dishing it out are otherwise
>operating legally within the limits of their license privileges. It is
>a fortunate coincidence that the worst offenders along these
>lines also tend to be prone to exceeding their privileges, and are
>thus eligible for enforcement action. Unfortunately, we can't
>"enforce" the content of speech in any more meaningful way than
>to set a good example. Even more unfortunately, those who
>engage in hate speech on-the-air aren't likely to be positively
>affected by good examples, so all that is left is to avoid and ignore.
>My transceiver has one of those big round things on the front
>of it, and I'm not afraid to use it!

Then perhaps you should do so when you hear the call "W5TIT"
instead of complaining that it is destroying ham radio.

>Uh oh -- now Kim's gonna think I'm talking about her again!
>I only said "one" Kim! Never mind -- she'll work her way into this
>somehow -- she usually does!

Well since you mentioned her directly . . .

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1971. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 23:08:00 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9trti202s0q@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24969

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tr5lj$2vs$1@208.206.142.68...
> > So have you changed your mind and now don't see anything wrong with
> > me smoking marijuana in the privacy of my own home?
>
>
> If you don't see anything wrong with breaking the law, knock yerself
> out. Maybe you'll eventually get busted and clash with Society after
> all. Hey, you gotta buy that stuff somewhere. The most available
> salesmen are undercover cops.

This hasn't anything to do with breaking the law. It has to do with whether laws against (certain) drugs are just. Would your opinion be different if marijuana were legal?

1972. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 23:16:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <010671EF27DE9960.84BF843FD2DEAEAF.5A6D078F98DC5D15@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 24968

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 17:14:17 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>I always wondered that, if I said that I was a male lesbian, that
>would mean that I'm a heterosexual man. Because lesbians
>like women, and the same is true of hetrosexual men, they also
>like women.
>
>:-)
>
>Man with hole in pocket feel cocky.

Not if man lesbian. Lesbian not have cocky.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1973. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 23:19:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tru7m02tph@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24970

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:ZMbM7.128747$WW.8060759@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> If 58 years on the planet has taught me one thing it is that the ladies
are
> far more pre-occupied with 'them' than we are.
>
> I recall wandering in to the late show at a local theatre at about the age
> of 17 or so into one of these floppy boob movies; was interesting for
about
> 3.5 minutes at most. Incidentally the last X flick I went to was in Salt
> Lake City.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK

With the strict control the LDS has over that state, it's surprising that
any such theatres exist at all.

1974. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 23:30:01 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9trurb02ur7@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 24971

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C016997.2E81D22F@ix.netcom.com...
> Just recently the Catholic church did own up to
> the Crusades being a bad idea.

Is this the official church position? I heard some scholars say that if the crusades hadn't taken place, Europe today would be predominately Muslim.

1975. Re: Dropping the code, or is it something more?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-25 23:52:26 UTC
From: Bob - KE4JCD <ke4jcd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <_ufM7.120444$Yb.30136751@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>
Source record: 24972

Finally someone talking sense and without all the CB humor like Cam and Dick seen to do so well. Now that I got that out of my system, lets get down to business...

I till you why me, my wife and my two friends joined Amateur Radio. We joined to get away form CBers and all the DX, Noise, jammers, ect. When we did, We meet with very rude comments like lazy, go back to the CB, because we had no uses for HF. We loved the VHF and UHF bands, you can really talk local without running AMPS to talk over the DX. It was heavenly, but they keep it up and soon Tim KE4VBR quit, then me and my wife quit, now only John KE4UNO remains on HAM Bands, but he to is getting fed up with the DX Patrol. Now ME, My Wife and Tim, all moved to GMRS, as their is a very fine local GMRS Repeater here in town ran by a local HAM WB4ONX who dose like HF and has a very fine station...

Now about JAMMERS which were taking control of our local repeaters, please refer to my website on jammers
http://www.hartungpress.com/hamradio/crummyhams.htm

Code is not the problem, its the way people act! Right Cam and Dick? You should be happy that people like me, my wife and others join just to use just VHF and UHF. Plus the others who take their time and go all the way. I found this to be true in most places, and these people are running people off! I talked a friend and her husband in to HAM radio and giving up their cellphone. Soon the MUST HAVE DX OR YOU'LL DIE Patrol got to them too and they both QUIT and still hate me for wasting their time..

Now there is another problem, the internet. I mean you can talk, e-mail, find vast amounts of information without CODE, License, The DX Patrol, jammers who can be block and can't hear anymore. Soon, wireless internet, something I have via my cellphone and laptop computer. I can talk to my family via I-Phone, Yahoo Chat, ICQ and a number of other ways. You need no ANT. Farm, High Priced HF Rigs, tuner Boxes, Ect. Just a low priced computer and a phone line and your all set. Then if your like ME, DSL or Cable Modems for High-speed access, How can you compete with that, Simple quit trying to push HF on people who can careless about it. Then Hope that soon, they take a bit if that's what they want. Going on to HF, what I call the NOISE BAND. Like to old out of date AM Radio band, Me I like FM Radio both for music and to talk.

Now I could go on, but I think you get what I'm saying. Now your turn, do agree or not?

Bob - KE4JCD
http://www.ke4jcd.org

Hartung Press
http://www.hartungpress.com

"Roger Halstead" <rdhalste@tm.net> wrote in message
news:jIdM7.32$7d.7984@newshog.newsread.com...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C010F0F.E1A55401@IEEE.org...
> I'll add my two cents here...
>
> I see no real *need* for the CW test for the licenses even though I had to
take it at all levels.
> I do think it's a good idea to know the code, but that is a bit different
than needing it.
> I would like to see the speed for the Extra put back to 20 WPM as the
extra
> is not much more than a "prestige" license. You gain almost nothing by
> getting it except saying you made it, so why not keep the speed in there
too.
>
> As far as the quality of people coming into the service as well as those
> already here, it matters not what license grade, they all have their
problem
> children (reguardless of age or education)
>
> Although there is a stigma associated with CB and in particular "free
> banders", the former are mostly straight forward folks. Freebanders are
by
> their very nature, outlaws. They are operating illegally which indicated
> their ability to follow regulations and their opinion of following
> regulations only when it suits them.
>
> OTOH, Amateur radio is a technical service (hobby to some) and getting
> people to follow technical subjects is an up hill battle. A "steep" up
hill battle.
>
> It's not just Amateur Radio, but technical subjects in college as well.
> Students would, in general, much rather go into the liberal arts than
> science. Enrolments are much higher in Liberal Arts than in the Sciences.
> The Sciences are thought of as being difficult, and being a "techie" has a
> stigma attached. Sooo...many do not want to be thought of as techies and
> would also follow the much easier course with a Libera Arts Education.
>
> Albeit, I do not say *all* liberal arts subjects are easy. It's just that
> the ones I was exposed to were far easier than the three terms of Calc I
had
> to take (have math and art minors) Well, except music...I had an A in
those
> courses too, but music theory...forget it.
>

> Making it easier to get the ticket, or shifting the emphasis from tech
plus
> rules and regs with CW to mainly tech whch does not make it any easier
over
> all is not enough. IF we want more hams there has to be something to
entice
> the newcomers into the service. Something we can offer not found easier
> elsewhere.
>
> What would bring in more new people to a mainly tech hobby? I have no
idea.
>
> I really think that instead of devoting energy to the sometimes emotional
> debate for code Vs no code we should be debating how to bring in more
> quality people in the face of the general population having less and less
> interest in technical subjects.
>
>
> --
> Roger Halstead (K8RI)
> WWW.RogerHalstead.com
> N833R, World's Oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
>

1976. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 00:04:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011125190400.27432.00001644@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 24973

>Subject: Hollingsworth
>From: Leland KC8LD0 Leland_member@newsguy.com
>Date: 11/25/2001 8:16 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9tqufm01c23@drn.newsguy.com>

>
>I wonder what I could get for it on e-bay ?

Spanked?

Steve, K4YZ

1977. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 00:08:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011125190804.27432.00001645@mb-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 24974

>Subject: Re: Dropping the code.
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 11/25/2001 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C010FE7.B6BD9DDD@IEEE.org>

>Intel contributed about 100 nocode techs with
>engineering degrees to the ARS. I assume other similar
>compainies did the same thing.

You know what happens when you "assume", Cecil.

Considering that Intel is but one of hundreds of techno-tanks, if all the others created the similar numbers (percentage wise, anyway) of new Hams, we WOULD have had the "digital paradise" otherwise alluded to.

In as much as it hasn't happened in the last 11 years, I dare say it's not going to in the near term future either.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1978. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 00:26:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C018C47.45594BFB@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 24975

>
> > > >There is nothing 'evil' or illegal about the call sign, just show
> > > >a lack of class and taste...the trailer park mentality.

I found a nice picture of a pair of tits (birds, for those of
you with dirty minds) I made into a QSL card for Kim
(in case she doesn't have some already). Look in
alt.binaries.pictures.radio

Think it has taste and class....

1979. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 00:49:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts3jj$4qa$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24976

Try chapter 5 verse 33.

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 25 Nov 2001 07:27:49 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > There you go, lying out your ass again. Read the Koran and see what
> >they are taught.
>
> I've read it, Dick. And I say you are totally wrong in your
> statements.
>
> Have YOU read it--or only read ABOUT it? If you claim to have
> read it, then by all means provide me citations of the statements that
> back your claims so I can read them in context in the copy of the
> Koran sitting five feet from me right now.
>
> Put up or shut up, Dick. You claim to have read it--prove it.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

1980. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 00:53:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts3qn$4qa$1@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24977

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Those are your feelings, Dave, that you have used your free
> > > will to choose to feel them. Thus, if they are a problem,
> > > they are 100% your personal problem. The rest of the world
> > > doesn't care what feelings you choose to experience.
> >
> > That's been your story and you're still sticking to it, but it is no
> > less wrong.
>
> Dick, you are not going to reach adult maturity until you take
> responsibility for your own feelings. Children don't understand
> such but they gain understanding as they mature. You never did.
>
> > When a large percentage of society views it as wrong, it is a moral
> > issue and thus a part of the mores of that society.
>
> Aha, the old argumentum ad populum diversion. Can't you do any
> better than a diversion, Dick?

So now you yet again attempt a diversion by accusing others of creating
a diversion? Where have we seen this from you before???

I'll repoeat, when a large percentage of society views it as wrong it
is a moral issue and thus a part of the mores of that society. Basic
psychology, not advanced.

1981. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 01:04:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011125200413.24612.00000992@nso-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 24978

In article <9598F1FAEAF3CEAA.1E1CB1ECEF5BBD15.25A160AD88E7F86E@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 24 Nov 2001 13:04:00 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>You do exactly the same thing, Rick.
>
> Of course I do--everyone does. That's the entire point.

So your concepts of right and wrong are no more based on "logic" than anyone
else's. OK
>
> If I base my concepts of right and wrong on my own moral
>values, you base yours on your values, Dave does, etc.--so long as we
>can agree that harm to nonconsenting individuals is considered wrong
>by all of us, then there is no conflict involved.

Agreed.

>I may behave in a
>manner I find moral, you may behave in one you find moral, and neither
>of us will in any way affect the other.

That's the easy part. It's self-evident.

> What is so difficult for people to accept about that simple
>concept?

The problem is, who gets to define "harm"? You might say that a particular
action of yours causes no harm, and others may disagree. The devil is in the
details.
>>
>>How do you KNOW there are no absolute values for right and wrong? Besides,
>>making that statement is an absolute!
>
> But not an absolute value of right and wrong.

Yes. it is.

>I never said there were no absolutes in life!

OK
>
> How do I know there are no absolute values for right or wrong?
>A couple ways:
>
> 1. There has never been universal agreement among ALL sane and

>intelligent people (I'll leave the mentally ill and intellectually
>challenged out of the definition, since their perceptions would by
>necessity inaccurately influence their decisions) as to ANY universals
>that were right and wrong.

So? Just because a thing has not yet been discoverd does not mean it does not exist. Go back around 200 years, and your argument could be applied to electronic communications (nobody has ever done it, so it must not exist). There is almost universal acceptance of relativistic physics today, yet a little over 100 years ago nobody had ever thought of it. Yet it existed.

>If absolutes existed, there would
>necessarily be agreement as to their existence.

Nope. Not at all. A thing exists whether its existence is acknowledged or not. Did electromagnetic waves exist before there was agreement on their existence?

>Yet for ANY "right" or
>"wrong" you can list, I can identify at least one (or more) culture
>that feels the opposite.
>
So? The fact that some culture(s) don't agree to them does not mean moral absolutes do not exist.

> 2. There is no commonly accepted source for such absolutes to
>have been decided. Some people believe right and wrong are defined by
>a "god," others by culture, still others by the individual. Unless
>one, invariant, and demonstrably infallible source of such absolutes
>can be shown to exist (not on a basis of belief--as in a diety--but in
>a scientifically verifiable sense), no such absolutes can be
>reasonably be considered TO exist.

Wrong again, Rick. Do the laws of physics exist? Yes. Is there universal acceptance of their source or origin? Nope. Yet they exist anyway.
>
> Why is it so difficult for people to accept that concepts of
>right and wrong are relative, instead of absolute?

The fact that you have not proved your contentions, for one.

> We don't live in a
>static, unchanging, world--we live in a dynamic, evolving, one.

Yup. Which means that we are learning more and more about the moral absolutes. Just as Newtonian physics was shown to be inadequate for some phenomena, old moral systems have been shown to need renewal. Doesn't mean moral absolutes don;t exist, just that they haven't been completely identified yet.
>
> What
>is "right" today may well be "wrong" tomorrow.

Only because we have misdefined "right" in the first case. For example, slavery was once considered "right", yet it was always "wrong".

>Some examples:
>
> 1. I would hope we all agree that killing another adult human
>being who does not wish to die and did not commit a capital crime is
>"wrong."

Why do you limit it to adults? Is it OK to kill children??

>But if that is the case, doesn't that make war (in which
>conscripts and civilians are routinely killed--as is happening now in
>Afghanistan) wrong and those who wage war evil by definition?

Nope. It all depends on the intent. Killing those who are trying to kill you is self-defense.

What is absolutely wrong is to START a war. Like Germany did in WW2. First they used the threat of force to get Austria and some other territories, then they used force itself on Poland.

> If not,
>then killing is NOT an absolute "wrong."

Yup. Murder is an absolute wrong, though.

>If so, then everyone in this
>group who ever served in uniform (as I did as well) was "wrong" as
>his/her role could have reasonably been expected to result in the
>killing of others.

Incorrect, as shown above.
>
> 2. In most early cultures (including the Egyptian and Roman
>cultures), prostitution was considered an act of spirituality--many
>temples had prostitutes who contributed their fees to the temple
>itself. Today, the churches define prostitution as "wrong" and
>immoral. Which is it? Depends a LOT on your perspective--and thus the
>concept of an "absolute" wrong doesn't apply here either.

Nope. Not the same thing at all.

The prostitution of ancient pagan cultures bears no real resemblance to the modern version. Your example is so flawed as to be useless.

> Many examples could be used just as easily. The important fact
>is, there are NO universals concerning right and wrong (the closest is
>an almost--but not complete--taboo on incest throughout cultures, but
>of course each culture defines what incest IS in a different manner;
>what an American would consider incest may not be considered such in,
>for example, Borneo, and what a Sudanese would consider incest
>wouldn't be considered incest here in the USA).

What you are avoiding is the reasons these things are considered "wrong". For example, on reason incest is not a good idea is the high incidence of genetic defects resulting from such unions.

> But lacking
>universals, we likewise lack absolutes.

Nope.
>
> The closest we can come to an absolute value is to limit our
>"Universals" to a statement that any act which harms the person or
>property of a non-consenting (and, in the case of criminal punishment
>or war, inappropriately targeted) individual is "wrong" from any
>reasonable perspective.

Yup. But ya gotta define "harm". You keep avoiding that little detail.

>Thus, if I commit murder, rape, theft, or
>expose myself to children at a bus stop for that matter, it can
>clearly be seen that harm HAS been inflicted directly on
>non-consenting individuals, and thus by any reasonable definition the
>act was "wrong."

Maybe. Suppose I committed theft of medical supplies from a closed store to
save a life at an accident scene. Was that act "wrong"?
>
> On the other hand, if instead of acting in the manner above, I
>choose to attend a nude beach, smoke a joint, or attend a swing party
>for that matter, it is equally clear that no non-consenting person is
>in any way involved in the action, and thus no harm has occurred.

No, it's not clear at all. At least not in the second and third examples. The
nude beach I'm not sure of.

You are "presuming the conclusion" that no harm was done.

>Given such a circumstance, the ONLY valid judge of whether or not my
>action was "wrong" is myself--and that decision can only be based on
>my personal interpretation of morality, not on one being imposed on me
>by others.

IF you can show that no harm was done to others, yes. But you have to show that
first. You simply presume it.
>
> Why is that concept so difficult for people to understand and
>accept? It allows EVERYONE the right to engage in any activity that
>does not harm others, and forbids anyone from engaging in any activity
>that DOES harm others. Sounds pretty logical to me.

The problem is that actions you consider harmless are not considered harmless
by others. For example, if a "swing party" results in the transmission of
venereal disease(s) or unwanted pregnancies, it isn't harmless to others at
all.
>
>>> Why is that so difficult to understand? If my actions harm
>>>you, it is clear (by recourse to logic) that a "wrong" has occurred.
>>
>>Yup. But who gets to decide whether "harm" has occurred? The person who did

>>the action? The person who is supposedly harmed? Some neutral third party?
>>What criteria determines "harm"? That is all "personal value" stuff.
>
> You mean moral values are NOT "personal" but the definition of
>"harm" is?

I mean BOTH have to be generally agreed upon.
>
> That's absurd!

What is absurd is for me to accept that an action is harmless just because you
say it is.
>
> It's pretty easy to tell if someone has been harmed. All
>that's necessary is to learn if they were directly involved in the
>activity concerned, and if so if they gave their informed consent for
>the activity TO occur. If--and only if--they were involved and did not
>consent to the activity can we define the experience as having harmed
>them.

Nope. Incorrect.
>
> For example, if I choose to attend a nude beach, it clearly
>cannot cause you harm. If you are not at that beach, you _can_ not be
>harmed in any manner by my attendance and if you ARE at the nude
>beach, you have given an implied consent for others to be nude in your
>presence--if you are offended by seeing nude people yet choose to go
>to a nude beach, you really don't have any grounds for complaint if
>people ignore your claim to be offended.

As I said above, I'm not sure about the nude beach.
>
> On the other hand, if instead of a clearly designated nude
>beach, I choose to wander through your yard nude, then you DO have a
>legitimate grounds to claim harm. Because I will have invaded your
>privacy and reduced your enjoyment of your yard, by necessity my
>action harmed you and you have valid grounds for a complaint.

That part I agree on.
>
> Is that really so difficult to understand? It simply states
>the same thing as the old cliche: "Your right to swing your arm ends
>at the tip of my nose."
>
So it's OK to swing one's fist but stop a fraction of an inch from another
person's nose? I disagree! Such action is a threat.

>>There's no claim at all - that's obvious. But again the question is: who
>gets
>>to decide whether harm has occurred?
>
> Use the criteria above to determine harm. Anyone could then

>recognize whether it occurred or not.

Apply it to the smoke a joint or swing party ideas, then see what happens.
>
>>>It can't be your values, you aren't
>>>involved in the action and thus aren't in a position to judge its
>>>"rightness."
>>
>>Does this mean that the "victim" has no say about whether harm has occurred?
>
> No--it means that the non-victim (the person who is not
>involved in the action--as stated above) has no voice in the matter.

An action may involve more people than you realize.
>
>>> It can't be society's values, for the same reason. That
>>>leaves ONLY myself and others involved in the action.
>>
>>So only the persons committing an action get to decide whether harm has
>>occurred? I don't think you mean that!
>
> I don't think I _said_ that either!

You discount society's values, so the only people left are those committing the
action.
>
> I said that only the persons INVOLVED in an action have a
>voice, not that only the persons PERFORMING an action do. If, for
>example, I hold you up at gun point, we are BOTH involved in the
>action.

Yep.

> But if I place a bet on a horse race, unless you are present
>and a part of the action, you are NOT involved, and therefore have no
>voice in deciding whether my action (in which you can't legitimately
>identify a victim who was harmed) was right or wrong in any absolute
>sense.

Nope. Your placing a bet on a horse race affects me even if I am not there. Not
in a big way, but there is an effect.
>
>>> Just as I'm not "in charge" of deciding that your views are
>>>narrow-minded,

They are not.

>>> you are not "in charge" of deciding that Kim's (or mine
>>>for that matter) are "immoral" or "tasteless."
>>
Yes, I am. I say callsigns like that are inappropriate, that's all. My opinion
only.

>>Who gets to decide if a particular callsign causes harm or not?
>
> The FCC. They set the standards for issuing call signs.

So they are infallible in that decision? I don't think so. By that logic, govt. agencies define right and wrong because they determine whether or not harm has occurred.

Note that the FCC will not issue a call like Kim's unless asked. That means they recognize it is somehow different from other calls.
>
>>You're avoiding the central questions, Rick: Who decides whether harm has
>>occurred? Who decides whether the harm is great enough to require some sort
>of
>>action to remedy the situation?
>
> Answered above.

Avoided above.
>
>>Here's an example: Suppose A lets his property become a real mess. Grass
>isn't
>>cut, paint is peeling, junk in the yard, etc. Nothing that is a clear health
>or
>>safety hazard but the place looks awful. B, who lives right next door, wants
>to
>>sell his house and move away because B doesn't like living next to such a
>dump.
>>But B cannot find a buyer because of the condition of A's place. Has A
>harmed
>>B? Who gets to decide? If the decision is yes, how much harm has occurred
>and
>>what is the remedy?
>
> It is clear that A has harmed B.

Agreed.

>Through his direct and
>deliberate violation of reasonably expected standards in a residential
>community he has caused B to suffer an economic loss.

"Reasonably expected standards" simply means society's values. In a different residential community, A's actions might have no effect at all.

So what we have is SOCIETY deciding what the values are. Not the individuals involved!

>B, in any such
>circumstances, could sell his house--however he would be forced to
>accept a price below that which he would have realized had the
>neighboring home not reduced his property value.

In some markets, a house next to such a property becomes unsellable. This is how blighted areas are created from nice neighborhoods.

>Thus, the amount of
>the loss (the harm suffered by B) is the amount of reduction in price
>between a fair market value, given expected neighborhood values, and
>the actual realized offering price.

Plus consideration for B's time and aggravation in having to deal with it, legal fees, excess RE taxes, etc.

> The remedy, obviously, is a legal
>action against A compelling him to either repair his property and thus
>restore B's property values or to compensate B for the difference in
>selling prices resulting from his actions. As far as who gets to
>decide, in such a case, clearly the decision would be made by a judge.

And all this is OK with you and your moral ideas?
>
> BTW, consider this. Obviously, you view A as having harmed B
>(a view I agree with), and felt that way when you wrote this example.

That was part of it, but there's a lot more. For example, did the harm occur when A let his property run down, or only when B tried to sell?

>Let's change it a bit. Suppose instead of failing to maintain his
>property, A is a ham radio operator who chooses to put up an antenna
>farm that, because it distracts from the visual appearance of the
>neighborhood, results in the same difficulty in selling for B. Is the
>situation the same or different? Why?

It's the same. But studies have shown that putting up antennas does NOT negatively impact property values unless said antennas are poorly maintained.
>
>>Suppose B finds a buyer (C) who agrees to buy B's house but at a price far
>>below fair market value because of the condition of A's place. Is A
>responsible
>>for B's loss? Can C try to get A to fix up the property?
>
> The answer to the first part is above. With respect to the
>second part, C has NO legitimate grounds to demand that A fix up the
>property (although he is certainly free to ask him to do so and to try
>to convince him that it would benefit him as well). C purchased the
>property at a price consistent with being next door to a property in
>the condition of A's--thus he is NOT harmed by A's actions in any way
>(assuming A doesn't allow his property to deteriorate even further,
>thus reducing C's property value further, and placing him in the same
>position B was in originally).

I disagree. Such action permits neighborhoods to decline.

>Sounds simple to me, and requires no
>recourse to any "absolute" values.
>

>>Who decides? Whose values of "harm" should be used? Think about it.
>
> I have--read over my examples and try to do the same yourself.

I have. Your ideas don't work in real life.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1982. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 01:08:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts4ls$7t4$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24979

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > And how do you presume that economics can do that when Islam officially
> > rejects all that is economic theory in favor of a religious dogma that
> > is based on no econonimic theory at all, rather based on hatred of all
> > other religious and particularily secular social systems, from which all
> > advanced economic theory stems? Yoiu fail to appreciate that they gladly
> > kill off their own kind as readily as the opposition, when they can find
> > any valid reason. I'm amazed that the women of Islam aren't all Lorena
> > Bobbits.
>
> You are such a bullshit artist, Dick. Many Islamic nations are, and have
> been, supporters of free market forces. Islam doesn't prohibit free
> economies. You have allowed a handful of extremists to get your goat.
> You have allowed them to turn you into a person just as evil as they.

Ok, lets recap Cecil's position here.

Of 52 Islamic nations, none have any hint of freedom in their societies save Turkey, and all severely repress women, some even legalizing killing them for imagined minor infractions such as talking to a man not a family member. He, by his attitude of support, *does* support that.

He also states categorically that Islam is not a religion basically different from Christianity or Judism although of the three only Islam dictates that non-Islamics *must* be converted, enslaved or otherwise killed. He supports that, from his postings here.

He states that the radical Islamics are nothing more than Southern Baptists in disguise, since some tiny segment of some Chrtistian fundamentalist group (not known to be a Southern Baptist splinter group) has committed a very few acts of terrorism such as bombing abortion clinics. He equates that to the Al Queda organization which has trained literally hundreds of thousands of terrorists who have all been trained to 'destroy the evil Infidel of the West' even though it cost all their own lives and the lives of all other Moslems. Allah has dictated it to be their fates if that is to be the outcome.
Cecil refuses to acknowledge that I have stated that there are a great many Moslems who want nothing to do with this concept but who are forced by their clergy who are also their civil government to accede to that principle or be themselves treated as evil infidels. He equates this to modern Christian theory and practice. Basically the only Moslems who have any real choice in the ongoing Moslem process of Jihad are those who live in free countries where they are not subject to Islamic law,

and even a large portion of those voluntarily support the concept of Jihad against the west which has welcomed them.

What an lamebrained idiot.

1983. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 01:09:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts4nq$7t4$1@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24980

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 06:29:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Do you carry a national ID card?
>
> Sure--I have a social security card. My son, as required by
> law, has a drift card. I am required to show picture identification to
> board an aircraft in the United States and, based on the laws that
> have been passed and will take effect in January, I will soon be
> required to show such identification to board ANY form of
> transportation that crosses a state line. That the card is issued by
> the State instead by the federal government is irrelevant--in many
> nations id cards are issued by their provinces not the national
> government.
>
> Incidently, in the Netherlands you are NOT required to carry a
> national ID card--you are ISSUED one, but it is the equivalent of a
> combination of our social security cards and a medical insurance id
> card--such as a Blue Cross card in the US.
>
> >> Since your statement not only goes against experience, but
> >> goes against the recently released UN study of freedom in member
> >> nations (which listed the Netherlands as the freest nation on earth,
> >> followed by Denmark, etc.), it would seem that you need to offer more
> >> than a simply statement of opinion to support your claim.
> >>
> >The UN? 'nuff said.
>
> Can't stand anything that comes from an impartial source, or
> just afraid of Black Helicopter?
>

If you consider the UN an inpatial source you are to be pitied.

1984. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 01:47:40 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <08c08def11908a3b18dec108509784d7.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 24981

>Subject: Re: Dropping the code.
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 11/25/2001 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C010FE7.B6BD9DDD@IEEE.org>

>Intel contributed about 100 nocode techs with
>engineering degrees to the ARS. I assume other similar
>compainies did the same thing.

At ADC Telecom we had about 95 amateurs last time I counted, including
our Chief Scientist (a Tech). The class ratios seem pretty much to be
in proportion to the ARS as a whole.

But they are a contribution from the ARS -to- ADC, not vice versa.
I assume other similar companies enjoy a similar contribution -from-
the ARS.

73, de Hans, K0HB
ChOp K0RT

--
Posted from 1cust168.tnt4.minneapolis3.mn.da.uu.net [63.22.118.168]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1985. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 01:50:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts759dps0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24982

CAM wrote:
>
> > Muslims are taught from infancy as an integral part of their religious
> > training, that all other belief systems are not only inferior but that
> > they must be wiped out and their adherents either converted, enslaved or
> > killed.
>
> The exact same thing is taught in *YOUR* Bible, Dick. You should crack it
> open and enlighten yourself. Civilized Christians don't pay much attention
> to the atrocities we are supposed to commit in the name of Jehovah.
> Civilized Muslims don't pay much attention to the atrocities they
> are supposed to commit in the name of Allah.

You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out
with the Inquisition. In Islam it was clearly demonstrated September 11,
and in numerous lesser but horrific incidents in the preceding decades.
The widespread cheering in Islamic countries following the fall of WTC
was widely televised. Your know all this and choose to ignore it. Your
idiotic statements in the wake of what has happened in recent months
shows clearly for all to see what you truly are.

1986. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 01:51:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts76v$dq0$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24983

CAM wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > National Review? Bwahhhahahaha, my acceptance of that as anything but
> > conservative rhetoric would be about as probable that I am going to begin
> > listening to Limbaugh with any regularity.
>
> Like the terrorists, Dick is determined to stir up trouble. He,
> like the terrorists, would like to revive The Crusades. That is,
> of course, as long as he doesn't have to do the fighting.

Well, I spent 5 years on active duty while you laid around on yoiur ass
as a 4F. Nuff said.

1987. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 01:52:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts79q$dq0$1@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24984

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 25 Nov 2001 03:12:40 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > And you are not only a dumbass you're a phony lying dumbass. You have
> >not the first clue what you're talking about.
>
> Anyone ever notice that when Dick has nothing he can say in
> response to a statement, he turns to insults and obscenities and to
> accusing his opponent of being a liar instead of demonstrating
> integrity and conceding the point?
>
> Great example of ham radio for young kids to emulate. Sort of
> like teaching your children about good government by apprenticing them
> to the Taliban.

Well, if you're a lying, phony dumbass that's waht you'll be labelled.

1988. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 01:58:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts7jletc0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24985

Rick Adams wrote:

> behavior is so common in the animal kingdom. I always thought animal
> behavior was, by definition, "normal."

It isn't. There is virtually no homosexual behavior in the animal
kingdom.
That's a figment of human homosexual supporters.

> BTW, over 96% of ALL child molestation is performed by
> heterosexuals (according to the Department of Justice statistics
> available at http://www.doj.gov), despite the fact that between 7% and
> 10% of our population is homosexual.

So why do you compare apples and oranges? The two are not the same at
all and you should know it. Pedophiles are commonly heteros.

It would seem that your
> insistence that we keep homosexuals away from our children would only
> result in increased levels of child sexual abuse--is that what you
> hope for?

It would seem that you are still a blooming idiot.

1989. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:03:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts7u8etc1@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24986

Nonya Bidniz wrote:
>
> On 25 Nov 2001 02:28:27 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Evidently you were too deep into the drug culture to notice, but things
> >changed in ham radio pretty drastically about the time we began to get
> >large numbers of CBers -I mean the seasoned, hard core CBers- into ham
> >radio. Before that you never heard any of the trash on HF. A single
> >swear word was enough to get other hams down on your case as well as
> >certainly the FCC. Ever hear of W4EGB? FCC took his license and put him
> >off the air because every evening he'd get slowly drunker and nastier on
> >the air. Such crap as the so-called Liberty Net wouldn't have ever been
> >allowed to develop, much less become an ongoing cesspool.
>
> Evidently you were too deep into the drug culture to notice, but the
> Liberty Net was on the air long before restructuring went into effect.

Ah, poor Baby!!!! For you history started with restructuring. Take your
pacifier quietly, now!

1990. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:15:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts8j7hrg0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24987

Nonya Bidniz wrote:
>
> On 25 Nov 2001 02:29:23 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > A real, *VALID* CW test had more to do with keeping the bands clean and
> >orderly than anything else, whatever the FCC says these days. (Of course
> >that fact is no longer poltically correct) There were just no hams who
> >were so mildly interested in ham radio they just didn't care. Today
> >we're overloaded with them, largely courtesy of CB. I give you as
> >evidence a blowsy broad who chose TIT as her "vanity" callsign, ha ha ha
> >ha ha!
>
> Rather flimsy evidence, that, considering that (since operation on the
> HF bands requires passing a code test) everyone in the Liberty Net
> supposedly passed a code test, eh?

You have no idea what a real code test amounts to. For the entire time
of the VE system a code test was largely a sham, with the multiple guess
questions where you could literally guess your way to a license. I've
seen it repeatedly, and was obligated to go along with it as VE. It was
the rule.

Your vaunted Liberty net that you'r so proud of is a recent development,
of only a few years.Of course to a beginner that's forever.

>
> Sorry, bigot. You'll have to do a lot better than that.
>

If being a code supporter makes me a bigot the that is what I is. On the
other hand you are an illiterate dipschit.

> > Back then most people really put out to get a ham ticket
>
> OH! Is THAT how you got your ticket?

Surely that is what I did. I studied, learned the material and missed
not a single question on the General, Advanced and Extra written exams,
and passed the 13 and 20wpm code tests, in a single test sitting at the
FCC district office in Kansas City. Tht was after making a 260 mile one
way drive to get there.
All that is moot except that you seem to think that the VE shsould come
to your home and test you on subjects of your choice at a difficulty
level that you feel comfortable with.

And here I was thiking you'd
> actually passed the tests. Excuse me while I toss my religion in the
> garbage can.
>
> >and were not about to jeopardize it by stupid behavior.
>
> There is stupid behavior at every level of society (of which the ARS
> is a cross-section and therefore a reasonably good reflection).

Now you're going to say that people who invest lots of time, energy and effort won't feel any different about protecting that investment than those who have it all given to them. BS.

As
> evidence, I offer Bill Clinton

Thanks just the same, but you can keep that other idiot. You'll get along just fine with him.

1991. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:20:16 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <397bbd8f51b96b2316bcffd9a718cad7.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 24988

The opinion of N2EY seems to be.....

>Just because a thing has not yet been discoverd does not mean it does not
>exist. Go back around 200 years, and your argument could be applied to
>electronic communications (nobody has ever done it, so it must not exist).

Electronic communications did not exist in 1801, at least not on this
planet.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from 1cust168.tnt4.minneapolis3.mn.da.uu.net [63.22.118.168]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1992. Re: Dropping the code, or is it something more?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:21:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts8uvivd0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24989

Bob - KE4JCD wrote:
>
> Finally someone talking sense and without all the CB humor like Cam and
> Dick seen to do so well. Now that I got that out of my system, lets get down
> to business...
>
> Code is not the problem, its the way people act! Right Cam and Dick? You
> should be happy that people like me, my wife and others join just to use
> just VHF and UHF. Plus the others who take their time and go all the way. I
> found this to be true in most places, and these people are running people
> off! I talked a friend and her husband in to HAM radio and giving up their
> cellphone. Soon the MUST HAVE DX OR YOU'LL DIE Patrol got to them too and
> they both QUIT and still hate me for wasting their time..
>

You got NONE of that from me. It is the folks who believe that you
should get everything for nothing that I take issue with. I've never
have had a problem with those who just want to get a tech license for
VHF/UHF. Never will.

1993. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:22:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts91jivf0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24990

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > There are lots of former or current CBers in *our* age group, as you
> > well know, Cecil.
>
> Former 11m CBers didn't exist when I was first licensed, Dick.
> I participated in the last 11m ham contest. Please prove that
> the Liberty Net troublemakers are former CBers.

Hey, it was you who said they were my peers. They are not. They are
yours.

1994. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:29:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts9dr$k1v$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24991

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 25 Nov 2001 07:13:54 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >> Yep, and Riley Hollingsworth sez those bad guys are mostly
> >> Extras and Advanced class.
> >>
> > >
> > > Easy as the tests have been since the CB influx, that's no surprise.
> > >Makes the Tech and Extra lites whiners look that much more pitiful and
> > >lame.
>
> They didn't _make_ an easy test for Advanced class licenses,
> Dick, remember? They eliminated the class for new licensee. And many
> of us who are Extras (and were Advanced) upgraded BEFORE the tests
> changed.

And that's why your license is dated after the date of the
restructuring???

>
> If Hollingsworth is claiming Advanced class hams are causing
> more trouble than Techs, he is NOT talking about new licensees.
>

So you've discussed it with him and he made that statement?

> Sorry, Dick, but if you communicate on the air the way you do
> on line (and if you don't all you are doing is showing disrespect for
> ham radio in another venue), YOU and your cronies are the people
> Hollingsworth warned us about!

You are a horses ass whether on the air on the net. I didn't need to be
warned about the likes of you, your manner gives you away right away!

1995. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:29:38 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mOhM7.129188$WW.8103588@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24992

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9ts7jletc0@208.206.142.78...
>
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
>
> > behavior is so common in the animal kingdom. I always thought animal
> > behavior was, by definition, "normal."
>
>
> It isn't. There is virtually no homosexual behavior in the animal
> kingdom.
> That's a figment of human homosexual supporters.
>

There is not because the human is the only primate at least where both the X and Y chromosomes get involved with brain wiring. Female homosexuals are generally a product of another equally natural process but male ones are more than likely wired that way. It is also why the best guess for the proportion in the male population is about the same as left-handedness as the same process produces both. Were it not for Caleb (Southern Kingdom Joshua) who was left-handed the God Squad would be after them as well. Lefties have in general have more extremes of behavior than righties, i.e. more geniuses and more serial killers; they are over-represented in both. It should not be too surprising that gays will as well although absent the social pressures who in hell knows.

Perhaps surprisingly there is no correlation between handedness (also missing in the animal kingdom) and gayitude.

The lesson of all of this is that modern genetics has just scratched the surface.

As the Greeks proved, there can be some social pressure toward homosexual behavior but probably not toward homosexuality itself.

Pedophilia is a whole different can of worms.

Dick NBK

1996. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:30:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts9gp$k7k$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24993

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3c011ef6$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Watch it, Dick...you're getting as preoccupied with "them" as Larry R. is.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Wrong again, as usual. I am not even remotely preoccupied with "them."
> It is YOU who have the preoccupation with your own breasts, and desire
> for everyone else to be preoccupied with "them" as you are; therefore your
> call sign is imposed on the whole of the ARS, at the expense of any
> good opinion of your personal judgment. Quit trying to throw this back
> on others, Kim. You are to blame for taking the ARS "...one step
> closer to extinction," not us.
>

It is difficult for me to become preoccupied with that which disgusts
me. She is disgusting. You are right, Larry- Her choice of a vanity
callsign clearly shows her own preoccupation.

1997. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:33:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9ts9lt$k7k$1@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24994

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011125132821.28714.00001994@nso-md.aol.com...
> > In article <3c011ef6$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >Watch it, Dick...you're getting as preoccupied with "them" as Larry R.
> is.
> > >
> > > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > Wrong again, as usual. I am not even remotely preoccupied with "them."
> > It is YOU who have the preoccupation with your own breasts, and desire
> > for everyone else to be preoccupied with "them" as you are; therefore your
> > call sign is imposed on the whole of the ARS, at the expense of any
> > good opinion of your personal judgment. Quit trying to throw this back
> > on others, Kim. You are to blame for taking the ARS "...one step
> > closer to extinction," not us.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> If 58 years on the planet has taught me one thing it is that the ladies are
> far more pre-occupied with 'them' than we are.

Somehow some of them such as Kim seem to stress quantity when the real
attribute is quality. Some never learn. Instead, they choose vanity
callsigns to keep their 'Ass-ets' in the limelight. Turns out they're
not assets at all.

> Incidentally the last X flick I went to was in Salt
> Lake City.

And that ain't exactly Sin City.

1998. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:41:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsa44lon0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 24995

Krell wrote:
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:ZMbM7.128747$WW.8060759@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > If 58 years on the planet has taught me one thing it is that the ladies
> are
> > far more pre-occupied with 'them' than we are.
> >
> > I recall wandering in to the late show at a local theatre at about the age
> > of 17 or so into one of these floppy boob movies; was interesting for
> about
> > 3.5 minutes at most. Incidentally the last X flick I went to was in Salt
> > Lake City.
> >
> > Dick Nï¿½BK
>
> With the strict control the LDS has over that state, it's surprising that
> any such theatres exist at all.

You'll find a lot of those folks to lean a lot more liberal in many
areas than you probably would have guessed. The LDS church doesn't
actually control the state but it does have vast influence, and that
isn't surprising given that SLC has 50% Mormon population and the Salt
Lake Valley, which contains 90% of the state's population is 90% Mormon.
Alcohol is sold only in state liquor stores (I don't know what they
stock as I didn't go into one). Redneck bars are rare but I saw a
couple.

1999. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:42:52 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <f4ab7fa0a99839d27a05f1c1e3ce231b.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 24996

The opinion of Dick Carroll seems to be......

> You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out
> with the Inquisition. In Islam it was clearly demonstrated September 11,
> and in numerous lesser but horrific incidents in the preceding decades.

Terroristic activity in the name of religion (Christianity) has been
going on in Northern Ireland for decades too -- and BOTH sides claim
a different flavor of Christianity as their motivation.

With all kind wishes,

de K0HB

--
Posted from 1cust168.tnt4.minneapolis3.mn.da.uu.net [63.22.118.168]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2000. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 02:51:10 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <y6iM7.129220$WW.8109433@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 24997

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tsa44lon0@208.206.142.78...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:ZMbM7.128747$WW.8060759@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > If 58 years on the planet has taught me one thing it is that the
ladies
> > are
> > > far more pre-occupied with 'them' than we are.
> > >
> > > I recall wandering in to the late show at a local theatre at about the
age
> > > of 17 or so into one of these floppy boob movies; was interesting for
> > about
> > > 3.5 minutes at most. Incidentally the last X flick I went to was in
Salt
> > > Lake City.
> > >
> > > Dick N�BK
> >
> > With the strict control the LDS has over that state, it's surprising
that
> > any such theatres exist at all.
>
>
> You'll find a lot of those folks to lean a lot more liberal in many
> areas than you probably would have guessed. The LDS church doesn't
> actually control the state but it does have vast influence, and that
> isn't surprising given that SLC has 50% Mormon population and the Salt
> Lake Valley, which contains 90% of the state's population is 90% Mormon.
> Alcohol is sold only in state liquor stores (I don't know what they
> stock as I didn't go into one). Redneck bars are rare but I saw a
> couple.

How do you know if you were resisting temptations if there weren't any? I got a chuckle out of Snowbird, which among other things was slang for a bullshitter and a coke freak. The X-flick wasn't much but the alternative was the square dance convention down at the Salt Palace.

Want to see something funnier when the Gentiles meet the LDS, go to the Polynesian Cultural Center on Oahu but get there early. It is hilarious to

see the tourists find out they can't get a cuppa and see the exhibits come to life. A big black Maori looking at his mates and in a clipped N-Zee accent say something like 'OK mates, let's try to make it look like we've done this before'.
The PCC is part of Brigham Young University and the kids do the displays to pay the tab.

2001. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:01:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01AEB1.27313194@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24998

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > If you need more prison space, build it.
>
> Prisons don't come for free. The Texas legislature will not
> approve building any new prisons.

Looks like something for Texans to debate. I'm sure you'll do your part
to enlighten the legislature by posting here.

Dave K8MN

2002. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:03:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01AF1A.703BF391@earthlink.net>
Source record: 24999

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'm surprised at how ignorant you are of human psychology.
> >
> > Probably no more surprised than I am at your inability to comprehend a
> > simple English language sentence.
>
> I comprehended it much better than you realize.

That simply can't be if you come back translating the sentence as
something entirely different than what I wrote.

If you need help, I had turkey for Thanksgiving. This morning I had
waffles for breakfast. Now, on with your quest Don Quixote.

Dave K8MN

2003. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:07:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01B019.5A5BB9AF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25000

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Let's try to iron this one out. You believe that because your
> > dictionary is deficient, I'm making something up?
>
> Talk about delusions of grandeur. My *unabridged* dictionary
> of the English language is deficient? ROTFLMBO Thanks fer
> the laugh, Dave. One more word added to that dictionary
> and I wouldn't be able to pick it up.

The worth of a dictionary is not measured by its weight. If yours is deficient, buy a new one or go to a library. If you don't want to drive, call your nearest theological seminary. Is your mind so closed to information you have not yet learned?

Dave K8MN

2004. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:08:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01B06C.27EED331@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25051

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I'm stating that it (Kim's call) is tacky, lacks decorum
> > > > and that it exhibits lack of taste.
> > >
> > > Those are your feelings, Dave, that you have used your free
> > > will to choose to feel them. Thus, if they are a problem,
> > > they are 100% your personal problem. The rest of the world
> > > doesn't care what feelings you choose to experience.
> >
> > Those are *views*, Cecil and they don't pose a problem.
>
> They are views based on unthinking feelings, Dave. That is the
> least reliable way to arrive at a rational conclusion. I'm glad
> your mob is not large enough to enforce your whims.

Does the name "Custer" mean anything to you, Cecil?

Dave K8MN
```

2005. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:12:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c01b3c0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25053

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9ts9gp$k7k$0@208.206.142.78...
>
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <3c011ef6$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
> >
> > > >
> > > >Watch it, Dick...you're getting as preoccupied with "them" as Larry R.
is.
> > > >
> > > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > > Kim:
> >
> > > Wrong again, as usual. I am not even remotely preoccupied with "them."
> > > It is YOU who have the preoccupation with your own breasts, and desire
> > > for everyone else to be preoccupied with "them" as you are; therefore
your
> > > call sign is imposed on the whole of the ARS, at the expense of any
> > > good opinion of your personal judgment. Quit trying to throw this back
> > > on others, Kim. You are to blame for taking the ARS "...one step
> > > closer to extinction," not us.
> >
>
> It is difficult for me to become preoccupied with that which disgusts
> me. She is disgusting. You are right, Larry- Her choice of a vanity
> callsign clearly shows her own preoccupation.
>

I didn't find the response about your balls, Dick?

Kim W5TIT

2006. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:15:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsc4uqnb0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25052

Roger Halstead wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tr2hu$p56$0@208.206.142.68...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Roger Halstead wrote:
> > > > There are many parts of the world where we would consider their morals
> > > > barbaric and they the same for us.
> > >
> > > For instance, there is an area in Africa where the accepted standards
> > > of society require a man to teach his daughter about sex by being the
> > > first to have sex with her. Say Dick, how do you like those standards
> > > of society?
> >
> >
> > I have no reason to like nor dislike it since I don't live there, am
> > not usbject to it, and have no reason to evaluate it. Of course it is
> > completely foreign to anything taught by the society I live within. You
> > seem to want to oppose much of our society and you have daughters, so
> > maybe you would want to answer your own question.
>
> Ahhh...How did your fractured logic come up with what some one would like or
> dislike from the above two posts.

MY fractured logic??? Or are you talking about Cecil's? If you've
read here long and seriously enough you already know what an absolute
troll Cecil is. He is trying to make his life interesting as he whiles
away his declining years alone. He said so. As for me, I'm not taking
his bait.

> Just because I, or some else, point out how society differs by region and
> ethnic backgrounds has absolutely no bearing on what I believe, or practice.

Evidently you missed Cecil's point which was to try to trap me in some
position where he could find some other reason to keep it up. A
progressive sort of game he always plays.

> Nor would it with any one else. Had I embraced one of those societies, or
> condemned one, or another, then it would be an entirely different matter. I
> only pointed out that society is not a constant from one city to another,
> one state to another and one country to another.

I hope we can assume that you condemn the Islamic fundamentalist regime
known as the Taliban, or should I say the late Taliban?

> One other thing is that each and every one of us is part of all those
> societies, although the farther away the less influence they have on us as
> individuals.

You can claim membership in radical fundamentalist Islam if you wish,
but I reject it for myself.

> Each and every one of those societies adds a bit of flavor to
> the next larger which dilutes it a bit, but a tiny bit of that societies
> flavor eventually trickles back down to local levels around the world.
>
> The friction arises when any particular group tries to force, their beliefs
> onto others of different beliefs, or standards.
>

Hate to tell ya, Roger Doger, but you're beginning to sound all
touchy-feely, like Rick the Slick.

2007. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:17:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tsc6k0m0b@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25058

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9ts79q$dq0$1@208.206.142.78...
> > Anyone ever notice that when Dick has nothing he can say in
> > response to a statement, he turns to insults and obscenities and to
> > accusing his opponent of being a liar instead of demonstrating
> > integrity and conceding the point?
> >
> > Great example of ham radio for young kids to emulate. Sort of
> > like teaching your children about good government by apprenticing them
> > to the Taliban.
>
>
> Well, if you're a lying, phony dumbass that's waht you'll be labelled.

Let's see; what's more damaging to amateur radio? Dick's ad hominem attacks
or Kim's callsign?

2008. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:21:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tscf0reo0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25054

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> German society decided that it was unacceptable to be a Jew, a
> Gypsy, or a homosexual. The chose concentration camp internment and
> death as a sanction for those "offenses."

German society did no such thing, Professor Nutty. Hitler's goons
decided that for one and all, after they had decieved the German
polulation and maneuvered the Nazi party into dictatorial power.

>
> You claim that society is the fair source of guidelines. Those
> were theirs. Do you accept THEM as valid and acceptable--or do you
> feel you would oppose those "guidelines" if they were imposed on you?
>

If you are really that much of a fool, I feel pity foir you.

> You can't have it both ways, Dick.

YOU can't get it right either way.

If society DOES have the
> legitimacy to set the guidelines for us all (as you claim) then it has
> the right to set ANY guidelines for behavior it chooses--whether you
> agree with them or not.

Nope. I have the right to persuade my fellows in society of the
justness of my views, just at anyone does in a free society.

All your trolling is for naught.

2009. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:25:01 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tsck00mnv@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25061

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9ts759dps0@208.206.142.78...
> You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out

Formal? It's still practiced by the KKK and Rev. Phelps of godhatesfags.com

> with the Inquisition. In Islam it was clearly demonstrated September 11,
> and in numerous lesser but horrific incidents in the preceding decades.
> The widespread cheering in Islamic countries following the fall of WTC
> was widely televised. Your know all this and choose to ignore it. Your
> idiotic statements in the wake of what has happened in recent months
> shows clearly for all to see what you truly are.

The Bible, Koran, and the Book of Mormon have all been twisted by fanatics
to suit their own ends. It continues to be done today. Islam, as practiced
by Arab countries is not a religion. It is a politcal system. This is not
what true Islam is all about.

2010. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:28:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01B4EC.3630E75C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25055

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 18:08:04 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Your last sentence is completely absurd. If you need more prison space,
> >build it.
>
> Sure, why not.
>
> After all, we ALREADY have the largest percentage of our
> population incarcerated of ANY first world nation--including the
> former USSR at its peak; and we surpass most third world nations as
> well (don't believe it? Take a look at the Department of Justice
> statistics at http://www.doj.gov). We certainly DO need new prisons if
> we are going to become more of a police state than we already are!
>
> Dave--open your eyes! If we have such a high percentage of our
> population in prison doesn't that tell you there's something wrong
> with our legal system? Particularly when we ALSO have more violent
> crime than any other first world nation as well (same source)?
>
> If "more prisons" are the answer, then we should have the most
> peaceful, safest, nation on earth. Until the end of the cold war you
> could walk down any street in Moscow safely at night. You can do so
> today in Stockholm, the Hague, or Bern. Even major cities such as
> Amsterdam, Munich, Madrid, and Copenhagen are vastly safer than the
> average US city. CLEARLY we're doing something wrong--and the ONLY
> things we're doing differently are:
>
> 1. Emphasizing victimless crime instead of violent crime. In
> many of those nations prostitution is legal and marijuana is either
> legal or no subject to prosecution.
>
> 2. Using a punishment model in our prisons instead of a
> rehabilitation one (used by virtually all other first world nations).
>
> 3. Maintaining a death penalty (none of those nations have
> one).
>
> 4. Emphasizing laws based on morality instead of rights and
> protection from harm.
>
> 5. Not responding to the needs of the poor in any realistic

> manner.
>
> 6. Private ownership of hand guns and no registration of other
> firearms.
>
> Take your pic, Dave, one or more of these is the root of our
> current prison crises. We don't need more prisons--we need an
> intelligent approach to criminal justice that locks up dangerous
> people not potheads like more modern countries have.

That isn't necessarily the case, Rick. This is just your pet theory. There are plenty of studies which do not agree with the information you've set forth. You haven't even given us a percentage of our poor, suffering and incarcerated souls who are in for possession of marijuana use. Just what percentage of U.S. prisoners are incarcerated for possessions of small amounts of marijuana?

You seem to have lots of "facts" at your disposal. I especially love the one about Moscow being safe until the end of the Cold War. Do you have any idea *why*? One of our embassy staff was out in the city one night in the '80s. He got drunk and stumbled into a canal. His life was saved by his KGB "tail".

Did you know that private ownership of handguns is permitted in Finland? Did you also know that you have a national I.D. card and that is necessary to provide the police with your new address when you move? Did you know that a yearly licensing fee of about $600 is imposed in order to watch the color TV you buy and that roving electronic eavesdropping patrols can come to your house and sieze your TV if you haven't paid the fee.

Prostitution is illegal in Finland (as I believe I mentioned earlier). So is the possession of marijuana. Finnish prisons now house the dutch manager of a touring rock band for bringing drugs into Finland as well as one stupid American girl who brought 15 lbs. of heroin into the country.

The Nordic prison systems are very enlightened though. During the late '90s, one Danish fellow was released from his Danish prison for a "holiday". He came to Finland, robbed a hotel and killed a Finnish policeman. Maybe we could institute a "holiday" system too.

If we have more violent crime than other first world countries, we need additional space for those who commit the crimes. It would seem that there are those who don't know how to handle the freedoms we have and who always push for just a little more.

Dave K8MN

2011. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:31:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsd21$t1q$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25056

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 25 Nov 2001 02:56:46 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Sure it it. If most hams want the ARS to appear as a family oriented
> >service, and wish it to appear that way to younger persons, and when
> >they demonstrate ham radio to younger folk, there is Kim W5TIT and her
> >(tee hee, big gabonzas, with all the double ententre or sexual innuendo
> >accompanying, what is that but harm?
>
> You know, what's interesting Dickie is that you insist you
> know what "most hams want."

Well, guess what! I have a better shot at it than you do, by a bunch.
And when that view is reinforced by various other entities among ham
radio society, you and Cecil being notable exceptions, that view stands.
Your loss.

>
> I think what "most hams want" is an environment where people
> communicate showing each other respect and courtesy;

No argument there, and Kim's callsign is NOT showing respect and
courtesy, rather it is simply offensive to most other hams. I know that
most women would view it as vulgar.

where hams don't
> jam each other because they don't want to listen to offensive ideas;
> where bigotry, racism, sexism, and prejudice are not part of the
> conversations; and where hams demonstrate welcome and friendship, not
> bitterness, ridicule, or a sense of superiority to new hams.

Why do you have this hangup on those few HF frequencies where that goes
on" If it is so offensive to you, why do you frequent those parts of ham
radio? Why don't you just routinely avoid them, as I do? I couldn't tell
you the "livberty net" frequency. I don't remember EVER listening to it,
and I would not even know it existed if not for all you poor fools
ranting here. Wellmeaning and proper folks just don't have anything to
do with all that. So I guess we know where that leaves you.

>
> THAT, not a "family oriented service" is what most of us want,
> Dick, at least as far as I can tell from my conversations with other
> hams.

So no it's you who have all the answers. Sorry, I got here first.

>
> Sorry you don't agree--maybe if you'd get your nose out of cw
> once in a while and listen to the hams using voice (and, Dick, if you
> claim to speak for "most hams" you BETTER listen to--and communicate
> with--those of us who prefer voice, because WE represent the majority
> of hams, not those who live in the cw sub-bands) you'd have a better
> idea of what "most hams" really DO want from the hobby.

Hey, stuff your advice Doc. Where the sun doesn't shine. Alongside your head.

>
> > Just because you take no offense over W5TIT doesn't mean that a
> >majority of other hams do not. Is your opinion the only one that
> >counts???
>
> Is yours?

Never said it was. I can ignore trivialities like her all day, form now on. But when Riley Hollingsworth says it's a problem you better believe its a problem.

>
> FAR more hams have posted here that they do NOT take offense
> at her sign than have posted that they do. That makes it pretty clear
> that most hams DON'T take offense at her sign.

Bullshit. Few hams even post here. Most have better sense.

2012. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:31:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01B5A2.D497D333@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25057

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > *YOU* are the individual who indicated that the majority of Southerners
> > > > supported segregation.
> > >
> > > Yep, that's true based on my personal experiences living and
> > > working in the South. I have absolutely no reason to believe
> > > otherwise. I have seen no evidence that would change my mind.
> > > Do you have any evidence?
> >
> > Based on my personal experiences living and working in the South, I say
> > you're all wet. Do you have any evidence?
>
> I have lots of evidence based on my personal experiences in the
> Southern US. What country are you talking about? It's not the US.

Sure it is, Cecil. You've obviously lived in places with a higher
percentage of bigots.

Dave K8MN
```

2013. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:33:04 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tsd360nfs@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25062

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9ts7u8etc1@208.206.142.78...

> > Evidently you were too deep into the drug culture to notice, but the
> > Liberty Net was on the air long before restructuring went into effect.
>
>
>
> Ah, poor Baby!!!! For you history started with restructuring. Take your
> pacifier quietly, now!

The score for the damage to amateur radio is as follows:

Dick's attitude - 98
Kim's callsign - 1 (the only damage being those hams that have complained
about it, but they really don't count)

2014. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:41:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsdkt$12q$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25059

K0HB wrote:
>
> The opinion of N2EY seems to be......
>
> >Just because a thing has not yet been discoverd does not mean it does not
> >exist. Go back around 200 years, and your argument could be applied to
> >electronic communications (nobody has ever done it, so it must not exist).
>
> Electronic communications did not exist in 1801, at least not on this
> planet.

But electromagnetic radiation did.

2015. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:46:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01B91A.2BFF1F60@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25060

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 06:15:36 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Sure you have to, Cecil. What I told you is that I do not intend to
> >assist you. If you want to win, you have to work for it. You'll either
> >be a *winner* or a guy who has gone to a lot of trouble for nothing.
> >I've made no revelation. You're just seeing dirty pictures in ink
> >blots.
>
> I'll make it simple, Cecil.
>
> He eats pork products.
>
> Unless he specifically contradicts me and states publicly that
> he does NOT eat pork products, you can take it as a given that I'm
> relating a fact, and you can count it on your side of the ledger. All
> he has to do is deny it, honestly, of course--but standing mute when
> evidence of your guilt has been introduced _always_ results in the
> presumption of guilt, even in a court of law.

You'll make it simple? You're pretty much of a grin too, Rick.
This part about "standing mute when evidence of your guilt..." is a
particularly entertaining. I can't seem to find that part where any
evidence at all has been introduced. If you guys are curious, you'll
have to research in order to find the answer. It may remain one of the
mysteries of your lives and I hope it provides an opportunity for you to
fritter away hours. Good luck in your quests.

Dave K8MN

2016. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:52:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01BA5E.2B41C02A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25063

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 06:19:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> Actually, a book was written about guys like Dave,
> >> "The Ugly American".
> > >
> > >It is quite obvious that you either did not read it or (more likely)
> > >that you don't remember Lederer's tome.
>
> That's true, Dave.
>
> The central character had FAR more concern for the culture he
> was interacting with, and was far more open minded, than yourself.
>
> Cecil should have known better.

For a "touchy-feely" New Age guy, you certainly have a tendency to make
snap judgements based on scant information.

Dave K8MN

2017. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 03:58:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C01BBCD.26DE2933@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25064

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 06:29:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Do you carry a national ID card?
>
> Sure--I have a social security card. My son, as required by
> law, has a drift card. I am required to show picture identification to
> board an aircraft in the United States and, based on the laws that
> have been passed and will take effect in January, I will soon be
> required to show such identification to board ANY form of
> transportation that crosses a state line. That the card is issued by
> the State instead by the federal government is irrelevant--in many
> nations id cards are issued by their provinces not the national
> government.

A Social Security card is not a national ID card. It isn't even
necessary to carry it with you. As to your son's drifting, we can only
hope that he finds himself and stops this drifting one day. I don't
know of any photo Social Security cards and I'm quite certain that a
state-issued drivers license doesn't count as a "national ID card".

> Incidently, in the Netherlands you are NOT required to carry a
> national ID card--you are ISSUED one, but it is the equivalent of a
> combination of our social security cards and a medical insurance id
> card--such as a Blue Cross card in the US.
>
> >> Since your statement not only goes against experience, but
> >> goes against the recently released UN study of freedom in member
> >> nations (which listed the Netherlands as the freest nation on earth,
> >> followed by Denmark, etc.), it would seem that you need to offer more
> >> than a simply statement of opinion to support your claim.
> >
> >The UN? 'nuff said.
>
> Can't stand anything that comes from an impartial source, or
> just afraid of Black Helicopter?

Neither. I find the UN to be largely tangled in its own bureaucracy.
I'd fear no helicopters within ten or so years. It would take 'em that
long to finish up the various meetings necessary to get one airborne.

Dave K8MN

2018. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:04:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsf1a$46g$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25065

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9ts7u8etc1@208.206.142.78...
>
> > > Evidently you were too deep into the drug culture to notice, but the
> > > Liberty Net was on the air long before restructuring went into effect.
> >
> >
> >
> > Ah, poor Baby!!!! For you history started with restructuring. Take your
> > pacifier quietly, now!
>
> The score for the damage to amateur radio is as follows:
>
> Dick's attitude - 98
> Kim's callsign - 1 (the only damage being those hams that have complained
> about it, but they really don't count)

The only damage is to your fragile code-phobic psyche and that doesn't
count.

2019. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232028.25429.00003451@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25067

In article <4B51A0DAD182D2CF.ABB1AEA7AF65AEBF.CE269D6E9AD3D21D@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> Sure--I have a social security card. My son, as required by
>law, has a drift card.

Rick:

I've heard of those. They require you use only transceivers which
have unstable VFO's. Bummer. We gotta get that law repealed!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2020. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232029.25429.00003453@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25071

In article <3C01429F.49FF4E36@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>> Then, tell me how my callsign is of such danger to the ARS.
>
>If W5TIT is a danger to the ARS, then so is
>"Kneading Three Large Tits".

Cecil:

If my callsign, and the phonetics you have constructed therefrom,
are truly a "danger to the ARS," then perhaps you should write to
Riley Hollingsworth and complain about it. He has already stated
that Kim's callsign has the potential to take the ARS "...one step
closer to extinction." If he says anything like that about *my*
callsign, then I will immediately take steps to change it to something
less offensive. Keep in mind that the phonetics I use for my
callsign are "Kilo Three Lima Tango," and my call letters, unlike
Kim's, don't spell out any recognizable word.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2021. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232029.25429.00003452@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25072

In article <681C504644C3DE49.94B8E00E697A6DF9.DD96F71F6B4B2BB2@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> Is yours?
>
> FAR more hams have posted here that they do NOT take offense
>at her sign than have posted that they do. That makes it pretty clear
>that most hams DON'T take offense at her sign. Why is YOUR opinion any
>more important than ours?
>
> Rick

I don't think you're in any position to ask that question, Rick. Using
Cecil's logic, the same logic by which he contends that my call is
"Kneading Three Large Tits," your callsign is KE8 Heil Hitler. As a
person who was raised Catholic, and has Jews on my mother's side
of the family, I find that pretty darned offensive -- if Cecil's "logic" is to
be given serious consideration. So, lemme akxs you -- are you going
to do anything about it -- or is Cecil's logic inherently flawed?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2022. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232030.25429.00003455@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25066

In article <3c013ca4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> If the selection was limited to the likes of you I wouldn't be, either.
>
>Oh, believe me, you have that right.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Yes, Kim, Dick did, indeed, have that right!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2023. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232030.25429.00003454@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25074

In article <3c013962_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Sure they do! If they are that offended, and there is nothing they can do
>about my callsign, they can choose another hobby. And, I challenge that I
>want to be vulgar, and I also challenge your notion that most women would be
>offended by my callsign. I can't imagine a kid having the capability to be
>offended by a callsign. If they are aware of tits in a derogatory light, it
>wasn't me who taught it to them. The same could be said, I suppose, for the
>adults. I didn't teach you, Dick, that the word tit is a derogatory
>term--who did?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

The word "tit" is not derogatory, just a vulgar and inherently offensive
way to refer to a woman's breasts. This term is used when one
intends to deliberately demean and depersonalize a woman through
the reference to secondary sexual characteristics which the viewer
finds attractive, in exception to or exclusion of all of the other personal
qualities she possesses as a woman, and as a human being. Most
modern women are personally offended by those who judge and value
her primarily for the size, shape, and general attractiveness of her
breasts. Men who do this are quite rightly criticized for this, yet you
not only deliberately encourage such behavior, you actively solicit it
through your selection of a callsign. In so doing, you not only bring
the ARS "…one step closer to extinction," you also set back all the
societal gains made by women in the last century, and bring about a
return to their objectification as mere sexual playthings. Is that
really how you see yourself?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2024. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232031.25429.00003457@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25069

In article <3C01422C.6DE3BF71@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Where do you, Rick, Cecil, and the rest of the no-coders/pro-TIT'ers
>> get the idea that anyone's "general behavior" on this newsgroup --
>> including yours -- could be detrimental to the ARS? This newsgroup
>> is NOT ham radio -- it is merely *about* ham radio.
>
>More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
>You, personally, have offended more potential hams than Kim will
>during the rest of her life.

Cecil:

What makes you think it is *I* who is offending them?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2025. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232031.25429.00003456@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25073

In article <3c013f4c_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> The world is full of double standards; this is just one of them, and
>> a pretty reasonable one, at that. Grow up and stop whining just
>> because participants in this newsgroup get to call things like they
>> see them -- at your own self-inflicted expense.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>heh heh heh No expense here, at all, Larry, I assure you. OH, and as to
>the double-standards comment? You know, the one where you *appear* to be
>quite willing to accept them? Accept my callsign. :)
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I have no choice but to accept your callsign. I have stated many times
that your callsign is your responsibility alone -- and you are also
responsible for the fact that you are taking the ARS "...one step
closer to extinction" by having chosen it. The whole shebang is totally
on *your* head alone -- and you're the only one who can rectify the
situation. If you choose not to, you merely provide all the proof
necessary that you are a person of poor taste and judgment, and
leave yourself open to the criticism of those who find it offensive.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2026. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232032.25429.00003459@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25068

In article <53DBEC038D54B145.105008A147A893A2.91FFABC950ED1A74@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>Cecil:
>>
>>*All* of my attempts at not sinning are feeble, compared to what they
>>should be. I am a sinner, of that there is no doubt. Perhaps you would
>>pray for me?
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Better not, Cecil.
>
> You might get what you pray for--and what on Earth would you
>do with Larry Roll?

Talk about your feeble attempts at humor...

73 de Larry, K3LT

2027. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232032.25429.00003458@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25070

In article <ZMbM7.128747$WW.8060759@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>I recall wandering in to the late show at a local theatre at about the age
>of 17 or so into one of these floppy boob movies; was interesting for about
>3.5 minutes at most. Incidentally the last X flick I went to was in Salt
>Lake City.

The first, last, and only in-theatre X-rated movie I ever saw was in
Times Square in NYC, circa 1970, during a Christmas season field
trip with my freshman class from the Catholic junior college I was
attending at the time, Villa Maria College of Buffalo. The movie was
named Scorpio 70. I just looked it up on imdb.com, there is no
info on the film whatsoever except for the main cast/crew listing.
What I do recall about the film is that the best set of breasts I saw
was on the girl I was with!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2028. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:20:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011125232033.25429.00003460@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 25075

>The only way I see gay men and lesbians is as unfortunate, confused
>people who need our prayers, and also need to be kept away from our
>children. A simple examination of human male/female anatomy will
>show that same-sex relationships are not what the Creator intended.
>The fact that this confusion is widespread does not make it normal.

> Gee, Larry, if that's the case I wonder why homosexual
>behavior is so common in the animal kingdom. I always thought animal
>behavior was, by definition, "normal."

Rick:

The commonality of homosexual behavior within the animal kingdom
is well documented, obviously, but still deviates from what is the
normal, intended means of sexual relations between the two sexes
of the species in question. In fact, within the animal kingdom, we
even see sexual relations between different species (certain sick
humans do likewise).

> BTW, over 96% of ALL child molestation is performed by
>heterosexuals

And I condemn 100% of it, regardless of the sexual preference of
who is committing it.

>(according to the Department of Justice statistics
>available at http://www.doj.gov), despite the fact that between 7% and
>10% of our population is homosexual. It would seem that your
>insistence that we keep homosexuals away from our children would only
>result in increased levels of child sexual abuse--is that what you
>hope for?

Obviously not -- and the fact that you would ask such a question only
tends to reveal your liberal agenda. I believe in keeping homosexuals
away from children for the simple reason that homosexuals tend to
view their sexual preference as a valid option, even a preferable one --
and are disposed toward "recruitment" of young people into their
"lifestyle."

73 de Larry, K3LT

2029. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:43:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0A0185E23A8EFBAD.42FE15BFB04EE01E.D81A60712F21ACC2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25076

On 26 Nov 2001 02:29:15 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> And that's why your license is dated after the date of the
>restructuring???

Look again, genius. It would have been impossible for my upgrade (from KE8HH--that's an Advanced call, remember?) using the new rules in time for it to have been issued by that date. My written was completed in December of 1999 and I took my cw test at the last session before the new rules went into effect [I failed the 20WPM in December by one question]). If your memory still works, you'll remember that I _discussed_ my upgrade here in this newsgroup and commented in the thread on code testing that I had just PASSED the 20 WPM the day I took the test. You, Larry, and Ed Hare (among others) were all part of that thread.

Take your Ginko, Dick, your memory is slipping.

>> If Hollingsworth is claiming Advanced class hams are causing
>> more trouble than Techs, he is NOT talking about new licensees.

> So you've discussed it with him and he made that statement?

Your memory is really slipping isn't it Dick?

There ARE no post-restructuring Advanced licenses, it was phased out at the time. If someone holds an Advanced ticket it's because he or she passed the test BEFORE the restructuring. I don't need to ask Hollingsworth about that--as a licensed ham I'm _supposed_ to know the license classes and privileges. Come to think of it, so are you.

>> Sorry, Dick, but if you communicate on the air the way you do
>> on line (and if you don't all you are doing is showing disrespect for
>> ham radio in another venue), YOU and your cronies are the people
>> Hollingsworth warned us about!
>
> You are a horses ass whether on the air on the net. I didn't need to be
>warned about the likes of you, your manner gives you away right away!

Great example of what I'm talking about.

Incidently, you have no idea what I'm like on the air--I've never communicated with you there, remember?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2030. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:47:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tshgq$b22$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25077

Nonya Bidniz wrote:
>
> On 26 Nov 2001 02:15:03 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > You have no idea what a real code test amounts to.
>
> Since you don't even know who I am let alone what my background in
> radio is, you have no valid basis on which to make that statement.
>

Sure I do. Youi gave yourself away.

> > For the entire time
> >of the VE system a code test was largely a sham, with the multiple guess
> >questions where you could literally guess your way to a license. I've
> >seen it repeatedly, and was obligated to go along with it as VE. It was
> >the rule.
>
> You weren't obligated to do any such thing. You retained the right to
> grab the nearest pair of scissors, snip your VE credentials into
> little pieces, and walk away.

And leavd a room full of applicants hanging? That may be a choice you'r
make but it wasn't one for me. I had signed onto the system and was
personally obligated to carry it out. I did not forsee how it would all
evolve or I might have done othewise. I couldn't know I was helping to
spawn a generation of hams like you and a few others posting here.

Judging from your attitude, you probably
> would have been doing the ARS a favor by doing so.

Tell it to the hundreds of hams I helped make it possible for them to
get a license when I had the only VE team for a couple hundred miles.

>
> >Your vaunted Liberty net that you'r so proud of is a recent development,
> >of only a few years.Of course to a beginner that's forever.
>
> Show me where I expressed pride in the Liberty Net. Also tell us on
> what information you base your assumption that I'm a beginner.

I ID'd you right away. You'r not a beginner, but as always you come
across like one.
For some reason you "aginers" seem hung up on the socalled Libety Net
which is nothing more that a tiny collection of misfits who do evidently
do little else in ham radio. Such a small percentage of hams as to be

inconsequentialif not for the content (evidently, from all the slant you guys give their nonsense. I domn't know since I never tune in there at all). Surely fresh meat for Riley's harvest. I can't imagine why anyone who doesn't want to be involved in that stuff even tunes in.

What I am disputing is
> your erroneous assertion that "a real code test" would have prevented
> such a rectal irritation from appearing within the hobby in the first
> place. Passing a test of one's proficiency in Morse code proves only
> one's proficiency with the code.

Today, that's pretty well evident. Was not always so. And it is a fact that you don't find unacceptable behavior among CW operators.

> Is is not a test of moral
> composition. Never was, never will be.

Well, you got it half right. Never will again be.

>
> >On the other hand you are an illiterate dipschit.
>
> Since you can't even spell "sipshit" properly,

And YOU can??? For your info, I choose to spell it my way.

I doubt that you are
> qualified to judge who is an is not a dipshit. On the other hand,
> since it takes one to know one, perhaps you ARE qualified.
>

Yeah, right, Brian. You should know.

> >I studied, learned the material and missed
> >not a single question on the General, Advanced and Extra written exams,
> >and passed the 13 and 20wpm code tests, in a single test sitting at the
> >FCC district office in Kansas City. Tht was after making a 260 mile one
> >way drive to get there.
>
> Uphill, naked and in four feet of snow, no doubt. <yawn!>

Ya gotta admit, I really wanted it or I would have stayed home in front of the boob toob instead of with nose in book. No question pools, either.

> >All that is moot except that you seem to think that the VE shsould come
> >to your home and test you on subjects of your choice at a difficulty
> >level that you feel comfortable with.
>
> Times change. Testing procedures change. Some of us see the value of
> change and learn to deal with it.

Yeah, right, all change is valuable. Especially when it makes it easy for you.

Others, apparently including
> yourself, are condemned to forever whine about it.
>
> Would you like some cheese to go with that whine, sir?

Just finshed a cheese stick, thank you just the same.

>
> >> There is stupid behavior at every level of society (of which the ARS
> >> is a cross-section and therefore a reasonably good reflection).

If the ARS is a crossection of society then it's because of the dumbed
down licene requirments have generated a CB like atmosphere. Ham radio
was never a passtime for the masses.

> >
> >Now you're going to say that people who invest lots of time, energy and
> >effort won't feel any different about protecting that investment than
> >those who have it all given to them. BS.
>
> Quite a generalization. However, like most generalizations about
> people, it is partially correct and partially incorrect. There are
> undoubtedly many people who invested a lot of time, energy, and effort
> to get their licenses, even under the post-restructuring system...or
> at least they themselves will feel that they have done so, since they
> will not be comparing their own experience to yours. Thus, there will
> also undoubtedly be many persons licensed under the post-restructuring
> system who will cherish the priviledges granted by their licenses
> every bit as much as you and I do, and will conduct themselves
> accordingly both on and off the air.

Hey, a rational paragraph! You're definitely improving.

> There will also undoubtedly be people who will get on the air and act
> like the morons that they in fact are minutes after finding out what
> their callsign is. What you fail to realize is that the result of an
> Element 1 test is by no means sufficient information on which to
> attempt to predict which side of the line any given individual is
> going to wind up on.
>

And you've got that mostly right, except for the part where I fail to
realize. I realized long ago that ham radio was on the skids and that
realization is ever more apparent. Of courdse there will be a core cadre
of 'good guys' that will be around until FCC finally shuts us down out
of embarassment and/or disgust.

> 73

Likewise.

2031. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:47:59 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <59D994A658CEE7F9.833DFD4C0F043EA2.9365CB88E55F5F32@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25078

On 26 Nov 2001 02:30:49 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> It is difficult for me to become preoccupied with that which disgusts
>me. She is disgusting. You are right, Larry- Her choice of a vanity
>callsign clearly shows her own preoccupation.

Now that we know you are disgusted by women's breasts, it
explains a lot about you Dick.

Out of curiosity, don't you think that you would eliminate a
lot of your hate and bitterness if you just came out of your closet
and admitted it to yourself?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2032. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:48:39 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0E8B445B014F3F73.A9A3A1BB9AAEB986.BF8953714CA1CF93@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25079

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 21:12:40 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>I didn't find the response about your balls, Dick?

I guess he didn't have enough of them to answer, Kim.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2033. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:52:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tshpvbof0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25080

K0HB wrote:
>
> The opinion of Dick Carroll seems to be......
>
> > You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out
> > with the Inquisition. In Islam it was clearly demonstrated September 11,
> > and in numerous lesser but horrific incidents in the preceding decades.
>
> Terroristic activity in the name of religion (Christianity) has been
> going on in Northern Ireland for decades too -- and BOTH sides claim
> a different flavor of Christianity as their motivation.

Ah, Yes, dear old Homeland. But only a blip on the radar beside Islamic fundamentalist terrorism, as demonstrated by longtime activities culminating at the World Trade Center.

2034. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 04:54:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C01CAE7.5C997706@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25081

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Don't fret, Dwight. You evidently
> don't know that only a third of the
> populace of the Colonies were active
> participants in the Revolutionary
> War for Independence from Britian.
> Another third were Loyalists to the
> Crown, and the final third were "Why
> can't we all just get along" sorts
> like you, Rick, Kim and Cecil.
> There are always enough freedom
> loving, THINKING citizens here to
> step up and get the job done.

Well, if the citizens you're referring to are trying to wipe out the freedoms this country fought the Revolutionary War for, then they're certainly no friends of mine. Conservatives, perhaps like youself, who would openly support this country's conversion into a military dictatorship, are just as dangerious in my mind as the extreme liberals.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2035. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:06:52 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <9tsilc$n0u$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 25082

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
>prevalent among may ham radio operators.

Out of our 600,000+ members, what percentage display those characteristics, Rick? If say, you've counted 60,000, that would be just 10%. Is ten percent "a tremendous amount"? (Do you even know 60,000 hams???)

(I wish you folks would preface your comments with "IMO" so that the non-hams reading this NG know you're not in any way stating facts but rather opinions...)

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Telecommunication Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard University of Hawaii System
jherman @ d14.uscg.mil jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

2036. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:11:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01CEF7.DF12C598@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25084

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> If my callsign, and the phonetics you have constructed therefrom,
> are truly a "danger to the ARS," then perhaps you should write to
> Riley Hollingsworth and complain about it.

It is not a danger to the ARS. Neither is Kim's call. Vulgarity
is in the eyes of the beholder. Just because I find your call
to be vulgar doesn't mean that it objectively is vulgar.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2037. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:11:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsiu7evq0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25083

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9ts759dps0@208.206.142.78...
> > You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out
>
> Formal? It's still practiced by the KKK and Rev. Phelps of godhatesfags.com

Oh really?? They advocate their death and total destruction?

>
> > with the Inquisition. In Islam it was clearly demonstrated September 11,
> > and in numerous lesser but horrific incidents in the preceding decades.
> > The widespread cheering in Islamic countries following the fall of WTC
> > was widely televised. Your know all this and choose to ignore it. Your
> > idiotic statements in the wake of what has happened in recent months
> > shows clearly for all to see what you truly are.
>
> The Bible, Koran, and the Book of Mormon have all been twisted by fanatics
> to suit their own ends. It continues to be done today. Islam, as practiced
> by Arab countries is not a religion. It is a politcal system. This is not
> what true Islam is all about.

So you'll be glad to pass that message along to the hundreds of
thousands of radical Islamic fundamentalist schooltrained terrorist
Jihadists - and all their more "moderate" cheerleaders - so that we can
cancel the current war and just all get along, right?

2038. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:12:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01CF58.64E74809@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25085

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> >You, personally, have offended more potential hams than Kim will
> >during the rest of her life.
>
> What makes you think it is *I* who is offending them?

Your bigoted postings even offend me, Larry, and I have a
thick skin.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2039. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:18:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D09A.E2629F7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25086

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The word "tit" is not derogatory, just a vulgar and inherently offensive
> way to refer to a woman's breasts.

Since the word "tit" does not elicit that response in me, Larry,
the word is NOT objectively vulgar and offensive. You find it
vulgar and offensive because you are filtering it through your
subjective belief system, i.e. you are using your free will to
choose to find it vulgar and offensive. You have a perfect right
to feel any way you choose but the rest of the world doesn't
give a hoot about your subjective beliefs and feelings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2040. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:23:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D1CD.844EDB10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25087

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > You know, what's interesting Dickie is that you insist you
> > know what "most hams want."
>
> Well, guess what! I have a better shot at it than you do, by a bunch.
> And when that view is reinforced by various other entities among ham
> radio society, you and Cecil being notable exceptions, that view stands.
> Your loss.

Dick, you are showing your ignorance of sampling theory. There are not
enough samples of 700,000 hams regarding Kim's callsign to make a
valid judgment one way or another. Your view is ridiculous.

> I know that most women would view it as vulgar.

Have you polled most women, Dick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2041. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:27:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D2D2.8706E4C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25088

Rick Adams wrote:
> I wonder which of those three societies Dick would have the
> greatest contempt for--I know which one (the last) repells me the
> most!).

Dick has stated that he is satisfied with allowing society
to dictate mores.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2042. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:32:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D3F5.18DDDAD0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25090

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > There are lots of former or current CBers in *our* age group, as you
> > > well know, Cecil.
> >
> > Former 11m CBers didn't exist when I was first licensed, Dick.
> > I participated in the last 11m ham contest. Please prove that
> > the Liberty Net troublemakers are former CBers.
>
> Hey, it was you who said they were my peers. They are not. They are
> yours.

Glad to see you admit it. My coded ham license predates yours and
predates the 11m CB band. So you have just admitted that CBers are
NOT the cause of the troubles on 75m and 20m. Good to see some reality
in your postings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2043. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:32:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C01D3B3.C197B4C5@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25089

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> (snip) I think those whining the hardest
> about the perceived "loss of our freedoms"
> as they pertain to the present state of
> emergency are those who would least like
> to be "obligated" to "pay" for their
> freedom...Regardless if it was to serve
> in the Armed Forces or simply have to
> endue some relatively meager
> inconvienience at home.

I disagree, Steve. Extremism on either side of the political spectrum is not a good thing. I'm all for defending this country but, unlike many conservatives, I'm not willing to write a blank check to allow the government, or the military, to do whatever they want - even in a situation like this. As citizens of a free country, we must challenge anything that we perceive to be a threat to our freedoms and our rights, no matter how slight or how little the inconvienience. If we fail to do that, we're walking down the path to being less free, or having less rights, than those other countries we find so objectable.

Short of military conquest, rights and freedoms are not taken away in massive sweeps (the people might revolt if that happened). Instead, rights and freedoms are nibbled away in little bits, in little laws, and in little inconvieniences. However, after enough of these little inconvieniences, the people wake up to realise they have nothing left.

Go back to the oath you took when you joined the military, Steve. You swore to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Anyone out to take away rights contained in that Constitution ARE the domestic enemies. That's why, in my opinion, anybody who messes with those rights, no matter how slight or how little the inconvienience, had better have a damn good reason before they do. And I want to know exactly what that reason is. And, if they don't tell me, I darn sure plan to ask. Now, if you want to call that "whining," then so be it. I, on the other hand, would call that being a good citizen.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2044. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:35:37 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4BA6E63D3AD2001C.A89828444B0AD29E.4650B37101A7194C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25091

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 03:28:59 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>That isn't necessarily the case, Rick. This is just your pet theory.
>There are plenty of studies which do not agree with the information
>you've set forth.

Ok, then cite them directly. I provided the source for my
information (the US Department of Justice). Care to do the same or is
it hard to cite vaporware?

> You haven't even given us a percentage of our poor,
>suffering and incarcerated souls who are in for possession of marijuana
>use. Just what percentage of U.S. prisoners are incarcerated for
>possessions of small amounts of marijuana?

From the NORML website:

"Marijuana prohibition needlessly destroys the lives and
careers of literally hundreds of thousands of good people each year in
this country. More than 700,000 Americans were arrested on marijuana
charges last year, and more than 5 million Americans have been
arrested for marijuana offenses in the past decade. Almost 90 percent
of these arrests are for simple possession, not trafficking or sale.
This is a misapplication of the criminal sanction that invites
government into areas of our private lives that are inappropriate and
wastes valuable law enforcement resources that should be focused on
serious and violent crime"

From the DoJ:

"In 2000, there were 1,579,566 drug arrests in the US. Of
those, 46.5 percent -- 734,497 arrests -- were for marijuana. There
were 646,042 arrests for simple possession of marijuana in 2000."

From Bartol, C. (2002). Criminal Behavior: A psychosocial
approach. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.:

"In 1998, 1.56 million people were arrested nationally either
for the sale and/or manufacture or possession of illegal drugs . . .
During that same year, an estimated 417,000 jail inmates or 70 percent
of all inmates in local facilities had committed a drug offense or
used drugs regularly."

Next question?

>You seem to have lots of "facts" at your disposal. I especially love
>the one about Moscow being safe until the end of the Cold War. Do you

>have any idea *why*? One of our embassy staff was out in the city one
>night in the '80s. He got drunk and stumbled into a canal. His life
>was saved by his KGB "tail".

Actually, in Moscow, a citizen would probably be served more
quickly by the Moscow Militia, or the NKVD, the civilian branch of
state security.

Do you really think that if a member of the Russian embassy
staff in Washington during the cold war had fallen into a river he
wouldn't have been seen to do so by his FBI tail? Perhaps he wouldn't
have saved him--but he WOULD have seen him fall.

>Did you know that private ownership of handguns is permitted in Finland?

Sure. Want to tell us how easy it is to get a permit to carry
one concealed, as is common in the US?

>Did you also know that you have a national I.D. card and that is
>necessary to provide the police with your new address when you move?

From the US Selective Service Registration Form (MB2):

"Failure to register is a felony and may result in up to
$250,000 in fines, up to 5 years imprisonment or both. . . Once you
register, the law requires you to keep Selective Service informed
within 10 days of your address change."

Not much difference I can see--except that 5 years sounds like
a bit more severe punishment than would be the case there.

>Did you know that a yearly licensing fee of about $600 is imposed in
>order to watch the color TV you buy and that roving electronic
>eavesdropping patrols can come to your house and sieze your TV if you
>haven't paid the fee.

Do the words "Personal Property Tax" ring a bell here in the
states?

>Prostitution is illegal in Finland (as I believe I mentioned earlier).

So? It's illegal here, too. Remember that it was the
Netherlands that I cited as the freest nation in the world--why not
try to cite some arguments about THAT nation?

Incidently, since you ARE citing Finland, care to tell us the
penalties for sodomy, adultery, homosexual sexual activities, personal
use (not sales) of marijuana, and being openly gay in the military?

Oh, I forgot, there ARE no penalties for those acts in
Finland, are there?

>So is the possession of marijuana. Finnish prisons now house the dutch
>manager of a touring rock band for bringing drugs into Finland as well
>as one stupid American girl who brought 15 lbs. of heroin into the

>country.

Er, Dave,

Smuggling 15 lbs. of heroin or other drugs into a nation isn't exactly the same as simple possession. Care to tell us how long the girl received as a sentence (in the US that quantity would guarantee life w/o parole due to mandatory minimum sentencing laws)? Better yet, tell us how many citizens are incarcerated for simple possession of marijuana--the drug offence you BEGAN this sentence with.

>The Nordic prison systems are very enlightened though. During the late
>'90s, one Danish fellow was released from his Danish prison for a
>"holiday". He came to Finland, robbed a hotel and killed a Finnish
>policeman. Maybe we could institute a "holiday" system too.

We have one--it's called "work release."

>If we have more violent crime than other first world countries, we need
>additional space for those who commit the crimes. It would seem that
>there are those who don't know how to handle the freedoms we have and
>who always push for just a little more.

Violent crime isn't an attempt to push for more freedom, Dave, it's a crime against people. And if we started addressing the causes of crime (poverty, racism, a lost drug war, etc.) instead of building more prisons perhaps we WOULDN'T have more violent crime than other first world nations in the first place.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2045. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:36:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D4E4.29ED6E43@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25092

Krell wrote:
> With the strict control the LDS has over that state, it's surprising that
> any such theatres exist at all.

LDS is against caffeine but they own Pepsi and put caffeine in them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2046. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:44:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D6AE.C61D9C3C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25094

Dave Heil wrote:
> If we have more violent crime than other first world countries, we need
> additional space for those who commit the crimes.

We would have plenty of space if we didn't lock up people
for victimless crimes, e.g. prostitution.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2047. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:46:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C01D6D8.1DBC72FC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25093

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> SHHHHHHhhhhhhh!!!! I was pretty certain
> Dick--you know the one who's read the
> book and now he knows all about the
> Muslim faith--was going to have to look
> that one up, and then recover from the
> shock that he's condemning a faith that
> subscribes to the thought that a
> Christian Jesus is regarded as a
> prophet. :)

Opps, sorry about that. I thought you were just asking a general
question. Warn me next time (e.g. "nobody else answer").

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2048. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:46:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D72C.7F41502B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25095

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > I'm surprised at how ignorant you are of human psychology.
> > >
> > > Probably no more surprised than I am at your inability to comprehend a
> > > simple English language sentence.
> >
> > I comprehended it much better than you realize.
>
> That simply can't be if you come back translating the sentence as
> something entirely different than what I wrote.

It's easy to read between the lines, Dave.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2049. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:48:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsl2i$ke1$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25096

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 26 Nov 2001 02:29:15 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > And that's why your license is dated after the date of the
> >restructuring???
>
> Look again, genius. It would have been impossible for my
> upgrade (from KE8HH--that's an Advanced call, remember?) using the new
> rules in time for it to have been issued by that date.

Not at all. You clearly could have taken your Advanced and your CSCE
for the Extra written to the April 15 VE session and your Extra license
was issued by the FCC on May 9. Simple enough.

My written was
> completed in December of 1999 and I took my cw test at the last
> session before the new rules went into effect ...

Yada,yada,yada.....you and your Pal Cecil always have your story worked
out in intricate detail well in advance.

> >> If Hollingsworth is claiming Advanced class hams are causing
> >> more trouble than Techs, he is NOT talking about new licensees.
>
> > So you've discussed it with him and he made that statement?
>
> Your memory is really slipping isn't it Dick?
>
> There ARE no post-restructuring Advanced licenses, it was
> phased out at the time. If someone holds an Advanced ticket it's
> because he or she passed the test BEFORE the restructuring.

Don't look now, but the nonsense didn't start after the Grate Dumb
Down.

> >> Sorry, Dick, but if you communicate on the air the way you do
> >> on line (and if you don't all you are doing is showing disrespect for
> >> ham radio in another venue), YOU and your cronies are the people
> >> Hollingsworth warned us about!
> >
> > You are a horses ass whether on the air on the net. I didn't need to be
> >warned about the likes of you, your manner gives you away right away!
>
> Great example of what I'm talking about.
>

Hey, man I didn't create you as a horses ass, you did that all on your own.

2050. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:48:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D7C0.1C8F7006@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25097

Dave Heil wrote:
> It may remain one of the
> mysteries of your lives and I hope it provides an opportunity for you to
> fritter away hours. Good luck in your quests.

It's absolutely no mystery, Dave. You have already provided the answer.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2051. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:54:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D928.D0675EB3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25099

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Muslims are taught from infancy as an integral part of their religious
> > > training, that all other belief systems are not only inferior but that
> > > they must be wiped out and their adherents either converted, enslaved or
> > > killed.
> >
> > The exact same thing is taught in *YOUR* Bible, Dick. You should crack it
> > open and enlighten yourself. Civilized Christians don't pay much attention
> > to the atrocities we are supposed to commit in the name of Jehovah.
> > Civilized Muslims don't pay much attention to the atrocities they
> > are supposed to commit in the name of Allah.
>
> You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out
> with the Inquisition.

If that is true, then Christians are ignoring Jehovah's directions in
the Bible. The great majority of Muslims also ignore Allah's directions
in the Koran. Only a very small percentage of Muslims are terrorists.
There are virtually no female Muslim terrorists. By itself, that's
half the Muslim population. Your bigoted attempt at collectivism
just doesn't wash.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2052. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:54:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tslfa$l4p$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25098

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> > >You, personally, have offended more potential hams than Kim will
> > >during the rest of her life.
> >
> > What makes you think it is *I* who is offending them?
>
> Your bigoted postings even offend me, Larry, and I have a
> thick skin.
>

So does an onion.
```

2053. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:56:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tslj4$l4p$1@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25100

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > The word "tit" is not derogatory, just a vulgar and inherently offensive
> > way to refer to a woman's breasts.
>
> Since the word "tit" does not elicit that response in me, Larry,
> the word is NOT objectively vulgar and offensive.

SOCIETY at large finds the word to be vulgar and offensive on its face,
more expecially when used in a public mixed setting. You insist that
just because you are as coarse and vulgar, that society also is. You are
wroing.

2054. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 05:57:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01D9D9.6C850807@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25001

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
> Well, I spent 5 years on active duty while you laid around on yoiur ass
> as a 4F. Nuff said.

Actually '1Y' and that classification wasn't my idea.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2055. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:00:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01DA94.AB5B379A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25002

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Well, if you're a lying, phony dumbass that's waht you'll be labelled.

Dick, you have such a way with words. Who first called you a Dick?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2056. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:02:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01DAEE.EA872E17@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25004

Dave Heil wrote:
> The worth of a dictionary is not measured by its weight. If yours is
> deficient, buy a new one or go to a library.

How about you just furnish a reference dictionary that
contains "Church" as an entry?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2057. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:04:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsm11$n4g$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25003

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > There are lots of former or current CBers in *our* age group, as you
> > > > well know, Cecil.
> > >
> > > Former 11m CBers didn't exist when I was first licensed, Dick.
> > > I participated in the last 11m ham contest. Please prove that
> > > the Liberty Net troublemakers are former CBers.
> >
> > Hey, it was you who said they were my peers. They are not. They are
> > yours.
>
> Glad to see you admit it.

Admit what? That the Liberty Nuts are your pals, not mine? That was as
easy as it was factual.

My coded ham license predates yours and
> predates the 11m CB band.

So? you have stated long ago that you were mostly inactive for most of
your license tenure. And just for the record, my coded license dates to
the time when 11 metes was a ham band. So what?

So you have just admitted that CBers are
> NOT the cause of the troubles on 75m and 20m.

Your deductive powers are magical, I see. For I said no such thing.

> Good to see some reality
> in your postings.

'Twould be very nice to see some in yours.

2058. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:07:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsm6o$n4g$1@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25005

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > SHHHHHHhhhhhhh!!!! I was pretty certain
> > Dick--you know the one who's read the
> > book and now he knows all about the
> > Muslim faith--was going to have to look
> > that one up, and then recover from the
> > shock that he's condemning a faith that
> > subscribes to the thought that a
> > Christian Jesus is regarded as a
> > prophet. :)
>
> Opps, sorry about that. I thought you were just asking a general
> question. Warn me next time (e.g. "nobody else answer").

Well just for THE RECORD Mohammad considered and discounted Jesus long before his own death, and proclaimed himself to be the Final Prophet, which remains Muslim doctrine to this day.

2059. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:09:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01DC8F.7A504C46@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25006

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I'll repoeat, when a large percentage of society views it as wrong it
> is a moral issue and thus a part of the mores of that society. Basic
> psychology, not advanced.

I'll bet you love the mores of the society that circumcises little
girls. The US has *individual* rights defined by The Constitution
to protect us from people like you. You and your mob can go to
hell.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2060. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:12:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01DD46.6BBBD748@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25008

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > They are views based on unthinking feelings, Dave. That is the
> > least reliable way to arrive at a rational conclusion. I'm glad
> > your mob is not large enough to enforce your whims.
>
> Does the name "Custer" mean anything to you, Cecil?

Are you threatening me with a massacre? I'm a little better
armed than Custer was.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2061. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:15:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C01DD9C.47D42A73@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25007

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> The first, last, and only in-theatre
> X-rated movie I ever saw was in Times
> Square in NYC, circa 1970, during a
> Christmas season field trip with my
> freshman class from the Catholic
> junior college I was attending at
> the time, Villa Maria College of
> Buffalo. (snip)

The first x-rated movie I saw was an accident. I was about 16 and was living with an older (28-29?) female church member while her husband was out of town. Anyway, one evening we decided to go to a drive-in and selected a movie with an innocent enough sounding name (long forgotten, but there was nothing to even hint it was x-rated). However, shortly after the movie started, we realised the mistake (and left just after that). Sadly, shortly before the movie started, we went to buy some popcorn and ran into a member of another church who was working on the electrical system. So, of course, by the next morning, everybody in the church knew we had went to an x-rated movie.

Happily, my next x-rated movie was much more pleasant. It involved a vacation trip to Verona with an Italian friend, a beautiful Italian girl who didn't speak a word of English (the friend's younger sister), a walk alone the beach of Lake Garda, a dinner at a outdoor cafe, a later movie she selected, and a week camping by the lake with this girl. I'll leave the details to your imagination - I can hardly believe them myself.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2062. Re: airmobile hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:19:16 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <4F961F442A32158D.CC0FFBF87EAB94D6.5DC9518B8C00D2CB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25009

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 19:19:00 GMT, vtail@hotmail.com wrote:

>Of course, the FAA doesn't bother to say how the pilot in command is
>supposed to go about making that determination.

Key it up at max power during preflight, with all the com radios on,
and nav radios set to 'TEST' and tuned to the end of their range
nearest the ham rig's band.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

2063. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:25:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C01E024.DE18FF84@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25010

N2EY wrote:
>
> I think Cecil means that they
> believe ALL Catholics and Mormons
> are going there, regardless of
> how they live their lives.

LOL. I know what Cecil was saying, Jim. My point is that there are a lot of judgemental people in all religions.

> Catholics and Mormons are
> Christians, btw. All of them.

For the intent of the discussion here, my name selection was just fine - you knew which I was talking about, didn't you?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2064. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:34:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C01E23D.9929D568@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25011

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > The Church is all of Christianity.
> > The church is a building.
>
> My unabridged dictionary doesn't
> have an entry for "Church".

Yes it does, Cecil. Look in the guide about capital letters at the beginning of a word - lower case when talking about something in general and upper case when talking about a specific. Therefore, "Church" would suggest a specific church (a Catholic Church, the Catholic Church, etc), while "church" is talking about nothing specific (a building, church in general, etc). You know that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2065. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:36:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01E2E7.87BD6C30@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25013

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Of 52 Islamic nations, none have any hint of freedom in their societies
> save Turkey, ...

Where are you getting your false information, Dick? Egypt, as an
example, has a relatively free market economy.

> He also states categorically that Islam is not a religion basically
> different from Christianity or Judism although of the three only Islam
> dictates that non-Islamics *must* be converted, enslaved or otherwise
> killed.

Your Bible dictates exactly the same thing, Dick. Rational Christians
take their Bible with a grain of salt. Rational Muslims take their
Koran with a grain of salt. What is it about that that you don't
understand? Would you have us nuke all Muslims? That sure sounds
like what you are advocating.

> He states that the radical Islamics are nothing more than Southern
> Baptists in disguise, since some tiny segment of some Chrtistian
> fundamentalist group (not known to be a Southern Baptist splinter group)
> has committed a very few acts of terrorism such as bombing abortion
> clinics.

Radicals are radicals and terrorists are terrorists. Their religions
are not at fault. Their radicalism and terrorism are at fault. There
are radical Catholics in Ireland who are every bit as warped as
the radical Muslims. Tim McVee, a Christian, was every bit as warped
as the radical Muslims. You are advocating genocide of a population
that is 99.9% innocent of any wrongdoing.

> He equates that to the Al Queda organization which has trained
> literally hundreds of thousands of terrorists who have all been trained
> to 'destroy the evil Infidel of the West' even though it cost all their
> own lives and the lives of all other Moslems.

Dick, you want to murder millions of peace-loving, law-abiding Muslims
to be sure you get a handful of terrorists. What you advocate *IS* terrorism.
And "hundreds of thousands of terrorists" is an unbelievable stretch. The
combined armies of the Taliban and Al Queda are only about 100,000 and
most of them are soldiers, not what can be defined as "terrorists". I
would be surprised if there are more than 10,000 true Muslim terrorists
in the entire world.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2066. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:36:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C01E2A6.BADD81F0@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25012

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote..
> >
> > Well said, Dave. I completely forgot
> > about that.
>
> Well, either that, or it is an excellent
> argument out of the scenario of those in
> the Old Testament. :>

Both.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2067. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:40:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01E3DC.96166361@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25014

Dave Heil wrote:
> Sure it is, Cecil. You've obviously lived in places with a higher
> percentage of bigots.

Not just lived, Dave. I used to be a traveling salesman covering
Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2068. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:48:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01E5AC.1B9A7299@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25015

Dick Carroll wrote:
> There is virtually no homosexual behavior in the animal kingdom.

You've got to be kidding, Dick. Just yesterday, my female dog
mounted my niece's female dog and started humping. Any farm boy
will tell you that homosexual behavior is rampant among domestic
animals. So is cross species stuff like ducks and chickens.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2069. K1MAN webpage.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:53:53 UTC
From: "N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <e1bb06a74f973f91732f3ab8815a96bd@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 25016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

This is a very good site......

http://www.carte.net/k1man/sites.htm

2070. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 06:54:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01E73F.7F8C85D3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25017

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> > Terroristic activity in the name of religion (Christianity) has been
> > going on in Northern Ireland for decades too -- and BOTH sides claim
> > a different flavor of Christianity as their motivation.
>
> Ah, Yes, dear old Homeland. But only a blip on the radar beside Islamic
> fundamentalist terrorism, as demonstrated by longtime activities
> culminating at the World Trade Center.

So murders in Ireland are only a blip on the radar? You say some
astounding things, Dick. Dead Irish people are just as dead as
dead American people.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2071. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:07:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01EA29.C4ACD9A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25019

Dick Carroll wrote:
> SOCIETY at large finds the word to be vulgar and offensive on its face,

Care to offer some proof, Dick? I say you are wrong.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2072. Twistedhed: Illegal CBer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:07:48 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0111252307.68b9be0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25018

From: Twstedhead@webtv.net (Twstedhead@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: CBer's to be fined
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 1999/10/06

Everyone knows amps on 11 meters are illegal. So what? So we have the holier-than-thou schmoes out there trying to convince us that we ought to change our ways. Look, I,ll make it real simple 4 u self appointed cops and monitors or whatever the hell u refer to yourselves as. We know the risks, if we take the chance, most of us are ready to deal with the consequences should the heat come down. I have respect for MOST hams, but I achieve the same results at a fraction of the cost. If I bleed a neighbor, all they have to do is knock on my door. We will work it out. I have been in the same area for quite some years and have no problems. If I am not hurting anyone, why the hell should you care WHAT I do? The bottom line is you shouldn't. Get a life. You guys that bitch about us freebanders and "peaked" radios have way too much time on your hands. I don't need to run anymore than 30 watts where I am located and I talk all over the world......yes.. on the freeband. Nothng pleases me more than one of you cb rambos to come in to my conversation and start preaching about rules. God, I love to squash you suckers.

2073. Crazy Twistedhed Sniffs Jock Straps And Talks To Saucer Men

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:13:01 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0111252313.4b7eadd9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25020

Subject: More Twistedhed's Blathering
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Author: twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed)
Date: 2001-03-26 17:20:06 PST

in 3741-3A87F5A4-23@storefull-122.iap.bryant.webtv.net
twistedhed@webtv.net wrote:
>nice forgery Dougie but the headers don't lie.
>Undoubtedly you don't understand how the Usenet
>works so I will explain it to you, my anonymous
>acolyte
>what do you know of my life? The jockstrap you sent
>in the mail is a trophy of your docile worship of
>me and it hangs proudly above my mantle
>I will never cease pirate CB activity as long as it irks
>you or someone like you. However, as a consolation
>and to ease your suffering, I will stay within the
>confines of the freeband for now. The saucer men tell
>me I have a good signal in the pile
==========

2074. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:14:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01EBED.B55ECAC6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25021

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So? you have stated long ago that you were mostly inactive for most of
> your license tenure.

You misunderstood. I had some *HF* inactivity but I was always
active on VHF/UHF during those periods.

> And just for the record, my coded license dates to
> the time when 11 metes was a ham band. So what?

So it means that the Liberty Net folk are indeed your peers.

> So you have just admitted that CBers are
> > NOT the cause of the troubles on 75m and 20m.
>
> Your deductive powers are magical, I see. For I said no such thing.

You have admitted that a lot of the Morse coded Liberty Net folk
obtained their licenses before a 11m CB band existed. It follows
that CB has nothing to do with the mess on 75m contrary to what
you asserted earlier.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2075. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:17:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01EC6E.5F41476@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25022

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Yada,yada,yada.....you and your Pal Cecil always have your story worked
> out in intricate detail well in advance.

That's a characteristic of telling the truth, Dick.
You should try it sometime.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2076. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:25:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01EE7C.BFEE1355@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25023

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So you'll be glad to pass that message along to the hundreds of
> thousands of radical Islamic fundamentalist schooltrained terrorist
> Jihadists - and all their more "moderate" cheerleaders - so that we can
> cancel the current war and just all get along, right?

Where are you getting those outrageous numbers, Dick? There are not
even "hundreds of thousands" of soldiers in the combined armies of
the Taliban and al Qaeda.

Are you advocating the murder of millions of Muslims in order to
kill a few thousand terrorists?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2077. Re: Twistedhed: Illegal CBer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:32:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C01F01D.199F3965@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25024

IllegalCBersMustGO wrote:
> Everyone knows amps on 11 meters are illegal.

Would you believe that every CB radio has a
built-in amp?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2078. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:35:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsrbf$6ak$1@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25025

Cecil, a travelling salesman? Wow! Pity the poor customers.

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Sure it is, Cecil. You've obviously lived in places with a higher
> > percentage of bigots.
>
> Not just lived, Dave. I used to be a traveling salesman covering
> Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2079. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:38:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsrh9$6ak$2@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25026

CAM wrote:
>
> You have admitted that a lot of the Morse coded Liberty Net folk
> obtained their licenses before a 11m CB band existed. It follows
> that CB has nothing to do with the mess on 75m contrary to what
> you asserted earlier.
>

I said no such thing. I said they were licensed before the Grate Dumb
Down.

2080. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:39:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsrj4$6ak$3@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25027

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Yada,yada,yada.....you and your Pal Cecil always have your story worked
> > out in intricate detail well in advance.
>
> That's a characteristic of telling the truth, Dick.
> You should try it sometime.
>

Yeah, right! so how many times have we caught you changing the story in
a later rendition.....

2081. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 07:43:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tsrrp$6ak$4@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25028

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I'll repoeat, when a large percentage of society views it as wrong it
> > is a moral issue and thus a part of the mores of that society. Basic
> > psychology, not advanced.
>
> I'll bet you love the mores of the society that circumcises little
> girls.

You really like to lose, don'te you?

The US has *individual* rights defined by The Constitution
> to protect us from people like you.

Far more likely us from you.

> You and your mob can go to
> hell.

You're doing a pretty good job of showing the way.

> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2082. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 08:02:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tssuuacq0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25029

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Of 52 Islamic nations, none have any hint of freedom in their societies
> > save Turkey, ...
>
> Where are you getting your false information, Dick? Egypt, as an
> example, has a relatively free market economy.

Ah, the Bazaar. Sure, mercantile exchange takes place. So does the
ongoing Islamic dictatorial government which quashes personal freedom as
dictated by the Koran and replaces it with total personal fealty to the
dictates of Allah. Or else.

>
> > He also states categorically that Islam is not a religion basically
> > different from Christianity or Judism although of the three only Islam
> > dictates that non-Islamics *must* be converted, enslaved or otherwise
> > killed.
>
> Your Bible dictates exactly the same thing, Dick. Rational Christians
> take their Bible with a grain of salt. Rational Muslims take their
> Koran with a grain of salt. What is it about that that you don't
> understand? Would you have us nuke all Muslims? That sure sounds
> like what you are advocating.

You still don't have a single clue, do youi? Yoiu juste can't accept
the fundamental differences, even after so many years of zealous assault
on Western people and infrastructure. You don't WANT to acknowledge the
fundamental differences. Even after September 11. President Bush had no
trouble acknowledging those differences, and acting accordingly.
And nowhere did I ever suggest that all Muslims should be
sanctioned,much less nuked. I did suggest that all Muslims-those who are
serious about their religion- are potentially a problem in that they may
harbor latent tendencies to suddenly get religion and follow Allah's
dictates to destroy the Evil Infidels.

>
> > He states that the radical Islamics are nothing more than Southern
> > Baptists in disguise, since some tiny segment of some Chrtistian
> > fundamentalist group (not known to be a Southern Baptist splinter group)
> > has committed a very few acts of terrorism such as bombing abortion
> > clinics.
>
> Radicals are radicals and terrorists are terrorists. Their religions

> are not at fault. Their radicalism and terrorism are at fault. There
> are radical Catholics in Ireland who are every bit as warped as
> the radical Muslims. Tim McVee, a Christian, was every bit as warped
> as the radical Muslims. You are advocating genocide of a population
> that is 99.9% innocent of any wrongdoing.

Cecil, when are you going to read what's there? Ever? I advocate that
we defend ourselves from genocide foisted upon us by a substantial
percentage of the Muslim population. This is not somebodies fantasy. If
you'd check the news every few days you'd know that. I don't mean the
local networks, either. Worldnews on satellite TV (fromCanada) is a good
source, BBC America another, Fox News also good. Evidently you pay
attention only when it fits your agenda. How long do you suppose it has
been that I realized just what we're facing? Not that long. I used to
think the the Moslems were relatively benign, even after the '93 WTC
bombing I didn't realize just how serious this really is, and has been
all along. Do some research and get rid of your blinders.

> > He equates that to the Al Queda organization which has trained
> > literally hundreds of thousands of terrorists who have all been trained
> > to 'destroy the evil Infidel of the West' even though it cost all their
> > own lives and the lives of all other Moslems.
>
> Dick, you want to murder millions of peace-loving, law-abiding Muslims
> to be sure you get a handful of terrorists. What you advocate *IS* terrorism.

Either you are blind or a ignoramus. I advocate no such thing. I
advocate striking the snake at its head, not coiling it in your lap.
Yoiu would just let things be while you worry about your "right" to
dabble in illicit substances until it's too late to stop. If you don't
believe that it's a serious threat its because you are in denial.

> And "hundreds of thousands of terrorists" is an unbelievable stretch. The
> combined armies of the Taliban and Al Queda are only about 100,000 and
> most of them are soldiers, not what can be defined as "terrorists". I
> would be surprised if there are more than 10,000 true Muslim terrorists
> in the entire world.

Well, we know of 19 that were successful on Sept 11. So how much havoc
do you expect 10,000 could manage, assuming you are correct, which youi
are not?

2083. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 08:06:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tst5gauj0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 25030

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > There is virtually no homosexual behavior in the animal kingdom.
>
> You've got to be kidding, Dick. Just yesterday, my female dog
> mounted my niece's female dog and started humping. Any farm boy
> will tell you that homosexual behavior is rampant among domestic
> animals. So is cross species stuff like ducks and chickens.

Nonsense. Animals have no awareness of sex. They are stimulated by pheromones, and sexual activity is the result of that stimuli. You don't see deer screwing around except during rutting season when the females provide the pheromones.
If the phereomones there they don't know sex exists.

2084. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 10:27:06 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <_NoM7.129566$WW.8155513@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25031

Nonya Bidniz <no_email@all.gov> wrote in message
news:91360u44hndlams35reqosgbhbggti1d7d@4ax.com...

> On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 03:24:31 GMT, Nonya Bidniz <no_email@all.gov>
> wrote:

> >>On the other hand you are an illiterate dipschit.

> >Since you can't even spell "sipshit" properly, I doubt that you are
> >qualified to judge who is an is not a dipshit. On the other hand,
> >since it takes one to know one, perhaps you ARE qualified.

> Oops...apparently I can't spell it right either, at least not the
> first time. Excuse me whilst I go wipe te egg off my face.

Heh, heh. An entirely understandable slip-up. Both SIP's and DIP's
are older forms of IC packages. To be really effective, and really
up-to-date, one might consider using the term 'TQFP-shit'.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

2085. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 12:25:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011126072530.20853.00000913@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 25037

In article <wIbM7.128739$WW.8061618@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> Yea, verily.
>>
>> Regale them with Tom Lehrer's "National Brotherhood Week" for a real
>show-stopper.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>We have already had the discussion about how good songs turn into hymns.
>What you may have been exposed to as Jesus Loves the Little Children is the
>tune to God Save Ireland. Our army used it in a little ditty that started
>out, "In this land of dopey dreams, happy peaceful Phillipines."
>
Yup.

But we have barely scratched the surface of true commentary/novelty/parody songs. Particularly the written-for-the-purpose stuff like Tom Lehrer and Monty Python ditties ("Every Sperm Is Sacred", "The Philosopher's Song", and of course "The Lumberjack Song".

Didja know that if you take Neil Diamond's hit "September Morn" and replace the words "September Morn" with "Internet Porn", and make a few other minor changes the song still works, although with a somewhat different meaning?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2086. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 12:25:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011126072530.20853.00000912@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 25038

In article <3bffadc1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>I have participated in NTS; have served as net control on NTS nets; have
>participated in public service events; have served as net control in public
>service events; have been the voice of training for Hunt County ARES nets
>and, a couple years back, nets for a group we named TRADES; and the list
>goes on.

That's nice, Kim. I've done the NTS thing, too - all the way up to Area level.

> My callsign has been no problem--in fact never even been mentioned
>after the fact--on any kind of net. I am sure that those who disagree with
>it just leave the matter alone and disregard it, and those who do find humor
>or whatever, in it, know that nets are not the time.

Everyone knows the nets are not the time. So the lack of comment simply means
that those who are offended don't compound the problem by mentioning it during
the net.

In addition, it's obvious that you won't voluntarily change it, so there's no
point in on-air mention of the issue.
>
>In fact, responsibly-minded people see it as nothing more than a callsign,
>and one that has a great deal of "conversational value" off the air, for
>those eyeball get-togethers!

Sems to me you define "responsibly minded people" as those who don't voice
objections.
>
>Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
>
Because this is the appropriate place to do so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2087. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 12:25:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011126072531.20853.00000915@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 25033

In article <3C01D6AE.C61D9C3C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> If we have more violent crime than other first world countries, we need
>> additional space for those who commit the crimes.
>
>We would have plenty of space if we didn't lock up people
>for victimless crimes, e.g. prostitution.

That would be a good idea if prostitution were a victimless crime. But it's not.

How many people are locked up for prostitution, vs. violent crimes? You're saying we would have plenty of space, Cecil, so you must know the numbers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2088. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 12:25:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011126072531.20853.00000914@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 25034

In article <3C01422C.6DE3BF71@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.

They DO? How do you know, Cecil?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2089. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 12:25:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011126072532.20853.00000917@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 25035

In article <397bbd8f51b96b2316bcffd9a718cad7.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>, "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> writes:

>The opinion of N2EY seems to be......
>
>>Just because a thing has not yet been discoverd does not mean it does not
>>exist. Go back around 200 years, and your argument could be applied to
>>electronic communications (nobody has ever done it, so it must not exist).
>
>Electronic communications did not exist in 1801, at least not on this
>planet.

Exactly. The concept of it, and the methods of making those concepts practical, hadn't been demonstrated in 1801.

KE8HH's logic is that if something hasn't been demonstrated, it cannot exist. That's simply not correct.

Sorry if I was a bit vague there.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2090. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 12:25:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011126072532.20853.00000916@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 25036

In article <3C01DC8F.7A504C46@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> I'll repoeat, when a large percentage of society views it as wrong it
>> is a moral issue and thus a part of the mores of that society. Basic
>> psychology, not advanced.
>
>I'll bet you love the mores of the society that circumcises little
>girls.

Is it OK to do it to boys but not girls?

>The US has *individual* rights defined by The Constitution
>to protect us from people like you.

All of those rights are subject to change. All it takes is for a large percentage of society, through their elected representatives, to amend the Constitution.

In addition, the interpretation of the Constitution is determined by a very small group of judges. Rights rise and fall on their decision. For example, abortion was illegal practically everywhere until 1973, when a single judgement of the Supremes struck down existing laws and established a "right of privacy" for those seeking abortions and wiped out the "right to life" of those being aborted.

The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2091. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 12:25:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011126072533.20853.00000918@nso-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 25032

In article <3C01E024.DE18FF84@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> I think Cecil means that they
>> believe ALL Catholics and Mormons
>> are going there, regardless of
>> how they live their lives.
>
> LOL. I know what Cecil was saying, Jim. My point is that there are a
>lot of judgemental people in all religions.

Agreed. There are also those who have all sorts of mistaken ideas about
Catholics and members of the LDS church, and the beliefs of same.
>
>> Catholics and Mormons are
>> Christians, btw. All of them.

> For the intent of the discussion here, my name selection was just
>fine - you knew which I was talking about, didn't you?
>
Just wanted to be clear.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2092. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 13:13:14 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <KdrM7.1741$m%.527643@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 25039

Amen Brother! Preach it to the masses!

Ryan

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3BFE52A2.BC9AED37@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > To help balance the views, Kim. We wouldn't want things to lean too far
> > to the left.
>
> Leaning in the direction of freedom is definitely not leaning to
> either the left or the right. The liberal left is generally for
> social freedom and against economic freedom. The conservative right
> is generally for economic freedom and against social freedom.
> Note that both are anti-freedom is certain areas. Libertarians
> are for both social and economic freedom, i.e. freedom in general.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2093. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 13:13:16 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <MdrM7.1742$m%.527285@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 25040

Oh, I know that..... I just thought it would be funny if we all sent a whole bunch to ya, just to see what happens to the message traffic along the way. I am sure there are some mega-prudes (people who like to control others actions of course) on the NTS as well as here.

Ryan

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3bffadc1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> Hello, Ryan. Well, I know you submitted with tongue-in-cheek, because I've
> always stated (and it's true) that my callsign is no distraction to
> responsibly-minded individuals on the air.
>
> I have participated in NTS; have served as net control on NTS nets; have
> participated in public service events; have served as net control in public
> service events; have been the voice of training for Hunt County ARES nets
> and, a couple years back, nets for a group we named TRADES; and the list
> goes on. My callsign has been no problem--in fact never even been mentioned
> after the fact--on any kind of net. I am sure that those who disagree with
> it just leave the matter alone and disregard it, and those who do find humor
> or whatever, in it, know that nets are not the time.
>
> In fact, responsibly-minded people see it as nothing more than a callsign,
> and one that has a great deal of "conversational value" off the air, for
> those eyeball get-togethers!
>
> Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> news:3LJL7.438$9d.140537@newshog.newsread.com...
> > Just had an interesting thought there Kim..... what if we had a bunch of
> > people generate message traffic TO YOU (with your call obviously). Can
> you
> > imagine what people might do within the NTS??? Definitely prove or
> disprove
> > the alleged comments made here. Just a though I had.
> >

> > Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> > >
> > > You must be the "silent majority" because the majority of people I
> > encounter
> > > over my callsign have no problem with it at all. And, a "silent
> majority"
> > > is either a) a secret society, or b) useless.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

2094. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 13:37:07 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ttgfp01iji@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25041

"Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message
news:9tsilc$n0u$1@news.hawaii.edu...
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
> >A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
> >prevalent among may ham radio operators.
>
> Out of our 600,000+ members, what percentage display those
> characteristics, Rick? If say, you've counted 60,000, that
> would be just 10%. Is ten percent "a tremendous amount"?
> (Do you even know 60,000 hams???)

That's as may be, but there is an old experiment my English teacher once showed us. He had a plain, white piece of paper, (standard 8 1/2 x 11 inches) and marked it with a black dot, about the size of a dime. He asked the class what they noticed about the paper. Everyone said they noticed the black dot. He then pointed that we didn't notice the white area, or that the other side was still blank, or even the shape or size. The first thing they saw was a black dot that stood out from the rest of the paper.

Even if 5% or 1% of hams are racist or bigots, they are like that black dot that stands out. People will notice this before anything else. People will base their judgements on this.

> (I wish you folks would preface your comments with "IMO"
> so that the non-hams reading this NG know you're not in any
> way stating facts but rather opinions...)
>
> 73, Jeff KH6O

Most postings on this, or any other newsgroup, are just that - opinions.

2095. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 13:42:46 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ttgqc01j2p@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25042

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C01D1CD.844EDB10@IEEE.org...
> > I know that most women would view it as vulgar.
>
> Have you polled most women, Dick?

Only in his dreams.

2096. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 13:59:23 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tthpg01jvn@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25044

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tsiu7evq0@208.206.142.78...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:9ts759dps0@208.206.142.78...
> > > You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out
> >
> > Formal? It's still practiced by the KKK and Rev. Phelps of
godhatesfags.com
>
>
> Oh really?? They advocate their death and total destruction?

That's seems to be the impression one gets from their doctrines and beliefs.

> > The Bible, Koran, and the Book of Mormon have all been twisted by
fanatics
> > to suit their own ends. It continues to be done today. Islam, as
practiced
> > by Arab countries is not a religion. It is a politcal system. This is
not
> > what true Islam is all about.
>
>
> So you'll be glad to pass that message along to the hundreds of
> thousands of radical Islamic fundamentalist schooltrained terrorist
> Jihadists - and all their more "moderate" cheerleaders - so that we can
> cancel the current war and just all get along, right?

Telling you something is like pouring water on a rock - it just doesn't sink
in.

2097. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 14:05:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tti5k01kcg@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25043

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C01EE7C.BFEE1355@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So you'll be glad to pass that message along to the hundreds of
> > thousands of radical Islamic fundamentalist schooltrained terrorist
> > Jihadists - and all their more "moderate" cheerleaders - so that we can
> > cancel the current war and just all get along, right?
>
> Where are you getting those outrageous numbers, Dick? There are not
> even "hundreds of thousands" of soldiers in the combined armies of
> the Taliban and al Qaeda.
>
> Are you advocating the murder of millions of Muslims in order to
> kill a few thousand terrorists?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil, since you're a Libertarian, you might have a subscription to Liberty magazine. Sarah McCarthy has an interesting article in the December issue. I share her views completely on this issue. Her article, "Rage Now!" advocates total retaliation without even bringing religion into the picture.

Dick, however, doesn't see things this way.

2098. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 14:10:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ttidt01l1u@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25046

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C01D4E4.29ED6E43@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> > With the strict control the LDS has over that state, it's surprising
that
> > any such theatres exist at all.
>
> LDS is against caffeine but they own Pepsi and put caffeine in them.

That probably only applies to church members. Even Jews sell pork to goyim.
They just don't consume it themselves.

2099. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 14:12:58 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ttij201leu@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25047

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011125232032.25429.00003458@nso-fc.aol.com...
> What I do recall about the film is that the best set of breasts I saw
> was on the girl I was with!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Yet, you don't think it's right for a word meaning "breasts" to be viewed by the rest of the world via an amateur callsign. What a hypocrite!

2100. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 14:22:25 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ttj4m01m57@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25101

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9ts7u8etc1@208.206.142.78...
> > > Ah, poor Baby!!!! For you history started with restructuring. Take
your
> > > pacifier quietly, now!
> >
> > The score for the damage to amateur radio is as follows:
> >
> > Dick's attitude - 98
> > Kim's callsign - 1 (the only damage being those hams that have
complained
> > about it, but they really don't count)
>
>
> The only damage is to your fragile code-phobic psyche and that doesn't
> count.

Umm...What does my opinion of code have to do with Kim's callsign and your
attitude?

2101. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 14:23:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011126092324.22712.00001887@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 25045

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 11/25/2001 11:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C01D3B3.C197B4C5@sccoast.net>

>I'm not willing to write a blank check to
>allow the government, or the military, to do whatever they want - even
>in a situation like this.

And neither is Congress....witness the inclusion of sunset requirements in many of the "emergency" acts being implemented. Congress will ahve to at least revisit and re-vote on many of these acts for them to continue. And I agree.

>However, after enough of these little
>inconvieniences, the people wake up to realise they have nothing left.

It's been that way for years, and much of it has been imposed on us by agencies OTHER than the government....However the Government has it's own peculiarities.....

I recieved a letter Saturday from the Agency in Ohio that oversees my son's child support. The letter was postmarked November 19th, dated November 19th, and in the text it advised me that there "would" be an administrative hearing to review the present amount on October 29th, but that it was not necessary for me to attend...

Thankgoodness, too, cuz my free pass in the Time Tunnel expired on November 18th.

>That's why, in my opinion,
>anybody who messes with those rights, no matter how slight or how
>little the inconvienience, had better have a damn good reason before
>they do. And I want to know exactly what that reason is

I agree, but I also acknowledge that there are times when "debate" over such actions is incompatable with imminent need. Therefore I have no problem with the implementation of certain restrictions and limits as long as there are reasonable time constraints from the onset.

>Now, if you want to call that
>"whining," then so be it. I, on the other hand, would call that being
>a good citizen.

There's a difference between the bonafide interaction of the citizen in the process of the government and those who just whine. I know the difference.

73
Steve, K4YZ

2102. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 14:43:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C025523.C561E1CA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25048

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
>
> They DO? How do you know, Cecil?

Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2103. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 14:46:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0255AE.C6284AF4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25049

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > You have admitted that a lot of the Morse coded Liberty Net folk
> > obtained their licenses before a 11m CB band existed. It follows
> > that CB has nothing to do with the mess on 75m contrary to what
> > you asserted earlier.
> >
>
> I said no such thing. I said they were licensed before the Grate Dumb
> Down.

You agreed that a lot of them are my peers who were licensed
before 11m CB even existed which contradicts virtually
everything you have ever said about the subject. Nobody
believed you anyway.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2104. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 14:47:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C02561F.A7F2D9A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25050

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Yada,yada,yada.....you and your Pal Cecil always have your story worked
> > > out in intricate detail well in advance.
> >
> > That's a characteristic of telling the truth, Dick.
> > You should try it sometime.
>
> Yeah, right! so how many times have we caught you changing the story in
> a later rendition.....

Not changing, Dick - just adding details. That, of course, doesn't
include my tongue-in-cheek humor which you invariably fall for.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2105. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 15:10:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C025B64.CCE107D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25102

N2EY wrote:
> That would be a good idea if prostitution were a victimless crime. But it's
> not.

Exactly what is the real difference between a one night stand (legal) and
paying for a one night stand (illegal)? Prostitution is an economic contract
between two consenting adults. There is no victim unless adultery is committed
and those victims are caused by the adultery, not by the prostitution. Blaming
adultery on prostitution is like blaming armed robberies on guns.

Years ago I was single and doing consulting engineering in Korea. One
night this lovely lady knocked on my door and said she had been
sent by one of the firms with which I had placed an order. She was
my commission. I had the night of my life, she got to spend a rare night
with a gentleman, and earned her living doing what she was best at.
It was perfectly legal. Exactly who was the victim?

> How many people are locked up for prostitution, vs. violent crimes? You're
> saying we would have plenty of space, Cecil, so you must know the numbers.

One estimate I read on the web is that 1/3 of all prisoners committed
victimless crimes. One prisoner got more prison time for possession
of one marijuana cigarette than a serial child molester got for his
string of multiple broken lives. Do you think that's right?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2106. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 15:14:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C025C6F.F31FD526@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25103

Krell wrote:
> Cecil, since you're a Libertarian, you might have a subscription to Liberty
> magazine. Sarah McCarthy has an interesting article in the December issue. I
> share her views completely on this issue. Her article, "Rage Now!" advocates
> total retaliation without even bringing religion into the picture.

I'm not sure what she meant by "total". If by total retaliation, she
means eliminating the threat, I agree with her. We can minimize the
threat of terrorism without genocide against a billion innocent people.

> Dick, however, doesn't see things this way.

Dick apparently desires to commit genocide against Muslims. That's
what some Muslim terrorists want to do to us. Dick is just like them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2107. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 15:18:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C025D3E.B4BAED66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25104

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > I'll repoeat, when a large percentage of society views it as wrong it
> > > is a moral issue and thus a part of the mores of that society. Basic
> > > psychology, not advanced.
> >
> > I'll bet you love the mores of the society that circumcises little
> > girls.
>
> You really like to lose, don'te you?

You are so hung up on the mores of society, Dick, I thought I would
show how mores can be just as evil as anything else.

> > You and your mob can go to
> > hell.
>
> You're doing a pretty good job of showing the way.

"Here's A Quarter, Call Someone Who Cares".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2108. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 15:22:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C025E4B.3B7CB1E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25105

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I'll bet you love the mores of the society that circumcises little
> >girls.
>
> Is it OK to do it to boys but not girls?

I don't believe it's OK to do it to either sex. Did you see Woody
Allen's movie where he demanded his foreskin back from his parents?

> >The US has *individual* rights defined by The Constitution
> >to protect us from people like you.
>
> All of those rights are subject to change. All it takes is for a large
> percentage of society, through their elected representatives, to amend the
> Constitution.

Takes 2/3 of the states to do that avoiding the tyranny of a small majority.

> The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.

It ain't perfect but it will do until something better comes along.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2109. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 15:38:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0261E8.4508E37F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25106

Dick Carroll wrote:
> And nowhere did I ever suggest that all Muslims should be
> sanctioned,much less nuked. I did suggest that all Muslims-those who are
> serious about their religion- are potentially a problem in that they may
> harbor latent tendencies to suddenly get religion and follow Allah's
> dictates to destroy the Evil Infidels.

Let's, for the sake of argument, say you are right about *all* Muslims.
What actions do you propose to take? Please be specific. If you don't
advocate killing or jailing *all* Muslims, what is your purpose in
stirring up hatred for *all* Muslims?

> Cecil, when are you going to read what's there? Ever? I advocate that
> we defend ourselves from genocide foisted upon us by a substantial
> percentage of the Muslim population.

So if you don't advocate killing them, exactly what are you advocating?
Please be specific.

> Worldnews on satellite TV (fromCanada) is a good
> source, BBC America another, Fox News also good. Evidently you pay
> attention only when it fits your agenda.

I don't get any of those news services.

> > Dick, you want to murder millions of peace-loving, law-abiding Muslims
> > to be sure you get a handful of terrorists. What you advocate *IS* terrorism.
>
> Either you are blind or a ignoramus. I advocate no such thing. I
> advocate striking the snake at its head, not coiling it in your lap.

Are you going to give us a parable or spell out some details? Exactly
what do you propose to do?

> You would just let things be while you worry about your "right" to
> dabble in illicit substances until it's too late to stop. If you don't
> believe that it's a serious threat its because you are in denial.

I don't believe you are capable of a posting without a diversion.
Unlike you, I believe in jailing or killing *all* the few thousand
terrorists, Dick, not *all* one billion Muslims.

> Well, we know of 19 that were successful on Sept 11. So how much havoc
> do you expect 10,000 could manage, assuming you are correct, which you
> are not?

I advocate going after and neutralizing or killing, *all* the terrorists.
I believe we can do that without murdering a billion Muslims. You,

apparently do not share my view. Your goal is to get every non-Muslim to hate every Muslim. Toward what end? You are no better than the terrorists. They hate all Christians. You hate all Muslims.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2110. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 15:42:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0262F8.42AA4CCC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25107

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil, a travelling salesman? Wow! Pity the poor customers.

My customers awarded me so much business (at 8% commission)
that I had to transfer to California as a Project Engineer
to manage the projects that I had sold. I designed so much
of the digital electronics, they later transferred me to R&D.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2111. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 15:44:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C026375.5B86CBCD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25108

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > There is virtually no homosexual behavior in the animal kingdom.
> >
> > You've got to be kidding, Dick. Just yesterday, my female dog
> > mounted my niece's female dog and started humping. Any farm boy
> > will tell you that homosexual behavior is rampant among domestic
> > animals. So is cross species stuff like ducks and chickens.
>
> Nonsense. Animals have no awareness of sex.

Guess that's why none of them ever reproduce, eh? There is not one
other person on this newsgroup who agrees with you, Dick. You seem
to be the only ignorant one this time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2112. Updated web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:02:47 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c0275b7$1@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 25109

Added a Q Signals page to my site. The full list can also be downloaded
as either a text file or MS Word document file.....

Web site listed below....

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

2113. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:07:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0272E5.25F9BD94@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25110

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 03:28:59 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >That isn't necessarily the case, Rick. This is just your pet theory.
> >There are plenty of studies which do not agree with the information
> >you've set forth.
>
> Ok, then cite them directly. I provided the source for my
> information (the US Department of Justice). Care to do the same or is
> it hard to cite vaporware?

Wish you'd stop snipping relevant portions, Rick. It isn't clear from
your edit what it is that I'm in disagreement with. Did you read from
my statement that the portion of your claims with which I disagree are
the Department of Justice figures?

> > You haven't even given us a percentage of our poor,
> >suffering and incarcerated souls who are in for possession of marijuana
> >use. Just what percentage of U.S. prisoners are incarcerated for
> >possessions of small amounts of marijuana?
>
> From the NORML website:
>
> "Marijuana prohibition needlessly destroys the lives and
> careers of literally hundreds of thousands of good people each year in
> this country. More than 700,000 Americans were arrested on marijuana
> charges last year, and more than 5 million Americans have been
> arrested for marijuana offenses in the past decade. Almost 90 percent
> of these arrests are for simple possession, not trafficking or sale.
> This is a misapplication of the criminal sanction that invites
> government into areas of our private lives that are inappropriate and
> wastes valuable law enforcement resources that should be focused on
> serious and violent crime"

Heh, NORML is a group advocating the legalization of marijuana.

> From the DoJ:
>
> "In 2000, there were 1,579,566 drug arrests in the US. Of
> those, 46.5 percent -- 734,497 arrests -- were for marijuana. There
> were 646,042 arrests for simple possession of marijuana in 2000."

This does not address convictions nor imprisonments.

> From Bartol, C. (2002). Criminal Behavior: A psychosocial
> approach. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.:
>
> "In 1998, 1.56 million people were arrested nationally either
> for the sale and/or manufacture or possession of illegal drugs . . .
> During that same year, an estimated 417,000 jail inmates or 70 percent
> of all inmates in local facilities had committed a drug offense or
> used drugs regularly."

Sale and manufacture? You have a problem with those people being
arrested? The book certainly does not make clear what percentage of the
417,000 jail inmates it speaks of are there for a drug offense. It
simply states that they had committed one or that they use drugs.

> Next question?

Where's the beef?
>
> >You seem to have lots of "facts" at your disposal. I especially love
> >the one about Moscow being safe until the end of the Cold War. Do you
> >have any idea *why*? One of our embassy staff was out in the city one
> >night in the '80s. He got drunk and stumbled into a canal. His life
> >was saved by his KGB "tail".
>
> Actually, in Moscow, a citizen would probably be served more
> quickly by the Moscow Militia, or the NKVD, the civilian branch of
> state security.

Actually, his tail was KGB. He wasn't a citizen.

> Do you really think that if a member of the Russian embassy
> staff in Washington during the cold war had fallen into a river he
> wouldn't have been seen to do so by his FBI tail? Perhaps he wouldn't
> have saved him--but he WOULD have seen him fall.

I don't care. What was your reasoning behind making your statement in
the first place?

> >Did you know that private ownership of handguns is permitted in Finland?
>
> Sure. Want to tell us how easy it is to get a permit to carry
> one concealed, as is common in the US?

Is there a secret? Tell us.

> >Did you also know that you have a national I.D. card and that is
> >necessary to provide the police with your new address when you move?
>
> From the US Selective Service Registration Form (MB2):
>
> "Failure to register is a felony and may result in up to
> $250,000 in fines, up to 5 years imprisonment or both. . . Once you
> register, the law requires you to keep Selective Service informed
> within 10 days of your address change."

I'm not subject to the draft. Neither is my wife. Are you? Is Kim? Is Cecil? Try again.

> Not much difference I can see--except that 5 years sounds like
> a bit more severe punishment than would be the case there.
>
> >Did you know that a yearly licensing fee of about $600 is imposed in
> >order to watch the color TV you buy and that roving electronic
> >eavesdropping patrols can come to your house and sieze your TV if you
> >haven't paid the fee.
>
> Do the words "Personal Property Tax" ring a bell here in the
> states?

I don't pay personal property tax on a TV. The tax is not a personal property tax. It is a use tax. If you never have your set turned on, you'll never have it siezed.

> >Prostitution is illegal in Finland (as I believe I mentioned earlier).
>
> So? It's illegal here, too. Remember that it was the
> Netherlands that I cited as the freest nation in the world--why not
> try to cite some arguments about THAT nation?

I'm not the individual claiming that legalized prostitution makes a nation more free. You cited Finland, among other nations, as being more free than the U.S.

> Incidently, since you ARE citing Finland, care to tell us the
> penalties for sodomy, adultery, homosexual sexual activities, personal
> use (not sales) of marijuana, and being openly gay in the military?

I don't have the slightest idea. I did not try to state anything I did not have firsthand knowledge of.

> Oh, I forgot, there ARE no penalties for those acts in
> Finland, are there?

My guess would be that you have no more idea than I do.

> >So is the possession of marijuana. Finnish prisons now house the dutch
> >manager of a touring rock band for bringing drugs into Finland as well
> >as one stupid American girl who brought 15 lbs. of heroin into the
> >country.
>
> Er, Dave,
>
> Smuggling 15 lbs. of heroin or other drugs into a nation isn't
> exactly the same as simple possession. Care to tell us how long the
> girl received as a sentence (in the US that quantity would guarantee
> life w/o parole due to mandatory minimum sentencing laws)? Better yet,
> tell us how many citizens are incarcerated for simple possession of
> marijuana--the drug offence you BEGAN this sentence with.

I believe her sentence was was 13 years. I provided the information in addition to information about marijuana being illegal. I know that those found to possess marijuana are arrested. I'll ask my wife if she knows how many are incarcerated.

> >The Nordic prison systems are very enlightened though. During the late
> >'90s, one Danish fellow was released from his Danish prison for a
> >"holiday". He came to Finland, robbed a hotel and killed a Finnish
> >policeman. Maybe we could institute a "holiday" system too.
>
> We have one--it's called "work release."

Violent criminals are not provided "work release".

> >If we have more violent crime than other first world countries, we need
> >additional space for those who commit the crimes. It would seem that
> >there are those who don't know how to handle the freedoms we have and
> >who always push for just a little more.
>
> Violent crime isn't an attempt to push for more freedom, Dave,
> it's a crime against people. And if we started addressing the causes
> of crime (poverty, racism, a lost drug war, etc.) instead of building
> more prisons perhaps we WOULDN'T have more violent crime than other
> first world nations in the first place.

Some folks become violent simply because it is as much a part of their genetic makeup as sexuality. There are some just plain evil people loose. As far as addressing the root causes, I believe there are numerous groups along with government addressing those very issues.

Dave K8MN

2114. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:08:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C027343.47119E1D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25111

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > If we have more violent crime than other first world countries, we need
> > additional space for those who commit the crimes.
>
> We would have plenty of space if we didn't lock up people
> for victimless crimes, e.g. prostitution.

You might have a case if everyone believed as you do. Most folks don't.

Dave K8MN

2115. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:10:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0273AC.2B79ACDE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25112

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > I'm surprised at how ignorant you are of human psychology.
> > > >
> > > > Probably no more surprised than I am at your inability to comprehend a
> > > > simple English language sentence.
> > >
> > > I comprehended it much better than you realize.
> >
> > That simply can't be if you come back translating the sentence as
> > something entirely different than what I wrote.
>
> It's easy to read between the lines, Dave.

Why, you'd have to be a fool to believe that.

Dave K8MN
```

2116. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:12:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C027411.75CC95C8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25113

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > It may remain one of the
> > mysteries of your lives and I hope it provides an opportunity for you to
> > fritter away hours. Good luck in your quests.
>
> It's absolutely no mystery, Dave. You have already provided the answer.

I've provided no information whatever. It is up to you to divine the
information from the facts at your disposal. Oh, there aren't any?
Darn the luck!

Dave K8MN

2117. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:16:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C027502.D0B45EDB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25114

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > They are views based on unthinking feelings, Dave. That is the
> > > > least reliable way to arrive at a rational conclusion. I'm glad
> > > > your mob is not large enough to enforce your whims.
> > >
> > > Does the name "Custer" mean anything to you, Cecil?
> >
> > Are you threatening me with a massacre? I'm a little better
> > armed than Custer was.

The "mob" you refer to is society. You're outnumbered and outvoted
pardner.

Dave K8MN

2118. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:19:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0275BB.5036EB54@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25115

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > The Church is all of Christianity.
> > > The church is a building.
> >
> > My unabridged dictionary doesn't
> > have an entry for "Church".
>
> Yes it does, Cecil. Look in the guide about capital letters at the
> beginning of a word - lower case when talking about something in
> general and upper case when talking about a specific. Therefore,
> "Church" would suggest a specific church (a Catholic Church, the
> Catholic Church, etc), while "church" is talking about nothing
> specific (a building, church in general, etc). You know that.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Sure he does but he'd prefer to play games.

Dave K8MN

2119. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:22:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C027687.5FAF6413@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25116

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Sure it is, Cecil. You've obviously lived in places with a higher
> > percentage of bigots.
>
> Not just lived, Dave. I used to be a traveling salesman covering
> Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas.

Yeah, I know. I waved at you twice while you were passing through Shreveport but you must not have seen me. I think I saw you pass through the Tupelo area too while I was visiting my former in-laws. I hope you've taken steps to correct your vision.

Dave K8MN

2120. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:34:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C027953.E74613F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25117

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> >
> > They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
>
> Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.

Brilliant! Of course there's the part where they'd have to be online, would have to be aware of newsgroups, would have to find this particular newsgroup and would have to be interested in a mild sort of way in amateur radio in order to start reading it.

I think we may have another Sherlock Holmes on our hands.

Dave K8MN

2121. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 17:37:25 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <p5vM7.198527$3d2.8380017@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25118

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011126072530.20853.00000913@nso-cc.aol.com...
> In article <wIbM7.128739$WW.8061618@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >> Yea, verily.
> >>
> >> Regale them with Tom Lehrer's "National Brotherhood Week" for a real
> >show-stopper.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >We have already had the discussion about how good songs turn into hymns.
> >What you may have been exposed to as Jesus Loves the Little Children is
the
> >tune to God Save Ireland. Our army used it in a little ditty that
started
> >out, "In this land of dopey dreams, happy peaceful Phillipines."
> >
> Yup.
>
> But we have barely scratched the surface of true commentary/novelty/parody
> songs. Particularly the written-for-the-purpose stuff like Tom Lehrer and
Monty
> Python ditties ("Every Sperm Is Sacred", "The Philosopher's Song", and of
> course "The Lumberjack Song".
>
> Didja know that if you take Neil Diamond's hit "September Morn" and
replace the
> words "September Morn" with "Internet Porn", and make a few other minor
changes
> the song still works, although with a somewhat different meaning?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I do want to keep my job. Are you familiar with Lou and Peter Berryman???

2122. Re: K1MAN webpage.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 18:01:41 UTC
From: old one-eye <andryne3333@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <9svM7.6852$Kc2.766424@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 25119
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

It's a good site if your into reading self-gratification
by a commensurate mental patient with an
ego the size of the State of Montana who likes
to QRM existing QSO's with his redundant bullshitcasts..

I do encourage a look at the webpage however.
An excellent example of ham radio at it's "best".
(this being a retard - hire the handicapped, their fun to watch)

"N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:e1bb06a74f973f91732f3ab8815a96bd@spamfreenews.com...
> This is a very good site......
>
> http://www.carte.net/k1man/sites.htm
>
>
>

2123. Re: K1MAN webpage.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 18:06:11 UTC
From: old one-eye <andryne3333@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <nwvM7.6873$Kc2.769802@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 25120
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

From the ARRL Letter, Vol. 18, # 27, July 9, 1999

FCC queries K1MAN on control op's whereabouts
The FCC wants to know who was the control operator and where he or she was when it visited the station of Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, in Belgrade Lakes, Maine, in mid- May and failed to find Baxter or anyone else on the premises. As FCC Attorney for Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, announced at the Dayton Hamvention, FCC engineers from the Commission's Boston office unsuccessfully attempted to inspect Baxter's station while it was on the air May 14 and again the following day. They reported that the station was transmitting, but facilities appeared to be locked and no one was around.

Hollingsworth wrote Baxter June 25 to formally inquire into the circumstances of the May visits.
He also asked if K1MAN employed station automation equipment and if the station ever was remotely
controlled.

The FCC says that during its first attempt to visit K1MAN, on the morning of May 14, 1999, K1MAN was transmitting on 3.975 MHz. FCC personnel say they were unable to find anyone"either at Baxter" s station at the tip of Long Point or at his nearby residence"and, according to Hollingsworth's letter, "there were no vehicles on the premises."

"The radio transmissions continued while the FCC personnel went to your residence at Point Road, but there was no one present there either," Hollingsworth wrote. The next day while K1MAN was on the air, Hollingsworth wrote, "FCC personnel again attempted to inspect your station but there was no one present and there were no vehicles."

In addition to the name, address, and telephone number of the control operator on those two occasions, the FCC also wants to find out where the control operator was and at what times, and on
what frequencies, K1MAN transmitted on May 14 and 15, 1999.

Hollingsworth also asked Baxter to list the name, address and telephone number of all control operators of K1MAN during the hours of operation listed on Baxter's Web site and in his daily transmissions. He also inquired if any portions of K1MAN transmissions automated, and, if so, to provide details and a copy of the control circuit.

In addition, Hollingsworth asked Baxter to list the programming schedule for K1MAN for the period of January 1, 1998 through June 1, 1999, "and provide the dates, times and frequencies," as well as the name address, and telephone number of the control operator for each of those transmissions.

The FCC also wants to know if automated tape control devices were utilized at K1MAN during the
period January 1, 1998 to June 1, 1999, and, if so, on what dates, times, and frequencies.

Hollingsworth's letter also asks Baxter to list all dates, times and frequencies that K1MAN has transmitted without a control operator being present since the inception of the license term on October 17, 1995.

Finally, the FCC said it wants to know if K1MAN has been controlled remotely since the inception of the license term on October 17, 1995, and, if so, on what dates, times, frequencies. Hollingsworth's letter also requested a "detailed schematic of the control circuit configuration."

The FCC letter gave Baxter 30 days to provide the requested information.

BELGRADE LAKES, ME: The FCC's Riley Hollingsworth wrote Extra licensee Glenn A. Baxter, K1MAN, June 25, after FCC engineers from the Commission's Boston office unsuccessfully attempted to inspect Baxter's station while it was on the air May 14 and again the following day. The FCC engineers reported that the station was transmitting, but facilities appeared to be locked and no one was around during both attempted visits. The FCC says that during its first attempt to visit K1MAN, on the morning of May 14, 1999, K1MAN was transmitting on 3.975 MHz. FCC personnel reportedly were unable to find anyone--either at Baxter's station at the tip of Long Point or at his nearby residence--and, according to Hollingsworth's letter, "there were no vehicles on the premises." Among other things, the FCC wants to know the name, address, and telephone number of the control operator on those two occasions, where the control operator was and at what times, and on what frequencies, K1MAN transmitted on May 14 and 15, 1999. The FCC also asked if K1MAN has been controlled remotely since the inception of the license term on October 17, 1995. The FCC letter gave Baxter 30 days to provide the requested information.

2124. Re: Airmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 18:07:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnexo92.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25121

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 22:44:36 GMT, BH wrote:

>> What is or was the purpose of this rule? [97.11]
>>Is it to prevent other non ham radio operators from getting on
>>a ham band by mistake?

>I think the rule applies to amateur (non-type accepted) equipment
>and not the installed comms on board the aircraft or ship. The
>installed comms can be operated on the ham bands by a qualified
>operator, but if amateur equipment is installed, it must be
>according to the rule below.

No, the "installed" in the Rule applies to "commercial" gear
installed on the vessel/aircraft for compliance with marine or
aviation safety rules. The idea is that this equipment is dedicated
to and provided for that task, and not for any other purpose, even
if it tuned through the ham bands.

That question came up quite often on shipboard where the operator
stood an 8-hour watch. If s/he wanted to work ham radio while
off-watch, separate ham band apparatus was required.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2125. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 18:22:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C028863.639568CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25122

Dave Heil wrote:
> Brilliant! Of course there's the part where they'd have to be online,
> would have to be aware of newsgroups, would have to find this particular
> newsgroup and would have to be interested in a mild sort of way in
> amateur radio in order to start reading it.

Why do you think that potential hams would not be interested in ham
radio newsgroups?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2126. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 18:25:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C02891E.C3774AF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25123

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > It's easy to read between the lines, Dave.
>
> Why, you'd have to be a fool to believe that.

Wiggle, wiggle, wiggle. Are you denying being a
Homo sapien, Dave? Reading between the lines is
as easy as predicting that you breath air.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2127. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 18:26:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C02895B.97F17E82@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25124

Dave Heil wrote:
> I've provided no information whatever.

Keep up those delusional thoughts, Dave.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2128. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 18:28:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0289DB.9AB1D7F9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25125

Dave Heil wrote:
> The "mob" you refer to is society. You're outnumbered and outvoted
> pardner.

That matters not a whit while I still have the protection of my
bodyguard, The US Constitution.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2129. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 19:08:45 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C02933D.2AEE1E5F@uci.edu>
Source record: 25126

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 21 Nov 2001 11:37:10 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >> Nothing Cecil has said in this newsgroup would even remotely
> >> lead to a diagnosis of obsessive/compulsive--and I _am_ a
> >> diagnostician!
> >>
> >Doh!
>
> I still stick by that statement.

Incuding his own statement to the contrary? Wow. I'd have to conclude
that your experience in discussing topics with him is apparently
somewhat limited.

2130. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 19:20:36 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0111261120.6b9651e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25127

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:<3bff4c4f_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> "Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:74351f51ce66c5eb65293fe2012446f8.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Kim-W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> > >
> > > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
> > >
> > > Larry
> > > Dick Carroll
> > > Richard McCollum
> > > Hans (I'm not sure though)
> > > Dave Heil
> >
> > Kim,
> >
> > I've never called you ignorant, bigoted, or any other defamatory or
> > denigrating personal characteristic. To my knowledge I have never met
> > you or had any opportunity to know you. Therefor, I wouldn't have the
> > audacity to label you as such.
> >
> > I am of the sincere opinion, however, that you have chosen a trashy
> > vanity callsign. Expressing that opinion reflects on your choice,
> > not on your character.
> >
> > Your decision to label me (or any of the other four on your list, for
> > that matter) as an "ignorant bigoted ham" based on having civilly
> > expressed my opinion, speaks volumes about your personal integrity,
> > however.
> >
> > Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
>
> The approach, with you, wasn't from the angle of my callsign. It was from
> other stuff I've seen posted from you.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Please point out to me instances on which you base your defamatory
appellation "bigotted". Have you ever seen me post ANYTHING voicing
an intolerant attitude toward any group or person based on race, gender,
religious affiliation, or similar characteristic?

Your personal integrity is on the line on this one, and nothing short
of a specific public apology to me and others you have named will restore
your credibility as a responsible individual.

de Hans, K0HB

2131. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 19:30:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B80E2A1CE34A3121.0E7E78DB627D6776.BFD08550BCBEBD60@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25128

On 26 Nov 2001 03:21:04 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> German society did no such thing, Professor Nutty. Hitler's goons
>decided that for one and all, after they had decieved the German
>polulation and maneuvered the Nazi party into dictatorial power.

Deceived the population, Dick?

Mein Kampf was published in the 1920s (Volume one in 1924) and
became the best selling book in Germany (in one year alone it sold
over 1,000,000 copies). In that book, Hitler outlined EVERYTHING he
planned--the invasion of Poland, Russia, and France; the establishment
of an "Aryan" state in which only aryans would be in power;
destruction of the Jews, Gypsies, and other "inferior" races (his
term). He made absolutely no bones about the kind of nation he
intended to create--or about the practices that would exist within it.

More, most of the right wing parties completely supported his
attitudes towards Jews, etc. Among those groups were the trade unions,
the military, and most of the groups opposing the communists in
Germany.

Read Mein Kampf or The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich
someday if you want to actually _understand_ what happened in Germany.

>> You claim that society is the fair source of guidelines. Those
>> were theirs. Do you accept THEM as valid and acceptable--or do you
>> feel you would oppose those "guidelines" if they were imposed on you?
>
> If you are really that much of a fool, I feel pity foir you.

Want to try answering the question instead of pontificating,
Dick?

> If society DOES have the
>> legitimacy to set the guidelines for us all (as you claim) then it has
>> the right to set ANY guidelines for behavior it chooses--whether you
>> agree with them or not.
>
> Nope. I have the right to persuade my fellows in society of the
>justness of my views, just at anyone does in a free society.

Two points:

1. No claim that it was only "free" society that could set
rules was made--the statement was that society did so. Try your
"persuasion" in Communist China or a South American dictatorship and

see how successful it is.

2. I didn't ask if you had the right to persuade others to
change their views--I asked if society has the right to SET guidelines
for any behavior it wishes (as was claimed)--as usual you avoided the
question.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2132. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-26 20:16:56 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0111261216.2503cb4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25129

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011120215926.27773.00002961@nso-fo.aol.com>...
> Fully half the people I work with are women, and
> within the confines of the workplace, I have many interesting
> conversations with them. However, these are not exclusive, one-on-
> one meetings at Starbucks or anywhere else. That would not be
> appropriate behavior, since most of these women are married, and
> I am engaged in an exclusive, monogamous relationship with a
> woman myself. Such meetings are inherently inappropriate unless
> the mates of both parties are physically present and mutually
> involved. I don't believe that the kind of loyalty and commitment
> to such a relationship has any room in it for "friendly" intimate
> meetings such as that. If one has such commitment, then he or
> she must not take any action which would even give the appearance
> of an outside relationship.

Larry, I thought your ideas about Kim's call sign were a bit odd, and
I really thought you were defending them a bit more than was actually
needed, but this is ridiculas.

Not trust my wife because she had lunch with another man? Think that
it's only appropriate to see another woman when her spouse is with her?

This all harkens back to a time when men thought they owned women.

Or worse, you feel you can't trust your wife when she's with another man?

No wonder you aren't married. If a woman I was seeing was so insecure that
she couldn't trust me alone with another woman, I'd know she wasn't a
woman I'd want to marry.

Insecure. I hate to say it, because it sounds insulting, but Larry, this
idea that you're insecure certainly seems realisitic when one applies it
to your hatred of Kim's call sign.

Geez, Larry. If you can't trust the woman you marry, who can you trust?
And why would you marry her if you can't trust her? Those women out there
who "don't understand" -- they probably do understand. They just reject
your beliefs as being either too insecure or too old fashioned. I doubt
I know *anyone* -- my mother included -- who'd agree with you.

Sheesh.

Sean.

2133. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 00:22:40 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <k1BM7.130282$WW.8221079@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25130

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:b7c5262e.0111261120.6b9651e1@posting.google.com...
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:<3bff4c4f_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > "Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> > news:74351f51ce66c5eb65293fe2012446f8.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > > "Kim-W5TIT" wrote:
> > >
> > > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> > >
> > > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
> > >
> > > Larry
> > > Dick Carroll
> > > Richard McCollum
> > > Hans (I'm not sure though)
> > > Dave Heil
> > >
> > > Kim,
> > >
> > > I've never called you ignorant, bigoted, or any other defamatory or
> > > denigrating personal characteristic. To my knowledge I have never met
> > > you or had any opportunity to know you. Therefor, I wouldn't have the
> > > audacity to label you as such.
> > >
> > > I am of the sincere opinion, however, that you have chosen a trashy
> > > vanity callsign. Expressing that opinion reflects on your choice,
> > > not on your character.
> > >
> > > Your decision to label me (or any of the other four on your list, for
> > > that matter) as an "ignorant bigoted ham" based on having civilly
> > > expressed my opinion, speaks volumes about your personal integrity,
> > > however.
> > >
> > > Hans, K0HB
> > >
> > >
> >
> > The approach, with you, wasn't from the angle of my callsign. It was
from
> > other stuff I've seen posted from you.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>

>
> Please point out to me instances on which you base your defamatory
> appellation "bigotted". Have you ever seen me post ANYTHING voicing
> an intolerant attitude toward any group or person based on race, gender,
> religious affiliation, or similar characteristic?
>
> Your personal integrity is on the line on this one, and nothing short
> of a specific public apology to me and others you have named will restore
> your credibility as a responsible individual.
>
> de Hans, K0HB

If I bothered to think about it, I would probably ask for exactly the same
information/apology.
So I will.

Dick N&#65533;BK

2134. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 00:50:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C02DD44.5327D432@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25131

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Brilliant! Of course there's the part where they'd have to be online,
> > would have to be aware of newsgroups, would have to find this particular
> > newsgroup and would have to be interested in a mild sort of way in
> > amateur radio in order to start reading it.
>
> Why do you think that potential hams would not be interested in ham
> radio newsgroups?

Not all potential hams know that they are potential hams. Next year's
ham may not even have heard about ham radio yet. The other points I
made are valid, Sherlock.

Dave K8MN

2135. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 00:54:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C02DE49.6DFBFAD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25132

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > It's easy to read between the lines, Dave.
> >
> > Why, you'd have to be a fool to believe that.
>
> Wiggle, wiggle, wiggle. Are you denying being a
> Homo sapien, Dave? Reading between the lines is
> as easy as predicting that you breath air.

No, I've never denied being part of the human race. Neither have I denied eating pork. Of course I haven't admitted eating pork. Had I not given you the hint about eating turkey, you'd have not known whether I was a vegetarian. Your work is cut out for you. I think you'll have your best luck trying to contact those who have had meals in my home or those who have eaten meals in restaurants with me. We haven't eaten many meals out since our return and we haven't done much entertaining so I suggest you begin your search with the city of Dar es Salaam phone book beginning under the letter "A".

Good luck on your quest!

Dave K8MN

2136. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 00:59:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C02DF74.14AD0EC4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25133

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > The "mob" you refer to is society. You're outnumbered and outvoted
> > pardner.
>
> That matters not a whit while I still have the protection of my
> bodyguard, The US Constitution.

You are the individual who wants numerous laws changed. You are the libertarian who will not live to see a libertarian as a chief executive of this country. You little "L" libertarians should take the hint after watching throuncing after throuncing of big "L" Libertarian (or even libertarian) candidates for national office. There aren't many in the U.S. who'd vote your way. What do you think is the reason?

Dave K8MN

2137. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 01:35:17 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tuqjg02gp2@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25135

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C02DF74.14AD0EC4@earthlink.net...

> libertarian) candidates for national office. There aren't many in the
> U.S. who'd vote your way. What do you think is the reason?

Easy. Most people are sheep that believe whatever the media tell them.

2138. Is this rec.radio.cb or what?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 01:43:32 UTC
From: nevagaveadamn@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011126204332.10752.00001607@mb-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 25134

Looks just like it.

2139. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:19:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tut7i$f9n$0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 25136

```
Krell wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tsiu7$evq$0@208.206.142.78...
> >
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:9ts759$dps$0@208.206.142.78...
> > > > You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out
> > >
> > > Formal? It's still practiced by the KKK and Rev. Phelps of
> godhatesfags.com
> >
> >
> > Oh really?? They advocate their death and total destruction?
>
> That's seems to be the impression one gets from their doctrines and beliefs.
>
> > > The Bible, Koran, and the Book of Mormon have all been twisted by
> fanatics
> > > to suit their own ends. It continues to be done today. Islam, as
> practiced
> > > by Arab countries is not a religion. It is a politcal system. This is
> not
> > > what true Islam is all about.
> >
> >
> > So you'll be glad to pass that message along to the hundreds of
> > thousands of radical Islamic fundamentalist schooltrained terrorist
> > Jihadists - and all their more "moderate" cheerleaders - so that we can
> > cancel the current war and just all get along, right?
>
> Telling you something is like pouring water on a rock - it just doesn't sink
> in.

You might want to look into a mirror when you say that. You've just
described yourself.
```

2140. Old Germanium Transistors Needed please!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:33:29 UTC
From: synchromusic@compaq.net
Message-ID: <5dc5f3d3.0111261833.1b1bb404@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25137

Hi I'm looking for the following germanium transistors to make some repairs to some old fuzztones:
OC81D,OC75, OC76,OC44,OC71,AC125,AC126, and NKT275.
Looking for NOS European but used is OK too! Please e-mail me and let me know what you have. Thanks in advance.

2141. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:33:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tuu1vhmt0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 25138

CAM wrote:
>
> > Well, we know of 19 that were successful on Sept 11. So how much havoc
> > do you expect 10,000 could manage, assuming you are correct, which you
> > are not?
>
> I advocate going after and neutralizing or killing, *all* the terrorists.
> I believe we can do that without murdering a billion Muslims. You,
> apparently do not share my view. Your goal is to get every non-Muslim
> to hate every Muslim. Toward what end? You are no better than the
> terrorists. They hate all Christians. You hate all Muslims.
>

I'm beginning to despise fools who insist I say things I have never
said.
Do you plan to just assume that any Muslim who says he is not really a
follower of his religion is thus automatically benign? Do youor do you
not believe it is a fact that we have allowed thousands of "risks" to
settle into the USA anonymously, and that an unknown number of them are
now living among us, ready to act at will? What the hell do you think
I'm talking about? Wiping out all Muslim women and children, just
because they're Muslim? Kindly show where I said anything even close to
that, otherwise you are a senile old fool who can't get anything
striaght.

2142. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:35:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tuu4thmt1@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 25139

N2EY wrote:
> The Lumberjack Song".
>
> Didja know that if you take Neil Diamond's hit "September Morn" and replace the
> words "September Morn" with "Internet Porn", and make a few other minor changes
> the song still works, although with a somewhat different meaning?

Gee, imagine what you could do with "Cracklin' Rosie".

2143. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:37:29 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <J%CM7.199014$3d2.8428398@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25140

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tsdkt$12q$0@208.206.142.78...
>
>
> K0HB wrote:
>>snip>>
>> Electronic communications did not exist in 1801, at least not on this
> > planet.
>
>
> But electromagnetic radiation did.

And we prove it by the fact that plant life (and we) exist.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

2144. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:40:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c02fde1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25142

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011125232030.25429.00003455@nso-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3c013ca4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >> If the selection was limited to the likes of you I wouldn't be, either.
> >
> >Oh, believe me, you have that right.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Yes, Kim, Dick did, indeed, have that right!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Is there an echo online? Of course he has that right. There is *NO* way in
Hell I'd find him attractive to the likes of me! For once, you're *both*
right.

Kim W5TIT

2145. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:44:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tuum8jbg0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 25141

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > There is virtually no homosexual behavior in the animal kingdom.
> > >
> > > You've got to be kidding, Dick. Just yesterday, my female dog
> > > mounted my niece's female dog and started humping. Any farm boy
> > > will tell you that homosexual behavior is rampant among domestic
> > > animals. So is cross species stuff like ducks and chickens.
> >
> > Nonsense. Animals have no awareness of sex.
>
> Guess that's why none of them ever reproduce, eh? There is not one
> other person on this newsgroup who agrees with you, Dick. You seem
> to be the only ignorant one this time.

You really don't get it, do you? I wouldn't say it's universal across all species, but generally animals have no awareness of sex, instead they are stimulated sexually almost exclusively by pheremones emitted by the opposite sex at estrus, mating time. If not, they *wouldn't* reproduce. They usually have no ongoing interest in the opposite sex, in fact many never go near the opposite sex other that at rutting time when the pheremones are flowing. Some males even kill and eat the opposite sex and their own offspring, if they can (bears in particular). Often animals in captivity, such as in zoos, never reproduce or engage in sexual activity and show no interest in sex.

You have a masters degree and much of a Phd and don't know that???

2146. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:53:11 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0300ce_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25144

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011125232030.25429.00003454@nso-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3c013962_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Sure they do! If they are that offended, and there is nothing they can
do
> >about my callsign, they can choose another hobby. And, I challenge that
I
> >want to be vulgar, and I also challenge your notion that most women would
be
> >offended by my callsign. I can't imagine a kid having the capability to
be
> >offended by a callsign. If they are aware of tits in a derogatory light,
it
> >wasn't me who taught it to them. The same could be said, I suppose, for
the
> >adults. I didn't teach you, Dick, that the word tit is a derogatory
> >term--who did?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> The word "tit" is not derogatory, just a vulgar and inherently offensive
> way to refer to a woman's breasts.
>

Larry:

The word tit is not offensive to scores of women I know, and I probably have
known far more than you. I know of no woman who refers to her tops as
breasts or mammaries. We all call them tits. We call all you guys' thangs
dicks.

>
> This term is used when one
> intends to deliberately demean and depersonalize a woman through
> the reference to secondary sexual characteristics which the viewer
> finds attractive, in exception to or exclusion of all of the other
personal
> qualities she possesses as a woman, and as a human being.
>

Where *do* you come up with your Puritan crap? No wonder you think the word tit (which, by the way is not my callsign, my callsign is W5TIT, phonetically Whiskey Five Tango India Tango) is offensive! Could you please 'splain to me what "secondary sexual characteristics" tits can have? Tits serve two purposes. They can nurse babies or men, or woman if the owner of the tits is prone to that persuasion. We have to cover our tits and you men have to cover your dicks. Know why? They "mean" sex to many people. I know of no primary purpose for tits other than nursing and sex. So, if there's no primary, what is *your* definition of a "secondary sexual characteristic"?

> Most
> modern women are personally offended by those who judge and value
> her primarily for the size, shape, and general attractiveness of her
> breasts.
>

Uh, Larry. What the *Hell* would you know about a modern woman? Puhleeze. You're still looking for some virgin who believes that her man should tell her how to live!

> Men who do this are quite rightly criticized for this, yet you
> not only deliberately encourage such behavior, you actively solicit it
> through your selection of a callsign.
>

And I think whomever criticizes a man or woman for calling a spade a spade or a tit a tit is looking for far more attention than I have time to give! I am not soliciting a damned thing from *anyone*, Larry. I call my tits tits and always have. I call my, well....never mind. Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.

> In so doing, you not only bring
> the ARS ".one step closer to extinction," you also set back all the
> societal gains made by women in the last century, and bring about a
> return to their objectification as mere sexual playthings. Is that
> really how you see yourself?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Nope. I don't see myself that way, Larry. Only people like you are capable of such arrogance. I don't think I have the slightest bit of power you relay to me. We women are mere playthings, always have been and always will be. That's why we are so darned good at everything else we do. We do it well and we can *still* come home and "take care" of our man. But, now we're on a subject to which you cannot relate, and is so far beyond your reach that you have to dream up ways to have power over women. Ha!

Kim W5TIT

2147. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:54:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c030115_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25146

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011125232031.25429.00003457@nso-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3C01422C.6DE3BF71@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Where do you, Rick, Cecil, and the rest of the no-coders/pro-TIT'ers
> >> get the idea that anyone's "general behavior" on this newsgroup --
> >> including yours -- could be detrimental to the ARS? This newsgroup
> >> is NOT ham radio -- it is merely *about* ham radio.
> >
> >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> >You, personally, have offended more potential hams than Kim will
> >during the rest of her life.
>
> Cecil:
>
> What makes you think it is *I* who is offending them?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Ummmmmmmmmmmmmm, Larry. If I am ruining ham radio, then *you* are
offending people. That's pretty darned simple to figure out.

Kim W5TIT

2148. Re: Twistedhed: Illegal CBer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:55:43 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C02483F.E6178359@mailcity.net>
Source record: 25143

Now don't go confusing the cber, I know it's easy to do.

CAM wrote:
>
> IllegalCBersMustGO wrote:
> > Everyone knows amps on 11 meters are illegal.
>
> Would you believe that every CB radio has a
> built-in amp?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2149. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:56:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c030195_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25147

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011125232031.25429.00003456@nso-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3c013f4c_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >> The world is full of double standards; this is just one of them, and
> >> a pretty reasonable one, at that. Grow up and stop whining just
> >> because participants in this newsgroup get to call things like they
> >> see them -- at your own self-inflicted expense.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >heh heh heh No expense here, at all, Larry, I assure you. OH, and as to
> >the double-standards comment? You know, the one where you *appear* to be
> >quite willing to accept them? Accept my callsign. :)
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I have no choice but to accept your callsign. I have stated many times
> that your callsign is your responsibility alone -- and you are also
> responsible for the fact that you are taking the ARS "...one step
> closer to extinction" by having chosen it. The whole shebang is totally
> on *your* head alone -- and you're the only one who can rectify the
> situation. If you choose not to, you merely provide all the proof
> necessary that you are a person of poor taste and judgment, and
> leave yourself open to the criticism of those who find it offensive.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Ya know what, Larry? You've just provided me with all the evidence I need
that you are not serious about your objection to my callsign at all--you
just get your rocks off by pushing that message. LOL

One must feel they are responsible for something in order to feel criticism,
Larry. I don't.

Kim W5TIT

2150. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:58:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tuvh1jbg1@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 25145

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> >
> > They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
>
> Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.

You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
usenet.
When you tell them about it and how to download the 60,000 groups, and
that you must download ALL of them, most decide they want nothing to do
with it.

2151. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 02:59:00 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c03022b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25148

^5. ROFLMAO!!

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:0E8B445B014F3F73.A9A3A1BB9AAEB986.BF8953714CA1CF93@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 21:12:40 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I didn't find the response about your balls, Dick?
>
> I guess he didn't have enough of them to answer, Kim.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2152. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:02:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0302eb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25149

Jeff:

I know you're smarter than that. The percentage of any measurement can only be made against the field sampled. Of the ham radio operators I listen to in the Dallas area, I'd say at least 50% of them are prejudiced or bigots.

Your example would even be "OK" if we knew, of those 600,000, how many don't even operate.

Experience is that a tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism "seem" (note the operative word there) to be prevalent in ham radio.

Kim W5TIT

"Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message news:9tsilc$n0u$1@news.hawaii.edu...
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
> >A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
> >prevalent among may ham radio operators.
>
> Out of our 600,000+ members, what percentage display those
> characteristics, Rick? If say, you've counted 60,000, that
> would be just 10%. Is ten percent "a tremendous amount"?
> (Do you even know 60,000 hams???)
>
> (I wish you folks would preface your comments with "IMO"
> so that the non-hams reading this NG know you're not in any
> way stating facts but rather opinions...)
>
> 73, Jeff KH6O
>
> --
> Telecommunication Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
> U.S. Coast Guard University of Hawaii System
> jherman @ d14.uscg.mil jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

2153. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:10:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0304ed_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25150

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C01D6D8.1DBC72FC@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > SHHHHHHhhhhhhh!!!! I was pretty certain
> > Dick--you know the one who's read the
> > book and now he knows all about the
> > Muslim faith--was going to have to look
> > that one up, and then recover from the
> > shock that he's condemning a faith that
> > subscribes to the thought that a
> > Christian Jesus is regarded as a
> > prophet. :)
>
>
> Opps, sorry about that. I thought you were just asking a general
> question. Warn me next time (e.g. "nobody else answer").
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

:) Right now, I have many more posts to go...but still haven't seen a
response from Dick on this one. But, I also haven't seen a response from
Dave on a long response I made to him. And, I haven't seen a
response...well, you know, the list goes on!

Kim W5TIT

2154. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:13:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c030583_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25152

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tslfa$l4p$0@208.206.142.78...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> > > >You, personally, have offended more potential hams than Kim will
> > > >during the rest of her life.
> > >
> > > What makes you think it is *I* who is offending them?
> > >
> > Your bigoted postings even offend me, Larry, and I have a
> > thick skin.
> >
>
> So does an onion.

BWAAHAHAHHHAhaaaaaahhahahhahaha!!!! Is that why the nickname for tracing
paper is onion skin? OHMYGAWD...ROFLMAO

Kim W5TIT

2155. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:16:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9tv0j9nsm0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 25151

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > It's easy to read between the lines, Dave.
> >
> > Why, you'd have to be a fool to believe that.
>
> Wiggle, wiggle, wiggle. Are you denying being a
> Homo sapien, Dave? Reading between the lines is
> as easy as predicting that you breath air.

Oh, for you but for no one else? Just as I thought.
```

2156. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:17:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c030670_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25153

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tsm6o$n4g$1@208.206.142.78...
>
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > SHHHHHHhhhhhhh!!!! I was pretty certain
> > > Dick--you know the one who's read the
> > > book and now he knows all about the
> > > Muslim faith--was going to have to look
> > > that one up, and then recover from the
> > > shock that he's condemning a faith that
> > > subscribes to the thought that a
> > > Christian Jesus is regarded as a
> > > prophet. :)
> >
> > Opps, sorry about that. I thought you were just asking a general
> > question. Warn me next time (e.g. "nobody else answer").
>
>
> Well just for THE RECORD Mohammad considered and discounted Jesus long
> before his own death, and proclaimed himself to be the Final Prophet,
> which remains Muslim doctrine to this day.

Uh huh. Yeah. And, exactly, what book are you reading that from?

Kim W5TIT

2157. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:28:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c030919_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25154

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011126072530.20853.00000912@nso-cc.aol.com...
> In article <3bffadc1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >I have participated in NTS; have served as net control on NTS nets; have
> >participated in public service events; have served as net control in
public
> >service events; have been the voice of training for Hunt County ARES nets
> >and, a couple years back, nets for a group we named TRADES; and the list
> >goes on.
>
> That's nice, Kim. I've done the NTS thing, too - all the way up to Area
level.
>
> > My callsign has been no problem--in fact never even been mentioned
> >after the fact--on any kind of net. I am sure that those who disagree
with
> >it just leave the matter alone and disregard it, and those who do find
humor
> >or whatever, in it, know that nets are not the time.
>
> Everyone knows the nets are not the time. So the lack of comment simply
means
> that those who are offended don't compound the problem by mentioning it
during
> the net.
>

You may choose to think of it that way. I choose to believe that people just don't have a problem with it. We have lots of get-togethers around here, and I've never been approached negatively (oooops, except from one ham) about my callsign.

> In addition, it's obvious that you won't voluntarily change it, so there's
no
> point in on-air mention of the issue.
> >

Your knowledge that I am adamant about not changing it is due to your reading it so often from me here in the newsgroup. Knowledge of my feelings about changing it aren't all that known because of discussions I've had either on the air or at get-togethers. My callsign just isn't a point of discussion among hams around here--or at least not that I am aware of. And, if it is not important enough for them to express disapproval, then it's not

important.

> >In fact, responsibly-minded people see it as nothing more than a
callsign,
> >and one that has a great deal of "conversational value" off the air, for
> >those eyeball get-togethers!
>
> Sems to me you define "responsibly minded people" as those who don't voice
> objections.
> >

Well, that would be correct in terms of someone who does not express
objections to a callsign during a net, wouldn't you?

However, I would also say someone is quite responsibly minded if they see my
callsign for what it is. It is something meant for quiet fun on the air,
and a all the kidding about it we want off the air, however there isn't all
that much.

> >Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
> >
> Because this is the appropriate place to do so.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Uh, you don't know most of the hams around here. Some pretty darned
inappropriate conversations take place on the air here on 2M daily. :)

Kim W5TIT

2158. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:30:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c030996_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25155

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011126072530.20853.00000913@nso-cc.aol.com...
> In article <wIbM7.128739$WW.8061618@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >> Yea, verily.
> >>
> >> Regale them with Tom Lehrer's "National Brotherhood Week" for a real
> >show-stopper.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >We have already had the discussion about how good songs turn into hymns.
> >What you may have been exposed to as Jesus Loves the Little Children is
the
> >tune to God Save Ireland. Our army used it in a little ditty that
started
> >out, "In this land of dopey dreams, happy peaceful Phillipines."
> >
> Yup.
>
> But we have barely scratched the surface of true commentary/novelty/parody
> songs. Particularly the written-for-the-purpose stuff like Tom Lehrer and
Monty
> Python ditties ("Every Sperm Is Sacred", "The Philosopher's Song", and of
> course "The Lumberjack Song".
>
> Didja know that if you take Neil Diamond's hit "September Morn" and
replace the
> words "September Morn" with "Internet Porn", and make a few other minor
changes
> the song still works, although with a somewhat different meaning?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Here's one for ya...though I've never been able to test it:

Put the album "The Wall" on,
Put the movie "The Wizard of Oz" on,

On the third MGM lion roar, start "The Wall" and turn down the sound on the
movie. I am told they both go along nearly perfect.

Kim W5TIT

2159. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:41:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c030c1c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25156

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:k1BM7.130282$WW.8221079@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:b7c5262e.0111261120.6b9651e1@posting.google.com...
> > "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:<3bff4c4f_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > > "Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> > > news:74351f51ce66c5eb65293fe2012446f8.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > > > "Kim-W5TIT" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams?????????????
> > > > >
> > > > > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's
see:
> > > > >
> > > > > Larry
> > > > > Dick Carroll
> > > > > Richard McCollum
> > > > > Hans (I'm not sure though)
> > > > > Dave Heil
> > > >
> > > > Kim,
> > > >
> > > > I've never called you ignorant, bigoted, or any other defamatory or
> > > > denigrating personal characteristic. To my knowledge I have never
met
> > > > you or had any opportunity to know you. Therefor, I wouldn't have
the
> > > > audacity to label you as such.
> > > >
> > > > I am of the sincere opinion, however, that you have chosen a trashy
> > > > vanity callsign. Expressing that opinion reflects on your choice,
> > > > not on your character.
> > > >
> > > > Your decision to label me (or any of the other four on your list,
for
> > > > that matter) as an "ignorant bigoted ham" based on having civilly
> > > > expressed my opinion, speaks volumes about your personal integrity,
> > > > however.
> > > >
> > > > Hans, K0HB
> > > >

> > > >
> > >
> > > The approach, with you, wasn't from the angle of my callsign. It was
> from
> > > other stuff I've seen posted from you.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> > Please point out to me instances on which you base your defamatory
> > appellation "bigotted". Have you ever seen me post ANYTHING voicing
> > an intolerant attitude toward any group or person based on race, gender,
> > religious affiliation, or similar characteristic?
> >
> > Your personal integrity is on the line on this one, and nothing short
> > of a specific public apology to me and others you have named will
> restore
> > your credibility as a responsible individual.
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> If I bothered to think about it, I would probably ask for exactly the same
> information/apology.
> So I will.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
>

You must have already missed your apology, Dick.

As to credibility, Hans, you've never given me any of that, so how shall I
"win it back"?

Kim W5TIT

2160. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:45:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c030d04_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25157

```
"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:b7c5262e.0111261120.6b9651e1@posting.google.com...
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:<3bff4c4f_1@newsa.ev1.net>...
> > "Hans Brakob" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> > news:74351f51ce66c5eb65293fe2012446f8.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > > "Kim-W5TIT" wrote:
> > >
> > > > Ten ignorant bigoted hams are MOST of 700,000 hams???????????
> > >
> > > Is there ten? I don't think there is, in the newsgroup. Let's see:
> > >
> > > Larry
> > > Dick Carroll
> > > Richard McCollum
> > > Hans (I'm not sure though)
> > > Dave Heil
> > >
> > > Kim,
> > >
> > > I've never called you ignorant, bigoted, or any other defamatory or
> > > denigrating personal characteristic. To my knowledge I have never met
> > > you or had any opportunity to know you. Therefor, I wouldn't have the
> > > audacity to label you as such.
> > >
> > > I am of the sincere opinion, however, that you have chosen a trashy
> > > vanity callsign. Expressing that opinion reflects on your choice,
> > > not on your character.
> > >
> > > Your decision to label me (or any of the other four on your list, for
> > > that matter) as an "ignorant bigoted ham" based on having civilly
> > > expressed my opinion, speaks volumes about your personal integrity,
> > > however.
> > >
> > > Hans, K0HB
> > >
> > >
> >
> > The approach, with you, wasn't from the angle of my callsign. It was
from
> > other stuff I've seen posted from you.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
```

>
> Please point out to me instances on which you base your defamatory
> appellation "bigotted". Have you ever seen me post ANYTHING voicing
> an intolerant attitude toward any group or person based on race, gender,
> religious affiliation, or similar characteristic?
>

Haven't you been one of those who so wholeheartedly takes delight in the "dumbed down" ham experience? If not, then I am mistaken and I certainly apologize. If so, I find that a rather bigoted attitude, though your mileage may vary--as it has nothing to do with race, gender, religious affiliation, etc.

> Your personal integrity is on the line on this one, and nothing short
> of a specific public apology to me and others you have named will restore
> your credibility as a responsible individual.
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans, are you willing to say that you've ever given me any credibility to begin with? If not, then how would I win it back?

Kim W5TIT

2161. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:57:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c030fe8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25164

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tuvh1jbg1@208.206.142.65...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> > >
> > > They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
> >
> > Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
>
>
> You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
> usenet.
> When you tell them about it and how to download the 60,000 groups, and
> that you must download ALL of them, most decide they want nothing to do
> with it.
>

Why?! It takes--maybe--10 minutes and that would be with a very, very slow connection. The browser can be set to "Catch Up" (IE; I don't know what its equivalent is on Netscape), so a lot of time doesn't even have to be spent with downloading the headers.

Then, there's also sites such as Google (formerly Deja). Don't know if there's any others.

It's just not that hard or time consuming.

Kim W5TIT

2162. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:59:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E777E7E977F222AE.4F10C375DD104472.8051A47C96A6D557@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25163

On 26 Nov 2001 01:52:58 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>> Great example of ham radio for young kids to emulate. Sort of
>> like teaching your children about good government by apprenticing them
>> to the Taliban.
>
>
> Well, if you're a lying, phony dumbass that's waht you'll be labelled.

Now, now, Dick.

That's a very harsh evaluation of yourself.

Don't be so hard on yourself.

You're just out of touch with the real world and stuck in the
20s. You're not a bad man--just an ill informed, rigid, and bigoted
one.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2163. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:59:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D21E2C5BB3DF33E6.16EBD794597AE7A0.C3FE08C55B135834@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25159

On 26 Nov 2001 01:51:27 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Well, I spent 5 years on active duty while you laid around on yoiur ass
>as a 4F. Nuff said.

How wonderful.

I spent two tours in SE Asia as a corpsman assigned to the 2nd
Recon Marines. I have one lung and 15% hearing as a result of that
tour and I was awarded a Navy Cross as well as two purple hearts and
other more traditional decorations (check the Vietnam Veterans web
page if you don't believe me--I'm listed). Maybe you can get away with
claiming that Cecil doesn't have the right to speak (although I
disagree completely--I didn't serve in the military to protect an
elitist society), but you DAMN sure don't have the right to do so in
my case.

I EARNED the right to criticize this country, Dick. By ANY
medical opinion I've lost at least 10 years of my life from my
wounds--and I DON'T accept Veterans benefits for them--I earn my own
way. Don't like MY opinions, stuff them!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2164. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:59:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9C08DE6630CA7081.BF2AE79320912F22.B545E19E6401B8EE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25162

On 26 Nov 2001 01:50:33 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out
>with the Inquisition. In Islam it was clearly demonstrated September 11,
>and in numerous lesser but horrific incidents in the preceding decades.
>The widespread cheering in Islamic countries following the fall of WTC
>was widely televised. Your know all this and choose to ignore it. Your
>idiotic statements in the wake of what has happened in recent months
>shows clearly for all to see what you truly are.

Dick, several years ago a man in Iron Mountain Michigan took
his two sons to the iron foundry where he worked and threw them into
the vat of molten iron because he believed it was his obligation to
God. Obviously, he was wrong but equally obviously Osama ben Laden was
as well. If you truly believe that Islamic religious beliefs are
responsible for the deaths of the people in NYC, then you MUST accept
that Christianity is responsible for the death of those children. And
if we must fight Islam as a result, then it follows that we are
equally obligated to ban Christianity in the US as well.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2165. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:59:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BF867E1303CC203D.10CAC3FEC18728DD.9AA17D5FA840BB03@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25160

On 26 Nov 2001 00:49:55 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Try chapter 5 verse 33.
>
>

Nice try, Dick, but the Koran isn't divided into chapters.

Here's the fifth VOLUME of the Koran complete:

=======
SURA XCIV. THE OPENING [V.]

MECCA. 8 Verses

In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful

HAVE we not OPENED thine heart for thee?

And taken off from thee thy burden,

Which galled thy back?

And have we not raised thy name for thee?

Then verily along with trouble cometh ease.

Verily along with trouble cometh ease.

But when thou art set at liberty, then prosecute thy toil.

And seek thy Lord with fervour.
===========

Care to tell us what you're talking about--or cite the
specific text you are referring to so I can search my own versions of
the Koran?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2166. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:59:44 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <42D7EE0A2C7BFCD2.D1A8E7DDA825A0DB.03B43304D0007088@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25161

On 26 Nov 2001 01:09:14 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> If you consider the UN an inpatial source you are to be pitied.

Oh get off your "Black Helicopter" paranoia, Dick. The UN is
as impartial as you can get when it comes to national organizations.

America just isn't as "perfect" as your brainwashed mind
believes it to be--I know it's a shock to you, but there are some
other nations with some pretty good ideas too.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2167. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 03:59:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F4CCFE14ACF8FDEC.CC28C09249FBB33E.30627B07AF8921FD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25158

On 26 Nov 2001 01:58:13 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> It isn't. There is virtually no homosexual behavior in the animal
>kingdom.
>That's a figment of human homosexual supporters.

BULLSHIT!

Pick up ANY book on zoology and you'll find you are wrong. Of
course, I'm sure you won't accept the word of scientists--it
contradicts the word of your bigoted religious leaders--but it happens
to be fact.

Look up the Bonobo Chimpanzees in any book available, the
females are ALL bisexual, and the males engage in homosexual behavior
whenever the opportunity presents itself. They're TYPICAL of the
animal kingdom.

It isn't a "figment of human homosexual supporters" that
animals display homosexual behavior, it's a delusion of homophobes and
religious zealots that they don't!

>> BTW, over 96% of ALL child molestation is performed by
>> heterosexuals (according to the Department of Justice statistics
>> available at http://www.doj.gov), despite the fact that between 7% and
>> 10% of our population is homosexual.
>
> So why do you compare apples and oranges? The two are not the same at
>all and you should know it. Pedophiles are commonly heteros.

Excuse me?

The statement was made that we have to protect our children
from homosexuals. If it isn't from molestation, what are we supposed
to protect them from--exposure to an alternative view on morality?

Are you one of those idiots who believe that homosexuals
"recruit" straight kids into their lifestyle? Do you REALLY believe
that all it takes is exposure to a gay experience to turn a straight
into a gay? If so, then it must mean that homosexuality is BETTER than
heterosexuality, something I don't happen to believe (as good,
yes--better, no).

> It would seem that your
>> insistence that we keep homosexuals away from our children would only
>> result in increased levels of child sexual abuse--is that what you
>> hope for?

>
> It would seem that you are still a blooming idiot.

Once again, instead of discussing issues you use put-downs.
You really ARE a loser aren't you, Dickie boy?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2168. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:02:37 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9tv36l0307s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25170

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9tut7i$f9n$0@208.206.142.65...

> > Telling you something is like pouring water on a rock - it just doesn't
sink
> > in.
>
>
> You might want to look into a mirror when you say that. You've just
> described yourself.

While I have advocated attacks on countries that support terrorism, I've
never singled out Muslims as Dick has.

2169. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:08:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <17A80AA1704FAE52.C9EC46F066B9DA87.A6725897A005888A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25165

On 26 Nov 2001 05:48:02 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Not at all. You clearly could have taken your Advanced and your CSCE
>for the Extra written to the April 15 VE session and your Extra license
>was issued by the FCC on May 9. Simple enough.

Wake up, genius. It was _averaging_ over 40 days from test to
issuance when the restructuring first came in--and my upgrade was
dated 24 days after that date.

Try using you memory as well, Dick. If you can reach back that
far, you'll remember that I not only was opposing your position on the
change in code requirements before the change, but I pointed out more
than once (in response to your accusations that I was in favor of
no-code because I couldn't pass a test) that I already HAD passed my
20 WPM, remember? I even argued that I _could_ have had it waived due
to my hearing loss, but chose not to do so--something I was
complimented for by some and slammed for by others in this news group!

> Yada,yada,yada.....you and your Pal Cecil always have your story worked
>out in intricate detail well in advance.

I don't know Cecil personally, Dick. But I _do_ agree with
much of what he says--far more of what he voices makes sense than is
the case for you.

>> There ARE no post-restructuring Advanced licenses, it was
>> phased out at the time. If someone holds an Advanced ticket it's
>> because he or she passed the test BEFORE the restructuring.
>
> Don't look now, but the nonsense didn't start after the Grate Dumb
>Down.

Then your own statements are ridiculous and meaningless. Read
the entire thread you're trying to respond to.

>> >> Sorry, Dick, but if you communicate on the air the way you do
>> >> on line (and if you don't all you are doing is showing disrespect for
>> >> ham radio in another venue), YOU and your cronies are the people
>> >> Hollingsworth warned us about!
>> >
>> > You are a horses ass whether on the air on the net. I didn't need to be
>> >warned about the likes of you, your manner gives you away right away!
>>
>> Great example of what I'm talking about.

> Hey, man I didn't create you as a horses ass, you did that all on your
>own.

And that just demonstrates how crude and ill mannered you are.
If that doesn't carry to on-the-air behavior it's because you don't
have the courage to state your beliefs there as you do here.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2170. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:12:07 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EDB9BD3EF67D75C7.A87C3525971D2B64.6B892F39E2D18AB9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25166

On 26 Nov 2001 06:07:20 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Well just for THE RECORD Mohammad considered and discounted Jesus long
>before his own death, and proclaimed himself to be the Final Prophet,
>which remains Muslim doctrine to this day.

Care to provide a cite, or is this more of the Dick Carroll
school of ouija board knowledge?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2171. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:16:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0313A1.D00898FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25167

Dave Heil wrote:
> Not all potential hams know that they are potential hams.

That's obviously true. But there have been many potential hams asking questions about becoming a ham on this newsgroup using his personal computer. I have never heard a potential ham ask questions about becoming a ham over the air using his personal transceiver. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2172. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:18:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C031418.65B3DD09@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25168

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
> usenet.

Doubt it. Internet savvy people know about usenet and usually
don't possess a transceiver. Hope that's not too much for you
to comprehend.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2173. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:19:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03145A.ED5B0158@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25169

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> It's just not that hard or time consuming.

You've got to realize, Kim, that everything is hard for Dick,
especially tying his shoelaces.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2174. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:23:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C031532.4680DDC0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25171

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > Well just for THE RECORD Mohammad considered and discounted Jesus long
> > before his own death, and proclaimed himself to be the Final Prophet,
> > which remains Muslim doctrine to this day.
>
> Uh huh. Yeah. And, exactly, what book are you reading that from?

Dick is reading stuff from radical Christian terrorist web pages.
In reality, Mohammed considered Jesus to be a great prophet although
somewhat misguided with the turn-the-other-cheek stuff.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2175. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:24:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0E08216FB16F54A9.167DB12D8CBFCC92.62F6966A32ABBC50@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25172

On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:30 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In addition, it's obvious that you won't voluntarily change it, so there's no
>point in on-air mention of the issue.

Then precisely what is the point of mentioning it (over and
over again, for that matter) here?

You, and others, expect the ARS to be treated with respect.
Great. I'm a ham as well. On the other hand, I'm ALSO a computer
hobbyist who spends far more time on the Internet than on the air.
From my perspective, people like you, Dick, and Larry, who scream that
the ham bands should be free of any form of bigotry, racism, or
"offensive" behavior are the worst kind of hypocrites! It's wrong in
YOUR hobby, but perfectly alright here where OTHERS are hobbyists!

If you don't like Kim's sign, then say so on the air. If you
feel (as Dick and others do) that Islamic people are inferior, that
their religion is inferior, or that minorities are losers who depend
on affirmative action to provide them jobs they don't deserve then
voice your opinions on the ham bands or shut the fuck up! You have no
more right to fill the Internet with that moralistic, racist, or
bigoted crap than you do to fill the ham bands with it. Either take it
BOTH places or drop it completely.

Think about it.

>Sems to me you define "responsibly minded people" as those who don't voice
>objections.
>>
>>Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
>>
>Because this is the appropriate place to do so.

Bullshit!

This venue is no more appropriate than the ham bands. Who the
hell gave hams the right to come into the Internet Usenet groups and
post offensive material they wouldn't think of voicing in the ham
bands? There are just as many children here as there are on the
air--if you're so goddamn concerned with them then try practicing what
you keep preaching in THIS venue too!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2176. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:26:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0315E1.F1B989ED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25173

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Wiggle, wiggle, wiggle. Are you denying being a
> > Homo sapien, Dave? Reading between the lines is
> > as easy as predicting that you breath air.
>
> No, I've never denied being part of the human race. Neither have I
> denied eating pork.

Yep.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2177. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:29:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03168E.9CE42AC8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25174

Dave Heil wrote:
> You are the individual who wants numerous laws changed. You are the
> libertarian who will not live to see a libertarian as a chief executive
> of this country. You little "L" libertarians should take the hint after
> watching throuncing after throuncing of big "L" Libertarian (or even
> libertarian) candidates for national office. There aren't many in the
> U.S. who'd vote your way. What do you think is the reason?

Ignorance.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2178. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:32:38 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <5e9445dcf03d5b166315f01d00b1bb0b.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 25175

The opinion of Kim-W5TIT seems to be......

>Haven't you been one of those who so wholeheartedly takes delight in the
>"dumbed down" ham experience?

You simply don't pay attention, and apparently just willy-nilly apply
insults like "bigotted". I have never used that term, or any similar
related to the current licensing structure. Below is a copy of my comments
to FCC on the NPRM which led to "restructuring". Does it strike you as
support for the "old smart ways"?

Hans, K0HB

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of) WT Docket No. 98-143
)
1998 Biennial Regulatory Review --) RM-9148
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-9150
Amateur Service Rules.) RM-9196
)
)

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments contain proposals on reducing the number of amateur radio
operator license classes, and suggestions regarding Morse testing.

I. Discussion:

The NPRM proposes reducing the number of operator classes from six
to four. This reduction would be accomplished by phasing out Novice
and Technician Plus classes, leaving the remaining four classes in
place. It is worthy of note that this plan would preserve the heart
of the so-called "incentive licensing" plan which was implemented in
1968.

I believe that the effects originally expected of the incentive
licensing scheme have not been realized in practice. There is
little evidence that this scheme, now 30 years old, has produced any
notable increase in the skills, operating excellence, advanced electronic
techniques, or other tangible valuable difference between the operators
in the various "non-entry-level" classes of licensee.

As a non-scientific but pragmatic experiment, tune a receiver to 14.350MHz. Close your eyes and slowly tune the receiver down across the 20M amateur radio band. Try to detect the "class boundaries" based on a difference in signal quality, better operating practices, or more advanced technical conversations. I think you will find no detectable difference as you transit across the frequencies which mark the boundary between General, Advanced, and Amateur Extra sub-bands. Thus it can be assumed that the expectations of the incentive licensing program (greater levels of technical and operating skill at higher license classes) have not been realized, and the incentive licensing plan can be safely abandoned as providing no significant benefit to the public interest, necessity, or convenience (PICON).

II Proposal:

A. License Classes:

If the interest of the FCC is (as stated in the NPRM) streamlining of the licensing structure, then I propose that the license classes be reduced to two classes, namely "Basic" and "Advanced".

The "Basic" license would have an entry-level test (basic regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC electronics). Without CW endorsement this class would have full frequency and mode priveleges above 30MHz, power limited to 50W output.

The "Standard" license test would be of a difficulty level similar to the current Advanced class test, and would have full privileges above 30MHz at power levels up to 1500W.

B. Morse required for operation below 30MHz

Either license class could gain access to all MF/HF amateur radio frequency allocations (at 50W and 1500W respectively) upon passing a Morse test of 5WPM and gaining a "CW endorsement" for their operator license.

The Morse test should be "fill in the blank" or "1 minute of solid copy". Multiple-choice test formats should not be allowed.

C. Status of current licensees.

Current licensees should be redistributed as follows:

Current class	Converts to
Novice:	Basic CW Endorsed
Technician:	Basic
Technician+:	Basic CW Endorsed (Note 1)
General:	Standard CW Endorsed
Advanced:	Standard CW Endorsed (Note 2)
Extra:	Standard CW Endorsed (Note 2)

Notes:
1) "Old" Technicians (who took same written
test as General and 5WPM) would be
"Standard" CW endorsed.
2) Current Advanced and Extra licensees could
continue to have that class printed on their
license in recognition of their previous status.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Hans Brakob, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas11poolb158.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.20.158]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2179. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:35:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C031816.AA70F341@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25176

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What the hell do you think
> I'm talking about? Wiping out all Muslim women and children, just
> because they're Muslim? Kindly show where I said anything even close to
> that, otherwise you are a senile old fool who can't get anything
> striaght.

You have said that *every* Muslim is a potential terrorist, Dick. You
have said that Muslims have no choice except to kill Christians.
Exactly why would you be fomenting so much hatred of Muslims if you
don't want them exterminated? You can't back down now. You have been
advocating genocide.

I, OTOH, recognize that Muslim terrorists are a small fraction of
one percent of Muslims. I say go after the terrorists, not the
rest of the one billion Muslims who are peaceful and law-abiding.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2180. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:38:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0318CF.E87FD40C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25177

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You really don't get it, do you? I wouldn't say it's universal across
> all species, but generally animals have no awareness of sex, ...

Dick, consciousness makes animals aware of sex. You do believe that
animals are conscious, don't you? You are the only exception I know
to animals being conscious.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2181. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:46:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F43CEE277D37515B.663FD7FDD4316B4D.63E9B4AB07ADF1C8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25178

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 17:07:37 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Wish you'd stop snipping relevant portions, Rick. It isn't clear from
>your edit what it is that I'm in disagreement with. Did you read from
>my statement that the portion of your claims with which I disagree are
>the Department of Justice figures?

Then remember what you said. Internet convention is to cut all
material other than the specific material you are responding to
directly, remember? I _do_ quote the preceding statement if, and only
if, it is impossible to understand the quote I'm responding to without
doing so.

>Heh, NORML is a group advocating the legalization of marijuana.

Yup. And the US Government is one opposing it. I guess NEITHER
is a valid source of information.

>> From the DoJ:
>>
>> "In 2000, there were 1,579,566 drug arrests in the US. Of
>> those, 46.5 percent -- 734,497 arrests -- were for marijuana. There
>> were 646,042 arrests for simple possession of marijuana in 2000."
>
>This does not address convictions nor imprisonments.

Check out their website (http://www.doj.gov) and read the data
for yourself. I've provided plenty to support my claims. Besides, if
NORML isn't a legitimate source, the DoJ site isn't either. Guess that
means there IS no valid source of information, right?

>> From Bartol, C. (2002). Criminal Behavior: A psychosocial
>> approach. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.:
>>
>> "In 1998, 1.56 million people were arrested nationally either
>> for the sale and/or manufacture or possession of illegal drugs . . .
>> During that same year, an estimated 417,000 jail inmates or 70 percent
>> of all inmates in local facilities had committed a drug offense or
>> used drugs regularly."
>
>Sale and manufacture? You have a problem with those people being
>arrested? The book certainly does not make clear what percentage of the
>417,000 jail inmates it speaks of are there for a drug offense. It
>simply states that they had committed one or that they use drugs.

Depends on whether they are selling to minors or adults. To
minors, yes--but I feel people belong in prison for selling alcohol or
tobacco to children, too. To adults? No, I DON'T see that as a valid
grounds for arrest--it is people's RIGHT to use those substances if
they choose--just as it is their right to use alcohol or tobacco
products, both of which are more addicting and harmful to the health
than other recreational drugs.

>Where's the beef?

Between the buns.

>> Actually, in Moscow, a citizen would probably be served more
>> quickly by the Moscow Militia, or the NKVD, the civilian branch of
>> state security.
>
>Actually, his tail was KGB. He wasn't a citizen.

True--but we were talking about the rights of a citizen, not a
non-citizen, remember?

If you want to include non-citizens, consider the fact that
recent laws enacted thanks to the September 11 terrorist attacks allow
the US to take foreign nationals into custody for an indefinite period
(even if the INS does not believe there are any grounds to arrest the
individual), to try him or her in a military tribunal instead of a
court of law (and the tribunals do NOT have to allow even the measure
of rights available under the UCMJ), and to execute him or her on a
2/3 majority decision with no appeal possible.

Compared to that being followed by the KGB is an exercise in
freedom!

>> Do you really think that if a member of the Russian embassy
>> staff in Washington during the cold war had fallen into a river he
>> wouldn't have been seen to do so by his FBI tail? Perhaps he wouldn't
>> have saved him--but he WOULD have seen him fall.
>
>I don't care. What was your reasoning behind making your statement in
>the first place?

That it paralleled exactly the situation YOU narrated in
Moscow, of course.

>> Sure. Want to tell us how easy it is to get a permit to carry
>> one concealed, as is common in the US?
>
>Is there a secret? Tell us.

Ok--unless you are a member of the militia, you CAN'T carry a
concealed weapon.

>> From the US Selective Service Registration Form (MB2):
>>
>> "Failure to register is a felony and may result in up to

>> $250,000 in fines, up to 5 years imprisonment or both. . . Once you
>> register, the law requires you to keep Selective Service informed
>> within 10 days of your address change."
>
>I'm not subject to the draft. Neither is my wife. Are you? Is Kim? Is
>Cecil? Try again.

You asked for a national id card. I provided it. Next case.

>> Do the words "Personal Property Tax" ring a bell here in the
>> states?
>
>I don't pay personal property tax on a TV. The tax is not a personal
>property tax. It is a use tax. If you never have your set turned on,
>you'll never have it siezed.

If you lived in several states in the US, you would be liable
for an annual personal property tax--which WOULD include the value of
your tv, etc. whether you used them or not. And again, this is an
ECONOMIC issue--stop ignoring those of freedom.

>> So? It's illegal here, too. Remember that it was the
>> Netherlands that I cited as the freest nation in the world--why not
>> try to cite some arguments about THAT nation?
>
>I'm not the individual claiming that legalized prostitution makes a
>nation more free. You cited Finland, among other nations, as being more
>free than the U.S.

Are you arguing that lack of legal prostitution marks a nation
as NOT free?

Fine--you just made my argument for me--the US is not a free
country.

>> Incidently, since you ARE citing Finland, care to tell us the
>> penalties for sodomy, adultery, homosexual sexual activities, personal
>> use (not sales) of marijuana, and being openly gay in the military?
>
>I don't have the slightest idea. I did not try to state anything I did
>not have firsthand knowledge of.

I'll help. All are legal.

>> Oh, I forgot, there ARE no penalties for those acts in
>> Finland, are there?
>
>My guess would be that you have no more idea than I do.

Try working with facts instead of guesses--or at least
researching issues before speaking. I stated that those were legal not
as an opinion but as a statement of fact.

>> Smuggling 15 lbs. of heroin or other drugs into a nation isn't
>> exactly the same as simple possession. Care to tell us how long the
>> girl received as a sentence (in the US that quantity would guarantee
>> life w/o parole due to mandatory minimum sentencing laws)? Better yet,
>> tell us how many citizens are incarcerated for simple possession of
>> marijuana--the drug offence you BEGAN this sentence with.
>
>I believe her sentence was was 13 years. I provided the information in
>addition to information about marijuana being illegal. I know that
>those found to possess marijuana are arrested. I'll ask my wife if she
>knows how many are incarcerated.

Try -0-.

13 years is less than 1/4 of the sentence she would serve for
the same offense in the US.

>> We have one--it's called "work release."
>
>Violent criminals are not provided "work release".

Really?

Tell that to the officials at Southern Michigan Prison (the
largest walled prison in the world, btw). They do so.

Or how about sex offenders--the only reason "Megan's Law"
became popular is the early release of a sex offender who later raped
and murdered a girl in NJ.

>Some folks become violent simply because it is as much a part of their
>genetic makeup as sexuality.

BULL.

That's pure nonsense. Ask ANY behavioral scientist about it
and they will tell you it's an old wives tale without a single bit of
evidence to support it--and a great deal of evidence to refute it.

Dave, I _TEACH_ Criminal Justice Psychology--telling me that
is like telling a ham that radio works by making the air vibrate from
my antenna to yours! It's utter nonsense and the mark of the
uninformed person.

> There are some just plain evil people loose.

More nonsense.

Prove it or don't claim it.

> As far as addressing the root causes, I believe there are
>numerous groups along with government addressing those very issues.

From a political/pork-barrel perspective. Not with any attempt
to actually SOLVE the problems--it might not be comfortable
politically.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2182. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:48:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1C78AE1DB66BA18C.E5597E0A87831BEB.172013B39C92541E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25179

On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:31 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>That would be a good idea if prostitution were a victimless crime. But it's
>not.

A lot of people keep claiming that. Care to identify the
victim?

>How many people are locked up for prostitution, vs. violent crimes? You're
>saying we would have plenty of space, Cecil, so you must know the numbers.

He didn't limit it to prostitution, he stated "victimless
crimes like prostitution." How many? Over 70% of all inmates. Don't
believe it? Check the figures at the DoJ website or at the
correctional association web site.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2183. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:49:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <77E5E5FCCFC8716E.1E4094517FDA162F.AE05C36FA45051B5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25180

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 17:08:36 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>You might have a case if everyone believed as you do. Most folks don't.

Is that supposed to make him wrong?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2184. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:53:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BFB2B4227D21E5B3.D7C0B78F007632C5.D83D7D0909C07098@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25181

On 26 Nov 2001 04:20:29 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>If my callsign, and the phonetics you have constructed therefrom,
>are truly a "danger to the ARS," then perhaps you should write to
>Riley Hollingsworth and complain about it. He has already stated
>that Kim's callsign has the potential to take the ARS "...one step
>closer to extinction." If he says anything like that about *my*
>callsign, then I will immediately take steps to change it to something
>less offensive. Keep in mind that the phonetics I use for my
>callsign are "Kilo Three Lima Tango," and my call letters, unlike
>Kim's, don't spell out any recognizable word.

Larry, grow up!

Riley Hollingsworth is an expert on communications law. He is
NOT an expert on morality, on the way in which social influences will
impact on the ARS, or, for that matter, any more of an expert on the
ARS (legal and enforcement issues aside) than you, Dick, me, or any
other ham who has been on the air for more than a few months (I've
been licensed since the mid seventies--and as I understand both you
and Dick have been licensed longer than that). Hollingsworth is just
like anyone else, Larry, he has opinions that he holds but his
opinions are no more valid than anyone else's.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2185. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:57:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DC86BF375B90AC31.C827AA44D761B32A.5855EB376386E6EF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25182

On 26 Nov 2001 04:20:31 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I have no choice but to accept your callsign. I have stated many times
>that your callsign is your responsibility alone -- and you are also
>responsible for the fact that you are taking the ARS "...one step
>closer to extinction" by having chosen it.

No, Larry, if that call sign takes the ARS "one step closer to
extinction" it isn't Kim's fault for having chosen it--it's the FCC's
fault for having ISSUED it.

There is no way that Kim is responsible for damage to the ARS
if her actions are ALL within the guidelines of the FCC
regulations--and her's were. If Hollingsworth or anyone else is so
convinced that her call is harmful, then it is up to them to convince
the FCC to limit the range of available call signs, not to criticize
Kim for acting in accordance with the law.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2186. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 04:59:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1A7EA877217F328F.363625849C7957A8.3D676BEF89372E80@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25183

On 26 Nov 2001 04:20:31 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>What makes you think it is *I* who is offending them?

You, Dave, and Dick present a far worse image of hams here
than Kim could do if she posted PICTURES of her tits instead of using
TIT in her call sign!

I'm happy that the ARS has more of a range than the three of
you present. If it didn't, I'd be ashamed to admit I was a ham.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2187. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:00:48 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EF808A1606C3EE29.8CDE645EED11D004.733B2C5703A23C59@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25184

On 26 Nov 2001 05:54:50 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>> Your bigoted postings even offend me, Larry, and I have a
>> thick skin.
>>
>
> So does an onion.

Don't you ever get ANYTHING right, Dick?

An onion doesn't have a "thick skin" it has a very thin one
with many layers of "meat" inside.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2188. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:03:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <84CCC52A61BD8F83.5B63C76B1E716016.4BE1D7AFC76E87DE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25186

On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:31 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>>More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
>
>They DO? How do you know, Cecil?

Try checking the daily statistics in the NEWS newsgroup
hierarchy. Since the daily readership of this group is higher than the
number of hams licensed in the US last year, it seems pretty likely
that at least as many readers are potential hams as are likely to be
listening to the ham bands.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2189. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:03:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127000358.02880.00000915@nso-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 25188

In article <p5vM7.198527$3d2.8380017@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> But we have barely scratched the surface of true commentary/novelty/parody
>> songs. Particularly the written-for-the-purpose stuff like Tom Lehrer and
>Monty
>> Python ditties ("Every Sperm Is Sacred", "The Philosopher's Song", and of
>> course "The Lumberjack Song".
>>
>> Didja know that if you take Neil Diamond's hit "September Morn" and
>replace the
>> words "September Morn" with "Internet Porn", and make a few other minor
>changes
>> the song still works, although with a somewhat different meaning?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>I do want to keep my job.

Yeah, me too.

> Are you familiar with Lou and Peter Berryman???
>
You mean the ones who do "Squalor" and "A Chat With Your Mom"?

Oh yes.

Let us not forget Tom Paxton ("Yuppies In The Sky", "Not Tonight, Marie", "I Am
Changing My Name To Chrysler"). And, of course, Utah Phillips and Loudon
Wainwright III.

--

Counter culture comedy alert!!! The Firesign Theatre will celebrate their 35th
anniversary by doing their first TV special on PBS. Air time in Philly is 8 Pm
on Nov 28th. Check your local listings.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Brought to you by Loosener's Castor Oil Flakes and Ralph Spoilsport Motors.

2190. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:03:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127000359.02880.00000916@nso-fl.aol.com>
Source record: 25187

In article <3C025523.C561E1CA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
>>
>> They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
>
>Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.

Your deduction does not follow from the facts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2191. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:04:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C031771.8B95F51E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25185

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C02DF74.14AD0EC4@earthlink.net...
>
> > libertarian) candidates for national office. There aren't many in the
> > U.S. who'd vote your way. What do you think is the reason?
>
> Easy. Most people are sheep that believe whatever the media tell them.

Er, sure. THAT'S right. We're Demoncrats. We're Republicans. We're Democrats. We're Republicans. Damn! I'm confused. Why does the media lead us everywhere except toward the Libertarian Party and the Communist Party and the tiny little single issue parties?

Dave K8MN

2192. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:12:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <93357BF7806084C7.599ED4622DE4BBB4.C744DF0AF6BB42C0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25189

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 17:34:49 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Brilliant! Of course there's the part where they'd have to be online,
>would have to be aware of newsgroups, would have to find this particular
>newsgroup and would have to be interested in a mild sort of way in
>amateur radio in order to start reading it.

Ok, let's examine that part by part.

Online: There are twenty TIMES as many homes connected to the
Internet then there are hams in the US alone.

Aware of newsgroups. This information is made available to ALL
online service (isp) users--and nearly all isps either offer news
servers (and send configuration instructions to ALL new users) or
recommend certain news groups in their monthly mailings to users.

Find this particular newsgroup. Anyone can find a ham radio
related newsgroup in the Usenet listings (ALL news readers in common
use--i.e., Agent, NewsBin, Outlook Express, Netscape, etc.) have the
ability to find news groups in their groups lists (downloaded from the
news server) based on simple criteria. Try typing "amateur" and
"radio" into one and you'll this group very easily. Someone too stupid
to do that is too stupid to pass even the dumbed down Tech test in use
today and would never become a ham anyway.

Interest. If a potential ham is NOT interested in reading the
ham newsgroups so he or she can find out more about ham radio--and
hams in general--before buying a rig and getting a license, he or she
doesn't have very much interest in the hobby in the first place.

>I think we may have another Sherlock Holmes on our hands.

Well, one of us used logic in this message. But I think you'll
have to settle for being a slightly befuddled Watson.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2193. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:12:51 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DB05A39F51229FDE.9B546AA5444FA72E.E7C38DB57BBB3119@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25190

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 00:50:10 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Not all potential hams know that they are potential hams. Next year's
>ham may not even have heard about ham radio yet. The other points I
>made are valid, Sherlock.

If they don't know they are potential hams, they aren't
listening to the ham bands either.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2194. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:14:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0319DC.4EA73CD4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25191

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> I know of no woman who refers to her tops as
> breasts or mammaries. We all call them tits. We call all you guys'
> thangs dicks.

> Tits serve two purposes. They can nurse babies or men, or woman if
> the owner of the tits is prone to that persuasion. We have to cover
> our tits and you men have to cover your dicks.

> I call my tits tits and always have. I call my, well....never mind. > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.

This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*

...and that's just part of the reason I refer to the woman as Tugboat Annie.

Dave K8MN
* The view expressed is my personal opinion.

2195. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:17:19 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <71FF13C1D50B5079.5074E212311610A9.404C11FD5051E64D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25192

On 27 Nov 2001 02:58:41 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>When you tell them about it and how to download the 60,000 groups, and
>that you must download ALL of them, most decide they want nothing to do
>with it.

Maybe because that's a totally inaccurate statement, Dick.

You need a LIST of the newsgroups--but that only takes a few
seconds to download on your first connection. After that, if you use a
decent reader (and excellent ones such as Agent are available in FREE
versions) you only download the HEADERS for the groups that interest
you--and THEN download only the messages you care to read.

If you have been telling people they have to download 60,000
groups (btw, there are only 48,000 accepted ones--you added a few
there) you've been lying to them.

You would be offended if people told potential hams they had
to pass a 20 WPM code test to get their first license, and must have a
sound understanding of calculus to pass the written test. Well, guess
what, Dick. People who are involved in the Usenet see what you are
telling people as being just as offensively wrong.

Take the time to learn what you're talking about before you
make such idiotic comments.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2196. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:19:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <81E19112DEB830E5.BE57C8CE25828668.2573A153377CD80A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25193

On 26 Nov 2001 05:56:52 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> SOCIETY at large finds the word to be vulgar and offensive on its face,
>more expecially when used in a public mixed setting. You insist that
>just because you are as coarse and vulgar, that society also is. You are
>wroing.

No, Dick. You insist that because you are an old fashioned
prude that everyone else in society is. Many of us disagree. Live with
it.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2197. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:22:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C031BB8.7FEA1512@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25194

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Not all potential hams know that they are potential hams.
>
> That's obviously true. But there have been many potential hams
> asking questions about becoming a ham on this newsgroup using
> his personal computer. I have never heard a potential ham ask
> questions about becoming a ham over the air using his personal
> transceiver. :-)

Nice smiley.
Is a few or ten or fifteen people "many"? How does that equate to your earlier statement that more potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to amateur radio?

Dave K8MN

2198. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:24:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C031C2F.D4BBF9BD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25195

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
> > usenet.
>
> Doubt it. Internet savvy people know about usenet and usually
> don't possess a transceiver. Hope that's not too much for you
> to comprehend.

My dad, my sister and my two neighbors all own computers and have internet access. None are internet savvy and none access newsgroups. You don't have any solid information, do you?

Dave K8MN

2199. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:24:44 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D03AF4640085312D.4A6C735A226CF76A.F5F03DDB8710A28B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25196

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 20:53:11 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>We women are mere playthings, always have been and always will
>be.

Really, Kim?

Now I KNOW I want my next "Buddha's Birthday" gifts from Toys
'R Us! ;-)

Trivia time: Since all the Christians in the group expect
everyone to know the day Jesus birthday is celebrated, is there a
single person here who has enough respect for other religions to know
when Buddha's Birthday (a historically accurate date, btw) is
celebrated? I'll even give a hint--it's a holiday in the US.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2200. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:25:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7178D063D40EFB0B.3783B3B5D4C5F2C5.5B853428D3D633E6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25197

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 23:23:25 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Have you polled most women, Dick?

Nope. And that's why he's so cranky!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2201. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:27:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C031CD3.A2D685F4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25198

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:30 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In addition, it's obvious that you won't voluntarily change it, so there's no
> >point in on-air mention of the issue.
>
> Then precisely what is the point of mentioning it (over and
> over again, for that matter) here?
>
> You, and others, expect the ARS to be treated with respect.
> Great. I'm a ham as well. On the other hand, I'm ALSO a computer
> hobbyist who spends far more time on the Internet than on the air.
> From my perspective, people like you, Dick, and Larry, who scream that
> the ham bands should be free of any form of bigotry, racism, or
> "offensive" behavior are the worst kind of hypocrites! It's wrong in
> YOUR hobby, but perfectly alright here where OTHERS are hobbyists!
>
> If you don't like Kim's sign, then say so on the air. If you
> feel (as Dick and others do) that Islamic people are inferior, that
> their religion is inferior, or that minorities are losers who depend
> on affirmative action to provide them jobs they don't deserve then
> voice your opinions on the ham bands or shut the fuck up! You have no
> more right to fill the Internet with that moralistic, racist, or
> bigoted crap than you do to fill the ham bands with it. Either take it
> BOTH places or drop it completely.
>
> Think about it.
>
> >Sems to me you define "responsibly minded people" as those who don't voice
> >objections.
> >>
> >>Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
> >>
> >Because this is the appropriate place to do so.
>
> Bullshit!
>
> This venue is no more appropriate than the ham bands. Who the
> hell gave hams the right to come into the Internet Usenet groups and
> post offensive material they wouldn't think of voicing in the ham
> bands? There are just as many children here as there are on the
> air--if you're so goddamn concerned with them then try practicing what
> you keep preaching in THIS venue too!

>
> Rick

This is the voice of the tranquil Buddhist libertarian New Age Man.
S'cuse the language, kids.

Dave K8MN

2202. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:28:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C031D11.E52CED1B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25199

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Wiggle, wiggle, wiggle. Are you denying being a
> > > Homo sapien, Dave? Reading between the lines is
> > > as easy as predicting that you breath air.
> >
> > No, I've never denied being part of the human race. Neither have I
> > denied eating pork.
>
> Yep.

You're plaintive cries and your inane arguments are growing weaker.

Dave K8MN
```

2203. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:30:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C031D84.501F473@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25200

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You are the individual who wants numerous laws changed. You are the
> > libertarian who will not live to see a libertarian as a chief executive
> > of this country. You little "L" libertarians should take the hint after
> > watching throuncing after throuncing of big "L" Libertarian (or even
> > libertarian) candidates for national office. There aren't many in the
> > U.S. who'd vote your way. What do you think is the reason?
>
> Ignorance.

I don't think you're view isn't supported because folks think you're
ignorant, Cecil. I think they just believe you to be misguided.

Dave K8MN

2204. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:33:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C031E2E.B9335DCB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25301

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 17:08:36 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >You might have a case if everyone believed as you do. Most folks don't.
>
> Is that supposed to make him wrong?

In the eyes of the majority, apparently so.

Dave K8MN

2205. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:43:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B0B67C16D8B5A692.EDA9DA20B52C6DEE.43AEF76893F13EFE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25302

On 26 Nov 2001 04:20:29 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I don't think you're in any position to ask that question, Rick. Using
>Cecil's logic, the same logic by which he contends that my call is
>"Kneading Three Large Tits," your callsign is KE8 Heil Hitler. As a
>person who was raised Catholic, and has Jews on my mother's side
>of the family, I find that pretty darned offensive -- if Cecil's "logic" is to
>be given serious consideration. So, lemme akxs you -- are you going
>to do anything about it -- or is Cecil's logic inherently flawed?

Actually, it's not KE8 Heil Hitler--that doesn't use the first
two letters and the numeral.

It's King Edward Ate Horatio Hornblower.

Better?

Am I going to do something about it?

Yup!

I plan to get a vanity sign in the next couple weeks. How
would W8GOD, W8POT, K8DIC, W8DIK, W8FUK, W8FUC, W8ASS, or W8BAL work
for you? All are available (among others).

Don't like those choices?

Complain to the FCC, not to me--I don't decide what's
acceptable and what isn't--they do.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2206. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:45:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <748744DAB993441F.3EE40D4E986810BF.B126C9E26A98D268@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25303

On 26 Nov 2001 07:35:11 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Cecil, a travelling salesman? Wow! Pity the poor customers.

Why, do you think he left them pregnant?

He has more sense than that, Dick. You'll have to blame your
grandkids on someone else.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2207. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:46:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2B121C183993ECC8.F9CF8D8ADE0AC17B.65C16E071B70AB43@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25304

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 23:46:20 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>It's easy to read between the lines, Dave.

Holding up three fingers for him huh, Cecil? ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2208. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:50:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B493FC82922011A6.A7BCC27B09672BEC.74E675A108ECE54D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25305

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 03:46:43 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>*You'll* make it simple? You're pretty much of a grin too, Rick.
>This part about "standing mute when evidence of your guilt..." is a
>particularly entertaining. I can't seem to find that part where any
>evidence at all has been introduced. If you guys are curious, you'll
>have to research in order to find the answer. It may remain one of the
>mysteries of your lives and I hope it provides an opportunity for you to
>fritter away hours. Good luck in your quests.

Read carefully, Dave.

I don't CARE if you eat pork products.

Cecil does.

I just told him you did.

You can either contradict me, and state you do NOT eat pork
products or you can let my accusation stand.

If you contradict me, Cecil then knows for certain (assuming
you are honest in your response instead of a liar, of course) that you
do NOT eat pork products.

If you DON'T contradict me, the only evidence Cecil has is my
statement, and in the absence of any denial on your part it's
perfectly reasonable for him to accept it as a given and make his
point on that basis.

Have fun weaseling out of this one.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2209. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:51:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E8D600D8E9FD585E.2A0F94EB5393A542.4B1D3041B81AE121@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25306

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 00:00:52 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dick, you have such a way with words. Who first called you a Dick?

Not me--that's an insult to penises!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2210. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:54:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F3DCDFAD898E2826.457C3A26220EDCE8.8D0EC62D371072A1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25307

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 09:14:55 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dick apparently desires to commit genocide against Muslims. That's
>what some Muslim terrorists want to do to us. Dick is just like them.

Cecil, that's a nasty thing to say about terrorists. At least
THEY believe in what they are doing--and are willing to die for their
principles--Dick doesn't have the integrity to stand by his beliefs.

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2211. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 05:57:57 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <71BF5E958D73A950.0AAA353BC8A56730.A3E0D998A6EAB719@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25308

On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 23:57:45 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Actually '1Y' and that classification wasn't my idea.

Wasn't 1Y the designation for an honorably discharged vet with
medical conditions that prevented conscription? I thought that was the
designation on my own card after I was discharged from the Navy for
the wounds I got in SE Asia, but I could be wrong.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2212. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 06:00:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D5BF3CC8284DF18E.77373733AB2BB7F0.60B11E5406552A95@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25309

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 03:52:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>For a "touchy-feely" New Age guy, you certainly have a tendency to make
>snap judgements based on scant information.

I never claimed to be either "touchy-feely" OR interested in
New Age topics, Dave. The fact that people accuse me of that doesn't
make it a fact.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2213. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 06:08:32 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <51292258B2A79366.54F57C1163DA2840.1050AA72B4ED8C2F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25310

On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:32 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Is it OK to do it to boys but not girls?

Are you aware of the difference, Jim?

A girl is "circumcised" by having her clitoris cut out and her
vagina sewn shut so her husband can tear out the stitches and prove
she was a virgin on her wedding night.

Not only does the clitoridectomy (it's proper name) mutilate
the girl and prevent her from ever experiencing orgasms, it makes her
five TIMES as likely to be infected with HIV--usually during the
procedure, which is conducted at age five or six.

I think there's a bit of difference there, don't you?

>>The US has *individual* rights defined by The Constitution
>>to protect us from people like you.
>
>All of those rights are subject to change. All it takes is for a large
>percentage of society, through their elected representatives, to amend the
>Constitution.

Yup.

That's all it took in Germany when the Nazis took power, too.

>In addition, the interpretation of the Constitution is determined by a very
>small group of judges. Rights rise and fall on their decision. For example,
>abortion was illegal practically everywhere until 1973, when a single judgement
>of the Supremes struck down existing laws and established a "right of privacy"
>for those seeking abortions and wiped out the "right to life" of those being
>aborted.

It didn't wipe out ANYONE'S rights--as George W. Bush just
proved with his terrorism legislation.

According to current law, which HAS been examined from
Constitutional aspects, non-citizens are NOT protected by the rights
guaranteed in the US Constitution. And since the Constitution defines
a citizen as a person who is either naturalized by a court of law, is
born and draws his/her first breath in the United States, or is born
of US parents in a foreign nation, it follows that a fetus is NOT a
citizen, and thus is NOT protected by the Constitution.

Rick

>
>The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2214. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 06:11:59 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <493E183518BD064F.B1D133096F83331E.B93307EA28D27703@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25311

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 00:59:38 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>You are the individual who wants numerous laws changed. You are the
>libertarian who will not live to see a libertarian as a chief executive
>of this country.

We already have--Thomas Jefferson.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2215. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 06:19:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B8A9C32B9F96A786.FA66D06AC6749091.5AE17EB6CD0BCF18@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25312

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 03:58:18 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>A Social Security card is not a national ID card. It isn't even
>necessary to carry it with you. As to your son's drifting, we can only
>hope that he finds himself and stops this drifting one day. I don't
>know of any photo Social Security cards and I'm quite certain that a
>state-issued drivers license doesn't count as a "national ID card".

Ignoring the obvious stupidity of your response to a typo of
drift instead of draft, don't lean too hard on your "photo" concept to
prove something is a national id card. The papers issued to Italian
citizens under Mussolini didn't have pictures either--just a number
(as my social security card has). And you weren't required to carry
them all the time, only when conducting an activity (applying for a
job, opening a bank account, etc.) where they were required. Tried
applying for a job w/o a social security number lately?

>Neither. I find the UN to be largely tangled in its own bureaucracy.
>I'd fear no helicopters within ten or so years. It would take 'em that
>long to finish up the various meetings necessary to get one airborne.

They do pretty well when it comes to relief efforts, Dave. Or
to pointing out the failings in various nations--ours included.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2216. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 07:31:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C03414A.5001FCF7@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25313

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> I recieved a letter Saturday from
> the Agency in Ohio that oversees my
> son's child support. The letter was
> postmarked November 19th, dated November
> 19th, and in the text it advised me
> that there "would" be an administrative
> hearing to review the present amount on
> October 29th, but that it was not
> necessary for me to attend...

Don't you know that time means nothing in many government offices? When I went to work for the IRS once, they said they were going to check my returns for the last three years. A month later, they wanted to talk to me about a return I filed nine years earlier. When I asked about the time difference (nine is more than three), they said that is just what they tell people. When I asked why they didn't just tell people they were going to look back at an undetermined number of years, they said that was against the rules. Of course, when I asked the obvious question of why they were looking past the three years for me, they gave the same first answer - that's just what we tell people.

Luckily, the problem they had found with my return was that I had over paid and was due a refund. Of course, since I understood there was a time limit on that (three years), I asked if I would still get the refund. They said of course.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2217. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 07:44:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C034460.E4E1C4A7@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25314

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Well just for THE RECORD Mohammad
> considered and discounted Jesus long
> before his own death, and proclaimed
> himself to be the Final Prophet,
> which remains Muslim doctrine to
> this day.

I first learned about Jesus' standing in the Muslim faith when I saw a picture of him on the wall of a mosque in Istanbul. If what you say is true, that seems to he a fairly prominent place to display a picture of someone who had been dismissed by Mohammed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2218. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 07:59:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0347E2.38B30A4A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25315

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Sure he does but he'd prefer to play games.

Of course, Dave. But don't get caught up in the game - we understood
what you were trying to say, and Cecil's response didn't alter that understanding.

By the way, everybody, did you notice this thread has just about
reached the all time record for the number of messages posted to a
single thread (check out google.com for the totals). Perhaps it is
time to bring this thread "one step closer to extinction" and move
some of the unrelated topics into their own threads. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2219. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 11:56:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127065622.22754.00000757@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 25316

In article <9tuu4thmt1@208.206.142.65>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> The Lumberjack Song".
>>
>> Didja know that if you take Neil Diamond's hit "September Morn" and replace
>the
>> words "September Morn" with "Internet Porn", and make a few other minor
>changes
>> the song still works, although with a somewhat different meaning?
>
>
> Gee, imagine what you could do with "Cracklin' Rosie".

I thought "Cracklin' Rosie" was already a novelty song (about inexpensive
wine).

73 de Jim, N2EY

2220. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 11:56:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127065623.22754.00000758@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 25317

In article <3C0347E2.38B30A4A@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

> By the way, everybody, did you notice this thread has just about
>reached the all time record for the number of messages posted to a
>single thread (check out google.com for the totals). Perhaps it is
>time to bring this thread "one step closer to extinction" and move
>some of the unrelated topics into their own threads. :-)
>
No, no, no! The whole point is for us to keep this going until March. Can't
expect Kim to do it alone!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2221. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 12:25:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127072502.20950.00000763@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 25319

In article <3c030996_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>Here's one for ya...though I've never been able to test it:
>
>Put the album "The Wall" on,
>Put the movie "The Wizard of Oz" on,
>
>On the third MGM lion roar, start "The Wall" and turn down the sound on the
>movie. I am told they both go along nearly perfect.
>
The imdb database

http://www.imdb.com

gives a list of the coincidences under the trivia for the movie. Quite amazing, really.

Some more "Wizard of Oz" trivia:

The coat worn by the wizard was found in a used-clothing store in LA and turned out to have belonged to Frank L. Baum.

The wicked witch's guards are actually singing words as they march into the palace at the changing of the guard. The words are "All we owe, we owe her"

Dorothy has a last name, mentioned in the film. What is it?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2222. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 12:25:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127072503.20950.00000764@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 25321

In article <3c030919_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

(N2EY wrote):
>> Everyone knows the nets are not the time. So the lack of comment simply
>means
>> that those who are offended don't compound the problem by mentioning it
>during
>> the net.
>>
>
>You may choose to think of it that way. I choose to believe that people
>just don't have a problem with it.

We may both be right. Most of the hams you know may not have a problem with it,
while most of the hams I know would have one. Dallas sure ain't in EPA.

>We have lots of get-togethers around
>here, and I've never been approached negatively (oooops, except from one
>ham) about my callsign.

So it isn't 100% accepted.
>
>> In addition, it's obvious that you won't voluntarily change it, so there's
>no
>> point in on-air mention of the issue.
>
>Your knowledge that I am adamant about not changing it is due to your
>reading it so often from me here in the newsgroup.

Yup. Also from your attitudes and responses about other issues. Plus it's
pretty obvious that you chose and paid for it.

> Knowledge of my feelings
>about changing it aren't all that known because of discussions I've had
>either on the air or at get-togethers.

OK

> My callsign just isn't a point of
>discussion among hams around here--or at least not that I am aware of.

Bingo.

> And,
>if it is not important enough for them to express disapproval, then it's not
>important.
>

>> >In fact, responsibly-minded people see it as nothing more than a
>callsign,
>> >and one that has a great deal of "conversational value" off the air, for
>> >those eyeball get-togethers!
>>
>> Sems to me you define "responsibly minded people" as those who don't voice
>> objections.
>
>Well, that would be correct in terms of someone who does not express
>objections to a callsign during a net, wouldn't you?

Yup - because a net isn't the appropriate time/place to do so.
>
>However, I would also say someone is quite responsibly minded if they see my
>callsign for what it is. It is something meant for quiet fun on the air,
>and a all the kidding about it we want off the air, however there isn't all
>that much.

Different tastes in what's funny and appropriate, that's all. I think calls
like that are inappropriate in the ARS, and causes harm to the image of the
ARS. And you don't see it that way. We both know folks who agree and disagree.
>
>> >Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
>> >
>> Because this is the appropriate place to do so.

>Uh, you don't know most of the hams around here.

True. You have described a high percentage of them as "bigoted" and/or
"prejudiced".

I DO know lots of hams around here and other places, and they are quite
different from what you describe. So it may be a regional thing. Or it may be
we hang out in different ham circles.

>Some pretty darned
>inappropriate conversations take place on the air here on 2M daily. :)

There ya go!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2223. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 12:25:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127072504.20950.00000765@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 25320

In article <51292258B2A79366.54F57C1163DA2840.1050AA72B4ED8C2F@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:32 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Is it OK to do it to boys but not girls?
>
> Are you aware of the difference, Jim?

Yup.
>
> A girl is "circumcised" by having her clitoris cut out and her
>vagina sewn shut so her husband can tear out the stitches and prove
>she was a virgin on her wedding night.

That's ONE definition. In other countries it is done differently. I did not say
it was acceptable, moral or a good thing.

The question still remains: is it OK to do it to boys but not girls?
>
> *I* think there's a bit of difference there, don't you?

Did I say there wasn't? No. I simply asked if it was OK for boys but not girls.
>
>>>The US has *individual* rights defined by The Constitution
>>>to protect us from people like you.
>>
>>All of those rights are subject to change. All it takes is for a large
>>percentage of society, through their elected representatives, to amend the
>>Constitution.
>
> Yup.
>
> That's all it took in Germany when the Nazis took power, too.

Did Germany have the same Constitution as the USA? Did the Nazi party take
power by a majority vote in a free election? Did the Reichstag vote on every
change in the laws, and approve every one by a 2/3 majority?

I don't think so.
>
>>In addition, the interpretation of the Constitution is determined by a very
>>small group of judges. Rights rise and fall on their decision. For example,
>>abortion was illegal practically everywhere until 1973, when a single
>judgement
>>of the Supremes struck down existing laws and established a "right of

>privacy"
>>for those seeking abortions and wiped out the "right to life" of those being
>>aborted.
>
> It didn't wipe out ANYONE'S rights

Sure it did. It ruled that the right of privacy was more important.

>--as George W. Bush just
>proved with his terrorism legislation.

Huh??
>
> According to current law, which HAS been examined from
>Constitutional aspects, non-citizens are NOT protected by the rights
>guaranteed in the US Constitution.

Ahhh. Now I get ya. But the Supremes could change that if a test case is brought before them. The Supremes have reversed their position before, too.

>And since the Constitution defines
>a citizen as a person who is either naturalized by a court of law, is
>born and draws his/her first breath in the United States, or is born
>of US parents in a foreign nation, it follows that a fetus is NOT a
>citizen, and thus is NOT protected by the Constitution.

Does it say "is born and draws his/her first breath in the United States" or just "is born in the United States"?

You missed the whole point, though. Cecil was describing the Constitution as if it were an unchangable thing, with only one interpretation. That's simply not true.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2224. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 12:25:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127072505.20950.00000766@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 25318

In article <84CCC52A61BD8F83.5B63C76B1E716016.4BE1D7AFC76E87DE@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:31 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>>More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
>>
>>They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
>
> Try checking the daily statistics in the NEWS newsgroup
>hierarchy.

I tried, but there doesn't seem to be a listing of daily statistics.

How about posting a link so we can all check?

>Since the daily readership of this group is higher than the
>number of hams licensed in the US last year, it seems pretty likely
>that at least as many readers are potential hams as are likely to be
>listening to the ham bands.

There are more than 680,000 readers of rrap?? Amazing!

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2225. Re: Contest idea, work all your own suffix

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 13:05:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127080518.09918.00002040@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 25323

>Subject: Contest idea, work all your own suffix
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 11/24/2001 3:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C00101A.EC216778@ix.netcom.com>
>
>Be the first to work your suffix in all American prefixes!

And did you see the fellow in QST not too long ago who worked his way through the alphabet "AAA" through "ZZZ" suffixes? He had a couple cards up there I have!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2226. Re: Contest idea, work all your own suffix

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 13:07:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127080747.09918.00002041@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 25322

>Subject: Re: Contest idea, work all your own suffix
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 11/25/2001 12:57 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011125015738.12427.00003226@nso-cg.aol.com>

>This is a good idea. When I held the call WR2F, I worked about eight
>of the other WR2's -- and always wished I could finish them all. I'll have
>to check QRZ.com and see how many LT's are out there!

Hey Larry....WR2F has been reissued. Maybe you can STILL work them all! I
hope to work KC8M someday!1

73

Steve, K4YZ

2227. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 15:10:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03ACC9.57A0F2A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25324

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Not all potential hams know that they are potential hams.
> >
> > That's obviously true. But there have been many potential hams
> > asking questions about becoming a ham on this newsgroup using
> > his personal computer. I have never heard a potential ham ask
> > questions about becoming a ham over the air using his personal
> > transceiver. :-)
>
> Nice smiley.
> Is a few or ten or fifteen people "many"? How does that equate to your
> earlier statement that more potential hams read this newsgroup than
> listen to amateur radio?

That's my educated personal opinion, Dave, based on many years of
experience. If you don't like it, you can lump it. To me, it seems
obvious to the most casual observer. I personally have recommended
these newsgroups to hundreds of potential hams over the years who
usually did not possess shortwave receivers capable of CW and SSB
reception on the ham bands.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2228. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 15:13:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03AD98.17DA3BDB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25325

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >I think we may have another Sherlock Holmes on our hands.
>
> Well, one of us used logic in this message. But I think you'll
> have to settle for being a slightly befuddled Watson.

I have personally directed hundreds of potential hams to
these newsgroups. I assume other hams have done likewise.
The great majority of the people I directed to these
newsgroups had no way to receive shortwave ham CW/SSB.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2229. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 15:16:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03AE39.A734DE02@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25326

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
> > > usenet.
> >
> > Doubt it. Internet savvy people know about usenet and usually
> > don't possess a transceiver. Hope that's not too much for you
> > to comprehend.
>
> My dad, my sister and my two neighbors all own computers and have
> internet access. None are internet savvy and none access newsgroups.
> You don't have any solid information, do you?

Are your dad, sister, and two neighbors potential hams? I'm talking
primarily about people who have shown an interest in ham radio. I
have personally directed hundreds of those potential hams to these
newsgroups during Amateur Radio awareness days.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2230. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 15:18:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03AED1.DFDC0419@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25327

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C025523.C561E1CA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >> >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> >>
> >> They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
> >
> >Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
>
> Your deduction does not follow from the facts.

Got any proof? Seems to me a no-brainer to deduce that more people
have access to these ham radio newsgroups than have access to
shortwave receivers capable of receiving ham CW/SSB.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2231. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 15:23:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03AFE0.77C15A47@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25328

N2EY wrote:
>
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
> >Since the daily readership of this group is higher than the
> >number of hams licensed in the US last year, it seems pretty likely
> >that at least as many readers are potential hams as are likely to be
> >listening to the ham bands.
>
> There are more than 680,000 readers of rrap?? Amazing!

There were 680,000 new hams licensed in the US last year?? Amazing!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2232. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 15:26:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03B09F.240A3F73@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25329

Dave Heil wrote:
> > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
>
> This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*

Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
of Duncanville, TX.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2233. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 15:35:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03B2CF.DEFAB8BF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25330

Rick Adams wrote:
> Trivia time: Since all the Christians in the group expect
> everyone to know the day Jesus birthday is celebrated, is there a
> single person here who has enough respect for other religions to know
> when Buddha's Birthday (a historically accurate date, btw) is
> celebrated? I'll even give a hint--it's a holiday in the US.

Wonder how many Christians know that a pagan holiday was adopted
as Jesus' birthday because Romans were already celebrating it anyway?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2234. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 15:46:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C03A8F6.77DEA77E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25331

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 03:46:43 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >*You'll* make it simple? You're pretty much of a grin too, Rick.
> >This part about "standing mute when evidence of your guilt..." is a
> >particularly entertaining. I can't seem to find that part where any
> >evidence at all has been introduced. If you guys are curious, you'll
> >have to research in order to find the answer. It may remain one of the
> >mysteries of your lives and I hope it provides an opportunity for you to
> >fritter away hours. Good luck in your quests.
>
> Read carefully, Dave.
>
> I don't CARE if you eat pork products.
>
> Cecil does.
>
> I just told him you did.
>
> You can either contradict me, and state you do NOT eat pork
> products or you can let my accusation stand.

All I have to say is that you have absolutely no way of knowing whether
I do or whether I don't.

> If you contradict me, Cecil then knows for certain (assuming
> you are honest in your response instead of a liar, of course) that you
> do NOT eat pork products.

All I have to say is that you have absolutely no way of knowing.

> If you DON'T contradict me, the only evidence Cecil has is my
> statement, and in the absence of any denial on your part it's
> perfectly reasonable for him to accept it as a given and make his
> point on that basis.
>
> Have fun weaseling out of this one.
>
> Rick

Gee Rick, that'd be like catching up on the evening news from a guy who
has no radio, TV or internet access. Cecil would have to be a fool to
take his information from such a source. This "weaseling" stuff
certainly is easier than I ever believed possible.

Dave K8MN

2235. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 15:54:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C03AAE2.D728A302@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25332

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 03:58:18 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >A Social Security card is not a national ID card. It isn't even
> >necessary to carry it with you. As to your son's drifting, we can only
> >hope that he finds himself and stops this drifting one day. I don't
> >know of any photo Social Security cards and I'm quite certain that a
> >state-issued drivers license doesn't count as a "national ID card".
>
> Ignoring the obvious stupidity of your response to a typo of
> drift instead of draft, don't lean too hard on your "photo" concept to
> prove something is a national id card.

Damn! For a guy who brays about his sense of humor and who clucks about the lack of a sense of humor in others, I wouldn't think you'd be so touchy. At least I haven't come out and called you a liar based on your typo.

> The papers issued to Italian
> citizens under Mussolini didn't have pictures either--just a number
> (as my social security card has). And you weren't required to carry
> them all the time, only when conducting an activity (applying for a
> job, opening a bank account, etc.) where they were required. Tried
> applying for a job w/o a social security number lately?

So Maximo can carry Antonio's ID card and vice versa. It sounds as if their system needed work. I don't intend to apply for a job at all but the necessity for the Social Security number in obtaining a job is pretty evident. Uncle wants his payroll and Social Security taxes. You don't have a problem with that do you?

> >Neither. I find the UN to be largely tangled in its own bureaucracy.
> >I'd fear no helicopters within ten or so years. It would take 'em that
> >long to finish up the various meetings necessary to get one airborne.
>
> They do pretty well when it comes to relief efforts, Dave. Or
> to pointing out the failings in various nations--ours included.

I was not addressing relief efforts, nor were you. We don't need 'em to point out our failings. We have you and the Swedes for that.

Dave K8MN

2236. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:00:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03B8A8.E267F6C2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25333

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Well just for THE RECORD Mohammad considered and discounted Jesus long
> > before his own death, and proclaimed himself to be the Final Prophet,
> > which remains Muslim doctrine to this day.
>
> I first learned about Jesus' standing in the Muslim faith when I saw
> a picture of him on the wall of a mosque in Istanbul. If what you say
> is true, that seems to he a fairly prominent place to display a
> picture of someone who had been dismissed by Mohammed.

Contrary to Dick's ignorant postings, here's what Muslims believe
about Jesus.

"Many non-Muslims are surprised to find out that according to Muslim
belief, Jesus, the son of Mary, is one of the greatest messengers of
God. Muslims are taught to love Jesus, and a person cannot be a Muslim
without believing in the virgin birth and miracles of Jesus Christ,
peace be upon him. Muslims believe these things about Jesus not because
of the Bible or any other religion, but simply because the Holy Qur'an
says these things about him." http://www.muslim-answers.org/miscons.htm
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2237. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:05:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C03AD3B.56BAEEB0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25334

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Not all potential hams know that they are potential hams.
> > >
> > > That's obviously true. But there have been many potential hams
> > > asking questions about becoming a ham on this newsgroup using
> > > his personal computer. I have never heard a potential ham ask
> > > questions about becoming a ham over the air using his personal
> > > transceiver. :-)
> >
> > Nice smiley.
> > Is a few or ten or fifteen people "many"? How does that equate to your
> > earlier statement that more potential hams read this newsgroup than
> > listen to amateur radio?
>
> That's my educated personal opinion, Dave, based on many years of
> experience. If you don't like it, you can lump it.

Well, at least it is your personal opinion.

> To me, it seems
> obvious to the most casual observer.

I'm a casual observer. It isn't obvious to me.

> I personally have recommended
> these newsgroups to hundreds of potential hams over the years who
> usually did not possess shortwave receivers capable of CW and SSB
> reception on the ham bands.

Balderdash.

Dave K8MN

2238. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:05:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03B9CE.33FB9D8C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25336

N2EY wrote:
> We may both be right. Most of the hams you know may not have a problem with it,
> while most of the hams I know would have one. Dallas sure ain't in EPA.

Many Texans migrated from PA to be rid of you prudes. Now here you
are, 150 years later, bugging us again. Could be you damned yankees
are just jealous of Texas tits. Right Kim?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2239. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:07:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C03ADA6.49B5ECE4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25335

CAM wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > >I think we may have another Sherlock Holmes on our hands.
> >
> > Well, one of us used logic in this message. But I think you'll
> > have to settle for being a slightly befuddled Watson.
>
> I have personally directed hundreds of potential hams to
> these newsgroups. I assume other hams have done likewise.
> The great majority of the people I directed to these
> newsgroups had no way to receive shortwave ham CW/SSB.

Sure, Cecil. I certainly wish I could take you seriously.

Dave K8MN

2240. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:08:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03BA79.7FAC0FB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25338

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >
> > >You might have a case if everyone believed as you do. Most folks don't.
> >
> > Is that supposed to make him wrong?
>
> In the eyes of the majority, apparently so.

"Justice is blind" and doesn't care about the tyranny of the majority.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2241. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:08:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C03AE01.3258BE4C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25337

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
> > > > usenet.
> > >
> > > Doubt it. Internet savvy people know about usenet and usually
> > > don't possess a transceiver. Hope that's not too much for you
> > > to comprehend.
> >
> > My dad, my sister and my two neighbors all own computers and have
> > internet access. None are internet savvy and none access newsgroups.
> > You don't have any solid information, do you?
>
> Are your dad, sister, and two neighbors potential hams? I'm talking
> primarily about people who have shown an interest in ham radio. I
> have personally directed hundreds of those potential hams to these
> newsgroups during Amateur Radio awareness days.

Just about everybody is a potential ham, Cecil.

As to your claim about directing hundreds here, it is simply more crap.

Dave K8MN

2242. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:10:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03BAD9.B855ED28@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25340

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > No, I've never denied being part of the human race. Neither have I
> > > denied eating pork.
> > >
> > Yep.
>
> You're plaintive cries and your inane arguments are growing weaker.

Who are you trying to convince. Us or yourself?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2243. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:11:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C03AEB0.80A5178E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25339

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> >
> > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
>
> Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> of Duncanville, TX.

Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in the
manner Tugboat did.

Dave K8MN

2244. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:16:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03BC59.9A5DF243@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25341

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 23:57:45 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >Actually '1Y' and that classification wasn't my idea.
>
> Wasn't 1Y the designation for an honorably discharged vet with
> medical conditions that prevented conscription?

If so, it apparently wasn't limited to vets. I was classified '1Y'
because of migraine headaches. They told me they didn't want me
on the front lines with an automatic weapon during a blinding
headache.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2245. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:21:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03BD97.4F382FBE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25343

N2EY wrote:
> Did the Nazi party take power by a majority vote in a free election?

They did come to power through a *plurality* vote in a free election.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2246. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:23:10 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9u0e8i$q5b$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 25342

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9toc370t2t@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Interesting comments. It's also interesting to note that these Extra and
> Advanced hams passed the 13 and 20 WPM code tests.

Yes they were. I was very surprised by his comments. Given the comments made
by others to this group you would figure it would be the other way around.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

2247. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:24:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03BE48.A970AEA1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25344

Dave Heil wrote:
> I don't think you're view isn't supported because folks think you're
> ignorant, Cecil. I think they just believe you to be misguided.

It is not I who is ignorant, Dave. It is the Democratic/Republican
masses. Once they alleviate their ignorance they will become
freedom-loving Libertarians.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2248. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:26:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03BEBD.A15F276E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25346

Rick Adams wrote:
> Tried applying for a job w/o a social security number lately?

I had to produce a social security card to get a job as a
part-time GED teacher.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2249. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:27:03 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9u0efr$qa4$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 25345

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:1e8M7.235842$W8.7920026@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> I don't know, but suggest you not put it in the CB radio section! :-)
>
> Jim AA2QA

It would be even better if the CBers who seem to have a real fetish with
faking posts by me, like the one starting this thread, would just have the
balls to stick their own name (Handle) to what they wrote instead.

--

__
73 de,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic
Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
functions."

2250. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:32:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03C015.FC979BA3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25347

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Nope, it's social engineering in the same way a driver's license
> > is social engineering. We are talking about government requirements
> > not elective procedures.
>
> You're wrong. Obtaining an amateur radio license is an elective procedure.

Nope, you're wrong, Jim. Choosing not to obtain an amateur radio
license is an elective procedure. Obtaining an amateur radio
license *requires* one to meet the governmental requirements
which are a form of social engineering. Think about it. Every
licensed ham had only two choices - meet the requirements or
cheat. Since you are not the cheating kind, you had no choice
except to meet the requirements based on the desired social
engineering. There was no other choice for licensed hams
like you except to meet the requirements.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2251. Re: K1MAN webpage.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 16:40:50 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <a96f1f4d2ee76e5b3a11b225221d54bf.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 25348
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:e1bb06a74f973f91732f3ab8815a96bd@spamfreenews.com...

> This is a very good site......
>
> http://www.carte.net/k1man/sites.htm

K1MAN is a pathetic scam artist, and you are a pathetic suck-up.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas11poolb82.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.20.82]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2252. Re: K1MAN webpage.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 17:19:46 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@barfhqnet.net>
Message-ID: <9u0hri$1hh$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 25349
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:a96f1f4d2ee76e5b3a11b225221d54bf.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
> news:e1bb06a74f973f91732f3ab8815a96bd@spamfreenews.com...
> > This is a very good site......
> > http://www.carte.net/k1man/sites.htm
> K1MAN is a pathetic scam artist, and you are a pathetic suck-up.
> With all kind wishes,
> de Hans, K0HB
> Posted from mplsapanas11poolb82.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.20.82]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

K1MAN has been approved by me, the BARF Chief of
Communicatins, for consumption by the amateur radio community.
And if Roger would listen, it would make him a much better person
and would especially help him with that awful cursing habit he has.

Lloyd

2253. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 17:22:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u0i5c$7l$0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 25350

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tut7i$f9n$0@208.206.142.65...
>
> > > Telling you something is like pouring water on a rock - it just doesn't
> sink
> > > in.
> >
> >
> > You might want to look into a mirror when you say that. You've just
> > described yourself.
>
> While I have advocated attacks on countries that support terrorism, I've
> never singled out Muslims as Dick has.

Which means you have no idea what you're advocating attacking. There is not a single nation that supports radical Islamic terrorists that is not populated by Muslims. Your attitude is examplary of just how we go this far into such a rediculous scenario in the first place. We have been taught to be completely tolerant of all other religious systems, even one whose basic fundamentals dictate that we should be destroyed.

No one ever said (and I did not) that all Muslims are radical terrorists, as Cecil has flatly stated, lying, that I did say that. What I did say is that all Muslims are trained from infancy to believe that all other belief systems are inferior and are to be either converted, enslaved or eliminated by the sword. Cecil equates ancient Jewish actions far predating Islam with modern Islamic practice, as practiced by all their fundamentalist Jihadists and as still routinely taught as a fundamental part of Islam. I contend that this belief system and its lifeling teachings do indeed predispose Muslims to follow those teachings, when there is a choice that must be made between them and other systems. zIslam itself teaches that any Muslim is far superior to any infidel in any circumstance. What else should they then choose? The evidence of this factor is widespread for all, who will look, to see.

I also contend this makes the religion of Islam quite different in its basis from any other. Christianity and Judism, indeed no other modern religion of which I have knowedge today teaches murder of all others. Although such activity exists it is not the teachings of any other religion save Islam. If you can provide information to the contrary, I will be very glad to evaluate it, not just label you as a terrorist yourself for recognizing reality, as you Cecil and others have done for me. Cecil's quotes from the Old Testament do not apply. They to not

represent modern Christian theology and he knows it.

2254. Re: K1MAN webpage.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 17:23:23 UTC
From: long dongdong silver <singmeasongkenny2@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <f_PM7.9303$Kc2.1013805@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 25201
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

I sorta hope K1MAN goes back to broadcasting on 14.313
again, like he did during the heydays of the old 14.313 BARF vs
Piece Coalition Wars! Remember that Hans? I still recall with
glee the day old Mike MU-Juice was on there talkin to fat Judy and
Baxter fired up his stupid broadcast right on top of them! Ole dumbshit
Mike didn't know what was going on and threw one of his famous
on the air "shitfits" when he realized what happened. Yes, ole Glen sure
knew how to inflame the situation and interject himself into the fracas.
(Baxter thought he was *singlehandedly* going to cure the 15-Year 14.313
Booer War with the help of W4ASX whom he kissed and swapped-spit with at the
Orlando Hamfest earlier - yup, they had a plan - and the result of which was like when
the Three Stooges dumped that load of cats into the piano in that classic
2-reeler bit...hahaha!) Glub I love ham radio Hans! Got more opportunity
to have radio fun with for a freakin lifetime. Hopefully the old 14.313 is commin
back. Already sounds like a cat caught in a lawn mower on 14.275 when Baxter
fires up atop Dan and the boys. Let's hope it spreads north in freq

As they say at ARRL: "Now ur Talkin...." ROTFLMAO.

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:a96f1f4d2ee76e5b3a11b225221d54bf.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
> news:e1bb06a74f973f91732f3ab8815a96bd@spamfreenews.com...
>
> > This is a very good site......
> >
> > http://www.carte.net/k1man/sites.htm
>
>
> K1MAN is a pathetic scam artist, and you are a pathetic suck-up.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
> --
> Posted from mplsapanas11poolb82.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.20.82]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>

2255. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 17:31:51 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <776792AB7F86D57D.CF66EF89B84A3F52.DD3D5EE32EEE511C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25202

On 25 Nov 2001 06:16:22 -0800, Leland KC8LD0
<Leland_member@newsguy.com> wrote:

>I was able to get Rileys autograph at the fest,man that was great.
>
>I wonder what I could get for it on e-bay ?

I suspect those are getting more and more common...though having it on
something other than a nasty letter may increase the value a bit :)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

2256. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 17:47:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0111270947.507225bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25203

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:<0E08216FB16F54A9.167DB12D8CBFCC92.62F6966A32ABBC50@lp.airnews.net>...
> On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:30 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In addition, it's obvious that you won't voluntarily change it, so there's no
> >point in on-air mention of the issue.
>
> Then precisely what is the point of mentioning it (over and
> over again, for that matter) here?

The discussion here is about whether certain callsigns are appropriate
to the ARS. It's not just about Kim's callsign, but about the larger
topic of such callsigns in general. The W6 version of Kim's call has
been assigned to a person with the first name Michael since at least
1979, btw.
>
> You, and others, expect the ARS to be treated with respect.

Yep. I think that certain things are appropriate in the ARS and
certain things aren't. Is it wrong to discuss such issues in a forum
devoted to ARS policy? You seem to think so.

> Great. I'm a ham as well.

Anybody interested is welcome to post here.

> On the other hand, I'm ALSO a computer
> hobbyist who spends far more time on the Internet than on the air.

To each his own.

> From my perspective, people like you, Dick, and Larry, who scream that
> the ham bands should be free of any form of bigotry, racism, or
> "offensive" behavior are the worst kind of hypocrites! It's wrong in
> YOUR hobby, but perfectly alright here where OTHERS are hobbyists!

I don't "scream" anything here, Rick. And I don't think bigotry,
racism or "offensive" behavior belong on the ham bands or USENET. Have
I said that it's perfectly alright here? Nope.
>
> If you don't like Kim's sign, then say so on the air.

Why? And to whom? Kim and I have never worked each other on the air,
nor met in person. Nor are we likely to, because we don't seem to
share a common band/mode that will span the distance from Wayne to
Forney, and neither has much reason to travel to the other's area.

You will notice that I have not described any legal call as vulgar, obscene, profane or even trashy. Just inappropriate for the ARS. Nor have I "trashed" the holder(s) of such calls.

There is an ongoing discussion HERE about whether certain callsigns are good or bad for the image of the ARS. I have a certain view on the subject, so I make certain comments on it here. Is it wrong to do so? Am I being electro-politically incorrect because I dare to disagree with you?

If I encounter an on-air discussion about whether certain callsigns are appropriate or not, I may make some comments. I have not encountered such a discussion yet.

It is inappropriate to disrupt a public service net with non-net related issues, btw.

> If you
> feel (as Dick and others do) that Islamic people are inferior, that
> their religion is inferior, or that minorities are losers who depend
> on affirmative action to provide them jobs they don't deserve then
> voice your opinions on the ham bands or shut the

(expletive deleted)

> up!

I don't feel that way at all, Rick. Please produce some posts where I claim the followers of ANY religion, as a group, are inferior. Or their religion. Or some anti-minority stuff. C'mon, produce some posts - there all there in the archives.

> You have no
> more right to fill the Internet with that moralistic, racist, or
> bigoted

(expletive deleted)

> than you do to fill the ham bands with it.

Please show where I have done any "moralistic, racist or bigoted" posts on USENET.

> Either take it
> BOTH places or drop it completely.
>
> Think about it.

I have. You seem to like telling people what to think about, btw.

There are appropriate and inappropriate places for various discussions. Is this not an appropriate place to discuss whether certain callsigns have a negative impact on the image of the ARS? I think rrap IS the place.
>
> >Sems to me you define "responsibly minded people" as those who don't voice

> >objections.
> >>
> >>Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
> >>
> >Because this is the appropriate place to do so.
>
(expletive deleted)

> This venue is no more appropriate than the ham bands.

Yes, it is. It's a policy NG - why can't you see that simple fact?

> Who the
> hell gave hams the right to come into the Internet Usenet groups and
> post offensive material they wouldn't think of voicing in the ham
> bands?

The FCC. They regulate ALL electronic communication, not just radio.
People can send stuff over the internet that would be prosecutable
over the air. The rules are different. Ask Howard Stern. Or look at
some of the other, nonradio NGs.

> There are just as many children here as there are on the
> air--

How do you know, Rick? And, if so, why all the expletives? Do you talk
that way around children? Do you talk that way on the air? I don't.

> if you're so

(expletive deleted)

>concerned with them then try practicing what
> you keep preaching in THIS venue too!

My concern is with anyone who might be offended by inappropriate stuff
heard on the ham bands.

I challenge you to produce a post of mine where I wrote anything
racist, sexist, prejudiced, bigoted, vulgar, obscene or profane.
C'mon, produce the posts. Show where I don't practice what I preach.

Seems to me, Rick, that you lump me into a group instead of actually
reading my posts and responding as an individual. You talk as if all
who agree on this callsign thing agree with everything written by
others who happen to agree to it. We're all equivalent in your eyes.
That's bigotry, right there - by YOU.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2257. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:01:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u0kdm$5t1$0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 25204

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 26 Nov 2001 01:50:33 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > You're nuts. Such activity as a formal part of Christianity went out
> >with the Inquisition. In Islam it was clearly demonstrated September 11,
> >and in numerous lesser but horrific incidents in the preceding decades.
> >The widespread cheering in Islamic countries following the fall of WTC
> >was widely televised. Your know all this and choose to ignore it. Your
> >idiotic statements in the wake of what has happened in recent months
> >shows clearly for all to see what you truly are.
>
> Dick, several years ago a man in Iron Mountain Michigan took
> his two sons to the iron foundry where he worked and threw them into
> the vat of molten iron because he believed it was his obligation to
> God. Obviously, he was wrong but equally obviously Osama ben Laden was
> as well. If you truly believe that Islamic religious beliefs are
> responsible for the deaths of the people in NYC, then you MUST accept
> that Christianity is responsible for the death of those children. And
> if we must fight Islam as a result, then it follows that we are
> equally obligated to ban Christianity in the US as well.

I'm sure glad that I lived and worked far enough from a university that
an advanced degree was not a workable option. You and Cecil are giving
higher education a bad name.

Of course Islam was responiible for the WTC etc! If not for the basic
teachings of fundamentalist Islam those acts would have never been never
been performed -by ISLAMICS! Do you insinuate they were other than
Islamics? Do you insist that Islam does NOT, in its basic teachings,
dictate that all other belief systems are inferior and must be either
converted, enslaved, or eliminated? Do you refuse to realize that the
fundamentalist Islamics have concluded they will never be able to
dominate the West by religious means alone (conversion) and have
concluded that elimination is the only workable means remaining of
making sure that Islam dominates? Do you not know that the
fundamentalists dominate Islam in most of the world, and do so by
accusing moderates of violating the basics of Islam, and even kill or
otherwise punish them? Do you not know that such activity is becoming
ever more widespread throughout the world of Islam?
Do you really believe that so few Moslems follow their basic tenants
that they are as few in number as the single Christian mental case you
quoted above?

In fact it is becoming very clear that there is very little that you actually DO know on the subject, you just like to pretend. I suppose it boosts your ego.

You are still in denial and just another component of the problem. Most of us were glad to tolerate that sort of a belief system, considering it as non-threatening, until that day in September when the light went on. Looks like some of you are still in the dark.

Truly non-violent Muslims had better be very proactive in divorcing themseves from any and all of their soulmates while they still can since the trust is about gone, or it is going very fast. That may be difficult if they intend to adhere to the basic tenants of their religion. Seems that the radicals always are able to dominate the moderates on the basis that Allah says that ALL Muslims are obligated to follow the basic tentants. Even some of the hijackers found themselves in that situation, and evidently many ultimately failed to carry out the actions they were assigned at the last moment, realizing just what they had let themselves be led into, otherwise the carnage would have been even worse. In fact it seems moderate Muslims might be themselves candidates for conversion, or at least abandonment of such a radical and violent belief system, if they intend to just ignore so much of it, yet expose themselves to manipulation by the radical elements of that religion. That really is a very difficult way to have to live.

If some of you prefer to continue trusting that all well be well, I'm sure the radicals will be glad to dream up more nasty surprises for you, and of course you'll hand them the tools to use.

Oh, by the way, you demanded a few days ago that I provide proof of what I've been saying. I told you to read Chapter 5, verse 33 of the Koran. You have remained very,very silent on the subject since that time. I wonder why.

2258. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:02:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u0kgj$5t1$1@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 25205

CAM wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 23:57:45 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Actually '1Y' and that classification wasn't my idea.
> >
> > Wasn't 1Y the designation for an honorably discharged vet with
> > medical conditions that prevented conscription?
>
> If so, it apparently wasn't limited to vets. I was classified '1Y'
> because of migraine headaches. They told me they didn't want me
> on the front lines with an automatic weapon during a blinding
> headache.

Hmmmm. I wonder what a good Google search would show on this
subject....

2259. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:24:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03DA6B.FA3EB6BA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25206

Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3BFC2F7C.69E864CB@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You're such a card, Cecil (or should we call your cEcIlLy?)
> >
> > Cecilia will do. I'm a lesbian.
>
> Hey! If you're a young, shapely, attractive, fem, and are attracted to such,
> I'd like to watch some time. (But *NOT* if you're a stocky, overweight,
> gravel-voiced, butch dyke.)

I'm a young, shapely, attractive, fem trapped in the body of an
old, overweight, half-deaf, half-blind man. It's not fair.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2260. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:29:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03DBA5.B8CF28B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25207

Dave Heil wrote:
> Just about everybody is a potential ham, Cecil.

Ah, that's your mistake. I consider a potential ham as a person
who has an interest in ham radio and has a good change of becoming
a ham. That's what I meant when I used the words.

> As to your claim about directing hundreds here, it is simply more crap.

I taught ham radio classes at Intel for 13 years. Multiply 4 by 12
by 13 and see what you get. I passed out the names of all the
r.r.a.* newsgroups in each class.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2261. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:32:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03DC43.177FA5EC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25208

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > >
> > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> >
> > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > of Duncanville, TX.
>
> Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in the
> manner Tugboat did.

So it's OK for a man to have W5PSY but if a woman were issued that
call by the FCC, she would be a slut? Talk about sexist.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2262. Re: K1MAN webpage.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:36:21 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9u0smfpoe1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 25225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"LARDASS Lllllllllllllllllllllllllllloyd" <Lloyd@barfhqnet.net> wrote in
message news:9u0hri$1hh$0@pita.alt.net...
> "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:a96f1f4d2ee76e5b3a11b225221d54bf.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
> > news:e1bb06a74f973f91732f3ab8815a96bd@spamfreenews.com...
> > > This is a very good site......
> > > http://www.carte.net/k1man/sites.htm
> > K1MAN is a pathetic scam artist, and you are a pathetic suck-up.
> > With all kind wishes,
> > de Hans, K0HB
> > Posted from mplsapanas11poolb82.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.20.82]
> > via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>
>
> K1MAN has been approved by me, the BARF Chief of
> Communicatins, for consumption by the amateur radio community.
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Ironic that the "BARF" would have a Chief of "Communications" that can't
even spell "communications."

The BARF is about as useful today as the old Warsaw Pact is.

> And if Roger would listen, it would make him a much better person
> and would especially help him with that awful cursing habit he has.
>
> Lloyd

Poor Lllllllardasssss Lllllllllloyd, he gets so sexually excited at hearing
those kinds of words. Oh, well, there's a first time for *everything,* I
suppose.

2263. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:37:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03DD53.EB42D29E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25209

Dave Heil wrote:
> This "weaseling" stuff
> certainly is easier than I ever believed possible.

Could that be because you are a natural born weasel? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2264. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:51:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03E0C7.84276A0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25212

Dick Carroll wrote:
> No one ever said (and I did not) that all Muslims are radical
> terrorists, as Cecil has flatly stated, lying, that I did say that. What
> I did say is that all Muslims are trained from infancy to believe that
> all other belief systems are inferior and are to be either converted,
> enslaved or eliminated by the sword.

Your hatred for *all* Muslims can certainly be inferred from your postings. If you do not want to commit genocide against *all* Muslims, exactly what is your purpose in stirring up hatred for *all* Muslims? Last time I checked, all people, even including you, are free to believe and think anything they choose to believe and think. It's the force or threat of force from the terrorists that is a danger to us. Since the only way to stop what people believe and think is to kill them, if you are not advocating killing them, exactly what are you advocating? Concentration Camps for one billion Muslims?

The Muslim terrorists comprise much less than one percent of the Muslim population. Why do you want to punish 99.99% of the members of a religion for the actions of the other 0.01%? Note that these numbers assume that all 100,000 members of the Taliban and al Qaeda armies are terrorists which is a ridiculously large assumption. More likely, only about 0.001% of all Muslims are terrorists. I wouldn't be surprised to discover that 0.001% of Christians or Jews are terrorists. Certainly, more than 0.001% of Christians are criminals.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2265. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:52:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnguc54.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25211

On 27 Nov 2001 09:47:42 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>The discussion here is about whether certain callsigns are appropriate
>to the ARS. It's not just about Kim's callsign, but about the larger
>topic of such callsigns in general. The W6 version of Kim's call has
>been assigned to a person with the first name Michael since at least
>1979, btw.

One could not request a specific 1X3 call until the Vanity program
started in the mid-90s, except through the Dick Zeigler Under-The-Table
route (Dick went to the Federal pen for that in 1978 or so).

I would not ever claim that Michael was a crook so the call appears
to have been a "routine" issuance, albeit unusual.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2266. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:52:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gngues5.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25210

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 12:24:43 -0600, CAM wrote:

>I'm a young, shapely, attractive, fem trapped in the body of an
>old, overweight, half-deaf, half-blind man. It's not fair.

Welcome to the club......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2267. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 18:59:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111271059.e837328@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25213

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C03AED1.DFDC0419@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C025523.C561E1CA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > >N2EY wrote:
> > >>
> > >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >> >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> > >>
> > >> They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
> > >
> > >Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
> >
> > Your deduction does not follow from the facts.
>
> Got any proof?

You made the claim, Cecil, the proof is up to you.

> Seems to me a no-brainer to deduce that more people
> have access to these ham radio newsgroups than have access to
> shortwave receivers capable of receiving ham CW/SSB.

Maybe, maybe not. Even if true, it only means that more people have access, not that more of them actually read this particular NG than listen to ham radio. BTW, ham radio includes more than CW/SSB. Almost anyone with a scanner can listen to 2 meter FM.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2268. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:01:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C03E317.7B11FEE3@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25214

Rick Adams wrote:

> On 26 Nov 2001 05:48:02 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Not at all. You clearly could have taken your Advanced and your CSCE
> >for the Extra written to the April 15 VE session and your Extra license
> >was issued by the FCC on May 9. Simple enough.
>
> Wake up, genius. It was _averaging_ over 40 days from test to
> issuance when the restructuring first came in--and my upgrade was
> dated 24 days after that date.
>

FWIW, I cashed in my CSCE's and old tech plus on Restructuring
Day (4/15/00) and I had my new license issued within a week.
So I could claim to be an old extra. But I won't.

2269. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:05:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111271105.63b1ecb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25215

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C03B2CF.DEFAB8BF@IEEE.org>...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Trivia time: Since all the Christians in the group expect
> > everyone to know the day Jesus birthday is celebrated, is there a
> > single person here who has enough respect for other religions to know
> > when Buddha's Birthday (a historically accurate date, btw) is
> > celebrated? I'll even give a hint--it's a holiday in the US.
>
> Wonder how many Christians know that a pagan holiday was adopted
> as Jesus' birthday because Romans were already celebrating it anyway?

Of course. The evergreen tree, Yule log and many other symbols are
derived from pagan rituals. Same for Easter, whose name derives from
Eo-star, a feast of spring. That's where all the bunny rabbit and
fuzzy chick stuff comes from, as well as the new clothes customs.

The holidays and traditions develop as much from people's needs as
from religion or actual events.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2270. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:07:07 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9u0o6n02ipj@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25222

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u0i5c$7l$0@208.207.71.138...

> Which means you have no idea what you're advocating attacking. There
> is not a single nation that supports radical Islamic terrorists that is
> not populated by Muslims. Your attitude is examplary of just how we go
> this far into such a rediculous scenario in the first place. We have
> been taught to be completely tolerant of all other religious systems,
> even one whose basic fundamentals dictate that we should be destroyed.

...and where did you learn this? From "Islam for Dummies?"

Islam is a peaceful religion that has been hijacked by a group of radicals, and twisted into something that Mohammed would be appalled at. Dick, you and I want the same thing, but for different reasons. Ideally, I would be satisfied if the people of Muslim countries rose against these terrorists and blastted them nito oblivion, but that's not going to happen because Muslim nations are more frightened by the terrorists than Israel or the U.S. They are calling the shots and running the show. Who knows; we might even get a few to join the action if we nuked a couple of cities. After all, we nuked Japan in WWII and now they're a staunch ally.

2271. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:09:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03E4FF.97F8DFDC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25216

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Of course Islam was responiible for the WTC etc! If not for the basic
> teachings of fundamentalist Islam those acts would have never been never
> been performed -by ISLAMICS!

It's the Christians who are responsible for the WTC etc. If the
Christians had not engaged in the Crusades and sacked Constanople,
the Islamics wouldn't be mad at us. Actually, Jehovah=Yahweh=Allah
is responsible for the WTC etc. He created the Christians, Jews, and
the Islamics knowing that they would be at each other's throats for
centuries.

> You are still in denial and just another component of the problem. Most
> of us were glad to tolerate that sort of a belief system, considering it
> as non-threatening, until that day in September when the light went on.

Dick, did you discard Christianity because Tim McVee was a Christian?
How can you, with a straight face, condemn 99.999% of the Islamic people
for the actions of 0.001%?

> If some of you prefer to continue trusting that all well be well, I'm
> sure the radicals will be glad to dream up more nasty surprises for you,
> and of course you'll hand them the tools to use.

Nobody thinks that all is well, Dick. The terrorists need to be
neutralized but that is much less than one percent of Muslims. By
spreading such hatred and malicious lies, you are probably
re-enforcing the pre-conceived notions of some terrorists about
Christians. Maybe your Christian maliciousness should be neutralized.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2272. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:12:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03E59F.D55A9944@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25217

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > If so, it apparently wasn't limited to vets. I was classified '1Y'
> > because of migraine headaches. They told me they didn't want me
> > on the front lines with an automatic weapon during a blinding
> > headache.
>
> Hmmmm. I wonder what a good Google search would show on this
> subject....

Probably additional details about me being classified '1Y'.
I had been approved for induction by the Air Force before I
found out during an Army physical that migraine headaches
are grounds for rejection.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2273. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:18:03 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <LFRM7.131132$WW.8319527@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25218

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C03E59F.D55A9944@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > If so, it apparently wasn't limited to vets. I was classified '1Y'
> > > because of migraine headaches. They told me they didn't want me
> > > on the front lines with an automatic weapon during a blinding
> > > headache.
> >
> > Hmmmm. I wonder what a good Google search would show on this
> > subject....
>
> Probably additional details about me being classified '1Y'.
> I had been approved for induction by the Air Force before I
> found out during an Army physical that migraine headaches
> are grounds for rejection.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

1-Ys of the world, Unite! And yours, like mine and Dick Cheny's, was the product of some benevolent doc at the draft board who did not like sending college grads to the jungle. Believe it or not, mine was for chronic athlete's foot.

Dick NBK

2274. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:22:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03E7F2.6AFB1693@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25219

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C03AED1.DFDC0419@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
> > >
> > > Your deduction does not follow from the facts.
> >
> > Got any proof?
>
> You made the claim, Cecil, the proof is up to you.

Since you don't present any proof to the contrary, I will continue
to hold that opinion, thank you. Changing my opinion without any
evidence is not something that I do. Do you change your opinion
in the absence of evidence, Jim?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2275. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:25:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C03E88D.2AA9174F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25220

N2EY wrote:
> The holidays and traditions develop as much from people's needs as
> from religion or actual events.

Not to mention, Constantine wanted to make it easy for people
to believe in Christianity.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2276. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:34:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8A28DA642C125CE3.940DE072DF838EF3.70544A7151EF6981@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25221

On 26 Nov 2001 04:20:32 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>> Better not, Cecil.
>>
>> You might get what you pray for--and what on Earth would you
>>do with Larry Roll?
>
>Talk about your feeble attempts at humor...

Talk about feeble things to pray for . . . ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2277. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:50:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <665A50CC67ACFA35.8BA7C2B22687649E.11DF9FEC86026A88@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25223

On 26 Nov 2001 08:06:08 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Nonsense. Animals have no awareness of sex. They are stimulated by
>pheromones, and sexual activity is the result of that stimuli. You don't
>see deer screwing around except during rutting season when the females
>provide the pheromones.

From Bahemihl, B., Ph.D., (2000). Biological Exhuberance:
Animal Homosexuality and Natural Diversity, St. Martin's Press.

species % homosexual % bisexual % heterosexual
silver gulls (females) 10 11 79
black headed gulls (both sexes) 22 15 63
Japanese macaques (both sexes) 9 56 35
bonobo chimpanzees (both sexes) 0 100 0
galahs (both sexes) 44 11 44

From by Tina Adler writing in Science News Magazine

"Scientists have studied the sex drive and sexual orientation of
domesticated and wild rams. A heterosexual ram with a strong sex drive
will mount either other males or ewes. However, a significant
proportion of domesticated males - up to 16 percent - never mate with
females during a breeding season, Perkins says.

About 6 percent seem uninterested in any sexual activity; another 10
percent are homosexual, choosing males even when females are
available. Domesticated rams resemble their wild relatives, which
scientists have also observed participating in homosexual relations.
Ewes rarely engage in such activities."

From Newsweek Magazine:

"A zoo in Holland is offering tours of the homosexual animals in its
care to show that gay animals are found in the nature.

The Artis Zoo in Amsterdam has gay monkeys, geese, bulls, goats,
dophins, flamingos, elephants and gorillas says Director Maarten
Frankenhuis.

He went on to say that male animals even in the company of females
sometimes preferred their own sex. At other times animals that were in
all-male enclosures had sex with other males, ï¿½like in English
boarding schools,ï¿½ said Frankenhuis.

The tours are particularly popular amongst those wanting to show
others that homosexuality is normal in the animal kingdom.

ï¿½We get mostly gay people and mothers with their sons after theyï¿½ve come out,ï¿½ Frankenhuis told Newsweek.

Frankenhuis said that homosexual animals are not treated badly by others in their species as animals donï¿½t have the complications that humans have."

From Bidstrop, S. (2000). The Natural "Crime Against Nature"
A Brief Survey of Homosexual Behaviors In Animals.

"Just as in humans, animals often form long-term same-sex relationships. In species in which this normally occurs in heterosexual couples, that shouldn't come as a great surprise, but it does come as a surprise in species where heterosexual pair-bonds don't normally form for long if at all. This is true of bottlenose dolphins, which are not known to form heterosexual pair bonds, but which do in fact form homosexual pair bonds, including sex, and often lasting for life.
In animals in which "bachelor groups" form, such as bison, gazelles, antelope, sage grouse and Guinean cocks-of-the-rock, it is not uncommon for same sex pair bonds to form and last until one or the other member of the pair departs the relationship and breeds. It is also not uncommon for homosexual preference to form among members of such bachelor groups; when offered the opportunity to breed unencumbered with members of the opposite sex or the same sex, they choose the same sex.

The human pattern of bisexuality also appears in animals. In some cases, animals prefer same sex at one point in their lives, and change preference later. They may even change back and forth. In some cases, animals may seek sex with partners of either sex at random.

In animals with a seasonal breeding pattern, homosexuality can even be seasonal. Male walruses, for example, often form homosexual pair bonds and have sex with each other outside of the breeding season, but will revert to a heterosexual pattern during the normal breeding season."

>If the phereomones there they don't know sex exists.

Don't look that way to me!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2278. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 19:55:22 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gngxca8.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25224

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 13:12:31 -0600, CAM wrote:

>> Hmmmm. I wonder what a good Google search would show on this
>> subject....
>
>Probably additional details about me being classified '1Y'.
>I had been approved for induction by the Air Force before I
>found out during an Army physical that migraine headaches
>are grounds for rejection.

Induction physicals are weird anyhow.

They called me for one at age 25 when my I-S (industrial) deferment lapsed between jobs. Of course they called me while I was just recovering from a strep infection and my heart sounded like a cement mixer. I was classified as 4-F subject to recall in 90 days. By that time I had found another job and was again eligible for I-S deferment status, but the Draft Board kept me as 4-F without re-exam.

My younger brother, OTOH. who was born with partially developed optic nerves and has no better than 20/200 eyesight in both eyes was classified as 1-Y. Theoretically they could have called him before they called me.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2279. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:05:58 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9ADEEC8131962182.DD0E0ACB6A2E015F.135A51351943F6B4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25226

On 26 Nov 2001 01:04:13 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>So your concepts of right and wrong are no more based on "logic" than anyone
>else's. OK

My PERSONAL values don't NEED to be based on logic--only those
of the state. My values can't be used to limit your choices--those of
the state can, and thus the state has a greater responsibility to
insure that its values are strictly logical and not based on opinion,
religion, or any other basis than harm to non-consenting individuals.

>The problem is, who gets to define "harm"? You might say that a particular
>action of yours causes no harm, and others may disagree. The devil is in the
>details.

Not really.

So long as no one who does not consent to participate is
involved in an activity how is it POSSIBLE to harm someone who doesn't
give consent?

Those who would claim that "immoral" activities (by their
definition of morality, of course) "harm" society have an obligation
to demonstrate the nature of that harm, and to show that a concrete
victim (not some amorphous abstract as "society"--at least one,
identifiable, individual) suffered harm. If no victim can be
identified, or if all victims gave their consent to the harm (i.e.,
medically assisted suicide, etc.) it is completely unreasonable for
the state to claim that the activity "harms" anyone.

Harm isn't an abstract, it's absolute. Either a given action
causes direct harm to a non-consenting individual or it does not. If
it does, it should be prohibited. If not, it is not the concern of the
state.

Try to identify a single act which you would define as causing
harm, yet which does not fit my definition of harm above. You'll find
rather quickly that it can't be done--without a victim it's impossible
to identify ANY specific harm that has occurred (and remember, harm to
the property of an individual--including acts which render that
property less valuable--IS a form of personal harm).

>>>How do you KNOW there are no absolute values for right and wrong? Besides,
>>>making that statement is an absolute!
>>
>> But not an absolute value of right and wrong.
>

>Yes. it is.

Nope. An absolute statement of semantics.

>> 1. There has never been universal agreement among ALL sane and
>>intelligent people (I'll leave the mentally ill and intellectually
>>challenged out of the definition, since their perceptions would by
>>necessity inaccurately influence their decisions) as to ANY universals
>>that were right and wrong.
>
>So? Just because a thing has not yet been discoverd does not mean it does not
>exist. Go back around 200 years, and your argument could be applied to
>electronic communications (nobody has ever done it, so it must not exist).
>There is almost universal acceptance of relativistic physics today, yet a
>little over 100 years ago nobody had ever thought of it. Yet it existed.

Ok, let's assume I accept that point. Effectively it is
immaterial anyway because, as you agree above, such absolutes have NOT
been discovered. I will grant the "possibility" of such absolutes
being recognized--but because they WILL be absolutes, by definition,
no sane person will want to violate those standards anyway.

Until, however, such absolutes are shown to exist, I'll
maintain my view that the definition of "right" and "wrong" is based
on personal values (perhaps shared with others--but still personal
values), not on any absolutes, and thus are binding ONLY on those who
accept them as valid.

>>If absolutes existed, there would
>>necessarily be agreement as to their existence.
>
>Nope. Not at all. A thing exists whether its existence is acknowledged or not.
>Did electromagnetic waves exist before there was agreement on their existence?

Sure--but until that existence WAS discovered, they had no
relevance to society at all. And once their existence WAS known, there
was universal agreement among sane and intelligent adults as to both
their existence and (in so far as a person was educated in science) in
their principles.

Moral absolutes _may_ exist, but if they do they have NOT been
discovered as yet--if they were, like electromagnetic waves, they
would be universally accepted.

Incidently, the reverse argument is, by necessity, equally
true. Since there are NO values for "right" and "wrong" that all sane
and rational humans agree are absolutes, it follows that NO currently
existent system of morals has the right to claim its values ARE
absolute instead of relative, thus the claims of all religions to
present the only "truth" are demonstrably wrong.

>>Yet for ANY "right" or
>>"wrong" you can list, I can identify at least one (or more) culture

>>that feels the opposite.
>>
>So? The fact that some culture(s) don't agree to them does not mean moral
>absolutes do not exist.

Nonsense.

If they were absolutes, by definition ALL people would accept
them as valid!

>> 2. There is no commonly accepted source for such absolutes to
>>have been decided. Some people believe right and wrong are defined by
>>a "god," others by culture, still others by the individual. Unless
>>one, invariant, and demonstrably infallible source of such absolutes
>>can be shown to exist (not on a basis of belief--as in a diety--but in
>>a scientifically verifiable sense), no such absolutes can be
>>reasonably be considered TO exist.
>
>Wrong again, Rick. Do the laws of physics exist? Yes. Is there universal
>acceptance of their source or origin? Nope. Yet they exist anyway.

You're groping at straws there. The laws of physics are NOT
absolutes to start with (read Einstein, Hawking, or any modern
Theoretical Physicist), they are theories that are subject to change.
When Newton was alive, physics had a clear set of laws--are all the
same laws still accepted today, or did Einstein's equations refute
some of those "immutable" laws of the period?

More importantly, unlike morality, physics deals with
objective (versus subjective) criteria--they are not the same thing.

>> Why is it so difficult for people to accept that concepts of
>>right and wrong are relative, instead of absolute?
>
>The fact that you have not proved your contentions, for one.

I don't need to. Those who insist that they are absolute have
an obligation to demonstrate that fact clearly since they expect to
use those values to establish laws that affect my freedom of choice
directly, while my personal values do NOT have any influence on the
freedom of choice of others.

In addition, you are asking me to prove a negative--that
something does NOT exist. I'll make you a deal--if you'll prove to me,
beyond any doubt, that you have NEVER sold heroin to children, I will
in turn prove to you that moral values are not absolutes. Fair enough?

>> We don't live in a
>>static, unchanging, world--we live in a dynamic, evolving, one.
>
>Yup. Which means that we are learning more and more about the moral absolutes.
>Just as Newtonian physics was shown to be inadequate for some phenomena, old
>moral systems have been shown to need renewal. Doesn't mean moral absolutes

>don;t exist, just that they haven't been completely identified yet.

Weak. Very Weak. By that argument, we can assume that Santa
Claus and flying rain deer really exist, we just haven't found them
yet!

At least you make one point--if, as YOU state, we have not
found any absolute values of right & wrong, by necessity any group or
organization that claims to adhere to such absolute values is
incorrect and is basing its assumptions on false information. And, of
course, Christianity makes precisely that claim. Thus, by YOUR
argument, it can be seen that Christianity is based on false
information. But if that is the case, Christians are practicing a
religion that has no basis in fact, and the entire framework becomes
one of pure superstition.

>> What
>>is "right" today may well be "wrong" tomorrow.
>
>Only because we have misdefined "right" in the first case. For example, slavery
>was once considered "right", yet it was always "wrong".

Precisely.

But if right and wrong are subject to change, how can you
claim that ANY current definitions of right and wrong are accurate--or
worthy of acceptance? Just as slavery was once viewed as "right" by a
majority of people and is now considered "wrong" the same may hold
equally true for every other moral value currently being held up as
"right" or an "absolute."

>> 1. I would hope we all agree that killing another adult human
>>being who does not wish to die and did not commit a capital crime is
>>"wrong."
>
>Why do you limit it to adults? Is it OK to kill children??

Because, to avoid conflict over such topics as the right &
wrong of sex education, teenage sexuality, etc., I've elected to keep
the focus of the argument on the behavior of adults. Certainly killing
or otherwise physically harming a child is, by my definition,
wrong--but no more (or less) wrong than killing an adult. We can
include children in the debate, but if we do such topics as the
question of whether imposing religion on a child is abuse or not have
to be raised as well, and that just dilutes the focus of the
discussion needlessly.

>>But if that is the case, doesn't that make war (in which
>>conscripts and civilians are routinely killed--as is happening now in
>>Afghanistan) wrong and those who wage war evil by definition?
>
>Nope. It all depends on the intent. Killing those who are trying to kill you is
>self-defense.

THOU SHALT NOT KILL.

That's the rule the most Christians say is among the most
valid of the ten commandments. It doesn't say "Thou shalt not kill
except . . ." It says "Thou shalt not kill."

Can't have it both ways. Either killing someone is an absolute
wrong or it is not. If it is there are NO circumstances under which it
is acceptable. If it is not, there are.

>What is absolutely wrong is to START a war. Like Germany did in WW2. First they
>used the threat of force to get Austria and some other territories, then they
>used force itself on Poland.

The Taliban did NOT send the terrorists to the USA--Osama bin
Laden did so. George W. Bush responded to the act of an individual by
starting a war against a nation that wouldn't obey his order to
capture and turn him over to the USA. According to your statement
above, his act was an absolute wrong.

>> If not,
>>then killing is NOT an absolute "wrong."
>
>Yup. Murder is an absolute wrong, though.

Would it have been wrong to kill Hitler at the Beer Hall
Putsch in 1924 if the killer knew FOR CERTAIN what would follow? It
would have prevented the deaths of millions of innocent people. But it
would have been murder.

Would you consider it wrong if Osama bin Laden were murdered
by afghanis who wanted to see the destruction of their nation by the
US halted?

>>If so, then everyone in this
>>group who ever served in uniform (as I did as well) was "wrong" as
>>his/her role could have reasonably been expected to result in the
>>killing of others.
>
>Incorrect, as shown above.

Correct as shown above.

>> 2. In most early cultures (including the Egyptian and Roman
>>cultures), prostitution was considered an act of spirituality--many
>>temples had prostitutes who contributed their fees to the temple
>>itself. Today, the churches define prostitution as "wrong" and
>>immoral. Which is it? Depends a LOT on your perspective--and thus the
>>concept of an "absolute" wrong doesn't apply here either.
>
>Nope. Not the same thing at all.
>
>The prostitution of ancient pagan cultures bears no real resemblance to the
>modern version. Your example is so flawed as to be useless.

Really?

Did the women of the time not sell their sexual favors for
money? Did the men not pay for sexual pleasure?

Perhaps YOU see a difference that would justify claiming that
prostitution was not "wrong" then but is now, but I don't.

>> Many examples could be used just as easily. The important fact
>>is, there are NO universals concerning right and wrong (the closest is
>>an almost--but not complete--taboo on incest throughout cultures, but
>>of course each culture defines what incest IS in a different manner;
>>what an American would consider incest may not be considered such in,
>>for example, Borneo, and what a Sudanese would consider incest
>>wouldn't be considered incest here in the USA).
>
>What you are avoiding is the reasons these things are considered "wrong". For
>example, on reason incest is not a good idea is the high incidence of genetic
>defects resulting from such unions.

False.

Incest can involve anything from Father/Daughter sex to sex
between people so distantly related that there is absolutely NO chance
their relationship will result in any more defects than any random
pairing. In addition, those bans were made LONG before the concepts of
genetics were known in the first place--and did NOT apply to royalty
at all--only to the commoners.

>> The closest we can come to an absolute value is to limit our
>>"Universals" to a statement that any act which harms the person or
>>property of a non-consenting (and, in the case of criminal punishment
>>or war, inappropriately targeted) individual is "wrong" from any
>>reasonable perspective.
>
>Yup. But ya gotta define "harm". You keep avoiding that little detail.

No--you do.

If you claim harm exists, you have the obligation to
demonstrate that fact. It isn't my obligation to show that it doesn't.
In the absence of an identifiable victim, it's ASSUMED not to exist.

>>Thus, if I commit murder, rape, theft, or
>>expose myself to children at a bus stop for that matter, it can
>>clearly be seen that harm HAS been inflicted directly on
>>non-consenting individuals, and thus by any reasonable definition the
>>act was "wrong."
>
>Maybe. Suppose I committed theft of medical supplies from a closed store to
>save a life at an accident scene. Was that act "wrong"?

If you did not make an attempt to compensate the store owner
at a later time, yes it was. You harmed the store owner.

>> On the other hand, if instead of acting in the manner above, I
>>choose to attend a nude beach, smoke a joint, or attend a swing party
>>for that matter, it is equally clear that no non-consenting person is
>>in any way involved in the action, and thus no harm has occurred.
>
>No, it's not clear at all. At least not in the second and third examples. The
>nude beach I'm not sure of.

How are the second and third examples not clear? Demonstrate a
way in which attendance at a swing party, as an example, in any way
harms individuals who do not consent to the harm? Who is the victim?
Who is the victim if I smoke a joint or drink a beer (effectively the
same type of act) in a private setting? Don't claim it could result in
unsafe driving--THAT would constitute harm. Stick instead to the
concept of the person sitting at home smoking a joint or enjoying a
few drinks.

>You are "presuming the conclusion" that no harm was done.

In the absence of any identifiable victim or any proof that
harm HAS occurred, that's a reasonable conclusion.

Have you harmed your children today? If you say no, aren't you
just assuming that? Is it a reasonable assumption? If so, mine are as
well--if not, you need to spend more time addressing your children's
needs and less on the Inet! ;-)

>>Given such a circumstance, the ONLY valid judge of whether or not my
>>action was "wrong" is myself--and that decision can only be based on
>>my personal interpretation of morality, not on one being imposed on me
>>by others.
>
>IF you can show that no harm was done to others, yes. But you have to show that
>first. You simply presume it.

Nope, again it isn't up to me to show that no harm was done.
It is up to others to show that harm WAS done. Innocent until proven
guilty, remember?

>> Why is that concept so difficult for people to understand and
>>accept? It allows EVERYONE the right to engage in any activity that
>>does not harm others, and forbids anyone from engaging in any activity
>>that DOES harm others. Sounds pretty logical to me.
>
>The problem is that actions you consider harmless are not considered harmless
>by others. For example, if a "swing party" results in the transmission of
>venereal disease(s) or unwanted pregnancies, it isn't harmless to others at
>all.

But they don't!

I've studied swingers rather extensively (my dissertation for
my doctorate in Sociology was on "The influence of the Internet on
members of the swing lifestyle in the United States" and was the

result of four years of study). A few facts:

1. Only two cases of AIDS resulting from participation in swinging activities have EVER been recorded at the CDC; both occurred in 1985 at a swing club in Minneapolis where two women had unprotected anal sex with a local man known to frequent the gay bathhouses. Clearly, that wasn't a case of "swinging" causing infection, it was one of sheer stupidity.

2. The majority of club and party swingers use condoms and follow other safe-sex practices. Some swing clubs even require members to sign an agreement to practice safe sex on the premises.

3. Swingers are essentially a "closed loop" population. What that means is that they tend to have sexual relations only with other swingers (logical, right?). And because swingers are notoriously conservative (believe it or not, most are both Republicans and practicing Christians--there's even an organization online for Fundamentalist swingers!) and thus strongly opposed to both drug use (IV drug use is the single most common source of HIV infection in the US), marijuana often excepted, and male homosexual activities (female bisexuality is extremely common in the lifestyle, but poses virtually NO risk of HIV or other major infection according to the CDC).

4. The only disorders more common in swingers than in the general population are colds and the flu--both are statistically higher in swing groups, but that holds true of any setting in which people are in very close proximity (as they are when dancing, etc.) including those who regularly attend American Legion and VFW functions, and those very active in church groups. Yeast infections are also somewhat more common in swing groups, but not to any significant extent, nor are they necessarily sexually transmitted.

5. As far as unwanted pregnancies go--swingers are very careful to protect themselves from that result, many in fact have had vasectomies or tubal ligations (the AVERAGE swinging couple in the US have been married over 10 years [over 20 years is very common], are between 36 and 50 years old, and have all the children they wish to have--and thus vasectomies & ligations are fairly common). Of the people I interviewed (a fairly large, representative sample) none had either been impregnated at a swing function nor did they know anyone else who had (one woman said she was impregnated by her husband at a swing club--and that they were "soft" swingers [swingers who engage in foreplay but not intercourse with other couples], thus it couldn't have been anyone other than her husband who was responsible. They wanted another child, btw).

Based on your criteria above, I guess it's harmless after all.

>> You mean moral values are NOT "personal" but the definition of
>>"harm" is?
>

>I mean BOTH have to be generally agreed upon.

Why?

What business is it of yours, or anyone else's, what my moral
values are? And what business is it of mine what someone else's are?

So long as harm does not result, it isn't anyone's BUSINESS
what someone's values or behavior are. Perhaps it isn't the right of
free choice that is key here, it's the right to privacy.

>What is absurd is for me to accept that an action is harmless just because you
>say it is.

Then by all means identify a victim and demonstrate that harm
occurred. That's all that's necessary to make your point. In the
absence of such a victim, however, there is absolutely no rational
basis at all for considering an action anything BUT harmless.

>> It's pretty easy to tell if someone has been harmed. All
>>that's necessary is to learn if they were directly involved in the
>>activity concerned, and if so if they gave their informed consent for
>>the activity TO occur. If--and only if--they were involved and did not
>>consent to the activity can we define the experience as having harmed
>>them.
>
>Nope. Incorrect.

So demonstrate that with more proof than your opinion.

>> For example, if I choose to attend a nude beach, it clearly
>>cannot cause you harm. If you are not at that beach, you _can_ not be
>>harmed in any manner by my attendance and if you ARE at the nude
>>beach, you have given an implied consent for others to be nude in your
>>presence--if you are offended by seeing nude people yet choose to go
>>to a nude beach, you really don't have any grounds for complaint if
>>people ignore your claim to be offended.
>
>As I said above, I'm not sure about the nude beach.

Why not?

Either it harms you or it does not. It's a pretty clear cut
issue.

>> Is that really so difficult to understand? It simply states
>>the same thing as the old cliche: "Your right to swing your arm ends
>>at the tip of my nose."
>>
>So it's OK to swing one's fist but stop a fraction of an inch from another
>person's nose? I disagree! Such action is a threat.

Only if the intent is to threaten or harm. If, for example, I
happen to be one of those people who use gestures a great deal to

communicate and one of those gestures comes close to hitting your
nose, while I may be considered rude or careless, I _can't_ be
considered to have harmed you. But, otoh, if my hand actually CONNECTS
with your nose, accident or not, I HAVE harmed you.

>> Use the criteria above to determine harm. Anyone could then
>>recognize whether it occurred or not.
>
>Apply it to the smoke a joint or swing party ideas, then see what happens.

Ok. The criteria states that so long as an action does not
harm the person or property of a non-consenting individual, it is no
one's business other than that of the participants involved.

Smoking a joint: Unless non-smokers who object to/are
influenced by the marijuana smoke are present there is no possible
victim, and thus harm has not occurred.

Swing parties: Because no one is present at a swing party who
doesn't agree to be there, with the clear understanding that open
sexual behavior, nudity, and other adult activities will occur in
their presence (no one at a swing party is obligated to participate,
obviously, but they are expected to be tolerant of the activities of
other guests) in this case as well no victim exists, and thus harm has
not occurred.

>> No--it means that the non-victim (the person who is not
>>involved in the action--as stated above) has no voice in the matter.
>
>An action may involve more people than you realize.

Another vague statement. Identify them specifically. You can't
ban an action because someone, somewhere, who was not even involved in
it may be offended by it. If you feel that kind of action is
appropriate, then by necessity all churches should be closed
immediately because their teachings may be offensive to some members
of our society, all schools should be closed because they may teach
something offensive to some members of our society, and all government
programs should be discontinued because THEY may be offensive to some
members of our society. In other words, if we accept that harm can
involve "victims" who are not directly affected by the specific
actions in any way, then we must recognize that nearly all actions we
perform in our lives can be considered harmful as well for precisely
the same reason.

>>>So only the persons committing an action get to decide whether harm has
>>>occurred? I don't think you mean that!
>>
>> I don't think I _said_ that either!
>
>You discount society's values, so the only people left are those committing the
>action.

The word "committing" is NOT the same as the words
"participating in."

Why SHOULD society have a voice in activities that don't in
any way involve them? Should YOU have the right to tell me how to
interact with my wife in bed, for example? If you believe you should,
I'd LOVE to see you justify that one. But if YOU don't have that
right, why does society--which simply consists of a lot of individuals
like yourself--have any different right as a group? What I--or anyone
else--do in private is totally my own business, and not that of
society. What's so hard to understand about that?

You keep arguing that harm isn't limited to the participants.
Then demonstrate that instead of using it like a hammer to make your
points. Unless you can show concrete harm to concrete victims you
really don't have any justification for claiming such harm exists, and
we both know it.

>> But if I place a bet on a horse race, unless you are present
>>and a part of the action, you are NOT involved, and therefore have no
>>voice in deciding whether my action (in which you can't legitimately
>>identify a victim who was harmed) was right or wrong in any absolute
>>sense.
>
>Nope. Your placing a bet on a horse race affects me even if I am not there. Not
>in a big way, but there is an effect.

Care to demonstrate that?

Did I make a bet on a horse race today? Did Cecil? Did Kim?
Did anyone in this News Group? Who in the United States DID do so?
Which Americans "harmed you" today--and how were you harmed?

Easy to claim it--but if you don't even know if something
happened, it IS a bit absurd for you to claim it harmed you. Even if I
did make a bet on a horse race today and informed you of it in this
thread, precisely how would you have been harmed personally? If you
can't IDENTIFY the harm to yourself that you claim would occur, you
really don't have much of an argument there at all.

>>>> Just as I'm not "in charge" of deciding that your views are
>>>>narrow-minded,
>
>They are not.
>
>>>> you are not "in charge" of deciding that Kim's (or mine
>>>>for that matter) are "immoral" or "tasteless."
>>>
>Yes, I am. I say callsigns like that are inappropriate, that's all. My opinion
>only.

And it has precisely the same value as mine, Kim's, Cecil's,
or Hollingsworth's for that matter. NO opinion has any greater value
than anyone elses--which is the best possible reason for not accepting

"society" (which is only a grouping of individuals, not a separate
entity) as having the right to determine what is moral and what is
not.

>>>Who gets to decide if a particular callsign causes harm or not?
>>
>> The FCC. They set the standards for issuing call signs.
>
>So they are infallible in that decision? I don't think so. By that logic, govt.
>agencies define right and wrong because they determine whether or not harm has
>occurred.

No one said they are infallible. It IS however their
responsibility to issue call signs and to govern the use of the
airways in this country. Thus, it is their responsibility to make
decisions as to what is or is not appropriate use of those airways,
including the content (which itself includes the call sign) to be
permitted to various services (ranging from the most restrictions on
the broadcast media and the least on cellular telephone users). Thus
they are the ONLY legitimate arbiters of what call signs are
acceptable and what call signs are not. You can rant and rave all you
want about her sign, but if the FCC approves it (which, by granting
the sign, they have done) no one else has a say in the matter.

>Note that the FCC will not issue a call like Kim's unless asked. That means
>they recognize it is somehow different from other calls.

W8GOD is likewise available only on request. Presumably, since
you claim it to be true in Kim's case, the FCC must see "GOD" as
offensive as well.

>>>You're avoiding the central questions, Rick: Who decides whether harm has
>>>occurred? Who decides whether the harm is great enough to require some sort
>>of
>>>action to remedy the situation?
>>
>> Answered above.
>
>Avoided above.

No, ANSWERED above. Now try to provide any evidence that YOUR
view is accurate. FIND THE VICTIMS for the harm you claim occurs.

>> It is clear that A has harmed B.
>
>Agreed.
>
>>Through his direct and
>>deliberate violation of reasonably expected standards in a residential
>>community he has caused B to suffer an economic loss.
>
>"Reasonably expected standards" simply means society's values. In a different

>residential community, A's actions might have no effect at all.

Nope--it refers directly to the average behavior demonstrated
by a resident of that community. More specifically, it refers to
behavior that does not affect the property values or enjoyment of
other residents.

>So what we have is SOCIETY deciding what the values are. Not the individuals
>involved!

Not at all. The housing market decides in this case. If the
actions of the neighbor do NOT reduce the value of the home or
directly reduce the enjoyment and use of the property owned by
neighbors (by directly, I mean that simply _knowing_ what a person
does inside his/her home--that s/he is a practicing homosexual for
example--and being personally offended by that kind of activity does
NOT mean an individual is harmed by it), he or she has NOT harmed
anyone, regardless of the opinion of "society."

Why on earth is it so difficult for you to understand such a
simple concept?

>>B, in any such
>>circumstances, could sell his house--however he would be forced to
>>accept a price below that which he would have realized had the
>>neighboring home not reduced his property value.
>
>In some markets, a house next to such a property becomes unsellable. This is
>how blighted areas are created from nice neighborhoods.

Which, of course, would make the damages in B's case equal to
the normal market value of his home if A's home was not a
consideration.

>>Thus, the amount of
>>the loss (the harm suffered by B) is the amount of reduction in price
>>between a fair market value, given expected neighborhood values, and
>>the actual realized offering price.
>
>Plus consideration for B's time and aggravation in having to deal with it,
>legal fees, excess RE taxes, etc.

Within reason, yes.

>> The remedy, obviously, is a legal
>>action against A compelling him to either repair his property and thus
>>restore B's property values or to compensate B for the difference in
>>selling prices resulting from his actions. As far as who gets to
>>decide, in such a case, clearly the decision would be made by a judge.
>
>And all this is OK with you and your moral ideas?

Absolutely.

My moral values do NOT support causing others harm w/o their
permission. They simply insist that if no one is harmed it isn't any
of society's business. In the case above, a clear victim (B) exists
and real, identifiable, harm has occurred.

>> BTW, consider this. Obviously, you view A as having harmed B
>>(a view I agree with), and felt that way when you wrote this example.
>
>That was part of it, but there's a lot more. For example, did the harm occur
>when A let his property run down, or only when B tried to sell?

That depends on whether it reduced B's enjoyment of his
property. If it did not, then the harm didn't occur until the sale was
attempted (for example, if A offered to purchase B's property for fair
market value as soon as it was made available, A would NEVER have
harmed B). If, however, B's enjoyment of his property was reduced
directly by A's actions, clearly the harm began at that moment, not
the moment of sale.

>>Let's change it a bit. Suppose instead of failing to maintain his
>>property, A is a ham radio operator who chooses to put up an antenna
>>farm that, because it distracts from the visual appearance of the
>>neighborhood, results in the same difficulty in selling for B. Is the
>>situation the same or different? Why?
>
>It's the same. But studies have shown that putting up antennas does NOT
>negatively impact property values unless said antennas are poorly maintained.

How about enjoyment of the property?

Suppose I'm a non-ham living next door to you and I feel your
antenna farm is unsightly and detracts from my view of the
mountains/lake/ocean/cess pool beyond your property. I cannot escape
the view of your antennas because they dominate the only scenic side
of my yard.

Have you harmed me? From my perspective, that WOULD constitute
harm, as the property owner lost some measure of enjoyment in his
property as a direct result of your actions. Do you agree?

>> The answer to the first part is above. With respect to the
>>second part, C has NO legitimate grounds to demand that A fix up the
>>property (although he is certainly free to ask him to do so and to try
>>to convince him that it would benefit him as well). C purchased the
>>property at a price consistent with being next door to a property in
>>the condition of A's--thus he is NOT harmed by A's actions in any way
>>(assuming A doesn't allow his property to deteriorate even further,
>>thus reducing C's property value further, and placing him in the same
>>position B was in originally).
>
>I disagree. Such action permits neighborhoods to decline.

Only if others follow suit. The mere fact that a single
homeowner (who, remember, has already lost money in a court action

brought by "B" and who stands to lose an equivalent amount if any other neighbor loses money on the sale of his or her property) has allowed his personal property to deteriorate does not mean any other property owner will do the same. One run-down property does NOT make for a declining neighborhood.

>>>Who decides? Whose values of "harm" should be used? Think about it.
>>
>> I have--read over my examples and try to do the same yourself.
>
>I have. Your ideas don't work in real life.

Again, Jim, show some examples to prove your statements, not just vague generalities and opinions.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2280. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:09:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u0veo$356$0@208.207.71.155>
Source record: 25227

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 25 Nov 2001 07:27:49 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > There you go, lying out your ass again. Read the Koran and see what
> >they are taught.
>
> I've read it, Dick. And I say you are totally wrong in your
> statements.
>
> Have YOU read it--or only read ABOUT it? If you claim to have
> read it, then by all means provide me citations of the statements that
> back your claims so I can read them in context in the copy of the
> Koran sitting five feet from me right now.
>
> Put up or shut up, Dick. You claim to have read it--prove it.

Actually, Rick I have the entire document (actually an online translation, the Islamic fundamentalists insist that only the original is accurate and that no translation can ever be). I downloaded it from this website

online Koran at

http://www.hti.umich.edu/k/koran/browse.html

And here are a few direct quotations for your pleasure. Of course, all ancient writings are subject to the interpretations of today, and of course that is the major problem. The fundamentalists insist to moderates that their interpretations are correct, and that Allah obligates all Muslims to follow. Thus they are able to persuade so many believers of the accuracy of those interpretations. Of course I have never said that all Muslims are oreinted toward voilence toware nonbelievers, but as you can easily see, the scriptural mandate is there, and to the many who need only a little urging, it is clearly, from Sept 11, sufficient.

From the Koran:

[48.13] And whoever does not believe in Allah and His Apostle, then surely We have prepared burning fire for the unbelievers.

[48.16] Say to those of the dwellers of the desert who were left behind: You shall soon be invited (to fight) against a people possessing mighty prowess; you will fight against them until they submit; then if you obey, Allah will grant you a good reward;

and if you turn back as you turned back before, He will punish you with a painful punishment.

(So they MUST destroy the infidels, or they themselves will be severly punished)

[48.17] There is no harm in the blind, nor is there any harm in the lame, nor is there any harm in the sick (if they do not go forth); and whoever obeys Allah and His Apostle, He will cause him to enter gardens beneath which rivers flow, and whoever turns back, He will punish him with a painful punishment.

[48.25] It is they who disbelieved and turned you away from the Sacred Mosque and (turned off) the offering withheld from arriving at its destined place; and were it not for the believing men and the believing women, whom, not having known, you might have trodden down, and thus something hateful might have afflicted you on their account without knowledge-- so that Allah may cause to enter into His mercy whomsoever He pleases; had they been widely separated one from another, We would surely have punished those who disbelieved from among them with a painful punishment.

48.29] Muhammad is the Apostle of Allah, and those with him are firm of heart against the unbelievers, compassionate among themselves; you will see them bowing down, prostrating themselves, seeking grace from Allah and pleasure; their marks are in their faces because of the effect of prostration; that is their description in the Taurat and their description in the Injeel; like as seed-produce that puts forth its sprout, then strengthens it, so it becomes stout and stands firmly on its stem, delighting the
sowers that He may enrage the unbelievers on account of them; Allah has promised those among them who believe and do good, forgiveness and a great reward.

It is clear enough that the roots of violence come from the Koran itself, for those believers who would interpret it that way, and for all the masses they influence. If your mileage varies, that's your deficit. For me, Sept 11 was proof enough.

Dick

2281. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:12:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <85A12BD34BEB7725.BA55D38686CC6855.0C3F963FB2F98279@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25228

On 26 Nov 2001 04:20:33 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Obviously not -- and the fact that you would ask such a question only
>tends to reveal your liberal agenda. I believe in keeping homosexuals
>away from children for the simple reason that homosexuals tend to
>view their sexual preference as a valid option, even a preferable one --
>and are disposed toward "recruitment" of young people into their
>"lifestyle."

Give that tired "recruitment" nonsense a rest, Larry. Any
intelligent (and educated) person knows that's a straw dog.
Homosexuals don't "recruit" heterosexuals--there are plenty of
homosexuals for them to interact with.

As far as viewing their sexual preference as a "valid option,"
don't you view YOURS that way? Why shouldn't a homosexual (who is as
normal, by any reasonable scientific standard you care to name, as you
are) feel the same?

Maybe if you would spend less time looking down on homosexuals
and more time teaching your OWN children that homosexuality is
normal--and that homosexuals are just like everyone else in society,
some good, some bad, some just average--you would be raising far
healthier and better adjusted children yourself.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2282. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:20:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1025$42e$0@208.207.71.155>
Source record: 25229

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > We may both be right. Most of the hams you know may not have a problem with it,
> > while most of the hams I know would have one. Dallas sure ain't in EPA.
>
> Many Texans migrated from PA to be rid of you prudes. Now here you
> are, 150 years later, bugging us again. Could be you damned yankees
> are just jealous of Texas tits. Right Kim?

Cecil is pandering again. Wonder what he wants?

2283. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:24:46 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AC9C5E451D3AB705.3C12D39E2E187583.5E602034BF2A26C0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25230

On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 11:08:45 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>Incuding his own statement to the contrary? Wow. I'd have to conclude
>that your experience in discussing topics with him is apparently
>somewhat limited.

It is. But based on those exchanges, and reading his posts in
this and other threads I _still_ will argue that nothing he has said
justifies a diagnosis of obsessive/compulsive disorder.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2284. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:30:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9DDEC14B19BC57C9.E9D45611C65D4071.140BA0EF73E0F99F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25231

On 26 Nov 2001 05:06:52 GMT, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
wrote:

>Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>>A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seems to be
>>prevalent among many ham radio operators.
>
>Out of our 600,000+ members, what percentage display those
>characteristics, Rick? If say, you've counted 60,000, that
>would be just 10%. Is ten percent "a tremendous amount"?
>(Do you even know 60,000 hams???)

I never claimed to.

1. It would take a vastly smaller sample than 60,000 hams to
provide statistically viable information.

2. I didn't say a tremendous amount of HAMS were engaging in
that behavior, I said a tremendous amount of it was prevalent among
hams. Turn on your HF rig or your 2m rig (if you live in an urban
area) and see for yourself how much of it is going on.

>(I wish you folks would preface your comments with "IMO"
>so that the non-hams reading this NG know you're not in any
>way stating facts but rather opinions...)

My statement was that a tremendous amount of those behaviors
"SEEMS" to be prevalent . . . That, in itself, makes it clear that it
is a personal observation not a quantifiable fact.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2285. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:42:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0D016DE6627CA6F5.D51C83A32F9D03E9.90B0600E1A29A66D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25232

On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:32 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>KE8HH's logic is that if something hasn't been demonstrated, it cannot exist.
>That's simply not correct.

Jim, you need to learn to take your time and READ what people
say.

I never said that "if something hasn't been demonstrated, it
cannot exist." I have been stating, pretty clearly, that unless you
can demonstrate that a victim exists you CANNOT claim that harm
occurred. That is not even similar to what you claim.

As far as something not existing unless its demonstrated,
that's absurd. On the other hand, unless something CAN be demonstrated
to exist, it is NOT incumbent on anyone to believe it DOES exist. For
example, there is absolutely no evidence that "aethers" are real (as
was believed by many in the 19th Century. Are they? Scientists
certainly don't think so. On the other hand, we can neither totally
guarantee that they do NOT exist nor be expected to treat them as
though they do simply because someone, somewhere, believes in them.
The same, of course, holds true for the concept of a deity--it is
completely unreasonable to expect anyone to believe in the existence
of a God unless you can provide solid evidence (of a scientific nature
acceptable to the unbiased observer with no preconceptions about the
issue) that one exists. Since, like "aethers," the concept of a "god"
is diametrically opposed to any known scientific principle, the proof
IS incumbent on the person who claims the phenomenon exists, not on
the person who claims it does not.

That isn't arguing that something "CANNOT exist ..." It's
simply arguing that no one has an obligation to accept the existence
of anything that cannot be scientifically demonstrated TO exist, a
very different matter.

>Sorry if I was a bit vague there.

You were.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2286. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:43:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0408EF.B4777C9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25233

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > No, I've never denied being part of the human race. Neither have I
> > > > denied eating pork.
> > >
> > > Yep.
> >
> > You're plaintive cries and your inane arguments are growing weaker.
>
> Who are you trying to convince. Us or yourself?

Gee Cecil, I'm not the one who made the idiotic pronouncement. I detect
a death rattle in your rant.

Dave K8MN

2287. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:44:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C040948.37273B9D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25234

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I don't think you're view isn't supported because folks think you're
> > ignorant, Cecil. I think they just believe you to be misguided.
>
> It is not I who is ignorant, Dave. It is the Democratic/Republican
> masses. Once they alleviate their ignorance they will become
> freedom-loving Libertarians.

I'm certain that you attempt to achieve comfort from the above thought.

Dave K8MN

2288. Re: Twistedhed: Illegal CBer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:50:03 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9459F737B41CEC44.2C47F90E37CE7E44.68CD966AB315DFBC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25235

On 25 Nov 2001 23:07:48 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
(IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:

>Nothng pleases me more
>than one of you cb rambos to come in to my conversation and start
>preaching about rules. God, I love to squash you suckers.

Ignoring the rest of this troll, I wanted to point out the
worst weakness in the arguments made in it.

The poster claims that people "come in to" his conversations
and start preaching about rules. If this is true, either:

1. He is transmitting in the ham bands in the first place,
rather than the "Freeband" ones between the 10m ham band and the cb
band. Thus, the poster is the one who is violating the rights of the
hams by invading OUR bands. If that's the case, his arguments are
totally null since he demands respect for his "rights" but refuses to
respect the rights of others.

2. He is transmitting outside the ham bands in the "freeband"
area and hams are responding to him there. But if this is the case,
the hams themselves are at least as guilty of violating FCC rules as
he is, and therefore have no possible legitimate grounds for their
actions at all. If that's the case, his arguments are fair, since
others are violating the same regulations he is, yet are criticizing
HIM for the behavior.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2289. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:50:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C040AB6.7B2F2106@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25236

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Who are you trying to convince. Us or yourself?
>
> Gee Cecil, I'm not the one who made the idiotic pronouncement. I detect
> a death rattle in your rant.

You are free to delude yourself, Dave. Be my guest.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2290. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:53:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C040B39.6AE0803F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25237

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Just about everybody is a potential ham, Cecil.
>
> Ah, that's your mistake. I consider a potential ham as a person
> who has an interest in ham radio and has a good change of becoming
> a ham. That's what I meant when I used the words.

Ah, that's not my mistake. Most of us are potential Nobel laureates.
Now go forth and live up to your potential.

> > As to your claim about directing hundreds here, it is simply more crap.
>
> I taught ham radio classes at Intel for 13 years. Multiply 4 by 12
> by 13 and see what you get. I passed out the names of all the
> r.r.a.* newsgroups in each class.

Right. Your claim is now that this newsgroup (or any of the others)
has existed for 13 years. More crap. Sure wish I could take you
seriously. You play fast and loose with the truth. Convince us of your
liklihood of being a potential truth teller.

Dave K8MN

2291. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:54:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C040B98.7DF22E7D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25238

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > >
> > > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > >
> > > > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > > > of Duncanville, TX.
> > >
> > > Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> > > I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in the
> > > manner Tugboat did.
>
> So it's OK for a man to have W5PSY but if a woman were issued that
> call by the FCC, she would be a slut? Talk about sexist.

Mr. Olsen didn't show up here and talk about his call in comparison to a
part of a woman's anatomy. Tugboat Annie did.

Dave K8MN
```

2292. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:55:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C040BD9.162D36FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25240

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It is clear enough that the roots of violence come from the Koran
> itself, for those believers who would interpret it that way, and for all
> the masses they influence. If your mileage varies, that's your deficit.
> For me, Sept 11 was proof enough.

Let's assume what you say is correct and that the actions of a handful
of terrorists proves that all one billion Muslims are terrorists. What
actions do you propose to take to alleviate the problem? Please be
specific.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2293. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:55:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C040BE7.A3DA2A2B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25239

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > This "weaseling" stuff
> > certainly is easier than I ever believed possible.
>
> Could that be because you are a natural born weasel? :-)

Naw, I think it more likely that the weaselettes aren't as sharp as they think themselves to be.

Dave K8MN

2294. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 21:57:24 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AD6ECC8352DCD442.5A1B9184B6F0AEE1.1283EEB864CFCFC7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25241

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 05:27:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>This is the voice of the tranquil Buddhist libertarian New Age Man.
>S'cuse the language, kids.

Excuse it hell, I don't happen to feel children NEED to be
sheltered from real-world language--that's the view of the moralistic
types, remember.

And drop the New Age nonsense--I never claimed the slightest
involvement in that area.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2295. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 22:03:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2005F67864921A15.BADFEB3DFDE2C24D.20CA082E3E2B0806@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25242

On 27 Nov 2001 09:47:42 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>There is an ongoing discussion HERE about whether certain callsigns
>are good or bad for the image of the ARS. I have a certain view on the
>subject, so I make certain comments on it here. Is it wrong to do so?
>Am I being electro-politically incorrect because I dare to disagree
>with you?

No, actually there is an ongoing discussion here about whether
KIM'S call sign is good or bad for the image of the ARS. Not a single
other sign has been mentioned, and Dick has made it very clear that he
intends to keep this thread alive (with a subject line that is
DIRECTLY related to Kim) until she changes her call sign. THAT, Jim,
is an attempt to force her to act against her will, and it is wrong
from ANY moral perspective.

If this discussion was, as you claim, directed to the generic
topic of whether certain call signs are good or bad for the image of
the ARS, Kim's sign would be mentioned no more than any other that was
found in the callbook and was considered inappropriate by anyone. That
is patently not the case.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2296. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 22:06:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3076E41407B1FEEA.3B088E87FD10B5EC.6CB6AF643564FC5A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25243

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 05:33:06 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>In the eyes of the majority, apparently so.

I guess the same could be said for Martin Luther King's views
on civil rights as well then. Certainly a majority of the people in
the South (the area affected by his actions and statements) felt he
was wrong.

Then again, people thought Galileo was wrong, too.

Simply because the majority believe something does NOT make it
true.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2297. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 22:10:59 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <995039458B19F345.F081ADD1E856F561.C0E8C8262E8E8700@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25244

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 05:22:27 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Nice smiley.
>Is a few or ten or fifteen people "many"? How does that equate to your
>earlier statement that more potential hams read this newsgroup than
>listen to amateur radio?

If 15 people post, and the Usenet average is for 1 out of
every 100 participants in a newsgroup to ever post to it (which is the
current average), then it follows that approximately 1,500 potential
hams are in this news group. That's a lot more hams than take the test
in a typical month in the US as a whole.

Sounds like pretty good evidence that more potential hams read
this group than listen to ham radio to me.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2298. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 22:14:05 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A3D049A36B62DA4D.A6F532DC298F6476.47FD2A7CC650A112@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25245

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 05:24:27 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>My dad, my sister and my two neighbors all own computers and have
>internet access. None are internet savvy and none access newsgroups.
>You don't have any solid information, do you?

On aol, huh?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2299. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 22:14:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C041062.3DA23783@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25246

Dave Heil wrote:
> Ah, that's not my mistake. Most of us are potential Nobel laureates.

Sure we are, Dave, sure we are. (Somebody get the net!)

> Right. Your claim is now that this newsgroup (or any of the others)
> has existed for 13 years. More crap.

Netnews existed long before the world wide web and originated in
1979. (22 years ago but who's counting?) For awhile, groups
were supported by email reflectors. I suggest you alleviate your
gross ignorance by reading:
http://www.tltodd.com/~tlt/lists/wcgnews/netnews.hist.html
http://www.linuxdoc.org/LDP/nag/node256.html
I don't remember the name(s) of the first amateur radio newsgroups.
This particular newsgroup is a relative newcomer to the r.r.a.*
group and was created out of the r.r.a.misc group. In any case,
we have had amateur radio newsgroups since the early 1980's.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2300. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 22:17:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0410EA.96E5A418@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25248

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > So it's OK for a man to have W5PSY but if a woman were issued that
> > call by the FCC, she would be a slut? Talk about sexist.
>
> Mr. Olsen didn't show up here and talk about his call in comparison to a
> part of a woman's anatomy. Tugboat Annie did.

So it's OK to have the call, just not OK to talk about it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2301. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 22:17:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BD287ED335D85408.5EDC1F9287288EEB.82631341FB0C80B7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25247

On 27 Nov 2001 05:03:59 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>>Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
>
>Your deduction does not follow from the facts.

Are you claiming that more potential hams have radios than
computers?

Better argue that one with Dave, he claims EVERYONE is a
potential ham--and I doubt you would even attempt to claim more people
in the US own ham radios than computers with Internet access.

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2302. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 22:28:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F9C337F900F32EB4.209FE7730E1EBCC1.4BB8DCAC247457BE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25249

On 27 Nov 2001 12:25:05 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>>Since the daily readership of this group is higher than the
>>number of hams licensed in the US last year, it seems pretty likely
>>that at least as many readers are potential hams as are likely to be
>>listening to the ham bands.
>
>There are more than 680,000 readers of rrap?? Amazing!

Again, Jim, read more carefully.

I stated that the daily readership of this group is higher
than the number of hams LICENSED IN THE US LAST YEAR. Unless you are
trying to claim that more than 680,000 hams received their licenses in
the year 2000 your statement is absurd.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2303. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-27 22:32:50 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <0cdbe65b9ad483142e47e5c185cc79bb.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 25250

"Rick Adams" wrote:

> 2. I didn't say a tremendous amount of HAMS were engaging in
> that behavior, I said a tremendous amount of it was prevalent among
> hams. Turn on your HF rig or your 2m rig (if you live in an urban
> area) and see for yourself how much of it is going on.

I live in an urban area, and my HF rig is used several hours each
week on a wide range of bands. My 2M/70cM rig is on continuously
in my car. I'm a very active ham.

Guess what? I have NEVER heard any bigotry on uhf/vhf, and only a
couple of isolated instances on HF.

Seems you and Kim need to find a new subject for your trolling
expedition -- "ignorant bigotted hams" just doesn't have any
credibility these days.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas12poolb122.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.22.122]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2304. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 00:23:23 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <%7WM7.102$9d.19434@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 25251

As I understand it, it is viewed as a "living" document that is to evolve over time. At least that is the intent of it, I believe.

Ryan

> > The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.
>
> It ain't perfect but it will do until something better comes along.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2305. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 00:23:24 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <08WM7.103$9d.19434@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 25252

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C025523.C561E1CA@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> >
> > They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
>
> Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

True.... I can buy or build 3-5 awesome desktop PC's for the price of one
freakin' HF rig.

Ryan

2306. A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 00:23:25 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <18WM7.104$9d.19434@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 25253

Alrighty..... another one of those "what if" questions:

Is it legal to rent or lease ham gear? I was wondering about this one, say for instance, here in Michigan we have places called Rental King, Rent-a-Center etc. Not that we would want to have ham gear rented at a location like that, but if there were places that you could rent or lease equipment, in the short term, that may seem like a more feasable option for some who clearly cannot afford one of those way-overpriced, multi-band, do-everything rigs. (Between those and the "kit" radios, there is not much inbetween)

Also, would it be legal to rent someone elses station? Since the FCC license does not state what gear you are operating, only that YOU are licensed, is this a loophole?

Don't mean to start any arguments, just an honest question, looking for intelligent answers.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Check out www.qsl.net/w8kea

Amateur Radio Is Fun!!! Ask me!

2307. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 00:41:27 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <XoWM7.200195$3d2.8531144@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25254

Heh. Ok. I love your 'what CW is good for'. Kinda nice. Don't look for too many people with the guts to put their real e-mail address or real name on a lot of posts. Personally, I don't really care about the CW. As I have read many posts and entered into some 'discussions', I have realized it is better to let the thing drop. Why? It is otherwise getting too difficult to seperate the 'real' from the 'fake'. It is possible, even with the computer programs, to seperate real from fake. I pulled that stunt on Guam. I was in the shack with another ham who informed me that the 'gummies' monitored EVERYTHING from the shack. Yeah, like I'm gonna give away secrets. Although we usually operated on 20, sometimes 15, and once in a while 10, I tuned up on 40. Low on 40. Di dit dit di di dah dit di dit dit di di dah dit. My friend asked what I was doing. I answered "calling CQ". He exclaimed 'that isn't CQ!'. I replied that I was an American, he was an American, and I was simply being American. After the puzzled look, I told him I was using American Morse - as in land-line morse. I had a chap answer me and I had to ask him to QRS to about 16 words per minute (although I had copied 40 words per minute without error for several minutes in a test about 6 months earlier - that was international morse). We shot the breeze for a good 20 or 30 minutes. I'll bet the gummies were playing that tape for a week! The unfortunate side effect of this was they pulled the beer cooler out of the ham shack. Oh well ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:9u0efr$qa4$1@news.bignet.net...
>
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:1e8M7.235842$W8.7920026@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > I don't know, but suggest you not put it in the CB radio section! :-)
> >
> > Jim AA2QA
>
> It would be even better if the CBers who seem to have a real fetish with
> faking posts by me, like the one starting this thread, would just have the
> balls to stick their own name (Handle) to what they wrote instead.
>
> --
> __
> 73 de,
>
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>

> ARRL member
> NCI member
>
> "You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
> Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
> communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic
> Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
> Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
> transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
> functions."
>
>
>
>

2308. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:03:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127200314.23850.00000868@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 25256

In article <3C03BD97.4F382FBE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Did the Nazi party take power by a majority vote in a free election?
>
>They did come to power through a *plurality* vote in a free election.

Yup. Then they proceeded to dismantle the democratic system.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2309. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:03:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011127200314.23850.00000869@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 25257

In article <3C03B9CE.33FB9D8C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> We may both be right. Most of the hams you know may not have a problem with
>it,
>> while most of the hams I know would have one. Dallas sure ain't in EPA.
>
>Many Texans migrated from PA to be rid of you prudes.

No prudes around here that I know, Cecil. Lots of nice folks and hams who don;t act inappropriately on or off the air. The kind of stuff Kim describes as common on 2 meteres in her area is rare around here, and almost universally deplored by hams.

> Now here you
>are, 150 years later, bugging us again.

It's the other way around.

>Could be you damned yankees
>are just jealous of Texas

(body parts).

Nope. Not at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2310. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:05:13 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@home.net>
Message-ID: <dLWM7.263091$5A3.100346135@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 25255

Ryan ..I will buy your idea of the Constitution being a "living" document
only if the last 5000 years plus of human nature changes. 73 Tom KI3R
"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:%7WM7.102$9d.19434@newshog.newsread.com...
> As I understand it, it is viewed as a "living" document that is to evolve
> over time. At least that is the intent of it, I believe.
>
>
> Ryan
>
>
> > > The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.
> >
> > It ain't perfect but it will do until something better comes along.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

2311. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:18:21 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C043C59.1070004@att.net>
Source record: 25258

N2EY wrote:

> Counter culture comedy alert!!! The Firesign Theatre will celebrate their 35th
> anniversary by doing their first TV special on PBS. Air time in Philly is 8 Pm
> on Nov 28th. Check your local listings.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Brought to you by Loosener's Castor Oil Flakes and Ralph Spoilsport Motors.

Great, Jim, I'll check my local listings...

Oh, it ain't no use
If you ain't got the boost
The boost you get from
Loostners

JOHNNY... JOHNNY....
Coooommmmmmiiinnngggg Mother....

Bombs away, Dad

Pass the 30 weight, Mom...

Rich

"Shoes for Liberty... Shoes for Defence..."

2312. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:20:48 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C043CED.4070600@att.net>
Source record: 25259

Dave Heil wrote:

> Er, sure. THAT'S right. We're Demoncrats. We're Republicans. We're
> Democrats. We're Republicans. Damn! I'm confused. Why does the media
> lead us everywhere except toward the Libertarian Party and the Communist
> Party and the tiny little single issue parties?

Because those parties don't have anyone voting on the Supreme Court... :^

Rich...

2313. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:23:27 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C043D8C.5080304@att.net>
Source record: 25260

Dave Heil wrote:

> Er, sure. THAT'S right. We're Demoncrats. We're Republicans. We're
> Democrats. We're Republicans. Damn! I'm confused. Why does the media
> lead us everywhere except toward the Libertarian Party and the Communist
> Party and the tiny little single issue parties?

Hey I just noticed....

Demoncrats??????????????????????????

Was this a typo.... more than likely Freudian...

Rich....

We are not amused...
-- Queen Victoria

2314. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:29:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C043DF5.35490EB0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25261

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Who are you trying to convince. Us or yourself?
> >
> > Gee Cecil, I'm not the one who made the idiotic pronouncement. I detect
> > a death rattle in your rant.
>
> You are free to delude yourself, Dave. Be my guest.

You can babble about delusion all you'd like. It would appear that
you'll either have to come up some hard facts or look like an idiot.
Do I eat pork or not. Hmmmmm, one of the mysteries of the ages.

On with your quest, Don Quixote!

Dave K8MN

2315. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:34:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C043F21.1F1A3593@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25262

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 05:27:13 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >This is the voice of the tranquil Buddhist libertarian New Age Man.
> >S'cuse the language, kids.
>
> Excuse it hell, I don't happen to feel children NEED to be
> sheltered from real-world language--that's the view of the moralistic
> types, remember.
>
> And drop the New Age nonsense--I never claimed the slightest
> involvement in that area.
>
> Rick

There are those of us who believe you do harm to kids with that kind of stuff. This is the kind of "real world" language that real adults don't even need to use. You're one consenting adult. I didn't see that the party to whom you made your statement consented.

You'd like it all your way. You can skip the part about New Age if my comparison offends. You can just be the tranquil Buddhist Libertarian telling another to "shut (expletive deleted) up).

Dave K8MN

2316. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:38:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C044017.C2FC5DBE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25263

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 05:33:06 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >In the eyes of the majority, apparently so.
>
> I guess the same could be said for Martin Luther King's views
> on civil rights as well then. Certainly a majority of the people in
> the South (the area affected by his actions and statements) felt he
> was wrong.

Let's set the record straight. Most of us can see the difference between the Civil Rights movement and the libertarian line. That's why the U.S. has a Civil Rights Act and why the U.S. hasn't had a Libertarian President.

> Then again, people thought Galileo was wrong, too.

What political movement did he found?

> Simply because the majority believe something does NOT make it
> true.

In this case, it certainly does. The majority rejects the libertarian philosophy as impractical and votes for one or the other of the two major parties.

Dave K8MN

2317. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:40:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c044148_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25266

Hans, Hans, Hans. A) Why would you get so upset over something said "about" you if it isn't so? B) I haven't the time to look through all the old posts from you so here you go:

If you have never been in on the frenzy of the CW debate wherein you have alluded (not necessarily outwardly claimed), that those who are licensed under the current structure are somehow less a ham, then:

I apologize for having the opinion that you had.

Kim W5TIT

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:5e9445dcf03d5b166315f01d00b1bb0b.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> The opinion of Kim-W5TIT seems to be......
>
> >Haven't you been one of those who so wholeheartedly takes delight in the
> >"dumbed down" ham experience?
>
> You simply don't pay attention, and apparently just willy-nilly apply
> insults like "bigotted". I have never used that term, or any similar
> related to the current licensing structure. Below is a copy of my
comments
> to FCC on the NPRM which led to "restructuring". Does it strike you as
> support for the "old smart ways"?
>
> Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
> Before the
> Federal Communications Commission
> Washington, DC 20554
>
> In the Matter of) WT Docket No. 98-143
>)
> 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review --) RM-9148
> Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-9150
> Amateur Service Rules.) RM-9196
>)
>)
>
> PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB
>
>

>
> OVERVIEW
>
> These comments contain proposals on reducing the number of amateur radio
> operator license classes, and suggestions regarding Morse testing.
>
> I. Discussion:
>
> The NPRM proposes reducing the number of operator classes from six
> to four. This reduction would be accomplished by phasing out Novice
> and Technician Plus classes, leaving the remaining four classes in
> place. It is worthy of note that this plan would preserve the heart
> of the so-called "incentive licensing" plan which was implemented in
> 1968.
>
> I believe that the effects originally expected of the incentive
> licensing scheme have not been realized in practice. There is
> little evidence that this scheme, now 30 years old, has produced any
> notable increase in the skills, operating excellence, advanced
electronic
> techniques, or other tangible valuable difference between the operators
> in the various "non-entry-level" classes of licensee.
>
> As a non-scientific but pragmatic experiment, tune a receiver to
> 14.350MHz. Close your eyes and slowly tune the receiver down across the
> 20M amateur radio band. Try to detect the "class boundaries" based on
> a difference in signal quality, better operating practices, or more
> advanced technical conversations. I think you will find no detectable
> difference as you transit across the frequencies which mark the
boundary
> between General, Advanced, and Amateur Extra sub-bands. Thus it can be
> assumed that the expectations of the incentive licensing program
(greater
> levels of technical and operating skill at higher license classes) have
> not been realized, and the incentive licensing plan can be safely
abandoned
> as providing no significant benefit to the public interest, necessity,
or
> convenience (PICON).
>
>
> II Proposal:
>
>
> A. License Classes:
>
> If the interest of the FCC is (as stated in the NPRM) streamlining of
the
> licensing structure, then I propose that the license classes be reduced
> to two classes, namely "Basic" and "Advanced".

> The "Basic" license would have an entry-level test (basic
> regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC
> electronics). Without CW endorsement this class would have
> full frequency and mode priveleges above 30MHz, power limited
> to 50W output.
>
> The "Standard" license test would be of a difficulty level
> similar to the current Advanced class test, and would have
> full privileges above 30MHz at power levels up to 1500W.
>
>
> B. Morse required for operation below 30MHz
>
> Either license class could gain access to all MF/HF amateur
> radio frequency allocations (at 50W and 1500W respectively)
> upon passing a Morse test of 5WPM and gaining a "CW endorsement"
> for their operator license.
>
> The Morse test should be "fill in the blank" or "1 minute of
> solid copy". Multiple-choice test formats should not be allowed.
>
> C. Status of current licensees.
>
> Current licensees should be redistributed as follows:
>
> Current class Converts to
> ------------- -----------
> Novice: Basic CW Endorsed
> Technician: Basic
> Technician+: Basic CW Endorsed (Note 1)
> General: Standard CW Endorsed
> Advanced: Standard CW Endorsed (Note 2)
> Extra: Standard CW Endorsed (Note 2)
>
> Notes:
> 1) "Old" Technicians (who took same written
> test as General and 5WPM) would be
> "Standard" CW endorsed.
> 2) Current Advanced and Extra licensees could
> continue to have that class printed on their
> license in recognition of their previous status.
>
>
> Respectfully submitted,
>
> H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
>
>
>

> --
> Posted from mplsapanas11poolb158.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.20.158]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2318. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:42:37 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C04420A.204@att.net>
Source record: 25264

Rick Adams wrote:

> Wasn't 1Y the designation for an honorably discharged vet with
> medical conditions that prevented conscription? I thought that was the
> designation on my own card after I was discharged from the Navy for
> the wounds I got in SE Asia, but I could be wrong.

When I was Honorably Discharged my designation bcame 4A... That means if they wanted me back... it was 'women and children first'... ;-)

Rich

2319. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:44:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C04418B.F72A073C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25265

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 05:22:27 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Nice smiley.
> >Is a few or ten or fifteen people "many"? How does that equate to your
> >earlier statement that more potential hams read this newsgroup than
> >listen to amateur radio?
>
> If 15 people post, and the Usenet average is for 1 out of
> every 100 participants in a newsgroup to ever post to it (which is the
> current average), then it follows that approximately 1,500 potential
> hams are in this news group. That's a lot more hams than take the test
> in a typical month in the US as a whole.
>
> Sounds like pretty good evidence that more potential hams read
> this group than listen to ham radio to me.
>
> Rick

For a guy who has the credentials you purport to have, you don't strike me as a guy who lets things like facts stand in the way of a good rant. You quote a "newsgroup average" from an unnamed source. Maybe some newsgroups get 7,000 readers. Maybe some--maybe even this one--have 15. Maybe they are the *same* 15. No stats exist, to my knowledge, which provide numbers of new amateur exam takers correlated to the number of potential hams whether they are internet news group lurkers or those listening on the ham bands. If what you've posted sounds like good evidence to you, perhaps you can provide your insider info on when we might expect the mother ship to return.

Dave K8MN

2320. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:49:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c044337$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25268

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0319DC.4EA73CD4@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > I know of no woman who refers to her tops as
> > breasts or mammaries. We all call them tits. We call all you guys'
> > thangs dicks.
>
> > Tits serve two purposes. They can nurse babies or men, or woman if
> > the owner of the tits is prone to that persuasion. We have to cover
> > our tits and you men have to cover your dicks.
>
> > I call my tits tits and always have. I call my, well....never mind. >
Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
>
> This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
>
> ...and that's just part of the reason I refer to the woman as Tugboat
> Annie.
>
> Dave K8MN
> * The view expressed is my personal opinion.

Then consider that most women are tacky and lack class and decorum. Forgive
me for no desire to live up to either of the latter.

Kim W5TIT

2321. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:49:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0442A9.31671CB8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25267

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 05:24:27 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >My dad, my sister and my two neighbors all own computers and have
> >internet access. None are internet savvy and none access newsgroups.
> >You don't have any solid information, do you?
>
> On aol, huh?

Surprisingly, one one of 'em uses AOL. Two use MSN and one uses Earthlink. None does more than surf the web or e-mail except for my dad who has somehow figured out how to use IRC to chat. All are in the dark about newsgroups. The neighbors are a family of two adults and two children. I wonder what percentage of users are like these folks...

Dave K8MN

2322. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:51:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0443d8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25271

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C031CD3.A2D685F4@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:30 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> > >In addition, it's obvious that you won't voluntarily change it, so
there's no
> > >point in on-air mention of the issue.
> >
> > Then precisely what is the point of mentioning it (over and
> > over again, for that matter) here?
> >
> > You, and others, expect the ARS to be treated with respect.
> > Great. I'm a ham as well. On the other hand, I'm ALSO a computer
> > hobbyist who spends far more time on the Internet than on the air.
> > From my perspective, people like you, Dick, and Larry, who scream that
> > the ham bands should be free of any form of bigotry, racism, or
> > "offensive" behavior are the worst kind of hypocrites! It's wrong in
> > YOUR hobby, but perfectly alright here where OTHERS are hobbyists!
> >
> > If you don't like Kim's sign, then say so on the air. If you
> > feel (as Dick and others do) that Islamic people are inferior, that
> > their religion is inferior, or that minorities are losers who depend
> > on affirmative action to provide them jobs they don't deserve then
> > voice your opinions on the ham bands or shut the fuck up! You have no
> > more right to fill the Internet with that moralistic, racist, or
> > bigoted crap than you do to fill the ham bands with it. Either take it
> > BOTH places or drop it completely.
> >
> > Think about it.
> >
> > >Sems to me you define "responsibly minded people" as those who don't
voice
> > >objections.
> > >>
> > >>Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
> > >>
> > >Because this is the appropriate place to do so.
> >
> > Bullshit!
> >
> > This venue is no more appropriate than the ham bands. Who the
> > hell gave hams the right to come into the Internet Usenet groups and

> > post offensive material they wouldn't think of voicing in the ham
> > bands? There are just as many children here as there are on the
> > air--if you're so goddamn concerned with them then try practicing what
> > you keep preaching in THIS venue too!
> >
> > Rick
>
> This is the voice of the tranquil Buddhist libertarian New Age Man.
> S'cuse the language, kids.
>
> Dave K8MN

Oh, yeah. Lemmee guess, and you're a real gentleman, right? Pfffftttttttt

Kim W5TIT

2323. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:54:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0443CB.4C5376EF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25269

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Ah, that's not my mistake. Most of us are potential Nobel laureates.
>
> Sure we are, Dave, sure we are. (Somebody get the net!)

It must pain you that you didn't live up to your potential, Cecil.
I've learned to live with my failings.

> > Right. Your claim is now that this newsgroup (or any of the others)
> > has existed for 13 years. More crap.
>
> Netnews existed long before the world wide web and originated in
> 1979.

Neat factoid. And how many Americans were reading "Netnews" in 1979.
Imagine all of those hundreds or thousands of potential hams.

> (22 years ago but who's counting?) For awhile, groups
> were supported by email reflectors. I suggest you alleviate your
> gross ignorance by reading:
> http://www.tltodd.com/~tlt/lists/wcgnews/netnews.hist.html
> http://www.linuxdoc.org/LDP/nag/node256.html
> I don't remember the name(s) of the first amateur radio newsgroups.
> This particular newsgroup is a relative newcomer to the r.r.a.*
> group and was created out of the r.r.a.misc group. In any case,
> we have had amateur radio newsgroups since the early 1980's.

What if a tree fell in the forest and there was nobody there...

Dave K8MN

2324. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:55:36 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C044515.8030903@att.net>
Source record: 25270

>>>The US has *individual* rights defined by The Constitution
>>>to protect us from people like you.

The Constitution is (I hope) enough... but it's under attack from the Executive branch and the DOJ... (I don't trust that Ashcroft guy...)

>>All of those rights are subject to change. All it takes is for a large
>>percentage of society, through their elected representatives, to amend the
>>Constitution.
>>

>
> Yup.
>
> That's all it took in Germany when the Nazis took power, too.

'W' Bush just usurped the constitution with his proclamation that non-citizens can be 'brought to justice' at a military tribunal. I guess he hasn't 'snuffed' enough people in Texas now he'll be able to do it anywhere in the world that he sees fit...

>>In addition, the interpretation of the Constitution is determined by a very
>>small group of judges. Rights rise and fall on their decision. For example,
>>abortion was illegal practically everywhere until 1973, when a single judgement
>>of the Supremes struck down existing laws and established a "right of privacy"
>>for those seeking abortions and wiped out the "right to life" of those being
>>aborted.

The Military Tribunals can't be appealed... even to the Supremes... Bush has usurped the Legislature AND... the Judiciary...

Nice huh????

>>The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.
>>

"W" proved that... ;^

RIch...

2325. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:55:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0444c6$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25278

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011127065623.22754.00000758@nso-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3C0347E2.38B30A4A@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> > By the way, everybody, did you notice this thread has just about
> >reached the all time record for the number of messages posted to a
> >single thread (check out google.com for the totals). Perhaps it is
> >time to bring this thread "one step closer to extinction" and move
> >some of the unrelated topics into their own threads. :-)
> >
> No, no, no! The whole point is for us to keep this going until March.
Can't
> expect Kim to do it alone!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

ROFLMAO...you *are* paying attention...LOL

Kim W5TIT

2326. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:56:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0444e7$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25280

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011127065623.22754.00000758@nso-cs.aol.com...
> In article <3C0347E2.38B30A4A@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> > By the way, everybody, did you notice this thread has just about
> >reached the all time record for the number of messages posted to a
> >single thread (check out google.com for the totals). Perhaps it is
> >time to bring this thread "one step closer to extinction" and move
> >some of the unrelated topics into their own threads. :-)
> >
> No, no, no! The whole point is for us to keep this going until March.
Can't
> expect Kim to do it alone!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Oh, and by the way, the many branches of this thread have been pretty darned
interesting...

Kim W5TIT

2327. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:59:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0444EA.1BE56106@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25272

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 27 Nov 2001 05:03:59 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >>Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
> > >
> > >Your deduction does not follow from the facts.
> >
> > Are you claiming that more potential hams have radios than
> > computers?
> >
> > Better argue that one with Dave, he claims EVERYONE is a
> > potential ham--and I doubt you would even attempt to claim more people
> > in the US own ham radios than computers with Internet access.

How many of those folks (first we've eliminated those with computers but no internet access and those with internet access and no clue about newsgroups) are reading this stuff?

I do maintain that anyone is a potential ham. I met a retired Pittsburgh cop recently. He is an in-law of my neighbor. I gave him a damaged tower which he wanted to refurbish and use for TV reception and to mount his scanner antennas. He has used the scanners since his retirement to monitor police frequencies. After a demo of what ham radio can do, the guy is fired up to obtain a license. He has neither a shortwave radio nor a computer.

Dave K8MN

2328. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:59:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011127205927.12427.00003462@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 25273

In article <3C01CF58.64E74809@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Your bigoted postings even offend me, Larry, and I have a
>thick skin.

Cecil:

Right. I guess someone who was 300,000 feet tall in the fourth
dimension WOULD have a pretty thick skin!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2329. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:59:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011127205927.12427.00003461@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 25275

In article <3C01CEF7.DF12C598@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> If my callsign, and the phonetics you have constructed therefrom,
>> are truly a "danger to the ARS," then perhaps you should write to
>> Riley Hollingsworth and complain about it.
>
>It is not a danger to the ARS. Neither is Kim's call. Vulgarity
>is in the eyes of the beholder. Just because I find your call
>to be vulgar doesn't mean that it objectively is vulgar.

Nice backpedalling, Cecil. I just hope you didn't strain anything!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2330. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:59:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011127205928.12427.00003463@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 25274

In article <b7c5262e.0111261120.6b9651e1@posting.google.com>, k0hb@qwest.net (K0HB) writes:

>
>Your personal integrity is on the line on this one, and nothing short
>of a specific public apology to me and others you have named will restore
>your credibility as a responsible individual.
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

Don't hold your breath waiting for that!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2331. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:59:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011127205928.12427.00003464@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 25277

In article <ff37aa44.0111261216.2503cb4b@posting.google.com>,
uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org (Sean G Gilley) writes:

>
>Geez, Larry. If you can't trust the woman you marry, who can you trust?
>And why would you marry her if you can't trust her? Those women out there
>who "don't understand" -- they probably do understand. They just reject
>your beliefs as being either too insecure or too old fashioned. I doubt
>I know *anyone* -- my mother included -- who'd agree with you.
>
>Sheesh.
>
>Sean.

Sean:

That's the advantage of being all grown up, out of the house, and on
your own -- you don't have to worry about what others think about you,
including your mother! I hope the day comes when you are mature
enough to understand my position on this matter. However, considering
the way you were probably brought up, I doubt that will ever happen.

People who are married, or in committed relationships with a person
they love, respect, and trust, do not challenge that trust by having
private meetings, professional or otherwise, with people of the opposite
sex *unless* their spouse or partner is present. It simply is not done.
You say your mother wouldn't agree with me. Let me ask you -- is
she still married to your father?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2332. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 01:59:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011127205929.12427.00003465@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 25276

In article <9ts9gp$k7k$0@208.206.142.78>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> Wrong again, as usual. I am not even remotely preoccupied with "them."
>> It is YOU who have the preoccupation with your own breasts, and desire
>> for everyone else to be preoccupied with "them" as you are; therefore your
>> call sign is imposed on the whole of the ARS, at the expense of any
>> good opinion of your personal judgment. Quit trying to throw this back
>> on others, Kim. You are to blame for taking the ARS "...one step
>> closer to extinction," not us.
>>
>
> It is difficult for me to become preoccupied with that which disgusts
>me. She is disgusting. You are right, Larry- Her choice of a vanity
>callsign clearly shows her own preoccupation.

Dick:

Yup. I believe that instead of Kim being so preoccupied with what
she has hanging off of her chest, she should be more worried about
what she is missing between her ears!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2333. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:00:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0445fd_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25282

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C03AEB0.80A5178E@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > >
> > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> >
> > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > of Duncanville, TX.
>
> Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in the
> manner Tugboat did.
>
> Dave K8MN

And, I submit that *you* are the one with the mind who deciphered my message--all with nothing but mere inuendo from me. Who is it, exactly, with no class?

Kim W5TIT

2334. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:01:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C044566.B97741C5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25279

KC8PMX wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C025523.C561E1CA@IEEE.org...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> > >
> > > They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
> >
> > Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> True.... I can buy or build 3-5 awesome desktop PC's for the price of one
> freakin' HF rig.
>
> Ryan

Where do you get 3 awesome desktop PCs for under say, nine hundred
clams?

Dave K8MN

2335. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:03:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0445EA.2A546575@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25281

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Er, sure. THAT'S right. We're Demoncrats. We're Republicans. We're
> > Democrats. We're Republicans. Damn! I'm confused. Why does the media
> > lead us everywhere except toward the Libertarian Party and the Communist
> > Party and the tiny little single issue parties?
>
> Hey I just noticed....
>
> Demoncrats??????????????????????????
>
> Was this a typo.... more than likely Freudian...

Probably both. Cantcha tell? I'm a Republican.

Dave K8MN

2336. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:08:39 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <70774c9f1d8ddb84dd7f61831c10810c.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 25283

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:18WM7.104$9d.19434@newshog.newsread.com...

> Alrighty..... another one of those "what if" questions:
>
> Is it legal to rent or lease ham gear? I was wondering about this one, say
> for instance, here in Michigan we have places called Rental King,
> Rent-a-Center etc. Not that we would want to have ham gear rented at a
> location like that, but if there were places that you could rent or lease
> equipment, in the short term, that may seem like a more feasable option for
> some who clearly cannot afford one of those way-overpriced, multi-band,
> do-everything rigs. (Between those and the "kit" radios, there is not much
> inbetween)
>
> Also, would it be legal to rent someone elses station? Since the FCC license
> does not state what gear you are operating, only that YOU are licensed, is
> this a loophole?

Hi Ryan,

Everything you're suggesting is perfectly legal and above board.

A non-ham could build a first rate contesting station in a desireable
location (Virgin Islands for example) and rent it out to licensed hams
for their favorite contest weekend. There used to be a 'bed&breakfast'
operation in Hawaii which offered a fully equipped ham station as one
of their features.

The prohibition in 97.113(a)(2) is against actual on the air operation
for compensation. It does not prohibit you from being compensated for
the use of your station by another licensed person.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas12poolb122.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.22.122]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2337. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:10:51 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C0448A7.80305@att.net>
Source record: 25284

N2EY wrote:

> The question still remains: is it OK to do it to boys but not girls?

> Did I say there wasn't? No. I simply asked if it was OK for boys but not girls.

Jim, you know better than this... it is NOT the same thing... it's 'apples and oranges'...

Rich

BTW the answer is No... because if it were the same thing it would mean that the Doctor cut off my dick... so I say, no, it's NOT 'ok to do it to boys but not girls'.

2338. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:15:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c04497b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25287

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C040B98.7DF22E7D@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > > >
> > > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > > >
> > > > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > > > of Duncanville, TX.
> > > >
> > > Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> > > I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in the
> > > manner Tugboat did.
> > >
> > So it's OK for a man to have W5PSY but if a woman were issued that
> > call by the FCC, she would be a slut? Talk about sexist.
>
> Mr. Olsen didn't show up here and talk about his call in comparison to a
> part of a woman's anatomy. Tugboat Annie did.
>
> Dave K8MN

As, uh, most of us have in this thread?

Kim W5TIT

2339. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:17:13 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C044A26.5020008@att.net>
Source record: 25285

CAM wrote:

> Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> of Duncanville, TX.

W5PSY Duncanville Texas..... That is TOO funny....

Rich

2340. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:18:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1hi7$i5b$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25286

Krell wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011125232032.25429.00003458@nso-fc.aol.com...
> > What I do recall about the film is that the best set of breasts I saw
> > was on the girl I was with!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Yet, you don't think it's right for a word meaning "breasts" to be viewed by
> the rest of the world via an amateur callsign. What a hypocrite!

"Tits" is and has long been considered a vulgar expression. Breasts is
not.
What an idiot!

2341. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:21:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1hmm$i5b$1@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25288

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > >You might have a case if everyone believed as you do. Most folks don't.
> > >
> > > Is that supposed to make him wrong?
> >
> > In the eyes of the majority, apparently so.
>
> "Justice is blind" and doesn't care about the tyranny of the majority.

You once again come out with an oxymoron, you moron. The majority makes
the rules/laws. Remember "Majority rule, minority rights"? From Polysci
101

2342. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:24:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c044b6f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25291

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011127205928.12427.00003464@nso-cg.aol.com...
> In article <ff37aa44.0111261216.2503cb4b@posting.google.com>,
> uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org (Sean G Gilley) writes:
>
> >
> >Geez, Larry. If you can't trust the woman you marry, who can you trust?
> >And why would you marry her if you can't trust her? Those women out
there
> >who "don't understand" -- they probably do understand. They just reject
> >your beliefs as being either too insecure or too old fashioned. I doubt
> >I know *anyone* -- my mother included -- who'd agree with you.
> >
> >Sheesh.
> >
> >Sean.
>
> Sean:
>
> That's the advantage of being all grown up, out of the house, and on
> your own -- you don't have to worry about what others think about you,
> including your mother! I hope the day comes when you are mature
> enough to understand my position on this matter. However, considering
> the way you were probably brought up, I doubt that will ever happen.
>
> People who are married, or in committed relationships with a person
> they love, respect, and trust, do not challenge that trust by having
> private meetings, professional or otherwise, with people of the opposite
> sex *unless* their spouse or partner is present. It simply is not done.
> You say your mother wouldn't agree with me. Let me ask you -- is
> she still married to your father?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Well, since you're asking about the "voice of experience" Larry, and you
have so much advice and opinion on marrige: are you still married to ... er,
OH YEAH, that's right! YOU'RE NOT MARRIED.

Kim W5TIT

2343. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:25:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c044bce_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25294

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011127205929.12427.00003465@nso-cg.aol.com...
> In article <9ts9gp$k7k$0@208.206.142.78>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Wrong again, as usual. I am not even remotely preoccupied with "them."
> >> It is YOU who have the preoccupation with your own breasts, and desire
> >> for everyone else to be preoccupied with "them" as you are; therefore
your
> >> call sign is imposed on the whole of the ARS, at the expense of any
> >> good opinion of your personal judgment. Quit trying to throw this back
> >> on others, Kim. You are to blame for taking the ARS "...one step
> >> closer to extinction," not us.
> >>
> >
> > It is difficult for me to become preoccupied with that which disgusts
> >me. She is disgusting. You are right, Larry- Her choice of a vanity
> >callsign clearly shows her own preoccupation.
>
> Dick:
>
> Yup. I believe that instead of Kim being so preoccupied with what
> she has hanging off of her chest, she should be more worried about
> what she is missing between her ears!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, just because you leave women with something missing between their
ears, doesn't mean I have something missing between my ears.

Kim W5TIT

2344. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:26:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1i0b$i5b$2@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25289

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9tuvh1$jbg$1@208.206.142.65...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > > > >More potential hams read this newsgroup than listen to ham radio.
> > > >
> > > > They DO? How do you know, Cecil?
> > >
> > > Deduction. More potential hams have computers than ham radios.
> >
> >
> > You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
> > usenet.
> > When you tell them about it and how to download the 60,000 groups, and
> > that you must download ALL of them, most decide they want nothing to do
> > with it.
> >
>
> Why?! It takes--maybe--10 minutes and that would be with a very, very slow
> connection. The browser can be set to "Catch Up" (IE; I don't know what its
> equivalent is on Netscape), so a lot of time doesn't even have to be spent
> with downloading the headers.
>
> Then, there's also sites such as Google (formerly Deja). Don't know if
> there's any others.
>
> It's just not that hard or time consuming.

I know, but for some reason that big number sounds difficult to some
people. Sorta like 20wpm Morse code.
```

2345. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:27:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1i2g$i5b$3@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25290

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
> > > usenet.
> >
> > Doubt it. Internet savvy people know about usenet and usually
> > don't possess a transceiver. Hope that's not too much for you
> > to comprehend.
>
> My dad, my sister and my two neighbors all own computers and have
> internet access. None are internet savvy and none access newsgroups.
> You don't have any solid information, do you?

Literally everything he says outside his technical field turns out to
be conjecture, and largely BS.
```

2346. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:29:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c044ca6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25295

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1hi7$i5b$0@208.207.71.131...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20011125232032.25429.00003458@nso-fc.aol.com...
> > > What I do recall about the film is that the best set of breasts I saw
> > > was on the girl I was with!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > Yet, you don't think it's right for a word meaning "breasts" to be
viewed by
> > the rest of the world via an amateur callsign. What a hypocrite!
>
>
> "Tits" is and has long been considered a vulgar expression. Breasts is
> not.
> What an idiot!

Oh really? "Tits" is vulgar, eh? Then, you'd better put some kind of protective suit on, because most women refer to their "breasts" as tits. And, most women refer to a bra as a tit-sling. But, hopefully, you've never been in the restrooms or locker rooms I've been in. Come to think of it, if you believe that "tits" is vulgar, you'd probably faint dead away in a women's restroom or locker room.

Kim W5TIT

2347. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:30:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1i7n$i5b$4@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25292

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
> > > > usenet.
> > >
> > > Doubt it. Internet savvy people know about usenet and usually
> > > don't possess a transceiver. Hope that's not too much for you
> > > to comprehend.
> >
> > My dad, my sister and my two neighbors all own computers and have
> > internet access. None are internet savvy and none access newsgroups.
> > You don't have any solid information, do you?
>
> Are your dad, sister, and two neighbors potential hams? I'm talking
> primarily about people who have shown an interest in ham radio. I
> have personally directed hundreds of those potential hams to these
> newsgroups during Amateur Radio awareness days.

I know several internet savvy hams I have mentioned something I found
on usenet to who had no knowledge of it, and when I explained the
routine to access the groups they decided not to bother with it, All of
my family members are computer savvy and one is an engineer and a
licensed ham. I am the only one on usenet.
(Sorry bout that Cecil, I'm not either going to join them)

2348. test - do not reply

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:31:38 UTC
From: Frank Todd <k3eko@nospam.home.com>
Message-ID: <e0YM7.263166$5A3.100505457@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 25293

testing...

2349. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:37:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnhg6tb.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25296

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 02:08:39 +0000 (UTC), K0HB wrote:

[Re: Leasing/renting ham gear.]

>Everything you're suggesting is perfectly legal and above board.

Henry Radio in Los Angeles used to have a policy of "selling" a
piece of used ham gear (traded-in by someone) and returning 90% of
the sale price if the gear was returned within 5 days. They were
fully aware that this was de-facto "rental".

To date this practice, they had lots of Gonset Gooney-Birds for us
2-meter guys who needed a portable or mobile rig over a long
weekend. (Late 1950s)

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2350. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:38:23 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C044F1C.3050706@att.net>
Source record: 25297

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Of course, all
> ancient writings are subject to the interpretations of today, and of
> course that is the major problem.

Did you know that in olden (more enlightened) days tit was NOT considered a vulgar word? It's true... ;-)

I guess certain usages, even today, are subject to interpretation. :^

Rich

2351. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:42:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1iveklv0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25298

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You are the individual who wants numerous laws changed. You are the
> > > libertarian who will not live to see a libertarian as a chief executive
> > > of this country. You little "L" libertarians should take the hint after
> > > watching throuncing after throuncing of big "L" Libertarian (or even
> > > libertarian) candidates for national office. There aren't many in the
> > > U.S. who'd vote your way. What do you think is the reason?
> >
> > Ignorance.
>
> I don't think you're view isn't supported because folks think you're
> ignorant, Cecil. I think they just believe you to be misguided.
>

On the other hand,.....
```

2352. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:51:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1jg8$n5j$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25299

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > What the hell do you think
> > I'm talking about? Wiping out all Muslim women and children, just
> > because they're Muslim? Kindly show where I said anything even close to
> > that, otherwise you are a senile old fool who can't get anything
> > striaght.
>
> You have said that *every* Muslim is a potential terrorist, Dick. You
> have said that Muslims have no choice except to kill Christians.
> Exactly why would you be fomenting so much hatred of Muslims if you
> don't want them exterminated? You can't back down now. You have been
> advocating genocide.
>
> I, OTOH, recognize that Muslim terrorists are a small fraction of
> one percent of Muslims. I say go after the terrorists, not the
> rest of the one billion Muslims who are peaceful and law-abiding.

Ok, let's use your figures. If one tenth of one percent of the world/s
1.25 BILLION muslims are Islamic fundamentalist terrorists, that's
1,250,000 terrorists, if my calculator functioned correctly. Still think
it's no problem?

I DID say that based on the fundamental teachings of Islam, every
Muslim *is* a potential terrorist in that it is almost certaian that he
will be forced to make a choice-follow his religious teachings and
leaders, or reject them. In countries where fundamentalist Islam is not
only the religion but the law as well, asking a Muslim to reject his
religion can easily be fatal. At the least, it will cause him huge
amounts of personal problems and grief.

2353. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:52:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1jhj$n5j$1@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25300

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 26 Nov 2001 01:09:14 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > If you consider the UN an inpatial source you are to be pitied.
>
> Oh get off your "Black Helicopter" paranoia, Dick. The UN is
> as impartial as you can get when it comes to national organizations.
>
> America just isn't as "perfect" as your brainwashed mind
> believes it to be--I know it's a shock to you, but there are some
> other nations with some pretty good ideas too.

As I said, you are to be pitied.

2354. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:54:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1jke$n5j$2@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25351

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 26 Nov 2001 03:58:18 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >A Social Security card is not a national ID card. It isn't even
> >necessary to carry it with you. As to your son's drifting, we can only
> >hope that he finds himself and stops this drifting one day. I don't
> >know of any photo Social Security cards and I'm quite certain that a
> >state-issued drivers license doesn't count as a "national ID card".
>
> Ignoring the obvious stupidity of your response to a typo of
> drift instead of draft, don't lean too hard on your "photo" concept to
> prove something is a national id card. The papers issued to Italian
> citizens under Mussolini didn't have pictures either--just a number
> (as my social security card has). And you weren't required to carry
> them all the time, only when conducting an activity (applying for a
> job, opening a bank account, etc.) where they were required. Tried
> applying for a job w/o a social security number lately?
>
> >Neither. I find the UN to be largely tangled in its own bureaucracy.
> >I'd fear no helicopters within ten or so years. It would take 'em that
> >long to finish up the various meetings necessary to get one airborne.
>
> They do pretty well when it comes to relief efforts, Dave. Or
> to pointing out the failings in various nations--ours included.

Sure they do a great job at things like appoingint Syria to the
Security Council

2355. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:55:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1jn9$ni9$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25352

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <9tuu4thmt1@208.206.142.65>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> The Lumberjack Song".
> >>
> >> Didja know that if you take Neil Diamond's hit "September Morn" and replace
> >the
> >> words "September Morn" with "Internet Porn", and make a few other minor
> >changes
> >> the song still works, although with a somewhat different meaning?
> >>
> >>
> > Gee, imagine what you could do with "Cracklin' Rosie".
>
> I thought "Cracklin' Rosie" was already a novelty song (about inexpensive
> wine).

The Neil Diamond song? Not the way I hear it.

2356. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:56:49 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9CBD4B7FC9D1E529.4558EAE90FB5B3C7.6FD28F07A9E8EF0F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25353

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 15:46:29 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>All I have to say is that you have absolutely no way of knowing whether
>I do or whether I don't.

But that's the beauty of it, Dave. I don't HAVE to know it--I
just have to claim it is true, which provides evidence to Cecil. In
order to invalidate that information, you have to state it is
UNTRUE--in which case you answer Cecil's question. In the absence of
such "proof," however, Cecil is totally justified in accepting the
only evidence he is provided--my statement!

It's just like being accused of publicly exposing yourself
Dave, it doesn't matter if the accusation is true or not--if you are
accused and don't deny the allegation, you WILL be found guilty in a
court since the testimony of the accuser will be the only voice heard.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2357. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 02:59:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1jub$o49$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25354

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You really don't get it, do you? I wouldn't say it's universal across
> > all species, but generally animals have no awareness of sex, ...
>
> Dick, consciousness makes animals aware of sex. You do believe that
> animals are conscious, don't you? You are the only exception I know
> to animals being conscious.

Cecil, it's you that is unconscious. All the animals I have ever been around
or read about had no interest in sex whatever until the female was in estrus.
I think there may be some other primates,some monkey species, for which that may not be true, but even the large apes don't go ape over sex like humans do.

2358. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 03:00:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1k19$o9f$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25355

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011125232030.25429.00003455@nso-fc.aol.com...
> > In article <3c013ca4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >> If the selection was limited to the likes of you I wouldn't be, either.
> > >
> > >Oh, believe me, you have that right.
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Yes, Kim, Dick did, indeed, have that right!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> Is there an echo online? Of course he has that right. There is *NO* way in
> Hell I'd find him attractive to the likes of me! For once, you're *both*
> right.
>

Much more accurately, you'd never get the opportunity.

2359. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 03:03:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1k5q$o9f$1@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25356

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:30 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> > >In addition, it's obvious that you won't voluntarily change it, so there's no
> > >point in on-air mention of the issue.
> >
> > Then precisely what is the point of mentioning it (over and
> > over again, for that matter) here?
> >
> > You, and others, expect the ARS to be treated with respect.
> > Great. I'm a ham as well. On the other hand, I'm ALSO a computer
> > hobbyist who spends far more time on the Internet than on the air.
> > From my perspective, people like you, Dick, and Larry, who scream that
> > the ham bands should be free of any form of bigotry, racism, or
> > "offensive" behavior are the worst kind of hypocrites! It's wrong in
> > YOUR hobby, but perfectly alright here where OTHERS are hobbyists!
> >
> > If you don't like Kim's sign, then say so on the air. If you
> > feel (as Dick and others do) that Islamic people are inferior, that
> > their religion is inferior, or that minorities are losers who depend
> > on affirmative action to provide them jobs they don't deserve then
> > voice your opinions on the ham bands or shut the fuck up! You have no
> > more right to fill the Internet with that moralistic, racist, or
> > bigoted crap than you do to fill the ham bands with it. Either take it
> > BOTH places or drop it completely.
> >
> > Think about it.
> >
> > >Sems to me you define "responsibly minded people" as those who don't voice
> > >objections.
> > >>
> > >>Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
> > >>
> > >Because this is the appropriate place to do so.
> >
> > Bullshit!
> >
> > This venue is no more appropriate than the ham bands. Who the
> > hell gave hams the right to come into the Internet Usenet groups and
> > post offensive material they wouldn't think of voicing in the ham
> > bands? There are just as many children here as there are on the

> > air--if you're so goddamn concerned with them then try practicing what
> > you keep preaching in THIS venue too!
> >
> > Rick
>
> This is the voice of the tranquil Buddhist libertarian New Age Man.
> S'cuse the language, kids.

He's a real Sweetums, isn't he Dave?

2360. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 03:09:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1khaplm0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25357

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> > > Terroristic activity in the name of religion (Christianity) has been
> > > going on in Northern Ireland for decades too -- and BOTH sides claim
> > > a different flavor of Christianity as their motivation.
> > >
> > Ah, Yes, dear old Homeland. But only a blip on the radar beside Islamic
> > fundamentalist terrorism, as demonstrated by longtime activities
> > culminating at the World Trade Center.
>
> So murders in Ireland are only a blip on the radar? You say some
> astounding things, Dick. Dead Irish people are just as dead as
> dead American people.

So far I haven't been apprised of any atrocity connected with the Irish Troubles of anywhere the magnitude of Sept 11. Have you? But then, you're the igno that equates a 6000 year old passage in the Old Testament with modern religous practice.

2361. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 03:15:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1ks5$qt1$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25358

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Jeff:
>
> I know you're smarter than that. The percentage of any measurement can only
> be made against the field sampled. Of the ham radio operators I listen to
> in the Dallas area, I'd say at least 50% of them are prejudiced or bigots.
>

Great. So you listen to two, and one is such.

> Your example would even be "OK" if we knew, of those 600,000, how many don't
> even operate.
>
> Experience is that a tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism "seem"
> (note the operative word there) to be prevalent in ham radio.

And your vast experience probably includes that two hams mentioned
above.
If yoiu'd just avoid the lunatic fringe, which is found most everywhere
in this enlightened day where people liky you and Rick are so openminded
the wind blows through, you wouldn't have any worries. There are very
few bigots in ham radio.
On the other hand there is a growing number of airheads like you Rick
and Cecil.

2362. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 03:20:55 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C045913.4090700@att.net>
Source record: 25359

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> CAM wrote:
>
>>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>>>K0HB wrote:
>>>
>>>>Terroristic activity in the name of religion (Christianity) has been
>>>>going on in Northern Ireland for decades too -- and BOTH sides claim
>>>>a different flavor of Christianity as their motivation.
>>>>
>>> Ah, Yes, dear old Homeland. But only a blip on the radar beside Islamic
>>>fundamentalist terrorism, as demonstrated by longtime activities
>>>culminating at the World Trade Center.
>>>
>>So murders in Ireland are only a blip on the radar? You say some
>>astounding things, Dick. Dead Irish people are just as dead as
>>dead American people.
>>
>
>
> So far I haven't been apprised of any atrocity connected with the Irish
> Troubles of anywhere the magnitude of Sept 11. Have you? But then,
> you're the igno that equates a 6000 year old passage in the Old
> Testament with modern religous practice.
>

Ah... Carroll... from 1984 to 2000 around 10,000 people have died at the hands of the PKK... about 5500 Guards and 4500 citizens.

Do you consider that trivial? Or should we just ignore it?

Rich

Now this is where you do some more of your name-calling... you... you... you... name-caller.... :P

2363. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 03:27:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1ljjsmr0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25360

CAM wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > Well just for THE RECORD Mohammad considered and discounted Jesus long
> > > before his own death, and proclaimed himself to be the Final Prophet,
> > > which remains Muslim doctrine to this day.
> >
> > Uh huh. Yeah. And, exactly, what book are you reading that from?
>
> Dick is reading stuff from radical Christian terrorist web pages.

Must have missed those. Where did you find them on the web>

> In reality, Mohammed considered Jesus to be a great prophet although
> somewhat misguided with the turn-the-other-cheek stuff.

Nonsense. He rejected Chistianity as idolistic since Christians of the
time showed what he interpreted to be idolistic adoration of Mary,
mother of Jesus.
He thought that Christians were thus polytheistic, and he stated that
was against the true teachigns of the one Allah.

2364. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 03:34:31 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EECCE7721D8F3BD3.2905FE8BAB95D3C9.19AD449E3E0E63A0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25361

On 27 Nov 2001 18:01:26 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> I'm sure glad that I lived and worked far enough from a university that
>an advanced degree was not a workable option. You and Cecil are giving
>higher education a bad name.

Too willing to look at BOTH sides of issues for you Dickie?

> Of course Islam was responiible for the WTC etc!

No, you bigoted idiot, Islam was NOT responsible. A small
group of Islamic TERRORISTS were responsible.

In Belfast, Ireland, many terrorist bombings have been
performed by the IRA and other groups. This terrorism is due to a
schism between the Roman Catholic Irish and the Protestant Irish. Do
you believe we should blame the Catholic Church if the terrorism, or
just the individuals involved?

>If not for the basic
>teachings of fundamentalist Islam those acts would have never been never
>been performed -by ISLAMICS!

If not for the teachings of the Roman Catholic and Protestant
churches those killings in Belfast wouldn't have occurred.

If not for the teachings of the Old Testament, the killings in
Palestine and the West Bank by the Israelis would never have occurred.

Why is it you don't blame the religion in the other cases, but
you do in the case of Islam? Pure ignorance or bigotry?

> Do you insinuate they were other than
>Islamics?

Nope.

Do YOU insinuate that the terrorists in Ireland are other than
Christians?

>Do you insist that Islam does NOT, in its basic teachings,
>dictate that all other belief systems are inferior and must be either
>converted, enslaved, or eliminated?

Do YOU insist that the Christian Bible doesn't, in ITS basic
teachings, dictate that all other belief systems are inferior and must
be either converted, enslaved, or eliminated?

It's the same thing, Dickie. If it makes Islamic people into terrorists, it makes Christians into the same thing.

>Do you refuse to realize that the
>fundamentalist Islamics have concluded they will never be able to
>dominate the West by religious means alone (conversion) and have
>concluded that elimination is the only workable means remaining of
>making sure that Islam dominates?

Do you refuse to realize that fundamentalist Christians in the United States who have concluded they will never eliminate abortion by political means alone (laws) and have concluded that the elimination of abortion clinics and murder of physicians who perform abortions is the only workable means remaining of making sure that abortions are not performed?

Dickie, fundamentalist Islamic TERRORISTS and fundamentalist Christian TERRORISTS may have reached that conclusion, but not fundamentalists of EITHER religion as a whole.

> Do you not know that the
>fundamentalists dominate Islam in most of the world, and do so by
>accusing moderates of violating the basics of Islam, and even kill or
>otherwise punish them?

No, I do NOT know that--because it doesn't happen to be true!

The largest sect of Islam--by FAR--is the Sunni sect. And Sunnis are progressive in their religion, not fundamentalist. Such nations as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Egypt, etc. are all Sunni nations, only a few such as Iran are Shi'ite, or fundamentalist, muslim states--and even those for the most part totally oppose the concept of terrorism as being against the teachings of the Koran--a book, btw, it is very obviously you've never read despite pretending to know all about its teachings.

> Do you not know that such activity is becoming
>ever more widespread throughout the world of Islam?

Again, I don't know that because it isn't true.

>Do you really believe that so few Moslems follow their basic tenants
>that they are as few in number as the single Christian mental case you
>quoted above?

Do you really believe that so few Christians follow their basic tenants [sic] that they are as few in number as the single Christian mental case I quoted above?

No difference at all in the questions, Dickie. And no difference at all in the answers.

> In fact it is becoming very clear that there is very little that you
>actually DO know on the subject, you just like to pretend. I suppose it
>boosts your ego.

Really?

Try posting FACTS instead of bigoted misinterpretations of a
religion you neither understand nor wish to trouble yourself learning
about.

> You are still in denial and just another component of the problem. Most
>of us were glad to tolerate that sort of a belief system, considering it
>as non-threatening, until that day in September when the light went on.
>Looks like some of you are still in the dark.

How very generous of you--you were willing to "tolerate" a
religion that has been one of the most important influences on
civilization in history. How magnanimous.

How bigoted!

> Truly non-violent Muslims had better be very proactive in divorcing
>themseves from any and all of their soulmates while they still can since
>the trust is about gone, or it is going very fast.

Sure--otherwise bigots like you will be screaming for
concentration camps to house them in.

> Oh, by the way, you demanded a few days ago that I provide proof of
>what I've been saying. I told you to read Chapter 5, verse 33 of the
>Koran. You have remained very,very silent on the subject since that
>time. I wonder why.

Silent, Dickie?

I pointed out that there is no such THING as "Chapter 5, verse
33" in the Koran. Try using the real thing instead of a phoney quote
from the hate-mongers-are-us web site.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2365. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 03:37:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6D2221EF5ED70090.5E728878FBF7DA71.D6A213B19CD52AFE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25362

On 27 Nov 2001 18:02:59 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Hmmmm. I wonder what a good Google search would show on this
>subject....

I wouldn't have the vaguest idea Dick. As I stated, I'm pretty
sure my own classification was 1Y, but I'm not at all certain of that.
I _know_ it wasn't 4F, which I always thought was the designation for
non-service connected medical ineligibility, but again I could easily
be very wrong since Cecil apparently is sure of the 1Y in his case.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2366. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 03:41:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7846A04E2467A02E.2449A1AC284B5468.EDECA3E886E99C74@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25363

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 02:59:59 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> By the way, everybody, did you notice this thread has just about
>reached the all time record for the number of messages posted to a
>single thread (check out google.com for the totals). Perhaps it is
>time to bring this thread "one step closer to extinction" and move
>some of the unrelated topics into their own threads. :-)

I tried that with the "bigotry" thread but it hasn't helped.

Bear in mind that Dick has stated he will NOT allow this
thread to end until Kim changes her call sign. Regardless of content,
he'll keep it going just to try to force her to capitulate to his
demands.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2367. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:01:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C046198.CF0EBFD0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25364

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You once again come out with an oxymoron, you moron. The majority makes
> the rules/laws.

You are so absolutely ignorant, Dick. If Congress is the majority,
that means we have about 1500 citizens in the entire US.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2368. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:03:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C04620C.DB634C65@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25365

Dave Heil wrote:
> You can babble about delusion all you'd like. It would appear that
> you'll either have to come up some hard facts or look like an idiot.
> Do I eat pork or not.

You have already admitted that you do, Dave. You might as well have
taken the 5th to avoid self incrimination.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2369. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:06:27 UTC
From: Jim Pennino <jimp@mail.specsol.com>
Message-ID: <3sn1u9.eee.ln@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 25374

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote:
> Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> On Sun, 25 Nov 2001 23:57:45 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Actually '1Y' and that classification wasn't my idea.
>>
>> Wasn't 1Y the designation for an honorably discharged vet with
>> medical conditions that prevented conscription?

> If so, it apparently wasn't limited to vets. I was classified '1Y'
> because of migraine headaches. They told me they didn't want me
> on the front lines with an automatic weapon during a blinding
> headache.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

If you were discharged, you couldn't be drafted (called back under some
circumstances though).

1Y, to simplify, was semi-gimp; not healthy enough for first string, but
could be called if all the healthy were used up.

Jim Pennino

2370. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:16:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C04651B.53E50C59@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25366

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C0319DC.4EA73CD4@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > I know of no woman who refers to her tops as
> > > breasts or mammaries. We all call them tits. We call all you guys'
> > > thangs dicks.
> >
> > > Tits serve two purposes. They can nurse babies or men, or woman if
> > > the owner of the tits is prone to that persuasion. We have to cover
> > > our tits and you men have to cover your dicks.
> >
> > > I call my tits tits and always have. I call my, well....never mind. >
> Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> >
> > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> >
> > ...and that's just part of the reason I refer to the woman as Tugboat
> > Annie.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> > * The view expressed is my personal opinion.
>
> Then consider that most women are tacky and lack class and decorum. Forgive
> me for no desire to live up to either of the latter.

That is not the conclusion I draw at all. I don't know many women who would verbalize or write the type of thing you've written here. My comment wasn't directed at "other" women. It is written about your actions. My wife, mother, sister, next door neighbor, girl across the road don't speak like that. I consider it coarse and vulgar. I can see material like yours written on restroom walls at service stations. I don't much care for it there either.

Dave K8MN

2371. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:19:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0465CC.1897A3BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25367

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C031CD3.A2D685F4@earthlink.net...
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > >
> > > On 26 Nov 2001 12:25:30 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> > >
> > > >In addition, it's obvious that you won't voluntarily change it, so
> there's no
> > > >point in on-air mention of the issue.
> > >
> > > Then precisely what is the point of mentioning it (over and
> > > over again, for that matter) here?
> > >
> > > You, and others, expect the ARS to be treated with respect.
> > > Great. I'm a ham as well. On the other hand, I'm ALSO a computer
> > > hobbyist who spends far more time on the Internet than on the air.
> > > From my perspective, people like you, Dick, and Larry, who scream that
> > > the ham bands should be free of any form of bigotry, racism, or
> > > "offensive" behavior are the worst kind of hypocrites! It's wrong in
> > > YOUR hobby, but perfectly alright here where OTHERS are hobbyists!
> > >
> > > If you don't like Kim's sign, then say so on the air. If you
> > > feel (as Dick and others do) that Islamic people are inferior, that
> > > their religion is inferior, or that minorities are losers who depend
> > > on affirmative action to provide them jobs they don't deserve then
> > > voice your opinions on the ham bands or shut the fuck up! You have no
> > > more right to fill the Internet with that moralistic, racist, or
> > > bigoted crap than you do to fill the ham bands with it. Either take it
> > > BOTH places or drop it completely.
> > >
> > > Think about it.
> > >
> > > >Sems to me you define "responsibly minded people" as those who don't
> voice
> > > >objections.
> > > >>
> > > >>Believe me, the comments made here are made here only. :)
> > > >>
> > > >Because this is the appropriate place to do so.
> > >
> > > Bullshit!
> > >
```

> > > This venue is no more appropriate than the ham bands. Who the
> > > hell gave hams the right to come into the Internet Usenet groups and
> > > post offensive material they wouldn't think of voicing in the ham
> > > bands? There are just as many children here as there are on the
> > > air--if you're so goddamn concerned with them then try practicing what
> > > you keep preaching in THIS venue too!
> > >
> > > Rick
> >
> > This is the voice of the tranquil Buddhist libertarian New Age Man.
> > S'cuse the language, kids.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Oh, yeah. Lemmee guess, and you're a real gentleman, right? Pfffftttttttt

Kim, I know it may be difficult for you to digest but I don't talk like
that on the air or in public. Let's just say that you and I don't hang
with the same type crowd.

Dave K8MN

2372. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:21:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1ono$80i$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25368

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 26 Nov 2001 01:58:13 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > It isn't. There is virtually no homosexual behavior in the animal
> >kingdom.
> >That's a figment of human homosexual supporters.
>
> BULLSHIT!
>
> Pick up ANY book on zoology and you'll find you are wrong. Of
> course, I'm sure you won't accept the word of scientists--it
> contradicts the word of your bigoted religious leaders--but it happens
> to be fact.

Sure it does. You have no clue of my religious background or beliefs, or lack thereor. Nor my experience with animals. I guess I'm supposed to believe you and some other dippy "scientist" who likely never saw animals in their natural setting over my own observations and that of many other outdoorsmen, and over other SCIENTIFIC evidence. Not gonna happen.

> Look up the Bonobo Chimpanzees in any book available, the
> females are ALL bisexual, and the males engage in homosexual behavior
> whenever the opportunity presents itself. They're TYPICAL of the
> animal kingdom.

There's the Bullshit. I am aware of some species of primates which exhibit a preoccupation with sex. But if you call that typical it shows how LITTLE you know about the animal world.

> It isn't a "figment of human homosexual supporters" that
> animals display homosexual behavior, it's a delusion of homophobes and
> religious zealots that they don't!
>

Hear, Hear, Professor Bozo said it.

2373. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:22:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C046687.3F5C3C56@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25369

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C03AEB0.80A5178E@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > >
> > > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > >
> > > > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > > > of Duncanville, TX.
> > >
> > > Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> > > I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in the
> > > manner Tugboat did.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> And, I submit that *you* are the one with the mind who deciphered my
> message--all with nothing but mere inuendo from me. Who is it, exactly,
> with no class?

Right, Kim. You not only provided the call, you provided the innuendo.
I'll bet Mr. Olsen doesn't do that with his call. You did the same in
the selection of your vanity call.

Dave K8MN

2374. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:24:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1oum$8hj$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25370

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Nope, it's social engineering in the same way a driver's license
> > > is social engineering. We are talking about government requirements
> > > not elective procedures.
> >
> > You're wrong. Obtaining an amateur radio license is an elective procedure.
>
> Nope, you're wrong, Jim. Choosing not to obtain an amateur radio
> license is an elective procedure. Obtaining an amateur radio
> license *requires* one to meet the governmental requirements
> which are a form of social engineering. Think about it. Every
> licensed ham had only two choices - meet the requirements or
> cheat. Since you are not the cheating kind, you had no choice
> except to meet the requirements based on the desired social
> engineering. There was no other choice for licensed hams
> like you except to meet the requirements.

Give it up,Jim. These guys are out of touch with reality.

2375. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:26:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C04677A.325D84F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25371

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C040B98.7DF22E7D@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > > > >
> > > > > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > > > > of Duncanville, TX.
> > > > >
> > > > Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> > > > I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in the
> > > > manner Tugboat did.
> > > >
> > > So it's OK for a man to have W5PSY but if a woman were issued that
> > > call by the FCC, she would be a slut? Talk about sexist.
> > >
> > Mr. Olsen didn't show up here and talk about his call in comparison to a
> > part of a woman's anatomy. Tugboat Annie did.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
> As, uh, most of us have in this thread?

Right--mostly about the inappropriate choice made by you.
We all get the salty humor, *nudge* *wink*.

Dave K8MN

2376. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:27:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0467A5.6CE4C30@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25373

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ok, let's use your figures. If one tenth of one percent of the world/s
> 1.25 BILLION muslims are Islamic fundamentalist terrorists, that's
> 1,250,000 terrorists, if my calculator functioned correctly. Still think
> it's no problem?

Ignoring the fact that your estimate is ridiculously high, the terrorists are indeed a formidable force to be reckoned with and neutralized. What I am worried about is what you want to do with the other 99.99% of Muslims. Exactly what do you want to do with them, Dick? What would you do with the 300,000 American Muslims?

> I DID say that based on the fundamental teachings of Islam, every
> Muslim *is* a potential terrorist in that it is almost certaian that he
> will be forced to make a choice-follow his religious teachings and
> leaders, or reject them.

Well, let me quote what your God says to do with people who believe in other gods. "Thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein, and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword." Dick, your God isn't any more tolerant of other religions than is the Islamic God. In fact, they are the same God and a large percentage of Islamic beliefs are from your Bible. "If there be found among you, within any of thy gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee, man or woman, that hath wrought wickedness in the sight of the Lord thy God, in transgressing his covenant, and hath gone and served other gods, and worshipped them, ... Then shalt thou bring forth that man or that woman, which have committed that wicked thing, unto thy gates, even that man or that woman, and shalt stone them with stones, till they die." What's that about the Christians and Jews tolerating other religions? "But thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as the Lord thy God has commanded thee. That they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods; so should ye sin against the Lord your God." So there you are, Dick. Over and over, *your* God commands his followers to kill any and all people of other religions. How is your God different from the Islamic God? Here's what your God commands you to do to whores: "Then they shall bring the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her with stones that she die; because she hath wrought folly in Israel, to play the whore in her father's house:" And my favorite: Joshua and the Israelites invaded another country and sacked Jericho. "And they utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and

sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword." So Dick, the Koran looks somewhat mild compared to your very own Christian Bible.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2377. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:28:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0467F9.1BE64925@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25372

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9u1hi7$i5b$0@208.207.71.131...
> >
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > > news:20011125232032.25429.00003458@nso-fc.aol.com...
> > > > What I do recall about the film is that the best set of breasts I saw
> > > > was on the girl I was with!
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > Yet, you don't think it's right for a word meaning "breasts" to be
> viewed by
> > > the rest of the world via an amateur callsign. What a hypocrite!
> >
> >
> > "Tits" is and has long been considered a vulgar expression. Breasts is
> > not.
> > What an idiot!
>
> Oh really? "Tits" is vulgar, eh? Then, you'd better put some kind of
> protective suit on, because most women refer to their "breasts" as tits.
> And, most women refer to a bra as a tit-sling. But, hopefully, you've never
> been in the restrooms or locker rooms I've been in. Come to think of it, if
> you believe that "tits" is vulgar, you'd probably faint dead away in a
> women's restroom or locker room.

Just who is it you are hanging out with, Kim--a roller derby team?

Dave K8MN

2378. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:34:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C046954.4602B721@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25375

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You can babble about delusion all you'd like. It would appear that
> > you'll either have to come up some hard facts or look like an idiot.
> > Do I eat pork or not.
>
> You have already admitted that you do, Dave. You might as well have
> taken the 5th to avoid self incrimination.

I've provided you no information whatever regarding the matter. It
appears that *you* took the fifth--and drank it.

Dave K8MN

2379. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:36:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9240ACC63684DC30.212099251DB9C814.516A48B23E3A7069@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25376

On 27 Nov 2001 12:25:04 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>That's ONE definition. In other countries it is done differently. I did not say
>it was acceptable, moral or a good thing.

No, Jim, it is the ONLY definition--see any medical
dictionary.

You're right--in some countries it IS done differently. For
example, in the United States it's done in a hospital (there is only
ONE in the US--in Atlanta as I recall--that will permit the
surgery--most people here who have their daughters "circumcised" [over
40,000 in the 1990s according to UNICEF] send them overseas to
hospitals that specialize in that kind of operation). While the vagina
isn't sewn shut in all cases (it isn't in hospital clitoridectomies,
for example), the complete removal of the clitoris IS performed
(removal of the clitoral hood for medical or cosmetic reasons is
called "hooding" not "circumcision").

>The question still remains: is it OK to do it to boys but not girls?

Boys suffer no physical incapacitation as a result, and in
some cases (malformed foreskin, hypospadia surgery requiring tissue,
etc.) it's medically necessary or advisable. In the Jewish faith, of
course, it is a requirement based on the biblical injunction.

Is it ok? Perhaps not, but comparing it to the female version
is like comparing drinking a beer to heroin addiction, they have
nothing in common.

>> That's all it took in Germany when the Nazis took power, too.
>

>Did Germany have the same Constitution as the USA?

They had an excellent one (written after WWI) that had all the
guarantees of freedom and representation provided by the US
Constitution as well as a number of outstanding social provisions. At
the time, it was widely regarded (including by the USA) as an
outstanding Constitution, among the finest legal documents ever
created.

> Did the Nazi party take
>power by a majority vote in a free election?

Yup!

In the election of July 31, 1933, the Nazi party won
13,745,000 votes which gave them 230 seats in Parliament, and made
them the largest single party in government. Hitler was already the
legally selected Chancellor of the Republic. Through a coalition
formed with the Communist Party (a coalition Hitler hated but
accepted) the Nazis gained the majority of votes in the Parliament
legally.

As attractive as it would be to believe that the Nazis "took
over" Germany by force, the fact remains that it simply isn't true.

>Did the Reichstag vote on every
>change in the laws, and approve every one by a 2/3 majority?

Wasn't necessary to do so--examine the German Constitution of
the time. A simple majority was all that was necessary except in the
case of a Constitutional change, the same as is true in the US, of
course.

Many laws were subject to change by administrative
departments, in the same way laws such as tax regulations (but not
rates or forms), radio operations, or securities exchange regulations
are changed here in the US.

>I don't think so.

Then you incorrectly informed.

As an introductory book on the topic, try "The Rise and Fall
of the Third Reich" by William L. Shirer. If you're interested in the
allied response to Nazism, try the six volume "The Second World War"
by Winston S. Churchill.

>> It didn't wipe out ANYONE'S rights
>
>Sure it did. It ruled that the right of privacy was more important.

Yup!

Who is the PERSON whose rights were "wiped out?"

Bear in mind that in order to claim the fetus has rights you
much (1) prove it is a person by definition and (2) prove that it is a
person who is protected by laws determining rights in the first place.
In the USA, the laws protecting rights are contained in the
Constitution, which does NOT define a fetus as a citizen, and
explicitly limits the protections it affords TO citizens.

>> According to current law, which HAS been examined from
>>Constitutional aspects, non-citizens are NOT protected by the rights
>>guaranteed in the US Constitution.
>
>Ahhh. Now I get ya. But the Supremes could change that if a test case is
>brought before them. The Supremes have reversed their position before, too.

They can't change the fact that the Constitution SPECIFIES
that a person is not a citizen of the United States except under very
specific circumstances (given in my previous message) OR that those
who are not citizens are not protected by the provisions of the
Constitution--those are PART of the Constitution and not subject to SC
change. The responsibility of the SC is to rule on the
Constitutionality of laws and legal decisions. So long as those laws
are Constitutional (and, by definition, the Constitution IS
Constitutional), they are not empowered to rule against them.

>Does it say "is born and draws his/her first breath in the United States" or
>just "is born in the United States"?

The Fourteenth Amendment (the "citizenship amendment") states:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and
subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States
and of the State wherein they reside."

Because birth (which is legally defined as having exited the
birth canal and drawn an independent breath--important in some legal
cases, and affirmed by the SC) is a specific criteria of citizenship,
it follows that a fetus _cannot_ be a citizen, and thus is not
protected by the Constitution.

>
>You missed the whole point, though. Cecil was describing the Constitution as if
>it were an unchangable thing, with only one interpretation. That's simply not
>true.

Here, we agree--although the SC is not in a position to change
it--only the Congress and the population share that right.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2380. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:37:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0469F5.FF37E337@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25377

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil, it's you that is unconscious. All the animals I have ever been
> around or read about had no interest in sex whatever until the female
> was in estrus.

You are just not very aware, Dick. A couple of days ago, my fixed
female dog mounted my niece's fixed female dog and started humping.
No estrus in sight. I used to have a tomcat who wasn't a bit
choosy about which sex he humped. He raped many a smaller tomcat.
I had a male duck that raped my mother's chickens. Homosexuality
is rampant in animals and the thing that separates animals from
plants is that animals are *aware*.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2381. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:39:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C046A84.E3567032@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25378

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> People who are married, or in committed relationships with a person
> they love, respect, and trust, do not challenge that trust by having
> private meetings, professional or otherwise, with people of the opposite
> sex *unless* their spouse or partner is present.

Egads Larry, would you actually demand to sit in on your wife's
job review behind closed doors with her male boss? You are one
sick puppy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2382. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:42:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C046B47.98F316AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25379

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So far I haven't been apprised of any atrocity connected with the Irish
> Troubles of anywhere the magnitude of Sept 11. Have you?

Exactly how many people have to be murdered for it to matter to
you, Dick? A dead Irish victim is just as dead as a dead
American victim. The Oklahoma City bombing victims are just
as dead as the WTC victims. Tim McVee was a Christian. Why
aren't you badmouthing all Christians?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2383. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:47:48 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <92671D3A71B98C53.1A76B846AD7C80CE.06FD735BDBD03028@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25380

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 15:54:52 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>So Maximo can carry Antonio's ID card and vice versa. It sounds as if
>their system needed work. I don't intend to apply for a job at all but
>the necessity for the Social Security number in obtaining a job is
>pretty evident. Uncle wants his payroll and Social Security taxes. You
>don't have a problem with that do you?

Taxes? No, not most of them. I have an issue with some of the
regressive ones and those that tax income more than once (as do
property and inheritance taxes), but not with reasonable taxation.

On the other hand, I _do_ have a problem with having to
provide my social security number for any OTHER purpose than taxation.
For example, there is absolutely no justification for the FCC to have
my SS# simply because I am an amateur--they have my unique call sign,
that's sufficient. In the same light, my SS# should not be required
for a passport (it is) or other non-tax uses.

Today a child can't even be ENROLLED in a school unless he or
she provides a social security number. Unless you believe that a
kindergarten child is going to earn income by attending public school,
there is no legitimate grounds for demanding that he or she have such
a number in the first place, let alone requiring that it be furnished
to a school.

>> They do pretty well when it comes to relief efforts, Dave. Or
>> to pointing out the failings in various nations--ours included.
>
>I was not addressing relief efforts, nor were you. We don't need 'em to
>point out our failings. We have you and the Swedes for that.

Someone needs to do so with all the jingoism in our society
(and in this news group of course).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2384. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:48:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C046CB0.9A8800BD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25381

Dave Heil wrote:
> I've provided you no information whatever regarding the matter.

On the contrary, you have provided me all the information I need.
If you are too ignorant to realize it, I feel sorry for you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2385. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:52:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C046D97.4A88E58A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25382

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Give it up,Jim. These guys are out of touch with reality.

Were you required to pass the exams, Dick, or did you cheat?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2386. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:54:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1qm6cuk0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25383

Rick Adams wrote:
>

Dick has made it very clear that he
> intends to keep this thread alive (with a subject line that is
> DIRECTLY related to Kim) until she changes her call sign. THAT, Jim,
> is an attempt to force her to act against her will, and it is wrong
> from ANY moral perspective.

OK, so you now have earned the title of Professor Bullshit Squared.

>
> If this discussion was, as you claim, directed to the generic
> topic of whether certain call signs are good or bad for the image of
> the ARS, Kim's sign would be mentioned no more than any other that was
> found in the callbook and was considered inappropriate by anyone. That
> is patently not the case.

You are patently full of it up to your eyebrows.

2387. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:56:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1qp6cuk1@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25384

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 27 Nov 2001 09:47:42 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>
> >The discussion here is about whether certain callsigns are appropriate
> >to the ARS. It's not just about Kim's callsign, but about the larger
> >topic of such callsigns in general. The W6 version of Kim's call has
> >been assigned to a person with the first name Michael since at least
> >1979, btw.
>
> One could not request a specific 1X3 call until the Vanity program
> started in the mid-90s, except through the Dick Zeigler Under-The-Table
> route (Dick went to the Federal pen for that in 1978 or so).
>
> I would not ever claim that Michael was a crook so the call appears
> to have been a "routine" issuance, albeit unusual.

Phil you seem to have forgotten the period 1975-77 where Extras could indeed request a specific callsign. Zeigler was evidently selling them out the back door to the ineligible, and that was what got him in trouble, and got that program cancelled.

2388. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 04:57:55 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7B4239A4A04D973D.DC2153731CC206E3.9A05C7270098E8EE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25385

On 27 Nov 2001 12:25:02 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Dorothy has a last name, mentioned in the film. What is it?

Gale. In a later version of the book, Baum created the name to
add a pun to the story. When Dorothy tells the Scarecrow that her name
is "Dorothy Gale, of the Kansas Gales." he replies that it explains
her "breezy manner."

My turn:

The Tin Woodsman has a first and last name. What are they?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2389. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:08:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1rfvete0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25386

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > So far I haven't been apprised of any atrocity connected with the Irish
> > Troubles of anywhere the magnitude of Sept 11. Have you? But then,
> > you're the igno that equates a 6000 year old passage in the Old
> > Testament with modern religous practice.
> >
>
> Ah... Carroll... from 1984 to 2000 around 10,000 people have died at the hands
> of the PKK... about 5500 Guards and 4500 citizens.
>
> Do you consider that trivial? Or should we just ignore it?
>

Ah...Plourde, do you see anywhere that I said it was trivial? I said
there was no atrocity there that would match Sept 11.(An atrocity is
defined as an occurance or multiples occuring simulatenously. We have no
way to know just how luck we really were that many of the planned
hijackings did not reach the intended target).
What part of that is so complex that your fragile mind missed it?

2390. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:09:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1ri7ete1@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25387

Krell wrote:
>
> "Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message
> news:9tsilc$n0u$1@news.hawaii.edu...
> > Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
> > >A tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism seem to be
> > >prevalent among may ham radio operators.
> >
> > Out of our 600,000+ members, what percentage display those
> > characteristics, Rick? If say, you've counted 60,000, that
> > would be just 10%. Is ten percent "a tremendous amount"?
> > (Do you even know 60,000 hams???)
>
> That's as may be, but there is an old experiment my English teacher once
> showed us. He had a plain, white piece of paper, (standard 8 1/2 x 11
> inches) and marked it with a black dot, about the size of a dime. He asked
> the class what they noticed about the paper. Everyone said they noticed the
> black dot. He then pointed that we didn't notice the white area, or that the
> other side was still blank, or even the shape or size. The first thing they
> saw was a black dot that stood out from the rest of the paper.
>
> Even if 5% or 1% of hams are racist or bigots, they are like that black dot
> that stands out. People will notice this before anything else. People will
> base their judgements on this.

Better tell it to Rick and Kim who say that ham radio is loaded with
racism and bigotry when neither would recognize them if one jumped up
and bit them in the butt.

2391. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:11:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1rmsete2@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25388

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
>
> > On 26 Nov 2001 05:48:02 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> > > Not at all. You clearly could have taken your Advanced and your CSCE
> > >for the Extra written to the April 15 VE session and your Extra license
> > >was issued by the FCC on May 9. Simple enough.
> >
> > Wake up, genius. It was _averaging_ over 40 days from test to
> > issuance when the restructuring first came in--and my upgrade was
> > dated 24 days after that date.
> >
>
> FWIW, I cashed in my CSCE's and old tech plus on Restructuring
> Day (4/15/00) and I had my new license issued within a week.
> So I could claim to be an old extra. But I won't.

He could to, and is.

2392. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:14:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1rrkete3@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25389

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9u1hi7$i5b$0@208.207.71.131...
> >
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > > news:20011125232032.25429.00003458@nso-fc.aol.com...
> > > > What I do recall about the film is that the best set of breasts I saw
> > > > was on the girl I was with!
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > Yet, you don't think it's right for a word meaning "breasts" to be
> viewed by
> > > the rest of the world via an amateur callsign. What a hypocrite!
> >
> >
> > "Tits" is and has long been considered a vulgar expression. Breasts is
> > not.
> > What an idiot!
>
> Oh really? "Tits" is vulgar, eh? Then, you'd better put some kind of
> protective suit on, because most women refer to their "breasts" as tits.
> And, most women refer to a bra as a tit-sling. But, hopefully, you've never
> been in the restrooms or locker rooms I've been in. Come to think of it, if
> you believe that "tits" is vulgar, you'd probably faint dead away in a
> women's restroom or locker room.

Most people know that what is commonly accepted in locker rooms isn't
acceptable in public mixed company especially with children present.
Sorry you don't
```

2393. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:17:10 UTC
From: Jim Pennino <jimp@mail.specsol.com>
Message-ID: <m0s1u9.ngp.ln@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 25396

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> CAM wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > > > You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
>> > > > usenet.
>> > >
>> > > Doubt it. Internet savvy people know about usenet and usually
>> > > don't possess a transceiver. Hope that's not too much for you
>> > > to comprehend.
>> >
>> > My dad, my sister and my two neighbors all own computers and have
>> > internet access. None are internet savvy and none access newsgroups.
>> > You don't have any solid information, do you?
>>
>> Are your dad, sister, and two neighbors potential hams? I'm talking
>> primarily about people who have shown an interest in ham radio. I
>> have personally directed hundreds of those potential hams to these
>> newsgroups during Amateur Radio awareness days.

> Just about everybody is a potential ham, Cecil.

> As to your claim about directing hundreds here, it is simply more crap.

> Dave K8MN

ROTFLMO!

You have NO idea what the average person thinks of hams; clue, it isn't
flattering.

Jim Pennino
```

2394. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:21:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3CD2CF29665D635E.B8C55D82339AD2FE.F9070AE460C4EC5A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25390

On 28 Nov 2001 01:59:29 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Yup. I believe that instead of Kim being so preoccupied with what
>she has hanging off of her chest, she should be more worried about
>what she is missing between her ears!

Larry, has it occurred to you that it isn't Kim who is
demonstrating here that she is preoccupied by her tits--it's you,
Dave, and Dickie?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2395. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:23:40 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c04748c.3401829@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 25392

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 02:08:39 +0000 (UTC), "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net>
wrote:

>"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
>news:18WM7.104$9d.19434@newshog.newsread.com...
>
>> Alrighty..... another one of those "what if" questions:
>>
>> Is it legal to rent or lease ham gear? I was wondering about this one, say
>> for instance, here in Michigan we have places called Rental King,
>> Rent-a-Center etc. Not that we would want to have ham gear rented at a
>> location like that, but if there were places that you could rent or lease
>> equipment, in the short term, that may seem like a more feasable option for
>> some who clearly cannot afford one of those way-overpriced, multi-band,
>> do-everything rigs. (Between those and the "kit" radios, there is not much
>> inbetween)
>>
>> Also, would it be legal to rent someone elses station? Since the FCC license
>> does not state what gear you are operating, only that YOU are licensed, is
>> this a loophole?
>
>Hi Ryan,
>
>Everything you're suggesting is perfectly legal and above board.
>
>A non-ham could build a first rate contesting station in a desireable
>location (Virgin Islands for example) and rent it out to licensed hams
>for their favorite contest weekend. There used to be a 'bed&breakfast'
>operation in Hawaii which offered a fully equipped ham station as one
>of their features.

Yep, and I seem to recall a similar type rental for somewhere
in Australia being advertised in the ham mags.

>The prohibition in 97.113(a)(2) is against actual on the air operation
>for compensation. It does not prohibit you from being compensated for
>the use of your station by another licensed person.

Right on!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2396. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:24:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D3F9537EBCE99B8D.6268B446BD32D0B2.AFC771CA12B639D5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25391

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:34:27 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>There are those of us who believe you do harm to kids with that kind of
>stuff.

Then don't use it around them.

>This is the kind of "real world" language that real adults don't
>even need to use.

Opinion. Some people express certain thoughts more accurately
using such terms, others don't.

>You're one consenting adult. I didn't see that the
>party to whom you made your statement consented.

To what?

My use of the English language?

Don't like my messages? You know where your delete key is;
don't read them.

>You'd like it all your way. You can skip the part about New Age if my
>comparison offends. You can just be the tranquil Buddhist Libertarian
>telling another to "shut (expletive deleted) up).

Nope.

Never claimed to be tranquil either. OR a "large "L"
Libertarian--just a libertarian.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2397. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:25:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9FE0B8E48C07112C.C8E28D6282CFB388.15D29F2023ED5F15@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25393

On 28 Nov 2001 03:03:22 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> He's a real Sweetums, isn't he Dave?

Thanks for the strokes Dickie--but I'll pass. Not only aren't
you my type--I question whether you are even my species.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2398. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:27:19 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9u1siq01n88@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25403

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1hi7$i5b$0@208.207.71.131...
> > Yet, you don't think it's right for a word meaning "breasts" to be
viewed by
> > the rest of the world via an amateur callsign. What a hypocrite!
>
>
> "Tits" is and has long been considered a vulgar expression. Breasts is
> not.
> What an idiot!

It's only vulgar if you allow it to be so.

2399. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:27:32 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BAAB20D22126D171.25F9CB9AA1BF361A.1429EA91C5830B8E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25394

On 28 Nov 2001 02:21:10 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> You once again come out with an oxymoron, you moron. The majority makes
>the rules/laws. Remember "Majority rule, minority rights"? From Polysci
>101

I don't--and I _teach_ PLS101 classes!

Majority rule CAN mean Tyranny of the Majority, Dickie. Simply
because the "majority" want something does NOT make it either "right"
or appropriate.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2400. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:30:39 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <04FD8F1910D1D109.9185787D8F5A6A24.7B856716ED042234@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25395

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:38:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Let's set the record straight. Most of us can see the difference
>between the Civil Rights movement and the libertarian line. That's why
>the U.S. has a Civil Rights Act and why the U.S. hasn't had a
>Libertarian President.

Dave, you can't even see the difference between a Libertarian
(a member of the Libertarian political party) and a libertarian (one
who adheres to a policy of liberty). Confusing them--as you insist on
doing--is like confusing a Democrat (member of the Democratic party)
and a democrat (person who believes in democracy).

>> Simply because the majority believe something does NOT make it
>> true.
>
>In this case, it certainly does. The majority rejects the libertarian
>philosophy as impractical and votes for one or the other of the two
>major parties.

How nice.

The libertarian philosophy is integral to the US Constitution
and the Declaration of Independence. I guess both of THOSE are
impractical as well from your perspective, right?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2401. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:33:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <212A4F7AA7D2E1CD.2A47E290026B5A50.7AA27EA567A59B14@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25397

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:44:45 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>For a guy who has the credentials you purport to have, you don't strike
>me as a guy who lets things like facts stand in the way of a good rant.
>You quote a "newsgroup average" from an unnamed source. Maybe some
>newsgroups get 7,000 readers. Maybe some--maybe even this one--have 15.
>Maybe they are the *same* 15. No stats exist, to my knowledge, which
>provide numbers of new amateur exam takers correlated to the number of
>potential hams whether they are internet news group lurkers or those
>listening on the ham bands. If what you've posted sounds like good
>evidence to you, perhaps you can provide your insider info on when we
>might expect the mother ship to return.

Dave, for days I have posted explicit citations to MANY of the
points I make in my messages. As yet, you haven't seen fit to support
a single one of your own claims with a legitimate citation. When you
start, I'll worry about providing you sources for all my statements of
fact instead of just the ones I quote directly. Until then, if you
want the sources find them yourself.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2402. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:35:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <99556F09A71F8C6E.9BCB5191CCCB6A82.E2D7C9086AE95CD3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25398

On 28 Nov 2001 02:26:19 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> I know, but for some reason that big number sounds difficult to some
>people. Sorta like 20wpm Morse code.

You mean 10 minutes of computer time (with no human
intervention) is all that's needed to pass a 20WPM code test? I sure
wasted a LOT of time studying for that test (and flunking it twice
before passing it) for nothing.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2403. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:36:49 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B87095F3A387BF83.1AC749AA727459B0.27E69112CB019B90@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25399

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 21:53:00 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Right. Your claim is now that this newsgroup (or any of the others)
>has existed for 13 years. More crap. Sure wish I could take you
>seriously. You play fast and loose with the truth. Convince us of your
>liklihood of being a potential truth teller.

Care to provide the date on which this newsgroup WAS created?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2404. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:45:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4A006B6D0570F66C.D38FEF6E11609882.41867AF1283E6246@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25400

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:49:31 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Surprisingly, one one of 'em uses AOL. Two use MSN and one uses
>Earthlink. None does more than surf the web or e-mail except for my dad
>who has somehow figured out how to use IRC to chat. All are in the dark
>about newsgroups. The neighbors are a family of two adults and two
>children. I wonder what percentage of users are like these folks...

Around 30-35% according to online estimates of the number of
people who use local isps versus major providers.

I'm extremely confused by one thing. You say none of them know
about the Usenet--yet Earthlink recommends Usenet Groups of interest
to members in ALL it's email bulletins--at least once per month at a
minimum. Earthlink has its own news server for members as well. On
aol, of course, newsgroups are readily available from the aol main
menu. MSN, otoh, does NOT promote Usenet, since it has it's own
"communities" (essentially email lists) and no longer provides a news
server for its customers.

For the most part, if those individuals aren't aware of the
Usenet it's because they haven't taken the time to learn about the
services they are paying for each month--or to read any of the
bulletins those services send out. If that's the case, I doubt
seriously that a large percentage of users are like these folks.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2405. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:48:33 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0310C35CBE06A4BD.502B05FD3FFF0D15.42685176084825CB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25401

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 21:54:35 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Mr. Olsen didn't show up here and talk about his call in comparison to a
>part of a woman's anatomy. Tugboat Annie did.

No she didn't--Kim did. As a response to a thread started by
Dick, not herself.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2406. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:51:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C047B6E.EE440F53@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25402

CAM wrote:
>
> Contrary to Dick's ignorant
> postings, here's what Muslims
> believe about Jesus.

Thanks, Cecil. And, with that, I'll let this issue stand - if a person isn't going to believe what you posted, that person isn't going to believe a thing.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2407. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 05:53:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C3119E03D18365CE.A164EEE292EDEB30.A1B588A3882CEE4E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25404

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 04:16:26 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>That is not the conclusion I draw at all. I don't know many women who
>would verbalize or write the type of thing you've written here. My
>comment wasn't directed at "other" women. It is written about your
>actions. My wife, mother, sister, next door neighbor, girl across the
>road don't speak like that.

At least in front of you. Otoh, if they know your views, they
probably avoid a LOT of common terms in your presence. That's still
easier than talking to Dick--at least in your case they probably don't
have to avoid words with more than two syllables.

>I consider it coarse and vulgar.

That is your privilege. Not everyone would agree with you.

>I can see
>material like yours written on restroom walls at service stations. I
>don't much care for it there either.

So next time you stop at a restroom, leave your pen in the
car.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2408. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:00:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C047D72.228432D6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25405

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 15:54:52 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >So Maximo can carry Antonio's ID card and vice versa. It sounds as if
> >their system needed work. I don't intend to apply for a job at all but
> >the necessity for the Social Security number in obtaining a job is
> >pretty evident. Uncle wants his payroll and Social Security taxes. You
> >don't have a problem with that do you?
>
> Taxes? No, not most of them. I have an issue with some of the
> regressive ones and those that tax income more than once (as do
> property and inheritance taxes), but not with reasonable taxation.

Too bad we can't all pick and choose which taxes we don't mind paying
and simply ignore the rest. I assume that you don't feel that you are
being unfairly singled out. As the judge who administered my wife's
citizenship oath told her, "Congratulations on becoming a citizen with
all the rights and responsibilities--including the one to pay taxes."

> On the other hand, I _do_ have a problem with having to
> provide my social security number for any OTHER purpose than taxation.
> For example, there is absolutely no justification for the FCC to have
> my SS# simply because I am an amateur--they have my unique call sign,
> that's sufficient. In the same light, my SS# should not be required
> for a passport (it is) or other non-tax uses.

It is there in both cases for tax reasons. If you owe taxes, you'll not
receive a license or a passport.

> Today a child can't even be ENROLLED in a school unless he or
> she provides a social security number. Unless you believe that a
> kindergarten child is going to earn income by attending public school,
> there is no legitimate grounds for demanding that he or she have such
> a number in the first place, let alone requiring that it be furnished
> to a school.

Start a movement.

> >> They do pretty well when it comes to relief efforts, Dave. Or
> >> to pointing out the failings in various nations--ours included.
> >
> >I was not addressing relief efforts, nor were you. We don't need 'em to
> >point out our failings. We have you and the Swedes for that.
>

> Someone needs to do so with all the jingoism in our society
> (and in this news group of course).

Naw, Rick. It isn't jingoism. The UN isn't a country. The Swedes already think of themselves as the world's conscience. We, as you know, are the world's policeman. My Swedish friends and I often joke about it. Why should you have a problem with it? Now that we have established that, what is your axe to grind with the U.S.?

Dave K8MN

2409. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:03:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C047E08.E314026C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25406

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I've provided you no information whatever regarding the matter.
>
> On the contrary, you have provided me all the information I need.
> If you are too ignorant to realize it, I feel sorry for you.

You apparently can't take "I'm not telling you" as an answer. Maybe Rick should re-examine his diagnosis of your obsessive compulsive behavior.

I'm still not telling you, Cecil. On with your quest!

Dave K8MN

2410. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:08:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C047F3E.85E2C21@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25407

```
Jim Pennino wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > CAM wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil wrote:
> >> >
> >> > CAM wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> > > > You'd be surprised how many people including hams never heard of
> >> > > > usenet.
> >> > >
> >> > > Doubt it. Internet savvy people know about usenet and usually
> >> > > don't possess a transceiver. Hope that's not too much for you
> >> > > to comprehend.
> >> >
> >> > My dad, my sister and my two neighbors all own computers and have
> >> > internet access. None are internet savvy and none access newsgroups.
> >> > You don't have any solid information, do you?
> >>
> >> Are your dad, sister, and two neighbors potential hams? I'm talking
> >> primarily about people who have shown an interest in ham radio. I
> >> have personally directed hundreds of those potential hams to these
> >> newsgroups during Amateur Radio awareness days.
>
> > Just about everybody is a potential ham, Cecil.
>
> > As to your claim about directing hundreds here, it is simply more crap.
>
> > Dave K8MN
>
> ROTFLMO!
>
> You have NO idea what the average person thinks of hams; clue, it isn't
> flattering.
>
> Jim Pennino
```

Well why hold back, Jim? Enlighten us. Fill us in. If you make that claim, apparently you do have some idea of what the average person thinks of hams. You might also let us know what means you used to conduct your poll.

Dave K8MN

2411. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:09:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1v29obb0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25408

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > It is clear enough that the roots of violence come from the Koran
> > itself, for those believers who would interpret it that way, and for all
> > the masses they influence. If your mileage varies, that's your deficit.
> > For me, Sept 11 was proof enough.
>
> Let's assume what you say is correct and that the actions of a handful
> of terrorists proves that all one billion Muslims are terrorists. What
> actions do you propose to take to alleviate the problem? Please be
> specific.

As usual, your entire premise is wrong. Nothing I said or intimated can reasonably be interpreted to say that all 1.25 billion Muslims are terrorists, but it is clear that far more than enough to take us out are indeed of that persuasion. What to do with THEM? I think Dubya etc are handling that adequately at this point. Where it goes from Afghanistan will be the catch.

2412. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:12:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C048044.FA4DFCEF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25409

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:34:27 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >There are those of us who believe you do harm to kids with that kind of
> >stuff.
>
> Then don't use it around them.

I don't. You did. The kids didn't have an opportunity to consent.

> >This is the kind of "real world" language that real adults don't
> >even need to use.
>
> Opinion. Some people express certain thoughts more accurately
> using such terms, others don't.

You don't.

> >You're one consenting adult. I didn't see that the
> >party to whom you made your statement consented.
>
> To what?
>
> My use of the English language?

Is that the conclusion that you drew from my statement?

> Don't like my messages? You know where your delete key is;
> don't read them.
>
> >You'd like it all your way. You can skip the part about New Age if my
> >comparison offends. You can just be the tranquil Buddhist Libertarian
> >telling another to "shut (expletive deleted) up).
>
> Nope.
>
> Never claimed to be tranquil either. OR a "large "L"
> Libertarian--just a libertarian.

And the libertarian's idea of freedom is to tell someone to shut the
bleep up? Keep working on the Buddhist thing.

Dave K8MN

2413. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:16:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C048139.B7ED2E48@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25410

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:38:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Let's set the record straight. Most of us can see the difference
> >between the Civil Rights movement and the libertarian line. That's why
> >the U.S. has a Civil Rights Act and why the U.S. hasn't had a
> >Libertarian President.
>
> Dave, you can't even see the difference between a Libertarian
> (a member of the Libertarian political party) and a libertarian (one
> who adheres to a policy of liberty). Confusing them--as you insist on
> doing--is like confusing a Democrat (member of the Democratic party)
> and a democrat (person who believes in democracy).

Right. You little "L" types demonstrate your freedom by attempting to
stifle the views of another. Keep telling folks to shut up. It does
wonders for your image.

> >> Simply because the majority believe something does NOT make it
> >> true.
> >
> >In this case, it certainly does. The majority rejects the libertarian
> >philosophy as impractical and votes for one or the other of the two
> >major parties.
>
> How nice.
>
> The libertarian philosophy is integral to the US Constitution
> and the Declaration of Independence. I guess both of THOSE are
> impractical as well from your perspective, right?

Are you now stating what you'd like me to say? My sentence works just
fine on its own without the translation.

Dave K8MN

2414. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:17:22 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C048172.2EB65043@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25411

Rick Adams wrote:

>
> If 15 people post, and the Usenet average is for 1 out of
> every 100 participants in a newsgroup to ever post to it (which is the
> current average), then it follows that approximately 1,500 potential
> hams are in this news group. That's a lot more hams than take the test
> in a typical month in the US as a whole.
>

Could you cite a referece for "1 out of 100 post" statement?
Seems a little hard to believe, seeing that it is very easy
to post a followup or start a new thread.

2415. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:21:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1vpk$q45$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25412

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 02:59:59 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > By the way, everybody, did you notice this thread has just about
> >reached the all time record for the number of messages posted to a
> >single thread (check out google.com for the totals). Perhaps it is
> >time to bring this thread "one step closer to extinction" and move
> >some of the unrelated topics into their own threads. :-)
>
> I tried that with the "bigotry" thread but it hasn't helped.
>
> Bear in mind that Dick has stated he will NOT allow this
> thread to end until Kim changes her call sign. Regardless of content,
> he'll keep it going just to try to force her to capitulate to his
> demands.
>

Prefessor Nutball, you had really better work on your interpretive
reading skills, you couldn't pass Freshman Ccomposition 100 at this
point. *Nowhere* did I ever remotely indicate any such thing.

2416. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:22:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C048299.631C0B04@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25414

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:44:45 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >For a guy who has the credentials you purport to have, you don't strike
> >me as a guy who lets things like facts stand in the way of a good rant.
> >You quote a "newsgroup average" from an unnamed source. Maybe some
> >newsgroups get 7,000 readers. Maybe some--maybe even this one--have 15.
> >Maybe they are the *same* 15. No stats exist, to my knowledge, which
> >provide numbers of new amateur exam takers correlated to the number of
> >potential hams whether they are internet news group lurkers or those
> >listening on the ham bands. If what you've posted sounds like good
> >evidence to you, perhaps you can provide your insider info on when we
> >might expect the mother ship to return.
>
> Dave, for days I have posted explicit citations to MANY of the
> points I make in my messages. As yet, you haven't seen fit to support
> a single one of your own claims with a legitimate citation. When you
> start, I'll worry about providing you sources for all my statements of
> fact instead of just the ones I quote directly. Until then, if you
> want the sources find them yourself.

...and I just pointed out several opportunities for glaring errors in your theory. As I recall, I recently poked holes in some of the information you provided. Some was from suspect sources with an agenda (NORML). One was from a book which provided figures but not figures stating what you claimed. Your latest stuff doesn't even sound like evidence at all. Besides, most of this latest stuff is simply diversion from the debate over whether Kim's choice of call was a poor one. At least that had something to do with amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

2417. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:22:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u1vrr$q45$1@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25413

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C03BD97.4F382FBE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> Did the Nazi party take power by a majority vote in a free election?
> > >
> > >They did come to power through a *plurality* vote in a free election.
> >
> > Yup. Then they proceeded to dismantle the democratic system.

Yes, very quickly, since they had achieved the control they wanted. It
was a sham on the desperate German populace from the start.

2418. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:24:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C04831A.403E7139@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25415

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 21:53:00 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Right. Your claim is now that this newsgroup (or any of the others)
> >has existed for 13 years. More crap. Sure wish I could take you
> >seriously. You play fast and loose with the truth. Convince us of your
> >liklihood of being a potential truth teller.
>
> Care to provide the date on which this newsgroup WAS created?
>
> Rick

Be my guest, Rick. It wasn't 1979. I'll guess early '90s. I know I've
been here since the mid-'90s. Is there a prize for the correct answer?

Dave K8MN

2419. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:29:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E8738A6E16A9E8CC.3E4ECC2DB0E2037A.CAB03A084E38A25E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25416

On 27 Nov 2001 21:09:44 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Actually, Rick I have the entire document (actually an online
>translation, the Islamic fundamentalists insist that only the original
>is accurate and that no translation can ever be). I downloaded it from
>this website
>
>
>online Koran at
>
>
>http://www.hti.umich.edu/k/koran/browse.html

Interesting.

Here's the "Chapter 5 verse 33" you keep citing (it isn't a
chapter, but that's ok):

"[5.33] The punishment of those who wage war against Allah and
His apostle and strive to make mischief in the land is only this, that
they should be murdered or crucified or their hands and their feet
should be cut off on opposite sides or they should be imprisoned; this
shall be as a disgrace for them in this world, and in the hereafter
they shall have a grievous chastisement,"

Sure doesn't seem to say what you claimed it to say. What it
states is that those who wage war against Allah (i.e., those who make
war on the Islamic people) should be punished.

Would you expect them to say "Hey, guys, beat me, whip me,
pour beer on my belly?" Of COURSE they would want to punish anyone who
made war on them--wouldn't you?

>[48.13] And whoever does not believe in Allah and His Apostle, then
>surely We have prepared burning fire for the unbelievers.

[John 3:18] He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he
that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed
in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

>[48.16] Say to those of the dwellers of the desert who were left behind:
>You shall soon be invited (to fight) against a people possessing mighty
>prowess; you will fight against them until they submit; then if you
>obey, Allah will grant you a good reward;
>and if you turn back as you turned back before, He will punish you with
>a painful punishment.

Sounds a LOT like Jonah and Ninevea [sp??] to me.

>(So they MUST destroy the infidels, or they themselves will be severly
>punished)

No, they must fight against a powerful invading force and
strive to be victorious. Gee, sounds like something a DI would tell
you in basic training.

Remember Joshua with his horn? Solomon and his wars? Moses and
his magic tricks in Egypt? How about some of the injunctions in
Exodus, Genesis, and (of course) Revelations?

What the Koran presents sounds VERY tame compared to those.

>[48.17] There is no harm in the blind, nor is there any harm in the
>lame, nor is there any harm in the sick (if they do not go forth); and
>whoever obeys Allah and His Apostle, He will cause him to enter gardens
>beneath which rivers flow, and whoever turns back, He will punish him
>with a painful punishment.

This is supposed to be a threat to infidels? Dick, it's the
same thing that the Christians say: If you deny Christ's holiness you
to hell but if you accept him you go to heaven.

>[48.25] It is they who disbelieved and turned you away from the Sacred
>Mosque and (turned off) the offering withheld from arriving at its
>destined place; and were it not for the believing men and the believing
>women, whom, not having known, you might have trodden down, and thus
>something hateful might have afflicted you on their account without
>knowledge-- so that Allah may cause to enter into His mercy whomsoever
>He pleases; had they been widely separated one from another, We would
>surely have punished those who disbelieved from among them with a
>painful punishment.

Same here. Dick, you KNOW that the bible is filled with
threats of "punishment" for religious infractions or non-believers.
Why is it you don't interpret those as dangers to other faiths, but
you interpret far milder injunctions in the Koran as threats to yours?

>48.29] Muhammad is the Apostle of Allah, and those with him are firm of
>heart against the unbelievers, compassionate among themselves; you will
>see them bowing down, prostrating themselves, seeking grace from Allah
>and pleasure; their marks are in their faces because of the effect of
>prostration; that is their description in the Taurat and their
>description in the Injeel; like as seed-produce that puts forth its
>sprout, then strengthens it, so it becomes stout and stands firmly on
>its stem, delighting the
>sowers that He may enrage the unbelievers on account of them; Allah has
>promised those among them who believe and do good, forgiveness and a
>great reward.

And, again, the same here.

If THIS is the worst "threat" you can find in the Koran, you
should be very glad the people you are terrified of don't use the
bible instead. It has FAR more violent threats (as in the complete
destruction of whole peoples for daring not to accept the god of the
Israelites as their own) than anything you've posted by an order of
magnitude!

> It is clear enough that the roots of violence come from the Koran
>itself, for those believers who would interpret it that way, and for all
>the masses they influence. If your mileage varies, that's your deficit.
>For me, Sept 11 was proof enough.

Dick, those quotes prove nothing other than that Islam
believes those who do not accept Allah as god and Mu hammed as his
Prophet will be punished in the afterlife--EXACTLY the same thing
Christians believe about Jesus and THEIR god!

You need to stop seeing Islamic people with hate and prejudice
and see them as they really are--an ancient people who have
contributed enormously to our civilization, science, and arts.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2420. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:31:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u20c6sea0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25417

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> >>>The US has *individual* rights defined by The Constitution
> >>>to protect us from people like you.
>
> The Constitution is (I hope) enough... but it's under attack from the Executive
> branch and the DOJ... (I don't trust that Ashcroft guy...)
>

You don't know him. I worked for him for eight years as the state's
Governor. He is hardnosed but honest to a fault. I think the
confirmation hearings mellowed him considerably, he sure acts like it.

> >>All of those rights are subject to change. All it takes is for a large
> >>percentage of society, through their elected representatives, to amend the
> >>Constitution.
> >>
>
> > Yup.
> >
> > That's all it took in Germany when the Nazis took power, too.
>
> 'W' Bush just usurped the constitution with his proclamation that non-citizens
> can be 'brought to justice' at a military tribunal.

Question: Where in the COnstitution does it say that an alien has the
same rights as a citizen? It doesn't.

I guess he hasn't 'snuffed'
> enough people in Texas now he'll be able to do it anywhere in the world that he
> sees fit...

Oh, I'm *sure* HE was personally responsible for all the death penalty
murderers who met their fate in Texas, Yeah, Right! THose poor 'victims'
had nothing to do with it. And of course THEIR vicims are so soon
forgotten....

>
> >>In addition, the interpretation of the Constitution is determined by a very
> >>small group of judges. Rights rise and fall on their decision. For example,
> >>abortion was illegal practically everywhere until 1973, when a single judgement
> >>of the Supremes struck down existing laws and established a "right of privacy"
> >>for those seeking abortions and wiped out the "right to life" of those being
> >>aborted.
>

> The Military Tribunals can't be appealed... even to the Supremes... Bush has
> usurped the Legislature AND... the Judiciary...
>
> Nice huh????
>
> >>The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.
> >>
>
> "W" proved that... ;^
>
> RIch...

When it comes to terrorists who ARE out to get us -you, too- and none of them are American citizens, I have no problem with it. Why should they have the right to come here with our destruction as their sole intent and then be able to take advantage of our system of personal rights to get off free just because of evidentiary weaknesses? The OJ trial proved what jurys can all too easily do. And it cuts both ways...how would you like to be an Arab accused of terrorism standing trial in New York? Think you'd stand a chance even if you were totally innocent?
And the Military Tribulans apply only to non-citizens, you will note.

2421. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:31:46 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <17388096F574BBBC.7D02BFB14914A360.AF2E3261A78553B8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25418

On 28 Nov 2001 01:03:14 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Yup. Then they proceeded to dismantle the democratic system.

True.

But they did so within the framework of their Constitution,
not by force. Technically, the US Congress could do exactly the same
thing to our system anytime they chose to do so, provided they could
garner sufficient votes, as the Nazis did.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2422. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:36:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u20m9sea1@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25419

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 26 Nov 2001 04:20:33 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >Obviously not -- and the fact that you would ask such a question only
> >tends to reveal your liberal agenda. I believe in keeping homosexuals
> >away from children for the simple reason that homosexuals tend to
> >view their sexual preference as a valid option, even a preferable one --
> >and are disposed toward "recruitment" of young people into their
> >"lifestyle."
>
> Give that tired "recruitment" nonsense a rest, Larry. Any
> intelligent (and educated) person knows that's a straw dog.
> Homosexuals don't "recruit" heterosexuals--there are plenty of
> homosexuals for them to interact with.
>

That's patently untrue. Not all recruit, but many do. And you really
should know (I'm sure you do) that at certain states of adolescense
children are indeed recuitable, which can also seriously damage their
mental development. Now I'd wager you will come back with some indignant
"officlal" prounouncement that will be as wrong is it is indignant.

2423. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:37:33 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8FE686B849183886.8F19E5C8BFD0FAE3.E9CE2FF975EEFD9C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25420

On 28 Nov 2001 02:51:52 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Ok, let's use your figures. If one tenth of one percent of the world/s
>1.25 BILLION muslims are Islamic fundamentalist terrorists, that's
>1,250,000 terrorists, if my calculator functioned correctly. Still think
>it's no problem?

It would be if the original assumption was right--but of
course it was only a "throw-away" percentage that Cecil cited to make
his point and never intended to be accurate.

I would be VERY surprised if more than 1/10000 of 1 percent of
the muslims (i.e., 1,250 people) were in any way connected with
terrorism--and most of those are supporters or demonstrators, not
actual terrorists. Compare that to the right wing fanatics in the
militias throughout our country (you know, the Timothy McVeigh types)
and I think you'll find we have MANY more such individuals than they
have.

> I DID say that based on the fundamental teachings of Islam, every
>Muslim *is* a potential terrorist in that it is almost certaian that he
>will be forced to make a choice-follow his religious teachings and
>leaders, or reject them. In countries where fundamentalist Islam is not
>only the religion but the law as well, asking a Muslim to reject his
>religion can easily be fatal. At the least, it will cause him huge
>amounts of personal problems and grief.

And, of course, precisely the same thing applies to
Christians, as my own response to your Koran quotes shows.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2424. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:38:59 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EAFB85710A6CEBED.CA37C7E6C2194C14.8A1D0DB8B5365864@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25422

On 28 Nov 2001 02:54:06 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Sure they do a great job at things like appoingint Syria to the
>Security Council

Why not--the US is there and you can't get much more dangerous
or unpredictable than us!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2425. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:40:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0486D6.ECC95AD1@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25421

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart writes:
>
> > (snip) Perhaps it is time to bring
> > this thread "one step closer to
> > extinction" and move some of the
> > unrelated topics into their own
> > threads. :-)
>
>
> No, no, no! The whole point is for us
> to keep this going until March. Can't
> expect Kim to do it alone!

Well, it just popped into my head the other day what others might be thinking when they stumble into this newsgroup and see this massive thread. Surely a thread this large must be talking about a major event in human existence. What is one step closer to extinction - radio, this country, human beings, the whole planet? And what is causing this extinction - laws, famine, disease, a meteor?

But, then they read the thread and find out that someone thinks Kim's callsign is going to cause the extinction of ham radio (with a good mix of religion, damn yankees, new age men, racism, affirmative action, and so forth, thrown into the discussion for good measure).

Lets face it, people, this is one darn strange thread. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2426. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:40:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u20th$10r$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 25423

N2EY wrote:
>
> > If you
> > feel (as Dick and others do) that Islamic people are inferior, that
> > their religion is inferior, or that minorities are losers who depend
> > on affirmative action to provide them jobs they don't deserve then
> > voice your opinions on the ham bands or shut the
>
> (expletive deleted)
>
> > up!
>
> I don't feel that way at all, Rick. Please produce some posts where I
> claim the followers of ANY religion, as a group, are inferior. Or
> their religion. Or some anti-minority stuff. C'mon, produce some posts
> - there all there in the archives.
>

And neither do I,nor HAVE I posted such bigoted accusatory statements,
as I havd been repeatedly accused by Rick and Cecil. They are just
looking for reason and occasion to be blatently accusatory. Both are
clearly possesed by delusions of grandeur.

2427. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:42:13 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D78FF8967DC3F652.EFCD5F5E349E223C.D4343FBD37612A5D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25424

On 28 Nov 2001 04:21:12 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Sure it does. You have no clue of my religious background or beliefs,
>or lack thereor. Nor my experience with animals. I guess I'm supposed to
>believe you and some other dippy "scientist" who likely never saw
>animals in their natural setting over my own observations and that of
>many other outdoorsmen, and over other SCIENTIFIC evidence. Not gonna
>happen.

Right, Dickie. You know more about animals than zoologists,
biologists, or animal researchers in other scientific fields.

Had a reality check recently? You need one rather badly.

>> Look up the Bonobo Chimpanzees in any book available, the
>> females are ALL bisexual, and the males engage in homosexual behavior
>> whenever the opportunity presents itself. They're TYPICAL of the
>> animal kingdom.
>
> *There's* the Bullshit. I am aware of some species of primates which
>exhibit a preoccupation with sex. But if you call that typical it shows
>how LITTLE you know about the animal world.

Read the quotes (from INFORMED sources) on the topic Dick. You
are the one displaying ignorance (as usual) not me.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2428. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:43:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2740D23082EE13BE.35F5DE7DC4CFBC28.027F1408CFB1B56C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25425

On 28 Nov 2001 01:59:28 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>You say your mother wouldn't agree with me. Let me ask you -- is
>she still married to your father?

My wife doesn't agree with you Larry--and we've been happily
married for 21 years.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2429. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 06:45:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C048800.F8D932CC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25426

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> I tried that with the "bigotry"
> thread but it hasn't helped.
>
> Bear in mind that Dick has stated
> he will NOT allow this thread to
> end until Kim changes her call
> sign. (snip)

Well, we can't blame this on Dick alone. The thread has shot off into too many side discussions, many of which Dick isn't even directly involved in. In the end, this thread just seems to have a life of it's own. Like I said, one strange thread.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2430. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 07:13:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C048E82.53584256@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25427

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> You say your mother wouldn't agree with me. Let me ask you -- is
> she still married to your father?
>
>

"Your mama, she had sex with her husband before you were born!"
:-)

2431. Re: Twistedhed: Illegal CBer/JOCK STRAP IN MAIL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 07:20:04 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0111272320.718dc568@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25428

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:<9459F737B41CEC44.2C47F90E37CE7E44.68CD966AB315DFBC@lp.airnews.net>...
> On 25 Nov 2001 23:07:48 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
> (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:
>
> >Nothng pleases me more
> >than one of you cb rambos to come in to my conversation and start
> >preaching about rules. God, I love to squash you suckers.
>
> Ignoring the rest of this troll, I wanted to point out the
> worst weakness in the arguments made in it.
>
> The poster claims that people "come in to" his conversations
> and start preaching about rules. If this is true, either:
>
> 1. He is transmitting in the ham bands in the first place,
> rather than the "Freeband" ones between the 10m ham band and the cb
> band. Thus, the poster is the one who is violating the rights of the
> hams by invading OUR bands. If that's the case, his arguments are
> totally null since he demands respect for his "rights" but refuses to
> respect the rights of others.
>
> 2. He is transmitting outside the ham bands in the "freeband"
> area and hams are responding to him there. But if this is the case,
> the hams themselves are at least as guilty of violating FCC rules as
> he is, and therefore have no possible legitimate grounds for their
> actions at all. If that's the case, his arguments are fair, since
> others are violating the same regulations he is, yet are criticizing
> HIM for the behavior.
>
> Rick

YEAH THAT'S TWISTEDHED ALLRIGHT. HE MAKES NO SENSE. BUT MOST ILLEGAL
CRIMINAL CBERS DONT. THIS GUY IS MORE CRAZY THAN EVER. LOOK AT THIS
POST OF HIS --------

From: twistedhed@webtv.net (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Lesson # 2 for my trollup
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-03-24 15:21:24 PST

This is by far the most outrageous thing you have done to date my
felonious friend and if I were to take your warped sense of reality
into account I might be truly frightened. Sending me a malodorous
filthy stained and sperm-juiced man's JOCK STRAP is low, Dougie, very

low, but then thats what youre all about these days and it doesnt take a degree in psychology to see it. Well the joke is on you my tourettes-afflicted tormentor because I am sending the aformentioned garment to the chief postal inspector in the state capital of Ohio along with a demand that he trace the origin of the mailing to YOU Dougie, thats right it is going to come right back into your lap and then who will have the last laugh? Me that's who. I am SICK and TIRED of babysitting you here and waiting to see what else you will send me so you have dug your own rotten hole Dougie and we shall see what transpires.

2432. Re: Airtmobile Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 07:34:29 UTC
From: George <kb0mai@spam.msn.com>
Message-ID: <jr0N7.1197$I85.47926@eagle.america.net>
Source record: 25429

You are thinking that the FCC gives a shit about him. The fact of the matter is they could do all of these thing but they dont. They will go after the big fish but there is no money in it for them for the little guys like us.

> > I use my HT all the time on airplanes. Nobody gives a shit. They
> > think it's a Dictaphone for business notes.
>
> And when they catch you doing that and confiscate your HT (they can)
> and kick you off the flight (they can) and file a complaint with the
> FCC for the violation (they can) and the FCC hits you with a
> penalty and/or revokes your license (they can) what valid defense
> will you offer?
>

2433. Whats the deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 08:12:13 UTC
From: Chuck <kb8pdr@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <u09733tfurlt0a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 25430

I cme ot this new group in hopes of finding out intereting tid bits of Ham Radio Policy. What goes here?, not one posting about policy. Either my computer is goofed or you poeple are just enraged with one another. I hate to even post the message here, but this is all new to me. I will wait a few daays and see if anything actually comes up about policy if not I will move on. One thing that does strike me funny as that Dave Heil is here and posting, I hope this is not the same Dave Heil that builds the microphones. As this would be dissapointing to me. As I was hoping that you would have some very interesting tid bits posted here. Later all. I hope that does not offend anyone. But I would think that the news group would reflect the title. Chuck

2434. MORE TWISTEDHED the NUTTY CBER

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 10:00:09 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0111280200.3f2fadd8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25431

From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Hey WHAT ABOUT ME?
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-04-13 17:20:07 PST

Hello FCC,

I need to be busted. I tried and tried for so long but no dice. I bootlegged all over 10, 11 and 12 meters. I ran power. I even said bad words on the radio. When are you going to bust me? I NEED TO BE ARRESTED because then you will put me in a nice psycho hospital where I can be free of the saucermen who chase me and pinch my bum.

2435. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 10:23:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011128052320.28714.00002176@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 25433

In article <DC86BF375B90AC31.C827AA44D761B32A.5855EB376386E6EF@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>I have no choice but to accept your callsign. I have stated many times
>>that your callsign is your responsibility alone -- and you are also
>>responsible for the fact that you are taking the ARS "...one step
>>closer to extinction" by having chosen it.
>
> No, Larry, if that call sign takes the ARS "one step closer to
>extinction" it isn't Kim's fault for having chosen it--it's the FCC's
>fault for having ISSUED it.

Rick:

The FCC is not in the business of making value judgments on the
callsigns people select for themselves. Being a government agency,
they are legally constrained against doing so. An individual amateur's
Vanity call sign is strictly *their* choice; and the negative effect it has
on their image, and the image of the ARS, is strictly *their*
responsibility. Mr. Hollingsworth was very clear on that point.

> There is no way that Kim is responsible for damage to the ARS
>if her actions are ALL within the guidelines of the FCC
>regulations--and her's were.

Incorrect, for the reasons stated above.

>If Hollingsworth or anyone else is so
>convinced that her call is harmful, then it is up to them to convince
>the FCC to limit the range of available call signs, not to criticize
>Kim for acting in accordance with the law.

That is not Mr. Hollingsworth's job to do, nor should it be. The
best arbitrators of the effect of Kim's poor choice in a callsign are
her fellow hams; and that is precisely what is taking place here.
Obviously we, as her fellow hams, are in disagreement on this
issue. In fact, the majority would seem to support Kim. That,
however, will not make the debate come to an end. The only
thing that will stop it is for Kim to change her callsign to one
which no longer offends, or you can figure out some way to
silence your opposition.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2436. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 10:23:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011128052321.28714.00002177@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 25435

In article <1A7EA877217F328F.363625849C7957A8.3D676BEF89372E80@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>What makes you think it is *I* who is offending them?
>
> You, Dave, and Dick present a far worse image of hams here
>than Kim could do if she posted PICTURES of her tits instead of using
>TIT in her call sign!

Rick:

I see. So far, Kim has not chosen to do that, and I, for one, am
extremely grateful!

> I'm happy that the ARS has more of a range than the three of
>you present. If it didn't, I'd be ashamed to admit I was a ham.

I respect differences of opinion. The problem with liberals such as
yourself is that you can "tolerate" anything *except* a difference of
opinion! As an American, I'd defend to the death your right to express
your differences of opinion here or anywhere else -- but I'm not so
sure you would!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2437. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 10:23:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011128052322.28714.00002178@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 25432

In article <3C031CD3.A2D685F4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> This venue is no more appropriate than the ham bands. Who the
>> hell gave hams the right to come into the Internet Usenet groups and
>> post offensive material they wouldn't think of voicing in the ham
>> bands? There are just as many children here as there are on the
>> air--if you're so goddamn concerned with them then try practicing what
>> you keep preaching in THIS venue too!
>>
>> Rick
>
>This is the voice of the tranquil Buddhist libertarian New Age Man.
>S'cuse the language, kids.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Rick is a university professor; as such, he has a professional mandate
to be politically correct in thought, word, and deed. He is just doing
what comes naturally for people who are committed to supporting the
social decay necessary to ensure that liberal socialist elites maintain
their position as the ruling class in the New World Order. Lately, it
has become fashionable for liberals like themselves to couch their
beliefs in the label of Libertarianism, but it's still the same thing. The
difference is that conservatives are willing to share the hegemony,
liberals are not. While we may not dislike them personally, we still
cannot trust them.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2438. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 10:23:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011128052323.28714.00002179@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 25434

In article <85A12BD34BEB7725.BA55D38686CC6855.0C3F963FB2F98279@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

> Give that tired "recruitment" nonsense a rest, Larry. Any
>intelligent (and educated) person knows that's a straw dog.

Rick:

Hmmm -- well, you'll have to excuse me, but as a person who is both
intelligent and educated, I must respectfully disagree. Homosexuals
do, in fact, attempt to "recruit" others -- young children in particular,
into their lifestyle. Have you ever read the book "Heather Has Two
Mommies?" I have. I found it to be nothing but an attempt to convince
young children that a homosexual relationship is just as normal as
a heterosexual one.

>Homosexuals don't "recruit" heterosexuals--there are plenty of
>homosexuals for them to interact with.

Then why do they believe that there needs to be more?

> As far as viewing their sexual preference as a "valid option,"
>don't you view YOURS that way?

Of course not. There is nothing "optional" about being a normal
heterosexual. It is the way God and nature intended for us to be;
homosexuality is a deviation from the norm.

>Why shouldn't a homosexual (who is as
>normal, by any reasonable scientific standard you care to name, as you
>are) feel the same?

I'm sure they do; that doesn't make them right.

> Maybe if you would spend less time looking down on homosexuals
>and more time teaching your OWN children that homosexuality is
>normal--and that homosexuals are just like everyone else in society,
>some good, some bad, some just average--you would be raising far
>healthier and better adjusted children yourself.

I am not raising any children whatsoever, Rick. If I were, I'd be teaching
them that homosexuals are fellow human beings, who, unfortunately,
are confused about their sexual identity. I would teach them that
homosexuals are to be treated with the same human dignity anyone
else deserves, are not to be discriminated against in matters of
professional employment. However, I would warn them not to be
seduced by them, or even place themselves in a situation where that
could happen.

I have known and worked with many homosexuals. I knew two gay men who were civilian employees working for me when I was stationed in England. One of them is now dead from AIDS. I mourn the loss of his life, because aside from his sexual deviancy, he was a basically good person. I don't understand what makes people become homosexuals, but I can see from first-hand experience that it is not the right way to live one's life. I cannot change my views on this issue. We will have to agree to disagree.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2439. Re: K1MAN webpage.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 10:31:27 UTC
From: Carleton Ingerson <n1dxm@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <323N7.239375$W8.8287832@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25436
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

I agree, this jerk has been run off the air once already. Who the hell let
him back on??

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:a96f1f4d2ee76e5b3a11b225221d54bf.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
> news:e1bb06a74f973f91732f3ab8815a96bd@spamfreenews.com...
>
> > This is a very good site......
> >
> > http://www.carte.net/k1man/sites.htm
>
>
> K1MAN is a pathetic scam artist, and you are a pathetic suck-up.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
> --
> Posted from mplsapanas11poolb82.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.20.82]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2440. Re: Whats the deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 10:43:31 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <nd3N7.239384$W8.8287956@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25437

"Chuck" <kb8pdr@fuse.net> wrote in message
news:u09733tfurlt0a@corp.supernews.com...
> I cme ot this new group in hopes of finding out intereting tid bits of Ham
> Radio Policy. What goes here?, not one posting about policy. Either my
> computer is goofed or you poeple are just enraged with one another. I hate
> to even post the message here, but this is all new to me. I will wait a
few
> daays and see if anything actually comes up about policy if not I will
move
> on. One thing that does strike me funny as that Dave Heil is here and
> posting, I hope this is not the same Dave Heil that builds the
microphones.
> As this would be dissapointing to me. As I was hoping that you would have
> some very interesting tid bits posted here. Later all. I hope that does
not
> offend anyone. But I would think that the news group would reflect the
> title. Chuck
>
>

Chuck, this group was set up for the 'code wars' which apparently have
become a bore; they sure as hell have for me. Bob Heil makes his very good
mikes, Dave uses them. A few of the cast of characters are not entirely
what they appear. That and a buck will buy the morning coffee in a cheap
dive.

Dick N BK

2441. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 12:11:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011128071121.11017.00001247@nso-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 25439

In article <9u1jn9$ni9$0@208.207.71.131>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> > Gee, imagine what you could do with "Cracklin' Rosie".
>>
>> I thought "Cracklin' Rosie" was already a novelty song (about inexpensive
>> wine).
>
>
> The Neil Diamond song?

Yup. Took me years to get it. Like the very end of the classic film "North By
Northwest"...

> Not the way I hear it.
>
Hope I don't ruin it for ya. Try listening to it or reading the lyrics with the
idea that it's an ode to cheap sparkling rose' wine.

Lines like

"Cracklin' Rose, you're a store-bought woman"

are the give-away.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"Well, since she put me down
There's been owls pukin' in my bed" - The Beach Boys, "Help Me Rhonda"

2442. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 12:11:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011128071121.11017.00001246@nso-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 25441

In article <3C046D97.4A88E58A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Were you required to pass the exams, Dick, or did you cheat?

Cecil:

There is/was a legal way that a person could get an Extra license without taking any additional examsl, and without cheating. I don't think Dick got his that way, and neither did I, but it WAS possible.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2443. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 12:11:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011128071122.11017.00001248@nso-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 25442

In article <3C0448A7.80305@att.net>, Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
> > The question still remains: is it OK to do it to boys but not girls?
>
> > Did I say there wasn't? No. I simply asked if it was OK for boys but not
>girls.
>
>Jim, you know better than this... it is NOT the same thing... it's 'apples
>and
>oranges'...

I've seen varying descriptions of the procedure as applied in various
countries.
>
>Rich
>
>BTW the answer is No...

AT LAST! A straight answer from somebody!

>because if it were the same thing it would mean that
>the
>Doctor cut off my dick... so I say, no, it's NOT 'ok to do it to boys but not
>girls'.
>
In some cases, such amputations have occurred to boys because of mistakes and
infections.

Your point is well taken.

I would say that the routine nonreversible mutilation of any human without
their consent is pretty barabic.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2444. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 12:11:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011128071123.11017.00001249@nso-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 25438

In article <3C044515.8030903@att.net>, Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
writes:

(Cecil wrote):
> >>>The US has *individual* rights defined by The Constitution
> >>>to protect us from people like you.
>
>The Constitution is (I hope) enough... but it's under attack from the
>Executive
>branch and the DOJ... (I don't trust that Ashcroft guy...)
>
(N2EY wrote):
> >>All of those rights are subject to change. All it takes is for a large
> >>percentage of society, through their elected representatives, to amend the
> >>Constitution.
> >
> > Yup.
(I'm not sure who wrote):

> > That's all it took in Germany when the Nazis took power, too.
>
>
>'W' Bush just usurped the constitution with his proclamation that
>non-citizens
>can be 'brought to justice' at a military tribunal. I guess he hasn't
>'snuffed'
>enough people in Texas now he'll be able to do it anywhere in the world that
>he
>sees fit...

I think there is a precedent for Dubya's action. I understand that in WW2,
spies and saboteurs were handled that way - including some executions. The USA
was infiltrated more than once by well-trained German agents posing as
Americans. The idea is that nonuniformed foreigners acting in certain ways are
committing acts of war against the USA.

I'm not sure if I agree or not.
>
> >>In addition, the interpretation of the Constitution is determined by a
>very
> >>small group of judges. Rights rise and fall on their decision. For
>example,
> >>abortion was illegal practically everywhere until 1973, when a single
>judgement
> >>of the Supremes struck down existing laws and established a "right of

>privacy"
> >>for those seeking abortions and wiped out the "right to life" of those
>being
> >>aborted.
>
>The Military Tribunals can't be appealed... even to the Supremes... Bush has
>usurped the Legislature AND... the Judiciary...
>
>Nice huh????

I did not know that the even the Supremes could not be involved. A bit scary...
>
> >>The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.
>
>"W" proved that... ;^
>
Sure did. Thanks for the info, Rich. I had no idea it was so easy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2445. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 12:11:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011128071123.11017.00001250@nso-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 25440

In article <17388096F574BBBC.7D02BFB14914A360.AF2E3261A78553B8@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 28 Nov 2001 01:03:14 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Yup. Then they proceeded to dismantle the democratic system.
>
> True.
>
> But they did so within the framework of their Constitution,
>not by force.

Exactly.

>Technically, the US Congress could do exactly the same
>thing to our system anytime they chose to do so, provided they could
>garner sufficient votes, as the Nazis did.

Yup. My point is that the Constitution is not an absolute protection, as Cecil
seems to think.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2446. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 13:16:56 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <ct5N7.2022$m%.631581@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 25443

Oooohhhh! Now that's a shopping list. Only one problem if we wanted to
pursue a vanity call......It is my understanding that the vanity call system
has been put on hold due to the anthrax/mail situation/paranoia. Could take
a while....

Ryan

>
> I plan to get a vanity sign in the next couple weeks. How
> would W8GOD, W8POT, K8DIC, W8DIK, W8FUK, W8FUC, W8ASS, or W8BAL work
> for you? All are available (among others).
>
> Don't like those choices?
>
> Complain to the FCC, not to me--I don't decide what's
> acceptable and what isn't--they do.
>
> Rick
>
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2447. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 14:02:44 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C04EF82.10009@att.net>
Source record: 25444

> Richard Plourde wrote:

>> The Constitution is (I hope) enough... but it's under attack from the
>> Executive branch and the DOJ... (I don't trust that Ashcroft guy...)

Dick Carroll wrote:

> You don't know him. I worked for him for eight years as the state's
> Governor. He is hardnosed but honest to a fault. I think the
> confirmation hearings mellowed him considerably, he sure acts like it.

I hope you're right, but I don't have ANY confidence. The guy is a 'religious zealot'... and anyone who is 'guided' in that manner is someone to be feared.

>> 'W' Bush just usurped the constitution with his proclamation that
>> non-citizens can be 'brought to justice' at a military tribunal.

> Question: Where in the COnstitution does it say that an alien has the
> same rights as a citizen? It doesn't.

It's in the Bill of Rights... Article 6
Yes, Carroll, non-citizens are included in here.

>> I guess he hasn't 'snuffed' enough people in Texas now he'll
>> be able to do it anywhere in the world that he sees fit...

> Oh, I'm *sure* HE was personally responsible for all the death penalty
> murderers who met their fate in Texas, Yeah, Right! THose poor 'victims'
> had nothing to do with it. And of course THEIR vicims are so soon
> forgotten....

Of course... he was... he was the Chief Executive... (derived from the word execute)

>> The Military Tribunals can't be appealed... even to the Supremes...
>> Bush has usurped the Legislature AND... the Judiciary...

>>Nice huh????

>> >>The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.
>> >>

>>"W" proved that... ;^

> When it comes to terrorists who ARE out to get us -you, too- and none
> of them are American citizens,

We don't know... Ashcroft won't release the list...

> I have no problem with it. Why should
> they have the right to come here with our destruction as their sole
> intent and then be able to take advantage of our system of personal
> rights to get off free just because of evidentiary weaknesses?

Then, *&^$(&^ DECLARE WAR!!!!
The problem is that Bush has included 20 million people, here in the U S, and anyone in his scope.

> The OJ
> trial proved what jurys can all too easily do.

OJ, was a 'Hollywood' trial and I wouldn't hold him up as the 'poster boy' for ANY cause... ;-)

And it cuts both
> ways...how would you like to be an Arab accused of terrorism standing
> trial in New York? Think you'd stand a chance even if you were totally
> innocent?

They already did... And it was emminently fair. (remember the WTC bombers???)

> And the Military Tribulans apply only to non-citizens, you will note.

Non-citizens... for now... but it's a slippery slope... and I know that Bush and Ashcroft are too 'slick' for me...
If they want to do this, then they should at least declare war... I'm tired of them wanting it both ways...

Rich

2448. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 14:23:51 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C04F475.4080603@att.net>
Source record: 25445

N2EY wrote:

> I would say that the routine nonreversible mutilation of any human without
> their consent is pretty barabic.

I wouldn't say that... (pretty isn't an adverb)... ;-)

I would leave out all those qualifiers and say...

The mutilation of any human is unequivocably barabic.

...and yet, strangely, these hings happen in many 'civilizations'...

Rich

2449. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 14:45:08 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C04F972.20002@att.net>
Source record: 25446

> Richard Plourde writes:

>>'W' Bush just usurped the constitution with his proclamation that
>>non-citizens
>>can be 'brought to justice' at a military tribunal. I guess he hasn't
>>'snuffed'
>>enough people in Texas now he'll be able to do it anywhere in the world that
>>he
>>sees fit...
>>
N2EY wrote:

> I think there is a precedent for Dubya's action. I understand that in WW2,
> spies and saboteurs were handled that way - including some executions. The USA
> was infiltrated more than once by well-trained German agents posing as
> Americans. The idea is that nonuniformed foreigners acting in certain ways are
> committing acts of war against the USA.

> I'm not sure if I agree or not.

Yeah, there was about a half dozen submariners...

two points...

War had been declared and...

This action is way too broad...

Lincoln did it also... but... we were AT WAR in all previous examples. Let them
declare a war and then I'll join in the 'festivities'... ;-)

> I did not know that the even the Supremes could not be involved. A bit scary...

Well, the contest of the Presidential action in WW2 did go to the Supremes and
they said it was OK, BUT we were at war.

What can't go to the Supremes is an appeal... there is NO RIGHT OF APPEAL... and
they can't provide their own Lawyers and a few other 'goodies' and this applies
to 20 million people legally living (most of them) in the United States.

>>"W" proved that... ;^

> Sure did. Thanks for the info, Rich. I had no idea it was so easy.

Well in times of war the President can usurp Congress.... BUT.... we are not at
war if Congress doesn't say we are!!!

I think this action reeks of Bush coming out like a real 'cowboy' on this. Did
you hear his 'sound bite' about how he would 'explain' to the Pakistani

President why he's doing it?

Rich

OBTW... I also don't like the way Ashcroft's DOJ is letting Microsoft off with a slap on the wrist... (I don't trust that guy) They're only worried about where the next campaign contribution is coming from.

2450. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 14:51:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C04FA00.96840C78@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25447

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Richard Plourde wrote:
> >
> > 'W' Bush just usurped the constitution
> > with his proclamation that non-citizens
> > can be 'brought to justice' at a
> > military tribunal.
>
> Question: Where in the COnstitution does
> it say that an alien has the same rights
> as a citizen? It doesn't.

The Fifth Amendment... "_NO_ person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, ... nor shall _ANY_ person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law..." The key words are "no person" and "any person." Nothing here seems to limit those words to just U.S. Citizens.

The Sixth Amendment... "In _ALL_ criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury..." The key words are "all criminal prosecutions." Again, nothing there that would exclude aliens - a criminal prosecution of an alien is still a criminal prosecution, and this amendmend says "ALL" criminal prosecutions.

Furthermore, beyond the fact that these two amendments seem to cover aliens, any U.S. Citizen (including the President and Ashcroft) have the legal obligation to follow the laws outlined in the Constitution. In other words, any government official, who has sworn to protect and defend the Constitution, who attempts to prosecute someone under terms other than defined by the Constitution would be guilty of violating the laws of this land (as defined by that Constitution).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2451. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 15:02:31 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <3C04FD85.2050609@att.net>
Source record: 25448

>>Richard Plourde wrote:

>>>'W' Bush just usurped the constitution
>>>with his proclamation that non-citizens
>>>can be 'brought to justice' at a
>>>military tribunal.

> Dick Carroll wrote:

>> Question: Where in the COnstitution does
>>it say that an alien has the same rights
>>as a citizen? It doesn't.

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> The Fifth Amendment... "_NO_ person shall be held to answer for a
> capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or
> indictment of a Grand Jury, ... nor shall _ANY_ person be subject for
> the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor
> shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against
> himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due
> process of law..." The key words are "no person" and "any person."
> Nothing here seems to limit those words to just U.S. Citizens.

Correct...

> The Sixth Amendment... "In _ALL_ criminal prosecutions, the accused
> shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial
> jury..." The key words are "all criminal prosecutions." Again,
> nothing there that would exclude aliens - a criminal prosecution of an
> alien is still a criminal prosecution, and this amendmend says "ALL"
> criminal prosecutions.

Military tribunals are speedy... BUT... NOT public... we may never know what
happened at these things in our lifetime...

> Furthermore, beyond the fact that these two amendments seem to cover
> aliens, any U.S. Citizen (including the President and Ashcroft) have
> the legal obligation to follow the laws outlined in the Constitution.
> In other words, any government official, who has sworn to protect and
> defend the Constitution, who attempts to prosecute someone under terms
> other than defined by the Constitution would be guilty of violating
> the laws of this land (as defined by that Constitution).

Could it be that by excluding U S Citizens they were 'protecting' themselves???
hhhmmmmm....

Rich

2452. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 15:44:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C050645.1E92F970@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25449

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In fact, the majority would seem to support Kim.

That should tell you something, Larry.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2453. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 15:51:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0507F8.8A23C9AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25450

Rick Adams wrote:
> Care to provide the date on which this newsgroup WAS created?

When I said I provided the names of amateur radio newsgroups to
potential hams, I wasn't talking specifically about this one.
r.r.a.p was created to get the Morse code argument off of
r.r.a.misc. So I never meant to imply that r.r.a.p was 13
years old. I would guess that r.r.a.p is 8-10 years old.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2454. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 15:55:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C050902.8BF9957A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25451

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Contrary to Dick's ignorant
> > postings, here's what Muslims
> > believe about Jesus.
>
> Thanks, Cecil. And, with that, I'll let this issue stand - if a
> person isn't going to believe what you posted, that person isn't going
> to believe a thing.

It's funny that *all* Muslims believe in the virgin birth of Jesus
when the latest polls show a large percentage of US Christians don't
even believe in the virgin birth.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2455. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 15:58:12 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0111280758.35006325@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25452

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011127205928.12427.00003464@nso-cg.aol.com>...
> That's the advantage of being all grown up, out of the house, and on
> your own -- you don't have to worry about what others think about you,
> including your mother! I hope the day comes when you are mature
> enough to understand my position on this matter. However, considering
> the way you were probably brought up, I doubt that will ever happen.

Larry, I *am* "all grown up, out of the house and on my own".
Have been for over twenty-five years. I was brought up to respect
people, and to respect people's rights. Your "position on this
matter" (and others) shows that you do neither.

As for being mature enough to understand your position -- well, I do
understand it. I simply think it is apalling. I think it's stupid,
and I think it reeks of subservience and slavery. I think that any man
who'd be so distrusting as to not allow his wife to be alone with
another man isn't truly mature at all.

Maturity is understanding that adults should be treated like adults.
Adults shouldn't be treated like little children who need to be
watched every minute. To treat a person as an adult has to do with
trust. And until *you* grow up and learn that, you'll never be
perceived as mature.

> People who are married, or in committed relationships with a person
> they love, respect, and trust, do not challenge that trust by having
> private meetings, professional or otherwise, with people of the opposite
> sex *unless* their spouse or partner is present. It simply is not done.

And this is a ridiculous attitude. It simply *is* done. I think that
you have grave insecurity problems. If you can't trust your wife to be
alone with another man in *any* situation, then you should never have
married her. You don't want a partner in life, you want someone to whom
you are chained.

That's not a healthy way for two adults to interact.

> You say your mother wouldn't agree with me. Let me ask you -- is
> she still married to your father?

I brought my mother into this because she's 62 years old -- older than
you, if I remember correctly -- and would have attitudes more moralistic
than most people these days.

Is she still married to my father? If I say 'yes', does that prove
something to you? If I say 'no' does it prove something else?

In reality, either answer proves absolutely nothing to anyone. If I said 'yes', then perhaps it's because my mom choose to follow your rules, even though she didn't agree with them. Or perhaps my parents never had such rules, and yet they are still married. If I said 'no', it still proves nothing. Perhaps both my parents followed your rules to the letter, and yet are still divorced. Perhaps neither did. Maybe just my mom did, and yet my father left her.

In any case, without knowing a host of details, you really couldn't make any valid judgement based upon either answer.

On the other hand, I'm sure I could find any number of people married for over ten years that disagree with you. Over twenty years would be more difficult, simply because I doubt that as many use the internet.

This attitude of yours goes right along with the rest of the attitudes you exhibit here, however. Guess I shouldn't be surprised.

Sean.

2456. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 15:59:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0509FD.E8B9DB8B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25453

Dick Carroll wrote:
> And neither do I,nor HAVE I posted such bigoted accusatory statements,
> as I havd been repeatedly accused by Rick and Cecil.

That's the disadvantage of multiple personalities, Dick. One
doesn't remember what the other posted. Go back and read your
own postings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2457. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:02:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C050A8E.DB73B045@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25454

Rick Adams wrote:
> Dave, you can't even see the difference between a Libertarian
> (a member of the Libertarian political party) and a libertarian (one
> who adheres to a policy of liberty). Confusing them--as you insist on
> doing--is like confusing a Democrat (member of the Democratic party)
> and a democrat (person who believes in democracy).

Remember Dave is the guy who jumped down my throat for confusing
"church" with "Church". Too bad he doesn't practice what he
preaches.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2458. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:03:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C050AD1.CDA8E061@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25456

Dave Heil wrote:
> You little "L" types demonstrate your freedom by attempting to
> stifle the views of another.

Is that what Thomas Jefferson did?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2459. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:04:15 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <e49aad709841d33fd512fe1437f4b340.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 25455

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message

>
> Yep, and I seem to recall a similar type rental for somewhere
> in Australia being advertised in the ham mags.
>

Assuming he is talking about USA rules, the VK example wouldn't
be relevant. Having said that, there is (was?) a hotel in 9M8
which includes one suite with a ham setup, including a pretty
classy antenna farm.

3333333, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from 1cust252.tnt1.minneapolis3.mn.da.uu.net [63.30.251.252]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2460. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:04:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C050B17.79407C41@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25457

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I've provided you no information whatever regarding the matter.
> >
> > On the contrary, you have provided me all the information I need.
> > If you are too ignorant to realize it, I feel sorry for you.
>
> You apparently can't take "I'm not telling you" as an answer. Maybe
> Rick should re-examine his diagnosis of your obsessive compulsive
> behavior.
>
> I'm still not telling you, Cecil. On with your quest!

You are too ignorant to realize that you've already told me.
So be it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2461. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:07:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C050BBD.E1E8E33D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25458

Dick Carroll wrote:
> As usual, your entire premise is wrong. Nothing I said or intimated can
> reasonably be interpreted to say that all 1.25 billion Muslims are
> terrorists, but it is clear that far more than enough to take us out are
> indeed of that persuasion. What to do with THEM? I think Dubya etc are
> handling that adequately at this point. Where it goes from Afghanistan
> will be the catch.

Now wait just a minute, Dick. I'm the one who agrees with what Bush is
doing. You are the one who wants *all* Muslims punished because they
cannot seem to help themselves when they *all* believe in terrorism.
Where did the other Dick Carroll go, you know, the genocidal one?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2462. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:13:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C050D0C.F4BDD222@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25459

Rick Adams wrote:
> Same here. Dick, you KNOW that the bible is filled with
> threats of "punishment" for religious infractions or non-believers.

For instance, regarding people who "serve other gods": Deut 13:15
"Thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the
edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein,
and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword." That's how
tolerant Dick's religion is.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2463. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:16:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C050DC1.457FC0B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25460

Rick Adams wrote:
> But (the Nazis) did so within the framework of their Constitution,
> not by force. Technically, the US Congress could do exactly the same
> thing to our system anytime they chose to do so, provided they could
> garner sufficient votes, as the Nazis did.

Apparently, the President could do it with Executive Orders. Do
you think the President could disolve Congress with an Executive
Order?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2464. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:18:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C050E43.5ED81625@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25461

N2EY wrote:
> Yup. My point is that the Constitution is not an absolute protection, as Cecil
> seems to think.

I didn't say it is absolute protection nor do I believe such.
However, it has usually been adequate protection but not always.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2465. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:27:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u339i$41t$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 25462

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > And neither do I,nor HAVE I posted such bigoted accusatory statements,
> > as I havd been repeatedly accused by Rick and Cecil.
>
> That's the disadvantage of multiple personalities, Dick. One
> doesn't remember what the other posted. Go back and read your
> own postings.
>

You know about multiple personalities, all aright. It's reality you have problems with.

2466. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:27:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C051083.8C9D5A22@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25464

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ah...Plourde, do you see anywhere that I said it was trivial?

You certainly implied it. Maybe you should be more careful
with your words, Dick. Everyone seems to be misunderstanding
what you are trying to say.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2467. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:28:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u33bh$41t$1@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 25463

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C046D97.4A88E58A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Were you required to pass the exams, Dick, or did you cheat?
>
> Cecil:
>
> There is/was a legal way that a person could get an Extra license without
> taking any additional examsl, and without cheating. I don't think Dick got his
> that way, and neither did I, but it WAS possible.

Cecil has no clue.

2468. Re: Whats the deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:30:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C051124.EAA8B922@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25465

Chuck wrote:
> I cme ot this new group in hopes of finding out intereting tid bits of Ham
> Radio Policy. What goes here?, not one posting about policy.

Feel free to post one. What policy would you like to discuss?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2469. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:45:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u34bn$6ta$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 25466

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Cecil, it's you that is unconscious. All the animals I have ever been
> > around or read about had no interest in sex whatever until the female
> > was in estrus.
>
> You are just not very aware, Dick. A couple of days ago, my fixed
> female dog mounted my niece's fixed female dog and started humping.
> No estrus in sight.

Yep, it happens on occasion. I guess you believe that is actual homosexuality in animals just the same as humnans. You -and they- are to be pitied.

I used to have a tomcat who wasn't a bit
> choosy about which sex he humped. He raped many a smaller tomcat.
> I had a male duck that raped my mother's chickens.

More tall tales from the Cecilian files.

Homosexuality
> is rampant in animals and the thing that separates animals from
> plants is that animals are *aware*.

Cecil, I'm quite positive that I have been around far more animals of most types than you. The only time I ever have observed anything that could have been in any viewed as abberant sexual activity, other than a very rare curious exhibition such as your neice's confused female dog, was some monkeys in a zoo. In fact, I'm beginning to believe that you and Rick belong in the zoo with them.

2470. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 16:48:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u34hm$6ta$1@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 25467

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > I would say that the routine nonreversible mutilation of any human without
> > their consent is pretty barabic.
>
> I wouldn't say that... (pretty isn't an adverb)... ;-)
>
> I would leave out all those qualifiers and say...
>
> The mutilation of any human is unequivocably barabic.
>
> ...and yet, strangely, these hings happen in many 'civilizations'...
>

I believe that better describes the true quality of that (those)
civilizatioins, or the lack of it, than any words could ever do.

2471. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 17:13:14 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9u35ib$b9p$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 25468

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:XoWM7.200195$3d2.8531144@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Heh. Ok. I love your 'what CW is good for'. Kinda nice.

Some can't seem to take it for the tongue-in-cheek joke that it is.

> Don't look for
> too many people with the guts to put their real e-mail address or real
name
> on a lot of posts.

I've paid for that many times in another news group. Oh well it's one more
barb to shove in the other direction when need a rises.

> Personally, I don't really care about the CW.

You're in the wrong news group!!!

>I'll bet the gummies were
> playing that tape for a week! The unfortunate side effect of this was
they
> pulled the beer cooler out of the ham shack. Oh well ...

Yeah, you got them P.O. so they let you guys know in the only way that would
REALLY matter. 8-))

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

2472. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 17:16:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u3661bgk0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 25469

CAM wrote:
>
Exactly what do you want to do with them, Dick? What would
> you do with the 300,000 American Muslims?

Who hinted that I want to do anything at all with them? If they act like freedomloving Americans -and are in fact American citizens, and not here illigally on expired visas (2 million aliens are currently here on expired visas accordding to data I saw yesterday) that should be sufficient to assure their freedom just as you and I. The very many who are here in disdain of our laws are thus suspect, and must be caught and dealt with according to the results of the investigation involved. No doubt that will turn up a number of terrorist types. The rest of the world has gotten used to abusing the American system and some hold it in disdain, as it deserves. The actions and more to the point lack of any coherent action, of Clintoon and co. has left us very exposed.

> > I DID say that based on the fundamental teachings of Islam, every
> > Muslim *is* a potential terrorist in that it is almost certaian that he
> > will be forced to make a choice-follow his religious teachings and
> > leaders, or reject them.
>
> Well, let me quote what your God says to do with people who believe in
> other gods. "Thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with
> the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein,
> and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword." Dick, your God
> isn't any more tolerant of other religions than is the Islamic God.

Cecil I'm no the one attending Southern Baptist services every weekend, that's you. But don't tell me that current Christian theory and practice includes death and destruction to all nonbelievers as does a serious component of Islam today. It just isn't so and you know it. That sort of viewpoint is limited to a miniscule group of singleminded abortion clinic bombers in the USA. The radical Islamics on the other hand are determined to virtually destroy the USA and all within it, even their own kind, the Muslims living here, since it is not practical to keep them from the same fate. They are viewed as simply expendables. There is no comparing the two philosophies and you know it. So stop the BS.

2473. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 17:19:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u36b8bgk1@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 25470

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 02:51:52 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Ok, let's use your figures. If one tenth of one percent of the world/s
> >1.25 BILLION muslims are Islamic fundamentalist terrorists, that's
> >1,250,000 terrorists, if my calculator functioned correctly. Still think
> >it's no problem?
>
> It would be if the original assumption was right--but of
> course it was only a "throw-away" percentage that Cecil cited to make
> his point and never intended to be accurate.
>
> I would be VERY surprised if more than 1/10000 of 1 percent of
> the muslims (i.e., 1,250 people) were in any way connected with
> terrorism--and most of those are supporters or demonstrators, not
> actual terrorists. Compare that to the right wing fanatics in the
> militias throughout our country (you know, the Timothy McVeigh types)
> and I think you'll find we have MANY more such individuals than they
> have.
>
> > I DID say that based on the fundamental teachings of Islam, every
> >Muslim *is* a potential terrorist in that it is almost certaian that he
> >will be forced to make a choice-follow his religious teachings and
> >leaders, or reject them. In countries where fundamentalist Islam is not
> >only the religion but the law as well, asking a Muslim to reject his
> >religion can easily be fatal. At the least, it will cause him huge
> >amounts of personal problems and grief.
>
> And, of course, precisely the same thing applies to
> Christians, as my own response to your Koran quotes shows.
>

I guess you would believe that, given your twisted Ultraliberal
viewpoint,
masquerading as it does behind the fascia of libertarianism. You haven't
shown anything like that at all, of course.

2474. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 18:32:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C052DB1.15F82DDF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25471

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You know about multiple personalities, all aright. It's reality you have
> problems with.

Sometimes, Dick, but not this time. I advocated neutralizing the
terrorists. You advocated neutralizing the Islamics, presumably
all one billion of them. Exactly what actions do you propose to
take against one billion Muslims, Dick? Please be specific.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2475. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 18:48:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05316B.67D7360C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25472

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Who hinted that I want to do anything at all with them?

You did, Dick. You said, in so many words, that all Muslims have no choice except to become terrorists because they adhere to the letter of the Koran and are required to kill people of another religion. OTOH, I posted what Muslims believe about Jesus as one of the greatest prophets of all time, born of The Virgin Mary.

> Cecil I'm no the one attending Southern Baptist services every weekend,
> that's you. But don't tell me that current Christian theory and practice
> includes death and destruction to all nonbelievers as does a serious
> component of Islam today.

If, as you say, Muslims have no choice except to follow the letter of the Koran and kill any member of another religion, then I submit to you that Christians also have no choice except to follow the letter of the Bible and kill any member of another religion. To wit:

Here is what our God tells us to do to people who "serve other gods".

Deuteronomy 13
12 If thou shalt hear say in one of thy cities, which the Lord thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying,
13 Certain men, the children of Belial, are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which ye have not known;
14 Then shalt thou inquire, and make search, and ask diligently; and, behold, if it be the truth, and the thing is certain, that such abomination is wrought among you;
15 Thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein, and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword.
16 And thou shalt gather all the spoil of it into the midst of the street thereof, and shalt burn with fire the city, and all the spoil thereof of every whit, for the Lord thy God: and it shall be an heap for ever; it shall not be built again.

I submit that your logic is flawed, Dick. Probably 99.99% of Moslems are tolerant of other religions and take their Koran with a grain of salt just as 99.99%

of Christians are tolerant of other religions and take
their Bible with a grain of salt. Heck, half of the
religious writings of Judaism, Islam, and Christianity
are virtually identical. Moses, who wrote the above,
is a great prophet in all three religions. Guess what
"God" was in Jesus' native language? Would you believe
"Allah"? Jehovah=Yahweh=Allah
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2476. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 18:50:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0531F5.5C6D456C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25473

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil has no clue.

Are we talking about commercial radio licenses, Executive Orders,
or what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2477. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 18:57:02 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <2saN7.200797$3d2.8621226@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25474

Heh, you misunderstood my 'I don't care' attitude. I used to love CW. I'm just waiting to get another HF rig (after doing a couple of roofs, remodeling the kitchen and the bathroom - I just don't want to charge it. It will wait.). Most likely I'll end up on a few digital modes (largely CW) and some SSB. Who know? I've just got to start planning an antenna (no mean feat living on a city lot!). Anyone can construct a dummy load - I need a decent antenna. Heck, I haven't been on HF in 30 years!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message news:9u35ib$b9p$1@news.bignet.net...
>
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:XoWM7.200195$3d2.8531144@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Heh. Ok. I love your 'what CW is good for'. Kinda nice.
>
> Some can't seem to take it for the tongue-in-cheek joke that it is.
>
> > Don't look for
> > too many people with the guts to put their real e-mail address or real
> name
> > on a lot of posts.
>
> I've paid for that many times in another news group. Oh well it's one more
> barb to shove in the other direction when need a rises.
>
> > Personally, I don't really care about the CW.
>
> You're in the wrong news group!!!
>
> >I'll bet the gummies were
> > playing that tape for a week! The unfortunate side effect of this was
> they
> > pulled the beer cooler out of the ham shack. Oh well ...
>
> Yeah, you got them P.O. so they let you guys know in the only way that
would
> REALLY matter. 8-))
>
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0

>
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "
>
>

2478. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 18:57:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05339B.9DC86C7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25476

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You are just not very aware, Dick. A couple of days ago, my fixed
> > female dog mounted my niece's fixed female dog and started humping.
> > No estrus in sight.
>
> Yep, it happens on occasion. I guess you believe that is actual
> homosexuality in animals just the same as humnans.

Is a humnan anything like a hummer? Is that your species? Certainly
that is an example of homosexuality in dogs. And no, dogs are not
the same as humans. I'm surprised you would think such a thing.

> I used to have a tomcat who wasn't a bit
> > choosy about which sex he humped. He raped many a smaller tomcat.
> > I had a male duck that raped my mother's chickens.
>
> More tall tales from the Cecilian files.

Not a tall tale at all, Dick. The neighbors brought their half
grown tomcats over to show us their bleeding rear ends. Did you
know cats have barbs on their peni?

> Cecil, I'm quite positive that I have been around far more animals of
> most types than you.

Doubt it, Dick. I grew up on a farm. Most of my uncles were
ranchers. If you want to alleviate your ignorance on the
subject, do a web search for "homosexual+animals".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2479. Re: Whats the deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 18:58:54 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <OtaN7.200798$3d2.8622179@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25475

A lot of us post concerning one policy. The golden rule. Do unto others
BEFORE they do unto you. Then split!

:-)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Chuck" <kb8pdr@fuse.net> wrote in message
news:u09733tfurlt0a@corp.supernews.com...
> I cme ot this new group in hopes of finding out intereting tid bits of Ham
> Radio Policy. What goes here?, not one posting about policy. Either my
> computer is goofed or you poeple are just enraged with one another. I hate
> to even post the message here, but this is all new to me. I will wait a
few
> daays and see if anything actually comes up about policy if not I will
move
> on. One thing that does strike me funny as that Dave Heil is here and
> posting, I hope this is not the same Dave Heil that builds the
microphones.
> As this would be dissapointing to me. As I was hoping that you would have
> some very interesting tid bits posted here. Later all. I hope that does
not
> offend anyone. But I would think that the news group would reflect the
> title. Chuck
>
>

2480. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:01:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1A466C173E169CEA.DCB113D7AEA23EF2.73603558A302279C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25477

On 28 Nov 2001 05:11:56 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> He could to, and is.

Too bad your memory is so weak, Dick. YOU were part of the
discussion here when I DID take the test--and you even made comments
(sarcastic ones, as I recall) when I mentioned here that I'd just
passed my 20WPM.

As one of your idols (Dan Qayle) said: "What a terrible thing
it is to lose one's mind--or never to have had one before." I'm sure
you can relate to that.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2481. Re: Whats the deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:05:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C053572.B57ED535@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25478

Chuck wrote:
>
> I cme ot this new group in hopes of finding out intereting tid bits of Ham
> Radio Policy. What goes here?, not one posting about policy. Either my
> computer is goofed or you poeple are just enraged with one another. I hate
> to even post the message here, but this is all new to me. I will wait a few
> daays and see if anything actually comes up about policy if not I will move
> on. One thing that does strike me funny as that Dave Heil is here and
> posting, I hope this is not the same Dave Heil that builds the microphones.
> As this would be dissapointing to me. As I was hoping that you would have
> some very interesting tid bits posted here. Later all. I hope that does not
> offend anyone. But I would think that the news group would reflect the
> title. Chuck

There is no Dave Heil who builds microphones. That's Bob Heil K9EID.
Now you don't have to be disappointed. If you'd like some real
disappointment, try reading some of the utter filth in
rec.radio.amateur.misc.

Usually, a thread here begins with ham radio and wanders off topic to
degenerate into something about the U.S. not being free because it
doesn't permit prostitution or marijuana smoking. Apparently you are
now reading one or more of those off topic threads.

Dave K8MN

2482. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:15:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0537B6.E4480D24@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25479

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <1A7EA877217F328F.363625849C7957A8.3D676BEF89372E80@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> >>What makes you think it is *I* who is offending them?
> >
> > You, Dave, and Dick present a far worse image of hams here
> >than Kim could do if she posted PICTURES of her tits instead of using
> >TIT in her call sign!
>
> Rick:
>
> I see. So far, Kim has not chosen to do that, and I, for one, am
> extremely grateful!
>
> > I'm happy that the ARS has more of a range than the three of
> >you present. If it didn't, I'd be ashamed to admit I was a ham.
>
> I respect differences of opinion. The problem with liberals such as
> yourself is that you can "tolerate" anything *except* a difference of
> opinion! As an American, I'd defend to the death your right to express
> your differences of opinion here or anywhere else -- but I'm not so
> sure you would!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

What you've said about Rick is pretty much true. Once you've been told to "shut the (expletive deleted) up" by a Buddhist libertarian professor, the light begins to dawn that he isn't all that concerned with liberty other than his own.

I don't recall demanding that Kim "shut the (expletive deleted) up" though I have to admit that I might have wished she would on occasion. Rick comes across like a '60s radical with a real job but unchanged political views. I don't believe that there is anything which will convince him that his skewed views run counter to the mainstream but it is fun to watch him rail against the system, the country and mainstream morality and religion. I haven't called for him to desist and I don't remember that you have.

Dave K8MN

2483. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:15:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <5C3A68D7A1AAFC20.818450E39CC1B027.3FBA66BA24034C91@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25480

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 06:12:35 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I don't. You did. The kids didn't have an opportunity to consent.

Did your kids have the opportunity to consent to religious
exposure before you stated teaching them about Christianity?

Mine was only exposed to the real world (and I _don't_ use
that type of language frequently). Yours was/were exposed to
brainwashing and superstition. Neither consented. I wonder which of us
harmed our kids more?

>> Opinion. Some people express certain thoughts more accurately
>> using such terms, others don't.
>
>You don't.

You're right--which is why I seldom use them instead of more
precise terms.

>> My use of the English language?
>
>Is that the conclusion that you drew from my statement?

It's the view you presented in your statement.

>> Never claimed to be tranquil either. OR a "large "L"
>> Libertarian--just a libertarian.
>
>And the libertarian's idea of freedom is to tell someone to shut the
>*bleep* up? Keep working on the Buddhist thing.

Why?

You have the right to tell _me_ to shut up as well. The
libertarian idea of freedom includes free speech, including the right
to express your views--and if that view is that the person you are
communicating with should "shut up" then you have every right to
express it, just not to enforce it.

I don't need to work on the "Buddhist thing" Dave, I never
claimed to be a practicing Buddhist--I accept Buddhist philosophy but
not Buddhist religious practices (which, btw, is a perfectly
acceptable perspective in Buddhism, even though it wouldn't be in
Christianity). On the other hand, several people here present
themselves as Christians (including you, Dick, Larry, and others). Try
working on your OWN religious behavior before you criticize that of

others (motes and beams, remember?). Your religion teaches tolerance, non-judgementalism, compassion for others, and gentleness. Looks as though the three of you have a LONG way to go before you can even pretend to be "Christians" to me.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2484. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:23:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05399A.89BEE919@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25481

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > I would say that the routine nonreversible mutilation of any human without
> > their consent is pretty barabic.
>
> I wouldn't say that... (pretty isn't an adverb)... ;-)
>
> I would leave out all those qualifiers and say...
>
> The mutilation of any human is unequivocably barabic.
>
> ...and yet, strangely, these hings happen in many 'civilizations'...

In this peculiar day in which we live, it isn't necessary to mutilate children. We just wait until they are in their teens and they will pay to have all sorts of parts tattooed or pierced.

Dave K8MN

2485. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:26:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A4F4B2F8454FCA4B.83AA700126467C90.3098D71CB22851B9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25482

On 28 Nov 2001 10:23:22 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Rick is a university professor; as such, he has a professional mandate
>to be politically correct in thought, word, and deed.

I do?

That's news to me. If anything, on the campus where I teach
I'm KNOWN for not being "PC."

Sorry, Larry, but your picture of academia just doesn't mesh
with reality. In the early Nineties PC was the "in" thing--but today
it's far less emphasized and outside of expecting academics to
demonstrate respect for other cultures and races in the classroom
(something any intelligent person would do anyway) "PC" really doesn't
have much influence anymore.

>He is just doing
>what comes naturally for people who are committed to supporting the
>social decay necessary to ensure that liberal socialist elites maintain
>their position as the ruling class in the New World Order.

What a wonderfully absurd statement!

Larry, someday you REALLY need to take (or pass if you wasted
a professor's time taking it before) a course in Political Science.
Not only are those views contradictory--social decay does NOT "ensure
that liberal socialist elites maintain their position . . .," in the
first place the concept of a "liberal socialist elite" is a
contradiction in terms (by definition, elitists in a political sense
are conservatives not liberals), but that position is in direct
opposition to the libertarian perspective I've been presenting since I
entered this slugfest!

Libertarians (small OR large "l") are NOT liberals or
socialists, Larry. We come quite far from fitting that mold.

> Lately, it
>has become fashionable for liberals like themselves to couch their
>beliefs in the label of Libertarianism, but it's still the same thing. The
>difference is that conservatives are willing to share the hegemony,
>liberals are not. While we may not dislike them personally, we still
>cannot trust them.

Take a PoliSci course, Larry. You sound like even more of an
uneducated idiot here than usual.

For the last time without charging tuition, libertarians are
NOT liberals.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2486. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:29:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C053B07.E62B13E4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25483

CAM wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Dave, you can't even see the difference between a Libertarian
> > (a member of the Libertarian political party) and a libertarian (one
> > who adheres to a policy of liberty). Confusing them--as you insist on
> > doing--is like confusing a Democrat (member of the Democratic party)
> > and a democrat (person who believes in democracy).
>
> Remember Dave is the guy who jumped down my throat for confusing
> "church" with "Church". Too bad he doesn't practice what he
> preaches.

Your memory is slipping. I used a word with a capital "C". You did the jumping about it. Most of your jumping turned out to be to conclusions and incorrect ones at that. Did you find the relevant part in your heavy dictionary yet?

Now instead of voting for the "Libertarian Party" candidate, you'll have to search for a "libertarian Party" candidate.

Now about Kim's call, the only portion of this endless rant which related to amateur radio...

Dave K8MN

2487. Re: K1MAN webpage.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:29:57 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9u3omrfdg4@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 25502
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Carleton Ingerson" <n1dxm@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:323N7.239375$W8.8287832@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> I agree, this jerk has been run off the air once already. Who the hell let
> him back on??

FWIW, K1MAN claims to have been off the air because of taking a teaching
position.

> "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:a96f1f4d2ee76e5b3a11b225221d54bf.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
> > news:e1bb06a74f973f91732f3ab8815a96bd@spamfreenews.com...
> >
> > > This is a very good site......
> > >
> > > http://www.carte.net/k1man/sites.htm
> >
> >
> > K1MAN is a pathetic scam artist, and you are a pathetic suck-up.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Posted from mplsapanas11poolb82.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.20.82]
> > via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>
>

2488. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:32:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C053BB6.5F0CC371@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25484

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You little "L" types demonstrate your freedom by attempting to
> > stifle the views of another.
>
> Is that what Thomas Jefferson did?

Don't you know? At what point in his life did Uncle Thomas begin referring to himself as a libertarian? Remember in his quarrel with Hamilton how he shouted, "Just shut the (expletive deleted) up, Al!"?

Dave K8MN

2489. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:34:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C053C2B.85E8A7C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25485

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I've provided you no information whatever regarding the matter.
> > >
> > > On the contrary, you have provided me all the information I need.
> > > If you are too ignorant to realize it, I feel sorry for you.
> >
> > You apparently can't take "I'm not telling you" as an answer. Maybe
> > Rick should re-examine his diagnosis of your obsessive compulsive
> > behavior.
> >
> > I'm still not telling you, Cecil. On with your quest!
>
> You are too ignorant to realize that you've already told me.
> So be it.

...and your obsessive/compulsive side can't admit that no such thing has taken place in this dimension or reality. You just don't get any help from me in your search. On with your quest!

Dave K8MN

2490. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:46:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <34976FD0F948FB2C.B707F891A694C7A3.0E8FD74A804BEEB9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25486

On 28 Nov 2001 04:54:30 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Dick has made it very clear that he
>> intends to keep this thread alive (with a subject line that is
>> DIRECTLY related to Kim) until she changes her call sign. THAT, Jim,
>> is an attempt to force her to act against her will, and it is wrong
>> from ANY moral perspective.
>
> OK, so you now have earned the title of Professor Bullshit Squared.

Do you deny stating that you intend to keep the thread going,
Dick?

>> If this discussion was, as you claim, directed to the generic
>> topic of whether certain call signs are good or bad for the image of
>> the ARS, Kim's sign would be mentioned no more than any other that was
>> found in the callbook and was considered inappropriate by anyone. That
>> is patently not the case.
>
> You are patently full of it up to your eyebrows.

Why--because I disagree with you?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2491. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:48:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8A4C1104920D59DD.54EEDE22E0492CB3.D007AEAD4790BE8F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25487

On Tue, 27 Nov 2001 22:52:39 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Were you required to pass the exams, Dick, or did you cheat?

I'm sure he didn't have to cheat, Cecil.

How hard could it be to pass a test on spark gap theory
anyway?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2492. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:50:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <FD7243487561B960.26751406F9A8CEE1.E55C709CC7EA0D93@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25488

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 12:50:29 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Are we talking about commercial radio licenses, Executive Orders,
>or what?

Didn't they pass a rule that anyone that was licensed during
the first three years of the ARS received an automatic upgrade to
Extra on his 100th birthday?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2493. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 19:55:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <59321D8DBA23E3C8.6B405E6A488CBA30.ECF27DADE9948FF2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25489

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 06:16:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Right. You little "L" types demonstrate your freedom by attempting to
>stifle the views of another. Keep telling folks to shut up. It does
>wonders for your image.

Dave, not only would it be perfectly acceptable to a
libertarian to tell someone to shut up--just not to _require_ them to
do so--but I have yet to see you produce a direct quotation where I
TOLD you to shut up.

I HAVE told you that you don't have the vaguest idea what
you're talking about when it comes to libertarianism, and that you
should use the words correctly--but if you interpret that to be the
equivalent of telling you to shut up, it must be because you CAN'T use
the words correctly, and it mean shutting up if you tried.

>> The libertarian philosophy is integral to the US Constitution
>> and the Declaration of Independence. I guess both of THOSE are
>> impractical as well from your perspective, right?
>
>Are you now stating what you'd like me to say? My sentence works just
>fine on its own without the translation.

Precisely WHERE did I provide you a quote to recite, Dave? You
really ARE quite good at misquoting people, aren't you? Must help a
lot in winning arguments when you get to provide the dialog for both
sides.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2494. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 20:13:38 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9u3g4chaj1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 25490

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:2saN7.200797$3d2.8621226@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Heh, you misunderstood my 'I don't care' attitude. I used to love CW.

What do you figure your code speed is after all the years of I assume non
use?

> I'm
> just waiting to get another HF rig (after doing a couple of roofs,
> remodeling the kitchen and the bathroom - I just don't want to charge it.
> It will wait.).

Paying the interest charges on a credit card for a few months will ruin the
best deal you can find on a rig mail order.

> Most likely I'll end up on a few digital modes (largely CW)
> and some SSB. Who know?

Hollingsworth seemed to be a big fan of PSK31. He must have mentioned it at
least 20 times during his recent talk on enforcement issues at the Fort
Wayne Hamfest the other week.

>I've just got to start planning an antenna (no
> mean feat living on a city lot!). Anyone can construct a dummy load - I
> need a decent antenna.

I live in an apartment. Trying to come up antennas that work well even at
V/UHF is not easy to do.

> Heck, I haven't been on HF in 30 years!

Sounds like you have a bit of catching up to do. 8-))

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

--
"People have a societal and ethical responsibility to be considerate of
the rights of your fellow citizen. Those that choose to ignore and
dismiss this out of hand are, at the very least, social deviates and
misfits, who are morally bankrupt, and at the most, criminal. "

Dave Hall

2495. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 20:32:12 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0111281232.1ed0aea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25491

"Bob - KE4JCD" <ke4jcd@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<8yUL7.113107$Yb.28227333@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>...
> As you said "I haven't seen such "droves" in my area." Well the CODE TEST
> hasn't been dropped yet. People I talk to all say much of the same thing,
> The CODE is stopping them and when its gone so will HAM RADIO! CBers will
> come in droves and as I have on my website, BAD HABITS!

So argue for harder tests. I guarentee that if code is stopping them,
they won't be upgrading to AE. Not with the current test, at least.
It's too much work to learn that test. The key is to make the test difficult
enough that it takes effort to pass it. Doesn't matter whether it's
a code test or a written test. If it takes time and effort to pass it,
it's too much work.

> One page on my site deals with what Amateur radio is slowly becoming, the
> new children's band...
>
> Here something sweet for your ears...
> http://www.hartungpress.com/hamradio/crummyhams.htm

I listened to most of that last night. What's funny is that you often
couldn't tell the good guys from the bad guys.

All of them were acting that poorly.

Sean.

2496. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 20:40:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E549E727B6E43381.C6B3E03F9718E168.E2710D7DE8F1D9C5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25492

On 28 Nov 2001 10:23:20 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>The FCC is not in the business of making value judgments on the
>callsigns people select for themselves. Being a government agency,
>they are legally constrained against doing so. An individual amateur's
>Vanity call sign is strictly *their* choice; and the negative effect it has
>on their image, and the image of the ARS, is strictly *their*
>responsibility. Mr. Hollingsworth was very clear on that point.

I have no problem with that at all.

What I DO have a problem with is people who claim to believe
the above view, yet insist on making Kim's call sign THEIR business as
well as her's.

Either it is strictly *her* business (as your statement makes
it clear that it is) or it is not. If it is, then what possible
justification do you, Dick, and Dave have for taking her to task for
her choice? If, on the other hand, it is NOT her choice, then it is
the FCC, not you, Dick, and Dave, that is responsible for affecting
that decision. In no case, however, is it the business of others to
tell her (beyond a single statement of personal opinion) to change her
call or that she is "damaging the ARS" by maintaining it. In
particular, Dick's insistence that this thread will continue until she
changes her call is a direct contradiction of the spirit and the
content of your own statement above--it simply replaces FCC authority
with blackmail.

It's time for people to step back and drop the subject for
good. You, Dick, and Dave don't care for her call sign and feel it is
harmful to the image of the ARS. Fine. You have the right to feel that
way if you choose. Others of us, including myself, Cecil, and many
others feel the opposite, and we have just as much right to our view
as you have to yours. Neither you nor we, however, have the slightest
right to expect Kim to accept--or even care about--our personal views
on the subject. It's her call sign. She decided she wanted it and if
and when she no longer does want it, she will be the one to decide to
change it again. Slamming her or pressuring her here in this news
group accomplishes absolutely nothing for anyone, and creates an even
worse image of tolerance among hams than the discussions in rram!

>> There is no way that Kim is responsible for damage to the ARS
>>if her actions are ALL within the guidelines of the FCC
>>regulations--and her's were.
>

>Incorrect, for the reasons stated above.

Nope. Any action which can accurately be predicted to harm a governmental agency or to adversely impact on its operations is legitimately subject to Federal regulation. That Kim's call sign is NOT so subject makes it clear that the FCC does not regard it as a threat to the service.

>That is not Mr. Hollingsworth's job to do, nor should it be.

Neither is offering his personal opinion, in his official capacity, concerning the morality of her call (an implicit part of the claim that her call sign will bring the ARS "...one step closer to extinction" is the assumption that there is something inherently wrong with the call sign in the first place). Outside of a limited range of topics, all having to do with FCC regulations and enforcement, Hollingsworth's opinion has absolutely no more nor less weight than that of any other individual. Many of us in this news group have been part of the ARS as long as Hollingsworth or longer--and many of us have at least as much on-the-air experience as he does. I don't know when--or even IF--Hollingsworth was licensed as a ham (his name doesn't appear in the database on qrz.com), but having been a licensed ham for over 25 years I suspect I have at least as much practical experience with ham radio as he has--and I KNOW many of the people in this news group have more than he has. What makes HIS interpretation of the effect of Kim's call sign any more relevant or accurate than anyone else's? His title? Great--I'll be more than glad to write Noam Chomsky and ask HIS opinion on the topic--and as the top expert in linguistics in the world, he is certainly more qualified to speak on the subject of the interpretation and effect of words than is Riley Hollingsworth, Dick Carroll, or anyone else in this news group, myself included.

> The
>best arbitrators of the effect of Kim's poor choice in a callsign are
>her fellow hams; and that is precisely what is taking place here.

No it isn't Larry. This isn't an expression of opinion, it's a witch hunt!

It's one thing to inform Kim politely that you don't agree with her choice of call signs and that you feel it could have a negative effect on potential new hams. That's reasonable. But to hound her, ridicule her, and insult her as has been occurring here since the thread began is nothing but an attempt to force her to change her call against her will, and that's abominable behavior for people who CLAIM to be supporting morality.

>Obviously we, as her fellow hams, are in disagreement on this
>issue. In fact, the majority would seem to support Kim. That,
>however, will not make the debate come to an end. The only
>thing that will stop it is for Kim to change her callsign to one

>which no longer offends, or you can figure out some way to
>silence your opposition.

In other words, you, Dick, Dave, and the very few others who oppose her sign (you admit yourself that the majority of hams support her), will simply hound and harass her until you force her to obey your orders!

Talk about a group of smug, self-righteous, fascists! It's people like YOU who give a bad name to ham radio, you hypocrite, not decent people like Kim.

Trust me, Larry, until you and Dick back off on your vendetta against her I, and I'm sure others in this group, will see to it that your viciousness and lack of morality are VERY clearly pointed out to everyone who joins the thread.

At one time I had some respect for you, Larry. But no one who would deliberately harass and badger someone to do something even YOU admit is both her decision and one most other hams support doesn't deserve respect, only contempt.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2497. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 20:43:59 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B2E42985DE9AE6F8.1805E004EC1A4BF8.ACF7CE7F0E7491C9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25493

On 28 Nov 2001 10:23:21 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I see. So far, Kim has not chosen to do that, and I, for one, am
>extremely grateful!

Why, are you afraid it would make you too aroused?

>I respect differences of opinion.

No you don't. If you did you wouldn't harass Kim over a topic
that reflects such a difference.

> The problem with liberals such as
>yourself is that you can "tolerate" anything *except* a difference of
>opinion!

You're as bad as Dave, Larry. Can't you read at all? I'm NOT a
liberal, I'm a libertarian.

>As an American, I'd defend to the death your right to express
>your differences of opinion here or anywhere else -- but I'm not so
>sure you would!

Would you Larry?

Is that why you promise to badger Kim about her choices until
she capitulates to your demands?

Doesn't sound very "American" to me.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2498. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 20:50:03 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B97A0168FB090DB0.B7E1B34CFCD8AC8C.39ED4A3F158482DC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25494

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 06:22:35 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>...and I just pointed out several opportunities for glaring errors in
>your theory.

Opinions, Dave. Not statements of fact. You provide NO source
to contradict me other than your own personal views.

>As I recall, I recently poked holes in some of the
>information you provided.

No, actually, you didn't.

>Some was from suspect sources with an agenda
>(NORML).

Which I balanced with information from an opposing source with
the opposite agenda--the DEA.

NORML is a legitimate source of information, Dave. You may not
agree with their conclusions, but their facts and figures are
completely accurate, as even the DEA would agree.

> One was from a book which provided figures but not figures
>stating what you claimed.

Bunk.

> Your latest stuff doesn't even sound like
>evidence at all.

To you.

Again, when you start providing more solid grounds for your
arguments than your personal opinion, you might have legitimacy in
questioning the sources others use to debate you. As it is right now,
it's you against the range of sources I cited--and that doesn't make
your position look very defensible.

> Besides, most of this latest stuff is simply diversion
>from the debate over whether Kim's choice of call was a poor one. At
>least that had something to do with amateur radio.

Not really. Even Larry Roll admits that most hams support her
decision. The "debate" over Kim's choice of a call isn't a debate at
all, it's a way for a few people to attempt to force her to change it
against her will. As such it isn't something to do with ham radio, but
with dictating the behavior of others.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2499. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 21:23:13 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10111282122300.2003-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 25495

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001, KC8PMX wrote:
>Alrighty..... another one of those "what if" questions:
>
>Is it legal to rent or lease ham gear? I was wondering about this one, say
>for instance, here in Michigan we have places called Rental King,
>Rent-a-Center etc. Not that we would want to have ham gear rented at a
>location like that, but if there were places that you could rent or lease
>equipment, in the short term, that may seem like a more feasable option for
>some who clearly cannot afford one of those way-overpriced, multi-band,
>do-everything rigs. (Between those and the "kit" radios, there is not much
>inbetween)
>
>Also, would it be legal to rent someone elses station? Since the FCC license
>does not state what gear you are operating, only that YOU are licensed, is
>this a loophole?
>
>Don't mean to start any arguments, just an honest question, looking for
>intelligent answers.

There is nothing that forbids any of the above. The only thing that the FCC would care about is TRANSMITTING (without a license). As long as the renter/lessee is licensed, I don't see any issue here at all.

2500. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 21:26:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F1DDFEA961A5B00E.CE693C4F7887B6BA.B4F72F00205D6918@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25496

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:17:22 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>Could you cite a referece for "1 out of 100 post" statement?

Statistical evaluation of arbitron usenet statistics from Jan
1, 1995 to July 1, 1995 posted in news.lists

Actually the evaluation was based on a selection of discussion
groups in which the proportion of posters is VERY high. For example,
from the July 1995 arbitron Usenet statistics we learn that in
rec.radio.amateur.policy that month, the following figures were
obtained:

Number of people who read the group: 28098
Number of messages per month: 510

Even if we assume that every message posted that month was
from a different person (a completely absurd assumption, of course),
that would mean that only one out of every 55 readers posted to the
group--and even the most conservative estimate would agree that far
fewer unique individuals posted to the group. Assuming that one of
every 100 individuals posted, it would still mean posts by 281
different individuals that month--a number vastly larger than any
current member of this news group has ever seen post, including during
the heavy traffic months when restructuring was being discussed.

In this particular group, it's pretty doubtful that there are
more than 50 different individuals who post in any given month (if
that many). Using the July 1995 figures (far lower than current
readership, of course, given that Usenet usage has increased by a
factor of three in the last five years alone and it's reasonable to
assume that this increase holds true for rrap as it does for nearly
all other groups), that would mean that approximately one out of every
561 readers posted at least one message that month.

>Seems a little hard to believe, seeing that it is very easy
>to post a followup or start a new thread.

Sure it is (at least with most news clients)--but not only do
most people who read a newsgroup not feel comfortable posting (one of
the major reasons many of us debate in the usenet is not to convince
our opponent to change his/her mind--that seldom if ever happens--but
to present the alternative side of the issue to the majority of
readers who do NOT participate in the discussion), but the hostility
present in MANY threads in this news group would easily discourage
participation by all but the most determined members of the news

group.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2501. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 21:45:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B66095CD4062C6C2.6A4B29300A43CA61.35CA1E01D7EC9CD1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25497

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 06:24:44 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Be my guest, Rick. It wasn't 1979. I'll guess early '90s. I know I've
>been here since the mid-'90s. Is there a prize for the correct answer?

It was created in response to a request for discussion
generated on: Mon Mar 29 20:33:05 1993. Actual creation date would
have been thirty days later, on April 30, 1993.

By July 1995 (only two years later) the newsgroup already had
a readership of over 28,000. Although growth would certainly have
slowed after that time, it's extremely reasonable to assume it has
kept pace with other, special interest, newsgroups in the rec
hierarchy, and thus current readership should be _at least_ 84,000.
Thus, unless a large majority of readers are non-amateurs with an
interest in the hobby (which would certainly support the position that
Cecil and I--among others--have taken that the communications in this
newsgroup influence more potential hams than do on-the-air
discussions), this group is read by at least one out of every seven
licensed amateurs in the United States.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2502. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 21:47:31 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <22687F70492FBF5D.199963F29CBB8D23.31B4C2FD24DA0AFB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25498

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 13:16:56 GMT, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote:

>Oooohhhh! Now that's a shopping list. Only one problem if we wanted to
>pursue a vanity call......It is my understanding that the vanity call system
>has been put on hold due to the anthrax/mail situation/paranoia. Could take
>a while....

Electronic submissions are still being processed--only snail
mail applications are not.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2503. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 21:54:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1B4A8C91A488F7F1.1F0C209F7EF9A4BA.5C47E97EE14F5773@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25499

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:40:43 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Lets face it, people, this is one darn strange thread. :-)

Now THAT is something I can agree with completely! :-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2504. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:12:51 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D8ABE3D033ACAAFF.47358407874D1CB5.2E90FBA1D31912D0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25500

On 28 Nov 2001 06:21:40 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Prefessor Nutball, you had really better work on your interpretive
>reading skills, you couldn't pass Freshman Ccomposition 100 at this
>point. *Nowhere* did I ever remotely indicate any such thing.

My apologies, Dick, it was apparently another hypocrite who
made that statement, not you. It obviously came from Larry Roll, given
his comment in his recent post that:

>Obviously we, as her fellow hams, are in disagreement on this
>issue. In fact, the majority would seem to support Kim. That,
>however, will not make the debate come to an end. The only
>thing that will stop it is for Kim to change her callsign to one
>which no longer offends, or you can figure out some way to
>silence your opposition.

Since the two of you tend to share all the same views, I
mis-attributed the threat to you instead of to him.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2505. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:15:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <65825934752786A2.5F2C34EBE474D0B4.3C078469887A5178@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25501

On 28 Nov 2001 06:22:51 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Yes, very quickly, since they had achieved the control they wanted. It
>was a sham on the desperate German populace from the start.

Don't criticize them too harshly--our populace elected George
Wimpus, didn't we?

Oops. Come to think of it, we didn't--he's President because
of election fraud in the State where his brother is Governor, isn't
he?

Never mind.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2506. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:42:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8819ADD5BDEE6E9B.6A56D9C7759D6AD5.467701F9A232B529@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25503

On 28 Nov 2001 06:31:34 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Question: Where in the COnstitution does it say that an alien has the
>same rights as a citizen? It doesn't.

Neither does a fetus, but tell that to a pro-life proponent.

> Oh, I'm *sure* HE was personally responsible for all the death penalty
>murderers who met their fate in Texas, Yeah, Right! THose poor 'victims'
>had nothing to do with it. And of course THEIR vicims are so soon
>forgotten....

According to a summary posted to the Citizens United for
Alternatives to the Death Penalty web site:

"Bush has even opposed simple safeguards like holding open
meetings. The Texas governor has vetoed legislation which would have
provided funding for basic indigent defense. He called that bill,
which had bipartisan support, "a threat to public safety." Bush also
opposed legislation instituting life without parole and banning the
execution of people with IQ's less than 65. In general, he has been a
leading spokesperson in favor of the death penalty.

As of 7:30pm EDT, December 7, 2000, 152 people have been executed
during Bush's tenure as governor. This makes Texas Governor George W.
Bush the most-killing Governor, in the history of the United States of
America.

Under the leadership of George W. Bush, Texas continues to rank dead
last in virtually every social service area, yet first in executions.
Texas has some of the poorest funded programs to help the mentally ill
(who account for a good number of the prison population). Bush's
response to this dead last ranking was to insist that the legislature
pass a $5 billion tax cut.

Bush has been steadfast in his refusal to recognize the significance
of international treaty law, specifically the right of foreign
nationals facing the death penalty to receive notification of their
right to consular assistance. Texas has the second-largest death row
population of foreign citizens in the USA (after California). None of
these individuals were informed upon arrest of their right to consular
assistance, as guaranteed under the Vienna Convention on Consular
Relations. Even a personal intervention by the US Secretary of State
(in the Faulder case) was ignored by Bush, undermining the viability
of international law, outraging nations allied to the USA and
endangering the human rights of detained foreigners everywhere,
including American citizens arrested abroad.

Texas' criminal justice system as a whole is undoubtedly one of the worst in the nation. This is pointed out so clearly in the September 1999 issue of Harper's, in the Index:

"Number of death sentences upheld by Texas courts since 1990 for men whose lawyers slept during their trials: 3"

In a 1998 report entitled "Lethal Injustice", Amnesty International stated that "at every step in the death penalty process in Texas, a litany of grossly inadequate legal procedures fail to meet recognized minimum international standards for the protection of human rights."

A more recent article entitled "Death In Texas", in the July, 1999 edition of The Champion, Stephen B. Bright, Director of the Southern Center for Human Rights, details how the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals runs the fastest assembly line to the death chamber in the country.

Even more recently, two Texas agencies released reports on the practice of the death penalty in Texas. The Texas Defender Service Report, "A State of Denial: Texas Justice and the Death Penalty," can be downloaded by going to their web page and clicking on "Links and Resources." Also, The Texas Civil Rights Project issued an 87-page report on the death penalty in Texas. Check out "The Death Penalty in Texas: Due Process and Equal Justice or Rush to Execution, Regardless of Innocence.""

> When it comes to terrorists who ARE out to get us -you, too- and none
>of them are American citizens, I have no problem with it. Why should
>they have the right to come here with our destruction as their sole
>intent and then be able to take advantage of our system of personal
>rights to get off free just because of evidentiary weaknesses?

And what about those who are accused but not guilty? Should THEY be deprived of a fair trial too?

For that matter, what about American citizens overseas? If you feel it's acceptable that America is no longer willing to extend the same legal protections to foreign nationals that are available to our citizens, do you likewise feel it reasonable not to grant OUR citizens the same legal protections available to their own people in other nations?

>The OJ
>trial proved what jurys can all too easily do.

Sure. Return a not guilty verdict if they don't believe the case was proven. Off hand, I think that's a pretty good thing TO do. If a prosecutor wants a conviction, then he or she should HAVE to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Is that so hard to accept?

>And it cuts both
>ways...how would you like to be an Arab accused of terrorism standing
>trial in New York? Think you'd stand a chance even if you were totally

>innocent?

Given the legal protections our system provides, you'd have a
lot better chance there than if you were tried by one of Bush's Star
Chambers.

> And the Military Tribulans apply only to non-citizens, you will note.

Of course. If they tried (yet!) to apply such a rule to
citizens, the entire law would be struck down by the SC as completely
unconstitutional and the idiots who passed it would be guaranteed they
would NOT be re-elected.

The problem is, all it does is states that unless you are an
American citizen, you shouldn't be treated fairly by the system. What
a wonderful message to send to the world--America the king of jingoism
and ethnocentricism.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2507. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:43:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0568A7.EC1E305@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25504

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Is that what Thomas Jefferson did?
>
> Don't you know? At what point in his life did Uncle Thomas begin
> referring to himself as a libertarian?

I don't know if he did or didn't but historians have classified
him as a "civil libertarian" for hundreds of years. He certainly
believed in liberating Americans from British rule and giving
us as much personal freedom and protection from government as
is feasible in a civilized society.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2508. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:46:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <662D1F38FD8521B2.9C2BBEC35A4DE6FD.444F1121565268AC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25505

On 28 Nov 2001 06:36:57 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> That's patently untrue. Not all recruit, but many do. And you really
>should know (I'm sure you do) that at certain states of adolescense
>children are indeed recuitable, which can also seriously damage their
>mental development. Now I'd wager you will come back with some indignant
>"officlal" prounouncement that will be as wrong is it is indignant.

No, I'll come back with a professional view that is accurate
even if your personal homophobia refuses to allow you to accept it.

Homosexuals aren't "recruited" Larry--nearly all homosexuals
freely state that they knew their orientation long before they ever
reached puberty--or had their first exposure to sex. Homosexuality is
as natural (albeit less common, for obvious reasons) as
heterosexuality.

You seem to feel that all it takes is exposure to a homosexual
for someone to be "recruited." Are you really that insecure in your
own sexual identity, or do you just believe that no one else is a
"capable" as you of resisting "temptation?"

Adolescents are NOT "recruitable" Larry, as ANY developmental
psychologist would be glad to confirm.

Stick with your field of expertise, Larry, it's patently
apparent you don't know anything about mine.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2509. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:48:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <08CE5ECF79BC3D2F.0BCF20E5D8A70ED9.62E1206000F0F72F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25506

On 28 Nov 2001 06:40:49 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>And neither do I,nor HAVE I posted such bigoted accusatory statements,
>as I havd been repeatedly accused by Rick and Cecil. They are just
>looking for reason and occasion to be blatently accusatory. Both are
>clearly possesed by delusions of grandeur.

The loss of memory that accompanies dementia is a bitch, isn't
it Dickie?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2510. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:48:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0569B2.74EFE7A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25507

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Remember Dave is the guy who jumped down my throat for confusing
> > "church" with "Church". Too bad he doesn't practice what he
> > preaches.
>
> Did you find the relevant part in your heavy dictionary yet?

Nope.

> Now about Kim's call, the only portion of this endless rant which
> related to amateur radio...

And the only relevant question is: Does Kim have a right to choose
a flavor of ice cream that you dislike?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2511. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:51:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C056A5D.7753E38C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25508

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You are too ignorant to realize that you've already told me.
> > So be it.
>
> ...and your obsessive/compulsive side can't admit that no such thing has
> taken place in this dimension or reality. You just don't get any help
> from me in your search. On with your quest!

The odds that you eat pork are essentially equal to the odds
that you will be alive tomorrow. That's all I need to know.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2512. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:53:24 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3A9E9F89D6731966.C86B3D6FCC3DBEC6.468B50D3F5B0566A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25509

On 28 Nov 2001 12:11:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>>Technically, the US Congress could do exactly the same
>>thing to our system anytime they chose to do so, provided they could
>>garner sufficient votes, as the Nazis did.
>
>Yup. My point is that the Constitution is not an absolute protection, as Cecil
>seems to think.

On the contrary--the ability to amend the Constitution is
itself GOVERNED by the Constitution.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2513. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:54:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C056B2F.A8DDEA22@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25511

Dave Heil wrote:
> In this peculiar day in which we live, it isn't necessary to mutilate
> children. We just wait until they are in their teens and they will pay
> to have all sorts of parts tattooed or pierced.

You forgot about consent, Dave. Big difference.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2514. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 22:55:24 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <422D37777F11E919.EBA738ADB107A7A2.CF15F646E8890B0F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25510

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 10:16:01 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> But (the Nazis) did so within the framework of their Constitution,
>> not by force. Technically, the US Congress could do exactly the same
>> thing to our system anytime they chose to do so, provided they could
>> garner sufficient votes, as the Nazis did.
>
>Apparently, the President could do it with Executive Orders. Do
>you think the President could disolve Congress with an Executive
>Order?

No--because it isn't permitted by our Constitution. Some
method of dissolving the legislative body (congress, parliament, etc.)
IS permitted by most Constitutions of democratic nations (i.e., the
UK, etc.).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2515. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 23:12:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C056F55.85F31BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25512

```
Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >Apparently, the President could do it with Executive Orders. Do
> >you think the President could disolve Congress with an Executive
> >Order?
>
> No--because it isn't permitted by our Constitution.

Are Executive Orders permitted by our Constitution?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2516. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 23:18:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <96794E22F3372B39.3330EBBE6151D5EA.4D539B083D62D5FB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25513

On 28 Nov 2001 16:48:54 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> I believe that better describes the true quality of that (those)
>civilizatioins, or the lack of it, than any words could ever do.

But, of course, the United States leads the world in male
circumcision.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2517. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 23:40:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7E0EC1C16A081C82.C9C8456C86324EBA.47D4DEAA6C1687C6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25514

On 28 Nov 2001 12:11:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>I think there is a precedent for Dubya's action. I understand that in WW2,
>spies and saboteurs were handled that way - including some executions. The USA
>was infiltrated more than once by well-trained German agents posing as
>Americans. The idea is that nonuniformed foreigners acting in certain ways are
>committing acts of war against the USA.

Close, but not quite.

The idea is that nonuniformed foreigners acting in certain
ways on behalf of their government are committing acts of war against
the USA. The key point is that they are acting as agents of their
nation, not as individuals, terrorists, or just common criminals.

The trial of a spy or saboteur who is a citizen of the nation
he or she is acting for is treated as a military issue because a spy
is conducting military operations on behalf of a government, and thus
is considered to be acting in a military capacity. The trial of a
terrorist, on the other hand, is--and should be--a criminal matter not
a military one. There is no difference in principle, only in quantity
of dead, between a person who goes on a shooting binge in a MacDonalds
restaurant to "protest his plight" as a displaced worker and someone
like ben Laden who plans and executes a crime that results in the
death of thousands of innocent people. BOTH are criminals and treating
them in the same manner we would treat a spy only grants them a status
(as a loyal subject of a hostile nation) they don't deserve.

ALL terrorists should receive a fair trial--to do less simply
states that the US can't convict a guilty person without recourse to
unethical methods. We don't need a Star Chamber, we need public
trials.

Bear in mind that while TODAY military tribunals are
"supposed" to be used only in the case of terrorism, when they were
created the RICO statutes were only to be used in the case of
organized crime as well. Today, the RICO statutes are used in MANY
other types of cases; there's simply no reason to expect military
tribunals to be any different in the future themselves.

>>The Military Tribunals can't be appealed... even to the Supremes... Bush has
>>usurped the Legislature AND... the Judiciary...
>>
>>Nice huh????
>
>I did not know that the even the Supremes could not be involved. A bit scary...

It's VERY scary--and far too close to the way the KGB operated
at the height of the USSR for me.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2518. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-28 23:54:19 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9139C21ACB3AE35E.BC8D863AF966821E.ACFEC585B7CB7491@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25515

On 28 Nov 2001 16:45:43 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Yep, it happens on occasion. I guess you believe that is actual
>homosexuality in animals just the same as humnans. You -and they- are to
>be pitied.

It isn't belief, Dick, it's a fact as well proven as ohm's
law.

> Cecil, I'm quite positive that I have been around far more animals of
>most types than you. The only time I ever have observed anything that
>could have been in any viewed as abberant sexual activity, other than a
>very rare curious exhibition such as your neice's confused female dog,
>was some monkeys in a zoo. In fact, I'm beginning to believe that you
>and Rick belong in the zoo with them.

Dick, you've been around far more human beings than most
people here (you're older). How many acts of homosexual sex have you
personally observed? None? Gee, I guess that means there aren't any
homosexual humans and those who believe there are are deluded fools,
right?

It's too bad you aren't willing to accept scientific evidence
for homosexuality in animals as willingly as you will accept it for
electronics. You seem to feel that your _personal_ observations are
much more "evidential" than the detailed observations and research of
top scientific professionals.

I feel sorry for you, Dick, you're nothing but a bitter,
angry, and opinionated old man who can't accept a new idea no matter
how well it is demonstrated to be true.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2519. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:09:05 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8098BCD92BEB4CD7.116D0D15C9B06F07.D0960E5D60AB4B05@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25516

On 28 Nov 2001 10:23:23 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Hmmm -- well, you'll have to excuse me, but as a person who is both
>intelligent and educated, I must respectfully disagree. Homosexuals
>do, in fact, attempt to "recruit" others -- young children in particular,
>into their lifestyle. Have you ever read the book "Heather Has Two
>Mommies?" I have. I found it to be nothing but an attempt to convince
>young children that a homosexual relationship is just as normal as
>a heterosexual one.

Oh, now I understand.

To you, recruitment is synonymous with acceptance. If someone
encourages children to view homosexuals as normal (which science makes
it completely clear they are), that person is "recruiting" them.

Do you have any idea how homophobic and prejudiced that
statement is, Larry? No, I don't think you do. You're not CAPABLE of
viewing anything from any perspective other than your own
unscientific, moralistic, and self-righteous one.

>Then why do they believe that there needs to be more?

They don't believe there "needs to be more" Larry, they
believe (correctly) that they have the right to the same acceptance by
society that heterosexuals enjoy--and that children should be educated
to understand that they are as normal as anyone else. THAT, not
recruiting, is what fine books like "Heather Has Two Mommies" try to
demonstrate.

>> As far as viewing their sexual preference as a "valid option,"
>>don't you view YOURS that way?
>
>Of course not. There is nothing "optional" about being a normal
>heterosexual. It is the way God and nature intended for us to be;
>homosexuality is a deviation from the norm.

Take your religious arguments and ram them, Larry. I'm not
superstitious, nor is science.

If you are going to debate an issue in a news group at least
THEORETICALLY dedicated to people with an interest in science and
technology (or do you think hams are not supposed to be scientific) at
least have the respect for others in the news group to limit your
arguments to facts instead of homophobic, superstitious, prejudice.

Homosexuality IS normal, Larry. That's demonstrated (among
other ways) by the homosexual behavior observed commonly in the animal
kingdom. It's about time you got off your self-righteous soap box and
started at least PRETENDING to accept science. You CLAIM a good
education--PROVE IT!

>>Why shouldn't a homosexual (who is as
>>normal, by any reasonable scientific standard you care to name, as you
>>are) feel the same?
>
>I'm sure they do; that doesn't make them right.

What makes YOU right--divine guidance?

You know, Larry, recent studies (cites on request) demonstrate
that the greater the degree of homophobia in a man the more likely he
is to be suppressing his own homosexuality. You're definitely more
homophobic than most, and you ARE single . . .

Maybe you should make it a point to stay away from children
yourself. After all, if you believe they shouldn't be exposed to
homosexuals . . .

>I am not raising any children whatsoever, Rick. If I were, I'd be teaching
>them that homosexuals are fellow human beings, who, unfortunately,
>are confused about their sexual identity. I would teach them that
>homosexuals are to be treated with the same human dignity anyone
>else deserves, are not to be discriminated against in matters of
>professional employment. However, I would warn them not to be
>seduced by them, or even place themselves in a situation where that
>could happen.

Just like you would warn your "woman" that she shouldn't be
placed in a situation where she might end up talking with a man when
you weren't present, right?

I can understand WHY you aren't raising any children, Larry.
Who would put up with you long enough to become pregnant in the first
place--or trust you near her children if she did.

>I have known and worked with many homosexuals. I knew two
>gay men who were civilian employees working for me when I was
>stationed in England. One of them is now dead from AIDS. I mourn
>the loss of his life, because aside from his sexual deviancy, he was
>a basically good person. I don't understand what makes people
>become homosexuals, but I can see from first-hand experience that
>it is not the right way to live one's life. I cannot change my views
>on this issue. We will have to agree to disagree.

Fine. You are entitled to your views. But don't keep claiming
them to be facts--they aren't.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2520. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:15:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c057d36_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25519

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:3C044F1C.3050706@att.net...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>
> > Of course, all
> > ancient writings are subject to the interpretations of today, and of
> > course that is the major problem.
>
> Did you know that in olden (more enlightened) days tit was NOT considered
a
> vulgar word? It's true... ;-)
>

It isn't today either, except for less enlightened persons :^ !!!!!

Kim W5TIT

> I guess certain usages, even today, are subject to interpretation. :^
>
> Rich
>

2521. Re: MORE TWISTEDHED the NUTTY CBER

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:17:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7DA18F9749B0FD30.ACC2E8591B765D9E.C41133D55EC5843D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25517

On 28 Nov 2001 02:00:09 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
(IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:

>I need to be busted. I tried and tried for so long but no dice. I bootlegged
>all over 10, 11 and 12 meters. I ran power. I even said bad words on the
>radio. When are you going to bust me? I NEED TO BE ARRESTED because then
>you will put me in a nice psycho hospital where I can be free of the saucermen
>who chase me and pinch my bum.

Give it up--according to the resident "experts" here the FCC
has far more serious problems to consider--like Kim's call sign.
You'll just have to wait your turn.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2522. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:18:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c057dec_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25521

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1jg8$n5j$0@208.207.71.131...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > What the hell do you think
> > > I'm talking about? Wiping out all Muslim women and children, just
> > > because they're Muslim? Kindly show where I said anything even close
to
> > > that, otherwise you are a senile old fool who can't get anything
> > > striaght.
> >
> > You have said that *every* Muslim is a potential terrorist, Dick. You
> > have said that Muslims have no choice except to kill Christians.
> > Exactly why would you be fomenting so much hatred of Muslims if you
> > don't want them exterminated? You can't back down now. You have been
> > advocating genocide.
> >
> > I, OTOH, recognize that Muslim terrorists are a small fraction of
> > one percent of Muslims. I say go after the terrorists, not the
> > rest of the one billion Muslims who are peaceful and law-abiding.
>
>
> Ok, let's use your figures. If one tenth of one percent of the world/s
> 1.25 BILLION muslims are Islamic fundamentalist terrorists, that's
> 1,250,000 terrorists, if my calculator functioned correctly. Still think
> it's no problem?
>
> I DID say that based on the fundamental teachings of Islam, every
> Muslim *is* a potential terrorist in that it is almost certaian that he
> will be forced to make a choice-follow his religious teachings and
> leaders, or reject them. In countries where fundamentalist Islam is not
> only the religion but the law as well, asking a Muslim to reject his
> religion can easily be fatal. At the least, it will cause him huge
> amounts of personal problems and grief.

Dick, do you (or have you ever) gotten as upset over the tyranny, bigotry, and inhumanity of racists in this country (the United States). If it is sheer numbers that are your motivation for being upset, the total sum of people who have been killed by racists is not immediately realized, but is considerable, nevertheless.

You certainly have more power to affect change in this country.

Kim W5TIT

2523. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:19:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8E652C914AC9DE8B.07736F7C12A4B9D5.C49E7F10B3D59475@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25518

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:32:06 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Don't you know? At what point in his life did Uncle Thomas begin
>referring to himself as a libertarian? Remember in his quarrel with
>Hamilton how he shouted, "Just shut the (expletive deleted) up, Al!"?

He STRONGLY supported the views of John Locke, Dave. And
Locke, by _any_ definition, was a libertarian.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2524. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:19:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c057e44$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25522

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1jub$o49$0@208.207.71.131...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You really don't get it, do you? I wouldn't say it's universal
across
> > > all species, but generally animals have no awareness of sex, ...
> >
> > Dick, consciousness makes animals aware of sex. You do believe that
> > animals are conscious, don't you? You are the only exception I know
> > to animals being conscious.
>
>
> Cecil, it's you that is unconscious. All the animals I have ever been
> around
> or read about had no interest in sex whatever until the female was in
> estrus.
> I think there may be some other primates,some monkey species, for which
> that may not be true, but even the large apes don't go ape over sex like
> humans do.

Uh, like human *males* do.

Kim W5TIT

2525. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:21:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c057ec2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25523

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1k19$o9f$0@208.207.71.131...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20011125232030.25429.00003455@nso-fc.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c013ca4_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > writes:
> > >
> > > >> If the selection was limited to the likes of you I wouldn't be,
either.
> > > >
> > > >Oh, believe me, you have that right.
> > > >
> > > >Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > Yes, Kim, Dick did, indeed, have that right!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> > Is there an echo online? Of course he has that right. There is *NO*
way in
> > Hell I'd find him attractive to the likes of me! For once, you're
both
> > right.
> >
>
> Much more accurately, you'd never get the opportunity.

I don't know how to say it more clearly: again, you are right. I would not
get the opportunity because men like you and Larry would barely, even if,
get a notice from me. But, in this case, I wouldn't say it was a missed
opportunity, either.

Kim W5TIT

2526. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:22:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9704B7BB3E91CC7A.50C49C93937E4CD5.392392A65D851490@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25520

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:29:11 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Now instead of voting for the "Libertarian Party" candidate, you'll have
>to search for a "libertarian Party" candidate.

And since there's no such thing as a "libertarian Party" I
guess that means that your views on libertarians are a bit "off,"
doesn't it?

>Now about Kim's call, the only portion of this endless rant which
>related to amateur radio...

What about her call sign, Dave? Have anything new to add to
the thread on the topic, or just a repeat of the same statements once
again?

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2527. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:23:00 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c057f06$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25525

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1khaplm0@208.207.71.131...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > Terroristic activity in the name of religion (Christianity) has been
> > > > going on in Northern Ireland for decades too -- and BOTH sides claim
> > > > a different flavor of Christianity as their motivation.
> > >
> > > Ah, Yes, dear old Homeland. But only a blip on the radar beside
Islamic
> > > fundamentalist terrorism, as demonstrated by longtime activities
> > > culminating at the World Trade Center.
> >
> > So murders in Ireland are only a blip on the radar? You say some
> > astounding things, Dick. Dead Irish people are just as dead as
> > dead American people.
>
>
> So far I haven't been apprised of any atrocity connected with the Irish
> Troubles of anywhere the magnitude of Sept 11. Have you? But then,
> you're the igno that equates a 6000 year old passage in the Old
> Testament with modern religous practice.

So, you measure in terms of numbers of people killed. Would that be in 10
minutes; 15 minutes; a month; year? What?

Kim W5TIT

2528. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:25:32 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c057f9f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25526

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1ks5$qt1$0@208.207.71.131...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Jeff:
> >
> > I know you're smarter than that. The percentage of any measurement can
only
> > be made against the field sampled. Of the ham radio operators I listen
to
> > in the Dallas area, I'd say at least 50% of them are prejudiced or
bigots.
> >
>
> Great. So you listen to two, and one is such.
>
>
>
>
> > Your example would even be "OK" if we knew, of those 600,000, how many
don't
> > even operate.
> >
> > Experience is that a tremendous amount of bigotry, racism, and sexism
"seem"
> > (note the operative word there) to be prevalent in ham radio.
>
>
> And your vast experience probably includes that two hams mentioned
> above.
> If yoiu'd just avoid the lunatic fringe,
>

Dick. You *are* the lunatic fringe.

Kim W5TIT

>
> which is found most everywhere
> in this enlightened day where people liky you and Rick are so openminded
> the wind blows through, you wouldn't have any worries. There are very
> few bigots in ham radio.

Not in my experience. Are you speaking for me now, Dick? Good Lord, I hope not. I have feelings for fellow humans.

>
> On the other hand there is a growing number of airheads like you Rick
> and Cecil.

Your so cliche.

Kim W5TIT

2529. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:26:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c057fee_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25527

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:3C045913.4090700@att.net...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> >>Dick Carroll wrote:
> >>
> >>>K0HB wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>Terroristic activity in the name of religion (Christianity) has been
> >>>>going on in Northern Ireland for decades too -- and BOTH sides claim
> >>>>a different flavor of Christianity as their motivation.
> >>>>
> >>> Ah, Yes, dear old Homeland. But only a blip on the radar beside
Islamic
> >>>fundamentalist terrorism, as demonstrated by longtime activities
> >>>culminating at the World Trade Center.
> >>>
> >>So murders in Ireland are only a blip on the radar? You say some
> >>astounding things, Dick. Dead Irish people are just as dead as
> >>dead American people.
> >>
> >
> >
> > So far I haven't been apprised of any atrocity connected with the
Irish
> > Troubles of anywhere the magnitude of Sept 11. Have you? But then,
> > you're the igno that equates a 6000 year old passage in the Old
> > Testament with modern religous practice.
> >
>
> Ah... Carroll... from 1984 to 2000 around 10,000 people have died at the
hands
> of the PKK... about 5500 Guards and 4500 citizens.
>
> Do you consider that trivial? Or should we just ignore it?
>
> Rich
>
> Now this is where you do some more of your name-calling... you... you...
you...
> name-caller.... :P

>

BUT, those people didn't die in the timeframe that Dick has all premeasured out as the gauge for measurement of whether something is worth his time or not...you see.

Kim W5TIT

2530. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:27:08 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8353F4BBF3D0E86D.0F7798354C26A824.189A6E1DE298A169@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25524

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 16:48:18 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>And the only relevant question is: Does Kim have a right to choose
>a flavor of ice cream that you dislike?

Not according to some of the people here. She might choose
chocolate, which is brown in color, which is the color of
African-Americans, which means she would be choosing violence and
crime. Or, she might choose rainbow, which is the symbol of diversity,
which includes homosexuals, which means she would be choosing to
recruit our teenagers to a deviant lifestyle. And she CERTAINLY
doesn't have the right to choose ANY flavor if the counter clerk is
male and her husband isn't present so she can speak to him to place
her order.

You have to remember where you are posting, Cecil. Here
NOTHING is a right unless the God Squad says it is.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2531. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:28:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c05805d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25528

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1ljjsmr0@208.207.71.131...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > Well just for THE RECORD Mohammad considered and discounted Jesus
long
> > > > before his own death, and proclaimed himself to be the Final
Prophet,
> > > > which remains Muslim doctrine to this day.
> > >
> > > Uh huh. Yeah. And, exactly, what book are you reading that from?
> >
> > Dick is reading stuff from radical Christian terrorist web pages.
>
>
> Must have missed those. Where did you find them on the web>
>
>
> > In reality, Mohammed considered Jesus to be a great prophet although
> > somewhat misguided with the turn-the-other-cheek stuff.
>
> Nonsense. He rejected Chistianity as idolistic since Christians of the
> time showed what he interpreted to be idolistic adoration of Mary,
> mother of Jesus.
> He thought that Christians were thus polytheistic, and he stated that
> was against the true teachigns of the one Allah.

OK, forgive me, Dick. But "polytheistic" and "idolistic" are words way too
big for you. You even spelled them correctly. What book are you getting
your information from, because you couldn't think that up all by yourself.

Kim W5TIT

2532. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:40:52 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C22D976A5D73DC4F.64383BF34BF54216.57B8A50025153BD9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25529

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:15:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick comes across like a '60s radical with a real job but unchanged
>political views.

Thank you--that's the first half-way accurate portrayal of my
values I've seen you make.

I _am_ a sixties radical--I was a freedom rider (and spent
time in Southern jails for my civil rights activities), a staunch
supporter of women's rights, gay rights, and human rights in general,
an antiwar activist and member of Vietnam Veterans against the War,
the Vietnam Day Committee, and other such organizations, and I'm a
life long opponent of domestic violence, child abuse (I was a severely
abused child personally, and left home on my 13th birthday to avoid
further broken bones and burns--I've lived on my own ever since), and
censorship.

If you find those offensive "credentials" I'm perfectly
willing to accept that opinion. At least it will be based on an
accurate picture of my values.

>I don't believe that there is anything which will
>convince him that his skewed views run counter to the mainstream but it
>is fun to watch him rail against the system, the country and mainstream
>morality and religion. I haven't called for him to desist and I don't
>remember that you have.

It's easy to convince me that my views run counter to the
mainstream Dave, just provide solid evidence (backed by citations)
that demonstrates how the mainstream feel on the same issues.

Convincing me that my views are counter to the mainstream
morality and religion doesn't make them wrong, however, merely a
minority view. Mainstream morality is, essentially, based on Christian
morality and in order to convince me that it is a valid source for
moral values you would first need to provide proof that Christianity
is more than a system of belief shared by a number of people with no
more basis in fact than the beliefs of Buddhists, Hindus, Wiccans, or
Satanists for that matter. I have no obligation whatever to share the
moral values of a religion to which I do not subscribe, any more than
you have an obligation to subscribe to the moral values of the Native
American Church or the Communist Party of the People's Republic of
China.

I don't ask that you accept my values and views, Dave. Only
that you give them the same respect with which you expect your own to
be treated.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2533. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:44:33 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3F47D6AE886AD775.48819D7BDC99D628.902A9B03033BDA6E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25530

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 17:12:21 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Are Executive Orders permitted by our Constitution?

It depends on their nature, Cecil. The Executive Branch of
government has certain Constitutional responsibilities and privileges
and the Executive Order can be--but is not necessarily--included in
those privileges.

Of course, since we have a President who wasn't even elected
according to the Constitution (after the Florida fraud was finally
corrected and the votes counted recently it was announced that Gore
carried the state--and therefore garnered the greater number of
electoral votes), why should his orders be any different?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2534. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:48:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0585E9.75149B87@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25532

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote:
> > Did you know that in olden (more enlightened) days tit was NOT considered
> > a vulgar word? It's true... ;-)
>
> It isn't today either, except for less enlightened persons :^ !!!!!

You've got to realize what the dictionary means when it says a word is
vulgar. From Webster's: "vulgar - of or relating to the common people"
Seems to me it is the elite holier-than-thou class that has the problem.
I don't mind being in a group of common people, do you Kim? Common
people have a lot more fun than the stuffed shirt elite extra class. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2535. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:50:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <95E856B3D8BCC612.4B28D25D78F3F4C3.60A0347A0365868E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25531

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:23:06 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>In this peculiar day in which we live, it isn't necessary to mutilate
>children. We just wait until they are in their teens and they will pay
>to have all sorts of parts tattooed or pierced.

Heck, Dave, that isn't a recent development. I have a pierced
left ear (with a 3/4 carat diamond that is a mate to the one in my
wife's engagement ring in it) and a tattoo (USN, if it matters)--both
of which are VERY common in my generation--and I was born in 1945!

Of course, I don't have any piercings in my face (earlobe
excepted), mouth, nipples, or genitals as so many younger people
have--but that's purely a matter of fashion (and a dislike for
discomfort--I can't imagine eating with a barbell through my tongue or
lip, and as for a Prince Albert--OUCH!), not a fundamental difference.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2536. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:53:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0586FC.7C9D5D25@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25533

Rick Adams wrote:
> It's VERY scary--and far too close to the way the KGB operated
> at the height of the USSR for me.

I once read a book titled, "It Could Happen Here". The "It"
is fascism. Looks like we are on our way. Democrats take us
toward socialism and Republicans take us toward fascism.
Either way we lose.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2537. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:55:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C058776.D25DDE29@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25534

Rick Adams wrote:
> I feel sorry for you, Dick, you're nothing but a bitter,
> angry, and opinionated old man who can't accept a new idea no matter
> how well it is demonstrated to be true.

Reckon Dick doesn't believe in electromagnetic RF waves because he
has never seen any?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2538. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 00:59:19 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E4684FD6B380054B.A45B3E3B5DF4E9B0.F53F34FEBDB70EB6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25535

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 12:57:31 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Is a humnan anything like a hummer? Is that your species? Certainly
>that is an example of homosexuality in dogs. And no, dogs are not
>the same as humans. I'm surprised you would think such a thing.

True. Dogs are usually pretty loyal and accepting (and I'm a
cat person!).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2539. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 01:02:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011128200256.23334.00000986@nso-da.aol.com>
Source record: 25536

In article <3C04F475.4080603@att.net>, Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
> > I would say that the routine nonreversible mutilation of any human without
> > their consent is pretty barabic.
>
>I wouldn't say that... (pretty isn't an adverb)... ;-)

Let me rephrase:

The routine nonreversible mutilation of any human without their consent is a
serious violation of that person's rights.
>
>I would leave out all those qualifiers and say...
>
>The mutilation of any human is unequivocably barabic.
>
>...and yet, strangely, these hings happen in many 'civilizations'...
>
That would include tattoos, Rich.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2540. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 01:29:21 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <RbgN7.240127$W8.8354826@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25537

"Rick Adams" wrote in message

> Bear in mind that while TODAY military tribunals are
> "supposed" to be used only in the case of terrorism, when they were
> created the RICO statutes were only to be used in the case of
> organized crime as well. Today, the RICO statutes are used in MANY
> other types of cases; there's simply no reason to expect military
> tribunals to be any different in the future themselves.

Thanks you just solved my problem... Microsoft should be charged under
RICO... that would get them more than a 'slap on the hand'.... ;-)

Rich

2541. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 01:39:59 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <PlgN7.240138$W8.8356018@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25538

"N2EY" wrote

> Let me rephrase:
>
> The routine nonreversible mutilation of any human without their consent is
a
> serious violation of that person's rights.

That's fine... just didn't go quite far enough... but that'll do... ;-)

> That would include tattoos, Rich.

I don't have any tatoos or body piercing either...
Hell... I don't even like to wear a ring...

Rich

2542. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 01:41:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011128204101.08355.00003715@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 25539

In article <3c0300ce_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>Larry:
>
>The word tit is not offensive to scores of women I know, and I probably have
>known far more than you. I know of no woman who refers to her tops as
>breasts or mammaries. We all call them tits. We call all you guys' thangs
>dicks.

Tugboat Annie:

I'm sure that you and your fellow broads down at the trailer park
use all the standard vulgarities. How charming!

>> This term is used when one
>> intends to deliberately demean and depersonalize a woman through
>> the reference to secondary sexual characteristics which the viewer
>> finds attractive, in exception to or exclusion of all of the other
>personal
>> qualities she possesses as a woman, and as a human being.
>>
>
>Where *do* you come up with your Puritan crap? No wonder you think the word
>tit (which, by the way is not my callsign, my callsign is W5TIT,
>phonetically Whiskey Five Tango India Tango) is offensive!

Your callsign spells out the word "tit," which is a vulgar slang expression
referring to a woman's breasts, specifically, your own. You chose this
Vanity call sign with and for the specific purpose of calling attention to
your own breasts, which you obviously consider to be particularly
noteworthy for some reason. You did this in order to evoke purient
interest in male hams, thus hopefully giving you some sort of power
over them, and increasing the amount of attention you receive from
them. You had no other purpose in mind when you choose this call
sign.

>Could you please
>'splain to me what "secondary sexual characteristics" tits can have? Tits
>serve two purposes. They can nurse babies or men, or woman if the owner of
>the tits is prone to that persuasion. We have to cover our tits and you men
>have to cover your dicks. Know why? They "mean" sex to many people. I
>know of no primary purpose for tits other than nursing and sex. So, if
>there's no primary, what is *your* definition of a "secondary sexual
>characteristic"?

A secondary sexual characteristic is one which is not directly involved
in the physical act of reproduction. They are physical characteristics
related to the physical differences characteristic of the sex of the person
who possesses them. In women, this would include wider hips, larger
breasts, a softer, more fair complexion, and other secondary traits
not directly related to the creation of a child. In men it involves
attributes such as stronger muscle tone, facial hair, a deeper voice,
etc. Our "secondary" sexual characteristics are those which reveal
the more outward aspect of our sexual identity, and which are the
basis of our attractiveness to the opposite sex.

>> Most
>> modern women are personally offended by those who judge and value
>> her primarily for the size, shape, and general attractiveness of her
>> breasts.
>>
>
>Uh, Larry. What the *Hell* would you know about a modern woman? Puhleeze.

Apparently, a lot more than you do, "Annie."

>You're still looking for some virgin who believes that her man should tell
>her how to live!

Not hardly.

>> Men who do this are quite rightly criticized for this, yet you
>> not only deliberately encourage such behavior, you actively solicit it
>> through your selection of a callsign.
>>
>
>And I think whomever criticizes a man or woman for calling a spade a spade
>or a tit a tit is looking for far more attention than I have time to give!
>I am not soliciting a damned thing from *anyone*, Larry. I call my tits
>tits and always have. I call my, well....never mind. Just be glad I don't
>have the callsign W5PSY.

Kim -- if your callsign were W5PSY, we wouldn't be having this discussion!

>> In so doing, you not only bring
>> the ARS ".one step closer to extinction," you also set back all the
>> societal gains made by women in the last century, and bring about a
>> return to their objectification as mere sexual playthings. Is that
>> really how you see yourself?

>Nope. I don't see myself that way, Larry. Only people like you are capable
>of such arrogance. I don't think I have the slightest bit of power you
>relay to me. We women are mere playthings, always have been and always will
>be. That's why we are so darned good at everything else we do. We do it
>well and we can *still* come home and "take care" of our man. But, now
>we're on a subject to which you cannot relate, and is so far beyond your
>reach that you have to dream up ways to have power over women. Ha!

Kim -- having "power" over women is not, and never has been, a personal goal of mine. I prefer women I can relate to as equals, without having to engage in any tiresome "power struggle" with them. It is YOU who seek the "power" you can derive from the attention-getter call sign you have chosen -- and for you to claim anything else is an obvious lie. However, your lack of integrity is well known in this newsgroup, and probably everywhere else.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2543. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 02:38:49 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c059ec4.11907776@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 25540

On 28 Nov 2001 12:32:12 -0800, uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org (Sean G Gilley)
wrote:

>"Bob - KE4JCD" <ke4jcd@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<8yUL7.113107$Yb.28227333@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>...
>> As you said "I haven't seen such "droves" in my area." Well the CODE TEST
>> hasn't been dropped yet. People I talk to all say much of the same thing,
>> The CODE is stopping them and when its gone so will HAM RADIO! CBers will
>> come in droves and as I have on my website, BAD HABITS!
>
>So argue for harder tests. I guarentee that if code is stopping them,
>they won't be upgrading to AE. Not with the current test, at least.
>It's too much work to learn that test. The key is to make the test difficult
>enough that it takes effort to pass it. Doesn't matter whether it's
>a code test or a written test. If it takes time and effort to pass it,
>it's too much work.

Well said, and consider also...
The CBers, if they were to "come in droves" have nothing
stopping them now because we have had a code free
license for over 10 years. There's nothing a CBer can
legally do on CB that they can't do with a tech license.
Now there are certainly some illegal CBers that operate
high power, but that isn't worth much given the lousy
nighttime propogation of 11 meters...so why would those
illegals come anyway even after the end of all
morse testing?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2544. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 03:42:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4aqapua0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25541

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 04:54:30 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Dick has made it very clear that he
> >> intends to keep this thread alive (with a subject line that is
> >> DIRECTLY related to Kim) until she changes her call sign. THAT, Jim,
> >> is an attempt to force her to act against her will, and it is wrong
> >> from ANY moral perspective.
> >
> > OK, so you now have earned the title of Professor Bullshit Squared.
>
> Do you deny stating that you intend to keep the thread going,
> Dick?

I certainly do deny saying that. Show the post-you can't because it
doesn't exist. I made my comment, and that would have been the end of it
if not for verbal assaaults by you and Cecil.

>
> >> If this discussion was, as you claim, directed to the generic
> >> topic of whether certain call signs are good or bad for the image of
> >> the ARS, Kim's sign would be mentioned no more than any other that was
> >> found in the callbook and was considered inappropriate by anyone. That
> >> is patently not the case.
> >
> > You are patently full of it up to your eyebrows.
>
> Why--because I disagree with you?

By no means. Simply becaus you ARE.

2545. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 03:44:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4av4pua1@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25542

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You know about multiple personalities, all aright. It's reality you have
> > problems with.
>
> Sometimes, Dick, but not this time. I advocated neutralizing the
> terrorists. You advocated neutralizing the Islamics, presumably
> all one billion of them. Exactly what actions do you propose to
> take against one billion Muslims, Dick? Please be specific.

It is impossible to be specific on a subject that I did not and do not advocate at all. All that verbige is strictly YOURS. You explain it. What I intend to do is be careful, and as national authorities have continuously suggested, if I see something that appears amiss I'll call the cops.

2546. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 03:46:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4b2dpua2@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25543

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Cecil has no clue.
>
> Are we talking about commercial radio licenses, Executive Orders,
> or what?

We are talking about the only way that a General class ham radio license could ever legally obtain an Extra class license without any further examination.

2547. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 03:47:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4b4apua3@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25544

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 12:50:29 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >Are we talking about commercial radio licenses, Executive Orders,
> >or what?
>
> Didn't they pass a rule that anyone that was licensed during
> the first three years of the ARS received an automatic upgrade to
> Extra on his 100th birthday?

See Dave? They don't know everything, after all.

2548. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 03:52:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4bdq$r3k$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25545

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Ah...Plourde, do you see anywhere that I said it was trivial?
>
> You certainly implied it. Maybe you should be more careful
> with your words, Dick. Everyone seems to be misunderstanding
> what you are trying to say.

And when I "interpret" something you say, you slam me for reading between the lines. Your usual double standard, we see.

2549. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 03:55:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4bk3$r3k$1@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25546

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So far I haven't been apprised of any atrocity connected with the Irish
> > Troubles of anywhere the magnitude of Sept 11. Have you?
>
> Exactly how many people have to be murdered for it to matter to
> you, Dick?

There you go again, reading words I didn't even think, and certainly
didn;t write.

A dead Irish victim is just as dead as a dead
> American victim.

No joke.

The Oklahoma City bombing victims are just
> as dead as the WTC victims. Tim McVee was a Christian.

Why
> aren't you badmouthing all Christians?

I'm not even badmouthing Muslims, you imbecile, I'm showing that I have
learned to be very wary of their enigmatic religion.

2550. Re: Whats the deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 03:58:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4bpv$r3k$2@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25547

Chuck wrote:
>
> I cme ot this new group in hopes of finding out intereting tid bits of Ham
> Radio Policy. What goes here?, not one posting about policy. Either my
> computer is goofed or you poeple are just enraged with one another.

Chuck there are a few simpleminded assholes named Cecil, Rick, Plourge
or some such, and Kim whose entire life support system revolves around
stirring the pot here on this group. They do it by constantly
"inteerpreting" what other posters say and lying repeatedly in the
process. Don't worry, they haven't a clue.

2551. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:01:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4bul$r3k$3@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25548

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 05:11:56 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > He could to, and is.
>
> Too bad your memory is so weak, Dick. YOU were part of the
> discussion here when I DID take the test--and you even made comments
> (sarcastic ones, as I recall) when I mentioned here that I'd just
> passed my 20WPM.
>
> As one of your idols (Dan Qayle) said: "What a terrible thing
> it is to lose one's mind--or never to have had one before." I'm sure
> you can relate to that.

After all the repartee here with you, Cecil, Kim and Poodle Plourge I
surely can.

2552. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:08:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4cc3$16m$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25549

CAM wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Well just for THE RECORD Mohammad considered and discounted Jesus long
> > > before his own death, and proclaimed himself to be the Final Prophet,
> > > which remains Muslim doctrine to this day.
> >
> > I first learned about Jesus' standing in the Muslim faith when I saw
> > a picture of him on the wall of a mosque in Istanbul. If what you say
> > is true, that seems to he a fairly prominent place to display a
> > picture of someone who had been dismissed by Mohammed.
>
> Contrary to Dick's ignorant postings, here's what Muslims believe
> about Jesus.
>
> "Many non-Muslims are surprised to find out that according to Muslim
> belief, Jesus, the son of Mary, is one of the greatest messengers of
> God.

Makes nice press and for nominally better relations with Christians,
which they surely need. But skips the main point- Muslims believe that
Mohammed was the last and true prophet. He trumps Jesus in every
possible point. All that is eyewash.

Muslims are taught to love Jesus, and a person cannot be a Muslim
> without believing in the virgin birth and miracles of Jesus Christ,
> peace be upon him.

Nope. Mohammed himself believed that the adoration shown to Mary was
indicative of worhip of her as a deity, thus showing a polytheism that
he believed to be the equivalent of earlier multiple idolitry practiced
by arabs before Mohammed's own vision, prior to his becoming the
prophet. Thus he rejected Jesul on principle.
Now it is always possible that later Muslim scholars revised this
concept in the Koran. I haven'e read it carefully line for line, so I
cannot say that such does not appear, but if it is there, I missed it.

2553. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:09:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4cdi$16o$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25550

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:9u1hi7$i5b$0@208.207.71.131...
> > >
> > >
> > > Krell wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > > > news:20011125232032.25429.00003458@nso-fc.aol.com...
> > > > > What I do recall about the film is that the best set of breasts I saw
> > > > > was on the girl I was with!
> > > > >
> > > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > > >
> > > > Yet, you don't think it's right for a word meaning "breasts" to be
> > viewed by
> > > > the rest of the world via an amateur callsign. What a hypocrite!
> > >
> > >
> > > "Tits" is and has long been considered a vulgar expression. Breasts is
> > > not.
> > > What an idiot!
> >
> > Oh really? "Tits" is vulgar, eh? Then, you'd better put some kind of
> > protective suit on, because most women refer to their "breasts" as tits.
> > And, most women refer to a bra as a tit-sling. But, hopefully, you've never
> > been in the restrooms or locker rooms I've been in. Come to think of it, if
> > you believe that "tits" is vulgar, you'd probably faint dead away in a
> > women's restroom or locker room.
>
> Just who is it you are hanging out with, Kim--a roller derby team?

More likely the Dallas Cowgirls locker room.
```

2554. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:10:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4cfm$16o$1@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25551

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:9u1hi7$i5b$0@208.207.71.131...
> > > Yet, you don't think it's right for a word meaning "breasts" to be
> viewed by
> > > the rest of the world via an amateur callsign. What a hypocrite!
> >
> >
> > "Tits" is and has long been considered a vulgar expression. Breasts is
> > not.
> > What an idiot!
>
> It's only vulgar if you allow it to be so.

Kindly inform us as to how to prevent it, when ladies or children are
present who instinctively view it as such.

2555. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:12:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4cje$16o$2@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25552

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 01:59:29 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >Yup. I believe that instead of Kim being so preoccupied with what
> >she has hanging off of her chest, she should be more worried about
> >what she is missing between her ears!
>
> Larry, has it occurred to you that it isn't Kim who is
> demonstrating here that she is preoccupied by her tits--it's you,
> Dave, and Dickie?

I guers it flew right between your ears with the wind, but it was Kim
who chose that callsign to go with the gabonzas.

2556. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:16:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4cqd$2i7$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25553

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 02:21:10 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > You once again come out with an oxymoron, you moron. The majority makes
> >the rules/laws. Remember "Majority rule, minority rights"? From Polysci
> >101
>
> I don't--and I _teach_ PLS101 classes!
>

Then you don't teach Political Science. You teach some radical BS just
as I would expect from you.

2557. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:17:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4crt$2i7$1@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25554

Rick Adams wrote:
>
>
> Majority rule CAN mean Tyranny of the Majority, Dickie. Simply
> because the "majority" want something does NOT make it either "right"
> or appropriate.

Sure as hell makes it legal and proper, though.

2558. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:20:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4d26$3dt$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25555

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 01:38:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Let's set the record straight. Most of us can see the difference
> >between the Civil Rights movement and the libertarian line. That's why
> >the U.S. has a Civil Rights Act and why the U.S. hasn't had a
> >Libertarian President.
>
> Dave, you can't even see the difference between a Libertarian
> (a member of the Libertarian political party) and a libertarian (one
> who adheres to a policy of liberty).

And the ONLY difference is in the small mind of one would attempt to
draw a distinction.

2559. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:29:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011128232944.08355.00003721@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 25557

In article <3C050645.1E92F970@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> In fact, the majority would seem to support Kim.
>
>That should tell you something, Larry.

Cecil:

Just something I already knew -- that low personal standards are
the norm these days. Nothing new here. I just don't go along with
the crowd -- I'm truly my own person.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2560. Re: Contest idea, work all your own suffix

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:29:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011128232944.08355.00003720@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 25558

In article <20011127080747.09918.00002041@mb-da.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
> Hey Larry....WR2F has been reissued. Maybe you can STILL work them all!
>I
>hope to work KC8M someday!1
>

Steve:

I know about WR2F being re-issued -- I sent Jeff one each of my old WR2F QSL/eyeball cards, and gave him a bit of "history" on that call. I'm glad it went to another Pre-Restructuring CW operator! What I can't figure out is why my old General call -- N3CRA -- hasn't been snapped up! I've considered going back to it, but I like K3LT and it works great on CW.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Ex: KA3HXE, N3CRA, DA1RZ, DA1ZW, AFA7LR, WR2F, G0LYW

2561. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:29:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4djp$4uq$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25556

CAM wrote:

Does Kim have a right to choose
> a flavor of ice cream that you dislike?

Sure. She can even rename it Tits if she wants. Doesn't mean it's
appropriate.

2562. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:31:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011128233114.08355.00003722@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 25559

In article <3C0537B6.E4480D24@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>I don't recall demanding that Kim "shut the (expletive deleted) up"
>though I have to admit that I might have wished she would on occasion.
>Rick comes across like a '60s radical with a real job but unchanged
>political views. I don't believe that there is anything which will
>convince him that his skewed views run counter to the mainstream but it
>is fun to watch him rail against the system, the country and mainstream
>morality and religion. I haven't called for him to desist and I don't
>remember that you have.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Yup. You know you are dealing with a liberal because after about
two minutes worth of debate, they tell you to shut up. Makes you
wonder how they'd react if the got what they really wanted -- a
society run under a socialist, totalitarian, dictatorial government?
Of course, they reckon they'd be a part of the elite ruling class, but
in reality, would be mere voiceless supernumeraries required to
tow a very narrowly defined line, or get the carpet pulled out from
under them! But, I enjoy liberals -- they provide comic relief, and
serve to reinforce my love for the true freedom upon which this
nation is based. I'm willing to fight to defend that freedom, and have
sacrificed the best years of my adult life working to make that
defense a reality. I just wonder if Professor Adams would defend
the motivation to sacrifice that my fellow Veterans and I understand
and consider to be our obligation in return for the privilege of living
in a free society? Anyway, he gets to be what and who he is, and
whether he likes it or not, so do we. God Bless America!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2563. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:31:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05BA26.55C0ED0B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25560

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm truly my own person.

Yeah, cuz nobody else wants you. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2564. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:34:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05BA9F.180617CE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25561

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 06:12:35 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I don't. You did. The kids didn't have an opportunity to consent.
>
> Did your kids have the opportunity to consent to religious
> exposure before you stated teaching them about Christianity?

It is interesting to see you write a comparison between Christianity or another religion with your cursing. I'm sure that you are able to rationalize the comparison in some manner.

> Mine was only exposed to the real world (and I _don't_ use
> that type of language frequently). Yours was/were exposed to
> brainwashing and superstition. Neither consented. I wonder which of us
> harmed our kids more?

I don't have a single doubt about it.

> >> Opinion. Some people express certain thoughts more accurately
> >> using such terms, others don't.
> >
> >You don't.
>
> You're right--which is why I seldom use them instead of more
> precise terms.
>
> >> My use of the English language?
> >
> >Is that the conclusion that you drew from my statement?
>
> It's the view you presented in your statement.

No, it is only the conclusion which you drew from my statement.

> >> Never claimed to be tranquil either. OR a "large "L"
> >> Libertarian--just a libertarian.
> >
> >And the libertarian's idea of freedom is to tell someone to shut the
> >*bleep* up? Keep working on the Buddhist thing.
>
> Why?

If it is necessary to ask, you aren't there yet.

> You have the right to tell _me_ to shut up as well. The
> libertarian idea of freedom includes free speech, including the right
> to express your views--and if that view is that the person you are
> communicating with should "shut up" then you have every right to
> express it, just not to enforce it.

Oh, so you really didn't mean it? According to you, I have the *right*
to tell you *shut up* (but I used restraint instead). I have the
right to add the expletives (but I've used restraint). I used my free
speech to write what I think about Kim's choice of calls. You've tried
to tell me that I shouldn't do that. That cuts across the grain of your
libertarian philosophy. It appears that it is your *right* to free
speech...but not mine.

> I don't need to work on the "Buddhist thing" Dave, I never
> claimed to be a practicing Buddhist--I accept Buddhist philosophy but
> not Buddhist religious practices (which, btw, is a perfectly
> acceptable perspective in Buddhism, even though it wouldn't be in
> Christianity). On the other hand, several people here present
> themselves as Christians (including you, Dick, Larry, and others). Try
> working on your OWN religious behavior before you criticize that of
> others (motes and beams, remember?). Your religion teaches tolerance,
> non-judgementalism, compassion for others, and gentleness. Looks as
> though the three of you have a LONG way to go before you can even
> pretend to be "Christians" to me.

I do work on it, Rick. None of us ever reaches perfection and all of us
fail some way in each day. Maybe we're make-believe Christians like you
are a make-believe Buddhist.

I come here for amateur radio policy discussion. I don't come here for
discussions on marijuana smoking, the swinging lifestyle or legalized
prostitution. I don't really care that the laws against these things
somehow make you feel less free. At least I haven't told you to "shut
the (expletive deleted) up!". Maybe I'm a closet libertarian.

Dave K8MN

2565. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:35:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4duo$6hh$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25562

Rick Adams wrote:
>
>
> Either it is strictly *her* business (as your statement makes
> it clear that it is) or it is not.

When her choice negatively imnpacts the ARS that makes it MY business,
too.
I'm nor surprised you fail to notice that.

If it is, then what possible
> justification do you, Dick, and Dave have for taking her to task for
> her choice? If, on the other hand, it is NOT her choice, then it is
> the FCC, not you, Dick, and Dave, that is responsible for affecting
> that decision. In no case, however, is it the business of others to
> tell her (beyond a single statement of personal opinion) to change her
> call or that she is "damaging the ARS" by maintaining it.

Make no mistake, I never expected to change her mind, if she has one.
If she had sense enough to change her mind, she would never have chosen
it in the first place.

2566. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:41:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05BC90.62899026@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25563

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 06:16:40 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Right. You little "L" types demonstrate your freedom by attempting to
> >stifle the views of another. Keep telling folks to shut up. It does
> >wonders for your image.
>
> Dave, not only would it be perfectly acceptable to a
> libertarian to tell someone to shut up--just not to _require_ them to
> do so--but I have yet to see you produce a direct quotation where I
> TOLD you to shut up.

You told Dick Carroll to shut up. You couldn't have forgotten already.

> I HAVE told you that you don't have the vaguest idea what
> you're talking about when it comes to libertarianism, and that you
> should use the words correctly--but if you interpret that to be the
> equivalent of telling you to shut up, it must be because you CAN'T use
> the words correctly, and it mean shutting up if you tried.

You're babbling and I can't understand your last clause. What was that
about me not being able to use words correctly?

> >> The libertarian philosophy is integral to the US Constitution
> >> and the Declaration of Independence. I guess both of THOSE are
> >> impractical as well from your perspective, right?
> >
> >Are you now stating what you'd like me to say? My sentence works just
> >fine on its own without the translation.
>
> Precisely WHERE did I provide you a quote to recite, Dave? You
> really ARE quite good at misquoting people, aren't you? Must help a
> lot in winning arguments when you get to provide the dialog for both
> sides.

Gee, that'd be easy if you didn't once again snip the relevant
portion--the part to which I responded. Do people who take your classes
ever ask for their money back?

Dave K8MN

2567. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:46:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4eiu$88d$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25564

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:15:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick comes across like a '60s radical with a real job but unchanged
> >political views.
>
> Thank you--that's the first half-way accurate portrayal of my
> values I've seen you make.
>
> I _am_ a sixties radical--I was a freedom rider (and spent
> time in Southern jails for my civil rights activities), a staunch
> supporter of women's rights, gay rights, and human rights in general,
> an antiwar activist and member of Vietnam Veterans against the War,
> the Vietnam Day Committee, and other such organizations, and I'm a
> life long opponent of domestic violence, child abuse (I was a severely
> abused child personally, and left home on my 13th birthday to avoid
> further broken bones and burns--I've lived on my own ever since), and
> censorship.
>
> If you find those offensive "credentials"

What I find is that you are just as full of bullshit as Cecil, and
that, Sir is a real load. Never thought it possible but you may be even
more loaded than Cecil.
Maybe all your "credentials" are truth. maybe not. I find you to be the
poster boy for all that is wrong with higher education, a phenomena that
I found well begun when I was a college student in the late 60's and
early 70's. You will have it your way, just as soon as you can figure
out just what way that is, and for damn sure it will be contrary to
convention and all that is good and tried and true, real, and valuable
to society of free,preogerssive individuals. You freaks would instill
and install every craven, aberrant, undesirable and destructive behavior
and vice imaginable under the banner of "personal freedom" with total
disregard for any hint of personal responsibility. In short, you suck
and are sick.

2568. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:46:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05BDB5.3FDB7EAC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25565

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Makes nice press and for nominally better relations with Christians,
> which they surely need. But skips the main point- Muslims believe that
> Mohammed was the last and true prophet. He trumps Jesus in every
> possible point.

Of course, if he didn't trump Jesus then there wouldn't be any need
for a Muslim religion, now would there?

> Nope. Mohammed himself believed that the adoration shown to Mary was
> indicative of worhip of her as a deity, thus showing a polytheism that
> he believed to be the equivalent of earlier multiple idolitry practiced
> by arabs before Mohammed's own vision, prior to his becoming the
> prophet. Thus he rejected Jesus on principle.

He rejected Jesus as part of the Christian Trinity, a polytheist
concept. He accepted Jesus as a great prophet of Allah/Yahweh/Jehovah,
a monotheist concept. Muslims reject the concept of a Trinity, which
is a 4th century Roman invention. Those who put Jesus before Yahweh
may indeed be breaking the First Commandment.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2569. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:51:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05BEDA.BCFAAD05@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25566

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Krell wrote:
> > It's only vulgar if you allow it to be so.
>
> Kindly inform us as to how to prevent it, when ladies or children are
> present who instinctively view it as such.

"Instinctively"? Shirley, you jest. A word represents a concept, about as far from an instinct as can be. There are no instinctive reactions to words or else they would react instinctively to the Russian word for "tits". Any reaction to a word is a conceptual reaction and fully under the control of the person hearing the word. Whether the person chooses to exercise the control or not is the problem area.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2570. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:53:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05BF60.FCF246DE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25567

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I made my comment, and that would have been the end of it
> if not for verbal assaaults by you and Cecil.

This from the person who invariably initiates the
ad hominem attacks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2571. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:55:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05BFC8.8724F1B9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25569

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What I intend to do is be careful, and as national authorities have
> continuously suggested, if I see something that appears amiss I'll call
> the cops.

How does that fit with your assertion that all Muslims are potential
terrorists because they believe in the Koran?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2572. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:57:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4f73$a8q$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25568

CAM wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote:
> > > Did you know that in olden (more enlightened) days tit was NOT considered
> > > a vulgar word? It's true... ;-)
> >
> > It isn't today either, except for less enlightened persons :^ !!!!!
>
> You've got to realize what the dictionary means when it says a word is
> vulgar. From Webster's: "vulgar - of or relating to the common people"
> Seems to me it is the elite holier-than-thou class that has the problem.
> I don't mind being in a group of common people, do you Kim? Common
> people have a lot more fun than the stuffed shirt elite extra class. :-)

There you go, screwing up again. I am one who said her callsign is
vulgar, while you said it was not, so I get to choose the definition to
my use of the word.

From Funk and Wagnall's Standard College Dictionary:

vulgar, (adj). 1. Lacking in refinement, good taste, sensitivity, etc;
Coarse; crude; boorish; also, obscene; indecent.

Now you have the proper definition of Kim's W5TIT callsign.

2573. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 04:59:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05C098.A39A63B4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25570

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Does Kim have a right to choose a flavor of ice cream that you dislike?
>
> Sure. She can even rename it Tits if she wants. Doesn't mean it's
> appropriate.

Kim, now you have to ask Dick's permission to eat ice cream or
you risk being inappropriate. How's that for delusions of grandeur?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2574. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:00:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05C0E9.C0876360@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25571

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 10:23:20 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >The FCC is not in the business of making value judgments on the
> >callsigns people select for themselves. Being a government agency,
> >they are legally constrained against doing so. An individual amateur's
> >Vanity call sign is strictly *their* choice; and the negative effect it has
> >on their image, and the image of the ARS, is strictly *their*
> >responsibility. Mr. Hollingsworth was very clear on that point.
>
> I have no problem with that at all.
>
> What I DO have a problem with is people who claim to believe
> the above view, yet insist on making Kim's call sign THEIR business as
> well as her's.

That's funny. I could swear that you were the guy who said that it is acceptable under the libertarian philosophy for you to tell me to "shut the (expletive deleted) up!). You said it is a *right*. You told me that you just couldn't force me to shut up. If I use your own philosophy to say that Kim's choice of calls is tacky--let's even say that I choose to reiterate that statement every day--you "DO find a problem" with that. That's a first class, championship double standard on your part.

> Either it is strictly *her* business (as your statement makes
> it clear that it is) or it is not. If it is, then what possible
> justification do you, Dick, and Dave have for taking her to task for
> her choice? If, on the other hand, it is NOT her choice, then it is
> the FCC, not you, Dick, and Dave, that is responsible for affecting
> that decision. In no case, however, is it the business of others to
> tell her (beyond a single statement of personal opinion) to change her
> call or that she is "damaging the ARS" by maintaining it. In
> particular, Dick's insistence that this thread will continue until she
> changes her call is a direct contradiction of the spirit and the
> content of your own statement above--it simply replaces FCC authority
> with blackmail.

Are you really accusing Dick Carroll of blackmail?

> It's time for people to step back and drop the subject for
> good. You, Dick, and Dave don't care for her call sign and feel it is
> harmful to the image of the ARS. Fine. You have the right to feel that

> way if you choose. Others of us, including myself, Cecil, and many
> others feel the opposite, and we have just as much right to our view
> as you have to yours. Neither you nor we, however, have the slightest
> right to expect Kim to accept--or even care about--our personal views
> on the subject. It's her call sign. She decided she wanted it and if
> and when she no longer does want it, she will be the one to decide to
> change it again. Slamming her or pressuring her here in this news
> group accomplishes absolutely nothing for anyone, and creates an even
> worse image of tolerance among hams than the discussions in rram!

It is simply impossible for this discussion to create a worse image than
what goes on in r.r.a.m.

> >Obviously we, as her fellow hams, are in disagreement on this
> >issue. In fact, the majority would seem to support Kim. That,
> >however, will not make the debate come to an end. The only
> >thing that will stop it is for Kim to change her callsign to one
> >which no longer offends, or you can figure out some way to
> >silence your opposition.
>
> In other words, you, Dick, Dave, and the very few others who
> oppose her sign (you admit yourself that the majority of hams support
> her), will simply hound and harass her until you force her to obey
> your orders!

Don't jump to conclusions you silly boy. I have never stated that I
intend to force Kim to do anything. Get your ducks in a row and don't
start generalizing by lumping people together in clumps. I don't speak
for Larry Roll or Dick Carroll. They do not speak for me. By the way, I
don't recall issuing any orders to Kim. I certainly disagree with Larry
on one point; I don't think the majority of hams support Kim's tacky
choice at all.

> Talk about a group of smug, self-righteous, fascists! It's
> people like YOU who give a bad name to ham radio, you hypocrite, not
> decent people like Kim.

You'd have us change our views? Now THAT would be hypocritical!
I like the way in which you'd portray those who are offended by
trashiness as "smug, self-righteous fascists". Remember Rick:
According to your philosophy, I have the *right* to state my views.

Dave K8MN

2575. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:03:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011129000317.22754.00000811@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 25572

In article <3A9E9F89D6731966.C86B3D6FCC3DBEC6.468B50D3F5B0566A@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 28 Nov 2001 12:11:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>>Technically, the US Congress could do exactly the same
>>>thing to our system anytime they chose to do so, provided they could
>>>garner sufficient votes, as the Nazis did.
>>
>>Yup. My point is that the Constitution is not an absolute protection, as
>Cecil
>>seems to think.
>
> On the contrary--the ability to amend the Constitution is
>itself GOVERNED by the Constitution.
>
How is this "on the contrary"? The Consitution is designed to be changeable. Is there any limit on the possible changes if enough votes are gathered? I don't think so.

For example, if there were enough votes, the Second Amendment could be repealed, and the legal rights of Americans to keep and bear arms totally eliminated. Or a new amendment could specifically define when life begins and ends. All it takes is enough votes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2576. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:03:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011129000317.22754.00000810@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 25573

To keep post size manageable, and for time reasons, I'm responding to this part of KE8HH's post. A response to the rest will follow if time permits. This portion demonstrates a key point in the discussion.

In article <9ADEEC8131962182.DD0E0ACB6A2E015F.135A51351943F6B4@lp.airnews.net>, Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

(The discussion involved the effect the appearance of A's property could have on next-door neighbor B's property value). The hypothetical case:

Suppose A lets his property become a real mess. Grass isn't cut, paint is peeling, junk in the yard, etc. Nothing that is a clear health or safety hazard but the place looks awful. B, who lives right next door, wants to sell his house and move away because B doesn't like living next to such a dump. But B cannot find a buyer because of the condition of A's place. Has A harmed B? Who gets to decide? If the decision is yes, how much harm has occurred and what is the remedy?

>
>>> It is clear that A has harmed B.
>>
>>Agreed.
>>
>>>Through his direct and
>>>deliberate violation of reasonably expected standards in a residential
>>>community he has caused B to suffer an economic loss.
>>
>>"Reasonably expected standards" simply means society's values. In a
>different
>>residential community, A's actions might have no effect at all.
>
> Nope--it refers directly to the average behavior demonstrated
>by a resident of that community.

That's what I'm saying. The values of the local society (the people who live in that neighborhood, and those who want to live there) as demonstrated by how they keep THEIR properties. These values/behaviors are totally subjective, yet they determine whether A has harmed B.

> More specifically, it refers to
>behavior that does not affect the property values or enjoyment of
>other residents.
>
As determined by the subjective values of those other than the owner of the property.

>>So what we have is SOCIETY deciding what the values are. Not the individuals
>>involved!
>
> Not at all. The housing market decides in this case.

And who is "the housing market"? People other than the property owner! People whose personal, subjective values determine what someone else's property is worth.

In some neighborhoods, not cutting the grass and such will have a negative effect on nearby property values, because the local society expects that people will maintain their properties a certain way. In other neighborhoods, it will have no effect because in those communities the local society has different expectations.

>If the
>actions of the neighbor do NOT reduce the value of the home or
>directly reduce the enjoyment and use of the property owned by
>neighbors (by directly, I mean that simply _knowing_ what a person
>does inside his/her home--that s/he is a practicing homosexual for
>example--and being personally offended by that kind of activity does
>NOT mean an individual is harmed by it), he or she has NOT harmed
>anyone, regardless of the opinion of "society."

Which are all totally subjective judgements.

>>>B, in any such
>>>circumstances, could sell his house--however he would be forced to
>>>accept a price below that which he would have realized had the
>>>neighboring home not reduced his property value.
>>
>>In some markets, a house next to such a property becomes unsellable. This is
>>how blighted areas are created from nice neighborhoods.
>
> Which, of course, would make the damages in B's case equal to
>the normal market value of his home if A's home was not a
>consideration.

Yes.
>
>>>Thus, the amount of
>>>the loss (the harm suffered by B) is the amount of reduction in price
>>>between a fair market value, given expected neighborhood values, and
>>>the actual realized offering price.
>>
>>Plus consideration for B's time and aggravation in having to deal with it,
>>legal fees, excess RE taxes, etc.
>
> Within reason, yes.

"within reason" being a subjective quantity.

>>> The remedy, obviously, is a legal
>>>action against A compelling him to either repair his property and thus

>>>restore B's property values or to compensate B for the difference in
>>>selling prices resulting from his actions. As far as who gets to
>>>decide, in such a case, clearly the decision would be made by a judge.
>>
>>And all this is OK with you and your moral ideas?
>
> Absolutely.

Now let's see what we've got so far.

You agree that A can harm B by not maintaining A's property to the standards typically found in the community where A's and B's property are located. This harm is present even if A breaks no law and does not pose any sort of safety hazard to B. The mere fact that other people judge B's property to be worth less, or that B's enjoyment of his property is reduced by A's action, constitutes A harming B.

> My moral values do NOT support causing others harm w/o their
>permission. They simply insist that if no one is harmed it isn't any
>of society's business. In the case above, a clear victim (B) exists
>and real, identifiable, harm has occurred.

Yup - even though NO law has been violated and the harm is totally derived from people's personal values, NOT the state's.
>
>>> BTW, consider this. Obviously, you view A as having harmed B
>>>(a view I agree with), and felt that way when you wrote this example.
>>
>>That was part of it, but there's a lot more. For example, did the harm occur
>>when A let his property run down, or only when B tried to sell?
>
> That depends on whether it reduced B's enjoyment of his
>property. If it did not, then the harm didn't occur until the sale was
>attempted (for example, if A offered to purchase B's property for fair
>market value as soon as it was made available, A would NEVER have
>harmed B). If, however, B's enjoyment of his property was reduced
>directly by A's actions, clearly the harm began at that moment, not
>the moment of sale.
>
Agreed. One can also include such considerations as the amount of time and effort B needs to expend to sell, or that B may be dissuaded from even trying to sell because of A's property's condition.

So what we have is this: A can harm B by not maintaining A's property to the standards typically found in the community where A's and B's are located. This harm is present even if A breaks no law and does not pose any sort of safety hazard to B. The mere fact that other people judge B's property to be worth less, or that B's enjoyment of his property is reduced by A's action, constitutes A harming B.

And the standards by which A's property maintenance is judged are those of the neighborhood and local real estate market, which are totally subjective and

personal. The fact that A's property maintenance would be considered customary
and adequate in a different community has no bearing on the issue.

>>>Let's change it a bit. Suppose instead of failing to maintain his
>>>property, A is a ham radio operator who chooses to put up an antenna
>>>farm that, because it distracts from the visual appearance of the
>>>neighborhood, results in the same difficulty in selling for B. Is the
>>>situation the same or different? Why?
>>
>>It's the same. But studies have shown that putting up antennas does NOT
>>negatively impact property values unless said antennas are poorly
>maintained.
>
> How about enjoyment of the property?

Same thing. In addition, if A is prevented from enjoying HIS property because
of antenna limitations, a counter-claim exists.
>
> Suppose I'm a non-ham living next door to you and I feel your
>antenna farm is unsightly and detracts from my view of the
>mountains/lake/ocean/cess pool beyond your property. I cannot escape
>the view of your antennas because they dominate the only scenic side
>of my yard.

Same rules apply as if I were to put up a fence or plant trees or bushes that
blocked your view.

> Have you harmed me? From my perspective, that WOULD constitute
>harm, as the property owner lost some measure of enjoyment in his
>property as a direct result of your actions.

Only if it can be shown that YOUR view of things beyond MY property is somehow
superior to my enjoyment of my property.

What if I out up a fence or plant a bush that blocks your view?

>Do you agree?

See above. It depends on the situation.
>
>>> The answer to the first part is above. With respect to the
>>>second part, C has NO legitimate grounds to demand that A fix up the
>>>property (although he is certainly free to ask him to do so and to try
>>>to convince him that it would benefit him as well). C purchased the
>>>property at a price consistent with being next door to a property in
>>>the condition of A's--thus he is NOT harmed by A's actions in any way
>>>(assuming A doesn't allow his property to deteriorate even further,
>>>thus reducing C's property value further, and placing him in the same
>>>position B was in originally).
>>
>>I disagree. Such action permits neighborhoods to decline.
>
> Only if others follow suit.

Which is made more likely by A's actions.

>The mere fact that a single
>homeowner (who, remember, has already lost money in a court action
>brought by "B" and who stands to lose an equivalent amount if any
>other neighbor loses money on the sale of his or her property) has
>allowed his personal property to deteriorate does not mean any other
>property owner will do the same. One run-down property does NOT make
>for a declining neighborhood.

Wrong on several counts.

For one thing, in many cases A does not have just one immediate neighbor. It is quite common to have 8 immediate neighbors, all of whom could be affected by one poorly maintained property. So we can easily have not 1 or 2 but 9 properties whose value is reduced, all by the actions of ONE property owner. In addition, B must take legal action against A, and win. Unless this happnes, A sets a precedent for the neighborhood.

Neighborhoods and property values rise and fall on their reputations. Properties that are not maintained to community standards harm the reputation of the neighborhood. ("That used to be a nice neighborhood, but did you see the rundown place in the middle of the block and all those for-sale signs? I checked realtor.com and they are asking less than those houses sold for 10 years ago!")

But the main point is simple: A can harm B (and others) by not doing things like yard maintenance according to prevailing local community standards, even though A breaks no law nor directly poses a safety or health hazard. All A has to do is reduce B's enjoyment.

Now let's apply this to ham radio callsigns.

Suppose Z, a radio amateur, chooses a callsign that reduces the enjoyment other hams (X, Y, et al) get from amateur radio, and damages the reputation of the ARS. Even though Z's choice of callsign is legal it's clear that X, Y and others have been harmed by Z's choice, which was not up to community standards.

Saying that Z's callsign choice cannot harm anyone is like saying that A's nonmaintenace of his property cannot harm anyone. The real-estate example shows that the situation is more complicated than that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2577. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:06:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05C23F.A958378@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25574

Rick Adams wrote:
> True. Dogs are usually pretty loyal and accepting (and I'm a
> cat person!).

Did you hear the difference between dogs and cats? A dog looks at his
master and thinks: "This man fulfills all my needs - he must be a god".
A cat looks at her master and thinks: "This man fulfills all my needs -
I must be a god."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2578. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:06:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05C26F.9EF3CC10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25575

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Ah...Plourde, do you see anywhere that I said it was trivial?
> >
> > You certainly implied it. Maybe you should be more careful
> > with your words, Dick. Everyone seems to be misunderstanding
> > what you are trying to say.
>
> And when I "interpret" something you say, you slam me for reading
> between the lines. Your usual double standard, we see.

Trouble is, you read between the lines and then call me an asshole.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2579. Re: "....one step closer to extinction"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:08:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05C2E5.3F57A2C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25576

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I'm not even badmouthing Muslims, you imbecile, ...

Give us an ever-lovin' break, Dick. You have been bad mouthing
Muslims for the better part of a week. If what you have been
saying is not bad mouthing, I shudder to think what would be.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2580. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:12:54 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <38B58611A2D69B15.0982C9C6BC7FF3C5.AA540E797779DD68@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25577

On 29 Nov 2001 04:01:25 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> After all the repartee here with you, Cecil, Kim and Poodle Plourge I
>surely can.

Now Dick,

You know you love this kind of feisty debate--if everyone
agreed with you--you'd leave this newsgroup in disgust!

Hmmmm . . .

Come to think of it, if everyone agreed with you--*I'd* leave
this newsgroup in disgust!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2581. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:17:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4gcndod0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25578

Rick Adams wrote:
>

>Trimmed for brevity<

> If THIS is the worst "threat" you can find in the Koran, you
> should be very glad the people you are terrified of don't use the
> bible instead. It has FAR more violent threats (as in the complete
> destruction of whole peoples for daring not to accept the god of the
> Israelites as their own) than anything you've posted by an order of
> magnitude!

Somehow you and Cecil profess to "not get it" but I'm sure you do. I've made the point repeatedly. All those biblical "threats" are very ancient and have nothing whatever to do with modern Christian theology, theory nor particularly practice. Nowhere do you see Christians determined to kill all non-Christians, whatever history says about the Crusades, and ancient Jewish teachings aside. Islam is definitely the religion of the Islamic Jihad Terrorists, the true numbers of which we can only guess, but we KNOW that there are many, and that a considerable number have infiltrated our societey within the USA. You may ignore all this as you wish, but don't decieve yourself - if you happen to be in circumstances where you are a part of a targeted entity, you die too, regardless of your support to their cause. They don't hesitate to kill their own kind in their zeal, it's considered a small necessary cost. You would give them no pause whateveer.

>
> > It is clear enough that the roots of violence come from the Koran
> >itself, for those believers who would interpret it that way, and for all
> >the masses they influence. If your mileage varies, that's your deficit.
> >For me, Sept 11 was proof enough.
>
> Dick, those quotes prove nothing other than that Islam
> believes those who do not accept Allah as god and Mu hammed as his
> Prophet will be punished in the afterlife--EXACTLY the same thing
> Christians believe about Jesus and THEIR god!

WRONG. Current and widesspread radical Islamic preachings of Holy War, Jihad against the Infidel West, widely reported in press of all political stripe, and harshly confirmed on September 11, give the lie to your totally erroneous conclusion. It is simply not so. The Jihad is on, and ongoing, without end, to a conclusion. Either they win or they fight till they die. Whatever damage and destruction they wreak in the process will be the maximum that they CAN wreak.

And NO, certainly not all Muslims are involved, just as not all
Colonists were involved in the Revolutionary War. But perhaps just
enough, as then.

>
> You need to stop seeing Islamic people with hate and prejudice
> and see them as they really are--an ancient people who have
> contributed enormously to our civilization, science, and arts.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2582. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:18:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05C50C.42496CB9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25581

Dave Heil wrote:
> I come here for amateur radio policy discussion. I don't come here for
> discussions on marijuana smoking, the swinging lifestyle or legalized
> prostitution.

Then why do you spend so much of your time posting on those subjects?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2583. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:18:21 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0B6816C2D518DCC6.BA046ACE5B4756C0.A96E109ADAF34A37@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25580

On 29 Nov 2001 04:10:30 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Kindly inform us as to how to prevent it, when ladies or children are
>present who instinctively view it as such.

Response to language isn't instinctive, Dick. It's learned.
And whether a person learns that such terms are offensive or not
depends on the environment in which the learning takes place. If they
are exposed to an environment in which freedom of speech is considered
an essential freedom, they will NEVER learn to treat ordinary words as
offensive. But if the environment emphasizes protectionism and
censorship, they definitely will.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2584. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:18:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05C52D.4F4BFBDF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25579

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 06:22:35 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >...and I just pointed out several opportunities for glaring errors in
> >your theory.
>
> Opinions, Dave. Not statements of fact. You provide NO source
> to contradict me other than your own personal views.

T h e d a t a d o e s n o t s a y w h a t y o u s a y

i t s t a t e s. It doesn't even need an alternate source of data.
All it takes is for one to read your claims, read the data you yourself
provided and compare the two.

> >As I recall, I recently poked holes in some of the
> >information you provided.
>
> No, actually, you didn't.
>
> >Some was from suspect sources with an agenda
> >(NORML).
>
> Which I balanced with information from an opposing source with
> the opposite agenda--the DEA.

You balanced? The figures don't state what you say they state. That's
a pretty easy refutation of your "evidence".

> NORML is a legitimate source of information, Dave. You may not
> agree with their conclusions, but their facts and figures are
> completely accurate, as even the DEA would agree.

Where does the DEA agree with NORML's facts and figures?

> > One was from a book which provided figures but not figures
> >stating what you claimed.
>
> Bunk.

Not bunk at all, Rick. The text does not state how many people
incarcerated are currently there on drug charges. It does not state how
many are there for simple marijuana possession. It does not state how
many are there for drug *sales*. It isn't very relative to your claims
at all.

> > Your latest stuff doesn't even sound like
> >evidence at all.
>
> To you.

...or to anyone who reads the material you provide as "evidence".

> Again, when you start providing more solid grounds for your
> arguments than your personal opinion, you might have legitimacy in
> questioning the sources others use to debate you. As it is right now,
> it's you against the range of sources I cited--and that doesn't make
> your position look very defensible.

Do me the kindness of reading the material you posted. Then ask yourself if you can honestly claim that it says what you have said that it says (not part of the material--ALL of the material).

> > Besides, most of this latest stuff is simply diversion
> >from the debate over whether Kim's choice of call was a poor one. At
> >least that had something to do with amateur radio.
>
> Not really. Even Larry Roll admits that most hams support her
> decision. The "debate" over Kim's choice of a call isn't a debate at
> all, it's a way for a few people to attempt to force her to change it
> against her will. As such it isn't something to do with ham radio, but
> with dictating the behavior of others.

Larry can't admit since he doesn't have more solid information than you or me. Nobody has taken a poll. I'm not forcing Kim to do anything. I'd certainly like her to see that she has done something which does not reflect well on amateur radio or herself. I'll also admit, through past experience with reading Kim's views on other topics, that I think it is highly unlikely that Kim would change her mind about much of anything.

Under libertarian, Libertarian, Republican and Democratic philosophies and under the U.S. Constitution, it is my right to make my views on the matter known. That you don't like it bothers me not.

Dave K8MN

2585. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:20:00 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1491410725C88FBB.1A85559CB970ED35.B168627D3B7EF147@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25582

On 29 Nov 2001 04:12:30 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> I guers it flew right between your ears with the wind, but it was Kim
>who chose that callsign to go with the gabonzas.

And it is you, Larry, and Dave primarily who insist on
harassing her about it instead of minding your own business.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2586. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:23:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4gogepr0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25583

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 06:22:51 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Yes, very quickly, since they had achieved the control they wanted. It
> >was a sham on the desperate German populace from the start.
>
> Don't criticize them too harshly--our populace elected George
> Wimpus, didn't we?
>
> Oops. Come to think of it, we didn't--he's President because
> of election fraud in the State where his brother is Governor, isn't
> he?
>

Welp, all the news is widely reporting that all the Press recounts that have been done in Florida still show that Bush is the winner. Bleaaaahhh to you, too.

They also say that it looks like that if Gore had gone immediatly for a complete statwide recount, instead of only the precincts where he was convinced he was assured he had a large majority, that they believe he would have won.

Sometimes a wise guy just outsmarts himself.

2587. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:27:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4h01epr1@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25584

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 16:48:54 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > I believe that better describes the true quality of that (those)
> >civilizatioins, or the lack of it, than any words could ever do.
>
> But, of course, the United States leads the world in male
> circumcision.

As you should know, that is largely a health issue, the Jewish practice aside.
There are studies which show that the wives of uncircumcised men experience a higher rate of cervical cancer, and other studies show an elevated rate of penile cancer in uncircumcised men.

2588. Newbie ham ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:28:28 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0111282128.f56aa8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25585

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>If I was interested in becoming a ham radio operator,this
>NG would turn me off from the idea real quick.

HAMS DONT THINK HIGHLY OF DOPE-SMOKING BOOTLEGGERS MOPARHOLIC, SO
THERES VERY LITTLE CHANCE YOULL BE ENCOURAGED TO GET YOUR TICKET BY
THIS NG :)

From: Moparholic (moparholic@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: Illegal 1000 watt swing
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-01-04 16:16:51 PST

Criminal Mind ? Dude get a grip ! I live in a very rural area, have
horses and farm a small piece of my land. I've ran my Collins S series
with its matched 30 L1/phone patch and power supply for years out
here. (all tubes..rec,trans,amp..on 11 meters). Friggin thing takes up
a
bench and then some. Nothing but compliments on my audio and conduct.
Qsl's from the world and back. I can only hope when you get your
ticket
you will enjoy it at least half as much. I am new to this group, but
not
new to your type trollboy, you live for this ng . A sad state of
affairs
when the HAM attitude in all is self righteousness has to spoil a very
fun hobby. I smoke weed too, I know it's illegal but the stuff grows
like dandelions on the "back forty " <g>. You go ahead and let the
government take even more control of your life, it will distract them
from me.

****
Moparholic

2589. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:29:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4h2tepr2@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25586

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Richard Plourde wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > I would say that the routine nonreversible mutilation of any human without
> > > their consent is pretty barabic.
> >
> > I wouldn't say that... (pretty isn't an adverb)... ;-)
> >
> > I would leave out all those qualifiers and say...
> >
> > The mutilation of any human is unequivocably barabic.
> >
> > ...and yet, strangely, these hings happen in many 'civilizations'...
>
> In this peculiar day in which we live, it isn't necessary to mutilate
> children. We just wait until they are in their teens and they will pay
> to have all sorts of parts tattooed or pierced.

And after Professor Rickets gets finished with them they are mentally
mutilated for life.

2590. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:30:05 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <347D0A151250BEFC.76C2B25A46CB1C8F.183E6046A32615E6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25588

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 04:34:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:

>> >I don't. You did. The kids didn't have an opportunity to consent.
>>
>> Did your kids have the opportunity to consent to religious
>> exposure before you stated teaching them about Christianity?
>
>It is interesting to see you write a comparison between Christianity or
>another religion with your cursing. I'm sure that you are able to
>rationalize the comparison in some manner.

I really wish you could read, Dave, it would save a LOT of
typing.

Read the above C-A-R-E-F-U-L-L-Y and see if you can't see
beyond the concept of "cursing" (which, of course, is a term related
to morality and thus a religious value judgement).

Hint: Try focusing on the word in YOUR message "consent."

>> Mine was only exposed to the real world (and I _don't_ use
>> that type of language frequently). Yours was/were exposed to
>> brainwashing and superstition. Neither consented. I wonder which of us
>> harmed our kids more?
>
>I don't have a single doubt about it.

Neither do I.

I'm glad we agree.

Fortunately it wasn't my son who was harmed.

>> You have the right to tell _me_ to shut up as well. The
>> libertarian idea of freedom includes free speech, including the right
>> to express your views--and if that view is that the person you are
>> communicating with should "shut up" then you have every right to
>> express it, just not to enforce it.
>
>Oh, so you really didn't mean it? According to you, I have the *right*
>to tell you *shut up* (but I used restraint instead). I have the
>*right* to add the expletives (but I've used restraint). I used my free
>speech to write what I think about Kim's choice of calls. You've tried
>to tell me that I shouldn't do that. That cuts across the grain of your

>libertarian philosophy. It appears that it is your *right* to free
>speech...but not mine.

No, Dave, it's both our rights.

You have the right to write what you think about Kim's call
sign and I have a right to make it clear that you are an idiot for
harassing her about it.

Better?

>I do work on it, Rick. None of us ever reaches perfection and all of us
>fail some way in each day. Maybe we're make-believe Christians like you
>are a make-believe Buddhist.

Buddhism doesn't require me to practice the religious aspects
in order to be considered a good Buddhist. Christianity DOES require
you to practice the religious aspects in order to be considered a good
Christian. Looks like it's pretty clear which of us is a
"make-believe" member of our religion, and which is a legitimate one.

>I come here for amateur radio policy discussion.

Kim's tits have something to do with radio policy?

> I don't come here for
>discussions on marijuana smoking, the swinging lifestyle or legalized
>prostitution.

You know where your delete key is--and how to use a kill file
don't you?

No one is stopping you from using either or both.

> I don't really care that the laws against these things
>somehow make you feel less free. At least I haven't told you to "shut
>the (expletive deleted) up!". Maybe I'm a closet libertarian.

You may be in a closet, but it's not as a libertarian.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2591. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:30:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4h52epr3@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25587

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:23:06 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >In this peculiar day in which we live, it isn't necessary to mutilate
> >children. We just wait until they are in their teens and they will pay
> >to have all sorts of parts tattooed or pierced.
>
> Heck, Dave, that isn't a recent development. I have a pierced
> left ear (with a 3/4 carat diamond that is a mate to the one in my
> wife's engagement ring in it) and a tattoo (USN, if it matters)--both
> of which are VERY common in my generation--and I was born in 1945!
>

I would have wagered LARGE on it!

2592. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:31:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3DB931D01BBA4453.C81DD29E341BF5DC.3255BF71C5C1F2C9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25589

On 29 Nov 2001 03:47:22 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> See Dave? They don't know everything, after all.

You mean that ISN'T how you got your extra?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2593. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:32:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7D3DC19B79F8A84E.45DFDFED58F76D57.4704ECD45917CC70@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25590

On 29 Nov 2001 03:46:21 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>We are talking about the only way that a General class ham radio license
>could ever legally obtain an Extra class license without any further
>examination.

They waived the tests due to mental disabilities?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2594. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:33:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CFC809652063B97E.B74E8E8220196F6F.7F5B686B85E12264@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25591

On 29 Nov 2001 04:16:13 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>> I don't--and I _teach_ PLS101 classes!
>>
>
> Then you don't teach Political Science. You teach some radical BS just
>as I would expect from you.

Er, Dickie,

PLS101 IS a Political Science course.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2595. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:33:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05C8B9.1A779674@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25594

Dick Carroll wrote:
> From Funk and Wagnall's Standard College Dictionary:
>
> vulgar, (adj). 1. Lacking in refinement, good taste, sensitivity, etc;
> Coarse; crude; boorish; also, obscene; indecent.
>
> Now you have the proper definition of Kim's W5TIT callsign.

Not so fast, Dick. I distinctly remember looking up what a dictionary
in particular means when it says a word is vulgar and it said that
is simply means "used by common people". The dictionary makes a
definite distinction between vulgar words and obscene words and
"tit" is NOT an obscene word.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2596. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:33:57 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B384F0F6E1D4E958.EC5508D84978D023.4B4C08517F87E28B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25592

On 29 Nov 2001 04:17:01 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>> Majority rule CAN mean Tyranny of the Majority, Dickie. Simply
>> because the "majority" want something does NOT make it either "right"
>> or appropriate.
>
>
> Sure as hell makes it legal and proper, though.

True.

So did Hitler's orders to round up the Jews.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2597. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:35:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4hf6glc0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25593

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 12:11:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >I think there is a precedent for Dubya's action. I understand that in WW2,
> >spies and saboteurs were handled that way - including some executions. The USA
> >was infiltrated more than once by well-trained German agents posing as
> >Americans. The idea is that nonuniformed foreigners acting in certain ways are
> >committing acts of war against the USA.
>
> Close, but not quite.
>
> The idea is that nonuniformed foreigners acting in certain
> ways on behalf of their government are committing acts of war against
> the USA. The key point is that they are acting as agents of their
> nation, not as individuals, terrorists, or just common criminals.
>
> The trial of a spy or saboteur who is a citizen of the nation
> he or she is acting for is treated as a military issue because a spy
> is conducting military operations on behalf of a government, and thus
> is considered to be acting in a military capacity. The trial of a
> terrorist, on the other hand, is--and should be--a criminal matter not
> a military one. There is no difference in principle, only in quantity
> of dead, between a person who goes on a shooting binge in a MacDonalds
> restaurant to "protest his plight" as a displaced worker and someone
> like ben Laden who plans and executes a crime that results in the
> death of thousands of innocent people. BOTH are criminals and treating
> them in the same manner we would treat a spy only grants them a status
> (as a loyal subject of a hostile nation) they don't deserve.
>
> ALL terrorists should receive a fair trial--to do less simply
> states that the US can't convict a guilty person without recourse to
> unethical methods. We don't need a Star Chamber, we need public
> trials.
>
> Bear in mind that while TODAY military tribunals are
> "supposed" to be used only in the case of terrorism, when they were
> created the RICO statutes were only to be used in the case of
> organized crime as well. Today, the RICO statutes are used in MANY
> other types of cases; there's simply no reason to expect military
> tribunals to be any different in the future themselves.
>
> >>The Military Tribunals can't be appealed... even to the Supremes... Bush has
> >>usurped the Legislature AND... the Judiciary...

> >>
> >>Nice huh????
> >
> >I did not know that the even the Supremes could not be involved. A bit scary...
>
> It's VERY scary--and far too close to the way the KGB operated
> at the height of the USSR for me.
>

Is it time to battern down all your loose cannons, Prof?

2598. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:36:07 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EAAF77336ACAB21F.9E0D04409C179786.89F5C7A5C442025B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25596

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 04:41:48 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Gee, that'd be easy if you didn't once again snip the relevant
>portion--the part to which I responded. Do people who take your classes
>ever ask for their money back?

Dave, proper procedure dictates cutting back redundant quotes.
Since the part you responded TO already appears in the original
message AND your reply there is absolutely no reason to quote it
again. Learn to keep track of what you say--or don't say it in the
first place.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2599. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:36:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05C949.8FD0DEB3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25598

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> And your name is DICK, consider what comes to mind first...

From Webster's: "dick - PENIS - usually considered vulgar"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2600. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:36:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05C932.303D12D0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25595

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 06:24:44 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Be my guest, Rick. It wasn't 1979. I'll guess early '90s. I know I've
> >been here since the mid-'90s. Is there a prize for the correct answer?
>
> It was created in response to a request for discussion
> generated on: Mon Mar 29 20:33:05 1993. Actual creation date would
> have been thirty days later, on April 30, 1993.
>
> By July 1995 (only two years later) the newsgroup already had
> a readership of over 28,000. Although growth would certainly have
> slowed after that time, it's extremely reasonable to assume it has
> kept pace with other, special interest, newsgroups in the rec
> hierarchy, and thus current readership should be _at least_ 84,000.
> Thus, unless a large majority of readers are non-amateurs with an
> interest in the hobby (which would certainly support the position that
> Cecil and I--among others--have taken that the communications in this
> newsgroup influence more potential hams than do on-the-air
> discussions), this group is read by at least one out of every seven
> licensed amateurs in the United States.

I believe it is much more likely for radio amateurs to read the group
than non-radio amateurs. It is also possible that the figures (I'd like
to know how the figures are derived) are incorrect.

I've posted here since about 1996. In all of that time, I've received
only two e-mails (from other than regular posters) related to my
postings in r.r.a.p. Both were from already licensed amateurs. There
have been *no* "atta boy", *no* "your postings have pushed me away from
obtaining an amateur radio license" and *no* "you don't know what you're
talking about" e-mails from any non-hams.

That would almost defy statistics, wouldn't it?

I won't try to claim a prize for my guess as to the date this group was
created since my "early '90s" guess was too vague. It was certainly in
the ballpark. That doesn't matter much since Cecil was quick to point
out that he didn't actually mean *this* group once he realized the
numbers didn't add up.

Dave K8MN

2601. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:36:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2298D130E6070A8B.6D3AB438FB208AB9.BAFF67093C7B56F0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25597

On 29 Nov 2001 04:29:45 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Does Kim have a right to choose
>> a flavor of ice cream that you dislike?
>
>
> Sure. She can even rename it Tits if she wants. Doesn't mean it's
>appropriate.

Like I said--the God Squad.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2602. Re: Newbie ham ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:38:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05C9C7.608E6329@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25602

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> If I was interested in becoming a ham radio operator,this NG would turn me
> off from the idea real quick.

That's what I keep telling them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2603. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:38:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0A96D28DABCD9D80.5366509D4460FF5A.181D2F57C1A46D1D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25600

On 29 Nov 2001 04:29:44 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Just something I already knew -- that low personal standards are
>the norm these days. Nothing new here. I just don't go along with
>the crowd -- I'm truly my own person.

Of course you're your own person, Larry. Who else would have
you?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2604. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:38:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4hl4glc1@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25599

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Who hinted that I want to do anything at all with them?
>
> You did, Dick. You said, in so many words, that all Muslims have
> no choice except to become terrorists because they adhere to the
> letter of the Koran and are required to kill people of another
> religion.

Cecil, you are a lying SOB. I said nothing even close. Go back aand
READ it this time, without injecting all your characteristic alterations
to make it look like I am the radical. Your actions are deplorable,
actionable and obscene.

2605. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:39:17 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2C34259482C89013.DCE34FAC59CBA35A.05E2FA1599EA30A4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25601

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 22:31:34 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Yeah, cuz nobody else wants you. :-)

You beat me to it, Cecil!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2606. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:41:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4hr3glc2@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25603

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <9u1jn9$ni9$0@208.207.71.131>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >> > Gee, imagine what you could do with "Cracklin' Rosie".
> >>
> >> I thought "Cracklin' Rosie" was already a novelty song (about inexpensive
> >> wine).
> > >
> > >
> > > The Neil Diamond song?
> >
> > Yup. Took me years to get it. Like the very end of the classic film "North By
> > Northwest"...
> >
> > > Not the way I hear it.
> > >
> > Hope I don't ruin it for ya. Try listening to it or reading the lyrics with the
> > idea that it's an ode to cheap sparkling rose' wine.
> >
> > Lines like
> >
> > "Cracklin' Rose, you're a store-bought woman"
> >
> > are the give-away.
> >

Boy, it sure was subtle. Opening "Cracklin' Rosie, get on board, we're
gonna ride till there ain't no more...."

2607. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:42:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2E645FEEC5BF8B25.0882AB2F5952C50D.3ECF77D689CC471D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25604

On 29 Nov 2001 04:35:36 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> When her choice negatively imnpacts the ARS that makes it MY business,
>too.
>I'm nor surprised you fail to notice that.

Then, since I (and MANY other people here) sincerely believe
that your offensive posts on race, religion, and other issues here
negatively impact on the ARS, I guess that makes you prejudices and
hate speech OUR business, doesn't it?

> Make no mistake, I never expected to change her mind, if she has one.
>If she had sense enough to change her mind, she would never have chosen
>it in the first place.

And if you had 1/10 the respect for the ARS you CLAIM to have,
you wouldn't keep attacking a fellow ham over her personal choices OR
posting racist, sexist, or religiously prejudiced materials to a news
group read by hams and prospective hams.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2608. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:51:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05CCCF.8A10925C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25605

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Is that what Thomas Jefferson did?
> >
> > Don't you know? At what point in his life did Uncle Thomas begin
> > referring to himself as a libertarian?
>
> I don't know if he did or didn't but historians have classified
> him as a "civil libertarian" for hundreds of years. He certainly
> believed in liberating Americans from British rule and giving
> us as much personal freedom and protection from government as
> is feasible in a civilized society.

The word "civil" in front of "libertarian" certainly changes the meaning, doesn't it? My Columbia Concise Desktop Encyclopedia doesn't refer to Jefferson as a libertarian but says that he headed the (old) Republican Party, antecedent of today's Democratic Party. He also envisioned an agrarian society, something I'm sure that not many of us would like to see revived. I'll go over the several Jefferson biographies which I have and see what is said about him as a (non-adjective) libertarian.

Dave K8MN

2609. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:53:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <534BC4D8E92C72E0.B7BD287B0D5600C5.CF03E33937DCE36C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25607

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 05:00:57 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>That's funny. I could swear that you were the guy who said that it is
>acceptable under the libertarian philosophy for you to tell me to "shut
>the (expletive deleted) up!). You said it is a *right*. You told me
>that you just couldn't force me to shut up. If I use your own
>philosophy to say that Kim's choice of calls is tacky--let's even say
>that I choose to reiterate that statement every day--you "DO find a
>problem" with that. That's a first class, championship double standard
>on your part.

Nope--you DO have the right to voice your opinion about Kim
and her call sign.

But I--and others--have the right to view you as a
self-righteous idiot and a prudish pseudo-moralistic thug for doing so
as well. And, like you, we have the right to express that opinion and
the opinion that you should drop the issue, here in this news group.

>Are you really accusing Dick Carroll of blackmail?

Actually, I made an error there that I corrected in a later
post. I was under the impression that it was Dick Carroll who posted
that he would keep the thread going until she gave in and changed her
call sign. It was not. It was Larry Roll who said that--and therefore
it is Larry Roll who is attempting to blackmail her into obedience
(not surprising, given his view that women must obey men anyway), not
Dick.

Better?

>It is simply impossible for this discussion to create a worse image than
>what goes on in r.r.a.m.

In other words, because another usenet news group is filled
with offensive material that gives a negative image of ham radio, it's
ok for this one to be filled with offensive material as well?

Take your meds, Dave, you are DEFINITELY not thinking
rationally.

>Don't jump to conclusions you silly boy. I have never stated that I
>intend to force Kim to do anything. Get your ducks in a row and don't
>start generalizing by lumping people together in clumps. I don't speak
>for Larry Roll or Dick Carroll. They do not speak for me. By the way, I
>don't recall issuing any orders to Kim. I certainly disagree with Larry

>on one point; I don't think the majority of hams support Kim's tacky
>choice at all.

You don't think. Don't bother to add to that, it's already a
complete (and accurate) sentence.

>> Talk about a group of smug, self-righteous, fascists! It's
>> people like YOU who give a bad name to ham radio, you hypocrite, not
>> decent people like Kim.
>
>You'd have us change our views? Now THAT would be hypocritical!

You certainly want everyone else to change theirs. And there's
nothing hypocritical about wanting someone to change their views, the
hypocrisy comes from trying to FORCE them to do, as Larry & the God
Squad are CLEARLY doing with Kim.

>I like the way in which you'd portray those who are offended by
>trashiness as "smug, self-righteous fascists". Remember Rick:
>According to your philosophy, I have the *right* to state my views.

So did Hitler.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2610. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:54:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05CD85.85B7F14B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25606

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Remember Dave is the guy who jumped down my throat for confusing
> > > "church" with "Church". Too bad he doesn't practice what he
> > > preaches.
> >
> > Did you find the relevant part in your heavy dictionary yet?
>
> Nope.
>
> > Now about Kim's call, the only portion of this endless rant which
> > related to amateur radio...
>
> And the only relevant question is: Does Kim have a right to choose
> a flavor of ice cream that you dislike?

How is that a relevant question? Are we talking about ice cream
featuring a name brand which uses a vulgar term for a portion of the
female anatomy? Is the ice cream make a ham?

Dave K8MN

2611. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:55:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05CDCC.44A97616@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25609

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You may ignore all this as you
> wish, but don't decieve yourself - if you happen to be in circumstances
> where you are a part of a targeted entity, you die too, regardless of
> your support to their cause.

Uhhhhh Dick, innocent civilians, including women and children, are dying
by American actions right now in Afghanistan. They are dying regardless
of support for the American cause. What would be your attitude if your
family were included among those innocent victims? The situation is
not at all black and white.

> And NO, certainly not all Muslims are involved, ...

"Not all"???? An "extremely small percentage" would be more
appropriate. 99.99% or more of all Muslims are not involved.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2612. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:56:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05CE04.62FF19CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25608

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You are too ignorant to realize that you've already told me.
> > > So be it.
> >
> > ...and your obsessive/compulsive side can't admit that no such thing has
> > taken place in this dimension or reality. You just don't get any help
> > from me in your search. On with your quest!
>
> The odds that you eat pork are essentially equal to the odds
> that you will be alive tomorrow. That's all I need to know.

Is that kind of stuff available from the Vegas bookmakers? All you need
to know is, that since I haven't given you any information, you'd be a
fool to place a sizeable bet. On with your quest!

Dave K8MN

2613. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:57:17 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <738FEF7D8B780958.4E9C7D40079ED205.C6FFDC9435184715@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25610

On 29 Nov 2001 04:46:22 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> What I find is that you are just as full of bullshit as Cecil, and
>that, Sir is a real load. Never thought it possible but you may be even
>more loaded than Cecil.
> Maybe all your "credentials" are truth. maybe not. I find you to be the
>poster boy for all that is wrong with higher education, a phenomena that
>I found well begun when I was a college student in the late 60's and
>early 70's. You will have it your way, just as soon as you can figure
>out just what way that is, and for damn sure it will be contrary to
>convention and all that is good and tried and true, real, and valuable
>to society of free,preogerssive individuals. You freaks would instill
>and install every craven, aberrant, undesirable and destructive behavior
>and vice imaginable under the banner of "personal freedom" with total
>disregard for any hint of personal responsibility. In short, you suck
>and are sick.

Dick, your posts are becoming increasingly irrational and
seeing the image you are creating of ham radio operators is almost
embarrassing to a sane ham.

I won't bother to continue this thread with you--I'm tired of
talking to a bigot as though he were a rational human being.

I do, however, reserve the right to confuse or enrage you at
will in this or other threads in which you exert your self-righteous,
hypocritical, pompous blathering.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2614. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:58:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9u4ip8kum0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 25611

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 28 Nov 2001 06:36:57 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > That's patently untrue. Not all recruit, but many do. And you really
> >should know (I'm sure you do) that at certain states of adolescense
> >children are indeed recuitable, which can also seriously damage their
> >mental development. Now I'd wager you will come back with some indignant
> >"officlal" prounouncement that will be as wrong is it is indignant.
>
> No, I'll come back with a professional view that is accurate
> even if your personal homophobia refuses to allow you to accept it.
>
> Homosexuals aren't "recruited" Larry--nearly all homosexuals
> freely state that they knew their orientation long before they ever
> reached puberty--or had their first exposure to sex. Homosexuality is
> as natural (albeit less common, for obvious reasons) as
> heterosexuality.
>
> You seem to feel that all it takes is exposure to a homosexual
> for someone to be "recruited." Are you really that insecure in your
> own sexual identity, or do you just believe that no one else is a
> "capable" as you of resisting "temptation?"
>
> Adolescents are NOT "recruitable" Larry, as ANY developmental
> psychologist would be glad to confirm.
>
> Stick with your field of expertise, Larry, it's patently
> apparent you don't know anything about mine.
>

What is apparent is that you're not very knowledgable in it yourself.

2615. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:58:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05CE95.AD69D77E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25612

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > In this peculiar day in which we live, it isn't necessary to mutilate
> > children. We just wait until they are in their teens and they will pay
> > to have all sorts of parts tattooed or pierced.
>
> You forgot about consent, Dave. Big difference.

You forget that many of these kids aren't old enough to give legal
consent.

Dave K8MN

2616. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:59:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05CEC0.478D190E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25613

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Who hinted that I want to do anything at all with them?
> >
> > You did, Dick. You said, in so many words, that all Muslims have
> > no choice except to become terrorists because they adhere to the
> > letter of the Koran and are required to kill people of another
> > religion.
>
> Cecil, you are a lying SOB. I said nothing even close.

Do you really want me to go back, dig up your obscene God forsaken
postings, and repost them here? I will if you want me to. Anybody
who read your previous postings knows exactly what you said and
can see you are trying to crawfish out of them now.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2617. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 05:59:53 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9u4isa02rkh@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25624

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1rrkete3@208.207.71.131...

> Most people know that what is commonly accepted in locker rooms isn't
> acceptable in public mixed company especially with children present.
> Sorry you don't

Ham radio is not a family activity and this is not a family newsgroup.

2618. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:01:14 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9u4isk02ro5@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25625

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u4cfm$16o$1@208.206.142.101...

> > It's only vulgar if you allow it to be so.
>
>
> Kindly inform us as to how to prevent it, when ladies or children are
> present who instinctively view it as such.

It's not my place to prevent it.

2619. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:03:17 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D196C31997E531F3.C1B192B7FB9113FA.8AD22B1611C6E72A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25614

On 29 Nov 2001 01:41:01 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Kim -- if your callsign were W5PSY, we wouldn't be having this discussion!

Apparently Larry likes PSY but not TIT.

How odd.

>Kim -- having "power" over women is not, and never has been, a personal
>goal of mine. I prefer women I can relate to as equals, without having
>to engage in any tiresome "power struggle" with them.

As long as they will capitulate to your Victorian demands that
they not socialize or talk with members of the opposite sex unless you
are there to insure that they don't do something immoral, right?

>It is YOU who
>seek the "power" you can derive from the attention-getter call sign you
>have chosen -- and for you to claim anything else is an obvious lie.

Wrong call sign, Larry.

I've heard of PSY power, but TIT power?

>However, your lack of integrity is well known in this newsgroup, and
>probably everywhere else.

At least according to you and the God Squad.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2620. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:04:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05CFE8.E95FE9DF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25615

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:32:06 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Don't you know? At what point in his life did Uncle Thomas begin
> >referring to himself as a libertarian? Remember in his quarrel with
> >Hamilton how he shouted, "Just shut the (expletive deleted) up, Al!"?
>
> He STRONGLY supported the views of John Locke, Dave. And
> Locke, by _any_ definition, was a libertarian.

I'm a Republican but I strongly support the views of Harry Truman on many issues. Did Jefferson ever refer to himself as a libertarian (no adjective)?

Dave K8MN

2621. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:06:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05D05A.11D3C57A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25616

Dave Heil wrote:
> The word "civil" in front of "libertarian" certainly changes the
> meaning, doesn't it?

Not really. A "civil libertarian" would be someone like
Jefferson who believes in "civil liberties". What other
kinds of liberties are there?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2622. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:08:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05D0E1.DE546A31@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25618

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > And the only relevant question is: Does Kim have a right to choose
> > a flavor of ice cream that you dislike?
>
> How is that a relevant question?

Kim has a right to choose her callsign just as she has the right to
choose a flavor of ice cream. There's no law or rule against either
choice.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2623. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:08:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05D0E3.66B8D26B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25617

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:29:11 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Now instead of voting for the "Libertarian Party" candidate, you'll have
> >to search for a "libertarian Party" candidate.
>
> And since there's no such thing as a "libertarian Party" I
> guess that means that your views on libertarians are a bit "off,"
> doesn't it?

Oh, you DID get it. I think my views on self-proclaimed libertarians
are right on target. I've found little to agree with in your views or
Cecil's.

> >Now about Kim's call, the only portion of this endless rant which
> >related to amateur radio...
>
> What about her call sign, Dave? Have anything new to add to
> the thread on the topic, or just a repeat of the same statements once
> again?

Kim's call? I think her choice was tacky, and exhibits a lack of class.

Dave K8MN

2624. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:10:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05D15B.9EC48170@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25619

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The odds that you eat pork are essentially equal to the odds
> > that you will be alive tomorrow. That's all I need to know.
>
> Is that kind of stuff available from the Vegas bookmakers? All you need
> to know is, that since I haven't given you any information, you'd be a
> fool to place a sizeable bet.

I have won a lot of money in my life by placing sizable bets based
on probability. This is no different. I have all the information
that I need.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2625. Re: Bigotry in the ARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:11:27 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9u4jfp02t1c@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25627

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u1ri7ete1@208.207.71.131...

> Better tell it to Rick and Kim who say that ham radio is loaded with
> racism and bigotry when neither would recognize them if one jumped up
> and bit them in the butt.

Why? It's already posted for everyone to see.

2626. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:12:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05D1D8.1425FC11@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25620

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > In this peculiar day in which we live, it isn't necessary to mutilate
> > > children. We just wait until they are in their teens and they will pay
> > > to have all sorts of parts tattooed or pierced.
> > >
> > You forgot about consent, Dave. Big difference.
>
> You forget that many of these kids aren't old enough to give legal
> consent.

That's a legal problem that needs to be solved.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2627. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:14:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05D260.FCC52E25@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25621

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 17:12:21 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >Are Executive Orders permitted by our Constitution?
>
> It depends on their nature, Cecil. The Executive Branch of
> government has certain Constitutional responsibilities and privileges
> and the Executive Order can be--but is not necessarily--included in
> those privileges.
>
> Of course, since we have a President who wasn't even elected
> according to the Constitution (after the Florida fraud was finally
> corrected and the votes counted recently it was announced that Gore
> carried the state--and therefore garnered the greater number of
> electoral votes), why should his orders be any different?
>

Gee, according to the mainstream media (CNN, NBC, USA Today, The
Wheeling News-Register), your statement is a bald faced lie.

Dave K8MN

2628. Re: Newbie ham ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:16:33 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10111290615540.2832-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 25622

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001, CAM wrote:

>Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>> If I was interested in becoming a ham radio operator,this NG would turn me
>> off from the idea real quick.
>
>That's what I keep telling them.

Same here, except that I manage to use correct English language syntax and inflections.

2629. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:18:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05D33D.E9258BDE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25623

Dave Heil wrote:
> I've found little to agree with in your views or Cecil's.

I'm against slavery, Dave. Are you for slavery?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2630. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:34:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C05D6EE.C9EA673C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25626

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:15:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick comes across like a '60s radical with a real job but unchanged
> >political views.
>
> Thank you--that's the first half-way accurate portrayal of my
> values I've seen you make.
>
> I _am_ a sixties radical--I was a freedom rider (and spent
> time in Southern jails for my civil rights activities), a staunch
> supporter of women's rights, gay rights, and human rights in general,
> an antiwar activist and member of Vietnam Veterans against the War,
> the Vietnam Day Committee, and other such organizations, and I'm a
> life long opponent of domestic violence, child abuse (I was a severely
> abused child personally, and left home on my 13th birthday to avoid
> further broken bones and burns--I've lived on my own ever since), and
> censorship.

So we do have *some* common views. A lot of the difference in us comes
from your radicalization. I'm sorry for your experiences as a child.
That may have prompted your radicalization. It may also account for
some of your views of organized Christian religion.

> If you find those offensive "credentials" I'm perfectly
> willing to accept that opinion. At least it will be based on an
> accurate picture of my values.

Sometimes you wear it like a badge. At other times it appears like a
chip on your shoulder.

> >I don't believe that there is anything which will
> >convince him that his skewed views run counter to the mainstream but it
> >is fun to watch him rail against the system, the country and mainstream
> >morality and religion. I haven't called for him to desist and I don't
> >remember that you have.
>
> It's easy to convince me that my views run counter to the
> mainstream Dave, just provide solid evidence (backed by citations)
> that demonstrates how the mainstream feel on the same issues.

Then easy it will be. Just pick up some news magazines or newspapers.
It really is that simple. You've recently taken to railing not only
against numerous actions by the President but additionally calling in to

question the legitimacy of his Presidency--your statements running counter to what has been published in the media. Yet public support for this President is huge. You maintained earlier that because the public votes for Democrats or Republicans, we are all sheep. You apparently think that the people are sheep for supporting the President too. Do you still think your views are mainstream?

> Convincing me that my views are counter to the mainstream
> morality and religion doesn't make them wrong, however, merely a
> minority view. Mainstream morality is, essentially, based on Christian
> morality and in order to convince me that it is a valid source for
> moral values you would first need to provide proof that Christianity
> is more than a system of belief shared by a number of people with no
> more basis in fact than the beliefs of Buddhists, Hindus, Wiccans, or
> Satanists for that matter. I have no obligation whatever to share the
> moral values of a religion to which I do not subscribe, any more than
> you have an obligation to subscribe to the moral values of the Native
> American Church or the Communist Party of the People's Republic of
> China.

So I don't need to submit additional proof. You've just said that you aren't mainstream. I can offer you no proof for the validity of Christianity. There is no proof of God's existence or of Christ's divinity. It is a religion of faith.

> I don't ask that you accept my values and views, Dave. Only
> that you give them the same respect with which you expect your own to
> be treated.

It is clear that you have expressed your views without my once calling for you to shut up. All I've done is disagree with most of them.

Dave K8MN

2631. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:44:18 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C05D942.7BBCAB1F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25628

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Is that what Thomas Jefferson did?
> >
> > Don't you know? At what point in his life did Uncle Thomas begin
> > referring to himself as a libertarian?
>
> I don't know if he did or didn't but historians have classified
> him as a "civil libertarian" for hundreds of years. He certainly
> believed in liberating Americans from British rule and giving
> us as much personal freedom and protection from government as
> is feasible in a civilized society.

I heard he owned slaves. Guess they didn't count?

2632. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:50:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C05DAC2.5C28F11B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25629

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
>
> The FCC is not in the business of making value judgments on the
> callsigns people select for themselves. Being a government agency,
> they are legally constrained against doing so. An individual amateur's
> Vanity call sign is strictly *their* choice; and the negative effect it has
> on their image, and the image of the ARS, is strictly *their*
> responsibility. Mr. Hollingsworth was very clear on that point.
>

Think I can get the call "Whiskey Two Foxtrot Uniform Kilowatt"?
Somehow I doubt it. Not that I'd want it......

2633. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:52:17 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C05DB21.61170D4A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25630

Larry, how did that job interview go?

73s, Bob

2634. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:53:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05DB83.6A693A2A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25631

```
Robert Casey wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Is that what Thomas Jefferson did?
> > >
> > > Don't you know? At what point in his life did Uncle Thomas begin
> > > referring to himself as a libertarian?
> >
> > I don't know if he did or didn't but historians have classified
> > him as a "civil libertarian" for hundreds of years. He certainly
> > believed in liberating Americans from British rule and giving
> > us as much personal freedom and protection from government as
> > is feasible in a civilized society.
>
> I heard he owned slaves. Guess they didn't count?

If I remember right, they counted 2/5.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2635. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 06:54:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C05DBBE.7D92B6FB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25632

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Now you have the proper definition of Kim's W5TIT callsign.

Here's an example of where the word "vulgar" came from, Dick.

"Vulgar Latin - popular Latin, as distinguished from literary
or standard Latin"

Here's a definition you should enjoy.

"vulgar era - Christian era" Ain't it the truth! :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2636. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 07:00:03 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C1E17D36307668A2.89E152F2789513FE.6E76C0FC87570A30@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25633

On 29 Nov 2001 05:03:17 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>That's what I'm saying. The values of the local society (the people who live in
>that neighborhood, and those who want to live there) as demonstrated by how
>they keep THEIR properties. These values/behaviors are totally subjective, yet
>they determine whether A has harmed B.

My argument isn't with how the values of the local community
are determined, it's with how they are enforced.

A community is free to set any standards it wants, but before
it can force compliance with those standards it MUST show that
non-compliance will result in harm to one or more identifiable victims
(i.e., in the case you cite: "B" is an identifiable victim).

A simple analogy:

A community may decide that drinking alcohol to excess is in
opposition to their values. But they do NOT have the right to enforce
a no-drinking ban on private property unless they can demonstrate that
direct harm will result for non-consenting individuals if it is not
enforced (i.e., if the "private property" where the drinking takes
place is the driver's seat of a motor vehicle on a public street).

>> More specifically, it refers to
>>behavior that does not affect the property values or enjoyment of
>>other residents.
>>
>As determined by the subjective values of those other than the owner of the
>property.

No, as determined by objective measurement. Subjective values
represent opinion; they are NOT binding on anyone.

>>>So what we have is SOCIETY deciding what the values are. Not the individuals
>>>involved!
>>
>> Not at all. The housing market decides in this case.
>
>And who is "the housing market"? People other than the property owner! People
>whose personal, subjective values determine what someone else's property is
>worth.

The "housing market" is an economic construct that consists of
individuals and business organizations who purchase property. It is
not "society" because "society" is not uniformly in the market for
property (some are renters, some have no credit, some already have

homes they are happy with, some have no desire to be home owners,
etc.). Thus "society" has no direct voice in the issue.

>In some neighborhoods, not cutting the grass and such will have a negative
>effect on nearby property values, because the local society expects that people
>will maintain their properties a certain way. In other neighborhoods, it will
>have no effect because in those communities the local society has different
>expectations.

Exactly.

Society, as a whole, cannot establish such values because it
would consist of residents of BOTH neighborhoods. Only the housing
market in the specific neighborhood is capable of making this
distinction. If property values ARE adversely affected by an action
which reasonably could be expected not to occur, that action is
clearly causing harm. If they are not so affected, then the action
does not cause harm and thus society has no right to seek to regulate
or prohibit it.

>>If the
>>actions of the neighbor do NOT reduce the value of the home or
>>directly reduce the enjoyment and use of the property owned by
>>neighbors (by directly, I mean that simply _knowing_ what a person
>>does inside his/her home--that s/he is a practicing homosexual for
>>example--and being personally offended by that kind of activity does
>>NOT mean an individual is harmed by it), he or she has NOT harmed
>>anyone, regardless of the opinion of "society."
>
>Which are all totally subjective judgements.

Nope.

The market price of a home is an objective fact, not a
subjective value. The person seeking to purchase a home may be making
a subjective valuation of each property he or she views--but that
subjective valuation is NOT binding on anyone. If, on the other hand,
a property cannot realize fair market value because of the actions of
a second party, then the difference in the market value and the
selling price is _objective_ evidence of harm.

>>>Plus consideration for B's time and aggravation in having to deal with it,
>>>legal fees, excess RE taxes, etc.
>>
>> Within reason, yes.
>
>"within reason" being a subjective quantity.

Not if "reasonable damages" are decided by a court. At that
point they become objective data.

>Now let's see what we've got so far.
>

>You agree that A can harm B by not maintaining A's property to the standards
>typically found in the community where A's and B's property are located. This
>harm is present even if A breaks no law and does not pose any sort of safety
>hazard to B. The mere fact that other people judge B's property to be worth
>less, or that B's enjoyment of his property is reduced by A's action,
>constitutes A harming B.

Almost.

Judgement is NOT sufficient. In order for B to claim actual
damages he must, by necessity, actually sell the property at a lower
price than fair market value. If he chooses not to sell, he cannot
claim economic harm because no evidence exists that he WAS harmed.

In like manner, in order for B's enjoyment of his property to
constitute harm, B would have to demonstrate that he was _unable_ to
enjoy his property as a direct result of A's actions. If, for example,
he simply finds the appearance of A's property offensive, but it poses
no actual threat to him (i.e., an overgrown yard in which mosquitoes
breed, thus reducing B's enjoyment of his yard would clearly pose a
threat and thus constitute harm), B has no grounds to claim that
actual harm has occurred and seek redress. An individual has a right
to be protected from damages, he or she does NOT have the right to be
protected from being offended. That is one of the sacrifices we ALL
make to live in a (relatively) free society.

>> My moral values do NOT support causing others harm w/o their
>>permission. They simply insist that if no one is harmed it isn't any
>>of society's business. In the case above, a clear victim (B) exists
>>and real, identifiable, harm has occurred.
>
>Yup - even though NO law has been violated and the harm is totally derived from
>people's personal values, NOT the state's.

Neither. The harm is derived from economic loss, a
demonstrable, objective, value.

>>>That was part of it, but there's a lot more. For example, did the harm occur
>>>when A let his property run down, or only when B tried to sell?
>>
>> That depends on whether it reduced B's enjoyment of his
>>property. If it did not, then the harm didn't occur until the sale was
>>attempted (for example, if A offered to purchase B's property for fair
>>market value as soon as it was made available, A would NEVER have
>>harmed B). If, however, B's enjoyment of his property was reduced
>>directly by A's actions, clearly the harm began at that moment, not
>>the moment of sale.
>>
>Agreed. One can also include such considerations as the amount of time and
>effort B needs to expend to sell, or that B may be dissuaded from even trying
>to sell because of A's property's condition.

B's efforts to sell are a legitimate consideration. If,
however, B is dissuaded from trying to sell by the property condition
that becomes a personal opinion on B's part and not binding on A. In
the absence of evidence that B _has_ lost money as a result of the
condition of A's property, there is no legitimate grounds for
believing that B has suffered any harm at all.

>So what we have is this: A can harm B by not maintaining A's property to the
>standards typically found in the community where A's and B's are located. This
>harm is present even if A breaks no law and does not pose any sort of safety
>hazard to B. The mere fact that other people judge B's property to be worth
>less, or that B's enjoyment of his property is reduced by A's action,
>constitutes A harming B.

Not quite. Consideration of the property value is not grounds
for assuming A harmed B. Actual loss must be established for that
determination. Example: An individual may feel that an amateur radio
antenna erected in his neighbor's yard both reduces his enjoyment of
his property and decreases his property values. That view may even be
shared by others. But unless the person can demonstrate a tangible
reason why that antenna reduces his enjoyment of his property (simply
being offended by its appearance is NOT sufficient grounds--if it
were, a bigot could successfully claim that seeing a minority living
next door harmed him) or that his property value actually HAS been
reduced by the presence of the antenna (demonstrable ONLY by being
forced to sell the property at a price lower than fair market), he has
no legitimate grounds to establish that harm has occurred.

>And the standards by which A's property maintenance is judged are those of the
>neighborhood and local real estate market, which are totally subjective and
>personal. The fact that A's property maintenance would be considered customary
>and adequate in a different community has no bearing on the issue.

Partially true. Minimal maintenance levels can be established
objectively by actual selling price differential, which is objective
not subjective.

>> How about enjoyment of the property?
>
>Same thing. In addition, if A is prevented from enjoying HIS property because
>of antenna limitations, a counter-claim exists.

From a libertarian perspective, if A moved into that property
after antenna limitations were put in place, he has no claim--he made
a choice to live under those contractual terms. If, on the other hand,
those restrictions are placed after he has purchased and taken
possession of his property, from a libertarian perspective he has no
obligation to adhere to them--he did not agree to those contract terms
with the community when he made his purchase. If an attempt is made in
such a case to force his compliance, he has legitimate grounds for a
suit against the community on the basis of denial of use.

>> Suppose I'm a non-ham living next door to you and I feel your
>>antenna farm is unsightly and detracts from my view of the
>>mountains/lake/ocean/cess pool beyond your property. I cannot escape
>>the view of your antennas because they dominate the only scenic side
>>of my yard.
>
>Same rules apply as if I were to put up a fence or plant trees or bushes that
>blocked your view.

But weren't you just arguing in favor of "property enjoyment"
being a legitimate grounds for regulating the behavior of a property
owner? Just as A's inactions reduce property enjoyment, all those
listed above have the same potential (particularly an antenna farm or
a fence that might block a scenic view). If it is unacceptable to view
the antenna farm as causing harm (which I don't believe it to do
either), what possible justification exists for viewing A's actions as
doing so on any but a strictly economic loss basis?

>> Have you harmed me? From my perspective, that WOULD constitute
>>harm, as the property owner lost some measure of enjoyment in his
>>property as a direct result of your actions.
>
>Only if it can be shown that YOUR view of things beyond MY property is somehow
>superior to my enjoyment of my property.

What if I argue in A's case that his enjoyment of his leisure
(made possible by not maintaining his property) is not inferior to B's
enjoyment of the view in the direction of A's yard? How would that
differ?

>What if I out up a fence or plant a bush that blocks your view?

Addressed above.

>>Do you agree?
>
>See above. It depends on the situation.

Same here--which is why it's impossible to claim that values
are absolute. They are situational, something a libertarian takes for
granted but many conservatives seem to refuse to accept at all.

>> Only if others follow suit.
>
>Which is made more likely by A's actions.

Not if he suffers loss in a court action as a result of his
actions. That establishes a deterrent effect that will discourage
others from repeating his behavior.

>For one thing, in many cases A does not have just one immediate neighbor. It is
>quite common to have 8 immediate neighbors, all of whom could be affected by
>one poorly maintained property. So we can easily have not 1 or 2 but 9
>properties whose value is reduced, all by the actions of ONE property owner. In

>addition, B must take legal action against A, and win. Unless this happnes, A
>sets a precedent for the neighborhood.

That would be true under any circumstances as one of the
conditions you provided was that A was NOT in violation of any law or
ordinance, and thus no legal remedy could exist which would compel his
compliance.

More, if B did successfully sue A it would establish a court
precedent in the case and all of the other property owners whose
property values were reduced would be able to easily recover
comparable damages themselves, thus making A's decision a potentially
very costly one.

>Neighborhoods and property values rise and fall on their reputations.

A reputation is subjective value and cannot be the basis for
determining harm unless it can be shown that the reputation was
deliberately damaged in order to cause that harm.

>Properties that are not maintained to community standards harm the reputation
>of the neighborhood. ("That used to be a nice neighborhood, but did you see the
>rundown place in the middle of the block and all those for-sale signs?

But unless we set limits on the extent to which such a concept
can be applied, it would be equally valid for a racist neighborhood to
legally justify discrimination against minorities on the basis that
their neighborhood would deteriorate if minorities were permitted.
Obviously, such a concept is totally unacceptable from any rational
perspective.

>I
>checked realtor.com and they are asking less than those houses sold for 10
>years ago!")

If no other possible reasons for the decline in market value
exists, then a clearly objective basis for claiming loss is present.

>But the main point is simple: A can harm B (and others) by not doing things
>like yard maintenance according to prevailing local community standards, even
>though A breaks no law nor directly poses a safety or health hazard. All A has
>to do is reduce B's enjoyment.

Not quite--see the above responses to that.

>Now let's apply this to ham radio callsigns.
>
>Suppose Z, a radio amateur, chooses a callsign that reduces the enjoyment other
>hams (X, Y, et al) get from amateur radio, and damages the reputation of the
>ARS. Even though Z's choice of callsign is legal it's clear that X, Y and
>others have been harmed by Z's choice, which was not up to community standards.

Several points:

1. Damage to the ARS would not be actionable by individual hams. In order for such damage to constitute ALL members of the ARS would have to agree that they were harmed (in Kim's case, neither I nor Cecil agree--thus a consensus cannot be reached) and a tangible loss would have to be shown to have occurred.

2. For an individual ham to claim that her call sign reduces his or her enjoyment of amateur radio, it would be necessary for that ham to have direct on-the-air exposure to that call sign and for that sign to have caused demonstrable harm at that time. No one who has actually spoken to Kim on the air has voiced an opinion here that they were harmed, and the hams who have voiced opposition to her sign have not been in a position to be harmed by it and thus have no case. It would be like my neighbor complaining that your antennas were reducing his enjoyment of his property (we have a no antenna ordinance, although a hidden antenna is permitted--which is why I use a flag pole vertical) because he knew of its existence. Clearly, that would be an absurdity, just as claims that Kim's call sign harm people here is one.

3. If you read carefully what I have written above, it becomes clear that from my perspective at least (the one we are discussing), harm must take a tangible form to be considered actual. Unless you can show direct harm caused by a choice of call sign, you cannot legitimately claim that it causes any harm at all.

>Saying that Z's callsign choice cannot harm anyone is like saying that A's
>nonmaintenace of his property cannot harm anyone. The real-estate example shows
>that the situation is more complicated than that.

Nope. Saying that Z's call sign cannot harm anyone is like saying that A's nonmaintenance of his property cannot harm anyone not in his community. Someone directly exposed to Kim's sign who, for example, felt compelled to prohibit his or her children from listening to the amateur radio as a result of it (absurd, but an example) might have some validity in claiming he or she was harmed, but no one in this news group can make such a claim legitimately.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2637. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 07:01:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C05DD59.77BCBA53@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25634

Rick Adams wrote:

> On 29 Nov 2001 01:41:01 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >Kim -- if your callsign were W5PSY, we wouldn't be having this discussion!
>
> Apparently Larry likes PSY but not TIT.
>
>

Maybe Larry is a leg man.

2638. Re: Whats the deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 08:47:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111290047.e3cbba2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25635

>
> Chuck there are a few simpleminded assholes named Cecil, Rick, Plourge
> or some such, and Kim whose entire life support system revolves around
> stirring the pot here on this group. They do it by constantly
> "inteerpreting" what other posters say and lying repeatedly in the
> process. Don't worry, they haven't a clue.
>
>
You forgot Lenny and Squiggy . .
>
>
w3rv

2639. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 10:22:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C060C44.37BF3568@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25636

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Did your kids have the opportunity
> to consent to religious exposure
> before you stated teaching them
> about Christianity?
>
> Mine was only exposed to the real
> world (and I _don't_ use that type
> of language frequently). Yours was/
> were exposed to brainwashing and
> superstition. Neither consented. I
> wonder which of us harmed our
> kids more?

You kids were not just exposed to the "real world," Rick. They were exposed to your views (your concepts of the "real world") as well. So, lets ask you the same question. Did your kids have the opportunity to consent before you started filling them with your political views or with your brainwashing about religion? Why is it harmful to for a Christian to teach his children about his views, but not harmful to you do to the same with your views? I'm not here to defend Christianity. I'm simply pointing out your obvious double standard.

> You have the right to tell _me_
> to shut up as well. The libertarian
> idea of freedom includes free speech,
> including the right to express your
> views--and if that view is that the
> person you are communicating with
> should "shut up" then you have every
> right to express it, just not to
> enforce it.

The libertarian agenda don't even make sense. Since you seem knowledgeable about Libertarians, perhaps you can answer a question that remains unanswered after ten years of asking - what exactly would change if Libertarians were in power? The usual response is the libertarian concept of freedom - everything would be legal as long as it doesn't harm another. Of course, this argument almost always centers on the illegal drug issue (libertarians do love those drugs). Of course, I always respond to that with the argument that current drug laws were passed exactly because the majority believes illegal drugs do harm others. Therefore, unless the libertarians intend to go against the will of the majority and legalize illegal drugs anyway,

absolutely nothing would change concerning those laws. And the same could be said for most other laws in this country. So, if nothing would change under the libertarians, why would one even consider supporting that group?

In fact, at this point, libertarians do seem like a strange group. They don't seem able to comprehend that their views are way out of the mainstream of American politics. They've been around for many decades, yet still have almost no membership (far less then one percent of the population), nor have they ever receive even close to one percent of the vote in a national election. In the end, it seems these people are still trying to ride a horse that died a long time ago.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2640. Re: "...one step closer to erasure."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 10:37:50 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <2eoN7.201624$3d2.8705189@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25637

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011129000317.22754.00000811@nso-cs.aol.com...
> In article
<3A9E9F89D6731966.C86B3D6FCC3DBEC6.468B50D3F5B0566A@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >On 28 Nov 2001 12:11:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> >>>Technically, the US Congress could do exactly the same
> >>>thing to our system anytime they chose to do so, provided they could
> >>>garner sufficient votes, as the Nazis did.
> >>
> >>Yup. My point is that the Constitution is not an absolute protection, as
> >Cecil
> >>seems to think.
> >
> > On the contrary--the ability to amend the Constitution is
> >itself GOVERNED by the Constitution.
> >
> How is this "on the contrary"? The Consitution is designed to be
changeable. Is
> there any limit on the possible changes if enough votes are gathered? I
don't
> think so.
>
> For example, if there were enough votes, the Second Amendment could be
> repealed, and the legal rights of Americans to keep and bear arms totally
> eliminated. Or a new amendment could specifically define when life begins
and
> ends. All it takes is enough votes.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

What then do you guys think of inititiative and referendum? One the one side you have the example of California where votes are held hourly and all sorts of stupidity is written into the state constitution, but on the other side what else do you do to change your government structurally? Revolt?

Nebraska in 1934 eliminated a redundant second chamber in its legislature by initiative with some interesting results -- no one who has served in the unicameral (both a noun and an adjective in NE) has ever been elected to anything else. You do have to admit that two chambers representing precisely the same people is in principle a bit silly but so far NE is the only one since PA went to two in 1839.

Incidentally, the unicameral was passed over the opposition of the state's newspapers who in a fit of cutesy-poo started referring to members of the legislature as Unics. So LB1 of the 1937 session gave them the courtesy title of Senator.

Dick N&#65533;BK

2641. NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 11:56:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C062258.BFE88925@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25638

I've noticed the discussions in this newsgroup are getting really nasty lately (personal insults, name calling, ridicule, harassment, pettiness, and so forth). Is this what we really want? One of the best aspects of this newsgroup has always been that the long-time members have always tried to keep the discussions on a relatively decent level. In other words, while we might argue, and even argue fanatically, most have tended to back off before things got too personal. But, lately, some of the messages here have turned into nothing more than an insult-fest. Please, before you post that nasty little message, with the hateful little comments, think about the effect you're having on this newsgroup and it's members. If this keeps up, this newsgroups will degrade into something none of us will want to participate in.

I'm especially asking the long-time members (Rick, Cecil, Dave, Kim, Larry, Richard, Jim, Bill, Bob, Phil, and others) to back me up on this. Lets all (and that includes me - I'm not completely innocent here) watch our own messages and politely remind others to do the same when they get carried away. Thanks.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2642. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 12:10:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C06256D.7D94B687@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25639

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> But I--and others--have the right to
> view you as a self-righteous idiot and
> a prudish pseudo-moralistic thug for
> doing so as well. And, like you, we
> have the right to express that opinion
> and the opinion that you should drop
> the issue, here in this news group.

Dave is not at all like that, Rick. Based on the messages I've read over the last year or two, Dave seems like a fairly intelligent person, with viewpoints that often span the entire political spectrum (from conservative to liberal). In other words, because you're basing your opinion of him on what he has said about just a couple of issues, your characterization of him above is not at all accurate. Why don't you wait until you get to know him a little better before you start relating him to Hitler (and the other nonsense you said in your message).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2643. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 12:28:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0629B8.2C0F56B8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25640

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) I was a freedom rider (and
> spent time in Southern jails for
> my civil rights activities), (snip)

And are you one of those people who "say" you were at Woodstock
also? How many people were locked up in southern jails during the
civil rights period of the late 50's to late 60's? If I remember what
I read years ago in some national magazine correctly, it seems that
number was just under five hundred during that entire decade. If so,
isn't it amazing that we would run into one of those few here in this newsgroup?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2644. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 12:52:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <LcqN7.2163$m%.683971@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 25642

Actually... in my area at least, we have had TONS of people get ham licenses
that were CB'ers..... all 2 of them out of at least 50-60 new licensees in
the past two years in the tri-county area where I live.

Ryan

(CB'er being a major user of CB's, not the casual weekender that uses it on
the long road trip)

"Sean G Gilley" <uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org> wrote in message
news:ff37aa44.0111281232.1ed0aea@posting.google.com...
> "Bob - KE4JCD" <ke4jcd@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<8yUL7.113107$Yb.28227333@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>...
> > As you said "I haven't seen such "droves" in my area." Well the CODE
TEST
> > hasn't been dropped yet. People I talk to all say much of the same
thing,
> > The CODE is stopping them and when its gone so will HAM RADIO! CBers
will
> > come in droves and as I have on my website, BAD HABITS!
>
> So argue for harder tests. I guarentee that if code is stopping them,
> they won't be upgrading to AE. Not with the current test, at least.
> It's too much work to learn that test. The key is to make the test
difficult
> enough that it takes effort to pass it. Doesn't matter whether it's
> a code test or a written test. If it takes time and effort to pass it,
> it's too much work.
>
> > One page on my site deals with what Amateur radio is slowly becoming,
the
> > new children's band...
> >
> > Here something sweet for your ears...
> > http://www.hartungpress.com/hamradio/crummyhams.htm
>
> I listened to most of that last night. What's funny is that you often
> couldn't tell the good guys from the bad guys.
>
> All of them were acting that poorly.
>
> Sean.

2645. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 12:53:00 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <McqN7.2164$m%.684450@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 25641

I stated that as "I understand it as such" in relation to it "being carved
in stone."

"garigue" <garigue@home.net> wrote in message
news:dLWM7.263091$5A3.100346135@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> Ryan ..I will buy your idea of the Constitution being a "living" document
> only if the last 5000 years plus of human nature changes. 73 Tom KI3R
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> news:%7WM7.102$9d.19434@newshog.newsread.com...
> > As I understand it, it is viewed as a "living" document that is to
evolve
> > over time. At least that is the intent of it, I believe.
> >
> >
> > Ryan
> >
> >
> > > > The Constitution ain't carved in stone, Cecil.
> > >
> > > It ain't perfect but it will do until something better comes along.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> >
>
>

2646. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 12:53:00 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <McqN7.2165$m%.684466@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 25643

Well.... isn't that discrimination against people (for whatever reason) who choose or cannot get a credit card???? Seems as it is the only way to get ANYTHING you might wanna buy online. I refuse to get a credit card..... legal extortion.

Ryan

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message news:22687F70492FBF5D.199963F29CBB8D23.31B4C2FD24DA0AFB@lp.airnews.net...
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 13:16:56 GMT, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote:
>
> >Oooohhhh! Now that's a shopping list. Only one problem if we wanted to
> >pursue a vanity call......It is my understanding that the vanity call system
> >has been put on hold due to the anthrax/mail situation/paranoia. Could take
> >a while....
>
> Electronic submissions are still being processed--only snail
> mail applications are not.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2647. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:08:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C063329.13BAED2F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25644

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 05:00:57 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >That's funny. I could swear that you were the guy who said that it is
> >acceptable under the libertarian philosophy for you to tell me to "shut
> >the (expletive deleted) up!). You said it is a *right*. You told me
> >that you just couldn't force me to shut up. If I use your own
> >philosophy to say that Kim's choice of calls is tacky--let's even say
> >that I choose to reiterate that statement every day--you "DO find a
> >problem" with that. That's a first class, championship double standard
> >on your part.
>
> Nope--you DO have the right to voice your opinion about Kim
> and her call sign.
>
> But I--and others--have the right to view you as a
> self-righteous idiot and a prudish pseudo-moralistic thug for doing so
> as well. And, like you, we have the right to express that opinion and
> the opinion that you should drop the issue, here in this news group.

I simply dismiss your accusations as so much radical leftist pap.

> >Are you really accusing Dick Carroll of blackmail?
>
> Actually, I made an error there that I corrected in a later
> post. I was under the impression that it was Dick Carroll who posted
> that he would keep the thread going until she gave in and changed her
> call sign. It was not. It was Larry Roll who said that--and therefore
> it is Larry Roll who is attempting to blackmail her into obedience
> (not surprising, given his view that women must obey men anyway), not
> Dick.
>
> Better?

Some.

> >It is simply impossible for this discussion to create a worse image than
> >what goes on in r.r.a.m.
>
> In other words, because another usenet news group is filled
> with offensive material that gives a negative image of ham radio, it's
> ok for this one to be filled with offensive material as well?

There aren't any "other words" and that is not what was stated (except by you). One newsgroup is filled with utter filth. One (this one) is not. You have a history of making unnecessary "translations". You come up with "other words". Try reading sentences as written.

> Take your meds, Dave, you are DEFINITELY not thinking
> rationally.

Did you twist your ankle jumping to those conclusions, Radical Rick?

> >Don't jump to conclusions you silly boy. I have never stated that I
> >intend to force Kim to do anything. Get your ducks in a row and don't
> >start generalizing by lumping people together in clumps. I don't speak
> >for Larry Roll or Dick Carroll. They do not speak for me. By the way, I
> >don't recall issuing any orders to Kim. I certainly disagree with Larry
> >on one point; I don't think the majority of hams support Kim's tacky
> >choice at all.
>
> You don't think. Don't bother to add to that, it's already a
> complete (and accurate) sentence.

It must pain you to see your statements easily and convincingly refuted. Your squawks indicate as much.

> >> Talk about a group of smug, self-righteous, fascists! It's
> >> people like YOU who give a bad name to ham radio, you hypocrite, not
> >> decent people like Kim.
> >
> >You'd have us change our views? Now THAT would be hypocritical!
>
> You certainly want everyone else to change theirs. And there's
> nothing hypocritical about wanting someone to change their views, the
> hypocrisy comes from trying to FORCE them to do, as Larry & the God
> Squad are CLEARLY doing with Kim.

I really don't care if you change your views, Radical Rick. You don't have the tacky callsign. (yet).

> >I like the way in which you'd portray those who are offended by
> >trashiness as "smug, self-righteous fascists". Remember Rick:
> >According to your philosophy, I have the *right* to state my views.
>
> So did Hitler.

So did Luther. It is always interesting to guess when an opponent will resort to the "Hitler" word. You've done it with fair frequency.

Dave K8MN

2648. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:19:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0635CE.105201DE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25647

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I come here for amateur radio policy discussion. I don't come here for
> > discussions on marijuana smoking, the swinging lifestyle or legalized
> > prostitution.
>
> Then why do you spend so much of your time posting on those subjects?

Because that's where you and a few other diversionary types invariably take us. Rick chose to defend Kim's poor judgement in callsign selection by bringing up marijuana smoking, prostitution and the swinging lifestyle.

Do you have anything related to amateur radio or would you rather to ask additional questions to which you already have the answer?

Dave K8MN

2649. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:23:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0636CB.FDE461D5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25645

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 29 Nov 2001 04:12:30 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > I guers it flew right between your ears with the wind, but it was Kim
> >who chose that callsign to go with the gabonzas.
>
> And it is you, Larry, and Dave primarily who insist on
> harassing her about it instead of minding your own business.
>
> Rick

We're all hams, Rick. Anything which takes place in amateur radio is our business. Amateur radio is a public venue. Anything which takes place in a public venue is our business.

Dave K8MN

2650. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:26:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C06378B.327AE9DA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25646

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 29 Nov 2001 04:17:01 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >> Majority rule CAN mean Tyranny of the Majority, Dickie. Simply
> >> because the "majority" want something does NOT make it either "right"
> >> or appropriate.
> > >
> > >
> > > Sure as hell makes it legal and proper, though.
>
> True.
>
> So did Hitler's orders to round up the Jews.

You're on record pace, Radical Rick--two "Hitler" references within an hour!

Dave K8MN

2651. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:30:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C06387B.219EE610@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25650

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 04:41:48 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Gee, that'd be easy if you didn't once again snip the relevant
> >portion--the part to which I responded. Do people who take your classes
> >ever ask for their money back?
>
> Dave, proper procedure dictates cutting back redundant quotes.
> Since the part you responded TO already appears in the original
> message AND your reply there is absolutely no reason to quote it
> again. Learn to keep track of what you say--or don't say it in the
> first place.

Now all that is needed is for you to realize just what constitutes a redundant quote. If you snip the relevant portion, folks aren't likely to know what you are responding to. The thread won't make sense and things will be out of context. As to your last sentence, there you go giving orders again, Radical Rick.

I'd want my money back.

Dave K8MN

2652. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:34:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C06394F.6B76B8F4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25649

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > The word "civil" in front of "libertarian" certainly changes the
> > meaning, doesn't it?
>
> Not really. A "civil libertarian" would be someone like
> Jefferson who believes in "civil liberties". What other
> kinds of liberties are there?

There'd be the kinds like "libertarian" without any modifying adjectives and there'd be "libertarian" with any modifying adjectives other than "civil". An example would be Radical Rick as sexual libertarian.

Dave K8MN

2653. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:36:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0639D0.1DD7D3E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25652

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > And the only relevant question is: Does Kim have a right to choose
> > > a flavor of ice cream that you dislike?
> >
> > How is that a relevant question?
>
> Kim has a right to choose her callsign just as she has the right to
> choose a flavor of ice cream. There's no law or rule against either
> choice.

To my knowledge, there aren't any trashy ice cream flavor names. I'm a radio amateur posting in an amateur radio newsgroup about an issue relating to amateur radio. If you want to continue your ice cream idea, why not try an ice cream newsgroup?

Dave K8MN

2654. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:38:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C063A40.6BB6C2A1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25648

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The odds that you eat pork are essentially equal to the odds
> > > that you will be alive tomorrow. That's all I need to know.
> >
> > Is that kind of stuff available from the Vegas bookmakers? All you need
> > to know is, that since I haven't given you any information, you'd be a
> > fool to place a sizeable bet.
>
> I have won a lot of money in my life by placing sizable bets based
> on probability. This is no different. I have all the information
> that I need.

I'd certainly have to agree with your last sentence. I've see you form
other opinions based upon about the same amount of knowledge--none.

On with your quest, Don Quixote!

Dave K8MN

2655. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:40:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C063AE1.2CE5E5BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25651

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I've found little to agree with in your views or Cecil's.
>
> I'm against slavery, Dave. Are you for slavery?

The troll-o-meter is pegged, Cecil.

You'll have better luck with your does-he-eat-pork? quest.

Dave K8MN

2656. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 13:50:11 UTC
From: richard54@email.com
Message-ID: <3da73545.0111290550.7ec2abbe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25653

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C05DB83.6A693A2A@IEEE.org>...
> Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > Is that what Thomas Jefferson did?
> > > >
> > > > Don't you know? At what point in his life did Uncle Thomas begin
> > > > referring to himself as a libertarian?
> > >
> > > I don't know if he did or didn't but historians have classified
> > > him as a "civil libertarian" for hundreds of years. He certainly
> > > believed in liberating Americans from British rule and giving
> > > us as much personal freedom and protection from government as
> > > is feasible in a civilized society.
> >
> > I heard he owned slaves. Guess they didn't count?
>
> If I remember right, they counted 2/5.

Do we have freedom when secrecy dominates?

http://www.geocities.com/justicewell/dean.htm

John Dean doesn't think so

2657. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 14:45:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C064A17.FBAB380@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25654

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> And are you one of those people who "say" you were at Woodstock
> also? How many people were locked up in southern jails during the
> civil rights period of the late 50's to late 60's? If I remember what
> I read years ago in some national magazine correctly, it seems that
> number was just under five hundred during that entire decade. If so,
> isn't it amazing that we would run into one of those few here in this newsgroup?

Maybe, maybe not. How many hams here have ever been on a plane with
Willie Nelson? I was, two weeks ago.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2658. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 14:51:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C064B5B.5AC2B9C3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25655

KC8PMX wrote:
> I refuse to get a credit card..... legal extortion.

Yes, but in the opposite direction from what you are thinking.
My money pays interest at the bank while the credit card company
floats me an interest free loan of X thousand dollars which I pay
off every month and avoid any charges at all.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2659. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 14:52:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C064BC2.6643811C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25656

Dave Heil wrote:
> We're all hams, Rick. Anything which takes place in amateur radio is our
> business.

Does the FCC know you are making a *business* out of *amateur* radio? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2660. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 14:53:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C064C05.83759C9F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25657

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Then why do you spend so much of your time posting on those subjects?
>
> Because that's where you and a few other diversionary types invariably
> take us.

Have we installed a ring in your nose or what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2661. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 15:13:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C06509D.EF3ACB29@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25658

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Then why do you spend so much of your time posting on those subjects?
> >
> > Because that's where you and a few other diversionary types invariably
> > take us.
>
> Have we installed a ring in your nose or what?

The same could be asked of you? Are you bound by some peculiar code to
make reponses which lead the topic astray?

Dave K8MN

2662. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 15:20:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C065238.316411FF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25659

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> In fact, at this point, libertarians do seem like a strange group.
> They don't seem able to comprehend that their views are way out of the
> mainstream of American politics. They've been around for many decades,

I wouldn't call three decades "many" decades. I'm a charter member
and we are celebrating our 30th anniversary.

> yet still have almost no membership (far less then one percent of the
> population), nor have they ever receive even close to one percent of
> the vote in a national election. In the end, it seems these people are
> still trying to ride a horse that died a long time ago.

From the Libertarian website: "With about 300 candidates on the ballot
in November, the LP won about one of every five races it contested."
"[November 27] The number of Libertarians elected to office on November 6
has jumped to 67, thanks to a flurry of late-breaking victories."

67 is a record high, Dwight, for the Libertarians.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2663. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 15:23:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0111290723.72e229ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25660

A quick partial response..

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:<C1E17D36307668A2.89E152F2789513FE.6E76C0FC87570A30@lp.airnews.net>...
> On 29 Nov 2001 05:03:17 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >That's what I'm saying. The values of the local society (the people who live in
> >that neighborhood, and those who want to live there) as demonstrated by how
> >they keep THEIR properties. These values/behaviors are totally subjective, yet
> >they determine whether A has harmed B.
>
> My argument isn't with how the values of the local community
> are determined, it's with how they are enforced.
>
> A community is free to set any standards it wants, but before
> it can force compliance with those standards it MUST show that
> non-compliance will result in harm to one or more identifiable victims
> (i.e., in the case you cite: "B" is an identifiable victim).

That's YOUR value system, Rick. Here it is in another form:

To force compliance of a rule or law, a community MUST show:

1) Noncompliance WILL result in harm to a victim
2) The victim is one or more real individuals

Let's see where that leads.

> A simple analogy:
>
> A community may decide that drinking alcohol to excess is in
> opposition to their values.

They may decide what "excess" means, including a total ban.

> But they do NOT have the right to enforce
> a no-drinking ban on private property unless they can demonstrate that
> direct harm will result for non-consenting individuals if it is not
> enforced (i.e., if the "private property" where the drinking takes
> place is the driver's seat of a motor vehicle on a public street).
>
So you support DWI laws, as do I - even though many of them contradict
your standards.

Suppose law enforcement officer in an unmarked car sees a person
driving away from Location A late at night. The LEO follows and notes
that the driver obeys all traffic rules and regulations on from

Location A to Location B, which is the driver's destination, where the driver parks and gets out of his car. No other vehicles were on the road that late at night. The LEO approaches the driver, asks if he has been drinking, and the driver says yes. LEO administers a breathalyzer or other appproved test and determines from the results that the driver has been operating a motor vehicle while legally intoxicated. Driver winds up paying a fine, getting points or maybe losing his license, maybe even being arrested, etc., because that community does not take DWI lightly.

What harm was done by the intoxicated driver who violated no motor vehicle rule other than driving while intoxicated? And who, exactly, was harmed if no accident occurred and there were no other vehicles on the road but the intoxicated driver's and the LEO following?

According to YOUR value system, the community has NO right to penalize the intoxicated driver in any way because no actual harm has occurred and there is no identifiable victim. By your rules, DUI laws should only apply if an accident actually occurs.

According to my value system, operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated exposes other people and their property to an unreasonable and unnecessary RISK of harm, even if no actual harm occurs in all cases, and so the community has the duty to enact and enforce DWI laws.

Here's an even simpler example: An intersection is controlled by a traffic light. Visibility in all directions is excellent and I am familiar with the area. I can easily see that mine is the only vehicle on the road within a half-mile of the intersection. There is no emergency or other unusual situation, I just don't like waiting at red lights. Who is harmed if I run a red light under those conditions? Am I justified in running a red light at that intersection under those conditions, or should Officer Opie give me a ticket, fine and points for doing so?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2664. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 15:23:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0652EE.BA34F310@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25661

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Not really. A "civil libertarian" would be someone like
> > Jefferson who believes in "civil liberties". What other
> > kinds of liberties are there?
>
> There'd be the kinds like "libertarian" without any modifying adjectives
> and there'd be "libertarian" with any modifying adjectives other than
> "civil". An example would be Radical Rick as sexual libertarian.

I do believe that sexual liberty is a civil liberty. How about a
liberty that is not redundant to a civil liberty? Seems to me,
it is civil law Vs criminal law and "criminal liberty" doesn't
make any sense at all.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2665. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 15:27:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0653C9.8A7214F9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25662

Dave Heil wrote:
> As to your last sentence, there you go giving orders again, Radical Rick.

That's not an order, that's an admonition, i.e. a gentle reproof.

--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2666. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 15:28:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C065431.54A2C8E2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25663

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Kim has a right to choose her callsign just as she has the right to
> > choose a flavor of ice cream. There's no law or rule against either
> > choice.
>
> To my knowledge, there aren't any trashy ice cream flavor names.

There aren't any trashy callsigns either, Dave. The trash is all
in your mind.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2667. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 15:30:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0654A9.ABAEEA4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25665

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I've found little to agree with in your views or Cecil's.
> > >
> > I'm against slavery, Dave. Are you for slavery?
>
> The troll-o-meter is pegged, Cecil.
> You'll have better luck with your does-he-eat-pork? quest.

I'm also against smallpox, Dave. Are you for smallpox? I suspect,
contrary to what you say, that you agree with 99% of my views.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2668. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 15:31:02 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0111290731.2bee49ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25664

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011128204101.08355.00003715@nso-mq.aol.com>...
> Your callsign spells out the word "tit," which is a vulgar slang expression
> referring to a woman's breasts, specifically, your own. You chose this
> Vanity call sign with and for the specific purpose of calling attention to
> your own breasts, which you obviously consider to be particularly
> noteworthy for some reason. You did this in order to evoke purient
> interest in male hams, thus hopefully giving you some sort of power
> over them, and increasing the amount of attention you receive from
> them. You had no other purpose in mind when you choose this call
> sign.

Let's see. I believe I read Kim's explanation of how/why she chose her
callsign, and I don't believe she mentioned any of the above.

You can believe anything you wish. You can believe all those reasons above
are why Kim's callsign is what it is. Truth is, you don't know.

At first I thought you were in this discussion because you really believed
that her sign was bad for the ARS. I believed that. It's become clear
from your writings that while that may have been a part of it, it's really
much more simple than that. Kim has a callsign you don't like. It offends
you. You want it taken from her because of that. The ARS doesn't figure
into it much, if at all. She's doing something you don't like, and being
the person you are, you want to force your beliefs upon her and get her
to get rid of the callsign.

I'll fight for you to be able to have, speak, and write your beliefs, even
though I find them apalling. You argue against others being able to do
the same. Your desire to control others' freedoms is what brings us close
to extinction. Not a stupid callsign.

Sean.

2669. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 17:57:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0111290957.60fc7fc9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25666

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:<C1E17D36307668A2.89E152F2789513FE.6E76C0FC87570A30@lp.airnews.net>...
(continuation of earlier discussion)

> No, as determined by objective measurement. Subjective values
> represent opinion; they are NOT binding on anyone.
>
> >>>So what we have is SOCIETY deciding what the values are. Not the individuals
> >>>involved!
> >>
> >> Not at all. The housing market decides in this case.
> >
> >And who is "the housing market"? People other than the property owner! People
> >whose personal, subjective values determine what someone else's property is
> >worth.
>
> The "housing market" is an economic construct that consists of
> individuals and business organizations who purchase property.

OK

>It is
> not "society" because "society" is not uniformly in the market for
> property (some are renters, some have no credit, some already have
> homes they are happy with, some have no desire to be home owners,
> etc.). Thus "society" has no direct voice in the issue.

"Society" was not a good word choice, then. Let us say "the local RE
market" meaning all those individuals and organizations who might buy
a particular property, OR who have a direct effect on the pricing of a
property.

Then, it is "the local RE market" who determine what a property is
worth. Their criteria are NOT all objective.
>
> >In some neighborhoods, not cutting the grass and such will have a negative
> >effect on nearby property values, because the local society expects that people
> >will maintain their properties a certain way. In other neighborhoods, it will
> >have no effect because in those communities the local society has different
> >expectations.
>
> Exactly.
>
> Society, as a whole, cannot establish such values because it
> would consist of residents of BOTH neighborhoods. Only the housing
> market in the specific neighborhood is capable of making this

> distinction.

Agreed! Which means the values are not objective - they are set in
part by the warm fuzzies of those in "the local RE market".

> If property values ARE adversely affected by an action
> which reasonably could be expected not to occur, that action is
> clearly causing harm. If they are not so affected, then the action
> does not cause harm and thus society has no right to seek to regulate
> or prohibit it.

Yup. But the "harm" in many cases is purely in the subjective feelings
of those in the local RE market.
>
> >>If the
> >>actions of the neighbor do NOT reduce the value of the home or
> >>directly reduce the enjoyment and use of the property owned by
> >>neighbors (by directly, I mean that simply _knowing_ what a person
> >>does inside his/her home--that s/he is a practicing homosexual for
> >>example--and being personally offended by that kind of activity does
> >>NOT mean an individual is harmed by it), he or she has NOT harmed
> >>anyone, regardless of the opinion of "society."
> >
> >Which are all totally subjective judgements.
>
> Nope.

Yes, they are. Whether A's actions or lack of them reduces B's
enjoyment or use is up to B's subjective judgement.

Say A puts up a tower. B may find it unsightly and say it reduces his
enjoyment of his property. D, who lives on the other side of A, may
find it attractive, and say it ADDS to his enjoyment of the property.
>
> The market price of a home is an objective fact, not a
> subjective value.

True, but it is based on many subjective judgements.

> The person seeking to purchase a home may be making
> a subjective valuation of each property he or she views--but that
> subjective valuation is NOT binding on anyone.

Once an offer is made, it sure IS binding!

> If, on the other hand,
> a property cannot realize fair market value because of the actions of
> a second party, then the difference in the market value and the
> selling price is _objective_ evidence of harm.

The "fair market calue" is determined by subjective factors, though.
Here's an example:

Two years ago I moved about 8 miles. The house I left was slightly
older, slightly larger and in many ways nicer than the one I moved to.
Both are in the same county, have about the same amenities, features
and operating costs. The lots are comparable in size. Yet the new
house cost more than double the price of the old one. The reason is
simple: Location, location, location.
>
> >>>Plus consideration for B's time and aggravation in having to deal with it,
> >>>legal fees, excess RE taxes, etc.
> >>
> >> Within reason, yes.
> >
> >"within reason" being a subjective quantity.
>
> Not if "reasonable damages" are decided by a court. At that
> point they become objective data.

Based on SUBJECTIVE judgements.
>
> >Now let's see what we've got so far.
> >
> >You agree that A can harm B by not maintaining A's property to the standards
> >typically found in the community where A's and B's property are located. This
> >harm is present even if A breaks no law and does not pose any sort of safety
> >hazard to B. The mere fact that other people judge B's property to be worth
> >less, or that B's enjoyment of his property is reduced by A's action,
> >constitutes A harming B.
>
> Almost.
>
> Judgement is NOT sufficient. In order for B to claim actual
> damages he must, by necessity, actually sell the property at a lower
> price than fair market value. If he chooses not to sell, he cannot
> claim economic harm because no evidence exists that he WAS harmed.

Suppose B tries to refinance his mortgage but is refused by the
mortgage company because they say the property value has been lowered.
B cannot get a new loan because of A's actions and has been
economically harmed without actually selling his property.
>
> In like manner, in order for B's enjoyment of his property to
> constitute harm, B would have to demonstrate that he was _unable_ to
> enjoy his property as a direct result of A's actions. If, for example,
> he simply finds the appearance of A's property offensive, but it poses
> no actual threat to him (i.e., an overgrown yard in which mosquitoes
> breed, thus reducing B's enjoyment of his yard would clearly pose a
> threat and thus constitute harm), B has no grounds to claim that
> actual harm has occurred and seek redress. An individual has a right
> to be protected from damages, he or she does NOT have the right to be
> protected from being offended.

The line between being offended and being harmed is a purely
subjective one. Note that your example with the mosquitoes does not
demonstrate actual harm but only the threat (risk) of harm (until
someone is actually bitten by the mosquitoes, no harm exists, only the
threat).

>That is one of the sacrifices we ALL make to live in a (relatively)
free society.

Not a sacrifice at all. It's a tradeoff of rights. Each person's
rights need to be balanced against those of the neighbors. This
balance is based on subjective values, not objective ones.
>
> >> My moral values do NOT support causing others harm w/o their
> >>permission. They simply insist that if no one is harmed it isn't any
> >>of society's business. In the case above, a clear victim (B) exists
> >>and real, identifiable, harm has occurred.
> >
> >Yup - even though NO law has been violated and the harm is totally derived from
> >people's personal values, NOT the state's.
>
> Neither. The harm is derived from economic loss, a
> demonstrable, objective, value.

Based on subjective valuations.
>
> >>>That was part of it, but there's a lot more. For example, did the harm occur
> >>>when A let his property run down, or only when B tried to sell?
> >>
> >> That depends on whether it reduced B's enjoyment of his
> >>property. If it did not, then the harm didn't occur until the sale was
> >>attempted (for example, if A offered to purchase B's property for fair
> >>market value as soon as it was made available, A would NEVER have
> >>harmed B). If, however, B's enjoyment of his property was reduced
> >>directly by A's actions, clearly the harm began at that moment, not
> >>the moment of sale.
> >>
> >Agreed. One can also include such considerations as the amount of time and
> >effort B needs to expend to sell, or that B may be dissuaded from even trying
> >to sell because of A's property's condition.
>
> B's efforts to sell are a legitimate consideration. If,
> however, B is dissuaded from trying to sell by the property condition
> that becomes a personal opinion on B's part and not binding on A. In
> the absence of evidence that B _has_ lost money as a result of the
> condition of A's property, there is no legitimate grounds for
> believing that B has suffered any harm at all.

As shown above, a sale is not required to provide such evidence. The
mortgage company refusal is just one example.
>
> >So what we have is this: A can harm B by not maintaining A's property to the

> >standards typically found in the community where A's and B's are located. This
> >harm is present even if A breaks no law and does not pose any sort of safety
> >hazard to B. The mere fact that other people judge B's property to be worth
> >less, or that B's enjoyment of his property is reduced by A's action,
> >constitutes A harming B.
>
> Not quite. Consideration of the property value is not grounds
> for assuming A harmed B. Actual loss must be established for that
> determination.

Why?

> Example: An individual may feel that an amateur radio
> antenna erected in his neighbor's yard both reduces his enjoyment of
> his property and decreases his property values. That view may even be
> shared by others. But unless the person can demonstrate a tangible
> reason why that antenna reduces his enjoyment of his property (simply
> being offended by its appearance is NOT sufficient grounds--if it
> were, a bigot could successfully claim that seeing a minority living
> next door harmed him) or that his property value actually HAS been
> reduced by the presence of the antenna (demonstrable ONLY by being
> forced to sell the property at a price lower than fair market), he has
> no legitimate grounds to establish that harm has occurred.

The tangible reason can be based on subjective judgements, though.
Suppose A has a satellite "pizza dish". B allows a tree to grow so
that it blocks the signal to A's dish, thereby reducing A's enjoyment
of his property because his satellite TV doesn't work anymore. Has B
harmed A? Can A require B to cut down the tree so his dish will work
again?

Or must A relocate his dish? What if that is not practical?

> >> How about enjoyment of the property?
> >
> >Same thing. In addition, if A is prevented from enjoying HIS property because
> >of antenna limitations, a counter-claim exists.
>
> From a libertarian perspective, if A moved into that property
> after antenna limitations were put in place, he has no claim--he made
> a choice to live under those contractual terms.

Partially true. However, in many areas there is little choice.

> If, on the other hand,
> those restrictions are placed after he has purchased and taken
> possession of his property, from a libertarian perspective he has no
> obligation to adhere to them--he did not agree to those contract terms
> with the community when he made his purchase. If an attempt is made in
> such a case to force his compliance, he has legitimate grounds for a
> suit against the community on the basis of denial of use.

Agreed.
>
> >> Suppose I'm a non-ham living next door to you and I feel your
> >>antenna farm is unsightly and detracts from my view of the
> >>mountains/lake/ocean/cess pool beyond your property. I cannot escape
> >>the view of your antennas because they dominate the only scenic side
> >>of my yard.
> >
> >Same rules apply as if I were to put up a fence or plant trees or bushes that
> >blocked your view.
>
> But weren't you just arguing in favor of "property enjoyment"
> being a legitimate grounds for regulating the behavior of a property
> owner?

Yep.

> Just as A's inactions reduce property enjoyment, all those
> listed above have the same potential (particularly an antenna farm or
> a fence that might block a scenic view). If it is unacceptable to view
> the antenna farm as causing harm (which I don't believe it to do
> either), what possible justification exists for viewing A's actions as
> doing so on any but a strictly economic loss basis?

My point is that it's all based on subjective valuations, not
objective measures.
>
> >> Have you harmed me? From my perspective, that WOULD constitute
> >>harm, as the property owner lost some measure of enjoyment in his
> >>property as a direct result of your actions.
> >
> >Only if it can be shown that YOUR view of things beyond MY property is somehow
> >superior to my enjoyment of my property.
>
> What if I argue in A's case that his enjoyment of his leisure
> (made possible by not maintaining his property) is not inferior to B's
> enjoyment of the view in the direction of A's yard? How would that
> differ?

Thus the tradeoff and subjective nature of the judgements, which is my
point.
>
> >What if I out up a fence or plant a bush that blocks your view?
>
> Addressed above.
>
> >>Do you agree?
> >
> >See above. It depends on the situation.
>
> Same here--which is why it's impossible to claim that values
> are absolute. They are situational, something a libertarian takes for

> granted but many conservatives seem to refuse to accept at all.

Which means that "harm" is often a completely subjective thing.
>
> >> Only if others follow suit.
> >
> >Which is made more likely by A's actions.
>
> Not if he suffers loss in a court action as a result of his
> actions. That establishes a deterrent effect that will discourage
> others from repeating his behavior.
>
> >For one thing, in many cases A does not have just one immediate neighbor. It is
> >quite common to have 8 immediate neighbors, all of whom could be affected by
> >one poorly maintained property. So we can easily have not 1 or 2 but 9
> >properties whose value is reduced, all by the actions of ONE property owner. In
> >addition, B must take legal action against A, and win. Unless this happnes, A
> >sets a precedent for the neighborhood.
>
> That would be true under any circumstances as one of the
> conditions you provided was that A was NOT in violation of any law or
> ordinance, and thus no legal remedy could exist which would compel his
> compliance.

So A's inaction, unless successfully challenged, can start a trend
that causes a neighborhood to decline. That was my claim all along.
>
> More, if B did successfully sue A it would establish a court
> precedent in the case and all of the other property owners whose
> property values were reduced would be able to easily recover
> comparable damages themselves, thus making A's decision a potentially
> very costly one.

Only if A had any assets to be recovered.
>
> >Neighborhoods and property values rise and fall on their reputations.
>
> A reputation is subjective value and cannot be the basis for
> determining harm unless it can be shown that the reputation was
> deliberately damaged in order to cause that harm.

Yet that subjective value can result in economic loss.
>
> >Properties that are not maintained to community standards harm the reputation
> >of the neighborhood. ("That used to be a nice neighborhood, but did you see the
> >rundown place in the middle of the block and all those for-sale signs?
>
> But unless we set limits on the extent to which such a concept
> can be applied, it would be equally valid for a racist neighborhood to
> legally justify discrimination against minorities on the basis that
> their neighborhood would deteriorate if minorities were permitted.

That's why we have equal housing laws. Which I support.

> Obviously, such a concept is totally unacceptable from any rational
> perspective.

It is unacceptable from the perspective that a person's right to buy
and enjoy a property regardless of things like race or gender is
superior to the subjective values of the local RE market.

> >I
> >checked realtor.com and they are asking less than those houses sold for 10
> >years ago!")
>
> If no other possible reasons for the decline in market value
> exists, then a clearly objective basis for claiming loss is present.

Even for those not selling their houses?
>
> >But the main point is simple: A can harm B (and others) by not doing things
> >like yard maintenance according to prevailing local community standards, even
> >though A breaks no law nor directly poses a safety or health hazard. All A has
> >to do is reduce B's enjoyment.
>
> Not quite--see the above responses to that.

How "not quite"? Seems perfectly clear to me that A can harm B even
though A breaks no law IF it can be adequately shown that A reduces
B's enjoyment. What constitutes "adequately shown" is complicated.
>
> >Now let's apply this to ham radio callsigns.
> >
> >Suppose Z, a radio amateur, chooses a callsign that reduces the enjoyment other
> >hams (X, Y, et al) get from amateur radio, and damages the reputation of the
> >ARS. Even though Z's choice of callsign is legal it's clear that X, Y and
> >others have been harmed by Z's choice, which was not up to community standards.
>
> Several points:

I did not refer to any specific callsign. The discussion is about the
principles involved, not any specific person.
>
> 1. Damage to the ARS would not be actionable by individual
> hams. In order for such damage to constitute ALL members of the ARS
> would have to agree that they were harmed (in Kim's case, neither I
> nor Cecil agree--thus a consensus cannot be reached) and a tangible
> loss would have to be shown to have occurred.

Do ALL of the neighbors have to agree that A's actions result in loss
of enjoyment? No. Same thing applies here.
>
> 2. For an individual ham to claim that her call sign reduces
> his or her enjoyment of amateur radio, it would be necessary for that
> ham to have direct on-the-air exposure to that call sign and for that

> sign to have caused demonstrable harm at that time.

Why?

> No one who has
> actually spoken to Kim on the air has voiced an opinion here that they
> were harmed, and the hams who have voiced opposition to her sign have
> not been in a position to be harmed by it and thus have no case.

Why MUST it be over the air?

> It
> would be like my neighbor complaining that your antennas were reducing
> his enjoyment of his property (we have a no antenna ordinance,
> although a hidden antenna is permitted--which is why I use a flag pole
> vertical) because he knew of its existence. Clearly, that would be an
> absurdity, just as claims that Kim's call sign harm people here is
> one.

Not the same thing at all.
>
> 3. If you read carefully what I have written above, it becomes
> clear that from my perspective at least (the one we are discussing),
> harm must take a tangible form to be considered actual. Unless you can
> show direct harm caused by a choice of call sign, you cannot
> legitimately claim that it causes any harm at all.

See discussion about DWI laws. Who is harmed if an intoxicated driver
does not have an accident?
>
> >Saying that Z's callsign choice cannot harm anyone is like saying that A's
> >nonmaintenace of his property cannot harm anyone. The real-estate example shows
> >that the situation is more complicated than that.
>
> Nope. Saying that Z's call sign cannot harm anyone is like
> saying that A's nonmaintenance of his property cannot harm anyone not
> in his community.

OK. But all hams are part of the amateur radio community.

> Someone directly exposed to Kim's sign who, for
> example, felt compelled to prohibit his or her children from listening
> to the amateur radio as a result of it (absurd, but an example) might
> have some validity in claiming he or she was harmed, but no one in
> this news group can make such a claim legitimately.

Your example is not absurd at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2670. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 18:14:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C067B23.B9EF64F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25667

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Then why do you spend so much of your time posting on those subjects?
> > >
> > > Because that's where you and a few other diversionary types invariably
> > > take us.
> >
> > Have we installed a ring in your nose or what?
>
> The same could be asked of you? Are you bound by some peculiar code to
> make reponses which lead the topic astray?

Yep, AADD. I really have no choice. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

2671. Re: Newbie ham ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 18:39:01 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9u5v9i0231o@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25669

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.10.10111290615540.2832-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> Same here, except that I manage to use correct English language syntax and
> inflections.

This newsgroup isn't worth the use of an editing and style manual.

2672. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 18:43:22 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0111291043.2ccbf80b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25668

> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011127205928.12427.00003464@nso-cg.aol.com>...
> > People who are married, or in committed relationships with a person
> > they love, respect, and trust, do not challenge that trust by having
> > private meetings, professional or otherwise, with people of the opposite
> > sex *unless* their spouse or partner is present. It simply is not done.

Been married 35 years, goin' on 36. Never had the first problem with
accepting that my wife had professional (don't tear into that)
contacts with the opposite sex. Don't think my wife objects to my
professional (and in some cases, personal) contacts with members of
the opposite sex. None of which from my side were anything close to
what Larry fears. Our trust and confidence in what we have together
doesn't require the level of paranoia the statement above represents.
To assume anything untoward from our way of interacting would be
deeply insulting. Am I unaware that perception is reality? No. I just
choose to allow those to live in the squallor created by their
perceptions.

uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org (Sean G Gilley) wrote in message
news:<ff37aa44.0111280758.35006325@posting.google.com>...
> I brought my mother into this because she's 62 years old -- older than
> you, if I remember correctly -- and would have attitudes more moralistic
> than most people these days.
>
I'm 58, goin' on 59. I think my attitudes about morality are probably
more rigid than those of my children. But I don't think it's moralism
that creates or prevents a break-up. It's compatibility. I know of
more divorces (at least among my generation) caused by finally
realizing incompatibility than by any dalliances. Heck, most of us are
like dogs chasing a car. We wouldn't know what to with it if we caught
it.

73
Carl KB9RVB

2673. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 18:56:42 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9u60an024d0@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25670

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C062258.BFE88925@sccoast.net...
>
> I've noticed the discussions in this newsgroup are getting really
> nasty lately (personal insults, name calling, ridicule, harassment,
> pettiness, and so forth). Is this what we really want? One of the best

Maybe, but neither do any of us want to return to the days of Fidonet when every controversial post was subject to a moderator's whim.

> aspects of this newsgroup has always been that the long-time members
> have always tried to keep the discussions on a relatively decent

Remember when Carl Stevensen posted here prior to restructuring? I was much worse than what it is now.

> level. In other words, while we might argue, and even argue
> fanatically, most have tended to back off before things got too
> personal. But, lately, some of the messages here have turned into
> nothing more than an insult-fest. Please, before you post that nasty
> little message, with the hateful little comments, think about the
> effect you're having on this newsgroup and it's members. If this keeps
> up, this newsgroups will degrade into something none of us will want
> to participate in.

On the contrary, it's actually *doubled* activity. The newsgroups now gets well over 100 posts a day. A month or so ago it was only getting about 30 to 50. (Unless you're the type who prefers quality over quantity.)

> I'm especially asking the long-time members (Rick, Cecil, Dave, Kim,
> Larry, Richard, Jim, Bill, Bob, Phil, and others) to back me up on
> this. Lets all (and that includes me - I'm not completely innocent
> here) watch our own messages and politely remind others to do the same
> when they get carried away. Thanks.

The bottom line is that these types of arguments occur from time to time. They usually run their course and things return to normal.

2674. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 19:36:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C068E45.B822FF81@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25671

I'm an exCBer. Was active with a legal CB station for a few months
then decided to get the real thing: a ham license. This was back in
'76. when you had to take your test at an FCC field office. I had
to copy *AND* send code, albeit just 5WPM. And took and
barely passed the General written for an old tech plus license.
Which was suprizing, I expected to ace the written and squeak by
on the code, as I was a double E major in college at the time.
I put the CB set away.

KC8PMX wrote:

> Actually... in my area at least, we have had TONS of people get ham licenses
> that were CB'ers..... all 2 of them out of at least 50-60 new licensees in
> the past two years in the tri-county area where I live.
>
> Ryan
>
> (CB'er being a major user of CB's, not the casual weekender that uses it on
> the long road trip)
>

2675. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 19:49:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C06912C.F72286A0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25672

> >> More specifically, it refers to
> >>behavior that does not affect the property values or enjoyment of
> >>other residents.
> >>
> >As determined by the subjective values of those other than the owner of the
> >property.
>
> No, as determined by objective measurement. Subjective values
> represent opinion; they are NOT binding on anyone.
>
> >>>So what we have is SOCIETY deciding what the values are. Not the individuals
> >>>involved!
> >>
> >> Not at all. The housing market decides in this case.
> >
> >And who is "the housing market"? People other than the property owner! People
> >whose personal, subjective values determine what someone else's property is
> >worth.
>
> The "housing market" is an economic construct that consists of
> individuals and business organizations who purchase property. It is
> not "society" because "society" is not uniformly in the market for
> property (some are renters, some have no credit, some already have
> homes they are happy with, some have no desire to be home owners,
> etc.). Thus "society" has no direct voice in the issue.
>
> >In some neighborhoods, not cutting the grass and such will have a negative
> >effect on nearby property values, because the local society expects that people
> >will maintain their properties a certain way. In other neighborhoods, it will
> >have no effect because in those communities the local society has different
> >expectations.
>
>

Sometimes this get applied to antennas. Now that brings ham radio
"...one step closer to extinction."

2676. Re: PING: Jim N2EY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 19:51:41 UTC
From: JC from Gnat Flats <jccooperr@wcnet.net>
Message-ID: <XoxN7.263$FP6.19606@atlpnn01.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 25676

Henry County American Red Cross <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote in message
news:dC3t7.36212$ga2.1739788@cletus.bright.net...
>
> N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20010928080310.02205.00000176@nso-cc.aol.com...
> > In article <OSEs7.35847$ga2.1706239@cletus.bright.net>, "Henry County
> American
> > Red Cross" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> writes:
> >
> > >heheheh and people say that hams are dry, and have no sense of humor
> heheh.
> >
> > We're just getting started!
> >
> > >I'll have to dig out my copy of the worst country song titles.
> >
> > "Drop Kick Me, Jesus, Through The Goal Posts Of Life" is a favorite
here.
> >
> > Know what happens if you play country music backwards? Your spouse
> returns,
> > your truck gets fixed and you sober up.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
> I used to work as the kitchen supervisor of a truckstop along US 24 in
N.W.
> Ohio.
> We had a jukebox there with a cd that was a compilation of Ray Stevens
> greatest hits.
> One song I had never heard before was his rendition of the classig Glenn
> Miller tune "In The Mood", first time I heard it I laughed my a$$ off. And
> since I have a warped sense of humor and an eclectic taste in music that
> became the mostr played song on the jukebox, the waitresses hated that
song,
> and of course once the truck drivers found that out, they played it as
well
> just to drive them crazy. Even the drunks who came in on weekends after
the
> bars closed played it. The girls all signed a petition to get that cd
> removed from the jukebox, the company said no because it was the "most

> popular" hence it was a money maker. It is now 2 years since I quit
theree,
> and that song is STILL the most played song on the jukebox.
>
> Keith Hosman
>
>

I'm new here. I was a ditty bop back in '61 and always thought I would get my HAM or whatever license when I got out of the USAF. Well, it's been 34 years since I got out and I guess I better get started on the exams. So, I am going to trade you guys a lead on a real good country Christmas song, in return for a lead on where I start. Do you still have to know morse code? I still know it, but very, very slow.

Anyhow, you just gotta hear "Merry Christmas from the Family" by Robert Earl Keene. I guarantee you, you will recognize at least one incident as having occured in *your* family.

--
JC from Gnat Flats, Texas
Where we celebrate daybreak
all night long!!!

2677. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 19:58:59 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <5A1679C095CD2C27.079B50FD1FA21789.9B6BCB0233415E14@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25673

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 18:55:18 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Reckon Dick doesn't believe in electromagnetic RF waves because he
>has never seen any?

Sure he does.

That's what he thinks causes the spark.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2678. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 19:59:00 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <86D4705537D14825.83D0330BE00E19E7.6CCE4AE5A815221E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25674

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 18:19:46 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Uh, like human *males* do.

Er, Kim.

Women get pretty "Randy" at times, too . . . ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2679. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 20:09:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C069603.5A7F4A0C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25675

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> I'm especially asking the long-time members (Rick, Cecil, Dave, Kim,
> Larry, Richard, Jim, Bill, Bob, Phil, and others) to back me up on
> this. Lets all (and that includes me - I'm not completely innocent
> here) watch our own messages and politely remind others to do the same
> when they get carried away. Thanks.
>

We're just enjoying a good old fashioned flamefest. :-)

2680. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 21:28:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <18461F9582F38B34.F5BA3093FED4700A.3893E1566CA34C54@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25677

Just to clear the air on the "violent" content of the Koran,
and the so-called directions incorporated in it to kill non-believers,
here's an article that appeared in a local paper today that addresses
that issue and corrects the mis-interpretation of the religious
writings of Islam.

======

By Fedwa Wazwaz

Throughout the United States, critics of Islam have raised alarm by
proclaiming that Islam is either an "evil wicked religion" or by
claiming that the Koran (Islam's holy book) promotes violence. Taking
advantage of the fact that most Americans know little about Islam
and have no interaction with Muslims, these self-styled experts
distort and manipulate verses from the Koran to prove their hatred is
based on "evidence." Examples of frequently cited Koranic verses
include:

1. "And slay them wherever ye catch them." (Al-Baqarah: 191)

2. "... But if they turn away, seize them and slay them wherever ye
find them; and (in any case) take no friends or helpers from their
ranks." (An-Nisa': 89)

Shedding more light on this issue is critical to a better
understanding of Islam. First, there are two primary sources of
Islamic belief. One is the Koran, the revealed word of God. The second
is the Hadeeth, which are the sayings or actions of Prophet Muhammad.
In addition, three factors are essential for understanding the verses
in the Koran: textual context of the verse within the Koran, the
historical context, and the manner in which the Prophet Muhammad
implemented the verse.

For example, here is the first verse noted above in the appropriate
Koranic textual context: "Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight
you, but do not transgress limits; for Allah loves not transgressors.
And slay them wherever ye catch them, and turn them out from where
they have turned you out; for tumult and oppression are worse than
slaughter, but fight them not at the Sacred Mosque, unless they
(first) fight you there; but if they fight you, kill them. Such is the
reward of those who reject faith. But if they cease, Allah is
Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful. And fight them on until there is no more
tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah;
but if they cease, let there be no hostility except to those who
practice oppression. The prohibited month, for the prohibited month,

and so for all things prohibited, there is the law of equality. If then any one transgresses the prohibition against you, transgress ye likewise against him. But fear Allah, and know that Allah is with those who restrain themselves." (Al-Baqarah: 190-194)

And the second verse frequently cited out of context by critics occurs in the following series of verses:

"They but wish that ye should reject Faith, as they do, and thus be on the same footing (as they): so take not friends from their ranks until they flee in the way of Allah (from what is forbidden). But if they turn renegades, seize them and slay them wherever ye find them; and (in any case) take no friends or helpers from their ranks. Except those who join a group between whom and you there is a treaty (of peace), or those who approach you with hearts restraining them from fighting you as well as fighting their own people. If Allah had pleased, He could have given them power over you, and they would have fought you: Therefore if they withdraw from you but fight you not, and (instead) send you (guarantees of) peace, then Allah hath opened no way for you (to war against them). Others you will find that wish to gain your confidence as well as that of their people: Every time they are sent back to temptation, they succumb thereto; if they withdraw not from you nor give you (guarantees) of peace besides restraining their hands, seize them and slay them wherever ye get them; in their case We have provided you with a clear argument against them." (An-Nisa': 89-91)

An understanding of the historical context of these verses is also critical. Muslims believe that these verses were revealed by God to Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, at the time when Muslims were attacked by the non-Muslims of Mecca on a regular basis. The Meccans wanted to kill the Muslims and stop the rise of Islam in Medinah. These verses do not grant permission for "violence," but they are a warning against those who seek to instigate violence and oppression against the Muslims. Note that even in these warnings, restraint and caution are emphasized to the Muslims.

The third factor to keep in mind is how each verse was implemented at the time of Prophet Muhammad. The Prophet implemented these verses in the following manner: The intention must be pure, meaning those with personal agendas were not allowed to fight. The war was declared by a legitimate authority (Prophet Muhammad). War was a last resort. There existed an openness among Muslims to respond to just peace initiatives - even during the battle. The Prophet spared non-combatants and refrained from destruction of homes, trees or resources needed by Meccans to survive. In addition, the Prophet gave and ordered his followers to give humane treatment of the injured and prisoners of war.

Finally, what does the Koran say about murder? "... Take not life, which Allah hath made sacred, except by way of justice and law: Thus does He command you, that ye may learn wisdom." (Al-An'am: 151). Also,

"Nor take life, which Allah has made sacred, except for just cause. And if anyone is slain wrongfully, we have given his heir authority (to demand Qisas [retribution] or to forgive): but let him not exceed bounds in the matter of taking life; for he is _ helped (by the law)" (Al-Isra': 33).

According to the Koran, killing any person without a just cause is as enormous a sin as killing the whole of humanity, and saving the life of one person is as good a deed as saving the whole of humanity.

As can clearly be seen from the above examples, the Koran does not "promote" or glorify violence. Islam is a religion that preaches peaceful co-existence between communities, nations and tribes. Historically, Islam has shown tolerance to all religions and communities in its midst and around. Whatever "evidence" Islamophobes cite to legitimize their hatred of Islam can easily be shown to be deceptive and false when examined within the appropriate textual and historical context.

Fedwa Wazwaz is communications director of the Islamic Resource Group in Crystal, Minnesota, and a member of the Independent Writers Syndicate.

======

Nuf' said.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2681. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-29 22:22:09 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <lyyN7.202255$3d2.8747611@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25678

Well, I'll try and keep in touch when I'm back on the air. Passed the 20 WPM without a problem - although I'd be in deep do-do at 30. Well, make that would have been. I wrote a couple of programs that send and receive morse and had to debug them (quite a bit at that) and didn't want to spend forever at 20. After it is working, one tends to let it send long text messages (old basic programs - try that, complete with all kinds of punctuation and line numbers!) just to listen to the thing. Amazing what a couple of hours at 40 plus can do for your receiving capability (yes, I had to follow along - for a while)..

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

ummm ... I do remember a guy whining about no more CW during a chat on 440 FM. Fortunately, the repeater owner was on at the same time and, as an old buddy of mine, always willing to help. We switched to F-2 at about 40. Golly, the other guy sure was quiet. Can't understand it.

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:9u3g4chaj1@news.bignet.net...
>
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:2saN7.200797$3d2.8621226@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Heh, you misunderstood my 'I don't care' attitude. I used to love CW.
>
> What do you figure your code speed is after all the years of I assume non
> use?
>
> > I'm
> > just waiting to get another HF rig (after doing a couple of roofs,
> > remodeling the kitchen and the bathroom - I just don't want to charge
it.
> > It will wait.).
>
> Paying the interest charges on a credit card for a few months will ruin
the
> best deal you can find on a rig mail order.
>
> > Most likely I'll end up on a few digital modes (largely CW)
> > and some SSB. Who know?
>
> Hollingsworth seemed to be a big fan of PSK31. He must have mentioned it
at
> least 20 times during his recent talk on enforcement issues at the Fort
> Wayne Hamfest the other week.

>
> >I've just got to start planning an antenna (no
> > mean feat living on a city lot!). Anyone can construct a dummy load - I
> > need a decent antenna.
>
> I live in an apartment. Trying to come up antennas that work well even at
> V/UHF is not easy to do.
>
> > Heck, I haven't been on HF in 30 years!
>
> Sounds like you have a bit of catching up to do. 8-))
>
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>
> --
> "People have a societal and ethical responsibility to be considerate of
> the rights of your fellow citizen. Those that choose to ignore and
> dismiss this out of hand are, at the very least, social deviates and
> misfits, who are morally bankrupt, and at the most, criminal. "
>
> Dave Hall
>
>

2682. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 00:51:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C06D7E8.1F84496C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25679

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Not really. A "civil libertarian" would be someone like
> > > Jefferson who believes in "civil liberties". What other
> > > kinds of liberties are there?
> >
> > There'd be the kinds like "libertarian" without any modifying adjectives
> > and there'd be "libertarian" with any modifying adjectives other than
> > "civil". An example would be Radical Rick as sexual libertarian.
>
> I do believe that sexual liberty is a civil liberty. How about a
> liberty that is not redundant to a civil liberty? Seems to me,
> it is civil law Vs criminal law and "criminal liberty" doesn't
> make any sense at all.

But a "sexual libertarian" does not describe a "civil libertarian".
You asked a question. I provided an answer.

Dave K8MN

2683. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 00:53:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C06D84A.EAFEC414@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25680

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > As to your last sentence, there you go giving orders again, Radical Rick.
>
> That's not an order, that's an admonition, i.e. a gentle reproof.

You calls 'em as you sees 'em. I calls 'em as I sees 'em. I don't
believe he was writing for your benefit.

Dave K8MN

2684. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 00:56:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C06D925.9181F698@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25681

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Kim has a right to choose her callsign just as she has the right to
> > > choose a flavor of ice cream. There's no law or rule against either
> > > choice.
> >
> > To my knowledge, there aren't any trashy ice cream flavor names.
>
> There aren't any trashy callsigns either, Dave. The trash is all
> in your mind.

...and we strongly disagree on the point about the callsign. I'm happy
we can agree upon the ice cream.

Dave K8MN

2685. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 00:57:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C06D96C.9B54D0D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25682

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I've found little to agree with in your views or Cecil's.
> > >
> > > I'm against slavery, Dave. Are you for slavery?
> >
> > The troll-o-meter is pegged, Cecil.
> > You'll have better luck with your does-he-eat-pork? quest.
>
> I'm also against smallpox, Dave. Are you for smallpox? I suspect,
> contrary to what you say, that you agree with 99% of my views.

What ever happened to your "live and let live" philosophy?

Dave K8MN
```

2686. ham radio milita net connection ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 01:00:29 UTC
From: uncle meatballs <darastafra44@aol.com>
Message-ID: <NSAN7.4493$Ao6.530590@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 25683
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Leigh Hanlon" <lthanlon@ameritech.net> wrote in message
news:281120012251545430%lthanlon@ameritech.net...
>
> http://www.sierratimes.com/archive/files/nov/28/arjj112801.htm
>
From the above URL :

Lancaster, Kentucky -- An automotive technician had his home raided by federal agents Tuesday.
After the 7-hour action by the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms that cost the loss of all
firearms and a computer hard drive, Charlie Puckett vows to fight back. "I will do whatever it
takes to get my firearms back," he said.

------------ cut ---------------

Was this the same station who would check into and called himself
"Wolfman Jack" on the Eastern Regional Patriot Militia Net
without using a valid ham radio callsign on 3.860 mHz Lower sideband ?

Net meets mon, tue, thur, sat nights 3.860 mHz LSB ham radio
at 8:00 PM eastern time. Listen 4 yourself. I thought the Liberty net was bad.

Note: This net IS NOT affiliated with the Motley-Crew net that meets late on at the same frequency - no connection!

Did the ATF got there before Hollingsworth did....?

2687. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 01:03:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011129200314.23850.00000899@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 25684

In article <9u4hr3glc2@208.206.142.101>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> Hope I don't ruin it for ya. Try listening to it or reading the lyrics with
>the
>> idea that it's an ode to cheap sparkling rose' wine.
>>
>> Lines like
>>
>> "Cracklin' Rose, you're a store-bought woman"
>>
>> are the give-away.
>>
>
> Boy, it sure was subtle. Opening "Cracklin' Rosie, get on board, we're
>gonna ride till there ain't no more...."
>
Yup.

Say, just how old is that song? I seem to remember hearing it in the mid-1960s
on WPEN (950 AM).

73 de Jim, N2EY

2688. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 01:05:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129200534.10701.00003800@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25685

In article <B2E42985DE9AE6F8.1805E004EC1A4BF8.ACF7CE7F0E7491C9@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>As an American, I'd defend to the death your right to express
>>your differences of opinion here or anywhere else -- but I'm not so
>>sure you would!
>
> Would you Larry?

Rick:

The question is, would *you?* Please pay attention.

> Is that why you promise to badger Kim about her choices until
>she capitulates to your demands?

I am merely exercising my right to comment on an issue which concerns
the image of the Amateur Radio Service. As an licensed amateur
radio operator, I have a legitimate concern. Are you saying I have no
right to express my opinion on this matter?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2689. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 01:05:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129200534.10701.00003799@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25686

In article <3C0537B6.E4480D24@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>
>I don't recall demanding that Kim "shut the (expletive deleted) up"
>though I have to admit that I might have wished she would on occasion.
>Rick comes across like a '60s radical with a real job but unchanged
>political views. I don't believe that there is anything which will
>convince him that his skewed views run counter to the mainstream but it
>is fun to watch him rail against the system, the country and mainstream
>morality and religion. I haven't called for him to desist and I don't
>remember that you have.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Yup. You know you are dealing with a liberal because after about
two minutes worth of debate, they tell you to shut up. Makes you
wonder how they'd react if the got what they really wanted -- a
society run under a socialist, totalitarian, dictatorial government?
Of course, they reckon they'd be a part of the elite ruling class, but
in reality, would be mere voiceless supernumeraries required to
tow a very narrowly defined line, or get the carpet pulled out from
under them! But, I enjoy liberals -- they provide comic relief, and
serve to reinforce my love for the true freedom upon which this
nation is based. I'm willing to fight to defend that freedom, and have
sacrificed the best years of my adult life working to make that
defense a reality. I just wonder if Professor Adams would defend
the motivation to sacrifice that my fellow Veterans and I understand
and consider to be our obligation in return for the privilege of living
in a free society? Anyway, he gets to be what and who he is, and
whether he likes it or not, so do we. God Bless America!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2690. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 01:05:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129200535.10701.00003801@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25689

In article <B97A0168FB090DB0.B7E1B34CFCD8AC8C.39ED4A3F158482DC@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

> Not really. Even Larry Roll admits that most hams support her
>decision. The "debate" over Kim's choice of a call isn't a debate at
>all, it's a way for a few people to attempt to force her to change it
>against her will. As such it isn't something to do with ham radio, but
>with dictating the behavior of others.
>
> Rick

Rick:

Nobody is attempting to force Kim to change her callsign against
her will. I am attempting to convince her to change her decision
to keep her callsign, and change it on her own accord. This has
nothing to do with anything but amateur radio, and the fact that
the positive image of the amateur radio service is being taken
"…one step closer to extinction" by Kim's selection of a vulgar,
demeaning callsign for self-indulgent reasons.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2691. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 01:05:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129200536.10701.00003803@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25690

In article <3c044b6f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Well, since you're asking about the "voice of experience" Larry, and you
>have so much advice and opinion on marrige: are you still married to ... er,
>OH YEAH, that's right! YOU'RE NOT MARRIED.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Yes, that's right...I'm not married, and I've never been married. I've also never been divorced -- like about 75% of the people I know who are around my age. If and when I meet a woman who grasps a few simple concepts I believe in -- like total, unconditional loyalty -- the kind of loyalty which accepts conditions like no private lunch/Starbucks/ etc. meetings with "friends" of the opposite sex -- I would ask her to marry me! I have many "friends" who are married, and I consider their wives to be my friends as well, but I don't have private meetings of any sort with them -- not that I haven't had "offers." Whether or not they respect their marriage vows, I do!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2692. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 01:05:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129200536.10701.00003802@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25691

In article <662D1F38FD8521B2.9C2BBEC35A4DE6FD.444F1121565268AC@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>No, I'll come back with a professional view that is accurate
>even if your personal homophobia refuses to allow you to accept it.
>
> Homosexuals aren't "recruited" Larry--nearly all homosexuals
>freely state that they knew their orientation long before they ever
>reached puberty--or had their first exposure to sex. Homosexuality is
>as natural (albeit less common, for obvious reasons) as
>heterosexuality.
>
> You seem to feel that all it takes is exposure to a homosexual
>for someone to be "recruited." Are you really that insecure in your
>own sexual identity, or do you just believe that no one else is a
>"capable" as you of resisting "temptation?"

Rick:

My sexual identity is not at issue here. I'm a heterosexual, and cannot
conceive of being anything else. I know this offends your liberal values,
but that's the way it is.

> Adolescents are NOT "recruitable" Larry, as ANY developmental
>psychologist would be glad to confirm.

Very well. In that case, why do books like "Heather Has Two Mommies"
exist in our public schools?

> Stick with your field of expertise, Larry, it's patently
>apparent you don't know anything about mine.

I'm not claiming to be working your side of the street, Rick. I am just
reacting to what I've heard and read about the topic, and drawing my
own logical conclusions. Why would there be a book like "Heather
Has Two Mommies" unless someone with an agenda to normalize and
lend an aura of acceptability to homosexual behavior wanted young
children to be exposed to this concept? In other words, why are
homosexuals attempting to "recruit" young people to their lifestyle?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2693. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 01:05:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129200537.10701.00003805@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25687

In article <3C048E82.53584256@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> You say your mother wouldn't agree with me. Let me ask you -- is
>> she still married to your father?
>>
>>
>
>"Your mama, she had sex with her husband before you were born!"
>:-)
>

As a matter of fact, she did! How did you know?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2694. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 01:05:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129200537.10701.00003804@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25688

In article <3C046A84.E3567032@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> People who are married, or in committed relationships with a person
>> they love, respect, and trust, do not challenge that trust by having
>> private meetings, professional or otherwise, with people of the opposite
>> sex *unless* their spouse or partner is present.
>
>Egads Larry, would you actually demand to sit in on your wife's
>job review behind closed doors with her male boss? You are one
>sick puppy.

Cecil:

That's probably one of the few exceptions I would make. However,
in today's political climate, where women have all the power, any
male manager who had a private, closed-door counselling session
with a female subordinate is an absolute fool!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2695. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:13:10 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <WWBN7.241684$W8.8474632@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25692

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C06D7E8.1F84496C@earthlink.net...

> But a "sexual libertarian" does not describe a "civil libertarian".

I hear Jefferson was a sexual libertarian, though. Have you heard that?

Rich

2696. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:39:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129213913.10701.00003820@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25698

In article <18WM7.104$9d.19434@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
writes:

>Is it legal to rent or lease ham gear? I was wondering about this one, say
>for instance, here in Michigan we have places called Rental King,
>Rent-a-Center etc. Not that we would want to have ham gear rented at a
>location like that, but if there were places that you could rent or lease
>equipment, in the short term, that may seem like a more feasable option for
>some who clearly cannot afford one of those way-overpriced, multi-band,
>do-everything rigs. (Between those and the "kit" radios, there is not much
>inbetween)
>
>Also, would it be legal to rent someone elses station? Since the FCC license
>does not state what gear you are operating, only that YOU are licensed, is
>this a loophole?
>
>Don't mean to start any arguments, just an honest question, looking for
>intelligent answers.

Ryan:

I can't see any legal problem with "renting" ham radio gear, aside from
the issue of taking steps to ensure that only licensed amateurs get to
do so. However, it would seem to be impractical from a purely
financial standpoint. The money spent on rental fees would be better
used to save up for the purchase of equipment. If all you want to do
is try out a top-of-the-line rig for a week or two, then "renting" would
be OK as a one-time or occasional practice.

Some hams rent out their vacation properties, equipped with contest-
capable ham radio stations, for visiting hams looking for a DXpedition
opportunity. There's obviously nothing wrong with it, as long as it's
right for you and your checkbook!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2697. Re: MORE TWISTEDHED the NUTTY CBER

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:39:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129213914.10701.00003821@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25693

In article <7DA18F9749B0FD30.ACC2E8591B765D9E.C41133D55EC5843D@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> Give it up--according to the resident "experts" here the FCC
>has far more serious problems to consider--like Kim's call sign.
>You'll just have to wait your turn.
>
> Rick

Rick:

I have never suggested that Kim's call sign is the FCC's problem to
consider. It is *her* problem to consider!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2698. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:39:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129213914.10701.00003822@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25697

In article <1491410725C88FBB.1A85559CB970ED35.B168627D3B7EF147@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>> I guers it flew right between your ears with the wind, but it was Kim
>>who chose that callsign to go with the gabonzas.
>
> And it is you, Larry, and Dave primarily who insist on
>harassing her about it instead of minding your own business.
>
> Rick

Rick:

I can't presume to speak for Dick and Dave, but everything I do here
on this newsgroup seems to me to fall completely within any
reasonable description of "my business." If I am commenting on
issues which are public knowledge and related to ham radio, I feel
that this newsgroup is the place to do so, and the act of doing so
is certainly "my business."

To use your own logic against you, why is defending Kim's
self-indulgent choice of a callsign *your* "business?" I'm not
questioning your right to do so, as you've questioned mine, I
just want to understand the reason.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2699. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:39:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129213915.10701.00003823@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25699

In article <D196C31997E531F3.C1B192B7FB9113FA.8AD22B1611C6E72A@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>>Kim -- having "power" over women is not, and never has been, a personal
>>goal of mine. I prefer women I can relate to as equals, without having
>>to engage in any tiresome "power struggle" with them.
>
> As long as they will capitulate to your Victorian demands that
>they not socialize or talk with members of the opposite sex unless you
>are there to insure that they don't do something immoral, right?

Rick:

I don't think it's too much to ask for a married man or woman to expect
his/her spouse to refrain from private, intimate meetings with "friends" of
the opposite sex. And by "intimate," I don't mean a sexual affair, just
a private meeting where the two interact only with each other for a
period of time, where an informal, private, and perhaps affectionate
relationship may develop. When one is committed to a loving, caring
relationship with another, they don't challenge their partners trust --
they go out of their way to reinforce and solidify that trust. You can't
do that by meeting a "friend" of the opposite sex in Starbucks for a
discussion of world events. If I were married, I would find no need to
do any such thing, and my wife would be expected to respect that
and refrain from doing so herself.

Each and every time a married person cheats on their spouse, it is
because the opportunity to do so was created, usually with the
original intent being completely innocent. I believe that a spouse
or committed partner must conscientiously and deliberately avoid
such occasions, out of respect for the relationship, and as a way
of placing the trust they want their partner to have in them into
practical, viable reality.

> At least according to you and the God Squad.

I don't know what God has to do with this, because I'd feel the
same way even if I were an atheist, which I am not!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2700. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:39:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129213916.10701.00003825@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25694

In article <3C05DB21.61170D4A@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Larry, how did that job interview go?
>
>73s, Bob

Bob:

Thanks for asking. I thought it went pretty well. However, right now,
I'm having some serious second thoughts as to whether I want to give
up my present job. I've just decided that I like it -- and that it has a
lot of advantages over going back into a cubicle. But, there's other
things to consider, and if offered the position, I'll probably take it. I
won't hear anything for at least another week -- I'll keep you posted.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2701. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:39:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129213916.10701.00003826@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25695

In article <3C05DD59.77BCBA53@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> >Kim -- if your callsign were W5PSY, we wouldn't be having this discussion!
>>
>> Apparently Larry likes PSY but not TIT.
>>
>>
>
>Maybe Larry is a leg man.
>

Ok, everyone, I'll byte -- what's the big deal with a callsign like W5PSY?
I've taken several courses that had that callsign suffix as the prefix to the
course number. As far as I'm concerned, it stands for "Psychology" or
any other derivative of that word; and is not in any way controversial as
a ham radio callsign suffix. Like I said, if that were Kim's callsign, we
wouldn't be having this discussion! (At least *I* wouldn't!) Sooo --
where's the beef? (Apologies to Dave Thomas.)

73 de Larry, K3LT

2702. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:39:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129213916.10701.00003824@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25696

In article <3C05DAC2.5C28F11B@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> The FCC is not in the business of making value judgments on the
>> callsigns people select for themselves. Being a government agency,
>> they are legally constrained against doing so. An individual amateur's
>> Vanity call sign is strictly *their* choice; and the negative effect it has
>> on their image, and the image of the ARS, is strictly *their*
>> responsibility. Mr. Hollingsworth was very clear on that point.
>>
>
>Think I can get the call "Whiskey Two Foxtrot Uniform Kilowatt"?
>Somehow I doubt it. Not that I'd want it......

Bob:

I believe that similar calls have already been issued, both sequentially
and under the Vanity Call Sign program. The fact that you wouldn't
want it only reflects the fact that you have good taste and mature
judgment -- something apparently lacking in Kim Walker, W5TIT.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2703. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:39:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011129213917.10701.00003827@nso-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 25700

In article <ff37aa44.0111290731.2bee49ba@posting.google.com>,
uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org (Sean G Gilley) writes:

>
>At first I thought you were in this discussion because you really believed
>that her sign was bad for the ARS. I believed that. It's become clear
>from your writings that while that may have been a part of it, it's really
>much more simple than that. Kim has a callsign you don't like. It offends
>you. You want it taken from her because of that. The ARS doesn't figure
>into it much, if at all. She's doing something you don't like, and being
>the person you are, you want to force your beliefs upon her and get her
>to get rid of the callsign.
>
>I'll fight for you to be able to have, speak, and write your beliefs, even
>though I find them apalling. You argue against others being able to do
>the same. Your desire to control others' freedoms is what brings us close
>to extinction. Not a stupid callsign.
>
>Sean.

Sean:

I've endured several messages worth of your immature, misguided
rantings, now I must reply.

I have absolutely no desire to "control" Kim's actions. All throughout
my past and present discussions on that subject in this newsgroup,
I have made it clear that Kim is the only person who can act to make
a change, and the choice whether or not to do so is entirely hers to
make. I have no way to "control" Kim's actions other than to point out
the potentially harmful effects her callsign, which reflects very poor
taste and judgment on her part.

This is entirely about the effect of Kim's tasteless choice in a callsign
upon the image of the ARS. For at least the last decade of the debate
on code testing as a licensing requirement, I've had the concept of
the family-oriented nature of the ARS shoved down my throat, to the
point where I've become convinced. Therefore, Kim's choice of a sexually-
provocative callsign, which is demeaning not only to female hams, but
all women in general, obviously violates this principle. I am merely
exercising my right to state my objections to her callsign. How she
acts as a result is entirely her decision, and her responsibility. If she
hadn't chosen a controversial Vanity call sign, this wouldn't be an issue
in the first place.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2704. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:49:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c06f2cc_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25751

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C04651B.53E50C59@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C0319DC.4EA73CD4@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > > I know of no woman who refers to her tops as
> > > > breasts or mammaries. We all call them tits. We call all you guys'
> > > > thangs dicks.
> > >
> > > > Tits serve two purposes. They can nurse babies or men, or woman if
> > > > the owner of the tits is prone to that persuasion. We have to cover
> > > > our tits and you men have to cover your dicks.
> > >
> > > > I call my tits tits and always have. I call my, well....never mind.
> >
> > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > >
> > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > >
> > > ...and that's just part of the reason I refer to the woman as Tugboat
> > > Annie.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > > * The view expressed is my personal opinion.
> >
> > Then consider that most women are tacky and lack class and decorum.
Forgive
> > me for no desire to live up to either of the latter.
>
> That is not the conclusion I draw at all. I don't know many women who
> would verbalize or write the type of thing you've written here. My
> comment wasn't directed at "other" women. It is written about your
> actions. My wife, mother, sister, next door neighbor, girl across the
> road don't speak like that. I consider it coarse and vulgar. I can see
> material like yours written on restroom walls at service stations. I
> don't much care for it there either.
>
> Dave K8MN

I am of the female persuasion, Dave. Have been all my life. Are you going
to tell me that you are more experienced at being a woman than I am? I have

been in the Dressing Rooms with women, the locker rooms with women, the restrooms with women, and so it goes. I am here to tell you that, yes there are women who are as you perceive your wife, mother, sister, next door neighbor, etc. I am also here to tell you that you'd be quite, quite surprised at the behaviors of many women you think you know, when in the company of women only. I choose to be real wherever I am.

I also choose that people like you, who are besmirched by behaviors like mine are as unimportant to me as I am to you. So, we are even, and we both understand each other.

Kim W5TIT

2705. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:52:06 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c06f37c$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25752

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0465CC.1897A3BF@earthlink.net...
>
> Kim, I know it may be difficult for you to digest but I don't talk like
> that on the air or in public. Let's just say that you and I don't hang
> with the same type crowd.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Not difficult at all for me to digest that, Dave. In fact, I don't know why you felt the impulse or need to tell me--it's a given. One thing's for sure. I can hang with any type crowd much easier and more comfortably than you can, obviously. *That's* the difference between us. Know what gives me the ability to be more flexible than you?

Kim W5TIT

2706. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:54:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c06f404_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25754

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C046687.3F5C3C56@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C03AEB0.80A5178E@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > > >
> > > > > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > > > > of Duncanville, TX.
> > > >
> > > > Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> > > > I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in the
> > > > manner Tugboat did.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > And, I submit that *you* are the one with the mind who deciphered my
> > > message--all with nothing but mere inuendo from me. Who is it, exactly,
> > > with no class?
> >
> > Right, Kim. You not only provided the call, you provided the innuendo.
> > I'll bet Mr. Olsen doesn't do that with his call. You did the same in
> > the selection of your vanity call.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >

Once again, is there an echo online? I think I state above that I provided
the innuendo. It is you, apparently, that picked up on it, Dave. Did you
pick up on it for the sheer misery of it, or did you enjoy it just a little?
Surely, you don't relish misery, do you?

Kim W5TIT
```

2707. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:57:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C06F59F.50F317D5@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25753

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3C048E82.53584256@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >> You say your mother wouldn't agree with me. Let me ask you -- is
> >> she still married to your father?
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > >"Your mama, she had sex with her husband before you were born!"
> > >:-)
> > >
>
> As a matter of fact, she did! How did you know?
>

Just a guess that you were the proper product of a legal marriage. :-)

2708. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 02:59:26 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C06F60D.C6907FAA@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25755

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:

> Well, I'll try and keep in touch when I'm back on the air. Passed the 20
> WPM without a problem - although I'd be in deep do-do at 30. Well, make
> that would have been. I wrote a couple of programs that send and receive
> morse and had to debug them (quite a bit at that) and didn't want to spend
> forever at 20. After it is working, one tends to let it send long text
> messages (old basic programs - try that, complete with all kinds of
> punctuation and line numbers!) just to listen to the thing. Amazing what a
> couple of hours at 40 plus can do for your receiving capability (yes, I had
> to follow along - for a while)..

How about running the contents of this newsgroup thru that program. :-)

2709. Re: Newbie ham ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:12:28 UTC
From: hdr@gro.gulas
Message-ID: <3c06f44e.20504166@news.chcksw1.al.home.com>
Source record: 25756

On 29 Nov 2001 04:54:01 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>If I was interested in becoming a ham radio operator,this NG would turn me
>off from the idea real quick.
>
>This is the second or third time I've lurked here,and maybe the last.
>
>What a bunch of baby's.

Well, it hasn't put me off; and, if you are entertaining even the most occasional thoughts of becoming a ham, I'd encourage you to shrug off the abuses of this group as well. From what I've seen, rec.radio.amateur.policy is a lot like comp.os.linux.advocacy -- where the overly-opinionated come to shoot their mouths off. And like the comp.os.linux.* hierarchy, there is much useful information outside the "advocacy" group. The only reason I stay subscribed to .policy is for the occasional good laugh.

If the hams I know personally are any indication, the hobby attracts more than its share of intelligent, genuinely nice people. As for the loonies... well, r.r.a.p makes a nice catch-bin for them. :)

--
Russell rdh at salug dot org

2710. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:29:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c06fc54_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25757

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011128204101.08355.00003715@nso-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3c0300ce_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >Larry:
> >
> >The word tit is not offensive to scores of women I know, and I probably
have
> >known far more than you. I know of no woman who refers to her tops as
> >breasts or mammaries. We all call them tits. We call all you guys'
thangs
> >dicks.
>
> Tugboat Annie:
>
> I'm sure that you and your fellow broads down at the trailer park
> use all the standard vulgarities. How charming!
>

Uh, Larry, you likin' Dave's nickname for me? Can't you come up with
something more original? I don't live in a trailer park. I live in a
trailer on 5 acres of land, married to a wonderful man, have a great job
that I cherish going to every day, have two dogs, and a bird. That's a
start. What you got there, big fella? I know you don't have a wife. Can
you even interest a dog?

> >> This term is used when one
> >> intends to deliberately demean and depersonalize a woman through
> >> the reference to secondary sexual characteristics which the viewer
> >> finds attractive, in exception to or exclusion of all of the other
> >personal
> >> qualities she possesses as a woman, and as a human being.
> >>
> >
> >Where *do* you come up with your Puritan crap? No wonder you think the
word
> >tit (which, by the way is not my callsign, my callsign is W5TIT,
> >phonetically Whiskey Five Tango India Tango) is offensive!
>
> Your callsign spells out the word "tit," which is a vulgar slang
expression
> referring to a woman's breasts, specifically, your own. You chose this
> Vanity call sign with and for the specific purpose of calling attention to
> your own breasts, which you obviously consider to be particularly

> noteworthy for some reason. You did this in order to evoke purient
> interest in male hams, thus hopefully giving you some sort of power
> over them, and increasing the amount of attention you receive from
> them. You had no other purpose in mind when you choose this call
> sign.
>
> >Could you please
> >'splain to me what "secondary sexual characteristics" tits can have?
Tits
> >serve two purposes. They can nurse babies or men, or woman if the owner
of
> >the tits is prone to that persuasion. We have to cover our tits and you
men
> >have to cover your dicks. Know why? They "mean" sex to many people. I
> >know of no primary purpose for tits other than nursing and sex. So, if
> >there's no primary, what is *your* definition of a "secondary sexual
> >characteristic"?
>
> A secondary sexual characteristic is one which is not directly involved
> in the physical act of reproduction. They are physical characteristics
> related to the physical differences characteristic of the sex of the
person
> who possesses them. In women, this would include wider hips, larger
> breasts, a softer, more fair complexion, and other secondary traits
> not directly related to the creation of a child. In men it involves
> attributes such as stronger muscle tone, facial hair, a deeper voice,
> etc. Our "secondary" sexual characteristics are those which reveal
> the more outward aspect of our sexual identity, and which are the
> basis of our attractiveness to the opposite sex.
>
> >> Most
> >> modern women are personally offended by those who judge and value
> >> her primarily for the size, shape, and general attractiveness of her
> >> breasts.
> >>
> >
> >Uh, Larry. What the *Hell* would you know about a modern woman?
Puhleeze.
>
> Apparently, a lot more than you do, "Annie."
>
> >You're still looking for some virgin who believes that her man should
tell
> >her how to live!
>
> Not hardly.
>

Then, where is the wife? Eh? Where's the nice home? Eh? Where's the big
job with the big money, eh? Where's all the things you yourself idolize,

but just can't get a grip on?

> >> Men who do this are quite rightly criticized for this, yet you
> >> not only deliberately encourage such behavior, you actively solicit it
> >> through your selection of a callsign.
> >>
> >
> >And I think whomever criticizes a man or woman for calling a spade a
spade
> >or a tit a tit is looking for far more attention than I have time to
give!
> >I am not soliciting a damned thing from *anyone*, Larry. I call my tits
> >tits and always have. I call my, well....never mind. Just be glad I
don't
> >have the callsign W5PSY.
>
> Kim -- if your callsign were W5PSY, we wouldn't be having this discussion!
>
> >> In so doing, you not only bring
> >> the ARS ".one step closer to extinction," you also set back all the
> >> societal gains made by women in the last century, and bring about a
> >> return to their objectification as mere sexual playthings. Is that
> >> really how you see yourself?
>
> >Nope. I don't see myself that way, Larry. Only people like you are
capable
> >of such arrogance. I don't think I have the slightest bit of power you
> >relay to me. We women are mere playthings, always have been and always
will
> >be. That's why we are so darned good at everything else we do. We do it
> >well and we can *still* come home and "take care" of our man. But, now
> >we're on a subject to which you cannot relate, and is so far beyond your
> >reach that you have to dream up ways to have power over women. Ha!
>
> Kim -- having "power" over women is not, and never has been, a personal
> goal of mine. I prefer women I can relate to as equals, without having
> to engage in any tiresome "power struggle" with them. It is YOU who
> seek the "power" you can derive from the attention-getter call sign you
> have chosen -- and for you to claim anything else is an obvious lie.
> However, your lack of integrity is well known in this newsgroup, and
> probably everywhere else.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You aren't looking for an equal, Larry. You have none.

Kim W5TIT

2711. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:33:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c06fd1a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25758

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u4cfm$16o$1@208.206.142.101...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:9u1hi7$i5b$0@208.207.71.131...
> > > > Yet, you don't think it's right for a word meaning "breasts" to be
> > viewed by
> > > > the rest of the world via an amateur callsign. What a hypocrite!
> > >
> > >
> > > "Tits" is and has long been considered a vulgar expression. Breasts is
> > > not.
> > > What an idiot!
> >
> > It's only vulgar if you allow it to be so.
>
>
> Kindly inform us as to how to prevent it, when ladies or children are
> present who instinctively view it as such.

It is not instinctive behavior at all, Dick. It is learned.

Kim W5TIT

2712. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:34:04 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c06fd53_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25759

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011128232944.08355.00003721@nso-mq.aol.com...
> In article <3C050645.1E92F970@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> In fact, the majority would seem to support Kim.
> >
> >That should tell you something, Larry.
>
> Cecil:
>
> Just something I already knew -- that low personal standards are
> the norm these days. Nothing new here. I just don't go along with
> the crowd -- I'm truly my own person.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Is *that* what that's called...!!?? LOL

Kim W5TIT

2713. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:36:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c06fdf1$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25760

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u4duo$6hh$0@208.206.142.101...
>
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> >
> > Either it is strictly *her* business (as your statement makes
> > it clear that it is) or it is not.
>
>
> When her choice negatively imnpacts the ARS that makes it MY business,
> too.
> I'm nor surprised you fail to notice that.
>

Prove your position that it negatively impacts the ARS, Dick. Prove it.
Should be simple enough, especially given the magnitude of the situation as
you describe it.

>
> If it is, then what possible
> > justification do you, Dick, and Dave have for taking her to task for
> > her choice? If, on the other hand, it is NOT her choice, then it is
> > the FCC, not you, Dick, and Dave, that is responsible for affecting
> > that decision. In no case, however, is it the business of others to
> > tell her (beyond a single statement of personal opinion) to change her
> > call or that she is "damaging the ARS" by maintaining it.
>
>
>
> Make no mistake, I never expected to change her mind, if she has one.
> If she had sense enough to change her mind, she would never have chosen
> it in the first place.

You just can't handle a challenge from a woman.

Kim W5TIT

2714. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:38:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c06fe56_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25762

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:9u4eiu$88d$0@208.206.142.101...
>
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 19:15:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Rick comes across like a '60s radical with a real job but unchanged
> > >political views.
> >
> > Thank you--that's the first half-way accurate portrayal of my
> > values I've seen you make.
> >
> > I _am_ a sixties radical--I was a freedom rider (and spent
> > time in Southern jails for my civil rights activities), a staunch
> > supporter of women's rights, gay rights, and human rights in general,
> > an antiwar activist and member of Vietnam Veterans against the War,
> > the Vietnam Day Committee, and other such organizations, and I'm a
> > life long opponent of domestic violence, child abuse (I was a severely
> > abused child personally, and left home on my 13th birthday to avoid
> > further broken bones and burns--I've lived on my own ever since), and
> > censorship.
> >
> > If you find those offensive "credentials"
>
>
>
>
> What I find is that you are just as full of bullshit as Cecil, and
> that, Sir is a real load. Never thought it possible but you may be even
> more loaded than Cecil.
> Maybe all your "credentials" are truth. maybe not. I find you to be the
> poster boy for all that is wrong with higher education, a phenomena that
> I found well begun when I was a college student in the late 60's and
> early 70's. You will have it your way, just as soon as you can figure
> out just what way that is, and for damn sure it will be contrary to
> convention and all that is good and tried and true, real, and valuable
> to society of free,preogerssive individuals. You freaks would instill
> and install every craven, aberrant, undesirable and destructive behavior
> and vice imaginable under the banner of "personal freedom" with total
> disregard for any hint of personal responsibility. In short, you suck
> and are sick.

Man, I can't believe all these people that claim to be so much smarter and worthy than others they consider "dumbed down." Yet, here they are admitting that they were educated in such a shitty system. Whew...

Kim W5TIT

2715. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:39:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c06feaa_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25763

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C05BF60.FCF246DE@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I made my comment, and that would have been the end of it
> > if not for verbal assaaults by you and Cecil.
>
> This from the person who invariably initiates the
> ad hominem attacks.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

But, he's got God on his side, Cecil...'member?

Kim W5TIT

2716. Re: ham radio milita net connection ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:46:03 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <blowme@woody.com>
Message-ID: <%hDN7.81934$z55.9769354@typhoon.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 25761
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Nice plug for another group of freaks, if only you had worked a plug in for Hal Turner, Llyod would have gave you a free years subscription to the K1MAN newsletter.

EB

"uncle meatballs" <darastafra44@aol.com> wrote in message news:NSAN7.4493$Ao6.530590@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Leigh Hanlon" <lthanlon@ameritech.net> wrote in message
> news:281120012251545430%lthanlon@ameritech.net...
> >
> > http://www.sierratimes.com/archive/files/nov/28/arjj112801.htm
> >
> From the above URL :
>
> Lancaster, Kentucky -- An automotive technician had his home raided by federal agents Tuesday.
> After the 7-hour action by the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms that cost the loss of all
> firearms and a computer hard drive, Charlie Puckett vows to fight back. "I will do whatever it
> takes to get my firearms back," he said.
>
> ------------ cut ---------------
>
> Was this the same station who would check into and called himself
> "Wolfman Jack" on the Eastern Regional Patriot Militia Net
> without using a valid ham radio callsign on 3.860 mHz Lower sideband ?
>
> Net meets mon, tue, thur, sat nights 3.860 mHz LSB ham radio
> at 8:00 PM eastern time. Listen 4 yourself. I thought the Liberty net was bad.
>
> Note: This net IS NOT affiliated with the Motley-Crew net that meets late on at the same
> frequency - no connection!
>
> Did the ATF got there before Hollingsworth did....?
>
>
>
>

2717. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:52:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0701bd_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25764

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011129213916.10701.00003825@nso-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3C05DB21.61170D4A@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >Larry, how did that job interview go?
> >
> >73s, Bob
>
> Bob:
>
> Thanks for asking. I thought it went pretty well. However, right now,
> I'm having some serious second thoughts as to whether I want to give
> up my present job. I've just decided that I like it -- and that it has a
> lot of advantages over going back into a cubicle. But, there's other
> things to consider, and if offered the position, I'll probably take it. I
> won't hear anything for at least another week -- I'll keep you posted.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

To use one of your tactics, Larry:

TRANSLATION: He'll probably not be chosen and knows it.

Kim W5TIT

2718. Re: MORE TWISTEDHED the NUTTY CBER

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 03:54:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c070237_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25765

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011129213914.10701.00003821@nso-mv.aol.com...
> In article
<7DA18F9749B0FD30.ACC2E8591B765D9E.C41133D55EC5843D@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> > Give it up--according to the resident "experts" here the FCC
> >has far more serious problems to consider--like Kim's call sign.
> >You'll just have to wait your turn.
> >
> > Rick
>
> Rick:
>
> I have never suggested that Kim's call sign is the FCC's problem to
> consider. It is *her* problem to consider!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, Larry, Larry. When ya gonna get this right? My callsing is not *my*
problem! It's *yours*.

Kim W5TIT

2719. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:00:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c070388_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25766

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011129200536.10701.00003803@nso-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3c044b6f_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Well, since you're asking about the "voice of experience" Larry, and you
> >have so much advice and opinion on marrige: are you still married to ...
er,
> >OH YEAH, that's right! YOU'RE NOT MARRIED.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Yes, that's right...I'm not married, and I've never been married. I've
> also never been divorced -- like about 75% of the people I know who
> are around my age. If and when I meet a woman who grasps a few
> simple concepts I believe in -- like total, unconditional loyalty -- the
> kind of loyalty which accepts conditions like no private lunch/Starbucks/
> etc. meetings with "friends" of the opposite sex -- I would ask her to
> marry me!
>

Welp, lemmee give ya a clue: I doubt you'll find one.

>
> I have many "friends" who are married, and I consider
> their wives to be my friends as well, but I don't have private meetings
> of any sort with them -- not that I haven't had "offers." Whether or
> not they respect their marriage vows, I do!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You make it sound as though an offer to have a meal or visit, Larry, was an
offer of sex. Good grief.

Kim W5TIT

2720. Re: Contest idea, work all your own suffix

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:04:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0704a7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25767

"Nonya Bidniz" <no_email@all.gov> wrote in message
news:ltcg0ugikrjnnl616o08ofqs19fs85t9uu@4ax.com...
> On 29 Nov 2001 04:29:44 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
>
> >What I can't figure out is why my old General call -- N3CRA -- hasn't
been
> >snapped up!
>
> Either:
>
> 1. With the example of hams you set, there's nobody getting new
> licenses to snap up the old call.
>
> OR:
>
> 2. Everybody knows whose call it used to be and is afraid they'll be
> mistaken for you at a hamfest and shot to death.
>
> OR:
>
> 3. Both.
>

Uncalled for. Referring to someone being "shot to death" in a casual manner
is offensive and vulgar. Uncalled for...absolutely.

Kim W5TIT

2721. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:31:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C070B8E.D8298958@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25769

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Nobody is attempting to force Kim to change her callsign against
> her will. I am attempting to convince her to change her decision
> to keep her callsign, and change it on her own accord.

And I gather she is attempting to convince you to go jump
in the lake.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2722. Re: ham radio milita net connection ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:32:17 UTC
From: CB Rambone <sdinkensfrsch4@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <lZDN7.5044$Ao6.578640@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 25768
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Here's a post that was on something called the squrell's
communications pages. Looks like these militialoons
are also operating in the 10 meter ham band !!

****
From: http://www.frugalsquirrels.com/cgi-bin/ubb/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=forum&f=13

"The next SENICA Net will be held Sunday December 2, 2001 @ 1600 UTC
(11am EST, 9am MST) Primary will be 28.365 + or - 10khz for QRM.
The ALT freq will be 24.940 + or - 10 khz for QRM both USB.
Net Control will be in NC. Hope to hear you on the air! I may or may not
be on here before then after tonight so if you will keep this on top
of the SC board I really appreciate it.
Thanks & 73! BTW the net will be 99% for sure on 10M...

signed: "Zombieaxe"
****

weird shit eh?

"uncle meatballs" <darastafra44@aol.com> wrote in message
news:NSAN7.4593Ao6.5374757@newsread1.prod.itd.wans.net...
>
> "Leigh Hanlon" <lthanlon@ameritech.net> wrote in message
> news:2811200122515454 30%lthanlon@ameritech.net...
> >
> > http://www.sierratimes.com/archive/files/nov/28/arjj112801.htm
> >
> From the above URL :
>
> Lancaster, Kentucky -- An automotive technician had his home raided by federal agents
Tuesday.
> After the 7-hour action by the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms that cost the loss
of all
> firearms and a computer hard drive, Charlie Puckett vows to fight back. "I will do
whatever it
> takes to get my firearms back," he said.
>
> ------------ cut ---------------
>
> Was this the same station who would check into and called himself
> "Wolfman Jack" on the Eastern Regional Patriot Militia Net
> without using a valid ham radio callsign on 3.860 mHz Lower sideband ?
>
> Net meets mon, tue, thur, sat nights 3.860 mHz LSB ham radio

> at 8:00 PM eastern time. Listen 4 yourself. I thought the Liberty net was bad.
>
> Note: This net IS NOT affiliated with the Motley-Crew net that meets late on at the same
> frequency - no connection!
>
> Did the ATF got there before Hollingsworth did....?
>
>
>
>
>

2723. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:36:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C070CB1.6A016F6F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25770

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> But, he's got God on his side, Cecil...'member?

He just doesn't realize that God = Jehovah/Yahweh/Allah.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2724. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:40:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C070DD2.9811879F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25771

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > There aren't any trashy callsigns either, Dave. The trash is all
> > in your mind.
>
> ...and we strongly disagree on the point about the callsign.

The callsign enters your input system as five alpha-numeric characters
devoid of trash. You convert it into trash internally within your value
system. That's your problem, Dave, not Kim's.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2725. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:42:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C070E46.DC993EC8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25772

Dave Heil wrote:
> What ever happened to your "live and let live" philosophy?

It's still there, Dave, and I'll bet that in the great
majority of your daily life, you are also a live and let
live person.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2726. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:46:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C070F17.943AE888@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25773

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> If and when I meet a woman who grasps a few
> simple concepts I believe in -- like total, unconditional loyalty -- the
> kind of loyalty which accepts conditions like no private lunch/Starbucks/
> etc. meetings with "friends" of the opposite sex -- I would ask her to
> marry me!

You're in the wrong country for that, Larry. Slavery was outlawed in
this country more than a century ago.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2727. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:49:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C070FD7.973FCAB1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25774

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> That's probably one of the few exceptions I would make. However,
> in today's political climate, where women have all the power, any
> male manager who had a private, closed-door counselling session
> with a female subordinate is an absolute fool!

You are living in the distant past, Larry. Such happens millions
of times a day. It's called a one-on-one at Intel.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2728. Re: MORE TWISTEDHED the NUTTY CBER

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 04:52:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0710A0.32262462@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25775

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I have never suggested that Kim's call sign is the FCC's problem to
> consider. It is *her* problem to consider!

Kim doesn't seem to have a problem with it. Seems to be
your problem, Larry.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2729. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 05:05:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9u741o09fq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25781

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c070388_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > I have many "friends" who are married, and I consider
> > their wives to be my friends as well, but I don't have private meetings
> > of any sort with them -- not that I haven't had "offers." Whether or
> > not they respect their marriage vows, I do!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> You make it sound as though an offer to have a meal or visit, Larry, was
an
> offer of sex. Good grief.

It's probably wishful thinking on his part.

2730. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 05:12:35 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D81BC74FEF5DE794.445B06648ACAF35C.06B52BC874E150AE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25776

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:23:28 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>We're all hams, Rick. Anything which takes place in amateur radio is our
>business. Amateur radio is a public venue. Anything which takes place
>in a public venue is our business.

Fair enough.

Since ham radio is a public venue, that means the First
Amendment applies to it. Thus, no one has the right to regulate the
speech of people on the ham bands.

I'll drop down to rec.radio.cb and let them know that Dave
Heil said it's ok for them to freeband in the 10m band, ok?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2731. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 05:23:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <612CFC363E9E59A0.656CA9210B7736F5.69A427005A845239@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25777

On 30 Nov 2001 02:39:14 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:

>To use your own logic against you, why is defending Kim's
>self-indulgent choice of a callsign *your* "business?" I'm not
>questioning your right to do so, as you've questioned mine, I
>just want to understand the reason.

Fair question.

My defense of Kim's sign is twofold. (1) It is a response to what I perceive to be a vicious and unprovoked attack on a fellow ham (which, of course, has nothing to do with ham radio as a motive for my action, only standing up for someone who is being attacked personally) and; (2) I seriously question the view that discussions of her call sign in terms of morality ARE legitimate discussion of radio policy in that they must, inevitably, be based on religious values of morality and regardless of how sincere the beliefs of the critic may be, the fact remains that if ham radio IS a public venue, by necessity religion MUST be excluded from it, as the alternative is the use of public resources to promote religion.

We could, in fact, carry that concept further by asking--seriously, btw, not as a troll--if ANY attempt to promote religious values of any nature is appropriate in a Government regulated service, or rather such things as Christian and Jewish nets are, effectively, violations of the First Amendment in exactly the same way such activities would be violations in a public school (a college is different in that it specifically TEACHES about religion, and does not expose children to the teaching--but a college, likewise, is free to teach and discuss topics related to human sexuality and alternative lifestyles as well).

Perhaps such activities ARE reasonable--but if so it would be equally reasonable for a group of Wiccans, Satanists, or Rastafarians (for example) to participate in similar nets and promote their moral and religious values in the same manner as Christians do now (after all, it would be a CLEAR violation of the Constitution if the FCC attempted to restrict the religious topics that could be discussed to those acceptable to Christians and Jews). On the other hand, such discussions could (and would) be far more threatening to a parent of a potential ham than Kim's call sign could possibly be.

Comments?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2732. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 05:26:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <19A455C0471C42D4.E6227F76046D03AD.4ED29ED6775BB512@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25778

On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 23:18:04 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> I come here for amateur radio policy discussion. I don't come here for
>> discussions on marijuana smoking, the swinging lifestyle or legalized
>> prostitution.
>
>Then why do you spend so much of your time posting on those subjects?

And why does he discuss such topics as morality and taste
(with respect to Kim's call sign) which likewise have nothing to do
with ham radio at all.

If this thread was normally "on topic" his complaint would
make sense. But since this is the official "Thread That Wandereth
Forever in the Forest of Confusion" it's hardly a valid complaint. It
IS, however, a clear indication that he is losing his arguments and
thus wants to shut the discussion down while seeming not to be doing
so from a position of weakness or defeat.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2733. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 05:29:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8B927A581047B0EB.FE4D5A732EFAF285.5F78E7ECC617C96D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25779

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:19:15 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> > I come here for amateur radio policy discussion. I don't come here for
>> > discussions on marijuana smoking, the swinging lifestyle or legalized
>> > prostitution.
>>
>> Then why do you spend so much of your time posting on those subjects?
>
>Because that's where you and a few other diversionary types invariably
>take us. Rick chose to defend Kim's poor judgement in callsign
>selection by bringing up marijuana smoking, prostitution and the
>swinging lifestyle.

Sorry, Dave, but those topics (dealing with freedom) are at
least as appropriate here as your desire to viciously attack a fellow
ham over her personal choices.

Don't like the topics? Fine, don't post to them. Don't like my
posts? Fine, kill file me or ignore them. Don't want others to discuss
them? Tough--get a life.

>Do you have anything related to amateur radio or would you rather to ask
>additional questions to which you already have the answer?

Sure.

Have you thought of taking up cb?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2734. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 05:30:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7D3977661A14ECBE.CDFDD429FB84A64D.7E344388A25ABDF0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25780

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 15:13:39 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>The same could be asked of you? Are you bound by some peculiar code to
>make reponses which lead the topic astray?

Oh, horrors!

THIS thread is getting off topic?

Oh, dear, what shall we do?

I know.

We'll look for the answer in the Koran. Whoops--that
discussion (started by Dick Carroll as I recall) doesn't belong here
either, does it?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2735. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 05:42:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C071BFD.7B7B335@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25782

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C06D7E8.1F84496C@earthlink.net...
>
> > But a "sexual libertarian" does not describe a "civil libertarian".
>
> I hear Jefferson was a sexual libertarian, though. Have you heard that?

I've heard it, read it and have seen the living proof interviewed on TV.
He was a civil libertarian except when it came to his own "property".

Dave K8MN

2736. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 05:54:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C071EF0.C57F8302@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25783

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C04651B.53E50C59@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C0319DC.4EA73CD4@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I know of no woman who refers to her tops as
> > > > > breasts or mammaries. We all call them tits. We call all you guys'
> > > > > thangs dicks.
> > > > >
> > > > > Tits serve two purposes. They can nurse babies or men, or woman if
> > > > > the owner of the tits is prone to that persuasion. We have to cover
> > > > > our tits and you men have to cover your dicks.
> > > > >
> > > > > I call my tits tits and always have. I call my, well....never mind.
> > >
> > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > >
> > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > > >
> > > > ...and that's just part of the reason I refer to the woman as Tugboat
> > > > Annie.
> > > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > * The view expressed is my personal opinion.
> > > >
> > > Then consider that most women are tacky and lack class and decorum.
> Forgive
> > > me for no desire to live up to either of the latter.
> >
> > That is not the conclusion I draw at all. I don't know many women who
> > would verbalize or write the type of thing you've written here. My
> > comment wasn't directed at "other" women. It is written about your
> > actions. My wife, mother, sister, next door neighbor, girl across the
> > road don't speak like that. I consider it coarse and vulgar. I can see
> > material like yours written on restroom walls at service stations. I
> > don't much care for it there either.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
```

> I am of the female persuasion, Dave. Have been all my life. Are you going
> to tell me that you are more experienced at being a woman than I am? I have
> been in the Dressing Rooms with women, the locker rooms with women, the
> restrooms with women, and so it goes. I am here to tell you that, yes there
> are women who are as you perceive your wife, mother, sister, next door
> neighbor, etc. I am also here to tell you that you'd be quite, quite
> surprised at the behaviors of many women you think you know, when in the
> company of women only. I choose to be real wherever I am.

Just to be certain, I asked my wife. Not only does she not use the language you earlier ascribed to all women and later to most women. She assures me that that *she* has never heard my mother, my sister, the neighbors or any of her friends use such language in an "all woman" situation.

I believe you are "real" --that to you, there is no time when it seems improper to be coarse. You've used the terms here in a mostly male group. I guess that makes you "real".

> I also choose that people like you, who are besmirched by behaviors like
> mine are as unimportant to me as I am to you. So, we are even, and we both
> understand each other.

What you do as a radio amateur IS important to me. If my views are unimportant to you, I'm surprised you'd even bother to respond.

Dave K8MN

2737. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:00:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C07204E.1DCDEF3A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25784

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C0465CC.1897A3BF@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Kim, I know it may be difficult for you to digest but I don't talk like
> > that on the air or in public. Let's just say that you and I don't hang
> > with the same type crowd.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Not difficult at all for me to digest that, Dave. In fact, I don't know why
> you felt the impulse or need to tell me--it's a given. One thing's for
> sure. I can hang with any type crowd much easier and more comfortably than
> you can, obviously. *That's* the difference between us. Know what gives me
> the ability to be more flexible than you?

I don't happen to believe that it is true, Kim. I doubt that you'd feel
very comfortable using the language which makes you "real" all the time
if you were in the company of people I associate with. I'm certain that
you could use shock value to get some attention but I don't think it
would be the kind of attention you would appreciate.

This is the first attempt I've seen to portray the tendency use coarse
language as some kind of virtue.

Dave K8MN

2738. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:06:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0721B5.8452661E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25785

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C046687.3F5C3C56@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C03AEB0.80A5178E@earthlink.net...
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > > > >
> > > > > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > > > > of Duncanville, TX.
> > > > >
> > > > Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> > > > I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in the
> > > > manner Tugboat did.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > And, I submit that *you* are the one with the mind who deciphered my
> > > message--all with nothing but mere inuendo from me. Who is it, exactly,
> > > with no class?
> > >
> > Right, Kim. You not only provided the call, you provided the innuendo.
> > I'll bet Mr. Olsen doesn't do that with his call. You did the same in
> > the selection of your vanity call.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Once again, is there an echo online? I think I state above that I provided
> the innuendo. It is you, apparently, that picked up on it, Dave. Did you
> pick up on it for the sheer misery of it, or did you enjoy it just a little?
> Surely, you don't relish misery, do you?

It must be quite difficult for you to understand that I am not a monk
nor do I live in a vacuum. Sure, I picked up on it (even though it
doesn't spell anything). It didn't make me miserable. I did not enjoy
it. I just felt it was as lacking in decorum as your choice of calls.
```

I do feel kind of sorry for you though.

Dave K8MN

2739. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:18:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C072481.731E82C0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25786

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > There aren't any trashy callsigns either, Dave. The trash is all
> > > in your mind.
> >
> > ...and we strongly disagree on the point about the callsign.
>
> The callsign enters your input system as five alpha-numeric characters
> devoid of trash. You convert it into trash internally within your value
> system. That's your problem, Dave, not Kim's.

The callsign suffix *spells* a coarse term for a portion of female
anatomy. No one has a problem with calls like W6RCA or W5DXP.
Oh--I forgot. You already knew that.

Dave K8MN

2740. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:20:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C072509.966E4410@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25787

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > What ever happened to your "live and let live" philosophy?
>
> It's still there, Dave, and I'll bet that in the great
> majority of your daily life, you are also a live and let
> live person.

I'll bet I am too.

Dave K8MN

2741. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:25:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C072609.2BEEF3E7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25788

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:23:28 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >We're all hams, Rick. Anything which takes place in amateur radio is our
> >business. Amateur radio is a public venue. Anything which takes place
> >in a public venue is our business.
>
> Fair enough.
>
> Since ham radio is a public venue, that means the First
> Amendment applies to it. Thus, no one has the right to regulate the
> speech of people on the ham bands.

How is it that you can't add two and two and come up with the correct
answer? Better check Part 97 and get back to me later.

> I'll drop down to rec.radio.cb and let them know that Dave
> Heil said it's ok for them to freeband in the 10m band, ok?
>
> Rick

Man, you are oh-for-two tonight. You are the libertarian. Go tell 'em
YOU think it is okay if that's what you think. Don't put words in my
mouth.

Dave K8MN

2742. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:26:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B8E7C27C86DAB362.760BA2DB48423D5A.3224AE38B417E727@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25789

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 05:22:19 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> You kids were not just exposed to the "real world," Rick. They were
>exposed to your views (your concepts of the "real world") as well. So,
>lets ask you the same question. Did your kids have the opportunity to
>consent before you started filling them with your political views or
>with your brainwashing about religion?

Yup!

My son (only child) was ENCOURAGED to read the religious writings of various religions, Christian, Islamic, and Buddhist among them and to make his own decisions. Until he was a teenager I _never_ presented my views of Christianity in his presence--that would have biased him unfairly and I wanted him to make his own choices when he was a teenager. For the record, he is an atheist, choosing NEITHER Christianity OR Buddhism for himself. He has, however, read the Christian Bible, the Koran, and the major Buddhist works.

As far as politics go, I have no doubt that he was strongly exposed to my political views--on the other hand he was likewise exposed to the political views of others in our neighborhood as well--and we live in an almost exclusively Republican area (Jackson, MI, our nearest city, is the founding place of the Republican Party and actually has a MONUMENT to it in the park where it was founded). In addition, he has been active on the Internet since childhood and has, since he started college at 14, participated in a wide range of discussion groups (he doesn't care for the Usenet--too much spam--and prefers Web Boards and forums instead). In those groups he is exposed to a broad range of political views (including those of people in other nations) and has formed his own political values that, while similar to my own in terms of support for rights, differs significantly on the issues of social programs and the economy.

I practice what I preach.

>Why is it harmful to for a
>Christian to teach his children about his views, but not harmful to
>you do to the same with your views?

If I insisted that my child attend religious services, accept my personal moral values as the only correct ones, and that he accept the teachings of my--or anyone else's--religion on faith instead of demanding scientific proof, it would be just as harmful. But since I did none of those things, it obviously wasn't.

One key point--I limit my claims to those supported by scientific evidence when it comes to providing my son information. If I express an opinion or belief, I make it very clear that it IS my opinion, not a statement of fact (exactly as I do in a classroom if I express an opinion), and that he is as free to question my beliefs as he is to question anyone else's--and he knows I MEAN that. If Christians would limit themselves to the same guidelines, I would see nothing wrong with what they do--but the fact of the matter is, they don't! Instead, they inform their children that Christian tenets represent facts, not opinions or beliefs unsubstantiated by science and lacking in any objective proof. That, to me, is dishonest at best and destructive to their children at worst.

>I'm not here to defend
>Christianity. I'm simply pointing out your obvious double standard.

I don't have a double standard. I practice what I preach.

>> You have the right to tell _me_
>> to shut up as well. The libertarian
>> idea of freedom includes free speech,
>> including the right to express your
>> views--and if that view is that the
>> person you are communicating with
>> should "shut up" then you have every
>> right to express it, just not to
>> enforce it.
>
> The libertarian agenda don't even make sense. Since you seem
>knowledgeable about Libertarians, perhaps you can answer a question
>that remains unanswered after ten years of asking - what exactly would
>change if Libertarians were in power?

While I could answer some of the basic points of that, the fact remains that as a libertarian (which refers to a political philosophy, not a political party) rather than a Libertarian (the party) I don't know the Libertarian party platform well enough to intelligently present it. I _do_ know that they support the elimination of consensual crime legislation (with which I agree--providing protection for children is insured), a major reduction in the ways in which the government is permitted to violate our privacy (with which I likewise agree) the elimination of social service, social security, and other transfer payment programs (with which I disagree strongly--although I DO believe our social service programs need a very strong reworking to provide more help where it is legitimately needed and cut off funding to those who are looking for a free ride), and the elimination of income taxes (which, although I would obviously love to see it happen, simply isn't realistic from my perspective). I also know they oppose socialized medicine (which, on the basis of universal health insurance--but NOT government paid physicians--I happen to believe is badly needed in the US), foreign aid (a view I support only if it is used to support dictatorial

regimes or those in which human rights violations are common), and term limits (a view I agree with completely--term limits are not in the best interest of the public, from my perspective, they serve only to force potentially very valuable and experienced legislators with new, relatively inexperienced, ones).

The person to ask about the Libertarian Party is Cecil, who IS a Libertarian (to my understanding) and can far better answer your questions.

>The usual response is the
>libertarian concept of freedom - everything would be legal as long as
>it doesn't harm another.

A position I agree with completely.

>Of course, this argument almost always
>centers on the illegal drug issue (libertarians do love those drugs).

It isn't a "Love of drugs," and I think you know that as well as I do. The drug war is simply the most outrageous example of a total disregard for personal freedom of choice a libertarian OR a Libertarian can raise. Ask yourself, is there ANY sane reason we should be spending sixty BILLION dollars to make war on our own citizens simply because we have arbitrarily chosen to define one set of drugs as illegal and another MORE harmful set of drugs (nicotine, caffine--which is more physically harmful than either powder cocaine OR heroin [ask your pharmacist if you doubt it], and of course alcohol which kills more people in one year than have died from all illegal drugs combined in history) as legal? To me the concept that we can (and DO) send a person to prison for the rest of his life for growing a couple (2-4) marijuana plants in his basement or closet for his personal use (and that's ALL that few plants would yield) while giving a drunk driver who has endangered the lives of his neighbors a slap on the wrist fine. THAT is idiotic from any rational perspective.

EVERY President since Johnson (Nixon included) has privately admitted that moderate use of marijuana or other soft drugs is no more harmful or destructive to society than is social drinking--and several (Nixon, Ford, Carter, Clinton, and Both Bushes) have USED recreational drugs (not surprising--according to the DEA over 70% of all US citizens over the age of 18 have done so as well). Yet not a single politician has had the courage to openly argue for the abolition of our current prohibition. Libertarians (both kinds) view the drug war in the same vein we all now view prohibition, as unenforceable, unwinnable, and destined only to fill our prisons and create enormous profits for criminals--as, of course, occurred during our original experiment with alcohol prohibition early in the 20th Century.

In a like vein, libertarians (and Libertarians) believe that other consensual crimes (prostitution, gambling, pornography, etc.) so long as they involve only consenting adults are not the concern of

government and should not be regulated (some of us--myself included--would like to see prostitution legalized on the European model so it could be restricted to certain areas only--thus keeping it out of our neighborhoods--and so that the working women would be both safe from violence [and thus not dependent on a pimp for protection] and subject to regular health checks which would reduce the likelihood of STDs being spread.

More than anything else, we do NOT believe the government is the proper guardian of our morality. Take a look at our politicians--do YOU want them making decisions dealing with morality?

>Of course, I always respond to that with the argument that current
>drug laws were passed exactly because the majority believes illegal
>drugs do harm others.

Actually, that isn't accurate.

Surveys make it pretty clear that US citizens believe marijuana should be legal for adults, and that the drug war should end. When the drug laws were passed they were NOT subject to a public referendum, but were passed in large part at the instigation of a single official--Henry Anslinger--who was trying to prevent his job as the head of drug enforcement in the US from being eliminated by congress. Read the history of the drug war (you don't need to rely on the liberal or libertarian presentations--most law schools will have excellent histories that contain precisely the same information) and you will DEFINITELY change your opinion as to why our drug laws exist.

>Therefore, unless the libertarians intend to go
>against the will of the majority and legalize illegal drugs anyway,
>absolutely nothing would change concerning those laws.

You talk about the will of the majority--yet even where the majority have made it clear that they DO want drugs to be legal, the Federal Government refuses to accept their votes as valid. In several states, for example, the public voted for laws that make the use of medical marijuana legal. Yet the US Government, ignoring those laws, has continued to prosecute people who are exempted from prosecution by the laws enacted by the people.

Most libertarians (small "l") feel that the choice to ban or permit drug use belongs to the community not to the federal government. If, for example, Texas chooses to ban marijuana and Nevada chooses to legalize it (it WOULD increase the tourist trade), a libertarian does not see any legitimacy in the federal government attempting to prevent that decision. No libertarian would agree that a local community had the right to limit your personal behavior (even drug use) in the privacy of your home--but most libertarians WOULD agree that the local community has the right to prohibit the sales, manufacturer, or public use of drugs (including, btw, alcohol and nicotine).

>And the same
>could be said for most other laws in this country.

Not at all. No libertarian would consider it unreasonable that laws which can be shown to protect people from harm by others should exist. We simply don't accept the right of the government--ANY government--to "Protect us from ourselves." I don't need to be protected from myself, only from others. If I make a bad decision, I, not society, am the one who must suffer the consequences. Therefore, only I have the right to MAKE that decision with respect to my personal life.

>So, if nothing
>would change under the libertarians, why would one even consider
>supporting that group?

Quite a bit would change. For a view of the political platform, however, you need to be asking Cecil, not me.

> In fact, at this point, libertarians do seem like a strange group.
>They don't seem able to comprehend that their views are way out of the
>mainstream of American politics. They've been around for many decades,
>yet still have almost no membership (far less then one percent of the
>population), nor have they ever receive even close to one percent of
>the vote in a national election. In the end, it seems these people are
>still trying to ride a horse that died a long time ago.

Again, you are confusing the philosophy of libertarianism (on which, btw, the US was founded) with the Libertarian party. As I mentioned elsewhere, that's very similar to confusing a person who believes in democracy with a Democrat. The meanings are very different, even if many of the values are shared by both. Since I've never claimed to be a Libertarian (although I have voted for a number of Libertarian candidates--I vote the person not the ticket), my entire discussion has been focused on the philosophical perspective, not the political party one.

Hope that answers your question--I'm sure Cecil will be glad to present the Libertarian take on the question as well--which may well differ from my own in many areas.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2743. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:28:05 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8CFBA291D2079A96.E03CE34A4F1BF42B.A66B496CCCCA2469@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25790

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:26:39 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>You're on record pace, Radical Rick--two "Hitler" references within an
>hour!

Can't help it--the similarity is just too strong to resist.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2744. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:29:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <86C786CB18388C7D.E4FCFD0C28AACCD0.CC70738A35715359@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25791

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 00:06:18 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Not really. A "civil libertarian" would be someone like
>Jefferson who believes in "civil liberties". What other
>kinds of liberties are there?

Shame on you Cecil. You should know the answer to that. Look
at the "liberties" Dick Carroll takes with facts.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2745. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:31:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <26B768D9CDBEE79E.5542EFD7BDA16B30.B11544EDE07801C4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25792

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:34:12 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>An example would be Radical Rick as sexual libertarian.

You're half right, Dave.

I'm not a radical--that's a left wing extremist (i.e., a
communist).

I'll accept the sexual libertarian designation, however, so
long as you include civil libertarian, religious libertarian, and
other forms of libertarian as well.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2746. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:34:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C072847.D1C4C17D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25793

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 23:18:04 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >> I come here for amateur radio policy discussion. I don't come here for
> >> discussions on marijuana smoking, the swinging lifestyle or legalized
> >> prostitution.
> >
> >Then why do you spend so much of your time posting on those subjects?
>
> And why does he discuss such topics as morality and taste
> (with respect to Kim's call sign) which likewise have nothing to do
> with ham radio at all.

Why are you asking Cecil? We don't have a telepathic link between us.
Kim's call is an amateur radio call, not a vanity automobile tag (now
THERE is an ugly idea). It has plenty to do with amateur radio.
Your views on sexuality left the ham radio highway in a squeal of
brakes.

> If this thread was normally "on topic" his complaint would
> make sense. But since this is the official "Thread That Wandereth
> Forever in the Forest of Confusion" it's hardly a valid complaint. It
> IS, however, a clear indication that he is losing his arguments and
> thus wants to shut the discussion down while seeming not to be doing
> so from a position of weakness or defeat.

You are one of two individuals who did the most to take the thread away
from an amateur radio topic toward your gripes about your suppressed
freedoms. Which arguments am I supposed to be losing--the ones about
"freer Finland", your profession of libertarian philsophy vs. your
non-libertarian actions or the one about suppressed sexual "freedoms" in
the U.S.?

Dave K8MN

2747. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:35:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <00D5FBBEAC15A147.F731E275132E20E2.0A418F77DFB1DD05@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25794

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 06:04:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I'm a Republican but I strongly support the views of Harry Truman on
>many issues. Did Jefferson ever refer to himself as a libertarian (no
>adjective)?

Several times--as did Ben Franklin and many of the other
founding fathers. They were VERY supportive of John Locke's
philosophy--which Locke himself defined as libertarian.

Of course, George Washington grew 40,000 marijuana plants at
Mt. Vernon, and provided detailed instructions as to the preparation
of marijuana wine (his favorite--and viewed by a substantial number of
conservative historians as being the first wine served at a state
dinner by a sitting President) so what did THEY know? After all, under
the current law in the US, given that number of plants, George
Washington would have been executed by the Federal Government.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2748. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:39:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C85A46CED038713A.B48092AD7C4BD6F2.473361C380E348FA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25795

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:36:21 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>To my knowledge, there aren't any trashy ice cream flavor names.

Yum, yum, let's eat mud pies.

Sounds pretty disgusting to me!

BTW, ever seen some of the flavors of Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream?

>I'm a
>radio amateur posting in an amateur radio newsgroup about an issue
>relating to amateur radio.

No you aren't. You're a radio amateur posting in an amateur
radio newsgroup about an issue involving the private personal decision
of a fellow ham--and insulting or offending everyone who doesn't share
your view. Would you consider that appropriate behavior on the air? If
not then it has no place here, either.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2749. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:40:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9682563A92F986BB.3DC302A165FFAF9C.018B479E9635E2FC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25796

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 00:57:53 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>What ever happened to your "live and let live" philosophy?

He limits it to human life forms.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2750. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:51:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0FD2DED227008DE7.84F4938B7AFC6508.DD4EAC1A4BE5605E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25797

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 07:10:09 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Dave is not at all like that, Rick. Based on the messages I've read
>over the last year or two, Dave seems like a fairly intelligent
>person, with viewpoints that often span the entire political spectrum
>(from conservative to liberal). In other words, because you're basing
>your opinion of him on what he has said about just a couple of issues,
>your characterization of him above is not at all accurate. Why don't
>you wait until you get to know him a little better before you start
>relating him to Hitler (and the other nonsense you said in your message).

Dwight, when I entered this thread (because I honestly
felt--and still feel--that what Dick, Larry, Dave, and a few others
were doing with respect to Kim was wrong, vicious, cruel, and
completely at odds with the very arguments they were making about
giving a bad impression of ham radio) I did so politely. I didn't come
in calling Dick an idiot, Dave a radical and a fool, or Larry a loser.
I stated a position in opposition to their own that was no more an
attack on them personally than is my reply to you right now. What I
was greeted with wasn't open and respectful discussion, it was
insults, put downs, and innuendos that I has an ulterior (read sexual)
motive in defending Kim's choice (which I didn't--and still
don't--find offensive).

If I have a bad impression of Dave it's because he has given
me that impression in this thread. I can only base an opinion on
evidence, and the evidence I've seen is that the people I named above
have no desire to discuss this--or any other controversial topic--in a
way that demonstrates respect for those who disagree with them. That
being the case, I've been quite willing to respond in kind.

I agree that this has become ridiculous--but at the same time
the only reason the thread is continuing is because Larry Roll has
specifically insisted that it WILL continue until Kim is forced to
change her sign--and his attacks on her integrity and morality are
supported by the others I named above.

I'm perfectly willing to let the thread drop and more useful
discussions take place--and I believe it would benefit
everyone--particularly the potential hams who may be reading it--if
that occurred. But it will only occur if that group of people agree to
disagree with those of us who don't share their views, and to let the
matter drop themselves.

Comments?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2751. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 06:59:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2A61F6573BB5F666.1B7E92A583D1F7EB.F4D24671DE5599D4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25798

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 07:28:32 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> And are you one of those people who "say" you were at Woodstock
>also? How many people were locked up in southern jails during the
>civil rights period of the late 50's to late 60's? If I remember what
>I read years ago in some national magazine correctly, it seems that
>number was just under five hundred during that entire decade. If so,
>isn't it amazing that we would run into one of those few here in this newsgroup?

Do I "say" I was at Woodstock?

I point myself out in the movie to those who watch it with me.
Yes, Dwight, I was at Woodstock. If you doubt it log into the Jackson
Citizen Patriot website (I'm sure you can get the url from any search
engine) and search their back issue listings for the 25th Anniversary
of the festival. You'll find an article about the Jackson residents
who were at Woodstock that includes my name and picture as well as
excerpts from an interview the reporter conducted with the four of us
who were there.

Why is it amazing that you would run into a sixties civil
rights activist here, Dwight? MANY of the people from the sixties were
attracted to the Internet in the late seventies (while it was still
ARPANet) and in the eighties. Is it so unexpected that some of us are
Hams as well? Or that someone who was outspoken about rights almost
forty years ago would still be that way and would join a thread such
as this one?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2752. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 07:03:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D374FBD4DF91CC44.C39188505EE68B37.BD1631CE02D642E1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25799

On 30 Nov 2001 01:05:34 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I am merely exercising my right to comment on an issue which concerns
>the image of the Amateur Radio Service. As an licensed amateur
>radio operator, I have a legitimate concern. Are you saying I have no
>right to express my opinion on this matter?

Then I'm sure you won't mind if I exercise the same option and
discuss my feelings on an issue (sexism and hypocrisy) which I feel
concerns the image of the ARS.

Since I don't choose to do so on the Internet exclusively (as
is my right, of course), I'm sure you won't mind if I discuss my
impressions of you (along with quotes from your public messages here
in this thread) in what I would consider a more suitable venue--such
as 20m CW or 80m voice.

Any problem with that?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2753. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 07:08:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <36C0D7FECCBDD42C.ED24960ED45C2E31.98FF9764DA11CF59@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25800

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 12:53:00 GMT, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote:

>Well.... isn't that discrimination against people (for whatever reason) who
>choose or cannot get a credit card???? Seems as it is the only way to get
>ANYTHING you might wanna buy online. I refuse to get a credit card......
>legal extortion.

Use a VISA/debit card from your bank instead. Works just as
well.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2754. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 07:13:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0111292313.7c01080b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25801

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gnhg6tb.pminews@or.news.verio.net>...
> On Wed, 28 Nov 2001 02:08:39 +0000 (UTC), K0HB wrote:
>
> [Re: Leasing/renting ham gear.]
>
> >Everything you're suggesting is perfectly legal and above board.
>
> Henry Radio in Los Angeles used to have a policy of "selling" a
> piece of used ham gear (traded-in by someone) and returning 90% of
> the sale price if the gear was returned within 5 days. They were
> fully aware that this was de-facto "rental".
>
> To date this practice, they had lots of Gonset Gooney-Birds for us
> 2-meter guys who needed a portable or mobile rig over a long
> weekend. (Late 1950s)
>
>
Gooney BOXES, Benton Harbor LUNCHBOXES . . sheesh awready . .

2755. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 10:14:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C075C0C.A5715739@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25802

Krell wrote:
>
> On the contrary, it's actually
> *doubled* activity. The newsgroups
> now gets well over 100 posts a day.
> A month or so ago it was only
> getting about 30 to 50. (Unless
> you're the type who prefers quality
> over quantity.)

The number of message varies greatly. Go back two or three months, and you'll see numbers similar to today. Whatever the case, I don't think the insults and stuff are responsible for any increased activity at this particular moment.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2756. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 10:21:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C075D7E.33536965@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25803

CAM wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > yet still have almost no membership
> > (far less then one percent of the
> > population), nor have they ever
> > receive even close to one percent of
> > the vote in a national election. In
> > the end, it seems these people are
> > still trying to ride a horse that
> > died a long time ago.
>
> From the Libertarian website: "With
> about 300 candidates on the ballot
> in November, the LP won about one of
> every five races it contested."
> "[November 27] The number of
> Libertarians elected to office on
> November 6 has jumped to 67, thanks
> to a flurry of late-breaking victories."
>
> 67 is a record high, Dwight, for the
> Libertarians.

And which "national" elections did those 67 win, Cecil? I don't see
how anything you said changed what I said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2757. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 10:43:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0762A4.3E6B090A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25804

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Dwight, when I entered this thread
> (because I honestly felt--and still
> feel--that what Dick, Larry, Dave,
> and a few others were doing with
> respect to Kim was wrong, vicious,
> cruel, and completely at odds with
> the very arguments they were making
> about giving a bad impression of
> ham radio) I did so politely.

See, the problem is that you're getting into a discussion that has been going on for at least a year or so. And, throughout that time, Kim and her supporters have been throwing it back at Larry and his supporters just as hard. So, while you might see it as cruel and vicious, trust me when I say none of them (Larry, Kim, or supporters) are losing even a moment's sleep over it. I was even involved in this once (on Kim's side), but I just don't have the time at this point.

Anyway, by getting into this so late in the game, I feel you've gotten the wrong impression of some of the people in this newsgroup. All of them (Larry, Dick, Dave, Kim, Cecil, and so on) are a lot different than their positions in this single, long fought, battle. Take care, Rick.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2758. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 11:03:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C07676E.313FB0EA@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25805

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Why is it amazing that you would
> run into a sixties civil rights
> activist here, Dwight? MANY of the
> people from the sixties were
> attracted to the Internet in the
> late seventies (while it was still
> ARPANet) and in the eighties. Is it
> so unexpected that some of us are
> Hams as well? Or that someone who
> was outspoken about rights almost
> forty years ago would still be that
> way and would join a thread such
> as this one?

Well, since you've been around for some time, you should know the answers very well, Rick. A lot of people today claim they were at Woodstock (far more than the numbers actually there). And a lot of people today are claiming positions, and activities, in the sixties that also don't match the numbers involved. And, since so few people were locked up during the civil rights movement of the sixties, it would be rare to run into one of them anywhere (including this newsgroup).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2759. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 11:11:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C07691E.1B11C67C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25806

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Then I'm sure you won't mind if
> I exercise the same option and
> discuss my feelings on an issue
> (sexism and hypocrisy) which I feel
> concerns the image of the ARS.

Rick, in case you haven't noticed lately, this isn't the ARS. This is a newsgroup. What is said here has no more bearing on the ARS than what a liberal says at a dinner party has on any group that liberal might belong to.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2760. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 11:33:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C076E43.EF12C578@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25807

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> I don't think it's too much to ask
> for a married man or woman to expect
> his/her spouse to refrain from
> private, intimate meetings with
> "friends" of the opposite sex. (snip)

I agree with your entire message, Larry. A lasting relationship with a person is not built on relationships with others of the opposite sex - it is built on two people working together to build trust in their own relationship. Anything that even slightly undermines that trust is obviously harmful to the relationship and should be avoided by both parties. That is not a religious position or a moral position - it is simply common sense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2761. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 11:53:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C07730C.CDB72B2C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25808

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> You make it sound as though an offer
> to have a meal or visit, Larry, was
> an offer of sex. Good grief.

That brings up an interesting issue, Kim. Several years ago, a television personality (name long forgotten) raised the premise that a male and female cannot be friends without the issue of sex entering their minds. In other words, any person who is friends with a member of the opposite sex is sexually attracted to that person. What do you think, Kim? Can a man truly be friends (not a co-worker, associate, or an aquantance - a friend) with a woman without ever having thoughts about sex? Can a woman? What about your male friends? Can you honestly say they've never had sexual thoughts about you? Can you honestly say that you've never had sexual thoughts about them?

To answer my own question (it's not fair to ask a question like this without being willing to answer it also), I think such a relationship is possible, but it is extremely rare. Most people who have friends of the opposite sex are sexually attracted to them.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2762. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 12:02:39 UTC
From: Bob - KE4JCD <ke4jcd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <zzKN7.146436$Yb.37452115@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>
Source record: 25809

> So argue for harder tests. I guarantee that if code is stopping them,
> they won't be upgrading to AE. Not with the current test, at least.
> It's too much work to learn that test. The key is to make the test
difficult
> enough that it takes effort to pass it. Doesn't matter whether it's
> a code test or a written test. If it takes time and effort to pass it,
> it's too much work.
>
Yes that's true...

> I listened to most of that last night. What's funny is that you often
> couldn't tell the good guys from the bad guys.
>
> All of them were acting that poorly.
>
> Sean.
>

Well that was the point of the clips, to show that even the people on the
repeater were the problem. For if they follow what the FCC and ARRL said
"Pay no mind to the jammers" or WA8JSC.. Also TURN OFF the repeater if it
got out of hand as it did most of the time as you heard... I was not one of
them, I just sat back shacking my head.... I then turned the tapes over to
the FCC. Soon after, the FCC did get on the repeater owner about it and now
the repeater is cleaned up... As for the People that still use it, the FCC
can't help there... :)
--

Robert Hartung - KE4JCD
publisher@hartungpress.com

Hartung Press, is a Non-Profit Online Public Affairs Magazine.
http://www.hartungpress.com

KE4JCD Amateur Radio Web Site
http://www.ke4jcd.org

Be Sure To Protect Your Legal Rights,
Pre-Paid Legal Service, Inc.
http://www.legalbob.com

"Sean G Gilley" <uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org> wrote in message
news:ff37aa44.0111281232.1ed0aea@posting.google.com...
> "Bob - KE4JCD" <ke4jcd@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<8yUL7.113107$Yb.28227333@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>...

> > As you said "I haven't seen such "droves" in my area." Well the CODE
TEST
> > hasn't been dropped yet. People I talk to all say much of the same
thing,
> > The CODE is stopping them and when its gone so will HAM RADIO! CBers
will
> > come in droves and as I have on my website, BAD HABITS!
>
> So argue for harder tests. I guarantee that if code is stopping them,
> they won't be upgrading to AE. Not with the current test, at least.
> It's too much work to learn that test. The key is to make the test
difficult
> enough that it takes effort to pass it. Doesn't matter whether it's
> a code test or a written test. If it takes time and effort to pass it,
> it's too much work.
>
> > One page on my site deals with what Amateur radio is slowly becoming,
the
> > new children's band...
> >
> > Here something sweet for your ears...
> > http://www.hartungpress.com/hamradio/crummyhams.htm
>
> I listened to most of that last night. What's funny is that you often
> couldn't tell the good guys from the bad guys.
>
> All of them were acting that poorly.
>
> Sean.
>

2763. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 13:24:20 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <8MLN7.3155$m%.726401@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 25810

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C05C23F.A958378@IEEE.org...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > True. Dogs are usually pretty loyal and accepting (and I'm a
> > cat person!).
>
> Did you hear the difference between dogs and cats? A dog looks at his
> master and thinks: "This man fulfills all my needs - he must be a god".
> A cat looks at her master and thinks: "This man fulfills all my needs -
> I must be a god."
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

And my stupid cat looks at me as if to say "Get out of here and go to work to pay for the rent on MY place." Thank god she does some cute stuff now and then, otherwise I would sell her to the local chinese buffet place for what they allegedly call "chicken on a stick." (meow)

Ryan

2764. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 13:33:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C078AC5.9E0EFC0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25811

Dave Heil wrote:
> What you do as a radio amateur IS important to me. If my views are
> unimportant to you, I'm surprised you'd even bother to respond.

All it takes for the bad guys to win is for the good guys to
do nothing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2765. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 13:35:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C078B24.9D6E7D4D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25812

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote:
> >Well.... isn't that discrimination against people (for whatever reason) who
> >choose or cannot get a credit card???? Seems as it is the only way to get
> >ANYTHING you might wanna buy online. I refuse to get a credit card......
> >legal extortion.
>
> Use a VISA/debit card from your bank instead. Works just as well.

Except with a debit card, I can't float an interest free loan.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2766. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 13:42:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C078CDC.87A3EBFB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25813

Dave Heil wrote:
> Kim's call is an amateur radio call, not a vanity automobile tag (now
> THERE is an ugly idea). It has plenty to do with amateur radio.

That poses an interesting question. Will the state of Texas issue
Kim a set of "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"? If
so, seems your morality argument goes straight out the window.
Kim, I've got a spare application. Do you want it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2767. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 13:47:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C078E0A.E80A77ED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25814

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> And which "national" elections did those 67 win, Cecil? I don't see
> how anything you said changed what I said.

You implied that the Libertarian Party is a dead horse while it
is in fact more successful than it ever has been before. The
Libertarian Party is probably the largest third party in the US.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2768. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 13:54:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C078F7D.2B7EDF08@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25815

Rick Adams wrote:
> Shame on you Cecil. You should know the answer to that. Look
> at the "liberties" Dick Carroll takes with facts.

Oh yeah, I forgot about those kinds of "liberties".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2769. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 13:55:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C078FE9.72E450A1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25816

Rick Adams wrote:
> Of course, George Washington grew 40,000 marijuana plants at
> Mt. Vernon, and provided detailed instructions as to the preparation
> of marijuana wine (his favorite--and viewed by a substantial number of
> conservative historians as being the first wine served at a state
> dinner by a sitting President) so what did THEY know? After all, under
> the current law in the US, given that number of plants, George
> Washington would have been executed by the Federal Government.

I've often wondered how something could have been so right back
then and so wrong now.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2770. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 14:09:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C079309.95FAB5AA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25817

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The callsign enters your input system as five alpha-numeric characters
> > devoid of trash. You convert it into trash internally within your value
> > system. That's your problem, Dave, not Kim's.
>
> The callsign suffix *spells* a coarse term for a portion of female
> anatomy. No one has a problem with calls like W6RCA or W5DXP.
> Oh--I forgot. You already knew that.

W5TIT doesn't spell anything, Dave. It is just one combination
of 175,760 Wnxxx calls. It is your dirty mind struggling hard to
find something dirty in all possible random combinations of
characters that is the problem. If I set my mind to it, I can
find something dirty in your callsign.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2771. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 14:12:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0793CB.2C4AA79C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25818

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> You make it sound as though an offer to have a meal or visit, Larry, was an
> offer of sex. Good grief.

That's apparently the way Larry's mind works, Kim. He furnishes
the meal so his date furnishes sex.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2772. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 14:17:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0794E8.BEA78E9A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25819

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Most people who have friends of
> the opposite sex are sexually attracted to them.

Not true of me, Dwight. For months, I have been dating
a lady with absolutely no thought of sex on my mind.
We just enjoy socializing together as a couple.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2773. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 15:14:01 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <ZmNN7.203168$3d2.8836121@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25820

> > "Dave Heil" wrote

> > > But a "sexual libertarian" does not describe a "civil libertarian".

> Richard Plourde wrote:

> > I hear Jefferson was a sexual libertarian, though. Have you heard that?

"Dave Heil" wrote

> I've heard it, read it and have seen the living proof interviewed on TV.

So have I...

> He was a civil libertarian except when it came to his own "property".

That would make him an uncivil libertarian.

Rich

2774. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 15:31:43 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9u88mh02qrj@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25821

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C075C0C.A5715739@sccoast.net...
> The number of message varies greatly. Go back two or three months,
> and you'll see numbers similar to today. Whatever the case, I don't
> think the insults and stuff are responsible for any increased activity
> at this particular moment.

Everyone likes controversy, especially when they have passionate beliefs
about things that they're not going to change their minds about. Such
beliefs are easy marks for those who don't share the same ideas. When such
is the case, insults and ad hominem attacks are bound to happen.

2775. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 16:00:23 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0111300800.71601dfa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25822

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011129213917.10701.00003827@nso-mv.aol.com>...
> I've endured several messages worth of your immature, misguided
> rantings, now I must reply.

Then we're even. I find you immature and misguided as well.

As for enduring, well, I'd much rather you reply. You completely
ignored articles where I was a lot more forgiving than I am now.
Guess it takes slightly more anger to get you to say something.

> I have absolutely no desire to "control" Kim's actions. All throughout
> my past and present discussions on that subject in this newsgroup,
> I have made it clear that Kim is the only person who can act to make
> a change, and the choice whether or not to do so is entirely hers to
> make. I have no way to "control" Kim's actions other than to point out
> the potentially harmful effects her callsign, which reflects very poor
> taste and judgment on her part.

I never said you *could* control her callsign, I said you *wanted* to
control her callsign. Completely different things.

Let me repeat what I said in an earlier post: If you feel that her
callsign is as bad as you seem to feel, then you should be lobbying to
change the rules. Kim's callsign is a *symptom* of something much
bigger, and to attempt to torment her is useless. It's obvious she
won't voluntarily change her call, so the only way it's going to happen
is if the FCC changes its rules. Further, even if she does change her
callsign, someone else is likely to have or create another that is just
as, or more, offensive to you. It's futile and senseless to rant about
Kim's callsign. Lobby the FCC if you feel that strongly. Find others
who share your feelings and get them to lobby the FCC.

What you are doing in this group does *nothing* to promote your cause,
and does, in fact, more strongly ally people against you -- possibly
for you as well, but I've seen little evidence of that while I see
plenty of evidence for the former.

Just what good do you think you are doing? Do you actually think you are
implementing change by taunting people and making them angry here?
Do you actually think that rec.radio.amateur.policy will be
an instrument of change in the ARS and FCC?

> I am merely
> exercising my right to state my objections to her callsign.

Okay. We got it. You don't like her callsign, you don't believe it's family oriented, and you don't believe it's right for amateur radio.

You've stated your objections. And I think you had a perfect right to do so. But you're putting a lot of effect into *continually* stating those objects, over and over and over. And any worth it might once have had is now gone.

A long time ago I took a two weekend class. Between the two weekends, one of the assignments was not to complain to anyone who can't or won't help solve the problem. That's exactly what you're doing. Kim can't solve the problem, only the FCC can. No one reading or posting on this newsgroup can solve the problem. Only the FCC can.

You want to solve the problem? Get the FCC to change the rules. You aren't *ever* going to solve the problem here.

> How she
> acts as a result is entirely her decision, and her responsibility. If she
> hadn't chosen a controversial Vanity call sign, this wouldn't be an issue
> in the first place.

And I simply can't understand why you seem so angry *specifically* at Kim. Maybe it's because she's posting on this group and is completely uncontrite. Why aren't you as angry about other off-color callsigns? Are you simply not aware of them? They are out there, and there are calls that I'd believe are more offensive that her's.

Go ahead. Explain why you've centered your anger on Kim. Explain to us all what good you are doing here.

Sean.

2776. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 16:06:40 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0111300806.60a6c079@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25823

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C076E43.EF12C578@sccoast.net>...
> A lasting relationship with
> a person is not built on relationships with others of the opposite sex
> - it is built on two people working together to build trust in their
> own relationship. Anything that even slightly undermines that trust is
> obviously harmful to the relationship and should be avoided by both
> parties. That is not a religious position or a moral position - it is
> simply common sense.

I basically agree with this.

I simply disagree that my wife having a one on one conversation with
another man in a coffeshop is anything that would (or should) even
slightly undermine my trust in her.

Adults spend time with other adults, and if I can't trust my wife enough
to trust her to spend time alone with another man, then my relationship
isn't very good to begin with.

Sean.

2777. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 16:18:47 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0111300818.15adc3a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25824

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011111104320.12427.00001965@nso-cg.aol.com>...
> I recall having to answer a lot of questions about repeaters when I
> took my written exams for Tech, General, Advanced, and Extra. I
> also had to answer a lot of questions about SSB, RTTY, and FM.
> Why were these modes being "singled out?"

Not to beat a dead horse, but ... is it possible to miss ALL the
questions pertaining to SSB and still pass the test? RTTY? FM? And
still pass the test?
That, in itself, makes the code different.

...

> However, without
> the code tests, I never would have been able to use the Morse/CW
> mode, a mode which has produced over 85% of my HF operating
> achievements, and 99.999% of my overall enjoyment of ham radio.

There are two premises and I don't think the second always has a
direct connection to the first. Many people use packet exclusively,
yet never had to take a test equivalent to the code test to gain 99%
of their enjoyment of ham radio.

Presence of the code test does provide an interesting stimulus. There
are probably many who would not be operating CW, had they not had to
study it. Some would ask why the same is not true for the other modes.
Were folks required to study packet or SSB operation before using it,
might not that serve as the same stimulus to increase the numbers
using other modes? Yet, we don't test that way for any mode except CW.

> The difference is, once I lost my childish, self-serving objections to
> code testing -- based mainly on an immature fear of failure -- I saw
> the code tests as just as useful and necessary as the testing on
> any other mode. It's all about having the right attutude.

I never approached the code in that manner. I came to General from
Tech with the expressed purpose of using CW as the preferred mode in
QRP operation. Had I gone to code only in order to gain HF phone
privileges, I think I would've been, at the very least, puzzled by the
requirement: Pass a code test to earn phone privileges?

...

> .... Code testing *does*
> reinforce good operating technique, because you are tested in exactly
> the same way you operate in CW and a variety of other modes.

I must've missed that part. I recall copying a message in which the sender identified himself, said where he was from, said what equipment he was using, and reported the signal strength of the contact. I don't remember being required to send in CW. I don't remember very much at all about how to adjust the signal, about using "split" VFO's, about RIT or XIT or notch. I don't recall being asked how many CQ's I should send or whether I should send CQ CQ DE KB9RVB CQ over and over again. I don't recall anything at all about whether you should crank up your power to overwhelm everybody else on the frequency -- on the CW test.

Had I finished my ham studies in my teens with many of my friends, I probably would've come in as a Novice w/ 5wpm and gained that operating experience that you refer to. But that methodology wasn't then and isn't now part of the code test. Operations in ham radio probably are the least covered aspect of the service.

Yes, there are rules for operation -- and those are covered in all the study guides and on the tests. But what about the realities? What is the proper procedure for XYZ? What is the impact of ABC? These only come from actually getting out there and stumbling along, asking your "Elmer."

Why is code different?

> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Returning the 73,
Carl KB9RVB

2778. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 16:21:11 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9u8b80$to0$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 25825

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:lyyN7.202255$3d2.8747611@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> ummm ... I do remember a guy whining about no more CW during a chat on 440
> FM. Fortunately, the repeater owner was on at the same time and, as an
old
> buddy of mine, always willing to help. We switched to F-2 at about 40.
> Golly, the other guy sure was quiet. Can't understand it.

8-)) what a way to see who is being honest! This isn't the first time I've
heard that tactic being used.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

2779. Re: Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 16:25:53 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9u8bh4tte1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 25826

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011128234548.635$dF@newsreader.com...
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
> >
> > Yeah, you got them P.O. so they let you guys know in the only way that
> > would REALLY matter. 8-))
> >
> Same as you pissing off the CBer's Leland.....8-))

They get P.O'ed because that's how they want to feel. Has nothing to do with what I say or do. If they want to get angry they'll find an excuse no matter what.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

--
"Let me add that there are an awful lot of
extra class calls playing on the
VHF side of things
exclusively - just like me.

One of the truly great things about this hobby
is that there is so much to do in it, that
you should never get bored
regardless of your
license class."

Don Ross (an extra who has never logged an HF contact)
NL7CO/EM04

2780. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 16:33:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C07B4E7.D7E3A1B1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25827

Krell wrote:
> Everyone likes controversy, especially when they have passionate beliefs
> about things that they're not going to change their minds about. Such
> beliefs are easy marks for those who don't share the same ideas. When such
> is the case, insults and ad hominem attacks are bound to happen.

And some people enjoy yanking other people's chains. :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2781. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 16:39:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C07B64F.DCA8766@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25828

Sean G Gilley wrote:
> Adults spend time with other adults, and if I can't trust my wife enough
> to trust her to spend time alone with another man, then my relationship
> isn't very good to begin with.

And that relationship definitely certainly is NOT based on trust.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2782. Re: "...one step closer to trash"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 17:23:37 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <0615cf25296d75ca34bf1feea8bff690.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 25829

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

>
> This is entirely about the effect of Kim's tasteless choice in a callsign
> upon the image of the ARS.
>

Larry,

Most of us have pretty much agreed that Kim's choice of call is trashy.
We've also pretty much agreed that she probably isn't going to change
it. Thus this becomes a dead horse being uselessly beaten, and has the
additional negative effect of giving continued free visibility and
recognition to Mrs. Walkers piece of tastelessness. Perhaps only W5CAW
can influence her to discard the thing.

Meanwhile, you need to speak to the FCC about two of my neighbors, N0OKY
and KB0OBS.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas05poolc197.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.11.197]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2783. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 17:25:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C07C0DC.9D5748E9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25830

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:26:39 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >You're on record pace, Radical Rick--two "Hitler" references within an
> >hour!
>
> Can't help it--the similarity is just too strong to resist.

Make that three.

Dave K8MN

2784. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 17:30:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C07C1EA.AF64A470@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25831

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:34:12 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >An example would be Radical Rick as sexual libertarian.
>
> You're half right, Dave.
>
> I'm not a radical--that's a left wing extremist (i.e., a
> communist).

Gee, not many posts ago you admitted to being a radical. I like the new definition of "radical" you've come up with. All this time I thought that anyone could be a radical over any number of issues.

> I'll accept the sexual libertarian designation, however, so
> long as you include civil libertarian, religious libertarian, and
> other forms of libertarian as well.

Why should I have to include the others? Many of your perceived supressed "rights" have to do with sex. Maybe you'd like to known as the "Drug libertarian".

2785. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 17:36:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C07C36D.73300509@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25832

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:36:21 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >To my knowledge, there aren't any trashy ice cream flavor names.
>
> Yum, yum, let's eat mud pies.
>
> Sounds pretty disgusting to me!
>
> BTW, ever seen some of the flavors of Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream?

You really want to head off on another diversion?

> >I'm a
> >radio amateur posting in an amateur radio newsgroup about an issue
> >relating to amateur radio.
>
> No you aren't. You're a radio amateur posting in an amateur
> radio newsgroup about an issue involving the private personal decision
> of a fellow ham--and insulting or offending everyone who doesn't share
> your view. Would you consider that appropriate behavior on the air? If
> not then it has no place here, either.

Your writing of the dismissive "No you aren't" doesn't negate my statement. It looks like you are another of those folks who tries to make the perpetrator look like a victim. Kim isn't a victim. She chose to do what she did and she has outlined, on a number of occasions, why she did it. Now she's taking her lumps for it from those who disapprove.

Dave K8MN

2786. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 17:43:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C07C4E4.7D27F556@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25833

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 07:28:32 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > And are you one of those people who "say" you were at Woodstock
> >also? How many people were locked up in southern jails during the
> >civil rights period of the late 50's to late 60's? If I remember what
> >I read years ago in some national magazine correctly, it seems that
> >number was just under five hundred during that entire decade. If so,
> >isn't it amazing that we would run into one of those few here in this newsgroup?
>
> Do I "say" I was at Woodstock?
>
> I point myself out in the movie to those who watch it with me.
> Yes, Dwight, I was at Woodstock. If you doubt it log into the Jackson
> Citizen Patriot website (I'm sure you can get the url from any search
> engine) and search their back issue listings for the 25th Anniversary
> of the festival. You'll find an article about the Jackson residents
> who were at Woodstock that includes my name and picture as well as
> excerpts from an interview the reporter conducted with the four of us
> who were there.
>
> Why is it amazing that you would run into a sixties civil
> rights activist here, Dwight? MANY of the people from the sixties were
> attracted to the Internet in the late seventies (while it was still
> ARPANet) and in the eighties. Is it so unexpected that some of us are
> Hams as well? Or that someone who was outspoken about rights almost
> forty years ago would still be that way and would join a thread such
> as this one?

...not to mention that you must have been one of the youngest freedom
riders ever. You must have been what--seventeen in '63?

Dave K8MN

2787. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 17:47:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C07C5F8.C106F9EE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25834

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > What you do as a radio amateur IS important to me. If my views are
> > unimportant to you, I'm surprised you'd even bother to respond.
>
> All it takes for the bad guys to win is for the good guys to
> do nothing.

I know. That's why I'm still posting.

Dave K8MN

2788. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 17:49:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C07C66B.1B652AAD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25835

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Kim's call is an amateur radio call, not a vanity automobile tag (now
> > THERE is an ugly idea). It has plenty to do with amateur radio.
>
> That poses an interesting question. Will the state of Texas issue
> Kim a set of "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"? If
> so, seems your morality argument goes straight out the window.
> Kim, I've got a spare application. Do you want it?

Most states won't issue a vanity call with anything suggestive in it.
Good luck on your quest.

Dave K8MN

2789. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 17:52:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C07C722.6385C6CA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25836

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The callsign enters your input system as five alpha-numeric characters
> > > devoid of trash. You convert it into trash internally within your value
> > > system. That's your problem, Dave, not Kim's.
> > >
> > > The callsign suffix *spells* a coarse term for a portion of female
> > > anatomy. No one has a problem with calls like W6RCA or W5DXP.
> > > Oh--I forgot. You already knew that.
>
> W5TIT doesn't spell anything, Dave. It is just one combination
> of 175,760 Wnxxx calls. It is your dirty mind struggling hard to
> find something dirty in all possible random combinations of
> characters that is the problem. If I set my mind to it, I can
> find something dirty in your callsign.

Look back at my statement. See the word "suffix". Did you address
"suffix"?

You could probably find something dirty in your social security number.
It is simply your nature.

Dave K8MN

2790. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 17:56:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C07C803.E05C05E0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25837

```
Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > > "Dave Heil" wrote
>
> > > > But a "sexual libertarian" does not describe a "civil libertarian".
>
> > Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > > I hear Jefferson was a sexual libertarian, though. Have you heard that?
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote
>
> > I've heard it, read it and have seen the living proof interviewed on TV.
>
> So have I...
>
> > He was a civil libertarian except when it came to his own "property".
>
> That would make him an uncivil libertarian.

That makes him similar to the liberarians we have posting here.
Their quest for liberty is pretty one-sided and leans toward things
which benefit them. Their opponents don't have the same liberties.

Dave K8MN
```

2791. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 18:58:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C07D6CE.ECC2E53C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25838

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > That poses an interesting question. Will the state of Texas issue
> > Kim a set of "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"? If
> > so, seems your morality argument goes straight out the window.
> > Kim, I've got a spare application. Do you want it?
>
> Most states won't issue a vanity call with anything suggestive in it.
> Good luck on your quest.

Ah, but Texas "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"
are based on FCC issued callsigns. I suspect they would have
no choice except to issue Kim's ham callsign plates since the
feds apparently don't see anything wrong with it.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2792. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 19:01:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C07D77E.A24D3220@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25839

Dave Heil wrote:
> Look back at my statement. See the word "suffix". Did you address
> "suffix"?

A callsign suffix doesn't matter. It is just three letters, not a word.
What you choose to make of it is all in your mind.

> You could probably find something dirty in your social security number.
> It is simply your nature.

My social security number does contain three sixes. :-) I might
be "The Beast".
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

2793. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 19:29:22 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <m6RN7.137281$WW.8674297@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25840

> Richard Plourde wrote:

> > That would make him an uncivil libertarian.

> That makes him similar to the liberarians we have posting here.

That lacks logic, you just lost me there Dave...
The people here aren't trying to empregnate their slaves.

> Their quest for liberty is pretty one-sided and leans toward things
> which benefit them.

Why? Don't they want others to be at liberty to be staightlaced prudes?

Oh, I get it... you mean, they don't want the liberties dictated by the
staightlaced prudes.

Truth is, hey want the same liberties for their opponents.

Rich

2794. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 19:44:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C07E1A2.F5E51406@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25842

Dave Heil wrote:

>
>
> Kim's call is an amateur radio call, not a vanity automobile tag (now
> THERE is an ugly idea). It has plenty to do with amateur radio.
> Your views on sexuality left the ham radio highway in a squeal of
> brakes.

Kim could apply for ham radio automobile plates. Wonder if
the DMV would accept the fact that it is a legal ham callsign?
Do it Kim! :-)

2795. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 19:44:41 UTC
From: hairy apes <3tonmarydoesyou@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <JkRN7.7921$Ao6.707410@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 25841

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C062258.BFE88925@sccoast.net...
>
> Please, before you post that nasty
> little message, with the hateful little comments, think about the
> effect you're having on this newsgroup and it's members. If this keeps
> up, this newsgroups will degrade into something none of us will want
> to participate in.

I agree Dwight, but I think this is an indirect result of the FCC's cleaning up of the old 14.313
mess.
When 14.313 was still going hot and heavy, all the misfits, screwballs, radio-geeks, bicycle seat sniffers, RF trailer trash and bootleggers had a nice place to call all their own. A "red light district" frequency if you will, Ham radio's answer to the Jerry Springer Show. Now that's gone and all these hard up hams and bootleggers are on the internet. Just like as if the vice cops cleaned up one corner of the city downtown, the hookers just go and re-locate for business 5 blocks uptown.
I sorta wish we had the old 313 back. It did serve as a nice pen to keep all the animals in one place while the rest of the bands were comparativily clean.
Just my observations, and one I feel is 100% accurate.

Kenny

2796. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 19:57:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C07E4BA.13FC44B5@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 25843

Rick Adams wrote:

> On 30 Nov 2001 01:05:34 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >I am merely exercising my right to comment on an issue which concerns
> >the image of the Amateur Radio Service. As an licensed amateur
> >radio operator, I have a legitimate concern. Are you saying I have no
> >right to express my opinion on this matter?
>
> Then I'm sure you won't mind if I exercise the same option and
> discuss my feelings on an issue (sexism and hypocrisy) which I feel
> concerns the image of the ARS.
>
> Since I don't choose to do so on the Internet exclusively (as
> is my right, of course), I'm sure you won't mind if I discuss my
> impressions of you (along with quotes from your public messages here
> in this thread) in what I would consider a more suitable venue--such
> as 20m CW or 80m voice.

Better use CW. IIRC, that's Larry's favorite mode. :-)

2797. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 21:02:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011130160233.12731.00000061@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 25844

>Subject: Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!
>From: "hairy apes" 3tonmarydoesyou@hotmail.com
>Date: 11/30/2001 1:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <JkRN7.7921$Ao6.707410@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>

>Just my observations, and one I feel is 100% accurate.

My participation in this newsgroup has "proven" only one thing to
me....that opinions are just like rectums...Everyone has one but only cares
about their own.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2798. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 21:03:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011130160330.22754.00000888@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 25845

In article <3C07730C.CDB72B2C@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>Several years ago, a
>television personality (name long forgotten) raised the premise that a
>male and female cannot be friends without the issue of sex entering
>their minds. In other words, any person who is friends with a member
>of the opposite sex is sexually attracted to that person.

I recall something like that. I think that idea is total hogwash.

>Can a man truly be friends (not a co-worker, associate, or
>an aquantance - a friend) with a woman without ever having thoughts
>about sex?

Absolutely YES. Been there, done that. And the reverse....

> To answer my own question (it's not fair to ask a question like this
>without being willing to answer it also), I think such a relationship
>is possible, but it is extremely rare.

I think it's a lot more common than some people think.

>Most people who have friends of
>the opposite sex are sexually attracted to them.
>
I'm sure lots of that happens - been there, done that too. But it's not
universal.

Just because a person feels something doesn't mean they must act on it. People
can be highly attracted to each other and yet keep things at a platonic level.

Whole thing boils down to behaving like a grown-up. Some folks can do it, some
can't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2799. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 21:16:21 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <916221843e63d2edd6c44b0af58e24a5.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 25846

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote

> That brings up an interesting issue, Kim. Several years ago, a
> television personality (name long forgotten) raised the premise that a
> male and female cannot be friends without the issue of sex entering
> their minds. In other words, any person who is friends with a member
> of the opposite sex is sexually attracted to that person.

Makes a nice titillating centerpoint for a television entertainers
monologue, but fails an even cursory reality check.

I count many women among my closest friends, to whom I'm not even
remotely attracted sexually. Some of them come to mind which I would
be repulsed from a sexual viewpoint, but they are among my best friends.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas11poolc107.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.21.107]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2800. Re: Whats the deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 21:36:56 UTC
From: Vern Cole <coleve@ida.net>
Message-ID: <3C07FBF8.9030402@ida.net>
Source record: 25847

Yup....
I first started reading this newsgroup about 12 years ago. On a CRT terminal befor the www was even invented. Just tuned back in today. Its like a soap opera. I haven't missed a thing. Still an argument about incentive licensing and whether or not morse code in the backgroud, and a lot of flaming about stuff which has nothing to do with ham radio in the foreground.
Wish they'ld grow up.
Vernon -- KF7XM

Chuck wrote:

> I cme ot this new group in hopes of finding out intereting tid bits of Ham
> Radio Policy. What goes here?, not one posting about policy. Either my
> computer is goofed or you poeple are just enraged with one another. I hate
> to even post the message here, but this is all new to me. I will wait a few
> daays and see if anything actually comes up about policy if not I will move
> on. One thing that does strike me funny as that Dave Heil is here and
> posting, I hope this is not the same Dave Heil that builds the microphones.
> As this would be dissapointing to me. As I was hoping that you would have
> some very interesting tid bits posted here. Later all. I hope that does not
> offend anyone. But I would think that the news group would reflect the
> title. Chuck
>
>
>

--

Vernon Cole coleve@ida.net
Software Engineer 208.527.3000
Butte City, Idaho, USA

2801. Re: Newbie ham ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 22:09:51 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <PsTN7.137775$WW.8684917@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25848

I dunno. Haven't seen many babies around lately. Uh .. missed part of your message ... ummm bunch of baby's what?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message news:20011128235401.793$sT@newsreader.com...
> If I was interested in becoming a ham radio operator,this NG would turn me
> off from the idea real quick.
>
> This is the second or third time I've lurked here,and maybe the last.
>
> What a bunch of baby's.
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

2802. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-11-30 23:31:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnmr2zb.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25849

On 29 Nov 2001 23:13:45 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> To date this practice, they had lots of Gonset Gooney-Birds for us
>> 2-meter guys who needed a portable or mobile rig over a long
>> weekend. (Late 1950s)
>>
>>
>Gooney BOXES, Benton Harbor LUNCHBOXES . . sheesh awready . .

Weren't the Benton Harbor LunchBoxes products of Heath?

I'm talking 1958......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2803. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 02:43:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0844a9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25850

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9u741o09fq@enews3.newsguy.com...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c070388_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > I have many "friends" who are married, and I consider
> > > their wives to be my friends as well, but I don't have private
meetings
> > > of any sort with them -- not that I haven't had "offers." Whether or
> > > not they respect their marriage vows, I do!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> > You make it sound as though an offer to have a meal or visit, Larry, was
> an
> > offer of sex. Good grief.
>
> It's probably wishful thinking on his part.
>
>

ROFLMAO!!! You're probably right...

Kim W5TIT

2804. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 02:46:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c084560_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25701

If Larry follows suit, here, I am going to find a later post that will bear out my suspicion that you've just been classically set up by Larry Roll, Rick. It's a tactic he uses many times.

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message news:612CFC363E9E59A0.656CA9210B7736F5.69A427005A845239@lp.airnews.net...
> On 30 Nov 2001 02:39:14 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >To use your own logic against you, why is defending Kim's
> >self-indulgent choice of a callsign *your* "business?" I'm not
> >questioning your right to do so, as you've questioned mine, I
> >just want to understand the reason.
>
> Fair question.
>
> My defense of Kim's sign is twofold. (1) It is a response to
> what I perceive to be a vicious and unprovoked attack on a fellow ham
> (which, of course, has nothing to do with ham radio as a motive for my
> action, only standing up for someone who is being attacked personally)
> and; (2) I seriously question the view that discussions of her call
> sign in terms of morality ARE legitimate discussion of radio policy in
> that they must, inevitably, be based on religious values of morality
> and regardless of how sincere the beliefs of the critic may be, the
> fact remains that if ham radio IS a public venue, by necessity
> religion MUST be excluded from it, as the alternative is the use of
> public resources to promote religion.
>
> We could, in fact, carry that concept further by
> asking--seriously, btw, not as a troll--if ANY attempt to promote
> religious values of any nature is appropriate in a Government
> regulated service, or rather such things as Christian and Jewish nets
> are, effectively, violations of the First Amendment in exactly the
> same way such activities would be violations in a public school (a
> college is different in that it specifically TEACHES about religion,
> and does not expose children to the teaching--but a college, likewise,
> is free to teach and discuss topics related to human sexuality and
> alternative lifestyles as well).
>
> Perhaps such activities ARE reasonable--but if so it would be
> equally reasonable for a group of Wiccans, Satanists, or Rastafarians
> (for example) to participate in similar nets and promote their moral
> and religious values in the same manner as Christians do now (after

> all, it would be a CLEAR violation of the Constitution if the FCC
> attempted to restrict the religious topics that could be discussed to
> those acceptable to Christians and Jews). On the other hand, such
> discussions could (and would) be far more threatening to a parent of a
> potential ham than Kim's call sign could possibly be.
>
> Comments?
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2805. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 02:48:14 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0845aa$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25702

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:19A455C0471C42D4.E6227F76046D03AD.4ED29ED6775BB512@lp.airnews.net...
>
> If this thread was normally "on topic" his complaint would
> make sense. But since this is the official "Thread That Wandereth
> Forever in the Forest of Confusion" it's hardly a valid complaint. It
> IS, however, a clear indication that he is losing his arguments and
> thus wants to shut the discussion down while seeming not to be doing
> so from a position of weakness or defeat.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

BINGO....

Kim W5TIT

2806. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:00:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c084890_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25703

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C071EF0.C57F8302@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C04651B.53E50C59@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C0319DC.4EA73CD4@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I know of no woman who refers to her tops as
> > > > > > breasts or mammaries. We all call them tits. We call all you
guys'
> > > > > > thangs dicks.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Tits serve two purposes. They can nurse babies or men, or woman
if
> > > > > > the owner of the tits is prone to that persuasion. We have to
cover
> > > > > > our tits and you men have to cover your dicks.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I call my tits tits and always have. I call my, well....never
mind.
> > > >
> > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > >
> > > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > > >
> > > > > ...and that's just part of the reason I refer to the woman as
Tugboat
> > > > > Annie.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > * The view expressed is my personal opinion.
> > > >
> > > > Then consider that most women are tacky and lack class and decorum.
> > Forgive
> > > > > me for no desire to live up to either of the latter.
> > >
> > > That is not the conclusion I draw at all. I don't know many women who
> > > would verbalize or write the type of thing you've written here. My
> > > comment wasn't directed at "other" women. It is written about your

> > > actions. My wife, mother, sister, next door neighbor, girl across the
> > > road don't speak like that. I consider it coarse and vulgar. I can
see
> > > material like yours written on restroom walls at service stations. I
> > > don't much care for it there either.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I am of the female persuasion, Dave. Have been all my life. Are you
going
> > to tell me that you are more experienced at being a woman than I am? I
have
> > been in the Dressing Rooms with women, the locker rooms with women, the
> > restrooms with women, and so it goes. I am here to tell you that, yes
there
> > are women who are as you perceive your wife, mother, sister, next door
> > neighbor, etc. I am also here to tell you that you'd be quite, quite
> > surprised at the behaviors of many women you think you know, when in the
> > company of women only. I choose to be real wherever I am.
>
> Just to be certain, I asked my wife. Not only does she not use the
> language you earlier ascribed to all women and later to most women. She
> assures me that that *she* has never heard my mother, my sister, the
> neighbors or any of her friends use such language in an "all woman"
> situation.
>
> I believe you are "real" --that to you, there is no time when it seems
> improper to be coarse. You've used the terms here in a mostly male
> group. I guess that makes you "real".
>
> > I also choose that people like you, who are besmirched by behaviors like
> > mine are as unimportant to me as I am to you. So, we are even, and we
both
> > understand each other.
>
> What you do as a radio amateur IS important to me. If my views are
> unimportant to you, I'm surprised you'd even bother to respond.
>
> Dave K8MN

To get under your skin, Dave. To get under your skin. *If* you are so
smart, then why haven't you figured that out? This newsgroup is about
nothing to me but taking out a day's frustrations, and I actually enjoy the
exchanges--though I'd be abhorrent to have to deal with you on a personal
level of any kind each day... But, here in the newsgroup where *I* am in
control of whether I "deal" with you or not, I can handle it.

Not to say that my opinions expressed here are not real. They certainly
are. For instance, your profession that your wife says she's never heard
women talk that way. I was raised upper middle class, lived in gorgeous
homes all my childhood and teen life; married young (19) a guy from "south"

of the tracks, lived on welfare with him for as long as I had to until I ran as fast as I could away from him, lived on welfare again, more in between and I now make the middle-class income by myself and with my husband we are upper middle class, or near enough to count. I have met women such as your wife and some, but few, have been "real." I have met women who address things "real" as I call it, and more are real. By real, I mean I am not absorbed with makeup, tee hees, and giggles all day, nor do I wish to have a most boring discussion about the failure of my man to please me, or the pinings of motherhood promises gone undone. I much more enjoy a discussion about things such as get discussed in this newsgroup, and frequently cut through the bullshit. It's not my job to impress you, nor to make you judge me as a "decent" person. But, I guarantee you that you have met the real, genuine, Kim Walker. Not to say your wife isn't real--but if she is, she is in the minority of women at her level. I am with the majority of women at my level. To me, and I am all that counts, my "behavior" is not offensive at all. How much can one loathe the truth? I don't know. I suppose as much as you loathe me...because at a minimum I am truthful, with myself and with anyone/everyone else.

Kim W5TIT

2807. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:14:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C084ABC.D93D0E7D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25704

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > That poses an interesting question. Will the state of Texas issue
> > > Kim a set of "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"? If
> > > so, seems your morality argument goes straight out the window.
> > > Kim, I've got a spare application. Do you want it?
> >
> > Most states won't issue a vanity call with anything suggestive in it.
> > Good luck on your quest.
>
> Ah, but Texas "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"
> are based on FCC issued callsigns. I suspect they would have
> no choice except to issue Kim's ham callsign plates since the
> feds apparently don't see anything wrong with it.

That sounds right. Then it becomes a local problem for folks down there
to deal with.

Dave K8MN

2808. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:16:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C084B2B.61A4B3AD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25705

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Look back at my statement. See the word "suffix". Did you address
> > "suffix"?
>
> A callsign suffix doesn't matter. It is just three letters, not a word.
> What you choose to make of it is all in your mind.

I wrote "suffix" and I maintain that it does matter.

> > You could probably find something dirty in your social security number.
> > It is simply your nature.
>
> My social security number does contain three sixes. :-) I might
> be "The Beast".

Probably just "a beast".

Dave K8MN

2809. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:21:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c084d88_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25706

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C07204E.1DCDEF3A@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C0465CC.1897A3BF@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Kim, I know it may be difficult for you to digest but I don't talk
like
> > > that on the air or in public. Let's just say that you and I don't
hang
> > > with the same type crowd.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Not difficult at all for me to digest that, Dave. In fact, I don't know
why
> > you felt the impulse or need to tell me--it's a given. One thing's for
> > sure. I can hang with any type crowd much easier and more comfortably
than
> > you can, obviously. *That's* the difference between us. Know what
gives me
> > the ability to be more flexible than you?
>
> I don't happen to believe that it is true, Kim. I doubt that you'd feel
> very comfortable using the language which makes you "real" all the time
> if you were in the company of people I associate with.
>

Dave, for goodness sake. I wouldn't be free and open in an inappropriate
environment. And, before you go off on a tirade, I don't consider the ham
radio venue as the improper venue. Sorry, but I don't and you're not going
to convince me otherwise. However, even at a black tie dinner party there
would be a certain air of realism about me. I would have no problem telling
a stuffed shirt he is just that--but in a very, very nice way. (But, I
would walk away in grace and hope he'd just let his crystal wine glass drop
to the floor). And, the only person I would hope to do that with would be a
callous bastard, or wimpy bitch.

>
> I'm certain that
> you could use shock value to get some attention but I don't think it
> would be the kind of attention you would appreciate.
>

I don't need attention, Dave. You don't seem to understand that. And, shock value. I am not so sure that I use "shock value" as you probably view it in the traditional sense. Here's an example, let's get back to the black tie dinner party. I am making rounds, wearing my fake smile and nodding at everyone, doing the usual perfunctory hellos and how-are-yous. Once the obligatory round is done, I seek out and find a somewhat charming discussion where men and women are politely picking on each other and what it really sums up to is they are all perfectly miserable with each other and none has the guts or wonder to confront their "loved ones" with their "real" feelings. You can be sure that before I left the group--after having made several comments about conflict resolution and well it works, mind you--I'd pick the most miserable woman of the group, or maybe even man, and whisper something like this in their ear as I walked away:

"You are one huge chicken shit of a human and until you can learn to deal with your own failures, how can you expect your spouse to live up to and fix theirs?" Ask me if I care that they would from then on have a pretty shitty opinion of me. You think I am going to care that someone like that doesn't like me????!!!! Give me a break! I've hardly got enough time for my own problems, I don't need theirs, also. AND, what *IF* the truth I just spoke in their ear gets them to thinking and they either make a committment to fixing themselves and their marriage, or they live up to the responsibility of ending what is a useless venture?

Shock value? I don't think so...because I am not doing it to shock anyone. Shock value would be if I said that out loud to someone as I walked away, and I would not embarrass my hosts like that.

>
> This is the first attempt I've seen to portray the tendency use coarse
> language as some kind of virtue.
>
> Dave K8MN

Well, call it what you will. I consider the truth a virtue. Now, am I going to use the word "fuck" on the air? Hardly. A) I think it would be quite illegal. B) I think that is rather direct and much too open. C) A child may be listening. The *WORD* fuck leaves nothing to translation. What is, is. Yet, the callsign W5TIT, said as such (and it is), never used as name (and it is not), and never open for "fun" discussion on the air (I will not respond to conversation on the air about it--I won't even transmit); then a child is quite safe. As I've said in the past, if a child "picks up" on the TIT in my callsign and finds it vulgar, it is not I who taught that child to think that way.

Remember the character that Julia Roberts played in the movie with Richard Gere...her character is truly remarkable in my opinion. Dharma? Of Dharma and Greg? Another one I identify with. Rosanne's character on her show? Yep, another one. Mimi, from the Drew Carey show? Yep, another one. And, certainly the character in Julia Roberts' movie, Erin Brokovich(sp). I consider the reality that all of those characters play refreshing and meet people like that all the time that I instantly like. There's always room and time for the stuffed-shirt lifestyle. Me? I'd rather buy a $6,000.00

coffee table *just* to put my feet up on it. :)

Kim W5TIT

2810. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:26:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c084e9f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25707

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0721B5.8452661E@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C046687.3F5C3C56@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C03AEB0.80A5178E@earthlink.net...
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > > > > > of Duncanville, TX.
> > > > >
> > > > > Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> > > > > I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in
the
> > > > > manner Tugboat did.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > And, I submit that *you* are the one with the mind who deciphered my
> > > > message--all with nothing but mere inuendo from me. Who is it,
exactly,
> > > > with no class?
> > >
> > > Right, Kim. You not only provided the call, you provided the
innuendo.
> > > I'll bet Mr. Olsen doesn't do that with his call. You did the same in
> > > the selection of your vanity call.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Once again, is there an echo online? I think I state above that I
provided
> > the innuendo. It is you, apparently, that picked up on it, Dave. Did
you
```

> > pick up on it for the sheer misery of it, or did you enjoy it just a
little?
> > Surely, you don't relish misery, do you?
>
> It must be quite difficult for you to understand that I am not a monk
> nor do I live in a vacuum. Sure, I picked up on it (even though it
> doesn't spell anything). It didn't make me miserable. I did not enjoy
> it. I just felt it was as lacking in decorum as your choice of calls.
>
> I do feel kind of sorry for you though.
>
> Dave K8MN

I don't know why you'd spend the time "feeling sorry" for someone you don't even know. You do enjoy misery. At least a little. OH, here's one for ya. I imagine you as a proper and stuffed shirt sort of guy. Not too much on the stuffed shirt, but you're probably more impressed with a good wine as opposed to me who would be impressed with a bowl that allows a good slurp from the edge of it. You feel sorry for me, and I'll feel sorry for you. Because see, to each of us the other emulates a life that we'd find loathsome ourselves! Yeah, I feel sorry for you, too. How's that?

Kim W5TIT

Kim W5TIT

2811. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:28:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c084f24_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25708

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C072481.731E82C0@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > There aren't any trashy callsigns either, Dave. The trash is all
> > > > in your mind.
> > >
> > > ...and we strongly disagree on the point about the callsign.
> >
> > The callsign enters your input system as five alpha-numeric characters
> > devoid of trash. You convert it into trash internally within your value
> > system. That's your problem, Dave, not Kim's.
>
> The callsign suffix *spells* a coarse term for a portion of female
> anatomy. No one has a problem with calls like W6RCA or W5DXP.
> Oh--I forgot. You already knew that.
>
> Dave K8MN

<BIG EVIL GRIN> I think the callsign has the affect that one realizes
they've thought up something "dirty" or "forbidden" and just don't want to
accept the responsibility themselves. Ever think that might be a little bit
of motivation for the callsign, too? Hmmmm???

Kim W5TIT

2812. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:38:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c085164_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25709

I'm having way too much fun with all the topics and I only have to look up one thread...

My vote is it stays... I also acknowledge that this usually happens when a thread runs long. "We" also have a habit of completely being off topic from a posted thread header within a few posts of its creation.

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message news:0FD2DED227008DE7.84F4938B7AFC6508.DD4EAC1A4BE5605E@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 07:10:09 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > Dave is not at all like that, Rick. Based on the messages I've read
> >over the last year or two, Dave seems like a fairly intelligent
> >person, with viewpoints that often span the entire political spectrum
> >(from conservative to liberal). In other words, because you're basing
> >your opinion of him on what he has said about just a couple of issues,
> >your characterization of him above is not at all accurate. Why don't
> >you wait until you get to know him a little better before you start
> >relating him to Hitler (and the other nonsense you said in your message).
>
> Dwight, when I entered this thread (because I honestly
> felt--and still feel--that what Dick, Larry, Dave, and a few others
> were doing with respect to Kim was wrong, vicious, cruel, and
> completely at odds with the very arguments they were making about
> giving a bad impression of ham radio) I did so politely. I didn't come
> in calling Dick an idiot, Dave a radical and a fool, or Larry a loser.
> I stated a position in opposition to their own that was no more an
> attack on them personally than is my reply to you right now. What I
> was greeted with wasn't open and respectful discussion, it was
> insults, put downs, and innuendos that I has an ulterior (read sexual)
> motive in defending Kim's choice (which I didn't--and still
> don't--find offensive).
>
> If I have a bad impression of Dave it's because he has given
> me that impression in this thread. I can only base an opinion on
> evidence, and the evidence I've seen is that the people I named above
> have no desire to discuss this--or any other controversial topic--in a
> way that demonstrates respect for those who disagree with them. That
> being the case, I've been quite willing to respond in kind.
>
> I agree that this has become ridiculous--but at the same time
> the only reason the thread is continuing is because Larry Roll has

> specifically insisted that it WILL continue until Kim is forced to
> change her sign--and his attacks on her integrity and morality are
> supported by the others I named above.
>
> I'm perfectly willing to let the thread drop and more useful
> discussions take place--and I believe it would benefit
> everyone--particularly the potential hams who may be reading it--if
> that occurred. But it will only occur if that group of people agree to
> disagree with those of us who don't share their views, and to let the
> matter drop themselves.
>
> Comments?
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2813. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:46:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C085204.72DA5B20@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25710

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C071EF0.C57F8302@earthlink.net...

> > What you do as a radio amateur IS important to me. If my views are
> > unimportant to you, I'm surprised you'd even bother to respond.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> To get under your skin, Dave. To get under your skin.

Well, there we have it.

> *If* you are so
> smart, then why haven't you figured that out? This newsgroup is about
> nothing to me but taking out a day's frustrations, and I actually enjoy the
> exchanges--though I'd be abhorrent to have to deal with you on a personal
> level of any kind each day... But, here in the newsgroup where *I* am in
> control of whether I "deal" with you or not, I can handle it.
>
> Not to say that my opinions expressed here are not real. They certainly
> are. For instance, your profession that your wife says she's never heard
> women talk that way. I was raised upper middle class, lived in gorgeous
> homes all my childhood and teen life; married young (19) a guy from "south"
> of the tracks, lived on welfare with him for as long as I had to until I ran
> as fast as I could away from him, lived on welfare again, more in between
> and I now make the middle-class income by myself and with my husband we are
> upper middle class, or near enough to count. I have met women such as your
> wife and some, but few, have been "real." I have met women who address
> things "real" as I call it, and more are real. By real, I mean I am not
> absorbed with makeup, tee hees, and giggles all day, nor do I wish to have a
> most boring discussion about the failure of my man to please me, or the
> pinings of motherhood promises gone undone.

I can assure you that my wife is very "real". She just doesn't see the
necessity of being as base as she can be. She never swore or used off
color humor in Finnish and doesn't swear or use off color humor in
English. You indicate you've met women like my wife. Other than the
fact that she is Finnish and doesn't use coarse language, you don't know
a thing about her. Given that, your comment about very few of "them"
being real is kind of silly.

My mother and sister are "real" too. The neighbors are straight forward
and comfortable as a favorite flannel shirt to be around. One is a
church goer. One is not.

> I much more enjoy a discussion
> about things such as get discussed in this newsgroup, and frequently
> cut through the bullshit.

That's earthy. I can see why you'd rather be here discussing
important things rather than chat about the faiure of your man to
please you.

> It's not my job to impress you, nor to make you judge
> me as a "decent" person.

Your job? No I don't think that's your job. I do think you have a
responsibility toward yourself so that others don't get the impression
that you are not a decent person.

> But, I guarantee you that you have met the real,
> genuine, Kim Walker.

I never doubted that for a moment.

> Not to say your wife isn't real--but if she is, she is
> in the minority of women at her level. I am with the majority of
> women at my level.

Then dare to be above the crowd, Kim.

> To me, and I am all that counts, my "behavior" is not offensive
> at all.

That is basically been the reason behind all of this. You are not all
that counts. While your choice of calls is not offensive to you, you
need to understand that it is offensive to some.

> How much can one loathe the truth? I don't know. I suppose
> as much as you loathe me...because at a minimum I am truthful, with
> myself and with anyone/everyone else.

I have never ever loathed you, Kim.

Dave K8MN

2814. Re: DID W4JYZ GET HIS DRUGS FROM TEW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:52:34 UTC
From: KT4TuRd <Drunk_Bobby@FakeAirplane.com>
Message-ID: <9u9k1m$mq9$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 25711
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ahhh Shuddup Youngblood!!!!! Belt down some vodka
and go babble about your fake airplane. How hard did you have
to beg Riley not to publish the sanctions he took on your license?

"af2yisbinladen" <hammer007@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:e299bafd.0111301715.39f81204@posting.google.com...
> Now wait a minute, something is going on, and JYZ is sounding sedated.
> Riley pops the goof with another warning and he comes on the air and
> denies any wrong doing. This "Goof", must be taking medication that he
> got from TEW, the "TAMPA TURD". Now I realize that Jimmy must have a
> lot of stuff in the medicine cabinet at this time and he could make a
> few quick bucks, but how did "Dumbass" play into the equation ????? I
> heard Dumbass a couple of weeks ago transmitting from the campgrounds
> in north Fla, but could he have worked out a drugs for mows deal with
> TEW????
> Now listen up all of you hams, W4NTI the Dumbass follower will soon
> make his entry, but just wait a minue Dan, does Donnie Dumbass have
> the MOH like Duane?Hammer

2815. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 03:58:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c085631$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25712

I think a lot of folks "do" newsgroups for the same reason that they go to a wrestling, boxing, or other sporting match, or even the races.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C075C0C.A5715739@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > On the contrary, it's actually
> > *doubled* activity. The newsgroups
> > now gets well over 100 posts a day.
> > A month or so ago it was only
> > getting about 30 to 50. (Unless
> > you're the type who prefers quality
> > over quantity.)
>
>
> The number of message varies greatly. Go back two or three months,
> and you'll see numbers similar to today. Whatever the case, I don't
> think the insults and stuff are responsible for any increased activity
> at this particular moment.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2816. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:09:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <00C2A8CEB4B59C71.4B06E529E40F165D.600D8A7B623AFA87@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25713

On 29 Nov 2001 05:17:11 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Somehow you and Cecil profess to "not get it" but I'm sure you do. I've
>made the point repeatedly. All those biblical "threats" are very ancient
>and have nothing whatever to do with modern Christian theology, theory
>nor particularly practice. Nowhere do you see Christians determined to
>kill all non-Christians, whatever history says about the Crusades, and
>ancient Jewish teachings aside.

Try: http://www.wcotc.com/index.shtml

>Islam is definitely the religion of the
>Islamic Jihad Terrorists, the true numbers of which we can only guess,
>but we KNOW that there are many, and that a considerable number have
>infiltrated our societey within the USA.

We know this HOW, Dick?

Through evidence (cite it)?

Through research (cite it)?

Through the Dick Carroll ouija board school of knowledge?

What is the SOURCE of this "revelation" Dick? Where can Cecil
and I go to verify these claims that offers a legitimate source for
it's data? If the claims are true, it should be easy to confirm it. If
not, well that's YOUR problem, not ours.

>You may ignore all this as you
>wish, but don't decieve yourself - if you happen to be in circumstances
>where you are a part of a targeted entity, you die too, regardless of
>your support to their cause. They don't hesitate to kill their own kind
>in their zeal, it's considered a small necessary cost. You would give
>them no pause whateveer.

Dick I live about 60 miles from the largest Islamic community
in the United States (Dearborn, MI) and I have no fear at all of going
there for dinner with my family.

Is it REALLY that hard for you to accept that--like ALL major
religions--the focus of Islam is on peace, not violence? Sure, there
are a few fanatics--as you can see from the site I provided the url
for above, there are a number of them in Christianity as well. But a
few people do NOT make up the majority of a people--as you seem to
insist they do.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2817. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:11:57 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B03D250C6E02A3E2.E7F6462BC33BC54F.984E55F0B422449E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25714

On 29 Nov 2001 05:27:29 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> As you should know, that is largely a health issue, the Jewish practice
>aside.

>There are studies which show that the wives of uncircumcised men
>experience a higher rate of cervical cancer, and other studies show an
>elevated rate of penile cancer in uncircumcised men.

Relax, Dick. I'm cut. Your great-grand daughters are safe.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2818. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:13:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7464ED77FB9AD7C8.F4CA736A411CB9CC.8D31CE1E07A218C7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25715

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 05:58:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>You forget that many of these kids aren't old enough to give legal
>consent.

Then they can't get the piercing or tattooing done. If you are
under age, a parent or guardian MUST consent to any such invasive
procedure or the business that conducts it is liable.

And if the parent DOES consent, it's no one else's concern but
that of the family involved.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2819. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:14:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <FE3652CA7AA41D1A.68CB34725BC3BA20.F05C30877CEBF7AD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25716

On 29 Nov 2001 05:30:10 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> I would have wagered LARGE on it!

That I would have a 3/4 carat diamond earring that was the
mate to the diamond in my wife's engagement ring?

Are you claiming to be psychic?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2820. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:15:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c085a2e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25718

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C07730C.CDB72B2C@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > You make it sound as though an offer
> > to have a meal or visit, Larry, was
> > an offer of sex. Good grief.
>
>
> That brings up an interesting issue, Kim. Several years ago, a
> television personality (name long forgotten) raised the premise that a
> male and female cannot be friends without the issue of sex entering
> their minds. In other words, any person who is friends with a member
> of the opposite sex is sexually attracted to that person. What do you
> think, Kim? Can a man truly be friends (not a co-worker, associate, or
> an aquantance - a friend) with a woman without ever having thoughts
> about sex? Can a woman? What about your male friends? Can you honestly
> say they've never had sexual thoughts about you? Can you honestly say
> that you've never had sexual thoughts about them?
>
> To answer my own question (it's not fair to ask a question like this
> without being willing to answer it also), I think such a relationship
> is possible, but it is extremely rare. Most people who have friends of
> the opposite sex are sexually attracted to them.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Let me first say that I am truly not dodging the question. I am just going to give two different measurements of friendship.

Overall, yes, I believe that women and men can be friends without having sex. Note that I said without having sex. There will be few encounters with the opposite sex in which "sex" does not enter the minds of either--and a true friendship is capable of exploring that those thoughts and feelings are there. And, a true friendship will suffer through that (because it is strictly temporary) and get on to the real business of being friends.

Now, the situation which brings this whole topic up--that of Rick and I getting together at a Starbucks (I think it was) and Larry R. having such a vehement opposition to it (although I don't think he really did--half of the reactions Larry feels toward me any more are those that he feels he must live up to...if you understand what I am saying). Anyway, that two people

such as Rick and I, or you and I, or whomever and I, could get together for coffee and conversation and have sex never enter our minds? I think that's entirely possible. It happens on my behalf lots and lots. There's several male hams I know and would consider at least acquaintances--and maybe even some as friends. But, sex? Nope, haven't given it even a first thought--let alone a second or third.

There is one man I am very, very good friends with. He happens to be my teen-age sweetheart and we actually had "toyed" around with the idea of getting married. But, we parted ways, and met up years later again as friends and are to this day. Last time I talked to him? Hmmmm, about four years ago and that was the first time in about 7-8 years. BUT, let something happen and I need him; all I gotta do is call. Same here for me to him. Why are we that liberal with our willingness to help each other? Because neither of us would ever abuse it, and neither of us will probably ever need *that much* help, where we'd feel the need to call.

I don't think there's anything wrong at all with "feeling" desirable, or with fantasizing about other people. I think it's quite healthy--and have been in situations where that part of a friendship is discussed, dealt with, and allowed to "go away" (because it will). I would think my husband was extremely weird if he told me that he only ever looks at me and doesn't feel a thing about other women. I also trust him not to act on his emotions--we have a monogamous relationship; though not a possessive or jealous one. <GIGGLE> Actually, his greatest dream is for me to bring him home another girl someday...a dream I eternally remind him will never happen :)

Yep, friendships--*real* friendships--between men and women get past the distractions of sex. I wouldn't be in the company of a man I did not trust. And, if I find myself having misjudged a man, I trust myself implicitly. I love and honor my husband far too much to let the distractions of a climax overrule the many years of trust and adoration we have built with each other. And, if ya'd think about it...all sex is, is a good climax. A few seconds here and there aren't worth a lifetime of commitment.

Kim W5TIT

2821. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:17:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0859C8.68454D49@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25717

Dave Heil wrote:
> That sounds right. Then it becomes a local problem for folks down there
> to deal with.

Problem? One of the favorite songs around here is,
"Oh $hit, Would You Look At Them Tits". This is
C&W Honky Tonk country, Dave, at least down toward
Houston. One of my favorite C&W places has topless
waitresses.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2822. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:20:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c085b58_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25720

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C078CDC.87A3EBFB@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Kim's call is an amateur radio call, not a vanity automobile tag (now
> > THERE is an ugly idea). It has plenty to do with amateur radio.
>
> That poses an interesting question. Will the state of Texas issue
> Kim a set of "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"? If
> so, seems your morality argument goes straight out the window.
> Kim, I've got a spare application. Do you want it?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I've never had the W5TIT tags, though I'll be applying for them for my new truck. I just picked the tags (regular) up today, and don't know if I'll end up waiting until next year or will do it sooner.

I'll let you know how it comes out. I had KC5HQJ tags on my Golf. I like having the amateur radio tags for the reason that most rural cops have gotten the idea of who "we" are and won't try to shoo us from a good spotting location because they think we're some creep who's going to burglarize a place because we're parked near it. :) By the same token, the magnetic signs or stickers (Skywarn) work for that as well.

Kim W5TIT

2823. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:21:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C085ABA.EB0A4D9A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25719

Dave Heil wrote:
> I wrote "suffix" and I maintain that it does matter.

Maintain whatever makes you happy, Dave. In reality, Kim's callsign
is like a fart in a hurricane, not like a turd in the punchbowl.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2824. Re: "...one step closer to trash"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:27:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c085ce0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25724

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:0615cf25296d75ca34bf1feea8bff690.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>
> >
> > This is entirely about the effect of Kim's tasteless choice in a
callsign
> > upon the image of the ARS.
> >
>
> Larry,
>
> Most of us have pretty much agreed that Kim's choice of call is trashy.
> We've also pretty much agreed that she probably isn't going to change
> it. Thus this becomes a dead horse being uselessly beaten, and has the
> additional negative effect of giving continued free visibility and
> recognition to Mrs. Walkers piece of tastelessness. Perhaps only W5CAW
> can influence her to discard the thing.
>

W5CAW was the most instrumental in goading me to get the callsign. :)

> Meanwhile, you need to speak to the FCC about two of my neighbors, N0OKY
> and KB0OBS.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Kim W5TIT

2825. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:28:59 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DC841BA7789E9FFA.C6DA076A1010BABF.EE44EE5ECD101D0D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25721

On 30 Nov 2001 01:05:36 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>My sexual identity is not at issue here. I'm a heterosexual, and cannot
>conceive of being anything else. I know this offends your liberal values,
>but that's the way it is.

It doesn't offend me at all, Larry--because it makes my point
exactly. You are heterosexual (or state yourself to be, the only
evidence I have to go by). You are convinced (and RIGHT) that you
couldn't be "recruited" to be a homosexual.

Why on earth would you believe that anyone else could be?

>Very well. In that case, why do books like "Heather Has Two Mommies"
>exist in our public schools?

For the same reason that books dealing with African-American
families, Hispanic families, or Asian families are in those schools,
Larry, because they represent families in the community.

There are over 2,000,000 children being raised in gay/lesbian
households in the US right now (and, no, they do NOT have a higher
likelihood of being gay than their peers raised in straight
households, research has already confirmed that), don't those children
have the right to be recognized as coming from happy households, too?

>I'm not claiming to be working your side of the street, Rick. I am just
>reacting to what I've heard and read about the topic, and drawing my
>own logical conclusions. Why would there be a book like "Heather
>Has Two Mommies" unless someone with an agenda to normalize and
>lend an aura of acceptability to homosexual behavior wanted young
>children to be exposed to this concept? In other words, why are
>homosexuals attempting to "recruit" young people to their lifestyle?

Larry, how can you possibly equate "recruit" with "inform?"

I don't care what your personal opinion is, the fact is that
from any scientific perspective you care to identify, homosexuality IS
normal. You don't have to "normalize" it any more than you have to
"normalize" being an African-American. It happens to _already_ be
completely normal.

The book isn't looking for the chance to "recruit"
people--it's looking for ACCEPTANCE and TOLERANCE from people. I'm
sorry you can't accept this concept as valid--but most people can.

There is no "Homosexual Agenda" Larry. It's a figment in the
mind of right wing extremists who can't stand the thought that others
have rights too.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2826. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:29:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c085d77$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25725

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C07C66B.1B652AAD@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Kim's call is an amateur radio call, not a vanity automobile tag (now
> > > THERE is an ugly idea). It has plenty to do with amateur radio.
> >
> > That poses an interesting question. Will the state of Texas issue
> > Kim a set of "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"? If
> > so, seems your morality argument goes straight out the window.
> > Kim, I've got a spare application. Do you want it?
>
> Most states won't issue a vanity call with anything suggestive in it.
> Good luck on your quest.
>
> Dave K8MN

You mean a vanity "tag" or a vanity call. Your statement is that most
states won't issue a vanity call. I am just wondering what other calls
you're aware of that were not issued plates.

Kim W5TIT

2827. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:29:50 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c085c41.3337778@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 25722

On 30 Nov 2001 02:39:13 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <18WM7.104$9d.19434@newshog.newsread.com>, "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net>
>writes:
>
>>Is it legal to rent or lease ham gear? I was wondering about this one, say
>>for instance, here in Michigan we have places called Rental King,
>>Rent-a-Center etc. Not that we would want to have ham gear rented at a
>>location like that, but if there were places that you could rent or lease
>>equipment, in the short term, that may seem like a more feasable option for
>>some who clearly cannot afford one of those way-overpriced, multi-band,
>>do-everything rigs. (Between those and the "kit" radios, there is not much
>>inbetween)
>>
>>Also, would it be legal to rent someone elses station? Since the FCC license
>>does not state what gear you are operating, only that YOU are licensed, is
>>this a loophole?
>>
>>Don't mean to start any arguments, just an honest question, looking for
>>intelligent answers.
>
>Ryan:
>
>I can't see any legal problem with "renting" ham radio gear, aside from
>the issue of taking steps to ensure that only licensed amateurs get to
>do so.

Yet there's no requirement that one can or should ONLY
rent (or sell) ham gear to licensed hams.

>However, it would seem to be impractical from a purely
>financial standpoint.

Probably true.

>The money spent on rental fees would be better
>used to save up for the purchase of equipment. If all you want to do
>is try out a top-of-the-line rig for a week or two, then "renting" would
>be OK as a one-time or occasional practice.
>
>Some hams rent out their vacation properties, equipped with contest-
>capable ham radio stations, for visiting hams looking for a DXpedition
>opportunity. There's obviously nothing wrong with it, as long as it's
>right for you and your checkbook!

Agree too.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2828. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:31:13 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <995C65F72365ACC2.2B83748EA4C17B8C.228A1AF98D02AA74@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25723

>As a matter of fact, she did! How did you know?

He asked your sister. She said it happened once.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2829. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:39:54 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c085d7c.3652520@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 25726

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 06:56:59 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> I've noticed the discussions in this newsgroup are getting really
>nasty lately (personal insults, name calling, ridicule, harassment,
>pettiness, and so forth). Is this what we really want? One of the best
>aspects of this newsgroup has always been that the long-time members
>have always tried to keep the discussions on a relatively decent
>level. In other words, while we might argue, and even argue
>fanatically, most have tended to back off before things got too
>personal. But, lately, some of the messages here have turned into
>nothing more than an insult-fest. Please, before you post that nasty
>little message, with the hateful little comments, think about the
>effect you're having on this newsgroup and it's members. If this keeps
>up, this newsgroups will degrade into something none of us will want
>to participate in.
>
> I'm especially asking the long-time members (Rick, Cecil, Dave, Kim,
>Larry, Richard, Jim, Bill, Bob, Phil, and others) to back me up on
>this. Lets all (and that includes me - I'm not completely innocent
>here) watch our own messages and politely remind others to do the same
>when they get carried away. Thanks.
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight,

Well said. I read the group almost daily but haven't
seen any reason to chime into most threads for the very
reason you mention. While the newsgroup itself had
a primary motivation of taking the code debate out
of the .misc newsgroup, that is pretty much no longer
an issue. Except for the "wait", the code test will (IMHO)
be gone by the end of 2003. It is just a waiting period
until WRC 2003 does its thing.

With the code debate over for all practical purposes,
the newsgroup would be great if it did get into true
policy discussions (zoning restrictions, bandplans, or whatever)
rather than the inane rantings that have constituted most
of the posting for quite some time now.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2830. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:49:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c086218_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25727

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C085204.72DA5B20@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
>
> I can assure you that my wife is very "real". She just doesn't see the
> necessity of being as base as she can be. She never swore or used off
> color humor in Finnish and doesn't swear or use off color humor in
> English. You indicate you've met women like my wife. Other than the
> fact that she is Finnish and doesn't use coarse language, you don't know
> a thing about her. Given that, your comment about very few of "them"
> being real is kind of silly.
>
> My mother and sister are "real" too. The neighbors are straight forward
> and comfortable as a favorite flannel shirt to be around. One is a
> church goer. One is not.
>

Dave, your idea of real, and my idea of real are probably two or three
entirely different ideas.

> > I much more enjoy a discussion
> > about things such as get discussed in this newsgroup, and frequently
> > cut through the bullshit.
>
> That's earthy. I can see why you'd rather be here discussing
> *important* things rather than chat about the faiure of your man to
> please you.
>

One of the reasons I loathe discussions with women is it seems they
inherrently complain about husbands and children. I have few complaints
about either, and consider it whining to express it to other women who
certainly have no power to change the situation for the one complaining.

> > It's not my job to impress you, nor to make you judge
> > me as a "decent" person.
>
> Your job? No I don't think that's your job. I do think you have a
> responsibility toward yourself so that others don't get the impression
> that you are not a decent person.
>

Dave. I don't seek the approval of a mass majority. I am quite comfortable
with myself. I have the few friends I seek, I have the fun in life I seek.
Tell me what rewards I would have by "general acceptance of a mass

majority."

> > But, I guarantee you that you have met the real,
> > genuine, Kim Walker.
>
> I never doubted that for a moment.
>

Good.

> > Not to say your wife isn't real--but if she is, she is
> > in the minority of women at her level. I am with the majority of
> > women at my level.
>
> Then dare to be above the crowd, Kim.
>

That is apparently *your* game, Dave. It is not mine. Or, looking at it another way...perhaps I consider myself above the crowd. It's just that your "lower" crowd and my "lower" crowd may be measured differently.

> > To me, and I am all that counts, my "behavior" is not offensive
> > at all.
>
> That is basically been the reason behind all of this. You are not all
> that counts. While your choice of calls is not offensive to you, you
> need to understand that it is offensive to some.
>

I understand it and acknowledge it. I even accept it. But, you are wrong that I am all that counts. I am all that counts. From my perspective, this is my world. From your perspective, this is your world. The hope is that the two meet somewhere in the middle, and yield to each other if they do not. That my call is offensive to *some* (the operative word there, by the way) is their problem to deal with, not mine. Not a philosophy you share? It's *still* my world, Dave.

> > How much can one loathe the truth? I don't know. I suppose
> > as much as you loathe me...because at a minimum I am truthful, with
> > myself and with anyone/everyone else.
>
> I have never ever loathed you, Kim.
>
> Dave K8MN

Really. I am surprised.

Kim W5TIT

2831. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 04:56:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0863d3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25728

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3c085d7c.3652520@news.mindspring.com...
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 06:56:59 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > I've noticed the discussions in this newsgroup are getting really
> >nasty lately (personal insults, name calling, ridicule, harassment,
> >pettiness, and so forth). Is this what we really want? One of the best
> >aspects of this newsgroup has always been that the long-time members
> >have always tried to keep the discussions on a relatively decent
> >level.

I missed this from this evening's download, so I respond to it now. Dwight,
you've noticed a different newsgroup than I have if the discussions here are
kept at a "relatively decent level."

>
> In other words, while we might argue, and even argue
> >fanatically, most have tended to back off before things got too
> >personal. But, lately, some of the messages here have turned into
> >nothing more than an insult-fest. Please, before you post that nasty
> >little message, with the hateful little comments, think about the
> >effect you're having on this newsgroup and it's members. If this keeps
> >up, this newsgroups will degrade into something none of us will want
> >to participate in.
> >
> > I'm especially asking the long-time members (Rick, Cecil, Dave, Kim,
> >Larry, Richard, Jim, Bill, Bob, Phil, and others) to back me up on
> >this. Lets all (and that includes me - I'm not completely innocent
> >here) watch our own messages and politely remind others to do the same
> >when they get carried away. Thanks.
> >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Dwight,
>

I am not sure what messages you read that have illicited the above reaction,
but I've pretty much seen nothing any different than normal when "heated"
discussions have been taking place. It could be that my eyes generally
glaze over when I get to the insults part and just scan for the points--so
I'm not especially aware of anything any more insulting than usual.

> Well said. I read the group almost daily but haven't
> seen any reason to chime into most threads for the very
> reason you mention. While the newsgroup itself had

> a primary motivation of taking the code debate out
> of the .misc newsgroup, that is pretty much no longer
> an issue. Except for the "wait", the code test will (IMHO)
> be gone by the end of 2003. It is just a waiting period
> until WRC 2003 does its thing.
>
> With the code debate over for all practical purposes,
> the newsgroup would be great if it did get into true
> policy discussions (zoning restrictions, bandplans, or whatever)
> rather than the inane rantings that have constituted most
> of the posting for quite some time now.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Then, for goodness sake, why not just start a thread up?! I just don't understand it when people start complaining about a thread in a newsgroup! START ANOTHER ONE! And, if you don't like a thread's topic(s), then DON'T READ IT.

Kim W5TIT

2832. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:04:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0864F0.777DF156@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25729

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C07204E.1DCDEF3A@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C0465CC.1897A3BF@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > Kim, I know it may be difficult for you to digest but I don't talk
> like
> > > > that on the air or in public. Let's just say that you and I don't
> hang
> > > > with the same type crowd.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > >
> > > Not difficult at all for me to digest that, Dave. In fact, I don't know
> why
> > > you felt the impulse or need to tell me--it's a given. One thing's for
> > > sure. I can hang with any type crowd much easier and more comfortably
> than
> > > you can, obviously. *That's* the difference between us. Know what
> gives me
> > > the ability to be more flexible than you?
> >
> > I don't happen to believe that it is true, Kim. I doubt that you'd feel
> > very comfortable using the language which makes you "real" all the time
> > if you were in the company of people I associate with.
> >
>
> Dave, for goodness sake. I wouldn't be free and open in an inappropriate
> environment. And, before you go off on a tirade, I don't consider the ham
> radio venue as the improper venue. Sorry, but I don't and you're not going
> to convince me otherwise. However, even at a black tie dinner party there
> would be a certain air of realism about me. I would have no problem telling
> a stuffed shirt he is just that--but in a very, very nice way. (But, I
> would walk away in grace and hope he'd just let his crystal wine glass drop
> to the floor). And, the only person I would hope to do that with would be a
> callous bastard, or wimpy bitch.
>
> >
> > I'm certain that
```

> > you could use shock value to get some attention but I don't think it
> > would be the kind of attention you would appreciate.
> >
>
> I don't need attention, Dave. You don't seem to understand that. And,
> shock value. I am not so sure that I use "shock value" as you probably view
> it in the traditional sense. Here's an example, let's get back to the black
> tie dinner party. I am making rounds, wearing my fake smile and nodding at
> everyone, doing the usual perfunctory hellos and how-are-yous. Once the
> obligatory round is done, I seek out and find a somewhat charming discussion
> where men and women are politely picking on each other and what it really
> sums up to is they are all perfectly miserable with each other and none has
> the guts or wonder to confront their "loved ones" with their "real"
> feelings. You can be sure that before I left the group--after having made
> several comments about conflict resolution and well it works, mind you--I'd
> pick the most miserable woman of the group, or maybe even man, and whisper
> something like this in their ear as I walked away:
>
> "You are one huge chicken shit of a human and until you can learn to deal
> with your own failures, how can you expect your spouse to live up to and fix
> theirs?" Ask me if I care that they would from then on have a pretty shitty
> opinion of me. You think I am going to care that someone like that doesn't
> like me????!!!! Give me a break! I've hardly got enough time for my own
> problems, I don't need theirs, also. AND, what *IF* the truth I just spoke
> in their ear gets them to thinking and they either make a committment to
> fixing themselves and their marriage, or they live up to the responsibility
> of ending what is a useless venture?
>
> Shock value? I don't think so...because I am not doing it to shock anyone.
> Shock value would be if I said that out loud to someone as I walked away,
> and I would not embarrass my hosts like that.
>
> >
> > This is the first attempt I've seen to portray the tendency use coarse
> > language as some kind of virtue.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Well, call it what you will. I consider the truth a virtue. Now, am I
> going to use the word "fuck" on the air? Hardly. A) I think it would be
> quite illegal. B) I think that is rather direct and much too open. C) A
> child may be listening. The *WORD* fuck leaves nothing to translation.
> What is, is. Yet, the callsign W5TIT, said as such (and it is), never used
> as name (and it is not), and never open for "fun" discussion on the air (I
> will not respond to conversation on the air about it--I won't even
> transmit); then a child is quite safe. As I've said in the past, if a child
> "picks up" on the TIT in my callsign and finds it vulgar, it is not I who
> taught that child to think that way.
>
> Remember the character that Julia Roberts played in the movie with Richard

> Gere...her character is truly remarkable in my opinion. Dharma? Of Dharma
> and Greg? Another one I identify with. Rosanne's character on her show?
> Yep, another one. Mimi, from the Drew Carey show? Yep, another one. And,
> certainly the character in Julia Roberts' movie, Erin Brokovich(sp). I
> consider the reality that all of those characters play refreshing and meet
> people like that all the time that I instantly like. There's always room
> and time for the stuffed-shirt lifestyle. Me? I'd rather buy a $6,000.00
> coffee table *just* to put my feet up on it. :)

Kim, now that you've explained your views, I've changed my mind.
I've decided that you just don't know any better.

By the way, those folks you identify with--they aren't real. They're
movie and television characters. This is real life.

Dave K8MN

2833. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:13:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0866EC.3067EF1A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25730

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C0721B5.8452661E@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C046687.3F5C3C56@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C03AEB0.80A5178E@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > > > > Just be glad I don't have the callsign W5PSY.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > This too is tacky and lacks class and decorum.*
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Uhhhhhh Dave, W5PSY was issued by the FCC to Mr. Olsen
> > > > > > > of Duncanville, TX.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Uhhhhh Cecil, I was referring to Kim's post, not Mr. Olsen's call.
> > > > > > I don't believe Mr. Olson has the anatomical parts to reference in
> the
> > > > > > manner Tugboat did.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > And, I submit that *you* are the one with the mind who deciphered my
> > > > > message--all with nothing but mere inuendo from me. Who is it,
> exactly,
> > > > > with no class?
> > > > >
> > > > Right, Kim. You not only provided the call, you provided the
> innuendo.
> > > > I'll bet Mr. Olsen doesn't do that with his call. You did the same in
> > > > the selection of your vanity call.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > >
> > > Once again, is there an echo online? I think I state above that I
> provided
```

> > > the innuendo. It is you, apparently, that picked up on it, Dave. Did
> you
> > > pick up on it for the sheer misery of it, or did you enjoy it just a
> little?
> > > Surely, you don't relish misery, do you?
> >
> > It must be quite difficult for you to understand that I am not a monk
> > nor do I live in a vacuum. Sure, I picked up on it (even though it
> > doesn't spell anything). It didn't make me miserable. I did not enjoy
> > it. I just felt it was as lacking in decorum as your choice of calls.
> >
> > I do feel kind of sorry for you though.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I don't know why you'd spend the time "feeling sorry" for someone you don't
> even know. You do enjoy misery. At least a little.

Naw Kim. If I'd wanted to be miserable I could have married someone
like you.

> OH, here's one for ya.
> I imagine you as a proper and stuffed shirt sort of guy. Not too much on
> the stuffed shirt, but you're probably more impressed with a good wine as
> opposed to me who would be impressed with a bowl that allows a good slurp
> from the edge of it.

You've got me wrong again, Kim. I didn't wear a tie at the office
unless some dignitary was arriving or unless I was *invited* to a
(mandatory) reception. Back here I'm a flannel shirt and sweat pants
guy unless I'm going into town. I usually skip the spats and top hat
though.

I do like a good wine but I buy what's on sale. I'll have to admit that
I've never slurped from a bowl in my life.

You feel sorry for me, and I'll feel sorry for you.
> Because see, to each of us the other emulates a life that we'd find
> loathsome ourselves! Yeah, I feel sorry for you, too. How's that?

I'm still trying to figure how we're each emulating a life that we would
find loathsome. I don't emulate your life. Are you actually attempting
to emulate mine?

You can feel sorry for me if you like. I don't mind.

Dave K8MN

2834. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:16:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0867B0.EB8B32E2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25731

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C072481.731E82C0@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > There aren't any trashy callsigns either, Dave. The trash is all
> > > > > in your mind.
> > > > >
> > > > ...and we strongly disagree on the point about the callsign.
> > >
> > > The callsign enters your input system as five alpha-numeric characters
> > > devoid of trash. You convert it into trash internally within your value
> > > system. That's your problem, Dave, not Kim's.
> >
> > The callsign suffix *spells* a coarse term for a portion of female
> > anatomy. No one has a problem with calls like W6RCA or W5DXP.
> > Oh--I forgot. You already knew that.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> <BIG EVIL GRIN> I think the callsign has the affect that one realizes
> they've thought up something "dirty" or "forbidden" and just don't want to
> accept the responsibility themselves. Ever think that might be a little bit
> of motivation for the callsign, too? Hmmmm???

Why would that be? It is *your* vanity call and *you* chose it.
I'd think most folks would just think the holder doesn't know the
difference between good taste and poor taste.

Dave K8MN
```

2835. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:17:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0867FC.57D708A1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25732

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I think a lot of folks "do" newsgroups for the same reason that they go to a
> wrestling, boxing, or other sporting match, or even the races.
>
> Kim W5TIT

For the blood and accidents?

Dave K8MN

2836. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:22:12 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0869c3_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25735

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0864F0.777DF156@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C07204E.1DCDEF3A@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C0465CC.1897A3BF@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim, I know it may be difficult for you to digest but I don't talk
> > like
> > > > > that on the air or in public. Let's just say that you and I don't
> > hang
> > > > > with the same type crowd.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > Not difficult at all for me to digest that, Dave. In fact, I don't
know
> > why
> > > > > you felt the impulse or need to tell me--it's a given. One thing's
for
> > > > > sure. I can hang with any type crowd much easier and more
comfortably
> > than
> > > > > you can, obviously. *That's* the difference between us. Know what
> > gives me
> > > > > the ability to be more flexible than you?
> > > >
> > > I don't happen to believe that it is true, Kim. I doubt that you'd
feel
> > > very comfortable using the language which makes you "real" all the
time
> > > if you were in the company of people I associate with.
> > >
> >
> > Dave, for goodness sake. I wouldn't be free and open in an
inappropriate
> > environment. And, before you go off on a tirade, I don't consider the
ham
> > radio venue as the improper venue. Sorry, but I don't and you're not
```

going
> > to convince me otherwise. However, even at a black tie dinner party
there
> > would be a certain air of realism about me. I would have no problem
telling
> > a stuffed shirt he is just that--but in a very, very nice way. (But, I
> > would walk away in grace and hope he'd just let his crystal wine glass
drop
> > to the floor). And, the only person I would hope to do that with would
be a
> > callous bastard, or wimpy bitch.
> >
> > >
> > > I'm certain that
> > > you could use shock value to get some attention but I don't think it
> > > would be the kind of attention you would appreciate.
> > >
> >
> > I don't need attention, Dave. You don't seem to understand that. And,
> > shock value. I am not so sure that I use "shock value" as you probably
view
> > it in the traditional sense. Here's an example, let's get back to the
black
> > tie dinner party. I am making rounds, wearing my fake smile and nodding
at
> > everyone, doing the usual perfunctory hellos and how-are-yous. Once the
> > obligatory round is done, I seek out and find a somewhat charming
discussion
> > where men and women are politely picking on each other and what it
really
> > sums up to is they are all perfectly miserable with each other and none
has
> > the guts or wonder to confront their "loved ones" with their "real"
> > feelings. You can be sure that before I left the group--after having
made
> > several comments about conflict resolution and well it works, mind
you--I'd
> > pick the most miserable woman of the group, or maybe even man, and
whisper
> > something like this in their ear as I walked away:
> >
> > "You are one huge chicken shit of a human and until you can learn to
deal
> > with your own failures, how can you expect your spouse to live up to and
fix
> > theirs?" Ask me if I care that they would from then on have a pretty
shitty
> > opinion of me. You think I am going to care that someone like that
doesn't
> > like me????!!!! Give me a break! I've hardly got enough time for my

own
> > problems, I don't need theirs, also. AND, what *IF* the truth I just
spoke
> > in their ear gets them to thinking and they either make a committment to
> > fixing themselves and their marriage, or they live up to the
responsibility
> > of ending what is a useless venture?
> >
> > Shock value? I don't think so...because I am not doing it to shock
anyone.
> > Shock value would be if I said that out loud to someone as I walked
away,
> > and I would not embarrass my hosts like that.
> >
> > >
> > > This is the first attempt I've seen to portray the tendency use coarse
> > > language as some kind of virtue.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Well, call it what you will. I consider the truth a virtue. Now, am I
> > going to use the word "fuck" on the air? Hardly. A) I think it would
be
> > quite illegal. B) I think that is rather direct and much too open. C)
A
> > child may be listening. The *WORD* fuck leaves nothing to translation.
> > What is, is. Yet, the callsign W5TIT, said as such (and it is), never
used
> > as name (and it is not), and never open for "fun" discussion on the air
(I
> > will not respond to conversation on the air about it--I won't even
> > transmit); then a child is quite safe. As I've said in the past, if a
child
> > "picks up" on the TIT in my callsign and finds it vulgar, it is not I
who
> > taught that child to think that way.
> >
> > Remember the character that Julia Roberts played in the movie with
Richard
> > Gere...her character is truly remarkable in my opinion. Dharma? Of
Dharma
> > and Greg? Another one I identify with. Rosanne's character on her
show?
> > Yep, another one. Mimi, from the Drew Carey show? Yep, another one.
And,
> > certainly the character in Julia Roberts' movie, Erin Brokovich(sp). I
> > consider the reality that all of those characters play refreshing and
meet
> > people like that all the time that I instantly like. There's always
room

> > and time for the stuffed-shirt lifestyle. Me? I'd rather buy a
$6,000.00
> > coffee table *just* to put my feet up on it. :)
>
> Kim, now that you've explained your views, I've changed my mind.
> I've decided that you just don't know any better.
>
> By the way, those folks you identify with--they aren't real. They're
> movie and television characters. This is real life.
>
> Dave K8MN

Aw, Dave. So, you can't handle the truth? And, you don't have *any* movie heroes? Any depictions of characters that you respect and think about? How 'bout the character that Denzel Washington plays in "Remember the Titans?" How 'bout the character that is played by Mel Gibson in "The Patriot?" Sure, they're not real characters and, yeah, those were movies. OH!! And what about the characters played by Robert De Niro and Cuba Gooding in "Men of Honor." But, you mean to tell me that you've *never* encountered a personal crisis such as theirs and applied what you learned in those movies to the struggles we live here in real life every day? *NEVER?*!! Wow. That sounds so empty.

By the way, the movies "Erin Brokovich"(sp), "Remember the Titans" and "Men of Honor" were all based on true stories, Dave. You know...real life. *REAL* life. Sure, I mentioned some additional ones from my original post. But, a tale to be told does not have to be real to learn something from it, Dave. Yeah, I know better. Lots better.

Kim W5TIT

2837. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:23:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C08693D.F1DEC86C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25733

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 05:58:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >You forget that many of these kids aren't old enough to give legal
> >consent.
>
> Then they can't get the piercing or tattooing done. If you are
> under age, a parent or guardian MUST consent to any such invasive
> procedure or the business that conducts it is liable.

Sure Rick... (quick nod to the guys with the jacket)
And underage kids can't buy beer or cigarettes or liquor either.
Yeah, those underage kids aren't having any piercings or tattooing done
without their parents consent.

> And if the parent DOES consent, it's no one else's concern but
> that of the family involved.

Right again, Rick. Just because some parent is lacking common sense, I
won't worry at all about it.

Dave K8MN

2838. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:26:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0869EA.F908476B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25734

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > That sounds right. Then it becomes a local problem for folks down there
> > to deal with.
>
> Problem? One of the favorite songs around here is,
> "Oh $hit, Would You Look At Them Tits". This is
> C&W Honky Tonk country, Dave, at least down toward
> Houston. One of my favorite C&W places has topless
> waitresses.

I don't have any favorite C&W places or songs.
As long as your place isn't here and doesn't do curb service, I could
care less.

Dave K8MN

2839. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:26:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c086ad8$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25737

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0867FC.57D708A1@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > I think a lot of folks "do" newsgroups for the same reason that they go
to a
> > wrestling, boxing, or other sporting match, or even the races.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> For the blood and accidents?
>
> Dave K8MN

Heck yeah. But, it's not "real life" so it's OK.

Kim W5TIT

2840. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:28:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C086A8A.1B669E18@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25736

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C07C66B.1B652AAD@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Kim's call is an amateur radio call, not a vanity automobile tag (now
> > > > THERE is an ugly idea). It has plenty to do with amateur radio.
> > >
> > > That poses an interesting question. Will the state of Texas issue
> > > Kim a set of "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"? If
> > > so, seems your morality argument goes straight out the window.
> > > Kim, I've got a spare application. Do you want it?
> >
> > Most states won't issue a vanity call with anything suggestive in it.
> > Good luck on your quest.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You mean a vanity "tag" or a vanity call. Your statement is that most
> states won't issue a vanity call. I am just wondering what other calls
> you're aware of that were not issued plates.

Error noted. I meant vanity plate.

Dave K8MN

2841. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:32:21 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c086c25_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25738

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C08693D.F1DEC86C@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 05:58:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >You forget that many of these kids aren't old enough to give legal
> > >consent.
> >
> > Then they can't get the piercing or tattooing done. If you are
> > under age, a parent or guardian MUST consent to any such invasive
> > procedure or the business that conducts it is liable.
>
> Sure Rick... (quick nod to the guys with the jacket)
> And underage kids can't buy beer or cigarettes or liquor either.
> Yeah, those underage kids aren't having any piercings or tattooing done
> without their parents consent.
>
>
> > And if the parent DOES consent, it's no one else's concern but
> > that of the family involved.
>
> Right again, Rick. Just because some parent is lacking common sense, I
> won't worry at all about it.
>
> Dave K8MN

He didn't get the "or" statement in your submission, Rick ("or the business
that conducts it is liable").

Kim W5TIT

2842. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:36:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c086d1a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25739

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C086A8A.1B669E18@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C07C66B.1B652AAD@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > Kim's call is an amateur radio call, not a vanity automobile tag
(now
> > > > > THERE is an ugly idea). It has plenty to do with amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > > That poses an interesting question. Will the state of Texas issue
> > > > Kim a set of "Mobile Amateur Radio Operator License Plates"? If
> > > > so, seems your morality argument goes straight out the window.
> > > > Kim, I've got a spare application. Do you want it?
> > >
> > > Most states won't issue a vanity call with anything suggestive in it.
> > > Good luck on your quest.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > You mean a vanity "tag" or a vanity call. Your statement is that most
> > states won't issue a vanity call. I am just wondering what other calls
> > you're aware of that were not issued plates.
>
> Error noted. I meant vanity plate.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Well, we will see. It is my hope to get the tag W5TIT, because that is my
callsign. My contention is that the state either issues amateur callsign
license plates, or they do not. BUT, should the state choose not to issue a
license plate with my callsign on it, then that's a done deal. It's not so
important that I'm going to climb that mountain "just 'cuz."

Kim W5TIT

2843. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:48:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C086F1D.25B168C2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25740

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C0864F0.777DF156@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C07204E.1DCDEF3A@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C0465CC.1897A3BF@earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim, I know it may be difficult for you to digest but I don't talk
> > > like
> > > > > > that on the air or in public. Let's just say that you and I don't
> > > hang
> > > > > > with the same type crowd.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > Not difficult at all for me to digest that, Dave. In fact, I don't
> know
> > > why
> > > > > you felt the impulse or need to tell me--it's a given. One thing's
> for
> > > > > sure. I can hang with any type crowd much easier and more
> comfortably
> > > than
> > > > > you can, obviously. *That's* the difference between us. Know what
> > > gives me
> > > > > the ability to be more flexible than you?
> > > >
> > > > I don't happen to believe that it is true, Kim. I doubt that you'd
> feel
> > > > very comfortable using the language which makes you "real" all the
> time
> > > > if you were in the company of people I associate with.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Dave, for goodness sake. I wouldn't be free and open in an
> inappropriate
> > > environment. And, before you go off on a tirade, I don't consider the
```

> ham
> > > radio venue as the improper venue. Sorry, but I don't and you're not
> going
> > > to convince me otherwise. However, even at a black tie dinner party
> there
> > > would be a certain air of realism about me. I would have no problem
> telling
> > > a stuffed shirt he is just that--but in a very, very nice way. (But, I
> > > would walk away in grace and hope he'd just let his crystal wine glass
> drop
> > > to the floor). And, the only person I would hope to do that with would
> be a
> > > callous bastard, or wimpy bitch.
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I'm certain that
> > > > you could use shock value to get some attention but I don't think it
> > > > would be the kind of attention you would appreciate.
> > > >
> > >
> > > I don't need attention, Dave. You don't seem to understand that. And,
> > > shock value. I am not so sure that I use "shock value" as you probably
> view
> > > it in the traditional sense. Here's an example, let's get back to the
> black
> > > tie dinner party. I am making rounds, wearing my fake smile and nodding
> at
> > > everyone, doing the usual perfunctory hellos and how-are-yous. Once the
> > > obligatory round is done, I seek out and find a somewhat charming
> discussion
> > > where men and women are politely picking on each other and what it
> really
> > > sums up to is they are all perfectly miserable with each other and none
> has
> > > the guts or wonder to confront their "loved ones" with their "real"
> > > feelings. You can be sure that before I left the group--after having
> made
> > > several comments about conflict resolution and well it works, mind
> you--I'd
> > > pick the most miserable woman of the group, or maybe even man, and
> whisper
> > > something like this in their ear as I walked away:
> > >
> > > "You are one huge chicken shit of a human and until you can learn to
> deal
> > > with your own failures, how can you expect your spouse to live up to and
> fix
> > > theirs?" Ask me if I care that they would from then on have a pretty
> shitty
> > > opinion of me. You think I am going to care that someone like that

> doesn't
> > > like me????!!!! Give me a break! I've hardly got enough time for my
> own
> > > problems, I don't need theirs, also. AND, what *IF* the truth I just
> spoke
> > > in their ear gets them to thinking and they either make a committment to
> > > fixing themselves and their marriage, or they live up to the
> responsibility
> > > of ending what is a useless venture?
> > >
> > > Shock value? I don't think so...because I am not doing it to shock
> anyone.
> > > Shock value would be if I said that out loud to someone as I walked
> away,
> > > and I would not embarrass my hosts like that.
> > >
> > > >
> > > > This is the first attempt I've seen to portray the tendency use coarse
> > > > language as some kind of virtue.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Well, call it what you will. I consider the truth a virtue. Now, am I
> > > going to use the word "fuck" on the air? Hardly. A) I think it would
> be
> > > quite illegal. B) I think that is rather direct and much too open. C)
> A
> > > child may be listening. The *WORD* fuck leaves nothing to translation.
> > > What is, is. Yet, the callsign W5TIT, said as such (and it is), never
> used
> > > as name (and it is not), and never open for "fun" discussion on the air
> (I
> > > will not respond to conversation on the air about it--I won't even
> > > transmit); then a child is quite safe. As I've said in the past, if a
> child
> > > "picks up" on the TIT in my callsign and finds it vulgar, it is not I
> who
> > > taught that child to think that way.
> > >
> > > Remember the character that Julia Roberts played in the movie with
> Richard
> > > Gere...her character is truly remarkable in my opinion. Dharma? Of
> Dharma
> > > and Greg? Another one I identify with. Rosanne's character on her
> show?
> > > Yep, another one. Mimi, from the Drew Carey show? Yep, another one.
> And,
> > > certainly the character in Julia Roberts' movie, Erin Brokovich(sp). I
> > > consider the reality that all of those characters play refreshing and
> meet

> > > people like that all the time that I instantly like. There's always
> room
> > > and time for the stuffed-shirt lifestyle. Me? I'd rather buy a
> $6,000.00
> > > coffee table *just* to put my feet up on it. :)
> >
> > Kim, now that you've explained your views, I've changed my mind.
> > I've decided that you just don't know any better.
> >
> > By the way, those folks you identify with--they aren't real. They're
> > movie and television characters. This is real life.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Aw, Dave. So, you can't handle the truth?

What truth? It's MOVIES and TELEVISION.

> And, you don't have *any* movie
> heroes? Any depictions of characters that you respect and think about? How
> 'bout the character that Denzel Washington plays in "Remember the Titans?"
> How 'bout the character that is played by Mel Gibson in "The Patriot?"
> Sure, they're not real characters and, yeah, those were movies. OH!! And
> what about the characters played by Robert De Niro and Cuba Gooding in "Men
> of Honor." But, you mean to tell me that you've *never* encountered a
> personal crisis such as theirs and applied what you learned in those movies
> to the struggles we live here in real life every day? *NEVER?*!!

Probably not since I was ten or eleven.

> Wow. That sounds so empty.

Choosing reality over identifying with TV and movie characters is empty?

> By the way, the movies "Erin Brokovich"(sp), "Remember the Titans" and "Men
> of Honor" were all based on true stories, Dave. You know...real life.

We all know what the words "based on" mean when used by movie makers.
Are you asking if I watch and enjoy TV shows or movies, the answer is
yes. If you are asking if I identify with movie characters, the answer
is no.

> *REAL* life. Sure, I mentioned some additional ones from my original post.
> But, a tale to be told does not have to be real to learn something > from it, Dave.

Ever read a non-fiction book and then watch the movie made from it?
Ever notice that the movie version is always greatly imbellished and
that sometimes the ending is completely different?

> Yeah, I know better. Lots better.

Can't prove it from what I've read here, either in the initial posting
or your follow up.

Dave K8MN

2844. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:50:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C086FA4.A727DB03@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25741

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C08693D.F1DEC86C@earthlink.net...
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > >
> > > On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 05:58:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >You forget that many of these kids aren't old enough to give legal
> > > >consent.
> > >
> > > Then they can't get the piercing or tattooing done. If you are
> > > under age, a parent or guardian MUST consent to any such invasive
> > > procedure or the business that conducts it is liable.
> >
> > Sure Rick... (quick nod to the guys with the jacket)
> > And underage kids can't buy beer or cigarettes or liquor either.
> > Yeah, those underage kids aren't having any piercings or tattooing done
> > without their parents consent.
> >
> >
> > > And if the parent DOES consent, it's no one else's concern but
> > > that of the family involved.
> >
> > Right again, Rick. Just because some parent is lacking common sense, I
> > won't worry at all about it.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> He didn't get the "or" statement in your submission, Rick ("or the business
> that conducts it is liable").

Sure, I got it. The beer sellers, the drug dealers, the liquor
sellers--they're all liable too. It doesn't seem to slow up many of
'em.

Dave K8MN

2845. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:53:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <382AA305F6CFB6DB.71E0BC3B8776B176.BFD3C38BE460C84F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25743

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 17:49:41 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Most states won't issue a vanity call with anything suggestive in it.
>Good luck on your quest.

There's a Chevy driven by an attractive woman in Lansing that
has the license plate: "BIG 1S," a woman who works for a massage
parlor in Wyandotte, MI has (according to her niece who was my
student) the license number "CUM AGN," and according to the Secretary
of State's office, "BIG ONE" is owned by a man in Detroit.

Most states have an Amateur Radio Plate form that allows hams
to order license plates with their call sign on it and all they need
do is confirm the call sign is valid (i.e., show their license) when
they order them.

I don't think Kim would have the slightest bit of trouble
getting them myself--after all, to see any harm in her call takes a
dirty mind, and it's pretty hard to find ANY mind, dirty or not, in a
bureaucracy like the DMV.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2846. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:53:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C3E9D5B375553A57.FB72067E786E6FDE.836A935E70A11243@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25742

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 17:30:26 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Gee, not many posts ago you admitted to being a radical.

For someone who insists on quote backs, you're remarkably
unwilling to use them yourself.

Show me where I identified myself as a "RADICAL." Not where I
accepted someone else's definition of me as a "sixties radical," which
tends to imply only dissatisfaction with the existent political
system, but as a "stand-alone" _radical_.

>I like the new
>definition of "radical" you've come up with. All this time I thought
>that anyone could be a radical over any number of issues.

Perhaps if you took a political science class, you wouldn't
demonstrate such a lack of knowledge. A radical is DEFINED as an
individual who seeks to implement an extreme left-wing political
structure, usually by violent overthrow of the current system. In
contrast, btw, a reactionary is the same thing to the far RIGHT end of
the political spectrum (i.e., a fascist).

>Why should I have to include the others? Many of your perceived
>supressed "rights" have to do with sex. Maybe you'd like to known as
>the "Drug libertarian".

Would you like to be known as the earthlink ham, dave? Or the
www ham? How about the moralistic ham? No? Then why would you think I
would want to be limited to one form of libertarianism myself?

You choose to attack Kim's choice of a call sign here--does
that mean that the only area of ham radio you feel needs "cleaning up"
is in the area of call signs? Is your interest in ham radio limited to
the letters in the call signs of other hams?

I list sexual and drug issues because they are the most
obvious examples in our society--but I could as easily make a case for
prohibiting the government from banning alternative medicine,
abortion, polygamy, or any other private issue. The ones I used,
however, are the most obvious example in our society and thus the best
to use, from my perspective.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2847. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:53:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <327A50B838B940DA.92B82270B3D057C5.C3133FEFCC503FAD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25744

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 07:55:53 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>I've often wondered how something could have been so right back
>then and so wrong now.

Back then people valued their freedom and rights. Now their
only concern is protectionism and job security.

Besides, that was before the religious revival of the early
19th. Century

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2848. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:53:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <868DF2626E76634E.6AF43579E279E1FF.4CB3DC9CB1BD985F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25746

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 17:36:54 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:36:21 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >To my knowledge, there aren't any trashy ice cream flavor names.
>>
>> Yum, yum, let's eat mud pies.
>>
>> Sounds pretty disgusting to me!
>>
>> BTW, ever seen some of the flavors of Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream?
>
>You really want to head off on another diversion?

Er, Dave.

YOU made the statement about "trashy ice cream flavor names"
not existing, not me.

I merely demonstrated that you are wrong.

I guess every time I do that you find it easier to claim I'm
trying to "head off on another diversion," right?

>> >I'm a
>> >radio amateur posting in an amateur radio newsgroup about an issue
>> >relating to amateur radio.
>>
>> No you aren't. You're a radio amateur posting in an amateur
>> radio newsgroup about an issue involving the private personal decision
>> of a fellow ham--and insulting or offending everyone who doesn't share
>> your view. Would you consider that appropriate behavior on the air? If
>> not then it has no place here, either.
>
>Your writing of the dismissive "No you aren't" doesn't negate my
>statement.

No it doesn't. I disputes it. But it doesn't negate it.

>It looks like you are another of those folks who tries to
>make the perpetrator look like a victim.

Sure, Dave. Every one is picking on you and you're just
defending yourself by attacking Kim, right?

>Kim isn't a victim.

Would you tell that to rape and DV victims, too?

>She chose
>to do what she did and she has outlined, on a number of occasions, why
>she did it.

Yup.

She chose to change her call sign. That's IT. That's ALL she
did. She didn't invite people to slam her, insult her, ridicule her,
or even defend her here for that matter. She just changed her call
sign to another LEGAL call sign she preferred.

>Now she's taking her lumps for it from those who
>disapprove.

No, she's being unfairly attacked and ridiculed by people who
can't stand to mind their own business and are so moralistic they
insist that only THEY know what is best for the ARS, and for Kim.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2849. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:53:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <32BB5A302881536D.9B99749C19EF4CE3.A31CD85F148C2CB3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25745

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 05:54:41 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Just to be certain, I asked my wife. Not only does she not use the
>language you earlier ascribed to all women and later to most women. She
>assures me that that *she* has never heard my mother, my sister, the
>neighbors or any of her friends use such language in an "all woman"
>situation.

Funny, I asked my own wife (age 46, so she's not a member of a
more liberal modern generation) and she said the language was VERY
normal among women--including those in colleges and universities.

I also commented on this to some friends of ours who are blue
collar and younger (on the theory that perhaps we're from a more
"liberated" period) and they agreed with Chris (my wife) and couldn't
imagine that a term such as "tit" could possibly offend anyone in the
modern era (that was the consensus of about 7 people, 3 men and 4
women, aged from 34 to 45).

Considering the fact that I live in one of the more
conservative parts of the US (the midwest) in a rural area, you must
live in a VERY conservative community if your wife isn't an exception
to the rule in your area (which she may well be, of course).

>I believe you are "real" --that to you, there is no time when it seems
>improper to be coarse. You've used the terms here in a mostly male
>group. I guess that makes you "real".

A "male" group, Dave?

It's an _amateur radio_ group!

What a sexist statement to make!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2850. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 05:53:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <434D993DC066CFAA.F37727D2777A3684.57DF22A41986A01B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25747

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 17:43:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>...not to mention that you must have been one of the youngest freedom
>riders ever. You must have been what--seventeen in '63?

18--I was born on VE Day in 1945.

And, to be honest, one of the most attractive things about the
freedom riders at the time (apart from the fact that as someone who
lived for years on the East side of Detroit--one of VERY few whites in
my neighborhood--I honestly didn't understand why anyone would
discriminate against blacks) was the fact that when you were on the
busses or in the Southern towns you were provided a place to eat and
sleep--and I was homeless from my 13th birthday until I joined the
Navy at 19.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2851. ARNewsline 1268 - Nov 30 2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 06:39:23 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011201013923.22419.00000324@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 25748

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1268 - NOV 30, 2001

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1268 with a release date of
Friday, November 30th, 2001 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A enforcement issue involving a contest station and lots of news on ham radio in space are first on this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1268 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: SPLIT FREQUENCY OPERATION BRINGS INTERFERENCE WARNING NOTICE FROM THE FCC

If you are operating split frequency and another ham calls you on the phone to tell you that you are interfering with his QSO, listen to what he or she says. It could save you from getting a citation from the FCC. This advice comes from many operators after the FCC’s chief ham radio rules enforcer Riley Hollingsworth says he's letting stand a Warning Notice he sent to a Pennsylvania radio amateur after receiving allegations of deliberate interference that took place during a contest.

--
Hollingsworth: “We reaffirmed our Warning Letter to Joseph Brue, K3NM, of Pennsylvania in the case of interference he caused when operating split on 40 meters during a recent contest.”
--

The background on this story is quite complicated and will take a few minutes to explain it in detail. This is because it is very important to any ham who operates spit frequency in a contest or while chasing D-X.

The issues involves Joseph Brue, K3NM. He was sent the Warning Notice on September 12th after a Louisiana ham named John King, K5PGW, officially complained about a September 9 incident on 40 meter SSB. King claims that K3NM was operating split mode on during the Worked All Europe Contest. King says that during part of that contest period he was in QSO with Roy Ezell, K9ROY, in Kentucky when K3NM came on frequency. King says that K3NM did not bother to ask if the frequency was clear before beginning to call C-Q contest.

King says that he and K9ROY attempted to contact the operator at K3NM and alert him about the QRM. Unfortunately. he was listening outside the US phone band. Since neither King or Ezell could reach K3NM by radio, K9ROY reverted to an older form of communication. He telephoned Brue, to let him know that his station was interfering with his contact and asking him to move. In fact, King

claims that there were two calls made to K3NM but that station never did change frequency.

And here is where it all gets a bit more complex. You see, the person operating K3NM’s station at the time of the incident was not Joseph Brue. Rather a guest in the person of the Matt Vanni, callsign LU9AY. And it was Vanni who first responded to the FCC. He said that he could not hear K5PGW or K9ROY. So, even though he acknowledged the phone calls, he continued operating the station on the same transmit frequency. He also told the FCC that he always monitors his transmit frequency whenever he operates split frequency. Brue later confirmed Vanni's version of what happened to the FCC. But he also acknowledged receiving the two telephone calls from the complaining hams.

So why issue a warning letter? Hollingsworth explains it in the reaffirmation message itself. His key words to Brue are these:

"The fact remains, however, that both you and Vanni had notice, directly from the complainant operator in two separate telephone calls, that your station was indeed interfering with specific ongoing communications."

Hollingsworth added that based on the phone calls from Ezell that it was not good Amateur practice for the K3NM operators to ignore the complainant and continue operating the station. At least not without a good faith attempt at compromise or taking corrective action.

And the bottom line for all hams may be what Hollingsworth wrote in the original September 12th letter to Brue. There he said that Amateurs are responsible for taking steps to make sure they do not interfere with ongoing communications, and contest participants have no greater rights to any specific frequency than other hams. (RAIN, FCC)

**

RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Tacoma Washington may be the first city to prohibit Class D 11 meter C-B operators from using non-FCC certified transmitting equipment. Adopted last September 12th but only now becoming widely known, Tacoma City Ordinance 26851 amends Chapter 8.38 of their Municipal Code in two ways. First is Section 8.38.010 which directly prohibits use of non-approved radio equipment by CB’ers. And if a CB’er breaks the new law he or she is subject to Section

8.38.020. This makes using such a radio a misdemeanor punishable to a fine of up to $500, and/or up to 6 month imprisonment.

Tacoma enacted Ordinance 26851 based on an earlier amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which was adopted by Congress a couple of years ago. As this was a Congressional action, not an FCC action, any challenges by C-B operators to the new Tacoma local law would have to go through the federal courts. As far as we can determine, the new law is carefully crafted to affect only C-B operators and no other radio operators in the Tacoma area. (Various news sources)

**

LEGAL ISSUES: ANTENNA LAWS WILL BITE SOUTH AFRICAN AMATEURS

Ham radio operators in South Africa have something new to worry about. Expensive antenna regulation and added costs for evaluating an antenna installation. Q-News Graham Kemp has the details:

--

Following a lecture on Antenna regulation and planning, South African Clubs in many provinces have been urged to meet and appoint a mutual provincial representative to work in this field.

Tim Ellam, a Telecommunications lawyer, sketched the situation in Canada but the hams in ZS land soon discovered they are worse off! Amateurs there could soon be paying in access of Rand 10 000 to have a scooping study done before submitting plans for approval.

That is the reason the SARL installed the CPAS committee, a body with members representing each province to monitor development so that timely intervention can put the case for Amateur Radio Towers. This was successfully accomplished in the KwaZulu-Natal.

CPAS now has KZN and Eastern Cape and Western Cape represented. Will the rest of the country wait till it is too late?

--

According to Kemp, Tim Ellam put forward many useful suggestions and dealt extensively the South African situation. For our listeners in South Africa, C.P.A.S. itself is on e-mail at cpas@intekom.co.za (SARL via Q-News)

**

BREAK 1

This is ham radio news coming to you from the United States of America. we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on great bulletin stations around the world, including the 145.21 MHz repeater serving Andover Minnesota.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: EXPEDITION 4 CREW ON ITS WAY TO THE ISS

A new crew is headed to the International Space Station and could be there by the time this newscast goes to air. This time a Russian is in command of two Americans and all three have an interest in ham radio. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Roy Neal, K6DUE, gives us some insight into the Expedition 4 crew and what to expect while they are on board the I-S-S.

--

The new crew board the International Space Station plan to work in some hamming between work sessions of their sixteen hour daily schedule. Astronauts Dan Bursch and Carl Walz, both Flight Engineers are KD5PNU and KC5TIE and their commander, Cosmonaut Yuri Onufrienko once spent 193 days on the Mir Space

Station and was on the radio a lot.

They plan to use NA1SS, the amateur station on board the ISS, whenever they get a chance. If they come close to the records set by Frank Culbertson and Susan Helms of the last two station crews, it will be surprising. That's because they have a very ambitious work schedule.

Among other things, they are charged with delivering and installing a huge 356 foot long girder-like truss. They plan at least eight space walks, two of which will be used to install new ham radio antennas outside the space stations crew quarters.

Add a few such things as changing out the stations command and control computers with new, solid state memory units and playing host to two visiting shuttle flights and a Russian Progress taxi mission, plus more than 400 hours of carrying out scientific experiments, and you begin to get the idea. When the Expedition 4 crew comes back to Earth next May..they'll need a rest. Meanwhile, we hams look forward to at least a few contacts with them on 2 meters, via NA1SS, the ham radio station on board.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Roy Neal. K6DUE.

--

A new crew is not the only ham radio change taking place on board the International Space Station. According to ARISS Chairman Frank Bauer, KA3HDO the new ham radio antenna system mentioned in Roy's report has been approved for flight and manifested to be flown on the STS-108 flight. Once installed around the perimeter of the Russian Service Module early next year, the new I-S-S ham radio antennas will cover the H-F, VHF, UHF and microwave bands up to 2.4 Gigahertz.

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT THANKS DONAHUE

Newly elected ARRL Southeastern Division Vice Director Sandy Donahue, W4RU, has received his first award. In fact he got it before the ballots had even been counted.

The recognition came at the recent 2001 AMSAT Symposium awards which included a presentation to in grateful appreciation for work as the ARRL Liaison for the event. W4RU's dedicated service and hard work in this role was also well noted.

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: RSGB STOPS ORGANIZING TRADE SHOWS

The Radio Society of Great Britain says that its no longer going to organize ham radio trade shows. Instead it will participate at conventions organized on a local level. That a major change in policy as we hear from Jeramy Boot, G4NJH:

--

With the continuing success of the RSGB Regional organization it is becoming possible for the RSGB to have a presence at an increasing number of amateur radio events, rallies and trade shows around the country. In view of this enhanced activity, the RSGB has decided that it will no longer itself organize amateur radio trade shows.

The RSGB believes that there is a need for more convention-style meetings where radio amateurs can discuss new techniques and other innovations in seminar-like events and that such events represent a better use of the RSGB's resources.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH.

--

In other words, the moneys saved can go into other projects aimed at furthering the cause of ham radio in the U-K. (RSGB)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: GREENFIELD INDIANA

Things are a lot better here in the USA where there’s a hamfest almost every weekend. And Brad Hewson KB9VZL tells Amateur Radio Newsline that the Hancock County Amateur Radio Club Hamfest December 9th from 8 am to 2 p.m. It all happens at the Greenfield Indiana at the Greenfield Central High School with talk-in on the 145.33 MHz W9ATG repeater. For more information please contact Brad by e-mail to kb9vzl@excite.com. (KB9VZL)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: HAM RADIO UNIVERSITY 2002

New Yorkers attention. Mark down Sunday, January 20, 2002, for the next Ham Radio University session. The first 2002 session will be a part of the ARRL’s New York City and Long Island Section Convention. Sponsored by the Great South Bay Amateur Radio Club, both events will be held at the Babylon Town Hall Annex in North Babylon, Long Island. Ham Radio University 2002 will be a technical education forum featuring twenty one-hour presentations along with special forums geared to the non-ham as well as the experienced Amateur Radio operator. The focus will be hands on, with many demonstrations including emergency communications. For more information, contact Chairman Phil Lewis N2MUN or New York City Long Island Section Manager George Tranos, N2GA at their callbook address. (K2DO)

**

RADIO AT WAR: SHORTWAVE RETURNS TO AFGHANISTAN

A new shortwave radio station is broadcasting to Afghanistan. According to the Media Network e-newsletter, the arrival of Radio Voice of Afghanistan seemed to surprise just about everyone except those behind it. Who are they? As of airtime, they have chosen not to reveal their identity.

It was Glenn Hauser's DX Listening Digest that broke the news to the world. Then a Mexican listener to Radio Netherlands Spanish service, Adolfo Murrieta González, claimed credit for the first logging on November 17th. Clandestine

Radio Watch was soon on the chase as well with Takuya Hirayama of it's Japan Bureau listening in. Hirayama understands Pashto and Dari. He wrote a summary of the broadcast on November 22nd. Read more in the Media Network Afghanistan media dossier at http://www.rnw.nl/realradio/html/afghanistan.html. If you want to listen to the audio sample go to http://www.omroep.nl/cgi-bin/streams?/rnw/medianetwork/rvoa011123.rm (Media Network)

**

RADIO IN THE USA: CLEAR CHANNEL BUYING ACKERLY

The United States largest radio broadcaster, is getting a lot bigger. This as Clear Channel Communications Inc., announces that it is buying the Ackerley Group, which owns billboards and other outdoor advertising as well as radio and television stations.

Clear Channel, operates about 1,180 radio and 18 TV stations in the United States, already is involved in events promotion and billboard advertising. It is paying about $500 million in stock to acquire Ackerly. (Broadcast Weekly)

**

NOAA WEATHER RADIO: CRAIG AND DONNA NOT MUCH BETTER THAN PERFECT PAUL

Two well respected broadcasters who also happen to be ham radio operators have voiced their opinions on the new voices tapped by the National Weather Service to replace the not so perfect -- Perfect Paul. For those not aware, Perfect Paul is the nickname given to that mechanical sounding computerized voice that currently voices NOAA Weather Radio. Take a listen:

--
Perfect Paul Audio Here
--

The closest thing to it our world of Amateur Radio are the automated voices heard on many repeaters. You know, those announcements that say this is the W-A-3-such and such repeater. The ones that users are always complaining about.

In the case of Perfect Paul, the NOAA Radio received so many complaints that he will soon be replaced by two new and far less computer sounding voices named Craig and Donna. This came after months of evaluating voice technologies and receiving public input, including over 19,000 Internet survey comments. Based on this input, NOAA awarded Siemens Information and Communication Network a $633,615 contract for the voice improvement software product, known as Speechify. Siemens teamed with SpeechWorks International of Boston to provide software that combines phonetic sounds with natural language modeling. Heres a sample:

--
Audio Here
--

A lot better than Perfect Paul? Some say yes but Richard Rudman, W6TIA, is not that enthusiastic. Rudman is the chairman of the EAS National Advisory Committee and the Los Angeles County local emergency committee. He is quoted in the November 21st issue of the trade publication Radio World as saying he wished that the committee choosing the new voices for NOAA Weather Radio would have waited for something better to come along. W6TIA says that the new voices chosen are an improvement, but still have major shortcomings with regard to quality and inflection issues that bother him.

Also quoted in the Radio World article is Chris Boone, WB5ITT. He says that the voices still sound computer-like and canned. Boone says he can hear the digital artifacts in them and would not put them on a broadcast station. Even so, the computerized Craig and Donna would be a welcome change to the automatic I-D voices used on most ham radio repeaters today. (Radio World, NOAA, NWS, others)

**

BREAK 2

By telephone, satellite and the World Wide Web, we are the amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world at our only official website - www.arnewsline.org.

**

HAM RADIO ON THE BOOKSHELF: TUNE IN THE UNIVERSE

“Tune In The Universe” is a new book on CD-ROM by SETI League Director H. Paul Shuch, N6TX. The book is unique in that it is both interactive with the reader and because it can be read using any web browser. No special reader software is required.

Why a book now? N6TX tells Amateur Radio Newsline that its kind of overdue:

--
Shuch: “Ive been on the lecture circuit for SETI for the past seven years and everywhere I go people ask if I have a book about all of this. Well, we have a website but not everybody has an Internet connection and some other peoples download speeds are a bit slow. So I took the best material from seven years of running the SETI League and tried to put it together in one convenient place.”
--

And that’s exactly what Dr. Shuch has done. Called a ham radio operators guide to the search for extraterrestrial intelligence, the book is divided into six sections that cover every aspect of ham radio’s involvement in SETI as well as the ongoing search itself. Also included are a mix of photos and even some songs that Dr. Shuch says should educate as well as entertain. Why music you ask? N6TX says that its a fun way to learn about anything:

--

Shuch: “As any teacher knows, memory is enhanced and multiple learning styles are accommodated by invoking as many different sensory pathways as

possible. That is, we educators try to stimulate the students auditory, visual and tactile systems all at once to maximize the learning experience. Why do you think we are always writing on a chalk-board and asking you to take notes while we drone on in a monotone?

Somewhere along the line in my teaching career I figured out that music was another sensory pathway worth stimulating. And, just maybe would make my lectures a tad less monotonous. So I began introducing songs as learning aids.

--

Tune In The Universe" is published by the American Radio Relay League and is priced at under $25. For more information visit the League's website at www.arrl.org. More about the SETI League is also to be found in cyberspace. It's at www.setileague.org. (N6TX, SETI League, ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO AND EDUCATION: FAR ANNOUNCES SCHOLARSHIPS

Speaking of education, the Foundation for Amateur Radio, in Washington, D.C. says that it plans to administer 62 scholarships for the 2002 through 2003 academic year. The foundation, which is made up of more than seventy-five Amateur Radio Clubs fully funds seven of these scholarships using the income from grants and its annual hamfest. The remaining fifty-five are administered without cost to the donors. For more information or an application, please contact the F-A-R Scholarships, PO Box 831, Riverdale, Maryland. The zipcode is 20783. You can also check the website at www.amateurradio-far.org (FAR elease)

**

HAM RADIO ON THE INTERNET: NEW FLYING HAMS REMAILER

Joe Della Barba, N3HGB says that he has started a new Internet mailing list for anyone interested in airmobile ham radio. In a web posting, Joe says that he has been operating 2 meter airmobile for years now and finds it to be lot of fun. Joe notes that A-P-R-S adds a whole new dimension to airmobile operations these days as well. To become a part of that discussion and lots more you sign up by sending an e-mail to cqairmobile-subscribe@yahoogroups.com. (CQAIRMOBILE)

**

INTERNATIONAL - CANADA: DISABLED EXAMS

On the international front, word that an Industry Canada document pertaining to the examination of disabled candidates will be ready for incorporation into rules by January 31, 2002. This document, based on a proposal from Radio Amateurs of Canada, will provide guidance to medical doctors when asked to justify an exemption for disabled candidates for the Canadian Amateur Radio examination process. (RAC)

**

INTERNATIONAL NEW ZEALAND: RADIO EDUCATION TRUST

Amateur Radio Newsline’s South Pacific Bureau correspondent Jim Meachan, ZL2BHF reports that a charitable foundation called the NZART Radioscience Education Trust, founded in January 1998 is taking root. Jim explains that the trust was formed to help and encourage persons wishing to further their education in the science of radio. ZL2BHF says that the trust is financed from income produced from invested donations. More information can be obtained from the NZART web page at http://www.nzart.org.nz/nzart/nzart/trustweb.html (NZART)

**

DX

In the DX department, K5OE reports that OM5CM in the Slovak Republic has been active the AMSAT Oscar 10 satellite. Also, ZS2ACP in South Africa recently created a weekend pile-up on
AO-40, operating when both Europe and North America were in his window. (GB2RS)

Meantime, a little bit lower in frequency, well, take a listen:

--
6 m audio here
--

That was N0JK portable HC8 working the world the weekend of November 24th. And he was not the only D-X being heard. The VHF Reflector was loaded with reports from around the world of unexpected F 2 openings as more and more hams buy radio gear and discover the magic of the Magic Band. (VHF Reflector - audio supplied by KC6WFS)

And an Internet posting from the ARRL’s Wayne Mills N7NG says that an operation from war torn Afghanistan has been approved for DXCC credit. Mills post says that The DXCC Desk has received acceptable documentation for YA5T operated by ON4WW, ON6TT, S53R or SM7PKK. The documentation is for QSOs made November 20, 2001 and after. No other callsigns or operations have been approved as of this date. (VHF Reflector, OPDX, other DX remailers)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: A REPEATER CONTACT CONTEST?

And finally this week, while we here in the United States frown on contesters interfering with repeater contacts, down-under its a different story. Can you believe that Australia has a contest where only contacts made over repeaters count toward the final score? Well they do and Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, is back again with the details:

--

Westlakes unique CQ Repeater Contest where amateurs are encouraged to put a little life into usually quiet repeaters. The aim of all contests is to promote good will between amateurs and to encourage on air activity. The big difference

with this CQ Repeater contest is that all contacts MUST be made on repeaters.

The rules have been even simpler. Contest numbers do not have to be exchanged - just keep a record of the station spoken to and on which repeater and at what time the contact was made.

Contest Period is from 0001 local from 1st of January 2002 to 2359 local on the 7th January. The bands are 10 Meters, 6 Meters, 2 Meters and 70 centimeters. The mode is FM only ad scoring is 1 point for each contact. It doesn't get any simpler than that!

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News Australia.
--

Could such a contest be successful in North America? Maybe, but we do not know of any repeater owners who really want to find out. (Q-News)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address
is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

All amateurs Novice through Extra are eligible. Awards are decided by the Awards Committee, based partially upon the information received. Magazine articles, newsletters, newspaper clippings, videos and the like are appreciated but cannot be returned. The deadline for nominations is January 31, 2002. Nominations can be submitted by US Mail to Post Office Box 964, Dayton Ohio 45401 or by completing the convenient e-form on the web at www.hamvention.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying God Bless America, 73, and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2001. All rights reserved.

2852. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 06:44:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C087C3A.B328170@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25749

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 17:30:26 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Gee, not many posts ago you admitted to being a radical.
>
> For someone who insists on quote backs, you're remarkably
> unwilling to use them yourself.
>
> Show me where I identified myself as a "RADICAL." Not where I
> accepted someone else's definition of me as a "sixties radical," which
> tends to imply only dissatisfaction with the existent political
> system, but as a "stand-alone" _radical_.

What's a "stand along" radical? You did accept the term "sixties
radical".

> >I like the new
> >definition of "radical" you've come up with. All this time I thought
> >that anyone could be a radical over any number of issues.
>
> Perhaps if you took a political science class, you wouldn't
> demonstrate such a lack of knowledge. A radical is DEFINED as an
> individual who seeks to implement an extreme left-wing political
> structure, usually by violent overthrow of the current system. In
> contrast, btw, a reactionary is the same thing to the far RIGHT end of
> the political spectrum (i.e., a fascist).

Neat. So a "sixties radical" would be a guy who is, according to your
definition, a sixties communist. Have I got it right now? And a man
who has developed radical new cancer treatment is using leftist
treatment?

> >Why should I have to include the others? Many of your perceived
> >supressed "rights" have to do with sex. Maybe you'd like to known as
> >the "Drug libertarian".
>
> Would you like to be known as the earthlink ham, dave? Or the
> www ham? How about the moralistic ham? No? Then why would you think I
> would want to be limited to one form of libertarianism myself?

You know, Rick; you could use any of those to describe me and it
wouldn't particularly chafe me.

> You choose to attack Kim's choice of a call sign here--does
> that mean that the only area of ham radio you feel needs "cleaning up"
> is in the area of call signs? Is your interest in ham radio limited to
> the letters in the call signs of other hams?

For purposes of my argument, you may assume that it is the issue I am dealing with here and now. As to the last part, you must not spend much time on the air.

> I list sexual and drug issues because they are the most
> obvious examples in our society--but I could as easily make a case for
> prohibiting the government from banning alternative medicine,
> abortion, polygamy, or any other private issue. The ones I used,
> however, are the most obvious example in our society and thus the best
> to use, from my perspective.

I don't happen to think that the examples you used are the most obvious example. I enjoy seeing your other examples though. It helps me to understand what kind of man you are.

Dave K8MN

2853. Re: MORE TWISTEDHED the NUTTY CBER

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 06:48:13 UTC
From: Rickhit@att.net
Message-ID: <3c087cd2.116957501@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25750

On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 21:54:56 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20011129213914.10701.00003821@nso-mv.aol.com...
>> In article
><7DA18F9749B0FD30.ACC2E8591B765D9E.C41133D55EC5843D@lp.airnews.net>,
>> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>>
>> >
>> > Give it up--according to the resident "experts" here the FCC
>> >has far more serious problems to consider--like Kim's call sign.
>> >You'll just have to wait your turn.
>> >
>> > Rick
>>
>> Rick:
>>
>> I have never suggested that Kim's call sign is the FCC's problem to
>> consider. It is *her* problem to consider!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Larry, Larry, Larry. When ya gonna get this right? My callsing is not *my*
>problem! It's *yours*.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
Don't worry Kim, I like your call letters :-)

The other Rick, KC2ESD

2854. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 06:57:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C087F43.1A3D438F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25851

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 17:36:54 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 13:36:21 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >To my knowledge, there aren't any trashy ice cream flavor names.
> >>
> >> Yum, yum, let's eat mud pies.
> >>
> >> Sounds pretty disgusting to me!
> >>
> >> BTW, ever seen some of the flavors of Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream?
> >
> >You really want to head off on another diversion?
>
> Er, Dave.
>
> YOU made the statement about "trashy ice cream flavor names"
> not existing, not me.

Preposterous. Cecil Moore got us on the ice cream wagon. I used my
comment as dismissive and irrelevant.

> I merely demonstrated that you are wrong.

How did you do that?

> I guess every time I do that you find it easier to claim I'm
> trying to "head off on another diversion," right?

You haven't yet done it. I'll let you know my view when that takes
place.

> >> >I'm a
> >> >radio amateur posting in an amateur radio newsgroup about an issue
> >> >relating to amateur radio.
> >>
> >> No you aren't. You're a radio amateur posting in an amateur
> >> radio newsgroup about an issue involving the private personal decision
> >> of a fellow ham--and insulting or offending everyone who doesn't share
> >> your view. Would you consider that appropriate behavior on the air? If
> >> not then it has no place here, either.
> >

> >Your writing of the dismissive "No you aren't" doesn't negate my
> >statement.
>
> No it doesn't. I disputes it. But it doesn't negate it.

Then, whoopty doooo.

> >It looks like you are another of those folks who tries to
> >make the perpetrator look like a victim.
>
> Sure, Dave. Every one is picking on you and you're just
> defending yourself by attacking Kim, right?
>
> >Kim isn't a victim.
>
> Would you tell that to rape and DV victims, too?

Do those now apply to Kim's situation? You're really up on your soapbox
now.

>
> >She chose
> >to do what she did and she has outlined, on a number of occasions, why
> >she did it.
>
> Yup.
>
> She chose to change her call sign. That's IT. That's ALL she
> did. She didn't invite people to slam her, insult her, ridicule her,
> or even defend her here for that matter. She just changed her call
> sign to another LEGAL call sign she preferred.

None of us who do something stupid, issue an invitation to be rebuked
for it but it is certainly difficult to dodge responsibility.

> >Now she's taking her lumps for it from those who
> >disapprove.
>
> No, she's being unfairly attacked and ridiculed by people who
> can't stand to mind their own business and are so moralistic they
> insist that only THEY know what is best for the ARS, and for Kim.

Naw, I think she's first taken shots for her choice. I think she takes
additional shots for her brassiness in being so flip about her reasons
for her choice. She has made it clear that she doesn't care what
anybody thinks. That has become obvious.

I'd rather accept my own view of what's best for amateur radio than the
view of her most frequent libertarian defender. I'm not bound to accept
your "libertarian-with-attitude" view any more than I'm bound to accept
Kim's choice as appropriate.

Dave K8MN

2855. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 07:04:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C088119.DB36D38D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25852

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 05:54:41 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Just to be certain, I asked my wife. Not only does she not use the
> >language you earlier ascribed to all women and later to most women. She
> >assures me that that *she* has never heard my mother, my sister, the
> >neighbors or any of her friends use such language in an "all woman"
> >situation.
>
> Funny, I asked my own wife (age 46, so she's not a member of a
> more liberal modern generation) and she said the language was VERY
> normal among women--including those in colleges and universities.
>
> I also commented on this to some friends of ours who are blue
> collar and younger (on the theory that perhaps we're from a more
> "liberated" period) and they agreed with Chris (my wife) and couldn't
> imagine that a term such as "tit" could possibly offend anyone in the
> modern era (that was the consensus of about 7 people, 3 men and 4
> women, aged from 34 to 45).
>
> Considering the fact that I live in one of the more
> conservative parts of the US (the midwest) in a rural area, you must
> live in a VERY conservative community if your wife isn't an exception
> to the rule in your area (which she may well be, of course).

This is a conservative area. My folks live in the Cincinnati area. My
sister lives in Los Angeles. Cincinnati is a pretty conservative town
but L.A.?

> >I believe you are "real" --that to you, there is no time when it seems
> >improper to be coarse. You've used the terms here in a mostly male
> >group. I guess that makes you "real".
>
> A "male" group, Dave?
>
> It's an _amateur radio_ group!
>
> What a sexist statement to make!

I wrote "a mostly male group" which you translate to "a 'male' group".

Of course it is an amateur radio group!

What a silly and deliberately false translation you've made!

Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a mixed group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the contradiction didn't you understand?

Dave K8MN

2856. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 07:52:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <071FFE7033086E72.CC839EE20C0807F3.E0040A8A1A8450B7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25855

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 07:35:32 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Except with a debit card, I can't float an interest free loan.

Use a PayPal MC/Debit card.

They pay you interest on the money you deposit in the account
and you receive a 1.5% rebate on all MC purchases.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2857. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 07:52:17 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <32659EB8AA38FECE.E4EDDFF4A96811FE.C6B53CCCBC6FA706@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25853

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 06:53:37 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> That brings up an interesting issue, Kim. Several years ago, a
>television personality (name long forgotten) raised the premise that a
>male and female cannot be friends without the issue of sex entering
>their minds. In other words, any person who is friends with a member
>of the opposite sex is sexually attracted to that person. What do you
>think, Kim? Can a man truly be friends (not a co-worker, associate, or
>an aquantance - a friend) with a woman without ever having thoughts
>about sex? Can a woman? What about your male friends? Can you honestly
>say they've never had sexual thoughts about you? Can you honestly say
>that you've never had sexual thoughts about them?
>
> To answer my own question (it's not fair to ask a question like this
>without being willing to answer it also), I think such a relationship
>is possible, but it is extremely rare. Most people who have friends of
>the opposite sex are sexually attracted to them.

I've found just the opposite to be true, Dwight. I have a
number of friends who are women, and my wife has several friends who
are men. In NONE of those cases has the thought of a sexual
relationship ever entered into either of our heads. They are _friends_
not potential bed mates. Perhaps there are men who are incapable of
viewing a woman as a friend and equal w/o the concept of going to bed
with her occurring (certainly that seems to be the case for Larry,
given his views on the subject), but neither I, nor any of my friends
(to my knowledge) are among that group.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2858. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 07:52:17 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <5682A69BB31F28A9.0FF225ABE6ECABBA.683F1C557363050C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25854

On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 10:33:43 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>And some people enjoy yanking other people's chains. :-)

Immensely!!! ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2859. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 08:19:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C089287.A470B5EE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25856

CAM wrote:
>
> You implied that the Libertarian Party
> is a dead horse while it is in fact
> more successful than it ever has been
> before. The Libertarian Party is
> probably the largest third party in
> the US.

But their stated goal is to be a national political party, not just a party that wins a few local elections (and, yes, 67 is a few when you consider the total number of local elections), so my statement still stands. On a national basis, they have had almost no success after decades of trying. What else would you call that other than a dead horse?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2860. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 08:33:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0895AA.A0DBD95F@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25857

Sean G Gilley wrote:
>
> I simply disagree that my wife having
> a one on one conversation with another
> man in a coffeshop is anything that
> would (or should) even slightly
> undermine my trust in her.

Well, I'm glad you feel that way in your relationship, Sean. What I said, and I think what Larry was saying, is not rule or law that all relationships have to comply with. It is instead a basic concept of two individuals fostering trust in a relationship, and doing nothing to undermine that trust. If your relationship is different (that type of incident would not undermine trust), it still does nothing to change the basic concept. There are other situations in your relationship where that concept still applies, isn't there?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2861. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 08:51:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0899D9.5A5E12E5@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25858

CAM wrote:
>
> Sean G Gilley wrote:
> > Adults spend time with other adults,
> > and if I can't trust my wife enough
> > to trust her to spend time alone
> > with another man, then my relationship
> > isn't very good to begin with.
>
> And that relationship definitely certainly
> is NOT based on trust.

Are you arguing that total trust is what you believe in, Cecil? That you would trust your wife alone with another man in any situation, and that any man who doesn't is simply insecure and doesn't trust his wife? Nonsense. If you caught your wife alone with a man in a hotel room, I seriously doubt "trust" would be the first thing you thought of. The same is true if you caught your nude wife alone in a hottub with another man. For every couple, including you and your wife, there are limits to trust. And it is up to each partner in that relationship to know what those limits are and not cross them. True, one dinner with a male companion is not likely to break up most relationships. But I would darn sure what to know why that occured and why I wasn't invited (and I think most others would too).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2862. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 08:56:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C089B03.FA5B5D31@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25859

CAM wrote:
>
> Not true of me, Dwight. For months,
> I have been dating a lady with
> absolutely no thought of sex on my mind.
> We just enjoy socializing together
> as a couple.

Absolutely no thought of sex, Cecil? I find that very hard to
believe that you date a woman that you're not attracted to.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2863. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 08:59:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C089BCC.4B3AA098@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25860

N2EY wrote:
>
> Just because a person feels something
> doesn't mean they must act on it. People
> can be highly attracted to each other and
> yet keep things at a platonic level.

You missed the point, Jim. We're not talking about acting on it.
We're talking about what a person thinks. The question is whether they
are sexually attracted to each other, not whether they have sex.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2864. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 09:09:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3A8752873212E302.9F0A046DBAD0FC87.1F772500E045BE0B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25861

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 05:13:16 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Naw Kim. If I'd wanted to be miserable I could have married someone
>like you.

Excuse me Dave,

You have a typo there that someone is bound to jump on you
for.

It shouldn't be "wanted to be miserable . . ." It should be
"wanted to make someone miserable . . ."

Hope that helps.

>I do like a good wine but I buy what's on sale. I'll have to admit that
>I've never slurped from a bowl in my life.

One of our all time great experiences (and one that I suspect
Kim would approve of completely) was when Chris and I bought a bottle
of Chateau Lafite Rothchild 1977 (that was in the 80s--today the price
would be astronomical) and drank it from a paper bag in Golden Gate
Park in San Francisco.

A friend of ours would probably also be someone she'd
enjoy--he drinks only top quality liqours (Grand Mariner, XO Cognac,
Chartreuse, etc.)--but ONLY from the bottle!

Life is meant to be lived, not regulated by convention. Try
slurping from a bowl someday--if the contents are good enough you'll
probably enjoy it.

>I'm still trying to figure how we're each emulating a life that we would
>find loathsome. I don't emulate your life. Are you actually attempting
>to emulate mine?

Why--is it loathsome?

>You can feel sorry for me if you like. I don't mind.

Neither do Larry and Dick,

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2865. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 09:09:39 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0762E7A21CAD6096.CDD2D488FD0153BF.7B084DA67E28EED4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25862

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 07:04:57 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> Considering the fact that I live in one of the more
>> conservative parts of the US (the midwest) in a rural area, you must
>> live in a VERY conservative community if your wife isn't an exception
>> to the rule in your area (which she may well be, of course).
>
>This is a conservative area. My folks live in the Cincinnati area. My
>sister lives in Los Angeles. Cincinnati is a pretty conservative town
>but L.A.?

One of the colleges I attended is in Cincinnati--conservative
doesn't "exactly" describe it. Reactionary would be a lot closer.

L.A. on the other hand is a melting pot. It's perfectly
possible to live within a very small, exclusive, community of
conservatives where Midwestern values are the norm--it's just a lot
more probable that a person will live among far more modern residents.
If you sister was being honest with you (knowing your attitudes and
values, you HAVE to consider the possibility that others are not being
totally honest on the question because they don't want to upset you or
incur your wrath), she obviously is NOT part of the L.A. mainstream
society.

>> >I believe you are "real" --that to you, there is no time when it seems
>> >improper to be coarse. You've used the terms here in a mostly male
>> >group. I guess that makes you "real".
>>
>> A "male" group, Dave?
>>
>> It's an _amateur radio_ group!
>>
>> What a sexist statement to make!
>
>I wrote "a mostly male group" which you translate to "a 'male' group".

Does it make it any less sexist if you refer to discussion
group as a "mostly male" group instead of as a "male" group? The fact
still remains that it discounts the value of the women present in the
NG.

>Of course it is an amateur radio group!

No, actually it's a Usenet group created for the discussion of
amateur radio policy issues. If it were an amateur radio group, people

wouldn't keep telling me that what is said here has no effect on the amateur radio service.

And AS a Usenet group, it is subject not to amateur radio rules, but to Usenet conventions and Netiquette. Among those rules, incidently, is to trim your attributions--something you are loathe to do, apparently, since your messages contain several messages worth of quote backs which have nothing to do with your immediate comments.

I'm sure if we were on the air and I violated standard operating conventions out of ignorance or lack of consideration you would take the time to inform me of the fact, and would expect me to respect the ARS and change my behavior.

Consider yourself informed that in THIS venue you are violating standard operating conventions and it would be considered very courteous of you if you were to adhere to them more closely.

>What a silly and deliberately false translation you've made!

Sure.

>Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a mixed
>group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the
>contradiction didn't you understand?

But, Dave, you yourself stated that it is "a mostly male group." Thus, her comments were made primarily for a male audience who, presumably, are accustomed to frank language (and if you claim MEN don't use that language in conversation among themselves there isn't a person in this group who would believe you even THOUGHT that was true).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2866. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 09:09:39 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <526506E0740482AD.CDBC60026471AC4C.74C547EA7CF89B58@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25863

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 05:23:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Sure Rick... (quick nod to the guys with the jacket)
>And underage kids can't buy beer or cigarettes or liquor either.
>Yeah, those underage kids aren't having any piercings or tattooing done
>without their parents consent.

Dave, kids may get beer or cigarettes, but they usually don't
do so from the store itself--they have too much to lose selling to
them. Usually, kids (unless they are older teens--and frankly if an
older teen wants a tattoo or piercing, that's not the issue that it is
if a young teen or pre-teen wants one) have other kids buy FOR them.

When it comes to tattoos and piercings, however, you CAN'T
have someone over 21 go in and "buy it for you." You have to go to the
store or tattoo parlor personally. This means that the parents have
plenty of grounds for suit against the business and the community
(ever seen a community that SUPPORTED a tattoo parlor or a piercing
salon?) has plenty of grounds for having it closed in the "public
interest."

No, Dave, I _don't_ think very many early teens are getting
tattoos and piercings w/o their parent's consent. Do you?

>> And if the parent DOES consent, it's no one else's concern but
>> that of the family involved.
>
>Right again, Rick. Just because some parent is lacking common sense, I
>won't worry at all about it.

Dave if a teenager wants something legal and his or her
parents agree to it, it really isn't your business or anyone else's.
You may call it a matter of common sense, but not everyone views
piercings or tattoos the same way you do. I know some women who have
exceptionally attractive tattoos and more than a few who have body
jewelry (including some piercings NO teen would be able to have done
with or without parental consent) and are very happy with the
result--as are their spouses or significant others.

Your values apply only to yourself, not to others.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2867. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 10:41:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C08B3A3.177A0394@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25864

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Overall, yes, I believe that women
> and men can be friends without having
> sex. Note that I said without having
> sex. There will be few encounters
> with the opposite sex in which "sex"
> does not enter the minds of either--
> and a true friendship is capable of
> exploring that those thoughts and
> feelings are there. And, a true
> friendship will suffer through that
> (because it is strictly temporary)
> and get on to the real business of
> being friends.

Thanks for noticing the difference between to the two (sexual attraction and having sex). True, obviously many people can have relations with the opposite sex without actually having sex, but I do think it is difficult to have such without at least the thought of sex entering the minds of those involved at some point. We are very sexual creatures and there are few interactions with the opposite sex where the thought of sex doesn't come up.

> Now, the situation which brings this
> whole topic up--that of Rick and I
> getting together at a Starbucks (I
> think it was) and Larry R. having
> such a (snip)

I wasn't adding this as a part of that conversation. This was just something that popped into my head and I decided to add another branch off the existing discussions.

> I don't think there's anything wrong
> at all with "feeling" desirable, or
> with fantasizing about other people.
> I think it's quite healthy--and have
> been in situations where that part of
> a friendship is discussed, dealt with,
> and allowed to "go away" (because it
> will). I would think my husband was
> extremely weird if he told me that he
> only ever looks at me and doesn't feel
> a thing about other women. I also

> trust him not to act on his emotions--
> we have a monogamous relationship;
> though not a possessive or jealous one.
> <GIGGLE> Actually, his greatest dream
> is for me to bring him home another
> girl someday...a dream I eternally
> remind him will never happen :)

Well said. You raised so many topics that it will be difficult to address each. To simplify, I think most of what you said is not uncommon (right down to your husband's dream). We all seem to live in two worlds - the real world that exists around us and our made up fantasy world where anything is possible and everything works out exactly like we want. Many people "experiment" with bringing the fantasy world into the real world, but few find it as satisfying as they thought it would be (often because it's too contrived, too planned). In other words, the most satisfying sexual experimentation is when it simply happens without prior planning. Of course, that is very hard to do when it involves two, three, or more, people. And, obviously, certain fantasies should clearly remain exactly that.

One of these days we have to talk about fantasies and the thoughts behind them. After talking to a good number of people, reading, being married for 25+ years, and looking at my own, I've come up with some interesting observations (about the types of fantasies each sex has and why). Perhaps I could get a government grant - I would love the opportunity to research this further. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2868. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 10:48:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C08B52F.B3FC970A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25865

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> I've found just the opposite to be
> true, Dwight. I have a number of
> friends who are women, and my wife
> has several friends who are men. In
> NONE of those cases has the thought
> of a sexual relationship ever entered
> into either of our heads.

Then I would say you've convinced yourself (or are trying to convince me) that you're not human. I would find it very difficult to believe that you have a number of female friends, and thoughts of sex has never entered your mind with any of them.

> They are _friends_ not potential bed mates.

We're not talking about "bed mates," Rick. We're talking about being sexually attracted, in your mind, to that other person. That does not have to be just thoughts about how to get her (assuming "Rick" is a male's name in this case) into bed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2869. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 10:52:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C08B620.E7F93E01@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25866

Krell wrote:
>
> Everyone likes controversy, especially
> when they have passionate beliefs about
> things (snip)

Kim's callsign is a passionate belief? Oh, come on. If we're going to argue that fanatically, argue over something that matters. Or don't get so fanatical about it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2870. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 11:00:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C08B818.1F25571@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25867

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> With the code debate over for all
> practical purposes, the newsgroup
> would be great if it did get into
> true policy discussions (zoning
> restrictions, bandplans, or whatever)
> rather than the inane rantings that
> have constituted most of the posting
> for quite some time now.

I don't really mind the off topic discussions, Bill. There are plenty of other threads that do stay fairly well on topic. What concerns me is when the participants seem to be going out of their way to draw blood over a seemingly minor issue (Kim's callsign, for example). There it little sense in it and it does have a lasting effect (just look at r.r.a.m to see that - no sane person goes there anymore).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2871. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 11:02:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C08B86F.8279CBF4@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25868

CAM wrote:
>
> And some people enjoy yanking other
> people's chains. :-)

Well, then go for it - I've put in my two cents worth.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2872. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 11:07:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C08B9AB.7949ADAD@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25869

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I am not sure what messages you read
> that have illicited the above reaction,
> but I've pretty much seen nothing any
> different than normal when "heated"
> discussions have been taking place.
> It could be that my eyes generally
> glaze over when I get to the insults
> part and just scan for the points--so
> I'm not especially aware of anything
> any more insulting than usual.

Well, I've been seriously voted down (the majority seems to enjoy
things as they are), so just forget I ever said anything (my two cents
added with no change).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2873. Re: DID W4JYZ GET HIS DRUGS FROM TEW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 11:44:12 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uak41$k8o$1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 25871
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KT4TuRd" <Drunk_Bobby@FakeAirplane.com> wrote in message
news:9u9k1m$mq9$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Ahhh Shuddup Youngblood!!!!! Belt down some vodka
> and go babble about your fake airplane. How hard did you have
> to beg Riley not to publish the sanctions he took on your license?

Something was mentioned in QST about a ham from Vero Beach got something for
reading police and credit reports over the air.

> "af2yisbinladen" <hammer007@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:e299bafd.0111301715.39f81204@posting.google.com...
> > Now wait a minute, something is going on, and JYZ is sounding sedated.
> > Riley pops the goof with another warning and he comes on the air and
> > denies any wrong doing. This "Goof", must be taking medication that he
> > got from TEW, the "TAMPA TURD". Now I realize that Jimmy must have a
> > lot of stuff in the medicine cabinet at this time and he could make a
> > few quick bucks, but how did "Dumbass" play into the equation ????? I
> > heard Dumbass a couple of weeks ago transmitting from the campgrounds
> > in north Fla, but could he have worked out a drugs for mows deal with
> > TEW????
> > Now listen up all of you hams, W4NTI the Dumbass follower will soon
> > make his entry, but just wait a minue Dan, does Donnie Dumbass have
> > the MOH like Duane?Hammer
>
>

2874. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 12:46:34 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Ki4O7.204417$3d2.8939437@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25870

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3c085d7c.3652520@news.mindspring.com...
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 06:56:59 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > I've noticed the discussions in this newsgroup are getting really
> >nasty lately (personal insults, name calling, ridicule, harassment,
> >pettiness, and so forth). Is this what we really want? One of the best
> >aspects of this newsgroup has always been that the long-time members
> >have always tried to keep the discussions on a relatively decent
> >level. In other words, while we might argue, and even argue
> >fanatically, most have tended to back off before things got too
> >personal. But, lately, some of the messages here have turned into
> >nothing more than an insult-fest. Please, before you post that nasty
> >little message, with the hateful little comments, think about the
> >effect you're having on this newsgroup and it's members. If this keeps
> >up, this newsgroups will degrade into something none of us will want
> >to participate in.
> >
> > I'm especially asking the long-time members (Rick, Cecil, Dave, Kim,
> >Larry, Richard, Jim, Bill, Bob, Phil, and others) to back me up on
> >this. Lets all (and that includes me - I'm not completely innocent
> >here) watch our own messages and politely remind others to do the same
> >when they get carried away. Thanks.
> >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Dwight,
>
> Well said. I read the group almost daily but haven't
> seen any reason to chime into most threads for the very
> reason you mention. While the newsgroup itself had
> a primary motivation of taking the code debate out
> of the .misc newsgroup, that is pretty much no longer
> an issue. Except for the "wait", the code test will (IMHO)
> be gone by the end of 2003. It is just a waiting period
> until WRC 2003 does its thing.
>
> With the code debate over for all practical purposes,
> the newsgroup would be great if it did get into true
> policy discussions (zoning restrictions, bandplans, or whatever)
> rather than the inane rantings that have constituted most
> of the posting for quite some time now.
>
> Cheers,

> Bill K2UNK
>

Some do it, some talk about it.

2875. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 13:14:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08d865_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25872

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C086F1D.25B168C2@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Aw, Dave. So, you can't handle the truth?
>
> What truth? It's MOVIES and TELEVISION.
>

Oh, we'll just forget about the whole rest of the post. I *meant* the truth
about me.

> >
> > And, you don't have *any* movie
> > heroes? Any depictions of characters that you respect and think about?
How
> > 'bout the character that Denzel Washington plays in "Remember the
Titans?"
> > How 'bout the character that is played by Mel Gibson in "The Patriot?"
> > Sure, they're not real characters and, yeah, those were movies. OH!!
And
> > what about the characters played by Robert De Niro and Cuba Gooding in
"Men
> > of Honor." But, you mean to tell me that you've *never* encountered a
> > personal crisis such as theirs and applied what you learned in those
movies
> > to the struggles we live here in real life every day? *NEVER?*!!
>
> Probably not since I was ten or eleven.
>

You'd be an incredibly difficult person to decide on a movie for then. Do
ya have *any* heroes at all? I mean, other than the dad, the mom, the
grandpa, etc. I think those folks are heroes to most of us.

> >
> > Wow. That sounds so empty.
>
> Choosing reality over identifying with TV and movie characters is empty?
>

Dave, you're incapable of applying traits that are found in powerful movies
and applying them to real life situations. I am not. There is a
difference. "The Patriot" allowed me to reflect, for the very first time,
on the "personal" aspects that living during such time must have had on
regular, every day people. Made me appreciate those from that time a little

more.

> >
> > By the way, the movies "Erin Brokovich"(sp), "Remember the Titans" and
"Men
> > of Honor" were all based on true stories, Dave. You know...real life.
>
> We all know what the words "based on" mean when used by movie makers.
> Are you asking if I watch and enjoy TV shows or movies, the answer is
> yes. If you are asking if I identify with movie characters, the answer
> is no.
>

Well then, there we have it.

> >
> > *REAL* life. Sure, I mentioned some additional ones from my original
post.
> > But, a tale to be told does not have to be real to learn something >
from it, Dave.
>
> Ever read a non-fiction book and then watch the movie made from it?
> Ever notice that the movie version is always greatly imbellished and
> that sometimes the ending is completely different?
>

Are you suggesting just a teency bit that books (????!!!!) are more to base
real life on than movies? Sure, I've read books then watched the movie and
been disappointed every time. BUT, aren't they both the same in terms of
reality, to you? I suppose if you find yourself identifying more with a
book, it's a matter of media then.

> >
> > Yeah, I know better. Lots better.
>
> Can't prove it from what I've read here, either in the initial posting
> or your follow up.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Returning back to the last "bottom line" of this branch of this thread; the
one where I asked you do you know why I could "mingle" better with all
groups of people than you could? You never answered. The reason, in my
opinion, that I have more flexibility with people than you, Dave, is because
I believe I am far more appreciative of peoples' different points of view.
You base my approach to reality now, completely on the fact that I mentioned
some movies and you completely ignore the rest of a real honest submission
to you about myself.

To each his own. I can accept your statement for what it is. You cast a
judgement on mine. (Except for the part where I do say that it sounds very

empty that your emotions are not stirred by a good movie).

Kim W5TIT

2876. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 13:17:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08d93b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25873

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C086FA4.A727DB03@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C08693D.F1DEC86C@earthlink.net...
> > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > >
> > > > On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 05:58:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >You forget that many of these kids aren't old enough to give legal
> > > > >consent.
> > > >
> > > > Then they can't get the piercing or tattooing done. If you
are
> > > > under age, a parent or guardian MUST consent to any such invasive
> > > > procedure or the business that conducts it is liable.
> > >
> > > Sure Rick... (quick nod to the guys with the jacket)
> > > And underage kids can't buy beer or cigarettes or liquor either.
> > > Yeah, those underage kids aren't having any piercings or tattooing
done
> > > without their parents consent.
> > >
> > >
> > > > And if the parent DOES consent, it's no one else's concern
but
> > > > that of the family involved.
> > >
> > > Right again, Rick. Just because some parent is lacking common sense,
I
> > > won't worry at all about it.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > He didn't get the "or" statement in your submission, Rick ("or the
business
> > that conducts it is liable").
>
> Sure, I got it. The beer sellers, the drug dealers, the liquor
> sellers--they're all liable too. It doesn't seem to slow up many of
> 'em.
>
```

> Dave K8MN

And, it doesn't slow up the kids looking to buy. And, it doesn't slow up the parents who don't get more aggressive to do something about indicators that their kids are into things like that. You want *all* to keep from being able to avail themselves of something because of those who are too lazy to restrict themselves from doing wrong?

Kim W5TIT

2877. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 13:19:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08d991$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25874

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:382AA305F6CFB6DB.71E0BC3B8776B176.BFD3C38BE460C84F@lp.airnews.net...
>
> I don't think Kim would have the slightest bit of trouble
> getting them myself--after all, to see any harm in her call takes a
> dirty mind, and it's pretty hard to find ANY mind, dirty or not, in a
> bureaucracy like the DMV.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

ROFLMAO....!!! Oh, so true, so true!

Kim W5TIT

2878. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 13:40:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08dea4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25875

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:868DF2626E76634E.6AF43579E279E1FF.4CB3DC9CB1BD985F@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 17:36:54 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >She chose
> >to do what she did and she has outlined, on a number of occasions, why
> >she did it.
>
> Yup.
>
> She chose to change her call sign. That's IT. That's ALL she
> did. She didn't invite people to slam her, insult her, ridicule her,
> or even defend her here for that matter. She just changed her call
> sign to another LEGAL call sign she preferred.
>
> >Now she's taking her lumps for it from those who
> >disapprove.
>

Oh, good grief. Now you're dangerously close to sounding like Larry Roll.
You don't honestly believe your statement, above, do you, Dave? Naw, you
couldn't. No way. "Taking her lumps"???!!! Is that a barometer for how
affected you think I feel about your attitude towards a callsign? Hardly.
Puhleeze!

>
> No, she's being unfairly attacked and ridiculed by people who
> can't stand to mind their own business and are so moralistic they
> insist that only THEY know what is best for the ARS, and for Kim.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Hmmm. Rick? I would contend with the statement above, but I know what your
intention was/is. I don't think I am being unfairly attacked at all. The

issue, to me, with the debate over my callsign isn't that it is *my* callsign (necessarily), but more the whole concept of freedom of choice, being within the confines of legality, the moralistic values we *expect* to be delivered to us from others, etc.--that whole ball of wax.

The folks who are most adamant (I would usually have only included Larry Roll in that group of one--but it appears that Dave also is as stirred by a callsign issue) about my callsign--I add the blanket statement "a callsign" because if mine, then others) don't understand that about the debate. I am completely unaffected about their opinions of "me" because I don't look at it as a "me" issue.

My callsign is not the issue. I enjoy the debate that my callsign stirs--in fact, could never have dreamed of inspiring such debate. But, to look at myself as a "victim" of attack from other people? First, I would have to in some way feel wrong or responsible for my callsign. See what I mean? I feel neither. Well, OK, I was responsible for picking it.

That's why, when the value statements start in, I approach the point of view being expressed on a much broader level than a callsign. To me, there is not an angst against me--there is an angst against people who do things a little differently. Or, in some cases, a lot. *That* is how wrong Larry Roll is about me liking my callsign because it draws attention to myself. How wrong he is. However, that I like my callsign because it nearly instantly creates family-style debate (the ones famous for cutting through all the polite bullshit and just getting to the meat of the issue?) Yep, I love that. :)

Oh, but I do agree with you on the basis that it is a defense to change the minds of those who think so strictly (on *both* sides of the fence, even) :). If a debate about my callsign can lead to another branch of a debate about the rights and wrongs of racism, politics, government, society, raising children, education in our schools, and more, and if we can begin to understand each others' points of view (or, heck, even learn the way each other thinks and use that as a strategy for an argument front of City Hall or our boss), then I am all for it. And, in my opinion, the issue of my callsign has done more to stir debate in this newsgroup than anything else. From the beginnings of each time my callsign is brought up, we come to threads such as this right now.

Oh. That it has nothing to do with ham radio? I beg to differ. Whenever we each pick up a microphone, and certainly when one touches a key, or tunes up for digital communications, most of us are not thinking about "what ham radio related topic can I bring up today?". Most of us are looking to join or induce conversation. And, if someone doesn't believe that free expression, exchanges of ideas, etc., is not ham radio related, I don't know what they think it's all about. The *policy* of a valid callsign is a *policy* that the FCC regulates. And, everything it represents, good and bad, is about policy in ham radio.

Kim W5TIT

2879. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 13:46:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08dff8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25876

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:32BB5A302881536D.9B99749C19EF4CE3.A31CD85F148C2CB3@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 05:54:41 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I believe you are "real" --that to you, there is no time when it seems
> >improper to be coarse. You've used the terms here in a mostly male
> >group. I guess that makes you "real".
>
> A "male" group, Dave?
>
> It's an _amateur radio_ group!
>
> What a sexist statement to make!
>
> Rick
>
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Heh heh heh. I'd seen that. I wasn't going to make any observations about
it. Uh, I still won't...don't *even* get me going...LOL

OH, OK....hehehehehe Ya bent my arm. One woman, one newsgroup, on
callsign. Brings nearly an entire group of men to their knees with
expressing more than they usually would...uh, OK, I'll stop. :^

Kim W5TIT

2880. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 13:49:32 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08e0ab_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25877

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C087C3A.B328170@earthlink.net...
>
> I don't happen to think that the examples you used are the most obvious
> example. I enjoy seeing your other examples though. It helps me to
> understand what kind of man you are.
>
> Dave K8MN

Yeah, Rick. Dave likes to get straight to the judging. *SIGH*

Kim W5TIT

2881. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 13:59:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08e2e4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25878

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C087F43.1A3D438F@earthlink.net...
> >
> > She chose to change her call sign. That's IT. That's ALL she
> > did. She didn't invite people to slam her, insult her, ridicule her,
> > or even defend her here for that matter. She just changed her call
> > sign to another LEGAL call sign she preferred.
>
> None of us who do something stupid, issue an invitation to be rebuked
> for it but it is certainly difficult to dodge responsibility.
>

Oh, contraire. Contraire. I wholeheartedly *welcome and invite* anyone to "rebuke" (if that's what you wish to call it) my callsign! Prove to me that it's wrong, that it's going to bring the ARS "one step closer to extinction," that all children entering ham radio are harmed, that it's not a family radio service any more, that I offer nothing of positive value to the ARS, and on and on.

Prove it. Make one, just one, logical argument that it does. Remember, logic is that which is very personal.

>
> I'd rather accept my own view of what's best for amateur radio than the
> view of her most frequent libertarian defender. I'm not bound to accept
> your "libertarian-with-attitude" view any more than I'm bound to accept
> Kim's choice as appropriate.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

NOW, we get to something we agree on! No name calling, Dave. Let's make it as pure and simple as we can get: I absolutely understand that you do not believe my callsign is good for amateur radio. I also absolutely agree that you are not bound to accept my choice as appropriate.

I wholeheartedly understand, but disagree. Here you go: I'd rather accept my own view of what's best for amateur radio than the view of a most conservative man such as yourself. I'm not bound to accept your conservative attitude any more than I'm bound to believe that my choice of a callsign is inappropriate.

Kim W5TIT

2882. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 14:00:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08e33b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25879

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C088119.DB36D38D@earthlink.net...
>
> Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a mixed
> group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the
> contradiction didn't you understand?
>
> Dave K8MN

Man, you are stretching now, Dave. You're really stretching.

Kim W5TIT

2883. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 14:02:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08e3b3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25880

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0899D9.5A5E12E5@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Sean G Gilley wrote:
> > > Adults spend time with other adults,
> > > and if I can't trust my wife enough
> > > to trust her to spend time alone
> > > with another man, then my relationship
> > > isn't very good to begin with.
> >
> > And that relationship definitely certainly
> > is NOT based on trust.
>
>
> Are you arguing that total trust is what you believe in, Cecil? That
> you would trust your wife alone with another man in any situation, and
> that any man who doesn't is simply insecure and doesn't trust his
> wife? Nonsense. If you caught your wife alone with a man in a hotel
> room, I seriously doubt "trust" would be the first thing you thought
> of. The same is true if you caught your nude wife alone in a hottub
> with another man. For every couple, including you and your wife, there
> are limits to trust. And it is up to each partner in that relationship
> to know what those limits are and not cross them. True, one dinner
> with a male companion is not likely to break up most relationships.
> But I would darn sure what to know why that occured and why I wasn't
> invited (and I think most others would too).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Trust is trust. Insecurity is insecurity.

Kim W5TIT

2884. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 14:03:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08e3db_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25881

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C089B03.FA5B5D31@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Not true of me, Dwight. For months,
> > I have been dating a lady with
> > absolutely no thought of sex on my mind.
> > We just enjoy socializing together
> > as a couple.
>
>
> Absolutely no thought of sex, Cecil? I find that very hard to
> believe that you date a woman that you're not attracted to.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

WHY does an attraction have to be physical or sexual?

Kim W5TIT

2885. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 14:08:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08e523_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25882

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:3A8752873212E302.9F0A046DBAD0FC87.1F772500E045BE0B@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 05:13:16 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Naw Kim. If I'd wanted to be miserable I could have married someone
> >like you.
>
> Excuse me Dave,
>
> You have a typo there that someone is bound to jump on you
> for.
>
> It shouldn't be "wanted to be miserable . . ." It should be
> "wanted to make someone miserable . . ."
>
> Hope that helps.
>

DOH!!!!

> >
> >I do like a good wine but I buy what's on sale. I'll have to admit that
> >I've never slurped from a bowl in my life.
>
> One of our all time great experiences (and one that I suspect
> Kim would approve of completely) was when Chris and I bought a bottle
> of Chateau Lafite Rothchild 1977 (that was in the 80s--today the price
> would be astronomical) and drank it from a paper bag in Golden Gate
> Park in San Francisco.
>

Oh, I love it! I would have added a collection hat to see if I could make
my money back...LOL

> A friend of ours would probably also be someone she'd
> enjoy--he drinks only top quality liqours (Grand Mariner, XO Cognac,
> Chartreuse, etc.)--but ONLY from the bottle!
>
> Life is meant to be lived, not regulated by convention. Try
> slurping from a bowl someday--if the contents are good enough you'll
> probably enjoy it.
>

Oh, gosh! Absolutely! And, the flavor! Much more enhanced with
breath...and renewed with every bounce on the taste buds.

> >I'm still trying to figure how we're each emulating a life that we would
> >find loathsome. I don't emulate your life. Are you actually attempting
> >to emulate mine?
>
> Why--is it loathsome?
>
> >You can feel sorry for me if you like. I don't mind.
>
> Neither do Larry and Dick,
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Kim W5TIT

2886. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 14:12:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08e62a$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25883

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C08B620.E7F93E01@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > Everyone likes controversy, especially
> > when they have passionate beliefs about
> > things (snip)
>
>
> Kim's callsign is a passionate belief? Oh, come on. If we're going
> to argue that fanatically, argue over something that matters. Or don't
> get so fanatical about it.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Ah, but Dwight. It's not *about* the callsign. It's about the *issues*
around my callsign.

Kim W5TIT

2887. Re: MORE TWISTEDHED the NUTTY CBER

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 14:15:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08e6c2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25884

"Rick KC2ESD" <Rickhit@att.net> wrote in message
news:3c087cd2.116957501@netnews.worldnet.att.net...
> On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 21:54:56 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20011129213914.10701.00003821@nso-mv.aol.com...
> >> In article
> ><7DA18F9749B0FD30.ACC2E8591B765D9E.C41133D55EC5843D@lp.airnews.net>,
> >> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > Give it up--according to the resident "experts" here the FCC
> >> >has far more serious problems to consider--like Kim's call sign.
> >> >You'll just have to wait your turn.
> >> >
> >> > Rick
> >>
> >> Rick:
> >>
> >> I have never suggested that Kim's call sign is the FCC's problem to
> >> consider. It is *her* problem to consider!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Larry, Larry, Larry. When ya gonna get this right? My callsing is not
my
> >problem! It's *yours*.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
> Don't worry Kim, I like your call letters :-)
>
> The other Rick, KC2ESD

ahem :)

Kim W5TIT

2888. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 14:46:47 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c08ee1b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25885

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C088119.DB36D38D@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Fri, 30 Nov 2001 05:54:41 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Just to be certain, I asked my wife. Not only does she not use the
> > >language you earlier ascribed to all women and later to most women.
She
> > >assures me that that *she* has never heard my mother, my sister, the
> > >neighbors or any of her friends use such language in an "all woman"
> > >situation.
> >
> > Funny, I asked my own wife (age 46, so she's not a member of a
> > more liberal modern generation) and she said the language was VERY
> > normal among women--including those in colleges and universities.
> >
> > I also commented on this to some friends of ours who are blue
> > collar and younger (on the theory that perhaps we're from a more
> > "liberated" period) and they agreed with Chris (my wife) and couldn't
> > imagine that a term such as "tit" could possibly offend anyone in the
> > modern era (that was the consensus of about 7 people, 3 men and 4
> > women, aged from 34 to 45).
> >
> > Considering the fact that I live in one of the more
> > conservative parts of the US (the midwest) in a rural area, you must
> > live in a VERY conservative community if your wife isn't an exception
> > to the rule in your area (which she may well be, of course).
>
> This is a conservative area. My folks live in the Cincinnati area. My
> sister lives in Los Angeles. Cincinnati is a pretty conservative town
> but L.A.?
>
> > >I believe you are "real" --that to you, there is no time when it seems
> > >improper to be coarse. You've used the terms here in a mostly male
> > >group. I guess that makes you "real".
> >
> > A "male" group, Dave?
> >
> > It's an _amateur radio_ group!
> >
> > What a sexist statement to make!
>

> I wrote "a mostly male group" which you translate to "a 'male' group".
>
> Of course it is an amateur radio group!
>
> What a silly and deliberately false translation you've made!
>
> Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a mixed
> group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the
> contradiction didn't you understand?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Dave, I hope you'll remember that I don't think I said I would not use inappropriate language at the wrong times. I don't think I said "in a mixed group" and didn't mean to imply that way if I did or made it sound like I did. What I meant, and here's the example I think I presented, is that I would not use inappropriate language at a black tie dinner. This newsgroup is far from a black tie dinner. Here, I won't generally curse, but I will to make a point--as I did in the example in the post.

At a football game, you bet I'll generally be cursing...

I think your interpretation of what you read points up the fact even more that I know when behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate. If you truly feel like being that "proper" all the time, then by all means I have no problem. But, if you feel like you "have to" but don't really enjoy being proper at all times--then I ask why you allow such demands to be placed upon yourself. I don't live my life for others--though I will make allowances. I live for me.

Kim W5TIT

2889. Re: MORE TWISTEDHED the NUTTY CBER

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 15:08:55 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9uarq70177q@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25887

Leland KC8LDO
>
>On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 21:54:56 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
>wrote:
>
>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>>news:20011129213914.10701.00003821@nso-mv.aol.com...
>>> In article
>><7DA18F9749B0FD30.ACC2E8591B765D9E.C41133D55EC5843D@lp.airnews.net>,
>>> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>>>
>>> >
>>> > Give it up--according to the resident "experts" here the FCC
>>> >has far more serious problems to consider--like Kim's call sign.
>>> >You'll just have to wait your turn.
>>> >
>>> > Rick
>>>
>>> Rick:
>>>
>>> I have never suggested that Kim's call sign is the FCC's problem to
>>> consider. It is *her* problem to consider!
>>>
>>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>
>>
>>Larry, Larry, Larry. When ya gonna get this right? My callsing is not *my*
>>problem! It's *yours*.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>>
> Don't worry Kim, I like your call letters :-)
>
> The other Rick, KC2ESD
>
I wonder if Kim has big hooters as her callsign implies?
Hey Kim,what's your cup size?

"You ask w

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

2890. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 15:32:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C08F828.7B5DFF9E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25886

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 05:13:16 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Naw Kim. If I'd wanted to be miserable I could have married someone
> >like you.
>
> Excuse me Dave,
>
> You have a typo there that someone is bound to jump on you
> for.
>
> It shouldn't be "wanted to be miserable . . ." It should be
> "wanted to make someone miserable . . ."
>
> Hope that helps.

I think I got it right the first time.

> >I do like a good wine but I buy what's on sale. I'll have to admit that
> >I've never slurped from a bowl in my life.
>
> One of our all time great experiences (and one that I suspect
> Kim would approve of completely) was when Chris and I bought a bottle
> of Chateau Lafite Rothchild 1977 (that was in the 80s--today the price
> would be astronomical) and drank it from a paper bag in Golden Gate
> Park in San Francisco.

Maybe you should have tried using a bowl. It allows the wine to breathe
properly.

> A friend of ours would probably also be someone she'd
> enjoy--he drinks only top quality liqours (Grand Mariner, XO Cognac,
> Chartreuse, etc.)--but ONLY from the bottle!

I don't have a problem with what your "friend" does when he is alone or
with you folks. I wouldn't want him as a dinner guest. Does he drink
from *your* bottles?

> Life is meant to be lived, not regulated by convention. Try
> slurping from a bowl someday--if the contents are good enough you'll
> probably enjoy it.

There's no need for me to do so. I've already mastered the use of
cutlery and this allows much enhancement to the life I'm living.

> >I'm still trying to figure how we're each emulating a life that we would
> >find loathsome. I don't emulate your life. Are you actually attempting
> >to emulate mine?
>
> Why--is it loathsome?

Ask Kim. "Loathsome" is her word. It didn't make any sense to me
either.

> >You can feel sorry for me if you like. I don't mind.
>
> Neither do Larry and Dick,

How do you know?

Dave K8MN

2891. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 15:53:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C08FCAA.BC6B744D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25888

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 07:04:57 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> Considering the fact that I live in one of the more
> >> conservative parts of the US (the midwest) in a rural area, you must
> >> live in a VERY conservative community if your wife isn't an exception
> >> to the rule in your area (which she may well be, of course).
> > >
> > >This is a conservative area. My folks live in the Cincinnati area. My
> > >sister lives in Los Angeles. Cincinnati is a pretty conservative town
> > >but L.A.?
> >
> > One of the colleges I attended is in Cincinnati--conservative
> > doesn't "exactly" describe it. Reactionary would be a lot closer.
> >
> > L.A. on the other hand is a melting pot. It's perfectly
> > possible to live within a very small, exclusive, community of
> > conservatives where Midwestern values are the norm--it's just a lot
> > more probable that a person will live among far more modern residents.
> > If you sister was being honest with you (knowing your attitudes and
> > values, you HAVE to consider the possibility that others are not being
> > totally honest on the question because they don't want to upset you or
> > incur your wrath), she obviously is NOT part of the L.A. mainstream
> > society.

I think my sister is one of the most independent people I've ever met.
She has never hesitated to disagree with me nor has she ever been quiet
on an issue she feels strongly about. She was a New Yorker for over
fifteen years before moving to L.A.

> >> >I believe you are "real" --that to you, there is no time when it seems
> >> >improper to be coarse. You've used the terms here in a mostly male
> >> >group. I guess that makes you "real".
> >> >
> >> A "male" group, Dave?
> >> >
> >> It's an _amateur radio_ group!
> >> >
> >> What a sexist statement to make!
> > >
> > >I wrote "a mostly male group" which you translate to "a 'male' group".
> >
> > Does it make it any less sexist if you refer to discussion

> group as a "mostly male" group instead of as a "male" group? The fact
> still remains that it discounts the value of the women present in the
> NG.

Sure it does. If you leave out a modifier, it changes what the
statement means. If someone states a reality, how is the statement
sexist? There are, by far, more males posting here than females. There
are, by far, more male radio amateurs than female. Those statements are
simple reality.

> >Of course it is an amateur radio group!
>
> No, actually it's a Usenet group created for the discussion of
> amateur radio policy issues. If it were an amateur radio group, people
> wouldn't keep telling me that what is said here has no effect on the
> amateur radio service.

Did you have a real point to make?

> And AS a Usenet group, it is subject not to amateur radio
> rules, but to Usenet conventions and Netiquette. Among those rules,
> incidently, is to trim your attributions--something you are loathe to
> do, apparently, since your messages contain several messages worth of
> quote backs which have nothing to do with your immediate comments.

Don't read 'em if it bothers you. Only a fool would trim the things to
which he was responding.

> I'm sure if we were on the air and I violated standard
> operating conventions out of ignorance or lack of consideration you
> would take the time to inform me of the fact, and would expect me to
> respect the ARS and change my behavior.

Let's be honest. You don't know for a fact, what I would do.

> Consider yourself informed that in THIS venue you are
> violating standard operating conventions and it would be considered
> very courteous of you if you were to adhere to them more closely.

Always a pleasure to hear from the newsgroup police. What makes it
funnier is that you are a guy who often trims relevant info in an
apparent effort to make it appear that someone has said something he has
not.

> >What a silly and deliberately false translation you've made!
>
> Sure.
>
> >Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a mixed
> >group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the
> >contradiction didn't you understand?
>
> But, Dave, you yourself stated that it is "a mostly male

> group." Thus, her comments were made primarily for a male audience
> who, presumably, are accustomed to frank language (and if you claim
> MEN don't use that language in conversation among themselves there
> isn't a person in this group who would believe you even THOUGHT that
> was true).

Kim isn't male. There are *some* other females who read the group.
Kim explains that she wouldn't use that kind of language in a *mixed
group*. If Kim uses such language in a group of males, the group is a
mixed group.

Not all men use the same or similar language in conversation, Rick.
Of those who do, not many would use the language in the presence of a
woman. Good luck with your latest baseless rant.

Oh yeah, the netiquette version of this post appears below:

* * * * * * * * * * *

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 07:04:57 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:

I think my sister is one of the most independent people I've ever met.
She has never hesitated to disagree with me nor has she ever been quiet
on an issue she feels strongly about. She was a New Yorker for over
fifteen years before moving to L.A.

Sure it does. If you leave out a modifier, it changes what the
statement means. If someone states a reality, how is the statement
sexist? There are, by far, more males posting here than females. There
are, by far, more male radio amateurs than female. Those statements are
simple reality.

Did you have a real point to make?

Don't read 'em if it bothers you. Only a fool would trim the things to
which he was responding.

Let's be honest. You don't know for a fact, what I would do.

Always a pleasure to hear from the newsgroup police. What makes it
funnier is that you are a guy who often trims relevant info in an
apparent effort to make it appear that someone has said something he has
not.

Kim isn't male. There are *some* other females who read the group.
Kim explains that she wouldn't use that kind of language in a *mixed
group*. If Kim uses such language in a group of males, the group is a
mixed group.

Not all men use the same or similar language in conversation, Rick.
Of those who do, not many would use the language in the presence of a

woman. Good luck with your latest baseless rant.

Dave K8MN

2892. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 16:10:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0900EB.FBBDB719@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25889

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 05:23:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Sure Rick... (quick nod to the guys with the jacket)
> >And underage kids can't buy beer or cigarettes or liquor either.
> >Yeah, those underage kids aren't having any piercings or tattooing done
> >without their parents consent.
>
> Dave, kids may get beer or cigarettes, but they usually don't
> do so from the store itself--they have too much to lose selling to
> them. Usually, kids (unless they are older teens--and frankly if an
> older teen wants a tattoo or piercing, that's not the issue that it is
> if a young teen or pre-teen wants one) have other kids buy FOR them.
>
> When it comes to tattoos and piercings, however, you CAN'T
> have someone over 21 go in and "buy it for you." You have to go to the
> store or tattoo parlor personally. This means that the parents have
> plenty of grounds for suit against the business and the community
> (ever seen a community that SUPPORTED a tattoo parlor or a piercing
> salon?) has plenty of grounds for having it closed in the "public
> interest."

Your view simply isn't borne out by what I found in the Sunday Wheeling
News-Register just a couple of weeks back. Agents cited numerous
establishments in the Ohio Valley for selling tobacco, beer and liquor
to minors.

> No, Dave, I _don't_ think very many early teens are getting
> tattoos and piercings w/o their parent's consent. Do you?

Yes, I do.

> >> And if the parent DOES consent, it's no one else's concern but
> >> that of the family involved.
> >
> >Right again, Rick. Just because some parent is lacking common sense, I
> >won't worry at all about it.
>
> Dave if a teenager wants something legal and his or her
> parents agree to it, it really isn't your business or anyone else's.
> You may call it a matter of common sense, but not everyone views
> piercings or tattoos the same way you do.

For a parent to permit something which permanently defaces the human body such as piercings and tattooing sounds pretty irresponsible to me. We all know that people often participate in acts in youth which they come to regret as adults. That is one reason that courts try youthful offenders under different standards than adults.

> I know some women who have
> exceptionally attractive tattoos and more than a few who have body
> jewelry (including some piercings NO teen would be able to have done
> with or without parental consent) and are very happy with the
> result--as are their spouses or significant others.
>
> Your values apply only to yourself, not to others.
>

Ever hear of a term called "community values"? Its existence would refute your statement.

Do some school systems have dress codes?

Can you buy a copy of Hustler magazine in Hamilton County, Ohio?

On an FCC related topic:

Why does the Dish Network bleep offensive words from movies?

Dave K8MN

2893. Tacoma Wash equipment ban

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 16:13:50 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c09002f.1269382@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 25890

This should prove interesting as to specific enforcement:

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1268 - NOV 30, 2001

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1268 with a release date of
Friday, November 30th, 2001 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.
.....

RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

>Tacoma Washington may be the first city to prohibit Class D 11
>meter C-B operators from using non-FCC certified
>transmitting equipment. Adopted last
>September 12th but only now becoming widely known,
>Tacoma City Ordinance 26851
>amends Chapter 8.38 of their Municipal Code in two ways.
>First is Section 8.38.010 which directly prohibits use of
>non-approved radio equipment by CBers.

Does the ordinance LIST all approved equipment?
What does the ordinance say as to HOW FCC approval
is determined?

>And if a CBer breaks the new law he or she is subject to
>Section 8.38.020. This makes using such a radio a
>misdemeanor punishable to a fine of
>up to $500, and/or up to 6 month imprisonment.

Same question(s) as above.

>Tacoma enacted Ordinance 26851 based on an
>earlier amendment to the Communications Act of 1934,
>as amended, which was adopted by Congress a couple
>of years ago. As this was a Congressional action,
>not an FCC action, any challenges by C-B operators
>to the new Tacoma local law would have to go
>through the federal courts. As far as we can determine,
>the new law is carefully crafted to affect only C-B operators
>and no other radio operators in
>the Tacoma area. (Various news sources)

Can someone obtain and post the specific ordinance 26851
text?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2894. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 16:18:34 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112010818.4dcf4152@posting.google.com>
Source record: 25891

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C0895AA.A0DBD95F@sccoast.net>...
> Well, I'm glad you feel that way in your relationship, Sean. What I
> said, and I think what Larry was saying, is not rule or law that all
> relationships have to comply with. It is instead a basic concept of
> two individuals fostering trust in a relationship, and doing nothing
> to undermine that trust. If your relationship is different (that type
> of incident would not undermine trust), it still does nothing to
> change the basic concept. There are other situations in your
> relationship where that concept still applies, isn't there?

Yes and no.

Yes, there are things that would undermine my trust in my wife.

However, what Larry said in his postings were things that I believe really fall into another realm entirely. I work as a professional in a large corporation. Coworkers have lunch together. I don't believe (and it seems very few others believe) that having lunch with a coworker of the opposite sex brings up issues of trust.

Heck, at one point in my career, another woman and I spent about three months traveling together. Same flights, same hotels, we worked together during the day, had lunch together, and often had dinner together before going to our seperate hotel rooms. (In the same hotel.) Oh, the company only allowed us one car, so we drive places together.

That was my *job*.

Were their problems of trust from my wife? She never mentioned any.

I'm not saying that there are not things that men and women can do that would undermine trust in a spouse. I just believe that what Larry was saying (no lunches with other men, no professional contact alone with other men, no *nothing* alone with other men) goes so far as to be ludicrous.

Sean.

2895. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 16:48:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0909AC.B8F76DE6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25892

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C086F1D.25B168C2@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Aw, Dave. So, you can't handle the truth?
> > >
> > What truth? It's MOVIES and TELEVISION.
> > >
> >
> Oh, we'll just forget about the whole rest of the post. I *meant* the truth
> about me.

> > >
> > > And, you don't have *any* movie
> > > heroes? Any depictions of characters that you respect and think about?
> How
> > > 'bout the character that Denzel Washington plays in "Remember the
> Titans?"
> > > How 'bout the character that is played by Mel Gibson in "The Patriot?"
> > > Sure, they're not real characters and, yeah, those were movies. OH!!
> And
> > > what about the characters played by Robert De Niro and Cuba Gooding in
> "Men
> > > of Honor." But, you mean to tell me that you've *never* encountered a
> > > personal crisis such as theirs and applied what you learned in those
> movies
> > > to the struggles we live here in real life every day? *NEVER?*!!
> > >
> > Probably not since I was ten or eleven.
> > >
> >
> You'd be an incredibly difficult person to decide on a movie for then. Do
> ya have *any* heroes at all? I mean, other than the dad, the mom, the
> grandpa, etc. I think those folks are heroes to most of us.

I don't want anyone to decide on a movie for me. I'll decide on my own,
thanks. I don't view movies in order to find a solution to a personal
crisis. I view movies to be entertained.

My heroes are not movie or television characters, Kim. They aren't the
current crop of athletes who sell their autographs to kids. My
grandparents and parents were never heroes to me. They were (save for a
couple of exceptions) role models. I think you might be confusing the

two terms. I considered some of my school teachers and neighbors and
folks in the community to be role models.

I have plenty of heroes. They come from history. In many of those
cases, they sacrificed themselves for others. Some sacrificed for their
country. Some risked their lives to save others (so my heroes didn't
all die). Some heroes stood tall for principles.

> > >
> > > Wow. That sounds so empty.
> >
> > Choosing reality over identifying with TV and movie characters is empty?
> >
>
> Dave, you're incapable of applying traits that are found in powerful
> movies and applying them to real life situations. I am not. There is > a difference.

Being incapable of doing something and choosing not to do it are
different.

> "The Patriot" allowed me to reflect, for the very first time,
> on the "personal" aspects that living during such time must have had on
> regular, every day people. Made me appreciate those from that time a little
> more.

While I enjoyed the movie (its purpose), I didn't have any difficulty
understanding what kind of things that everyday people might have had
back in those times even before the film was made.

> > >
> > > By the way, the movies "Erin Brokovich"(sp), "Remember the Titans" and
> "Men
> > > of Honor" were all based on true stories, Dave. You know...real life.
> >
> > We all know what the words "based on" mean when used by movie makers.
> > Are you asking if I watch and enjoy TV shows or movies, the answer is
> > yes. If you are asking if I identify with movie characters, the answer
> > is no.
> >
>
> Well then, there we have it.
>
> > >
> > > *REAL* life. Sure, I mentioned some additional ones from my original
> post.
> > > But, a tale to be told does not have to be real to learn something >
> from it, Dave.
> >
> > Ever read a non-fiction book and then watch the movie made from it?
> > Ever notice that the movie version is always greatly imbellished and
> > that sometimes the ending is completely different?
> >

>
> Are you suggesting just a teency bit that books (????!!!!) are more to base
> real life on than movies? Sure, I've read books then watched the movie and
> been disappointed every time. BUT, aren't they both the same in terms of
> reality, to you? I suppose if you find yourself identifying more with a
> book, it's a matter of media then.

That'd be true if I hadn't written "non-fiction book" so it isn't a
matter of the medium at all. Do you claim that a documentary film is
not any diffent than a historical drama where liberties are taken with
fact and where a team of writers put words in the mouth of a character
which that person never uttered in life?

> > >
> > > Yeah, I know better. Lots better.
> >
> > Can't prove it from what I've read here, either in the initial posting
> > or your follow up.
>
>
> Returning back to the last "bottom line" of this branch of this thread; the
> one where I asked you do you know why I could "mingle" better with all
> groups of people than you could? You never answered. The reason, in my
> opinion, that I have more flexibility with people than you, Dave, is because
> I believe I am far more appreciative of peoples' different points of view.

Now we have a conundrum. What proof do you offer that you are more
flexible than me or that you are more appreciative of different points
of view? Was the proof in the line about your "fake smile" at that
cocktail party or in your detailed attributions to the thoughts and
attitudes of other attendees?

> You base my approach to reality now, completely on the fact that I mentioned
> some movies and you completely ignore the rest of a real honest submission
> to you about myself.

I assuredly have not based my impression of you on your identification
with movie characters. I've certainly based part of that impression on
your statement about what you'd like to whisper to some woman you'd
encountered at a cocktail party. The impression I came away with wasn't
good.

> To each his own. I can accept your statement for what it is. You cast a
> judgement on mine. (Except for the part where I do say that it sounds very
> empty that your emotions are not stirred by a good movie).

My emotions can be stirred by a good movie. I just don't identify with
a character and use that character in solving personal problems. What
sets us apart in this instance is in choosing to identify with fantasy
vs. reality.

Dave K8MN

2896. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 16:50:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C090A49.33E7229C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25893

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C086FA4.A727DB03@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C08693D.F1DEC86C@earthlink.net...
> > > > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > On Thu, 29 Nov 2001 05:58:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >You forget that many of these kids aren't old enough to give legal
> > > > > >consent.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then they can't get the piercing or tattooing done. If you
> are
> > > > > under age, a parent or guardian MUST consent to any such invasive
> > > > > procedure or the business that conducts it is liable.
> > > >
> > > > Sure Rick... (quick nod to the guys with the jacket)
> > > > And underage kids can't buy beer or cigarettes or liquor either.
> > > > Yeah, those underage kids aren't having any piercings or tattooing
> done
> > > > without their parents consent.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > > And if the parent DOES consent, it's no one else's concern
> but
> > > > > that of the family involved.
> > > >
> > > > Right again, Rick. Just because some parent is lacking common sense,
> I
> > > > won't worry at all about it.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > He didn't get the "or" statement in your submission, Rick ("or the
> business
> > > that conducts it is liable").
> >
> > Sure, I got it. The beer sellers, the drug dealers, the liquor
> > sellers--they're all liable too. It doesn't seem to slow up many of
```

> > 'em.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> And, it doesn't slow up the kids looking to buy. And, it doesn't slow up
> the parents who don't get more aggressive to do something about indicators
> that their kids are into things like that. You want *all* to keep from
> being able to avail themselves of something because of those who are too
> lazy to restrict themselves from doing wrong?

Huh? I said nothing even close to the motivations you have attributed
to me.

Dave K8MN

2897. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 17:06:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C090E12.E30A4DD2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25894

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C088119.DB36D38D@earthlink.net...
> > Rick Adams wrote:
.
> > >
> > > A "male" group, Dave?
> > >
> > > It's an _amateur radio_ group!
> > >
> > > What a sexist statement to make!
> >
> > I wrote "a mostly male group" which you translate to "a 'male' group".
> >
> > Of course it is an amateur radio group!
> >
> > What a silly and deliberately false translation you've made!
> >
> > Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a mixed
> > group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the
> > contradiction didn't you understand?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Dave, I hope you'll remember that I don't think I said I would not use
> inappropriate language at the wrong times. I don't think I said "in a mixed
> group" and didn't mean to imply that way if I did or made it sound like I
> did. What I meant, and here's the example I think I presented, is that I
> would not use inappropriate language at a black tie dinner. This newsgroup
> is far from a black tie dinner. Here, I won't generally curse, but I will
> to make a point--as I did in the example in the post.

Thanks for straightening up that point. What difference is there
between using the language at a black tie dinner and here? Is it in the
apparel?

> At a football game, you bet I'll generally be cursing...

You would? Why would you be cursing at a football game? Did you go to
the Karolyn Rose-Marge Schott School of Etiquette?

> I think your interpretation of what you read points up the fact even more
> that I know when behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate. If you truly

> feel like being that "proper" all the time, then by all means I have no
> problem. But, if you feel like you "have to" but don't really enjoy being
> proper at all times--then I ask why you allow such demands to be placed upon
> yourself. I don't live my life for others--though I will make allowances.
> I live for me.

What is being proper, Kim? Is it in living your life in a way which
includes acknowledgement of the sensitivities of others toward vulgarity
and what society considers to be foul language? There are as many
people who would be offended by your language at a football game as
would be offended at that black-tie function.

It is quite apparent that you live your life only for you.

Dave K8MN

2898. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 18:21:11 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ub71101seb@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25895

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c08e3db_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> WHY does an attraction have to be physical or sexual?
>
> Kim W5TIT

It's because, in most cases, a man's brain is directly connected to his penis.

As Red Green says, "We can't help it. We're men."

2899. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 18:33:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ub7n201tuk@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25897

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C08B620.E7F93E01@sccoast.net...

> Kim's callsign is a passionate belief? Oh, come on. If we're going
> to argue that fanatically, argue over something that matters. Or don't
> get so fanatical about it.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

So what are you complaining about? If you don't want to argue, don't
respond.

2900. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 18:35:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ub7r401u6k@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25896

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0867FC.57D708A1@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > I think a lot of folks "do" newsgroups for the same reason that they go
to a
> > wrestling, boxing, or other sporting match, or even the races.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> For the blood and accidents?
>
> Dave K8MN

Are you not entertained?! ARE YOU NOT ENTERTAINED!?!

2901. some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 20:10:23 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <POaO7.139177$WW.8801107@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25898

The World Bank defines adult illiteracy as the inability of someone 15 or older to read or write, with understanding, a short and simple statement about their everyday life. While the highest rates as one would expect are in Africa, when those are removed we come to this sequence:

Country Rate of Adult illiteracy

Pakistan 55%
Egypt 46%
India (second largest Muslim cty) 45%
Algeria 33%
Saudi Arabia 25%
China 18%
Brazil 17%
South Africa 17%
Turkey 16%
Indonesia 15%
Malaysia 13%

There has been a lot of discussion of Islam in this group so it is worth noting here that a huge proportion of the population gets its idea of Islam from the local imam. It is not an economic issue, Egypt and Ecuador have essentially the same income per head. South Africa may be excused for no better reason that the current regime' has not been in power for 15 years and replaced one where education was not a huge priority.

We have seen, in the USA for sure, what happens when the local imam's education is from the Schmellpell Institute of Pinochle, Religion, and Belles Lettres or is simply a money-raising fraud. When there is no hope, suicide bombers abound.

Dick NBK

2902. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 21:31:37 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7752ECFDC9939528.7C5E1635518C8755.483D57EBB25D190B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25899

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 15:32:55 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Maybe you should have tried using a bowl. It allows the wine to breathe
>properly.

Not with a decent red Bordeaux!!!

Lacking the bell of the wine glass and expanding it's
width/height ratio to that extent would cause the wine to lose its
more subtle flavors. A young red needs to be allowed to breathe--but
much more slowly than a bowl would cause--ideally in the wine glass
itself, which is shaped appropriately for the task. A good vintage red
shouldn't need time to breathe, it's already aged properly (the
purpose of breathing a wine is to simulate the changes of aging, not
to break up the wine), although with a very old wine you may need to
decant it to address cork decomposition. In either case, however, a
bowl wouldn't be suited to the use.

For a light aperitif wine, a fruity cordial, a rice wine (or a
good sake) or a micro brewery beer, on the other hand, a bowl would be
the perfect serving vessel, so long as it was glass or ceramic of
course (a metal bowl imparts a taste to the contents that isn't
appropriate to an alcoholic beverage). A bowl is also appropriate for
a non-alcoholic beverage of course.

Don't be stodgy, Dave. Try something slightly different--and
perhaps a bit "wacky" once in a while, it doesn't hurt anyone and you
might find it adds something to your life.

>> A friend of ours would probably also be someone she'd
>> enjoy--he drinks only top quality liqours (Grand Mariner, XO Cognac,
>> Chartreuse, etc.)--but ONLY from the bottle!
>
>I don't have a problem with what your "friend" does when he is alone or
>with you folks. I wouldn't want him as a dinner guest. Does he drink
>from *your* bottles?

Hardly, that would represent bad manners. And, to ease your
mind, he doesn't do so as a dinner guest either (although he seldom
gets to enjoy sitting down to dinner himself--he's the executive chef
and part owner of a top restaurant in Chicago, and he prefers to
entertain than to eat out when he's with friends, so he tends to end
up cooking the meal himself [according to her, she's never cooked a
meal since they married--their kitchen is HIS territory--and she
doesn't mind it a bit!]).

>> Life is meant to be lived, not regulated by convention. Try
>> slurping from a bowl someday--if the contents are good enough you'll
>> probably enjoy it.
>
>There's no need for me to do so. I've already mastered the use of
>cutlery and this allows much enhancement to the life I'm living.

Try something new.

Do you eat with chop sticks? If not, you are losing an
addition to the experience of eating Asian foods. Do you eat with your
fingers? If not, you can't enjoy buffalo wings, or other "finger
foods" to your detriment. Do you like to try new foods and beverages?
New restaurants? New cuisines? Many cuisines DO have dishes meant to
be "slurped from the bowl." If you aren't willing to try that, you'll
lose the opportunity to experience an entire range of wonderful
flavors--or you'll end up consuming them inappropriately and be viewed
by the restaurant staff as a "stodgy American" who rejects their
cultural practices.

>Ask Kim. "Loathsome" is her word. It didn't make any sense to me
>either.

A loathsome life, to me, is one that is wasted, Dave. It's one
in which bitterness, self-righteousness, materialism, jingoism, or
other negative experiences have prevented the full enjoyment of all
the riches that a healthy approach to life has to offer. It's the life
of the miser, the criminal, the prude, or the dour doom-sayer--all of
whom have far more in common than they would like to think they have.

It's a life to be pitied, Dave. And one it is very clear Kim
doesn't live.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2903. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 21:56:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0951F6.4686B619@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25900

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C087F43.1A3D438F@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > She chose to change her call sign. That's IT. That's ALL she
> > > did. She didn't invite people to slam her, insult her, ridicule her,
> > > or even defend her here for that matter. She just changed her call
> > > sign to another LEGAL call sign she preferred.
> > >
> > None of us who do something stupid, issue an invitation to be rebuked
> > for it but it is certainly difficult to dodge responsibility.
> > >
>
> Oh, contraire. Contraire. I wholeheartedly *welcome and invite* anyone to
> "rebuke" (if that's what you wish to call it) my callsign! Prove to me that
> it's wrong, that it's going to bring the ARS "one step closer to
> extinction," that all children entering ham radio are harmed, that it's not
> a family radio service any more, that I offer nothing of positive value to
> the ARS, and on and on.

Oh oh au contraire. It doesn't matter what you have to offer the ARS if
folks can't get past your call. All children don't have to be harmed.
How about if one child is offended? How about if one woman who doesn't
see your poke at ham radio is upset by it? How about if one man finds
your call an unpleasant embarrassment? In those cases, you are
responsible and your choice reflects badly upon amateur radio and upon
your judgement.

You don't need to take a leap toward the extinction of amateur radio. A
small step at a time will do it.

> Prove it. Make one, just one, logical argument that it does. Remember,
> logic is that which is very personal.

Would it make any difference if I could offer sound proof, Kim?
You've already indicated that your nose thumbing at humanity is your way
of telling us that all that matters to you is what you want. It is,
after all, your life and no one can tell you how to live it.

> >
> > I'd rather accept my own view of what's best for amateur radio than the
> > view of her most frequent libertarian defender. I'm not bound to accept
> > your "libertarian-with-attitude" view any more than I'm bound to accept
> > Kim's choice as appropriate.

> NOW, we get to something we agree on! No name calling, Dave. Let's make it
> as pure and simple as we can get: I absolutely understand that you do not
> believe my callsign is good for amateur radio. I also absolutely agree that
> you are not bound to accept my choice as appropriate.
>
> I wholeheartedly understand, but disagree. Here you go: I'd rather accept
> my own view of what's best for amateur radio than the view of a most
> conservative man such as yourself. I'm not bound to accept your
> conservative attitude any more than I'm bound to believe that my choice of a
> callsign is inappropriate.

No you aren't bound, Kim. It is your legal right to retain your call
and to continue to thumb your nose at society. You've already claimed
that you don't care how you are perceived by others. You haven't learned
a thing.

Dave K8MN

2904. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 21:57:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C095242.6EFF7ED8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25951

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C088119.DB36D38D@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a mixed
> > group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the
> > contradiction didn't you understand?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Man, you are stretching now, Dave. You're really stretching.

In what way, Kim?

Dave K8MN

2905. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 22:08:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0954D6.7CB26508@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25952

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 15:32:55 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:

>
> >Ask Kim. "Loathsome" is her word. It didn't make any sense to me
> >either.
>
> A loathsome life, to me, is one that is wasted, Dave. It's one
> in which bitterness, self-righteousness, materialism, jingoism, or
> other negative experiences have prevented the full enjoyment of all
> the riches that a healthy approach to life has to offer. It's the life
> of the miser, the criminal, the prude, or the dour doom-sayer--all of
> whom have far more in common than they would like to think they have.
>
> It's a life to be pitied, Dave. And one it is very clear Kim
> doesn't live.

Then account for her loathing my lifestyle. Maybe she lives it after all and perhaps Cecil is indeed compulsive/obsessive. You have to stop issuing denials for the claims of others.

I guess you've gotten used to that self-righteous, libertarian chip on your shoulder and have managed to come to terms with the self-loathing it has induced. Maybe you can turn it around before you have to consider your life wasted.

Dave K8MN

2906. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 22:24:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <081D8B9BD400AE59.4DF1746E7CAABF0F.1D04DB6A64040C9C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25953

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 15:53:24 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Sure it does. If you leave out a modifier, it changes what the
>statement means. If someone states a reality, how is the statement
>sexist? There are, by far, more males posting here than females. There
>are, by far, more male radio amateurs than female. Those statements are
>simple reality.

But does that mean that this is a primarily male news
group--or that the majority of the posters here are male? There are
tens of thousands of READERS of this group, Dave (I already cited the
source)--and there is absolutely no possible way to justify assuming
that a majority are male.

In classrooms it isn't at all uncommon for the males to speak
out while the women sit back and listen. Some of us who teach end up
encouraging the women to participate more actively--but if we don't do
so we invariably end up in a male-dominated classroom. Even in a class
that is 3/4 women a listener in the hall would be convinced there were
no women present--or at most only about one woman for every five men.
Precisely the same thing could be true of this news group--OR of those
who listen to (versus talk on) the ham bands as well.

I _do_ know that more women listen to short wave radio than
men (a statistic published in, as I recall, Science magazine). Given
that they already have radios capable of doing so, is it unlikely that
they are listening to ham conversations as well?

Obviously, they aren't licensed hams--but the concept of
government regulation of the airways doesn't imply that hams are to be
the only ones to receive enjoyment from the ARS--only that they are to
be the only ones permitted to transmit in those bands.

>> >Of course it is an amateur radio group!
>>
>> No, actually it's a Usenet group created for the discussion of
>> amateur radio policy issues. If it were an amateur radio group, people
>> wouldn't keep telling me that what is said here has no effect on the
>> amateur radio service.
>
>Did you have a real point to make?

Sure.

You--and others such as Larry and Dick--insist that people
should respect the practices that form the guidelines for amateur

radio communications when on the air--even when those guidelines (i.e., they should use the appropriate sideband for the band in which they are operating, show respect for traffic nets by not occupying their regular frequency when it is known they will begin operations soon, take the time to encourage new hams instead of snubbing them, etc.) are NOT matters of law, but strictly conventions.

Fine. I agree with that, as (I'm sure) do most of the people in this newsgroup.

But, by the same standard, the Usenet has it's own guidelines that users are expected to follow. Those guidelines include such practices as trimming attributions severely, providing sources for statements claimed to be facts rather than opinion, dropping a thread when it is clear that nothing new is left to say about the subject, etc.

As someone who legitimately insists that those who want to participate in his hobby (amateur radio) should adhere to the guidelines for that area of interest, you have an obligation to respect the guidelines for the hobbies of others in which you choose to participate as well.

That, Dave, is the point. You don't do so. Larry and Dick don't do so (although both tend to be more effective in trimming their attributions than you are). Yet all three of you argue here that your only reason for participating in this thread is because you are offended by actions you perceive to be harmful to the ARS. If that is the case, you--more than others--have an absolute obligation not to act in a manner that is likely to offend those who participate in hobby computing, and thus may be harmful to the Usenet community.

You claim to believe in fairness, Dave. Yet in this area you do not demonstrate that conviction.

>Don't read 'em if it bothers you. Only a fool would trim the things to
>which he was responding.

Isn't that like saying "only a fool would restrict or restrain his language on the air when making a point?"

Sorry, Dave, but if the guidelines for proper behavior on the Usenet aren't important enough to you to show respect for them, then your opinions concerning the way events may affect the ARS are totally unimportant to anyone else. It simply demonstrates that you are unwilling to demonstrate fairness in your behavior.

>> I'm sure if we were on the air and I violated standard
>> operating conventions out of ignorance or lack of consideration you
>> would take the time to inform me of the fact, and would expect me to
>> respect the ARS and change my behavior.
>
>Let's be honest. You don't know for a fact, what I would do.

No, I don't.

I presented that response as the most polite, respectful, and
courteous way in which an amateur radio operator could reasonably be
expected to behave under those conditions.

If you feel that you would be less courteous, respectful, or
polite on the air I certainly won't dispute your word on that issue.

>Always a pleasure to hear from the newsgroup police. What makes it
>funnier is that you are a guy who often trims relevant info in an
>apparent effort to make it appear that someone has said something he has
>not.

No, Dave, I do not.

What I trim is either: (1) material addressing subjects to
which I am not responding (there's no logical reason to quote-back an
entire message when you are only responding to part of it) and; (2)
quotes from previous messages. I NEVER trim your own statements (if I
am responding to them)--only the statements you are replying TO.

It's appropriate behavior Dave. It makes efficient use of the
medium and does NOT distort the meaning of the quote being replied to.
I'm sorry if you can't remember what you replied to or don't use a
good enough news reader to refer back to your posts yourself--but
there simply isn't any reason to waste bandwidth quoting extensive
material that the intelligent reader will simply skip over to reach
the new material anyway.

>> But, Dave, you yourself stated that it is "a mostly male
>> group." Thus, her comments were made primarily for a male audience
>> who, presumably, are accustomed to frank language (and if you claim
>> MEN don't use that language in conversation among themselves there
>> isn't a person in this group who would believe you even THOUGHT that
>> was true).
>
>Kim isn't male.

You mean that different rules of speech apply to women than to
men?

Dave, there is no way you can define that statement other than
as sexism.

>There are *some* other females who read the group.

Again, so what?

Unless you view women as incapable of dealing with language
that a man can deal with (which is likewise sexism) that makes no
difference what-so-ever.

>Kim explains that she wouldn't use that kind of language in a *mixed
>group*.

I suspect it would depend on the group in Kim's case--as it
would in my own.

Around a group of people who did not use frank language I have
no doubt she would not do so either by choice. And around a group who
DID commonly use frank language, I can't see any reason why she
wouldn't--or shouldn't!

> If Kim uses such language in a group of males, the group is a
>mixed group.

Then your argument boils down, essentially, to the point that
a woman shouldn't use language that is common among men unless she is
only speaking to a woman?

Want to explain how it is possible that your view is anything
at all but sexism?

>Not all men use the same or similar language in conversation, Rick.

Of course not. More importantly, men tend to use different
language in different settings. What you may say in a military
barracks, for example, is certainly different from what you would be
likely to say at a church supper.

>Of those who do, not many would use the language in the presence of a
>woman.

And here is where we break company.

If a man (or woman) is going to use a given term it is the
SETTING, not the sex of the listeners, that should be the sole
criteria. Precisely why is it that language appropriate for men is not
appropriate for women? Try to justify that claim on the basis of
logic, not sexism and stereotypes.

> Good luck with your latest baseless rant.

I'll let you know if I start one someday.

>Oh yeah, the netiquette version of this post appears below:

If you believe that is proper attributions, you demonstrate
the same level of knowledge of appropriate behavior that a cb 'er
would demonstrate by using a 2K linear and 150% modulation on 11m.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2907. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 22:53:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C095F55.1B1757C1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25954

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Are you arguing that total trust is what you believe in, Cecil?

A wife who would violate my trust is not worth having
as a wife. Better to find that out sooner than later.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2908. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 23:01:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C09614C.6E54FF7F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25955

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > You implied that the Libertarian Party
> > is a dead horse while it is in fact
> > more successful than it ever has been
> > before. The Libertarian Party is
> > probably the largest third party in
> > the US.
>
> ... so my statement still stands.

How can I be any clearer? The part of your statement to which I objected was the "dead horse" part. The Libertarian Party is growing every year and is not a "dead horse". It is a grass roots organization that just won more elections than at any other time in its short history. It is strong in a few states and weak in many others. That's why nothing is happening at a national level yet. From little acorns, might oaks grow.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2909. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 23:04:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0961F2.5A8AF7BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25956

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >Gee, not many posts ago you admitted to being a radical.
>
> For someone who insists on quote backs, you're remarkably
> unwilling to use them yourself.
>
> Show me where I identified myself as a "RADICAL."

Maybe Dave means that you are radically straight forward and honest. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2910. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 23:07:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DC17EF6C76FEAB88.9B5A70A7C08FC1D7.5D7897612278BACC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25957

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 16:10:39 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Your view simply isn't borne out by what I found in the Sunday Wheeling
>News-Register just a couple of weeks back. Agents cited numerous
>establishments in the Ohio Valley for selling tobacco, beer and liquor
>to minors.

Yup!

And how many tattoo parlors or piercing salons were providing
services to kids?

The very fact that "sting" operations ARE regularly conducted
to catch shops selling tobacco and alcohol to youths demonstrates that
a risk is involved in doing so. And the risk to a firm that performs
an act that is _permanent_ (i.e., a tattoo or a piercing) versus one
that can be claimed to have been made accidently (thought s/he was old
enough, new employee, etc.) and has no long term affect (based on the
specific incident--tobacco, obviously, has a long term effect when
used on a regular basis) is vastly more liable to damages.

If, for example, my son were 16 (he just turned 18), and he
purchased a six pack of beer at a local store I would have grounds to
prosecute and could possibly even sue for putative damages. Neither
the prosecution nor the law suit, however, would result in enough
damages to seriously harm the business (although either or both might
discourage further sales to minors). But if, instead, he went to a
piercing salon and had his tongue pierced (a permanent piercing) or
went to a tattoo parlor and had a picture of a bloody knife tattooed
on his forearm, I would have grounds for a law suit that would
probably put the firm out of business. That's a LOT more risk for a
firm than the simple offense of selling beer to a teen.

>> No, Dave, I _don't_ think very many early teens are getting
>> tattoos and piercings w/o their parent's consent. Do you?
>
>Yes, I do.

Then document your source for the information. Unless, of
course, it is purely opinion with no basis in demonstrable fact.

>For a parent to permit something which permanently defaces the human
>body such as piercings and tattooing sounds pretty irresponsible to me.

ONLY if piercings or tattoos are viewed as "defacing" rather
than as "enhancing." That isn't a question of general values, Dave,

it's one that is cultural--and if the youth culture of today finds them attractive (which it appears they do), why shouldn't they have the same right to set their standards of beauty that you and I have to set our own?

Many cultures world wide use piercings, tattoos, or scarification to (from their perspective) enhance beauty. In the US until the feminist movement caught on, women spent literally hours putting on elaborate makeup before going in public--again to enhance their beauty according to the standards of the current culture. To treat such accoutrements as "defacing" simply indicates that you believe your personal standards of beauty are the only ones that have validity, a patent absurdity.

>We all know that people often participate in acts in youth which they
>come to regret as adults. That is one reason that courts try youthful
>offenders under different standards than adults.

True.

But one of the greatest problems we have with juveniles in our nation today is the combination of justification and repression. Justification in that we tend to minimize the degree of their own responsibility for an offense and blame the act on society, and repression because we refuse to accept what are often very legitimate values and standards because they differ from our own generation's and are held by youths rather than adults.

By limiting teens (pre-pubescent kids are a different matter--from a psychological perspective they have not as yet fully matured mentally, where adolescents have done so) in ways that adults are not limited, we simply make it clear that they are "children" from our perspective--and then we wonder why they ACT like children on occasion.

>> I know some women who have
>> exceptionally attractive tattoos and more than a few who have body
>> jewelry (including some piercings NO teen would be able to have done
>> with or without parental consent) and are very happy with the
>> result--as are their spouses or significant others.
>>
>> Your values apply only to yourself, not to others.
>>
>
>Ever hear of a term called "community values"? Its existence would
>refute your statement.

Only if you can demonstrate that the community: (1) has a RIGHT to impose values on a given matter and; (2) has better or more relevant values than the individuals affected.

Your "Community values" when carried to any reasonable extent would define such behavior as piercing as totally inappropriate in

some communities--and completely acceptable in others. What if the person who is pierced in, for example, Santa Cruz California, where it is accepted, travels to Cincinnati where it is not well accepted? Are they obligated to remove their jewelry and have the piercing surgically closed? Or is it unreasonable for the new community to impose its values on those who don't share them?

Community values can only refute my statement if you can demonstrate community values that are absolutes rather than subjective decisions based on current stereotypes and political influences. So far, I have yet to see someone do that.

>Do some school systems have dress codes?

Sure.

In any private school you care to pay tuition for.

But in a public school?

Whose standards do you enforce with those codes? It can't be that of the parents--they aren't asked their opinion, which would be expressed by the clothing they permitted their children to wear to school anyway. It can't be that of the kids themselves, since it restricts those choices directly. And since the parents and the kids, together REPRESENT the community of interest (it isn't ANYONE'S business what the dress code is if he or she has no connection with the school or kids in the first place), it can't be the community's codes, either. The only thing left is an arbitrary set of values that have no justification what-so-ever.

A girl in a Michigan school was recently suspended for wearing a t-shirt with a pentagram on it (symbolic of Wicca). Yet a girl wearing a t-shirt with a religious icon (a picture of Jesus with a halo) on it was permitted to attend classes. According to the school, the pentagram violated the dress code. It sounds to me like the school was the one who committed a violation--of the religious rights of the student. But "community standards" supported the dress code and since the parents didn't have the money (or desire) to fight the case to the SC, the school won.

It was a public school.

>Can you buy a copy of Hustler magazine in Hamilton County, Ohio?

Nope. Which has nothing to do with "community standards" and has everything to do with suppression of freedom of speech and freedom of choice.

It is also the direct result of concentrated campaigns by the religious right that have thrust what should be religious issues into the legal process. The same holds true for Ft. Wayne, IN, and other extremist, bible-thumping, communities.

>On an FCC related topic:
>
>Why does the Dish Network bleep offensive words from movies?

It doesn't.

The dish network doesn't produce or show movies, Dave, it
merely provides a satellite downlink for the broadcasters such as HBO,
Showtime, etc.--at least if it works the same as DirecTV, as I
understand it does.

If the Dish network DOES censor in that manner, it is simply a
good reason to choose DirecTV instead--since the alternative is
allowing someone ELSE to decide what is appropriate for you to hear.

Let me reverse the question: If there's something wrong with
using those words--why are the present in a movie in the first place
to REQUIRE anyone to "bleep" them?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2911. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 23:07:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0962C0.6F38A886@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25958

Dave Heil wrote:
> How about if one child is offended?

Oh dear God, another "It takes a village" person.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2912. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 23:13:58 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0D8D991B72A34E78.54270F3EF82B0C73.9384415D0FFD4EA4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25959

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 05:48:15 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Then I would say you've convinced yourself (or are trying to
>convince me) that you're not human. I would find it very difficult to
>believe that you have a number of female friends, and thoughts of sex
>has never entered your mind with any of them.

On the contrary, Dwight, I'm very human. And in the right
settings, I'm (obviously) attracted to women on a sexual basis. But
the difference is, when the setting is NOT right I don't feel any such
attraction at all. I'm sorry if you can't relate to that experience,
but I can very definitely state that it is one that many men share.

> We're not talking about "bed mates," Rick. We're talking about being
>sexually attracted, in your mind, to that other person. That does not
>have to be just thoughts about how to get her (assuming "Rick" is a
>male's name in this case) into bed.

It's a male name.

And I still maintain that sexual attraction is NOT a necessary
part of an interaction between a man and a woman unless the setting is
appropriate to that reaction.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2913. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 23:15:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C09648B.95C1860F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25960

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Not true of me, Dwight. For months, I have been dating a lady with
> > absolutely no thought of sex on my mind. We just enjoy socializing together
> > as a couple.
>
> Absolutely no thought of sex, Cecil? I find that very hard to
> believe that you date a woman that you're not attracted to.

The purpose of dating my current lady friend is she is a member of
the country club and invites me to the monthly party where I have
a lot of fun. But I wasn't sexually attracted to her in high school
and, 46 years later, I'm still not sexually attracted to her.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2914. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 23:26:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C09673F.BAAF7C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25961

Rick Adams wrote:
> On the contrary, Dwight, I'm very human. And in the right
> settings, I'm (obviously) attracted to women on a sexual basis. But
> the difference is, when the setting is NOT right I don't feel any such
> attraction at all.

Dwight is obviously one of those Homo sapiens who hasn't yet evolved
to the stage where he is in control of and responsible for his own
feelings. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2915. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 23:32:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C3B23BABE838F00E.C11572E24CD16671.EA017BED2E0680EF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25962

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 21:56:05 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Oh oh au contraire. It doesn't matter what you have to offer the ARS if
>folks can't get past your call. All children don't have to be harmed.
>How about if one child is offended? How about if one woman who doesn't
>see your poke at ham radio is upset by it? How about if one man finds
>your call an unpleasant embarrassment? In those cases, you are
>responsible and your choice reflects badly upon amateur radio and upon
>your judgement.

Then by the same standard, if your last name reminds a Jewish
ham of the experience his or her parents underwent at the hands of the
Nazis ("Heil Hitler!") shouldn't you have your name changed or refrain
from making your last name known to amateurs on the air or on your QSL
cares?

>You don't need to take a leap toward the extinction of amateur radio. A
>small step at a time will do it.

That's ok, Dave.

After all, both of your supporters (Dick Carroll and Larry
Roll) believe that the people entering ham radio since the
restructuring aren't "real" hams anyway and will only damage the ARS.
So if Kim's call sign choice makes one or more of them stay out of the
hobby (as you all claim it has the potential to do) she will actually
be helping to PRESERVE the ARS through her choice rather than damage
it. In fact, it could be argued that if YOU refuse to change your sign
to one that could offend potential hams (perhaps W8DIK???) it is YOU,
not Kim, who is bringing the ARS "...one step closer to extinction."

>Would it make any difference if I could offer sound proof, Kim?

I believe it would make a difference. If you could actually
PROVE to Kim that her call sign was harming the ARS, I would be VERY
surprised if she wouldn't change it.

>You've already indicated that your nose thumbing at humanity is your way
>of telling us that all that matters to you is what you want. It is,
>after all, your life and no one can tell you how to live it.

One has nothing to do with the other. Kim DOES have a right to
live her life in the manner she chooses--as we ALL do--but at the same
time she has a sense of responsibility and would be very unlikely to
make a choice she KNEW would hurt others who hadn't first invited that
harm. She IS dedicated to ham radio, and unlike those who would demean

and ridicule new hams because they didn't have to go through the same
now pointless hazing rituals we had to undergoes (code testing), she
actually seems to care about people's feelings--so long as they don't
invite her disdain by pretending to be more moral than she herself.

>> NOW, we get to something we agree on! No name calling, Dave. Let's make it
>> as pure and simple as we can get: I absolutely understand that you do not
>> believe my callsign is good for amateur radio. I also absolutely agree that
>> you are not bound to accept my choice as appropriate.
>>
>> I wholeheartedly understand, but disagree. Here you go: I'd rather accept
>> my own view of what's best for amateur radio than the view of a most
>> conservative man such as yourself. I'm not bound to accept your
>> conservative attitude any more than I'm bound to believe that my choice of a
>> callsign is inappropriate.
>
>No you aren't bound, Kim. It is your legal right to retain your call
>and to continue to thumb your nose at society.

Not at society, Dave. At those in society who she feels
(rightly, in my opinion) are unreasonable in their demands.

>You've already claimed
>that you don't care how you are perceived by others. You haven't learned
>a thing.

From you?

What was she supposed to learn? How to attack others for
disagreeing with her? Why would she need to learn that from someone
who generally loses when he attempts to do so himself?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2916. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-01 23:36:05 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <09FE07A34AAC864E.C638CD63629A4537.94B627A7E840F203@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25963

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 22:08:22 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> A loathsome life, to me, is one that is wasted, Dave. It's one
>> in which bitterness, self-righteousness, materialism, jingoism, or
>> other negative experiences have prevented the full enjoyment of all
>> the riches that a healthy approach to life has to offer. It's the life
>> of the miser, the criminal, the prude, or the dour doom-sayer--all of
>> whom have far more in common than they would like to think they have.
>>
>> It's a life to be pitied, Dave. And one it is very clear Kim
>> doesn't live.
>
>Then account for her loathing my lifestyle. Maybe she lives it after
>all and perhaps Cecil is indeed compulsive/obsessive. You have to stop
>issuing denials for the claims of others.

Perhaps she simply sees your life as wasted, Dave.

That would be a pretty good reason to loathe your lifestyle,
wouldn't it?

>I guess you've gotten used to that self-righteous, libertarian chip on
>your shoulder and have managed to come to terms with the self-loathing
>it has induced. Maybe you can turn it around before you have to consider
>your life wasted.

I don't have any self-loathing, Dave. Like Kim and Cecil (and,
I'm sure, most others) I come here for recreation not because I expect
to influence anyone to change his views.

Of course, wasted is in the mind of the beholder, and while
you may consider my life wasted, I find the freedom that has formed
its core a LOT more positive and worthwhile than the hate and
superstition that obviously forms your own. I'll leave it up to others
to decide which of us has had a "wasted" life on that basis.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2917. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:01:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c096e91_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25964

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C08B3A3.177A0394@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Overall, yes, I believe that women
> > and men can be friends without having
> > sex. Note that I said without having
> > sex. There will be few encounters
> > with the opposite sex in which "sex"
> > does not enter the minds of either--
> > and a true friendship is capable of
> > exploring that those thoughts and
> > feelings are there. And, a true
> > friendship will suffer through that
> > (because it is strictly temporary)
> > and get on to the real business of
> > being friends.
>
>
> Thanks for noticing the difference between to the two (sexual
> attraction and having sex). True, obviously many people can have
> relations with the opposite sex without actually having sex, but I do
> think it is difficult to have such without at least the thought of sex
> entering the minds of those involved at some point. We are very sexual
> creatures and there are few interactions with the opposite sex where
> the thought of sex doesn't come up.
>

Hmmmm. I think I'd tend to agree if the "friendship" is a true friendship and, by that, I mean a friendship outside of those acquaintances we make at work and even many we hams make. If I were to have a friendship in which a man and I have many situations to be with each other, there is high liklihood that at some point I may feel sexually to him. But, feeling sexually attracted to male friends at work, casual friends from ham radio, etc., is pretty nil. At least, I've never felt a sexual attraction to someone I would consider a casual friend. I am not a very sexual creature--quite different from many women I've been told (by the women :)). By your definition of "few interactions with the opposite sex where the thought of sex doesn't come up" I am not so sure about that for me; or from the perspective of women in general. Not being sexist here, I hope, but I think men are much more likely to be sexually attracted to a casual acquaintence than women are.

What's your opinion of that?

>
> > Now, the situation which brings this
> > whole topic up--that of Rick and I
> > getting together at a Starbucks (I
> > think it was) and Larry R. having
> > such a (snip)
>
>
> I wasn't adding this as a part of that conversation. This was just
> something that popped into my head and I decided to add another branch
> off the existing discussions.
>
>
> > I don't think there's anything wrong
> > at all with "feeling" desirable, or
> > with fantasizing about other people.
> > I think it's quite healthy--and have
> > been in situations where that part of
> > a friendship is discussed, dealt with,
> > and allowed to "go away" (because it
> > will). I would think my husband was
> > extremely weird if he told me that he
> > only ever looks at me and doesn't feel
> > a thing about other women. I also
> > trust him not to act on his emotions--
> > we have a monogamous relationship;
> > though not a possessive or jealous one.
> > <GIGGLE> Actually, his greatest dream
> > is for me to bring him home another
> > girl someday...a dream I eternally
> > remind him will never happen :)
>
>
> Well said. You raised so many topics that it will be difficult to
> address each. To simplify, I think most of what you said is not
> uncommon (right down to your husband's dream). We all seem to live in
> two worlds - the real world that exists around us and our made up
> fantasy world where anything is possible and everything works out
> exactly like we want. Many people "experiment" with bringing the
> fantasy world into the real world, but few find it as satisfying as
> they thought it would be (often because it's too contrived, too
> planned). In other words, the most satisfying sexual experimentation
> is when it simply happens without prior planning. Of course, that is
> very hard to do when it involves two, three, or more, people. And,
> obviously, certain fantasies should clearly remain exactly that.
>
> One of these days we have to talk about fantasies and the thoughts
> behind them. After talking to a good number of people, reading, being
> married for 25+ years, and looking at my own, I've come up with some
> interesting observations (about the types of fantasies each sex has
> and why). Perhaps I could get a government grant - I would love the

> opportunity to research this further. :-)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

My fantasy is simply a never-ending body rub--no sex involved...LOL

Kim W5TIT

2918. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:07:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c096ffa_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25965

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C08F828.7B5DFF9E@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > A friend of ours would probably also be someone she'd
> > enjoy--he drinks only top quality liqours (Grand Mariner, XO Cognac,
> > Chartreuse, etc.)--but ONLY from the bottle!
>
> I don't have a problem with what your "friend" does when he is alone or
> with you folks. I wouldn't want him as a dinner guest. Does he drink
> from *your* bottles?
>

The friend would likely "behave" as a guest at your dinner table. In fact, unless you both had the opportunity to really get to know each other, you'd probably never realize or learn about the "wild" side.

As to drinking from each others' bottles, that was quite common among us at mountain get-togethers when I was younger. It's a little difficult to carry wine glasses and carafs on snow mobiles and when hiking in the snow! Our "joke" with each other was that alcohol would kill anything... :)

Kim W5TIT

2919. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:30:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c097562_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25967

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C08FCAA.BC6B744D@earthlink.net...
> >
> >
> > >Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a mixed
> > >group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the
> > >contradiction didn't you understand?
> >

Wrong, Dave. I never used the words "mixed group." At least not that I could find. The reason I took the time to look is because "mixed company" and "mixed group" are not phrases I like, so couldn't believe I would have used them. I don't think I used the term "mixed group." I used the phrase "inappropriate environment" (see quotes from post below).

> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > But, Dave, you yourself stated that it is "a mostly male
> > group." Thus, her comments were made primarily for a male audience
> > who, presumably, are accustomed to frank language (and if you claim
> > MEN don't use that language in conversation among themselves there
> > isn't a person in this group who would believe you even THOUGHT that
> > was true).
>
> Kim isn't male. There are *some* other females who read the group.
> Kim explains that she wouldn't use that kind of language in a *mixed
> group*. If Kim uses such language in a group of males, the group is a
> mixed group.
>

Dave, *WHERE* are you getting that I stated I wouldn't use that kind of language in a *mixed group* (emphasis yours)!!?? I *DID NOT* say a mixed group. I simply said "inappropriate environment."

In the message posted by you, "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C07204E.1DCDEF3A@earthlink.net..., posted 11/30/01 at 9:21PM, here are my two quotes, copied and pasted directly out of the post:
****
FIRST (and this one doesn't even reference a term meaning group):
Well, call it what you will. I consider the truth a virtue. Now, am I going to use the word "fuck" on the air? Hardly. A) I think it would be quite illegal. B) I think that is rather direct and much too open. C) A child may be listening. The *WORD* fuck leaves nothing to translation. What is, is. Yet, the callsign W5TIT, said as such (and it is), never used

as name (and it is not), and never open for "fun" discussion on the air (I will not respond to conversation on the air about it--I won't even transmit); then a child is quite safe. As I've said in the past, if a child "picks up" on the TIT in my callsign and finds it vulgar, it is not I who taught that child to think that way.
THEN THIS (and here is where I mention the environment):
Dave, for goodness sake. I wouldn't be free and open in an inappropriate environment. And, before you go off on a tirade, I don't consider the ham radio venue as the improper venue. Sorry, but I don't and you're not going to convince me otherwise. However, even at a black tie dinner party there would be a certain air of realism about me. I would have no problem telling a stuffed shirt he is just that--but in a very, very nice way. (But, I would walk away in grace and hope he'd just let his crystal wine glass drop to the floor). And, the only person I would hope to do that with would be a callous bastard, or wimpy bitch.
****

Now, where have I said "mixed group?" That is *your* interpretation of what I said. I also not only said it the way I said it, I clarified further and said that I don't consider that ham radio is an improper venue. It should therefore stand that I *SURELY* don't consider this forum an improper venue! It is not. This is the internet, usegroup, and anyone is invited to download or not the posts.

>
> Not all men use the same or similar language in conversation, Rick.
> Of those who do, not many would use the language in the presence of a
> woman. Good luck with your latest baseless rant.
>

And, not all women use the same or similar language, but many do. Many will not use the language in the presence of a man. Aren't we all just grand at being a bunch of fakes with each other?

Kim W5TIT

2920. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:31:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnoojch.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25966

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 17:15:23 -0600, CAM wrote:

>The purpose of dating my current lady friend is she is a member of
>the country club and invites me to the monthly party where I have
>a lot of fun. But I wasn't sexually attracted to her in high school
>and, 46 years later, I'm still not sexually attracted to her.

What a waste.

On a more serious note, I have several very close lifelong women
friends towards whom I suppress my sexual attraction (and vice
versa) because I'm very married and intend to stay that way and
that's how they remain friends of my wife as well.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2921. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:34:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c09764f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25968

"Sean G Gilley" <uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org> wrote in message
news:ff37aa44.0112010818.4dcf4152@posting.google.com...
>
> I'm not saying that there are not things that men and women can do that
> would undermine trust in a spouse. I just believe that what Larry was
> saying (no lunches with other men, no professional contact alone with
> other men, no *nothing* alone with other men) goes so far as to be
> ludicrous.
>
> Sean.

DITTO.... But then, Larry also displays a huge deal (not just great deal)
of insecurity in his posts, so being constantly suspicious of "his woman"
would be his nature.

Kim W5TIT

2922. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:38:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c097738_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25969

You are so blase, Dave. So very blase.

Kim W5TIT

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0909AC.B8F76DE6@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C086F1D.25B168C2@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Aw, Dave. So, you can't handle the truth?
> > >
> > > What truth? It's MOVIES and TELEVISION.
> > >
> >
> > Oh, we'll just forget about the whole rest of the post. I *meant* the
truth
> > about me.
>
> > > >
> > > > And, you don't have *any* movie
> > > > heroes? Any depictions of characters that you respect and think
about?
> > How
> > > > 'bout the character that Denzel Washington plays in "Remember the
> > Titans?"
> > > > How 'bout the character that is played by Mel Gibson in "The
Patriot?"
> > > > Sure, they're not real characters and, yeah, those were movies.
OH!!
> > And
> > > > what about the characters played by Robert De Niro and Cuba Gooding
in
> > "Men
> > > > of Honor." But, you mean to tell me that you've *never* encountered
a
> > > > personal crisis such as theirs and applied what you learned in those
> > movies
> > > > to the struggles we live here in real life every day? *NEVER?*!!
> > >
> > > Probably not since I was ten or eleven.
> > >
> >

> > You'd be an incredibly difficult person to decide on a movie for then.
Do
> > ya have *any* heroes at all? I mean, other than the dad, the mom, the
> > grandpa, etc. I think those folks are heroes to most of us.
>
> I don't want anyone to decide on a movie for me. I'll decide on my own,
> thanks. I don't view movies in order to find a solution to a personal
> crisis. I view movies to be entertained.
>
> My heroes are not movie or television characters, Kim. They aren't the
> current crop of athletes who sell their autographs to kids. My
> grandparents and parents were never heroes to me. They were (save for a
> couple of exceptions) role models. I think you might be confusing the
> two terms. I considered some of my school teachers and neighbors and
> folks in the community to be role models.
>
> I have plenty of heroes. They come from history. In many of those
> cases, they sacrificed themselves for others. Some sacrificed for their
> country. Some risked their lives to save others (so my heroes didn't
> all die). Some heroes stood tall for principles.
>
> > > >
> > > > Wow. That sounds so empty.
> > >
> > > Choosing reality over identifying with TV and movie characters is
empty?
> > >
> >
> > Dave, you're incapable of applying traits that are found in powerful
> > movies and applying them to real life situations. I am not. There is >
a difference.
>
> Being incapable of doing something and choosing not to do it are
> different.
>
>
> > "The Patriot" allowed me to reflect, for the very first time,
> > on the "personal" aspects that living during such time must have had on
> > regular, every day people. Made me appreciate those from that time a
little
> > more.
>
> While I enjoyed the movie (its purpose), I didn't have any difficulty
> understanding what kind of things that everyday people might have had
> back in those times even before the film was made.
>
> > > >
> > > > By the way, the movies "Erin Brokovich"(sp), "Remember the Titans"
and
> > "Men

> > > > of Honor" were all based on true stories, Dave. You know...real
life.
> > >
> > > We all know what the words "based on" mean when used by movie makers.
> > > Are you asking if I watch and enjoy TV shows or movies, the answer is
> > > yes. If you are asking if I identify with movie characters, the
answer
> > > is no.
> > >
> >
> > Well then, there we have it.
> >
> > > >
> > > > *REAL* life. Sure, I mentioned some additional ones from my
original
> > post.
> > > > But, a tale to be told does not have to be real to learn something >
> > from it, Dave.
> > >
> > > Ever read a non-fiction book and then watch the movie made from it?
> > > Ever notice that the movie version is always greatly imbellished and
> > > that sometimes the ending is completely different?
> > >
> >
> > Are you suggesting just a teency bit that books (????!!!!) are more to
base
> > real life on than movies? Sure, I've read books then watched the movie
and
> > been disappointed every time. BUT, aren't they both the same in terms
of
> > reality, to you? I suppose if you find yourself identifying more with a
> > book, it's a matter of media then.
>
> That'd be true if I hadn't written "non-fiction book" so it isn't a
> matter of the medium at all. Do you claim that a documentary film is
> not any diffent than a historical drama where liberties are taken with
> fact and where a team of writers put words in the mouth of a character
> which that person never uttered in life?
>
> > > >
> > > > Yeah, I know better. Lots better.
> > >
> > > Can't prove it from what I've read here, either in the initial posting
> > > or your follow up.
> >
> >
> > Returning back to the last "bottom line" of this branch of this thread;
the
> > one where I asked you do you know why I could "mingle" better with all
> > groups of people than you could? You never answered. The reason, in my

> > opinion, that I have more flexibility with people than you, Dave, is
because
> > I believe I am far more appreciative of peoples' different points of
view.
>
> Now we have a conundrum. What proof do you offer that you are more
> flexible than me or that you are more appreciative of different points
> of view? Was the proof in the line about your "fake smile" at that
> cocktail party or in your detailed attributions to the thoughts and
> attitudes of other attendees?
>
> > You base my approach to reality now, completely on the fact that I
mentioned
> > some movies and you completely ignore the rest of a real honest
submission
> > to you about myself.
>
> I assuredly have not based my impression of you on your identification
> with movie characters. I've certainly based part of that impression on
> your statement about what you'd like to whisper to some woman you'd
> encountered at a cocktail party. The impression I came away with wasn't
> good.
>
> > To each his own. I can accept your statement for what it is. You cast
a
> > judgement on mine. (Except for the part where I do say that it sounds
very
> > empty that your emotions are not stirred by a good movie).
>
> My emotions can be stirred by a good movie. I just don't identify with
> a character and use that character in solving personal problems. What
> sets us apart in this instance is in choosing to identify with fantasy
> vs. reality.
>
> Dave K8MN

2923. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:46:52 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <0SeO7.205038$3d2.9001391@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25970

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C09648B.95C1860F@IEEE.org...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Not true of me, Dwight. For months, I have been dating a lady with
> > > absolutely no thought of sex on my mind. We just enjoy socializing
together
> > > as a couple.
> >
> > Absolutely no thought of sex, Cecil? I find that very hard to
> > believe that you date a woman that you're not attracted to.
>
> The purpose of dating my current lady friend is she is a member of
> the country club and invites me to the monthly party where I have
> a lot of fun. But I wasn't sexually attracted to her in high school
> and, 46 years later, I'm still not sexually attracted to her.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Still leading them on, eh Cecil?

Reek, the way you throw away women.

Born Kewl

2924. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:54:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c097af7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25971

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C090E12.E30A4DD2@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Dave, I hope you'll remember that I don't think I said I would not use
> > inappropriate language at the wrong times. I don't think I said "in a
mixed
> > group" and didn't mean to imply that way if I did or made it sound like
I
> > did. What I meant, and here's the example I think I presented, is that
I
> > would not use inappropriate language at a black tie dinner. This
newsgroup
> > is far from a black tie dinner. Here, I won't generally curse, but I
will
> > to make a point--as I did in the example in the post.
>
> Thanks for straightening up that point. What difference is there
> between using the language at a black tie dinner and here? Is it in the
> apparel?
>

Certainly not (clothes do *not* make the person). Although a formal affair
is likely not a function where hosts would appreciate their guests taking a
chance that there are not people in attendance who would be offended by
terse language, cursing, off-color jokes, etc. In this newsgroup there is
no host, and it certainly is not a formal affair. There's not much chance I
am going to have some affect on your personal life by my actions here and,
if there is, then it is you who are in control to keep away from newsgroups
in the event that you have a neighbor, friend, family member, or co-worker
read the language of people you "hang out" with online.

What's that you say? You aren't "hanging out" with us? I don't know what
else to call it. You are certainly free to abstain from interaction in
these posts. But you have not. I am not in control of what you or your
neighbors, or family, etc., do online in a computer environment. I am in
control of my actions for the benefit of a host at a gathering of people
whom I don't know, and don't mind "behaving" on their turf. This venue is
"anyone's" turf.

>
> > At a football game, you bet I'll generally be cursing...
>
>
> You would? Why would you be cursing at a football game? Did you go to

> the Karolyn Rose-Marge Schott School of Etiquette?
>

Have no idea who that person is. This must be another "Dave's world"
person, right?

> >
> > I think your interpretation of what you read points up the fact even
more
> > that I know when behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate. If you
truly
> > feel like being that "proper" all the time, then by all means I have no
> > problem. But, if you feel like you "have to" but don't really enjoy
being
> > proper at all times--then I ask why you allow such demands to be placed
upon
> > yourself. I don't live my life for others--though I will make
allowances.
> > I live for me.
>
> What is being proper, Kim? Is it in living your life in a way which
> includes acknowledgement of the sensitivities of others toward vulgarity
> and what society considers to be foul language?
>

To me, yes. I acknowledge the sensitivities of others, but also make
decisions as to *my* tolerance level. If I am at a formal affair, a
friend's house with people I don't know, etc., then I am more likely to be
much more demure than at a football game.

>
> There are as many
> people who would be offended by your language at a football game as
> would be offended at that black-tie function.
>

Well, I am only willing to "give up" so much for society. If I want to
curse at a football game, I will. And, if there's someone offended by that,
then it is between me and them--*NOT* my host, hostess...or whatever.

>
> It is quite apparent that you live your life only for you.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Absolutely. And, whether you wish to acknowledge it or believe it, you do
also (live life only for you). If you don't, then you've cheated yourself
and others of the greatest you can be. By living life for ourselves, it is
by virtue that we live life for the rest of the world.

Kim W5TIT

2925. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:56:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c097b56$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25972

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9ub71101seb@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c08e3db_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > WHY does an attraction have to be physical or sexual?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
>
> It's because, in most cases, a man's brain is directly connected to his
> penis.
>
> As Red Green says, "We can't help it. We're men."
>

Ah, so true. So true. BUT I have known one (only one) ... oh, what's that called...when a woman is insatiable!!! Anyway, I've only known one in my life. The flashing light on her forehead said "STAY AWAY" "STDs LIKELY" LOL

Kim W5TIT

2926. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 00:56:57 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c097b87_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25973

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9ub7n201tuk@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> news:3C08B620.E7F93E01@sccoast.net...
>
> > Kim's callsign is a passionate belief? Oh, come on. If we're going
> > to argue that fanatically, argue over something that matters. Or don't
> > get so fanatical about it.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> So what are you complaining about? If you don't want to argue, don't
> respond.
>
>

The "issues" around my callsign are quite passionate.

Kim W5TIT

2927. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 01:07:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c097df5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25974

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:7752ECFDC9939528.7C5E1635518C8755.483D57EBB25D190B@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 15:32:55 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Maybe you should have tried using a bowl. It allows the wine to breathe
> >properly.
>
> Not with a decent red Bordeaux!!!
>
> Lacking the bell of the wine glass and expanding it's
> width/height ratio to that extent would cause the wine to lose its
> more subtle flavors. A young red needs to be allowed to breathe--but
> much more slowly than a bowl would cause--ideally in the wine glass
> itself, which is shaped appropriately for the task. A good vintage red
> shouldn't need time to breathe, it's already aged properly (the
> purpose of breathing a wine is to simulate the changes of aging, not
> to break up the wine), although with a very old wine you may need to
> decant it to address cork decomposition. In either case, however, a
> bowl wouldn't be suited to the use.
>
> For a light aperitif wine, a fruity cordial, a rice wine (or a
> good sake) or a micro brewery beer, on the other hand, a bowl would be
> the perfect serving vessel, so long as it was glass or ceramic of
> course (a metal bowl imparts a taste to the contents that isn't
> appropriate to an alcoholic beverage). A bowl is also appropriate for
> a non-alcoholic beverage of course.
>
> Don't be stodgy, Dave. Try something slightly different--and
> perhaps a bit "wacky" once in a while, it doesn't hurt anyone and you
> might find it adds something to your life.
>
> >> A friend of ours would probably also be someone she'd
> >> enjoy--he drinks only top quality liqours (Grand Mariner, XO Cognac,
> >> Chartreuse, etc.)--but ONLY from the bottle!
> >
> >I don't have a problem with what your "friend" does when he is alone or
> >with you folks. I wouldn't want him as a dinner guest. Does he drink
> >from *your* bottles?
>
> Hardly, that would represent bad manners. And, to ease your
> mind, he doesn't do so as a dinner guest either (although he seldom
> gets to enjoy sitting down to dinner himself--he's the executive chef
> and part owner of a top restaurant in Chicago, and he prefers to

> entertain than to eat out when he's with friends, so he tends to end
> up cooking the meal himself [according to her, she's never cooked a
> meal since they married--their kitchen is HIS territory--and she
> doesn't mind it a bit!]).
>
> >> Life is meant to be lived, not regulated by convention. Try
> >> slurping from a bowl someday--if the contents are good enough you'll
> >> probably enjoy it.
> >
> >There's no need for me to do so. I've already mastered the use of
> >cutlery and this allows much enhancement to the life I'm living.
>
> Try something new.
>
> Do you eat with chop sticks? If not, you are losing an
> addition to the experience of eating Asian foods. Do you eat with your
> fingers? If not, you can't enjoy buffalo wings, or other "finger
> foods" to your detriment. Do you like to try new foods and beverages?
> New restaurants? New cuisines? Many cuisines DO have dishes meant to
> be "slurped from the bowl." If you aren't willing to try that, you'll
> lose the opportunity to experience an entire range of wonderful
> flavors--or you'll end up consuming them inappropriately and be viewed
> by the restaurant staff as a "stodgy American" who rejects their
> cultural practices.
>
> >Ask Kim. "Loathsome" is her word. It didn't make any sense to me
> >either.
>
> A loathsome life, to me, is one that is wasted, Dave. It's one
> in which bitterness, self-righteousness, materialism, jingoism, or
> other negative experiences have prevented the full enjoyment of all
> the riches that a healthy approach to life has to offer. It's the life
> of the miser, the criminal, the prude, or the dour doom-sayer--all of
> whom have far more in common than they would like to think they have.
>
> It's a life to be pitied, Dave. And one it is very clear Kim
> doesn't live.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

One of my favorite, favorite, favorite people is Leo Buscaglia. Now, I am near certain that Leo would not approve of my blatant disregard for the English language (as he'd probably put it). But, I know he'd appreciate slurping...LOL I absolutely adored his story of putting all the beautiful Fall leaves inside his living room. He kept his neighbor happy by having a clean, pristine yard devoid of the givings of God (the beautiful Fall colors blanketed across a sleeping yard), yet still was able to enjoy the colors, smell, and sounds of leaves after a life of living.

Kind thoughts to one of the wonderful people of this world, greatly missed by many...

Kim W5TIT

2928. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 01:21:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c09815f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25975

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0951F6.4686B619@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C087F43.1A3D438F@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > She chose to change her call sign. That's IT. That's ALL she
> > > > did. She didn't invite people to slam her, insult her, ridicule her,
> > > > or even defend her here for that matter. She just changed her call
> > > > sign to another LEGAL call sign she preferred.
> > > >
> > > None of us who do something stupid, issue an invitation to be rebuked
> > > for it but it is certainly difficult to dodge responsibility.
> > > >
> > >
> > Oh, contraire. Contraire. I wholeheartedly *welcome and invite* anyone
to
> > "rebuke" (if that's what you wish to call it) my callsign! Prove to me
that
> > it's wrong, that it's going to bring the ARS "one step closer to
> > extinction," that all children entering ham radio are harmed, that it's
not
> > a family radio service any more, that I offer nothing of positive value
to
> > the ARS, and on and on.
>
> Oh oh au contraire. It doesn't matter what you have to offer the ARS if
> folks can't get past your call.
>

I know this is going to sound calloused...maybe it even is. *If* there is
not room for anyone and everyone in ham radio, then I want no part of it. I
believe there is room for everyone.

>
> All children don't have to be harmed.
> How about if one child is offended?
>

As I've said in the past, if a child is "offended" by a callsign, even by a
concept (callsigns aside), then they need not join the rest of humanity.
Ham radio is a venue for all--not mutually exclusive for just the "good
guys." If a kid's going to grow up and be in this world, he'll have an
excellent start in ham radio.
```

>
> How about if one woman who doesn't
> see your poke at ham radio is upset by it?
>

A grown woman? She needs to get over it, and herself.

>
> How about if one man finds
> your call an unpleasant embarrassment?
>

See above.

>
> In those cases, you are
> responsible and your choice reflects badly upon amateur radio and upon
> your judgement.
>

If you believe that, there is nothing I can do to change your mind.

>
> You don't need to take a leap toward the extinction of amateur radio. A
> small step at a time will do it.
>

As I said, I don't believe my callsign is going to bring the ARS even a
teency step toward extinction. I don't believe the HF gangs that people
talk about bring it closer. I don't even believe that someone saying "10-4
good buddy" does it.

> >
> > Prove it. Make one, just one, logical argument that it does. Remember,
> > logic is that which is very personal.
>
> Would it make any difference if I could offer sound proof, Kim?
>

In all honesty? Yes, it would. But, I don't believe it will.

>
> You've already indicated that your nose thumbing at humanity is your way
> of telling us that all that matters to you is what you want. It is,
> after all, your life and no one can tell you how to live it.
>

That is correct. And if that kind of thought threatens you in any way, then
you truly aren't universally minded enough to understand what liberty that
truly implies.

> > >
> > > I'd rather accept my own view of what's best for amateur radio than
the
> > > view of her most frequent libertarian defender. I'm not bound to

accept
> > > your "libertarian-with-attitude" view any more than I'm bound to
accept
> > > Kim's choice as appropriate.
>
> > NOW, we get to something we agree on! No name calling, Dave. Let's
make it
> > as pure and simple as we can get: I absolutely understand that you do
not
> > believe my callsign is good for amateur radio. I also absolutely agree
that
> > you are not bound to accept my choice as appropriate.
> >
> > I wholeheartedly understand, but disagree. Here you go: I'd rather
accept
> > my own view of what's best for amateur radio than the view of a most
> > conservative man such as yourself. I'm not bound to accept your
> > conservative attitude any more than I'm bound to believe that my choice
of a
> > callsign is inappropriate.
>
> No you aren't bound, Kim. It is your legal right to retain your call
> and to continue to thumb your nose at society. You've already claimed
> that you don't care how you are perceived by others. You haven't learned
> a thing.
>
> Dave K8MN

Whatever, Dave. As I said, if you are threatened in any way by my philosophy of life, then you don't truly look beyond the nose on your face and contemplate exactly what it is I am saying. By the way, I believe it is the combination of *some* Eastern philosophy, along with *some* Christianity and my own possibly demented views, that my beliefs are founded. There's a single philosophy out there called self-realization--but I don't completely subscribe to it. Maybe you'll understand if you ever understand any of that.

Kim W5TIT

2929. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 01:23:20 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0981b5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25976

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C095242.6EFF7ED8@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C088119.DB36D38D@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a
mixed
> > > group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the
> > > contradiction didn't you understand?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Man, you are stretching now, Dave. You're really stretching.
>
> In what way, Kim?
>
> Dave K8MN

Well, I don't wish to make value judgements for you, Dave. Suffice it to say that a newsgroup is far from a place where proper-ness is the rule. (Plus, I never used the term "mixed group"). Gads, I hate that term.

Kim W5TIT

2930. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 02:47:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C09960F.394202A0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25977

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 16:10:39 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Your view simply isn't borne out by what I found in the Sunday Wheeling
> >News-Register just a couple of weeks back. Agents cited numerous
> >establishments in the Ohio Valley for selling tobacco, beer and liquor
> >to minors.
>
> Yup!
>
> And how many tattoo parlors or piercing salons were providing
> services to kids?

We don't have a single such place in operation on this side of the river. I don't know whether any are located on the Ohio side.

> The very fact that "sting" operations ARE regularly conducted
> to catch shops selling tobacco and alcohol to youths demonstrates that
> a risk is involved in doing so. And the risk to a firm that performs
> an act that is _permanent_ (i.e., a tattoo or a piercing) versus one
> that can be claimed to have been made accidently (thought s/he was old
> enough, new employee, etc.) and has no long term affect (based on the
> specific incident--tobacco, obviously, has a long term effect when
> used on a regular basis) is vastly more liable to damages.

Right, Rick. No kid ever produces a fake I.D. and uses it to do anything illegal. No kid ever obtains a "homemade" tattoo or does a homebrew job of piercing.

> If, for example, my son were 16 (he just turned 18), and he
> purchased a six pack of beer at a local store I would have grounds to
> prosecute and could possibly even sue for putative damages. Neither
> the prosecution nor the law suit, however, would result in enough
> damages to seriously harm the business (although either or both might
> discourage further sales to minors). But if, instead, he went to a
> piercing salon and had his tongue pierced (a permanent piercing) or
> went to a tattoo parlor and had a picture of a bloody knife tattooed
> on his forearm, I would have grounds for a law suit that would
> probably put the firm out of business. That's a LOT more risk for a
> firm than the simple offense of selling beer to a teen.

I've learned a lot from the above. Your first reaction is to think about prosecution or a suit rather than dealing with your kid's misdeeds.

> >> No, Dave, I _don't_ think very many early teens are getting
> >> tattoos and piercings w/o their parent's consent. Do you?
> >
> >Yes, I do.
>
> Then document your source for the information. Unless, of
> course, it is purely opinion with no basis in demonstrable fact.

Document it yourself. I'm taking no homework assignments today, Prof.
You asked what I thouhgt and I told you.

> >For a parent to permit something which permanently defaces the human
> >body such as piercings and tattooing sounds pretty irresponsible to me.
>
> ONLY if piercings or tattoos are viewed as "defacing" rather
> than as "enhancing." That isn't a question of general values, Dave,
> it's one that is cultural--and if the youth culture of today finds
> them attractive (which it appears they do), why shouldn't they have
> the same right to set their standards of beauty that you and I have to
> set our own?

No. They don't have those rights until they reach their majority by
which time it is hoped that they'll have developed enough common sense
to avoid something which could become a lifelong regret for them.

> Many cultures world wide use piercings, tattoos, or
> scarification to (from their perspective) enhance beauty. In the US
> until the feminist movement caught on, women spent literally hours
> putting on elaborate makeup before going in public--again to enhance
> their beauty according to the standards of the current culture. To
> treat such accoutrements as "defacing" simply indicates that you
> believe your personal standards of beauty are the only ones that have
> validity, a patent absurdity.

Are you a Mauri too?

> >We all know that people often participate in acts in youth which they
> >come to regret as adults. That is one reason that courts try youthful
> >offenders under different standards than adults.
>
> True.
>
> But one of the greatest problems we have with juveniles in our
> nation today is the combination of justification and repression.
> Justification in that we tend to minimize the degree of their own
> responsibility for an offense and blame the act on society, and
> repression because we refuse to accept what are often very legitimate
> values and standards because they differ from our own generation's and
> are held by youths rather than adults.
>
> By limiting teens (pre-pubescent kids are a different
> matter--from a psychological perspective they have not as yet fully
> matured mentally, where adolescents have done so) in ways that adults

> are not limited, we simply make it clear that they are "children" from
> our perspective--and then we wonder why they ACT like children on
> occasion.

We do that because they ARE children. They have not yet matured. Such
is the natural order of things. They act like children because they are
children. I don't wonder about that at all.

> >> I know some women who have
> >> exceptionally attractive tattoos and more than a few who have body
> >> jewelry (including some piercings NO teen would be able to have done
> >> with or without parental consent) and are very happy with the
> >> result--as are their spouses or significant others.
> >>
> >> Your values apply only to yourself, not to others.
> >>
> >
> >Ever hear of a term called "community values"? Its existence would
> >refute your statement.
>
> Only if you can demonstrate that the community: (1) has a
> RIGHT to impose values on a given matter and; (2) has better or more
> relevant values than the individuals affected.

Check out Hamilton County. You'll find your proof there in the
existence of such laws. Let me know what you find out.

> Your "Community values" when carried to any reasonable extent
> would define such behavior as piercing as totally inappropriate in
> some communities--and completely acceptable in others. What if the
> person who is pierced in, for example, Santa Cruz California, where it
> is accepted, travels to Cincinnati where it is not well accepted? Are
> they obligated to remove their jewelry and have the piercing
> surgically closed? Or is it unreasonable for the new community to
> impose its values on those who don't share them?

I brought up ways that group values can limit individual values.
I don't care if an individual is pierced in Poughkeepsie and moves to
Cuyahoga Falls. You can work out the details later.

> Community values can only refute my statement if you can
> demonstrate community values that are absolutes rather than subjective
> decisions based on current stereotypes and political influences. So
> far, I have yet to see someone do that.

Call it what you want, Rick. If you choose to deny that there are
places with laws on the books based on community values, I don't care.

> >Do some school systems have dress codes?
>
> Sure.
>
> In any private school you care to pay tuition for.

>
> But in a public school?
>
> Whose standards do you enforce with those codes? It can't be
> that of the parents--they aren't asked their opinion, which would be
> expressed by the clothing they permitted their children to wear to
> school anyway. It can't be that of the kids themselves, since it
> restricts those choices directly. And since the parents and the kids,
> together REPRESENT the community of interest (it isn't ANYONE'S
> business what the dress code is if he or she has no connection with
> the school or kids in the first place), it can't be the community's
> codes, either. The only thing left is an arbitrary set of values that
> have no justification what-so-ever.

You say that the parents aren't asked their opinions. I don't know that to be true. Taxpayers foot the bill for schools whether they have children in the schools. I think he who pays, says. I take it that you think that dress codes are a bad idea.

> A girl in a Michigan school was recently suspended for wearing
> a t-shirt with a pentagram on it (symbolic of Wicca). Yet a girl
> wearing a t-shirt with a religious icon (a picture of Jesus with a
> halo) on it was permitted to attend classes. According to the school,
> the pentagram violated the dress code. It sounds to me like the school
> was the one who committed a violation--of the religious rights of the
> student. But "community standards" supported the dress code and since
> the parents didn't have the money (or desire) to fight the case to the
> SC, the school won.

> It was a public school.

...and I gather that you have a problem with this one too.

> >Can you buy a copy of Hustler magazine in Hamilton County, Ohio?
>
> Nope. Which has nothing to do with "community standards" and
> has everything to do with suppression of freedom of speech and freedom
> of choice.

Hamilton County disagrees with you.

> It is also the direct result of concentrated campaigns by the
> religious right that have thrust what should be religious issues into
> the legal process. The same holds true for Ft. Wayne, IN, and other
> extremist, bible-thumping, communities.

Hamilton County disagrees with you. Apparently Ft. Wayne disagrees too.

> >On an FCC related topic:
> >
> >Why does the Dish Network bleep offensive words from movies?
>
> It doesn't.

It does. Starz movies are bleeped.

> The dish network doesn't produce or show movies, Dave, it
> merely provides a satellite downlink for the broadcasters such as HBO,
> Showtime, etc.--at least if it works the same as DirecTV, as I
> understand it does.

You're getting as bad as Lenny at stating the obvious. I know what it
is; I have it in my home.

> If the Dish network DOES censor in that manner, it is simply a
> good reason to choose DirecTV instead--since the alternative is
> allowing someone ELSE to decide what is appropriate for you to hear.

I don't agree with you at all. I find it kind of refreshing.

> Let me reverse the question: If there's something wrong with
> using those words--why are the present in a movie in the first place
> to REQUIRE anyone to "bleep" them?

Oh, you haven't come up with a good reason for them either, huh?
I'd guessed that it was obligatory to insert a good sex scene (whether
or not it had any real relevance to the story line) and to throw in a
few good swear words or you wouldn't get many kids to attend the flick.

Dave K8MN

2931. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 02:48:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C099687.84F54739@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25978

CAM wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Not true of me, Dwight. For months, I have been dating a lady with
> > > absolutely no thought of sex on my mind. We just enjoy socializing together
> > > as a couple.
> >
> > Absolutely no thought of sex, Cecil? I find that very hard to
> > believe that you date a woman that you're not attracted to.
>
> The purpose of dating my current lady friend is she is a member of
> the country club and invites me to the monthly party where I have
> a lot of fun. But I wasn't sexually attracted to her in high school
> and, 46 years later, I'm still not sexually attracted to her.

You'd better hope she doesn't read this newsgroup or there goes your
standing date.

Dave K8MN

2932. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 02:56:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c099903_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25979

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gnoojch.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 17:15:23 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >The purpose of dating my current lady friend is she is a member of
> >the country club and invites me to the monthly party where I have
> >a lot of fun. But I wasn't sexually attracted to her in high school
> >and, 46 years later, I'm still not sexually attracted to her.
>
> What a waste.
>
> On a more serious note, I have several very close lifelong women
> friends towards whom I suppress my sexual attraction (and vice
> versa) because I'm very married and intend to stay that way and
> that's how they remain friends of my wife as well.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

So well put, Phil!

Kim W5TIT

2933. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 03:02:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c099aa2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25981

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C099687.84F54739@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > The purpose of dating my current lady friend is she is a member of
> > the country club and invites me to the monthly party where I have
> > a lot of fun. But I wasn't sexually attracted to her in high school
> > and, 46 years later, I'm still not sexually attracted to her.
>
> You'd better hope she doesn't read this newsgroup or there goes your
> standing date.
>
> Dave K8MN

That would discount that this woman may be very content with such relationship. I know an older co-worker (lady) who is a ballroom dancer and enjoys it very much. While she "has a man" (as she puts it), she says there are many women who have "gotten" fellas that are younger and are not a whole lot more than decorations on their arms.

The women are quite happy to have a man to escort them, dance with them, and be competition mates. The men are quite happy to be receiving the "favors" of these older and, often, affluent women.

Cecil? Been doing any two-steppin'? ;)

Kim W5TIT

2934. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 03:03:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0999F2.16EAAC0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25980

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 22:08:22 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> A loathsome life, to me, is one that is wasted, Dave. It's one
> >> in which bitterness, self-righteousness, materialism, jingoism, or
> >> other negative experiences have prevented the full enjoyment of all
> >> the riches that a healthy approach to life has to offer. It's the life
> >> of the miser, the criminal, the prude, or the dour doom-sayer--all of
> >> whom have far more in common than they would like to think they have.
> >>
> >> It's a life to be pitied, Dave. And one it is very clear Kim
> >> doesn't live.
> >
> >Then account for her loathing my lifestyle. Maybe she lives it after
> >all and perhaps Cecil is indeed compulsive/obsessive. You have to stop
> >issuing denials for the claims of others.
>
> Perhaps she simply sees your life as wasted, Dave.

See? I said she didn't know any better.

> That would be a pretty good reason to loathe your lifestyle,
> wouldn't it?

If their was a grain of truth to your wild guesses, that could be.

> >I guess you've gotten used to that self-righteous, libertarian chip on
> >your shoulder and have managed to come to terms with the self-loathing
> >it has induced. Maybe you can turn it around before you have to consider
> >your life wasted.
>
> I don't have any self-loathing, Dave. Like Kim and Cecil (and,
> I'm sure, most others) I come here for recreation not because I expect
> to influence anyone to change his views.

It isn't too late to develop some, Rick. I suppose the last part is
uplifting to you in some manner, given the liklihood of your success in
doing so.

> Of course, wasted is in the mind of the beholder, and while
> you may consider my life wasted, I find the freedom that has formed
> its core a LOT more positive and worthwhile than the hate and
> superstition that obviously forms your own. I'll leave it up to others
> to decide which of us has had a "wasted" life on that basis.

There isn't any hate or superstition in my life, Rick. You fabricated your statement. It must come from your obvious bias toward anyone who doesn't share your hedonistic views. I find your views to be mostly made up of things which most of us have already rejected as impractical.

Dave K8MN

2935. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 03:34:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011201223428.12427.00003870@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 25982

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gnmr2zb.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>
> Weren't the Benton Harbor LunchBoxes products of Heath?
>
> I'm talking 1958......

Phil:

My YL "Elmer" had a 2-meter "Lunch Box," and it was, in fact, a
Heathkit. It used the AM mode; I've always wondered why that
mode has been largely abandoned on the VHF bands?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2936. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 03:34:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011201223430.12427.00003871@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 25983

In article <ff37aa44.0111300800.71601dfa@posting.google.com>,
uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org (Sean G Gilley) writes:

>> I've endured several messages worth of your immature, misguided
>> rantings, now I must reply.
>
>Then we're even. I find you immature and misguided as well.

Sean:

You're entitled to your own opinion; I can't do your thinking for you.

>As for enduring, well, I'd much rather you reply. You completely
>ignored articles where I was a lot more forgiving than I am now.

Actually, I merely ignored articles which wern't worth my time to
compose a reply.

>Guess it takes slightly more anger to get you to say something.
>
>> I have absolutely no desire to "control" Kim's actions. All throughout
>> my past and present discussions on that subject in this newsgroup,
>> I have made it clear that Kim is the only person who can act to make
>> a change, and the choice whether or not to do so is entirely hers to
>> make. I have no way to "control" Kim's actions other than to point out
>> the potentially harmful effects her callsign, which reflects very poor
>> taste and judgment on her part.
>
>I never said you *could* control her callsign, I said you *wanted* to
>control her callsign. Completely different things.

Well, that's where you demonstrate your immaturity. I'm mature
enough to know that it is foolish to *want*to control something like a
person's callsign. I would prefer that radio amateurs choose their
callsigns in a responsible manner, one which doesn't call their good
taste and judgement into question. Unfortunately, Kim didn't do that --
and thus is the topic of what is now one of the largest threads ever
seen on this newsgroup!

>Let me repeat what I said in an earlier post: If you feel that her
>callsign is as bad as you seem to feel, then you should be lobbying to
>change the rules.

Why would I do that? My quarrel is not with the FCC's rules on
call sign assignment. Under the Vanity Call Sign program, the
selection of a call sign is now the individual amateur's choice, and
that choice reflects their good taste and judgement; or, in Kim's

case, the lack thereof. The FCC is not acting as an arbiter of
such taste and judgement, and I don't think it should be.

>Kim's call sign is a *symptom* of something much
>bigger, and to attempt to torment her is useless. It's obvious she
>won't voluntarily change her call, so the only way it's going to happen
>is if the FCC changes its rules.

Pardon me, Sean, but to say that, you are not giving Kim any credit
for being able to change her mind, and do the right thing. In spite
of whatever I've said about her, I do recognize the fact that as an
intelligent human being, she could, possibly, be influenced to change
her mind, and her call sign. Kim is human, and I will never overlook
the human element in any equation. Why would YOU?

>Further, even if she does change her
>callsign, someone else is likely to have or create another that is just
>as, or more, offensive to you.

There are literally dozens of hams with call signs which are just as
offensive as Kim's, but they aren't participating in this newsgroup, and
Kim is. I can only work with the tools at my disposal.

>It's futile and senseless to rant about
>Kim's callsign. Lobby the FCC if you feel that strongly. Find others
>who share your feelings and get them to lobby the FCC.

Once again, this is not the FCC's problem -- it's Kim's.

>What you are doing in this group does *nothing* to promote your cause,
>and does, in fact, more strongly ally people against you -- possibly
>for you as well, but I've seen little evidence of that while I see
>plenty of evidence for the former.

Are you saying you have access to my E-mail? How do you know
how many people agree or disagree with me? The visible
participants in this newsgroup are not the only source of feedback I
receive on what I post here.

>Just what good do you think you are doing? Do you actually think you are
>implementing change by taunting people and making them angry here?

Oh, I get it. Another liberal, who wants to shut me up for speaking
the truth. Yawn!

>Do you actually think that rec.radio.amateur.policy will be
>an instrument of change in the ARS and FCC?

I don't see why it couldn't -- do you think it can't be?

>> I am merely
>> exercising my right to state my objections to her callsign.
>
>Okay. We got it. You don't like her callsign, you don't believe it's

>family oriented, and you don't believe it's right for amateur radio.

Well, at least you seem to have a higher level of reading
comprehension than some others I've dealt with in this newsgroup.
(Sorry about that, Cecil!)

>You've stated your objections. And I think you had a perfect right to
>do so. But you're putting a lot of effect into *continually* stating
>those objects, over and over and over. And any worth it might once have
>had is now gone.

I'm not restating things "over and over" in a vacuum -- I am replying
to postings which have challenged my statements, and I am supporting
what I have said by a point/counterpoint debate. This is what
Usenet newsgroups are for -- and if you don't care for it, why waste
your time reading it?

>A long time ago I took a two weekend class. Between the two weekends,
>one of the assignments was not to complain to anyone who can't or won't
>help solve the problem.

I'd like to hear more about that class -- care to give a more detailed
description?

>That's exactly what you're doing. Kim can't
>solve the problem, only the FCC can. No one reading or posting on this
>newsgroup can solve the problem. Only the FCC can.

Just the exact opposite is true. The FCC is not the answer to this
problem -- only Kim can choose to change her call sign, and only she
can take action to do so. The FCC doesn't care about the effect of
her call sign, or anyone else's, on the image of the ARS. That's not
their function. Kim's call sign does not violate any FCC rules, and if
it did, they wouldn't have issued it. This point has been driven home
repeatedly by myself and others. Perhaps you should have done some
research on Google before wading into this debate with your
emotional responses.

>You want to solve the problem? Get the FCC to change the rules. You
>aren't *ever* going to solve the problem here.

This is getting monotonous.

>And I simply can't understand why you seem so angry *specifically* at Kim.

She's the one who choose a call sign which is sexually provocative, is in
poor taste, reflects poor judgment on her part, and reflects poorly on the
overall image of amateur radio operators. I thought you said you understood?

>Maybe it's because she's posting on this group and is completely uncontrite.
>Why aren't you as angry about other off-color callsigns? Are you simply
>not aware of them? They are out there, and there are calls that I'd believe
>are more offensive that her's.

Asked and answered. You're repeating yourself.

>Go ahead. Explain why you've centered your anger on Kim. Explain to us
>all what good you are doing here.
>
>Sean.

Go back and read this thread from the beginning, and you'll have your
answers.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2937. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 04:05:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnoz11i.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25984

On 02 Dec 2001 03:34:28 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>> Weren't the Benton Harbor LunchBoxes products of Heath?
>
>My YL "Elmer" had a 2-meter "Lunch Box," and it was, in fact, a
>Heathkit. It used the AM mode;

I operated 2-m AM (tunable receiver, xtal transmitter) from 1958 thru 1964 when I went overseas. When I returned in 1967 FM was starsing to take hold (see my comments below).

I've always wondered why that
>mode has been largely abandoned on the VHF bands?

The availability of old two-way radios, retired for several reasons.

In the late 1960s, the FCC mandated that all 15 kHz-deviation radios be narrow-banded to 5 kHz, and about that time better radios came out which didn't use dynamotors or vibrators for transmitter power supplies. Most of the first-generation radios and some of the second-generation radios made their way to the ham market. In the mid-70s, fully transistorized radios hit the commercial market and the older hybrid radios went ham-ward.

The "rice box" craze came about as a by-product of the VHF-FM Marine Radio development a few years later.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2938. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 04:23:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C09ACA9.746CEC44@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25985

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Still leading them on, eh Cecil?
> Reek, the way you throw away women.

I trust that she is enjoying herself as she has never indicated otherwise.
She hates to go to the party alone. I hate to stay at home while others
are having a party. We are perfectly compatible.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2939. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 04:27:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C09ADA5.FF7C87BF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25986

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The purpose of dating my current lady friend is she is a member of
> > the country club and invites me to the monthly party where I have
> > a lot of fun. But I wasn't sexually attracted to her in high school
> > and, 46 years later, I'm still not sexually attracted to her.
>
> You'd better hope she doesn't read this newsgroup or there goes your
> standing date.

She doesn't even own a computer. But that leads me to another question.
I am not sexually attracted to 99% of females, i.e. I am very choosy. I
gather that you are attracted to virtually every female you lay eyes on,
i.e. you are not very choosy?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2940. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 04:29:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C09AE2A.C6DE6080@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25987

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> Cecil? Been doing any two-steppin'? ;)

Actually, I'm a lot better at square dancing but I haven't been doing
much of that since I blew out my knee.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2941. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 04:43:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011201234304.12427.00003954@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 25988

In article <3c085c41.3337778@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>>Ryan:
>>
>>I can't see any legal problem with "renting" ham radio gear, aside from
>>the issue of taking steps to ensure that only licensed amateurs get to
>>do so.
>
>Yet there's no requirement that one can or should ONLY
>rent (or sell) ham gear to licensed hams.

Bill:

True enough; however, I would think that asking to see a valid license would be a reasonable precaution, to prevent the possibility of harmful interference arising from irresponsible use by an unlicensed person. I see this as any ham's responsibility. Of course, misuse is possible in the hands of licensed amateurs, but that is not as likely as it would be if unlicensed hams were to gain access to ham gear by renting it out.

>>However, it would seem to be impractical from a purely
>>financial standpoint.
>
>Probably true.
>
>>The money spent on rental fees would be better
>>used to save up for the purchase of equipment. If all you want to do
>>is try out a top-of-the-line rig for a week or two, then "renting" would
>>be OK as a one-time or occasional practice.
>>
>>Some hams rent out their vacation properties, equipped with contest-
>>capable ham radio stations, for visiting hams looking for a DXpedition
>>opportunity. There's obviously nothing wrong with it, as long as it's
>>right for you and your checkbook!
>
>Agree too.

And if the deal were a rental of a "ham property," I would be even more concerned with making sure a licensed ham were the rentor, in order to reduce possible financial liability for RFI problems. It's a simple, logical, and reasonable precaution, and the decision not to take that precaution would be difficult to defend in a court of law.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2942. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 04:43:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011201234306.12427.00003955@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 25989

In article <DC841BA7789E9FFA.C6DA076A1010BABF.EE44EE5ECD101D0D@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>Very well. In that case, why do books like "Heather Has Two Mommies"
>>exist in our public schools?
>
> For the same reason that books dealing with African-American
>families, Hispanic families, or Asian families are in those schools,
>Larry, because they represent families in the community.

Rick:

Speaking only for myself, I don't see anything out of the ordinary with
families of American Hispanics, American Asians, or Americans of
African descent. I *do* find something highly unusual in a family where
the "parents" are two lesbians or gay men.

> There are over 2,000,000 children being raised in gay/lesbian
>households in the US right now (and, no, they do NOT have a higher
>likelihood of being gay than their peers raised in straight
>households, research has already confirmed that), don't those children
>have the right to be recognized as coming from happy households, too?

I see. And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
influence on their sexual "identity." Right.

>>I'm not claiming to be working your side of the street, Rick. I am just
>>reacting to what I've heard and read about the topic, and drawing my
>>own logical conclusions. Why would there be a book like "Heather
>>Has Two Mommies" unless someone with an agenda to normalize and
>>lend an aura of acceptability to homosexual behavior wanted young
>>children to be exposed to this concept? In other words, why are
>>homosexuals attempting to "recruit" young people to their lifestyle?
>
> Larry, how can you possibly equate "recruit" with "inform?"

I don't know why young children in elementary school need to be
"informed" about abnormal sexual relationships -- or any other sexual
relationships, for that matter -- unless someone is trying to, as I said,
make it appear to be normal and acceptable.

> I don't care what your personal opinion is, the fact is that
>from any scientific perspective you care to identify, homosexuality IS
>normal. You don't have to "normalize" it any more than you have to
>"normalize" being an African-American. It happens to _already_ be
>completely normal.

Well, I've never considered being black to be abnormal; but a simple examination of human male/female comparative anatomy seems to suggest that heterosexuality is the intended norm.

> The book isn't looking for the chance to "recruit"
>people--it's looking for ACCEPTANCE and TOLERANCE from people. I'm
>sorry you can't accept this concept as valid--but most people can.

I don't think any intelligent person has a problem "tolerating" or "accepting" homosexuals. I acknowledge their existance as part of the whole of humanity, albeit as an abnormality. I feel no hatred or animosity toward homosexuals, and have no personal need to increase the suffering in what must already be miserable, confused lives. However, I cannot in clear conscience consider them to be "normal," simply because they are not. People with various developmental disabilities are not "normal" either, but I don't hate them, or lack "tolerance" of them. I make my living working with them every day, and I take very good care of them. I bear no prejudice against homosexuals or anyone else who does not fall within the conventional definition of "normal," but I believe that they must accept their abnormality, and be as "tolerant" of the need of normal people to be assured that they are not going to attempt to win over their children to their "alternative" lifestyle as a means of gaining greater political power. If gays and lesbians are, indeed, "normal" as you claim, then they shouldn't seek to be venerated for their lifestyle, and keep their sex lives as private as most heterosexuals do.

> There is no "Homosexual Agenda" Larry. It's a figment in the
>mind of right wing extremists who can't stand the thought that others
>have rights too.

No, it is an attempt to gain greater political privilege based on the fact of their abnormality. They want nothing to do with equality -- they seek the comfort of victim status in order to strengthen their claim to membership in the elite ruling class of the New World Order. If this were not true, then militant Gay/Lesbian "rights" groups would not exist.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2943. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 05:10:35 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ucd2l019gj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25990

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:POaO7.139177$WW.8801107@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> The World Bank defines adult illiteracy as the inability of someone 15 or
> older to read or write, with understanding, a short and simple statement
> about their everyday life. While the highest rates as one would expect
are
> in Africa, when those are removed we come to this sequence:

The World Bank defined the criteria. Are they also the source of these
numbers?

2944. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 05:39:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c09bf50_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25991

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011201223430.12427.00003871@nso-cg.aol.com...
>
> >It's futile and senseless to rant about
> >Kim's callsign. Lobby the FCC if you feel that strongly. Find others
> >who share your feelings and get them to lobby the FCC.
>
> Once again, this is not the FCC's problem -- it's Kim's.
>

Larry. Let me absolutely, without a doubt assure you: it is no problem for me. If there is a problem, and I don't think there is, then it is yours.

Kim W5TIT

2945. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 05:50:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C09C121.DA4489A8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25992

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The purpose of dating my current lady friend is she is a member of
> > > the country club and invites me to the monthly party where I have
> > > a lot of fun. But I wasn't sexually attracted to her in high school
> > > and, 46 years later, I'm still not sexually attracted to her.
> >
> > You'd better hope she doesn't read this newsgroup or there goes your
> > standing date.
>
> She doesn't even own a computer. But that leads me to another question.
> I am not sexually attracted to 99% of females, i.e. I am very choosy. I
> gather that you are attracted to virtually every female you lay eyes on,
> i.e. you are not very choosy?

My reply isn't even needed here. You compose the questions and you
compose the answer.

I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.

Dave K8MN

2946. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 06:00:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C09C35C.E314477E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25993

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> You are so blase, Dave. So very blase.

You write this in response to the fact that I prefer identifying with reality rather than movies. I prefer to get excited about having sundowners at the beach on Zanzibar or seeing the sunrise over the hill across the way from my place. You, on the other hand, can rent the video.

Dave K8MN

2947. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 06:14:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C09C6C2.8E6122B8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25994

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C090E12.E30A4DD2@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave, I hope you'll remember that I don't think I said I would not use
> > > inappropriate language at the wrong times. I don't think I said "in a
> mixed
> > > group" and didn't mean to imply that way if I did or made it sound like
> I
> > > did. What I meant, and here's the example I think I presented, is that
> I
> > > would not use inappropriate language at a black tie dinner. This
> newsgroup
> > > is far from a black tie dinner. Here, I won't generally curse, but I
> will
> > > to make a point--as I did in the example in the post.
> >
> > Thanks for straightening up that point. What difference is there
> > between using the language at a black tie dinner and here? Is it in the
> > apparel?
> >
>
> Certainly not (clothes do *not* make the person). Although a formal affair
> is likely not a function where hosts would appreciate their guests taking a
> chance that there are not people in attendance who would be offended by
> terse language, cursing, off-color jokes, etc.

But if the black tie crowd is seated around you at the football game,
you wouldn't mind shouting the "eff" word at the top of your lungs?

> In this newsgroup there is
> no host, and it certainly is not a formal affair. There's not much chance I
> am going to have some affect on your personal life by my actions here and,
> if there is, then it is you who are in control to keep away from newsgroups
> in the event that you have a neighbor, friend, family member, or co-worker
> read the language of people you "hang out" with online.

That may be the most convoluted attempt at rationalizing behavior that
I've yet seen here.

>
> What's that you say? You aren't "hanging out" with us? I don't know what
> else to call it. You are certainly free to abstain from interaction in

> these posts. But you have not.

Kim, We don't hang out. We aren't buddies. We simply post messages on
an electronic bulletin board. This isn't even real time.

> I am not in control of what you or your
> neighbors, or family, etc., do online in a computer environment. I am in
> control of my actions for the benefit of a host at a gathering of people
> whom I don't know, and don't mind "behaving" on their turf. This venue is
> "anyone's" turf.

What was that thing you whisper to one of the female guests after you've
wandered about glad handing with your "fake smile". Was that for the
benefit of the host or hostess? What of the obvious disgust you
expressed for the other attendees and the attributes which you gave
them?

> >
> > > At a football game, you bet I'll generally be cursing...
> >
> >
> > You would? Why would you be cursing at a football game? Did you go to
> > the Karolyn Rose-Marge Schott School of Etiquette?
> >
>
> Have no idea who that person is. This must be another "Dave's world"
> person, right?

It's two people. Karolyn Rose is Pete Rose's ex. She used to be the
foul language queen of Cincinnati until Marge Schott bought the Reds.

> > >
> > > I think your interpretation of what you read points up the fact even
> more
> > > that I know when behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate. If you
> truly
> > > feel like being that "proper" all the time, then by all means I have no
> > > problem. But, if you feel like you "have to" but don't really enjoy
> being
> > > proper at all times--then I ask why you allow such demands to be placed
> upon
> > > yourself. I don't live my life for others--though I will make
> allowances.
> > > I live for me.
> >
> > What is being proper, Kim? Is it in living your life in a way which
> > includes acknowledgement of the sensitivities of others toward vulgarity
> > and what society considers to be foul language?
> >
>
> To me, yes. I acknowledge the sensitivities of others, but also make
> decisions as to *my* tolerance level. If I am at a formal affair, a

> friend's house with people I don't know, etc., then I am more likely to be
> much more demure than at a football game.

You mean you can only behave for just so long? I notice that your good
behavior would be more likely at a formal affair but not guaranteed.

> >
> > There are as many
> > people who would be offended by your language at a football game as
> > would be offended at that black-tie function.
> >
>
> Well, I am only willing to "give up" so much for society. If I want to
> curse at a football game, I will. And, if there's someone offended by that,
> then it is between me and them--*NOT* my host, hostess...or whatever.

You mean that you can't sit through a football game without uttering a
curse word? You equate that with "giving up" something for society?

> >
> > It is quite apparent that you live your life only for you.
>
> Absolutely. And, whether you wish to acknowledge it or believe it, you do
> also (live life only for you). If you don't, then you've cheated yourself
> and others of the greatest you can be. By living life for ourselves, it is
> by virtue that we live life for the rest of the world.

That's one of the biggest pieces of touchy-feely nonsense I've seen in
ages. I share my life with my wife, with my aging parents, with my
friends, with my neighbors and with my community. I don't feel I've
cheated myself or others by giving away my time.

Your last line sounds like it was cribbed from a Rod McKuen book.

Dave K8MN

2948. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 06:24:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C09C92D.EA7F1C9A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25995

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C095242.6EFF7ED8@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C088119.DB36D38D@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a
> mixed
> > > > group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of the
> > > > contradiction didn't you understand?
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Man, you are stretching now, Dave. You're really stretching.
> >
> > In what way, Kim?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Well, I don't wish to make value judgements for you, Dave. Suffice it to
> say that a newsgroup is far from a place where proper-ness is the rule.
> (Plus, I never used the term "mixed group"). Gads, I hate that term.

Okay, "formal affair". I'd guess you don't go to many of those so that lets you off the hook for most of your time. How about the grocery store? the hair salon? on a bike path?

Why does something have to be formal in order for you not to curse? What is it about this newsgroup which makes it okay for cursing. What's not proper about the newsgroup?

Would it bother you if the same folks you met at the formal affair read some of your earthier stuff here?

Dave K8MN

2949. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 12:18:21 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <h_oO7.246100$W8.8769535@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25996

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C09C121.DA4489A8@earthlink.net...
>
> My reply isn't even needed here. You compose the questions and you
> compose the answer.
>
> I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.
>
> Dave K8MN

And there were some good ones. Felt a bit sorry for the Texas QB who was victimized more than incompetant by some defensive strategy I recognized from my coaching days (the bandit made famous by Dick Butkus and the back-and-out style I taught my backers) but the yoyo that got the roughing the kicker penalty should be eating his meals off the stove after the butt-kicking he has coming is delivered unto him. On most days, Texas would win on talent but on this particular day, Texas was flat out-coached.

The Colorado coach did it at of all places Northwestern so we are going to hear a bit more from them. While Nebraska does run a class act as well as as fine a demonstration of football from the wax museum you are likely to see it did my heart good to see the Cornhuskers get their plow cleaned last week; the expected mass suicide did not occur.

Dick N BK

2950. 14313 Comes Full Circle

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 14:53:26 UTC
From: Herbie <Herbie@BARFforever.net>
Message-ID: <9udf4o$117$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 25997
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

With the return of NR5T full time to 14313, the
controversial frequency has almost come full circle.
KV4FZ is all that is now needed to complete the circle
and for 14313 to return to its pre-Riley Hollingsworth
days.

All the old familiar calls are back on 14313, up to their
same old habits, all day, every day: K9GOR, WA2EXQ,
W1BWV (WB1BWV), W4AMP (KD4CDB), W4JYZ
(KF4JYZ), K3QAM, W2OOQ, KB1EVE (KC1ZQ), just
to name of few of the high-profile operators.

The situation begs the questions, Just what has Riley
Hollingsworth really accomplished? Does he ever hope to
accomplish anything? Is Riley Hollingsworth even
relevant anymore to ham radio? Just what is Riley
Hollingsworth's true purpose in life? Riley Hollingsworth
failed to permanently remove from ham radio many of the
most violative ham operators in the history of ham radio,
and that has directly contributed to the return of 14313 to
its old state of affairs.

Respectfully,

Rod Johnson

2951. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 15:24:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0a486a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25998

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C09C35C.E314477E@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > You are so blase, Dave. So very blase.
>
> You write this in response to the fact that I prefer identifying with
> reality rather than movies. I prefer to get excited about having
> sundowners at the beach on Zanzibar or seeing the sunrise over the hill
> across the way from my place. You, on the other hand, can rent the
> video.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

For you to compare the reality of nature as opposed to the big screen v. finding admirable traits in a depicted character and trying to apply that to every struggles emphasizes that you are simply happy being so blase.

By the way, I don't like travel, nor do I have the money or time for it. So, if it takes a damned video for me to experience something of what beauty is offered on this great Earth, then so beit. I have the capability, Dave, to close my eyes and imagine. That's something you might want to work on...or not, for your reality is your reality.

Kim W5TIT

2952. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 15:45:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0a4d3a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26000

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C09C6C2.8E6122B8@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C090E12.E30A4DD2@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave, I hope you'll remember that I don't think I said I would not
use
> > > > inappropriate language at the wrong times. I don't think I said "in
a
> > mixed
> > > > group" and didn't mean to imply that way if I did or made it sound
like
> > I
> > > > did. What I meant, and here's the example I think I presented, is
that
> > I
> > > > would not use inappropriate language at a black tie dinner. This
> > newsgroup
> > > > is far from a black tie dinner. Here, I won't generally curse, but
I
> > will
> > > > to make a point--as I did in the example in the post.
> > >
> > > Thanks for straightening up that point. What difference is there
> > > between using the language at a black tie dinner and here? Is it in
the
> > > apparel?
> > >
> >
> > Certainly not (clothes do *not* make the person). Although a formal
affair
> > is likely not a function where hosts would appreciate their guests
taking a
> > chance that there are not people in attendance who would be offended by
> > terse language, cursing, off-color jokes, etc.
>
> But if the black tie crowd is seated around you at the football game,
> you wouldn't mind shouting the "eff" word at the top of your lungs?
>
```

Not at all. The football game is a different venue altogether, and if the black tie crowd can't handle roudiness, high emotion, etc., at a football game, then they don't need to be there. Would I holler FUCK YOU in a movie theater, restaraunt, library, museum, opera, symphony, office? NO.

> > In this newsgroup there is
> > no host, and it certainly is not a formal affair. There's not much chance I
> > am going to have some affect on your personal life by my actions here and,
> > if there is, then it is you who are in control to keep away from newsgroups
> > in the event that you have a neighbor, friend, family member, or co-worker
> > read the language of people you "hang out" with online.
>
> That may be the most convoluted attempt at rationalizing behavior that
> I've yet seen here.
>

Very well. To me, that just means it made more sense to you than you wanted it to. If you can't understand that I have the finesse to give honor to a host, then you're beyond my ability to help you understand.

> >
> > What's that you say? You aren't "hanging out" with us? I don't know what
> > else to call it. You are certainly free to abstain from interaction in
> > these posts. But you have not.
>
> Kim, We don't hang out. We aren't buddies. We simply post messages on
> an electronic bulletin board. This isn't even real time.
>

Uh huh. I could use your "convoluted" sentence, but that would be bringing myself to your level. You call interaction in this newsgroup whatever you like, Dave. Online is a venue for anything and everything. If I get to some newsgroup that is discussing or posting things vehemently opposed to the way I think or believe the word I use is "Unsubscribe."

> >
> > I am not in control of what you or your
> > neighbors, or family, etc., do online in a computer environment. I am in
> > control of my actions for the benefit of a host at a gathering of people
> > whom I don't know, and don't mind "behaving" on their turf. This venue is
> > "anyone's" turf.
>
> What was that thing you whisper to one of the female guests after you've
> wandered about glad handing with your "fake smile". Was that for the
> benefit of the host or hostess? What of the obvious disgust you

> expressed for the other attendees and the attributes which you gave
> them?
>

Uh, Dave? That would have been a--what did you call it: "real
time"--situation. This, however, and the comment I made above is from the
perspective of online. The *WHISPER* I would give someone personally would
be between myself and that person--no one else unless they chose to share it
with whomever. Oh, I also see you don't like my "fake smile" comments. You
really think that everyone you encounter at a formal affair is tickled to
death to be there, and relishes the close proximity to everyone who is
there? You're delusional if so. One of the greatest agonies about
weddings, funerals, and christenings are the family members and friends that
show up that would rather be seen on the exit bus. But, due to something
called protocol and civility, Dave, for the *benefit* of the function, we
(or those of us with finesse) resist our urges. Now, have someone walk up
to *me* (I don't know that everyone is this honest) and begin trying to lean
forward with one of those incessant pecks on the cheek? Or "just to chat"?
Uh uh...I stand there and politely and quietly tell them to get lost.

> > >
> > > > At a football game, you bet I'll generally be cursing...
> > >
> > >
> > > You would? Why would you be cursing at a football game? Did you go
to
> > > the Karolyn Rose-Marge Schott School of Etiquette?
> > >
> >
> > Have no idea who that person is. This must be another "Dave's world"
> > person, right?
>
> It's two people. Karolyn Rose is Pete Rose's ex. She used to be the
> foul language queen of Cincinnati until Marge Schott bought the Reds.
>
>

Whatever. Do they curse? Then include me in that "school" if you must.

> > > >
> > > > I think your interpretation of what you read points up the fact even
> > more
> > > > that I know when behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate. If you
> > truly
> > > > feel like being that "proper" all the time, then by all means I have
no
> > > > problem. But, if you feel like you "have to" but don't really enjoy
> > being
> > > > proper at all times--then I ask why you allow such demands to be
placed
> > upon

> > > > yourself. I don't live my life for others--though I will make
> > allowances.
> > > > I live for me.
> > >
> > > What is being proper, Kim? Is it in living your life in a way which
> > > includes acknowledgement of the sensitivities of others toward
vulgarity
> > > and what society considers to be foul language?
> > >
> >
> > To me, yes. I acknowledge the sensitivities of others, but also make
> > decisions as to *my* tolerance level. If I am at a formal affair, a
> > friend's house with people I don't know, etc., then I am more likely to
be
> > much more demure than at a football game.
>
> You mean you can only behave for just so long? I notice that your good
> behavior would be more likely at a formal affair but not guaranteed.
>

Yeah, Dave. That's it. Uh huh.

> > >
> > > There are as many
> > > people who would be offended by your language at a football game as
> > > would be offended at that black-tie function.
> > >
> >
> > Well, I am only willing to "give up" so much for society. If I want to
> > curse at a football game, I will. And, if there's someone offended by
that,
> > then it is between me and them--*NOT* my host, hostess...or whatever.
>
> You mean that you can't sit through a football game without uttering a
> curse word? You equate that with "giving up" something for society?
>

Well, actually, truth be known, I wouldn't be seen at a football game. If I
choose to watch a game, I like the television crews who do all the work to
get me the best seats in "the house." But, in the right environment, if I'm
prone to curse, I'll curse. Sure will. And, yeah, if I am at an affair
that requires elite behavior, say visting the Queen of England, I can be the
best of the best. What they do, and what I do, on our own time outside the
venue of the Queen is of no concern to the Queen. If she thinks it is,
that's *her* problem, not mine.

> > >
> > > It is quite apparent that you live your life only for you.
> >
> > Absolutely. And, whether you wish to acknowledge it or believe it, you
do

> > also (live life only for you). If you don't, then you've cheated
yourself
> > and others of the greatest you can be. By living life for ourselves, it
is
> > by virtue that we live life for the rest of the world.
>
> That's one of the biggest pieces of touchy-feely nonsense I've seen in
> ages. I share my life with my wife, with my aging parents, with my
> friends, with my neighbors and with my community. I don't feel I've
> cheated myself or others by giving away my time.
>
> Your last line sounds like it was cribbed from a Rod McKuen book.
>
> Dave K8MN

Then, you are different from me. That brings us full circle back to the point originally being made that began this whole exchange. I am far more willing and capable of conforming to and understanding the needs and desires of others than you are, Dave. You are more prone to having things *only* on your own terms. You were far more offended and demonstrative toward me, than I was toward you. If you will objectively go back and read over this exchange between you and I, you'll learn and see (if your truthful with yourself) that I was far more flexible than you. I share my life--truthfully--with the entire world.

Kim W5TIT

2953. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 15:47:46 UTC
From: "N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <f7cf91e0da8ea11776a80d8126aa6118@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 25999

Screw these other countries!

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:POaO7.139177$WW.8801107@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> The World Bank defines adult illiteracy as the inability of someone 15 or
> older to read or write, with understanding, a short and simple statement
> about their everyday life. While the highest rates as one would expect
are
> in Africa, when those are removed we come to this sequence:
>
> Country Rate of Adult illiteracy
>
> Pakistan 55%
> Egypt 46%
> India (second largest Muslim cty) 45%
> Algeria 33%
> Saudi Arabia 25%
> China 18%
> Brazil 17%
> South Africa 17%
> Turkey 16%
> Indonesia 15%
> Malaysia 13%
>
> There has been a lot of discussion of Islam in this group so it is worth
> noting here that a huge proportion of the population gets its idea of
Islam
> from the local imam. It is not an economic issue, Egypt and Ecuador have
> essentially the same income per head. South Africa may be excused for no
> better reason that the current regime' has not been in power for 15 years
> and replaced one where education was not a huge priority.
>
> We have seen, in the USA for sure, what happens when the local imam's
> education is from the Schmellpell Institute of Pinochle, Religion, and
> Belles Lettres or is simply a money-raising fraud. When there is no hope,
> suicide bombers abound.
>
> Dick N[illegible]BK
>
>
>

2954. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 16:04:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0a51b6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25901

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C09C92D.EA7F1C9A@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C095242.6EFF7ED8@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C088119.DB36D38D@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim made the point that she wouldn't use (expletive deleted) in a
> > mixed
> > > > > group and then does just that by posting it here. What part of
the
> > > > > contradiction didn't you understand?
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Man, you are stretching now, Dave. You're really stretching.
> > >
> > > In what way, Kim?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Well, I don't wish to make value judgements for you, Dave. Suffice it
to
> > say that a newsgroup is far from a place where proper-ness is the rule.
> > (Plus, I never used the term "mixed group"). Gads, I hate that term.
>
>
> Okay, "formal affair". I'd guess you don't go to many of those so that
> lets you off the hook for most of your time. How about the grocery
> store? the hair salon? on a bike path?
>

You're wrong, Dave. I go to formal affairs quite often. The grocery store,
no. The hair salon, no. (Though I've heard some of the best off-color
jokes at the hair salon). (Oh, and I go to a hair salon far less than I do
formal affairs). The bike path, damned straight I'd have no problem
cursing...unless a small kid is around.

>
> Why does something have to be formal in order for you not to curse?
> What is it about this newsgroup which makes it okay for cursing. What's
```

> not proper about the newsgroup?
>

There's absolutely NOTHING proper about this newsgroup, Dave. As to the situations in which I choose to curse. Have you *ever* *ever* *ever* let your hair down? When someone you are greeting leans over to kiss you on the cheek, you aren't one of those types that just seriously stiffens up, are you?!

>
> Would it bother you if the same folks you met at the formal affair read
> some of your earthier stuff here?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Not at all. And, while I don't know how this could be proved, I'd imagine that most of them wouldn't find it all that surprising, either. I've met and gotten to know many folks in a formal situation that we've been pleasantly surprised by one another later--due to finding out how "earthy" (that's great how you put it) we are. I'll never forget standing in the middle of a hallway while I heard the word "fu__" uttered from the most demure, wonderfully delightful, professional woman I'd known. She had uttered the word in a moment of anger and frustration, and hadn't realized that she'd said it. When she was done, I grinned at her, and I said, "But, you *didn't* just say the word fu__, did you?" She reviewed her memory banks, got this horribly shocked look on her face, turned red and said, "I *did* didn't I?"

The same folks at the formal affair, by the way, would realize that I'd paid honor to my hosts by "behaving" and I think that's all they'd see out of it. Your mileage, though, may vary. I have known people who are very offended by their perceived notion of the quality of a person just because they may choose to swear, tell a dirty joke, use some kind of risque behavior. Some people believe folks like that are akin to heathens. Some people are so very staunch and stern in their life, that they choose not to see the humor, not to see the satire, not to see the beauty. It is those I feel the most sorry for. They'll never know the wonder people like myself have known.

Oh, and if you don't like the new-agey stuff, I suggest you never try to get to know me any better. I subscribe to a lot of the principles of new age thought, though I am even risque in that tradition. I walk to the beat of a different drummer, Dave. You march in a parade. ;)

Kim W5TIT

2955. Re: 14313 Comes Full Circle

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 16:05:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0a5209$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25902

"Herbie" <Herbie@BARFforever.net> wrote in message
news:9udf4o$117$0@pita.alt.net...
> With the return of NR5T full time to 14313, the
> controversial frequency has almost come full circle.
> KV4FZ is all that is now needed to complete the circle
> and for 14313 to return to its pre-Riley Hollingsworth
> days.
>
> All the old familiar calls are back on 14313, up to their
> same old habits, all day, every day: K9GOR, WA2EXQ,
> W1BWV (WB1BWV), W4AMP (KD4CDB), W4JYZ
> (KF4JYZ), K3QAM, W2OOQ, KB1EVE (KC1ZQ), just
> to name of few of the high-profile operators.
>
> The situation begs the questions, Just what has Riley
> Hollingsworth really accomplished? Does he ever hope to
> accomplish anything? Is Riley Hollingsworth even
> relevant anymore to ham radio? Just what is Riley
> Hollingsworth's true purpose in life? Riley Hollingsworth
> failed to permanently remove from ham radio many of the
> most violative ham operators in the history of ham radio,
> and that has directly contributed to the return of 14313 to
> its old state of affairs.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> Rod Johnson
>

You must be quite busy listening, so I don't imagine Riley will accomplish
much.

2956. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 16:15:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0A53AD.6AAE5B04@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25903

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C09C121.DA4489A8@earthlink.net...
> >
> > My reply isn't even needed here. You compose the questions and you
> > compose the answer.
> >
> > I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> And there were some good ones. Felt a bit sorry for the Texas QB who was
> victimized more than incompetant by some defensive strategy I recognized
> from my coaching days (the bandit made famous by Dick Butkus and the
> back-and-out style I taught my backers) but the yoyo that got the roughing
> the kicker penalty should be eating his meals off the stove after the
> butt-kicking he has coming is delivered unto him. On most days, Texas would
> win on talent but on this particular day, Texas was flat out-coached.
>
> The Colorado coach did it at of all places Northwestern so we are going to
> hear a bit more from them. While Nebraska does run a class act as well as
> as fine a demonstration of football from the wax museum you are likely to
> see it did my heart good to see the Cornhuskers get their plow cleaned last
> week; the expected mass suicide did not occur.
>
> Dick Nï¿½BK

There were some outstanding games. I loved the outcome of the
Tennessee-Florida match. I pity the "goat" who dropped the ball on the 2
point try for Virginia Tech. He couldn't have had it easier after the
defender fell and he was all alone in that end zone.

Colorado looks tremendous.

Now for today's pro games...

Dave K8MN

2957. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 16:20:35 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9udk9t06if@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25905

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C09C92D.EA7F1C9A@earthlink.net...
> Okay, "formal affair". I'd guess you don't go to many of those so that
> lets you off the hook for most of your time. How about the grocery
> store? the hair salon? on a bike path?
>
> Why does something have to be formal in order for you not to curse?
> What is it about this newsgroup which makes it okay for cursing. What's
> not proper about the newsgroup?
>
> Would it bother you if the same folks you met at the formal affair read
> some of your earthier stuff here?
>
> Dave K8MN

People act differently in given situations. Factory workers behave differently around co-workers than they do around their families. Teenagers behave differently around their friends than they do when a parent is around.

It's just human nature. Whether we want to admit to it or not, we all have multiple personalities.

2958. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 16:21:55 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9udkce06o4@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25906

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C09C6C2.8E6122B8@earthlink.net...
> > In this newsgroup there is
> > no host, and it certainly is not a formal affair. There's not much
chance I
> > am going to have some affect on your personal life by my actions here
and,
> > if there is, then it is you who are in control to keep away from
newsgroups
> > in the event that you have a neighbor, friend, family member, or
co-worker
> > read the language of people you "hang out" with online.
>
> That may be the most convoluted attempt at rationalizing behavior that
> I've yet seen here.

Just because you refuse to accept the explanation, doesn't mean that it
isn't true.

2959. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 16:24:53 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9udkhv06vt@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25907

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C09C121.DA4489A8@earthlink.net...
> My reply isn't even needed here. You compose the questions and you
> compose the answer.
>
> I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.
>
> Dave K8MN

GO STEELERS!

2960. Re: 14313 Comes Full Circle

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 16:27:03 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9udkm10759@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 25908
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Herbie" <Herbie@BARFforever.net> wrote in message
news:9udf4o$117$0@pita.alt.net...
> With the return of NR5T full time to 14313, the
> controversial frequency has almost come full circle.
> KV4FZ is all that is now needed to complete the circle
> and for 14313 to return to its pre-Riley Hollingsworth
> days.
>
> All the old familiar calls are back on 14313, up to their
> same old habits, all day, every day: K9GOR, WA2EXQ,
> W1BWV (WB1BWV), W4AMP (KD4CDB), W4JYZ
> (KF4JYZ), K3QAM, W2OOQ, KB1EVE (KC1ZQ), just
> to name of few of the high-profile operators.

Not quite full circle...

No one has yet to apply for the vanity call of KA4MUJ

2961. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 16:43:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0A5A36.4348F6B7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 25904

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C09C6C2.8E6122B8@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C090E12.E30A4DD2@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave, I hope you'll remember that I don't think I said I would not
> use
> > > > > inappropriate language at the wrong times. I don't think I said "in
> a
> > > mixed
> > > > > group" and didn't mean to imply that way if I did or made it sound
> like
> > > I
> > > > > did. What I meant, and here's the example I think I presented, is
> that
> > > I
> > > > > would not use inappropriate language at a black tie dinner. This
> > > newsgroup
> > > > > is far from a black tie dinner. Here, I won't generally curse, but
> I
> > > will
> > > > > to make a point--as I did in the example in the post.
> > > >
> > > > Thanks for straightening up that point. What difference is there
> > > > between using the language at a black tie dinner and here? Is it in
> the
> > > > apparel?
> > > >
> > >
> > > Certainly not (clothes do *not* make the person). Although a formal
> affair
> > > is likely not a function where hosts would appreciate their guests
> taking a
> > > chance that there are not people in attendance who would be offended by
> > > terse language, cursing, off-color jokes, etc.
> >
> > But if the black tie crowd is seated around you at the football game,
> > you wouldn't mind shouting the "eff" word at the top of your lungs?
> >
```

>
> Not at all. The football game is a different venue altogether, and if the
> black tie crowd can't handle roudiness, high emotion, etc., at a football
> game, then they don't need to be there. Would I holler FUCK YOU in a movie
> theater, restaraunt, library, museum, opera, symphony, office? NO.

I'm 53. I've never in my life heard anyone shout that particular
offensive remark at a high school, college or professional football game
and I've attended many of them. I'd consider it in extremely poor taste
as I find your use of it here.

> > > In this newsgroup there is
> > > no host, and it certainly is not a formal affair. There's not much
> chance I
> > > am going to have some affect on your personal life by my actions here
> and,
> > > if there is, then it is you who are in control to keep away from
> newsgroups
> > > in the event that you have a neighbor, friend, family member, or
> co-worker
> > > read the language of people you "hang out" with online.
> >
> > That may be the most convoluted attempt at rationalizing behavior that
> > I've yet seen here.
> >
>
> Very well. To me, that just means it made more sense to you than you wanted
> it to. If you can't understand that I have the finesse to give honor to a
> host, then you're beyond my ability to help you understand.

How is it possible that you read what I've written and come to believe
that it means the opposite? Why would you "honor" a host or hostess and
not give the same "honor" to those sitting around you in a football
game? Why wouldn't you "honor" those who read this newsgroup?

> > >
> > > What's that you say? You aren't "hanging out" with us? I don't know
> what
> > > else to call it. You are certainly free to abstain from interaction in
> > > these posts. But you have not.
> >
> > Kim, We don't hang out. We aren't buddies. We simply post messages on
> > an electronic bulletin board. This isn't even real time.
> >
>
> Uh huh. I could use your "convoluted" sentence, but that would be bringing
> myself to your level.

Look up the word "convoluted". My sentences were direct and simple.

> You call interaction in this newsgroup whatever you
> like, Dave. Online is a venue for anything and everything. If I get to

> some newsgroup that is discussing or posting things vehemently opposed to
> the way I think or believe the word I use is "Unsubscribe."

So you idea of liberty for all is that when you show up here and start
writing on the restroom walls, I should go away. I've got a better
idea. How about if you behave yourself?

> > > I am not in control of what you or your
> > > neighbors, or family, etc., do online in a computer environment. I am
> in
> > > control of my actions for the benefit of a host at a gathering of people
> > > whom I don't know, and don't mind "behaving" on their turf. This venue
> is
> > > "anyone's" turf.
> >
> > What was that thing you whisper to one of the female guests after you've
> > wandered about glad handing with your "fake smile". Was that for the
> > benefit of the host or hostess? What of the obvious disgust you
> > expressed for the other attendees and the attributes which you gave
> > them?
> >
>
> Uh, Dave? That would have been a--what did you call it: "real
> time"--situation. This, however, and the comment I made above is from the
> perspective of online. The *WHISPER* I would give someone personally would
> be between myself and that person--no one else unless they chose to share it
> with whomever. Oh, I also see you don't like my "fake smile" comments. You
> really think that everyone you encounter at a formal affair is tickled to
> death to be there, and relishes the close proximity to everyone who is
> there? You're delusional if so. One of the greatest agonies about
> weddings, funerals, and christenings are the family members and friends that
> show up that would rather be seen on the exit bus. But, due to something
> called protocol and civility, Dave, for the *benefit* of the function, we
> (or those of us with finesse) resist our urges. Now, have someone walk up
> to *me* (I don't know that everyone is this honest) and begin trying to lean
> forward with one of those incessant pecks on the cheek? Or "just to chat"?
> Uh uh...I stand there and politely and quietly tell them to get lost.

So you just haven't learned any manners at all. I see.

> > > > > At a football game, you bet I'll generally be cursing...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > You would? Why would you be cursing at a football game? Did you go
> to
> > > > the Karolyn Rose-Marge Schott School of Etiquette?
> > > >
> > >
> > > Have no idea who that person is. This must be another "Dave's world"
> > > person, right?
> >

> > It's two people. Karolyn Rose is Pete Rose's ex. She used to be the
> > foul language queen of Cincinnati until Marge Schott bought the Reds.
> >
> >
>
> Whatever. Do they curse? Then include me in that "school" if you must.

You've been enrolled.

> > > > >
> > > > > I think your interpretation of what you read points up the fact even
> > > more
> > > > > that I know when behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate. If you
> > > truly
> > > > > feel like being that "proper" all the time, then by all means I have
> no
> > > > > problem. But, if you feel like you "have to" but don't really enjoy
> > > being
> > > > > proper at all times--then I ask why you allow such demands to be
> placed
> > > upon
> > > > > yourself. I don't live my life for others--though I will make
> > > allowances.
> > > > > I live for me.
> > > > >
> > > > What is being proper, Kim? Is it in living your life in a way which
> > > > includes acknowledgement of the sensitivities of others toward
> vulgarity
> > > > and what society considers to be foul language?
> > > >
> > >
> > > To me, yes. I acknowledge the sensitivities of others, but also make
> > > decisions as to *my* tolerance level. If I am at a formal affair, a
> > > friend's house with people I don't know, etc., then I am more likely to
> be
> > > much more demure than at a football game.
> >
> > You mean you can only behave for just so long? I notice that your good
> > behavior would be more likely at a formal affair but not guaranteed.
> >
>
> Yeah, Dave. That's it. Uh huh.
>
> > > >
> > > > There are as many
> > > > people who would be offended by your language at a football game as
> > > > would be offended at that black-tie function.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Well, I am only willing to "give up" so much for society. If I want to
> > > curse at a football game, I will. And, if there's someone offended by

> that,
> > > then it is between me and them--*NOT* my host, hostess...or whatever.
> >
> > You mean that you can't sit through a football game without uttering a
> > curse word? You equate that with "giving up" something for society?
> >
>
> Well, actually, truth be known, I wouldn't be seen at a football game. If I
> choose to watch a game, I like the television crews who do all the work to
> get me the best seats in "the house." But, in the right environment, if I'm
> prone to curse, I'll curse. Sure will. And, yeah, if I am at an affair
> that requires elite behavior, say visting the Queen of England, I can be the
> best of the best. What they do, and what I do, on our own time outside the
> venue of the Queen is of no concern to the Queen. If she thinks it is,
> that's *her* problem, not mine.

Give her my regards.

> > > >
> > > > It is quite apparent that you live your life only for you.
> > >
> > > Absolutely. And, whether you wish to acknowledge it or believe it, you
> do
> > > also (live life only for you). If you don't, then you've cheated
> yourself
> > > and others of the greatest you can be. By living life for ourselves, it
> is
> > > by virtue that we live life for the rest of the world.
> >
> > That's one of the biggest pieces of touchy-feely nonsense I've seen in
> > ages. I share my life with my wife, with my aging parents, with my
> > friends, with my neighbors and with my community. I don't feel I've
> > cheated myself or others by giving away my time.
> >
> > Your last line sounds like it was cribbed from a Rod McKuen book.

> Then, you are different from me.

Anyone reading this exchange would have realized that by now.

> That brings us full circle back to the
> point originally being made that began this whole exchange. I am far more
> willing and capable of conforming to and understanding the needs and desires
> of others than you are, Dave. You are more prone to having things *only* on
> your own terms.

I don't think that is what your comments have told us, Kim. I think you
have a social problem. When I attend a social function, I don't stand
around attributing motivation to the other attendees. If someone want
to give me a peck on the cheek, I accept it graciously and I don't
harbor ill will toward the individual bestowing it. I participate in
small talk realizing that some folks are likely to be as uncomfortable

as I am in a room full of people who are attempting to find some common ground. I don't whisper something out of a Stephen King novel into anyone's ear.

> You were far more offended and demonstrative toward me,
> than I was toward you. If you will objectively go back and read over this
> exchange between you and I, you'll learn and see (if your truthful with
> yourself) that I was far more flexible than you. I share my
> life--truthfully--with the entire world.

I've gone back over the exchange and vigorously disagree with your statement.

It isn't necessary for you to share everything with me or the entire world. There are some things that I just don't need to know.

Dave K8MN

2962. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 17:26:57 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0a6398_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25909

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0A5A36.4348F6B7@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> >
> > Not at all. The football game is a different venue altogether, and if
the
> > black tie crowd can't handle roudiness, high emotion, etc., at a
football
> > game, then they don't need to be there. Would I holler FUCK YOU in a
movie
> > theater, restaraunt, library, museum, opera, symphony, office? NO.
>
> I'm 53. I've never in my life heard anyone shout that particular
> offensive remark at a high school, college or professional football game
> and I've attended many of them. I'd consider it in extremely poor taste
> as I find your use of it here.
>

Are you thinking I wouldn't understand that some people would find it poor
taste? Is that what you're thinking? I am quite aware that people may find
it in extremely poor taste. I ask why do I yield, rather than they, Dave?

> > > >
> > > > In this newsgroup there is
> > > > no host, and it certainly is not a formal affair. There's not much
> > chance I
> > > > am going to have some affect on your personal life by my actions
here
> > and,
> > > > if there is, then it is you who are in control to keep away from
> > newsgroups
> > > > in the event that you have a neighbor, friend, family member, or
> > co-worker
> > > > read the language of people you "hang out" with online.
> > >
> > > That may be the most convoluted attempt at rationalizing behavior that
> > > I've yet seen here.
> > >
> >
> > Very well. To me, that just means it made more sense to you than you
wanted
> > it to. If you can't understand that I have the finesse to give honor to
a
> > host, then you're beyond my ability to help you understand.

>
> How is it possible that you read what I've written and come to believe
> that it means the opposite? Why would you "honor" a host or hostess and
> not give the same "honor" to those sitting around you in a football
> game? Why wouldn't you "honor" those who read this newsgroup?
>

Because they're different venues, Dave.

> > > >
> > > > What's that you say? You aren't "hanging out" with us? I don't
know
> > what
> > > > > else to call it. You are certainly free to abstain from interaction
in
> > > > > these posts. But you have not.
> > > >
> > > > Kim, We don't hang out. We aren't buddies. We simply post messages
on
> > > > an electronic bulletin board. This isn't even real time.
> > > >
> > >
> > Uh huh. I could use your "convoluted" sentence, but that would be
bringing
> > myself to your level.
>
> Look up the word "convoluted". My sentences were direct and simple.
>

How arrogantly sinister of you, to think I don't understand the meaning of
the word convoluted.

>
> > You call interaction in this newsgroup whatever you
> > like, Dave. Online is a venue for anything and everything. If I get to
> > some newsgroup that is discussing or posting things vehemently opposed
to
> > the way I think or believe the word I use is "Unsubscribe."
>
> So you idea of liberty for all is that when you show up here and start
> writing on the restroom walls, I should go away. I've got a better
> idea. How about if you behave yourself?
>

No. You needn't go away at all. In fact, I'd personally prefer you stay.
But you need to realize that you'll apparently be putting yourself through
some very negative experiences since you won't "appreciate" me being around.
Do I need to go away, for you, Dave? How 'bout instead of me "behaving,"
you get down and dirty with me? Why do you want me to do all the character
adjustments for you?

> > > > I am not in control of what you or your
> > > > neighbors, or family, etc., do online in a computer environment. I
am
> > in
> > > > control of my actions for the benefit of a host at a gathering of
people
> > > > whom I don't know, and don't mind "behaving" on their turf. This
venue
> > is
> > > > "anyone's" turf.
> > >
> > > What was that thing you whisper to one of the female guests after
you've
> > > wandered about glad handing with your "fake smile". Was that for the
> > > benefit of the host or hostess? What of the obvious disgust you
> > > expressed for the other attendees and the attributes which you gave
> > > them?
> > >
> >
> > Uh, Dave? That would have been a--what did you call it: "real
> > time"--situation. This, however, and the comment I made above is from
the
> > perspective of online. The *WHISPER* I would give someone personally
would
> > be between myself and that person--no one else unless they chose to
share it
> > with whomever. Oh, I also see you don't like my "fake smile" comments.
You
> > really think that everyone you encounter at a formal affair is tickled
to
> > death to be there, and relishes the close proximity to everyone who is
> > there? You're delusional if so. One of the greatest agonies about
> > weddings, funerals, and christenings are the family members and friends
that
> > show up that would rather be seen on the exit bus. But, due to
something
> > called protocol and civility, Dave, for the *benefit* of the function,
we
> > (or those of us with finesse) resist our urges. Now, have someone walk
up
> > to *me* (I don't know that everyone is this honest) and begin trying to
lean
> > forward with one of those incessant pecks on the cheek? Or "just to
chat"?
> > Uh uh...I stand there and politely and quietly tell them to get lost.
>
> So you just haven't learned any manners at all. I see.
>

I certainly have. *AND* I know when and where they *must* be applied.

> > > > > > At a football game, you bet I'll generally be cursing...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > You would? Why would you be cursing at a football game? Did you
go
> > to
> > > > > the Karolyn Rose-Marge Schott School of Etiquette?
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Have no idea who that person is. This must be another "Dave's
world"
> > > > person, right?
> > >
> > > It's two people. Karolyn Rose is Pete Rose's ex. She used to be the
> > > foul language queen of Cincinnati until Marge Schott bought the Reds.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Whatever. Do they curse? Then include me in that "school" if you must.
>
> You've been enrolled.
>

Grand! Are *you* paying?

> > > > > >
> > > > > > I think your interpretation of what you read points up the fact
even
> > > > more
> > > > > > that I know when behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate. If
you
> > > truly
> > > > > > feel like being that "proper" all the time, then by all means I
have
> > no
> > > > > > problem. But, if you feel like you "have to" but don't really
enjoy
> > > being
> > > > > > proper at all times--then I ask why you allow such demands to be
> > placed
> > > > upon
> > > > > > yourself. I don't live my life for others--though I will make
> > > allowances.
> > > > > > I live for me.
> > > > >
> > > > > What is being proper, Kim? Is it in living your life in a way
which
> > > > > includes acknowledgement of the sensitivities of others toward
> > vulgarity
> > > > > and what society considers to be foul language?
> > > > >
> > > >

> > > > To me, yes. I acknowledge the sensitivities of others, but also
make
> > > > decisions as to *my* tolerance level. If I am at a formal affair, a
> > > > friend's house with people I don't know, etc., then I am more likely
to
> > be
> > > > much more demure than at a football game.
> > >
> > > You mean you can only behave for just so long? I notice that your
good
> > > behavior would be more likely at a formal affair but not guaranteed.
> > >
> >
> > Yeah, Dave. That's it. Uh huh.
> >
> > > > > >
> > > > > There are as many
> > > > > people who would be offended by your language at a football game
as
> > > > > would be offended at that black-tie function.
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > Well, I am only willing to "give up" so much for society. If I want
to
> > > > curse at a football game, I will. And, if there's someone offended
by
> > that,
> > > > then it is between me and them--*NOT* my host, hostess...or
whatever.
> > >
> > > You mean that you can't sit through a football game without uttering a
> > > curse word? You equate that with "giving up" something for society?
> > >
> >
> > Well, actually, truth be known, I wouldn't be seen at a football game.
If I
> > choose to watch a game, I like the television crews who do all the work
to
> > get me the best seats in "the house." But, in the right environment, if
I'm
> > prone to curse, I'll curse. Sure will. And, yeah, if I am at an affair
> > that requires elite behavior, say visting the Queen of England, I can be
the
> > best of the best. What they do, and what I do, on our own time outside
the
> > venue of the Queen is of no concern to the Queen. If she thinks it is,
> > that's *her* problem, not mine.
>
> Give her my regards.
>

> > > > >
> > > > > It is quite apparent that you live your life only for you.
> > > > >
> > > > > Absolutely. And, whether you wish to acknowledge it or believe it,
you
> > do
> > > > > also (live life only for you). If you don't, then you've cheated
> > yourself
> > > > > and others of the greatest you can be. By living life for
ourselves, it
> > is
> > > > > by virtue that we live life for the rest of the world.
> > > >
> > > That's one of the biggest pieces of touchy-feely nonsense I've seen in
> > > ages. I share my life with my wife, with my aging parents, with my
> > > friends, with my neighbors and with my community. I don't feel I've
> > > cheated myself or others by giving away my time.
> > >
> > > Your last line sounds like it was cribbed from a Rod McKuen book.
>
> > Then, you are different from me.
>
> Anyone reading this exchange would have realized that by now.
>
> > That brings us full circle back to the
> > point originally being made that began this whole exchange. I am far
more
> > willing and capable of conforming to and understanding the needs and
desires
> > of others than you are, Dave. You are more prone to having things
only on
> > your own terms.
>
> I don't think that is what your comments have told us, Kim. I think you
> have a social problem. When I attend a social function, I don't stand
> around attributing motivation to the other attendees. If someone want
> to give me a peck on the cheek, I accept it graciously and I don't
> harbor ill will toward the individual bestowing it. I participate in
> small talk realizing that some folks are likely to be as uncomfortable
> as I am in a room full of people who are attempting to find some common
> ground. I don't whisper something out of a Stephen King novel into
> anyone's ear.
>

I've actually never had the opportunity myself.

> >
> > You were far more offended and demonstrative toward me,
> > than I was toward you. If you will objectively go back and read over
this
> > exchange between you and I, you'll learn and see (if your truthful with

> > yourself) that I was far more flexible than you. I share my
> > life--truthfully--with the entire world.
>
> I've gone back over the exchange and vigorously disagree with your
> statement.
>

And that is exactly as I had thought *you* would see it.

>
> It isn't necessary for you to share everything with me or the entire
> world. There are some things that I just don't need to know.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Oh, yes you do. You just don't realize it.

Kim W5TIT

2963. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 19:26:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0A8059.59118CFE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25910

Dave Heil wrote:
> There are some things that I just don't need to know.

Apparently, human psychology is one of those things. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2964. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 19:29:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0A810E.E3C28739@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25911

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I see. And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
> influence on their sexual "identity." Right.

Larry, if *you* were raised by homosexuals, would *you* be a
homosexual?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2965. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 19:32:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0A81B0.EDCC689A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 25912

Dave Heil wrote:
> I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.

The context is sexual attraction, Dave. Does "every televised football
game this day" equate to multiple orgasms for you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

2966. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 19:41:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnq5rwm.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25913

On 02 Dec 2001 04:43:06 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>No, it is an attempt to gain greater political privilege based on the
>fact of their abnormality. They want nothing to do with equality --
>they seek the comfort of victim status in order to strengthen their
>claim to membership in the elite ruling class of the New World
>Order. If this were not true, then militant Gay/Lesbian "rights" groups
>would not exist.

I'll pass your analysis on to a very close friend's stepdaughter
who is the chair of such a group. Her partner, BTW, is (or at
least was) on the White House staff handling issues that had no
relationship to sexual orientation.

Perhaps they can explain the reality to you in simple and
non-accusatory terms.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2967. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 20:01:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnq794n.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 25914

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 13:29:18 -0600, CAM wrote:

>> I see. And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
>> influence on their sexual "identity." Right.
>
>Larry, if *you* were raised by homosexuals, would *you* be a
>homosexual?

I have a very close friend who has two children of her own and
raised two stepchildren almost from infancy. All four were raised
together and were of roughly equal ages.

Her two children turned out to be "straight". Her two stepchildren
turned out to be "gay" although both she and their father were
"straight".

At the same time one of her co-workers turned out to be "gay" but
his children are "straight". All the "gay" or "bi" people whom I
know had "straight" parents.

Can Larry explain his claims of parents' orientation transferring to
childrens' orientation.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2968. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 20:08:52 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <023D79A87CF502EB.EBE1CA7B2AF3BC92.C67D13A7293CE1DA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25915

On Sat, 1 Dec 2001 18:56:57 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>The "issues" around my callsign are quite passionate.

Careful, Kim.

You'll turn the god squad on with statements like that!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2969. Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 20:14:44 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <e02358f67ea6c52f7c42ba0f221dc153.47899@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 25916
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to tell me. Help me!

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

--
Posted from surfola.com [208.184.25.39]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2970. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 20:24:13 UTC
From: Kent <kwinrich@wi.rr.com>
Message-ID: <N5wO7.1287651$si5.61567286@typhoon.kc.rr.com>
Source record: 25917
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yes!! We ARE trying to get you. It is out way of communicating with each other. We do it to confuse you small minded Hu-Mans.

Dah da di di dit Di di dit da dah

Kent, K9EZ
President - Little Green Men that support Beep Beeps
Member - B0ZO Amateur Radio Fraternity
Member - CW 4-EVER Club

You should see how it feels after a weekend contest (i.e. Field Day, CQWW, etc.)!!

"Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:e02358f67ea6c52f7c42ba0f221dc153.47899@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
> tell me. Help me!
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "
>
>
> --
> Posted from surfola.com [208.184.25.39]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2971. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 20:24:35 UTC
From: JJ&A <w7ls@blarg.net>
Message-ID: <3C0A8EF1.2BAC5592@blarg.net>
Source record: 25918
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

No problem. Make up a little hat out of aluminum foil and wear it. That will shield you from alien transmissions getting into your head. Jim

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:

> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
> tell me. Help me!
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "
>
> --
> Posted from surfola.com [208.184.25.39]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2972. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 20:31:03 UTC
From: migrant of <copypro50@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bcwO7.14236$Ao6.1226985@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 25919

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> reproduced
WB data in message news:POaO7.139177$WW.8801107@

> Country Rate of Adult illiteracy
>
> Pakistan 55%
> India (second largest Muslim cty) 45%

Know what's REALLY AMUSING about all of this ??
The two Countries above (both of which are in the top 3)
have nuclear weapons and innorant dipshits who make
up paper-mache and cardboard tube mockups of ICBM's
they ride atop in parades atop flatbed trucks. Let's HOPE
that the Pakis and the DotHeads **do have themselves**
a limited NUCLEAR EXCHANGE in the not too distant
future !! They both breed like freakin rabbits on Viagra
and they come over to this country to suck-off the welfare
system and sell watered-down gasoline or operate Motel-6
fleabag rent-by-the-hour rooms. Yeah! I say let them NUKE
each other so as to reduce the already-overburdened world
population a couple of million in just 5 minutes. That'll leave more
food and resources for the rest of us.

DO IT !! DO IT !!!

BOOOOOOOOOMMMMMMMMM!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

2973. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 20:42:54 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <inwO7.246848$W8.8814028@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25920

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011201234306.12427.00003955@nso-cg.aol.com...
> In article
<DC841BA7789E9FFA.C6DA076A1010BABF.EE44EE5ECD101D0D@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> I see. And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
> influence on their sexual "identity." Right.
>
> >>I'm not claiming to be working your side of the street, Rick. I am just
> >>reacting to what I've heard and read about the topic, and drawing my
> >>own logical conclusions. Why would there be a book like "Heather
> >>Has Two Mommies" unless someone with an agenda to normalize and
> >>lend an aura of acceptability to homosexual behavior wanted young
> >>children to be exposed to this concept? In other words, why are
> >>homosexuals attempting to "recruit" young people to their lifestyle?
> >
"
>
> I don't know why young children in elementary school need to be
> "informed" about abnormal sexual relationships -- or any other sexual
> relationships, for that matter -- unless someone is trying to, as I said,
> make it appear to be normal and acceptable.
>
> Well, I've never considered being black to be abnormal; but a simple
> examination of human male/female comparative anatomy seems to
> suggest that heterosexuality is the intended norm.
>
> I don't think any intelligent person has a problem "tolerating" or
"accepting"
> homosexuals. I acknowledge their existance as part of the whole of
> humanity, albeit as an abnormality. I feel no hatred or animosity toward
> homosexuals, and have no personal need to increase the suffering in
> what must already be miserable, confused lives. However, I cannot in
> clear conscience consider them to be "normal," simply because they
> are not. People with various developmental disabilities are not "normal"
> either, but I don't hate them, or lack "tolerance" of them. I make my
> living working with them every day, and I take very good care of them.
> I bear no prejudice against homosexuals or anyone else who does not
> fall within the conventional definition of "normal," but I believe that
they
> must accept their abnormality, and be as "tolerant" of the need of
> normal people to be assured that they are not going to attempt to win
> over their children to their "alternative" lifestyle as a means of gaining

> greater political power. If gays and lesbians are, indeed, "normal" as
> you claim, then they shouldn't seek to be venerated for their lifestyle,
> and keep their sex lives as private as most heterosexuals do.
>
>
> No, it is an attempt to gain greater political privilege based on the
> fact of their abnormality. They want nothing to do with equality --
> they seek the comfort of victim status in order to strengthen their
> claim to membership in the elite ruling class of the New World
> Order. If this were not true, then militant Gay/Lesbian "rights" groups
> would not exist.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

We have been around about this before but let's review. I can certainly agree about political privlege, read money. The NWO has zip to do with it. I would remind you that the whole gay rights schtick got started when the NYPD pulled one of its usual gay bashes - literally - and got the crap beat out of it. A lot of Indian reservations have similar atmospheres out here where Phil Sheridan's Maxim still holds, the only good Indian is a dead one. Can't say as I particularly blame them for being a little pissy about it; I am an _____ so wtf you gonna do about it is a lot of things but not anti-American by any means.

I have marveled at the ability of the Black community to take the worst features of Anglo existence and make them their own. When I drive the inter-campus shuttle at Nebroma over 90 % of the idiots parked in the bus lane are blacks. Now this is the behavior of animals running in packs playing status games and I am sorely tempted to apply the advice I got as a dachshund owner about pack behavior: when he sleeps in the hallway to gain status by making you walk around him, insert foot under belly and bounce him off both walls. But I also drove a national golf tournament shuttle and got a hell of a charge out of the yuppies towing off each other's luxoboats and Sport Pukes when their parking regs were ignored; there is something about a Lincoln Mortifier on the hook that is a thing of beauty. When every mistake or misunderstanding is a racial incident I think I might prefer gays. Whether this is racism or social observation I will leave to Mark.

But at bottom, our disagreement is on the causes of homosexuality more than anything else. In females it is apparently a birth accident because there are a lot of characteristics (ring finger length for one) that would indicate an over-exposure to testosterone during the first of the two hormone baths humans take. So raising a child, while indeed odd, is not likely to cause homosexuality or even behavior for that matter and the proper emphasis is on the well-being of the child not its nannies. In males, it appears to be part of the same brain-wiring process that produces left handedness and the general extremes of behavior that males appear to be prone to given prison and looney bin stats. The same process that produces extremely beneficial capabilities and behaviors is the one that produces some gut-rumbling ones. The unraveling of the human genome is about 2% of

what it will take to understand the process but there is enough evidence available to at least influence the way a gambler will bet.

One of Robert Heinlein's novels contained the good advice not to confuse the rumbling of one's stomach with the immutable laws of God. I haven't been cruised in years but it was revolting to say the least; but then my wife and I agreed not to be in the bathroom when the other was fiddling with their contact lenses: her popping her hard lenses and me re-arranging the soft ones resulted in a mutual stomach churn.

In the long run of things, what the gays are doing is demanding a place in society of relative equality in spite of not being in engineering terms 'design center'. Compared to some racial minorities trying to live in three centuries at once, their approach is irritating but not all that irrational and in fact somewhat understandable. Takes about three generations or some well-placed coronaries and always has. It is just too new for some.

But yeah, status games in general give me gas.

Dick NBK

2974. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 20:51:49 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <FvwO7.246878$W8.8814737@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25921
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

How's tings in Wi-scons-in der hey?

Judging from the address, I think poor Leland is being forged again.

"Kent" <kwinrich@wi.rr.com> wrote in message
news:N5wO7.1287651$si5.61567286@typhoon.kc.rr.com...
> Yes!! We ARE trying to get you. It is out way of communicating with each
> other. We do it to confuse you small minded Hu-Mans.
>
> Dah da di di dit Di di dit da dah
>
> Kent, K9EZ
> President - Little Green Men that support Beep Beeps
> Member - B0ZO Amateur Radio Fraternity
> Member - CW 4-EVER Club
>
> You should see how it feels after a weekend contest (i.e. Field Day, CQWW,
> etc.)!!
>
>
> "Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:e02358f67ea6c52f7c42ba0f221dc153.47899@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away
from
> > those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and
its
> > haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying
> to
> > tell me. Help me!
> >
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
> > KC8LD0
> >
> > Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
> >
> > "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> > me running, try to keep up. "
> >
> >
> > --
> > Posted from surfola.com [208.184.25.39]
> > via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>

2975. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 21:06:14 UTC
From: n7ws@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3c0a96ac.16388531@news.triconet.org>
Source record: 25922
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 2 Dec 2001 20:14:44 +0000 (UTC), "Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com>
wrote:

|Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
|those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
|haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
|tell me. Help me!

How do you figure two meters is supposed to be "codeless?"

All the serious two meter operators use CW. Trust me, I didn't get my two meter
Worked All Continents using FM and neither did the guys with WAS and DXCC.

Wes N7WS

2976. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 21:21:49 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8D7BBE8EFA537F7B.3B70D36534F45C63.E5ABCD5CFDE2A1D9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25923

On 02 Dec 2001 03:34:30 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>You're entitled to your own opinion; I can't do your thinking for you.

Then why do you try to do Kim's thinking for her?

Oh, I forgot.

In you're universe, women can't think as well as men, that's
why they have to be told what they can or can't do (including,
obviously, choosing a call sign), right?

>Actually, I merely ignored articles which wern't worth my time to
>compose a reply.

That defines a good portion of your own posts, Larry. At least
we know you won't be talking to yourself here in the news group
(although you're probably muttering to yourself right now).

>Well, that's where you demonstrate your immaturity. I'm mature
>enough to know that it is foolish to *want*to control something like a
>person's callsign.

And you prove it by creating a thread you insist will continue
regardless of the desires of others until she capitulates to your
will?

Sounds a bit strange to me.

>I would prefer that radio amateurs choose their
>callsigns in a responsible manner,

She did.

She considered her options, no doubt checked the list of
available call signs, and applied following FCC regulations. She
undoubtedly earned the $12 to pay for the vanity call herself instead
of stealing it from the corner "Stop & Frisk," and she was able to
successfully pay for it w/o bouncing a check or being turned down by
her credit card company.

Sounds like a responsible way to choose and obtain a vanity
call to me. Which part of that did you assume she irresponsibly
skipped?

>one which doesn't call their good
>taste and judgement into question.

She didn't call her good taste and judgement into question,
Larry, you did. And to the best of our knowledge here in the news
group, it wasn't her week to watch you at the time.

> Unfortunately, Kim didn't do that --

Really?

Looks to most everyone here as though she did.

>and thus is the topic of what is now one of the largest threads ever
>seen on this newsgroup!

Larry--if I chose to act like you have I could start a thread
on "CW...the mode for losers" and keep it alive as long as this news
group exists (for that matter, the same topic HAS been alive since the
news group has existed--just with a changing name). YOU chose to
create a thread for the sole purpose of attacking a member of the news
group and attempting to ridicule and harass her into changing her call
sign. That's behavior that would be considered obnoxious in any news
group but alt.flame. Don't blame Kim for the existence and
continuation of this thread--that was YOUR responsibility.

>>Let me repeat what I said in an earlier post: If you feel that her
>>callsign is as bad as you seem to feel, then you should be lobbying to
>>change the rules.

>Why would I do that?

Because it would be the appropriate and mature response.

Oops, that's why you WOULDN'T do it, isn't it?

>My quarrel is not with the FCC's rules on
>call sign assignment.

No--it's with someone who exercised her freedom of choice.

> Under the Vanity Call Sign program, the
>selection of a call sign is now the individual amateur's choice,

See!

There's that nasty word. Choice. You really hate that one
don't you Larry? It keeps everything from being orderly, regulated,
and compartmentalized into little cubby-holes where you know exactly
what to expect at any given moment.

Choice is like that monster you still fear is under your bed,
Larry. If you give it the chance to grab you, that orderly, boring,
life will be unavoidably changed.

> and
>that choice reflects their good taste and judgement;

Actually, it just represents their personal choice.

> or, in Kim's
>case, the lack thereof.

In your not-so-mainstream opinion.

Larry, even YOU have admitted that the majority of hams in
this news group support her choice. Doesn't that begin to hint at
which one of you is the one with poor taste--her for choosing a unique
call sign or you for harassing her publicly for her choice?

It does to me--and many others. And it isn't Kim we see
demonstrating poor taste and judgement.

> The FCC is not acting as an arbiter of
>such taste and judgement, and I don't think it should be.

Then why in hell do you think YOU have the right to do so?

Are you really so full of yourself (or, at least, full of
something) that you believe you have the right to speak for others or
to regulate the taste and judgement of other adults? Who elected you
god of the airways?

>There are literally dozens of hams with call signs which are just as
>offensive as Kim's, but they aren't participating in this newsgroup, and
>Kim is. I can only work with the tools at my disposal.

And since in a news group those are intellectual tools, you
really ARE at a disadvantage, aren't you?

>Once again, this is not the FCC's problem -- it's Kim's.

No, actually, it's yours. Kim--and the FCC--are both perfectly
satisfied with her call sign.

>>What you are doing in this group does *nothing* to promote your cause,
>>and does, in fact, more strongly ally people against you -- possibly
>>for you as well, but I've seen little evidence of that while I see
>>plenty of evidence for the former.
>
>Are you saying you have access to my E-mail? How do you know
>how many people agree or disagree with me? The visible
>participants in this newsgroup are not the only source of feedback I
>receive on what I post here.

But they ARE the only valid one.

Besides, why on earth should we believe you when you claim to
be receiving supportive email? You could just as easily (and far more
believably) be receiving "Knock off the vendetta, jerk!" messages
instead. We certainly have no reason to trust or believe you Larry,
you give the impression of being willing to do anything to "prove" Kim
is wrong, and if that includes lying we have no reason to assume you
wouldn't do that as well. After all, you make it clear from your
arguments about trust that even your own wife (if you had one)

couldn't trust you behind her back--why should we trust you here?

>Oh, I get it. Another liberal, who wants to shut me up for speaking
>the truth. Yawn!

Is everyone who thinks your are a jerk who is carrying this
FAR to far a liberal, Larry?

There must be a LOT of them in this group!

>I don't see why it couldn't -- do you think it can't be?

Sure it could--it could disgust potential hams and discourage
growth of the ARS. But, hey, if they aren't going to learn 20WPM code
you don't want them in the ARS anyway, do you?

>Well, at least you seem to have a higher level of reading
>comprehension than some others I've dealt with in this newsgroup.
>(Sorry about that, Cecil!)

Larry, I don't happen to like mushrooms. I find the concept of
eating fungus in poor taste and offensive to my palate. By your
standards, I have the right--and perhaps the obligation--to start a
thread and demand that the production of mushrooms end, and that
anyone who eats them recognize that they are doing something
disgusting.

Sound stupid?

Of course it is--but no more so than your OWN insistence that
Kim change her call sign because YOU object to it!

>>You've stated your objections. And I think you had a perfect right to
>>do so. But you're putting a lot of effect into *continually* stating
>>those objects, over and over and over. And any worth it might once have
>>had is now gone.

>I'm not restating things "over and over" in a vacuum

You mean you don't think before you post?

>-- I am replying
>to postings which have challenged my statements,

See what I meant about our not being able to trust you not to
lie, Larry?

You stated in this group that you would NOT let this thread
die until she changed her sign. You didn't say that you would not let
it die as long as people responded to your posts--you stated that it
didn't matter WHAT other people thought, you would not let it die
personally.

That, Larry, is the kind of obcessive/compulsive behavior that
people have accused Cecil of displaying in this news group--and in

your case, unlike his, it really IS excessive enough to be
legitimately diagnostic.

> and I am supporting
>what I have said by a point/counterpoint debate. This is what
>Usenet newsgroups are for -- and if you don't care for it, why waste
>your time reading it?

But, Larry, you state yourself that you will not let the
thread die no matter what (unless Kim changes her call sign, of
course). Now you claim that you are continuing because you are
responding to others. Which is it? If people stop responding to you
will you allow the thread to end and quit harassing Kim or
pontificating about her call sign? Or is that just another Larry
Rollism, to be read but not taken seriously?

>Just the exact opposite is true. The FCC is not the answer to this
>problem -- only Kim can choose to change her call sign, and only she
>can take action to do so.

IF she wants to, Larry. IF she wants to.

That's the part you hate--you can't badger, harass, or
ridicule her to the point that she will do so to soothe YOUR ego.

> The FCC doesn't care about the effect of
>her call sign, or anyone else's, on the image of the ARS. That's not
>their function.

It's not yours either, you idiot. You are just another ham, no
more, no less. Your opinion is worth no more than mine, Kim's,
Cecil's, or anyone else's that holds a license--including the no-code
group and post-restructuring licensees. What on earth gives YOU the
right to speak for the rest of us on this--or any OTHER matter?

There IS an organization that exists to promote the ARS and
its image, Larry. It's called the ARRL, and most (not all) of us are
members of it. If Kim's call sign is something that can cause damage
to the ARS, they--not you--should be the ones to address the issue and
encourage her (as an ARRL member) to change it for the good of the
ARS. That they are NOT doing so should give you a hint that it is not
a major concern of anyone but you and a few others in this group--and
that they are not doing so should be a VERY clear sign that you have
no justification in doing so yourself. The ARRL, in a limited sense,
can speak for most US hams (at least those of us who are members) on
issues related to the enhancement of the ARS--we give them that right
(with limits) when we join the ARRL. But no one in this news group has
joined the "Larry Roll Amateur Radio Association" and granted YOU that
same right.

There are ARRL officials and employees in this news group.
That they haven't jumped in to support your position should send you
at least a hint of a suggestion that they don't consider it their

business. And Larry, if it isn't the business of the ARRL, it sure as hell isn't yours!

> Kim's call sign does not violate any FCC rules, and if
>it did, they wouldn't have issued it.

Which, of course, should close the issue once and for all.

>>And I simply can't understand why you seem so angry *specifically* at Kim.
>
>She's the one who choose a call sign which is sexually provocative,

This, of course, answers it.

The thought of sex is at once so exciting for him and so unattainable that he can't help striking out at anyone or anything who might make him think of it even more than he normally does.

Larry, let your hair down (if you have any), take your tie off, have a leisurely glass of a nice Medoc, then go get laid. It will do you a world of good!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2977. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 22:11:22 UTC
From: KA2CTN <radio@spillett.com>
Message-ID: <eGxO7.72362$8C6.13614472@typhoon.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 25924
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Instructions for the aluminum foil hat are here.....

http://zapatopi.net/afdb.html

"JJ&A" <w7ls@blarg.net> wrote in message news:3C0A8EF1.2BAC5592@blarg.net...
> No problem. Make up a little hat out of aluminum foil and wear it. That
will
> shield you from alien transmissions getting into your head. Jim
>
> "Leland C. Scott" wrote:
>
> > Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away
from
> > those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and
its
> > haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying
to
> > tell me. Help me!
> >
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
> > KC8LD0
> >
> > Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
> >
> > "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> > me running, try to keep up. "
> >
> > --
> > Posted from surfola.com [208.184.25.39]
> > via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>

2978. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 22:28:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ZVxO7.140745$WW.8939502@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25925
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And another Hotmail forgery exposes a new generation of largemouth bass.

"Wes Stewart" <n7ws@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3c0a96ac.16388531@news.triconet.org...
> On Sun, 2 Dec 2001 20:14:44 +0000 (UTC), "Leland C. Scott"
<kc8ldo@hotmail.com>
> wrote:
>
> |Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away
from
> |those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and
its
> |haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying
to
> |tell me. Help me!
>
> How do you figure two meters is supposed to be "codeless?"
>
> All the serious two meter operators use CW. Trust me, I didn't get my two
meter
> Worked All Continents using FM and neither did the guys with WAS and DXCC.
>
> Wes N7WS

2979. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 22:32:43 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <f_xO7.140750$WW.8939556@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25926

Strikes me that blowing that popsicle stand takes more balls than an
anonymous posting in a newsgroup.

"migrant of" <copypro50@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bcwO7.14236$Ao6.1226985@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> reproduced
> WB data in message news:POaO7.139177$WW.8801107@
>
> > Country Rate of Adult illiteracy
> >
> > Pakistan 55%
> > India (second largest Muslim cty) 45%
>
> Know what's REALLY AMUSING about all of this ??
> The two Countries above (both of which are in the top 3)
> have nuclear weapons and innorant dipshits who make
> up paper-mache and cardboard tube mockups of ICBM's
> they ride atop in parades atop flatbed trucks. Let's HOPE
> that the Pakis and the DotHeads **do have themselves**
> a limited NUCLEAR EXCHANGE in the not too distant
> future !! They both breed like freakin rabbits on Viagra
> and they come over to this country to suck-off the welfare
> system and sell watered-down gasoline or operate Motel-6
> fleabag rent-by-the-hour rooms. Yeah! I say let them NUKE
> each other so as to reduce the already-overburdened world
> population a couple of million in just 5 minutes. That'll leave more
> food and resources for the rest of us.
>
> DO IT !! DO IT !!!
>
> BOOOOOOOOOMMMMMMMMM!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
>

2980. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 22:37:24 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <E2yO7.140754$WW.8940964@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25927

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gnq794n.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 13:29:18 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >> I see. And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
> >> influence on their sexual "identity." Right.
> >
> >Larry, if *you* were raised by homosexuals, would *you* be a
> >homosexual?
>
> I have a very close friend who has two children of her own and
> raised two stepchildren almost from infancy. All four were raised
> together and were of roughly equal ages.
>
> Her two children turned out to be "straight". Her two stepchildren
> turned out to be "gay" although both she and their father were
> "straight".
>
> At the same time one of her co-workers turned out to be "gay" but
> his children are "straight". All the "gay" or "bi" people whom I
> know had "straight" parents.
>
> Can Larry explain his claims of parents' orientation transferring to
> childrens' orientation.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Didn't Stalin have a commissar who held that socially-acquired
characteristics would find their way into the gene pool and produce a race
of good Communists? I think he set Russian biological science back a
century all by himself.

Beer Keg

2981. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 23:00:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011202180013.08945.00000488@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 25928

>Subject: Re: some sobering numbers
>From: "N0VFP, Lloyd" lloyd_vfp@msn.com
>Date: 12/2/2001 9:47 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f7cf91e0da8ea11776a80d8126aa6118@spamfreenews.com>

>Screw these other countries

Not that I ever doubted that you incapable of comprehending, Lloyd, but every once in a while you make it real easy to understand just how simple you really are.

The LACK of literacy in those "other countries" makes it real easy for religious fanatics to manipulate the masses. It's the same everywhere. Take ignorant, hungry people, feed them bull!@#$ and they think they have steak.

Read down that list of "other countries" and you will see that it's a "Who's who" of terrorism. And who leads these people? Well educated, zealots on a mission. Pig Laden couldn't muster the numbers of followers that he does, save for the numbers of people "educated" in the schools of the fundamentalists. THEY don't have the "luxury" of multiple channels of news, international opinion and the basic premise that individual thought is a RIGHT that they have.

They ARE taught that only the clerics are right, and that failure to follow THIER interpretation of Islam is a direct ticket to hell. Just like most of the CHRISTIAN zealots that we seem to be forgetting about lately.

These people are rasied believeing that America is the sole cause of thier plight in life, and that we have some dark motive for wanting to seem them subjugated. A study of thier history, however, will show that the middle eastern peoples have been at war with "someone" for centuries...certainly many MANY centuries before the United States ever existed.

The one constant in all of this warfare and servitude has been ignorance and religious fervor. It's just amazing what some literacy and compassion could do for world peace.

But you go ahead with your "screw them" attitude and the hate and the fighting will continue. Just like it always has.

Steve, K4YZ

2982. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 23:13:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <51C0BB45AA004DA6.F4C8ACE841E16D59.C33129394D048E45@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25929

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 02:47:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>We don't have a single such place in operation on this side of the
>river. I don't know whether any are located on the Ohio side.

It doesn't surprise me.

It takes an open minded community to allow people to make
their own decisions--many DO ban tattoo parlors or piercing salons to
prevent that from happening.

>Right, Rick. No kid ever produces a fake I.D. and uses it to do
>anything illegal. No kid ever obtains a "homemade" tattoo or does a
>homebrew job of piercing.

You were speaking about parents allowing their kids to get a
tattoo or piercing, not about kids doing so in their rooms. Precisely
how is THAT the parent's fault--they didn't install spy cameras in the
bathrooms and bedrooms?

I repeat--fake I.D. or not, no shop would risk the lawsuit
that would result from providing those services to a younger teen w/o
the parent's consent. And as far as older teens go--if the law says
they are old enough to try as adults (which, in most states, it does),
that they are old enough to make decisions about sexual activities,
and that they are old enough to quit school, don't you think they are
likewise old enough to make decisions about body ornamentation?

>> If, for example, my son were 16 (he just turned 18), and he
>> purchased a six pack of beer at a local store I would have grounds to
>> prosecute and could possibly even sue for putative damages. Neither
>> the prosecution nor the law suit, however, would result in enough
>> damages to seriously harm the business (although either or both might
>> discourage further sales to minors). But if, instead, he went to a
>> piercing salon and had his tongue pierced (a permanent piercing) or
>> went to a tattoo parlor and had a picture of a bloody knife tattooed
>> on his forearm, I would have grounds for a law suit that would
>> probably put the firm out of business. That's a LOT more risk for a
>> firm than the simple offense of selling beer to a teen.
>
>I've learned a lot from the above. Your first reaction is to think
>about prosecution or a suit rather than dealing with your kid's
>misdeeds.

What makes you think I would REGARD them as "misdeeds?"

By the time my son was 16 if Chris and I hadn't instilled a
sound set of values in him then we would have ALREADY failed as
parents and whether he bought alcohol or had a tattoo would be the
least of our worries.

On the other hand, if sound values were instilled, and I
believe they were, then by the time he was 16 he was old enough TO
make an intelligent decision about those matters. Did he drink at 16?
No--but he knew that if he did so he would not be in trouble (I did,
nearly everyone else I've ever met did, I expect there's a very good
chance YOU did as well--so why should I be a hypocrite and tell him HE
couldn't?). As it happens, he tried alcohol, didn't care for the taste
and _still_ doesn't drink, despite the fact that most of his friends
from college (who, in most cases, are old enough to buy alcohol
legally) do drink. The same holds true for drugs (he tried pot once
and didn't care for it--and yes, he DID tell us openly that he had
tried it). If he had chosen at 16 to get a tattoo or a piercing I
might have advised him against it (depending on the nature--his ear
has been pierced since he asked to have it done in childhood and I
probably wouldn't have objected to a small, inoffensive, tattoo at
that age if he wanted one), but I wouldn't have told him no unless the
procedure were extensive or medically risky. I happen to respect his
freedom of choice.

>> >> No, Dave, I _don't_ think very many early teens are getting
>> >> tattoos and piercings w/o their parent's consent. Do you?
>> >
>> >Yes, I do.
>>
>> Then document your source for the information. Unless, of
>> course, it is purely opinion with no basis in demonstrable fact.
>
>Document it yourself. I'm taking no homework assignments today, Prof.
>You asked what I thouhgt and I told you.

Let me get this straight.

You claim that many early teens are getting tattoos and
piercings w/o their parent's consent and when I ask you for sources to
confirm that absurd claim you tell me to document it myself?

I'll just assume that it's nonsense instead--if you had any
evidence to support your ridiculous claims you would cite it.

>> >For a parent to permit something which permanently defaces the human
>> >body such as piercings and tattooing sounds pretty irresponsible to me.
>>
>> ONLY if piercings or tattoos are viewed as "defacing" rather
>> than as "enhancing." That isn't a question of general values, Dave,
>> it's one that is cultural--and if the youth culture of today finds
>> them attractive (which it appears they do), why shouldn't they have
>> the same right to set their standards of beauty that you and I have to
>> set our own?

>
>No. They don't have those rights until they reach their majority by
>which time it is hoped that they'll have developed enough common sense
>to avoid something which could become a lifelong regret for them.

Or a lifelong pleasure--haven't you ever met people with
tattoos or piercings who were glad they had them?

It's funny, Dave. People like you would permit 17 year olds to
enlist in the service and risk (or lose) their lives fighting in a
war, but you won't let them get a tattoo or a piercing. I suppose if
your son joined the Navy and wanted a USN tattoo on his forearm (VERY
common among sailors) you would tell him he wasn't old enough for one,
right?

To me, if a person is old enough to die for his country, he's
old enough to portray that patriotism (or anything else, for that
matter) on his skin.

>> Many cultures world wide use piercings, tattoos, or
>> scarification to (from their perspective) enhance beauty. In the US
>> until the feminist movement caught on, women spent literally hours
>> putting on elaborate makeup before going in public--again to enhance
>> their beauty according to the standards of the current culture. To
>> treat such accoutrements as "defacing" simply indicates that you
>> believe your personal standards of beauty are the only ones that have
>> validity, a patent absurdity.
>
>Are you a Mauri too?

No--are you?

>> But one of the greatest problems we have with juveniles in our
>> nation today is the combination of justification and repression.
>> Justification in that we tend to minimize the degree of their own
>> responsibility for an offense and blame the act on society, and
>> repression because we refuse to accept what are often very legitimate
>> values and standards because they differ from our own generation's and
>> are held by youths rather than adults.
>>
>> By limiting teens (pre-pubescent kids are a different
>> matter--from a psychological perspective they have not as yet fully
>> matured mentally, where adolescents have done so) in ways that adults
>> are not limited, we simply make it clear that they are "children" from
>> our perspective--and then we wonder why they ACT like children on
>> occasion.
>
>We do that because they ARE children. They have not yet matured. Such
>is the natural order of things. They act like children because they are
>children. I don't wonder about that at all.

Perhaps you should.

Until the Industrial revolution there WAS no such thing as "adolescence" in the sense we use it today. A person was a child until they passed puberty, then they were an adult. The system worked fine because it WAS based on physiological fact--a teen is a mature adult physically (and, from a developmental perspective, mentally). Of course he or she still has much to learn and needs to mature emotionally--but so do many adults.

Once the Industrial Revolution came along, however, we needed a better educated citizenry. The eight years of school that was formerly the most the majority of people achieved simply wasn't enough for success in a more modern and complex world. But if a person was an adult, you couldn't REQUIRE him or her to continue in school, and since the nation was primarily agrarian at the time most kids had to start working on the family farm as soon as they finished the (compulsory) eighth grade instead of attending high school (farming is also the reason we have a Summer vacation in our educational system, of course, as it allowed kids to be home working on the farm during the busiest season). By defining a person as a "child" until he or she was 18, however, it became possible to make attendance in school mandatory, at least to the age of 16 (at which age most young women--and many young men--were married in those days).

What's my point? Simply because the law DEFINES someone as a child, does NOT mean they will behave immaturely or make childish decisions. The chances are very high that at least one of your great grandparents (if not more) had given birth to your grandparent before they were 16 years of age. Are you willing to argue that a person who is old enough to raise a family isn't old enough to make a decision about body decoration, or were your great grandparents child molesters?

>> >Ever hear of a term called "community values"? Its existence would
>> >refute your statement.
>>
>> Only if you can demonstrate that the community: (1) has a
>> RIGHT to impose values on a given matter and; (2) has better or more
>> relevant values than the individuals affected.
>
>Check out Hamilton County. You'll find your proof there in the
>existence of such laws. Let me know what you find out.

Why?

A few religious zealots managed to create repressive laws and you use THAT as justification for community values?

Dave, there is a small town in Georgia (population is under 2500) that passed an ordinance against the sales or rentals of any movie rated higher than PG (i.e., PG-13, R, NC-17, etc.). One of the residents had a satellite receiver and paid a subscription rate to receive and descramble the Tuxedo Network (which shows adult shows and soft core adult films). When the local prosecutor (who was a neighbor)

learned about it, he filed criminal charges against the Tuxedo network (headquartered and broadcasting in NYC, btw, where such shows are considered perfectly acceptable by the "community values")--and he WON! It was ruled that the Tuxedo network had violated the law in that community by delivering content ruled "unacceptable" by the community values of that town in violation of its laws.

The case is currently on its way to the SC. If the decision is upheld there, you will see a considerable change in television programming--the Networks (public and subscription such as HBO, etc.) will be forced to limit their broadcasts to movies acceptable anywhere in the USA--and there's at least ONE town (in Texas) where the limit is "G" rated!

Do you REALLY think that a community has the right to limit our entertainment to Disney movies? More to the point, do you sincerely believe that the community has the right to limit the nature of entertainment we view in the privacy of our homes at all?

In Cincinnati, your favorite city to cite, the curator of the museum of art was prosecuted for presenting an exhibition of art that no one even attempted to claim was not legitimately of artistic merit, and which would have lent prestige to the Cincinnati museum. The art, however, included images that violated Cincinnati's intrusive "Community Values" and the curator was convicted. To me, that's completely reprehensible behavior and no one with a shred of respect for the Constitution of the United States would even consider a community where such a travesty of law occurred to be worthy of any respect whatever--let alone a suitable place to cite as an example of "community values."

>> Your "Community values" when carried to any reasonable extent
>> would define such behavior as piercing as totally inappropriate in
>> some communities--and completely acceptable in others. What if the
>> person who is pierced in, for example, Santa Cruz California, where it
>> is accepted, travels to Cincinnati where it is not well accepted? Are
>> they obligated to remove their jewelry and have the piercing
>> surgically closed? Or is it unreasonable for the new community to
>> impose its values on those who don't share them?
>
>I brought up ways that group values can limit individual values.
>I don't care if an individual is pierced in Poughkeepsie and moves to
>Cuyahoga Falls. You can work out the details later.

Correction. You brought up ways that groups values can limit individual rights and freedom of choice, not ways they can limit values.

Sorry, but to me that smacks way too much of fascism and censorship.

Incidently, have you noticed that there are groups in
Cincinnati right now working to ban both the "Harry Potter" movie and
series of books because they feel they violate "Community Values?"

I'll bet you're proud of your old community in it's fight
against children's literature, aren't you?

>> Community values can only refute my statement if you can
>> demonstrate community values that are absolutes rather than subjective
>> decisions based on current stereotypes and political influences. So
>> far, I have yet to see someone do that.
>
>Call it what you want, Rick. If you choose to deny that there are
>places with laws on the books based on community values, I don't care.

There are places with laws on the books that restrict the
rights of minority members, too (try Kuwait or Iran). That doesn't
mean I have to either respect those places (and laws) or that the fact
they exist makes them any less offensive to a free society.

>You say that the parents aren't asked their opinions. I don't know that
>to be true. Taxpayers foot the bill for schools whether they have
>children in the schools. I think he who pays, says. I take it that you
>think that dress codes are a bad idea.

I think ANY restriction that can't be shown to prevent harm
and that circumvents the role of the family in deciding a child's
manner of dress is wrong.

Don't you?

>> Nope. Which has nothing to do with "community standards" and
>> has everything to do with suppression of freedom of speech and freedom
>> of choice.
>
>Hamilton County disagrees with you.

Show me where "Hamilton County" has stated that community
standards are NOT ways to suppress speech. Otherwise, you can't claim
they "disagree with me."

>> It is also the direct result of concentrated campaigns by the
>> religious right that have thrust what should be religious issues into
>> the legal process. The same holds true for Ft. Wayne, IN, and other
>> extremist, bible-thumping, communities.
>
>Hamilton County disagrees with you. Apparently Ft. Wayne disagrees too.

How about citing the United States Constitution instead of the
views of a few religious zealots in the bible-belt, Dave? Or are those
zealots the only support you can find for your absurd claims?

>> >Why does the Dish Network bleep offensive words from movies?
>>
>> It doesn't.

>
>It does. Starz movies are bleeped.

Really?

I can _guarantee_ they don't with CineMAX--we were at the home
of some friends Thursday night and while I was working on their
computers (the reason we went over), Chris was watching an "R-Rated"
movie with Linda (the wife in the couple) on MAX--and it was NOT
bleeped.

I just sent an IM to them asking them to check Starz and let
me know if it is "bleeped" but off hand, I'm pretty sure they'll say
it isn't. It would make no sense for the Dish network to "bleep" one
channel and not others.

Perhaps you just live in such a conservative, AFA dominated
community (as Cincinnati and Ft. Wayne are) that Dish is protecting
itself by bleeping content to your area. Sorry to hear that you are
subject to censorship instead of being allowed freedom of choice as
the rest of us are--but it meets your needs so it should be no
problem.

You DO prefer Disney class entertainment, right?

Incidently, what do they do about the closed captions--bleep
the offending words there, too?

>You're getting as bad as Lenny at stating the obvious. I know what it
>is; I have it in my home.

IF you are telling the truth (you provide no evidence of that
in other areas of this debate/discussion/flame war), which has yet to
be proven, and IF it is done by Dish rather than some parental control
setting in your own receiver, frankly you deserve the censorship you
receive (you DO support censorship, right?). In my home--and I expect
in the homes of the other members of this news group who have
satellite services such as Dish & DirecTV--we neither have nor want
someone else deciding what we should be permitted to hear.

>> If the Dish network DOES censor in that manner, it is simply a
>> good reason to choose DirecTV instead--since the alternative is
>> allowing someone ELSE to decide what is appropriate for you to hear.
>
>I don't agree with you at all. I find it kind of refreshing.

Why? Does it keep you from having to think?

What do they do when there is nudity or strongly sexual
content (also part of an "R" rating) Dave? Put "CENSORED BY FASCISTS"
banners across the screen?

Must be relaxing for you not to have to watch tv and decide
for yourself about the adult parts & language; it's so much easier to

allow the American Family Association to do your thinking for you, isn't it?

>> Let me reverse the question: If there's something wrong with
>> using those words--why are the present in a movie in the first place
>> to REQUIRE anyone to "bleep" them?
>
>Oh, you haven't come up with a good reason for them either, huh?

Try "Freedom of speech" Dave--I know that one hurts you censorship fanatics, but some of us not only believe in it--but actually fought for it in Vietnam.

Out of curiosity, as I recall you claim to have been in the Foreign Service of the US. Since that's a part of the Department of State, didn't you have to swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States (as do other State Department officials both domestically and abroad--and as the US military are required to do)? I'll bet that pesky Bill of Rights was a real pain to pretend to support wasn't it--or is that why you're no longer a Foreign Service employee?

>I'd guessed that it was obligatory to insert a good sex scene (whether
>or not it had any real relevance to the story line) and to throw in a
>few good swear words or you wouldn't get many kids to attend the flick.

Dave, what is so difficult about choosing to vote with your viewership? If you don't care for the content of a movie, don't watch, rent, or purchase it. Is that REALLY so difficult to understand? Don't you have any will power at all?

I've always suspected (and I have no idea if research would support my suspicion or not--I haven't looked to see if it does) that those who most strongly support limitations on adult content are the same people who can't be trusted to exercise good judgement with respect to their reading/viewing habits. From everything I read in this news group I have no reason to change that view.

Let adults make their decisions, Dave. Stop trying to claim that the "community" has the right to make those choices for them. It didn't have the right with segregation laws (which, although immoral from any reasonable perspective, WERE legal until the 1960s), and it doesn't (legal or not) with respect to censorship today.

I don't care for explicit films or porn personally. Not because they are "offensive" or "immoral," simply because I find them superficial, poorly plotted and acted, and representative of some of the most distorted stereotypes of sexual roles (as well as the worst sexual techniques--yuck!) found anywhere. As a result, I don't watch or read porn. I don't subscribe to the Playboy channel (even though the documentary "Sexcetera" has some very redeeming values in that it documents what is going on in the more extreme sexual cultures in the world--something of obvious interest to me as a sociologist and

psychologist); I don't view PPV movies on the adult channels; I don't watch the "Mature" (and no-star) rated shows on MoMAX at night, and I don't rent adult movies (I _do_ own a couple classics such as "Cafe Flesh" and the soft-core classic "Barbarella" but that is because they actually have a real story, competent acting, and an interesting plot line--which is, of course, why they ARE classics). But unlike you, and those communities you rave about, I don't feel that my personal values should be used to limit the interests of others. If you, Cecil, Larry, Kim, or anyone else in this group choose to watch "X-Rated" films that is YOUR right and I not only respect it, I will defend it with my freedom and with my life--even though I would NOT make the same choice.

THAT, Dave, is an American value, not the "Community Values" crap you and the AFA try to shove down our throats.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2983. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 23:24:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AB7FA.19D0556@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25930

CAM wrote:
>
> How can I be any clearer? The part
> of your statement to which I objected
> was the "dead horse" part. The
> Libertarian Party is growing every
> year and is not a "dead horse".

Oh, you were very clear, just not making any sense. When exactly do you expect this "national" political party to have any success at the "national" level? After 30 years of little or no success at it's stated goal (to be a "national" political party), isn't it about time to give it up?

> From little acorns, might oaks grow.

LOL. I don't want to sound mean, but, after 30 years, an acorn has already grown into a tree. During that same time period, the Libertarian Party, with it's 67 local offices, is still nothing more than a tiny twig. At this rate of growth, it is going to be a very long time before the Libertarian Party turns into that mighty oak you're talking about (and we'll probably both be dead of old age by then). That is assuming the Party ever turns into a mighty oak, which I'm not convinced at this point will ever happen.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2984. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 23:45:26 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C0ABCBD.FF3EAAF2@spam.me.not>
Source record: 25931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

nice forge

-SSB

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:
>
> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
> tell me. Help me!
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "
>
> --
> Posted from surfola.com [208.184.25.39]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2985. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-02 23:55:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0ABF35.20A86F13@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25932

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Trust is trust. Insecurity is insecurity.

Tell that to the many millions who have experienced an end to a relationship because of the infidelity of a "trusted" partner. Total, blind, trust is absolutely foolish (and there is nothing insecure about not being foolish).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2986. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:07:31 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3FE45F020CC27DF8.D0AE985B2198BF8D.EEFBEEA8CF61FB68@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25933

On 02 Dec 2001 04:43:06 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Speaking only for myself, I don't see anything out of the ordinary with
>families of American Hispanics, American Asians, or Americans of
>African descent. I *do* find something highly unusual in a family where
>the "parents" are two lesbians or gay men.

Larry, for a change, I'll try to respond to your post w/o
flames and to discuss the issue rationally (I haven't read the rest of
your message yet--I tend to respond on a paragraph by paragraph basis
to long posts) since it appears you are willing to do so.

I know that this is a major point of contention for many
Americans--but it IS one that has been very extensively researched. As
a person with a degree in science (I believe you commented that you
have a BSEE, although I could be wrong--if so, I apologize for the
error), you are--or can reasonably be expected to be--a person for
whom scientific evidence is both valid and acceptable as a grounds for
belief.

>> There are over 2,000,000 children being raised in gay/lesbian
>>households in the US right now (and, no, they do NOT have a higher
>>likelihood of being gay than their peers raised in straight
>>households, research has already confirmed that), don't those children
>>have the right to be recognized as coming from happy households, too?
>
>I see. And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
>influence on their sexual "identity." Right.

Not according to research on the subject.

The University of Washington and the University of Chicago (a
Jesuit Institution, btw), among other institutions, have done very
extensive research into this issue and the results indicate that while
kids raised in homosexual parented households hold fewer prejudices
against homosexuals (why does that seem reasonable? :-), the are NO
MORE LIKELY to become or identify as homosexuals than those raised in
straight households--even very religious ones where homosexuality is
viewed as "sinful" and "evil" or "degenerate."

According to the best scientific evidence, homosexuality as an
orientation is NOT influenced by attitudes toward homosexuality or by
role models.

Ask yourself, honestly, if your parents were lesbians (the
more usual homosexual household to raise kids) or gay men (more common

in cases where the man has gained custody of his child through the death of a spouse or her voluntary relinquishment of custody) would YOU be a homosexual today?

If so, you already have homosexual interests--and you are aware of them. If not (which is MUCH more likely), why do you believe others would?

>> Larry, how can you possibly equate "recruit" with "inform?"
>
>I don't know why young children in elementary school need to be
>"informed" about abnormal sexual relationships -- or any other sexual
>relationships, for that matter -- unless someone is trying to, as I said,
>make it appear to be normal and acceptable.

Here we have to look at the issue in an unbiased (from BOTH our perspectives) manner if we are to establish any degree of accuracy.

Should we "inform" children about sexual relationships? That depends on what you consider informing them. If you mean discussing the sexual aspects of the relationship, then outside of a sex education class I agree completely--we have no need to (or benefit from) discussing these issues with children in the common classroom. That's up to the parent, not the school.

But--and it's an important but--if you are referring to the act of acknowledging that M-M or F-F households exist, and that kids raised in those households (and the households themselves) are just as "Normal," if less prevalent, as M-F or single-parent households, then I have to disagree with you.

There ARE kids in our schools--lots of them--from gay households or from other minority households (including single parent ones). To teach children that these kids are just as normal and have just as successful of family lives as those from M-F households is not only appropriate, it benefits everyone. The kids from the gay households because they are being unfairly ostracized and ridiculed in most schools over their families (which, to ANYONE'S way of thinking in unfair to the kids). The parents of those kids themselves, because they are being discriminated against and their children ridiculed for being exactly what they are. The other kids, because they learn to judge people as individuals not as members of a minority. And the community because prejudice and discrimination is being reduced for future generations. There ARE no losers in that situation.

Larry, and this is not meant as a put-down, only a legitimate question, since you cite "Heather has two Mommies," have you actually READ the book or are you going by what you have read ABOUT it? I _have_ read it (and the male version, Daddy's Roommate) and it has NOTHING even slightly sexual or offensive in nature (to me) in it at all. It simply presents the image of a household in which a child is

loved, cared for, supported emotionally, intellectually, and
economically and encouraged to feel pride in herself and her family.
Are those values you DON'T want presented in children's books?

If you're going by the opinion of others, I encourage you to
read them for yourself, Larry. We BOTH know that the opinions of
others are not our own, and despite the fact that I disagree with many
of your values I can't believe you are the kind of person who lets
other people make his decisions for him--Dave, yes but you no.

>> I don't care what your personal opinion is, the fact is that
>>from any scientific perspective you care to identify, homosexuality IS
>>normal. You don't have to "normalize" it any more than you have to
>>"normalize" being an African-American. It happens to _already_ be
>>completely normal.
>
>Well, I've never considered being black to be abnormal; but a simple
>examination of human male/female comparative anatomy seems to
>suggest that heterosexuality is the intended norm.

Actually, it only suggests that heterosexuality is the
majority orientation--something I've never disputed. There ARE very
sound reasons illustrated by anthropology and evolutionary psychology
why the development of a minority group of homosexuals would be a
positive for society, but those are irrelevant to the conversation.

The fact that homosexuality is NOT the majority orientation
does, statistically, make it abnormal. But PRECISELY the same is true
of being black, hispanic, or left-handed for that matter. The "Norm"
is the mean or median of a group--and the median value for sexual
orientation is heterosexual, just as the median value for race in the
United States is caucasian. Thus it is just as "abnormal" to be black
or hispanic as it is to be homosexual.

>I don't think any intelligent person has a problem "tolerating" or "accepting"
>homosexuals.

I wish you were right, Larry. But too many religious
extremists dispute that. You only need to look at the published
statements of Anita Bryant, Fred Phelps, Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson,
or any other so-styled Christian leader to know that there is an
enormous amount of homophobia in our society.

> I acknowledge their existance as part of the whole of
>humanity, albeit as an abnormality.

But abnormal only in that they are a relatively small (10% +/-
3%) minority, I hope.

> I feel no hatred or animosity toward
>homosexuals, and have no personal need to increase the suffering in
>what must already be miserable, confused lives.

I wouldn't support the "confused" part--but I know many homosexuals who DO suffer a great deal at the hands of an unaccepting and self-righteous society--including more than a few who have been victims of gay-bashing.

Actually, if there was ever a need for "proof" that homosexuals don't "Choose" to be gay, that's it. Who would even consider making the choice of a lifestyle that would result in ostracism, prejudice, intolerance, oppression, and physical danger over one that was safe, secure, and totally accepted by their society?

> However, I cannot in
>clear conscience consider them to be "normal," simply because they
>are not.

From the perspective of statistics, they are not (nor are blacks or hispanics).

From the perspective of science and behaviorism, they are totally normal as even the briefest recourse to scientific evidence or research will immediately demonstrate.

> People with various developmental disabilities are not "normal"
>either, but I don't hate them, or lack "tolerance" of them.

People with developmental disabilities are not "normal" from a scientific perspective, either. There IS a difference.

Instead of relying on personal opinion or religious indoctrination, try to present arguments that represent scientific thinking on this subject, Larry. You'll have a great deal of difficulty making a convincing case using that evidence--and that's the best evidence we have available.

> I make my
>living working with them every day, and I take very good care of them.

But, of course, homosexuals have no need to be "taken care of."

>I bear no prejudice against homosexuals or anyone else who does not
>fall within the conventional definition of "normal," but I believe that they
>must accept their abnormality, and be as "tolerant" of the need of
>normal people to be assured that they are not going to attempt to win
>over their children to their "alternative" lifestyle as a means of gaining
>greater political power.

Larry, that sounds incredibly paranoid.

The desire to be accepted as a part of the community, to receive the same respect from others that you and I expect (and receive) automatically as heterosexuals, and to be permitted by the community to live their own lives and raise their children free of the threat of violence or ridicule isn't asking for greater political powere--it's asking for acceptance and tolerance, something every

human has the right to expect of society.

> If gays and lesbians are, indeed, "normal" as
>you claim, then they shouldn't seek to be venerated for their lifestyle,
>and keep their sex lives as private as most heterosexuals do.

Do heterosexuals hide the fact that they are married? Do they
hide the fact that the love their partners? I don't--and I don't know
any other heterosexuals who do, either. All homosexuals ask is the
same privilege that has always been available to heterosexuals. They
don't ask the schools to teach about their sexual behavior (any more
than you do as a heterosexual), they merely want to be accepted as a
FAMILY. Is that so wrong in our "family oriented" society?

>> There is no "Homosexual Agenda" Larry. It's a figment in the
>>mind of right wing extremists who can't stand the thought that others
>>have rights too.
>
>No, it is an attempt to gain greater political privilege based on the
>fact of their abnormality. They want nothing to do with equality --
>they seek the comfort of victim status in order to strengthen their
>claim to membership in the elite ruling class of the New World
>Order. If this were not true, then militant Gay/Lesbian "rights" groups
>would not exist.

Show me some proof of that.

All every gay/lesbian group I have ever encountered has asked
for is equal treatment under law and the protection of the law against
discrimination and violence--precisely the same things the Black
community (and women for that matter) have asked for and been granted.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2987. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:13:01 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BAE6B175982853CA.08329041B5F3FC8B.0DC5530FCCBA084A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25935

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 02:47:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> >Why does the Dish Network bleep offensive words from movies?
>>
>> It doesn't.
>
>It does. Starz movies are bleeped.
>
>> The dish network doesn't produce or show movies, Dave, it
>> merely provides a satellite downlink for the broadcasters such as HBO,
>> Showtime, etc.--at least if it works the same as DirecTV, as I
>> understand it does.
>
>You're getting as bad as Lenny at stating the obvious. I know what it
>is; I have it in my home.

Dave, if you claim this is a universal for the Dish network,
you are a liar!. I just heard back from our friends with Dish and she
deliberately tuned the Starz network and listened for an hour. The
show was NOT "bleeped."

I'm sure there are many readers here who, likewise, receive
the Dish network. I _encourage_ them to turn on Starz and determine
for themselves whether you are an honest man or not--and when they
find that you have lied deliberately about this to evaluate your other
statements in this news group on that basis.

If you can't make your point without lying, Dave, don't bother
to make it at all. You'll understand if, from now on, I don't accept
ANYTHING you say without proof--you've demonstrated that there is no
reason to do so and every reason not to.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2988. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:13:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AC37D.60F55B20@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25934

Sean G Gilley wrote:
>
> However, what Larry said in his
> postings were things that I believe
> really fall into another realm
> entirely. I work as a professional
> in a large corporation. Coworkers
> have lunch together. I don't
> believe (and it seems very few
> others believe) that having lunch
> with a coworker of the opposite
> sex brings up issues of trust.

Perhaps that attitude is why so many illicit relationships begin in the workplace. I also work in a professional environment and I do not have lunches with female co-workers unless there were other employees present. I respect my wife, my co-workers, and my own professional reputation. Because of that, I don't do things that might reflect badly on any of those. And I have worked in the real world long enough to know that if one has "lunches" with female co-workers on a regular basis, that is exactly what is going to happen.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2989. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:16:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AD5A96A2189CCD8A.2B18D9C5643479C4.D57076F228FD7731@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25936

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 20:01:39 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

> Can Larry explain his claims of parents' orientation transferring to
> childrens' orientation.

Want a REALLY scary concept to think about, Phil?

Thanks to a voter initiative begun by (and with the petitions
circulated IN) the churches, in the State of Washington not only do
gay parents lose custody of their children, but children who are gay
are removed from the family home (by law) and placed in foster care
facilities because the parents are deemed unfit.

Minnesota, on the other hand, permits gay adoption--and has a
LOWER rate of homosexuality than does Washington State.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2990. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:18:49 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <05F3A3B61443CD4E.EB61411CDCE4DF3A.7A419F5C0BE916E1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25937

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 22:27:17 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>> > The purpose of dating my current lady friend is she is a member of
>> > the country club and invites me to the monthly party where I have
>> > a lot of fun. But I wasn't sexually attracted to her in high school
>> > and, 46 years later, I'm still not sexually attracted to her.
>>
>> You'd better hope she doesn't read this newsgroup or there goes your
>> standing date.
>
>She doesn't even own a computer. But that leads me to another question.
>I am not sexually attracted to 99% of females, i.e. I am very choosy. I
>gather that you are attracted to virtually every female you lay eyes on,
>i.e. you are not very choosy?

If you were Dave Heil, would (or COULD) you be?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2991. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:24:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6555F07B7C3B8EA6.50C71BF84F401D35.6250A240EEB73AAE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25938

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 05:50:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>My reply isn't even needed here. You compose the questions and you
>compose the answer.

I'll help out and do it for him, Dave.

He's not choosy, Cecil, he'll screw any woman that can't
outrun him.

Just thought I'd help Dave out a bit.

>I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.

Just remember: Football is a "sport" in which to large groups
of body builders, all dressed in skin-tight silky pants, gather in
groups with their arms around each other, whispering intimately, reach
between each other's legs, grab each other's balls, pile on top of
each other, and try to penetrate each other's end zones.

And that attracts you, right?

Hmmm . . .

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2992. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:26:19 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2616EACE2EF8BD01.285403B24F6DF03C.4D8AA4F8F9F8DC7F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25939

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 13:32:00 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.
>
>The context is sexual attraction, Dave. Does "every televised football
>game this day" equate to multiple orgasms for you?

Only if they provide close-ups of the quarterbacks or
interviews in the locker rooms.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2993. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:27:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <FB36C58BC3586752.89A84B04E9C25036.95188363063B487A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25940

On 02 Dec 2001 03:34:28 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>My YL "Elmer" had a 2-meter "Lunch Box," and it was, in fact, a
>Heathkit. It used the AM mode; I've always wondered why that
>mode has been largely abandoned on the VHF bands?

Excuse me?

You had a YL for an Elmer?

Did you have a chaperone, or was her husband or father
present?

I DO assume you would never have allowed yourself to be
compromised by being alone with her, would you?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2994. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:30:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2013D90C8178A230.C54937D00E9D24AB.B3358D878351B0CC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25942

On Sun, 2 Dec 2001 09:47:46 -0600, "N0VFP, Lloyd" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
wrote:

>Screw these other countries!

Spoken like a true jingoist with no concept of humanity.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2995. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:31:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0ac887_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25945

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0ABF35.20A86F13@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Trust is trust. Insecurity is insecurity.
>
>
> Tell that to the many millions who have experienced an end to a
> relationship because of the infidelity of a "trusted" partner. Total,
> blind, trust is absolutely foolish (and there is nothing insecure
> about not being foolish).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

In terms of health I'd rather blindly trust and be wrong, than trust a
little and turn my worry into ulcers or worse. Think about it. :)

Kim W5TIT

2996. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:31:40 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <MJzO7.247162$W8.8836706@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 25943
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

No, you just don't read the thread before replying to a forgery.

"DBN" <dnicholson@socket.net> wrote in message
news:u0lht1r28ehl95@corp.supernews.com...
> 2 meters is a codeless band? when did this happen? CW is used by the weak
> signal guys at the bottom end of the band all the time. And a lot of
> repeaters have CW ID's and as far as I know the FCC has not said code was
> illegal to use for repeater ID's. hmmm.....maybe I was asleep when that
> rule was made....
>
> Dan
>
>

2997. Re: 14313 Comes Full Circle

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:32:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <80F74ACBDBF7AF1C.32B1ADE29AC209D8.BB1ECA1C3B6E1149@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25944

On Sun, 2 Dec 2001 09:53:26 -0500, "Herbie" <Herbie@BARFforever.net>
wrote:

> The situation begs the questions, Just what has Riley
>Hollingsworth really accomplished? Does he ever hope to
>accomplish anything? Is Riley Hollingsworth even
>relevant anymore to ham radio? Just what is Riley
>Hollingsworth's true purpose in life? Riley Hollingsworth
>failed to permanently remove from ham radio many of the
>most violative ham operators in the history of ham radio,
>and that has directly contributed to the return of 14313 to
>its old state of affairs.

He's too busy finding imaginary threats to the ARS in call
signs to bother with real ones in on-the-air behaviors.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

2998. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:39:06 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0aca63_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 25947

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0AC37D.60F55B20@sccoast.net...
> Sean G Gilley wrote:
> >
> > However, what Larry said in his
> > postings were things that I believe
> > really fall into another realm
> > entirely. I work as a professional
> > in a large corporation. Coworkers
> > have lunch together. I don't
> > believe (and it seems very few
> > others believe) that having lunch
> > with a coworker of the opposite
> > sex brings up issues of trust.
>
>
> Perhaps that attitude is why so many illicit relationships begin in
> the workplace. I also work in a professional environment and I do not
> have lunches with female co-workers unless there were other employees
> present. I respect my wife, my co-workers, and my own professional
> reputation. Because of that, I don't do things that might reflect
> badly on any of those. And I have worked in the real world long enough
> to know that if one has "lunches" with female co-workers on a regular
> basis, that is exactly what is going to happen.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Dwight! I am so surprised at your above response. You are saying that you would not have lunch with a female co-worker, right? And you are saying that continued lunches with a female co-worker will absolutely lead to a bad reputation? In what way, Dwight?

There are men and women coworkers who who travel alone every day. And, I am talking every day for up to a month and a half at a time.

Wow. I wonder what you'd think of me going to lunch with 9, 10, 15 men who are co-workers! I wonder what you'd think of me *going to dinner* with a bunch of male hams after work or on a Saturday night! Wow. I learn more reasons every day why the man I married is so wonderful...

Kim W5TIT

2999. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:39:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AC978.3014CCD4@sccoast.net>
Source record: 25946

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I see. And their gay/lesbian
> > parents are not going to have
> > any influence on their sexual
> > "identity." Right.
>
> Larry, if *you* were raised by
> homosexuals, would *you* be a
> homosexual?

That's not what Larry said, Cecil. He said it would "influence" sexual identity, not define it. One can be influenced by something, but choose something entirely different. The same with a child who is influenced by the parent's sexual identity. But that is not saying influence has no affect - children often grow up to be very similar to their parents.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3000. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:44:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <28C5F6BAC23D177F.E420E9ADD8167C6D.202C3FF9DFB3E096@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25948

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 18:24:09 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Oh, you were very clear, just not making any sense. When exactly do
>you expect this "national" political party to have any success at the
>"national" level? After 30 years of little or no success at it's
>stated goal (to be a "national" political party), isn't it about time
>to give it up?

Cecil probably isn't going to like this (particularly since I
identify myself as a libertarian) but I agree with you to some extent.

The Libertarian party goes well beyond the concept of personal
freedom implicit in libertarian philosophy to one of complete
independence from any form of government regulation. It seeks to
eliminate taxes (I've never been clear on how Libertarians expect to
finance governmental operations), to remove all restrictions on big
business (including environmental controls, OSHA requirements, minimum
wage, and safety requirements) replacing them with a free market
control and civil action, and does NOT identify children as being
incapable of giving informed consent, but instead views them as the
"property" of their parents.

I agree with MANY Libertarian principles, but the emphasis on
property as the central issue (Libertarians view property as the core
of law, with the individual defined to be his or her own property,
btw) instead of focusing exclusively on rights and freedoms--which
WOULD propel the party to the forefront.

No third party has much chance for quite some time in our
system--it's stacked in favor of a two-party system--but if the
Libertarians hope to grow significantly, they really are going to have
to alter some of these stands to meet with the needs of both society
as a whole and those of us who view social concerns (in terms of free
education and universal health care, hate crime legislation, etc.) as
being as nearly as important as rights and freedoms.

> LOL. I don't want to sound mean, but, after 30 years, an acorn has
>already grown into a tree. During that same time period, the
>Libertarian Party, with it's 67 local offices, is still nothing more
>than a tiny twig. At this rate of growth, it is going to be a very
>long time before the Libertarian Party turns into that mighty oak
>you're talking about (and we'll probably both be dead of old age by
>then). That is assuming the Party ever turns into a mighty oak, which
>I'm not convinced at this point will ever happen.

Right now we have effectively ONE party--the Republicrats.
Both so-called parties have moved so close to center (actually to the
right of center by a considerable margin) that they are
indistinguishable. Despite the extreme views of the Libertarian party,
at least it can be said to consist of honest people who sincerely
believe in what they are promoting, as a whole--and that's a LOT more
than can be said for the Democrats or the Republicans with their many
hidden agendas and election debts to special interest groups.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3001. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:47:37 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D37EE14C152DBD09.B710A8811A785601.44841C401466A004@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25949

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 18:55:11 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Tell that to the many millions who have experienced an end to a
>relationship because of the infidelity of a "trusted" partner. Total,
>blind, trust is absolutely foolish (and there is nothing insecure
>about not being foolish).

Gee, that sounds like an argument in favor of swinging or open
marriage, not one in favor of a repressive relationship.

If people are cheating on their spouses, either they need to
re-negotiate their relationships or they need to end them. Cheating
isn't about opportunity--it's about integrity. There's nothing wrong
with having sex outside your marriage--there's EVERYTHING wrong with
doing so behind your partner's back instead of with their agreement
and ability to do the same if they choose. Marriage isn't about
control, it's about partnership, equality, friendship and most of all
love and trust.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3002. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:54:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CAA71E3FDC83920C.20CFCEA8E9054238.DCE33B7F7504A175@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 25950

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 20:31:03 GMT, "migrant of" <copypro50@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>Know what's REALLY AMUSING about all of this ??
>The two Countries above (both of which are in the top 3)
>have nuclear weapons and innorant dipshits who make
>up paper-mache and cardboard tube mockups of ICBM's
>they ride atop in parades atop flatbed trucks. Let's HOPE
>that the Pakis and the DotHeads **do have themselves**
>a limited NUCLEAR EXCHANGE in the not too distant
>future !! They both breed like freakin rabbits on Viagra
>and they come over to this country to suck-off the welfare
>system and sell watered-down gasoline or operate Motel-6
>fleabag rent-by-the-hour rooms. Yeah! I say let them NUKE
>each other so as to reduce the already-overburdened world
>population a couple of million in just 5 minutes. That'll leave more
>food and resources for the rest of us.

And if they nuke US instead?

Idiot!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3003. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 00:56:00 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <968BC6F71D7D0120.B890163CC2F063B4.6B62320384D2A393@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26001
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 2 Dec 2001 20:14:44 +0000 (UTC), "Leland C. Scott"
<kc8ldo@hotmail.com> wrote:

>Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
>those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
>haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
>tell me. Help me!

Nice troll--but the fact is, 2m isn't "codeless" at all--it
has cw segments.

Don't like them--don't tune there.

Is that REALLY so difficult to understand?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3004. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:02:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0ACF13.309D3751@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26002

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C09C92D.EA7F1C9A@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> > Okay, "formal affair". I'd guess you don't go to many of those so that
> > lets you off the hook for most of your time. How about the grocery
> > store? the hair salon? on a bike path?
> >
>
> You're wrong, Dave. I go to formal affairs quite often. The grocery store,
> no. The hair salon, no. (Though I've heard some of the best off-color
> jokes at the hair salon). (Oh, and I go to a hair salon far less than I do
> formal affairs). The bike path, damned straight I'd have no problem
> cursing...unless a small kid is around.

Why let a little kid mess up good thing?

> >
> > Why does something have to be formal in order for you not to curse?
> > What is it about this newsgroup which makes it okay for cursing. What's
> > not proper about the newsgroup?
> >
>
> There's absolutely NOTHING proper about this newsgroup, Dave.

What makes you think so, Kim? Other than your recent stuff, this place
has been pretty calm.

> As to the
> situations in which I choose to curse. Have you *ever* *ever* *ever* let
> your hair down?

My hair is no longer long enough to have to worry about letting it down.
I can be perfectly at ease and having a great time without once uttering
the big "eff".

When someone you are greeting leans over to kiss you on the
> cheek, you aren't one of those types that just seriously stiffens up, are
> you?!

You're going in circles. You were the individuals who hates that peck
on the cheek stuff. Make up your mind.

> >
> > Would it bother you if the same folks you met at the formal affair read

> > some of your earthier stuff here?
>
> Not at all. And, while I don't know how this could be proved, I'd imagine
> that most of them wouldn't find it all that surprising, either. I've met
> and gotten to know many folks in a formal situation that we've been
> pleasantly surprised by one another later--due to finding out how "earthy"
> (that's great how you put it) we are. I'll never forget standing in the
> middle of a hallway while I heard the word "fu__" uttered from the most
> demure, wonderfully delightful, professional woman I'd known. She had
> uttered the word in a moment of anger and frustration, and hadn't realized
> that she'd said it. When she was done, I grinned at her, and I said, "But,
> you *didn't* just say the word fu__, did you?" She reviewed her memory
> banks, got this horribly shocked look on her face, turned red and said, "I
> *did* didn't I?"

In that case, you might as well let out all the stops and go for it at
the next big social event.

> The same folks at the formal affair, by the way, would realize that I'd paid
> honor to my hosts by "behaving" and I think that's all they'd see out of it.
> Your mileage, though, may vary. I have known people who are very offended
> by their perceived notion of the quality of a person just because they may
> choose to swear, tell a dirty joke, use some kind of risque behavior. Some
> people believe folks like that are akin to heathens.

Depending on where it is done and with whom, yeah some people do believe
something like that.

> Some people are so
> very staunch and stern in their life, that they choose not to see the humor,
> not to see the satire, not to see the beauty. It is those I feel the most
> sorry for. They'll never know the wonder people like myself have known.

That's right. People who don't talk like sailors can't possibly have
fun, enjoy a joke, appreciate satire or see beauty. You may have the
makings of a good book there, Kim. You might be 47 but you have the
mouth of a 20-year-old.

>
> Oh, and if you don't like the new-agey stuff, I suggest you never try to get
> to know me any better.

Agreed.

> I subscribe to a lot of the principles of new age
> thought, though I am even risque in that tradition. I walk to the beat of a
> different drummer, Dave. You march in a parade. ;)

I'd guess your drummer is paradiddling along in waltz time and you're
stepping along in 4/4.

Dave K8MN

3005. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:03:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0ace9c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26004

ROFLMAO....^5 Rick.

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:FB36C58BC3586752.89A84B04E9C25036.95188363063B487A@lp.airnews.net...
> On 02 Dec 2001 03:34:28 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >My YL "Elmer" had a 2-meter "Lunch Box," and it was, in fact, a
> >Heathkit. It used the AM mode; I've always wondered why that
> >mode has been largely abandoned on the VHF bands?
>
> Excuse me?
>
> You had a YL for an Elmer?
>
> Did you have a chaperone, or was her husband or father
> present?
>
> I DO assume you would never have allowed yourself to be
> compromised by being alone with her, would you?
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3006. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:07:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AD066.B067F689@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26003

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > There are some things that I just don't need to know.
>
> Apparently, human psychology is one of those things. :-)

I never take advice on psychology from a retired electrical engineer.

Dave K8MN

3007. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:09:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AD0C3.906DDE58@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26005

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.
>
> The context is sexual attraction, Dave. Does "every televised football
> game this day" equate to multiple orgasms for you?

Is that the context you placed on my sentence?
Shame on you.

Dave K8MN
```

3008. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:13:12 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0ad0de_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26007

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0ACF13.309D3751@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C09C92D.EA7F1C9A@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > Okay, "formal affair". I'd guess you don't go to many of those so
that
> > > lets you off the hook for most of your time. How about the grocery
> > > store? the hair salon? on a bike path?
> > >
> >
> > You're wrong, Dave. I go to formal affairs quite often. The grocery
store,
> > no. The hair salon, no. (Though I've heard some of the best off-color
> > jokes at the hair salon). (Oh, and I go to a hair salon far less than I
do
> > formal affairs). The bike path, damned straight I'd have no problem
> > cursing...unless a small kid is around.
>
> Why let a little kid mess up good thing?
>

That would actually be me messing up, Dave.

> > >
> > > Why does something have to be formal in order for you not to curse?
> > > What is it about this newsgroup which makes it okay for cursing.
What's
> > > not proper about the newsgroup?
> > >
> >
> > There's absolutely NOTHING proper about this newsgroup, Dave.
>
> What makes you think so, Kim? Other than your recent stuff, this place
> has been pretty calm.
>

You must read only my posts.

> >
> > As to the
> > situations in which I choose to curse. Have you *ever* *ever* *ever*

let
> > your hair down?
>
> My hair is no longer long enough to have to worry about letting it down.
> I can be perfectly at ease and having a great time without once uttering
> the big "eff".
>

How 'bout the big dee? Or the squiggly ess?

>
> When someone you are greeting leans over to kiss you on the
> > cheek, you aren't one of those types that just seriously stiffens up,
are
> > you?!
>
> You're going in circles. You were the individuals who hates that peck
> on the cheek stuff. Make up your mind.
>

I'll accept a peck from someone I like. I'll stiffen up if it's someone I
don't.

> > >
> > > Would it bother you if the same folks you met at the formal affair
read
> > > some of your earthier stuff here?
> >
> > Not at all. And, while I don't know how this could be proved, I'd
imagine
> > that most of them wouldn't find it all that surprising, either. I've
met
> > and gotten to know many folks in a formal situation that we've been
> > pleasantly surprised by one another later--due to finding out how
"earthy"
> > (that's great how you put it) we are. I'll never forget standing in the
> > middle of a hallway while I heard the word "fu__" uttered from the most
> > demure, wonderfully delightful, professional woman I'd known. She had
> > uttered the word in a moment of anger and frustration, and hadn't
realized
> > that she'd said it. When she was done, I grinned at her, and I said,
"But,
> > you *didn't* just say the word fu__, did you?" She reviewed her memory
> > banks, got this horribly shocked look on her face, turned red and said,
"I
> > *did* didn't I?"
>
> In that case, you might as well let out all the stops and go for it at
> the next big social event.
>

Whatever the Hell you mean by that.

> >
> > The same folks at the formal affair, by the way, would realize that I'd
paid
> > honor to my hosts by "behaving" and I think that's all they'd see out of
it.
> > Your mileage, though, may vary. I have known people who are very
offended
> > by their perceived notion of the quality of a person just because they
may
> > choose to swear, tell a dirty joke, use some kind of risque behavior.
Some
> > people believe folks like that are akin to heathens.
>
> Depending on where it is done and with whom, yeah some people do believe
> something like that.
>
> > Some people are so
> > very staunch and stern in their life, that they choose not to see the
humor,
> > not to see the satire, not to see the beauty. It is those I feel the
most
> > sorry for. They'll never know the wonder people like myself have known.
>
>
> That's right. People who don't talk like sailors can't possibly have
> fun, enjoy a joke, appreciate satire or see beauty. You may have the
> makings of a good book there, Kim. You might be 47 but you have the
> mouth of a 20-year-old.
>

You sound like you lead such a protected life, yet I know that isn't so.

> >
> > Oh, and if you don't like the new-agey stuff, I suggest you never try to
get
> > to know me any better.
>
> Agreed.
>
> > I subscribe to a lot of the principles of new age
> > thought, though I am even risque in that tradition. I walk to the beat
of a
> > different drummer, Dave. You march in a parade. ;)
>
> I'd guess your drummer is paradiddling along in waltz time and you're
> stepping along in 4/4.
>
> Dave K8MN

Yep, and your parade has less attendees every day. They're all hearing that
drummer! ;)

Kim W5TIT

3009. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:15:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011202201552.12427.00004071@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 26006

In article <3c09bf50_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> Once again, this is not the FCC's problem -- it's Kim's.
>>
>
>Larry. Let me absolutely, without a doubt assure you: it is no problem for
>me. If there is a problem, and I don't think there is, then it is yours.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim, let me absolutely, without a doubt assure you: Riley Hollingsworth's words were true. That makes this YOUR problem. I haven't seen him send me any E-mails stating that my callsign had the potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction." To use a pop-culture phrase which I'm sure you will recognize and appreciate, you are spending your life floating in denial, which is not a river in Egypt!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3010. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:17:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0AD2AA.BA5AFE02@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26008

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > There are some things that I just don't need to know.
> >
> > Apparently, human psychology is one of those things. :-)
>
> I never take advice on psychology from a retired electrical engineer.

How about a secondary school counselor?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3011. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:19:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0ad245_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26010

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
ews:20011202201552.12427.00004071@nso-cg.aol.com...
> In article <3c09bf50_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >> Once again, this is not the FCC's problem -- it's Kim's.
> >>
> > >Larry. Let me absolutely, without a doubt assure you: it is no problem
for
> >me. If there is a problem, and I don't think there is, then it is yours.
> > >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim, let me absolutely, without a doubt assure you: Riley Hollingsworth's
> words were true. That makes this YOUR problem. I haven't seen him
> send me any E-mails stating that my callsign had the potential to take
> the ARS "...one step closer to extinction." To use a pop-culture phrase
> which I'm sure you will recognize and appreciate, you are spending your
life
> floating in denial, which is not a river in Egypt!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh, sure Riley said what he said. I don't negate that at all. However, I
have no problems with my callsign...at all. The problems Riley has with it
are his, the problems you have with it are yours. And so on. I like it.
I'll keep it. The ARS will not go into extinction, and that can be proven.

Sorry, you're wrong. As usual. And notice I didn't have to use any worn
out cliches to make my point...

Kim W5TIT

3012. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:19:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0AD33A.4BE2200E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26009

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Trust is trust. Insecurity is insecurity.
>
> Tell that to the many millions who have experienced an end to a
> relationship because of the infidelity of a "trusted" partner. Total,
> blind, trust is absolutely foolish (and there is nothing insecure
> about not being foolish).

"Total" is not the problem. "Blind" is the problem. There are about
a dozen people in the world that I would trust to safely store 100
Gold Eagles for me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3013. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:31:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0AD5FA.688BD826@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26011

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Oh, you were very clear, just not making any sense. When exactly do
> you expect this "national" political party to have any success at the
> "national" level? After 30 years of little or no success at it's
> stated goal (to be a "national" political party), isn't it about time
> to give it up?

Nope, we've only begun to fight. Every year we have a fight on our hands with the entrenched political parties in about 20 states that try to keep Libertarians off the national ballots and try to keep us from getting "matching funds" from the government. What do you think they are afraid of? Why should they even bother about such a small unimportant third party?

> > From little acorns, might oaks grow.
>
> LOL. I don't want to sound mean, but, after 30 years, an acorn has
> already grown into a tree.

If a business' profits grew percentage wise exactly as fast as the Libertarian party membership, you would say it was a very successful business. We are growing percentage wise faster than the Republican and Democratic parties.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3014. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:38:16 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <9uel28$bm8$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 26015
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <9udon60mf3@enews4.newsguy.com>, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:

>"Shane Minor" <Shane0319@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> HI HI.

>HI HI is intended for use on CW to indicate something humorous. When spoken
>or written in a message, however, it makes you look like an idiot. Maybe you
>should tell Santa that you need a clue for Christmas.

Krell: "CQ" and "73" and other prosigns originated on the landline
telegraph and carried over to wireless telegraphy, yet they're both
welcome and used on phone; if you had HF privileges you yourself
would even be using them on phone, yet no one would dare call you an
idiot for saying them.

Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."
Post your reply to the NG; we're all waiting...

73, Jeff KH6O

--
Telecommunication Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard University of Hawaii System
jherman @ d14.uscg.mil jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

3015. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:38:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0AD7AF.31F8AE02@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26012

Rick Adams wrote:
> The Libertarian party goes well beyond the concept of personal
> freedom implicit in libertarian philosophy to one of complete
> independence from any form of government regulation.

Nope, you're wrong, Rick. Libertarians are for laws prohibiting force or threat of force in human relationships. We are for armed forces to protect us from foreign criminals, police to protect us from domestic criminals, and a court system to administer the law. For instance, most Libertarians believe in the death penalty for murder.

Libertarians do believe that just as there is separation of religion and state, that there should be separation of economics and state. Most people don't realize that it took the Federal Reserve 15 years to engineer the crash and depression of 1929.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3016. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:41:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0AD84A.244411C6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26013

Phil Kane wrote:
> Can Larry explain his claims of parents' orientation transferring to
> childrens' orientation?

Larry probably believes that two left-handed parents will have
left-handed children.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3017. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:45:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0AD940.C9090831@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26014

```
Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > I see. And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have
> > > any influence on their sexual
> > > "identity." Right.
> >
> > Larry, if *you* were raised by homosexuals, would *you* be a
> > homosexual?
>
> That's not what Larry said, Cecil.

I know that's not what he said, Dwight, which prompted me to ask
a question. Isn't that what you do when not enough information
is forthcoming?

Incidentally Dwight, would you please set your editor to wrap at
80 characters instead of wrapping at 40 characters?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3018. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:50:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0ADA77.C6630477@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26016

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.
> > >
> > The context is sexual attraction, Dave. Does "every televised football
> > game this day" equate to multiple orgasms for you?
>
> Is that the context you placed on my sentence?
> Shame on you.

Well, the context was "sexual attraction" and you have gone on record
condemning others for changing the context. So I assumed you were
sticking to the context because changing the context would make you
a hypocrite.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3019. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 01:55:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0ADB74.F79FCF7A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26017

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >I am not sexually attracted to 99% of females, i.e. I am very choosy. I
> >gather that you are attracted to virtually every female you lay eyes on,
> >i.e. you are not very choosy?
>
> If you were Dave Heil, would (or COULD) you be?

You're right, Rick. If I were rolypoly like Dave Heil, I guess I couldn't
afford to be choosy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3020. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 02:00:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0ADC61.BE3A1684@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26018

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 02:47:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >We don't have a single such place in operation on this side of the
> >river. I don't know whether any are located on the Ohio side.
>
> It doesn't surprise me.
>
> It takes an open minded community to allow people to make
> their own decisions--many DO ban tattoo parlors or piercing salons to
> prevent that from happening.

Your thinking is so skewed that any person or group disagreeing with you
is somehow close-minded.

> >Right, Rick. No kid ever produces a fake I.D. and uses it to do
> >anything illegal. No kid ever obtains a "homemade" tattoo or does a
> >homebrew job of piercing.
>
> You were speaking about parents allowing their kids to get a
> tattoo or piercing, not about kids doing so in their rooms. Precisely
> how is THAT the parent's fault--they didn't install spy cameras in the
> bathrooms and bedrooms?

Not really. My initial comment was simply that we could wait until they
were older and they'd mutilate themselves. It was in response to
statements about child circumcision. You began this particular tangent.

> I repeat--fake I.D. or not, no shop would risk the lawsuit
> that would result from providing those services to a younger teen w/o
> the parent's consent. And as far as older teens go--if the law says
> they are old enough to try as adults (which, in most states, it does),
> that they are old enough to make decisions about sexual activities,
> and that they are old enough to quit school, don't you think they are
> likewise old enough to make decisions about body ornamentation?

There's some sound logic for you. "If they are old enough to quite
school..."

> >> If, for example, my son were 16 (he just turned 18), and he
> >> purchased a six pack of beer at a local store I would have grounds to
> >> prosecute and could possibly even sue for putative damages. Neither
> >> the prosecution nor the law suit, however, would result in enough
> >> damages to seriously harm the business (although either or both might

> >> discourage further sales to minors). But if, instead, he went to a
> >> piercing salon and had his tongue pierced (a permanent piercing) or
> >> went to a tattoo parlor and had a picture of a bloody knife tattooed
> >> on his forearm, I would have grounds for a law suit that would
> >> probably put the firm out of business. That's a LOT more risk for a
> >> firm than the simple offense of selling beer to a teen.
> >
> >I've learned a lot from the above. Your first reaction is to think
> >about prosecution or a suit rather than dealing with your kid's
> >misdeeds.
>
> What makes you think I would REGARD them as "misdeeds?"

Because what he did would have been illegal. Don't you think you might
bring that up?

> >> >> No, Dave, I _don't_ think very many early teens are getting
> >> >> tattoos and piercings w/o their parent's consent. Do you?
> >> >
> >> >Yes, I do.
> >>
> >> Then document your source for the information. Unless, of
> >> course, it is purely opinion with no basis in demonstrable fact.
> >
> >Document it yourself. I'm taking no homework assignments today, Prof.
> >You asked what I thouhgt and I told you.
>
> Let me get this straight.
>
> You claim that many early teens are getting tattoos and
> piercings w/o their parent's consent and when I ask you for sources to
> confirm that absurd claim you tell me to document it myself?
>
> I'll just assume that it's nonsense instead--if you had any
> evidence to support your ridiculous claims you would cite it.

Let's DO get it straight. You asked me if I thought many kids were
getting piercings or tattoos without consent. I said , "yes".
I'm not going to write you a term paper.

> >> >For a parent to permit something which permanently defaces the human
> >> >body such as piercings and tattooing sounds pretty irresponsible to me.
> >>
> >> ONLY if piercings or tattoos are viewed as "defacing" rather
> >> than as "enhancing." That isn't a question of general values, Dave,
> >> it's one that is cultural--and if the youth culture of today finds
> >> them attractive (which it appears they do), why shouldn't they have
> >> the same right to set their standards of beauty that you and I have to
> >> set our own?
> >
> >No. They don't have those rights until they reach their majority by

> >which time it is hoped that they'll have developed enough common sense
> >to avoid something which could become a lifelong regret for them.
>
> Or a lifelong pleasure--haven't you ever met people with
> tattoos or piercings who were glad they had them?

Not many. My wife's older sister got some in her teens and later had
them removed. It caused some scarring. A number of old WWII vets have
told me that they wished they had never gotten tattoos.

> It's funny, Dave. People like you would permit 17 year olds to
> enlist in the service and risk (or lose) their lives fighting in a
> war, but you won't let them get a tattoo or a piercing. I suppose if
> your son joined the Navy and wanted a USN tattoo on his forearm (VERY
> common among sailors) you would tell him he wasn't old enough for one,
> right?
>
> To me, if a person is old enough to die for his country, he's
> old enough to portray that patriotism (or anything else, for that
> matter) on his skin.

You tell 'em Rick. If one is old enough to die, he is old enough to do
something else silly. People like you are often people who say, "People
like you...".

> >> By limiting teens (pre-pubescent kids are a different
> >> matter--from a psychological perspective they have not as yet fully
> >> matured mentally, where adolescents have done so) in ways that adults
> >> are not limited, we simply make it clear that they are "children" from
> >> our perspective--and then we wonder why they ACT like children on
> >> occasion.
> >
> >We do that because they ARE children. They have not yet matured. Such
> >is the natural order of things. They act like children because they are
> >children. I don't wonder about that at all.
>
> Perhaps you should.

Perhaps I shouldn't.

> What's my point? Simply because the law DEFINES someone as a
> child, does NOT mean they will behave immaturely or make childish
> decisions. The chances are very high that at least one of your great
> grandparents (if not more) had given birth to your grandparent before
> they were 16 years of age. Are you willing to argue that a person who
> is old enough to raise a family isn't old enough to make a decision
> about body decoration, or were your great grandparents child
> molesters?

Sorry, the house pays 18. You lose. None of my great-grandparents had
a child at 16 or earlier.

> >> >Ever hear of a term called "community values"? Its existence would
> >> >refute your statement.
> >>
> >> Only if you can demonstrate that the community: (1) has a
> >> RIGHT to impose values on a given matter and; (2) has better or more
> >> relevant values than the individuals affected.
> >
> >Check out Hamilton County. You'll find your proof there in the
> >existence of such laws. Let me know what you find out.
>
> Why?
>
> A few religious zealots managed to create repressive laws and
> you use THAT as justification for community values?

No use trying to reason with (smirk) sound facts like those.

> Dave, there is a small town in Georgia (population is under
> 2500) that passed an ordinance against the sales or rentals of any
> movie rated higher than PG (i.e., PG-13, R, NC-17, etc.). One of the
> residents had a satellite receiver and paid a subscription rate to
> receive and descramble the Tuxedo Network (which shows adult shows and
> soft core adult films). When the local prosecutor (who was a neighbor)
> learned about it, he filed criminal charges against the Tuxedo network
> (headquartered and broadcasting in NYC, btw, where such shows are
> considered perfectly acceptable by the "community values")--and he
> WON! It was ruled that the Tuxedo network had violated the law in that
> community by delivering content ruled "unacceptable" by the community
> values of that town in violation of its laws.

Gee, I think I see how they won.

> The case is currently on its way to the SC. If the decision is
> upheld there, you will see a considerable change in television
> programming--the Networks (public and subscription such as HBO, etc.)
> will be forced to limit their broadcasts to movies acceptable anywhere
> in the USA--and there's at least ONE town (in Texas) where the limit
> is "G" rated!

You mean there is hope that the networks will be cleaned up?

> Do you REALLY think that a community has the right to limit
> our entertainment to Disney movies? More to the point, do you
> sincerely believe that the community has the right to limit the nature
> of entertainment we view in the privacy of our homes at all?

Do you really think that the only good entertainment contains
gratuitious sex, violence and the so-called "adult" language?

> In Cincinnati, your favorite city to cite, the curator of the
> museum of art was prosecuted for presenting an exhibition of art that
> no one even attempted to claim was not legitimately of artistic merit,
> and which would have lent prestige to the Cincinnati museum. The art,
> however, included images that violated Cincinnati's intrusive

> "Community Values" and the curator was convicted. To me, that's
> completely reprehensible behavior and no one with a shred of respect
> for the Constitution of the United States would even consider a
> community where such a travesty of law occurred to be worthy of any
> respect whatever--let alone a suitable place to cite as an example of
> "community values."

Maplethorpe as I recall. There's lots more to it than you've outlined.
Wonder why that conviction was never overturned?

> >
> >I brought up ways that group values can limit individual values.
> >I don't care if an individual is pierced in Poughkeepsie and moves to
> >Cuyahoga Falls. You can work out the details later.
>
> Correction. You brought up ways that groups values can limit
> individual rights and freedom of choice, not ways they can limit
> values.

Correction accepted.

> Sorry, but to me that smacks way too much of fascism and
> censorship.

...and your view strikes me as being hedonism unchained.

> Incidently, have you noticed that there are groups in
> Cincinnati right now working to ban both the "Harry Potter" movie and
> series of books because they feel they violate "Community Values?"
>
> I'll bet you're proud of your old community in it's fight
> against children's literature, aren't you?

I'll bet I don't know a thing about it.

> >> Community values can only refute my statement if you can
> >> demonstrate community values that are absolutes rather than subjective
> >> decisions based on current stereotypes and political influences. So
> >> far, I have yet to see someone do that.
> >
> >Call it what you want, Rick. If you choose to deny that there are
> >places with laws on the books based on community values, I don't care.
>
> There are places with laws on the books that restrict the
> rights of minority members, too (try Kuwait or Iran). That doesn't
> mean I have to either respect those places (and laws) or that the fact
> they exist makes them any less offensive to a free society.

We're not in Kuwait or Iran. Take your issues up with the respective
governments.

> >You say that the parents aren't asked their opinions. I don't know that
> >to be true. Taxpayers foot the bill for schools whether they have

> >children in the schools. I think he who pays, says. I take it that you
> >think that dress codes are a bad idea.
>
> I think ANY restriction that can't be shown to prevent harm
> and that circumvents the role of the family in deciding a child's
> manner of dress is wrong.
>
> Don't you?

Only to a point. I don't think kids should wear clothing (i.e. T-shits)
with any religious or political statements on them.

> >> Nope. Which has nothing to do with "community standards" and
> >> has everything to do with suppression of freedom of speech and freedom
> >> of choice.
> >
> >Hamilton County disagrees with you.
>
> Show me where "Hamilton County" has stated that community
> standards are NOT ways to suppress speech. Otherwise, you can't claim
> they "disagree with me."

The onus is on you to prove that Hamilton County has restricted free
speech. Maybe you'd like to try a court challenge.

> >> It is also the direct result of concentrated campaigns by the
> >> religious right that have thrust what should be religious issues into
> >> the legal process. The same holds true for Ft. Wayne, IN, and other
> >> extremist, bible-thumping, communities.
> >
> >Hamilton County disagrees with you. Apparently Ft. Wayne disagrees too.
>
> How about citing the United States Constitution instead of the
> views of a few religious zealots in the bible-belt, Dave? Or are those
> zealots the only support you can find for your absurd claims?

Please explain why the courts have not overturned the laws in those
communities.

> >> >Why does the Dish Network bleep offensive words from movies?
> >>
> >> It doesn't.
> >
> >It does. Starz movies are bleeped.
>
> Really?
>
> I can _guarantee_ they don't with CineMAX--we were at the home
> of some friends Thursday night and while I was working on their
> computers (the reason we went over), Chris was watching an "R-Rated"
> movie with Linda (the wife in the couple) on MAX--and it was NOT
> bleeped.

I don't subscribe to Cinemax.

> I just sent an IM to them asking them to check Starz and let
> me know if it is "bleeped" but off hand, I'm pretty sure they'll say
> it isn't. It would make no sense for the Dish network to "bleep" one
> channel and not others.
>
> Perhaps you just live in such a conservative, AFA dominated
> community (as Cincinnati and Ft. Wayne are) that Dish is protecting
> itself by bleeping content to your area. Sorry to hear that you are
> subject to censorship instead of being allowed freedom of choice as
> the rest of us are--but it meets your needs so it should be no
> problem.

It isn't a problem.

> You DO prefer Disney class entertainment, right?

I don't believe I've said that.

> Incidently, what do they do about the closed captions--bleep
> the offending words there, too?

I have no need for closed captions.

> >You're getting as bad as Lenny at stating the obvious. I know what it
> >is; I have it in my home.
>
> IF you are telling the truth (you provide no evidence of that
> in other areas of this debate/discussion/flame war), which has yet to
> be proven, and IF it is done by Dish rather than some parental control
> setting in your own receiver, frankly you deserve the censorship you
> receive (you DO support censorship, right?). In my home--and I expect
> in the homes of the other members of this news group who have
> satellite services such as Dish & DirecTV--we neither have nor want
> someone else deciding what we should be permitted to hear.

I don't have a parental control setting on my receiver.

> >> If the Dish network DOES censor in that manner, it is simply a
> >> good reason to choose DirecTV instead--since the alternative is
> >> allowing someone ELSE to decide what is appropriate for you to hear.
> > >
> > >I don't agree with you at all. I find it kind of refreshing.
> >
> > Why? Does it keep you from having to think?

When did one have to start thinking to watch TV? An article a few years
back stated that one burn more calories while sleeping than while
watching TV. How does hearing an oath cause my brain cell activity to
pick up?

> What do they do when there is nudity or strongly sexual
> content (also part of an "R" rating) Dave? Put "CENSORED BY FASCISTS"
> banners across the screen?

They run the video portion unedited to my knowledge.

> Must be relaxing for you not to have to watch tv and decide
> for yourself about the adult parts & language; it's so much easier to
> allow the American Family Association to do your thinking for you,
> isn't it?

Do you have a point?

> >> Let me reverse the question: If there's something wrong with
> >> using those words--why are the present in a movie in the first place
> >> to REQUIRE anyone to "bleep" them?
> >
> >Oh, you haven't come up with a good reason for them either, huh?
>
> Try "Freedom of speech" Dave--I know that one hurts you
> censorship fanatics, but some of us not only believe in it--but
> actually fought for it in Vietnam.

Stow the Vietnam stuff, Rick. You no more went to Vietnam to fight for freedom of speech than I did. We went because they sent us. One of the huge differences between us is that I don't wear Vietnam as an excuse. You don't get to play the Vietnam card with me.

> Out of curiosity, as I recall you claim to have been in the
> Foreign Service of the US. Since that's a part of the Department of
> State, didn't you have to swear to uphold the Constitution of the
> United States (as do other State Department officials both
> domestically and abroad--and as the US military are required to do)?
> I'll bet that pesky Bill of Rights was a real pain to pretend to
> support wasn't it--or is that why you're no longer a Foreign Service
> employee?

I don't claim to have been in the Foreign Service. I was in the Foreign Service. I resent your cheap accusations.

Dave K8MN

3021. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 02:00:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0ADCBA.49DC4701@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26019

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Kim, let me absolutely, without a doubt assure you: Riley Hollingsworth's
> words were true. That makes this YOUR problem.

Actually, it is not Kim's problem at all. The Constitution
protects people like Kim from people like you and Riley.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3022. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 02:03:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0ADD82.79BD4C61@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26021
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Wes Stewart wrote:
>
> On Sun, 2 Dec 2001 20:14:44 +0000 (UTC), "Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com>
> wrote:
>
> |Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> |those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> |haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
> |tell me. Help me!
>
> How do you figure two meters is supposed to be "codeless?"

Maybe he doesn't realize that the only CW-only ham frequencies
are located in the 2m band.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3023. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 02:03:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0ADD87.81AAA411@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26020

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 02:47:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> >Why does the Dish Network bleep offensive words from movies?
> >>
> >> It doesn't.
> >
> >It does. Starz movies are bleeped.
> >
> >> The dish network doesn't produce or show movies, Dave, it
> >> merely provides a satellite downlink for the broadcasters such as HBO,
> >> Showtime, etc.--at least if it works the same as DirecTV, as I
> >> understand it does.
> >
> >You're getting as bad as Lenny at stating the obvious. I know what it
> >is; I have it in my home.
>
> Dave, if you claim this is a universal for the Dish network,
> you are a liar!. I just heard back from our friends with Dish and she
> deliberately tuned the Starz network and listened for an hour. The
> show was NOT "bleeped."

I have no way of making a universal claim for Starz as received through
the Dish Network. It is bleeped here.

> I'm sure there are many readers here who, likewise, receive
> the Dish network. I _encourage_ them to turn on Starz and determine
> for themselves whether you are an honest man or not--and when they
> find that you have lied deliberately about this to evaluate your other
> statements in this news group on that basis.

You can stow this one with your Vietnam comments. I'll not dignify it
further.

> If you can't make your point without lying, Dave, don't bother
> to make it at all. You'll understand if, from now on, I don't accept
> ANYTHING you say without proof--you've demonstrated that there is no
> reason to do so and every reason not to.

You are one of the most obnoxious individuals I've encountered in ages,
Rick.

Dave K8MN

3024. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 02:06:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0ADE1E.3EED084B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26022

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 05:50:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >My reply isn't even needed here. You compose the questions and you
> >compose the answer.
>
> I'll help out and do it for him, Dave.
>
> He's not choosy, Cecil, he'll screw any woman that can't
> outrun him.
>
> Just thought I'd help Dave out a bit.

Those are your words, Rick. You write what comes from within you.

> >I was attracted to nearly every televised football game played this day.
>
> Just remember: Football is a "sport" in which to large groups
> of body builders, all dressed in skin-tight silky pants, gather in
> groups with their arms around each other, whispering intimately, reach
> between each other's legs, grab each other's balls, pile on top of
> each other, and try to penetrate each other's end zones.
>
> And that attracts you, right?
>
> Hmmm . . .

You wrote it up that way, Rick. Maybe the game means more to you than
it does to me.

Dave K8MN

3025. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 02:11:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0ADF61.DD861A44@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26023

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > There are some things that I just don't need to know.
> > >
> > > Apparently, human psychology is one of those things. :-)
> >
> > I never take advice on psychology from a retired electrical engineer.
>
> How about a secondary school counselor?

If he is the same individual as the retired EE, I'll still pass.

Dave K8MN
```

3026. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 02:20:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AE110.93476259@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26024

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote...
> >
> > (snip)
>
> ONLY if piercings or tattoos are
> viewed as "defacing" rather than as
> "enhancing." That isn't a question
> of general values, Dave, it's one
> that is cultural--and if the youth
> culture of today finds them
> attractive (which it appears they
> do), why shouldn't they have the
> same right to set their standards
> of beauty that you and I have to
> set our own?

Because they're children. They don't have the same rights because they don't have the same responsibilities. Let me give you an example. My neighbor's daughter got a tattoo without her parent's knowledge or consent. Days later, thanks to a nasty infection, the family was facing medical bills exceeding $18,000 (and the daughter had a ugly scar on her back - hardly "enhancing" her appearance). Of course, the daughter was not responsible for those medical bills - the parents were. And as long as parents are responsible, and children are not, it is foolish to say children should have the same rights.

> > Ever hear of a term called "community
> > values"? Its existence would refute
> > your statement.
>
> Only if you can demonstrate that
> the community: (1) has a RIGHT to
> impose values on a given matter and;
> (2) has better or more relevant values
> than the individuals affected.

Are you saying that communities have no right to pass laws in this country? Of course they do. Are you saying members of a community have no right to support laws based on their own values? Of course they do. So, obviously, the community has a "right" to impose values. Since this appears to be a fairly world-wide situation, what part of this planet do you live on where this does not happen?

As for the second part of your sentence, why would he need to demonstrate that the community has "better or more relevant values" to refute your claim that "your values apply only to yourself, not to others?" The paragraph above, all by itself, throws your statement right out the window.

> (snip) And since the parents and the
> kids, together REPRESENT the community
> of interest (it isn't ANYONE'S business
> what the dress code is if he or she has
> no connection with the school or kids
> in the first place), it can't be the
> community's codes, either. (snip)

"Community of interest?" Now there is a new one. Anyway, when we're talking about how children are educated in this country, it is the business of everyone in the community. The community pays the bill for that education and has to live with the results. You statement also left out the teachers who have to deal with those children on a daily basis (and, because of that, also has a say in the matter).

> (snip) A girl in a Michigan school was
> recently suspended for wearing a t-shirt
> with a pentagram on it (symbolic of
> Wicca). Yet a girl wearing a t-shirt with
> a religious icon (a picture of Jesus with
> a halo) on it was permitted to attend
> classes. (snip)

As I understand it, satanic symbols, such as the pentagram, were banned after these were linked to a string of violent incidents at schools, including at least one of the recent school shooting incidents.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3027. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 02:28:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AE2EE.7653063A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26025

CAM wrote:
>
> The purpose of dating my current lady
> friend is she is a member of the
> country club and invites me to the
> monthly party where I have a lot of
> fun. (snip)

Well, then perhaps you're using a rather loose definition of a date.
Anyway, read back over my original premise. I specifically excluded
co-workers, associates, and aquantances. And your "date" sounds more
like an aquantance.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3028. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 02:29:48 UTC
From: DBN <dnicholson@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u0lht1r28ehl95@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 25941
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

2 meters is a codeless band? when did this happen? CW is used by the weak signal guys at the bottom end of the band all the time. And a lot of repeaters have CW ID's and as far as I know the FCC has not said code was illegal to use for repeater ID's. hmmm.....maybe I was asleep when that rule was made....

Dan

3029. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 03:18:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0aefcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26027

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0AE110.93476259@sccoast.net...
>
> As I understand it, satanic symbols, such as the pentagram, were
> banned after these were linked to a string of violent incidents at
> schools, including at least one of the recent school shooting incidents.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

The Pentagon is built in the shape of a pentagram. Wonder if your belief
that the pentagram is Satanic is one of the reasons the Islamic terrorists
find our government/country as such infidels. Hmmmmm....

Kim W5TIT

3030. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 03:23:14 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C0AEFC7.5AE490B9@spam.me.not>
Source record: 26026
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

CAM:

Actually, There's a CW and Weak Signal portion on 6 meters, from 50.0 to
50.1, on 2 meters from 144.0 to 144.1, on 1.25 meters from 222.00 to
222.34, on 70 centimeters from 902 to 904, and on the 1240 band from
1295 to 1297. Not just on 2M

73 de AB8LR

-SSB

CAM wrote:
>
> Wes Stewart wrote:
> >
> > On Sun, 2 Dec 2001 20:14:44 +0000 (UTC), "Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com>
> > wrote:
> >
> > |Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> > |those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> > |haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
> > |tell me. Help me!
> >
> > How do you figure two meters is supposed to be "codeless?"
>
> Maybe he doesn't realize that the only CW-only ham frequencies
> are located in the 2m band.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3031. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 03:55:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AF741.23998FAC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26028

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> By your definition of "few interactions
> with the opposite sex where the thought
> of sex doesn't come up" I am not so
> sure about that for me; or from the
> perspective of women in general. Not
> being sexist here, I hope, but I think
> men are much more likely to be sexually
> attracted to a casual acquaintence
> than women are.
>
> What's your opinion of that?

Perhaps I should have worded that differently (to better fit the context of the discussion about "friends"). Perhaps "... few 'extended' interactions..." would have been closer to what I was trying to say.

Anyway, as for your question, I'm not so sure there is that much of a difference. Men are certainly much more likely to "act" on an attraction (staring, flirting, etc), but that has more to do with the way our society defines the roles of men and women in these situations (men as the active pursuer and women as the more passive pursued). And, because of the difference in the way men and women act in these situations, it is hard to be certain of a greater frequency in one versus the other. Furthermore, using a small sample (such as myself) as a gauge would not provide an accurate sweeping conclusion.

There has been some interesting research done relating to this (nothing conclusive). For example, in one study (and I don't remember who did it), a camera was hidden to observe a grocery store check out line, while stereotypical "attractive" people were placed into the line at random. In each case, men and women looked at the person with similar frequency. Moreover, men and women displayed similar attention to their own appearance while the person was in line (brushing hair with hand, straightening cloths, etc). Interestingly, women were more likely to initiate a conversation with the person (often with the pretense of being helpful - that is a good magazine, that is on sale, etc.), while men were more likely to seek additional conversation once addressed by the person (the women were more likely to take a passive role once addressed - waiting for the person to continue the conversation).

I've read other studies, but I don't think any truly determined which were more likely to be sexually attracted to a casual

acquaintance. However, if we were to base this solely on action, I'd be convinced men were attracted to just about anything moving that looked good - and even that isn't a strong requirement. :-)

> My fantasy is simply a never-ending body
> rub--no sex involved...LOL

That's not far from what I've observed in other women. Women's fantasies often involve prolonged personal pleasure (baths, sunbathing, touching, hugging, etc), with sex added at the end almost as an afterthought. Water (baths, hot tubs, beaches, swimming pools, etc) plays a major role in many women's fantasies also (warm water even more so).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3032. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 03:56:43 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <f2c8d3ac843b24a284be7decc2f0a4d3.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 26030
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote =

> Maybe he doesn't realize that the only CW-only ham frequencies
> are located in the 2m band.

I didn't realize that either (because it isn't true).

There is another band with a "CW-only" segment.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB/4ID

--
Posted from 1cust128.tnt1.minneapolis3.mn.da.uu.net [63.30.251.128]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3033. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 03:57:39 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C0AF7D8.49218A2C@spam.me.not>
Source record: 26029
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Just realized I goofed...
should have been 70 cm from 432.000 to 432.125 and 900Mhz from 902 to
904.

Also, 30M is all CW and FSK.

There are not, to my knowledge, any CW-ONLY bands at all. CW and Weak
Signal or CW and FSK live together everywhere.

-SSB

Sideband wrote:
>
> CAM:
>
> Actually, There's a CW and Weak Signal portion on 6 meters, from 50.0 to
> 50.1, on 2 meters from 144.0 to 144.1, on 1.25 meters from 222.00 to
> 222.34, on 70 centimeters from 902 to 904, and on the 1240 band from
> 1295 to 1297. Not just on 2M
>
> 73 de AB8LR
>
> -SSB
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Wes Stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > On Sun, 2 Dec 2001 20:14:44 +0000 (UTC), "Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > |Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> > > |those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> > > |haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
> > > |tell me. Help me!
> > >
> > > How do you figure two meters is supposed to be "codeless?"
> >
> > Maybe he doesn't realize that the only CW-only ham frequencies
> > are located in the 2m band.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3034. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:05:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AF9B3.88F0B296@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26031

CAM wrote:
>
> Dwight is obviously one of those
> Homo sapiens who hasn't yet evolved
> to the stage where he is in control
> of and responsible for his own
> feelings. :-)

No, I don't attempt to suppress or control my feelings. I control how I act on those feelings and I'm obviously responsible for them, but I would never attempt to suppress or control how I feel (for that matter, I don't think it's truly possible).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3035. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:22:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AFD83.9E92FD25@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26032

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On the contrary, Dwight, I'm very human.
> And in the right settings, I'm (obviously)
> attracted to women on a sexual basis. But
> the difference is, when the setting is NOT
> right I don't feel any such attraction at
> all. I'm sorry if you can't relate to that
> experience, but I can very definitely
> state that it is one that many men share.

Okay, that sounds more reasonable. It would be very strange indeed
if you had a number of female friends and had never had a sexual thought.

> It's a male name.

Sorry, I wasn't trying to be funny. I had a friend once who often
shortened her name to "Rick," and it would not be that strange for a
female Rick to not be attracted to a female. Anyway, since I can't see
you through my computer, I just wanted cover either possibility.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3036. Re: NEWSGROUP DEGRADES INTO INSULT-FEST!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:29:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0AFF4E.18CAD15@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26033

Krell wrote:
>
> So what are you complaining about?
> If you don't want to argue, don't
> respond.

First of all, asking politely is not "complaining." Second, I enjoy a good argument as much as the next person. I just don't think we have to kill each other verbally while doing it.

And that is my last comment on this.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3037. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:43:05 UTC
From: QRQ <nospam@hot.rr.com>
Message-ID: <tpDO7.9103$oz4.275022@typhoon.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 26040
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying
to
> tell me. Help me!
> --
> Leland C. Scott

Leland, you're not codeless, you're clueless.

3038. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:49:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011202234954.14773.00002746@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 26034

In article <3C0A810E.E3C28739@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I see. And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
>> influence on their sexual "identity." Right.
>
>Larry, if *you* were raised by homosexuals, would *you* be a
>homosexual?

No. Not unless they wanted me to be. And I'm sure that's what most
homosexual "couples" want for their children.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3039. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:49:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011202234954.14773.00002744@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 26035

In article <382AA305F6CFB6DB.71E0BC3B8776B176.BFD3C38BE460C84F@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> I don't think Kim would have the slightest bit of trouble
>getting them myself--after all, to see any harm in her call takes a
>dirty mind, and it's pretty hard to find ANY mind, dirty or not, in a
>bureaucracy like the DMV.

Rick:

Perhaps it is *not* seeing the harm in Kim's call sign which requires
a dirty mind!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3040. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:49:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011202234954.14773.00002745@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 26036

In article <3C0ABF35.20A86F13@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> Tell that to the many millions who have experienced an end to a
>relationship because of the infidelity of a "trusted" partner. Total,
>blind, trust is absolutely foolish (and there is nothing insecure
>about not being foolish).

Dwight:

Exactly. I'm sure that divorce statistics pre- and post-WWII reflect
the impact of the rise in the predominance of women in the workplace.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3041. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:49:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011202234955.14773.00002747@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 26038

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gnq5rwm.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

> I'll pass your analysis on to a very close friend's stepdaughter
> who is the chair of such a group. Her partner, BTW, is (or at
> least was) on the White House staff handling issues that had no
> relationship to sexual orientation.

Phil:

Hmmm -- so your friend's lesbian stepdaughter's "partner" was on Bill Clinton's White House staff. Is this supposed to be some kind of revelation? I'm sure he had a few token straight people working for him, somewhere...

> Perhaps they can explain the reality to you in simple and
> non-accusatory terms.

And what "reality" would that be?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3042. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:49:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011202234955.14773.00002748@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 26039

In article <3c0ace9c_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> >My YL "Elmer" had a 2-meter "Lunch Box," and it was, in fact, a
>> >Heathkit. It used the AM mode; I've always wondered why that
>> >mode has been largely abandoned on the VHF bands?
>>
>> Excuse me?
>>
>> You had a YL for an Elmer?
>>
>> Did you have a chaperone, or was her husband or father
>> present?

Rick:

She was single; and I've never said I had anything against single people spending time alone together! It is only when one of those involved is married that there is a problem.

>> I DO assume you would never have allowed yourself to be
>> compromised by being alone with her, would you?

In her case, no -- definitely not. She was a very nice person, but I had no interest in her as a possible lover. BTW, she is no longer licensed under her original call sign; I know she married, but don't know her married name so can't look her up that way. I think she's out of ham radio for good.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3043. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 04:49:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011202234956.14773.00002749@nso-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 26037

In article <u0lht1r28ehl95@corp.supernews.com>, "DBN" <dnicholson@socket.net>
writes:

>
>2 meters is a codeless band? when did this happen? CW is used by the weak
>signal guys at the bottom end of the band all the time. And a lot of
>repeaters have CW ID's and as far as I know the FCC has not said code was
>illegal to use for repeater ID's. hmmm.....maybe I was asleep when that
>rule was made....
>
>Dan

Not to mention that 2-meters is one of the two bands where "No-code"
Technician class licensees can use the CW mode! (The other is the
six-meter band.)

73 de Larry, K3LT ---> Does 2-meter CW using a Kenwood TR-9130, circa
1982!

3044. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:01:40 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c0b057e.1878637@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26041

On 02 Dec 2001 04:43:04 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3c085c41.3337778@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>
>>>Ryan:
>>>I can't see any legal problem with "renting" ham radio gear, aside from
>>>the issue of taking steps to ensure that only licensed amateurs get to
>>>do so.
>>
>>Yet there's no requirement that one can or should ONLY
>>rent (or sell) ham gear to licensed hams.
>
>Bill:
>True enough; however, I would think that asking to see a valid
>license would be a reasonable precaution, to prevent the possibility
>of harmful interference arising from irresponsible use by an
>unlicensed person. I see this as any ham's responsibility.

Interesting concept...one not implemented by
any retail store I am aware of. Another thought, since
it isn't a law, can a retail establishment (AES, etc.)
actualy refuse to sell ham gear to someone without
a license?

Of
>course, misuse is possible in the hands of licensed amateurs, but
>that is not as likely as it would be if unlicensed hams were to
>gain access to ham gear by renting it out.

Unlicensed people BUY ham gear all the time. I did
as a teenager BEFORE being licensed. Today, the only
practical/economic reality of listening to hams is to
buy a transciever. Buying only a reciever is a waste
of money if the person has any inclination to become
a ham.

>>>The money spent on rental fees would be better
>>>used to save up for the purchase of equipment. If all you want to do
>>>is try out a top-of-the-line rig for a week or two, then "renting" would
>>>be OK as a one-time or occasional practice.
>>>
>>>Some hams rent out their vacation properties, equipped with contest-
>>>capable ham radio stations, for visiting hams looking for a DXpedition
>>>opportunity. There's obviously nothing wrong with it, as long as it's

>>>right for you and your checkbook!
>>
>>Agree too.
>
>And if the deal were a rental of a "ham property," I would be even
>more concerned with making sure a licensed ham were the rentor,
>in order to reduce possible financial liability for RFI problems. It's
>a simple, logical, and reasonable precaution, and the decision not
>to take that precaution would be difficult to defend in a court of law.

Defend against what? If I RENT you ham equipment, I have no
obligation to ensure you use it correctly. Who would have
any cause of action against the rentor for a ham or non-ham
that caused interference?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3045. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:03:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203000309.03411.00001041@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26042

In article <E2yO7.140754$WW.8940964@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Didn't Stalin have a commissar who held that socially-acquired
>characteristics would find their way into the gene pool and produce a race
>of good Communists?

YEp. Can't recall the name right now, but he revived an idea that was disproven
shortly after Darwin's ideas got wide attention.

Simple test: Try de-horning cattle of species that grow horns. No matter how
many generations you do it to, the next generation will grow horns.

>I think he set Russian biological science back a
>century all by himself.

Yup.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3046. Re: Tacoma Wash equipment ban

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:07:57 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c0b0826.2558128@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26043

Does anyone have the FULL TEXT of the ordinance
(Tacoma City Ordinance 26851) they can post here for discussion?

On Sat, 01 Dec 2001 16:13:50 GMT, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
wrote:

>This should prove interesting as to specific enforcement:
>>Tacoma Washington may be the first city to prohibit Class D 11
>>meter C-B operators from using non-FCC certified
>>transmitting equipment. Adopted last
>>September 12th but only now becoming widely known,
>>Tacoma City Ordinance 26851
>>amends Chapter 8.38 of their Municipal Code in two ways.
>>First is Section 8.38.010 which directly prohibits use of
>>non-approved radio equipment by CBers.
>
>Does the ordinance LIST all approved equipment?
>What does the ordinance say as to HOW FCC approval
>is determined?
>
>>And if a CBer breaks the new law he or she is subject to
>>Section 8.38.020. This makes using such a radio a
>>misdemeanor punishable to a fine of
>>up to $500, and/or up to 6 month imprisonment.
>
>Same question(s) as above.
>
>>Tacoma enacted Ordinance 26851 based on an
>>earlier amendment to the Communications Act of 1934,
>>as amended, which was adopted by Congress a couple
>>of years ago. As this was a Congressional action,
>>not an FCC action, any challenges by C-B operators
>>to the new Tacoma local law would have to go
>>through the federal courts. As far as we can determine,
>>the new law is carefully crafted to affect only C-B operators
>>and no other radio operators in
>>the Tacoma area. (Various news sources)
>
>Can someone obtain and post the specific ordinance 26851
>text?
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK
>

3047. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:13:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B0A05.58F6AF16@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26044

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm sure that divorce statistics pre- and post-WWII reflect
> the impact of the rise in the predominance of women in the workplace.

Egads, Larry, are you a member of the Taliban?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3048. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:16:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B0AB8.F2728F9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26045

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Larry, if *you* were raised by homosexuals, would *you* be a
> >homosexual?
>
> No. Not unless they wanted me to be.

So if they wanted you to be a homosexual, you would become one?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3049. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:20:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B0BA0.BF383E41@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26046

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Well, then perhaps you're using a rather loose definition of a date.
> Anyway, read back over my original premise. I specifically excluded
> co-workers, associates, and aquantances. And your "date" sounds more
> like an aquantance.

Since you exclude acquaintances, do you only have sex with people you
are not acquainted with, Dwight? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3050. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:27:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B0D18.F090B61C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26047

CAM wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > >I am not sexually attracted to 99% of females, i.e. I am very choosy. I
> > >gather that you are attracted to virtually every female you lay eyes on,
> > >i.e. you are not very choosy?
> >
> > If you were Dave Heil, would (or COULD) you be?
>
> You're right, Rick. If I were rolypoly like Dave Heil, I guess I couldn't
> afford to be choosy.

I suppose to a guy who is built like Ichabod Crane, 6'3" and 240 lbs
would seem rolypoly.

Dave K8MN

3051. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:30:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B0E02.D28045@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26048

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> ... I would never attempt to suppress or control how I feel (for that
> matter, I don't think it's truly possible).

Some of us more evolved Homo sapiens regularly control our
learned emotional responses, Dwight, and even reprogram
ourselves to avoid inappropriate feelings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3052. Re: Another repeat case of 14.275 QRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:32:42 UTC
From: dreamweaver <bcherao99@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <_7EO7.15523$Ao6.1330909@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26049
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Nothing that a good notch filter can't take care of perhaps?

"polish da boo" <copypro50@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:SfCO7.24155$WC1.2494632@newsread2.go.net...
> There were two stations on 14.275 this afternoon.
> One in 4-land the other in 9-land having a qso
> after comming down from 15 Meters. Six minutes
> into the QSO here comes K1MAN with his Broadcast.
>
> Later tonite on 3.975 the same s--t happens again.
>
> AT NO TIME did a LIVE Station Operator ask if the frequency
> was in use first. The transmitter and tapes (via electric timer
> controlled station?) just come up on 14.275 and 3.975
> knock em right out of the box...
>
> How is it that a ham radio transmitter which
> is not even under MANNED OPERATOR CONTROL
> can conduct broadcasting on FCC allocated ham radio
> frequencies legally? Make no mistake, these transmissions
> are NOT bulletins, they are one-way broadcasts directed
> to nobody.
>
> Is Mr Hollingsworth and the FCC doing their job?
> Perhaps you too will call and leave a message
> on his voicemail at 717.338.2502 and ask
> him politely, what's going on here ?
>
>
>
>
>

3053. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:36:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B0F3C.E049E9C7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26050

Rick Adams wrote:

> If you can't make your point without lying, Dave, don't bother
> to make it at all. You'll understand if, from now on, I don't accept
> ANYTHING you say without proof--you've demonstrated that there is no
> reason to do so and every reason not to.

So, by this reasoning, we can assume that by including Finland on your
list of countries supposedly "freer" than the U.S., you were lying.
If you can't make your point without lying, Rick...

Dave K8MN

3054. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:36:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B0F5B.C5CF21A9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26051
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband wrote:
> Actually, There's a CW and Weak Signal portion on 6 meters, from 50.0 to
> 50.1, on 2 meters from 144.0 to 144.1, on 1.25 meters from 222.00 to
> 222.34, on 70 centimeters from 902 to 904, and on the 1240 band from
> 1295 to 1297. Not just on 2M

But only the 6m and 2m portions carry the force of law.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3055. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:38:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B0FD3.5AC3449F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26052
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband wrote:
> There are not, to my knowledge, any CW-ONLY bands at all. CW and Weak
> Signal or CW and FSK live together everywhere.

The first 100 kHz of 6m and 2m are indeed "CW only".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3056. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:41:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B10A1.AA6AD79@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26053

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You're right, Rick. If I were rolypoly like Dave Heil, I guess I couldn't
> > afford to be choosy.
>
> I suppose to a guy who is built like Ichabod Crane, 6'3" and 240 lbs
> would seem rolypoly.

At 6'3" and 205, I am about ten pounds overweight. That makes you
about 45 pounds overweight. Sounds rolypoly to me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3057. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 05:51:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B124C.C66A9617@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26054

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> The World Bank defines adult illiteracy
> (snip) While the highest rates as one
> would expect are in Africa, when those
> are removed we come to this sequence:
>
> (snip) When there is no hope, suicide
> bombers abound.

If you're going to relate suicide bombings to illiteracy, then why isn't there more suicide bombings in connection with Africa (which you admit has the highest illiteracy rates)? Obviously, illiteracy isn't the cause of the anger in the Middle East. Ask _ANY_ Arab and he will gladly tell you why they're angry.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3058. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:06:00 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <cDEO7.2038$JO6.656305454@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26055
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

To all that is concerned, this post was
not done by Leland, it is a forge using
his name. Please stop responding and
cross posting the responses.

Landshark

--
We are men at work, we've got a job to do.
Neil Young

"QRQ" <nospam@hot.rr.com> wrote in message
news:tpDO7.9103$oz4.275022@typhoon.austin.rr.com...
> > Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away
from
> > those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and
its
> > haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying
> to
> > tell me. Help me!
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
>
> Leland, you're not codeless, you're clueless.
>
>

3059. TWISTEDHED THE CB CLOWN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:12:37 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112022212.73571240@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26056

From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Seeks older man
Newsgroups: alt.personals.gay
Date: 2001-04-06 19:46:04 PST

I am looking for hot action between me and an older man. I am 32, in shape,
live in Florida, but will travel for right person. Email only.

3060. TWISTEDHED LOVES HIS ILLEGAL CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:14:52 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112022214.1ca476be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26057

From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Big Kicker FS
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.equipment
Date: 2001-04-06 19:44:03 PST

I have a CB amp it is not marked but I have been told it puts out 3500 watts.
I'll throw in an echo mike. All for $75. Reply via email.

RS 1175
FLA

3061. TWISTEDHED = TOP CB CRIMINAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:17:54 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112022217.2d7d6c38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26058

From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Stealing Is Great!
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-02-26 10:16:10 PST

Okay, I guess if a guy wanders onto 10 meters he deserves what he gets (if he gets caught) but I see nothing wrong with stealing. Freebanders stole frequencies from government services and others below 1 and above 40. Tough luck, I say. If it ain't nailed down, we'll take it. (Hey, are you usin' that Mercedes?)

Twistedhed

3062. TWISTEDHED DEMANDS RESPECT FOR FREEBAND BOOTLEGGERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:22:25 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112022222.1854c2f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26059

From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Respect For Freebanders
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
Date: 2001-04-06 00:22:05 PST

I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the frequencies from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think. We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions. We use Yeasus, Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know technical issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This should not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do. For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him before you condemn him.

I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)

Unit 2711, Florida

3063. Re: Another repeat case of 14.275 QRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:24:26 UTC
From: The Better Amateur Radio Federation <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <fd94b3ad168ac1921bc998d95bc708b4@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 26060
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

There is better solution. Let K1MAN have 14.275. W4NTI and his bunch of
pricks dont deserve to be on there......

--
Lloyd Davies,
B.A.R.F. Chief of Communications
http://www.angelfire.com/in/w9xn/
http://www.anglefire.com/al/sj61 - Under development

"dreamweaver" <bcherao99@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:_7EO7.15523$Ao6.1330909@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Nothing that a good notch filter can't take care of perhaps?
>
>
> "polish da boo" <copypro50@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:SfCO7.24155$WC1.2494632@newsread2.go.net...
> > There were two stations on 14.275 this afternoon.
> > One in 4-land the other in 9-land having a qso
> > after comming down from 15 Meters. Six minutes
> > into the QSO here comes K1MAN with his Broadcast.
> >
> > Later tonite on 3.975 the same s--t happens again.
> >
> > AT NO TIME did a LIVE Station Operator ask if the frequency
> > was in use first. The transmitter and tapes (via electric timer
> > controlled station?) just come up on 14.275 and 3.975
> > knock em right out of the box...
> >
> > How is it that a ham radio transmitter which
> > is not even under MANNED OPERATOR CONTROL
> > can conduct broadcasting on FCC allocated ham radio
> > frequencies legally? Make no mistake, these transmissions
> > are NOT bulletins, they are one-way broadcasts directed
> > to nobody.
> >
> > Is Mr Hollingsworth and the FCC doing their job?
> > Perhaps you too will call and leave a message
> > on his voicemail at 717.338.2502 and ask
> > him politely, what's going on here ?
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

>
>

3064. TWISTEDHED AND HIS PALS ARE FELONS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:29:22 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112022229.ed183d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26061

From: "Landshark" S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net
Date: Mon, Dec 3, 2001 6:06 AM
Message-id: <cDEO7.2038$JO6.656305454@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>

To all that is concerned, this post was
not done by Leland, it is a forge using
his name. I did it. Me and Twistedhed like
to harass Leland. But enough is enough.
Please stop responding and cross posting
the responses cuz its disturbing our sales
of illegal cb equipment in the other news
group.

Landshark

--
Screw the goverment, trash the world, I'm gay.
The Sex Pistols

3065. TWISTEDHED CANT HIDE FROM THAT CRAZY JOCKSTRAP POSTING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:37:09 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112022237.3892b22d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26062

Subject: More Twistedhed's Blathering
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Author: twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed)
Date: 2001-03-26 17:20:06 PST
in 3741-3A87F5A4-23@storefull-122.iap.bryant.webtv.net

nice forgery Dougie but the headers don't lie. Undoubtedly you don't understand how the Usenet works so I will explain it to you, my anonymous acolyte what do you know of my life? The jockstrap you sent in the mail is a trophy of your docile worship of me and it hangs proudly above my
mantle I will never cease pirate CB activity as long as it irks you or someone like you. However, as a consolation and to ease your suffering, I will
stay within the confines of the freeband for now. The saucer men tell me I have a good signal in the pile

3066. TWISTEDHED: HE COLLECTS JOCKSTRAPS/ TALKS TO SAUCER MEN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:38:22 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112022238.29050c3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26063
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Subject: More Twistedhed's Blathering
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Author: twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed)
Date: 2001-03-26 17:20:06 PST
in 3741-3A87F5A4-23@storefull-122.iap.bryant.webtv.net

nice forgery Dougie but the headers don't lie. Undoubtedly you don't understand how the Usenet works so I will explain it to you, my anonymous acolyte what do you know of my life? The jockstrap you sent in the mail is a trophy of your docile worship of me and it hangs proudly above my
mantle I will never cease pirate CB activity as long as it irks you or someone like you. However, as a consolation and to ease your suffering, I will
stay within the confines of the freeband for now. The saucer men tell me I have a good signal in the pile

3067. TWISTEDHED....CBER, JOCKSTRAP COLLECTOR, CONFIDANT OF SAUCER MEN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 06:41:10 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112022241.7f85dcba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26064
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Subject: More Twistedhed's Blathering
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Author: twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed)
Date: 2001-03-26 17:20:06 PST
in 3741-3A87F5A4-23@storefull-122.iap.bryant.webtv.net

nice forgery Dougie but the headers don't lie. Undoubtedly you don't understand how the Usenet works so I will explain it to you, my anonymous acolyte what do you know of my life? The jockstrap you sent in the mail is a trophy of your docile worship of me and it hangs proudly above my
mantle I will never cease pirate CB activity as long as it irks you or someone like you. However, as a consolation and to ease your suffering, I will
stay within the confines of the freeband for now. The saucer men tell me I have a good signal in the pile

3068. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 07:01:33 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <EC014B9DA1345D2D.139E79049A384D6F.F385928F11E101F1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26065

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 05:01:40 GMT, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote:

>Interesting concept...one not implemented by
>any retail store I am aware of. Another thought, since
>it isn't a law, can a retail establishment (AES, etc.)
>actualy refuse to sell ham gear to someone without
>a license?

They can refuse to sell to anybody. In this case, suspicion of intent to use the equipment in an illegal manner would probably cover them against any potential discrimination claim.

Texas Towers has always asked for a callsign when I've bought anything capable of transmitting.

>Unlicensed people BUY ham gear all the time. I did
>as a teenager BEFORE being licensed. Today, the only
>practical/economic reality of listening to hams is to
>buy a transciever. Buying only a reciever is a waste
>of money if the person has any inclination to become
>a ham.

Agreed, but renting a transceiver, as opposed to a receiver only is a waste of money unless you plan to get your license very early in the rental period.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3069. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 07:27:05 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C0B28EC.2B9C83CB@spam.me.not>
Source record: 26066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Refer to this chart, Page 2:

http://www.icomamerica.com/downloads/bandchar.pdf

It clearly shows that those two segments are CW and Weak Signal, which
means CW and [QRP SSB or AM or RTTY].

-SSB

CAM wrote:
>
> Sideband wrote:
> > There are not, to my knowledge, any CW-ONLY bands at all. CW and Weak
> > Signal or CW and FSK live together everywhere.
>
> The first 100 kHz of 6m and 2m are indeed "CW only".
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3070. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 07:28:58 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C0B295D.926717A3@spam.me.not>
Source record: 26067
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

force of law? Where is it stated in the FCC rules regarding these bands
that those areas are CW only? Why would ICOM show them as CW and Weak
Signal (QRP FSK/RTTY/SSB/AM)? Why would the ARRL freq. chart show the
same thing?

Just curious...

de AB8LR

-SSB

CAM wrote:
>
> Sideband wrote:
> > Actually, There's a CW and Weak Signal portion on 6 meters, from 50.0 to
> > 50.1, on 2 meters from 144.0 to 144.1, on 1.25 meters from 222.00 to
> > 222.34, on 70 centimeters from 902 to 904, and on the 1240 band from
> > 1295 to 1297. Not just on 2M
>
> But only the 6m and 2m portions carry the force of law.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3071. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 07:34:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B2A93.84BAF8D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26068

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You're right, Rick. If I were rolypoly like Dave Heil, I guess I couldn't
> > > afford to be choosy.
> >
> > I suppose to a guy who is built like Ichabod Crane, 6'3" and 240 lbs
> > would seem rolypoly.
>
> At 6'3" and 205, I am about ten pounds overweight. That makes you
> about 45 pounds overweight. Sounds rolypoly to me.

You'd probably say the same thing to Jerome Bettis. I haven't weighed
under 200 lbs since my days in West Africa. At 188 lbs., my collar
bones stuck out and my ribcage looked like a xylophone.They have FOOD
here.

Dave K8MN

3072. Re: Tacoma Wash equipment ban

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 07:52:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B2F2C.2CE9880E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26069

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > Tacoma Washington may be the first
> > city to prohibit Class D 11 meter
> > C-B operators from using non-FCC
> > certified transmitting equipment.
> > Adopted last September 12th but
> > only now becoming widely known,
> > Tacoma City Ordinance 26851 amends
> > Chapter 8.38 of their Municipal
> > Code in two ways. First is Section
> > 8.38.010 which directly prohibits
> > use of non-approved radio equipment
> > by CBers.

I think somebody may be pulling your leg, Bill. I went to the City of Tacoma web site and checked the Tacoma Municipal Code at...

http://www.cityoftacoma.org/default.asp?main=/54municode/default.asp

...and could not find a Chapter 8.38 (updated 11/26/01). I also checked the Tacoma City Ordinances at...

http://mrsc-web.mrsc.org/

...and was not able to find ordinance 26851. If this was adopted September 12th, it should be on both of those web sites.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3073. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 08:12:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B33DA.27D55604@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26070

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Cecil probably isn't going to like
> this (particularly since I identify
> myself as a libertarian) but I agree
> with you to some extent. (snip)
>
> (snip) No third party has much chance
> for quite some time in our system--it's
> stacked in favor of a two-party system
> --but if the Libertarians hope to grow
> significantly, they really are going to
> have to alter some of these stands to
> meet with the needs of both society as
> a whole and those of us who view social
> concerns (in terms of free education
> and universal health care, hate crime
> legislation, etc.) as being as nearly
> as important as rights and freedoms.

Well, I'll try to make Cecil feel better by pointing out that I would love to see Libertarian Party grow into a much more viable political force in this country. Like so many others, I'm fed up with the two party system and would like more choice. But I do think they have to move some of their positions a little closer to the middle and span out into wider political issues. I also think the party has to give some to get some - pick up some conservative issues to balance it's liberal issues. Surely there has to be some conservative issues that liberals can tolerate. I know there is no tolerance for conservative views on abortion, etc. But what about more financial aid to poor white families in the south to balance the massive minority aid programs? Farm protections? Cutting back immigration (which benefits employers, while screwing employees)? There has to be something conservatives want that liberals can tolerate.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3074. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 08:20:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B35AD.BBC3C783@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26071

CAM wrote:
>
> Nope, we've only begun to fight. (snip)

Okay, I'll ask you the same questions I asked Rick. As I told him, I think the party has to give some to get some. Why can't the party add some conservative issues to balance
it's liberal issues. Surely there has to be some conservative issues liberals can tolerate. Ignoring abortion (no way most Libertarians will ever go against that), what about more financial aid to poor white families in the south to balance the massive minority aid programs? Farm protections? Cutting back immigration (which benefits employers, while screwing employees)? There has to be something conservatives want that liberals can tolerate. I don't want to get into an issue by issue discussion - I just wanted to introduce the concept.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3075. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 08:24:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112030024.79ea7b43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26072
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:<3C0AEFC7.5AE490B9@spam.me.not>...
> CAM:
>
> Actually, There's a CW and Weak Signal portion on 6 meters, from 50.0 to
> 50.1, on 2 meters from 144.0 to 144.1, on 1.25 meters from 222.00 to
> 222.34, on 70 centimeters from 902 to 904, and on the 1240 band from
> 1295 to 1297. Not just on 2M
>
> 73 de AB8LR
>
>
'Snot quite the way it is dude. The *only* FCC-mandated cw-only
spectrum space in all of U.S. hamdom are 50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1
ARRL/IARU bandplans and Riley aside.
>
>
Not that the usual collection of noclue machine-hopping channelheads
have radios which can hear VHF cw like it needs to be tuned. Even
worse if perchance they do happen to have Real VHF Radios they still
can't copy the bloomin' stuff with their heads. "Progress" marches on
. . . back to "full quieting" radio, the wave of the future . .
>
>
w3rv

3076. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 08:25:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B36F2.FF6EA3BF@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26073

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> In terms of health I'd rather blindly
> trust and be wrong, than trust a
> little and turn my worry into ulcers
> or worse. Think about it. :)

No worries, mate. My wife and I both know what is expected of us and neither cross that line. A system of mutual respect that has worked for 25+ years so far.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3077. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 09:08:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B40D8.D456A105@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26074

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > Tell that to the many millions who have
> > experienced an end to a relationship
> > because of the infidelity of a "trusted"
> > partner. Total, blind, trust is
> > absolutely foolish (and there is nothing
> > insecure about not being foolish).
>
> Gee, that sounds like an argument in favor
> of swinging or open marriage, not one in
> favor of a repressive relationship.

No, it's an argument against total, blind, trust. And there is nothing "repressive" about maintaining certain standards in a relationship. My wife (who, at various times of her life, has been a Sergeant assigned to an Army Air Assault unit, an aid to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations in Europe, a college student, a stripper, and so much more - these few selected to show a range of freedom of choice in her life) will flat tell you she is certainly not repressed. Nor have I ever felt repressed in our relationship. However, in spite of the diversity of our experiences, there has never been a moment in our relationship where there has been unbridled freedom to do whatever we wanted with members of the opposite sex. Not because one said to the other you can't do that. But because we each respect the other enough to not give the other reason to lose trust.

> (snip) Cheating isn't about opportunity--
> it's about integrity.

Cheating cannot possibly start without opportunity - the integrity comes from not seeking the opportunity.

> There's nothing wrong with having sex outside
> your marriage (snip)

Well, that pretty much sums up the difference between us, because I flatly disagree. In this age of AIDS, venereal diseases, screwed up marriages, screwed up kids living in broken homes, screwed up lives from illicit sex, only a totally self-centered puppy would mess around outside his marriage.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3078. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 09:17:46 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112030117.5ef4435@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26075
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DummyLoad@webtv.net wrote in message
news:<8378-3C09A053-90@storefull-112.iap.bryant.webtv.net>...
> Comanche Warrior 10 meter base station radio for sale. 450 channels in
> Am, Fm, Usb & Lsb modes. Unit is stock other than frequency expansion.
> Condition is a 10 electronically & aesthetically. Best deal you will
> find on the net! Less than a year old and used less than 2 hours. Bought
> 2 of them on sale and never used this one. Sell for $100. Buyer pays
> shipping.

CHANNELS???

FREQENCY EXPANSION???

CBERS WHO SELL/BUY/USE "10 METER RADIOS" ARE GETTING HUNTED DOWN LIKE
DOGS WHEN THEY SHOW THEIR FACES OUTSIDE OF
REC.RADIO.CB.............!!!

3079. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 09:18:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B4355.9CBD02A8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26076

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Exactly. I'm sure that divorce
> statistics pre- and post-WWII
> reflect the impact of the rise
> in the predominance of women in
> the workplace.

It's not just women in the work place. Much of this has been growing in proportion to the industrial revolution (where first men, and later women, left home to work elsewhere). Women in the workplace certainly offered more opportunity than before (which caused the dramatic growth you mention), but so did something as simple as easier transportation. And, of course, a liberal media has had a influence on the situation also.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3080. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 09:37:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B47A9.5084E461@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26077

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Dwight! I am so surprised at your
> above response. You are saying that
> you would not have lunch with a
> female co-worker, right? (snip)

Yes, as I said, I would not have lunch with a female co-worker unless there were other employees present. I've seen too many nasty rumors, started by too many nasty people, with too many hurt feelings, to ever wish that on a fellow co-worker.

> And you are saying that continued
> lunches with a female co-worker
> will absolutely lead to a bad
> reputation? (snip)

No, I did not say it would "absolutely" lead to a bad reputation. But, by the same token, I've seen it happen often enough to decide not to offer an opportunity.

> Wow. I wonder what you'd think of
> me going to lunch with 9, 10, 15 men
> who are co-workers!

Did you miss the part where I clearly said, "unless there were other employees present." I'm not talking about a bunch of co-workers heading off to the lunch room for a break. I'm talking about leaving the workplace to have private lunches with a single co-worker, or even regular private get togethers with a single co-worker in the workplace.

> I wonder what you'd think of me
> *going to dinner* with a bunch of
> male hams after work or on a
> Saturday night! (snip)

Well, you sure missed the whole point of this. Again, we're not talking about a bunch of buddies, co-workers, or so forth, getting together for dinner or whatever. We're talking about private meetings with a single person.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3081. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 09:40:06 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <46081FE54FC5F612.705179977824D282.D8827BF31450DCFB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26078
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 3 Dec 2001 01:17:46 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
(IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:

>DummyLoad@webtv.net wrote in message
news:<8378-3C09A053-90@storefull-112.iap.bryant.webtv.net>...
>> Comanche Warrior 10 meter base station radio for sale. 450 channels in
>> Am, Fm, Usb & Lsb modes. Unit is stock other than frequency expansion.
>> Condition is a 10 electronically & aesthetically. Best deal you will
>> find on the net! Less than a year old and used less than 2 hours. Bought
>> 2 of them on sale and never used this one. Sell for $100. Buyer pays
>> shipping.
>
>CHANNELS???
>
>FREQENCY EXPANSION???
>
>CBERS WHO SELL/BUY/USE "10 METER RADIOS" ARE GETTING HUNTED DOWN LIKE
>DOGS WHEN THEY SHOW THEIR FACES OUTSIDE OF
>REC.RADIO.CB.............!!!

Did it occur to you that if any of the expanded frequencies are in the
legitimate ham bands, a licensed amateur could buy the rig and use it
perfectly legally on those frequencies?

It was only posted in rec.radio.swap until you added rec.radio.cb to
the group list. Last I checked there were lots of hams in there
swapping rigs. Besides, it was listed as "10 Meter Base Station," not
"CB base station."

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3082. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 09:50:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B4ACE.97AADA08@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26079

CAM wrote:
>
> Incidentally Dwight, would you
> please set your editor to wrap
> at 80 characters instead of
> wrapping at 40 characters?

I have mine set to wrap at 70 characters, which means those with editors set to 80 don't have to edit quotes from my messages so hard to eliminate strangely wrapped text. I also wrap messages I quote down even further, as I have done with this message, so those who include that have nothing to wrap. So far, you're the only one who has complained. Does anyone else have a problem with this system?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3083. Re: Tacoma Wash equipment ban

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 10:13:28 UTC
From: kf6vyh@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203051328.06621.00000387@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26080

>and was not able to find ordinance 26851. If this was adopted
>September 12th, it should be on both of those web sites.
>

I am just guesing, but if the law does not go into effect that day it may not be posted. Some cities have a set date that a law takes effect. This may be why it is not there. Just a thought at 2am.

3084. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 10:18:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B514A.DA9F8536@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26081

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> The Pentagon is built in the shape of
> a pentagram. (snip)

No, the Pentagon was built in the shape of a pentagon (pentagon - a plane figure with five angles and five sides). A pentagram is a five tipped star, also called a pentacle with a circle around it, that is not shaped like the Pentagon building at all.

> Wonder if your belief that the pentagram
> is Satanic (snip)

I didn't say a thing about my "belief" in anything, Kim. I simply offered an explanation of why many schools have have started to ban such symbols. However, it is true that the pentagram and pentacle have long been occult symbols used in association with satanic identity - even today by those using various rehashed names (wiccams, pagans, etc) to whitewash the association.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3085. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 10:25:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B530C.E55726FE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26082

CAM wrote:
>
> Since you exclude acquaintances, do you
> only have sex with people you are not
> acquainted with, Dwight? :-)

Whenever I get a change! However, I do tend to have sex mainly with those I know more than just slightly, which often does rule out the casual acquaintance.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3086. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 10:37:55 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7CIO7.247603$W8.8892135@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26083

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011202234954.14773.00002745@nso-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3C0ABF35.20A86F13@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> >
> > Tell that to the many millions who have experienced an end to a
> >relationship because of the infidelity of a "trusted" partner. Total,
> >blind, trust is absolutely foolish (and there is nothing insecure
> >about not being foolish).
>
> Dwight:
>
> Exactly. I'm sure that divorce statistics pre- and post-WWII reflect
> the impact of the rise in the predominance of women in the workplace.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Probably has more to do with having an alternative to a couch that burps.

3087. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 10:38:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B55F8.5B5515AF@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26084

CAM wrote:
>
> Some of us more evolved Homo
> sapiens regularly control our
> learned emotional responses,
> Dwight, and even reprogram
> ourselves to avoid inappropriate
> feelings.

I don't tend to have "inappropriate" feelings to worry about, so I'm very comfortable with my feelings, Cecil. Because of that, I see no reason to program or reprogram myself. Perhaps when your feelings evolve to the level where you don't have to worry about them, you can give up programming also.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3088. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 10:39:47 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <TDIO7.247605$W8.8892703@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26085

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011203000309.03411.00001041@nso-cb.aol.com...
> In article <E2yO7.140754$WW.8940964@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >Didn't Stalin have a commissar who held that socially-acquired
> >characteristics would find their way into the gene pool and produce a
race
> >of good Communists?
>
> YEp. Can't recall the name right now, but he revived an idea that was
disproven
> shortly after Darwin's ideas got wide attention.
>
> Simple test: Try de-horning cattle of species that grow horns. No matter
how
> many generations you do it to, the next generation will grow horns.
>
> >I think he set Russian biological science back a
> >century all by himself.
>
> Yup.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Lysenko. Remembered it

3089. Re: Damn Code!!! (not Leland)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 11:05:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B5C31.B8717FD8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26086

A person forging Leland C. Scott's identity wrote:
>
> Even on 2 meters, (snip)

This is not Leland, everybody. Leland has pissed off some CB'er from that newsgroup, who is now trying to get even by posting negative messages using his name. You can always tell the difference by looking at the content of the message. If it is trying to stir up trouble, or is off topic, or contains rude language, it is not Leland.

In fact, if you see any message that seems way out of character for the person, assume it is this CB'er. He simply loves to cause trouble and will probably forge other identities in this newsgroup before he tires and moves on.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3090. Re: Tacoma Wash equipment ban

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 11:23:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B6070.67BAB080@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26087

Kf6vyh wrote:
>
> I am just guesing, but if the law
> does not go into effect that day
> it may not be posted. Some cities
> have a set date that a law takes
> effect. This may be why it is not
> there. Just a thought at 2am.

That is a possibility. However, I checked the second web site for the 26851 ordinance itself, which is what is voted on before it goes into the city code. If the ordinance was adopted two and a half months ago, it should have been listed on one or both of those sites by now (either as a recently voted on city ordinance on the second site or as city code on the first site). Not finding it on either is strange (though I will admit that not all web sites are reliably kept up to date, so it may still be out there - I have just not found it yet).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3091. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 12:16:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203071634.20950.00000958@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 26089

In article <3C0AD7AF.31F8AE02@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Libertarians are for laws prohibiting
>force or threat of force in human relationships. We are for armed
>forces to protect us from foreign criminals, police to protect us
>from domestic criminals, and a court system to administer the law.
>For instance, most Libertarians believe in the death penalty for
>murder.

How about DWI laws?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3092. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 12:16:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203071635.20950.00000960@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 26088

In article <3c0aefcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>The Pentagon is built in the shape of a pentagram.

No, it's in the shape of a pentagon, which is a regular polygon with 5 sides.
(regular polygons have all sides the same length and all angles the same).

A pentagram is a 5 pointed star inscribed in a pentagon.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3093. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 12:16:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203071635.20950.00000959@nso-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 26090

In article <3C0AD5FA.688BD826@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Every year we have a fight on our
>hands with the entrenched political parties in about 20 states that
>try to keep Libertarians off the national ballots and try to keep
>us from getting "matching funds" from the government. What do you
>think they are afraid of? Why should they even bother about such a
>small unimportant third party?
>
The spoiler effect. Third parties in antional elections often have the effect of deciding races.

For example, consider the effect of Ross Perot in the 1992 and 1996 elections. RP drained away far more votes from the Republicans than the Democrats, and so we got 8 years of Bill Clinton.

In 2000, the shoe was on the other foot and Ralph Nader drained away mostly Democrat votes. The eelection would not have been close if RN hadn't been in it.

Exit polls showed that, if RN had not run:

about a quarter would have voted for Bush
about half would have voted for Gore
about a quarter would have stayed home.

I'm NOT saying 3rd parties shouldn't exist. Just why the Republicrats try to stop them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3094. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 13:30:18 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ufumq01o5p@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26092

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C0B2A93.84BAF8D@earthlink.net...
> > At 6'3" and 205, I am about ten pounds overweight. That makes you
> > about 45 pounds overweight. Sounds rolypoly to me.
>
> You'd probably say the same thing to Jerome Bettis. I haven't weighed

Only if he were a "short bus."

3095. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 13:41:17 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0112030541.48ebcc1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26091

Here are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583

Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209

As of December 2, 2001:

Novice - 40,430 (decrease of 8,899)
Tech - 232,994 (increase of 27,600)
Tech Plus - 86,268 (decrease of 42,592)
General - 138,424 (increase of 25,747)
Advanced - 86,668 (decrease of 13,114)
Extra - 97,671 (increase of 18,921)
Total - 682,455 (increase of 7,663)

Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,692 (decrease of 23,891)

Total General/Advanced/Extra: 322,763 (increase of 31,554)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3096. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 13:58:35 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9ufvvqih1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 26093
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011202151741.219$nc@newsreader.com...
> "Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away
> > from those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep
> > and its haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men"
are
> > trying to tell me. Help me!
> >
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
> > KC8LD0
> >
> Why did you cross-post this to rec.radio.cb?

You should ask the person who forged the message Mopar. Seems like he/she is
from your side of the fence so I have to assume you know who it is.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

--
"I will not be frowned upon or be looked down upon
or be made to keep silent because I have these
beliefs and opinions. I thought this country allowed
me that right. I will not conform or compromise just
to keep from hurting somebody's feelings. "

Ted Nugent

3097. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 14:03:15 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9ug08i$j5$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 26094
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"QRQ" <nospam@hot.rr.com> wrote in message
news:tpDO7.9103$oz4.275022@typhoon.austin.rr.com...
> > Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away
from
> > those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and
its
> > haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying
> to
> > tell me. Help me!
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
>
> Leland, you're not codeless, you're clueless.

I doubt it. In fact if you took the time to check you would have noticed the original message was a forgery. At least Richard was the only one smart enough to have figured it out before shooting off at the keyboard. However you didn't, so talk about being clueless.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

--
"1500Kbs cable modem
MediaOne Roadrunner."

3098. Re: Another repeat case of 14.275 QRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 14:19:00 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ug5h4$h6g$1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26105
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation"
<lllllllardasssslllllllllloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:fd94b3ad168ac1921bc998d95bc708b4@spamfreenews.com...
> There is better solution. Let K1MAN have 14.275. W4NTI and his bunch of
> pricks dont deserve to be on there......

Says Lllllllllardasssssss Lllllllllllllllloyd who has no real interest in HF
since he's been trying for about 9 years to pass the General test.

3099. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 14:33:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B8D3B.1E061FF6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26095

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C0AD7AF.31F8AE02@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Libertarians are for laws prohibiting
> >force or threat of force in human relationships. We are for armed
> >forces to protect us from foreign criminals, police to protect us
> >from domestic criminals, and a court system to administer the law.
> >For instance, most Libertarians believe in the death penalty for
> >murder.
>
> How about DWI laws?

Driving while intoxicated is certainly a threat of force (.5mv^2)
and I personally would increase the penalities for people convicted
of DWI. I lost my wife and son to a drunk driver. However, I think
most Libertarians are against sobriety checkpoints where the probable
cause rights of sober citizens are violated. Until there exists
some evidence that a driver is DWI, e.g. weaving in traffic,
there exists no evidence and everyone in this country is
supposed to be innocent until proven guilty. At a sobriety
checkpoint, everyone is assumed guilty until proven innocent
by the sniffer. But this issue is muddied by the government's
"ownership" of the roads.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3100. RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 14:37:41 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C0B8E50.56C82205@gte.net>
Source record: 26096
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Tacoma Washington may be the first city to prohibit Class D 11 meter C-B

operators from using non-FCC certified transmitting equipment. Adopted last September 12th but only now becoming widely known, Tacoma City Ordinance 26851 amends Chapter 8.38 of their Municipal Code in two ways.

First is Section 8.38.010 which directly prohibits use of non-approved radio equipment by CB'ers. And if a CB'er breaks the new law he or she is subject to Section

8.38.020. This makes using such a radio a misdemeanor punishable to a fine of up to $500, and/or up to 6 month imprisonment.

Tacoma enacted Ordinance 26851 based on an earlier amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which was adopted by Congress a couple of years ago. As this was a Congressional action, not an FCC action, any challenges by C-B operators to the new Tacoma local law would have to go through the federal courts. As far as we can determine, the new law is carefully crafted to affect only C-B operators

and no other radio operators in the Tacoma area. (Various news sources)

**
ftp://ftp.arnewsline.org/quincy/News/news.txt

3101. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 14:56:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B9282.9995A376@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26097

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> But I do think they (the Libertarians)
> have to move some of their positions a little closer to the middle and
> span out into wider political issues.

Libertarianism is based on a system of principles. Moving toward the
"middle" would compromise those principles. It is interesting that
you suggest that Libertarians should do exactly what you find
objectionable about the Democrats and Republicans, i.e. the
compromising of their basic principles.

> Surely there has to be some conservative issues that liberals can tolerate.

Shows how little you know about Libertarian principles, Dwight. In a
nutshell, Libertarians are social liberals and *economic conservatives*.
Libertarians would phase out redistribution of wealth by the federal
government. They would phase in a privatization of social security
and over a number of years, completely eliminate the present welfare
system along with the Dept. of Education and Welfare. Eliminating
transfer payments (redistribution of wealth) would allow a large
reduction in federal taxes, thus allowing more disposable income
to go to charitable causes. Libertarians would be more inclined
to charge fees for governmental services than to finance such
through taxes. Libertarians are vehemently against using the
federal welfare system to finance the breeding of more welfare
recipients. Libertarians basically believe that if welfare
cannot be implemented through private voluntary enterprises, e.g.
charities/churches/etc. then it doesn't deserve to exist. Is that
conservative enough for you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3102. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:10:56 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C0B959F.9A960A51@spam.me.not>
Source record: 26098
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ok... now this is the third time this has been posted to rec.radio.cb...

Think we could stop plastering the newsgroup? It's been discussed, argued, stirred up, and beaten to death already... Could we just stop it?

de AB8LR

-SSB

N9NWO wrote:

<Another repetitive, annoying, troll-like post, snipped for your protection>

3103. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:12:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B9666.528F561F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26099

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Why can't the party add some conservative issues to balance
> it's liberal issues?

You are showing your ignorance of the Libertarian Party, Dwight.
Most of the economic principles advocated by the Libertarian
Party are conservative principles. Most Libertarian principles
involve governmental economics, i.e. most Libertarian principles are
conservative principles. Please access the following web page:
http://www.lp.org/issues/
and read what the Libertarian stand on government and the
economy really is. In a nutshell, it is a philosophy that
rewards success and penalizes failure, i.e. what the Republicans
used to believe in. Libertarians believe that rewarding failure
is immoral.

There is a booklet titled, "Libertarianism in One Easy Lesson",
that is available from the Libertarian Party. Would you like
to have a copy?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3104. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:18:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B97B4.4BD4A2D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26101

```
Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Incidentally Dwight, would you
> > please set your editor to wrap
> > at 80 characters instead of
> > wrapping at 40 characters?
>
> I also wrap messages I quote down
> even further, as I have done with this message, so those who include
> that have nothing to wrap.

Thus wasting 3/4 of my display area and doubling the length of the
posting.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3105. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:18:16 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112030718.4e90f39b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26100

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C07730C.CDB72B2C@sccoast.net>...
> That brings up an interesting issue, Kim. Several years ago, a
> television personality (name long forgotten) raised the premise that a
> male and female cannot be friends without the issue of sex entering
> their minds. In other words, any person who is friends with a member
> of the opposite sex is sexually attracted to that person. What do you
> think, Kim? Can a man truly be friends (not a co-worker, associate, or
> an aquantance - a friend) with a woman without ever having thoughts
> about sex?

Before I actually answer the question, I feel I need to pose another.

If your wife had thoughts about sex with another man, but never actually had sex with another man, is that a violation of your trust? If she looked at a coworker and thought he was handsome, is that a violation of your trust?

My point is this -- can a thought that doesn't lead to an action be a violation of your trust?

My answer to that question is no. Any relationship I'm in is based upon promises, and those promises are about *actions*, *not* thoughts. You can never know what someone else is thinking, but you can know their actions. As long as your spouse breaks no promises, then you have no reason for distrust.

As for your question? Well, as stated, it's not really a good question.

What I do believe is that a man and a woman can be close friends without the possibility of sexual relations between them ever being considered as possible. In other words, sex enters their minds, but is rejected.

I had a close female friend, but sex wasn't an issue. We were both married and faithful, and the possibility of sex beween us wasn't ever considered, at least not by me. Well, to be more exact, I'd probably guess that it was considered and rejected and not an issue. It's been so long now I don't remember more than the fact it simply wasn't an issue for me. Don't know her thoughts on the matter, but I'd guess they'd be about the same.

Sean.

3106. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:20:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B9857.35B35D4B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26102

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > At 6'3" and 205, I am about ten pounds overweight. That makes you
> > about 45 pounds overweight. Sounds rolypoly to me.
>
> You'd probably say the same thing to Jerome Bettis.

Are you trying to tell us that you are a professional athlete?

> At 188 lbs., my collar
> bones stuck out and my ribcage looked like a xylophone.

And you were probably healthier.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3107. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:23:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B98EC.F3419752@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26104

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Some of us more evolved Homo
> > sapiens regularly control our
> > learned emotional responses,
> > Dwight, and even reprogram
> > ourselves to avoid inappropriate
> > feelings.
>
> I don't tend to have "inappropriate" feelings to worry about, so I'm
> very comfortable with my feelings, Cecil. Because of that, I see no
> reason to program or reprogram myself. Perhaps when your feelings
> evolve to the level where you don't have to worry about them, you can
> give up programming also.

I'm always improving myself, Dwight. I'm sorry that you think self-
improvement is impossible for you. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3108. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:23:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203102327.08912.00000624@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26103

>Subject: Re: Santa on the Radio
>From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
>Date: 12/2/2001 7:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9uel28$bm8$1@news.hawaii.edu>

>
>Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."

Hey Jeff...Isn't it just "Calling all Stations?"

73

Steve, K4YZ

3109. Re: TWISTEDHED DEMANDS RESPECT FOR FREEBAND BOOTLEGGERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:26:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203102624.08912.00000626@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26106

>Subject: TWISTEDHED DEMANDS RESPECT FOR FREEBAND BOOTLEGGERS
>From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com (IllegalCBersMustGO)
>Date: 12/3/2001 12:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <ce9e428e.0112022222.1854c2f4@posting.google.com>

>I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
>group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
>frequencies
>from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.

As long as you do not have the approval of law, you have NOTHING in common
with Amateur Radio.

>I am saying is
>that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him before
>you condemn him.

We'll condem you anyway, even when the post is an exact repeat of one made
6 months ago. Illegal is illegal.

Steve, A Licensed Operator
K4YZ

3110. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:27:47 UTC
From: AL GOSS <renal@localnet.com>
Message-ID: <3C0B99F3.4AB3C59B@localnet.com>
Source record: 26107
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Who told you CODELESS band!!! Codeless band is FRS band. About 50% of the QSO's taking place are CW mode, some long haul ansd 99% AURORA. Get with it....learn it...you weren't born knowing how to operate a PC. I "think" you had to learn and learn ---you did, because "you wanted to ". The BEST DISTANCE will be via morse code. 90% of "real" DX on 6 meters and upper bands is via CW mode. It's only a few didgits...like your PC uses at FAST speed. Now ya see ---I was raised on CW I had to learn PC, wasn't born to it. de "ol' fart" , I guess, per no-codes in most circles AL, K2ERG

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:

> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
> tell me. Help me!
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "
>
> --
> Posted from surfola.com [208.184.25.39]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3111. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:28:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B9A32.31E46B0F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26108
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband wrote:
>
> Refer to this chart, Page 2:
> http://www.icomamerica.com/downloads/bandchar.pdf
> It clearly shows that those two segments are CW and Weak Signal, which
> means CW and [QRP SSB or AM or RTTY].

Welp, my ARRL Handbook clearly shows those two 100 kHz segments at the
bottom of 6m and 2m to be "CW only". Wonder which one is right - the
American one or the Japanese one?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3112. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 15:38:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0B9C82.6F320E1C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26109
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband wrote:
>
> force of law? Where is it stated in the FCC rules regarding these bands
> that those areas are CW only? Why would ICOM show them as CW and Weak
> Signal (QRP FSK/RTTY/SSB/AM)? Why would the ARRL freq. chart show the
> same thing?

My ARRL frequency chart shows the lower 100 kHz of 2m and 6m to be
"CW only" and from "The FCC Rule Book": "97.305 An amateur station may
transmit a CW emission on any frequency authorized to the control
operator." Under "emissions types authorized":
6m 50.1-51.0 MHz - RTTY, data (doesn't include 50.0-50.1)
2m 144.1-148.0 MHz - RTTY, data (doesn't include 144.0-144.1)
Is "The FCC Rule Book" a good enough reference for you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3113. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 16:00:17 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112030800.384ccbd7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26110

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011201223430.12427.00003871@nso-cg.aol.com>...
> >Kim's call sign is a *symptom* of something much
> >bigger, and to attempt to torment her is useless. It's obvious she
> >won't voluntarily change her call, so the only way it's going to happen
> >is if the FCC changes its rules.
>
> Pardon me, Sean, but to say that, you are not giving Kim any credit
> for being able to change her mind, and do the right thing. In spite
> of whatever I've said about her, I do recognize the fact that as an
> intelligent human being, she could, possibly, be influenced to change
> her mind, and her call sign. Kim is human, and I will never overlook
> the human element in any equation. Why would YOU?

Because I've read what she's said in this newsgroup. She has repeatedly
said she doesn't believe her callsign is offensive. She has repeatedly
either said or implied she won't change it. I'm taking her at her word.

> >Further, even if she does change her
> >callsign, someone else is likely to have or create another that is just
> >as, or more, offensive to you.
>
> There are literally dozens of hams with call signs which are just as
> offensive as Kim's, but they aren't participating in this newsgroup, and
> Kim is. I can only work with the tools at my disposal.
>
> >It's futile and senseless to rant about
> >Kim's callsign. Lobby the FCC if you feel that strongly. Find others
> >who share your feelings and get them to lobby the FCC.
>
> Once again, this is not the FCC's problem -- it's Kim's.

Uh, no. It's yours. Yours and whoever else chooses to agree with you.

Kim doesn't have a problem with her callsign. You do. The FCC doesn't have
a problem with her callsign. You do. I don't have a problem with her callsign.
You do.

Until *you* take responsibility for solving this problem, it will
exist -- for you. Right now you are placing the solution to the problem
in someone elses hands. As long as you do that, you don't have any
control over the problem, and all you can ever do is yell at the person
who does have control. Leave the responsibility in Kim's hands, and
the problem will probably continue indefinately, as she doesn't seem
inclined to change her callsign. Kim could leave this newsgroup tomorrow
and never return. If it's her problem, it's still her problem and at

that point you have even less access to her.

> Are you saying you have access to my E-mail? How do you know
> how many people agree or disagree with me? The visible
> participants in this newsgroup are not the only source of feedback I
> receive on what I post here.

Correct -- but the ones who are visible here are more likely to be the
vocal ones in other circumstances.

> >Just what good do you think you are doing? Do you actually think you are
> >implementing change by taunting people and making them angry here?
>
> Oh, I get it. Another liberal, who wants to shut me up for speaking
> the truth. Yawn!

Liberal? Not exactly. Shut you up? Not really. But I do believe that
people who *really* want things to change don't use a newsgroup to try
to accomplish that change because it's unlikely to do much good. Newsgroups
are great for engaging in fairly innoculous debate but when it comes to
real change they are pretty lacking. I've been on the net a *long* time.
Don't think I've ever seen signigicant change enacted because of a newsgroup.

> >Do you actually think that rec.radio.amateur.policy will be
> >an instrument of change in the ARS and FCC?
>
> I don't see why it couldn't -- do you think it can't be?

I think the potential or this newsgroup being used to change any FCC
policy is extremely low.

> I'm not restating things "over and over" in a vacuum -- I am replying
> to postings which have challenged my statements, and I am supporting
> what I have said by a point/counterpoint debate. This is what
> Usenet newsgroups are for -- and if you don't care for it, why waste
> your time reading it?

I'll perhaps give this one to you. I haven't seen anything new from
you for a while, but I don't have time to read everything. From
my perspective you've been stating the same things over and over, but I
could be wrong.

> >A long time ago I took a two weekend class. Between the two weekends,
> >one of the assignments was not to complain to anyone who can't or won't
> >help solve the problem.
>
> I'd like to hear more about that class -- care to give a more detailed
> description?

If you *really* want a description email me. I'll be happy to give you
the basics and can put you in touch with someone who can give you current
information. It's changed a lot since I took it, and I don't keep up
on the current trends.

> >That's exactly what you're doing. Kim can't
> >solve the problem, only the FCC can. No one reading or posting on this
> >newsgroup can solve the problem. Only the FCC can.
>
> Just the exact opposite is true. The FCC is not the answer to this
> problem -- only Kim can choose to change her call sign, and only she
> can take action to do so.

But the problem from your end, as I see it, is that there are non family oriented callsigns, of which Kim's is one. Am I wrong? Do you really believe that Kim's callsign is *the* problem? If that's what you believe, I really *don't* understand why you are bothering.

> The FCC doesn't care about the effect of
> her call sign, or anyone else's, on the image of the ARS. That's not
> their function. Kim's call sign does not violate any FCC rules, and if
> it did, they wouldn't have issued it. This point has been driven home
> repeatedly by myself and others. Perhaps you should have done some
> research on Google before wading into this debate with your
> emotional responses.

Are you saying that all it would take for you to end this thread is for Kim to change her callsign?

> >And I simply can't understand why you seem so angry *specifically* at Kim.
>
> She's the one who choose a call sign which is sexually provocative, is in
> poor taste, reflects poor judgment on her part, and reflects poorly on the
> overall image of amateur radio operators. I thought you said you understood?

Well, I thought I did. But are you're ranting at Kim simply because she's here, and not at her because she's an example of an attitude you don't find appropriate for the ARS?

Sean.

3114. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 16:44:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112030844.79574bac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26111
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:<3C0B28EC.2B9C83CB@spam.me.not>...
> Refer to this chart, Page 2:
>
> http://www.icomamerica.com/downloads/bandchar.pdf
>
> It clearly shows that those two segments are CW and Weak Signal, which
> means CW and [QRP SSB or AM or RTTY].

The chart is wrong, plain and simple. Whoever drew it up simply didn't bother to create a separate and distinct color for "CW only".

Check out Part 97 and see what the FCC sez.

btw, there was a petition to the FCC to change the rules so that the lower 300 kHz of 2 meters would be reserved for "narrowband" modes (CW, RTTY, SSB, PSK, etc., but no FM). The idea was to give the SSB and digital 2 meter DX folks some 2 meter band space where they'd be protected from FM locals who don't follow the bandplan and don't realize they are QRM becuz they use FM-only radios. FCC said no because support for the idea wasn't universal. Guess who opposed giving 7.5% of 2 meters to the SSB/digital DX folks? (No, it wasn't the ARRL).

73 de Jim, N2EY

3115. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 17:18:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0BB31E.2E992063@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26112

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > At 6'3" and 205, I am about ten pounds overweight. That makes you
> > > about 45 pounds overweight. Sounds rolypoly to me.
> >
> > You'd probably say the same thing to Jerome Bettis.
>
> Are you trying to tell us that you are a professional athlete?

Is that what I typed?

> > At 188 lbs., my collar
> > bones stuck out and my ribcage looked like a xylophone.
>
> And you were probably healthier.

Yeah, frequent bouts of dysentery and food poisoning will make one look
radiant.

Dave K8MN

3116. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 17:28:04 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <pCOO7.55611$S93.1581410@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26113
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well,

You know how it is SSB, some folks just have to gloat--you know, NAH, NAH,
NAH, NAH,
BOO BOO. The playground didn't get bigger--just more expensive.

Jerry

Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C0B959F.9A960A51@spam.me.not...
> Ok... now this is the third time this has been posted to rec.radio.cb...
>
> Think we could stop plastering the newsgroup? It's been discussed,
> argued, stirred up, and beaten to death already... Could we just stop
> it?
>
> de AB8LR
>
> -SSB
>
> N9NWO wrote:
>
> <Another repetitive, annoying, troll-like post, snipped for your
> protection>

3117. Re: PING: Jim N2EY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 17:50:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112030950.3279c6ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26114

"JC from Gnat Flats" <jccooperr@wcnet.net> wrote in message
news:<XoxN7.263$FP6.19606@atlpnn01.usenetserver.com>...
>
> I'm new here. I was a ditty bop back in '61 and always thought I would get
> my HAM or whatever license when I got out of the USAF.

WELCOME, JC!!

> Well, it's been 34
> years since I got out and I guess I better get started on the exams. So, I
> am going to trade you guys a lead on a real good country Christmas song, in
> return for a lead on where I start.

Works for me!

> Do you still have to know morse code? I
> still know it, but very, very slow.

That's all you need to get a license anymore.
>
> Anyhow, you just gotta hear "Merry Christmas from the Family" by Robert Earl
> Keene. I guarantee you, you will recognize at least one incident as having
> occured in *your* family.

HAW! Will check it out!

--

Here's how the licenses work now, for newcomers:

Technician Class - No code test, 35 question multiple-choice written
test. All authorized ham bands and modes above 30 MHz.

General Class - 5 wpm receive-only code test, 35 question
multiple-choice written test plus Technician written test. All amateur
privileges on 160, 30, 17, 12 and higher bands. All modes and most of
the frequencies on the 80, 40, 20 and 15 meter bands.

Extra Class - 5 wpm receive only code test, 50 question multiple
choice written test plus General and Technician written tests.

All tests given by Volunteer Examiners (VEs) at VE test sessions.

--

For free code and written learning software, check out:

http://www.ah0a.org

73 de Jim, N2EY

3118. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 17:53:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112030953.5b597590@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26115

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<TDIO7.247605$W8.8892703@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...

> Lysenko. Remembered it

THAT'S the guy! Right up there with phrenology, astrology, the
"ether", and creationism.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3119. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 18:25:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112031025.2fe4cc11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26116

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011128052322.28714.00002178@nso-md.aol.com>...

(big snip of old stuff)

> is a university professor; as such, he has a professional mandate
> to be politically correct in thought, word, and deed. He is just doing
> what comes naturally for people who are committed to supporting the
> social decay necessary to ensure that liberal socialist elites maintain
> their position as the ruling class in the New World Order. Lately, it
> has become fashionable for liberals like themselves to couch their
> beliefs in the label of Libertarianism, but it's still the same thing. The
> difference is that conservatives are willing to share the hegemony,
> liberals are not. While we may not dislike them personally, we still
> cannot trust them.

Here's proof!!!:

http://www.salon.com/comics/tomo/2001/12/03/tomo/index.html

73 de Jim "irony is not dead" N2EY

3120. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 18:35:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0BC5FE.F54CE62D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26117

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > At 6'3" and 205, I am about ten pounds overweight. That makes you
> > > > about 45 pounds overweight. Sounds rolypoly to me.
> > >
> > > You'd probably say the same thing to Jerome Bettis.
> >
> > Are you trying to tell us that you are a professional athlete?
>
> Is that what I typed?

You compared yourself directly to a professional athlete. What else
can I infer from that?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3121. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 19:24:38 UTC
From: J'm Sm'th <smith.house@sbcglobal.clothes.net>
Message-ID: <3C0BD176.8B725780@sbcglobal.clothes.net>
Source record: 26118
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:
>
> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
> tell me. Help me!
>

You asked for help, here it is. They are saying "Obey my dog!"

--
J'm

To Reply Direct, Remove Clothes.
...-.-

3122. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 19:44:58 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112031144.205c50c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26119
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:<3C0B959F.9A960A51@spam.me.not>...
> Ok... now this is the third time this has been posted to rec.radio.cb...
>
> Think we could stop plastering the newsgroup? It's been discussed,
> argued, stirred up, and beaten to death already... Could we just stop
> it?
>
> de AB8LR
>
> -SSB
>
> N9NWO wrote:
>
> <Another repetitive, annoying, troll-like post, snipped for your
> protection>

way to go sideband.....police those ham radio techies.....

3123. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 20:04:37 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112031204.36cb722e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26121
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:<46081FE54FC5F612.705179977824D282.D8827BF31450DCFB@lp.airnews.net>...
> On 3 Dec 2001 01:17:46 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
> (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:
>
> >DummyLoad@webtv.net wrote in message
news:<8378-3C09A053-90@storefull-112.iap.bryant.webtv.net>...
> >> Comanche Warrior 10 meter base station radio for sale. 450 channels in
> >> Am, Fm, Usb & Lsb modes. Unit is stock other than frequency expansion.
> >> Condition is a 10 electronically & aesthetically. Best deal you will
> >> find on the net! Less than a year old and used less than 2 hours. Bought
> >> 2 of them on sale and never used this one. Sell for $100. Buyer pays
> >> shipping.
> >
> >CHANNELS???
> >
> >FREQENCY EXPANSION???
> >
> >CBERS WHO SELL/BUY/USE "10 METER RADIOS" ARE GETTING HUNTED DOWN LIKE
> >DOGS WHEN THEY SHOW THEIR FACES OUTSIDE OF
> >REC.RADIO.CB.............!!!
>
> Did it occur to you that if any of the expanded frequencies are in the
> legitimate ham bands, a licensed amateur could buy the rig and use it
> perfectly legally on those frequencies?
>
> It was only posted in rec.radio.swap until you added rec.radio.cb to
> the group list. Last I checked there were lots of hams in there
> swapping rigs. Besides, it was listed as "10 Meter Base Station," not
> "CB base station."
>
>
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

joe , these radio lawyers have been trying their best to as they put
it , 'clean up rec.radio.cb ' for about a year and a half...their best
efforts have fell on hard times.....so this cross posting, would
appear as some cheap back door attempt to recruit unwilling allies in
their pursuit of the holy grail of hard core tech class ham radio

operators, a clean and sacrosanct 11 meter band, that meets with their undying approval....and of course no radio operating at over 4 watts pep.....too.....we respect their ideas and their wishes and have told them such......but alas they continue infinitum.....perhaps you guys could come get them , would you please.?????

3124. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 20:20:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0BDDAF.6C3426F5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26122

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > At 6'3" and 205, I am about ten pounds overweight. That makes you
> > > > > about 45 pounds overweight. Sounds rolypoly to me.
> > > >
> > > > You'd probably say the same thing to Jerome Bettis.
> > >
> > > Are you trying to tell us that you are a professional athlete?
> >
> > Is that what I typed?
>
> You compared yourself directly to a professional athlete. What else
> can I infer from that?

You aren't all that bright after all, are you? There aren't many 52
year old professional football players. Infer what you like.

Dave K8MN
```

3125. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 20:53:15 UTC
From: David Little <dalite01@sprynet.com>
Message-ID: <9ugl7qtnn1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 26120
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

My, My, Things have changes since I worked weak signal, meteor scatter and satellites on 2m SSB. 50% CW???? Are we talking overseas or in the USA? If in the USA, are they trying to further complicate things by transmitting micro-qrp (under 100 mW). Have this 50% ever thought of trying it with an antenna connected so the rest of us may know they are out there?

There is a portion of the band that is reserved under ARRL gentleman's agreement for CW and non-voice modes..... However PSK31 and other emerging digital modes are far more efficient and occupy minuscule portions of spectrum to allow multiple QSOs to take place in the bandwidth of one CW QSO.

Out of the long distance work I did on 2m phone, maybe 2% was Aurora. Where are you getting your guesses from. I wasn't born knowing code, but I also didn't have to shoe a horse at the State Patrol office in order to get a driver's license..... There is a place in history for the CW Forever crowd; as the group that destroyed the future of Ham Radio for all future generations by stifling it's growth and development by keeping the sharper minds away with the CW requirement.

Instead of think of the group as No-Codes, I prefer to use the term No-Lids........

Bang that one on your SPST Momentary Contact binary oscillator.....

David Little
KD4NUE

"AL GOSS" <renal@localnet.com> wrote in message news:3C0B99F3.4AB3C59B@localnet.com...
> Who told you CODELESS band!!! Codeless band is FRS band. About 50% of the
> QSO's taking place are CW mode, some long haul ansd 99% AURORA. Get with
> it....learn it...you weren't born knowing how to operate a PC. I "think" you
> had to learn and learn ---you did, because "you wanted to ". The BEST
> DISTANCE will be via morse code. 90% of "real" DX on 6 meters and upper bands
> is via CW mode. It's only a few didgits...like your PC uses at FAST speed.
> Now ya see ---I was raised on CW I had to learn PC, wasn't born to it.
> de "ol' fart" , I guess, per no-codes in most circles AL, K2ERG

3126. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 21:04:49 UTC
From: W0MN <gbaron@mailandnews.com>
Message-ID: <u0nq7i5g3ib461@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 26123
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote
in message news:d9f7b76c.0112031204.36cb722e@posting.google.com...
> "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:<46081FE54FC5F612.705179977824D282.D8827BF31450DCFB@lp.airnews.net>
...
> > On 3 Dec 2001 01:17:46 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
> > (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:
> >
> > >DummyLoad@webtv.net wrote in message
news:<8378-3C09A053-90@storefull-112.iap.bryant.webtv.net>...
> > >> Comanche Warrior 10 meter base station radio for sale. 450
channels in
> > >> Am, Fm, Usb & Lsb modes. Unit is stock other than frequency
expansion.
> > >> Condition is a 10 electronically & aesthetically. Best deal you
will
> > >> find on the net! Less than a year old and used less than 2 hours.
Bought
> > >> 2 of them on sale and never used this one. Sell for $100. Buyer
pays
> > >> shipping.
> > >
> > >CHANNELS???
> > >
> > >FREQENCY EXPANSION???
> > >
> > >CBERS WHO SELL/BUY/USE "10 METER RADIOS" ARE GETTING HUNTED DOWN
LIKE
> > >DOGS WHEN THEY SHOW THEIR FACES OUTSIDE OF
> > >REC.RADIO.CB.............!!!
> >
> > Did it occur to you that if any of the expanded frequencies are in
the
> > legitimate ham bands, a licensed amateur could buy the rig and use
it
> > perfectly legally on those frequencies?
> >

In the US you cannot use a Ham Radio in the CB bands nor a CB radio in
the ham bands because they are not type accepted. At least the vast
majority are not.

> > It was only posted in rec.radio.swap until you added rec.radio.cb to
> > the group list. Last I checked there were lots of hams in there

> > swapping rigs. Besides, it was listed as "10 Meter Base Station,"
not
> > "CB base station."
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> > kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
>
>
> joe , these radio lawyers have been trying their best to as they put
> it , 'clean up rec.radio.cb ' for about a year and a half...their best
> efforts have fell on hard times.......so this cross posting, would
> appear as some cheap back door attempt to recruit unwilling allies in
> their pursuit of the holy grail of hard core tech class ham radio
> operators, a clean and sacrosanct 11 meter band, that meets with their
> undying approval....and of course no radio operating at over 4 watts
> pep.....too.....we respect their ideas and their wishes and
> have told them such......but alas they continue infinitum.....perhaps
> you guys could come get them , would you please.?????

3127. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 21:10:57 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <BTRO7.79980$z8.11980755@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 26124
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"W0MN" <gbaron@mailandnews.com> wrote in message
news:u0nq7i5g3ib461@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote
> in message news:d9f7b76c.0112031204.36cb722e@posting.google.com...
> > "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
> news:<46081FE54FC5F612.705179977824D282.D8827BF31450DCFB@lp.airnews.net>
> ...
> > > On 3 Dec 2001 01:17:46 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
> > > (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:
> > >
> > > >DummyLoad@webtv.net wrote in message
> news:<8378-3C09A053-90@storefull-112.iap.bryant.webtv.net>...
> > > >> Comanche Warrior 10 meter base station radio for sale. 450
> channels in
> > > >> Am, Fm, Usb & Lsb modes. Unit is stock other than frequency
> expansion.
> > > >> Condition is a 10 electronically & aesthetically. Best deal you
> will
> > > >> find on the net! Less than a year old and used less than 2 hours.
> Bought
> > > >> 2 of them on sale and never used this one. Sell for $100. Buyer
> pays
> > > >> shipping.
> > > >
> > > >CHANNELS???
> > > >
> > > >FREQENCY EXPANSION???
> > > >
> > > >CBERS WHO SELL/BUY/USE "10 METER RADIOS" ARE GETTING HUNTED DOWN
> LIKE
> > > >DOGS WHEN THEY SHOW THEIR FACES OUTSIDE OF
> > > >REC.RADIO.CB.............!!!
> > >
> > > Did it occur to you that if any of the expanded frequencies are in
> the
> > > legitimate ham bands, a licensed amateur could buy the rig and use
> it
> > > perfectly legally on those frequencies?
> > >
>
> In the US you cannot use a Ham Radio in the CB bands nor a CB radio in
> the ham bands because they are not type accepted.

Please learn to use proper English and logic. One MAY not use ....I certainly CAN but I probably shouldn't.
The sign on the side of the road says I may go 65 MPH although the Ferrari 365 will do just over 150 MPH

Train

3128. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 21:19:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112031319.38e8197e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26125
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"QRQ" <nospam@hot.rr.com> wrote in message
news:<tpDO7.9103$oz4.275022@typhoon.austin.rr.com>...
> > Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> > those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> > haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying
> to
> > tell me. Help me!
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
>
> Leland, you're not codeless, you're clueless.
>
>
He's both.
>
>
w3rv

3129. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 21:53:13 UTC
From: ZOOM <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <nvSO7.5077$V12.979262@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 26126
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Perhaps Amateur radio is not for you!
-... -.-- .

"Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:e02358f67ea6c52f7c42ba0f221dc153.47899@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying
to
> tell me. Help me!
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "
>
>
> --
> Posted from surfola.com [208.184.25.39]
> via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3130. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 22:15:22 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u0nu95oealqna4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 26127
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

A long time ago in a galaxy far, far away, an
evil legacy long believed dead is stirring....

darth vader responds:

> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> those confounded beeps!

"I find your lack of faith disturbing." (according to the ARRL the whole 2M
can do CW).

> I hate them.

"If you only knew the power, of the dark side." (1500 Watts PEP?)

> I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its haunting me because

"I have you now!" (great... all that jedi school tuition down the drain.)

> I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to tell me. Help me!

"Join us, or die." (of course death might be preferable to those damn beeps
:p)

phil :)

3131. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 22:22:44 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ugtt909ve@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26128
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message
news:9uel28$bm8$1@news.hawaii.edu...

> Krell: "CQ" and "73" and other prosigns originated on the landline
> telegraph and carried over to wireless telegraphy, yet they're both
> welcome and used on phone; if you had HF privileges you yourself
> would even be using them on phone, yet no one would dare call you an
> idiot for saying them.

So what's that have to do with use of "HI HI" that's spoken or used in
print? (unless the printed matter is a morse transcription) What's wrong
with actually laughing at something?

> Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."
> Post your reply to the NG; we're all waiting...
>
> 73, Jeff KH6O

What do you mean "we're" waiting? You and who else? Did you take a poll?

3132. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 22:27:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ugu650ada@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26129

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011203071635.20950.00000960@nso-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3c0aefcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >The Pentagon is built in the shape of a pentagram.
>
> No, it's in the shape of a pentagon, which is a regular polygon with 5
sides.
> (regular polygons have all sides the same length and all angles the same).
>
> A pentagram is a 5 pointed star inscribed in a pentagon.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

No. A five pointed star is a pentagon with the lines of each side extended
to the intersecting points. A pentagram is a five pointed star inscribed
within a circle.

3133. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:04:40 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <cyTO7.280864$5A3.109683398@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26130
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

There are new people reading this group daily perhaps they would have missd it, why do you a Extra class Ham worry about what is posted in rec.radio.cb and not any of the amateur groups? Just a little curious.

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:3C0B959F.9A960A51@spam.me.not...
> Ok... now this is the third time this has been posted to rec.radio.cb...
>
> Think we could stop plastering the newsgroup? It's been discussed,
> argued, stirred up, and beaten to death already... Could we just stop
> it?
>
> de AB8LR
>
> -SSB
>
> N9NWO wrote:
>
> <Another repetitive, annoying, troll-like post, snipped for your
> protection>

3134. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:19 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <61D2CC1B61B6AE69.8E5AE0CD29100FA8.A609C01956D9931B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26131

On 03 Dec 2001 04:49:54 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Perhaps it is *not* seeing the harm in Kim's call sign which requires
>a dirty mind!

That one was _really_ weak, Larry. I count on you for a more
intelligent response than that.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3135. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:19 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <690C6F96FADBF3B4.032536217F773272.1A57AC7280CD7877@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26132

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 19:38:55 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Nope, you're wrong, Rick. Libertarians are for laws prohibiting
>force or threat of force in human relationships. We are for armed
>forces to protect us from foreign criminals, police to protect us
>from domestic criminals, and a court system to administer the law.

But who pays for them?

From what I've read of the Libertarian platform, many of these essential services are to be paid for on a "subscription" type of basis, that is you either "subscribe" to, for example, police services or you pay a higher fee on a per-incident basis. But who is going to cover the cost of those who can't or won't pay for those services? For example, houses A, B, and C are in a row. The owners of house A and C are subscribers to the fire service--B is not. House C catches fire and it appears that the fire will spread to house B unless it is prevented from doing so, and from there to A (A & B are very close together). A, of course, demands that the fire service protect his house, since he is paying for that service. C as well expects the fire service to extinguish the blaze at his home. Now assume B does NOT want to pay for fire services for his home (it's run down and he plans to rebuild from scratch, anyway--and sees no reason to pay to protect a building he intends to tear down).

What does the "subscription" fire service do? If they do NOT prevent the fire from reaching B's home they cannot prevent it from reaching A's home, and thus they default on their contract because they COULD have prevented it. If, on the other hand, they DO prevent it from reaching B's home, B is under no obligation to pay for the service, as he has specifically rejected the service and under Libertarian policy forcing to accede to, and pay for, it would cause him harm.

Given that the Libertarian policy will have already reduced taxes to a minimal level, who will pay for the fire services for B?

Sounds silly, but extend that to the hundreds of thousands of incidents in all public service areas that take place each day and you begin to see the scope of the problem.

I believe the Libertarians have a number of good ideas, but I likewise believe that their economic policy is totally unworkable in the real world rather than a theoretical one, as were the theoretically ideal economic policies of the Soviet Union.

>For instance, most Libertarians believe in the death penalty for
>murder.

Which, of course, I happen to oppose.

Research indicates that up to 10% of the people on death row
did NOT commit the offense for which they were convicted. Given that
the Libertarian philosophy stresses individual responsibility for any
act, who will be held responsible for homicide if it is learned later
that an innocent person was put to death (as has happened more than
once in recent years)? The Judge who sentenced him? The Prosecutor who
asked for the death penalty? The Juror's who awarded the death
penalty? If Libertarian law is to be consistent with Libertarian
philosophy (and if it isn't it has no value at all) by necessity
someone must take ultimate responsibility for the murder of an
innocent person at the hands of the state--which means that person
should receive the death penalty as well.

It DOES lead to some rather convoluted problems when coupled
with the Libertarian philosophy, doesn't it?

>Libertarians do believe that just as there is separation of religion
>and state, that there should be separation of economics and state.

If by economics you mean business, I agree to an extent but
not to the extent of the Libertarian party. One of the keystones of
our difference is in the area of protecting the worker and the
environment. By separating the two completely, business becomes able
to pollute with impunity and to set wages at ridiculously low levels
in depressed areas (obviously market considerations prevent that in
labor poor markets, but not in labor rich depressed ones like much of
the rural South). The end result is a more polluted environment and
often underpaid or overworked labor. Those, to me, aren't desirable
outcomes.

I DO believe in a free market economy--no tariffs (unless the
other nation imposes them on us), no import duties, no price supports
(including agricultural supports--but because under the Libertarians
hemp would be a legal cash crop anyway [as the Farm Bureau has been
asking for years] and the additional revenue it would generate [you
can produce over 40,000 different items from hemp--including a fuel
oil capable of fueling motor vehicles designed for its use] so
agricultural supports wouldn't be as necessary for the small farmer).

My strongest conflict with the Libertarian party, however,
comes in the area of social programs. Obviously our social programs
are broken here in the US--they neither serve the needs of the poor
nor do they reduce poverty and unemployment by their approach). But
it's one thing to overhaul the system and make it work (assuming we
can ever get quality enough political representatives to be willing to
put the needs of the country ahead of the needs of their districts and
spend on change instead of pork barrel projects, of course), it's
another thing altogether to eliminate the programs with no suitable

replacement. For one thing, given the increasing cost of health care and the trend toward contract employment instead of regular employment with benefits, we need some form of universal health care system. Not the British model with state-sponsored physicians, etc. (which stifles specialization and research), but rather one of a universal insurance card, issued by the government and paid for with taxes (the savings on health care costs to the average American would definitely offset the tax bite, given the economies of scale possible in insuring the entire population). Even applying a Libertarian approach and having the government put the insurance out for bids to the insurance company willing to cover an extensive list of medical costs (perhaps the famous--and successful--Oregon list) at the lowest cost to the government for a three-five year contract period wouldn't convince the Libertarian party to back universal health care, since it goes against the principle of separation of government and economics.

>Most people don't realize that it took the Federal Reserve 15 years
>to engineer the crash and depression of 1929.

That's a bit extreme, Cecil. Certainly the Fed was primarily responsible for the crash & depression, but to accuse them of deliberately causing it (as "engineer" suggests) is a bit more than history can support.

The Libertarian party has a lot to commend it--but if it is to appeal to a wide enough range of voters to gain real power in government it's going to have to change some of its policies to recognize that a VERY large percentage of those who believe in personal freedom (and thus find the party attractive) also believe in social programs and won't vote a party line that doesn't support that area as well.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3136. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DD14892AF9B1A454.88907C17D0FA58E9.AAA8633DAF64AECB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26133

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 08:56:02 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Shows how little you know about Libertarian principles, Dwight. In a
>nutshell, Libertarians are social liberals and *economic conservatives*.
>Libertarians would phase out redistribution of wealth by the federal
>government. They would phase in a privatization of social security
>and over a number of years, completely eliminate the present welfare
>system along with the Dept. of Education and Welfare. Eliminating
>transfer payments (redistribution of wealth) would allow a large
>reduction in federal taxes, thus allowing more disposable income
>to go to charitable causes. Libertarians would be more inclined
>to charge fees for governmental services than to finance such
>through taxes. Libertarians are vehemently against using the
>federal welfare system to finance the breeding of more welfare
>recipients. Libertarians basically believe that if welfare
>cannot be implemented through private voluntary enterprises, e.g.
>charities/churches/etc. then it doesn't deserve to exist. Is that
>conservative enough for you?

Unfortunately, it's _too_ conservative for the majority of the
people who might otherwise support the Libertarian party.

It sounds nice, Cecil, but what it really says is that the
poor can go p--- up a rope! The Libertarian party paints a nice
picture of charities/churches taking up the enormous slack that will
result from the elimination of transfer payments (which, bear in mind,
do not consist ONLY of welfare but of unemployment compensation, SSI,
etc. as well), but in practice it isn't going to happen. Here's why:

Private charities: Right now there's an enormous tax advantage
to donating money to charities. Under the Libertarian system, because
taxes would be significantly less so would the incentive to donate
money (and if you claim that people would do so out of the goodness of
their hearts you are taking a VERY strong leftist perspective on the
issue--and an unrealistic one, given the nature of our population).
Charities that DID exist would concentrate on providing for those they
felt most "worthy," probably those who would, today, have qualified
for unemployment or SSI followed by women with preschool children. As
far as the majority of the people in the US who needed aid however
(for example, right now one out of every 12 Americans receives some
form of help--mostly food stamps which go not just to the welfare
recipient but to the person whose income simply can't feed his
family), there simply wouldn't be the funding to help them.

Churches: Two problems here; (1) By counting on churches to take up the slack, the Libertarian Party is essentially violating its own principles of separation of church and state and making the government dependent on organized religion--which in turn makes the politicians indebted to the churches and thus influenced by them and; (2) there would be no way to insure that the churches didn't use the power it would give them to proselytize new members by giving preferential treatment to their own members (logical, if not terribly helpful to non-members) or requiring (as do many missions today) attendance at religious activities to receive aid.

Clearly, neither of these solutions is a sound one--and when the question of health care is added to it, they become insurmountable.

Another area of concern is, of course, education. As poor as public education is in the US today, at least it provides SOME form of universal education. Under a privatized system schooling would be strictly private (a potentially good thing) but, again, the poor would suffer in that their children would not be able to afford a school and would have to go to a charity school--which, given limited funds and no tax incentives worth pursuing by the schools, would probably mean a Christian schools where, again, religious requirements would be present and thus force the parent to decide between an uneducated child and one who was required to learn a religion they may not practice themselves. As a result, poor children would either have to relinquish their religious rights or would have an inferior (or no) education and thus perpetuate the culture of poverty rather than breaking the chain.

The party has some good ideas, Cecil. And it certainly doesn't have to become "middle of the road" as the Republicrats have done. But until it decides to take a hard look at social support programs it will never attract enough members to make an attack on the major parties truly possible on a national scale.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3137. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1288960686891313.55A5F7EDCCAAD332.869A90DDC7A020E9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26134

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 01:07:55 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I never take advice on psychology from a retired electrical engineer.

How about from a clinical psychologist/psychology professor?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3138. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:21 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E23D6B794AEF2E76.1CA9919608E24B47.5B1689F1EC154B16@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26135

On 03 Dec 2001 04:49:54 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Exactly. I'm sure that divorce statistics pre- and post-WWII reflect
>the impact of the rise in the predominance of women in the workplace.

Let's see:

You want your woman to stay away from even innocent meetings
with other men.

You want your woman to stay out of the work place.

Hmmm . . .

Barefoot & Pregnant, huh?

Larry, you really ARE living in the past--and you're
forgetting all the bad parts of that era as well.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3139. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:21 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A846A958E039AA2F.5F30A736302F9528.02327DD5ECFE6DF7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26136

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 04:08:01 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> No, it's an argument against total, blind, trust. And there is
>nothing "repressive" about maintaining certain standards in a
>relationship. My wife (who, at various times of her life, has been a
>Sergeant assigned to an Army Air Assault unit, an aid to the Deputy
>Chief of Staff for Operations in Europe, a college student, a
>stripper, and so much more - these few selected to show a range of
>freedom of choice in her life) will flat tell you she is certainly not
>repressed. Nor have I ever felt repressed in our relationship.
>However, in spite of the diversity of our experiences, there has never
>been a moment in our relationship where there has been unbridled
>freedom to do whatever we wanted with members of the opposite sex. Not
>because one said to the other you can't do that. But because we each
>respect the other enough to not give the other reason to lose trust.

Let me be sure I understand what you just stated.

According to that, you do NOT have absolute freedom in your
relationship because to have that would risk losing trust, which you
state should not be given blindly anyway.

Is that supposed to make sense?

Dwight, very freedom TO make your own decisions in such
circumstances _knowing_ that your partner will support and accept
those decisions instills complete mutual trust--it doesn't abrogate
it! How can you claim to trust someone yet tell them their choices
must be limited to those you feel comfortable with so you can continue
to trust them? Isn't that a complete contradiction?

Bear in mind I am NOT suggesting that couples should act on
such freedom--that becomes a choice made by each individual couple
based on their unique needs and values--only that unless two people
respect each other enough to allow each other complete personal
freedom and the right to MAKE such decisions w/o fear of censure or
loss of the relationship, the relationship has barriers to trust and
complete openness. I don't have any interest in pursuing other
women--but if my wife were to take the position that I _couldn't_ have
outside relationships not only would I feel that she was violating my
freedom of choice but that she was demonstrating a lack of trust in
me. And, of course, precisely the same would apply in her case as
well.

>> (snip) Cheating isn't about opportunity--
>> it's about integrity.

> Cheating cannot possibly start without opportunity - the integrity
>comes from not seeking the opportunity.

No, Dwight. The integrity comes from not taking advantage of
the opportunity w/o the prior knowledge and consent of your partner.

>> There's nothing wrong with having sex outside
>> your marriage (snip)

> Well, that pretty much sums up the difference between us, because I
>flatly disagree. In this age of AIDS, venereal diseases, screwed up
>marriages, screwed up kids living in broken homes, screwed up lives
>from illicit sex, only a totally self-centered puppy would mess around
>outside his marriage.

Take a look at the statistics, Dwight. The majority of men in
the United States HAVE done just that at least once during their
marriage, and in many cases on a regular basis (and the numbers aren't
that much lower for women, either). By doing so behind their spouses
backs they are not only betraying their trust but they are not
allowing them to make the same choices they, themselves, have made.

STDs are, in a sense, a reason for such relationships TO be
open and above board. If a spouse is going to have an outside
relationship, isn't it better that they share the knowledge, discuss
the risks, and agree together what steps they will take to insure that
their partner is not infected by them? I know quite a number of
swingers and poly groups--and ALL of them take far more care not to be
infected with an STD than does the typical single on a date--or
married individual cheating on a spouse. The openness permits
communications between the partners on this, and other, important
issues.

Finally, your straw dogs.

Kids: Which has the greatest likelihood of breaking up, a
marriage where one of the partners is cheating on the other or a
marriage where both partners are open and honest about their outside
actions, and in fact participate as a couple, not as individuals (most
swingers interact ONLY as a couple WITH other couples). In the first
case, the odds of a marriage breaking up are very high. In the latter,
extremely low (the divorce rate among couples who are part of the
swinging lifestyle is less than one-third that of the population as a
whole).

Screwed up lives from illicit sex: Outside of relationships
that fail because one partner is cheating on the other (the exact
opposite of the kind of freedom we're discussing), I think you'd have
a lot of trouble identifying lives that were "screwed up from illicit
sex." Care to cite examples of what you're referring to in this
context? Certainly it can't be the lives of the swingers, since

they're a pretty solid and conservative group (yes, I DID say conservative--most swingers are Republicans and Upper Middle Class in income) with very stable home lives. But who does that leave? Their kids? They seldom know about their parents interests (do you discuss your sexual practices with YOUR kids? Neither do most swingers). All they DO know is that their parents spend a lot of time together with friends (a positive image) and often go out of town for the night together (again, a positive image of a couple sharing things together). They also know that their parents DO care for each other, and for them, and that they live in a two-parent household where many of their friends live in one parent households. Don't sound "screwed up" to me.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3140. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:21 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2A44FE41546E8D59.64ADD089F3E34EFA.CE4E0BBC5BE67429@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26139

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 02:00:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Your thinking is so skewed that any person or group disagreeing with you
>is somehow close-minded.

No, any person or group that seeks to limit behavior to only
those activities they, themselves, approve of is close-minded--BY
DEFINITION.

>> You were speaking about parents allowing their kids to get a
>> tattoo or piercing, not about kids doing so in their rooms. Precisely
>> how is THAT the parent's fault--they didn't install spy cameras in the
>> bathrooms and bedrooms?
>
>Not really. My initial comment was simply that we could wait until they
>were older and they'd mutilate themselves. It was in response to
>statements about child circumcision. You began this particular tangent.

With respect to the circumcision issue, I watched a rather
interesting documentary on The Learning Channel last night. It
addressed the relationship between male circumcision and AIDS--and
after a large number of research projects have been conducted, they've
learned that an uncircumcised man has EIGHT TIMES the chance of being
infected with AIDS from heterosexual intercourse that a circum sized
man has. In fact, one of the reasons that heterosexual AIDS hasn't
become anywhere as widespread in the USA as it was feared it would may
be do to the simple fact that a higher percentage of American men are
circum sized than is true of most nations--Africa (which AIDS is far
more widespread than here) in particular. Thus there IS a solid and
medically sound reason for circumcision--protection from disease (they
are finding that other diseases can likewise be transmitted more
easily to uncircumcised men than to circumcised ones as well).

>> I repeat--fake I.D. or not, no shop would risk the lawsuit
>> that would result from providing those services to a younger teen w/o
>> the parent's consent. And as far as older teens go--if the law says
>> they are old enough to try as adults (which, in most states, it does),
>> that they are old enough to make decisions about sexual activities,
>> and that they are old enough to quit school, don't you think they are
>> likewise old enough to make decisions about body ornamentation?
>
>There's some sound logic for you. "If they are old enough to quite
>school..."

Yes, as a matter of fact it is.

You are the one claiming "Community values." Well, one of
those values is the age at which a person is defined as old enough to
make his or her own decision about school attendance. Since it is
completely ridiculous to view the act of getting a tattoo or a
piercing as being anything close to as serious a life choice as
quitting school, it's pretty reasonable to state that if the community
considers a person old enough to make this decision (as well as those
about sexual activity, etc.), that same person is certainly old enough
to make a decision about a tattoo or piercing as well.

>> >I've learned a lot from the above. Your first reaction is to think
>> >about prosecution or a suit rather than dealing with your kid's
>> >misdeeds.
>>
>> What makes you think I would REGARD them as "misdeeds?"
>
>Because what he did would have been illegal. Don't you think you might
>bring that up?

Sorry, Dave, but I don't regard a community definition of what
is legal as grounds to define something PERSONALLY as a "misdeed."
Misdeeds, to me, are actions I would personally oppose--not ones
someone else says are wrong. That's the biggest difference between us;
you are content to allow others to define right and wrong for you, I
insist on making my own definitions based on my personal values. I may
have to OBEY the law, but that doesn't mean I have to agree with it or
regard those who do NOT obey it as wrong.

>> >Document it yourself. I'm taking no homework assignments today, Prof.
>> >You asked what I thouhgt and I told you.
>>
>> Let me get this straight.
>>
>> You claim that many early teens are getting tattoos and
>> piercings w/o their parent's consent and when I ask you for sources to
>> confirm that absurd claim you tell me to document it myself?
>>
>> I'll just assume that it's nonsense instead--if you had any
>> evidence to support your ridiculous claims you would cite it.
>
>Let's DO get it straight. You asked me if I thought many kids were
>getting piercings or tattoos without consent. I said , "yes".
>I'm not going to write you a term paper.

Too bad. I'd like to compare it to those I received from the
first year students in one of my classes to see how far you needed to
progress before you could discuss a subject objectively instead of
from a biased perspective.

>> >No. They don't have those rights until they reach their majority by
>> >which time it is hoped that they'll have developed enough common sense
>> >to avoid something which could become a lifelong regret for them.
>>

>> Or a lifelong pleasure--haven't you ever met people with
>> tattoos or piercings who were glad they had them?
>
>Not many. My wife's older sister got some in her teens and later had
>them removed. It caused some scarring. A number of old WWII vets have
>told me that they wished they had never gotten tattoos.

And in both cases you cite the people got their tattoos after
becoming adults. So much for the concept that if they are forbidden as
youths they will mature and not do so later.

>> To me, if a person is old enough to die for his country, he's
>> old enough to portray that patriotism (or anything else, for that
>> matter) on his skin.
>
>You tell 'em Rick. If one is old enough to die, he is old enough to do
>something else silly. People like you are often people who say, "People
>like you...".

I would have to regard dying for political or economic
interests a trifle sillier than getting a tattoo, wouldn't you?

And I stand by my statement--if a person is old enough to make
the choice to enlist in the military and potentially die for his or
her nation, that person is old enough to make a decision as to rather
he or she wants a tattoo as well. Anything else is just plain absurd.

>> >We do that because they ARE children. They have not yet matured. Such
>> >is the natural order of things. They act like children because they are
>> >children. I don't wonder about that at all.
>>
>> Perhaps you should.
>
>Perhaps I shouldn't.

Probably not. You'd get it wrong, anyway.

>> What's my point? Simply because the law DEFINES someone as a
>> child, does NOT mean they will behave immaturely or make childish
>> decisions. The chances are very high that at least one of your great
>> grandparents (if not more) had given birth to your grandparent before
>> they were 16 years of age. Are you willing to argue that a person who
>> is old enough to raise a family isn't old enough to make a decision
>> about body decoration, or were your great grandparents child
>> molesters?
>
>Sorry, the house pays 18. You lose. None of my great-grandparents had
>a child at 16 or earlier.

Married as old maids, huh?

>> >Check out Hamilton County. You'll find your proof there in the
>> >existence of such laws. Let me know what you find out.

>>
>> Why?
>>
>> A few religious zealots managed to create repressive laws and
>> you use THAT as justification for community values?
>
>No use trying to reason with (smirk) sound facts like those.

Show me facts that demonstrate that Hamilton County has values
that I _should_ respect--or that are based on logic instead of
religious zealotry and I might have a different view.

>> Dave, there is a small town in Georgia (population is under
>> 2500) that passed an ordinance against the sales or rentals of any
>> movie rated higher than PG (i.e., PG-13, R, NC-17, etc.). One of the
>> residents had a satellite receiver and paid a subscription rate to
>> receive and descramble the Tuxedo Network (which shows adult shows and
>> soft core adult films). When the local prosecutor (who was a neighbor)
>> learned about it, he filed criminal charges against the Tuxedo network
>> (headquartered and broadcasting in NYC, btw, where such shows are
>> considered perfectly acceptable by the "community values")--and he
>> WON! It was ruled that the Tuxedo network had violated the law in that
>> community by delivering content ruled "unacceptable" by the community
>> values of that town in violation of its laws.
>
>Gee, I think I see how they won.

Really?

How?

By proving that a firm outside their jurisdiction cannot do
business with a citizen in their jurisdiction w/o being prosecuted for
actions that are legal everywhere else? They didn't prosecute the
person who RECEIVED the shows, Dave (that would have rather quickly
overturned the law and they knew it), they prosecuted the network for
delivering them.

By that standard, every network has an obligation to confirm
with every local government, regardless of how small that government
is, that their service is permitted in that jurisdiction. Not only is
that absurd but it leaves itself open to some pretty strong political
influence on the network content ("Y'all best support the mayor fer
re-election or we're gonna be lookin' at settin' some new limits on
what y'all can send to this here county!"). Of course, they could seek
out ways to block delivery to subscribers in such areas, but the cost
would be so high that all satellite services would be priced out of
the market unless they chose the path of least resistance and limited
their programming to "G-Rated" shows only. Maybe YOU want to be
limited to a Disney image of reality, but most people don't.

>> The case is currently on its way to the SC. If the decision is
>> upheld there, you will see a considerable change in television
>> programming--the Networks (public and subscription such as HBO, etc.)
>> will be forced to limit their broadcasts to movies acceptable anywhere
>> in the USA--and there's at least ONE town (in Texas) where the limit
>> is "G" rated!
>
>You mean there is hope that the networks will be cleaned up?

Don't like em? Vote with your feet, stupid. Don't watch em.

We watch precisely ONE network show regularly
(Enterprise--we're confirmed trekkies) and will watch the Olympic
events on network tv as well--in both cases only because the
programming isn't available elsewhere. Outside of that, we watch the
History Channel, History International, TLC, Discovery, Discovery
Health, CNN, and similar stations--with occasional movies on the
premium networks such as HBO and Showtime. If you don't care for the
content of network television (we don't) then do the same thing--or
just turn it off. What you--and your "community values" do NOT have
the right to do, however, is to attempt to censor the programming that
is of interest to others. You have an on/off switch. Use it.

>> Do you REALLY think that a community has the right to limit
>> our entertainment to Disney movies? More to the point, do you
>> sincerely believe that the community has the right to limit the nature
>> of entertainment we view in the privacy of our homes at all?
>
>Do you really think that the only good entertainment contains
>gratuitious sex, violence and the so-called "adult" language?

That isn't the point. The point is that you are unwilling to
allow others to MAKE that choice for themselves!

>> In Cincinnati, your favorite city to cite, the curator of the
>> museum of art was prosecuted for presenting an exhibition of art that
>> no one even attempted to claim was not legitimately of artistic merit,
>> and which would have lent prestige to the Cincinnati museum. The art,
>> however, included images that violated Cincinnati's intrusive
>> "Community Values" and the curator was convicted. To me, that's
>> completely reprehensible behavior and no one with a shred of respect
>> for the Constitution of the United States would even consider a
>> community where such a travesty of law occurred to be worthy of any
>> respect whatever--let alone a suitable place to cite as an example of
>> "community values."
>
>Maplethorpe as I recall. There's lots more to it than you've outlined.
>Wonder why that conviction was never overturned?

Because it wasn't appealed by the Cincinnati Museum due to
opposition by the city counsel.

You're correct that it was Mapplethorpe. So what? It was a valid exhibit of art. The museum director made it very clear that children would not be permitted to view the works considered to be sexual in nature (it might burst your bubble to know it, but Maplethorpe created a great many images that were NOT sexually oriented) under any circumstances, and that only inoffensive images would be used in the promotion of the showing (which would clearly indicate that many of the contents contained troubling sexual images). If you can find the slightest legitimacy in a community preventing the showing of legitimate art in a legitimate art museum simply because some members find the material depicted offensive, I'd like to know what it is.

Freedom of Speech isn't about permitting only innocuous speech, Dave, you don't need a Constitutional protection for that. It's about permitting speech that is controversial, challenging, unpopular and, yes, offensive to many--because ONLY when that kind of speech is permitted can Americans exercise their right to protest or to criticize government. You don't have to respect someone's speech (and art IS a form of speech--the SC has ruled on that several times) to support its right to exist--you only need to respect the Constitution of the United States to do so. Clearly, the people of Cincinnati don't respect our Constitution to the degree they respect the views of a few religious fanatics such as Donald Wildmon of the AFA. Don't expect any intelligent and fair minded person to accept a community like that as a "good example" of community values.

>> >I brought up ways that group values can limit individual values.
>> >I don't care if an individual is pierced in Poughkeepsie and moves to
>> >Cuyahoga Falls. You can work out the details later.
>>
>> Correction. You brought up ways that groups values can limit
>> individual rights and freedom of choice, not ways they can limit
>> values.
>
>Correction accepted.
>
>> Sorry, but to me that smacks way too much of fascism and
>> censorship.
>
>...and your view strikes me as being hedonism unchained.

Freedom of choice==hedonism to you?

Dave, there is simply no way you can justify that view rationally (you can do so by recourse to your "moral values" but then the rationale only applies to you, not to the rest of the world).

>> Incidently, have you noticed that there are groups in
>> Cincinnati right now working to ban both the "Harry Potter" movie and
>> series of books because they feel they violate "Community Values?"
>>
>> I'll bet you're proud of your old community in it's fight

>> against children's literature, aren't you?
>
>I'll bet I don't know a thing about it.

You do now. Apparently, the concept that Harry Potter is a
sorcerer is so offensive to the Christians in the community (or at
least to those religious leaders they allow to do their thinking for
them) that they see no reason children should be exposed to the books
or movie--it might convince the children to waiver from Christianity!

Give me a break!

>> There are places with laws on the books that restrict the
>> rights of minority members, too (try Kuwait or Iran). That doesn't
>> mean I have to either respect those places (and laws) or that the fact
>> they exist makes them any less offensive to a free society.
>
>We're not in Kuwait or Iran. Take your issues up with the respective
>governments.

So we're not Kuwait or Iran. Does that make us perfect?

>> I think ANY restriction that can't be shown to prevent harm
>> and that circumvents the role of the family in deciding a child's
>> manner of dress is wrong.
>>
>> Don't you?
>
>Only to a point. I don't think kids should wear clothing (i.e. T-shits)
>with any religious or political statements on them.

Including Christian ones? If you support that perspective,
I'll agree with you. But if ONE religion is permitted to be
represented, all should receive equal treatment.

>> Show me where "Hamilton County" has stated that community
>> standards are NOT ways to suppress speech. Otherwise, you can't claim
>> they "disagree with me."
>
>The onus is on you to prove that Hamilton County has restricted free
>speech. Maybe you'd like to try a court challenge.

No it isn't.

You cited Hamilton County. You prove or disprove your claims..

>> How about citing the United States Constitution instead of the
>> views of a few religious zealots in the bible-belt, Dave? Or are those
>> zealots the only support you can find for your absurd claims?
>
>Please explain why the courts have not overturned the laws in those
>communities.

Two reasons:

1. The SC established the "community standards" doctrine in
dealing with obscenity laws and it's pretty difficult to define what
that includes.

2. Very few people have had the resources to challenge those
laws--and the ones who have done so have often seen charges dropped by
prosecutors who are unwilling to risk the decision of a higher court
on shaky legislation.

>It isn't a problem.

>I don't believe I've said that.

>I have no need for closed captions.

>I don't have a parental control setting on my receiver.

Do you notice a trend in your replies, Dave?

I-I-I-I-I. What about other's rights? YOU don't care if shows
are "bleeped," or not (of course, we know they aren't, so . . .) so
who cares if others don't care for the practice. YOU don't need closed
captions, so screw those with hearing loss. YOU don't have parental
control settings so other people should be censored to prevent
offensive material from entering YOUR home--to save you the trouble of
turning the set off or changing the channel.

>> >> If the Dish network DOES censor in that manner, it is simply a
>> >> good reason to choose DirecTV instead--since the alternative is
>> >> allowing someone ELSE to decide what is appropriate for you to hear.
>> >
>> >I don't agree with you at all. I find it kind of refreshing.
>>
>> Why? Does it keep you from having to think?
>
>When did one have to start thinking to watch TV? An article a few years
>back stated that one burn more calories while sleeping than while
>watching TV. How does hearing an oath cause my brain cell activity to
>pick up?

How does hearing a "bleep" allow you to enjoy the dialog and
acting?

>> What do they do when there is nudity or strongly sexual
>> content (also part of an "R" rating) Dave? Put "CENSORED BY FASCISTS"
>> banners across the screen?
>
>They run the video portion unedited to my knowledge.

They run everything unedited, Dave, I tested your claim and it
was false, remember?

>> Must be relaxing for you not to have to watch tv and decide
>> for yourself about the adult parts & language; it's so much easier to
>> allow the American Family Association to do your thinking for you,

>> isn't it?
>
>Do you have a point?

I just made it.

>> >> Let me reverse the question: If there's something wrong with
>> >> using those words--why are the present in a movie in the first place
>> >> to REQUIRE anyone to "bleep" them?
>> >
>> >Oh, you haven't come up with a good reason for them either, huh?
>>
>> Try "Freedom of speech" Dave--I know that one hurts you
>> censorship fanatics, but some of us not only believe in it--but
>> actually fought for it in Vietnam.
>
>Stow the Vietnam stuff, Rick. You no more went to Vietnam to fight for
>freedom of speech than I did. We went because they sent us. One of the
>huge differences between us is that I don't wear Vietnam as an excuse.
>You don't get to play the Vietnam card with me.

I didn't "go because they sent me," Dave. I volunteered and I
voluntarily stayed for a second tour as well. And if I wasn't fighting
for freedom, then there was no reason for me to be there at
all--unlike you I don't do things strictly because someone in
authority tells me to--I do them because I believe in them. Had I not
believed that military service meant defending our rights and freedoms
I would never have enlisted and, had my draft number been low, would
have emigrated to Canada instead of being drafted.

>> Out of curiosity, as I recall you claim to have been in the
>> Foreign Service of the US. Since that's a part of the Department of
>> State, didn't you have to swear to uphold the Constitution of the
>> United States (as do other State Department officials both
>> domestically and abroad--and as the US military are required to do)?
>> I'll bet that pesky Bill of Rights was a real pain to pretend to
>> support wasn't it--or is that why you're no longer a Foreign Service
>> employee?
>
>I don't claim to have been in the Foreign Service. I was in the Foreign
>Service. I resent your cheap accusations.

Accusations, Dave?

To a person who has already been proven to have lied about his
tv reception?

Why ever would I doubt your word on other subjects?

More to the point--by claiming outrage here you just tried to
weasel out of answering the specific point I made. That's alright,
Dave, we'll just acknowledge the fact that you can't answer it and go
on from there.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3141. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <15B2EAE2EB4DBD16.14B2B4D0286FD002.9AA7BE366BC2A102@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26138

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 02:03:50 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I have no way of making a universal claim for Starz as received through
>the Dish Network. It is bleeped here.

Sure you did. You claimed that the Dish Network bleeps
"offensive" words in movies. Then you claimed you could only speak for
the Starz network since you don't receive CineMAX. Now, since your
claim was refuted, you claim you can't speak for Starz either.

Earth to Dave--try consistency in your ravings.

>You can stow this one with your Vietnam comments. I'll not dignify it
>further.

Translation: I got caught so I'l pretend it's beneath me to
respond.

>You are one of the most obnoxious individuals I've encountered in ages,

Dave, coming from someone with your values, I'll take that as
a compliment.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3142. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:23 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6FC9EAE578A82270.2326A666B37A4F40.C9DBC62DC09E052E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26137

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 05:36:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>
>> If you can't make your point without lying, Dave, don't bother
>> to make it at all. You'll understand if, from now on, I don't accept
>> ANYTHING you say without proof--you've demonstrated that there is no
>> reason to do so and every reason not to.
>
>So, by this reasoning, we can assume that by including Finland on your
>list of countries supposedly "freer" than the U.S., you were lying.
>If you can't make your point without lying, Rick...

Nice try Dave--but you have yet to demonstrate (with PROOF,
btw, not just on your unsupported statement) that Finland is NOT freer
than the US.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3143. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:23 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C7B796A3E638438D.FB0DEE8469BFFA06.6F2E6B16EA03114C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26142

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 21:20:17 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Because they're children. They don't have the same rights because
>they don't have the same responsibilities. Let me give you an example.
>My neighbor's daughter got a tattoo without her parent's knowledge or
>consent. Days later, thanks to a nasty infection, the family was
>facing medical bills exceeding $18,000 (and the daughter had a ugly
>scar on her back - hardly "enhancing" her appearance). Of course, the
>daughter was not responsible for those medical bills - the parents
>were. And as long as parents are responsible, and children are not, it
>is foolish to say children should have the same rights.

You leave out several important points, Dwight:

1. How old is the daughter? Is she a small child or an 18 year
old?

2. Did she get the tattoo at a commercial enterprise or from
an amateur? If it was a commercial firm (the subject of the
discussion) why didn't the parents file suit to recover their damages?

3. Did the infection result from the tattoo work or from her
attempt to hide it from her parents out of fear they wouldn't accept
it?

4. Are we talking about a massive, extensive, tattoo or a
small tattoo of a butterfly or rose? The latter can very definitely
represent enhancement.

5. Is there some reason why the parent's have lost so much
control over their daughter that she would do this behind their back?
Do they bother to take her views and desires seriously, or do they
discount everything as being from "a child?"

Try answering those, and I'll be glad to respond more directly
to the specific question. Let me ask YOU something, as well. If a
person under 18 is NOT to have the same rights as others, what
justification exists for trying him or her as an adult in a criminal
courts (as is common for felony cases in many jurisdictions)? If the
rights don't exist, is it reasonable that the sanctions should?

>> Only if you can demonstrate that
>> the community: (1) has a RIGHT to
>> impose values on a given matter and;
>> (2) has better or more relevant values
>> than the individuals affected.

>
> Are you saying that communities have no right to pass laws in this
>country? Of course they do. Are you saying members of a community have
>no right to support laws based on their own values? Of course they do.

No, I'm saying that communities do NOT have the right to
establish "values" they only have the right to establish "laws" to
protect their residents from harm. Simply because a most members of a
community as a whole are racist, it does NOT give them the right to
pass racial limitations. And simply because those same members are
very religious doe NOT give them the right to ban access to materials
that they find offensive by others.

I'm not talking about legalities, Dwight. I'm talking about
rights. In our special-interest-focused society they aren't always the
same.

>So, obviously, the community has a "right" to impose values. Since
>this appears to be a fairly world-wide situation, what part of this
>planet do you live on where this does not happen?

No, they have the right to impose LAWS, not values.

> As for the second part of your sentence, why would he need to
>demonstrate that the community has "better or more relevant values" to
>refute your claim that "your values apply only to yourself, not to
>others?" The paragraph above, all by itself, throws your statement
>right out the window.

Nope. Because unless it can be shown that the community DOES
have better or more relevant values, it follows that any attempt to
legislate their values simply causes the law to discriminate between
two subjective states--which is NOT the function of law.

>> (snip) A girl in a Michigan school was
>> recently suspended for wearing a t-shirt
>> with a pentagram on it (symbolic of
>> Wicca). Yet a girl wearing a t-shirt with
>> a religious icon (a picture of Jesus with
>> a halo) on it was permitted to attend
>> classes. (snip)
>
> As I understand it, satanic symbols, such as the pentagram, were
>banned after these were linked to a string of violent incidents at
>schools, including at least one of the recent school shooting incidents.

Guns are linked to them even more directly--ever seen a school
ban hunting jackets or NRA patches?

Islamic terrorists are linked to the World Trade Center
tragedy--how many schools do you think could get away with banning
traditional muslim dress?

Jewish terrorists are linked to many shootings in the middle
east--is it ok for schools to ban the star of david and hasidic dress?

In the first place, wicca is NOT satanism, it is a legitimate
religion and recognized as such in all 50 states. As such, it has as
much right to display its symbols as does Christianity--yet no attempt
is being made to prohibit the wearing of a crucifix or other Christian
symbol. And in the second place, the fact that a few wangos have
committed crimes and credited Satanism for it has no more bearing on
respect for religious rights than does the act of a Christian
terrorist who bombs an abortion clinic. Like Christianity, Satanism IS
a legitimate religion, and the rights of a Satanist are just as
important as those of a Christian.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3144. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:24 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1083516BD16E1361.92D3A944BDF9B92C.F253BC455E844072@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26141

On 03 Dec 2001 05:03:09 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Simple test: Try de-horning cattle of species that grow horns. No matter how
>many generations you do it to, the next generation will grow horns.

But, of course, if you selectively breed cattle with
progressively shorter horns together, eventually you WILL develop a
hornless herd.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3145. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:24 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3C05FD971687B57C.56369181E76CC87B.78C4C933081D0EE9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26144

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 05:18:28 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> I didn't say a thing about my "belief" in anything, Kim. I simply
>offered an explanation of why many schools have have started to ban
>such symbols. However, it is true that the pentagram and pentacle have
>long been occult symbols used in association with satanic identity -
>even today by those using various rehashed names (wiccams, pagans,
>etc) to whitewash the association.

Wiccans and pagans don't believe in a Devil, Dwight. Nor is
their religion in any way related to Satanism or Christianity. It
isn't "Rehashed" it's fact.

And it is the INVERTED pentagram that is symbolic of Satanism
(although not exclusively), not the upright one usually displayed by
Wiccans and Pagans.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3146. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7AB17BB33C6C639A.00B1931E26A702DB.56B199C7BFBC7A85@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26140

On 03 Dec 2001 04:49:55 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>And what "reality" would that be?

Now THERE'S a question I would expect from Larry.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3147. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EC1F625585CCEE6B.C1793C64BD1D00EB.D51633617FC89882@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26143

On 03 Dec 2001 04:49:54 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>No. Not unless they wanted me to be. And I'm sure that's what most
>homosexual "couples" want for their children.

Sure. Just like all military families want their kids to die
in a war, right?

Get off your homophobic delusions, Larry, and learn something
about the subject before you make such stupid and inaccurate
statements.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3148. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:41:26 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <839BD86B955EBD24.52FF13789478BBB1.A7C491C184367D65@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26145

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 23:20:32 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Since you exclude acquaintances, do you only have sex with people you
>are not acquainted with, Dwight? :-)

Probably easier for him that way, Cecil. ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3149. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:45:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnsap8x.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 26146

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 19:44:18 -0500, Rick Adams wrote:

>[The Libertarian party] seeks to ... remove all restrictions on big
>business (including environmental controls, OSHA requirements, minimum
>wage, and safety requirements) replacing them with a free market
>control and civil action ...

Many years ago, at a convention of the National Association of
Broadcasters, an anonymous late-night (and well-lubricated) private
survey was taken amongst network and major broadcast executives to
see if they would prefer removing FCC regulatory control and
replacing it with free-market control enforced by civil action.

Almost unanimously they wanted to retain FCC control, because "you
gotta' have someone to rant at....."

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3150. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:45:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gns9xqw.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 26148

On Sun, 02 Dec 2001 19:16:34 -0500, Rick Adams wrote:

> Want a REALLY scary concept to think about, Phil?
>
> Thanks to a voter initiative begun by (and with the petitions
>circulated IN) the churches, in the State of Washington not only do
>gay parents lose custody of their children, but children who are gay
>are removed from the family home (by law) and placed in foster care
>facilities because the parents are deemed unfit.

And to think that Washington State is ony 6 miles north of here.
<shudder>

A good example of what happens when we allow the mob rule of the
majority.

A good friend of mine - single, straight, and activist - is an
attorney in Seattle fighting family law battles like that. I had
thought that such stuff went away in recent years.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3151. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:45:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnsb8py.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 26149

On Sun, 2 Dec 2001 21:18:30 -0600, Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>The Pentagon is built in the shape of a pentagram.

A pentagram is a pentagon (basic geometric figure) with lines
connecting each apex with the opposite apexes - a five-pointed star
circumscribed by a pentagon.

"The Pentagon" is not built in the form of a pentagram.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3152. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-03 23:45:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnsbybz.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 26147

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 05:01:40 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>>a simple, logical, and reasonable precaution, and the decision not
>>to take that precaution would be difficult to defend in a court of law.
>
>Defend against what? If I RENT you ham equipment, I have no
>obligation to ensure you use it correctly. Who would have
>any cause of action against the rentor for a ham or non-ham
>that caused interference?

In many if not most states by now, a bartender or host who serves
intoxicating beverages to a customer or guest can be held legally
responsible for the negligent or unlawful acts of the drinker
brought about by such service.

Basic tort law.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3153. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 00:04:08 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C0C129D.94DEB134@spam.me.not>
Source record: 26150
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mostly because I still talk on CB, with a CB, and I still enjoy CB. Is
that a problem? Is that odd? Is that strange? Should I leave my friends
on 27.385 LSB behind just because I can now talk on 7.175?

-SSB

"middlefiger4@home.comss" wrote:
>
> There are new people reading this group daily perhaps they would have missd
> it, why do you a Extra class Ham worry about what is posted in rec.radio.cb
> and not any of the amateur groups? Just a little curious.
>
> "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> news:3C0B959F.9A960A51@spam.me.not...
> > Ok... now this is the third time this has been posted to rec.radio.cb...
> >
> > Think we could stop plastering the newsgroup? It's been discussed,
> > argued, stirred up, and beaten to death already... Could we just stop
> > it?
> >
> > de AB8LR
> >
> > -SSB
> >
> > N9NWO wrote:
> >
> > <Another repetitive, annoying, troll-like post, snipped for your
> > protection>

3154. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 00:07:24 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C0C1361.8783BC5C@spam.me.not>
Source record: 26201
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hrm.. Guess someone will have to email the FCC and find out.. All of the band charts I've seen (excepting the ARRL one you mentioned) show those segments as CW and Weak Signal. ::Shrug::

-SSB

CAM wrote:
>
> Sideband wrote:
> >
> > Refer to this chart, Page 2:
> > http://www.icomamerica.com/downloads/bandchar.pdf
> > It clearly shows that those two segments are CW and Weak Signal, which
> > means CW and [QRP SSB or AM or RTTY].
>
> Welp, my ARRL Handbook clearly shows those two 100 kHz segments at the
> bottom of 6m and 2m to be "CW only". Wonder which one is right - the
> American one or the Japanese one?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3155. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 00:13:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0C13BB.C596B7B6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26202

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 01:07:55 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I never take advice on psychology from a retired electrical engineer.
>
> How about from a clinical psychologist/psychology professor?
>
> Rick

That would depend entirely who he is. I wouldn't want to get hooked up
with a quack.

Dave K8MN

3156. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 00:15:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C15AA.DA57CC54@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26203

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >Nope, you're wrong, Rick. Libertarians are for laws prohibiting
> >force or threat of force in human relationships. We are for armed
> >forces to protect us from foreign criminals, police to protect us
> >from domestic criminals, and a court system to administer the law.
>
> But who pays for them?

Taxes for now. But the thinking is that if the judicial system would
charge for its civil services, those charges for things like contract
enforcement would bear the brunt of the cost of all proper functions
of government. Something like a 10% fee on the total amount of
the contract for guaranteeing enforcement of the contract.

> My strongest conflict with the Libertarian party, however,
> comes in the area of social programs.

Yep, and that's an area where we will have to agree to disagree.
I simply don't believe in rewarding failure and penalizing success.
Over my lifetime, the government has done me more financial harm
than criminals have done to everyone else that I personally know.

> That's a bit extreme, Cecil. Certainly the Fed was primarily
> responsible for the crash & depression, but to accuse them of
> deliberately causing it (as "engineer" suggests) is a bit more than
> history can support.

I used the term in the sense of engineering a bridge that falls down -
like the Tacomas Straits - was that the one?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3157. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 00:22:41 UTC
From: PipeLayer <pipedream@hotmail.comspam>
Message-ID: <20011203193213.100$HV@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 26204
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Of course you can still do both but why did you only defend rec.radio.cb.
btw who is talking about where your friends are this is a NG I cannot tune
27.385 on my newsreader last time i looked they have no idea whats going on.
You never answered the question. Ill ask again why are you worrying how many
time that was posted to rec.radio.cb and not worried about how many times it
was posted to any other NG's The question remains unanswered and twisted
to your friends being part of this somehow.
"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C0C129D.94DEB134@spam.me.not...
> Mostly because I still talk on CB, with a CB, and I still enjoy CB. Is
> that a problem? Is that odd? Is that strange? Should I leave my friends
> on 27.385 LSB behind just because I can now talk on 7.175?
>
> -SSB
>
> "middlefiger4@home.comss" wrote:
> >
> > There are new people reading this group daily perhaps they would have
missd
> > it, why do you a Extra class Ham worry about what is posted in
rec.radio.cb
> > and not any of the amateur groups? Just a little curious.
> >
> > "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> > news:3C0B959F.9A960A51@spam.me.not...
> > > Ok... now this is the third time this has been posted to
rec.radio.cb...
> > >
> > > Think we could stop plastering the newsgroup? It's been discussed,
> > > argued, stirred up, and beaten to death already... Could we just stop
> > > it?
> > >
> > > de AB8LR
> > >
> > > -SSB
> > >
> > > N9NWO wrote:
> > >
> > > <Another repetitive, annoying, troll-like post, snipped for your
> > > protection>

3158. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 00:35:19 UTC
From: Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <9uh5o70h9o@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26208

Leland KC8LDO
>
>"Leland C. Scott" wrote:
>>
>> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
>> those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
>> haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
>> tell me. Help me!
>>
>
>You asked for help, here it is. They are saying "Obey my dog!"
>
Just the kind of help I'd expect from you,just wait until 2003,you'll see who's
dog I'm obeying. ;-))

"You ask w

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

3159. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 00:39:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9uh5lsfet1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 26205
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C0B295D.926717A3@spam.me.not...
> Where is it stated in the FCC rules regarding these bands
> that those areas are CW only?

When did ceral boxes start offering ham licenses?

3160. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:03:16 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <7952B1BE49E6C864.00EE3F407F4A176A.FC4B3FF0E0923D16@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26206
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 3 Dec 2001 01:38:16 GMT, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
wrote:

>Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."

"Hey y'all"

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3161. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:06:24 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <38C0C5314213C1DA.5ED2EE1613DC654E.96F95297F35FF82B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26207
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 3 Dec 2001 15:04:49 -0600, "W0MN" <gbaron@mailandnews.com>
wrote:

>In the US you cannot use a Ham Radio in the CB bands nor a CB radio in
>the ham bands because they are not type accepted. At least the vast
>majority are not.

Ham radios don't have to be type accepted. If they did, the entire
homebrewing aspect of ham radio would be illegal. Buying an 11m radio
and modifying it for legitimate 10m use is no different than building
a 10m radio.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3162. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:12:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0c23c7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26209

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011202234954.14773.00002746@nso-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3C0A810E.E3C28739@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> I see. And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
> >> influence on their sexual "identity." Right.
> >
> >Larry, if *you* were raised by homosexuals, would *you* be a
> >homosexual?
>
> No. Not unless they wanted me to be. And I'm sure that's what most
> homosexual "couples" want for their children.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

The true pity, folks, is Larry likely believes that.

Kim W5TIT

3163. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:17:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0c24f5_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26210

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:EC014B9DA1345D2D.139E79049A384D6F.F385928F11E101F1@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 05:01:40 GMT, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
> wrote:
>
> >Interesting concept...one not implemented by
> >any retail store I am aware of. Another thought, since
> >it isn't a law, can a retail establishment (AES, etc.)
> >actualy refuse to sell ham gear to someone without
> >a license?
>
> They can refuse to sell to anybody. In this case, suspicion of intent
> to use the equipment in an illegal manner would probably cover them
> against any potential discrimination claim.
>
> Texas Towers has always asked for a callsign when I've bought anything
> capable of transmitting.
>

They *have*???? They've never asked me, my husband, my father, other hams I
know.

Kim W5TIT

3164. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:24:41 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0c26a5_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26211

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0B40D8.D456A105@sccoast.net...
>
> No, it's an argument against total, blind, trust. And there is
> nothing "repressive" about maintaining certain standards in a
> relationship. My wife (who, at various times of her life, has been a
> Sergeant assigned to an Army Air Assault unit, an aid to the Deputy
> Chief of Staff for Operations in Europe, a college student, a
> stripper, and so much more - these few selected to show a range of
> freedom of choice in her life) will flat tell you she is certainly not
> repressed. Nor have I ever felt repressed in our relationship.
> However, in spite of the diversity of our experiences, there has never
> been a moment in our relationship where there has been unbridled
> freedom to do whatever we wanted with members of the opposite sex. Not
> because one said to the other you can't do that. But because we each
> respect the other enough to not give the other reason to lose trust.
>

I'll pick just the last sentence to comment on. That may work well for you, Dwight, and your wife. But I'll make the point that just because I go to lunch with a male friend, or my husband goes to dinner with a female friend, is not giving the other reason to lose trust. I hope you understand what I mean by that.

The only time I would lose trust in my husband is if he'd said he were going out to dinner with a female friend, and I walked in on them in each others' embrace and locked together in a passionate kiss. *That* is when I'd lose trust and never before. :)

Kim W5TIT

3165. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:31:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0c2855_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26214

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0B47A9.5084E461@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Dwight! I am so surprised at your
> > above response. You are saying that
> > you would not have lunch with a
> > female co-worker, right? (snip)
>
>
> Yes, as I said, I would not have lunch with a female co-worker
> unless there were other employees present. I've seen too many nasty
> rumors, started by too many nasty people, with too many hurt feelings,
> to ever wish that on a fellow co-worker.
>

Well, other than the fact that I'd feel my job was threatened over something
like that, I'd not even give a rumor a second thought. *I* know what the
truth is. Let's say my husband comes home absolutely adamant that I've had
sex with another man. If I know I haven't, there's no other reaction he is
going to get from me than to tell him that I haven't. If *he* is the one so
affected, then he needs to decide what he is going to do about it. Again,
I know the truth.

>
> > And you are saying that continued
> > lunches with a female co-worker
> > will absolutely lead to a bad
> > reputation? (snip)
>
>
> No, I did not say it would "absolutely" lead to a bad reputation.
> But, by the same token, I've seen it happen often enough to decide not
> to offer an opportunity.
>

Wow, I've never seen that happen yet.

>
> > Wow. I wonder what you'd think of
> > me going to lunch with 9, 10, 15 men
> > who are co-workers!
>
>
> Did you miss the part where I clearly said, "unless there were other

> employees present." I'm not talking about a bunch of co-workers
> heading off to the lunch room for a break. I'm talking about leaving
> the workplace to have private lunches with a single co-worker, or even
> regular private get togethers with a single co-worker in the workplace.
>

Hiccup. I'll go to lunch or dinner with anyone, married or single...man or
woman. :) CECIL??!!! Speaking of rainchecks, dude!?

>
> > I wonder what you'd think of me
> > *going to dinner* with a bunch of
> > male hams after work or on a
> > Saturday night! (snip)
>
>
> Well, you sure missed the whole point of this. Again, we're not
> talking about a bunch of buddies, co-workers, or so forth, getting
> together for dinner or whatever. We're talking about private meetings
> with a single person.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

That's exactly what I'm talking about. I have a lunch date with Cecil, as a
matter of fact. I just didn't "take" you for being like that...and, for
goodness sakes not saying that's bad. It's just definitely not me. If my
husband said that Cecil and I could not have dinner together, I'd fall over
laughing. He would do the same if I told him he couldn't go to dinner with
another woman, married or single.

Kim W5TIT

3166. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:33:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0C2664.11AF4F65@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26212

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 02:00:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Your thinking is so skewed that any person or group disagreeing with you
> >is somehow close-minded.
>
> No, any person or group that seeks to limit behavior to only
> those activities they, themselves, approve of is close-minded--BY
> DEFINITION.

Your attempts to limit MY thinking to that which is approved by you
would then seem to be close-minded.

> >> >I've learned a lot from the above. Your first reaction is to think
> >> >about prosecution or a suit rather than dealing with your kid's
> >> >misdeeds.
> >>
> >> What makes you think I would REGARD them as "misdeeds?"
> >
> >Because what he did would have been illegal. Don't you think you might
> >bring that up?
>
> Sorry, Dave, but I don't regard a community definition of what
> is legal as grounds to define something PERSONALLY as a "misdeed."
> Misdeeds, to me, are actions I would personally oppose--not ones
> someone else says are wrong. That's the biggest difference between us;
> you are content to allow others to define right and wrong for you, I
> insist on making my own definitions based on my personal values. I may
> have to OBEY the law, but that doesn't mean I have to agree with it or
> regard those who do NOT obey it as wrong.

You are a great role model, Rick. You reject whichever laws with which
you do not agree but are quick to jump on the lawsuit bandwagon. You
talk out of both sides of your mouth.

> >> >Document it yourself. I'm taking no homework assignments today, Prof.
> >> >You asked what I thouhgt and I told you.
> >>
> >> Let me get this straight.
> >>
> >> You claim that many early teens are getting tattoos and
> >> piercings w/o their parent's consent and when I ask you for sources to
> >> confirm that absurd claim you tell me to document it myself?

> >>
> >> I'll just assume that it's nonsense instead--if you had any
> >> evidence to support your ridiculous claims you would cite it.
> >
> >Let's DO get it straight. You asked me if I thought many kids were
> >getting piercings or tattoos without consent. I said , "yes".
> >I'm not going to write you a term paper.
>
> Too bad. I'd like to compare it to those I received from the
> first year students in one of my classes to see how far you needed to
> progress before you could discuss a subject objectively instead of
> from a biased perspective.

You aren't in a position of authority, Rick. You might be able to blow
smoke in a classroom and intimidate some student. I'm afraid you are
likely to be disappointed at my lack of deference toward you here.

> >> >No. They don't have those rights until they reach their majority by
> >> >which time it is hoped that they'll have developed enough common sense
> >> >to avoid something which could become a lifelong regret for them.
> >>
> >> Or a lifelong pleasure--haven't you ever met people with
> >> tattoos or piercings who were glad they had them?
> >
> >Not many. My wife's older sister got some in her teens and later had
> >them removed. It caused some scarring. A number of old WWII vets have
> >told me that they wished they had never gotten tattoos.
>
> And in both cases you cite the people got their tattoos after
> becoming adults. So much for the concept that if they are forbidden as
> youths they will mature and not do so later.

Actually not. The folks I cite had their tattoos done prior to reaching
the age of majority. There goes your *poof* point.

> >> To me, if a person is old enough to die for his country, he's
> >> old enough to portray that patriotism (or anything else, for that
> >> matter) on his skin.
> >
> >You tell 'em Rick. If one is old enough to die, he is old enough to do
> >something else silly. People like you are often people who say, "People
> >like you...".
>
> I would have to regard dying for political or economic
> interests a trifle sillier than getting a tattoo, wouldn't you?

Sure, Rick. If a person is able to join the military without parental
consent, that person is old enough to get a tattoo. The person can
still be immature enough to make a decision he'll later regret.
>
> >> >Check out Hamilton County. You'll find your proof there in the
> >> >existence of such laws. Let me know what you find out.

> >>
> >> Why?
> >>
> >> A few religious zealots managed to create repressive laws and
> >> you use THAT as justification for community values?
> >
> >No use trying to reason with (smirk) sound facts like those.
>
> Show me facts that demonstrate that Hamilton County has values
> that I _should_ respect--or that are based on logic instead of
> religious zealotry and I might have a different view.
>
> >> Dave, there is a small town in Georgia (population is under
> >> 2500) that passed an ordinance against the sales or rentals of any
> >> movie rated higher than PG (i.e., PG-13, R, NC-17, etc.). One of the
> >> residents had a satellite receiver and paid a subscription rate to
> >> receive and descramble the Tuxedo Network (which shows adult shows and
> >> soft core adult films). When the local prosecutor (who was a neighbor)
> >> learned about it, he filed criminal charges against the Tuxedo network
> >> (headquartered and broadcasting in NYC, btw, where such shows are
> >> considered perfectly acceptable by the "community values")--and he
> >> WON! It was ruled that the Tuxedo network had violated the law in that
> >> community by delivering content ruled "unacceptable" by the community
> >> values of that town in violation of its laws.
> >
> >Gee, I think I see how they won.
>
> Really?
>
> How?

...by applying the laws of their community rather than those of New
York.

> By proving that a firm outside their jurisdiction cannot do
> business with a citizen in their jurisdiction w/o being prosecuted for
> actions that are legal everywhere else? They didn't prosecute the
> person who RECEIVED the shows, Dave (that would have rather quickly
> overturned the law and they knew it), they prosecuted the network for
> delivering them.

Seems to me that they should have prosecuted the individual subscribing.
If the law was overturned, that is the way things work in this society.

> >> The case is currently on its way to the SC. If the decision is
> >> upheld there, you will see a considerable change in television
> >> programming--the Networks (public and subscription such as HBO, etc.)
> >> will be forced to limit their broadcasts to movies acceptable anywhere
> >> in the USA--and there's at least ONE town (in Texas) where the limit
> >> is "G" rated!
> >

> >You mean there is hope that the networks will be cleaned up?
>
> Don't like em? Vote with your feet, stupid. Don't watch em.

Y'know, that's just what we do. We watch selectively.

> We watch precisely ONE network show regularly
> (Enterprise--we're confirmed trekkies) and will watch the Olympic
> events on network tv as well--in both cases only because the
> programming isn't available elsewhere. Outside of that, we watch the
> History Channel, History International, TLC, Discovery, Discovery
> Health, CNN, and similar stations--with occasional movies on the
> premium networks such as HBO and Showtime. If you don't care for the
> content of network television (we don't) then do the same thing--or
> just turn it off. What you--and your "community values" do NOT have
> the right to do, however, is to attempt to censor the programming that
> is of interest to others. You have an on/off switch. Use it.

What "people like you" believe is that there is some sort of right have
sexually explicit material and so-called "adult" language beamed into
homes across the land. How about this: If you want that kind of
material in your home, you pay extra for a subscription. The material
then enters only the homes of those who desire it.

> >> Do you REALLY think that a community has the right to limit
> >> our entertainment to Disney movies? More to the point, do you
> >> sincerely believe that the community has the right to limit the nature
> >> of entertainment we view in the privacy of our homes at all?
> >
> >Do you really think that the only good entertainment contains
> >gratuitious sex, violence and the so-called "adult" language?
>
> That isn't the point. The point is that you are unwilling to
> allow others to MAKE that choice for themselves!

Sure--make your choice. Subscribe to it.

> >> In Cincinnati, your favorite city to cite, the curator of the
> >> museum of art was prosecuted for presenting an exhibition of art that
> >> no one even attempted to claim was not legitimately of artistic merit,
> >> and which would have lent prestige to the Cincinnati museum. The art,
> >> however, included images that violated Cincinnati's intrusive
> >> "Community Values" and the curator was convicted. To me, that's
> >> completely reprehensible behavior and no one with a shred of respect
> >> for the Constitution of the United States would even consider a
> >> community where such a travesty of law occurred to be worthy of any
> >> respect whatever--let alone a suitable place to cite as an example of
> >> "community values."
> >
> >Maplethorpe as I recall. There's lots more to it than you've outlined.
> >Wonder why that conviction was never overturned?
>

> Because it wasn't appealed by the Cincinnati Museum due to
> opposition by the city counsel.

Yeah, go on. Why was counsel opposed to an appeal?

> You're correct that it was Mapplethorpe. So what? It was a
> valid exhibit of art.

...according to you but not according to the people of Cincinnati.

> The museum director made it very clear that
> children would not be permitted to view the works considered to be
> sexual in nature (it might burst your bubble to know it, but
> Maplethorpe created a great many images that were NOT sexually
> oriented) under any circumstances, and that only inoffensive images
> would be used in the promotion of the showing (which would clearly
> indicate that many of the contents contained troubling sexual images).

I don't think that the idea that the publicly funded art museum should
be closed to a portion of the public is representative of your
libertarian views.

As you have agreed, while some of Maplethorpe's work was not of sexual
themes, much was. We're not talking just about what is viewed by most
folks as normal sex here, are we Rick? Troubling indeed.

> If you can find the slightest legitimacy in a community preventing the
> showing of legitimate art in a legitimate art museum simply because
> some members find the material depicted offensive, I'd like to know
> what it is.

More than "some members" found it objectionable. I wonder how many of
the public officials involved in bringing the suit were re-elected by
the people of Cincinnati.

> Freedom of Speech isn't about permitting only innocuous
> speech, Dave, you don't need a Constitutional protection for that.
> It's about permitting speech that is controversial, challenging,
> unpopular and, yes, offensive to many--because ONLY when that kind of
> speech is permitted can Americans exercise their right to protest or
> to criticize government.

What is it that you think Maplethorpe's work protested? What government
action was he criticizing? The courts recognize that there are limits
on free speech.

> You don't have to respect someone's speech
> (and art IS a form of speech--the SC has ruled on that several times)
> to support its right to exist--you only need to respect the
> Constitution of the United States to do so. Clearly, the people of
> Cincinnati don't respect our Constitution to the degree they respect
> the views of a few religious fanatics such as Donald Wildmon of the
> AFA. Don't expect any intelligent and fair minded person to accept a
> community like that as a "good example" of community values.

...yet Cincinnati and some of the northern Kentucky environs are
consistently declared to be among the most "liveable" places in America.
You can burn your flag in Cincinnati if you like, Rick. Just don't show
a graphic photo of homosexual sex and try to convince the folks there
that is art. Many attempts have been made to present crud masquerading
as art.
>
> >> >I brought up ways that group values can limit individual values.
> >> >I don't care if an individual is pierced in Poughkeepsie and moves to
> >> >Cuyahoga Falls. You can work out the details later.
> >>
> >> Correction. You brought up ways that groups values can limit
> >> individual rights and freedom of choice, not ways they can limit
> >> values.
> >
> >Correction accepted.
> >
> >> Sorry, but to me that smacks way too much of fascism and
> >> censorship.
> >
> >...and your view strikes me as being hedonism unchained.
>
> Freedom of choice==hedonism to you?

I liken your views to a frequent mantra of the sixties: If it feels
good, do it.

> Dave, there is simply no way you can justify that view
> rationally (you can do so by recourse to your "moral values" but then
> the rationale only applies to you, not to the rest of the world).
>
> >> Incidently, have you noticed that there are groups in
> >> Cincinnati right now working to ban both the "Harry Potter" movie and
> >> series of books because they feel they violate "Community Values?"
> >>
> >> I'll bet you're proud of your old community in it's fight
> >> against children's literature, aren't you?
> >
> >I'll bet I don't know a thing about it.
>
> You do now. Apparently, the concept that Harry Potter is a
> sorcerer is so offensive to the Christians in the community (or at
> least to those religious leaders they allow to do their thinking for
> them) that they see no reason children should be exposed to the books
> or movie--it might convince the children to waiver from Christianity!

I only know that you've told me about it. I haven't read anything about
it in the press nor have I seen anything on network news broadcasts.
For the record, I don't see anything wrong with Harry Potter books.

> Give me a break!

Choose a limb.

> >> There are places with laws on the books that restrict the
> >> rights of minority members, too (try Kuwait or Iran). That doesn't
> >> mean I have to either respect those places (and laws) or that the fact
> >> they exist makes them any less offensive to a free society.
> >
> >We're not in Kuwait or Iran. Take your issues up with the respective
> >governments.
>
> So we're not Kuwait or Iran. Does that make us perfect?

YOU brought up Kuwait and Iran. I thought you had a thing about them.
I don't believe I've even come close to stating that the U.S. is
perfect.

> >> I think ANY restriction that can't be shown to prevent harm
> >> and that circumvents the role of the family in deciding a child's
> >> manner of dress is wrong.
> >>
> >> Don't you?
> >
> >Only to a point. I don't think kids should wear clothing (i.e. T-shits)
> >with any religious or political statements on them.
>
> Including Christian ones? If you support that perspective,
> I'll agree with you. But if ONE religion is permitted to be
> represented, all should receive equal treatment.

Yeah, including the Christian ones. Just don't try selling me on the
idea that wicca practices constitute a religion.

> >> Show me where "Hamilton County" has stated that community
> >> standards are NOT ways to suppress speech. Otherwise, you can't claim
> >> they "disagree with me."
> >
> >The onus is on you to prove that Hamilton County has restricted free
> >speech. Maybe you'd like to try a court challenge.
>
> No it isn't.

Yes it is.

> You cited Hamilton County. You prove or disprove your claims..

You already know about Hamilton County. You want me to prove that which
you already know to exist? If you are interested enough, go read the
law which is on the books. Again, you don't assign homework here.
There is no grade. I don't get a swell job if I do well. It's a
newsgroup.

> >> How about citing the United States Constitution instead of the
> >> views of a few religious zealots in the bible-belt, Dave? Or are those
> >> zealots the only support you can find for your absurd claims?
> >
> >Please explain why the courts have not overturned the laws in those

> >communities.
>
> Two reasons:
>
> 1. The SC established the "community standards" doctrine in
> dealing with obscenity laws and it's pretty difficult to define what
> that includes.
>
> 2. Very few people have had the resources to challenge those
> laws--and the ones who have done so have often seen charges dropped by
> prosecutors who are unwilling to risk the decision of a higher court
> on shaky legislation.
>
> >It isn't a problem.
>
> >I don't believe I've said that.
>
> >I have no need for closed captions.
>
> >I don't have a parental control setting on my receiver.
>
> Do you notice a trend in your replies, Dave?
>
> I-I-I-I-I. What about other's rights? YOU don't care if shows
> are "bleeped," or not (of course, we know they aren't, so . . .) so
> who cares if others don't care for the practice. YOU don't need closed
> captions, so screw those with hearing loss. YOU don't have parental
> control settings so other people should be censored to prevent
> offensive material from entering YOUR home--to save you the trouble of
> turning the set off or changing the channel.

Yeah, I've noticed that you've suddenly stacked 'em all up neatly for
me. I could easily go back through your stuff and find a numbers of
"I's" in which you speak your views.

The Starz stuff is bleeped here. My wife confirms it. That you don't
accept that is tough.

I don't need a parental control for my set. There are no children here.
Maybe you meant that it is to control *my* parents when they visit.

I don't need closed captioning. Neither my wife nor I have any hearing
problem. There's also the fact that our living room TV and VCR are
multi-system pieces of equipment bought overseas. Maybe you'd like to
come for an inspection tour.

> >> >> If the Dish network DOES censor in that manner, it is simply a
> >> >> good reason to choose DirecTV instead--since the alternative is
> >> >> allowing someone ELSE to decide what is appropriate for you to hear.
> >> >
> >> >I don't agree with you at all. I find it kind of refreshing.
> >>

> >> Why? Does it keep you from having to think?
> >
> >When did one have to start thinking to watch TV? An article a few years
> >back stated that one burn more calories while sleeping than while
> >watching TV. How does hearing an oath cause my brain cell activity to
> >pick up?
>
> How does hearing a "bleep" allow you to enjoy the dialog and
> acting?

Tell me, Rick. How many angels can dance on the head of a pin? I still find it kind of refreshing. Are you somehow offended that this is my belief? It certainly sounds like another example of, "Be reasonable. Do it MY way".

> >> What do they do when there is nudity or strongly sexual
> >> content (also part of an "R" rating) Dave? Put "CENSORED BY FASCISTS"
> >> banners across the screen?
> >
> >They run the video portion unedited to my knowledge.
>
> They run everything unedited, Dave, I tested your claim and it
> was false, remember?

You tested? Oh, OK. I must have been delirious and made the entire thing up in order to make a point with you here. Yeah, that's it...

> >> Must be relaxing for you not to have to watch tv and decide
> >> for yourself about the adult parts & language; it's so much easier to
> >> allow the American Family Association to do your thinking for you,
> >> isn't it?
> >
> >Do you have a point?
>
> I just made it.

Not if I didn't get it, you didn't.

> >Stow the Vietnam stuff, Rick. You no more went to Vietnam to fight for
> >freedom of speech than I did. We went because they sent us. One of the
> >huge differences between us is that I don't wear Vietnam as an excuse.
> >You don't get to play the Vietnam card with me.
>
> I didn't "go because they sent me," Dave. I volunteered and I
> voluntarily stayed for a second tour as well. And if I wasn't fighting
> for freedom, then there was no reason for me to be there at
> all--unlike you I don't do things strictly because someone in
> authority tells me to--I do them because I believe in them. Had I not
> believed that military service meant defending our rights and freedoms
> I would never have enlisted and, had my draft number been low, would
> have emigrated to Canada instead of being drafted.

Oh, I volunteered for the Air Force, Rick. I didn't have "no steenking lottery number". As far as your statement which begins, "unlike you, I don't do things strictly because someone in authority tells me..."--it is unadulterated crap as it applies to your military service. You damn well DID do things because someone in authority told you and you didn't stop to reason with him or to ask why. Just don't try to cow another Vietnam vet with your "wrapped in the flag" personna. You tried that "I earned the right to..." stuff on another here recently. You didn't earn anything more than each American receives at birth--even those who never served in the military.

> >> Out of curiosity, as I recall you claim to have been in the
> >> Foreign Service of the US. Since that's a part of the Department of
> >> State, didn't you have to swear to uphold the Constitution of the
> >> United States (as do other State Department officials both
> >> domestically and abroad--and as the US military are required to do)?
> >> I'll bet that pesky Bill of Rights was a real pain to pretend to
> >> support wasn't it--or is that why you're no longer a Foreign Service
> >> employee?
> > >
> >I don't claim to have been in the Foreign Service. I was in the Foreign
> >Service. I resent your cheap accusations.
> >
> Accusations, Dave?
> >
> To a person who has already been proven to have lied about his
> tv reception?

That's simply so much crud, Rick--and not "accusations"--I said "cheap accusations".

> Why ever would I doubt your word on other subjects?

> More to the point--by claiming outrage here you just tried to
> weasel out of answering the specific point I made. That's alright,
> Dave, we'll just acknowledge the fact that you can't answer it and go
> on from there.

Did you really have a point to make? Did you think I was going to dignify your "question" with a response? Let's turn it around: You served a few years in the military. I've done that and six overseas tours with State. I served my country for a couple of decades. If you choose not to accept my statement, I can live with that. It doesn't have any effect on my views or upon how I live up here on the hill. You'll still be raging against the system for quite a number of years in order to obtain what you claim are "rights". When and if your ideas come up for a vote hereabouts, I'll vote against 'em.

Dave K8MN

3167. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:35:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0c291f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26216

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0B514A.DA9F8536@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > The Pentagon is built in the shape of
> > a pentagram. (snip)
>
>
> No, the Pentagon was built in the shape of a pentagon (pentagon - a
> plane figure with five angles and five sides). A pentagram is a five
> tipped star, also called a pentacle with a circle around it, that is
> not shaped like the Pentagon building at all.
>
>
> > Wonder if your belief that the pentagram
> > is Satanic (snip)
>
>
> I didn't say a thing about my "belief" in anything, Kim. I simply
> offered an explanation of why many schools have have started to ban
> such symbols. However, it is true that the pentagram and pentacle have
> long been occult symbols used in association with satanic identity -
> even today by those using various rehashed names (wiccams, pagans,
> etc) to whitewash the association.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Hmmm, correct me if I'm wrong, but if my studies of Wicca serve me well, I believe it is the "internal" part of the star that is considered the "meat" of the pentagram, not the five points or the star itself. The shape of the Pentagon is the same as the internal part of a 5-pointed star. Isn't it?

Kim W5TIT

3168. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:36:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0C272A.1A96EC71@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26213

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 02:03:50 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I have no way of making a universal claim for Starz as received through
> >the Dish Network. It is bleeped here.
>
> Sure you did. You claimed that the Dish Network bleeps
> "offensive" words in movies. Then you claimed you could only speak for
> the Starz network since you don't receive CineMAX. Now, since your
> claim was refuted, you claim you can't speak for Starz either.
>
> Earth to Dave--try consistency in your ravings.

I guess you'll have to drive down this way, Rick. Maybe one of the
local farmers will let you watch Starz through his Dish Network system.
Most folks around here are friendly to strangers.

> >You can stow this one with your Vietnam comments. I'll not dignify it
> >further.
>
> Translation: I got caught so I'l pretend it's beneath me to
> respond.

You're pretty good at reading between the lines but not so good at
actually reading the lines. I meant what I said.

> >You are one of the most obnoxious individuals I've encountered in ages,
>
> Dave, coming from someone with your values, I'll take that as
> a compliment.

No translation? If you take that as a compliment, you'd love what I'm
thinking right now.

Dave K8MN

3169. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:37:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0C2774.194E52C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26215

```
Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 05:36:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> >> If you can't make your point without lying, Dave, don't bother
> >> to make it at all. You'll understand if, from now on, I don't accept
> >> ANYTHING you say without proof--you've demonstrated that there is no
> >> reason to do so and every reason not to.
> >
> >So, by this reasoning, we can assume that by including Finland on your
> >list of countries supposedly "freer" than the U.S., you were lying.
> >If you can't make your point without lying, Rick...
>
> Nice try Dave--but you have yet to demonstrate (with PROOF,
> btw, not just on your unsupported statement) that Finland is NOT freer
> than the US.

Excuse me? What was your "proof" again?

Know any Finns? Call 'em and ask 'em.

Dave K8MN
```

3170. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:38:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0c29c7_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26217

Hmmmm, we'll have to watch those decreases. ROFLMAO...maybe Riley's right about my callsign...? NOT.

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <N2EY@aol.com> wrote in message news:975b4ea9.0112030541.48ebcc1b@posting.google.com...
> Here are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the
> dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
>
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
>
> As of December 2, 2001:
>
> Novice - 40,430 (decrease of 8,899)
> Tech - 232,994 (increase of 27,600)
> Tech Plus - 86,268 (decrease of 42,592)
> General - 138,424 (increase of 25,747)
> Advanced - 86,668 (decrease of 13,114)
> Extra - 97,671 (increase of 18,921)
> Total - 682,455 (increase of 7,663)
>
> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,692 (decrease of 23,891)
>
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 322,763 (increase of 31,554)
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3171. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:44:00 UTC
From: KU4YP <ku4yp@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ATVO7.136$714.15460@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26218
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

well,

we can put this one to rest because i bought the rig. and, i plan to use it on 10 meters, espically during the upcoming contest. no, i do not use 11 meters. no, i do not care that it can be "modified" to operate on 11 meters. if this was illegal, over half of the rigs on the market and all homebrew stuff would be out the window. why? because most of them can be "modified" to operate on 11 meters. i mean, my car will do 100 mph, but i do not drive it 100 mph because that is against the law. same principle applies.

remember the swan 10/11 rigs? one solder movement on the tuning coil and your hauling the mail on channel 19. i know that. you know that. and everyone in or around radio for the past 25 years knows that. does that mean they can not be repaired back to factory spec's on 10 meters and used? i think not and so do alot of 10/11 owners.

now, what keeps "most" of us operating a station legally is our respect and attention to our license and fcc regulations.

this reminds me of a very good friend, who is now silent key who used a "moonraker 4" quad on ten meters to work a ton of dx. almost everyone in the club "talked down" about the guy's antenna. is it marketed as a "11 meter" antenna? sure. did he use it legally to operate 10 meters? sure. i failed to see the problem myself and fully supported his use of the antenna as long as it was within his operating privilage. for God's sake, we use wire, fence and alot of other "items" as antennas. hell, i even remember reading about a guy trying to load up an oak tree or something onetime. by the way, the "cb" antenna had one of the best front to back ratios on 10 meters i have ever seen in a beam.

so, yes, i know the rig can operate somewhere it should not. however, it is MY responsibility to operate it legally.

next slide.....

73 ku4yp
mike prevatt
10X #70625

3172. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:45:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0c2b6e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26220

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9ugu650ada@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011203071635.20950.00000960@nso-cu.aol.com...
> > In article <3c0aefcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >The Pentagon is built in the shape of a pentagram.
> >
> > No, it's in the shape of a pentagon, which is a regular polygon with 5
> sides.
> > (regular polygons have all sides the same length and all angles the
same).
> >
> > A pentagram is a 5 pointed star inscribed in a pentagon.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> No. A five pointed star is a pentagon with the lines of each side extended
> to the intersecting points. A pentagram is a five pointed star inscribed
> within a circle.
>
>

THAT's it. Thanks, Krell. I couldn't remember all that stuff...and, am I
right in that the center area of the star is the shape of the Pentagon
building?

Kim W5TIT

3173. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:48:58 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <eYVO7.207782$3d2.9236315@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26219

> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Incidentally Dwight, would you
> > please set your editor to wrap
> > at 80 characters instead of
> > wrapping at 40 characters?

"Dwight Stewart" wrote

> I have mine set to wrap at 70 characters, which means those with
> editors set to 80 don't have to edit quotes from my messages so hard
> to eliminate strangely wrapped text. I also wrap messages I quote down
> even further, as I have done with this message, so those who include
> that have nothing to wrap. So far, you're the only one who has
> complained. Does anyone else have a problem with this system?

Dwight...

The 'style' is fine... it's the 'content' that's debatable... ;-)

Rich

3174. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 01:51:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0c2ceb$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26221
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:7952B1BE49E6C864.00EE3F407F4A176A.FC4B3FF0E0923D16@lp.airnews.net...
> On 3 Dec 2001 01:38:16 GMT, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
> wrote:
>
> >Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."
>
> "Hey y'all"
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

ho ho ho ho...ROFLMAO. Now, *that's* a good one, Joe!

Kim W5TIT

3175. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:07:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203210750.03411.00001117@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26229

In article <3C0B47A9.5084E461@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> Dwight! I am so surprised at your
>> above response. You are saying that
>> you would not have lunch with a
>> female co-worker, right? (snip)
>
> Yes, as I said, I would not have lunch with a female co-worker
>unless there were other employees present. I've seen too many nasty
>rumors, started by too many nasty people, with too many hurt feelings,
>to ever wish that on a fellow co-worker.

This is a good policy, Dwight.
>
>> And you are saying that continued
>> lunches with a female co-worker
>> will absolutely lead to a bad
>> reputation? (snip)
>
> No, I did not say it would "absolutely" lead to a bad reputation.
>But, by the same token, I've seen it happen often enough to decide not
>to offer an opportunity.

Right on target.

> I'm not talking about a bunch of co-workers
>heading off to the lunch room for a break. I'm talking about leaving
>the workplace to have private lunches with a single co-worker, or even
>regular private get togethers with a single co-worker in the workplace.

Yup. There is another aspect to this as well. In our lawsuit-happy society, it
is easy for some actions to be
misinterpreted. Best not to even give the appearance of something questionable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3176. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:07:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203210751.03411.00001119@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26227

In article <3C0AF9B3.88F0B296@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>CAM wrote:
>>
>> Dwight is obviously one of those
>> Homo sapiens who hasn't yet evolved
>> to the stage where he is in control
>> of and responsible for his own
>> feelings. :-)
>
>
> No, I don't attempt to suppress or control my feelings. I control
>how I act on those feelings and I'm obviously responsible for them,
>but I would never attempt to suppress or control how I feel (for that
>matter, I don't think it's truly possible).
>
I agree, Dwight. I would say that a person is responsible for their behavior,
but not their feelings.

People do, however, sometimes attempt to control their behavior by denying that
they have certain feelings.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3177. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:07:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203210751.03411.00001118@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26228

In article <3C0B4355.9CBD02A8@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> Exactly. I'm sure that divorce
>> statistics pre- and post-WWII
>> reflect the impact of the rise
>> in the predominance of women in
>> the workplace.
>
>
> It's not just women in the work place. Much of this has been growing
>in proportion to the industrial revolution (where first men, and later
>women, left home to work elsewhere). Women in the workplace certainly
>offered more opportunity than before (which caused the dramatic growth
>you mention), but so did something as simple as easier transportation.

All sorts of things contributed. Cars with automatic starters, power steering
and automatic transmissions made a big difference, for example.

>And, of course, a liberal media has had a influence on the situation also.

As did things like voting, higher education, contraception, and better public
health. Relaxed laws resulting in "no-fault" divorces helped, too.

But the biggest cause for divorce has little to do with any of the above. The
800 pound gorilla problem is that many people get married without the necessary
knowledge and skills to stay married. A marriage license is one of the easiest
licenses to get, yet one of the most important.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3178. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:07:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203210752.03411.00001120@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26223

In article <3C0C15AA.DA57CC54@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>I used the term in the sense of engineering a bridge that falls down -
>like the Tacomas Straits - was that the one?

The Tacoma Narrows bridge tore itself apart due to undamped oscillations in a sustained wind. The home movie of "Galloping Gertie's" last moments is an engineering classic.

The problem was that the bridge deck was too narrow in relation to its length.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3179. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:07:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203210752.03411.00001121@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26225

In article <1083516BD16E1361.92D3A944BDF9B92C.F253BC455E844072@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 03 Dec 2001 05:03:09 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Simple test: Try de-horning cattle of species that grow horns. No matter how
>>many generations you do it to, the next generation will grow horns.
>
> But, of course, if you selectively breed cattle with
>progressively shorter horns together, eventually you WILL develop a
>hornless herd.

Oh yes. Or if you select the occasional animals that are otherwise normal but
have no horns and let them breed, you'll have a herd of hornless animals in
short order.

But old Lysenko couldn't see that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3180. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:07:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203210753.03411.00001122@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26224

In article <1288960686891313.55A5F7EDCCAAD332.869A90DDC7A020E9@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>>I never take advice on psychology from a retired electrical engineer.
>
> How about from a clinical psychologist/psychology professor?

Old joke but a good one:

Psychotics build castles in the air.
Neurotics live in them.
Psychologists collect the rent.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3181. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:07:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011203210753.03411.00001123@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26226

In article <9ugu650ada@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011203071635.20950.00000960@nso-cu.aol.com...
>> In article <3c0aefcd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
>writes:
>>
>> >The Pentagon is built in the shape of a pentagram.
>>
>> No, it's in the shape of a pentagon, which is a regular polygon with 5
>sides.
>> (regular polygons have all sides the same length and all angles the same).
>>
>> A pentagram is a 5 pointed star inscribed in a pentagon.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>No. A five pointed star is a pentagon with the lines of each side extended
>to the intersecting points. A pentagram is a five pointed star inscribed
>within a circle.
>
Dang. I knew I should have paid more attention at Hogwarts.

Thanks for the correction, Krell.

Of course your prove the point even more than I did. The Pentagon is not a
circle!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3182. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:17:33 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112031817.51203d95@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26230
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KU4YP" ku4yp@earthlink.net wrote:
>well,

> we can put this one to rest because i bought the rig.
> and, i plan to use it on 10 meters, espically during the
> upcoming contest.

TOO BAD YOUR LIMITED TO THOSE 450 'CHANNELS'. THAT WILL BE TOUGH ON
YOU TO MISS WORKING STATIONS IN BETWEEN THE "CHANNELS". ESPECIALLY IF
YOUR A CONTESTER.

> no, i do not use 11 meters. no, i do
> not care that it can be "modified" to operate on 11 meters.

LETS SEE. WHAT FREQ RANGE DOES THE "450 CHANNELS" COVER? ACCORDING TO
http://www.radiomods.co.nz/comanchewarrior.html THE EXPANSION MOD
MAKES IT COVER CB FREQS. SO IT IS ALREADY AN ILLEGAL CB.

> >> Comanche Warrior 10 meter base station radio for sale. 450 channels in
> >> Am, Fm, Usb & Lsb modes. Unit is stock other than frequency expansion.

AND NO CW, HUH....SURE THIS RADIO WAS DESIGNED FOR HAMS.

3183. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:17:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <gnWO7.248505$W8.8961085@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26231

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011203210752.03411.00001121@nso-cb.aol.com...
> In article
<1083516BD16E1361.92D3A944BDF9B92C.F253BC455E844072@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >On 03 Dec 2001 05:03:09 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> >>Simple test: Try de-horning cattle of species that grow horns. No
matter how
> >>many generations you do it to, the next generation will grow horns.
> >
> > But, of course, if you selectively breed cattle with
> >progressively shorter horns together, eventually you WILL develop a
> >hornless herd.
>
> Oh yes. Or if you select the occasional animals that are otherwise
normal but
> have no horns and let them breed, you'll have a herd of hornless animals
in
> short order.
>
> But old Lysenko couldn't see that.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Or shoot an outlandish proportion of horned ones as has happened with tusked elephants. The proportion of tuskless elephants has been rising for years because of poaching.

This can happen by the law of unintended consequences. Shooting coyotes has produced some really effective coyotes by eliminating the stupid ones. But as Grandpa Stonebender put it, "If ye be wanting a better sheep, first ye invents a better coyote."

Dick BK

3184. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:20:52 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8qWO7.248514$W8.8961094@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26232

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011203210752.03411.00001120@nso-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3C0C15AA.DA57CC54@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >I used the term in the sense of engineering a bridge that falls down -
> >like the Tacomas Straits - was that the one?
>
> The Tacoma Narrows bridge tore itself apart due to undamped oscillations
in a
> sustained wind. The home movie of "Galloping Gertie's" last moments is
an
> engineering classic.
>
> The problem was that the bridge deck was too narrow in relation to its
length.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

It is also a classic in the insurance biz about the law of agency. Seems the agent pocketed the premium, issued a binder, and neglected to tell the company. Damn near broke the company.

For what it is worth, well over half the insurance on the Titanic was assumed after it had been announced as sunk. Some people really bought off on the 'unsinkable' idea.

Beer Keg
>

3185. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:28:02 UTC
From: user@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3c0c25a7.118388137@news.triconet.org>
Source record: 26233

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 00:07:24 GMT, Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote:

|Hrm.. Guess someone will have to email the FCC and find out.. All of the
|band charts I've seen (excepting the ARRL one you mentioned) show those
|segments as CW and Weak Signal. ::Shrug::

" TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION

COMMISSION (CONTINUED)

PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents

Subpart D--Technical Standards

Sec. 97.305 Authorized emission types.

(a) An amateur station may transmit a CW emission on any frequency
authorized to the control operator.
.
.
.

(c) A station may transmit the following emission types on the
frequencies indicated, as authorized to the control operator, subject to
the standards specified in Sec. 97.307(f) of this part.

2 m 144.1-148.0 MHz..... MCW, phone, image, RTTY, data,"

So by the above, CW is the ONLY emission type allowed in the 144.0 to 144.1 band
segment.

"Weak signal" isn't a recognized type of signal emission, but a mode of
operation.

The FCC doesn't give a rat's ass whether the signals we send and receive are
"weak" or strong. They only care what the emission type is.

"Weak signal" in this context indicates that the people operating in that band
segment are engaged in communications that require protection from all of the
FunnyModulators, AFSK, FSK, BPSK, QSPK, PSK31and three-eights, and the
mountain-top Army MARS repeater on 143.990 running AFSK nets with the limiter
control full counterclockwise (it's happened).

QRP other than CW is not allowed. Period. In fact QRP CW shouldn't be allowed
either. They ought to make a rule that says you must run at least 1KW to the
antenna in the 144 to 144.1 segment.

N7WS

|
|-SSB
|
|CAM wrote:
|>
|> Sideband wrote:
|> >
|> > Refer to this chart, Page 2:
|> > http://www.icomamerica.com/downloads/bandchar.pdf
|> > It clearly shows that those two segments are CW and Weak Signal, which
|> > means CW and [QRP SSB or AM or RTTY].
|>
|> Welp, my ARRL Handbook clearly shows those two 100 kHz segments at the
|> bottom of 6m and 2m to be "CW only". Wonder which one is right - the
|> American one or the Japanese one?
|> --
|> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3186. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:43:37 UTC
From: Rob <crandall@ee.net>
Message-ID: <tLWO7.116$i57.1720@news>
Source record: 26222
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Now ladies go to your rooms!
"Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message
news:9uel28$bm8$1@news.hawaii.edu...
> In article <9udon60mf3@enews4.newsguy.com>, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:
>
> >"Shane Minor" <Shane0319@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >> HI HI.
>
> >HI HI is intended for use on CW to indicate something humorous. When
spoken
> >or written in a message, however, it makes you look like an idiot. Maybe
you
> >should tell Santa that you need a clue for Christmas.
>
> Krell: "CQ" and "73" and other prosigns originated on the landline
> telegraph and carried over to wireless telegraphy, yet they're both
> welcome and used on phone; if you had HF privileges you yourself
> would even be using them on phone, yet no one would dare call you an
> idiot for saying them.
>
> Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."
> Post your reply to the NG; we're all waiting...
>
> 73, Jeff KH6O
>
>
> --
> Telecommunication Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
> U.S. Coast Guard University of Hawaii System
> jherman @ d14.uscg.mil jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

3187. Re: Another repeat case of 14.275 QRM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:52:43 UTC
From: wz8a@aol.commie.NOT
Message-ID: <20011203215243.17397.00001539@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 26234

>From: "KC8JBO"
>> There is better solution. Let K1MAN have 14.275.

Whatever 14.275 may have going on it, don't let it be Baxter and his idiot
one-way transmissions and Bermuda Net jamming sessions!

End the massive abuses of 26 USC section 6103 - written to protect taxpayers,
not hide IRS misconduct. Remove from our government those IRS 'Disclosure
Officers' who obstruct justice, rather that protect taxpayer privacy.
Reform IRS! AK

3188. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:53:52 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <4VWO7.248569$W8.8964942@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26235
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jeffrey Herman wrote

> Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."
> Post your reply to the NG; we're all waiting...

Yeah... it's "Hello all Stations"

Rich

3189. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 02:56:21 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <1000F952C116E921.67BF1485A7969841.70CAB5BD7D0EBFF4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26236
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 3 Dec 2001 19:51:28 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
>news:7952B1BE49E6C864.00EE3F407F4A176A.FC4B3FF0E0923D16@lp.airnews.net...
>> On 3 Dec 2001 01:38:16 GMT, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."
>>
>> "Hey y'all"

>ho ho ho ho...ROFLMAO. Now, *that's* a good one, Joe!

And you don't have to tell them where you're from :)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3190. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:07:52 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <13de3299e8c9d280c48b1cd9d9ddc28b.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 26237
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb

"W0MN" <gbaron@mailandnews.com> wrote

>
> In the US you cannot use a Ham Radio in the CB bands nor a CB radio in
> the ham bands because they are not type accepted. At least the vast
> majority are not.
>

Have to disagree with half of that statement, Gil.

I can use _any_ radio I want in the Ham Bands without any kind of type acceptance. So long as I stay inside the band, put out a clean signal, observe power limits, etc, then it's totally legal.

The FCC doesn't give a rip who built it, what it originally was intended to be used for (CB, military, taxicab, railroad, whatever), or what modifications I have made to it. I could legally build a full KW rig with full coverage from 2MHz to 2GHz, and so long as I only used it inside the ham bands I haven't broken a single rule and the FCC couldn't care less.

Wish all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from 2cust29.tnt3.minneapolis3.mn.da.uu.net [63.22.112.29]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3191. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:14:30 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9uhf1d017lh@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26246

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c0c2b6e_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> THAT's it. Thanks, Krell. I couldn't remember all that stuff...and, am I
> right in that the center area of the star is the shape of the Pentagon
> building?
>
> Kim W5TIT

That's right. Also, a five pointed star can be made from all of the
diagonals of a pentagon, but it still is not a pentagram, because it is not
within a circle.

3192. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:15:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9uhf26017nh@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26247

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011203210753.03411.00001123@nso-cb.aol.com...
> Dang. I knew I should have paid more attention at Hogwarts.

Five points from Griffindor!

3193. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:22:40 UTC
From: KU4YP <ku4yp@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4kXO7.330$714.42694@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26238
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

hello,

>TOO BAD YOUR LIMITED TO THOSE 450 'CHANNELS'. THAT WILL BE TOUGH ON
>YOU TO MISS WORKING STATIONS IN BETWEEN THE "CHANNELS". ESPECIALLY IF
>YOUR A CONTESTER.

thanks for your concern. check the past years stats. i have never scored high enough to mention in a contest. i just enjoy working the contest. i am happy with my purchase. thanks for asking.
>
>LETS SEE. WHAT FREQ RANGE DOES THE "450 CHANNELS" COVER? ACCORDING TO
>http://www.radiomods.co.nz/comanchewarrior.html THE EXPANSION MOD
>MAKES IT COVER CB FREQS. SO IT IS ALREADY AN ILLEGAL CB.

obviously, you did not read and understand my earlier post to this thread.

>AND NO CW, HUH....SURE THIS RADIO WAS DESIGNED FOR HAMS.
>
i work code, but it is not my favorite mode. guess a swan 240 was not designed for hams either since it was designed to be a ssb only rig. i do not think a radio is "designed" for hams just because it is able to operate cw.

catch you on 10 meters! and, by the way, merry christmas!

mike prevatt
ku4yp

3194. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:28:47 UTC
From: Richard Malone <malone1956@home.net>
Message-ID: <PpXO7.76910$Ze5.43794419@news1.rdc1.md.home.com>
Source record: 26239
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well guys, I'm just coming in on the end of this thread but I have to agree with ku4yp. I know there has been a feud between the "cb" and "ham" populations since before time. But look around at the auctions, newsgroups, etc. and you'll see everything in the world used and accepted in the amateur radio world. I don't recall a Motorola amateur radio, however you might find more of those radios for sale than Yaesu, Icom or Kenwood. There's a mod list longer than a roll of Charmin telling us how we can mod this or that radio to do this or that. I remember an article in QST years ago explaining how to remove a solder jump to enable a radio to transmit across the expanded 136-174 Mhz band. They defended the article by stating in the event of an emergency, you may need to transmit across that band. I can understand that. If a man built a transmitter out of old parts laying around the house, he's a good ham, but if he started with a radio that works 11 meters or even targets 11 meter markets he's not??? I think not.

73's
Richard
n3fif

IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:ce9e428e.0112031817.51203d95@posting.google.com...
> "KU4YP" ku4yp@earthlink.net wrote:
> >well,
>
> > we can put this one to rest because i bought the rig.
> > and, i plan to use it on 10 meters, espically during the
> > upcoming contest.
>
> TOO BAD YOUR LIMITED TO THOSE 450 'CHANNELS'. THAT WILL BE TOUGH ON
> YOU TO MISS WORKING STATIONS IN BETWEEN THE "CHANNELS". ESPECIALLY IF
> YOUR A CONTESTER.
>
> > no, i do not use 11 meters. no, i do
> > not care that it can be "modified" to operate on 11 meters.
>
> LETS SEE. WHAT FREQ RANGE DOES THE "450 CHANNELS" COVER? ACCORDING TO
> http://www.radiomods.co.nz/comanchewarrior.html THE EXPANSION MOD
> MAKES IT COVER CB FREQS. SO IT IS ALREADY AN ILLEGAL CB.
>
> > >> Comanche Warrior 10 meter base station radio for sale. 450 channels
in
> > >> Am, Fm, Usb & Lsb modes. Unit is stock other than frequency
expansion.
>

> AND NO CW, HUH....SURE THIS RADIO WAS DESIGNED FOR HAMS.

3195. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:31:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011203223143.28714.00002776@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 26240

In article <20011203102327.08912.00000624@mb-cr.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."
>
> Hey Jeff...Isn't it just "Calling all Stations?"

Steve:

I think that it would more accurately be defined as "Calling *Any* Station." If Jeff is looking for the ITU phonetic equivalent, it would obviously be "Charlie Quebec," "Quebec" being pronounced "Kay Beck."

73 de Larry, K3LT

3196. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:31:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011203223144.28714.00002777@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 26242

In article <61D2CC1B61B6AE69.8E5AE0CD29100FA8.A609C01956D9931B@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>Perhaps it is *not* seeing the harm in Kim's call sign which requires
>>a dirty mind!
>
> That one was _really_ weak, Larry. I count on you for a more
>intelligent response than that.
>
> Rick

Rick:

As always, a personal attack is the best confirmation that I have hit
the nail right on the head!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3197. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:31:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011203223144.28714.00002778@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 26244

In article <EC1F625585CCEE6B.C1793C64BD1D00EB.D51633617FC89882@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>No. Not unless they wanted me to be. And I'm sure that's what most
>>homosexual "couples" want for their children.
>
> Sure. Just like all military families want their kids to die
>in a war, right?
>
> Get off your homophobic delusions, Larry, and learn something
>about the subject before you make such stupid and inaccurate
>statements.
>
> Rick

Rick:

Sooo, your saying, then, that most homosexual couples go out of
their way to ensure that their children turn out to be normal,
unconfused heterosexuals? I certainly hope that this is so --
perhaps you can provide some quantifiable proof?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3198. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:31:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011203223145.28714.00002779@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 26241

In article <3c0c23c7_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> No. Not unless they wanted me to be. And I'm sure that's what most
>> homosexual "couples" want for their children.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>The true pity, folks, is Larry likely believes that.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

The fact that you feel the need to imply that I may not believe what
I post leads me to conclude that perhaps, you don't believe in what
you post! Trust me, I don't post statements like the above unless
I do, in fact, believe what I am saying.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3199. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:31:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011203223145.28714.00002780@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 26245

In article <3c0ad245_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Oh, sure Riley said what he said. I don't negate that at all. However, I
>have no problems with my callsign...at all. The problems Riley has with it
>are his, the problems you have with it are yours. And so on. I like it.
>I'll keep it. The ARS will not go into extinction, and that can be proven.

Kim:

As Riley (that's MISTER Hollingsworth to you) clearly stated, the
negative impact of your callsign exists in the form of the potential
discouragement of concerned parents, grandparents, and other
influential adults from bringing young, impressionable children into
the realm of Amateur Radio as a result of hearing or seeing your
call sign, which has the effect of objectifying women in a demeaning
manner. The potential for you to bring the ARS "...one step closer
to extinction" is a reality. Of course, you might not admit this, because
it doesn't serve your selfish motives to do so. However, I hold out
the hope that you may, possibly, do the right thing, someday. I have
faith in your potential to change, even if you don't see that possibility
on your radar screen at this time. I like to see the potential for good
in people, and I don't exclude you whatsoever.

>Sorry, you're wrong. As usual. And notice I didn't have to use any worn
>out cliches to make my point...

Well, not this time, at least.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3200. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:31:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011203223146.28714.00002781@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 26243

In article <3C0ADCBA.49DC4701@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Kim, let me absolutely, without a doubt assure you: Riley Hollingsworth's
>> words were true. That makes this YOUR problem.
>
>Actually, it is not Kim's problem at all. The Constitution
>protects people like Kim from people like you and Riley.

Cecil:

Kim's Constitutional right to make a fool of herself and all other YL hams is not the issue; Mr. Hollingsworth was very clear on that point, and I have repeatedly acknowledged this. That doesn't change the fact that the potential negative impact of her decision to select a call sign, which is in poor taste, still exists. This is Kim's problem, and always will be unless and until she decides to change her call sign to one which reflects better taste and judgment.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3201. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 03:55:27 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <79DD107831C9FA2E.418FBA9141CE663E.276BFD31757E1512@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 01:44:00 GMT, "KU4YP" <ku4yp@earthlink.net> wrote:

>well,
>
> we can put this one to rest because i bought the rig.

Cool, now we can hassle you for the details :)

How's it sound?

>hell, i even remember reading about a
>guy trying to load up an oak tree

I'm not even going to go into the safety issues involved in getting an
oak tree to the top of a tower...

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3202. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 04:40:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C53C7.957DCBC2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26249

N2EY wrote:
> The problem was that the bridge deck was too narrow in relation to its length.

Yep, it was engineered to fail although the engineers didn't
realize it at the time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3203. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 04:52:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C567D.4ABBB9D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26250

Rick Adams wrote:
> It sounds nice, Cecil, but what it really says is that the
> poor can go p--- up a rope!

Actually, it says that we shouldn't contribute to breeding herds
of poor people. I think it was Ayn Rand who said if we took all
the wealth and divided it equally that in 50 years, the rich people
would have all their wealth back and the poor people would be just
as poor. I have some experience with a poor family. I adopted the
youngest girl and supported the mother and two older daughters.
No matter how much money I gave them, they remained just as poor.
At one point I was giving them more money than it cost me and my
two girls to live.

> ... there simply wouldn't be the funding to help them.

I'm sorry you feel that way about your fellow man. A poor guy
whose wife just had a baby asked me if I had any work that he
could do for me. I gave him $50. He spent it mostly on cigarettes.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3204. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 04:56:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C5777.D7513DC4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26151

Dave Heil wrote:
> Excuse me? What was your "proof" again?
> Know any Finns? Call 'em and ask 'em.

I just heard some interesting trivia on the radio. Question:
Before 9-11, who was the most famous suicide committed while
killing a bunch of people on the opposing side?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3205. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 05:03:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C5921.3EE87898@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26152

Dave Heil wrote:
> Infer what you like.

I'd rather infer what you provide for me. So exactly what does
Jerome Bettis have to do with your 52 year old rolypoly body?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3206. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 05:10:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C5AD2.385DD3FD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26153

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Kim's Constitutional right to make a fool of herself and all other YL
> hams is not the issue; Mr. Hollingsworth was very clear on that
> point, and I have repeatedly acknowledged this.

Mr. Hollingsworth and you are both dinosaurs as far as
morality goes. To give you an idea how the world has
changed in the last 50 years, I am in a Southern Baptist
Christmas Pageant in which the woman who plays Mary, the
mother of Jesus, is actually in reality six months
pregnant.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3207. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 05:12:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C5B2C.6AF55825@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26155

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote:
> > Texas Towers has always asked for a callsign when I've bought anything
> > capable of transmitting.
>
> They *have*???? They've never asked me, my husband, my father, other hams I
> know.

They even asked me my callsign when I bought a piece of aluminum
capable of transmitting. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3208. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 05:13:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C5B6F.9A9EF90E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26156
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband wrote:
> Hrm.. Guess someone will have to email the FCC and find out.. All of the
> band charts I've seen (excepting the ARRL one you mentioned) show those
> segments as CW and Weak Signal. ::Shrug::

"The FCC Rule Book" is not good enough for you?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3209. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 05:13:37 UTC
From: Larry Roll <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <9uhm21$aq8$0@216.155.32.45>
Source record: 26154

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> ROFLMAO....^5 Rick.

And THIS is one of Kim's more intelligent postings!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3210. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 05:17:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C5C71.9E36DDB5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26158
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Krell wrote:
> So what's that have to do with use of "HI HI" that's spoken or used in
> print? (unless the printed matter is a morse transcription) What's wrong
> with actually laughing at something?

There's nothing wrong with laughing but during half-duplex
operation, nobody can hear you. When one comes back on, one
can say, "HI HI on that last joke", instead of feigning a
fake delayed laugh.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3211. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 05:18:37 UTC
From: Larry Roll <k3lt@magpage.com>
Message-ID: <9uhmbdcfb0@216.155.32.45>
Source record: 26157

> > They can refuse to sell to anybody. In this case, suspicion of intent
> > to use the equipment in an illegal manner would probably cover them
> > against any potential discrimination claim.
> >
> > Texas Towers has always asked for a callsign when I've bought anything
> > capable of transmitting.
> >
>
> They *have*???? They've never asked me, my husband, my father, other hams > I know.
>
> Kim W5TIT

I've done business with AES and HRO for years, and they always
ask my callsign. It just happens to be a convenient way to index
their sales records in their computer. It's also a highly
individual ID -- prevents the guesswork of multiple Smiths,
Joneses, Browns, etc. If Texas Towers doesn't ask for and use
call signs in this manner, one must wonder why?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3212. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 05:22:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0C5D9E.899911F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26159
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

IllegalCBersMustGO wrote:
> LETS SEE. WHAT FREQ RANGE DOES THE "450 CHANNELS" COVER? ACCORDING TO
> http://www.radiomods.co.nz/comanchewarrior.html THE EXPANSION MOD
> MAKES IT COVER CB FREQS. SO IT IS ALREADY AN ILLEGAL CB.

Most any homebrew 10m transceiver covers 11m as well. As long as the
ham doesn't transmit on 11m, no law has been broken. It is not
illegal for hams to modify CB equipment for use on 10m.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3213. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 05:43:11 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C0C6212.298A6008@spam.me.not>
Source record: 26160
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The portion you quoted did not say anything about the subbands in
question.. It stated that CW was "legal" everywhere, and that ssb
started at .1 for each band.

Barring the specific exclusion of any particular mode in your quote, I
would think it would be best to get it directly from the FCC themselves.

Of course, you've clipped that quote from your most recent reply, so
I'll requote it here...

>... from "The FCC Rule Book": "97.305 An amateur station may
>transmit a CW emission on any frequency authorized to the control
>operator." Under "emissions types authorized":
>6m 50.1-51.0 MHz - RTTY, data (doesn't include 50.0-50.1)
>2m 144.1-148.0 MHz - RTTY, data (doesn't include 144.0-144.1)

I assume the portion in parenthesis was added by you....

Based on the evidence you've presented, Weak Signal emissions don't seem
to be excluded from 50.0 to 50.1 and 144.0 to 144.1. Since you've not
provided any facts to the contrary, the question remains unanswered.
Would it be incorrect to go to the authority in this matter (the FCC) to
get the question answered?

de AB8LR

-SSB

CAM wrote:
>
> Sideband wrote:
> > Hrm.. Guess someone will have to email the FCC and find out.. All of the
> > band charts I've seen (excepting the ARRL one you mentioned) show those
> > segments as CW and Weak Signal. ::Shrug::
>
> "The FCC Rule Book" is not good enough for you?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3214. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 07:00:56 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <5BE0F2A37B79F1DB.3CDA8427999C9ACD.291FD45F830DDAD3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26161
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 19:06:24 -0600, "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH"
<kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote:

>On Mon, 3 Dec 2001 15:04:49 -0600, "W0MN" <gbaron@mailandnews.com>
>wrote:
>
>>In the US you cannot use a Ham Radio in the CB bands nor a CB radio in
>>the ham bands because they are not type accepted. At least the vast
>>majority are not.
>
>Ham radios don't have to be type accepted. If they did, the entire
>homebrewing aspect of ham radio would be illegal. Buying an 11m radio
>and modifying it for legitimate 10m use is no different than building
>a 10m radio.

Now that I think about it, why the hell am I, a codeless Tech, having
to tell an Extra what is and isn't legal on HF?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3215. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 07:01:06 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <9uhsbi$qb0$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 26163
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net> wrote:

>Jeffrey Herman wrote
>> Here's a quiz just for you: State the ITU phone equivalent of "CQ."
>> Post your reply to the NG; we're all waiting...

>Yeah... it's "Hello all Stations"

That's good, Rich; Krell dodged the question.

Since Krell's so adamant in believing that it's incorrect to say
"HI HI" on phone (to the point that he called someone an idiot),
then surely he must believe it's incorrect to call "CQ" on phone,
too. He'll be the first ham to ever say "Hello All Stations."

Jeff KH6O

--
Telecommunication Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard University of Hawaii System
jherman @ d14.uscg.mil jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

3216. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 07:12:12 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <9uht0c$qu3$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 26164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
>So what's that have to do with use of "HI HI" that's spoken or used in

The point being that since the CW prosigns "CQ" and "73" are
universally accepted and used on phone, you shouldn't call
folks derogatory names for also saying "HI HI"; it's just
another CW prosign that's been adopted for phone.

Jeff KH6O

--
Telecommunication Specialist Mathematics Lecturer
U.S. Coast Guard University of Hawaii System
jherman @ d14.uscg.mil jeffreyh @ hawaii.edu

3217. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 07:18:48 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112032318.1ae87bc9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:<79DD107831C9FA2E.418FBA9141CE663E.276BFD31757E1512@lp.airnews.net>...
>Ham radios don't have to be type accepted. If they did, the entire
>homebrewing aspect of ham radio would be illegal. Buying an 11m
radio
>and modifying it for legitimate 10m use is no different than building
>a 10m radio.

>Now that I think about it, why the hell am I, a codeless Tech, having
>to tell an Extra what is and isn't legal on HF?

HMMMMMMMMM. COME TO THINK OF IT WHY DOES A PERSON LIKE KD5NRH WHO
CANT LEGALLY OPERATE ON 10 METERS RUSH IN TO DEFEND THE SALE OF THESE
FAKE EXPORT 10 METER RADIOS ?????????

3218. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 09:04:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0C915B.D1662F8F@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26165

N2EY wrote:
>
> The Tacoma Narrows bridge tore itself
> apart due to undamped oscillations in a
> sustained wind. The home movie of
> "Galloping Gertie's" last moments is an
> engineering classic.
>
> The problem was that the bridge deck was
> too narrow in relation to its length.

Well, they'll probably get another chance at it fairly soon. The current bridge (built to replace "Galloping Gertie") is in poor repair and traffic routinely exceeds it's design limits. As a result, a new, even wider, bridge will have to be built soon to end the massive gridlock caused by the limited capacity of the current bridge. Then we'll see how a much wider bridge stands up to the winds through the narrows.

By the way, the current bridge is no ride in the park when the winds blow. If you walk out on a windy day, you can get motion sickness from the bouncing around. Because of the vehicle springs and shock absorbers, you don't notice it as much when riding.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3219. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 09:21:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0C955E.8C6892A6@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26166

CAM wrote:
>
> Libertarianism is based on a system
> of principles. Moving toward the
> "middle" would compromise those
> principles. It is interesting that
> you suggest that Libertarians should
> do exactly what you find objectionable
> about the Democrats and Republicans,
> i.e. the compromising of their basic
> principles.

The Democrats and Republicans have moved to the middle. What I'm suggesting is for Libertarians to move towards the middle, without moving all the way to it. The key is to take some of the rough edges off some issues, without going so far as to compromise principles.

> Shows how little you know about
> Libertarian principles, Dwight. In a
> nutshell, Libertarians are social
> liberals and *economic conservatives*.

Well, I don't want to get into a point by point discussion of the party's positions (and that is exactly where this thread is heading). Besides, it seems others are more willing to do that, so I'll let them. Instead, I'll just leave it with what I said above.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3220. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 09:32:26 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0F05C92B79132959.4FD6EE3932617254.A75F2E6B939B652E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26167

On 04 Dec 2001 03:31:44 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>> That one was _really_ weak, Larry. I count on you for a more
>>intelligent response than that.
>>
>> Rick
>
>Rick:
>
>As always, a personal attack is the best confirmation that I have hit
>the nail right on the head!

Actually, that was a compliment to your intelligence, Larry. I
wouldn't have _expected_ a more intelligent response in the first
place from some of the people in this thread.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3221. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 09:32:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A2DA16DADF4031AC.C0A895AF7F845982.187C5817EB17E639@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26168

On 04 Dec 2001 02:07:53 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Old joke but a good one:
>
>Psychotics build castles in the air.
>Neurotics live in them.
>Psychologists collect the rent.

And psychiatrists provide the drugs for the parties.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3222. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 09:32:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B37622189F6F5680.BCD1E72B62A798F1.0E3DB91600B0313A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26169

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 18:15:38 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>> But who pays for them?
>
>Taxes for now. But the thinking is that if the judicial system would
>charge for its civil services, those charges for things like contract
>enforcement would bear the brunt of the cost of all proper functions
>of government. Something like a 10% fee on the total amount of
>the contract for guaranteeing enforcement of the contract.

I could see charging for civil services (provided, of course,
that the loser in the action was the one who had to pay, not the
winner). But you can't expect those fees to cover the cost of the
criminal justice system--particularly if you include corrections. And
while it might be nice to picture convicts paying their own board and
room there would be two problems with that:

1. It would permit successful criminals (who have considerable
savings on the outside) to afford a better level of treatment than
less successful ones--which rewards success at crime, hardly the
optimum situation.

2. If convicts are required to do productive work to pay their
way, that means that jobs for honest citizens will be taken away and
given to them. Again, this is a way of rewarding dishonest behavior
and penalizing honest behavior.

>> My strongest conflict with the Libertarian party, however,
>> comes in the area of social programs.
>
>Yep, and that's an area where we will have to agree to disagree.
>I simply don't believe in rewarding failure and penalizing success.
>Over my lifetime, the government has done me more financial harm
>than criminals have done to everyone else that I personally know.

Sorry, Cecil, but that's way too elitist for me.

What about battered women, widows with small kids, people who
are disabled, seniors with no pensions, the mentally ill, those who
are learning disabled or retarded, displaced workers, those who are
laid off, or unemployed workers in a depressed economy? For that
matter what about medical coverage for those who can't afford it? Do
we just let children starve or become ill because the parents can't
afford to pay for their food and medical expenses--or do we terminate
their rights as parents because they are poor and place the kids with

strangers?

Too many weaknesses there for me--and for many other
people--which is one of the greatest reasons the Libertarian party
isn't very likely to displace the "majors" until it decides to revise
its position on these issues.

>I used the term in the sense of engineering a bridge that falls down -
>like the Tacomas Straits - was that the one?

Close, it was the Tacoma Narrows Bridge! :-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3223. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 09:32:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0D34E0994F53AD8F.0B46CF5C2C1DACF3.B1FF811944C62C9F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26170

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 22:52:13 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Actually, it says that we shouldn't contribute to breeding herds
>of poor people.

Which, of course, assumes that poverty is caused by genetics.

We've had a lot of people who emerged from poverty and did
pretty well for themselves--and for the country (think Lincoln,
Carnegie, Clinton, etc.). Your view would simply take the attitude
that only those who are successful deserve to have children.

> I think it was Ayn Rand who said if we took all
>the wealth and divided it equally that in 50 years, the rich people
>would have all their wealth back and the poor people would be just
>as poor.

Which is about as classest of a statement as anyone could
make. Ayn Rand had some good ideas and was a very good fiction writer,
but I wouldn't base an economic system on her philosophy.

>I have some experience with a poor family. I adopted the
>youngest girl and supported the mother and two older daughters.
>No matter how much money I gave them, they remained just as poor.
>At one point I was giving them more money than it cost me and my
>two girls to live.

Cecil, in the United States, the average welfare recipient is
a caucasian woman who has been widowed, divorced, or deserted by her
husband, lives in a rural area, has 2 children at least one of whom is
under school age, and does not have the job skills necessary to earn
enough to pay for both child care and their minimal costs of living.
She will spend 1.9 years of her life on welfare and an additional .8
years on food stamps and medicaid, the cost of which she will pay back
into the system within 9 years of working.

That is the person you are planning to remove the support
network from, not the stereotype crack mother or the person who takes
advantage of others as was done with you.

If all welfare recipients were like the ones depicted on
television and in right wing literature, I would agree with removing
welfare (although not completely--kids STILL deserve our protection,
they aren't responsible for their parent's actions). But the fact of
the matter is, they are not.

Incidently, welfare only counts for a very small part of our transfer payments--the largest portion by far is Social Security. By simply making Social Security need based using the same needs tables as are used for OTHER transfer payments, we would cut our transfer payments to 20% of today's levels.

>> ... there simply wouldn't be the funding to help them.
>
>I'm sorry you feel that way about your fellow man. A poor guy
>whose wife just had a baby asked me if I had any work that he
>could do for me. I gave him $50. He spent it mostly on cigarettes.

Maybe you should have tried to suggest a place for him to work, instead. I don't feel that "giving" money IS the best solution. A person receiving welfare or other transfer payments should have to demonstrate progress toward independence (seniors, the disabled and mentally ill excepted, obviously)--but there are a variety of ways to do that. In order of benefit to society they are:

1. Education. Every study ever conducted demonstrated that an investment in education for the poor is almost invariably returned by increased taxes. An educated person is seldom likely to need state assistance (emergencies and serious recessions excepted, of course).

2. Job training and underwriting. By underwriting the expense of training people for semi-skilled positions (through tax incentives or outright payment) we can remove people from the unskilled labor market (notoriously under-employed) and place them in higher paying, and more secure, semi-skilled jobs.

3. Job preparation programs. As simple a thing as teaching people how to interview for a job, how to fill out an application for work, or how to conduct a job search can be sufficient to move someone from the ranks of the chronically unemployed to that of the employed.

4. Job search programs and community service. By conducting both as mandatory parts of a welfare program (assuming none of the above, preferable, options is available or exercised), we not only insure that welfare recipients ARE seeking work (where practical--it may make better sense to support a mother with small children for the few years it takes until they are in school than to pay for child care while she works at minimum wage--particularly if she uses that time to improve her education or skills) but by community service we simultaneously provide the community benefits and the welfare recipient the experience of working at a regular job and meeting the requirements of his or her position.

Your method would simply leave these people on the streets, Cecil. Because while you may personally be willing to donate some money from time to time most Americans aren't going to do so--and the result will be that the dollars you donate will be eaten up in administrative costs instead of used to benefit the poor.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3224. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 09:32:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F24264628A3673FB.2DB42A396FF6E220.0F19BEDDE51984EB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26171

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 01:33:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Your attempts to limit MY thinking to that which is approved by you
>would then seem to be close-minded.

I don't attempt to limit your thinking, Dave, I just search
for indications that you DO think.

>You are a great role model, Rick. You reject whichever laws with which
>you do not agree but are quick to jump on the lawsuit bandwagon. You
>talk out of both sides of your mouth.

Lawsuits provide a neutral playing field in which both
participants have the opportunity to state their positions--a criminal
action provides only a platform to demonstrate guilt or innocence, a
very different thing.

And if you feel it's wrong to reject laws with which you don't
agree try telling that to Gandhi, MLK, or the Revolutionaries at the
Boston Tea Party for that matter. Presumably, had you been typical of
our forefathers we'd still be subjects of the Crown.

>> Too bad. I'd like to compare it to those I received from the
>> first year students in one of my classes to see how far you needed to
>> progress before you could discuss a subject objectively instead of
>> from a biased perspective.

>You aren't in a position of authority, Rick. You might be able to blow
>smoke in a classroom and intimidate some student. I'm afraid you are
>likely to be disappointed at my lack of deference toward you here.

No problem, Dave. You have so many features lacking here that
this is just the least of them.

>> And in both cases you cite the people got their tattoos after
>> becoming adults. So much for the concept that if they are forbidden as
>> youths they will mature and not do so later.
>
>Actually not. The folks I cite had their tattoos done prior to reaching
>the age of majority. There goes your *poof* point.

What ages did they get them?

>> I would have to regard dying for political or economic
>> interests a trifle sillier than getting a tattoo, wouldn't you?
>
>Sure, Rick. If a person is able to join the military without parental

>consent, that person is old enough to get a tattoo. The person can
>still be immature enough to make a decision he'll later regret.

And what of the 17 year old who HAS his or her parent's
permission to enlist? The military will treat him/her like an adult
and expect the same of him or her that they do of a 21 year old
recruit. Shouldn't he or she have the same rights that would be
available at 18--including the right to decide if he or she wants a
tattoo?

If the answer is no, how can you justify permitting such an
individual to enter the military in the first place?

If the answer is yes, then how can you justify saying that a
17 year old is old enough to make THAT decision but not old enough to
make a decision about a tattoo--regardless of whether he or she DOES
choose to join the military or not?

But if 17 is an acceptable age for a tattoo, then your
argument that a person must achieve majority goes up in smoke.

>> >Gee, I think I see how they won.
>>
>> Really?
>>
>> How?
>
>...by applying the laws of their community rather than those of New
>York.

Translation: By limiting the actions of a firm in NYC to those
acceptable for a firm in "Uptightville, GA."

>> By proving that a firm outside their jurisdiction cannot do
>> business with a citizen in their jurisdiction w/o being prosecuted for
>> actions that are legal everywhere else? They didn't prosecute the
>> person who RECEIVED the shows, Dave (that would have rather quickly
>> overturned the law and they knew it), they prosecuted the network for
>> delivering them.
>
>Seems to me that they should have prosecuted the individual subscribing.

They would have lost. That WOULD have violated his First
Amendment rights. The prosecutor himself stated that publicly.

>If the law was overturned, that is the way things work in this society.

It wasn't overturned--that's the problem. If it ISN'T
overturned it will mean a radical change in the nature of the programs
we receive on Television--and not one in the direction of freedom of
choice.

>> Don't like em? Vote with your feet, stupid. Don't watch em.
>

>Y'know, that's just what we do. We watch selectively.

And that, not censorship, is the sane way to respond to
unwanted programming. If not enough people want it to make it
profitable, the networks are going to cancel it--but if enough people
want it, it's unreasonable to prevent them from receiving it simply
because one group of people don't care for that type of entertainment.

>What "people like you" believe is that there is some sort of right have
>sexually explicit material and so-called "adult" language beamed into
>homes across the land.

There is such a right, Dave. It's called freedom of speech.

> How about this: If you want that kind of
>material in your home, you pay extra for a subscription. The material
>then enters only the homes of those who desire it.

Earth to Dave:

That's EXACTLY what the premium channels ARE! I pay for HBO,
Showtime, Starz, and other such channels because I CHOOSE to view
uncut and commercial free movies and documentaries. If those shows are
'R-Rated' it's my decision whether I want to view/hear them or
not--and if I do, it shouldn't be anyone else's concern but my own.

The case with the Tuxedo network is another similar example.
Not only is Tuxedo subscription only--it is scrambled so that if you
don't have a decoder you CAN'T view or hear it at all! Yet one small
community in Georgia was able to prevent that network from delivering
content to an adult, paid, subscriber in Georgia. THAT, Dave, is going
way too far.

I have no objection to reasonable controls on the content of
BROADCAST television. But the subscription channels are a totally
different matter. If you can't receive it w/o subscribing it isn't the
government's concern to determine what it's content will be.

>> That isn't the point. The point is that you are unwilling to
>> allow others to MAKE that choice for themselves!
>
>Sure--make your choice. Subscribe to it.

Dave, you aren't following the conversation. The man in
Georgia DID subscribe to Tuxedo--it wasn't a broadcast network.

>> >Maplethorpe as I recall. There's lots more to it than you've outlined.
>> >Wonder why that conviction was never overturned?
>>
>> Because it wasn't appealed by the Cincinnati Museum due to
>> opposition by the city counsel.
>
>Yeah, go on. Why was counsel opposed to an appeal?

Because the counsel was under pressure from the religious
right to drop the matter, Dave. The AFA practically laid siege to the
community--and it was successful.

>> You're correct that it was Mapplethorpe. So what? It was a
>> valid exhibit of art.
>
>...according to you but not according to the people of Cincinnati.

According to the Arts counsel, the Smithsonian Institute, the
NYC Museum of Modern Art, and virtually every art authority in the
United States, Dave, not just according to me.

The city of Cincinnati does NOT have the authority to define
art--anymore than it has the authority to define who may be considered
a licensed amateur radio operator. Art is defined by very specific
guidelines and one of those guidelines is NOT "community values."

>> The museum director made it very clear that
>> children would not be permitted to view the works considered to be
>> sexual in nature (it might burst your bubble to know it, but
>> Maplethorpe created a great many images that were NOT sexually
>> oriented) under any circumstances, and that only inoffensive images
>> would be used in the promotion of the showing (which would clearly
>> indicate that many of the contents contained troubling sexual images).
>
>I don't think that the idea that the publicly funded art museum should
>be closed to a portion of the public is representative of your
>libertarian views.

At least if it was open to adults it would have allowed people
to view the art--as it was NO ONE was permitted to see it.

>As you have agreed, while some of Maplethorpe's work was not of sexual
>themes, much was. We're not talking just about what is viewed by most
>folks as normal sex here, are we Rick? Troubling indeed.

So?

Since when is what is considered "normal sex" by most people a
criteria for art?

Are you so repressed that you can't allow people to see what
could be disturbing images (most of the pictures, btw, are not
"abnormal" sex or disturbing images--I've seen the exhibit in a more
tolerant city, Ann Arbor, MI) if they choose to do so? Who elected the
people of Cincinnati the guardians of the public morality?

>> If you can find the slightest legitimacy in a community preventing the
>> showing of legitimate art in a legitimate art museum simply because
>> some members find the material depicted offensive, I'd like to know
>> what it is.
>
>More than "some members" found it objectionable. I wonder how many of

>the public officials involved in bringing the suit were re-elected by
>the people of Cincinnati.

I wonder how many of the people who passed segregation laws in
the South were re-elected by the people of THEIR communities. We're
discussing freedom of speech, Dave, not politics as usual.

>> Freedom of Speech isn't about permitting only innocuous
>> speech, Dave, you don't need a Constitutional protection for that.
>> It's about permitting speech that is controversial, challenging,
>> unpopular and, yes, offensive to many--because ONLY when that kind of
>> speech is permitted can Americans exercise their right to protest or
>> to criticize government.
>
>What is it that you think Maplethorpe's work protested? What government
>action was he criticizing? The courts recognize that there are limits
>on free speech.

And the right wing extremist idiots are the first to go
sniveling to them when they see anything that might offend their
self-righteous sensibilities, aren't they?

Dave, when people set themselves as the moral interpreters of
society we lose our freedom and become a police state. I'm sorry you
aren't capable of seeing the difference between freedom of choice and
repression--most of us can see it rather well.

>> You don't have to respect someone's speech
>> (and art IS a form of speech--the SC has ruled on that several times)
>> to support its right to exist--you only need to respect the
>> Constitution of the United States to do so. Clearly, the people of
>> Cincinnati don't respect our Constitution to the degree they respect
>> the views of a few religious fanatics such as Donald Wildmon of the
>> AFA. Don't expect any intelligent and fair minded person to accept a
>> community like that as a "good example" of community values.
>
>...yet Cincinnati and some of the northern Kentucky environs are
>consistently declared to be among the most "liveable" places in America.
>You can burn your flag in Cincinnati if you like, Rick. Just don't show
>a graphic photo of homosexual sex and try to convince the folks there
>that is art. Many attempts have been made to present crud masquerading
>as art.

And many attempts have been made to present religion as
community values. So what?

Dave, if those pictures were of HETEROSEXUALS instead of
HOMOSEXUALS would you feel the same way? Would the citizens of
Cincinnati? I doubt it seriously--the key isn't the sexual component,
it's the fact that you and the people of Cincinnati are homophobic.

>> Freedom of choice==hedonism to you?
>

>I liken your views to a frequent mantra of the sixties: If it feels
>good, do it.

And yours are far closer to the Inquisition. I think I prefer
the sixties, off hand.

>> You do now. Apparently, the concept that Harry Potter is a
>> sorcerer is so offensive to the Christians in the community (or at
>> least to those religious leaders they allow to do their thinking for
>> them) that they see no reason children should be exposed to the books
>> or movie--it might convince the children to waiver from Christianity!
>
>I only know that you've told me about it. I haven't read anything about
>it in the press nor have I seen anything on network news broadcasts.
>For the record, I don't see anything wrong with Harry Potter books.

Shhhhh!

Don't tell them that in Cincinnati, they'll probably ban your
postings.

>> Give me a break!
>
>Choose a limb.

Your left leg? ;-)

>> >Only to a point. I don't think kids should wear clothing (i.e. T-shits)
>> >with any religious or political statements on them.
>>
>> Including Christian ones? If you support that perspective,
>> I'll agree with you. But if ONE religion is permitted to be
>> represented, all should receive equal treatment.
>
>Yeah, including the Christian ones. Just don't try selling me on the
>idea that wicca practices constitute a religion.

Why should I bother. Your mind is made up, it would only
confuse you to state the facts.

Religious bigot!

>> I-I-I-I-I. What about other's rights? YOU don't care if shows
>> are "bleeped," or not (of course, we know they aren't, so . . .) so
>> who cares if others don't care for the practice. YOU don't need closed
>> captions, so screw those with hearing loss. YOU don't have parental
>> control settings so other people should be censored to prevent
>> offensive material from entering YOUR home--to save you the trouble of
>> turning the set off or changing the channel.
>
>Yeah, I've noticed that you've suddenly stacked 'em all up neatly for
>me. I could easily go back through your stuff and find a numbers of
>"I's" in which you speak your views.

And I present them as MY VIEWS, Dave. You present yours as
though they represented a revealed truth or facts.

>The Starz stuff is bleeped here. My wife confirms it. That you don't
>accept that is tough.

Then call Dish, because they are violating their contract with
you and with Starz.

>I don't need a parental control for my set. There are no children here.
>Maybe you meant that it is to control *my* parents when they visit.

Why--are they too open minded for you?

>I don't need closed captioning. Neither my wife nor I have any hearing
>problem. There's also the fact that our living room TV and VCR are
>multi-system pieces of equipment bought overseas. Maybe you'd like to
>come for an inspection tour.

No thanks--the religious icons would probably overpower the
decor.

>> How does hearing a "bleep" allow you to enjoy the dialog and
>> acting?
>
>Tell me, Rick. How many angels can dance on the head of a pin?

None. There is no such thing as an angel.

> I still
>find it kind of refreshing. Are you somehow offended that this is my
>belief? It certainly sounds like another example of, "Be reasonable. Do
>it MY way".

Dave, you may find it refreshing--your neighbor (if he has
"bleeped" shows) may find it angering. Why should YOUR desire to be
protected from the script in a movie overweigh his desire to see the
movie in unaltered form?

>> They run everything unedited, Dave, I tested your claim and it
>> was false, remember?
>
>You tested? Oh, OK. I must have been delirious and made the entire
>thing up in order to make a point with you here. Yeah, that's it...

Sounds ok to me. I'll accept your word that's what happened.

Dave, this conversation is going no where. I've stated my
views and you've stated yours. At this point I'll simply drop out of
the discussion and let you either do the same or continue to
pontificate.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3225. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 10:23:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CA3DC.EE490B0A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26172

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) Churches: Two problems here;
> (1) By counting on churches to take
> up the slack, the Libertarian Party
> is essentially violating its own
> principles of separation of church
> and state and making the government
> dependent on organized religion--
> which in turn makes the politicians
> indebted to the churches and thus
> influenced by them and; (2) there
> would be no way to insure that the
> churches didn't use the power it
> would give them to proselytize new
> members by giving preferential
> treatment to their own members
> (logical, if not terribly helpful
> to non-members) or requiring (as
> do many missions today) attendance
> at religious activities to receive
> aid.

We just had this discussion in the newsgroup a few months ago.
Anyway, there doesn't appear to be a great "separation of church and
state" conflict with the government aid programs already pouring many
millions into church ran activities each year. Take a trip over to the
Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs (CFDA) at...

http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/cfda/index.htm

...and look through their programs. You'll notice that many of them
(especially community aid, minority aid, inner city programs, after
school programs, and aid to the poor) are already open to churches
(classified as public/private nonprofit organizations). And you'll
also notice many of these programs available to churches have already
dealt with the issues you raised in "(2)" above. In fact, about the
only complaint I've heard about these programs is that they primarily
target inner cities, while largely ignoring rural communities
throughout the country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3226. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 10:38:02 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <672843AB044B2518.94A4425C9C7CF2D8.120C5F2BB645239E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26173
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 3 Dec 2001 23:18:48 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
(IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:

>HMMMMMMMMM. COME TO THINK OF IT WHY DOES A PERSON LIKE KD5NRH WHO
>CANT LEGALLY OPERATE ON 10 METERS RUSH IN TO DEFEND THE SALE OF THESE
>FAKE EXPORT 10 METER RADIOS ?????????

I can be an Extra in a month. You'll be an anonymous coward forever.

<TRANSLATION LANGUAGE="tardspeak">
I CAN BE AN EXTRA IN A MONTH..... YOU'LL BE AN
ANONYMOUS COWARD FOREVER.....
</TRANSLATION>

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3227. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 10:56:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CAB9E.C080AFE0@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26174

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) Research indicates that up to
> 10% of the people on death row did
> NOT commit the offense for which they
> were convicted. (snip)

I find that very hard to believe. However, given for a moment this 10% actually exists, how many of these "innocent" death row inmates make it through the eight to twelve years of review and appeals without their innocence being discovered? In fact, the appeal process is so weighted in favor of the accused, I suspect many criminals are simply walking away free (not the other way around). Of course, this doesn't seem to bother those opposed to the death penalty as much. They're more concerned for the criminals in jail than they are for the victims of the criminals they work so hard to set free.

> (snip) an innocent person was put to
> death (as has happened more than once
> in recent years)? (snip)

Nonsense. Funny how only those opposed to the death penalty can "see" those "innocent" people who were put to death. Everyone else (jury, judges, appeal judges, pardon boards, and so forth) saw a guilty person.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3228. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 11:05:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CADAE.AAF1C299@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26175

CAM wrote:
>
> There is a booklet titled, "Libertarianism
> in One Easy Lesson", that is available
> from the Libertarian Party. Would you like
> to have a copy?

No, thanks, Cecil. About ten years ago, I took a look at the Libertarian Party, in depth (including going to several area party meetings) and was not able to find much I could support (all seemed way too liberal to me - in spite of what you're saying now). Perhaps I'll take another look one day, but right now I just don't have the time.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3229. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 12:17:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011204071737.03411.00001126@nso-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26176

In article <3C0C5777.D7513DC4@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Question:
>Before 9-11, who was the most famous suicide committed while
>killing a bunch of people on the opposing side?

Most famous or most effective?

Ploesti comes to mind. Also Rourke's Drift. But they weren't true suicides.

WW2 gave us Japanese kami kaze pilots (the words mean "divine wind") some of whom were successful. There was the truck bomber who took out the Marine barracks in Lebanon, numerous other truck bombers including the attacks on US embassies a few years ago.

The defenders of the Alamo were wiped out but held off and decimated Santa Ana so much that SA was later defeated. SA probably never heard of the 300 Spartans

Nelson's defeat of the Spanish Armada at Trafalgar was considered by some as a suicide mission when he set out but it turned the other way.

In ancient Greece, a small group of Spartans held a much bigger Persian invasion force at bay at Thermopylae. Although eventually betrayed and wiped out, the Spartans cost the Persians so much time and trouble that the invaders were later repelled.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3230. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 12:32:05 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunkmail_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CC245.471C@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 26181
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

AL GOSS wrote:
>
> Who told you CODELESS band!!! Codeless band is FRS band. About 50% of the
> QSO's taking place are CW mode, some long haul ansd 99% AURORA. Get with
> it....learn it...you weren't born knowing how to operate a PC. I "think" you
> had to learn and learn ---you did, because "you wanted to ". The BEST
> DISTANCE will be via morse code. 90% of "real" DX on 6 meters and upper bands
> is via CW mode. It's only a few didgits...like your PC uses at FAST speed.
> Now ya see ---I was raised on CW I had to learn PC, wasn't born to it.
> de "ol' fart" , I guess, per no-codes in most circles AL, K2ERG
>

You'd better check your rig's IF filters, if you think the amount of CW
contacts are as high as you do. The other week when 6 meters was open to
Europe, I heard many SSB QSO's but nary a few CW contacts. It's easier
to work voice. So unless you are looking for that hopelessly weak signal
or somehow enjoy painfully slow data exchanges, voice is the way to go.
Voice outnumbers CW contacts by a considerable margin on HF and CW is
vitually non-existant on VHF and higher except during contests, or other
"special" events. You need to get off the Titanic and come to the
realization that Voice replaced CW, video killed the radio star and
computers are a must-know to get along in the information age. It's
called progress. You're either with it, or your obsolete.

Dave
"Sandbagger"

3231. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 13:04:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CC97F.B32ECE49@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26177

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Let me be sure I understand what
> you just stated.
>
> According to that, you do NOT have
> absolute freedom in your relationship
> because to have that would risk losing
> trust, which you state should not be
> given blindly anyway.
>
> Is that supposed to make sense?

READ MY 3RD RESPONSE, "HELLO!!," BELOW BEFORE PROCEEDING.

Rick, you seem to think anyone who chooses differently than you is somehow less free (more repressed). My wife has always had absolutely freedom over her choices and the same with me. I have never told my wife that she cannot have intimate meetings with a member of the opposite sex. And she has never told me that. And neither of us have spies following us around to make sure we obey the rules. However, we decided early in our relationship to maintain a monogamous relationship, and each of use has made a free choice to live our lives in a manner that fully respects that decision. And, until that decision changes, I will not do anything that challenges, even slightly, that decision. And, after years of marriage, I don't think my wife would either.

> Dwight, very freedom TO make your own
> decisions in such circumstances _knowing_
> that your partner will support and accept
> those decisions instills complete mutual
> trust--it doesn't abrogate it!

And, as I said above, we have both already freely made our decisions a long time ago. Each of us are free to change our minds, but I would never do so as long as I care for and respect my wife. And I'll bet you a million dollars that you could not force my wife to change her mind.

> How can you claim to trust someone yet
> tell them their choices must be limited
> to those you feel comfortable with so
> you can continue to trust them? Isn't
> that a complete contradiction?

HELLO!! Tell me where I have ever said I FORCE my wife to live by my rules. Show me where I've ever said that my wife's "choices must be limited to those.." I "..feel comfortable with." If you look back over this thread, you'll see that I've told you what _I_ would do, not what I expect my wife to do. I have NEVER, not would I ever consider, dictating to my wife rules that she must live by. Such a concept has never, EVER, entered my mind. Again, I have made a free choice to live _MY_ life in a manner that respects our relationship. Since my wife also avoids such situations, obviously she has made a similar choice.

> (snip) I don't have any interest
> in pursuing other women--but if my
> wife were to take the position that
> I _couldn't_ have outside relationships
> not only would I feel that she was
> violating my freedom of choice but
> that she was demonstrating a lack
> of trust in me. (snip)

Bullcrap, Rick! That is the most self centered, asinine, thing I've ever read in these newsgroups. Your wife does not have to allow you to bury your penis wherever you want to show that she trusts you. And, if you demand that from your wife, you have no right whatsoever to talk about any demands you think I've made on mine. You talk about freedom of choice, but you've denied you wife the right to choose a monogamous relationship with you (as you said, if she did, you would feel "she was violating.. [your] ..freedom of choice" and "demonstrating a lack of trust in.. [you]"). And where does "trust" enter into the situation of you jumping into bed with another woman to get your jollies? All that tells me is that your lust for the other woman, and your penis, is more important to you than your own wife's feelings (because no person who really cares would not be hurt by such behavior, in spite of what he/she might say to keep the other person happy).

> Take a look at the statistics, Dwight.
> The majority of men in he United States
> HAVE done just that at least once
> during their marriage, (snip)

I don't need statistics, Rick. I don't run my live by statistics, and I don't make my choices using statistics. And, more importantly, I don't do something just because "everyone" else is doing it. I don't do that, my wife doesn't do that, and that is all I care about.

> (snip) By doing so behind their spouses
> backs they are not only betraying their
> trust but they are not allowing them to
> make the same choices they, themselves,
> have made. (snip)

So doing it in front of them isn't betraying their trust? Nonsense. I don't care where you do it, or how you do it, you're still having sex with another person. And that means, at least for that moment,

that person means more to you then your spouse.

> Finally, your straw dogs.

Man, you need to write shorter messages. I would not have the time
to respond to each person if they decided to write a book each time
they posted a message.

> (snip) the divorce rate among couples
> who are part of the swinging lifestyle
> is less than one-third that of the
> population as a whole. (snip)

Of course, that is the claim of those who support that lifestyle.
After all, it is easy to claim something when there are no
independent, reliable, statistics to back it up.

> (snip) Outside of relationships that
> fail because one partner is cheating on
> the other (the exact opposite of the
> kind of freedom we're discussing), I
> think you'd have a lot of trouble
> identifying lives that were "screwed
> up from illicit sex."

Actually, up until this message, WE'RE not discussing the crap
you're discussing. You're discussing some silly nonsense about open
marriages, while I'm discussing normal relationships with normal
people. Normal relationships are all around for me to see. But, so far
I've seen nothing reliable to back up your claims about open marriages.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3232. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 13:07:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CCA1F.93C883D7@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26178

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I'll pick just the last sentence to
> comment on. That may work well for
> you, Dwight, and your wife. But I'll
> make the point that just because I
> go to lunch with a male friend, or
> my husband goes to dinner with a
> female friend, is not giving the
> other reason to lose trust. (snip)

Then we're right back where we started, because I've said from the very beginning that these are not standards that all have to live their life by (they're choices we've made in our relationship).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3233. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 13:21:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CCD74.C46190D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26179

N2EY wrote:
>
> But the biggest cause for divorce has
> little to do with any of the above. The
> 800 pound gorilla problem is that many
> people get married without the necessary
> knowledge and skills to stay married. A
> marriage license is one of the easiest
> licenses to get, yet one of the most
> important.

Amen to that. For all our advances, most are so poorly skilled today when it comes to basic human relationships (of any kind). In fact, it seems many are less skilled in this regard than those who grew up decades ago (at least most of them knew how to cook something before leaving home, unlike so many of the kids today). Of course, in many regards, life was less complicated back then, but that only makes it more important for these kids to be better equipped today. Add in an easy marriage license and you have nothing but a recipe for failure. By the way, for the kids reading, "recipe" is a cooking term. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3234. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 13:43:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CD27D.34508B76@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26180

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote...
>
> > Yes, as I said, I would not have
> > lunch with a female co-worker unless
> > there were other employees present.
> > I've seen too many nasty rumors,
> > started by too many nasty people,
> > with too many hurt feelings, to ever
> > wish that on a fellow co-worker.
>
> Well, other than the fact that I'd feel
> my job was threatened over something
> like that, I'd not even give a rumor a
> second thought. *I* know what the
> truth is. (snip)

Well, I think our workplace experience is coming from a different perspective. For the last twenty years, I've worked mostly in senior management positions with large companies or in large government offices. Therefore, my behavior in the workplace is often very much of interest to those around me. In addition, my experience has given me the opportunity to see the effect workplace relationships have on other co-workers and on office performance.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3235. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 13:50:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CD429.8176A4C7@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26182

N2EY wrote:
>
> Yup. There is another aspect to this
> as well. In our lawsuit-happy society,
> it is easy for some actions to be
> misinterpreted. Best not to even give
> the appearance of something questionable.

That is becoming much more of an issue each day. Luckily, I've rarely had to work in situations where lawsuits are much of an issue (overseas and government offices), but I still think a conservative approach to workplace relationships is a wise choice. However, in some employment situations today, I think I'd almost have to video tape all conversations with the opposite sex just to be safe. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3236. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 13:53:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CD50A.4D2E37B8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26183

CAM wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > I also wrap messages I quote down even further, as I have done with this message, so those who include that have nothing to wrap.
>
> Thus wasting 3/4 of my display area and doubling the length of the posting.

Is that better? Too bad, other then this message, I'm not changing my system. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3237. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 13:57:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CD5CE.A80FD25A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26184

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> The 'style' is fine... it's the
> 'content' that's debatable... ;-)

LOL. No problem, Rich. Lets debate away.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3238. state police license for mobile R/T

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 14:10:19 UTC
From: brokenemail@brokenemail.ccm
Message-ID: <u0pmnq911j8c42@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 26187

Howdy,
I just got my Technician's license a few days ago (KC8SPR) and
have a hand held for 2m and 70cm as my sole radio. The gent that kept
proding me along to get my license told me that I needed a Michigan
State Police permit to monitor police frequencies in a vehicle.

That was a suprise to me. But since most VHF radios are wide
band on recieve they do pick up the 150mhz range where the police live
and having a police scanner in a car is a no no in many states.

In Michigan it is a violation of MCL 740.508 which is a
misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in the county jail foor not
more than 1 year or a fine not more then $500.00.

That > 180 day misdemeanor thing sends out some alarm bells.
I think one can lose their right to keep and bear arms over that.
Maybe I have it wrong but I think it is either 90 or 180 day that gets
you in hot water on a misdemeanor and firearms.

So now I am interested in the law in other states as far as
amateur radio in vehicles, permits, and penalties. Seems you can't
make a move without agency trying to trip you up now a days.

So any web links on the law and reciprocity of police licenses
would be great to have.

Wes

KC8SPR

3239. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 14:11:14 UTC
From: Kenneth Vaughan <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <6Q4P7.249174$W8.9018956@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26185
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

pass all the "laws" you want.....answer me one question.....how does it make
any difference? how is this new law going to be actively enforced?? local
atthorities still have to obtain a search warrant,with reasonable cause
submitted before a judge......tax revenues will have to be spent.....i think
the local tacoma atthorities have more on their minds than cb-ers. this is
just more "feel-good" legislation passed to quiet a minority of people who
are angry about some radio interference problems. more of the
same.........business as usual guys!!
elpasogunslinger catch yah on the band. (yawn)
PipeLayer <pipedream@hotmail.comspam> wrote in message
news:20011203193213.100$HV@news.newsreader.com...
> Of course you can still do both but why did you only defend rec.radio.cb.
> btw who is talking about where your friends are this is a NG I cannot
tune
> 27.385 on my newsreader last time i looked they have no idea whats going
on.
> You never answered the question. Ill ask again why are you worrying how
many
> time that was posted to rec.radio.cb and not worried about how many times
it
> was posted to any other NG's The question remains unanswered and twisted
> to your friends being part of this somehow.
> "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> news:3C0C129D.94DEB134@spam.me.not...
> > Mostly because I still talk on CB, with a CB, and I still enjoy CB. Is
> > that a problem? Is that odd? Is that strange? Should I leave my friends
> > on 27.385 LSB behind just because I can now talk on 7.175?
> >
> > -SSB
> >
> > "middlefiger4@home.comss" wrote:
> > >
> > > There are new people reading this group daily perhaps they would have
> missd
> > > it, why do you a Extra class Ham worry about what is posted in
> rec.radio.cb
> > > and not any of the amateur groups? Just a little curious.
> > >
> > > "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> > > news:3C0B959F.9A960A51@spam.me.not...
> > > > Ok... now this is the third time this has been posted to
> rec.radio.cb...
> > > >

> > > > Think we could stop plastering the newsgroup? It's been discussed,
> > > > argued, stirred up, and beaten to death already... Could we just
stop
> > > > it?
> > > >
> > > > de AB8LR
> > > >
> > > > -SSB
> > > >
> > > > N9NWO wrote:
> > > >
> > > > <Another repetitive, annoying, troll-like post, snipped for your
> > > > protection>
>
>

3240. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 14:17:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CDA88.3525FA90@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26186

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Wiccans and pagans don't believe in
> a Devil, Dwight. Nor is their religion
> in any way related to Satanism or
> Christianity. It isn't "Rehashed" it's
> fact.
>
> And it is the INVERTED pentagram that
> is symbolic of Satanism (although not
> exclusively), not the upright one
> usually displayed by Wiccans and Pagans.

Well, I'm certainly not going to get into a long-winded debate about these so called "religions." Both are modern day offshoots of satanism, using different names and their own variations of satanism. And the pentagram/penticle, displayed either way, has long been a satanic symbol (which is exactly why wiccans and pagans, who you claim are in no way related to satanism, selected the exact same symbol for their own).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3241. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 14:19:05 UTC
From: Kent <kwinrich@wi.rr.com>
Message-ID: <tX4P7.7145$8I6.1087775@typhoon.kc.rr.com>
Source record: 26188
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave, I think that you have not spent a good amount of time on the CW bands.
"Hopelessly weak"???? Not with CW! Ask the EMEers.

"Voice has replaced CW"??? Ask the SSB ops that wanted a contact with the
VP8 in the Shetlands. He never went to SSB. Though the SSB ops were
BEGGING for it to happen!

"Painfully slow data exchange"??? I bet I can exchange an RST just as fast
as with voice. Please read below about cw ops using 8000 cps (characters
per second).

"Voice outnumbers CW contacts by a considerable margin on HF .." Guess you
have never been in a decent cw pileup. You would think differently. In
addition I find CW ops to be FAR more courteous and knowledgeable about HOW
to operate!!!

"CW is virtually non-existent on VHF and higher except during contests".
Guess you have never heard an AU opening. How about meteor scatter where
they are using cw speeds up to 8000 CPS??? You can even HEAR that cw it is
so fast. (Check out HSCW in google if you want more info.)

"Either you are with it or obsolete". I would suggest that YOU are the one
that is obsolete. CW is FAR from dead. It is the PREFERRED method of
exchanging info for weak signal and for MANY DXers. Contesters, QRPers all
use CW. Or are they obsolete (in your eyes) too? Most of the MAJOR DXers,
Contesters, EMEers, QRPers, VHFers, etc. consider CW to be necessary!

We all have our specific likes and dis-likes. Just because you don't like
CW doesn't mean you should put it down. To each there own...right?

Kent, K9EZ (NOT an old fart!!)

"Dave Hall" <nojunkmail_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:3C0CC245.471C@worldlynx.net...
> AL GOSS wrote:
> >
> > Who told you CODELESS band!!! Codeless band is FRS band. About 50% of
the
> > QSO's taking place are CW mode, some long haul ansd 99% AURORA. Get
with
> > it....learn it...you weren't born knowing how to operate a PC. I
"think" you
> > had to learn and learn ---you did, because "you wanted to ". The BEST
> > DISTANCE will be via morse code. 90% of "real" DX on 6 meters and upper
bands
> > is via CW mode. It's only a few didgits...like your PC uses at FAST

speed.
> > Now ya see ---I was raised on CW I had to learn PC, wasn't born to
it.
> > de "ol' fart" , I guess, per no-codes in most circles AL,
K2ERG
> >
>
> You'd better check your rig's IF filters, if you think the amount of CW
> contacts are as high as you do. The other week when 6 meters was open to
> Europe, I heard many SSB QSO's but nary a few CW contacts. It's easier
> to work voice. So unless you are looking for that hopelessly weak signal
> or somehow enjoy painfully slow data exchanges, voice is the way to go.
> Voice outnumbers CW contacts by a considerable margin on HF and CW is
> vitually non-existant on VHF and higher except during contests, or other
> "special" events. You need to get off the Titanic and come to the
> realization that Voice replaced CW, video killed the radio star and
> computers are a must-know to get along in the information age. It's
> called progress. You're either with it, or your obsolete.
>
> Dave
> "Sandbagger"
>
>
>

3242. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 14:21:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0CDBF3.36D7F4CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26190

Dave Heil wrote:
> > I have personally directed hundreds of potential hams to
> > these newsgroups. I assume other hams have done likewise.
> > The great majority of the people I directed to these
> > newsgroups had no way to receive shortwave ham CW/SSB.
>
> Sure, Cecil. I certainly wish I could take you seriously.

By "these newsgroups", I was talking about ham radio newsgroups which have existed since the early 80's. I held ham radio classes at Intel during the 13 years I was there. When we got a minimum of ten potential hams to sign up we held a class about four times a year. Most of the attendees didn't have shortwave radios. This event was probably duplicated in many companies like Motorola, TI, AMD, etc.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3243. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 14:22:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CDBAB.D67C3F0F@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26189

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> (snip) The shape of the Pentagon is the
> same as the internal part of a 5-pointed
> star. Isn't it?

I suppose so, Kim. What's your point? The Pentagon building was built in the shape of a pentagon - the shape of some part of a pentagram had nothing to do with it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3244. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 14:32:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CDE0C.EFD135EB@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26191

Krell wrote:
>
> "N2EY" wrote...
> >
> > No, it's in the shape of a pentagon, which
> > is a regular polygon with 5 sides. (regular
> > polygons have all sides the same length and
> > all angles the same).
> >
> > A pentagram is a 5 pointed star inscribed
> > in a pentagon.
>
> No. A five pointed star is a pentagon with
> the lines of each side extended to the
> intersecting points.

Krell, you need to get out a dictionary. Jim is absolutely right.
According to Webster's, a pentagon is a plane figure with five angles
and five sides.

> A pentagram is a five pointed star inscribed
> within a circle.

No, a pentagram does not have a circle around it - the star with the
circle around it is called a pentacle.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3245. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 14:38:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0CDFF6.A3ACD229@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26192

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Actually, up until this message, WE'RE not discussing the crap
> you're discussing. You're discussing some silly nonsense about open
> marriages, while I'm discussing normal relationships with normal
> people. Normal relationships are all around for me to see. But, so far
> I've seen nothing reliable to back up your claims about open marriages.

If you don't have an open marriage, Dwight, you are unlikely to
encounter open marriages. I had an open marriage in CA which worked
well for ten years until my wife violated the marriage contract.
During those ten years, we socialized with a half dozen other
couples with open marriages.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3246. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 14:58:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0CE4AD.21CE1648@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26193

Rick Adams wrote:
> I could see charging for civil services (provided, of course,
> that the loser in the action was the one who had to pay, not the
> winner). But you can't expect those fees to cover the cost of the
> criminal justice system--

Why not? Have you any idea of the size of the civil contract system?
A ten percent fee on every contract would be a huge amount.

> Sorry, Cecil, but that's way too elitist for me.

So do you advocate subsidizing the breeding of ever larger herds
of welfare recipients? That's what is happening today. The problem
is growing because it is being subsidized. And when the governmental
employees plus the welfare population becomes a large majority
of the voters, this country, as we know it, will be doomed to
socialism/fascism.

When my dad was growing up, his family was so poor they didn't even
know there was a depression. When I was born my dad was making one
dollar for working a 12 hour day. Without help, he worked his way out
of poverty. Most poor people can do that if they try.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3247. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 15:16:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0CE8BD.297DA235@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26194

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >Actually, it says that we shouldn't contribute to breeding herds
> >of poor people.
>
> Which, of course, assumes that poverty is caused by genetics.

Nope, it assumes that poverty will increase if poverty is subsidized.
The way to reduce poverty is to stop subsidizing poverty, i.e.
require welfare people to work to earn their keep.

> Your view would simply take the attitude
> that only those who are successful deserve to have children.

In a way, that is true. Only people who can afford children should
have children. If one cannot afford to have children, one shouldn't
have any.

> Incidently, welfare only counts for a very small part of our
> transfer payments--the largest portion by far is Social Security.

I will never live long enough to get back all the money I paid
into Social Security. If they had let me invest those tens of
thousands of dollars, they would be worth millions today.

> Your method would simply leave these people on the streets, ...

Actually, my method would have discouraged those people from
ever being born. You are presenting me with the problems that
years and years of subsidizing poverty has caused and not
solved. You should have asked me sooner before the cancer
spread and became terminal.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3248. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 15:19:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0CE98F.1448B498@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26195

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> The Democrats and Republicans have moved to the middle.

Yes, and in the process, they compromised their most sacred
principles. Libertarians refuse to compromise their principles.
Do you compromise your principles, Dwight?

> Well, I don't want to get into a point by point discussion of the
> party's positions (and that is exactly where this thread is heading).

That's why I gave you the web page reference.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3249. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 15:24:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0CEA9E.75D5438@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26196

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> About ten years ago, I took a look at the
> Libertarian Party, in depth (including going to several area party
> meetings) and was not able to find much I could support (all seemed
> way too liberal to me - in spite of what you're saying now).

The liberal social freedoms aspect of Libertarianism is a minor part.
The major part is the conservative economic freedoms aspect. As far
as economics goes, Libertarians hold many of the traditional values
that modern-day Republicans have given up on.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3250. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 15:37:23 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <T46P7.3057$az3.1049709668@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26199
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I liked what a few locals did a few years back:
They were having a problem with a CB'er in the
neighbor hood, he was running about 1000 watts
at home in a very compact type of housing area.
Needless to say he was trashing everyone's
phone, TV, stereo, phone machines etc etc.
So after repeated attempts to have the FCC
do something, the came up with a great
idea. It was 6 or 8 of them got together
and each took him to small claims court for
two thousand dollars each, reason for case:
Our standard of life was being hampered
with.
It worked, he was convicted and had
to pay them a monetary award, though less
than the total, but still significant.

Landshark

--
We are men at work, we've got a job to do.
Neil Young

"Kenneth Vaughan" <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:6Q4P7.249174$W8.9018956@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> pass all the "laws" you want.....answer me one question.....how does it
make
> any difference? how is this new law going to be actively enforced?? local
> atthorities still have to obtain a search warrant,with reasonable cause
> submitted before a judge......tax revenues will have to be spent.....i
think
> the local tacoma atthorities have more on their minds than cb-ers. this is
> just more "feel-good" legislation passed to quiet a minority of people who
> are angry about some radio interference problems. more of the
> same.....business as usual guys!!
> elpasogunslinger catch yah on the band. (yawn)
> PipeLayer <pipedream@hotmail.comspam> wrote in message
> news:20011203193213.100$HV@news.newsreader.com...
> > Of course you can still do both but why did you only defend
rec.radio.cb.
> > btw who is talking about where your friends are this is a NG I cannot
> tune
> > 27.385 on my newsreader last time i looked they have no idea whats going
> on.

> > You never answered the question. Ill ask again why are you worrying how
> many
> > time that was posted to rec.radio.cb and not worried about how many
times
> it
> > was posted to any other NG's The question remains unanswered and
twisted
> > to your friends being part of this somehow.
> > "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> > news:3C0C129D.94DEB134@spam.me.not...
> > > Mostly because I still talk on CB, with a CB, and I still enjoy CB. Is
> > > that a problem? Is that odd? Is that strange? Should I leave my
friends
> > > on 27.385 LSB behind just because I can now talk on 7.175?
> > >
> > > -SSB
> > >
> > > "middlefiger4@home.comss" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > There are new people reading this group daily perhaps they would
have
> > missd
> > > > it, why do you a Extra class Ham worry about what is posted in
> > rec.radio.cb
> > > > and not any of the amateur groups? Just a little curious.
> > > > >
> > > > "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C0B959F.9A960A51@spam.me.not...
> > > > > Ok... now this is the third time this has been posted to
> > rec.radio.cb...
> > > > > >
> > > > > Think we could stop plastering the newsgroup? It's been discussed,
> > > > > argued, stirred up, and beaten to death already... Could we just
> stop
> > > > > it?
> > > > > >
> > > > > de AB8LR
> > > > > >
> > > > > -SSB
> > > > > >
> > > > > N9NWO wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > <Another repetitive, annoying, troll-like post, snipped for your
> > > > > protection>
> > >
> > >
> >
>

3251. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 15:38:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0CEE05.7BC45178@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26197

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Question:
> >Before 9-11, who was the most famous suicide committed while
> >killing a bunch of people on the opposing side?
>
> Most famous or most effective?

Probably the most famous in the Western Countries. Most children have
heard of him and know his story. He killed himself and in the process
took thousands of the opposition with him. Incidentally, it happened
in Gaza close to where yesterday's Israeli attacks occurred.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3252. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 15:40:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011204104044.08905.00000653@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26198

>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>From: "Kenneth Vaughan" kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 12/4/2001 8:11 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <6Q4P7.249174$W8.9018956@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>

>pass all the "laws" you want.....answer me one question.....how does it make
>any difference? how is this new law going to be actively enforced?? local
>atthorities still have to obtain a search warrant,with reasonable cause
>submitted before a judge

Not so.

All a police officer has to do is see what s/he perceives to be a two-way radio antenna and then find some other legitimate excuse to stop you and "poof"...They have you.

If you refuse to allow the inspection of your car or residence, that's fine with them. They can take you into custody on any number of other "legitimate" applications, obtain the warrant at THIER leisure, and then you're in even more hot water than before.

>......tax revenues will have to be spent

Yep. And as soon as some enterprising local pol realizes that there may be some opportunity to MAKE money for the cities coffers, how long do you think it will take for them to convince someone to invest some money in "enforcement"...?!?!

>.....i think
>the local tacoma atthorities have more on their minds than cb-ers. this is
>just more "feel-good" legislation passed to quiet a minority of people who
>are angry about some radio interference problems. more of the
>same.....business as usual guys!!

Perhaps...but SOMEONE is going to be made an example of. God forbid it is some legitimate Amateur who will then have to spend him/herself into bankruptcy "proving" they are not at fault.

And God forbid that an Amateur's station WAS "causing" interference to someone else's Part 15 device...Now s/he not only has to prove that s/he was not a legitimate target of this law, they have to prove that thier station is not the problem, rather it's the poor engineering of the Part 15 device. Either way, it's going to be a big black eye for legitimate Amatuers and CBers both.

Basically, I think it's a "grab your ankles" situation, because someone is gonna take it the hard way.....

73

Steve in Winchester, TN
K4YZ

3253. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 15:47:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CEF85.E7045801@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26200

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> You leave out several important points,

No, I didn't leave out any "important" points, but I'll answer nevertheless.

> 1. How old is the daughter? Is she a small
> child or an 18 year old?

Since I repeatedly said, "children," then obviously the daughter in less than 18 years old. And she is not a "small child" since I don't think any tattoo place would do a small child. Anyway, this happened about four years ago (a few months before she was trying to get a learners' permit), so I guess the daughter was about 15 at the time.

> 2. Did she get the tattoo at a commercial
> enterprise or from an amateur? If it was a
> commercial firm (the subject of the
> discussion) why didn't the parents file
> suit to recover their damages?

Yes, it was a licensed tattoo parlor. And, yes, I believe a lawsuit was filed (they said they were going to file). However, that does not change the fact that they were stuck with huge medical bills in the meantime, and, if a suit was filed, probably lawyer bills on top of that.

> 3. Did the infection result from the tattoo
> work or from her attempt to hide it from her
> parents out of fear they wouldn't accept
> it?

I don't know. However, since the mother found out about it that evening, there could not have been too much of an effort to hide it.

> 4. Are we talking about a massive, extensive,
> tattoo or a small tattoo of a butterfly or
> rose? The latter can very definitely represent
> enhancement.

I don't know. I didn't see the tattoo.

> 5. Is there some reason why the parent's have
> lost so much control over their daughter that
> she would do this behind their back? Do they
> bother to take her views and desires
> seriously, or do they discount everything as
> being from "a child?"

Now, how in the heck am I suppose to know that (she was the neighbor's daughter, not mine)? For that matter, what does it matter? Kids do stupid stuff like this (regardless of how "understanding" or not the parents are).

> Let me ask YOU something, as well. If a person
> under 18 is NOT to have the same rights as
> others, what justification exists for trying
> him or her as an adult in a criminal courts
> (as is common for felony cases in many
> jurisdictions)? If the rights don't exist, is
> it reasonable that the sanctions should?

Well, first of all, that child does have the same rights, and same protections, as others in that courtroom. Second, killing someone is not stealing a bicycle, shoplifting, or some other minor crime which the juvenile courts were designed to handle. Because of that, the child is judged in a regular court (not an "adult" court, a "regular" court). And he is charged with murder, and faces the penalties for murder, because that is the crime he committed (not a lessor crime which warrants him being set free in a few years when he reaches his 21st birthday, which is a requirement for juvenile court).

Of course, none of this has any bearing on the "right" of a child to do whatever he/she wants (in spite of the parent's wishes). We all live with different rules throughout our lives. For examples, we live with one set of rules as children, another set of rules when we're drafted into the military (UCMJ), another set of rules in the workplace (company policies), and still another set of rules when we're old (can't drive a car).

> (snip) I'm not talking about legalities,
> Dwight. I'm talking about rights. In our
> special-interest-focused society they
> aren't always the same. (snip)
>
> No, they have the right to impose LAWS,
> not values. (snip)

No, you're talking about semantics. Since laws are based directly on the values of the majority within a community, and communities do have a right to pass laws, there is no difference (the community does indeed have a "right" to impose values).

> Nope. Because unless it can be shown
> that the community DOES have better or
> more relevant values, it follows that
> any attempt to legislate their values
> simply causes the law to discriminate
> between two subjective states--which
> is NOT the function of law.

Okay, I'll bite, if it is not the function of laws to impose the
will of the majority within a community (including their "values"),
what exactly is the function of laws? And who said so?

> Guns are linked to them even more directly
> --ever seen a school ban hunting jackets
> or NRA patches?

Were any of the school shooters wearing hunting patches or hunting jackets?

> Islamic terrorists are linked to the World
> Trade Center tragedy--how many schools do
> you think could get away with banning
> traditional muslim dress?

Was the WTC located in a school?

> Jewish terrorists are linked to many
> shootings in the middle east--is it ok
> for schools to ban the star of david
> and hasidic dress?

Which of our schools are located in the middle east?

> In the first place, wicca is NOT
> satanism (snip)

Addressed in another message, so for brevity will avoid here.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3254. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 15:56:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CF183.30AE77B8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26301

CAM wrote:
>
> I'm always improving myself, Dwight. I'm
> sorry that you think self-improvement is
> impossible for you. :-)

Not impossible, Cecil. Just not seriously needed. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET) <-- Near Perfect as is. :-)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3255. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 15:58:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CF21B.7AD137D9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26302

N2EY wrote:
>
> People do, however, sometimes attempt to
> control their behavior by denying that
> they have certain feelings.

Oh, that is extremely commonplace. In fact, I'm sure all of us have done at one time or another (easier to deal with feelings if you can convince yourself you don't really have them).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3256. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 16:18:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CF6B5.47561B25@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26303

Sean G Gilley wrote:
>
> Before I actually answer the question,
> I feel I need to pose another. If your
> wife had thoughts about sex with another
> man, but never actually had sex with
> another man, is that a violation of your
> trust? If she looked at a coworker and
> thought he was handsome, is that a
> violation of your trust?
>
> My point is this -- can a thought that
> doesn't lead to an action be a violation
> of your trust?
>
> My answer to that question is no.

Ah, the old Jimmy Carter's "lust in the heart." Anyway, I would agree wholeheartedly with you, Sean. It is very hard to control what we're thinking (some strange stuff is bouncing around inside all those minds). But a thought is very different than an act.

> As for your question? Well, as stated,
> it's not really a good question.

It's not meant to be. It is a question designed to stimulate discussion (and solicit viewpoints and perspectives). As such, it's doing a pretty good job so far.

> What I do believe is that a man and a
> woman can be close friends without
> the possibility of sexual relations
> between them ever being considered
> as possible. In other words, sex enters
> their minds, but is rejected.

And I'd say that is about typical (in spite of some of the objections raised elsewhere in this thread). To some extent, you have to like a person to be friends. And, if you really like the person, you are even more likely to be attracted to the person. Which means that it is even more likely that thoughts of sex would be there. Now, obviously, most friends can, and do, get beyond that (ignore it, reject it, keep it to themselves, or whatever). But, whatever the case, I do think the idea pops in there much more than many are willing to admit.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3257. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 16:31:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0CF9D5.32DE70F1@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26304
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N9NWO wrote:
>
> > Tacoma Washington may be the first
> > city to prohibit Class D 11 meter
> > C-B operators from using non-FCC
> > certified transmitting equipment.
> > Adopted last September 12th but
> > only now becoming widely known,
> > Tacoma City Ordinance 26851 amends
> > Chapter 8.38 of their Municipal
> > Code in two ways. First is Section
> > 8.38.010 which directly prohibits
> > use of non-approved radio equipment
> > by CBers.

Has anyone heard this from a source other than the Amateur Radio Newsline? I think it may be a hoax. I went to the City of Tacoma web site and checked the Tacoma Municipal Code at...

http://www.cityoftacoma.org/default.asp?main=/54municode/default.asp

...and could not find a Chapter 8.38 (last updated 11/26/01). I also checked the Tacoma City Ordinances at...

http://mrsc-web.mrsc.org/

...and was not able to find ordinance 26851. If this was adopted September 12th, it should be on both of those web sites.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3258. TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 16:34:49 UTC
From: oldkeykollekter@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <b71d3652.0112040834.63c588b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26305
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

MORE TO COME!!! YOU KEYCLOWNS ARE ON THE WAY OUT!

N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:<3C0B8E50.56C82205@gte.net>...
> RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>
>
>
> Tacoma Washington may be the first city to prohibit Class D 11 meter C-B
>
> operators from using non-FCC certified transmitting equipment. Adopted
> last September 12th but only now becoming widely known, Tacoma City
> Ordinance 26851 amends Chapter 8.38 of their Municipal Code in two ways.
>
> First is Section 8.38.010 which directly prohibits use of non-approved
> radio equipment by CB'ers. And if a CB'er breaks the new law he or she
> is subject to Section
>
> 8.38.020. This makes using such a radio a misdemeanor punishable to a
> fine of up to $500, and/or up to 6 month imprisonment.
>
>
>
> Tacoma enacted Ordinance 26851 based on an earlier amendment to the
> Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which was adopted by Congress a
> couple of years ago. As this was a Congressional action, not an FCC
> action, any challenges by C-B operators to the new Tacoma local law
> would have to go through the federal courts. As far as we can
> determine, the new law is carefully crafted to affect only C-B operators
>
> and no other radio operators in the Tacoma area. (Various news sources)
>
>
>
> **
> ftp://ftp.arnewsline.org/quincy/News/news.txt

3259. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 17:23:18 UTC
From: KU4YP <ku4yp@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <aE7P7.27618$WC1.2881635@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26306
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

this guy is off the scale,

i, and others have attempted to explain this in terms anyone can understand. however, mr. "illegalCBersMustGo" is just all in a tizzy about this radio and i really don't get it. i suggest he channel his energy into something more productive.

and i KNOW he does not want to get on the "Extra license holders are BETTER operators" deal. two words will quiet that one, "Eighty Meters." listen around there for two minutes and you'll know what i mean. 80 meters is mixed with some of the most talented people and some of the worst operators i have ever heard.

--
73 de KU4YP
Mike Prevatt
Willow Oak, Florida
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:672843AB044B2518.94A4425C9C7CF2D8.120C5F2BB645239E@lp.airnews.net...
> On 3 Dec 2001 23:18:48 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
> (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:
>
> >HMMMMMMMMM. COME TO THINK OF IT WHY DOES A PERSON LIKE KD5NRH WHO
> >CANT LEGALLY OPERATE ON 10 METERS RUSH IN TO DEFEND THE SALE OF THESE
> >FAKE EXPORT 10 METER RADIOS ?????????
>
> I can be an Extra in a month. You'll be an anonymous coward forever.
>
> <TRANSLATION LANGUAGE="tardspeak">
> I CAN BE AN EXTRA IN A MONTH..... YOU'LL BE AN
> ANONYMOUS COWARD FOREVER.....
> </TRANSLATION>
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net
>

3260. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 17:25:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011204122541.28714.00002796@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 26307

In article <3C0C5AD2.385DD3FD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Kim's Constitutional right to make a fool of herself and all other YL
>> hams is not the issue; Mr. Hollingsworth was very clear on that
>> point, and I have repeatedly acknowledged this.
>
>Mr. Hollingsworth and you are both dinosaurs as far as
>morality goes. To give you an idea how the world has
>changed in the last 50 years, I am in a Southern Baptist
>Christmas Pageant in which the woman who plays Mary, the
>mother of Jesus, is actually in reality six months
>pregnant.

Cecil:

Uh, gee, you Southern Baptists are really into avant garde theatre
now, aren't you! We Catholics have been using real pregnant
women to play Mary for as long as I have been going to Christmas
Pageants! The next Christmas, they usually have their child play
baby Jesus, if he/she is still young/small enough to be a convincing
"infant." Sooo, what was your point, anyway?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3261. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 17:25:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011204122541.28714.00002797@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 26308

In article <0F05C92B79132959.4FD6EE3932617254.A75F2E6B939B652E@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>>Rick:
>>
>>As always, a personal attack is the best confirmation that I have hit
>>the nail right on the head!
>
> Actually, that was a compliment to your intelligence, Larry. I
>wouldn't have _expected_ a more intelligent response in the first
>place from some of the people in this thread.
>
> Rick

Rick:

OIC. Now the personal attack is expanded from just being against me,
to everyone else participating in this thread. Oh, as you were...just
"some" of the people in this thread. The ones who aren't openly
accepting and totally thrilled with the cleverness of Kim's call sign,
no doubt! A typical childish response from a liberal who isn't getting
his own way. Nothing new here!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3262. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 18:04:26 UTC
From: CBRambo <CBRambo@nowhereyouknowx.net>
Message-ID: <9uj32jrdt0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26309
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"KK4TL" <kk4tl@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011203204442.23871.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com...
>> This would explain why you used the anon to talk tough?

Apparently, Mr KK4TL has never been on the receiving end
of anonymous late night hang up calls, anon calls to his employer,
anonymous defamatory letters written to his neighbors, fraudulent
magazine subscriptions, fraudulent COD orders, unidentified cars
parked in front of his house after midnight, anonymous threatening
emails, anon threats to harm members of your family, and a host
of other harassment and stalking activities which more often than
not originate from Hiram, Georgia. I wonder if Mr KK4TL has
ever been told on 14313 and 3901 that his minor daughters suck
the dicks of truck drivers or that your wife sucks the dicks and
swallows the sperm of niggers (not my words, these were actual
recorded statements made on 14313 and 3901 by an operator in
Hiram, Georgia who readily identified himself with his legitimate amateur
call sign.) The same operator in Hiram, Georgia featured the photo
of an amateur, the same one with the minor daughters he said sucked
truck driver's dicks, on a web page, claiming that this amateur was
the Olympic Park bomber and was being sought by federal law
enforcement authorities. The same operator, in a wild out of control
frenzy on 14313, heard by thousands of ham operators, threatened to
murder a ham in NJ. In yet another out of control frenzy on 14313, the
same Hiram, Georgia operator threatened to kick in the door of another
ham operator and assault him and his family. Both of these threats were
recorded, documented, and forwarded to Riley Hollingsworth for action
or, should I say inaction.

Riley Hollingsworth has long been aware of the activities of the
operator in Hiram, Georgia and has dozens of recordings of this
operator, made by OOs, the FCC, and individual ham operators.

The station in Hiram, Georgia, is currently, once again, attacking
his perceived enemies on 14313 and 3901 and once again the
amateur community wonders why noting has ever been done by
Riley to remove the Hiram, Georgia station from amateur radio.

So Mr KK4TL, just maybe now you might begin to see the need
for people to post anonymously and why people post snide remarks
about Riley's impotence. Me, I see nothing to be gained in attacking
Riley, but that's only my opinion. I can readily understand the
frustration that the rest of the amateur community has with Riley's
inability or lack of action in addressing the blatant violations of the

station in Hiram, Georgia.

Here's a question for you, Mr KK4TL. How do you propose that Riley Hollingsworth can finally be motivated to remove the Hiram, Georgia operator from amateur radio?

And yes, I am anon, for the protection of myself and my family from a very unstable person.

3263. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 18:32:50 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112041032.ecf5f2c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26310

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C0B40D8.D456A105@sccoast.net>...
> > (snip) Cheating isn't about opportunity--
> > it's about integrity.
>
>
> Cheating cannot possibly start without opportunity - the integrity
> comes from not seeking the opportunity.

I think I'd have to argue that integrity is keeping the promises you've made, regardless of what they are. If those promises include not having sex outside of the marriage, then those are the promises you should keep. But not all marriages or relationships include monogamy as one of the promises.

> > There's nothing wrong with having sex outside
> > your marriage (snip)
>
> Well, that pretty much sums up the difference between us, because I
> flatly disagree. In this age of AIDS, venereal diseases, screwed up
> marriages, screwed up kids living in broken homes, screwed up lives
> from illicit sex, only a totally self-centered puppy would mess around
> outside his marriage.

Some people believe in, subside in, and are successful in, alternate lifestyles including what you might term "open" marraige. Successful polygamous relationships are not nearly as rare as you might wish to believe.

But the most important point about these successful relationships is that they are built on honesty and integrity. The people who are successful make their promises and keep them -- just as you say you have.

Don't get me wrong. I'm not necessarily arguing in favor of polygamy. The relationship between two people and the promises they choose to make to each other is none of my business. If two people choose to promise to never be alone with a member of the opposite sex, I won't criticize them for making that promise, regardless of how I feel.

On the other hand I wouldn't support someone going into a relationship making promises he or she didn't truly believe in. It doesn't matter whether those promises are restrictive or permisive.

Sean.

3264. Re: state police license for mobile R/T

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 18:49:30 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9uj5cvoeg1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 26311

<brokenemail@brokenemail.ccm> wrote in message
news:u0pmnq911j8c42@corp.supernews.com...
> Howdy,
> I just got my Technician's license a few days ago (KC8SPR) and
> have a hand held for 2m and 70cm as my sole radio. The gent that kept
> proding me along to get my license told me that I needed a Michigan
> State Police permit to monitor police frequencies in a vehicle.

He's dead wrong. You do not need a permit. Your Ham license is enough to grant you the right to monitor all public service frequencies. What he may have really meant to suggest is getting a signed letter from the Michigan State Police stating you have the right to have a radio in your vehicle that can receive public service frequencies such as police and fire. The reason is a few Hams from time to time have found themselves being ticketed, and their radios confiscated by police offices who don't know the law, and or are to lazy to check back with HQ to verify the facts first. They then have to go through the expense of going to court to get their equipment back.

If you don't have a letter then the next best thing is a copy of the applicable state statue, which specifically exempts Hams etc., and the small copy of your license, which is at the bottom of the main full size ticket. Keep both with you at all times when out and about monitoring those public service frequencies.

If you're ever stopped and questioned about the radio receiving police calls, be very polite, explain the facts to the officer, then show them either the letter and or the applicable state statue with the copy of your Ham license. Normally that's the end of it.

Of course the really prudent thing to do is to keep the volume down, or turn off the rig, so the police officer can't hear it, thus saving you the hassle of answering those questions in the first place.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

3265. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 19:03:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0D1E12.C795AE7F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26312

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Is that better?

Yes, much better. Why have three screens when you can put it
all on one screen? Or, if what you are doing is so good, why
not put one letter per line?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3266. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 19:04:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0D1E49.D332F6F9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26313

```
Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > I'm always improving myself, Dwight. I'm
> > sorry that you think self-improvement is
> > impossible for you. :-)
>
> Not impossible, Cecil. Just not seriously needed. :-)

If only I were as omniscient as you, Dwight.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3267. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 19:09:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0D1F53.40A29C34@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sideband wrote:
> Based on the evidence you've presented, Weak Signal emissions don't seem
> to be excluded from 50.0 to 50.1 and 144.0 to 144.1.

Weak signal emissions are certainly allowed as long as they are CW.
You are arguing with "The FCC Rule Book", not me. Nothing but
CW is allowed 50.0-50.1 MHz and 144.0-144.1 MHz. Sorry.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3268. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 19:26:09 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9uj7hm$pl7$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 26315
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C0C6212.298A6008@spam.me.not...
> Based on the evidence you've presented, Weak Signal emissions don't seem
> to be excluded from 50.0 to 50.1 and 144.0 to 144.1.

I've been reading this thread and I think the 100KHz band sections are typically used for EME work only, which has up to now been almost always done using CW. I know a few EME contacts have been done on SSB, but I don't know if it was done in those band segments. If they were then they those band segments are not CW only, but are still "weak signal" considering the mode, and not for the "typical" terrestrial weak signal use.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

3269. TWISTEDHED JUSTIFIES HIS "free banding"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 19:30:00 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112041130.7bbeacee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26316
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed) wrote in message
news:<27880-3C0B9FB4-35@storefull-121.iap.bryant.webtv.net>...
> > suggest you 'recheck' your information about
> > abandoned frequencies.
>"Hi, Doc. I am pretty confident my knowledge of where I
>choose to operate is accurate. I don't indiscriminately
>operate on just any frequency between 25 and 32 MHZ.
>My favorite DX frequencies are just that, DX freqs and
>nothing more. Some of these contracts these businesses
>and services have that licenses their exclusive use to a
>certain frequency in that portion of the spectrum don't
>expire for years.....meanwhile, these companies have
>long abandoned their 2 ways for Nextels. If the contract on
>the freq. where I choose to DX doesn't expire for 2 more
>years, why would I bother to "recheck" the info.
>before then?

TWISTEDHED IGNORES THE FCC AND MAKES HIS OWN RULES! UNBELIEVEABLE!

3270. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 19:43:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <357B067895E42D44.E913EC8D71D243ED.630700A52EAF4B9E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26317

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 22:56:23 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>I just heard some interesting trivia on the radio. Question:
>Before 9-11, who was the most famous suicide committed while
>killing a bunch of people on the opposing side?

George Armstrong Custer??? ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3271. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 19:45:56 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <81FDA5B2FEE48C45.AF931BCC80E98337.2C7AE95D20E452F1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26318

On Mon, 3 Dec 2001 19:35:16 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Hmmm, correct me if I'm wrong, but if my studies of Wicca serve me well, I
>believe it is the "internal" part of the star that is considered the "meat"
>of the pentagram, not the five points or the star itself. The shape of the
>Pentagon is the same as the internal part of a 5-pointed star. Isn't it?

Actually, a five-pointed star inscribed _inside_ a pentagon is
likewise a symbol of Wicca (the Black Forest Trad, not the New Forest
Trad or Hungarian Wiccae, if it matters).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3272. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 19:55:57 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F6810546D53725E5.6EF88BEDB388075B.AF85839994E73691@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26319

On 04 Dec 2001 02:07:53 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Of course your prove the point even more than I did. The Pentagon is not a
>circle!

But, of course, from a mathematical perspective it IS an
approximation of one.

Consider the limits of any given function that returns a
circle as its graphic representation. An attempt to refine the
function will provide successive approximations of the instantaneous
value of the tangent line. Because those approximations can be of any
degree of accuracy desired, given the final result (a circle made of
straight line segments), one such approximation is, legitimately, a
pentagon.

Sorry if the explanation is poor--I can visualize the math
concept, but not being a mathematician I recognize that I'm not
presenting it particularly well--but hopefully it will be clear enough
to make the point.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3273. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 19:59:45 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunkmail_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3C0D2B31.3CA6@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 26326
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Kent wrote:
>
> Dave, I think that you have not spent a good amount of time on the CW bands.
> "Hopelessly weak"???? Not with CW! Ask the EMEers.

If the signal is NOT weak, then it becomes more practical to use a phone mode. IF CW is the only mode that works, then the signal is weak by definition. EME'er regularly work ssb if they have any sort of decent station.

>
> "Voice has replaced CW"??? Ask the SSB ops that wanted a contact with the
> VP8 in the Shetlands. He never went to SSB. Though the SSB ops were
> BEGGING for it to happen!

I have no desire to exchange anything with an elitist mode snob. If he can't talk to me on the modes I use, "uck 'em".

>
> "Painfully slow data exchange"??? I bet I can exchange an RST just as fast
> as with voice. Please read below about cw ops using 8000 cps (characters
> per second).

There is no way a person can manually send CW at that rate. If you are using a computer to "type" CW, then there are far better digital modes with FEC that get the job done faster and better. CW is not a very robust digital mode, and it is severely limited in speed if done manually.

>
> "Voice outnumbers CW contacts by a considerable margin on HF .." Guess you
> have never been in a decent cw pileup. You would think differently. In
> addition I find CW ops to be FAR more courteous and knowledgeable about HOW
> to operate!!!

For every one CW op in a pileup there are 10 or 20 in the SSB pileup. The fact that CW ops are more courteous is irrelevant to this discussion. I find older people to be more courteous as a rule mo matter what segment of the population you are dealing with.

>
> "CW is virtually non-existent on VHF and higher except during contests".
> Guess you have never heard an AU opening. How about meteor scatter where
> they are using cw speeds up to 8000 CPS??? You can even HEAR that cw it is
> so fast. (Check out HSCW in google if you want more info.)

Again a waste of bandwidth if your intent is to send high speed data.
There are far better digital modes for that. Those rare band openings
that you mention are hardly the daily norm, and not something id term
"reliable".

>
> "Either you are with it or obsolete". I would suggest that YOU are the one
> that is obsolete. CW is FAR from dead. It is the PREFERRED method of
> exchanging info for weak signal and for MANY DXers. Contesters, QRPers all
> use CW. Or are they obsolete (in your eyes) too? Most of the MAJOR DXers,
> Contesters, EMEers, QRPers, VHFers, etc. consider CW to be necessary!

CW is kept alive mostly by nostalgic old timers that are still living
out their childhood fantasies, and die hard weak signal dxers. For those
of us that just want to socialize, it's much easier to just TALK.

>
> We all have our specific likes and dis-likes. Just because you don't like
> CW doesn't mean you should put it down. To each there own...right?

I only "put down" the exhaltation that many "CW forever" types exhibit
for the mode. CW is a MODE, no different than AM, SSB, FM, FSK or
whatever. Yet no other mode has created such a divide among hams.

I'll make you a promise. I won't put CW down, if you don't tell me how
great it is.

Dave

3274. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:07:37 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112041207.19d5dc50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26320

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C0CD429.8176A4C7@sccoast.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Yup. There is another aspect to this
> > as well. In our lawsuit-happy society,
> > it is easy for some actions to be
> > misinterpreted. Best not to even give
> > the appearance of something questionable.
>
>
> That is becoming much more of an issue each day. Luckily, I've
> rarely had to work in situations where lawsuits are much of an issue
> (overseas and government offices), but I still think a conservative
> approach to workplace relationships is a wise choice. However, in some
> employment situations today, I think I'd almost have to video tape all
> conversations with the opposite sex just to be safe. :-)

I don't know where you people work, but I'm glad I *don't* work
there.

I've worked in several large companies in several locations and
not once have I heard of a single lawsuit filed because of
inappropriate behavior that wasn't truly inappropriate. And I'm
not sure I've *ever* heard of a lawsuit being filed -- I have heard
of one (maybe two) women (rightfully) complaining they had been
treated inappropriately. There were probably others of that sort
I did not hear about. But I really believe that if two employees
being involved in a civil lawsuit was commonplace, I would've heard
about it.

Sean.

3275. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:08:27 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C0C7539.EB7DB774@mailcity.net>
Source record: 26321
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

W0MN mistakenly wrote:

>
> In the US you cannot use a Ham Radio in the CB bands nor a CB radio in
> the ham bands because they are not type accepted. At least the vast
> majority are not.

Wrong!! You can use a cb radio in the ham bands. Any cb can be
modified for ham band use, but now the type certification is no
longer valid and it can no longer be use on cb. Equipment used in
the ham bands does not need to be type certified.

3276. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:10:17 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <J4aP7.8$9P5.5696@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 26325
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:672843AB044B2518.94A4425C9C7CF2D8.120C5F2BB645239E@lp.airnews.net...
> On 3 Dec 2001 23:18:48 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
> (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:
>
> >HMMMMMMMMM. COME TO THINK OF IT WHY DOES A PERSON LIKE KD5NRH WHO
> >CANT LEGALLY OPERATE ON 10 METERS RUSH IN TO DEFEND THE SALE OF THESE
> >FAKE EXPORT 10 METER RADIOS ?????????
>
> I can be an Extra in a month. You'll be an anonymous coward forever.
>

I'll check the callbooks in 6 weeks and see... :>)

73 de W6DKN

3277. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:11:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <827D0A694C7576B4.7AC3B9814B1AAB99.B74060A9E841800D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26322

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 23:45:08 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

> A good friend of mine - single, straight, and activist - is an
> attorney in Seattle fighting family law battles like that. I had
> thought that such stuff went away in recent years.

Unfortunately, it hasn't.

The worst case I've seen occurred in Washington state a few
years ago. A lesbian couple in Hawaii decided to have a child and one
of the women was impregnated by artificial insemination. Because
Hawaii permits gay adoption, her partner filed the necessary papers
and became legally her second parent. The child, a girl, was raised by
them in the same way any other kid would be raised by two devoted and
loving parents.

The family decided to take a vacation to Seattle to visit
friends and, while there, the birth mother was in killed by a drunk
driver. At that point, the state took custody of the girl (then 10
years old) and placed her in foster care. According to the
state--upheld by the Washington courts--because homosexual adoption is
illegal in Washington and because no blood relationship or marital
relationship existed between the two women, the surviving partner had
no custody claim at all. The result (pending an eventual review by the
US SC--by which time the girl will probably be of age if it occurs at
all) was that the child lost TWO parents in that accident--one to the
drunk driver and one to the homophobic state.

In a similar case in Virginia, a woman who came out as a
lesbian after her divorce had custody of her young daughter taken from
her, despite the fact that everyone concerned from social services
workers to her ex-husband testified that she was an outstanding mother
and fully capable of caring for her child. The court reasoning was
that a homosexual would, automatically, raise a child to be a
homosexual (despite overwhelming scientific evidence to the contrary,
most of which the court refused to hear). Custody was given to the
mother of the lesbian, who had twice been convicted of child abuse.
Thus, to avoid the so-called risk of leaving custody in the hands of a
person who _might_ raise a daughter to be a lesbian, they gave custody
to an abuser who had already demonstrated that she DID raise a
daughter to be a lesbian.

And people wonder why I don't see gays as asking for "special"
rights--or why I believe everyone, including our children, should be
educated with respect to the FACTS about homosexuals instead of right

wing propaganda with no basis in science.

Sheesh!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3278. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:16:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7C1CC0578453AE14.14A48FB06053F76A.6CA09ED2C0182E3F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26323

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 01:48:58 GMT, "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net>
wrote:

>> CAM wrote:
>> >
>> > Incidentally Dwight, would you
>> > please set your editor to wrap
>> > at 80 characters instead of
>> > wrapping at 40 characters?
>
>"Dwight Stewart" wrote
>
>> I have mine set to wrap at 70 characters, which means those with
>> editors set to 80 don't have to edit quotes from my messages so hard
>> to eliminate strangely wrapped text. I also wrap messages I quote down
>> even further, as I have done with this message, so those who include
>> that have nothing to wrap. So far, you're the only one who has
>> complained. Does anyone else have a problem with this system?
>
>Dwight...
>
>The 'style' is fine... it's the 'content' that's debatable... ;-)

The style isn't bad--but if the wrap on the quote backs was a
bit larger (i.e., 60-65 characters) it would serve the same purpose
and would make it much easier to follow the quoted material in the
context of the new.

For example, the above statement, using Dwight's settings,
would look like this:

The style isn't bad--but if
the wrap on the quote backs was a
bit larger (i.e., 60-65 characters)
it would serve the same purpose and
would make it much easier to follow
the quoted material in the context
of the new.

For a short paragraph, that's not too bad. But for a long one,
it means a LOT more quote back space in the message and a greater
difficulty following the train of thought of the new material that is
interspersed with it.

Just a personal opinion,

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3279. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:16:51 UTC
From: The Better Amateur Radio Federation <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <62363b4da3668cc67debfe9c8a8e807e@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 26324
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"CBRambo" <CBRambo@nowhereyouknowx.net> wrote in message
news:9uj32jrdt0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KK4TL" <kk4tl@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011203204442.23871.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com...
> >> This would explain why you used the anon to talk tough?
> >
> >
> > Apparently, Mr KK4TL has never been on the receiving end
> > of anonymous late night hang up calls, anon calls to his employer,
> > anonymous defamatory letters written to his neighbors, fraudulent
> > magazine subscriptions, fraudulent COD orders, unidentified cars
> > parked in front of his house after midnight, anonymous threatening
> > emails, anon threats to harm members of your family, and a host
> > of other harassment and stalking activities which more often than
> > not originate from Hiram, Georgia. I wonder if Mr KK4TL has
> > ever been told on 14313 and 3901 that his minor daughters suck
> > the dicks of truck drivers or that your wife sucks the dicks and
> > swallows the sperm of niggers (not my words, these were actual
> > recorded statements made on 14313 and 3901 by an operator in
> > Hiram, Georgia who readily identified himself with his legitimate amateur
> > call sign.) The same operator in Hiram, Georgia featured the photo
> > of an amateur, the same one with the minor daughters he said sucked
> > truck driver's dicks, on a web page, claiming that this amateur was
> > the Olympic Park bomber and was being sought by federal law
> > enforcement authorities. The same operator, in a wild out of control
> > frenzy on 14313, heard by thousands of ham operators, threatened to
> > murder a ham in NJ. In yet another out of control frenzy on 14313, the
> > same Hiram, Georgia operator threatened to kick in the door of another
> > ham operator and assault him and his family. Both of these threats were
> > recorded, documented, and forwarded to Riley Hollingsworth for action
> > or, should I say inaction.
> >
> > Riley Hollingsworth has long been aware of the activities of the
> > operator in Hiram, Georgia and has dozens of recordings of this
> > operator, made by OOs, the FCC, and individual ham operators.
> >
> > The station in Hiram, Georgia, is currently, once again, attacking
> > his perceived enemies on 14313 and 3901 and once again the
> > amateur community wonders why noting has ever been done by
> > Riley to remove the Hiram, Georgia station from amateur radio.
> >
> >

> So Mr KK4TL, just maybe now you might begin to see the need
> for people to post anonymously and why people post snide remarks
> about Riley's impotence. Me, I see nothing to be gained in attacking
> Riley, but that's only my opinion. I can readily understand the
> frustration that the rest of the amateur community has with Riley's
> inability or lack of action in addressing the blatant violations of the
> station in Hiram, Georgia.
>
> Here's a question for you, Mr KK4TL. How do you propose that
> Riley Hollingsworth can finally be motivated to remove the Hiram,
> Georgia operator from amateur radio?
>
> And yes, I am anon, for the protection of myself and my family
> from a very unstable person.
>

And this is one of the main reasons for restoring the Better Amateur Radio Federation. The mentioned person was once a proud member, but has fallen out of grace with his wild behavior. We will deal with these "fallen angels" in whatever way deemed acceptable.

People like Wiseman are pimple on the rear of the B.A.R.F. They will get tired of beating themselves against the wall in this newsgroup, and then leave in disgrace. We took out his ability to get on the newsgroups once, and will do it again if needed. It's not time yet.

That's why need YOU. With your help, we can clean the ham bands of garbage.

--
Lloyd Davies,
B.A.R.F. Chief of Communications
http://www.angelfire.com/in/w9xn/
http://www.anglefire.com/al/sj61 - Under development

3280. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:24:32 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <44E8A79E6EBDDCD7.749EC3CE475B8469.A0C9B76D2455A975@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26327

On 04 Dec 2001 03:31:44 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Sooo, your saying, then, that most homosexual couples go out of
>their way to ensure that their children turn out to be normal,
>unconfused heterosexuals? I certainly hope that this is so --
>perhaps you can provide some quantifiable proof?

While that's not what I'm saying (most gay couples simply
allow their children to develop naturally--which in 90-95% of all
cases is heterosexually, just as it is in straight families), I'll be
happy to provide the evidence.

The University of Washington did a very extensive research
project dealing with the question of homosexuality among children
raised in gay households (they also studied other characteristics such
as relative happiness, social skills, etc.--all of which demonstrated
these were happy, healthy, kids not misfits). The source of their
subject pool was a random selection of families in Minnesota in which
gay parents had legally adopted a child (Minnesota leads the nation in
gay adoption by a very wide margin). The result--which have been
replicated by other research projects, some done by Christian
Universities openly trying to disprove the result Washington
obtained--was that children in such environments, while far less
likely to demonstrate homophobia than the norm for society (not much
of a surprise) were no more likely to develop into homosexual
adolescents or adults than were children raised in two-parent
heterosexual households (the control group was, likewise, chosen from
adoptive parents in Minnesota to eliminate any regional differences).
I'm pretty sure the study is available through their web site, if not
you can undoubtedly download it through one of the informational links
on http://www.gaynet.org.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3281. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:40:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0D345F.4BDBD7C1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26328

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 01:33:25 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Your attempts to limit MY thinking to that which is approved by you
> >would then seem to be close-minded.
>
> I don't attempt to limit your thinking, Dave, I just search
> for indications that you DO think.

I've expressed my views based upon my beliefs. They are (especially in light of your proclaimed libertarian beliefs) just as valid as your beliefs.

> >You are a great role model, Rick. You reject whichever laws with which
> >you do not agree but are quick to jump on the lawsuit bandwagon. You
> >talk out of both sides of your mouth.
>
> Lawsuits provide a neutral playing field in which both
> participants have the opportunity to state their positions--a criminal
> action provides only a platform to demonstrate guilt or innocence, a
> very different thing.

That isn't necessarily true. A great number of frivolous lawsuits are brought every day. One party may not have the financial wherewithal to see a lawsuit through. Those things certainly don't sound like a level playing field to me.

> And if you feel it's wrong to reject laws with which you don't
> agree try telling that to Gandhi, MLK, or the Revolutionaries at the
> Boston Tea Party for that matter. Presumably, had you been typical of
> our forefathers we'd still be subjects of the Crown.

Again a false attribution of motivation. We were not discussing Gandhi, MLK or American revolutionaries. We were discussing obtaining a tattoo, presumably with a false ID. If your kid stole an orange, you wouldn't discuss suing the market.

> >> Too bad. I'd like to compare it to those I received from the
> >> first year students in one of my classes to see how far you needed to
> >> progress before you could discuss a subject objectively instead of
> >> from a biased perspective.
>
> >You aren't in a position of authority, Rick. You might be able to blow
> >smoke in a classroom and intimidate some student. I'm afraid you are

> >likely to be disappointed at my lack of deference toward you here.
>
> No problem, Dave. You have so many features lacking here that
> this is just the least of them.

That is so much babbling inserted for lack of real response. Go ahead
and give me an "F", "Teach".

> >> And in both cases you cite the people got their tattoos after
> >> becoming adults. So much for the concept that if they are forbidden as
> >> youths they will mature and not do so later.
> >
> >Actually not. The folks I cite had their tattoos done prior to reaching
> >the age of majority. There goes your *poof* point.
>
> What ages did they get them?

One at age 16, two at age 18 (not then the age of majority).

> >> I would have to regard dying for political or economic
> >> interests a trifle sillier than getting a tattoo, wouldn't you?
> >
> >Sure, Rick. If a person is able to join the military without parental
> >consent, that person is old enough to get a tattoo. The person can
> >still be immature enough to make a decision he'll later regret.
>
> And what of the 17 year old who HAS his or her parent's
> permission to enlist? The military will treat him/her like an adult
> and expect the same of him or her that they do of a 21 year old
> recruit. Shouldn't he or she have the same rights that would be
> available at 18--including the right to decide if he or she wants a
> tattoo?

Seventeen is not the age of majority. Eighteen is the age of majority.
If the kid was eighteen, his parents wouldn't have to give consent.

> If the answer is no, how can you justify permitting such an
> individual to enter the military in the first place?

Frankly, I don't. I've never met a seventeen year old who belonged in
the military.

> If the answer is yes, then how can you justify saying that a
> 17 year old is old enough to make THAT decision but not old enough to
> make a decision about a tattoo--regardless of whether he or she DOES
> choose to join the military or not?

A seventeen-year-old *isn't* old enough to make that decision legally.

> But if 17 is an acceptable age for a tattoo, then your
> argument that a person must achieve majority goes up in smoke.

> >> >Gee, I think I see how they won.
> >>

> >> Really?
> >>
> >> How?
> >
> >...by applying the laws of their community rather than those of New
> >York.
>
> Translation: By limiting the actions of a firm in NYC to those
> acceptable for a firm in "Uptightville, GA."

...only limiting the NYC firm to do business in a place where the
product is against local law.

> >> By proving that a firm outside their jurisdiction cannot do
> >> business with a citizen in their jurisdiction w/o being prosecuted for
> >> actions that are legal everywhere else? They didn't prosecute the
> >> person who RECEIVED the shows, Dave (that would have rather quickly
> >> overturned the law and they knew it), they prosecuted the network for
> >> delivering them.
> >
> >Seems to me that they should have prosecuted the individual subscribing.
>
> They would have lost. That WOULD have violated his First
> Amendment rights. The prosecutor himself stated that publicly.

Maybe it would have and maybe it wouldn't have. It would seem that
either the law stands and both the program provider and the individual
subscribing are guilty of breaking it or the law is overturned are not
guilty.

> >If the law was overturned, that is the way things work in this society.
>
> It wasn't overturned--that's the problem. If it ISN'T
> overturned it will mean a radical change in the nature of the programs
> we receive on Television--and not one in the direction of freedom of
> choice.
>
> >> Don't like em? Vote with your feet, stupid. Don't watch em.
> >
> >Y'know, that's just what we do. We watch selectively.
>
> And that, not censorship, is the sane way to respond to
> unwanted programming. If not enough people want it to make it
> profitable, the networks are going to cancel it--but if enough people
> want it, it's unreasonable to prevent them from receiving it simply
> because one group of people don't care for that type of entertainment.

We both know how the networks operate. Sure, they'll cancel it and,
typically, replace it with another vapid, cheesey program.

> >What "people like you" believe is that there is some sort of right have
> >sexually explicit material and so-called "adult" language beamed into

> >homes across the land.
>
> There is such a right, Dave. It's called freedom of speech.

There is certainly debate about what constitutes freedom of speech and whether that free speech applies to large entertainment corporations in the same way it does to individuals. I don't happen to believe that pornography is free speech. If the founding fathers believed that it was, they certainly didn't write anything up which would make that view clear.

> > How about this: If you want that kind of
> >material in your home, you pay extra for a subscription. The material
> >then enters only the homes of those who desire it.
>
> Earth to Dave:
>
> That's EXACTLY what the premium channels ARE! I pay for HBO,
> Showtime, Starz, and other such channels because I CHOOSE to view
> uncut and commercial free movies and documentaries. If those shows are
> 'R-Rated' it's my decision whether I want to view/hear them or
> not--and if I do, it shouldn't be anyone else's concern but my own.

I'm aware that premium channels are received through paid subscription.

> >> >Maplethorpe as I recall. There's lots more to it than you've outlined.
> >> >Wonder why that conviction was never overturned?
> >>
> >> Because it wasn't appealed by the Cincinnati Museum due to
> >> opposition by the city counsel.
> >
> >Yeah, go on. Why was counsel opposed to an appeal?
>
> Because the counsel was under pressure from the religious
> right to drop the matter, Dave. The AFA practically laid siege to the
> community--and it was successful.

The citizens of Cincinnati didn't need anyone to lay siege to the community. They supported the ban on the exhibit.

> >> You're correct that it was Mapplethorpe. So what? It was a
> >> valid exhibit of art.
> >
> >...according to you but not according to the people of Cincinnati.
>
> According to the Arts counsel, the Smithsonian Institute, the
> NYC Museum of Modern Art, and virtually every art authority in the
> United States, Dave, not just according to me.

That's peculiar since I remember reading of debates within the art community regarding Maplethorpe's work. If I put a frame around a piece of feces, you could call it art. Most folks would call it what it is.

I might get comments like, "Nice frame!"

> The city of Cincinnati does NOT have the authority to define
> art--anymore than it has the authority to define who may be considered
> a licensed amateur radio operator. Art is defined by very specific
> guidelines and one of those guidelines is NOT "community values."

Apparently, the city DOES have that authority and the further authority
to say that it cannot be exhibited in a publicly funded art museum.

> >> The museum director made it very clear that
> >> children would not be permitted to view the works considered to be
> >> sexual in nature (it might burst your bubble to know it, but
> >> Maplethorpe created a great many images that were NOT sexually
> >> oriented) under any circumstances, and that only inoffensive images
> >> would be used in the promotion of the showing (which would clearly
> >> indicate that many of the contents contained troubling sexual images).
> >
> >I don't think that the idea that the publicly funded art museum should
> >be closed to a portion of the public is representative of your
> >libertarian views.
>
> At least if it was open to adults it would have allowed people
> to view the art--as it was NO ONE was permitted to see it.

Right. No one was permitted to see it in a publicly funded art museum.
Maybe they needed to put it in a carnival tent. Then "subscribers"
could be permitted a peek for $5.

> >As you have agreed, while some of Maplethorpe's work was not of sexual
> >themes, much was. We're not talking just about what is viewed by most
> >folks as normal sex here, are we Rick? Troubling indeed.
>
> So?
>
> Since when is what is considered "normal sex" by most people a
> criteria for art?

Since when is any sexual act "art"?

> Are you so repressed that you can't allow people to see what
> could be disturbing images (most of the pictures, btw, are not
> "abnormal" sex or disturbing images--I've seen the exhibit in a more
> tolerant city, Ann Arbor, MI) if they choose to do so? Who elected the
> people of Cincinnati the guardians of the public morality?

The people of Cincinnati ARE the guardians of THEIR public morality.
They elected folks to carry out their policy. I don't think the
Maplethorpe show would have been banned at all if the abnormal sex or
disturbing images were included.

> >> If you can find the slightest legitimacy in a community preventing the
> >> showing of legitimate art in a legitimate art museum simply because

> >> some members find the material depicted offensive, I'd like to know
> >> what it is.
> >
> >More than "some members" found it objectionable. I wonder how many of
> >the public officials involved in bringing the suit were re-elected by
> >the people of Cincinnati.
>
> I wonder how many of the people who passed segregation laws in
> the South were re-elected by the people of THEIR communities. We're
> discussing freedom of speech, Dave, not politics as usual.

We're not talking about segregation laws. The people of Cincinnati
rejected the Maplethorpe show. Who are you to force it upon them?

> >> Freedom of Speech isn't about permitting only innocuous
> >> speech, Dave, you don't need a Constitutional protection for that.
> >> It's about permitting speech that is controversial, challenging,
> >> unpopular and, yes, offensive to many--because ONLY when that kind of
> >> speech is permitted can Americans exercise their right to protest or
> >> to criticize government.
> >
> >What is it that you think Maplethorpe's work protested? What government
> >action was he criticizing? The courts recognize that there are limits
> >on free speech.
>
> And the right wing extremist idiots are the first to go
> sniveling to them when they see anything that might offend their
> self-righteous sensibilities, aren't they?

What about the snivelers who bleat their litanies of great civil wrongs
because they aren't permitted the opportunity to view pornography
presented as art--and that at public expense in a public venue?

> Dave, when people set themselves as the moral interpreters of
> society we lose our freedom and become a police state. I'm sorry you
> aren't capable of seeing the difference between freedom of choice and
> repression--most of us can see it rather well.

My response is that when people begin to tell me that everything is
okay--that there is no right and no wrong, we have become a nation under
siege by barbarians. We have lost our values.

> >> You don't have to respect someone's speech
> >> (and art IS a form of speech--the SC has ruled on that several times)
> >> to support its right to exist--you only need to respect the
> >> Constitution of the United States to do so. Clearly, the people of
> >> Cincinnati don't respect our Constitution to the degree they respect
> >> the views of a few religious fanatics such as Donald Wildmon of the
> >> AFA. Don't expect any intelligent and fair minded person to accept a
> >> community like that as a "good example" of community values.
> >
> >...yet Cincinnati and some of the northern Kentucky environs are

> >consistently declared to be among the most "liveable" places in America.
> >You can burn your flag in Cincinnati if you like, Rick. Just don't show
> >a graphic photo of homosexual sex and try to convince the folks there
> >that is art. Many attempts have been made to present crud masquerading
> >as art.
>
> And many attempts have been made to present religion as
> community values. So what?

A number of them have been successful. Giuliani even cleaned up New
York.

> Dave, if those pictures were of HETEROSEXUALS instead of
> HOMOSEXUALS would you feel the same way? Would the citizens of
> Cincinnati? I doubt it seriously--the key isn't the sexual component,
> it's the fact that you and the people of Cincinnati are homophobic.

Yep. I'd feel the same way. I can't speak for Cincinnatians. I live
in West Virginia now. I am not homophobic. I do not fear homosexuals
nor do I fear sameness since I think the word translates to "same fear".

> >> Freedom of choice==hedonism to you?
> >
> >I liken your views to a frequent mantra of the sixties: If it feels
> >good, do it.
>
> And yours are far closer to the Inquisition. I think I prefer
> the sixties, off hand.

You are welcome to both. I think I'll skip the time travel and remain
here in the present.

> >> >Only to a point. I don't think kids should wear clothing (i.e. T-shits)
> >> >with any religious or political statements on them.
> >>
> >> Including Christian ones? If you support that perspective,
> >> I'll agree with you. But if ONE religion is permitted to be
> >> represented, all should receive equal treatment.
> >
> >Yeah, including the Christian ones. Just don't try selling me on the
> >idea that wicca practices constitute a religion.
>
> Why should I bother. Your mind is made up, it would only
> confuse you to state the facts.
>
> Religious bigot!

Do you mean to tell me that your mind is open to the idea that wiccan
practices do not constitute a religion? If it isn't, you'd appear to be
a close-minded individual, Rick.

> >> I-I-I-I-I. What about other's rights? YOU don't care if shows
> >> are "bleeped," or not (of course, we know they aren't, so . . .) so

> >> who cares if others don't care for the practice. YOU don't need closed
> >> captions, so screw those with hearing loss. YOU don't have parental
> >> control settings so other people should be censored to prevent
> >> offensive material from entering YOUR home--to save you the trouble of
> >> turning the set off or changing the channel.
> >
> >Yeah, I've noticed that you've suddenly stacked 'em all up neatly for
> >me. I could easily go back through your stuff and find a numbers of
> >"I's" in which you speak your views.
>
> And I present them as MY VIEWS, Dave. You present yours as
> though they represented a revealed truth or facts.

That's funny. I'd reverse things and say that I present them as MY
VIEWS and that you present yours as though they revealed truth or fact?
All in the eye of the beholder, Teach.

> >The Starz stuff is bleeped here. My wife confirms it. That you don't
> >accept that is tough.
>
> Then call Dish, because they are violating their contract with
> you and with Starz.

I don't believe I will. I don't mind it.

> >I don't need a parental control for my set. There are no children here.
> >Maybe you meant that it is to control *my* parents when they visit.
>
> Why--are they too open minded for you?

If you don't like MY views, you'd have a rough time with my parents
views. I'm the family liberal.

> >I don't need closed captioning. Neither my wife nor I have any hearing
> >problem. There's also the fact that our living room TV and VCR are
> >multi-system pieces of equipment bought overseas. Maybe you'd like to
> >come for an inspection tour.
>
> No thanks--the religious icons would probably overpower the
> decor.

Actually the Orthodox cross and icon present just the right touch. They
help protect the home from the barbarians.

> >> How does hearing a "bleep" allow you to enjoy the dialog and
> >> acting?
> >
> >Tell me, Rick. How many angels can dance on the head of a pin?
>
> None. There is no such thing as an angel.

Why you closed-minded, Christian-bashing heathen!

> > I still
> >find it kind of refreshing. Are you somehow offended that this is my
> >belief? It certainly sounds like another example of, "Be reasonable. Do
> >it MY way".
>
> Dave, you may find it refreshing--your neighbor (if he has
> "bleeped" shows) may find it angering. Why should YOUR desire to be
> protected from the script in a movie overweigh his desire to see the
> movie in unaltered form?

Rember all those sentences in which the "I" is included? That's because I'm speaking of MY views and MY perspectives. I'm not speaking for my neighbor. I didn't address his views. Perhaps one day, if he ever gets a computer and internet access, he'll show up here and inform you of his views.

> >> They run everything unedited, Dave, I tested your claim and it
> >> was false, remember?
> >
> >You tested? Oh, OK. I must have been delirious and made the entire
> >thing up in order to make a point with you here. Yeah, that's it...
>
> Sounds ok to me. I'll accept your word that's what happened.
>
> Dave, this conversation is going no where. I've stated my
> views and you've stated yours. At this point I'll simply drop out of
> the discussion and let you either do the same or continue to
> pontificate.

If you've tired, I understand.

Dave K8MN

3282. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:52:08 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F8ABF993A13CA29C.694B4E650AAC1FEA.6E62DB90ADD3CCC4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26329

On 04 Dec 2001 03:31:45 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>As Riley (that's MISTER Hollingsworth to you) clearly stated, the
>negative impact of your callsign exists in the form of the potential
>discouragement of concerned parents, grandparents, and other
>influential adults from bringing young, impressionable children into
>the realm of Amateur Radio as a result of hearing or seeing your
>call sign, which has the effect of objectifying women in a demeaning
>manner.

Here is where the problem lies, Larry. Riley Hollingsworth has
no more knowledge that those events would occur than I, or anyone
else, does. He is speculating, based on his personal opinion of the
nature of the call sign, exactly as you are doing. The difference is,
in his case his position with the FCC lends a false aura of veracity
to a statement that is strictly one of opinion--and is no more likely
to be accurate than the opinion of anyone else.

>The potential for you to bring the ARS "...one step closer
>to extinction" is a reality.

The potential for her to bring the ARS "...one step FURTHER
FROM extinction" is just as valid a reality. It is well within the
range of possibility that instead of being offended by her sign,
potential hams would be amused by it and see it as a sign that hams
have a sense of humor and are open minded people--and thus would be
ENCOURAGED to earn their licenses.

Is it probably? No more or less so than the opposite scenario.
But it IS an alternative view that is logically as sound as the
original one. Given the fact that either could be true, and that
neither would make any significant impact on the ARS in any case, it
should be clear that the entire matter is one in which Kim has no
reason to regret or reconsider her decision to obtain that call sign.

> Of course, you might not admit this, because
>it doesn't serve your selfish motives to do so.

Are YOU willing to admit the possibility that her sign may
encourage potential new hams instead discouraging them? If not, why
should she admit that your view is possible either?

> However, I hold out
>the hope that you may, possibly, do the right thing, someday.

In my opinion (and that of others here) she already is, Larry.
She's standing up to attempts to stifle her freedom of choice.

>I have
>faith in your potential to change, even if you don't see that possibility
>on your radar screen at this time. I like to see the potential for good
>in people, and I don't exclude you whatsoever.

Then attempt to see the potential good in her RETAINING the
sign instead of only in her following your instructions and changing
it. THAT, not a statement such as the one above, will show you are
fair minded.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3283. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:52:36 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26341
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"CBRambo" <CBRambo@nowhereyouknowx.net> wrote in message
news:9uj32jrdt0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KK4TL" <kk4tl@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011203204442.23871.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com...
> >> This would explain why you used the anon to talk tough?
> >
> >
> > Apparently, Mr KK4TL has never been on the receiving end
> > of anonymous late night hang up calls, anon calls to his employer,
> > anonymous defamatory letters written to his neighbors, fraudulent
> > magazine subscriptions, fraudulent COD orders, unidentified cars
> > parked in front of his house after midnight, anonymous threatening
> > emails, anon threats to harm members of your family, and a host
> > of other harassment and stalking activities which more often than
> > not originate from Hiram, Georgia. I wonder if Mr KK4TL has
> > ever been told on 14313 and 3901 that his minor daughters suck
> > the dicks of truck drivers or that your wife sucks the dicks and
> > swallows the sperm of niggers (not my words, these were actual
> > recorded statements made on 14313 and 3901 by an operator in
> > Hiram, Georgia who readily identified himself with his legitimate amateur
> > call sign.) The same operator in Hiram, Georgia featured the photo
> > of an amateur, the same one with the minor daughters he said sucked
> > truck driver's dicks, on a web page, claiming that this amateur was
> > the Olympic Park bomber and was being sought by federal law
> > enforcement authorities. The same operator, in a wild out of control
> > frenzy on 14313, heard by thousands of ham operators, threatened to
> > murder a ham in NJ. In yet another out of control frenzy on 14313, the
> > same Hiram, Georgia operator threatened to kick in the door of another
> > ham operator and assault him and his family. Both of these threats were
> > recorded, documented, and forwarded to Riley Hollingsworth for action
> > or, should I say inaction.
> >
> > Riley Hollingsworth has long been aware of the activities of the
> > operator in Hiram, Georgia and has dozens of recordings of this
> > operator, made by OOs, the FCC, and individual ham operators.
> >
> > The station in Hiram, Georgia, is currently, once again, attacking
> > his perceived enemies on 14313 and 3901 and once again the
> > amateur community wonders why noting has ever been done by
> > Riley to remove the Hiram, Georgia station from amateur radio.
> >
> >

> So Mr KK4TL, just maybe now you might begin to see the need
> for people to post anonymously and why people post snide remarks
> about Riley's impotence. Me, I see nothing to be gained in attacking
> Riley, but that's only my opinion. I can readily understand the
> frustration that the rest of the amateur community has with Riley's
> inability or lack of action in addressing the blatant violations of the
> station in Hiram, Georgia.
>
> Here's a question for you, Mr KK4TL. How do you propose that
> Riley Hollingsworth can finally be motivated to remove the Hiram,
> Georgia operator from amateur radio?

I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
W4AMP tried to reason with him.
N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago on
75 meters.

> And yes, I am anon, for the protection of myself and my family
> from a very unstable person.

Try to spin a justification all you want, you're just an ANONYMOUS COWARD.

3284. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 20:55:35 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ujium$gf2$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26342
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:62363b4da3668cc67debfe9c8a8e807e@spamfreenews.com...
>
> "CBRambo" <CBRambo@nowhereyouknowx.net> wrote in message
> news:9uj32jrdt0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "KK4TL" <kk4tl@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011203204442.23871.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com...
> > >> This would explain why you used the anon to talk tough?
> > >
> > >
> > > Apparently, Mr KK4TL has never been on the receiving end
> > > of anonymous late night hang up calls, anon calls to his employer,
> > > anonymous defamatory letters written to his neighbors, fraudulent
> > > magazine subscriptions, fraudulent COD orders, unidentified cars
> > > parked in front of his house after midnight, anonymous threatening
> > > emails, anon threats to harm members of your family, and a host
> > > of other harassment and stalking activities which more often than
> > > not originate from Hiram, Georgia. I wonder if Mr KK4TL has
> > > ever been told on 14313 and 3901 that his minor daughters suck
> > > the dicks of truck drivers or that your wife sucks the dicks and
> > > swallows the sperm of niggers (not my words, these were actual
> > > recorded statements made on 14313 and 3901 by an operator in
> > > Hiram, Georgia who readily identified himself with his legitimate
amateur
> > > call sign.) The same operator in Hiram, Georgia featured the photo
> > > of an amateur, the same one with the minor daughters he said sucked
> > > truck driver's dicks, on a web page, claiming that this amateur was
> > > the Olympic Park bomber and was being sought by federal law
> > > enforcement authorities. The same operator, in a wild out of control
> > > frenzy on 14313, heard by thousands of ham operators, threatened to
> > > murder a ham in NJ. In yet another out of control frenzy on 14313, the
> > > same Hiram, Georgia operator threatened to kick in the door of another
> > > ham operator and assault him and his family. Both of these threats were
> > > recorded, documented, and forwarded to Riley Hollingsworth for action
> > > or, should I say inaction.
> > >
> > > Riley Hollingsworth has long been aware of the activities of the
> > > operator in Hiram, Georgia and has dozens of recordings of this
> > > operator, made by OOs, the FCC, and individual ham operators.
> > >
> > > The station in Hiram, Georgia, is currently, once again, attacking
> > > his perceived enemies on 14313 and 3901 and once again the

> > amateur community wonders why noting has ever been done by
> > Riley to remove the Hiram, Georgia station from amateur radio.
> >
> >
> > So Mr KK4TL, just maybe now you might begin to see the need
> > for people to post anonymously and why people post snide remarks
> > about Riley's impotence. Me, I see nothing to be gained in attacking
> > Riley, but that's only my opinion. I can readily understand the
> > frustration that the rest of the amateur community has with Riley's
> > inability or lack of action in addressing the blatant violations of the
> > station in Hiram, Georgia.
> >
> > Here's a question for you, Mr KK4TL. How do you propose that
> > Riley Hollingsworth can finally be motivated to remove the Hiram,
> > Georgia operator from amateur radio?
> >
> > And yes, I am anon, for the protection of myself and my family
> > from a very unstable person.
> >
>
> And this is one of the main reasons for restoring the Better Amateur Radio
> Federation. The mentioned person was once a proud member, but has fallen
> out of grace with his wild behavior. We will deal with these "fallen
> angels" in whatever way deemed acceptable.
>
> People like Wiseman are pimple on the rear of the B.A.R.F.

LARDASSSSSSSSS LLLLLLLLOYD, you are the festered pimple on the ass of the
human race that your're not a part of.

> They will get
> tired of beating themselves against the wall in this newsgroup, and then
> leave in disgrace. We took out his ability to get on the newsgroups once,
> and will do it again if needed. It's not time yet.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!
Lardasssss Lllllllloyd you couldn't take out anything. Especially that
cucumber you stick up your FAT ASS on a nightly basis.

> That's why need YOU. With your help, we can clean the ham bands of
garbage.

Says Lllllllllllllllaardass Lllllllllllllllllllllllllllloyd, who gets on
HF unidentifed.

3285. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 21:04:36 UTC
From: Roll Call Please <NewBARF@RollCallForever.net>
Message-ID: <9ujdke$i5l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26330
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"CBRambo" <CBRambo@nowhereyouknowx.net> wrote in message
news:9uj32jrdt0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KK4TL" <kk4tl@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011203204442.23871.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com...
> >> This would explain why you used the anon to talk tough?
> >
> >
> > Apparently, Mr KK4TL has never been on the receiving end
> > of anonymous late night hang up calls, anon calls to his employer,
> > anonymous defamatory letters written to his neighbors, fraudulent
> > magazine subscriptions, fraudulent COD orders, unidentified cars
> > parked in front of his house after midnight, anonymous threatening
> > emails, anon threats to harm members of your family, and a host
> > of other harassment and stalking activities which more often than
> > not originate from Hiram, Georgia. I wonder if Mr KK4TL has
> > ever been told on 14313 and 3901 that his minor daughters suck
> > the dicks of truck drivers or that your wife sucks the dicks and
> > swallows the sperm of niggers (not my words, these were actual
> > recorded statements made on 14313 and 3901 by an operator in
> > Hiram, Georgia who readily identified himself with his legitimate amateur
> > call sign.) The same operator in Hiram, Georgia featured the photo
> > of an amateur, the same one with the minor daughters he said sucked
> > truck driver's dicks, on a web page, claiming that this amateur was
> > the Olympic Park bomber and was being sought by federal law
> > enforcement authorities. The same operator, in a wild out of control
> > frenzy on 14313, heard by thousands of ham operators, threatened to
> > murder a ham in NJ. In yet another out of control frenzy on 14313, the
> > same Hiram, Georgia operator threatened to kick in the door of another
> > ham operator and assault him and his family. Both of these threats were
> > recorded, documented, and forwarded to Riley Hollingsworth for action
> > or, should I say inaction.
> >
> > Riley Hollingsworth has long been aware of the activities of the
> > operator in Hiram, Georgia and has dozens of recordings of this
> > operator, made by OOs, the FCC, and individual ham operators.
> >
> > The station in Hiram, Georgia, is currently, once again, attacking
> > his perceived enemies on 14313 and 3901 and once again the
> > amateur community wonders why noting has ever been done by
> > Riley to remove the Hiram, Georgia station from amateur radio.
> >
> >

> So Mr KK4TL, just maybe now you might begin to see the need
> for people to post anonymously and why people post snide remarks
> about Riley's impotence. Me, I see nothing to be gained in attacking
> Riley, but that's only my opinion. I can readily understand the
> frustration that the rest of the amateur community has with Riley's
> inability or lack of action in addressing the blatant violations of the
> station in Hiram, Georgia.
>
> Here's a question for you, Mr KK4TL. How do you propose that
> Riley Hollingsworth can finally be motivated to remove the Hiram,
> Georgia operator from amateur radio?
>
> And yes, I am anon, for the protection of myself and my family
> from a very unstable person.
>
>
We need to bring the BARF back. There were never
problems like this when we had Herbie and the great
BARF on 14313.....BARF Lives!!!!!!!!!!!!!

3286. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 21:13:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0D3C5C.70596E8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26331

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> >I just heard some interesting trivia on the radio. Question:
> >Before 9-11, who was the most famous suicide committed while
> >killing a bunch of people on the opposing side?
>
> George Armstrong Custer??? ;-)

Nope. Hint: He earlier killed 1000 of those enemies with the
jawbone of an ass.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3287. Re: state police license for mobile R/T

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 21:16:19 UTC
From: brokenemail@brokenemail.ccm
Message-ID: <u0qfmi8outhh47@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 26332

Thanks for the reply. So it is a 'get out of jail free' card so to
say. I agree that having it busy blaring out police calls while he is
getting your information is a bit like pulling on superman's cape.

I re-read the law MCL 750.508 and you are correct.

Many Thanks,

Wes

KC8SPR

W E S S at G T I I dot C O M

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

>
><brokenemail@brokenemail.ccm> wrote in message
>news:u0pmnq911j8c42@corp.supernews.com...
>> Howdy,
>> I just got my Technician's license a few days ago (KC8SPR) and
>> have a hand held for 2m and 70cm as my sole radio. The gent that kept
>> proding me along to get my license told me that I needed a Michigan
>> State Police permit to monitor police frequencies in a vehicle.
>
>He's dead wrong. You do not need a permit. Your Ham license is enough to
>grant you the right to monitor all public service frequencies. What he may
>have really meant to suggest is getting a signed letter from the Michigan
>State Police stating you have the right to have a radio in your vehicle that
>can receive public service frequencies such as police and fire. The reason
>is a few Hams from time to time have found themselves being ticketed, and
>their radios confiscated by police offices who don't know the law, and or
>are to lazy to check back with HQ to verify the facts first. They then have
>to go through the expense of going to court to get their equipment back.
>
>If you don't have a letter then the next best thing is a copy of the
>applicable state statue, which specifically exempts Hams etc., and the small
>copy of your license, which is at the bottom of the main full size ticket.
>Keep both with you at all times when out and about monitoring those public
>service frequencies.
>
>If you're ever stopped and questioned about the radio receiving police
>calls, be very polite, explain the facts to the officer, then show them
>either the letter and or the applicable state statue with the copy of your
>Ham license. Normally that's the end of it.
>

>Of course the really prudent thing to do is to keep the volume down, or turn
>off the rig, so the police officer can't hear it, thus saving you the hassle
>of answering those questions in the first place.

3288. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 21:24:46 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B597282F40783FDF.66006BE4959CCC1E.77783F44B4E1017D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26333

On 04 Dec 2001 17:25:41 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>OIC. Now the personal attack is expanded from just being against me,
>to everyone else participating in this thread. Oh, as you were...just
>"some" of the people in this thread. The ones who aren't openly
>accepting and totally thrilled with the cleverness of Kim's call sign,
>no doubt! A typical childish response from a liberal who isn't getting
>his own way. Nothing new here!

Darn it, Larry. There's just no pleasing you.

Insult you, you get offended.

Compliment you, you get offended.

And you STILL can't learn the difference between a liberal and
a libertarian.

Have a nice day pork chop.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3289. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 21:28:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C0D3FFA.ABE1DDDD@uci.edu>
Source record: 26334

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Ask _ANY_ Arab and he will
> gladly tell you why they're angry.

That's almost right. Ask MOST any Arab, and he'll tell you that he was told by his imam he should be angry and hateful. The reason? Well it's because there's a great satan - sorta like the boogie man, only meaner. You see, he must rely on his religious leaders for all his information because he's too illiterate to discover the truth for himself. Of course even if he can read, the Arab press will tell him that he should be angry and hateful.

What the world can only hope for is the second coming of Mohammed in order that he would teach all of his people not to hate.

What's the air pressure over there where you are, Dwight? Seems like you're kinda runnin' at a vacuum.

3290. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 21:49:06 UTC
From: user@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3c0d4124.17592641@news.triconet.org>
Source record: 26335

On Tue, 4 Dec 2001 14:26:09 -0500, "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
wrote:

|
|"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
|news:3C0C6212.298A6008@spam.me.not...
|> Based on the evidence you've presented, Weak Signal emissions don't seem
|> to be excluded from 50.0 to 50.1 and 144.0 to 144.1.
|
|I've been reading this thread and I think the 100KHz band sections are
|typically used for EME work only, which has up to now been almost always
|done using CW. I know a few EME contacts have been done on SSB, but I don't
|know if it was done in those band segments. If they were then they those
|band segments are not CW only, but are still "weak signal" considering the
|mode, and not for the "typical" terrestrial weak signal use.

Yes the 144.0 to 144.1 sub-band is used for EME, but not exclusively. I have
many states worked on CW in this segment that were via meteor and tropo scatter.
However, I can work my neighbor on CW on 144.050 and be perfectly legal.

I have one two-way EME SSB QSO and the contact was initiated on CW and we QSY to
the appropriate part of the band (144.11) to go to SSB. SSB or any mode other
than CW IS NOT ALLOWED in the 144.0-144.1 band segment, no matter how "weak" the
signal might be.

Please understand, "weak signal" modes are considered to be CW and SSB and
currently by gentlemen's agreement, but not (yet) by the force of regulation,
the weak signal band segments are protected from deaf modes such as FM.

Wes Stewart N7WS

3291. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 21:56:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112041356.1167cb5f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26336

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C0CEE05.7BC45178@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >Question:
> > >Before 9-11, who was the most famous suicide committed while
> > >killing a bunch of people on the opposing side?
> >
> > Most famous or most effective?
>
> Probably the most famous in the Western Countries. Most children have
> heard of him and know his story. He killed himself and in the process
> took thousands of the opposition with him. Incidentally, it happened
> in Gaza close to where yesterday's Israeli attacks occurred.

So famous that Tom Jones sang a song about a woman in his life, and a
brand of luggage is named for him.

Samson.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3292. Re: state police license for mobile R/T

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 22:01:06 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112042200530.12861-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 26337

On Tue, 4 Dec 2001 brokenemail@brokenemail.ccm wrote:
> I just got my Technician's license a few days ago (KC8SPR) and
>have a hand held for 2m and 70cm as my sole radio. The gent that kept
>proding me along to get my license told me that I needed a Michigan
>State Police permit to monitor police frequencies in a vehicle.
>
> That was a suprise to me. But since most VHF radios are wide
>band on recieve they do pick up the 150mhz range where the police live
>and having a police scanner in a car is a no no in many states.
>
> In Michigan it is a violation of MCL 740.508 which is a
>misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in the county jail foor not
>more than 1 year or a fine not more then $500.00.
>
> That > 180 day misdemeanor thing sends out some alarm bells.
>I think one can lose their right to keep and bear arms over that.
>Maybe I have it wrong but I think it is either 90 or 180 day that gets
>you in hot water on a misdemeanor and firearms.
>
> So now I am interested in the law in other states as far as
>amateur radio in vehicles, permits, and penalties. Seems you can't
>make a move without agency trying to trip you up now a days.
>
> So any web links on the law and reciprocity of police licenses
>would be great to have.

Back in 1993, the FCC addressed this. I think it was ruling 93-17. Amateur radio licenseholders are exempt from states' anti-monitoring laws of public safety frequencies.

3293. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 22:06:08 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AD534EB48CB7870F.2CDD7BEBE3B600B4.446F049E93826E3B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26338

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 08:58:53 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>> I could see charging for civil services (provided, of course,
>> that the loser in the action was the one who had to pay, not the
>> winner). But you can't expect those fees to cover the cost of the
>> criminal justice system--
>
>Why not? Have you any idea of the size of the civil contract system?
>A ten percent fee on every contract would be a huge amount.

True--but given current incarceration rates (1.2M as of 2000
and still growing) and the cost of incarceration ($33,000.00/yr at
current rates), you're talking about $39,600,000,000 per year BEFORE
factoring in the costs of law enforcement, the courts, jails, legal
costs, etc., or about $80,000,000,000.00 per year total.

Admittedly, under a Libertarian government, there would be
less prisoners incarcerated since consensual crime laws would be
repealed--but at the same time the "buyer beware" aspects of
Libertarian economic policy would reduce the total size of the civil
contract system correspondingly.

I doubt seriously you could cover THIS kind of costs with only
a ten percent fee on contracts. Plus, all you are really doing by
implementing a compulsory 10% on contracts is to create a new form of
taxation (effectively there is no difference between a 10% contract
fee and a 10% sales or excise tax), something the Libertarians oppose.

>> Sorry, Cecil, but that's way too elitist for me.
>
>So do you advocate subsidizing the breeding of ever larger herds
>of welfare recipients?

I didn't know people in poverty lived in herds, Cecil.

> That's what is happening today.

No it isn't. What is happening today is a combination of bad
programs (if you examine most of the AFDC programs in the US, you'll
discover that the design of the programs themselves make it very
difficult for someone to get off welfare and become self-sufficient),
lack of alternative resources (GOOD schools in poverty level areas,
job programs, etc.), inadequate funding for prevention programs, and
prejudice against the poor (example: the single most effective way to
insure that kids will grow up part of the system is to provide homes
for welfare recipients not in ghettos but in working class

neighborhoods where the family will be surrounded by working class people and where the kids will go to schools where a work ethos is a given).

>The problem
>is growing because it is being subsidized. And when the governmental >employees plus the welfare population becomes a large majority >of the voters, this country, as we know it, will be doomed to >socialism/fascism.

Ok, then lets start with the Social Security programs and eliminate welfare for the elderly!

Social security costs FAR more than all other programs combined--and if innocent kids don't have the right to expect the government to help them why should seniors? When I see the Libertarian Party take a stand against ANY form of transfer payment (including all subsidies, Social Security, Disability Pensions, special benefits for veterans, any form of foreign aid, loans to industry, etc.) then at least I'll view them as consistent instead of prejudiced against the poor. But, of course, if they took that position they would have no chance of election at all.

Cecil, it isn't that I don't believe that there are serious problems with our welfare system--there are. But to simply treat the poor as an unwanted "herd" goes beyond reform to classism--something particularly objectionable from an organization that is supposed to be based on libertarian philosophy.

We are a wealthy country--if we can't survive without ignoring the needs of the poor, sick, or hungry then we're no better than the Taliban or Iraq.

>When my dad was growing up, his family was so poor they didn't even >know there was a depression. When I was born my dad was making one >dollar for working a 12 hour day. Without help, he worked his way out >of poverty. Most poor people can do that if they try.

Bull.

At that time there was a growing economy in this nation, and that meant jobs. There was a war (WWII) that accelerated the growth of industry, and THAT meant jobs. The military was at a far higher manpower level than today and THAT meant jobs. Technology was booming with hundreds of new, and desirable, products, and THAT meant jobs. And education was becoming available and affordable beyond the high school level, and THAT meant jobs.

I'm not saying that it's impossible to work one's way out of poverty today--but there are a LOT more barriers than there were then.

Put yourself in this position: You are a young (18 years old), honest, African-American male living on the East Side of Detroit (the

hard-core inner city area--substitute South Central LA or Bedford Styvesant if you prefer). You have received an inner city public school education (which, in every area of this country, is sub-standard). You have no car, nor any way to purchase one, nor do you have clothing suitable for the mainstream marketplace. Your community has an unemployment rate of 14% or more--with most of the people who DO work holding minimum wage service jobs, many of them part time or seasonal. Your SAT/ACT scores are inadequate for a scholarship at a college, and no jobs exist in your area of the city. Because of your average grades (unlike many classmates you didn't cheat to get better grades) you are not eligible for acceptance by the military services (which have become quite selective in recent years). You have a mother who is only able to work as a domestic three days a week, and two younger siblings. Your father died when you were 12, victim of a robbery/homicide in the liquor store where he clerked at night. Your goal is to find a job with a future, marry your girl friend, and move away from the neighborhood where you live and where, due to poverty, a substantial amount of violent crime occurs.

What do you do?

Today, you could apply for a community college (where your SAT/ACT scores are not relevant and where remedial courses to make up for the quality of your high school are available) and receive financial aid (pell grant, state grants, etc.) to attend. After two years there, if your grades were good and you worked hard at your studies, you would be qualified to transfer to a four-year institution with enough financial aid to cover your costs of attendance. In the mean time, your family would be eligible to receive state aid so you could devote your time to your education instead of having to drop out of school to support them.

Under a Libertarian government, the academic grants and the social service programs would BOTH be gone--and you would have no legal means of supporting yourself OR your family at all.

Sound far fetched? It's a very accurate description of one of the students in my Criminal Justice Psychology class (his goal is to become a Youth Officer on the Detroit PD and work with kids in the inner city). His girlfriend is also a student at the college, where she's almost finished with her nursing degree.

Are THESE the kind of "herd members" you want to see eliminated from our society?

Sorry, Cecil. But while I respect many of the views of the Libertarian party, it's precisely this kind of problems that keep me from joining it--or identifying with it. And I doubt seriously that I'm alone in that response.

The US is in desperate need of a new party that represents a fresh perspective--the old ones have essentially fused into a single

political position. And the concept of personal liberty implicit in the Libertarian perspective makes it a very attractive alternative to the more repressive Republicrats--for both libertarians and economic conservatives alike. But until the Libertarian Party acknowledges the fact that our poor and needy must be helped by the state, it will never become that party or experience widespread acceptance.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3294. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 22:18:58 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <915F8B7E79351881.C3654131CCAE94C7.03C67BF91F6CD7B2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26339

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 05:56:27 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> I find that very hard to believe. However, given for a moment this
>10% actually exists, how many of these "innocent" death row inmates
>make it through the eight to twelve years of review and appeals
>without their innocence being discovered? In fact, the appeal process
>is so weighted in favor of the accused, I suspect many criminals are
>simply walking away free (not the other way around). Of course, this
>doesn't seem to bother those opposed to the death penalty as much.
>They're more concerned for the criminals in jail than they are for the
>victims of the criminals they work so hard to set free.

What bothers us is the concept that unlike any other penalty
there simply isn't any way to make amends for an error in conviction
if the death penalty has been carried out.

If we send a man or woman to prison for natural life, and ten
years later we discover that he or she was innocent, that person can
be released and at least partially compensated for the harm that was
done to them. But if we have already killed him or her it's just a
little bit late to say "sorry."

Even more to the point, however, is the concept that we are
knowingly killing people on death row for crimes they didn't commit.
In ANY way of thinking, that's murder. That it is justified--and
performed--by the state only compounds the crime.

Perhaps if the death penalty actually accomplished its goal
(deterrence) it might be worth the risk of such results--but it
doesn't. Every study that has ever been conducted has shown that the
presence or absence of a death penalty in a state has no effect on the
crime rate whatever.

Incidently, the reason so many death row inmates are being
found innocent today has little to do with the appeals process
directly. Several years ago a project was started by law students at
the University of Illinois to examine DNA evidence in the cases of
capital crimes. The result was that using modern DNA testing, in the
case of fully 10% of the convicted inmates it was shown that they
could NOT have been the perpetrator. And that's only cases where DNA
evidence could be used (i.e., bits of hair, blood, semen, etc. were
found at the scene and used to convict the inmate)--most capital cases
don't include such evidence, and thus we have no way of knowing if the
problem is even worst there. One thing we DO know, however, is that in
more and more DNA cases, eyewitness testimony is proving unreliable.

If the same holds true for other cases (and there is absolutely no
reason it shouldn't), a substantial number of people are going to
prison--or to their execution--for crimes committed by others.

>> (snip) an innocent person was put to
>> death (as has happened more than once
>> in recent years)? (snip)
>
> Nonsense. Funny how only those opposed to the death penalty can
>"see" those "innocent" people who were put to death. Everyone else
>(jury, judges, appeal judges, pardon boards, and so forth) saw a
>guilty person.

Really?

DNA evidence has been used in a very substantial number of
cases to prove that the person executed did NOT commit the crime--the
research was conducted as a part of the Illinois Legal Defense
Project. That isn't opinion, it's solid, legally admissible, proof
that innocent men and women were executed by the state.

And THAT, Dwight, is murder in any way you care to define the
crime.

Rick

>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3295. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 22:22:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0D805AC9506C1873.8EF4F5AC9082C9EF.E852C809DDECF342@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26340

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 09:24:14 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>The liberal social freedoms aspect of Libertarianism is a minor part.
>The major part is the conservative economic freedoms aspect. As far
>as economics goes, Libertarians hold many of the traditional values
>that modern-day Republicans have given up on.

Which, of course, is reason enough for those of us who are
social libertarians to vote the Green party instead.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3296. Re: state police license for mobile R/T

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 22:37:39 UTC
From: brokenemail@brokenemail.ccm
Message-ID: <u0qkf1qn6rsu74@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 26343

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote:

>Back in 1993, the FCC addressed this. I think it was ruling 93-17. Amateur
>radio licenseholders are exempt from states' anti-monitoring laws of public
>safety frequencies.

Good info. I will find it and put a copy in glove box.

73

Wes

KC8SPR

3297. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 22:54:51 UTC
From: Lloyd <TheNewBARF@TheNewBARFgroup.net>
Message-ID: <9ujk32jjo0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26344
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
> W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago
on
> 75 meters.
>

NO arguement there Scheissman YOU ARE THE UNCONTESTED
expert on Usenet when it comes to filthy obscene language!!!!!!!!!!

3298. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:00:21 UTC
From: Polly <PollyBARF@PollyBARFforever.edu>
Message-ID: <9ujkdckij0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26345
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
> W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago
on
> 75 meters.

You made one very big mistake Wiseman, and that mistake
gave yourself away as the unidentified jammer on 3901. All info
has been forwarded to Hollingsworth. Your license is toast Wiseman!
Laugh all you want now, HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR

3299. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:01:53 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ujn2f$s1v$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26253
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Roll Call Please" <NewBARF@RollCallForever.net> wrote in message
news:9ujdke$i5l$0@pita.alt.net...
> "CBRambo" <CBRambo@nowhereyouknowx.net> wrote in message
> news:9uj32jrdt0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "KK4TL" <kk4tl@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011203204442.23871.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com...
> > >> This would explain why you used the anon to talk tough?
> >
> >
> > Apparently, Mr KK4TL has never been on the receiving end
> > of anonymous late night hang up calls, anon calls to his employer,
> > anonymous defamatory letters written to his neighbors, fraudulent
> > magazine subscriptions, fraudulent COD orders, unidentified cars
> > parked in front of his house after midnight, anonymous threatening
> > emails, anon threats to harm members of your family, and a host
> > of other harassment and stalking activities which more often than
> > not originate from Hiram, Georgia. I wonder if Mr KK4TL has
> > ever been told on 14313 and 3901 that his minor daughters suck
> > the dicks of truck drivers or that your wife sucks the dicks and
> > swallows the sperm of niggers (not my words, these were actual
> > recorded statements made on 14313 and 3901 by an operator in
> > Hiram, Georgia who readily identified himself with his legitimate
amateur
> > call sign.) The same operator in Hiram, Georgia featured the photo
> > of an amateur, the same one with the minor daughters he said sucked
> > truck driver's dicks, on a web page, claiming that this amateur was
> > the Olympic Park bomber and was being sought by federal law
> > enforcement authorities. The same operator, in a wild out of control
> > frenzy on 14313, heard by thousands of ham operators, threatened to
> > murder a ham in NJ. In yet another out of control frenzy on 14313, the
> > same Hiram, Georgia operator threatened to kick in the door of another
> > ham operator and assault him and his family. Both of these threats were
> > recorded, documented, and forwarded to Riley Hollingsworth for action
> > or, should I say inaction.
> >
> > Riley Hollingsworth has long been aware of the activities of the
> > operator in Hiram, Georgia and has dozens of recordings of this
> > operator, made by OOs, the FCC, and individual ham operators.
> >
> > The station in Hiram, Georgia, is currently, once again, attacking
> > his perceived enemies on 14313 and 3901 and once again the
> > amateur community wonders why noting has ever been done by

> > Riley to remove the Hiram, Georgia station from amateur radio.
> >
> >
> > So Mr KK4TL, just maybe now you might begin to see the need
> > for people to post anonymously and why people post snide remarks
> > about Riley's impotence. Me, I see nothing to be gained in attacking
> > Riley, but that's only my opinion. I can readily understand the
> > frustration that the rest of the amateur community has with Riley's
> > inability or lack of action in addressing the blatant violations of the
> > station in Hiram, Georgia.
> >
> > Here's a question for you, Mr KK4TL. How do you propose that
> > Riley Hollingsworth can finally be motivated to remove the Hiram,
> > Georgia operator from amateur radio?
> >
> > And yes, I am anon, for the protection of myself and my family
> > from a very unstable person.
> >
> >
> We need to bring the BARF back. There were never
> problems like this when we had Herbie and the great
> BARF on 14313.............BARF Lives!!!!!!!!!!!!!

You need to get a brain transplant first.

3300. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:02:39 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ujn2h$s1v$2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26254
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9ujium$gf2$1@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "The Better Amateur Radio Federation" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
> news:62363b4da3668cc67debfe9c8a8e807e@spamfreenews.com...
> >
> > "CBRambo" <CBRambo@nowhereyouknowx.net> wrote in message
> > news:9uj32jrdt0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KK4TL" <kk4tl@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20011203204442.23871.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com...
> > > >> This would explain why you used the anon to talk tough?
> > >
> > >
> > > Apparently, Mr KK4TL has never been on the receiving end
> > > of anonymous late night hang up calls, anon calls to his employer,
> > > anonymous defamatory letters written to his neighbors, fraudulent
> > > magazine subscriptions, fraudulent COD orders, unidentified cars
> > > parked in front of his house after midnight, anonymous threatening
> > > emails, anon threats to harm members of your family, and a host
> > > of other harassment and stalking activities which more often than
> > > not originate from Hiram, Georgia. I wonder if Mr KK4TL has
> > > ever been told on 14313 and 3901 that his minor daughters suck
> > > the dicks of truck drivers or that your wife sucks the dicks and
> > > swallows the sperm of niggers (not my words, these were actual
> > > recorded statements made on 14313 and 3901 by an operator in
> > > Hiram, Georgia who readily identified himself with his legitimate
> amateur
> > > call sign.) The same operator in Hiram, Georgia featured the photo
> > > of an amateur, the same one with the minor daughters he said sucked
> > > truck driver's dicks, on a web page, claiming that this amateur was
> > > the Olympic Park bomber and was being sought by federal law
> > > enforcement authorities. The same operator, in a wild out of control
> > > frenzy on 14313, heard by thousands of ham operators, threatened to
> > > murder a ham in NJ. In yet another out of control frenzy on 14313,
the
> > > same Hiram, Georgia operator threatened to kick in the door of another
> > > ham operator and assault him and his family. Both of these threats
were
> > > recorded, documented, and forwarded to Riley Hollingsworth for action
> > > or, should I say inaction.
> > >
> > > Riley Hollingsworth has long been aware of the activities of the
> > > operator in Hiram, Georgia and has dozens of recordings of this

> > > operator, made by OOs, the FCC, and individual ham operators.
> > >
> > > The station in Hiram, Georgia, is currently, once again, attacking
> > > his perceived enemies on 14313 and 3901 and once again the
> > > amateur community wonders why noting has ever been done by
> > > Riley to remove the Hiram, Georgia station from amateur radio.
> > >
> > >
> > > So Mr KK4TL, just maybe now you might begin to see the need
> > > for people to post anonymously and why people post snide remarks
> > > about Riley's impotence. Me, I see nothing to be gained in attacking
> > > Riley, but that's only my opinion. I can readily understand the
> > > frustration that the rest of the amateur community has with Riley's
> > > inability or lack of action in addressing the blatant violations of
the
> > > station in Hiram, Georgia.
> > >
> > > Here's a question for you, Mr KK4TL. How do you propose that
> > > Riley Hollingsworth can finally be motivated to remove the Hiram,
> > > Georgia operator from amateur radio?
> > >
> > > And yes, I am anon, for the protection of myself and my family
> > > from a very unstable person.
> > >
> >
> > And this is one of the main reasons for restoring the Better Amateur
Radio
> > Federation. The mentioned person was once a proud member, but has
fallen
> > out of grace with his wild behavior. We will deal with these "fallen
> > angels" in whatever way deemed acceptable.
> >
> > People like Wiseman are pimple on the rear of the B.A.R.F.
>
> LARDASSSSSSSSSS LLLLLLLLOYD, you are the festered pimple on the ass of the
> human race that your'e not a part of.
<corrected>
>
> > They will get
> > tired of beating themselves against the wall in this newsgroup, and then
> > leave in disgrace. We took out his ability to get on the newsgroups
once,
> > and will do it again if needed. It's not time yet.
>
> BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!
> Lardasssss Lllllllloyd you couldn't take out anything. Especially that
> cucumber you stick up your FAT ASS on a nightly basis.
>
> > That's why need YOU. With your help, we can clean the ham bands of
> garbage.

>
> Says Lllllllllllllllaardass Lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllloyd, who gets on
> HF unidentifed.

And Llllloyd, how is it Herbie says he's never heard of you?

3301. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:03:48 UTC
From: user@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3c0d460e.18850666@news.triconet.org>
Source record: 26346

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 14:59:45 -0500, Dave Hall <nojunkmail_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
wrote:

|Kent wrote:
|>
|> Dave, I think that you have not spent a good amount of time on the CW bands.
|> "Hopelessly weak"???? Not with CW! Ask the EMEers.
|
|If the signal is NOT weak, then it becomes more practical to use a phone
|mode. IF CW is the only mode that works, then the signal is weak by
|definition. EME'er regularly work ssb if they have any sort of decent
|station.

Since I can't find you in any list I have of known EME operators, I assume you
do not have a "decent station" so how would you know what is regularly done?

If by decent you mean some of the stations with antenna arrays worth tens of $K
and all commercial gear then yes, SSB is "regularly used." With my former
"indecent" all homebrew station with a modest 4 Yagi array, SSB was not
regularly used for EME.

|
|>
|> "Voice has replaced CW"??? Ask the SSB ops that wanted a contact with the
|> VP8 in the Shetlands. He never went to SSB. Though the SSB ops were
|> BEGGING for it to happen!

Right on. N7WS worked VP8SGK 11/26/2001 @23:48 on 20 CW. It took one call.

OTOH, I had to call about 20 times to work 4L4FN/P5 on 20 SSB this morning heh
heh heh.

|
|I have no desire to exchange anything with an elitist mode snob. If he
|can't talk to me on the modes I use, "uck 'em".

What an enlightened attitude.

|>
|> "Painfully slow data exchange"??? I bet I can exchange an RST just as fast
|> as with voice. Please read below about cw ops using 8000 cps (characters
|> per second).
|
|There is no way a person can manually send CW at that rate. If you are
|using a computer to "type" CW, then there are far better digital modes
|with FEC that get the job done faster and better. CW is not a very
|robust digital mode, and it is severely limited in speed if done

|manually.

I'm really glad VP8SGK wasn't relying on FEC to pick my call out of the pile-up;
I'd still be calling. Talk about "speed limited."

3302. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:07:49 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C0D5744.C72F598A@uci.edu>
Source record: 26347

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 29 Nov 2001 04:16:13 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >> I don't--and I _teach_ PLS101 classes!
> >>
> > >
> > > Then you don't teach Political Science. You teach some radical BS just
> > >as I would expect from you.
>
> Er, Dickie,
>
> PLS101 IS a Political Science course.

I think what Dick is saying is that when you teach it, PLS101 is a Rick
Adams course.

3303. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:15:12 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C0D5900.A47FECD7@uci.edu>
Source record: 26349

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:

> > At what point in his life did Uncle Thomas begin
> > referring to himself as a libertarian?
>
> I don't know if he did or didn't but historians have classified
> him as a "civil libertarian" for hundreds of years. He certainly
> believed in liberating Americans from British rule and giving
> us as much personal freedom and protection from government as
> is feasible in a civilized society.

I think that's right. But a litigious society is replacing the
civilized society we once had; a process which has lead us to where we
are now.

3304. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:16:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0D5943.AB0072C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26348

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>
> >OIC. Now the personal attack is expanded from just being against me,
> >to everyone else participating in this thread. Oh, as you were...just
> >"some" of the people in this thread. The ones who aren't openly
> >accepting and totally thrilled with the cleverness of Kim's call sign,
> >no doubt! A typical childish response from a liberal who isn't getting
> >his own way. Nothing new here!
>
> Darn it, Larry. There's just no pleasing you.
>
> Insult you, you get offended.
>
> Compliment you, you get offended.
>
> And you STILL can't learn the difference between a liberal and
> a libertarian.
>
> Have a nice day pork chop.

Larry reminds me of Samson. He's trying to kill us with the jawbone
of an ass. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3305. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:24:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0D5B11.E2249970@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26350

Rick Adams wrote:
> I doubt seriously you could cover THIS kind of costs with only
> a ten percent fee on contracts. Plus, all you are really doing by
> implementing a compulsory 10% on contracts is to create a new form of
> taxation (effectively there is no difference between a 10% contract
> fee and a 10% sales or excise tax), something the Libertarians oppose.

Of course there's a difference between a fee and a tax, Rick.

> Ok, then lets start with the Social Security programs and
> eliminate welfare for the elderly!

Social Security is not welfare for me. I will never recover all I
paid into the Social Security program.

> Cecil, it isn't that I don't believe that there are serious
> problems with our welfare system--there are. But to simply treat the
> poor as an unwanted "herd" goes beyond reform to classism--

Treating the poor as unwanted seems logical to me, Rick. Why would
you *want* anyone to be poor?

> Put yourself in this position: You are a young (18 years old),...

I would gladly give everything I own for that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3306. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:28:58 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C0D5C3A.8AA5C286@uci.edu>
Source record: 26251

Rick Adams wrote:
> Of course, George Washington grew 40,000 marijuana plants at
> Mt. Vernon, and provided detailed instructions as to the preparation
> of marijuana wine (his favorite--and viewed by a substantial number of
> conservative historians as being the first wine served at a state
> dinner by a sitting President).......

Yuck. Prolly tasted like bong water. :-)

3307. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:34:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0D5D99.35726EE0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26252

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Of course, George Washington grew 40,000 marijuana plants at
> > Mt. Vernon, and provided detailed instructions as to the preparation
> > of marijuana wine (his favorite--and viewed by a substantial number of
> > conservative historians as being the first wine served at a state
> > dinner by a sitting President).......
>
> Yuck. Prolly tasted like bong water. :-)

What does bong water taste like, Jim? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3308. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:49:46 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ujpbb$560$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26257
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.2600

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:roger.staggers.master@houston-hunks.com...
>
> On Tue, 4 Dec 2001 15:52:36 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> :
> : Try to spin a justification all you want, you're just an ANONYMOUS
COWARD.
>
> And [IKYWABWAI]

And they call him "Pee Wee Stagger Lee" for several reasons.
But He/she/it's still a hiding, anonymous COWARD.

3309. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:51:32 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ujpbd$560$2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26258
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"LARDASSSSSSSSS Lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllloyd"
<TheNewBARF@TheNewBARFgroup.net> wrote in message
news:9ujk32jjo0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
> > W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> > N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago
> on
> > 75 meters.
> >
>
> NO arguement there Scheissman

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAAHHA!!!!!!!! Still listening in on those CHEAP-ASS Radio
Shit, er Shack radios, Lllllllardasssssss Llllllloyd? The ones that aren't
even double conversion recievers?
MUWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!

3310. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-04 23:55:00 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ujpbe$560$3@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26259
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Pedophile
"Polly" <PollyBARF@PollyBARFforever.edu> wrote in message
news:9ujkdckij0@dosa.alt.net...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
> > W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> > N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago
> on
> > 75 meters.
>
> You made one very big mistake Wiseman, and that mistake
> gave yourself away as the unidentified jammer on 3901. All info
> has been forwarded to Hollingsworth. Your license is toast Wiseman!
> Laugh all you want now, HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!
I did? How did I do that when I said N4CND used profanity the other night on
3.901?
That's quite a stretch, fuckwitted anonymous COWARD. And Riley knows that I
haven't been on 3.901, but he has DFed you unidentified.
Since I keep a log, your pathetic attemps, are going to be toast, and he
doesn't accept anonymous coward's blatherings. Now, under the FOIA, I will
find out exactly who you are.
Mwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha!!!!!!!!!
or as you say : HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR!!!!!!!!!!!

3311. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 00:08:27 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <175E4DBAFF58FCAA.3E26F871732CF88D.60B28AADDE5C3A5B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 14:11:14 GMT, "Kenneth Vaughan"
<kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>pass all the "laws" you want.....answer me one question.....how does it make
>any difference? how is this new law going to be actively enforced?? local
>atthorities still have to obtain a search warrant,with reasonable cause
>submitted before a judge.

If it's mobile, they only have to see some indication that it's not a
legal rig from outside the vehicle. After that, they'll have probable
cause to search.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3312. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 00:14:51 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <8C53E9080B92DB62.D468512814D31083.02F0FB29581505C3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26256
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 20:10:17 GMT, "W6DKN" <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote:

>"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
>news:672843AB044B2518.94A4425C9C7CF2D8.120C5F2BB645239E@lp.airnews.net...
>> On 3 Dec 2001 23:18:48 -0800, keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
>> (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:
>>
>> >HMMMMMMMMM. COME TO THINK OF IT WHY DOES A PERSON LIKE KD5NRH WHO
>> >CANT LEGALLY OPERATE ON 10 METERS RUSH IN TO DEFEND THE SALE OF THESE
>> >FAKE EXPORT 10 METER RADIOS ?????????
>>
>> I can be an Extra in a month. You'll be an anonymous coward forever.
>>
>
>I'll check the callbooks in 6 weeks and see... :>)

I may just take you up on that :)

So far, my YL has been wanting us to upgrade at the same time, but
she's practically hiding from the books, so I may just study harder
and go try for it. I'm pretty much set for the code, nearly ready for
General, and past electronics experience got me a fair chunk of the
info in the Extra book.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3313. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 00:45:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0d6f07_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26260

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011203223145.28714.00002780@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c0ad245_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Oh, sure Riley said what he said. I don't negate that at all. However,
I
> >have no problems with my callsign...at all. The problems Riley has with
it
> >are his, the problems you have with it are yours. And so on. I like it.
> >I'll keep it. The ARS will not go into extinction, and that can be
proven.
>
> Kim:
>
> As Riley (that's MISTER Hollingsworth to you)

Nope. Sorry if you thought so. I call him Riley.

>
> clearly stated, the
> negative impact of your callsign exists in the form of the potential
> discouragement of concerned parents, grandparents, and other
> influential adults from bringing young, impressionable children into
> the realm of Amateur Radio as a result of hearing or seeing your
> call sign, which has the effect of objectifying women in a demeaning
> manner.
>

Uh, Larry, Riley did *not* say all that in the email. His email was about 3
lines if I recall. But, to carry *your* statements, they're wrong. That
they are wrong is borne out in the fact that the ARS is under no worse shape
than before I got my callsign; in fact, the numbers have grown.

>
> The potential for you to bring the ARS "...one step closer
> to extinction" is a reality.
>

I agree. The "potential" as reality is the equivalent of anything is
possible, and it is.

>
> Of course, you might not admit this, because
> it doesn't serve your selfish motives to do so.

>

I always ask you to 'splain what "selfish motives" I have, Larry. You've never exactly answered that question.

>
> However, I hold out
> the hope that you may, possibly, do the right thing, someday.
>

Oh? Didn't anyone tell you? I've done the right thing, Larry.

>
> I have
> faith in your potential to change, even if you don't see that possibility
> on your radar screen at this time. I like to see the potential for good
> in people, and I don't exclude you whatsoever.
>

In my opinion, you are totally incapable of seeing the good in anyone, Larry, unless there's something in it for you.

> >
> >Sorry, you're wrong. As usual. And notice I didn't have to use any worn
> >out cliches to make my point...
>
> Well, not this time, at least.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Kim W5TIT

3314. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 00:46:57 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0d6f51_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26261

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011203223145.28714.00002779@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c0c23c7_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >> No. Not unless they wanted me to be. And I'm sure that's what most
> >> homosexual "couples" want for their children.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >The true pity, folks, is Larry likely believes that.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> The fact that you feel the need to imply that I may not believe what
> I post leads me to conclude that perhaps, you don't believe in what
> *you* post! Trust me, I don't post statements like the above unless
> I do, in fact, believe what I am saying.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I think I stated the obvious. What's the matter with you? It is a true
pity that you believe what you posted and I stated that it is a true pity.
Understand now?

Kim W5TIT

3315. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 00:47:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0d6f8b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26262

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011203223146.28714.00002781@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3C0ADCBA.49DC4701@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Kim, let me absolutely, without a doubt assure you: Riley
Hollingsworth's
> >> words were true. That makes this YOUR problem.
> >
> >Actually, it is not Kim's problem at all. The Constitution
> >protects people like Kim from people like you and Riley.
>
> Cecil:
>
> Kim's Constitutional right to make a fool of herself and all other YL
> hams is not the issue; Mr. Hollingsworth was very clear on that
> point, and I have repeatedly acknowledged this. That doesn't change
> the fact that the potential negative impact of her decision to select
> a call sign, which is in poor taste, still exists. This is Kim's problem,
> and always will be unless and until she decides to change her call
> sign to one which reflects better taste and judgment.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

OK OK OK. Tell me how it's my problem, Larry. Maybe that'll help.

Kim W5TIT

3316. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 00:50:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0d704b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26263

"Larry Roll" <k3lt@magpage.com> wrote in message
news:9uhm21$aq8$0@216.155.32.45...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > ROFLMAO....^5 Rick.
>
> And THIS is one of Kim's more intelligent postings!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Well, for goodness sake. Why didn't you tell me I have to get that simple minded for you to understand, Larry? If the one-liners are all you can understand, then don't read the other posts.

Kim W5TIT

3317. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 01:03:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011204200348.03557.00000001@mb-fg.aol.com>
Source record: 26264

In article <3c0c29c7_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>Hmmmm, we'll have to watch those decreases.

Your license class is the one that has encountered the biggest decrease by far,
Kim.

> ROFLMAO..

Why?

>.maybe Riley's right
>about my callsign...?

Maybe.

>NOT.

How do you know?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3318. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 01:07:11 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0d7410_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26265

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0CDA88.3525FA90@sccoast.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > Wiccans and pagans don't believe in
> > a Devil, Dwight. Nor is their religion
> > in any way related to Satanism or
> > Christianity. It isn't "Rehashed" it's
> > fact.
> >
> > And it is the INVERTED pentagram that
> > is symbolic of Satanism (although not
> > exclusively), not the upright one
> > usually displayed by Wiccans and Pagans.
>
>
> Well, I'm certainly not going to get into a long-winded debate about
> these so called "religions." Both are modern day offshoots of
> satanism, using different names and their own variations of satanism.
>

Wrong, wrong, wrong.

>
> And the pentagram/penticle, displayed either way, has long been a
> satanic symbol (which is exactly why wiccans and pagans, who you claim
> are in no way related to satanism, selected the exact same symbol for
> their own).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3319. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 01:09:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0d749c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26266

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0CDBAB.D67C3F0F@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > (snip) The shape of the Pentagon is the
> > same as the internal part of a 5-pointed
> > star. Isn't it?
>
>
> I suppose so, Kim. What's your point? The Pentagon building was
> built in the shape of a pentagon - the shape of some part of a
> pentagram had nothing to do with it.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

I think someone, maybe even you, was making the point that something shaped like a pentagram was satanic. The Pentagon building, shaped as it is, holds the foundation for a pentagram, does it not?

It was a stab at trying to get the equation of pentagram=satanic out of the holder's head...because it's hogwash.

Kim W5TIT

3320. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 01:13:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0d757b$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26267

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0CD429.8176A4C7@sccoast.net...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Yup. There is another aspect to this
> > as well. In our lawsuit-happy society,
> > it is easy for some actions to be
> > misinterpreted. Best not to even give
> > the appearance of something questionable.
>
>
> That is becoming much more of an issue each day. Luckily, I've
> rarely had to work in situations where lawsuits are much of an issue
> (overseas and government offices), but I still think a conservative
> approach to workplace relationships is a wise choice. However, in some
> employment situations today, I think I'd almost have to video tape all
> conversations with the opposite sex just to be safe. :-)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

You guys must be a lot more "aware" of situations where litigation is a prohibitive for having business lunches. I have female supervisors, married ones at that, who have business lunches every day with their married, male subordinates. There are lunches, every day, where married men and women go alone with each other--just for the heck of it.

I think the response you are having (above) with the caution of litigation for such actions is overboard. Your mileage may vary.

Kim W5TIT

3321. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 01:19:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C0D762A.DB4FBC38@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26268

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>
>
> OK OK OK. Tell me how it's my problem, Larry. Maybe that'll help.
>
>

It will cause the end of civilization as we know it. :-)

3322. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 01:19:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0d76ff$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26269

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011204200348.03557.00000001@mb-fg.aol.com...
> In article <3c0c29c7_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >Hmmmm, we'll have to watch those decreases.
>
> Your license class is the one that has encountered the biggest decrease by
far,
> Kim.
>
> > ROFLMAO..
>
> Why?
>
> >.maybe Riley's right
> >about my callsign...?
>
> Maybe.
>
> >NOT.
>
> How do you know?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

I just do, Jim. For the same reason that anyone else might believe the
opposite.

Kim W5TIT

3323. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 01:20:20 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0d7724_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26270

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C0D762A.DB4FBC38@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > OK OK OK. Tell me how it's my problem, Larry. Maybe that'll help.
> >
> >
>
> It will cause the end of civilization as we know it. :-)
>
>

Well, that would leave Larry out. He isn't very civilized. ;)

Kim W5TIT

3324. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 01:41:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011204204132.01104.00000001@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 26271

In article <81FDA5B2FEE48C45.AF931BCC80E98337.2C7AE95D20E452F1@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On Mon, 3 Dec 2001 19:35:16 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Hmmm, correct me if I'm wrong, but if my studies of Wicca serve me well, I
>>believe it is the "internal" part of the star that is considered the "meat"
>>of the pentagram, not the five points or the star itself. The shape of the
>>Pentagon is the same as the internal part of a 5-pointed star. Isn't it?
>
> Actually, a five-pointed star inscribed _inside_ a pentagon is
>likewise a symbol of Wicca (the Black Forest Trad, not the New Forest
>Trad or Hungarian Wiccae, if it matters).
>
Rearrabge the letters in "Santa" and you get "Satan". How convenient!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3325. Re: state police license for mobile R/T

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 01:55:40 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112050155180.13144-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 26272

On Tue, 4 Dec 2001 brokenemail@brokenemail.ccm wrote:
>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote:
>>Back in 1993, the FCC addressed this. I think it was ruling 93-17. Amateur
>>radio licenseholders are exempt from states' anti-monitoring laws of public
>>safety frequencies.
>
>Good info. I will find it and put a copy in glove box.

Also, I believe the exact question asked of the FCC that generated the ruling
was with regard to reception of public safety frequencies by amateur radio
equipment (although the response is a bit wider).

3326. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 02:07:23 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9ujvgq0n26@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26274
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message
news:9uht0c$qu3$1@news.hawaii.edu...
> Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >So what's that have to do with use of "HI HI" that's spoken or used in
>
> The point being that since the CW prosigns "CQ" and "73" are
> universally accepted and used on phone, you shouldn't call
> folks derogatory names for also saying "HI HI"; it's just
> another CW prosign that's been adopted for phone.
>
> Jeff KH6O

It still sounds moronic and contrived, instead of genuinely spontaneous.
But, I guess some people are used to laughing at their own jokes.

3327. Re: Santa on the Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 02:17:54 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9uk02b0p90@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26276
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message
news:9uhsbi$qb0$1@news.hawaii.edu...

> That's good, Rich; Krell dodged the question.

No. It's just that I'm not a dog that performs tricks for some pompous
college professor's amusement. Besides, I noticed that you did the same
thing.

> Since Krell's so adamant in believing that it's incorrect to say
> "HI HI" on phone (to the point that he called someone an idiot),
> then surely he must believe it's incorrect to call "CQ" on phone,
> too. He'll be the first ham to ever say "Hello All Stations."

You make far too many ASSumptions.

3328. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 02:21:10 UTC
From: Dimmy Dimwit <HiramHog@Anon.con>
Message-ID: <9uk056$i78$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26273
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "CBRambo" <CBRambo@nowhereyouknowx.net> wrote in message
> news:9uj32jrdt0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "KK4TL" <kk4tl@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011203204442.23871.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com...
> > >> This would explain why you used the anon to talk tough?
> > >
> > >
> > > Apparently, Mr KK4TL has never been on the receiving end
> > > of anonymous late night hang up calls, anon calls to his employer,
> > > anonymous defamatory letters written to his neighbors, fraudulent
> > > magazine subscriptions, fraudulent COD orders, unidentified cars
> > > parked in front of his house after midnight, anonymous threatening
> > > emails, anon threats to harm members of your family, and a host
> > > of other harassment and stalking activities which more often than
> > > not originate from Hiram, Georgia. I wonder if Mr KK4TL has
> > > ever been told on 14313 and 3901 that his minor daughters suck
> > > the dicks of truck drivers or that your wife sucks the dicks and
> > > swallows the sperm of niggers (not my words, these were actual
> > > recorded statements made on 14313 and 3901 by an operator in
> > > Hiram, Georgia who readily identified himself with his legitimate
amateur
> > > call sign.) The same operator in Hiram, Georgia featured the photo
> > > of an amateur, the same one with the minor daughters he said sucked
> > > truck driver's dicks, on a web page, claiming that this amateur was
> > > the Olympic Park bomber and was being sought by federal law
> > > enforcement authorities. The same operator, in a wild out of control
> > > frenzy on 14313, heard by thousands of ham operators, threatened to
> > > murder a ham in NJ. In yet another out of control frenzy on 14313, the
> > > same Hiram, Georgia operator threatened to kick in the door of another
> > > ham operator and assault him and his family. Both of these threats were
> > > recorded, documented, and forwarded to Riley Hollingsworth for action
> > > or, should I say inaction.
> > >
> > > Riley Hollingsworth has long been aware of the activities of the
> > > operator in Hiram, Georgia and has dozens of recordings of this
> > > operator, made by OOs, the FCC, and individual ham operators.
> > >
> > > The station in Hiram, Georgia, is currently, once again, attacking
> > > his perceived enemies on 14313 and 3901 and once again the
> > > amateur community wonders why noting has ever been done by

> > Riley to remove the Hiram, Georgia station from amateur radio.
> >
> >
> > So Mr KK4TL, just maybe now you might begin to see the need
> > for people to post anonymously and why people post snide remarks
> > about Riley's impotence. Me, I see nothing to be gained in attacking
> > Riley, but that's only my opinion. I can readily understand the
> > frustration that the rest of the amateur community has with Riley's
> > inability or lack of action in addressing the blatant violations of the
> > station in Hiram, Georgia.
> >
> > Here's a question for you, Mr KK4TL. How do you propose that
> > Riley Hollingsworth can finally be motivated to remove the Hiram,
> > Georgia operator from amateur radio?
>
> I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
> W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago
on
> 75 meters.
>
> > And yes, I am anon, for the protection of myself and my family
> > from a very unstable person.
>
> Try to spin a justification all you want, you're just an ANONYMOUS COWARD.

Is that akin to posting under "Mysterian 2001"? That's not being an
anonymous coward, is it? Of course it isn't .
Did you not squeak just a bit only recently about anon phone calls you have
been getting? Well, you have not seen even one tenth of what that sick
squirrell in Hiram can do and has done to not one or two, but to at least a
dozen Hams. And as if that is not enough, this sick fool makes wild guesses
as to who the posters may be and he still continues to spam, spam and spam.
The dude has a major screw loose, and now it is understandable why the two
of you get along so well.

3329. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 02:36:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112041836.21f2272c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26275
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<9uj7hm$pl7$1@news.bignet.net>...
> "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> news:3C0C6212.298A6008@spam.me.not...
> > Based on the evidence you've presented, Weak Signal emissions don't seem
> > to be excluded from 50.0 to 50.1 and 144.0 to 144.1.
>
> I've been reading this thread and I think the 100KHz band sections are
> typically used for EME work only, which has up to now been almost always
> done using CW.
>
>
For the most part yes.
>
>
>I know a few EME contacts have been done on SSB, but I don't
>know if it was done in those band segments. If they were then they
those
> band segments are not CW only,
>
Ya can run ssb on 144.102, "depends" . .
>
>
>but are still "weak signal" considering the
> mode, and not for the "typical" terrestrial weak signal use.
>
>
EME is only one trick the VHF big guns have in their dxing arsenals
modes aside, they also are big into ducting and meteor scatter in
addition to their usual freak high-MUF trips. Ya gotta TUNE . .
>
>
w3rv

3330. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 02:40:11 UTC
From: Dimmy Dimwit <HiramHog@Anon.con>
Message-ID: <9uk18s$k1h$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26277
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"Lloyd" <TheNewBARF@TheNewBARFgroup.net> wrote in message
news:9ujk32jjo0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
> > W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> > N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago
> on
> > 75 meters.
> >
>
> NO arguement there Scheissman YOU ARE THE UNCONTESTED
> expert on Usenet when it comes to filthy obscene language!!!!!!!!!!

Sure. Good old W4AMP. Trying to reason with him? After the sick, sad, crap
this hillrat said about Oris in the past? The sick and flthy things AMP
called Oris' wife and daughters? One does not "reason" with AMP. This is how
he plays his sick game. He tries to act ever the nice guy, THEN he stabs you
in the back, over and over and over.
Have you ever heard the sick, obscene language AMP used against Doc, AF2Y?
It was pure filth.

3331. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 02:52:34 UTC
From: Dimmy Dimwit <HiramHog@Anon.con>
Message-ID: <9uk205$l2r$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26278
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"Polly" <PollyBARF@PollyBARFforever.edu> wrote in message
news:9ujkdckij0@dosa.alt.net...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
> > W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> > N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago
> on
> > 75 meters.
>
> You made one very big mistake Wiseman, and that mistake
> gave yourself away as the unidentified jammer on 3901. All info
> has been forwarded to Hollingsworth. Your license is toast Wiseman!
> Laugh all you want now, HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR

Was what Oris said as bad as what AMP said to Doc no so long ago? Remember
that? AMP cussing and swearing like a drunken sailor? (one of the few things
he learned from the Navy).
Roger is good at jamming. He and Riley are old friends when it comes to that
sort of thing, eh, Rog?

3332. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 02:53:39 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c0d89db.1826114@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26279

On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 23:45:12 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

>On Mon, 03 Dec 2001 05:01:40 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>>>a simple, logical, and reasonable precaution, and the decision not
>>>to take that precaution would be difficult to defend in a court of law.
>>
>>Defend against what? If I RENT you ham equipment, I have no
>>obligation to ensure you use it correctly. Who would have
>>any cause of action against the rentor for a ham or non-ham
>>that caused interference?
>
> In many if not most states by now, a bartender or host who serves
> intoxicating beverages to a customer or guest can be held legally
> responsible for the negligent or unlawful acts of the drinker
> brought about by such service.
>
> Basic tort law.

Not quite as the barender has to be shown to have had knowledge
or should have known that the person was TOO intoxicated to
be served.

If we buy your logic on face value, the estate of a person murdered
by someone with a hammer rented from a hardware store will
have a claim against the hardware store.

Now in the "interference" case, would you expect the FCC to
bring charges against the person that rented the rig, or rented
the location with a rig?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3333. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 04:08:35 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c0d9c4d.6548917@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26280
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 18:08:27 -0600, "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH"
<kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote:

>On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 14:11:14 GMT, "Kenneth Vaughan"
><kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
>>pass all the "laws" you want.....answer me one question.....how does it make
>>any difference? how is this new law going to be actively enforced?? local
>>atthorities still have to obtain a search warrant,with reasonable cause
>>submitted before a judge.
>
>If it's mobile, they only have to see some indication that it's not a
>legal rig from outside the vehicle. After that, they'll have probable
>cause to search.

The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3334. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 04:35:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0DF0B6103914F28E.55F720DE920DCCF9.EB543EB71E45DD81@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26281

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 09:17:35 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Well, I'm certainly not going to get into a long-winded debate about
>these so called "religions." Both are modern day offshoots of
>satanism, using different names and their own variations of satanism.

Dwight that is absolute nonsense! Learn something about the
subject before you make such absurd claims!

Neither wicca nor any other form of pagan faith have anything
at all to do with Satan--that's an invention of the Judeo-Christian
faith that has nothing whatever to do with nature religions.

Wiccan and pagan faiths can trace their roots to the
polytheistic nature religions of Greece and Rome and to the pagan
faiths of Germany and England. They were in existence LONG before
Christianity attempted to eradicate them by claiming they were
"Satanic." Most Christian holidays, in fact (including Christmas, All
Saints Day, and others) were deliberately scheduled to fall on, or
near, major pagan celebrations (thus requiring the pagans who were
"passing" in the community to cut short their religious observations
in order to attend [compulsory] Christian services). Christmas, for
example, falls close to the original date of Candlemas and All Saints
Day falls on All Hallow's Eve (Halloween).

Claiming that wicca and pagan faiths are variations of
Satanism is no more accurate than claiming that Native American
religions are variations on Satanism. It is a completely false
statement perpetuated by the Christian church in an attempt to hide
the actual nature of the religions. It's despicable, and only
compounded when presumably well educated individuals perpetuate it as
you have done.

>And the pentagram/penticle, displayed either way, has long been a
>satanic symbol (which is exactly why wiccans and pagans, who you claim
>are in no way related to satanism, selected the exact same symbol for
>their own).

Dwight, that is pure religious bigotry with no foundation in
fact what-so-ever. Try LEARNING something about the subject before you
come off with idiotic and provably false statements such as that
one--you only cost yourself respect by such posts.

The pentagram, for your information, was a religious symbol in
Egypt, Macedonia, Sumeria, Greece, Rome, China, India, and among the
Norse peoples--NONE of which groups "stole" it from Christianity. If

anything, it is the Christian faith that has been guilty of stealing
symbols from older religions (including, btw, the cross) and using
them to further their own ends.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3335. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 04:47:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0DA6E3.B5A3CB6C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26282

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> We Catholics have been using real pregnant
> women to play Mary for as long as I have been going to Christmas
> Pageants!

The lady playing Mary was obviously impregnated by a man,
not by God. Thus it is a vulgar and obscene slap at the
Virgin Mary.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3336. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:09:32 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AB533912AFC3145A.36E3693CAB6CDB66.AC620153AC581B71@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26283

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 10:47:29 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Yes, it was a licensed tattoo parlor. And, yes, I believe a lawsuit
>was filed (they said they were going to file). However, that does not
>change the fact that they were stuck with huge medical bills in the
>meantime, and, if a suit was filed, probably lawyer bills on top of that.

Then the lawsuit should serve as compensation to the parents
(and child) concerned. If they win (and if the circumstances you
describe are accurate, they certainly should) the firm will suffer the
consequences of its inappropriate actions.

A case like this is not, however, grounds for banning tattoo
parlors or piercing salons, as the original message in this sub-thread
postulated. Unless you agree that if a liquor store sells beer to a
minor, it justifies banning ALL liquor stores as a result (a pretty
absurd concept), then by necessity the same holds true for a tattoo
parlor or piercing salon.

It's perfectly reasonable to set legal limits as to the
minimum age for tattooing or piercing without parental consent (bear
in mind that if you ban piercing, you must ALSO prohibit piercing of
ears in jewelry stores, etc.--something MANY children--particularly
girls--have done with their parent's consent and approval), however it
is completely unreasonable to ban the practices simply because a minor
MAY circumvent the law (and their parents) and obtain the services.

> Well, first of all, that child does have the same rights, and same
>protections, as others in that courtroom.

Only when charged as an adult. Children tried in Juvenile
courts do NOT have the same rights as an adult who is charged with a
crime--it isn't even necessary to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that
they committed the offense, and they are NOT guaranteed a lawyer to
defend them--or even that a lawyer hired BY them will be permitted to
act on their behalf.

>Second, killing someone is
>not stealing a bicycle, shoplifting, or some other minor crime which
>the juvenile courts were designed to handle. Because of that, the
>child is judged in a regular court (not an "adult" court, a "regular"
>court). And he is charged with murder, and faces the penalties for
>murder, because that is the crime he committed (not a lessor crime
>which warrants him being set free in a few years when he reaches his
>21st birthday, which is a requirement for juvenile court).

I agree that these crimes are far more serious. But it seems
that those who want criminal trials for such offenders simultaneously
want to treat the same youths as children incapable of making a
decision in other cases. Think about it, if a person is not capable of
making an adult decision as to whether or not he should get a tattoo,
how can anyone possibly expect him to make an adult decision as to
whether to commit a crime? The concept is ridiculous. Either a person
is or is not mature enough to be treated as an adult. If not, they
should NEVER be treated that way; if so they ALWAYS should (with the
cravat that so as their parents are financially responsible for them,
they have certain rights to limit behaviors they find objectionable).

> Of course, none of this has any bearing on the "right" of a child to
>do whatever he/she wants (in spite of the parent's wishes).

I never claimed such a "right" existed. I DID claim that
society has no right to dictate those rules, if they don't apply to
adults as well or offer a risk of danger to others or to the youth
(and the infection you describe is NOT a legitimate "risk" factor, any
more than it would be a risk factor if a child stepped on a jellyfish
while swimming at a public beach), only the parents do.

>We all
>live with different rules throughout our lives. For examples, we live
>with one set of rules as children, another set of rules when we're
>drafted into the military (UCMJ), another set of rules in the
>workplace (company policies), and still another set of rules when
>we're old (can't drive a car).

I'll agree with most of those, but at least one (rules in the
work place) are a matter of personal choice. Don't like the rules,
don't work there--no one forces anyone to take a job they don't want.
As far as the "old driver" rules you cite--most states don't have them
(here in Michigan the senior lobby is far to strong to limit the
driving of the elderly--with the result that we've had cases where an
80+ year old man drove along the sidewalk at Detroit Metro Airport and
ran down a group of children boarding a bus for a return from a trip
and another senior caused a major pile-up by driving down the wrong
side of the Freeway--the signs confused him). Perhaps where you live
there are more chances to take such drivers off the road (such as
compulsory re-testing on a regular basis after a certain age, etc.).

> No, you're talking about semantics. Since laws are based directly on
>the values of the majority within a community, and communities do have
>a right to pass laws, there is no difference (the community does
>indeed have a "right" to impose values).

Not in the United States if those laws fail to recognize the
rights we are GUARANTEED by the Constitution of the United States OR
by the Constitution of their own State.

> Okay, I'll bite, if it is not the function of laws to impose the
>will of the majority within a community (including their "values"),

>what exactly is the function of laws? And who said so?

To protect people from harm.

Thomas Jefferson, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Ben Franklin,
among others.

> Were any of the school shooters wearing hunting patches or hunting jackets?

They were carrying guns and in most cases their fathers were
card-carrying NRA members. Let's save the kids in the schools--we'll
declare the NRA a terrorist organization and put all the members in
prison for supporting terrorism in the United States (which, under the
new laws, the President of the United States now has the right to do
with any organization he wishes).

>> Islamic terrorists are linked to the World
>> Trade Center tragedy--how many schools do
>> you think could get away with banning
>> traditional muslim dress?
>
> Was the WTC located in a school?

It had a preschool in it--as, of course, did the Federal
Building in Oklahoma City.

> Which of our schools are located in the middle east?

The ones in Dearborn, MI are pretty close--the student bodies
are almost exclusively Arab Muslims.

>> In the first place, wicca is NOT
>> satanism (snip)
>
> Addressed in another message, so for brevity will avoid here.

Inaccurately addressed in another message, to be precise.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3337. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:11:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <33C5563F91F6D42B.EA5E9FD34CA1F84E.23C0B155DD9D126E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26284

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 13:04:41 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>> >
>> > I'm always improving myself, Dwight. I'm
>> > sorry that you think self-improvement is
>> > impossible for you. :-)
>>
>> Not impossible, Cecil. Just not seriously needed. :-)
>
>If only I were as omniscient as you, Dwight.

Or as self-deluded.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3338. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:13:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D024B482BCA3223D.90D36DC9A7D04FB4.BBA2223A4798BDFD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26285

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 11:18:14 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Ah, the old Jimmy Carter's "lust in the heart." Anyway, I would
>agree wholeheartedly with you, Sean. It is very hard to control what
>we're thinking (some strange stuff is bouncing around inside all those
>minds). But a thought is very different than an act.

Shame on you Dwight--you criticize Wicca and claim it to be
Satanic--yet you ignore the principles of your OWN religion.

According to the bible (new testament, even) there IS no
difference between committing adultery in reality and doing so "in
your heart."

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3339. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:16:23 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9EEE1ECE3625BBCE.588C3FBBE4CD11BA.AB01C0D9D22F3914@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26286

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 17:16:19 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Larry reminds me of Samson. He's trying to kill us with the jawbone
>of an ass. :-)

ROTFLMAO!!!!

That was perfect (and accurate)!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3340. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:24:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E9DA4496254CF5D5.A640469A5ACB9299.AF9A524A567C3FD0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26287

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 17:24:01 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>> I doubt seriously you could cover THIS kind of costs with only
>> a ten percent fee on contracts. Plus, all you are really doing by
>> implementing a compulsory 10% on contracts is to create a new form of
>> taxation (effectively there is no difference between a 10% contract
>> fee and a 10% sales or excise tax), something the Libertarians oppose.
>
>Of course there's a difference between a fee and a tax, Rick.

Then if a state chooses to change it's sales tax to a
transaction fee, it will suddenly become acceptable to the Libertarian
Party?

Why?

>> Ok, then lets start with the Social Security programs and
>> eliminate welfare for the elderly!
>
>Social Security is not welfare for me. I will never recover all I
>paid into the Social Security program.

Really?

Sit down and total your payments into the system. Divide that
number by the monthly amount you will receive at retirement. That's
how many months of benefits you will receive before the government has
to start paying you welfare. Don't count the interest you "Might" have
made on other investments--you might ALSO have invested badly and lost
all your money. Instead, treat that interest as having been paid as a
tax (fee if you prefer) so that those who have NOT paid into the
system (surviving spouses or children, the disabled, etc.) will be
able to receive Social Security payments as well.

Now tell me you'll never recover it all.

>> Cecil, it isn't that I don't believe that there are serious
>> problems with our welfare system--there are. But to simply treat the
>> poor as an unwanted "herd" goes beyond reform to classism--

>Treating the poor as unwanted seems logical to me, Rick. Why would
>you *want* anyone to be poor?

Cecil, I KNOW you can understand a message better than that!
No one wants people to be poor--that does NOT have the same meaning as
not wanting the poor themselves, and we both know it.

This is a friendly debate, play fair!

>> Put yourself in this position: You are a young (18 years old),...
>
>I would gladly give everything I own for that.

To be an inner city black male youth of 18? Among MANY other
disadvantages, your chances of being killed by violence before your
25th birthday would be one in four and your chances of dying from
disease would be one in sixteen. What would you estimate YOUR chances
of living past the next seven years will be?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3341. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:25:52 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <33677C3BE93FFB27.967BF5A9637BB53E.C25CF7DB27E76D56@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26288

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 15:28:58 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>> Of course, George Washington grew 40,000 marijuana plants at
>> Mt. Vernon, and provided detailed instructions as to the preparation
>> of marijuana wine (his favorite--and viewed by a substantial number of
>> conservative historians as being the first wine served at a state
>> dinner by a sitting President).......
>
>Yuck. Prolly tasted like bong water. :-)

If it's made right, it's pretty good, actually. I've tried it
in the past (don't ask how FAR in the past--I'd rather not think about
that :-).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3342. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:27:35 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C9EEA9EBF0958585.A1761F79A43A4C48.F09A8AE2B11F503E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26289

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 15:13:00 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>>
>> >I just heard some interesting trivia on the radio. Question:
>> >Before 9-11, who was the most famous suicide committed while
>> >killing a bunch of people on the opposing side?
>>
>> George Armstrong Custer??? ;-)
>
>Nope. Hint: He earlier killed 1000 of those enemies with the
>jawbone of an ass.

Larry Roll committed suicide?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3343. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:29:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8252D74A879C3B2D.9B94049D604B3D1F.4CD4DD853FA5FD76@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26290

On 05 Dec 2001 01:41:32 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Rearrabge the letters in "Santa" and you get "Satan". How convenient!

devil spelled backward is "lived"

evil spelled backward is "live"

now consider god ...

Rick <wondering who let the dog out preach, preach, preach...>

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3344. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:32:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9FFDDDC15F55CFB9.0FBD03EE05CBCBE0.8496424BBAF61FDF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26291

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 22:47:31 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>The lady playing Mary was obviously impregnated by a man,
>not by God. Thus it is a vulgar and obscene slap at the
>Virgin Mary.

Now Cecil.

That isn't fair to the churches that are putting on these
productions.

I'm sure that the pregnant women they use for the role were
impregnated the _same way_ Mary would have been.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3345. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:33:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <94B3B491ECBA0C74.7996BD3E4D8948D9.F8FC8F6BC9DC65C8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26292

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 20:19:38 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>> OK OK OK. Tell me how it's my problem, Larry. Maybe that'll help.
>
>It will cause the end of civilization as we know it. :-)

Promises, promises . . .

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3346. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:42:19 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C0DB3BA.2AE91A6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26293

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>
>
> It was a stab at trying to get the equation of pentagram=satanic out of the
> holder's head...because it's hogwash.
>
>

And then there's this thing with the number 666, like it's the area
code for hell or something....

3347. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:47:42 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <7B768628800FC15F.186BC9241D8DE1D0.CD4E53D023119056@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26294
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 04:08:35 GMT, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
wrote:

>On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 18:08:27 -0600, "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH"
><kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote:

>>If it's mobile, they only have to see some indication that it's not a
>>legal rig from outside the vehicle. After that, they'll have probable
>>cause to search.
>
>The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
>a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.

Maybe not, but it's easy to walk into a truck stop that sells the
things, take a few polaroids, and issue them to the beat officers for
comparison. They're still not going to catch the guy with a modified
'normal' rig, but they'll be able to spot the 'export' radios.

As far as other services, there's only one mobile FRS rig that I'm
aware of, and for any service requiring a license, they can look at
the license.

OTOH, if you're using an export CB as your mobile 10m rig, I'd
recommend having a copy of the applicable sections of Part 97 in the
glovebox anyway.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3348. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 05:55:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C0DB6E4.FF6C934E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26295

>
>
> Of course there's a difference between a fee and a tax, Rick.

Someone in Congress or the Senate once said in session:
"If it looks like a duck, and quacks like a duck,....."

3349. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 06:27:57 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <A5F6F85E4BEA4250.58C619836ACF0D5A.E3A538B07CCA1853@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26296
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 05 Dec 2001 06:13:16 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>"Indication that it's not a legal rig from the outside of the vehicle"!?!?
>
>So a 9 foot stainless whip will clue them?
>
>Or perhaps a firestick?

Most cars have windows. They are allowed to look at anything they can
see through the windows.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3350. Re: I need some help...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 06:56:18 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112042256.666dd9c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dredg" <layne@neo.rr.com> wrote in message
news:<MhdP7.92968$z55.12264702@typhoon.neo.rr.com>...
> Hey guys! I am new to the export radio business, I needed a little bit of
> information from all the demi-gods of the cb radio forum. I purchased
> recently a factory reburbished Northstar 9000. First of all what do you guys
> think about this radio and what do you think its strong points?

OK, DREDG. LETS LOOK HERE AT THE SPECS ON YER NEW CB EXPORT
RADIO......

Northstar 9000 Ten Meter , Amateur Band Radioï¿½ï¿½

SPECIFICATIONS
Unit Dimensions: 8"Wï¿½ x 2-1/8"" H x 9.5"Dï¿½
Microphone Type: 4 Pin Screw-On Dynamikeï¿½
Frequency Control:ï¿½ Phase Lock Loop Synthesizerï¿½
RF Output Power:ï¿½ 3.5W Lo -ï¿½ 7 Watts Hi
Channels: 28.315 to 28.755 MHz
SKU#:ï¿½ SS-NS-9000ï¿½
UPC#: 7 42486 10121 4ï¿½

> Secondly,
> The radio has been scoped and the radio has a 4 watt dead key and 35 watts
> rms. Is there any amp that can be run in line that could handle this power
> coming through? Thirdly, I have a 1994 chryler concord, it has a k40
> baseload trunk lip mount on it and I have been warned that I may be getting
> a reflection, what causes the reflection, should I move the antenna, and how
> detrimental is this to my setup? Also what is your best guess as to my range
> with this whole setup?

I RECKON YOU SHOULD ASK SOME OF THE HAMS ON THIS NEWSSGROUP. THEY
APPROVE OF THESE HERE EXPORT 10 METER RADIOS AND WILL SHOW YOU WAYS TO
GIT AROUND THE LAW!

3351. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 10:45:23 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ul5jlskv4@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26298
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dimmy Dimwit" <HiramHog@Anon.con> wrote in message
news:9uk18s$k1h$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Lloyd" <TheNewBARF@TheNewBARFgroup.net> wrote in message
> news:9ujk32jjo0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901
when
> > > W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> > > N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights
ago
> > on
> > > 75 meters.
> > >
> >
> > NO arguement there Scheissman YOU ARE THE UNCONTESTED
> > expert on Usenet when it comes to filthy obscene language!!!!!!!!!!
>
> Sure. Good old W4AMP. Trying to reason with him? After the sick, sad, crap
> this hillrat said about Oris in the past? The sick and flthy things AMP
> called Oris' wife and daughters? One does not "reason" with AMP. This is
how
> he plays his sick game. He tries to act ever the nice guy, THEN he stabs
you
> in the back, over and over and over.
> Have you ever heard the sick, obscene language AMP used against Doc, AF2Y?
> It was pure filth.

Now Orass, you are the one who used profanity the other night on 3.901. One
ham named Bill out in St. Louis said he'd never come back to the frequency
because of your actions. You're stuck in the spin cycle, Orasssssss.
I'm sure somebody taped it and sent it in.

3352. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 10:47:14 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ul5joskv5@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26299
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dimmy Dimwit" <HiramHog@Anon.con> wrote in message
news:9uk205$l2r$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Polly" <PollyBARF@PollyBARFforever.edu> wrote in message
> news:9ujkdckij0@dosa.alt.net...
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901
when
> > > W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> > > N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights
ago
> > on
> > > 75 meters.
> >
> > You made one very big mistake Wiseman, and that mistake
> > gave yourself away as the unidentified jammer on 3901. All info
> > has been forwarded to Hollingsworth. Your license is toast Wiseman!
> > Laugh all you want now, HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR
>
> Was what Oris said as bad as what AMP said to Doc no so long ago? Remember
> that? AMP cussing and swearing like a drunken sailor? (one of the few
things
> he learned from the Navy).

But AMP didn't cuss eevn when orasssss was cussing him out on 3.901 the
other night.
But an anonymous COWARD like you only hears what he wants to hear.

> Roger is good at jamming. He and Riley are old friends when it comes to
that
> sort of thing, eh, Rog?

But wait until Riley becomes your freind for transmitting unidentified.

3353. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 10:48:46 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9ul5jrskv6@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26300
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dimmy Dimwit" <HiramHog@Anon.con> wrote in message
news:9uk056$i78$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "CBRambo" <CBRambo@nowhereyouknowx.net> wrote in message
> > news:9uj32jrdt0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KK4TL" <kk4tl@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20011203204442.23871.00000548@mb-ca.aol.com...
> > > >> This would explain why you used the anon to talk tough?
> > >
> > >
> > > Apparently, Mr KK4TL has never been on the receiving end
> > > of anonymous late night hang up calls, anon calls to his employer,
> > > anonymous defamatory letters written to his neighbors, fraudulent
> > > magazine subscriptions, fraudulent COD orders, unidentified cars
> > > parked in front of his house after midnight, anonymous threatening
> > > emails, anon threats to harm members of your family, and a host
> > > of other harassment and stalking activities which more often than
> > > not originate from Hiram, Georgia. I wonder if Mr KK4TL has
> > > ever been told on 14313 and 3901 that his minor daughters suck
> > > the dicks of truck drivers or that your wife sucks the dicks and
> > > swallows the sperm of niggers (not my words, these were actual
> > > recorded statements made on 14313 and 3901 by an operator in
> > > Hiram, Georgia who readily identified himself with his legitimate
> amateur
> > > call sign.) The same operator in Hiram, Georgia featured the photo
> > > of an amateur, the same one with the minor daughters he said sucked
> > > truck driver's dicks, on a web page, claiming that this amateur was
> > > the Olympic Park bomber and was being sought by federal law
> > > enforcement authorities. The same operator, in a wild out of control
> > > frenzy on 14313, heard by thousands of ham operators, threatened to
> > > murder a ham in NJ. In yet another out of control frenzy on 14313,
the
> > > same Hiram, Georgia operator threatened to kick in the door of another
> > > ham operator and assault him and his family. Both of these threats
were
> > > recorded, documented, and forwarded to Riley Hollingsworth for action
> > > or, should I say inaction.
> > >
> > > Riley Hollingsworth has long been aware of the activities of the

> > > operator in Hiram, Georgia and has dozens of recordings of this
> > > operator, made by OOs, the FCC, and individual ham operators.
> > >
> > > The station in Hiram, Georgia, is currently, once again, attacking
> > > his perceived enemies on 14313 and 3901 and once again the
> > > amateur community wonders why noting has ever been done by
> > > Riley to remove the Hiram, Georgia station from amateur radio.
> > >
> > >
> > > So Mr KK4TL, just maybe now you might begin to see the need
> > > for people to post anonymously and why people post snide remarks
> > > about Riley's impotence. Me, I see nothing to be gained in attacking
> > > Riley, but that's only my opinion. I can readily understand the
> > > frustration that the rest of the amateur community has with Riley's
> > > inability or lack of action in addressing the blatant violations of
the
> > > station in Hiram, Georgia.
> > >
> > > Here's a question for you, Mr KK4TL. How do you propose that
> > > Riley Hollingsworth can finally be motivated to remove the Hiram,
> > > Georgia operator from amateur radio?
> >
> > I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
> > W4AMP tried to reason with him.
> > N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago
> on
> > 75 meters.
> >
> > > And yes, I am anon, for the protection of myself and my family
> > > from a very unstable person.
> >
> > Try to spin a justification all you want, you're just an ANONYMOUS
COWARD.
>
> Is that akin [blather]

Poor Orasssss.....Mysterian2001 heh. You really are stupid, aren't you?

Anonymous COWARD.

3354. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 14:09:39 UTC
From: John Kimball <johnkimb@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <9ul9p7eck0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26351
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

On Tue, 4 Dec 2001 18:00:21 -0500, "Polly"
<PollyBARF@PollyBARFforever.edu> wrote in Message id:
<9ujkdckij0@dosa.alt.net>:

>"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
>> I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901 when
>> W4AMP tried to reason with him.
>> N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights ago
>on
>> 75 meters.
>
> You made one very big mistake Wiseman, and that mistake
>gave yourself away as the unidentified jammer on 3901. All info
>has been forwarded to Hollingsworth. Your license is toast Wiseman!
>Laugh all you want now, HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR

Uh oh, is Woger going to get spanked again? Will he have to take the
test for a third time?

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!

--
"Dr. Seuess is above your reading level."
^^^^^^
Roger Wiseman, Rhodes scholar, blows his cover
in Message-ID: <9u0smepoe0@dosa.alt.net>

3355. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 14:09:41 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <FUpP7.210745$3d2.9418990@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26352

> Kim-W5TIT writes:

> >Hmmmm, we'll have to watch those decreases.

"N2EY" wrote

> Your license class is the one that has encountered the biggest decrease by
far,

> >.maybe Riley's right
> >about my callsign...?

> Maybe.

> >NOT.

> How do you know?

Now, Jim, think about it...

How many Technician Plus Licenses expired this past year??? very very low!!!

How many Technician Plus Licenses were issued this past year??? ZERO!!!

How many Technician Plus Licenses were upgraded this past year??? many
many!!!

Is your assertion that her call sign may be responsible for upgrades???

I'm confused...

I think anyone who worries about her callsign, could smell a fart in a
hurricane.

Rich

3356. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 15:10:31 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C0E3906.115272DA@gte.net>
Source record: 26353
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> >>pass all the "laws" you want.....answer me one question.....how does it make
> >>any difference? how is this new law going to be actively enforced?? local
> >>atthorities still have to obtain a search warrant,with reasonable cause
> >>submitted before a judge.
> >
> >If it's mobile, they only have to see some indication that it's not a
> >legal rig from outside the vehicle. After that, they'll have probable
> >cause to search.
>
> The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.

Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
then make the arrest. Let the lawyers settle
the differences.

3357. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 15:17:31 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C0E3A08.FF033402@gte.net>
Source record: 26354
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>
> Posted by a ham operator. Typical.
>
> If you're a ham (as I am), you really shouldn't be gloating over this.
>
> Do you think the average traffic cop can tell the difference between a CB
> antenna and a ham antenna? Will he be able to tell your HR2600 10m mobile from
> a Galaxy "export" CB? Doubtful.
>
> These new "local yokel" anti-CB laws are BAD NEWS for ALL operators of mobile
> radio equipment. Just another excuse for unwarranted police harrassment.
> Anyone with an antenna will now be suspect.

He pulls you over. Sees the radio, asks for
a ham license. In most states it is already
illegal to have radios that can listen to police
bands in cars if you do not have a license
so they just "expand" the law a bit. No license
then you and the car are off the street.

Let the lawyers settle this. The police have
radio techs who can determine if a radio
is illegal. And the police might even start
having military style signal intelligence units
to monitor radio traffic, to include cell phones.

3358. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 15:28:20 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C0E3C10.CC321C27@gte.net>
Source record: 26355
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >Just turn the friggin thing off ,if you get >pulled over
>
> No, I will not. I have a FEDERAL LICENSE to operate my radio...and I'll be
> damned if some local beat cop is going to have anything to say about it.
>
> If he pushes the issue, he'll find himself in court...defending his department
> against a harassment and/or wrongful arrest lawsuit.
>
> Trust me on this one.

In the post Sept. 11th climate be careful that
you are not labeled a terrorist or an anti government
activist. That can get you dead.

And the local police have full rights to affirm
that you are legally qualified to pursue a hobby
on a federal license. After all they do so with
those who hold federal firearms licenses such
as FFLs or Class III tax permits.

3359. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 15:31:22 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C0E3DE8.B3BCF4B6@gte.net>
Source record: 26356
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

TooManyRadios wrote:

> >Again, the new CB enforcement laws automatically exempt anybody holding a
> >valid ham license, regardless of what equipment they may be using. This
> >exemption is clearly spelled out in the FCC ruling, which must be
> >incorporated into all local ordinances providing local enforcement. There's
> >no need for all the paranoia (if you are a licensed ham operator).
>
> On paper, this sounds good. But in the real world of overzealous local cops,
> looking to make their arrest quotas for the month, it won't work this way.
>
> Want proof? Look no further than states which have mobile scanner bans and
> amateur exemptions. How many hams have been harrassed and had their scanners
> confiscated? Plenty. You're guilty until proven innocent. To prove your
> innocence and get your property back, you need to go to court (often at
> considerable expense) and "tell it to the judge."
>
> This will work the same way.

That is what lawyers are for. If you can not
afford good legal help then you should not own
guns or radios. Besides these are no longer
hobbies for the little guys, only the rich.

3360. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 15:39:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0E3FB8.E6D51C8C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26357

Rick Adams wrote:
> Then if a state chooses to change it's sales tax to a
> transaction fee, it will suddenly become acceptable to the Libertarian
> Party?

Fees are for services performed. Exactly what service would the state
be performing? However, a national sales tax would be superior to
the regressive graduated income tax.

> Don't count the interest you "Might" have made ...

Why not? I made "interest" on my other investments while the government
was holding my money interest-free against my will thus allowing inflation
to erode my social security principle. And some of those years include 20%
inflation. I would have been happy to invest that $55K over those 40
years and give the government the $55K when I retired. That would have
left me with a couple of hundred thousand dollars profit.

> Now tell me you'll never recover it all.

I will never recover it all. I haven't touched the principle on my
other investments. That $55K would have appreciated to more than
a quarter of a million dollars by now. My present investments in
put options are doing great.

> No one wants people to be poor--

That's where you are wrong, Rick. The liberals want to breed legions
of poor people who collect their welfare checks and vote Democratic.
They also want more and more federal employees who collect their pay
checks and vote Democratic.

> This is a friendly debate, play fair!

When you imply that my life and the products of my life belong to someone
other than me, the debate ceases to be friendly. Muggers also believe
that my life and the products of my life don't belong to me.

> >> Put yourself in this position: You are a young (18 years old),...
> >
> >I would gladly give everything I own for that.
>
> To be an inner city black male youth of 18?

Yes, yes, yes. I would get me a job and put myself through college
just like I did before. Then, instead of going to work for Schlumberger,
I would make big bucks in the NBA.

The present welfare system encourages and subsidizes poverty. We need
to do exactly the opposite, i.e. discourage poverty. How about we pass
a law outlawing poverty?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3361. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 15:46:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0E413C.85BFD96F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26358

Rick Adams wrote:
> I'm sure that the pregnant women they use for the role were
> impregnated the _same way_ Mary would have been.

God could have saved us all a lot of grief if he had arranged for
an immaculate birth rather than an immaculate conception.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3362. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 16:13:53 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C0D8FB3.DE9554F1@mailcity.net>
Source record: 26359
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

KC8JBO wrote:

.
>
> But AMP didn't cuss eevn when orasssss was cussing him out on 3.901 the
> other night.
> But an anonymous COWARD like you only hears what he wants to hear.
>

What is 'eevn', learn to spell woger.

3363. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 16:35:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0E4C8B.B61A3266@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26360

Rick Adams wrote:
> Christmas, for
> example, falls close to the original date of Candlemas and All Saints
> Day falls on All Hallow's Eve (Halloween).

All Saints Day is the day which follows Halloween.

Dave K8MN

3364. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 17:07:42 UTC
From: KA4MUJ <Mike@MikeAndJudyShow.com>
Message-ID: <9ulk41$ms4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26361
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9ul5jeskv0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "A. Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com> wrote in message
> news:f2bf1daaef2f31d7b3b89604b1907351@melontraffickers.com...
> > Yes it is true. W4AMP is performing daily
> > again on 14313, and 3901 in the evenings.
> >
> > don't miss the Hiram Psycho in action, as
> > he cusses Oris and others out....not suitable
> > for viewing by those under 18.
>
> Wrong! N4CND cussed W4AMP out on 3.901 just a few nights ago.
> Smoke some more crack, maybe you'll get your lies straight.
>

Roger, don't know how long back you go in the
14313 wars, but those in here who go back several years
will recall KA4MUJ of The 14313 Mike & Judy Show.
Poor Mike was not too swift in the brains dept., but he was
a deaf & dumb blind supporter of KV4FZ. The Mooooj,
as Mike was known, was the best friend Herbie ever had. Mike
would support Herbie, even when the clear facts showed
otherwise. Anyway, Herbie ended up fucking Mike and
stealing money from Mike, but all the way to Mike's death
bed, in Mike's eyes, Herbie was still always right. And you
are going the same way Roger. You are one to never let the
clear facts deter you from your preconceived opinions. You
will blindly follow your faulted beliefs to the bitter end and
defeat. You are going down the exact path that KA4MUJ
followed.

3365. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 17:39:35 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9ullovsiv1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 26362

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C0D5D99.35726EE0@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > Of course, George Washington grew 40,000 marijuana plants at
> > > Mt. Vernon, and provided detailed instructions as to the preparation
> > > of marijuana wine (his favorite--and viewed by a substantial number of
> > > conservative historians as being the first wine served at a state
> > > dinner by a sitting President).......
> >
> > Yuck. Prolly tasted like bong water. :-)
>
> What does bong water taste like, Jim? :-)

:-) I was almost sure you would know. It prolly tastes like marijuana
wine.

3366. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 18:08:10 UTC
From: harddrive229@aol.com
Message-ID: <9ulnqakaj1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26363
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <9ul5joskv5@dosa.alt.net>, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> writes:
>
>"Dimmy Dimwit" <HiramHog@Anon.con> wrote in message
>news:9uk205$l2r$0@pita.alt.net...
>>
>> "Polly" <PollyBARF@PollyBARFforever.edu> wrote in message
>> news:9ujkdckij0@dosa.alt.net...
>> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
>> news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
>> > > I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901
>when
>> > > W4AMP tried to reason with him.
>> > > N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights
>ago
>> > on
>> > > 75 meters.
>> >
>> > You made one very big mistake Wiseman, and that mistake
>> > gave yourself away as the unidentified jammer on 3901. All info
>> > has been forwarded to Hollingsworth. Your license is toast Wiseman!
>> > Laugh all you want now, HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR
>>
>> Was what Oris said as bad as what AMP said to Doc no so long ago? Remember
>> that? AMP cussing and swearing like a drunken sailor? (one of the few
>things
>> he learned from the Navy).
>
>But AMP didn't cuss eevn when orasssss was cussing him out on 3.901 the
>other night.
>But an anonymous COWARD like you only hears what he wants to hear.
>
>> Roger is good at jamming. He and Riley are old friends when it comes to
>that
>> sort of thing, eh, Rog?
>
>But wait until Riley becomes your freind for transmitting
unidentified.
++

Pure bullshit. Jimmy, Oris, Doc, Rich and all the rest. Riley ought to be
FIRED.He's a Wyatt Earp with the aim of a cockeyed monkey. On Haps page I see
letters on top of letters. Big shit. Twenty still sounds like a toilet and so
does 75. Where is Sheriff Smiley Riley when needed? Out fishing. Sitting

there at his desk waiting for squealers, ass kissers, liars and bitch snitches to tip him off to whose doing what to who. What a crock. Smiley ain't worth his weight in used Kleenex.

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3367. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 18:08:37 UTC
From: harddrive229@aol.com
Message-ID: <9ulnr5kbe1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26364
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <9ul5joskv5@dosa.alt.net>, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> writes:
>
>"Dimmy Dimwit" <HiramHog@Anon.con> wrote in message
>news:9uk205$l2r$0@pita.alt.net...
>>
>> "Polly" <PollyBARF@PollyBARFforever.edu> wrote in message
>> news:9ujkdckij0@dosa.alt.net...
>> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
>> news:9ujiuk$gf2$0@dosa.alt.net...
>> > > I heard N4CND use the vilest language just the other night on 3.901
>when
>> > > W4AMP tried to reason with him.
>> > > N4CND needs to be removed for his use of profanity just a few nights
>ago
>> > on
>> > > > 75 meters.
>> > >
>> > You made one very big mistake Wiseman, and that mistake
>> > gave yourself away as the unidentified jammer on 3901. All info
>> > has been forwarded to Hollingsworth. Your license is toast Wiseman!
>> > Laugh all you want now, HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR
>>
>> Was what Oris said as bad as what AMP said to Doc no so long ago? Remember
>> that? AMP cussing and swearing like a drunken sailor? (one of the few
>things
>> he learned from the Navy).
>
>But AMP didn't cuss eevn when orasssss was cussing him out on 3.901 the
>other night.
>But an anonymous COWARD like you only hears what he wants to hear.
>
>> Roger is good at jamming. He and Riley are old friends when it comes to
>that
>> sort of thing, eh, Rog?
>
>But wait until Riley becomes your freind for transmitting
unidentified.
++

Pure bullshit. Jimmy, Oris, Doc, Rich and all the rest. Riley ought to be
FIRED.He's a Wyatt Earp with the aim of a cockeyed monkey. On Haps page I see
letters on top of letters. Big shit. Twenty still sounds like a toilet and so
does 75. Where is Sheriff Smiley Riley when needed? Out fishing. Sitting

there at his desk waiting for squealers, ass kissers, liars and bitch snitches to tip him off to whose doing what to who. What a crock. Smiley ain't worth his weight in used Kleenex.

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3368. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 18:25:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0E66AC.473DD4BD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26365

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > What does bong water taste like, Jim? :-)
>
> :-) I was almost sure you would know.

I'm an old Bull Durham man, Jim. What's a bong?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3369. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 19:43:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A80C1779552085C2.E775368B48D64643.8D11B9706A3235C7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26366

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 09:39:36 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Fees are for services performed.

Then using a 10% fee for court services, in addition to not
providing enough resources to cover the rest of the court and criminal
justice system, would be radically overpricing a service--and by
Libertarian principles the state would have to allow competition from
an independent, privatized, court system which charged lower rates and
handled civil cases only--a sort of "courtroom arbitration." The end
result, of course, would be use of that system over the state
sponsored one and the criminal justice system would end up unfunded.

>However, a national sales tax would be superior to
>the regressive graduated income tax.

Reverse order, Cecil. By definition, sales taxes are
regressive; they impose a heavier load on the less well off--who must
use the majority of their income to purchase needed products, and thus
are taxed on the majority of their earnings--than they impose on the
more affluent who are able to save or invest the majority of their
earnings and thus end up paying a much lower effective rate of
taxation.

Graduated income tax, otoh, when properly designed and absence
any deductions (starting at a figure 10% above the poverty level, for
example, the tax would be based on ALL income, and would be
progressive to, perhaps, a 30% ceiling--resulting in more income than
is now available, btw). That tax, unlike the sales tax, would be
progressive.

From a personal perspective, btw, I believe in a flat tax. By
setting a tax rate of, for example, 20% across the board (starting, as
above, from a point just above the poverty level--in this case 25%
above it to insure that increased income did NOT result in loss) the
rate would be the same for everyone--20% of their earnings--and would
be neither progressive (hated by the affluent) nor regressive (unfair
to the poor). It would also generate enough income (with no
permissible deductions, of course) to replace all other taxes in the
US apart from Social Security--which itself could be covered by an
"employee tax" on all businesses of any size (flat rate, not
regressive or progressive, of course)--thus effectively serving as a
"universal benefit" to all citizens and paid for by the slightly
higher cost of goods that would result from the tax being passed on to
the consumer.

>> Don't count the interest you "Might" have made ...
>
>Why not? I made "interest" on my other investments while the government
>was holding my money interest-free against my will thus allowing inflation
>to erode my social security principle. And some of those years include 20%
>inflation. I would have been happy to invest that $55K over those 40
>years and give the government the $55K when I retired. That would have
>left me with a couple of hundred thousand dollars profit.

Would you have been as content to avoid paying for Social Security and been disabled in your first or second year of working? Who, given your opposition to transfer programs and decision to "opt out" of Social Security, would provide your medical expenses, long term care, or support? Who would care for your children if you died at 25 or 30 years of age?

Perhaps in your case you could have invested the money more wisely than the government--so could I and a lot of other people--but not everyone has either the investment skills or the money to invest in the first place. If the choice is between paying your Social Security and paying for a car in good condition to replace public transportation, people now must pay their Social Security--but do you really believe anyone would invest in preference to purchasing transportation? Maybe you would--but do you _really_ believe everyone would?

The result of eliminating Social Security (beyond the breech of contract actions that would result under a Libertarian state [where prohibitions on suing the government would, by necessity, be removed] when the state was no longer able to fulfill the terms of my--and everyone else's--contract with the Social Security system) would be to create an incredible number of people who were seniors, widows, minor children, and disabled who had no source of income and who would represent a "new poor" of enormous proportions to augment the "old poor" you would likewise remove state support from.

Isn't that "just a bit" elitist--not to mention short sighted?

>> Now tell me you'll never recover it all.
>
>I will never recover it all. I haven't touched the principle on my
>other investments. That $55K would have appreciated to more than
>a quarter of a million dollars by now. My present investments in
>put options are doing great.

Ok, let's take your own figures of $250,000.00 (I would argue that you could as easily have NOTHING at all as a result of bad investments, but let's take that number alone). Assume (since I don't know your income, this is just a "throw-away" figure) that you would receive $1,500.00/mo. from Social Security. Assume also that you live 15 years beyond retirement (with good health care you should). That would mean you would receive the entire $250,000.00 you cite with an additional $20,000.00 in interest for good measure). In that case, you

would obviously neither profit or lose from your investment in Social Security--but would earn the same amount that you would earn by investing it privately (and optimally).

Now let's look at alternatives. Assume that instead of reaching retirement age, you were disabled at the age of 45 by an illness or natural disaster (i.e., in a manner that did not allow you to sue for damages). Assume also that while the disability would prohibit working, it would NOT result in a serious shortening of your life (a very reasonable assumption for many forms of disability). Since you are now about 60, that would mean you were disabled fifteen years ago, or in other words, you would have lost 1/3 of your working life--the portion which, in most people, should have had the highest overall earnings. Because it WOULD have cut the most productive years, and the ones when (after your kids were grown) you would have been able to invest the largest portion of your income, it isn't unreasonable to assume that as of the time of the disability you would have earned no more than 1/2 of the $250,000.00 you cite above, or $125,000.00. Even assuming you have medical insurance that would (1) cover all the expenses of your disability for life and; (2) would not require any further payment on your part as of the disability (both rather unlikely), you would have $125,000.00 to live on for the rest of your life. At the rate we used above, $1,500.00/mo. that would run out by your 52nd birthday. What, precisely, would have allowed you to survive until today?

And THOSE assumptions, Cecil, take the figures you, yourself provided as given and assume that your investments would be as successful as you feel they would have been. Clearly, if everyone was in the same position, the earnings on investments would be significantly lower (the more people willing to invest, the lower the required yield--a very reasonable expectation and one in line with Libertarian economic thought), and your $250,000.00 may well be only $125,000.00 instead--with the result that even normal retirement income would only last for 7 years after which if you couldn't find a private charity to support you, you would simply starve to death.

The average citizen would, of course, be even worse off than you would in that scenario since he or she would not necessarily have either the earning capacity to free money for investment or the investment skills necessary to earn that return. In their case, they would simply starve to death earlier (and if you believe that private charities could take over the kind of load loss of Social Security would lead to, you have a LOT more faith in people than I have).

Be realistic, Cecil, how many people are going to vote for a party that would be willing to create a culture of poverty among the elderly in order to make things easier for the rich and successful, regardless of HOW many great strides it might take in the direction of personal freedom.

>> No one wants people to be poor--
>
>That's where you are wrong, Rick. The liberals want to breed legions
>of poor people who collect their welfare checks and vote Democratic.

Cecil--that's as self-righteous (and wrong) as the views I've
been reading here about Muslims and women! I expected far more of you
than an absurd dig at the liberals like that one.

>They also want more and more federal employees who collect their pay
>checks and vote Democratic.

Again, pure hype. We both know that bureaucracies--WHATEVER
party creates them (including the Libertarians--even they can't exist
as a government without them) are self-perpetuating. It isn't
necessary for "liberals" to create them to garner votes--if anything
the opposite is true. A society in which there is high unemployment is
FAR more likely to vote liberal than one in which everyone has a good
income.

Democrats may not share the Libertarian perspective, Cecil,
but that doesn't make them the monsters you depict them as. They,
unlike the Libertarians, simply want to help those in need. They may
be doing so badly, but at least they DO care about them--and don't
want to simply shut them off from society and encourage them to die
off.

>When you imply that my life and the products of my life belong to someone
>other than me, the debate ceases to be friendly. Muggers also believe
>that my life and the products of my life don't belong to me.

Then by the same token you have no right to demand that anyone
else part with any of the products of their life to assist you. Thus
if you are sick or injured it is only fair to let you die instead of
being forced (by moral commitments) to donate money to a charity to
care for you.

Think about that a bit.

>> To be an inner city black male youth of 18?
>
>Yes, yes, yes. I would get me a job and put myself through college
>just like I did before. Then, instead of going to work for Schlumberger,
>I would make big bucks in the NBA.

What an abominable stereotype. I thought better of you than
that. The NBA, Cecil? Why not the watermelon and chicken eaters
association?

Cecil, there are only 1,500 blacks in the United States right
now who are able to earn their living from professional sports. That's
1,500 out of 35,700,000 African-Americans in our nation. In other
words the chance that a given black individual will achieve this
status is one in 23,800 and represents the top 0.07% of the African

American population. Unless you can demonstrate that you would be in the top 0.07% of your field (are you NOW???) you have no reason to expect that you would have become one of those NBA players. For that matter, if you can play basketball at that level, why aren't you making big bucks from the NBA _now_? There certainly isn't any requirement that you be black to do so.

In addition, you state you would "get a job and put yourself through college." Given the circumstances I outlined, would you care to explain how you would go about doing that? Why are _you_ better able to do that than other black men in the inner city?

You state you did that before. Did you? Did you start from abject poverty, living in a community with inadequate schools or role models? Do you belong to a minority group that is discriminated against, feared, and assumed to be dishonest or lazy? Did you come from a broken home where your mother needed your income (as a teen) to survive? If not, how can you possibly make a statement such as the one you made above?

>The present welfare system encourages and subsidizes poverty. We need
>to do exactly the opposite, i.e. discourage poverty. How about we pass
>a law outlawing poverty?

As long as the punishment is the requirement that you live in luxury (provided by the state), I'll go along with that one! :-)

We agree that we need to reduce poverty (you will NEVER eliminate it completely--with the exception of doing so through a legal fiction such as under defining the poverty line). And we even agree that there is a serious problem with the current welfare system. But that's where we part company on the issue. You believe that by simply removing those social supports and encouraging private charity to take over the responsibility the problem can be resolved. I think from studying society and culture rather intensely that your solution is completely unrealistic--all that would happen is that the charities would themselves become, or influence, political powers (take a look at the American Red Cross or the United Way Fund for examples of that occurring directly or indirectly) even more than they are capable of doing today. More, it shifts the burden from society as a whole (where the per-person cost is tempered by the numbers of contributors) to those with a social conscious (who, being smaller in numbers, would either be unable to provide enough support to do the job or would be forced to make sacrifices in their own lives to do so out of a feeling of obligation).

Sorry, Cecil, but if I ever needed sound reasons NOT to vote Libertarian, you've provided them for me in this discussion.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3370. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 20:39:59 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <63e8fb491337b9be839012a438d7342e.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 26367
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E3906.115272DA@gte.net...

> > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
>
> Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> then make the arrest.

Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?

You're out to lunch on this one!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas05poolc190.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.11.190]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3371. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 20:41:13 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9um6oroh3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26373
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jizzwallowing Retard" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C0D8FB3.DE9554F1@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> .
> >
> > But AMP didn't cuss even when Orasssss was cussing him out on 3.901 the
> > other night.
> > But an anonymous COWARD like you only hears what he wants to hear.
> >
>
> What is [spell lame]

Learn to use English, Fairy Perry the anonymous COWARD.

3372. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 20:55:03 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9um6p0oh7@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26374
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Anonymous COWARD and not
"KA4MUJ" <Mike@MikeAndJudyShow.com> wrote in message
news:9ulk41$ms4$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9ul5jeskv0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "A. Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com> wrote in message
> > news:f2bf1daaef2f31d7b3b89604b1907351@melontraffickers.com...
> > > Yes it is true. W4AMP is performing daily
> > > again on 14313, and 3901 in the evenings.
> > >
> > > don't miss the Hiram Psycho in action, as
> > > he cusses Oris and others out....not suitable
> > > for viewing by those under 18.
> >
> > Wrong! N4CND cussed W4AMP out on 3.901 just a few nights ago.
> > Smoke some more crack, maybe you'll get your lies straight.
> >
>
> Roger, don't know how long back you go in the
> 14313 wars, but those in here who go back several years
> will recall KA4MUJ of The 14313 Mike & Judy Show.

Too bad you aren't him since he's dead. You are an anonymous COWARD.

> Poor Mike was not too swift in the brains dept., but he was
> a deaf & dumb blind supporter of KV4FZ. The Mooooj,
> as Mike was known, was the best friend Herbie ever had. Mike
> would support Herbie, even when the clear facts showed
> otherwise. Anyway, Herbie ended up fucking Mike and
> stealing money from Mike, but all the way to Mike's death
> bed, in Mike's eyes, Herbie was still always right. And you
> are going the same way Roger. You are one to never let the
> clear facts deter you from your preconceived opinions. You
> will blindly follow your faulted beliefs to the bitter end and
> defeat. You are going down the exact path that KA4MUJ
> followed.

But at least I'm not an anonymous COWARD who hides because of that yellow
streak running down that hunched back of yours. I know what I heard, and
N4CND clearly used profanity directed towards W4AMP. I wish that I'd have
recorded it, because I would send it in. The station will be set up so I can
record very soon.

3373. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 21:20:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112051320.47c9cb43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26368

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:<FUpP7.210745$3d2.9418990@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > Kim-W5TIT writes:
>
> > >Hmmmm, we'll have to watch those decreases.
>
> "N2EY" wrote
>
> > Your license class is the one that has encountered the biggest decrease by
> far,
>
> > > >.maybe Riley's right
> > > >about my callsign...?
>
> > Maybe.
>
> > > >NOT.
>
> > How do you know?
>
>
> Now, Jim, think about it...

I have. Correlation is not causation.
>
> How many Technician Plus Licenses expired this past year??? very very low!!!

Actually, quite a few. Check

http://www.ah0a.org

He lists all sortsa numbers, including expirations, cancellations,
renewals and renewal-in-the-grace-period.
>
> How many Technician Plus Licenses were issued this past year??? ZERO!!!

Yup.
>
> How many Technician Plus Licenses were upgraded this past year??? many
> many!!!

Impossible to know exactly from the raw database.

Another point:

Tech Pluses are being renewed as Techs.
>

> Is your assertion that her call sign may be responsible for upgrades???

Nope!!
>
> I'm confused...

There are now more Extras than Advanceds, Tech Pluses or Novices.
>
> I think anyone who worries about her callsign, could smell a

(expletive deleted)

> in a hurricane.

I don't worry about any callsign except my own. But I do think that
Kim made an inappropriate choice. One which does harm to the ARS. Not
much harm, but a little.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3374. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 21:41:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112051341.310ef26a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26369

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C0E3FB8.E6D51C8C@IEEE.org>...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Then if a state chooses to change it's sales tax to a
> > transaction fee, it will suddenly become acceptable to the Libertarian
> > Party?
>
> Fees are for services performed. Exactly what service would the state
> be performing?

The govt. protects both businesses and customers by enforcing things
like fair trade practices, health laws, etc. plus programs that
benefit business. That's what sales taxes/fees should be used for.

> However, a national sales tax would be superior to
> the regressive graduated income tax.

A single, uniform national sales tax, yes. Current social security
taxes are highly regressive while income taxes are progressive. Then
there's the marriage tax penalty....
>
> > Don't count the interest you "Might" have made ...
>
> Why not? I made "interest" on my other investments while the government
> was holding my money interest-free against my will thus allowing inflation
> to erode my social security principle. And some of those years include 20%
> inflation. I would have been happy to invest that $55K over those 40
> years and give the government the $55K when I retired. That would have
> left me with a couple of hundred thousand dollars profit.

Only if you realized a certain level of gain on the investments -
after taxes. One of the main reasons SS exists in the first place is
because people made poor investment decisions.

> > Now tell me you'll never recover it all.
>
> I will never recover it all. I haven't touched the principle on my
> other investments.

Principal

>That $55K would have appreciated to more than
> a quarter of a million dollars by now. My present investments in
> put options are doing great.

The yardstick to use is govt. bonds. Suppose that you could have
invested all that SS money in, say, US savings bonds. Many of them
would be convertible to HH bonds now. Wonder what the principal and

income would be, compared to SS benefits....
>
> > No one wants people to be poor--
>
> That's where you are wrong, Rick. The liberals want to breed legions
> of poor people who collect their welfare checks and vote Democratic.
> They also want more and more federal employees who collect their pay
> checks and vote Democratic.

Nope. Nobody wants that.

The problem is that the real solutions are not simple or easy.
>
> > This is a friendly debate, play fair!
>
> When you imply that my life and the products of my life belong to someone
> other than me, the debate ceases to be friendly. Muggers also believe
> that my life and the products of my life don't belong to me.

You choose to live in the USA, Cecil. You could have avoided all this
taxation by moving to some other country.

Muggers take your money without giving you a choice. Does a mugger say
"give me your money or run away? No.

The govt. takes your money because you choose to live here.
>
> > >> Put yourself in this position: You are a young (18 years old),...
> > >
> > >I would gladly give everything I own for that.
> >
> > To be an inner city black male youth of 18?
>
> Yes, yes, yes. I would get me a job and put myself through college
> just like I did before.

You have any idea what college costs today, Cecil? Minimum wage
doesn't cut it.

Which raises a question: WHY have college costs risen so dramatically
for so long? The cost of a college education has far outpaced the rate
of inflation for decades. Yet much of the real work is done by poorly
paid grad students.

> Then, instead of going to work for Schlumberger,
> I would make big bucks in the NBA.

Maybe. No guarantee you'd come back as Shaq or Allan Iverson.

The real question is - 18 under what conditions? 18 today or 18 when
you were 18? Knowing what you know now, or knowing what you knew at
18? And 18 where, with what background? All sorts of things.

> The present welfare system encourages and subsidizes poverty.

Absolutely agree. It also encourages things like single-parent
families.

> We need to do exactly the opposite, i.e. discourage poverty. How about we pass
> a law outlawing poverty?

Bricks without straw.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3375. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 21:53:00 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C0E974A.9F5A6DA1@gte.net>
Source record: 26370
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

```
>
>
> > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> >
> > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> > then make the arrest.
>
> Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
>
> You're out to lunch on this one!

That is what happens in my state with respect
to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
you are arrested. That even goes for family
members.
```

3376. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 21:53:33 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <wHwP7.1031$292.238197@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 26371
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E3A08.FF033402@gte.net...
> > >RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
> >
> > Posted by a ham operator. Typical.
> >
> > If you're a ham (as I am), you really shouldn't be gloating over this.
> >
> > Do you think the average traffic cop can tell the difference between a
CB
> > antenna and a ham antenna? Will he be able to tell your HR2600 10m
mobile from
> > a Galaxy "export" CB? Doubtful.
> >
> > These new "local yokel" anti-CB laws are BAD NEWS for ALL operators of
mobile
> > radio equipment. Just another excuse for unwarranted police
harrassment.
> > Anyone with an antenna will now be suspect.
>
> He pulls you over. Sees the radio, asks for
> a ham license. In most states it is already
> illegal to have radios that can listen to police
> bands in cars if you do not have a license
> so they just "expand" the law a bit. No license
> then you and the car are off the street.
>

There you go, it's as simple as that. Why all the needless paranoia (unless
you are operating illegally) ?

73 de W6DKN

3377. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 22:07:45 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <RUwP7.4251$MX1.981753@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 26372
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

One more SMF for the kill file!
Train

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E974A.9F5A6DA1@gte.net...
> >
> >
> > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> > >
> > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> > > then make the arrest.
> >
> > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> >
> > You're out to lunch on this one!
>
> That is what happens in my state with respect
> to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> you are arrested. That even goes for family
> members.
>
>
>

3378. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 22:33:16 UTC
From: Pipedreans <pipedream@hotmail.comspa>
Message-ID: <20011205173318.253$6A@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 26375
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Thats it Train Kill file anyone who's views don't agree with your criminal mind.

"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message news:RUwP7.4251$MX1.981753@news02.optonline.net...
> One more SMF for the kill file!
> Train
>
> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E974A.9F5A6DA1@gte.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> > > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> > > > >
> > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> > > > then make the arrest.
> > > >
> > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> > >
> > > You're out to lunch on this one!
> > >
> > That is what happens in my state with respect
> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
> > members.
> >
> >
> >
>
>

3379. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 23:32:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0EAEAB.F3FE240E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26376

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >Fees are for services performed.
>
> Then using a 10% fee for court services, in addition to not
> providing enough resources to cover the rest of the court and criminal
> justice system, would be radically overpricing a service--

How do you know that? I don't know if 10% would be overpriced or under-
priced. It was a WAG.

> >However, a national sales tax would be superior to
> >the regressive graduated income tax.
>
> Reverse order, Cecil.

Sorry, I obviously meant progressive tax.

> From a personal perspective, btw, I believe in a flat tax.

OK, until something better comes along, I'll buy that. The feds
mugged me for half a mil during my last three years of work.

> Who, given your opposition to transfer programs and decision to "opt
> out" of Social Security, would provide your medical expenses, long
> term care, or support? Who would care for your children if you died at
> 25 or 30 years of age?

All that is *MY* responsibility, not anyone else's. I've always carried
health, disability, and life insurance. It's just one other thing to
budget for.

> Perhaps in your case you could have invested the money more
> wisely than the government--so could I and a lot of other people--but
> not everyone has either the investment skills or the money to invest
> in the first place.

Not my problem. I do not desire to protect people from themselves and
I would appreciate that same consideration for myself.

> ... --but do you
> really believe anyone would invest in preference to purchasing
> transportation? Maybe you would--but do you _really_ believe everyone
> would?

Nope, and that's not my problem any more than providing shoes for
people who would rather spend their money on drugs and booze.

> The result of eliminating Social Security (beyond the breech
> of contract actions that would result under a Libertarian state [where
> prohibitions on suing the government would, by necessity, be removed]
> when the state was no longer able to fulfill the terms of my--and
> everyone else's--contract with the Social Security system) would be to
> create an incredible number of people who were seniors, widows, minor
> children, and disabled who had no source of income and who would
> represent a "new poor" of enormous proportions to augment the "old
> poor" you would likewise remove state support from.

Bush is somewhat following the Libertarian lead when he talks about
phasing out the present Social Security system and phasing in privatization
of Social Security. There would be no breech of contract, just a gradual
switching of systems over a couple of generations.

> In that case, you
> would obviously neither profit or lose from your investment in Social
> Security--but would earn the same amount that you would earn by
> investing it privately (and optimally).

Funny how it works out that way, isn't it? The government would be much
better off if they had allowed me to manage my own Social Security
instead of them mismanaging it for me.

> Now let's look at alternatives. Assume that instead of
> reaching retirement age, you were disabled at the age of 45 ...

Disability would be handled by a completely different system, Rick.
One of the reasons that Social Security is in such a mess is that
they tried to do too much with the system and it is in the process
of failing because of that.

> Be realistic, Cecil, ...

Nope, I would much rather choose to be principled than pragmatic.

> Then by the same token you have no right to demand that anyone
> else part with any of the products of their life to assist you. Thus
> if you are sick or injured it is only fair to let you die instead of
> being forced (by moral commitments) to donate money to a charity to
> care for you.

If I am too stupid to prepare for probable risks, then I deserve
to be eliminated from the gene pool.

> What an abominable stereotype. I thought better of you than
> that. The NBA, Cecil? Why not the watermelon and chicken eaters
> association?

Because all I lacked being a great basketball player was the NBA
genes.

> There certainly isn't any requirement that you be black to do so.

What's the percentage of blacks in the general population? What's
the percentage of blacks in the NBA? Their basketball genes are
just better than mine.

> In addition, you state you would "get a job and put yourself
> through college." Given the circumstances I outlined, would you care
> to explain how you would go about doing that? Why are _you_ better
> able to do that than other black men in the inner city?

Because I would refuse to be kept like the government's domestic animal.

> You believe that by
> simply removing those social supports and encouraging private charity
> to take over the responsibility the problem can be resolved.

The first step would be requiring healthy people on welfare to actually
do some hard work for that income. A local TV station went into the
homeless shelter and offered jobs to a dozen individuals. They offered
them baths and clean clothes to get started. ONE of them showed up. Even
he didn't show up the second day.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3380. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 23:36:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0EAF6C.CC6E4A5B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26377
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote:
> That is what happens in my state with respect
> to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> you are arrested. That even goes for family
> members.

I have a rifle that isn't type accepted in CA. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3381. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 23:51:00 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9umbr201uu9@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26378

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C0E3FB8.E6D51C8C@IEEE.org...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Then if a state chooses to change it's sales tax to a
> > transaction fee, it will suddenly become acceptable to the Libertarian
> > Party?
>
> Fees are for services performed. Exactly what service would the state
> be performing? However, a national sales tax would be superior to
> the regressive graduated income tax.

Do you know who the first one's would be to oppose such a tax? The IRS.
Their power to pry into the lives of every American would be severely
hampered if we switched to a sales tax.

3382. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 23:53:08 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9umbv501v6a@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26379

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C0E66AC.473DD4BD@IEEE.org...
> I'm an old Bull Durham man, Jim. What's a bong?

It's a sound effect from old Three Stooges shorts when Moe hit Curly in the
head with a hammer.

3383. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-05 23:57:20 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9umc7001vmm@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26380

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:8252D74A879C3B2D.9B94049D604B3D1F.4CD4DD853FA5FD76@lp.airnews.net...
> On 05 Dec 2001 01:41:32 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Rearrabge the letters in "Santa" and you get "Satan". How convenient!
>
> devil spelled backward is "lived"
>
> evil spelled backward is "live"
>
> now consider god ...
>
> Rick <wondering who let the dog out preach, preach, preach...>

Don't forget Stephen King's favorite aperitif - Red Rum.

3384. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 00:59:43 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <MkzP7.102029$8n4.6420029@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26381
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

SO you want to have to go thru the hassle, take time to go to court, risk having your equipment
damaged because some rambo cop was too gung ho (Ah am th' law 'round hyar, boy) to take
time to examine your papers and find out that you are not doing anything wrong? I don't think
so--not me. If some rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the license
I am trying to show him, I guarantee you I'll do everything I can to sue the SOB and his agency
and cause him as much trouble as I can.

Jerry

W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote in message
news:wHwP7.1031$292.238197@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E3A08.FF033402@gte.net...
> > > >RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
> > >
> > > Posted by a ham operator. Typical.
> > >
> > > If you're a ham (as I am), you really shouldn't be gloating over this.
> > >
> > > Do you think the average traffic cop can tell the difference between a
> CB
> > > antenna and a ham antenna? Will he be able to tell your HR2600 10m
> mobile from
> > > a Galaxy "export" CB? Doubtful.
> > >
> > > These new "local yokel" anti-CB laws are BAD NEWS for ALL operators of
> mobile
> > > radio equipment. Just another excuse for unwarranted police
> harrassment.
> > > Anyone with an antenna will now be suspect.
> >
> > He pulls you over. Sees the radio, asks for
> > a ham license. In most states it is already
> > illegal to have radios that can listen to police
> > bands in cars if you do not have a license
> > so they just "expand" the law a bit. No license
> > then you and the car are off the street.
> >
>
> There you go, it's as simple as that. Why all the needless paranoia

(unless
> you are operating illegally) ?
>
> 73 de W6DKN
>
>

3385. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 02:10:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <TsAP7.145577$WW.9288535@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26382

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112051320.47c9cb43@posting.google.com...
> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:<FUpP7.210745$3d2.9418990@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > > Kim-W5TIT writes:
> >
> > > >Hmmmm, we'll have to watch those decreases.
> >
> > "N2EY" wrote
> >
> > > Your license class is the one that has encountered the biggest
decrease by
> > far,
> >
> > > >.maybe Riley's right
> > > >about my callsign...?
> >
> > > Maybe.
> >
> > > >NOT.
> >
> > > How do you know?
> >
> >
> > Now, Jim, think about it...
>
> I have. Correlation is not causation.
> >
> > How many Technician Plus Licenses expired this past year??? very very
low!!!
>
> Actually, quite a few. Check
>
> http://www.ah0a.org
>
> He lists all sortsa numbers, including expirations, cancellations,
> renewals and renewal-in-the-grace-period.
> >
> > How many Technician Plus Licenses were issued this past year???
ZERO!!!
>
> Yup.
> >
> > How many Technician Plus Licenses were upgraded this past year??? many

> > many!!!
>
> Impossible to know exactly from the raw database.
>
> Another point:
>
> Tech Pluses are being renewed as Techs.
> >
> > Is your assertion that her call sign may be responsible for
upgrades???
>
> Nope!!
> >
> > I'm confused...
>
> There are now more Extras than Advanceds, Tech Pluses or Novices.
> >
> > I think anyone who worries about her callsign, could smell a
>
> (expletive deleted)
>
> > in a hurricane.
>
> I don't worry about any callsign except my own. But I do think that
> Kim made an inappropriate choice. One which does harm to the ARS. Not
> much harm, but a little.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Without having a clue how it happens, 141 Tech Pluses have been renewed since der Tag including one in November. The last one expires in December 2011.

3386. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 02:36:06 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9umlgl0b5s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26385
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9um6p0oh7@pita.alt.net...

> But at least I'm not an anonymous COWARD who hides because of that yellow

<snip>

20,000 plus newsgroups are available on usenet. It allows you to post (semi) anonymously, and most people accept that, flames and trolls. Most people accept that they don't know the true identity of the person at the other end of the message. (Although it does tend to prove Oscar Wilde's claim about men and masks.)

...except for the rec.radio.amatuer.* newsgroups.

A few people expect you to post a callsign, (if you have one) thus giving away information about yourself. With the publicity about internet stalking and identity theft, you'd be foolish to post such information. If I'm to be branded as an anonymous coward, simply because I have a different opinon, so be it.

3387. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 02:40:21 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0edb5d$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26383

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:8252D74A879C3B2D.9B94049D604B3D1F.4CD4DD853FA5FD76@lp.airnews.net...
> On 05 Dec 2001 01:41:32 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Rearrabge the letters in "Santa" and you get "Satan". How convenient!
>
> devil spelled backward is "lived"
>
> evil spelled backward is "live"
>
> now consider god ...
>
> Rick <wondering who let the dog out preach, preach, preach...>
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Ronald Wilson Reagan

use each letter of above name only once:

Insane Anglo Warlord.

Kim W5TIT

3388. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 02:50:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c0edda9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26384

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:TsAP7.145577$WW.9288535@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:9f4bfe89.0112051320.47c9cb43@posting.google.com...
> > "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
> news:<FUpP7.210745$3d2.9418990@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT writes:
> > >
> > > > >Hmmmm, we'll have to watch those decreases.
> > >
> > > > "N2EY" wrote
> > >
> > > > Your license class is the one that has encountered the biggest
> decrease by
> > > > far,
> > >
> > > > >.maybe Riley's right
> > > > >about my callsign...?
> > >
> > > > Maybe.
> > >
> > > > >NOT.
> > >
> > > > How do you know?
> > >
> > >
> > > > Now, Jim, think about it...
> >
> > I have. Correlation is not causation.
> > >
> > > > How many Technician Plus Licenses expired this past year??? very very
> low!!!
> >
> > Actually, quite a few. Check
> >
> > http://www.ah0a.org
> >
> > He lists all sortsa numbers, including expirations, cancellations,
> > renewals and renewal-in-the-grace-period.
> > >
> > > > How many Technician Plus Licenses were issued this past year???
> ZERO!!!
> >

> > Yup.
> > >
> > > How many Technician Plus Licenses were upgraded this past year??? many
> > > many!!!
> >
> > Impossible to know exactly from the raw database.
> >
> > Another point:
> >
> > Tech Pluses are being renewed as Techs.
> > >
> > > Is your assertion that her call sign may be responsible for
> upgrades???
> >
> > Nope!!
> > >
> > > I'm confused...
> >
> > There are now more Extras than Advanceds, Tech Pluses or Novices.
> > >
> > > I think anyone who worries about her callsign, could smell a
> >
> > (expletive deleted)
> >
> > > in a hurricane.
> >
> > I don't worry about any callsign except my own. But I do think that
> > Kim made an inappropriate choice. One which does harm to the ARS. Not
> > much harm, but a little.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Without having a clue how it happens, 141 Tech Pluses have been renewed
> since der Tag including one in November. The last one expires in December
> 2011.
>
>

I think, if anything, you all are going to have to start realizing that if my callsign harms anyone, it is me; though I don't believe it harms anyone at all.

Now, if a scapegoat is needed for harm done to the ARS, well I suppose it's just as well I am chosen. Someone else might really decide to be offended by being told they harm the ARS. :o

Kim W5TIT

3389. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 03:32:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0EE68E.A98D081@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26386

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) If we send a man or woman to prison
> for natural life, and ten years later we
> discover that he or she was innocent, that
> person can be released and at least
> partially compensated for the harm that was
> done to them. But if we have already killed
> him or her it's just a little bit late to
> say "sorry."

On the other hand, if you're going to keep judging evidence for ten, twenty, or thirty years, you could probably find almost everyone innocent. This has been the problem with so many cases where DNA results have gotten people off. These people are not necessarily innocent - they're released because DNA evidence has raised questions about key evidence used in the first trial. However, that process ignores the remaining evidence from the original trial that still points strongly to the person's guilt. Sadly, once the person is released after so many years, it is almost impossible to try them again since that other evidence often no longer exists (decayed, lost, thrown away, witnesses moved away or died, or whatever). So what you have now is a truly guilty person walking the street who simply cannot be tried again for the crime he actually committed.

> (snip) Perhaps if the death penalty actually
> accomplished its goal (deterrence) it might
> be worth the risk of such results--but it
> doesn't. Every study that has ever been
> conducted has shown that the presence or
> absence of a death penalty in a state has
> no effect on the crime rate whatever.

Deterrence is only one aspect of the death penalty - it also serves as just punishment for a serious crime and as an ultimate means to safeguard others. If you take one aspect out of context, such as deterrence alone, then indeed the death penalty does appear not to accomplish it's goal. However, when taken together, the various aspects are well served by the death penalty.

> (snip) Incidently, the reason so many death
> row inmates are being found innocent today
> has little to do with the appeals process
> directly. Several years ago a project was
> started by law students at the University

> of Illinois to examine DNA evidence in the
> cases of capital crimes. The result was
> that using modern DNA testing, in the case
> of fully 10% of the convicted inmates it
> was shown that they could NOT have been
> the perpetrator.

No, that is not what the DNA shows - instead all it shows is that a particular piece of evidence used in a trial did not come from the perpetrator. In other words, it shows that blood found, or semen found, and used as evidence in the original trial, did not come from the perpetrator. But that DOES NOT prove innocence.

Let me give an example to illustrate this. A girl has sex with her boyfriend. On the way home, she is killed by the perpetrator. Later, the perpetrator is arrested and the blood type of the semen is used in his trial as evidence she was also raped. Twenty years later, law students from the University of Illinois, edged on by their anti-death penalty advocate teacher, comes up with DNA evidence to show the semen could not have come from the perpetrator. Because some of the evidence used in the original trial is now suspect, the perpetrator is released pending a new trial. Of course, the perpetrator cannot be tried again because the remaining evidence from the original trial is long gone. So, in the end, the law students have simply released a killer back onto the streets who will now never pay for his crime. And, of course, the very happy perpetrator warmly thanks the law students (for being idiots) and goes off to celebrate his success at beating the system.

And this scenario, with only slight variations to fit the crime situation, is repeated over and over in cases where DNA is used to bring into question evidence from decades old death penalty trials. And, of course, the media, with it's liberal stance on the death penalty, continues to promote the lie that DNA has proven these people innocent. And, either through ignorance or equal dishonesty, that media refrain is picked up and repeated by other people also opposed to the death penalty, such as yourself.

> (snip) DNA evidence has been used in a very
> substantial number of cases to prove that the
> person executed did NOT commit the crime --the
> research was conducted as a part of the
> Illinois Legal Defense Project. That isn't
> opinion, it's solid, legally admissible, proof
> that innocent men and women were executed by
> the state.

Again, that is _NOT_ at all what DNA evidence proves. All it proves is that a particular piece of evidence used in a trial did not come from the perpetrator. The perpetrator is not released as a person proven innocent - he is released pending a new trial. Again, the perpetrator is seldom retried because the other evidence pointing to guilt is often no longer available.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3390. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 03:35:45 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <IIBP7.251520$W8.9189263@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26387

> Richard Plourde wrote

> > Now, Jim, think about it...

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112051320.47c9cb43@posting.google.com...

> I have. Correlation is not causation.

Does that imply you don't know? ;-)

> > How many Technician Plus Licenses expired this past year??? very very
low!!!

> Actually, quite a few. Check
> He lists all sortsa numbers, including expirations, cancellations,
> renewals and renewal-in-the-grace-period.

I did...

The rate of Technician Plus expirations was 474 per month December 1, 2000
to November 1, 2001
(top of Speroni's chart)

The rate of Technician Plus expirations was 712 per month June 1, 1997 to
May 1, 1998
(bottom of Speroni's chart)

I'm not sure what it means but it sounds like things are much better now...
but I have a feeling you're going to tell me... ;-)

> > How many Technician Plus Licenses were issued this past year??? ZERO!!!

> Yup.

> > How many Technician Plus Licenses were upgraded this past year??? many
> > many!!!

> Impossible to know exactly from the raw database.

Wrong, Jim, IT IS as I said... (many many!!!) we do know the facts.

1) Technician Plus licensees decreased by 41,660. (your previous post)

2) 5,691 Technician Plus license expirations

3) 180 Technician Plus license cancelations

4) 73 Technician Plus license renewals (on time)

5) 7 Technician Plus license renewals (during grace period)

So... let's see...

We lost 41,660 but...
5,691 were expirations, so subtract them...
we know where they went...
that leaves 35,969 unaccounted for...

180 were cancelations, so subtract them...
we know where they went...
that leaves 35,789 unaccounted for...

80 (73 + 7) wer renewals, so add them...
we know where they came from...
that means 35,869 are unaccounted for...
hmmmm.... could they be upgrades???? :^

> Another point:
>
> Tech Pluses are being renewed as Techs.

Mox nix... We still see them as Technician Plus renewing.... they're NOT
hidden.

> > Is your assertion that her call sign may be responsible for upgrades???

> There are now more Extras than Advanceds, Tech Pluses or Novices.

In 1999 I said the Technician Plus licensees would do exactly this...
they're upgrading in droves because the license is a loser... it's obvious
that they DO NOT want to remain Technician Plus. Witness that only an
average of 6 per month renews on time and only a HALF A HAM per month renews
in the grace period. Don't get me wrong I think the people who renew are
important because the renewal tells me they actually use their license and
that's a good thing but the license class has virtually no redeeming
qualities. Given that, the logical conclusion is it's a vulgar, base,
(classless) license. ;-) (and I almost mean that...)

> > I think anyone who worries about her callsign, could smell a
>
> (expletive deleted)
>
> > in a hurricane.
>
> I don't worry about any callsign except my own. But I do think that
> Kim made an inappropriate choice. One which does harm to the ARS. Not
> much harm, but a little.

TSK TSK TSK... That, sir. is a baseless assumption. But it aligns with your
belief system so who am I to say you are incorrect. I'll say this... "You
are right; that it is your assertion..." ;-)

Sorry about the expletive. I should have said...

I think anyone who worries about her callsign, couldn't tell anybody what the hurricane smelled like... ;-)

Oh, for the record after the past 12 months 87% of Advanced are still standing... 82% of Novices are still there... but less than 68% of Technician Plus are still there... in other words... there were almost 50% more Technician Plus operators last year!!!!

Oh one last thing... (really the last...) ;-)

You mentioned Technician Plus renewing as Technicians in the database. True, and that will matter the NEXT time they renew; we won't see them. Good news though, there will only be about, let's see, 80 times 10 years.... 800 of them!!!! :-)

Rich

3391. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 03:41:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0EE899.10181E7@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26388

CAM wrote:
>
> Yes, and in the process, they compromised
> their most sacred principles. Libertarians
> refuse to compromise their principles. Do
> you compromise your principles, Dwight?

Actually, yes. In fact, often on a daily basis. There are many things that I don't like or believe in, and many things that I do like or believe in, that I don't attempt to force into the situation of the moment. I simply realize that not all are going to share my principles and it is not my place to demand they do. So, instead, I bend a little to fit the situation, reserving a fight for my principles to a more appropriate and fruitful time. Don't you do the same?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3392. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 03:52:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0EEB2A.D54EB90B@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26389

CAM wrote:
>
> If you don't have an open marriage, Dwight, you
> are unlikely to encounter open marriages. (snip)

We're not prudes, Cecil. We've had our experiences with other couples engaged in open marriages or just experimenting with such. But nothing in those marriages backed up the claims of those advocating open marriages (longer, happier, relationships and so forth).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3393. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:11:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0EF000.8D86B97@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26391

Krell wrote:
> Do you know who the first one's would be to oppose such a tax? The IRS.
> Their power to pry into the lives of every American would be severely
> hampered if we switched to a sales tax.

And wouldn't that be nice?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3394. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:12:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0EF03B.CA0BF434@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26392

```
Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C0E66AC.473DD4BD@IEEE.org...
> > I'm an old Bull Durham man, Jim. What's a bong?
>
> It's a sound effect from old Three Stooges shorts when Moe hit Curly in the
> head with a hammer.

Amazingly, there is a cable movie on right now named, "Bongwater".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3395. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:13:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0EF02A.3282D8AE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26390

Sean G Gilley wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
> >
> > Cheating cannot possibly start without
> > opportunity - the integrity comes from
> > not seeking the opportunity.
>
> I think I'd have to argue that integrity
> is keeping the promises you've made,
> regardless of what they are.

We were talking about "cheating" when I made that statement, not
about promises made in any type of marriage.

> (snip) Successful polygamous relationships
> are not nearly as rare as you might wish to
> believe.

I don't "wish" to believe anything. I want to see evidence and I've
seen none to support an argument for or against.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3396. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:14:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0EF0C1.164F7278@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26393

```
Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Yes, and in the process, they compromised
> > their most sacred principles. Libertarians
> > refuse to compromise their principles. Do
> > you compromise your principles, Dwight?
>
> Actually, yes. In fact, often on a daily basis. There are many
> things that I don't like or believe in, and many things that I do like
> or believe in, that I don't attempt to force into the situation of the
> moment. I simply realize that not all are going to share my principles
> and it is not my place to demand they do. So, instead, I bend a little
> to fit the situation, reserving a fight for my principles to a more
> appropriate and fruitful time. Don't you do the same?

I keep my mouth shut or bite my tongue sometimes, but I try never
to compromise my principles.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3397. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:17:12 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <cjCP7.145735$WW.9302360@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26394

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c0edda9_1@newsa.ev1.net...

> I think, if anything, you all are going to have to start realizing that if
> my callsign harms anyone, it is me; though I don't believe it harms anyone
> at all.

Correct... it harms no one. There are some who insist on telling you how sacrosanct they are, but, they fail because they are making sacrilegious protestations revealing their sanctimonious selves.

> Now, if a scapegoat is needed for harm done to the ARS, well I suppose
it's
> just as well I am chosen. Someone else might really decide to be offended
> by being told they harm the ARS. :o

That right... just do as the saints would do... turn the other cheek.

"tout comprenore est tout pardonner"

Rich

Remember... you never heard Mother Theresa say... "I'm one holy Mother!"
;-)

3398. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:25:49 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <hrCP7.145744$WW.9302287@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26395

Richard McCollum wrote

> Without having a clue how it happens, 141 Tech Pluses have been renewed
> since der Tag including one in November. The last one expires in December
> 2011.

Whats a "der Tag"?

Rich

3399. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:26:25 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <a1778fbe9a0646673d69abba89e9423c.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 26396
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E974A.9F5A6DA1@gte.net...

> >
> >
> > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> > >
> > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> > > then make the arrest.
> >
> > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> >
> > You're out to lunch on this one!
>
> That is what happens in my state with respect
> to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> you are arrested. That even goes for family
> members.

What state do you live in? Russia? Sure must suck
to be you! Here they look at you suspiciously
if you _don't_ have at least a deer rifle in the car!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from 1cust130.tnt1.minneapolis3.mn.da.uu.net [63.30.251.130]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3400. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:30:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0EF426.7EB131F5@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26397

Sean G Gilley wrote:
>
> I've worked in several large companies in
> several locations and not once have I heard
> of a single lawsuit filed because of
> inappropriate behavior that wasn't truly
> inappropriate. And I'm not sure I've *ever*
> heard of a lawsuit being filed -- I have
> heard of one (maybe two) women (rightfully)
> complaining they had been treated
> inappropriately. There were probably others
> of that sort I did not hear about. But I
> really believe that if two employees being
> involved in a civil lawsuit was commonplace,
> I would've heard about it. (snip)

Yea, like several thousand you did not hear about. According to an Stars & Stripes article I read a few years ago, there have been over 200 sexual harassment lawsuits brought against the military alone. And I'd speculate there has been several thousand brought against companies over the last few decades. And you've never heard of these lawsuits? Where have you been, Sean?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3401. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:52:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E2A7CF2E831F23FE.52B5C0ADC3341D24.0A9FAF15BE23DA7E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26398

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 16:35:18 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>All Saints Day is the day which follows Halloween.

Leaves a lot of time to travel from the site of your gathering
to your home in time to make it to early mass on All Saints Day,
doesn't it?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3402. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:52:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0003237759EB5296.2EF792B13CA5E913.E00FCDB6ADED3BE1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26399

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 00:42:19 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>And then there's this thing with the number 666, like it's the area
>code for hell or something....

The area code for Hell is 734.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3403. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:52:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2E3113992F1CE1DA.A460C8A19F9816E2.E297E2C6500CCEAD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26400

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 09:46:04 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> I'm sure that the pregnant women they use for the role were
>> impregnated the _same way_ Mary would have been.
>
>God could have saved us all a lot of grief if he had arranged for
>an immaculate birth rather than an immaculate conception.

It would have saved a lot of cleaning-up as well.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3404. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:52:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0251E36B39C47C40.29B19426915443DC.3EB9DF7F56135859@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26451

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 17:32:59 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>> Then using a 10% fee for court services, in addition to not
>> providing enough resources to cover the rest of the court and criminal
>> justice system, would be radically overpricing a service--
>
>How do you know that? I don't know if 10% would be overpriced or under-
>priced. It was a WAG.

The specific number doesn't matter Cecil. The important point
is that _any_ fee charged for civil court services which was intended
to pay for criminal court costs as well would, by necessity, be
overpriced since, sans the cost of criminal courts, a good profit
could be made at a lower price. Thus the private sector would
inevitably be able to underprice the government and take over
essentially all transactions with the result that no money would be
collected by the courts to pay for criminal court costs.

>> >However, a national sales tax would be superior to
>> >the regressive graduated income tax.
>>
>> Reverse order, Cecil.
>
>Sorry, I obviously meant progressive tax.

Why are progressive taxes any more offensive that regressive
ones? A flat-percentage on all income is reasonable, but anything that
either increases the tax burden (percentage of income wise) of a
person based on his or her earning capacity or increases the tax load
(percentage of income wise) on a person based on his or her saving
capacity is a tax that discriminates.

>> From a personal perspective, btw, I believe in a flat tax.
>
>OK, until something better comes along, I'll buy that. The feds
>mugged me for half a mil during my last three years of work.

You needed a better accountant!

I have friends who are multi-millionaires and pay
significantly less taxes than that.

>> Who, given your opposition to transfer programs and decision to "opt
>> out" of Social Security, would provide your medical expenses, long
>> term care, or support? Who would care for your children if you died at
>> 25 or 30 years of age?

>
>All that is *MY* responsibility, not anyone else's. I've always carried
>health, disability, and life insurance. It's just one other thing to
>budget for.

It may be your responsibility, but what if you don't meet that
responsibility? Is it reasonable that the state ignore the needs of
children because their fathers and mothers didn't demonstrate sound
financial planning?

Consider, also, the age I listed. Assuming the _average_
couple marry soon after graduation from college (and even the
Libertarian party can't possibly expect people to wait until they are
financially solvent to marry and start raising a family--that is
simply unrealistic and, in many ways, undesirable). Assume further
that by the time they are 30, they have two children (also very
logical and desirable from social and even physiological
perspectives). Are you seriously suggesting that the average couple
could reasonably be expected to have made adequate arrangements for
the care of the children and assistance for the surviving partner if
they die at this age? Cecil, that just isn't realistic!

>> Perhaps in your case you could have invested the money more
>> wisely than the government--so could I and a lot of other people--but
>> not everyone has either the investment skills or the money to invest
>> in the first place.
>
>Not my problem. I do not desire to protect people from themselves and
>I would appreciate that same consideration for myself.

No one is trying to "Protect people from themselves." On the
other hand if everyone, or even most everyone, were to invest using a
sound plan of investment, it would flood the money market to the
extent that interest rates of 2-4% would become the norm (supply and
demand fix equilibrium point in a free market--including an
equilibrium point for investment funds)--a profit totally incapable of
providing for the future for anyone, sound investor or not. The ONLY
people who would be expected to profit significantly from investments
in such circumstances would be those who made high risk
investments--precisely the kind of investment that would be highly
unwise for someone who was trying to save for the future.

>> ... --but do you
>> really believe anyone would invest in preference to purchasing
>> transportation? Maybe you would--but do you _really_ believe everyone
>> would?
>
>Nope, and that's not my problem any more than providing shoes for
>people who would rather spend their money on drugs and booze.

Cecil, try to post w/o the false stereotypes of welfare
recepients--you're beginning to sound like Dick Carroll speaking about

Muslims!

What on earth do drugs and booze have to do with the logical
decision to purchase a car for transportation (which is used to get to
work, after all) rather than investing for retirement?

>Bush is somewhat following the Libertarian lead when he talks about
>phasing out the present Social Security system and phasing in privatization
>of Social Security. There would be no breech of contract, just a gradual
>switching of systems over a couple of generations.

And, of course, the risk of total loss. Your assumption is
that the private sector will manage the Social Security funds in a
manner that will guarantee the contracts the government has made with
the citizenry will be paid. But while the private sector can
normally do a much better job of managing funds than the government,
that isn't a guarantee that they will do so in this case. Assume the
same form of mismanagement or outright fraud affected the program that
did the Savings & Loan firms some years ago. Who is going to make up
for the loss to the citizenry? Not the state, if the Libertarians are
in power. Not the private sector. Just a complete "wipe-out" of their
funds. And this is only one potential risk that could occur from this
move.

Sorry, but ANYTHING George Wimpus does I greet with an
enormous amount of skepticism.

>> In that case, you
>> would obviously neither profit or lose from your investment in Social
>> Security--but would earn the same amount that you would earn by
>> investing it privately (and optimally).
>
>Funny how it works out that way, isn't it? The government would be much
>better off if they had allowed me to manage my own Social Security
>instead of them mismanaging it for me.

In one case, perhaps.

But what about the majority of the people who would NOT have
invested successfully? Who takes care of them--and "who cares" is NOT
a reasonable response for any political party that wants to achieve
higher office than county clerk or dog catcher.

>> Now let's look at alternatives. Assume that instead of
>> reaching retirement age, you were disabled at the age of 45 ...
>
>Disability would be handled by a completely different system, Rick.

Why?

Give me one reason I owe even a PENNY more to a person because
he or she is disabled than I owe if he or she is destitute and
homeless? As you put it yourself:

>All that is *MY* responsibility, not anyone else's. I've always carried
>health, disability, and life insurance. It's just one other thing to
>budget for.

Thus if people don't have disability insurance, they have no
more right to expect help from the state than they do if they are in
poverty--both were results of their own decisions, right?

>One of the reasons that Social Security is in such a mess is that
>they tried to do too much with the system and it is in the process
>of failing because of that.

On the contrary, the problem was that the funds were made
available for uses other than the Social Security program itself. SS
funds should NEVER have been used for any other purpose, but our
legislators really didn't pay much attention to that obvious concept.
That, and lack of foresight in planning for the end of the rapid
population growth era, not "doing too much" was the key to the
problem.

>> Be realistic, Cecil, ...
>
>Nope, I would much rather choose to be principled than pragmatic.

Do your principles include stereotyping the poor, allowing
children to go hungry if their parents can't afford food, and
providing education based on the ability to pay?

Sorry, but I can't see ANY of those as being "principled,"
only as self-serving.

>> Then by the same token you have no right to demand that anyone
>> else part with any of the products of their life to assist you. Thus
>> if you are sick or injured it is only fair to let you die instead of
>> being forced (by moral commitments) to donate money to a charity to
>> care for you.
>
>If I am too stupid to prepare for probable risks, then I deserve
>to be eliminated from the gene pool.

And your children with you?

More to the point, from a political perspective, do you
seriously believe that a party with that kind of attitude could
conceivably win a large percentage of the vote?

>> What an abominable stereotype. I thought better of you than
>> that. The NBA, Cecil? Why not the watermelon and chicken eaters
>> association?
>
>Because all I lacked being a great basketball player was the NBA
>genes.

Cecil, I'm losing a lot of respect for you. First you
stereotype the poor, now it's blacks. For someone who was adamant in

his objections to stereotyping of Muslims, you are remarkably willing
to stereotype others.

Blacks have absolutely NO genetic advantage when it comes to
sports, Cecil, you are certainly educated enough to know that.

>> There certainly isn't any requirement that you be black to do so.
>
>What's the percentage of blacks in the general population? What's
>the percentage of blacks in the NBA? Their basketball genes are
>just better than mine.

No, Cecil, they don't have "basketball genes" that are
superior to yours or anyone else's--there is no such thing and you
should well be aware of it.

Blacks do unusually well in basketball because it has long
been seen (rightly or wrongly) as a way to escape poverty. While you
were spending your leisure time in a variety of recreational
activities, those black athletes were practicing (and improving) their
games. While you were attending extra curricular activities at your
high school, those black athletes were practicing (and improving)
their games. While you were studying advanced subjects in high school
to improve your chances of getting into a good college or earning a
scholarship--subjects that may not even have BEEN available in their
schools whether they wanted to study them or not--those black athletes
were practicing (and improving) their games. Because, unlike you,
those sports may have been the ONLY way they would ever get into
college and have a future.

If you had the basic skills necessary, and the height (and
blacks, as a group, are no taller than whites) to succeed at
basketball and had been willing to put in the kind of work those men
did, you, too, could have had one chance in 28,000 of becoming an NBA
professional.

You had options. They had different ones. Yours were
unquestionably better options than were available to them.

>> In addition, you state you would "get a job and put yourself
>> through college." Given the circumstances I outlined, would you care
>> to explain how you would go about doing that? Why are _you_ better
>> able to do that than other black men in the inner city?
>
>Because I would refuse to be kept like the government's domestic animal.

Cecil,you can refuse what you like--but if there are no jobs
available to you, how do you plan to support yourself? Through crime?

You have always had the ability to get a job. Not all inner
city minorities have that kind of opportunity--nor, for that matter,
do the even greater number of poor (mostly white, btw) in rural
American or in areas where the economy is depressed.

>> You believe that by
>> simply removing those social supports and encouraging private charity
>> to take over the responsibility the problem can be resolved.
>
>The first step would be requiring healthy people on welfare to actually
>do some hard work for that income.

I agree to an extent--but lacking skills and living in an economically depressed area, who is going to hire them? We could, of course, create WPA type programs in which they would work for the state, but that not only means the state would still be responsible for the funding (which you oppose) and that an additional, expensive, bureaucracy would have to be created to administer it (which we BOTH oppose) but that the work they did would, by necessity, either be useless work or work that, had they not done it, would have meant jobs for others who would then be unable to earn their own way as a RESULT of the government.

> A local TV station went into the
>homeless shelter and offered jobs to a dozen individuals. They offered
>them baths and clean clothes to get started. ONE of them showed up. Even
>he didn't show up the second day.

A homeless shelter is NOT typical of the poor in this country.

The average welfare recipient (as I described before and you ignored) is a young woman, formerly married, with 2 LEGITIMATE children, at least one of which is a pre-schooler, who has been widowed, divorced, or deserted by her husband (or, in the case of over 40% of all homeless in the United States--few of whom ever risk the extreme violence in the shelters [where a woman has a 50% chance that she or any daughter over the age of 12 will be raped on any given night], is fleeing an abusive spouse in fear of her life), and who will spend less than 2 years of her entire life on welfare.

THAT, Cecil, not some wino in the gutter, is the person you are claiming is not worth our time to help.

Sorry, but nothing on earth could convince me to vote for--or support--a party with a set of values like that.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3405. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:52:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <81B02902167A2525.CDE8D2984A467548.151E80DF058FE59B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26452

On Wed, 5 Dec 2001 18:57:20 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>
>"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
>news:8252D74A879C3B2D.9B94049D604B3D1F.4CD4DD853FA5FD76@lp.airnews.net...
>> On 05 Dec 2001 01:41:32 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >Rearrabge the letters in "Santa" and you get "Satan". How convenient!
>>
>> devil spelled backward is "lived"
>>
>> evil spelled backward is "live"
>>
>> now consider god ...
>>
>> Rick <wondering who let the dog out preach, preach, preach...>
>
>Don't forget Stephen King's favorite aperitif - Red Rum.
>
Sounds like a "killer" drink to me!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3406. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 04:58:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4751BF581C429799.57A49A12AF6341EE.067F890AE3361631@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26453

On Wed, 5 Dec 2001 20:40:21 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Ronald Wilson Reagan
>
>use each letter of above name only once:
>
>Insane Anglo Warlord.

Now be nice, Kim.

After all--how many world leaders have taken the time to
support and sign legislation that made potato bugs illegal?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3407. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:03:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011206000307.05154.00000053@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 26455

In article <3C0CE8BD.297DA235@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> >Actually, it says that we shouldn't contribute to breeding herds
>> >of poor people.
>>
>> Which, of course, assumes that poverty is caused by genetics.
>
>Nope, it assumes that poverty will increase if poverty is subsidized.
>The way to reduce poverty is to stop subsidizing poverty, i.e.
>require welfare people to work to earn their keep.

Work or do something else constructive, like going to school and making the grade.

The problem is that the benefits are not tied to responsible behaviors that will lead the dependent person to become independent.

>
>> Your view would simply take the attitude
>> that only those who are successful deserve to have children.
>
>In a way, that is true. Only people who can afford children should
>have children. If one cannot afford to have children, one shouldn't
>have any.

At first blush, this sounds cruel, Cecil. But upon reflection one must ask a simple question: If a person cannot take care of him/herself, how will that person take care of others who are even more dependent?

It comes down to every right or freedom having a related responsibility.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3408. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:03:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011206000307.05154.00000052@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 26459

In article <B37622189F6F5680.BCD1E72B62A798F1.0E3DB91600B0313A@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>But you can't expect those fees to cover the cost of the
>criminal justice system--particularly if you include corrections. And
>while it might be nice to picture convicts paying their own board and
>room there would be two problems with that:
>
> 1. It would permit successful criminals (who have considerable
>savings on the outside) to afford a better level of treatment than
>less successful ones--which rewards success at crime, hardly the
>optimum situation.

Not if all convicts had to work to earn their keep, and could not use
significant amounts of outside money to support themselves while in prison.

> 2. If convicts are required to do productive work to pay their
>way, that means that jobs for honest citizens will be taken away and
>given to them.

Nope. It means that fewer tax dollars would need to be spent on convicts' care,
if done correctly.

Example: Each convict is given a small plot of ground, some basic hand tools,
ans seeds, and is REQUIRED to have a garden to grow food - which the convict
then gets to eat.

>Again, this is a way of rewarding dishonest behavior
>and penalizing honest behavior.
>
Allowing convicts to be nonproductive while honest citizens work to feed,
clothe, and shelter them rewards dishonest behavior and penalizes honest
behavior. '

The convicts have a debt to pay society, not the other way around.

>>> My strongest conflict with the Libertarian party, however,
>>> comes in the area of social programs.
>>
>>Yep, and that's an area where we will have to agree to disagree.
>>I simply don't believe in rewarding failure and penalizing success.
>>Over my lifetime, the government has done me more financial harm
>>than criminals have done to everyone else that I personally know.
>
> Sorry, Cecil, but that's way too elitist for me.

It's not elitist at all. It's just a simple fact. Cecil has paid far more in taxes than he and those he knows have lost to thieves.

However, Cecil does not consider that part of the money he paid in taxes went to keep the thieves away from his and others' property. And to educate his kids and grandkids, defend our country, etc.

> What about battered women, widows with small kids, people who
>are disabled, seniors with no pensions, the mentally ill, those who
>are learning disabled or retarded, displaced workers, those who are
>laid off, or unemployed workers in a depressed economy? For that
>matter what about medical coverage for those who can't afford it? Do
>we just let children starve or become ill because the parents can't
>afford to pay for their food and medical expenses--or do we terminate
>their rights as parents because they are poor and place the kids with
>strangers?

There should be effective programs for all of the above. But those programs must require responsible behavior on the part of those getting the benefits.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3409. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:03:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011206000308.05154.00000054@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 26457

In article <3C0CCD74.C46190D@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> But the biggest cause for divorce has
>> little to do with any of the above. The
>> 800 pound gorilla problem is that many
>> people get married without the necessary
>> knowledge and skills to stay married. A
>> marriage license is one of the easiest
>> licenses to get, yet one of the most
>> important.
>
>
> Amen to that.

Yea, verily. The most important decison most people make, and yet it is made
with almost no training.

>For all our advances, most are so poorly skilled today
>when it comes to basic human relationships (of any kind). In fact, it
>seems many are less skilled in this regard than those who grew up
>decades ago (at least most of them knew how to cook something before
>leaving home, unlike so many of the kids today). Of course, in many
>regards, life was less complicated back then, but that only makes it
>more important for these kids to be better equipped today.

I think life has always been complicated. The problem lies elsewhere.

For one thing, the rate of change in modern societies has made relationship
skills much more difficult to maintain. It can be difficult to see how the
experiences of past generations applies to today's problems.

The increased specialization of modern life means we spend less time together
relating as people and more time relating as functions. Greater mobility means
less community. Greater "diversity" and "choice" means less social stability
and fewer applicable role models.

>Add in an
>easy marriage license and you have nothing but a recipe for failure.
>By the way, for the kids reading, "recipe" is a cooking term. :-)
>
HAW!!

For some odd reason, as a kid I was driven to learn how to do practical things.
Still am. Like cooking, carpentry, raising vegetables, rebuilding cars, all

sorts of stuff. Are there kids today like that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3410. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:03:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011206000309.05154.00000055@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 26458

In article <0DF0B6103914F28E.55F720DE920DCCF9.EB543EB71E45DD81@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>Wiccan and pagan faiths can trace their roots to the
>polytheistic nature religions of Greece and Rome and to the pagan
>faiths of Germany and England.

Yup. But ya don't see pentagrams on the Acropolis or in the Pantheon.

>They were in existence LONG before
>Christianity attempted to eradicate them by claiming they were
>"Satanic."

The Roman and Greek "nature religions" tried for centuries to eradicate
Christianity and its source religion, Judaism. Do you know who Antiochus was?

Constantine changed all that.

>Most Christian holidays, in fact (including Christmas, All
>Saints Day, and others) were deliberately scheduled to fall on, or
>near, major pagan celebrations (thus requiring the pagans who were
>"passing" in the community to cut short their religious observations
>in order to attend [compulsory] Christian services).

Nice try, but that's not the reason at all.

>Christmas, for
>example, falls close to the original date of Candlemas

see below

>and All Saints Day falls on All Hallow's Eve (Halloween).

Nope. All Saints Day is Nov. 1, the day AFTER Halloween.

Most religions have feast days because people need them, spiritually and
psychologically. For example, most European religions have some sort of winter
equinox celebration because of the effects lack of daylight causes in many
people. For peoples with limited understanding of how the seasons and weather
work, and with limited artificial lighting, the loss of the Sun at the end of
December could be very disturbing. Equinox celebrations, whatever they are
called, remind us that the Light will return and spring will comne again. It
was natural for the Christians to put Christmas on the first day when the
daylight gets noticeably longer using simple methods of measurement.

> The pentagram, for your information, was a religious symbol in
>Egypt, Macedonia, Sumeria, Greece, Rome, China, India, and among the
>Norse peoples--NONE of which groups "stole" it from Christianity.

The Egyptians, Greeks and Romans hid it pretty well.

>If
>anything, it is the Christian faith that has been guilty of stealing
>symbols from older religions (including, btw, the cross) and using
>them to further their own ends.
>
Who used the cross as a religious symbol before Christians? It derives from a Roman method of execution, not another religion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3411. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:03:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011206000310.05154.00000057@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 26454

In article <8252D74A879C3B2D.9B94049D604B3D1F.4CD4DD853FA5FD76@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 05 Dec 2001 01:41:32 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Rearrange the letters in "Santa" and you get "Satan". How convenient!
>
> devil spelled backward is "lived"
>
> evil spelled backward is "live"
>
> now consider god ...

Ya missed the joke, Rick. Didn't watch SNL, huh?

73 de Jim, N2EY

.....remembering the insomniac dyslexic agnostic, who stayed up all night
doubting the existence of dog....

3412. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:03:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011206000310.05154.00000056@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 26456

In article <E9DA4496254CF5D5.A640469A5ACB9299.AF9A524A567C3FD0@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>Sit down and total your payments into the system. Divide that
>number by the monthly amount you will receive at retirement. That's
>how many months of benefits you will receive before the government has
>to start paying you welfare.

If you consider SS to be the equivalent of stuffing money in a mattress, yes.

>Don't count the interest you "Might" have
>made on other investments--you might ALSO have invested badly and lost
>all your money.

Why not count it? Many investments are fully backed by the feds, who are the
same folks as run SS. At the very least, the calcualtion should consider what
would have piled up if Cecil had been allowed to use the money to buy US
Savings Bonds and let them pile up.

A few years ago I cashed in a Series E bond that had been bought for me as a
baby. It cost something like $18.75 new and cashed in at over $100 - and those
ancient 1950s bonds had very low interest. Take a working career's worth of SS
contributions and figure what they'd amount to invested that way. It's a lot
more than just what was put in.

>Instead, treat that interest as having been paid as a
>tax (fee if you prefer) so that those who have NOT paid into the
>system (surviving spouses or children, the disabled, etc.) will be
>able to receive Social Security payments as well.

Which proves Cecil's point - HE may not get back what he put in, plus interest.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3413. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:14:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <45CCF86700BB998B.4D4B70BFD3A8AA19.AAC9A6727B3AB43F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26460

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 23:13:52 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>> (snip) Successful polygamous relationships
>> are not nearly as rare as you might wish to
>> believe.
>
>
> I don't "wish" to believe anything. I want to see evidence and I've
>seen none to support an argument for or against.

http://www.polyamory.org/
http://www.nasca.com/
http://www.ejhs.org/volume3/swing/body.htm
Adams, R. (2001). _Social Effects of Internet Communications
on Alternative Lifestyles: A three year study of the effect of
electronic communications on couples involved in open marriage,
polygamy, and swinging._ Doctoral Dissertation. Available: Xerox
Microfilms.
Gould, T. (2000). _The Lifestyle._ New York: Firefly.

The last three are studies of the swinging lifestyle from
various perspectives. The First one is a study of swinging and open
marriage by experts in human sexuality, the second is a rather complex
(and boring) documentation of the effects of the Internet on swinging
and open marriage, and the third is a journalistic investigation of
the swinging lifestyle in the United States. All contain very
extensive bibliographies and references to other primary and secondary
sources. The last one, incidently, discusses the role of evolutionary
psychology on non-monogamy as well, as does the second one in more
technical terms.

Hope they help,

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3414. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:21:15 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <ffDP7.960$Pp1.232138@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 26462
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:MkzP7.102029$8n4.6420029@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> SO you want to have to go thru the hassle, take time to go to court, risk
> having your equipment
> damaged because some rambo cop was too gung ho (Ah am th' law 'round
hyar,
> boy) to take
> time to examine your papers and find out that you are not doing anything
> wrong? I don't think
> so--not me. If some rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s)
> while ignoring the license
> I am trying to show him, I guarantee you I'll do everything I can to sue
the
> SOB and his agency
> and cause him as much trouble as I can.
>
> Jerry

Until you can reference an actual case where a licensed ham has had "some rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the license", this is all just paranoid supposition. Relax...

73 de W6DKN

3415. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:35:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F0327.267492CB@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26461

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> You guys must be a lot more "aware" of
> situations where litigation is a
> prohibitive for having business lunches.
> I have female supervisors, married ones
> at that, who have business lunches every
> day with their married, male subordinates.
> There are lunches, every day, where
> married men and women go alone with each
> other--just for the heck of it.

And just wait until one of those women realises she can sue the company, and that 99% of the time the company will fire the male employee and settle with the woman, to see how fast that situation ends. It's going on from one end of the country to the other.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3416. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:51:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F06F3.E3851421@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26463

CAM wrote:
>
> Y
> e
> s
> ,
>
> m
> u
> c
> h
>
> b
> e
> t
> t
> e
> r
> .
>
> W
> h
> y
>
> h
> a
> v
> e
>
> t
> h
> r
> e
> e
>
> s
> c
> r
> e
> e
> n
> s
>
> w

> h
> e
> n
>
> y
> o
> u
>
> c
> a
> n
>
> p
> u
> t
>
> i
> t
>
> a
> l
> l
>
> o
> n
>
> o
> n
> e
>
> s
> c
> r
> e
> e
> n
> ?
>
> O
> r
> ,
>
> i
> f
>
> w
> h
> a
> t
>

> y
> o
> u
>
> a
> r
> e
>
> d
> o
> i
> n
> g
>
> i
> s
>
> s
> o
>
> g
> o
> o
> d,
>
> w
> h
> y
>
> n
> o
> t
>
> p
> u
> t
>
> o
> n
> e
>
> l
> e
> t
> t
> e
> r
>
> p
> e

> r
>
> l
> i
> n
> e
> ?
>
> (
> s
> n
> i
> p
>)

Did you really scroll all the way down to here to see what I was going to say? Too bad - it took so long to edit the above, I forgot what I was going to say. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3417. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 05:52:00 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B3F55C0F922956B8.32D1C647C22DFB80.BD4F73FC4B2F5389@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26464

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 22:32:45 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> On the other hand, if you're going to keep judging evidence for ten,
>twenty, or thirty years, you could probably find almost everyone
>innocent.

If we are talking about _legitimate_ evidence, that would mean
that almost everyone IS innocent. Think about it.

>This has been the problem with so many cases where DNA
>results have gotten people off. These people are not necessarily
>innocent - they're released because DNA evidence has raised questions
>about key evidence used in the first trial.

Not usually. Far more common is the case were DNA testing has
been able to prove conclusively that the person who was convicted
could NOT have been the offender.

The most common case is that of a sex crime. In such crimes,
there is normally physical evidence (sperm, skin scrapings, hair,
etc.) that still exists in the files years after conviction. If a DNA
test of that evidence demonstrates that it did NOT originate with the
inmate, that's plenty of proof that the conviction should not have
occurred.

>However, that process
>ignores the remaining evidence from the original trial that still
>points strongly to the person's guilt.

But that evidence is irrelevant if it can be shown that he
could NOT be the person who did so.

The most common evidence (apart from the physical evidence
above--which can conclusively be proven or disproven by DNA testing)
is eyewitness testimony. But ANY criminal justice professional will
tell you that, TV stories notwithstanding, eyewitness testimony is the
LEAST reliable form of evidence. Eyewitnesses are found totally wrong
almost daily--even in cases where they are absolutely sure their
identification is correct. This is a common phenomenon in criminal
justice and one prosecutors and police are well aware of. Simply put:
under stress people make mistakes. DNA evidence, in contrast, isn't
subject to "stress" and thus can be counted on to be accurate.

> Sadly, once the person is
>released after so many years, it is almost impossible to try them
>again since that other evidence often no longer exists (decayed, lost,

>thrown away, witnesses moved away or died, or whatever).

That's the state's problem. The alternative is to keep people
in prisons who are totally innocent, a completely unacceptable
alternative given the nature of our Constitution (Eighth Amendment).

> So what you
>have now is a truly guilty person walking the street who simply cannot
>be tried again for the crime he actually committed.

Very seldom. In nearly all cases, what you have is an innocent
man who has spent years of his life in prison because of mistaken
witnesses or circumstantial evidence, and who has finally been freed
because of science.

>> (snip) Perhaps if the death penalty actually
>> accomplished its goal (deterrence) it might
>> be worth the risk of such results--but it
>> doesn't. Every study that has ever been
>> conducted has shown that the presence or
>> absence of a death penalty in a state has
>> no effect on the crime rate whatever.
>
>
> Deterrence is only one aspect of the death penalty

It is the primary one, according to all experts.

> - it also serves as just punishment for a serious crime

Nope.

Punishment exists to affect change in the behavior of the
person being punished--something rather impossible for the death
penalty to affect.

What it DOES do is serve as a form of vengence--something we
as a civilized nation have no need for in our legal system.

>and as an ultimate means to
>safeguard others.

That part, incapacitation, IS correct. But the same can be
accomplished (as can EFFECTIVE punishment) by incarceration instead of
death. And, btw, at a considerably lower cost to the taxpayer.

> If you take one aspect out of context, such as
>deterrence alone, then indeed the death penalty does appear not to
>accomplish it's goal. However, when taken together, the various
>aspects are well served by the death penalty.

How?

If we seek vengeance, then yes they are--but is that the model
we want for our society?

If we want protection, other methods are just as effective.

And if we want deterrence, other methods (i.e., life without parole) are MORE effective according to studies. Criminals are FAR more afraid of being imprisoned for the rest of their lives than the are of being sentenced to death--they know the punishment is FAR more likely to be administered.

But leaving these issues aside, the main key is the fact that we DO make mistakes. There ARE people on death row who are innocent, just as there are people in our other prison settings who are. How can we even remotely pretend to be a civilized people, let alone a compassionate or even law abiding people when we knowingly permit the risk of killing innocent men and women (and, in many cases, children--the youngest inmate on death row in the USA is 13 years old!) by our legal system? That simply isn't the act of a civilized people.

If we could be absolutely sure that the person convicted was guilty of the offense, then perhaps the death penalty wouldn't be quite as offensive. But we can't be sure. And that, alone, is more than sufficient reason not to administer it.

> No, that is not what the DNA shows - instead all it shows is that a
>particular piece of evidence used in a trial did not come from the
>perpetrator. In other words, it shows that blood found, or semen
>found, and used as evidence in the original trial, did not come from
>the perpetrator. But that DOES NOT prove innocence.

In other words, if the semen found in the body of a rape-murder victim was NOT from the accused, it isn't proof that he didn't rape and kill her?

Assuming there is no evidence to suggest that there were more than one assailant (and usually there was not in such cases), there is absolutely no grounds for letting a conviction stand if it is known that the physical evidence is not connected to the accused!

> Let me give an example to illustrate this. A girl has sex with her
>boyfriend. On the way home, she is killed by the perpetrator. Later,
>the perpetrator is arrested and the blood type of the semen is used in
>his trial as evidence she was also raped.

At the trial, evidence would have been introduced that the boyfriend had sex with her. No defense attorney would allow such evidence to be introduced unchallenged if the slightest chance existed to demonstrate that it was NOT related to the defendent--and no honest prosecutor would consider going forward with such a case without first investigating such events him or her-self.

>Twenty years later, law
>students from the University of Illinois, edged on by their anti-death
>penalty advocate teacher,

Sorry--it was the students, not the prof, who came up with the idea. The professor serves as faculty advisor and attorney of record for the group, and that's pretty much it. The group themselves are all 3L's.

>comes up with DNA evidence to show the semen
>could not have come from the perpetrator. Because some of the evidence
>used in the original trial is now suspect, the perpetrator is released
>pending a new trial. Of course, the perpetrator cannot be tried again
>because the remaining evidence from the original trial is long gone.

Then where did the sample that was tested for DNA come from?
You mean that the semen or blood sample was kept but nothing else was?
That's really stretching it, Dwight.

>So, in the end, the law students have simply released a killer back
>onto the streets who will now never pay for his crime. And, of course,
>the very happy perpetrator warmly thanks the law students (for being
>idiots) and goes off to celebrate his success at beating the system.

You DO grope at straws to justify your stand, don't you?

> And this scenario, with only slight variations to fit the crime
>situation, is repeated over and over in cases where DNA is used to
>bring into question evidence from decades old death penalty trials.

That, as ANY crj professional will tell you, is absolute nonsense.

>And, of course, the media, with it's liberal stance on the death
>penalty, continues to promote the lie that DNA has proven these people
>innocent.

It has--get out of your right wing "kill em' all & sort em' out later" frame of mind and you'll see that, too.

What puzzles me is why you think a jury in the first trial had to be infallible? We ALL know that juries make mistakes or are influenced by more than the evidence (the skills of the attorneys, the appearance of the defendant, how convincing a [often rehearsed] witness is on the stand--even the attractiveness of the defendant plays a part). Why is it that you are unwilling to accept scientific evidence that was not available at the time of the trial (because the testing wasn't available) but are willing to accept the non-physical evidence that was used to secure a conviction?

> And, either through ignorance or equal dishonesty, that
>media refrain is picked up and repeated by other people also opposed
>to the death penalty, such as yourself.

Dwight--you assume that anyone who disagrees with you is influenced by the "liberal media" or similar sources. My influence came from my education--I TEACH Criminal Justice classes (CRJ Psychology, Criminology, Juvenile Delinquency, Sex Crime Analysis, Forensic Profiling, Human Relations in Corrections, Institutional

Populations, and Psychopharacology for Law Enforcement, to name a few. I probably have more graduate hours in criminal justice courses than you have graduate OR undergraduate hours in your major (assuming you don't have a doctorate)--and those courses weren't taken from the "liberal media" they were taken from the Criminal Justice and Sociology departments of major Universities. My students will work in law enforcement, corrections, forensics, and some will go on to become attorneys and work for prosecutor's offices. In short, I am NOT parroting the media, I am making statements of fact--try learning the difference.

>> (snip) DNA evidence has been used in a very
>> substantial number of cases to prove that the
>> person executed did NOT commit the crime --the
>> research was conducted as a part of the
>> Illinois Legal Defense Project. That isn't
>> opinion, it's solid, legally admissible, proof
>> that innocent men and women were executed by
>> the state.
>
> Again, that is _NOT_ at all what DNA evidence proves. All it proves
>is that a particular piece of evidence used in a trial did not come
>from the perpetrator. The perpetrator is not released as a person
>proven innocent - he is released pending a new trial.

That depends on the decision of the prosecutor in the case. If it is apparent (as it is in a surprising number of cases) that the only real evidence against the individual was the physical evidence thus disproved, the odds that he or she will be retried are vanishingly small. In addition, in MANY cases the statute of limitations for discovery of new evidence have run out and the person is released by Gubernatorial clemency.

>Again, the
>perpetrator is seldom retried because the other evidence pointing to
>guilt is often no longer available.

Or was non-existant in the first place.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3418. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 06:00:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011206010002.19213.00000152@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 26465

In article <C9EEA9EBF0958585.A1761F79A43A4C48.F09A8AE2B11F503E@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>>Nope. Hint: He earlier killed 1000 of those enemies with the
>>jawbone of an ass.
>
> Larry Roll committed suicide?
>
> Rick

Rick:

The rumors of my death are inaccurate.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3419. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 06:00:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011206010002.19213.00000153@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 26466

In article <94B3B491ECBA0C74.7996BD3E4D8948D9.F8FC8F6BC9DC65C8@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>> OK OK OK. Tell me how it's my problem, Larry. Maybe that'll help.
>>
>>It will cause the end of civilization as we know it. :-)
>
> Promises, promises . . .
>
> Rick

Rick:

Apparently you have no problem with "the end of civilization as we
know it." This begs the question: If civilization as we know it does
end, what kind of civilization would you like to take it's place?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3420. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 06:50:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F149F.FFEC859@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26467

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) Wiccan and pagan faiths can trace
> their roots to the polytheistic nature
> religions of Greece and Rome and to the
> pagan faiths of Germany and England.

And few, if any, of the wiccan or pagan groups in this country today can trace their roots back to those ancient religions in Greece or Rome. Instead, like I said, these are modern day offshoots of satanic groups trying to legitimize their existence by claiming to be descendants of those ancient religions (when no such link to these religions exists). And, while doing so, they engage in occult practices, witchcraft, and other activities commonly associated with satanism, while engaging in little or no activities commonly associated with the ancient wiccan or pagan religions. Sorry, Rick, it all comes down to an old saying - if is looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it...

By the way, you can see for yourself the connection between satanism and these groups (pagans and wiccans). Go to any internet search engine, enter "satanism," and watch how many wiccan and pagan web sites pop up on the list. If these groups have no link to satanism, why would so many mention satanism on their web sites?

> (snip) It is a completely false statement
> perpetuated by the Christian church in an
> attempt to hide the actual nature of the
> religions. (snip)

Well, sorry, my friend. I'm not the "Christian church." I'm a person with eyes that can see what is right in front of my face. Again, if is looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it...

> (snip) The pentagram, for your information,
> was a religious symbol in Egypt, Macedonia,
> Sumeria, Greece, Rome, China, India, and
> among the Norse peoples-- (snip)

This isn't Egypt, Macedonia, Sumeria, Greece, Rome, China, or India, Rick. In this country, in modern times, the pentagram and penticle are used as satanic symbols. And both groups (wiccan and pagan) selected those symbols exactly because of their association to satanism. Once again, if is looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it...

> NONE of which groups "stole" it from
> Christianity. (snip)

?? Did anyone say they did? I know I didn't.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3421. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 06:56:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F1635.C8E9B5FE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26468

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I think someone, maybe even you, was
> making the point that something shaped
> like a pentagram was satanic. The
> Pentagon building, shaped as it is,
> holds the foundation for a pentagram,
> does it not?

I never made any such claim. I said the pentagram itself was a satanic symbol.

> It was a stab at trying to get the
> equation of pentagram=satanic out of
> the holder's head...because it's hogwash.

Well, to get the connection between the pentagram and satanism out of my head, you'd have to tell me to ignore several hundred years of history - that symbol has been used by self proclaimed satanists for at least that long (possibly longer).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3422. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 06:59:55 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8f86ecaf.0112052259.2bdd8838@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26469
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

So what???
If one in 1 million of these fags gets busted its great!!
It will be in QST and on the web pages, etc...the fags will get what
they FEAR...exposure...

billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote in message
news:<3c0d9c4d.6548917@news.mindspring.com>...
> On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 18:08:27 -0600, "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH"
> <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote:
>
> >On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 14:11:14 GMT, "Kenneth Vaughan"
> ><kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> >
> >>pass all the "laws" you want.....answer me one question.....how does it make
> >>any difference? how is this new law going to be actively enforced?? local
> >>atthorities still have to obtain a search warrant,with reasonable cause
> >>submitted before a judge.
> >
> >If it's mobile, they only have to see some indication that it's not a
> >legal rig from outside the vehicle. After that, they'll have probable
> >cause to search.
>
> The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

3423. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:00:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112052300.167ddbcd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26470
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Hall <nojunkmail_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:<3C0D2B31.3CA6@worldlynx.net>...

>
> If the signal is NOT weak, then it becomes more practical to use a phone
> mode. IF CW is the only mode that works, then the signal is weak by
> definition. EME'er regularly work ssb if they have any sort of decent
> station.
>
A Real Ham runs the mode that works on the specific freq at the
specific time, if there's a new one on EME for instance and you need
to log him a Real Ham runs the mode of the moment, doesn't matter if
we're talking 2m or 160m.
>
> >
> > "Voice has replaced CW"??? Ask the SSB ops that wanted a contact with the
> > VP8 in the Shetlands. He never went to SSB. Though the SSB ops were
> > BEGGING for it to happen!
>
> I have no desire to exchange anything with an elitist mode snob. If he
> can't talk to me on the modes I use, "uck 'em".
>
>
Talk about mode snobs! Bwaaahaha! And/or good, while you're waiting
for the guy to switch to ssb I already beeped him into my log and I
didn't have any QRM from YOU in the pileup down the band. Thankew
bunches for helping keep the size of the cw pileup down.
>
> >
>
> . . . . CW is not a very
> robust digital mode, and it is severely limited in speed if done
> manually.
>
>
Walking, jogging and bicycling are not very "robust" modes of
transportation and are quite speed-limited too. But didja ever notice
how many folk use these modes anyway? There is beauty and invigoration
in simplicity, relaibility and the use of learned personal
capabilities.
> >

>
> For every one CW op in a pileup there are 10 or 20 in the SSB pileup.

>
Hee! Damned straight. You just reinforced the wisdom of running in the
cw piles instead of in the phone piles. Makes me wonder if you're a
troll . . ?
>
>
>
> CW is kept alive mostly by nostalgic old timers that are still living
> out their childhood fantasies,
>
No, we're just exercising the skills we worked to develop in our
childhoods.
>
>
>and die hard weak signal dxers.
>
>
Isn't that the topic of this thread?
>
>
>For those
> of us that just want to socialize, it's much easier to just TALK.
>
>
It's even easier to pick up the telephone to just talk and socialize
yer buns off. No QRM or FCC licensing pushups involved. What's your
point please?
>
> >
> > We all have our specific likes and dis-likes. Just because you don't like
> > CW doesn't mean you should put it down. To each there own...right?
>
> I only "put down" the exhaltation that many "CW forever" types exhibit
> for the mode. CW is a MODE, no different than AM, SSB, FM, FSK or
> whatever.
>
>
I agree with that.
>
>
>Yet no other mode has created such a divide among hams.
>
>
Utter nonsense, the mode didn't "create" the schism, that's asinine,
cw is just another mode. The people who are looking for free passes to
the bands without having demonstrated any competence in the mode
created the divide.
>
>
> I'll make you a promise. I won't put CW down, if you don't tell me how

> great it is.
>
Can't deal with it eh?
>
>
> Dave
>
w3rv

3424. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:04:55 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8f86ecaf.0112052304.43fdc08c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26471
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT

"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:<RUwP7.4251$MX1.981753@news02.optonline.net>...
> One more SMF for the kill file!
> Train
>
> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E974A.9F5A6DA1@gte.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> > > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> > > >
> > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> > > > then make the arrest.
> > >
> > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> > >
> > > You're out to lunch on this one!
> >
> > That is what happens in my state with respect
> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
> > members.
> >
> >

> >

3425. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:08:25 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8f86ecaf.0112052308.422a9dac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
vTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT

"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:<RUwP7.4251$MX1.981753@news02.optonline.net>...
> One more SMF for the kill file!
> Train
>
> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E974A.9F5A6DA1@gte.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> > > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> > > > >
> > > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> > > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> > > > > then make the arrest.
> > > >
> > > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> > > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> > > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> > > >
> > > > You're out to lunch on this one!
> > >
> > That is what happens in my state with respect

> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
> > members.
> >
> >
> >

3426. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:10:39 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8f86ecaf.0112052310.548c22a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26473
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT

"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:<RUwP7.4251$MX1.981753@news02.optonline.net>...
> One more SMF for the kill file!
> Train
>
> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E974A.9F5A6DA1@gte.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> > > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> > > > >
> > > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> > > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> > > > > then make the arrest.
> > > >
> > > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> > > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> > > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> > > >
> > > > You're out to lunch on this one!
> > >
> > That is what happens in my state with respect
> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
> > members.
> >
> >
> >

3427. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:11:36 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8f86ecaf.0112052311.2406b3cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26474
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A

FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
v"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:<7B768628800FC15F.186BC9241D8DE1D0.CD4E53D023119056@lp.airnews.net>...
> On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 04:08:35 GMT, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
> wrote:
>
> >On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 18:08:27 -0600, "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH"
> ><kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote:
>
> >>If it's mobile, they only have to see some indication that it's not a
> >>legal rig from outside the vehicle. After that, they'll have probable
> >>cause to search.
> >
> >The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> >a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
>
> Maybe not, but it's easy to walk into a truck stop that sells the
> things, take a few polaroids, and issue them to the beat officers for
> comparison. They're still not going to catch the guy with a modified
> 'normal' rig, but they'll be able to spot the 'export' radios.
>
> As far as other services, there's only one mobile FRS rig that I'm
> aware of, and for any service requiring a license, they can look at
> the license.
>
> OTOH, if you're using an export CB as your mobile 10m rig, I'd
> recommend having a copy of the applicable sections of Part 97 in the
> glovebox anyway.
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH

> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3428. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:12:41 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8f86ecaf.0112052312.6d4bcfb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26475
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:<RUwP7.4251$MX1.981753@news02.optonline.net>...
> One more SMF for the kill file!
> Train
>
> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0E974A.9F5A6DA1@gte.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > > > > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't

> > > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> > > >
> > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> > > > then make the arrest.
> > >
> > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> > >
> > > You're out to lunch on this one!
> >
> > That is what happens in my state with respect
> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
> > members.
> >
> >
> >

3429. TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:14:30 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8f86ecaf.0112052314.492aa3b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26476
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:<3C0B8E50.56C82205@gte.net>...
> RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>
>
>
> Tacoma Washington may be the first city to prohibit Class D 11 meter C-B
>
> operators from using non-FCC certified transmitting equipment. Adopted
> last September 12th but only now becoming widely known, Tacoma City
> Ordinance 26851 amends Chapter 8.38 of their Municipal Code in two ways.
>
> First is Section 8.38.010 which directly prohibits use of non-approved
> radio equipment by CB'ers. And if a CB'er breaks the new law he or she
> is subject to Section
>
> 8.38.020. This makes using such a radio a misdemeanor punishable to a
> fine of up to $500, and/or up to 6 month imprisonment.
>
>
>
> Tacoma enacted Ordinance 26851 based on an earlier amendment to the
> Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which was adopted by Congress a
> couple of years ago. As this was a Congressional action, not an FCC
> action, any challenges by C-B operators to the new Tacoma local law
> would have to go through the federal courts. As far as we can
> determine, the new law is carefully crafted to affect only C-B operators
>
> and no other radio operators in the Tacoma area. (Various news sources)
>
>
>
> **
> ftp://ftp.arnewsline.org/quincy/News/news.txt

3430. TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:15:07 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8f86ecaf.0112052315.33e15857@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26477
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:<3C0B959F.9A960A51@spam.me.not>...
> Ok... now this is the third time this has been posted to rec.radio.cb...
>
> Think we could stop plastering the newsgroup? It's been discussed,
> argued, stirred up, and beaten to death already... Could we just stop
> it?
>
> de AB8LR
>
> -SSB
>
> N9NWO wrote:
>
> <Another repetitive, annoying, troll-like post, snipped for your
> protection>

3431. TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:15:44 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8f86ecaf.0112052315.3e80bf7f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26478
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
"Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<e02358f67ea6c52f7c42ba0f221dc153.47899@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> Even on 2 meters, the supposedly codeless band i still can't get away from
> those confounded beeps! I hate them. I'm hearing morse in my sleep and its
> haunting me because I can not understand what the "Green Men" are trying to
> tell me. Help me!
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott

> KC8LD0
>
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "

3432. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 07:36:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F1F73.7D769FA4@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26479

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> > Rearrange the letters in "Santa" and you
> > get "Satan". How convenient!
>
> devil spelled backward is "lived"
>
> evil spelled backward is "live"
>
> now consider god ...
>
> Rick <wondering who let the dog out
> preach, preach, preach...>

And your last name rearranged spells "Sadam."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3433. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 08:24:42 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <F7663ECC02DF41D5.DE1E1CB09208BE46.903FBEC19F4F49B8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26480
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

On 5 Dec 2001 23:12:41 -0800, twithedsmaster@yahoo.com (Twithed's
Master) wrote:

>TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
>FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT

Train, stop advertising in here. Go to a personals group or
something.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3434. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 09:15:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F3695.9A4BD55B@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26481

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) A case like this is not, however,
> grounds for banning tattoo parlors or
> piercing salons, as the original message
> in this sub-thread postulated. (snip)

I'm glad you added the last part to that sentence, because I've
never advocated any such ban. My comments have been limited solely to minors.

> (snip) Only when charged as an adult. (snip)

I thought you asked about children charged as an adult.

> (snip) I agree that these crimes are far
> more serious. But it seems that those who
> want criminal trials for such offenders
> simultaneously want to treat the same youths
> as children incapable of making a decision
> in other cases. Think about it, if a person
> is not capable of making an adult decision
> as to whether or not he should get a tattoo,
> how can anyone possibly expect him to make
> an adult decision as to whether to commit
> a crime? (snip)

Actually, I think it's common sense. While a teenager might not see
any harm in getting a tattoo (everybody's doing it), they darn sure
know killing someone is both serious and wrong. So I don't see the
conflict. As adults, we use our adult experience to protect kids from
things that might have negative ramifications in the future (even if
the kids don't see that yet). Therefore, it makes sense to restrict
kids from participating in certain things they might want to do.
However, no kid should want to participate in a killing. And, if they
do kill, then we need to come down hard on them.

> (snip) Either a person is or is not mature
> enough to be treated as an adult. If not,
> they should NEVER be treated that way; if
> so they ALWAYS should (snip)

Laws don't work on such absolutes, Rick. Laws are designed for the
circumstances. For example, we don't have one absolute speed limit in
this country. Instead, speed limits are based on the circumstances at
any given point along a road. We have laws to allow alcohol
consumption in some places while not in others. We lock people up for

fighting in public while allowing others to pay to attend public boxing or wrestling events. We allow a person to kill in self defense while strapping them to a table if they did it for some other reason. And the list goes on and on. Likewise, we restrict certain activities of some age groups while allowing it for others. Now, you might argue that's unfair, but I suggest an absolute system of laws would be far less fair.

> (snip) As far as the "old driver" rules you
> cite -- most states don't have them (here in
> Michigan the senior lobby is far to strong to
> limit the driving of the elderly-- (snip)

Actually, most states still have them, but they're often not based on age anymore (the appearance of age discrimination). Instead, they're based on driving competency. Sadly, because these laws are dependant on the police officer detecting the problem driver, instead of some type of test, they often don't work until it is too late (an accident). And the result is exactly the example you gave.

> (snip) Not in the United States if those laws
> fail to recognize the rights we are GUARANTEED
> by the Constitution of the United States OR
> by the Constitution of their own State.

Well, that's rather of a given, isn't it? I was talking about laws (and values) that don't conflict with that.

> (snip) To protect people from harm.

Again, semantics. The majority within a community are the ones who decide what causes harm and what harms they want to address.

> (snip) They were carrying guns and in most cases
> their fathers were card-carrying NRA members.
> Let's save the kids in the schools--we'll
> declare the NRA a terrorist organization and
> put all the members in prison for supporting
> terrorism in the United States (snip)

The NRA is a political lobbying group, not a group involved in terrorism. You would have a hard time proving such a charge in court and I certainly would not want to attempt the arrest of the ten million or so NRA members based solely on their membership in that organization. Somehow, I think you would end up with one heck of a fight on your hands (especially if a few million more gun owners join them).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3435. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 09:21:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F380D.7877DA8F@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26482

CAM wrote:
>
> If only I were as omniscient as you, Dwight.

It's a tough burden to bear, Cecil.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3436. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 09:24:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F38C2.13F32E0@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26483

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Shame on you Dwight--you criticize Wicca and
> claim it to be Satanic--yet you ignore the
> principles of your OWN religion. (snip)

My own religion? I didn't know I even had a religion. Care to elaborate?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3437. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 09:33:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F3AA6.3EAFBD72@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26484

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> That's almost right. Ask MOST any Arab, and
> he'll tell you that he was told by his imam
> he should be angry and hateful. The reason?
> Well it's because there's a great satan -
> sorta like the boogie man, only meaner. You
> see, he must rely on his religious leaders
> for all his information because he's too
> illiterate to discover the truth for himself.
> Of course even if he can read, the Arab
> press will tell him that he should be angry
> and hateful.

Sounds a little like our own country, doesn't it? Replace "imam"
with "government," "religious leaders" with "political leaders," and
the "Arab press" with the "American press."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3438. custom-designed emblems

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 09:52:37 UTC
From: shuhsunw@yahoo.com.tw
Message-ID: <fc135f4b.0112060152.21f3f0f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26485
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.roller-coaster,rec.scuba

Hi,

Here is the source of lapel pins and embroidered patches. It contains
the American flag and custom-designed emblems with good price.
www.emblem-badge.com

3439. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 10:39:11 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <jVHP7.145981$WW.9330005@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26486

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:hrCP7.145744$WW.9302287@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Richard McCollum wrote
>
> > Without having a clue how it happens, 141 Tech Pluses have been
renewed
> > since der Tag including one in November. The last one expires in
December
> > 2011.
>
> Whats a "der Tag"?
>
> Rich

The Day. Since the Tech Plus supposedly no longer existed

3440. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 10:59:42 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ycIP7.145985$WW.9331503@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26487

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011206000310.05154.00000056@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article
<E9DA4496254CF5D5.A640469A5ACB9299.AF9A524A567C3FD0@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >Sit down and total your payments into the system. Divide that
> >number by the monthly amount you will receive at retirement. That's
> >how many months of benefits you will receive before the government has
> >to start paying you welfare.
>
> If you consider SS to be the equivalent of stuffing money in a mattress,
yes.
>
> >Don't count the interest you "Might" have
> >made on other investments--you might ALSO have invested badly and lost
> >all your money.
>
> Why not count it? Many investments are fully backed by the feds, who are
the
> same folks as run SS. At the very least, the calcualtion should consider
what
> would have piled up if Cecil had been allowed to use the money to buy US
> Savings Bonds and let them pile up.
>
> A few years ago I cashed in a Series E bond that had been bought for me
as a
> baby. It cost something like $18.75 new and cashed in at over $100 - and
those
> ancient 1950s bonds had very low interest. Take a working career's worth
of SS
> contributions and figure what they'd amount to invested that way. It's a
lot
> more than just what was put in.
>
> >Instead, treat that interest as having been paid as a
> >tax (fee if you prefer) so that those who have NOT paid into the
> >system (surviving spouses or children, the disabled, etc.) will be
> >able to receive Social Security payments as well.
>
> Which proves Cecil's point - HE may not get back what he put in, plus
interest.
>
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Which proves little else except that SS is a welfare program well hidden with a barrage of bullshit. In days of old, both Grandma and the kids hoped she did not live too long as supporting her was a pain; SS spread everyone's granny over everyone's grandkids, nothing else. Gave Granny some money and dignity however.

Granny at least had the sense to have lotsa grandkids, we are not that bright (?).

Whenever you have something like the post WW2 baby boom, all hell is going to break loose as the boom and its echoes work its way thru the system. There is simply no way to remove enough money from a functioning economy to fund SS on some reasonable actuarial basis, invest it at the assumed rate, and then withdraw it to pay the bills. That makes it welfare, income transfer on a current basis. Even makes you wonder about the viability of 401k plans over the next 40 years or so; assets are admirable if you have someone to sell them to.

I am not entirely anti-SS but as has been noted many times, solutions begin by calling things what they are. In the long run of things, the problem may not actually have a solution. By bringing in Jose, Abdul, and Wun Hung Lo however, we have begun the best attempt.

Dick, N BK

3441. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 12:20:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011206072047.10110.00000046@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 26488

In article <3C0EF426.7EB131F5@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>According to an
>Stars & Stripes article I read a few years ago, there have been over
>200 sexual harassment lawsuits brought against the military alone. And
>I'd speculate there has been several thousand brought against
>companies over the last few decades.

Exactly, Dwight.

In addition, it doesn't take a lawsuit to cause damage. All it takes is a
complaint to do all sorts of damage.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3442. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 12:20:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011206072047.10110.00000045@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 26489

In article <0251E36B39C47C40.29B19426915443DC.3EB9DF7F56135859@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 17:32:59 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>wrote:

> Why are progressive taxes any more offensive that regressive
>ones? A flat-percentage on all income is reasonable, but anything that
>either increases the tax burden (percentage of income wise) of a
>person based on his or her earning capacity or increases the tax load
>(percentage of income wise) on a person based on his or her saving
>capacity is a tax that discriminates.

Which is not a bad thing. There is a cost attached to the basic level of
independent existence. IOW, the necessities. Taking, X% of the gross income of
someone at the bottom of the wage scale has a much bigger impact on that
person's life than taking the same percentage from someone at the top.

The present SS+IRS system is regressive for many people, because once a certain
level of income is reached they max out the SS contributions.

>>> Who, given your opposition to transfer programs and decision to "opt
>>> out" of Social Security, would provide your medical expenses, long
>>> term care, or support? Who would care for your children if you died at
>>> 25 or 30 years of age?
>>
>>All that is *MY* responsibility, not anyone else's. I've always carried
>>health, disability, and life insurance. It's just one other thing to
>>budget for.
>
> It may be your responsibility, but what if you don't meet that
>responsibility? Is it reasonable that the state ignore the needs of
>children because their fathers and mothers didn't demonstrate sound
>financial planning?

Is it reasonable that the state take over the responsibilities of parents,
thereby penalizing those who are responsible?
>
> Consider, also, the age I listed. Assuming the _average_
>couple marry soon after graduation from college (and even the
>Libertarian party can't possibly expect people to wait until they are
>financially solvent to marry and start raising a family--that is
>simply unrealistic and, in many ways, undesirable).

WHOA!!! WHY is it unrealisitc and undesirable? I know MANY couples who waited
and worked until they were reasonably situated financially before taking on

more responsibilities.

>Assume further
>that by the time they are 30, they have two children (also very
>logical and desirable from social and even physiological
>perspectives).

WHY?? Many people today are not ready to have any children by the time they are 30.

>Are you seriously suggesting that the average couple
>could reasonably be expected to have made adequate arrangements for
>the care of the children and assistance for the surviving partner if
>they die at this age? Cecil, that just isn't realistic!

Sure it is. Many people do just that. It's what life insurance, mortgage insurance and relatives/friends are for.

Anyone who has dependent kids should have a will. And in the will the guardians of the children should be spelled out in advance (with their consent, of course) so that if both parents die or are incapacitated the children will be cared for by people who the parents trusted.

Term life insurance for healthy people of the age you specify is not expensive, either.

All Cecil is proposing is that people take some responsibility.
>
>>> Perhaps in your case you could have invested the money more
>>> wisely than the government--so could I and a lot of other people--but
>>> not everyone has either the investment skills or the money to invest
>>> in the first place.
>>
>>Not my problem. I do not desire to protect people from themselves and
>>I would appreciate that same consideration for myself.
>
> No one is trying to "Protect people from themselves."

Sure they are. SS protects people from using the money to make poor investment choices. That's why it started in the first place.

>On the
>other hand if everyone, or even most everyone, were to invest using a
>sound plan of investment, it would flood the money market to the
>extent that interest rates of 2-4% would become the norm (supply and
>demand fix equilibrium point in a free market--including an
>equilibrium point for investment funds)--a profit totally incapable of
>providing for the future for anyone, sound investor or not.

Incorrect. It all depends on things like the rate of inflation and how long the investing goes on.

Consider the couple who begin investing in their mid-20s and retire in their late '60s (longer life expectancy necessitates later retirement - no way around

that). If their investments outpace inflation, are not subject to tax until used, and they keep to a plan, they can put away quite a pile.

>The ONLY
>people who would be expected to profit significantly from investments
>in such circumstances would be those who made high risk
>investments--precisely the kind of investment that would be highly
>unwise for someone who was trying to save for the future.

Run the numbers, Rick.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3443. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 12:58:45 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9unuggfac5@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26492
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9umlgl0b5s@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9um6p0oh7@pita.alt.net...
>
> > But at least I'm not an anonymous COWARD who hides because of that
yellow
>
> <snip>
>
> 20,000 plus newsgroups are available on usenet. It allows you to post
(semi)
> anonymously, and most people accept that, flames and trolls. Most people
> accept that they don't know the true identity of the person at the other
end
> of the message. (Although it does tend to prove Oscar Wilde's claim about
> men and masks.)
>
> ...except for the rec.radio.amatuer.* newsgroups.
>
> A few people expect you to post a callsign, (if you have one) thus giving
> away information about yourself. With the publicity about internet
stalking
> and identity theft, you'd be foolish to post such information. If I'm to
be
> branded as an anonymous coward, simply because I have a different opinon,
so
> be it.

So you ARE an anonymous COWARD. Any "stalking" can be dealt with through law
enforcement channels, you insufferable dunce.

3444. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 13:37:17 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9uns8g02ave@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26490

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:0003237759EB5296.2EF792B13CA5E913.E00FCDB6ADED3BE1@lp.airnews.net...
> The area code for Hell is 734.
>
> Rick

...and it freezes over every year!

3445. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 13:39:58 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9unsdg02b75@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26491

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011206072047.10110.00000046@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In addition, it doesn't take a lawsuit to cause damage. All it takes is a
> complaint to do all sorts of damage.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

It's not so much the complaint, as it is inaction against it.

3446. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 14:15:02 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <G3LP7.8905$MX1.3057076@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 26493
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Hey Joe,
Fuck off and die!
Train

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:F7663ECC02DF41D5.DE1E1CB09208BE46.903FBEC19F4F49B8@lp.airnews.net...
> On 5 Dec 2001 23:12:41 -0800, twithedsmaster@yahoo.com (Twithed's
> Master) wrote:
>
> >TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> >FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
>
> Train, stop advertising in here. Go to a personals group or
> something.
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3447. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 14:20:25 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uo12vlfq0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26496
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
news:3204442.23871@ncvillage.net...
>
> On Wed, 5 Dec 2001 15:42:51 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> >
> > Oh, I don't know.....he may be listening more than you think. He got
on
> > 14.313 recently and talked to Dan.
> >
>
> We can take care of things ourselves instead of waiting around for Mr.
> No Show. I have a Collins KWM-2 all hooked up and ready to take Dimmy
> out whenever he shows up and starts his profanity again.

So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere with
another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97, doesn't it?
BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.

3448. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 14:32:14 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F818E.B3737975@gte.net>
Source record: 26495
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

> > >
> > >
> > > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> > > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> > > >
> > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> > > > then make the arrest.
> > >
> > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> > >
> > > You're out to lunch on this one!
> >
> > That is what happens in my state with respect
> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
> > members.
>
> What state do you live in? Russia? Sure must suck
> to be you! Here they look at you suspiciously
> if you _don't_ have at least a deer rifle in the car!

Indiana. We have one of the most pro gun set of
laws in the country. One of the oldest personal
protection permits. But you had better have a
permit if you have a handgun in the vehicle.

Rifles and shotguns are a bit different. Even a kid
can have one, if he has written permission from his
parents. But too many have gone to jail because
dad left his handgun in the car.

3449. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 14:42:55 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F8408.514598D7@gte.net>
Source record: 26494
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> SO you want to have to go thru the hassle, take time to go to court, risk
> having your equipment damaged because some rambo cop was too gung ho (Ah am
> th' law 'round hyar, boy) to take time to examine your papers and find out
> that you are not doing anything wrong? I don't think so--not me. If some
> rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the license
> I am trying to show him, I guarantee you I'll do everything I can to sue the
> SOB and his agency
> and cause him as much trouble as I can.

If you can not afford to have attorneys then
you really should not be in either the radio
hobby or in the shooting hobbies. Modern
America requires that you have an attorney
for everything you do.

And the cops do not hassle decent people,
especially if they know them. What cops
go after are those who look like they are
trouble makers.

Drive a decent, newer car but not too expensive.
Dress well, a bit conservative. Wear short hair and
avoid the hillbilly beard look. Learn to speak as
if you were college educated. Do that and the cops
generally leave you alone.

3450. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 15:01:25 UTC
From: Daniel Nicholson <dnicholson@socket.net>
Message-ID: <u0v23vt78kkl64@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 26497
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

GAWD Oh MIghty!! this conversation is soooo funnny!! I needed a good belly laugh! Keep it going for those of us the dont care one way or the other!
For me Ham radio is fun no matter what mode is used!!!!!

Dan/N�FPE

3451. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 15:40:55 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <71E8B5A34BC82906.72D2177CEF862180.E4ABE684AFB9FF66@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26498
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 14:15:02 GMT, "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
wrote:

>Hey Joe,
>Fuck off and die!

Creative. Did you think that one up yourself, or did your mommy tell
it to you?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3452. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 15:50:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0F93B2.D8EAA515@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26499

Rick Adams wrote:
> Thus the private sector would
> inevitably be able to underprice the government and take over
> essentially all transactions with the result that no money would be
> collected by the courts to pay for criminal court costs.

That doesn't compute. How could the private sector take over
enforcing legal contracts? Hire the Mafia?

> Why are progressive taxes any more offensive that regressive ones?

Because they are overpriced.

> You needed a better accountant!

Yeah, like the guy in CA who kept his stock instead of turning it
into cash? Now he owes the government 6 million dollars on one
million dollars worth of stock.

> I have friends who are multi-millionaires and pay
> significantly less taxes than that.

See above.

> It may be your responsibility, but what if you don't meet that
> responsibility?

Same thing that happens when I don't meet my other responsibilities.
I am held responsible for it. Why should half the population be
responsible for themselves and ALSO responsible for the other half?

> No one is trying to "Protect people from themselves."

Give us a break, Rick. Social Security is exactly an attempt to
protect people from themselves. Social Security provides the
majority of people an incentive not to provide for their retirement.

> Cecil, try to post w/o the false stereotypes of welfare
> recepients--you're beginning to sound like Dick Carroll speaking about
> Muslims!

I know a few of those walking, talking stereotypes, Rick. I've been
taken to the cleaners by them.

> What on earth do drugs and booze have to do with the logical
> decision to purchase a car for transportation (which is used to get to
> work, after all) rather than investing for retirement?

I bought a car for my adopted daughter's father. He sold it and bought drugs and booze.

> But what about the majority of the people who would NOT have
> invested successfully?

That's their responsibility, Rick, not yours or mine. Let the buyer beware.

> Do your principles include stereotyping the poor, allowing
> children to go hungry if their parents can't afford food, and
> providing education based on the ability to pay?

Do your principles include forcing me to support someone else's children as well as my own? Know how the cowbird operates? She lays her eggs in the nest of other birds. The young cowbird kicks the legitimate eggs out of the nest.

> And your children with you?

If the children are worth saving, then charities/churches will come to the rescue. I have done more than my share of charitable work.

> More to the point, from a political perspective, do you
> seriously believe that a party with that kind of attitude could
> conceivably win a large percentage of the vote?

Yep, when the American people come to their senses and object to being forced to support a welfare system that breeds herds of non-producers.

> Cecil, I'm losing a lot of respect for you.

Most people do until they realize that I am leading them down the primrose path. And I'll take either side of the argument. Once, during a high school debate, a member of our team fell ill and I had to argue one side in one debate and the opposite side in the other debate. I won both debates. :-)

> No, Cecil, they don't have "basketball genes" that are
> superior to yours or anyone else's--there is no such thing and you
> should well be aware of it.

Of course they do, Rick. It is partially the result of selective breeding during the time of slavery.

> If you had the basic skills necessary, and the height (and
> blacks, as a group, are no taller than whites) ...

Ever been to Waitusi territory?

> Cecil,you can refuse what you like--but if there are no jobs
> available to you, how do you plan to support yourself?

There are always jobs if one is willing to work hard. During the
depths of the Great Depression, my dad worked 12 hours a day as
a cook for one dollar a day.

> You have always had the ability to get a job. Not all inner
> city minorities have that kind of opportunity--nor, for that matter,
> do the even greater number of poor (mostly white, btw) in rural
> American or in areas where the economy is depressed.

Anybody who has prepared himself for work can get a job. The men
who can't get a job have usually chosen to be lazy and uneducated.
I've met a number of them and they are the way they have chosen
to be. And it doesn't have anything to do with race. There are
probably more lazy, uneducated whites than any minority group.

> >The first step would be requiring healthy people on welfare to actually
> >do some hard work for that income.
>
> I agree to an extent--but lacking skills and living in an
> economically depressed area, who is going to hire them?

Remember the CCC camps? My dad cleaned out Colossal Cave in
Arizona. Now we can't even require prisoners to work.

> Sorry, but nothing on earth could convince me to vote for--or
> support--a party with a set of values like that.

Good, we don't want you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3453. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 15:53:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0F9483.80CC3FA3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26500

N2EY wrote:
> The problem is that the benefits are not tied to responsible behaviors that
> will lead the dependent person to become independent.

That's a major fly in the ointment.

> At first blush, this sounds cruel, Cecil. But upon reflection one must ask a
> simple question: If a person cannot take care of him/herself, how will that
> person take care of others who are even more dependent?

I could be less blunt but then being less blunt wouldn't raise as many
hackles. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3454. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 15:57:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0F9555.A185006E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26401

N2EY wrote:
> At first blush, this sounds cruel, Cecil. But upon reflection one must ask a
> simple question: If a person cannot take care of him/herself, how will that
> person take care of others who are even more dependent?

I hate to admit it, but the Chinese have a good idea. The state will support
the first two children. Any more than two and you are on your own. That
would eliminate the women who choose to have kids for the purpose of collecting
welfare on them.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3455. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 16:41:08 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C0F9FA4.3116DA2C@uci.edu>
Source record: 26402

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > That's almost right. Ask MOST any Arab, and
> > he'll tell you that he was told by his imam
> > he should be angry and hateful. The reason?
> > Well it's because there's a great satan -
> > sorta like the boogie man, only meaner. You
> > see, he must rely on his religious leaders
> > for all his information because he's too
> > illiterate to discover the truth for himself.
> > Of course even if he can read, the Arab
> > press will tell him that he should be angry
> > and hateful.
>
> Sounds a little like our own country, doesn't it?

No. It doesn't sound anything at all like the country I live in,
Dwight.
Ur a little bit on the negative side there, don't ya think?

3456. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 17:02:42 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C0FA4B2.B79F271A@uci.edu>
Source record: 26403

CAM wrote:
> What's a bong?

It's the root word to a joke I made a couple posts back.

3457. Re: TWISTEDHED DEMANDS RESPECT FOR FREEBAND BOOTLEGGERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 17:22:37 UTC
From: eustiscornhauser@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e9af79fa.0112060922.4e24cea1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26404

The hams should hide their head in shame!! I have never seen a more incompetent bunch of boobs than the new no-coders on two meter fm in this area.

The average freebander works more dx, knows more about radio, and is much more polite than those stupid no-coders will ever be.

The no-coders are the new scum of the radio world. All the no-coders do is sit around in the trailer park, jerking off and kerchunking the local repeater. If you listen you will find that the most exciting thing in their life is picking up their welfare checks.

The no-coders also spend a fair amount of time stealing radios.

The technician class license has always been made up of bums who are just too lazy or too stupid to upgrade. With the advent of the no-code license things have gone from bad to worse.

At least the freebanders have an excitement about radio, they are constantly improving their stations and learning as much as they can.

No-coders are simply cell-phone user wanna-bees. They wish they could afford a cellular phone.

So, it's time for those who critisize the freebanders to get their heads out of their asses and do what they can to rid the amateur radio service of technician class operators. No-coders first, those with code second.

keyclownslappa@hotmail.com (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote in message news:<ce9e428e.0112022222.1854c2f4@posting.google.com>...
> From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
> Subject: Respect For Freebanders
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
> Date: 2001-04-06 00:22:05 PST
>
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.
> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions.
> We use Yeasus, Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know technical
> issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is

> a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him before
> you condemn him.
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
> Unit 2711, Florida

3458. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 17:53:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnwh4l0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 26405

[No readable article body recovered]

3459. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 18:23:08 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112061023.50d61cc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26406

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C0EF426.7EB131F5@sccoast.net>...
> Sean G Gilley wrote:
> > But I
> > really believe that if two employees being
> > involved in a civil lawsuit was commonplace,
> > I would've heard about it. (snip)
>
>
> Yea, like several thousand you did not hear about. According to an
> Stars & Stripes article I read a few years ago, there have been over
> 200 sexual harassment lawsuits brought against the military alone. And
> I'd speculate there has been several thousand brought against
> companies over the last few decades. And you've never heard of these
> lawsuits? Where have you been, Sean?

I meant within the companies that I worked for.

However, by far, the majority of those cases have nothing to do with
casual contact between peers -- or even casual contact between
employer and employee. The majority of the cases brought for sexual
harassment have to do with an employer or manager harassing an
employee in some manner. That manner may include being asked out to
lunch or something like that, but that sort of activity is rarely
the base of the lawsuit.

If there was a female empoyee at my company that I saw often or worked
with often, I wouldn't be worried about hasassment for asking her to
lunch with me any more than I'd worry about the same if I asked a
male employee to go to lunch.

That's what I thought we were discussing -- casual lunches and other casual
contacts between a male and female.

Sean.

3460. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 18:34:41 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112061034.cde2ef2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26407

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C0EE68E.A98D081@sccoast.net>...
> Deterrence is only one aspect of the death penalty - it also serves
> as just punishment for a serious crime [...]

Out of curiosity, could you explain why killing someone is a just punishment
for a crime?

Sean.

3461. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 18:50:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C0FBDE7.617D1AF@uci.edu>
Source record: 26408

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 15:28:58 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >> Of course, George Washington grew 40,000 marijuana plants at
> >> Mt. Vernon, and provided detailed instructions as to the preparation
> >> of marijuana wine (his favorite--and viewed by a substantial number of
> >> conservative historians as being the first wine served at a state
> >> dinner by a sitting President).......
> > >
> > >Yuck. Prolly tasted like bong water. :-)
> >
> > If it's made right, it's pretty good, actually. I've tried it
> > in the past (don't ask how FAR in the past--I'd rather not think about
> > that :-).
> >
> > Rick

Hey, Rick.

I've heard of trying to squeeze water from a stone. I'd have to think
that squeezing juice from a rope would have to be a pretty close second
to that. But I guess where there's a will there's a way.

;-)

73 de ac6xg

> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3462. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 18:53:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F4096A0B6D435DBA.C34FB1B26A756925.A2B9BA49F174A979@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26409

On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Which proves Cecil's point - HE may not get back what he put in, plus interest.

True--but if Social Security did not exist, he would have paid
that difference, probably plus some, into additional taxes to support
welfare for those who _didn't_ have sufficient investments for their
old age, or who were surviving children and spouses.

You cite the fact the your investments would have been
government insured--but that misses Cecil's entire point that NOTHING
should be paid for by the government other than certain essential
services. Your investments are insured by other people's tax dollars,
and were it not for those there would be absolutely no guarantee that
any investment, fund, bank or other financial institution would not
simply go broke and leave you destitute.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3463. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 18:55:47 UTC
From: kb9rvb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <77f1797e.0112061055.5f676b89@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26410
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0112052300.167ddbcd@posting.google.com>...

> Dave Hall <nojunkmail_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:<3C0D2B31.3CA6@worldlynx.net>...
> > CW is kept alive mostly by nostalgic old timers that are still living
> > out their childhood fantasies,
> >

> No, we're just exercising the skills we worked to develop in our
> childhoods.
> w3rv

And some of us are picking it up in old age (but a rookie in ham-dom)
because it is a mode that allows us to use lower power (remember the
admonition to use only what is necessary) and do some technical
experiments that give us a better understanding of the technology we
are using when we do UHF, VHF and HF phone.

73 KB9RVB
Carl

3464. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 19:19:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112061119.6c08fb5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26411

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C0F93B2.D8EAA515@IEEE.org>...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Thus the private sector would
> > inevitably be able to underprice the government and take over
> > essentially all transactions with the result that no money would be
> > collected by the courts to pay for criminal court costs.
>
> That doesn't compute. How could the private sector take over
> enforcing legal contracts? Hire the Mafia?

Simply make them an offer they couldn't refuse.
>
> > It may be your responsibility, but what if you don't meet that
> > responsibility?
>
> Same thing that happens when I don't meet my other responsibilities.
> I am held responsible for it. Why should half the population be
> responsible for themselves and ALSO responsible for the other half?

Precisely. I have no problem with my tax money being spent of social
programs IF those programs link responible behavior to benefits.
>
> > No one is trying to "Protect people from themselves."
>
> Give us a break, Rick. Social Security is exactly an attempt to
> protect people from themselves. Social Security provides the
> majority of people an incentive not to provide for their retirement.

Actually, there's nothing wrong with trying to protect people from
themselves IF that is done by teaching people responsible behavior. If
SS teaches people not to be responsible, then it is doing exactly the
opposite.

> > What on earth do drugs and booze have to do with the logical
> > decision to purchase a car for transportation (which is used to get to
> > work, after all) rather than investing for retirement?
>
> I bought a car for my adopted daughter's father. He sold it and
> bought drugs and booze.

Be sure to include tobacco under the heading of drugs.
>
> > But what about the majority of the people who would NOT have
> > invested successfully?
>
> That's their responsibility, Rick, not yours or mine. Let the buyer

> beware.

Who says the majority of people would not invest successfully? Suppose
Cecil had invested just half of his SS money into US Savings Bonds
from day one - what would they be worth today?

> Once,
> during a high school debate, a member of our team fell ill and
> I had to argue one side in one debate and the opposite side in
> the other debate. I won both debates. :-)

Cecil is a master debater.
>
> > >The first step would be requiring healthy people on welfare to actually
> > >do some hard work for that income.
> >
> > I agree to an extent--but lacking skills and living in an
> > economically depressed area, who is going to hire them?
>
> Remember the CCC camps? My dad cleaned out Colossal Cave in
> Arizona. Now we can't even require prisoners to work.

Something like CCC is one answer. If people can't find work where they
are, with the skills they have, they should go where the work is.
Cecil, how many times in your life have you moved to follow the work?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3465. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 19:40:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <726E69BAEBB166C4.C4A66C32562317FC.3574AD064A7BF17B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26412

On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>> 1. It would permit successful criminals (who have considerable
>>savings on the outside) to afford a better level of treatment than
>>less successful ones--which rewards success at crime, hardly the
>>optimum situation.
>
>Not if all convicts had to work to earn their keep, and could not use
>significant amounts of outside money to support themselves while in prison.

Two problems with that:

1. It defeats the entire Libertarian Party argument that your
money is yours to do with as you will. Simply because a person is
incarcerated that does NOT abrogate that right.

2. By giving prisoners work beyond that needed to support the
operation of prison itself (a minimal amount) such as cooking, etc.,
you end up giving them jobs that would otherwise be done by honest
wage earners. Thus you "reward" the prisoner with work while
penalizing the honest worker by taking his or her job away.

>> 2. If convicts are required to do productive work to pay their
>>way, that means that jobs for honest citizens will be taken away and
>>given to them.
>
>Nope. It means that fewer tax dollars would need to be spent on convicts' care,
>if done correctly.

You're ignoring the fact that under the system Cecil is
discussing there wouldn't BE any tax dollars to be spent on convict's
care.

>Example: Each convict is given a small plot of ground, some basic hand tools,
>ans seeds, and is REQUIRED to have a garden to grow food - which the convict
>then gets to eat.

Ok.

That only takes a small amount of work. A couple questions,
however:

1. Under a Libertarian system, any land owned by the state
must either be used for government services or sold to the private
sector. Who do you deprive of the land used for the private gardens?
How does the government handle the legitimate (to a Libertarian)
charge that it is depriving a farmer of legitimate income by using the

land for such a purpose?

2. What happens if there is a natural reason (drought,
unseasonable freeze, infestation by a new version of a plant predator,
etc.) that the convict--who sincerely tries but has neither the skills
nor the equipment (sprayers, irrigation systems, etc.) of a
professional farmer--is unable to extract enough food from the plot to
survive? Is he allowed to starve, or are the taxpayers forced to pay
for his food anyway?

3. Assume the opposite; that the convict has a "bumper crop."
What happens to the surplus? According to Libertarian policy, if he
has extra he should be able to sell that extra. But if he is permitted
to do so, how do you justify the competition with honest farmers?

>Allowing convicts to be nonproductive while honest citizens work to feed,
>clothe, and shelter them rewards dishonest behavior and penalizes honest
>behavior. '

No one suggests they be non-productive. Education and
rehabilitation programs, however, offer a much greater opportunity to
prevent recidivism. In addition, because we are NOT discussing the
current prison system, but one under a Libertarian state, it is not
only necessary that the convict pay for his or her own food &
clothing, but that they pay for their own cost of imprisonment as
well. Yet if we agree they have to do that, we must allow them the
opportunity, in fact the obligation, to earn $33,000.00 per year (the
cost of incarceration currently in the US). In order to do that, the
convict MUST come into competition with the private sector, and once
again that isn't fair to the honest worker.

>The convicts have a debt to pay society, not the other way around.

True. But it has to be paid in a way that does not harm the
person or property of anyone in society at the same time. Putting them
in competition with the private sector violates that principle.

>>>Yep, and that's an area where we will have to agree to disagree.
>>>I simply don't believe in rewarding failure and penalizing success.
>>>Over my lifetime, the government has done me more financial harm
>>>than criminals have done to everyone else that I personally know.
>>
>> Sorry, Cecil, but that's way too elitist for me.
>
>It's not elitist at all. It's just a simple fact. Cecil has paid far more in
>taxes than he and those he knows have lost to thieves.

So? What does that have to do with providing social programs
to help the needy instead of just ignoring them? Those taxes didn't go
to pay for welfare (only a very small part of our Federal budget goes
to such programs) for the most part it went to pay for inessential
bureaucracies (did you know we STILL have a "Helium Trust" that costs
us millions of dollars each year--the purpose of which is to buy and

stockpile Helium to fuel blimps which can then fly over enemy lines in a war to spy on troop movements safely, since they would be too high to shoot down--a program implemented during WWI?), the military, and Federal law enforcement, much of which is aimed at those who commit acts which harm no one but themselves (consensual crimes). Why is it whenever people talk about taxes being to high they blame the poor? Is it simply because the poor aren't in a position to defend themselves against the stereotypes and the accusations?

Do you REALLY believe we are justified in turning our backs on the poor and letting them starve or die of illness? Libertarians obviously do.

>However, Cecil does not consider that part of the money he paid in taxes went
>to keep the thieves away from his and others' property. And to educate his kids
>and grandkids, defend our country, etc.

This part isn't clear. Are you saying that Cecil is ignoring the percentage of his taxes that went to those uses instead of for transfer payments? If so, you have to bear in mind that he doesn't want to pay taxes for THOSE purposes either.

According to the Libertarian Party, each of those activities would be privatized, and those who could not afford them would do without. Thus if his kids and grandkids did not have the money for an education, they would not get one at all. If you don't have the money to pay for police services, you are NOT protected from thrives (although you may sue them after they rob you--provided you can afford an attorney to represent you). And the military would be limited to a far smaller size than today, it would be privatized on a fee basis (I've never been clear on what the Librarian party would do if a large number of people elected NOT to pay--and stated they did NOT want to be protected from invasion. How, precisely would they protect SOME citizens from foreign invasion, but not others--and if the require payment from all regardless of their desires they simply replace the word "tax" with "fee" and it acts precisely the same). Of course the military would be much smaller under the Libertarians, since it would NOT be used for anything except national defense--other nations would do totally without our assistance--the Monroe Doctrine extended to the max.

>> What about battered women, widows with small kids, people who
>>are disabled, seniors with no pensions, the mentally ill, those who
>>are learning disabled or retarded, displaced workers, those who are
>>laid off, or unemployed workers in a depressed economy? For that
>>matter what about medical coverage for those who can't afford it? Do
>>we just let children starve or become ill because the parents can't
>>afford to pay for their food and medical expenses--or do we terminate
>>their rights as parents because they are poor and place the kids with
>>strangers?
>
>There should be effective programs for all of the above. But those programs

>must require responsible behavior on the part of those getting the benefits.

Back up a minute, Jim. We're not talking about the current political system here, remember? Under a Libertarian state those programs would exist ONLY if the victims themselves paid for them. Otherwise, it would be entirely up to private charities (who would receive virtually no tax benefits by doing so, btw) to do so, or those people would simply not receive any assistance.

I have no argument with either a revision of our social support systems and welfare system--clearly our current approach is a "throw money--don't try to help people succeed and instill self-respect and self-sufficiency" one that doesn't work. In the same way, I believe (and have a lot of evidence to back my belief) that our criminal justice system needs some serious overhauling. But these arguments assume the current form of government--under the Libertarians the idea of revision of social programs becomes one of elimination alone, and the criminal justice system simply becomes a self-supporting commercial enterprise, as do nearly all activities currently engaged in by the government.

There is SOME justification in that approach--the private sector IS better able to operate with efficiency than the state. But on the other hand, the private sector has no possible reason to think of the best interests of the public, only those of the stockholders.

Here's an interesting example. When I studied Strategic Management for my MBA they presented a very simple question. Given that you are an executive with an industrial firm that exceeds EPA pollution standards do you install the required scrubbers to clean your emissions below the legal limit, or do you fail to do so, continue to pollute the environment, and become subject to fines for your violation?

According to modern practice, before making a decision you need only prorate the cost of the emissions control devices (the scrubbers), compare the annual cost of them to the annual cost of the fines you would pay for NOT implementing them, and, if the fines represent a lower cost (which they often do), continue to pollute. You would install the scrubbers ONLY if it were economically more beneficial to your firm to do so than not to do so.

From a business perspective, that makes sense. The purpose of a corporation is to increase stockholder equity--NOT to serve the needs of the public. But if _everything_ is privatized, nothing at all exists that places the needs of the public first. As poor as our current system is, at least it doesn't reach the excesses that would inevitably result from the implementation of a strictly Libertarian state. Pollution? Not the business of government--regulation stifles free trade. Ham Radio? Don't be ridiculous--that part of the spectrum can be SOLD at a profit, why should it be protected for hobbyists and experimenters? If people want to experiment they can work for a

commercial firm or "rent" airspace from one instead. Help for the poor? You can't be serious. If they aren't capable of self-support, let them die off and "better genes" take their place. Education? If you can't afford it, you'll just have to do without it. Museums and cultural centers? If people want them, and are willing to pay for them, the private sector will provide them at a price. If not, who cares about art or culture? National Parks? Sell them to the private sector to use as they wish--they can keep them pristine and charge admission (probable for parks such as Yellowstone or Glacier National Park), they can log them out (probable for parks such as Yosemite and Sequoia National Forest) or they can divide them into tracts and sell them to people to build on (probable in the case of National Seashores and Angel Island).

Sorry, Jim, but there are a LOT of very offensive concepts there for anyone who cares about people or the environment.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3466. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 19:45:41 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <FVPP7.212272$3d2.9554434@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26413

Jim, N2EY wrote:

> ....For example, most European religions have some sort of winter
> equinox celebration because of the effects lack of daylight causes in many
> people. For peoples with limited understanding of how the seasons and weather
> work, and with limited artificial lighting, the loss of the Sun at the end of
> December could be very disturbing. Equinox celebrations, whatever they are
> called, remind us that the Light will return and spring will comne again.

Yeah, but those were really WINTER SOLSTICE celebrations! <smirk>

Equinox celebrations were when the ancients would set their
clocks ahead one hour, or behind one hour, and then get really
confused for the next couple of weeks trying to remember whether
it was "Spring back, Fall forward", "Spring ahead, Fall back" or
"Move to Arizona".

> .....It
> was natural for the Christians to put Christmas on the first day when the
> daylight gets noticeably longer using simple methods of measurement.

You woulda thought that with omniscience and all that stuff that
Jesus coulda arranged to be born at a time when ice storms wouldn't
bolix-up airline travel plans so much.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3467. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 19:46:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <32E66B00688E1FAC.6E4880AD94FB3AFD.6ACF00FD3AD58309@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26414

On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Work or do something else constructive, like going to school and making the
>grade.

But according to Cecil we shouldn't be paying for school for
those who can't afford it either.

>The problem is that the benefits are not tied to responsible behaviors that
>will lead the dependent person to become independent.

Here I agree. But under the Libertarian Party the
consideration isn't for changing the programs into ones that WILL
work--it's on eliminating them w/o replacement.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3468. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 19:49:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <95C6D651077DCA7A.DE8B9C23D5C0B721.0113E38459B4D118@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26415

On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:08 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Yea, verily. The most important decison most people make, and yet it is made
>with almost no training.

Actually, the decision to marry isn't the critical one.
Marriage is simply a "legalized" version of living together.

The important decision is whether or not to have children.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3469. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 20:10:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <106EDAA36CBDB0CF.FBB270E149FC9B39.475A7CE35203100A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26416

On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:09 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Yup. But ya don't see pentagrams on the Acropolis or in the Pantheon.

You see them in ancient ruins in Northern Europe, in the
Temples of India and Sri Lanka, in parts of Egypt, and in the ruins of
Sumarian lands.

You don't see CRUCIFIXES in those settings, either, so
obviously that justifies viewing the Crucifix as a Satanic symbol,
right?

>The Roman and Greek "nature religions" tried for centuries to eradicate
>Christianity and its source religion, Judaism. Do you know who Antiochus was?

So?

The Christians did a pretty good job of reversing that trend
when it came to the Pagan faiths of Northern Europe--as well as the
Jewish faith in Spain--or did the Inquisition slip past you unnoticed.

>Constantine changed all that.

And a RC Pope restarted the killing.

Perhaps you can see a difference between a Roman killing a
person for his or her religion and a Christian doing the same.
Personally, I can't.

Speaking of killing people for their religion, here's a
completely accurate description of an historically important person.
See if you can identify him:

"<he> was both a passionate anti-Semite and a ferocious
believer in absolute obedience to political authority. He wanted (his
nation is named here) rid of the Jews and he advised that the be
deprived of "All their cash and jewels and silver and gold" and
furthermore, "that their synagogues or schools be set on fire, that
their houses be broken up and destroyed . . . and they be put under a
roof or stable, like the gypsies . . . in misery and captivity as they
incessantly lament and complain to God about us"--advice that was
later followed literally."

He also referred to the peasants who opposed the government as
"mad dogs," and employed a "coarseness and brutality of language
unequaled in <nation> history."

Let's see how good your knowledge of history is. Who is the
person I refer to above?

>Most religions have feast days because people need them, spiritually and
>psychologically. For example, most European religions have some sort of winter
>equinox celebration because of the effects lack of daylight causes in many
>people. For peoples with limited understanding of how the seasons and weather
>work, and with limited artificial lighting, the loss of the Sun at the end of
>December could be very disturbing. Equinox celebrations, whatever they are
>called, remind us that the Light will return and spring will comne again. It
>was natural for the Christians to put Christmas on the first day when the
>daylight gets noticeably longer using simple methods of measurement.

Which "conveniently" fell directly on a Pagan festival day, of
course, as did other Christian holy days.

>> The pentagram, for your information, was a religious symbol in
>>Egypt, Macedonia, Sumeria, Greece, Rome, China, India, and among the
>>Norse peoples--NONE of which groups "stole" it from Christianity.
>
>The Egyptians, Greeks and Romans hid it pretty well.

Not particularly, if you examine the writings of the time (in
Rome and Greece at least). It appears there with regularity. That it
isn't used often in buildings is irrelevant--how many Christian
churches do you see with a prominent image of a fish--the ORIGNIAL
symbol of Christianity?

>Who used the cross as a religious symbol before Christians?

The Mesopotamians, the Sumarian, and many other cultures. It
is the extended cross (the cross with a longer leg at the bottom) that
is uniquely Christian--just as the inverted Pentagram with the head of
a goat filling it's outline is, unlike the standard pentagram, a
symbol of Satanism or the Satanic Church.

The Swastika, for example, is a form of the cross that
predates Christianity, as are many other forms readily found in other
religions (including several Eastern religions, of course).

> It derives from a Roman method of execution, not another religion.

No, the CRUCIFIX derives from the Roman method of execution,
not the cross which predates considerably.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3470. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 20:11:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <428F28AB3315099B.7796FEA08D6E5593.8DB018FBD6E9BAD3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26417

On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Ya missed the joke, Rick. Didn't watch SNL, huh?

Not since the original version. I was more of a "Friday's"
person myself.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3471. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 20:44:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A40CCDA44AD350FE.7B9BEFE3F243D58C.0DFB18090AD4DAB1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26418

On 06 Dec 2001 12:20:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>The present SS+IRS system is regressive for many people, because once a certain
>level of income is reached they max out the SS contributions.

Here, at least, we agree!

>> It may be your responsibility, but what if you don't meet that
>>responsibility? Is it reasonable that the state ignore the needs of
>>children because their fathers and mothers didn't demonstrate sound
>>financial planning?

>Is it reasonable that the state take over the responsibilities of parents,
>thereby penalizing those who are responsible?

If those parents are not capable for providing for the needs
of their children it HAS to be the responsibility of the state to do
so. The alternative is to perpetuate precisely the kind of poverty
that is affecting them in the first place. No child should be punished
for the mistakes or failings of his or her parents--but the
Libertarian approach would do precisely that.

>> Consider, also, the age I listed. Assuming the _average_
>>couple marry soon after graduation from college (and even the
>>Libertarian party can't possibly expect people to wait until they are
>>financially solvent to marry and start raising a family--that is
>>simply unrealistic and, in many ways, undesirable).
>
>WHOA!!! WHY is it unrealisitc and undesirable? I know MANY couples who waited
>and worked until they were reasonably situated financially before taking on
>more responsibilities.

Unrealistic because it defies the social conventions of our
society. Unless our society agrees that marriage is NOT a socially
desirable prerequisite to sex and living together, it must either
encourage marriage as a young adult or expect people to violate social
convention anyway--a self-defeating concept.

Undesirable because women who are over thirty at their first
birth have increased likelihood of problem pregnancies and the
children have increased likelihood of birth defects or retardation
(those odd increase as a woman ages). In addition, the younger parent
is better able to relate to the needs of the child, and is far more
likely to survive long enough him/her self to insure the child has
adequate care and education to reach a successful adulthood.

It depends on how you define "reasonably situated
financially." Do you mean that the person was well established in a
career path, or that the person had sufficient investments to support
his/her family if he/she were to die suddenly? Does it assume that if
the person's career is halted by disability or a change in our
national economy (i.e., the high tech jobs that disappeared in the
Seattle area following the down scaling of SDI and Boeing's problems)
he or she can still support him or her-self and their family on
investment income? Your definition of "reasonably situated" may be
very different from that of someone else. If you mean that the person
has reason to believe that unless something occurs that is
unforeseeable at that time (early death, disability, etc.) his or her
career is secure enough to raise a family, I may agree that this is
the right time to start a family. But more than that is absurd to
expect of people.

>WHY?? Many people today are not ready to have any children by the time they are
>30.

Nonsense.

Most people today DO have children by that age. Thus, by
definition, they are "ready" to do so.

>>Are you seriously suggesting that the average couple
>>could reasonably be expected to have made adequate arrangements for
>>the care of the children and assistance for the surviving partner if
>>they die at this age? Cecil, that just isn't realistic!
>
>Sure it is. Many people do just that. It's what life insurance, mortgage
>insurance and relatives/friends are for.

Leave relatives/friends out of it--to base any sort of program
on the obligation others may feel to assist a family member or friend,
simply imposes an unfair obligation on that person.

As far as insurance goes--if you agree that a person has an
obligation to pay for that, why is it any different than paying taxes
to fund a reserve that will provide help for ANYONE in that spot
instead? Is it the fault of the child that the insurance doesn't
exist?

>Anyone who has dependent kids should have a will. And in the will the guardians
>of the children should be spelled out in advance (with their consent, of
>course) so that if both parents die or are incapacitated the children will be
>cared for by people who the parents trusted.

That, of course, has nothing to do with the Libertarian
perspective on social support programs, the subject of the sub-thread.

>Term life insurance for healthy people of the age you specify is not expensive,
>either.

But it IS a matter of choice. Expensive is relative. It's not
expensive to buy $100,000 in term life if you make an average income.
What if you are struggling to get by on minimum wage? Or if you have a
family history of heart disease? Or any of a dozen other reasons that
insurance costs could cut into badly needed money for food, shelter,
education, etc.? Are you arguing that the minimum wage worker has no
right to have children because he can't support them if he dies or is
disabled? That would be a pretty classist position to take for anyone
(of course, it IS the Libertarian Party position, but . . .).

>All Cecil is proposing is that people take some responsibility.

No, he's proposing that all social support programs be
eliminated if they operate at the taxpayer's expense. Ask him.

>>>Not my problem. I do not desire to protect people from themselves and
>>>I would appreciate that same consideration for myself.
>>
>> No one is trying to "Protect people from themselves."
>
>Sure they are. SS protects people from using the money to make poor investment
>choices. That's why it started in the first place.

It also protects people who don't have the time to build up an
investment portfolio, people who don't have enough income to invest,
and the spouses and children of people who don't have adequate
investments to support them if they die.

>>On the
>>other hand if everyone, or even most everyone, were to invest using a
>>sound plan of investment, it would flood the money market to the
>>extent that interest rates of 2-4% would become the norm (supply and
>>demand fix equilibrium point in a free market--including an
>>equilibrium point for investment funds)--a profit totally incapable of
>>providing for the future for anyone, sound investor or not.
>
>Incorrect. It all depends on things like the rate of inflation and how long the
>investing goes on.

I repeat. If EVERYONE invested soundly the interest rate would
drop to very little. It's a simple case of supply and demand. IF there
is an abundant supply of investment capital there will only be a
limited demand for it and the Equilibrium Point (in terms of interest)
will be quite low. The less investors in a given market, the higher
the end price (in terms of interest) will be for the investment
dollar.

>Consider the couple who begin investing in their mid-20s and retire in their
>late '60s (longer life expectancy necessitates later retirement - no way around
>that). If their investments outpace inflation, are not subject to tax until
>used, and they keep to a plan, they can put away quite a pile.

But with unlimited investment funds, how COULD their
investments outpace inflation? Given the nature of monetary theory the

greater the available investment pool, the quicker inflation will
increase. The Fed raises the prime rate to slow inflation and lowers
it to reduce unemployment. But w/o the Fed (which Libertarians would
do away with immediately--ask Cecil) the only regulation on interest
rates would be a free market--and if everyone invested the enormous
availability of liquid assets would drop that rate through the floor,
just as would occur if the Fed withdrew from the equation and allowed
increasing amounts of currency to be printed.

>>The ONLY
>>people who would be expected to profit significantly from investments
>>in such circumstances would be those who made high risk
>>investments--precisely the kind of investment that would be highly
>>unwise for someone who was trying to save for the future.
>
>Run the numbers, Rick.

Do so yourself. The figures the Fed uses are good enough for
me.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3472. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 21:09:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C0FDD4E.50FE0494@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26419

Phil Kane wrote:

" ". "
", he added.

Well, Phil,

" ". That's my final word on the
subject.

Dave K8MN

3473. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 21:12:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C0FDF55.800CA2A6@uci.edu>
Source record: 26420

N2EY wrote:
> I don't worry about any callsign except my own.

I think that's true of most people in the ARS.

> But I do think that
> Kim made an inappropriate choice. One which does harm to the ARS. Not
> much harm, but a little.

How does this harm to the ARS manifest itself? Do the callsigns with
CUM in the suffix likewise harm the ARS?

3474. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 21:37:44 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F2D1B.6D9DEC41@mailcity.net>
Source record: 26421
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

KC8JBO wrote:

>
> So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere with
> another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97, doesn't it?
> BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.

You're certainly one to talk woger after Riley spanked you for
jamming.

3475. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 21:45:56 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6210B109116CBE0E.AD9522936A897E8D.F5D91670C61A98A9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26422

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 09:50:10 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>That doesn't compute. How could the private sector take over
>enforcing legal contracts? Hire the Mafia?

Easy.

When the suit is filed, a person would have a choice to have
the trial conducted by the government at fee "X" or by the private
sector at fee "Y" either of which would be binding. It doesn't differ
at all from the current arbitration system, except it would include a
complete trial instead of just the services of an arbitrator.

>> Why are progressive taxes any more offensive that regressive ones?
>
>Because they are overpriced.

So are regressive ones.

>> You needed a better accountant!
>
>Yeah, like the guy in CA who kept his stock instead of turning it
>into cash? Now he owes the government 6 million dollars on one
>million dollars worth of stock.

No, more like the many people who shelter their funds. My
father-in-law is a millionaire and, before he retired some years ago,
complained about paying taxes that were less than my own at the time
(and I was NOT a millionaire).

>> I have friends who are multi-millionaires and pay
>> significantly less taxes than that.
>
>See above.

Same here.

>> It may be your responsibility, but what if you don't meet that
>> responsibility?
>
>Same thing that happens when I don't meet my other responsibilities.
>I am held responsible for it. Why should half the population be
>responsible for themselves and ALSO responsible for the other half?

Because the alternative is to admit we are NOT civilized and
allow our poor (including children) to starve.

Of course, they wouldn't actually starve. Once a government
came into existence that no longer concerned itself with their
poverty, you would without any question see a second revolution in
this nation--one that would be VERY communist in nature. But, if I
lived in a nation that had no more care for its poor than that, I'd
begin to agree with communist principles myself.

>> No one is trying to "Protect people from themselves."
>
>Give us a break, Rick. Social Security is exactly an attempt to
>protect people from themselves. Social Security provides the
>majority of people an incentive not to provide for their retirement.

Cecil, most people CAN'T provide for their retirement. Stop
looking at things from a personal perspective only and look at
reality. The reality is NOT that people are all Upper Middle Class
wage earners, well educated, and knowledgeable about investments. The
reality is that most people have far less education (in many cases
because it is all they can afford), earn wages that are marginally
adequate to cover their cost of living with very little left over to
invest, and don't know anything about investing anyway (and would thus
be more likely to lose their money in investments than to gain from
them).

>> Cecil, try to post w/o the false stereotypes of welfare
>> recepients--you're beginning to sound like Dick Carroll speaking about
>> Muslims!
>
>I know a few of those walking, talking stereotypes, Rick. I've been
>taken to the cleaners by them.

There are a few losers in any group, Cecil. There are, as we
all know far too well, Muslims who believe in (and practice) terrorism
as well. But just as it isn't reasonable to blame all Muslims for the
acts of a very minute percentage of their number, the same holds true
of the poor.

One of the greatest problems we have with addressing poverty
in this country is one of perception. We perceive the poor to be
represented by the people we see living on the streets or going to
homeless missions and by the media stereotypes we are presented.
Certainly there are poor like that--there are Muslims like bin Laden
as well. But the vast majority of the poor are "invisible." They don't
live on the streets, or in the shelters. They aren't alcoholics or
drug abusers. They don't abuse their kids, or have one after another
to "stay on welfare." And they don't LOOK like "welfare bums." They
are simply people who don't have enough income to support themselves
and their families without help from the rest of us. People who are
working at minimum wage (because it's all they CAN do--and if you feel
they don't belong in our society, ask yourself who will do those jobs
if they AREN'T here to do them) and can't afford to house and feed
their families without help in the form of food stamps or government
benefits. People who can't afford the very high cost of medical care

(even preventative medicine--which is OBVIOUSLY the best medical investment to make) without the help of the government. Those, not the small minority who meet the stereotypes, are the poor we need to consider in this nation--and the Libertarian Party would fail them as completely as it would the ones who meet the stereotypes.

>> What on earth do drugs and booze have to do with the logical
>> decision to purchase a car for transportation (which is used to get to
>> work, after all) rather than investing for retirement?
>
>I bought a car for my adopted daughter's father. He sold it and
>bought drugs and booze.

So?

Does that personal experience mean that all--or most--people who are poor would act that way?

Cecil, you take one isolated case with which you have personal experience and assume that represents the norm. It doesn't. Of course there are people like that--but for every one who IS that type there are hundreds who are honest and want only a chance to succeed.

A major research organization (I _think_ it was the Rand Corporation, but I'm not certain) conducted research on the extent to which various government programs were being defrauded by clients. They ignored such minor "frauds" as "failure to report a $10 Christmas gift" or "failure to report earnings less than $25.00/mo from such occupations as baby sitting, lawn mowing, etc." In short, they ignored offenses that were so petty as to be irrelevant in the context of the study. Two groups were singled out for in depth study. Those who receive disability benefits from the government and those who receive ADC benefits.

The disabled group demonstrated four TIMES the amount of fraud as the ADC group did.

If you were to base your stereotypes on that kind of study, you would be forced to conclude that it is the disabled who are dishonest and an unfair drain on our government, not the poor. If that doesn't fit with your current stereotypes of the disabled, then perhaps the poor don't really fit with your stereotypes of them, either.

>> But what about the majority of the people who would NOT have
>> invested successfully?
>
>That's their responsibility, Rick, not yours or mine. Let the buyer
>beware.

And his children starve.

>Do your principles include forcing me to support someone else's
>children as well as my own? Know how the cowbird operates? She
>lays her eggs in the nest of other birds. The young cowbird kicks
>the legitimate eggs out of the nest.

True. And if you limit your social interactions to those of a cowbird, by any stretch of the imagination it is unreasonable for you to provide for the disabled, the infirm, or the military dependent either. Far better to focus ONLY on what you personally want and let everyone else starve if they can't afford food.

Of course, that means that--like the cowbird--you accept the fact that YOU are legitimate prey for others. Thus is someone comes along and takes what is yours, you really don't have any grounds to complain. Why should MY dollars support YOUR protection from crime? If _I'M_ not being robbed, why on earth should I even consider spending money to prevent that from happening to you?

Obviously, your kids have been provided for. But are you willing to HONESTLY state here that, if you had NOT done so, you would be willing to live up to your Libertarian principles by allowing your children to starve or do without the necessities of life--and agreeing that no one had any reason to help them since you failed to do so?

>> And your children with you?
>
>If the children are worth saving, then charities/churches will
>come to the rescue. I have done more than my share of charitable
>work.

Let's take that apart.

Charities. How many non-religious charities can you name that would even EXIST if no tax advantages existed for people to donate to them? Don't claim people have a social conscious--you are arguing that YOU have no obligation to help others economically (you begrudge the use of your money for that purpose by the state), why would anyone else feel differently? In a Libertarian state the entire emphasis would be on personal responsibility--if people can't survive on their own, others won't feel at all obligated to help them at all. Look at your own stereotypes of the poor--are THOSE people you would help?

Churches. Even if the churches didn't use such a position to recruit ("if you want us to feed you, you MUST attend our services and learn about God," a view ALREADY demonstrated by the current food kitchens for the poor), do you seriously believe that the money would be there to do more than help their own parishioners if the state stopped assisting the poor?

In NEITHER case would enough money be available to provide for those needs. Of course, after enough people ended up homeless and enough children died from nutrition or environment related conditions, the poor would undoubtedly organize (they do now to some extent) and the results would be a LOT more violence and destruction than you

would enjoy seeing in our society. People will only put up with so much disparity between their goals and their reality. If they see a classist society in which they are NOT permitted to participate by reason of poverty, they WILL stage a revolution to get what they lack--that's been demonstrated over and over in other nations, and would be rather quickly demonstrated here as well. All those guns accumulated by the gangs and drug dealers (as well as by many others) would come out and the result would be complete anarchy until order was restored--probably under a Communist government.

>> More to the point, from a political perspective, do you
>> seriously believe that a party with that kind of attitude could
>> conceivably win a large percentage of the vote?
>
>Yep, when the American people come to their senses and object to
>being forced to support a welfare system that breeds herds of
>non-producers.

Perhaps it is the Libertarians who need to "come to their senses" Cecil. The rest of us feel that caring for our needy is a pretty important task of government. We may feel that it isn't being done right, and that far more productive ways to address poverty than "throwing money at it" are called for--but most of us recognize that SOME forms of social support are essential.

Unlike you, most people don't view the welfare system as a way to breed "herds of non-producers." Most of us don't view the poor as being parts of a "herd," we generally reserve that image for cattle or sheep.

>> Cecil, I'm losing a lot of respect for you.
>
>Most people do until they realize that I am leading them down the
>primrose path. And I'll take either side of the argument. Once,
>during a high school debate, a member of our team fell ill and
>I had to argue one side in one debate and the opposite side in
>the other debate. I won both debates. :-)

Nothing wrong with that--except that what you are arguing IS the Libertarian Party position--and you have consistently claimed to be a practicing Libertarian.

I'll be more than glad to switch sides in this debate (which will completely confuse the more "reality challenged" of our readers) if you will. Let's see if you can make MY points better than I do, or if I can make yours in the same manner.

>> No, Cecil, they don't have "basketball genes" that are
>> superior to yours or anyone else's--there is no such thing and you
>> should well be aware of it.

>Of course they do, Rick. It is partially the result of selective
>breeding during the time of slavery.

Gee, if that's the case, since the primary skills needed from
a slave were endurance and physical strength, how is it that the top
competitors in weight lifting, pentathlon, and body building are all
caucasian? If a few generations of "selective breeding" made that
significant a change in black physiology, those, not basketball (which
wasn't really a skill in great demand on plantations) should be the
sports at which they excel.

>> If you had the basic skills necessary, and the height (and
>> blacks, as a group, are no taller than whites) ...
>
>Ever been to Waitusi territory?

They're balanced by the hottentots and pigmys.

>> Cecil,you can refuse what you like--but if there are no jobs
>> available to you, how do you plan to support yourself?
>
>There are always jobs if one is willing to work hard. During the
>depths of the Great Depression, my dad worked 12 hours a day as
>a cook for one dollar a day.

Cecil, during the late fifties and early sixties, as a runaway
on the streets of NYC, I frequently worked for _far_ less than that
(you'd be amazed what people can get away with paying a runaway or a
throwaway who can't earn a living in a legitimate employment setting
because he can't get a work permit w/o being picked up for running
away or truancy). Does that mean that I should have been able to
support myself on the income? I was barely able to buy something to
eat (cheap--you CAN make macaroni & cheese in a coffee can over an oil
barrel fire if you have to--and can stretch one box enough that it
will provide two days of food), let alone pay for shelter (did you
know that people are KILLED for refrigerator and washing machine boxes
in parts of NYC--those can be HOMES for runaways and street people).
During the time you speak of your father working for one dollar a day,
the pay for a private in the US Army was $21.00/month. He made more
than a corporal!

>> You have always had the ability to get a job. Not all inner
>> city minorities have that kind of opportunity--nor, for that matter,
>> do the even greater number of poor (mostly white, btw) in rural
>> American or in areas where the economy is depressed.
>
>Anybody who has prepared himself for work can get a job. The men
>who can't get a job have usually chosen to be lazy and uneducated.
>I've met a number of them and they are the way they have chosen
>to be. And it doesn't have anything to do with race. There are
>probably more lazy, uneducated whites than any minority group.

More stereotypes, Cecil. The vast majority of poor people
simply CAN'T find work or support themselves without help. Sure there
are some losers such as those you describe, but they are a minority as
can be proven by ANY legitimate research project you care to name.

>> >The first step would be requiring healthy people on welfare to actually
>> >do some hard work for that income.
>>
>> I agree to an extent--but lacking skills and living in an
>> economically depressed area, who is going to hire them?
>
>Remember the CCC camps? My dad cleaned out Colossal Cave in
>Arizona. Now we can't even require prisoners to work.

Now, also, we would be taking the opportunity to earn a living
away from others if we IMPLEMENTED such programs. Is it fair to cost
one man a job to give it to someone else?

>> Sorry, but nothing on earth could convince me to vote for--or
>> support--a party with a set of values like that.
>
>Good, we don't want you.

Or the majority of the population of the US, given the points
you raise. Which means you don't want to be elected to significant
office either.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3476. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 21:58:16 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9uopk402mqk@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26426
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9unuggfac5@dosa.alt.net...

> So you ARE an anonymous COWARD. Any "stalking" can be dealt with through
law
> enforcement channels, you insufferable dunce.

Give it up, Roger. You can't even write a clever insult, let alone an
intelligent rebuttal.

3477. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:02:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <999455FBF9A8A12C.B8172CE8FCA5096C.08D82B8FEED83204@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26423

On 6 Dec 2001 11:19:50 -0800, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Precisely. I have no problem with my tax money being spent of social
>programs IF those programs link responible behavior to benefits.

Here I agree as well. But in Cecil's case the intent is not to
link programs to responsible behavior, but to simply eliminate them
completely and ignore those who can't make it without help at this
time.

>Actually, there's nothing wrong with trying to protect people from
>themselves IF that is done by teaching people responsible behavior. If
>SS teaches people not to be responsible, then it is doing exactly the
>opposite.

True. But if it provides support for those who need (and
deserve) it shouldn't it exist?

>> I bought a car for my adopted daughter's father. He sold it and
>> bought drugs and booze.
>
>Be sure to include tobacco under the heading of drugs.

Yup!

And tobacco taxes as regressive as well.

>> > But what about the majority of the people who would NOT have
>> > invested successfully?
>>
>> That's their responsibility, Rick, not yours or mine. Let the buyer
>> beware.
>
>Who says the majority of people would not invest successfully? Suppose
>Cecil had invested just half of his SS money into US Savings Bonds
>from day one - what would they be worth today?

If everyone did the same how could the government afford the
interest payments?

A saving bond is nothing more than a loan to the state (as are
T-Bills, of course). The state is expected to repay that loan with
interest. But in the absence of a tax base (remember, Libertarian
party principles--which Cecil is arguing--require the elimination of
all forms of government debt and all taxes) how is that interest to be
paid? In Cecil's government, there would BE no savings bonds or
T-Bills (or any other government bond issue, for that matter) because

the government would have neither the authority to borrow nor the tax
base to repay the loans the bonds represent.

The entire creedo of the Libertarian Party can be summed up in
a few simple statements: All rights are based on property (including
personal rights as your body is your most intimate property). Taxation
of any form is theft of property. All activities related to economics
should be conducted by the private sector unencumbered by government
intrusion or regulation. The buyer is unprotected from anything but
outright fraud (if that) and is responsible for his own loss if he is
convinced to participate in a poor investment by misleading
professionals. People who are capable will rise to the top and the
rest are better off dying off and not propagating their genes.

No thanks. I think I prefer a "kinder and gentler government"
that cares about people a bit more than that.

>> Once,
>> during a high school debate, a member of our team fell ill and
>> I had to argue one side in one debate and the opposite side in
>> the other debate. I won both debates. :-)
>
>Cecil is a master debater.

Use the European method of stating that.

Cecil is Master de Bate.

Or, to angelicize that term: Cecil is Master Bate.

Now, if you correct the grammar in that statement adding a
required article and matching the tenses, . . . ;-)

>> > >The first step would be requiring healthy people on welfare to actually
>> > >do some hard work for that income.
>> >
>> > I agree to an extent--but lacking skills and living in an
>> > economically depressed area, who is going to hire them?
>>
>> Remember the CCC camps? My dad cleaned out Colossal Cave in
>> Arizona. Now we can't even require prisoners to work.
>
>Something like CCC is one answer. If people can't find work where they
>are, with the skills they have, they should go where the work is.
>Cecil, how many times in your life have you moved to follow the work?

How do the poor go about doing so? Simply pack up the family
and start hitchhiking with no place to live (and no money to pay for
one) when they arrive?

I totally support a revision of our welfare policy and the
creation of programs designed to make people self-sufficient (where
ever possible, obviously the retarded, the disabled, and the mentally

ill can't be expected to be self-sufficient in our society). But the simple elimination of all programs (called for by the Libertarian Party) does nothing to lead to that result--it simply takes the position that everyone can "sink or swim" on their own with no help from the state.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3478. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:08:41 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A9F521F4CF7796B2.FD880F8F40D9EFD3.8612A40114B0DEA2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26424

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 09:57:09 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>I hate to admit it, but the Chinese have a good idea. The state will support
>the first two children. Any more than two and you are on your own. That
>would eliminate the women who choose to have kids for the purpose of collecting
>welfare on them.

Wrong.

The state will support your FIRST child. If you want a second
one, the first one must have died or you must have special permission
from the state (needed even if the first child DID die). In the
absence of such permission the law instructs the doctor performing the
delivery to inject the brain of the breeching baby with formaldehyde,
killing it before it is born (under Chinese law, the instant it is
born it has all the rights of a citizen and CAN'T be killed).

Would you really care to implement the Chinese (actually,
Communist Chinese, the Chinese in Taiwan have a very different
perspective, of course) system here?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3479. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:11:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <76BBDFADF4212D1F.5AE1F32CC760AC57.F152D023171D7D95@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26425

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 10:50:15 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>I've heard of trying to squeeze water from a stone. I'd have to think
>that squeezing juice from a rope would have to be a pretty close second
>to that. But I guess where there's a will there's a way.

You don't make it from the part of the plant that rope is
produced from (the stalk), you make it from the flowering tops.

It's no more "odd" than dandelion tea or other herbal teas and
wines. The flavor, btw, is not dissimilar to sake, but with a more
"herbal" tang.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3480. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:18:11 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uosac$4su$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26429
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"JizzRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C0F2D1B.6D9DEC41@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> >
> > So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere with
> > another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97, doesn't
it?
> > BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.
>
> [PKB]

So are you COWARD. Seen* your* letters on the Rain report.

3481. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:29:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0FF153.95117983@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26427

N2EY wrote:
> Cecil, how many times in your life have you moved to follow the work?

Six times, as far as I can recall - two were interstate.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3482. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:32:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0FF1F3.EAA60EFC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26428

Rick Adams wrote:
> But according to Cecil we shouldn't be paying for school for
> those who can't afford it either.

We'd be doing them a favor. The public schools are a disgrace
and a breeding ground for economic collectivism.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3483. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:45:04 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uoshh$5ks$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26430
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9uopk402mqk@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9unuggfac5@dosa.alt.net...
>
> > So you ARE an anonymous COWARD. Any "stalking" can be dealt with through
> > law enforcement channels, you insufferable dunce.
>
> Give [PKB]

Follow your own advice, child molester.

3484. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:46:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0FF54E.C567E4BD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26432

Rick Adams wrote:
> When the suit is filed, a person would have a choice to have
> the trial conducted by the government at fee "X" or by the private
> sector at fee "Y" either of which would be binding.

That's the entire point. The private sector would NOT be binding. How
can the private sector enforce anything? Again, Mafia?

> >That's their responsibility, Rick, not yours or mine. Let the buyer
> >beware.
>
> And his children starve.

If he/she cannot provide for his/her children, take them away and
give them to someone who will provide for them (adoption).

> Nothing wrong with that--except that what you are arguing IS
> the Libertarian Party position--and you have consistently claimed to
> be a practicing Libertarian.

Just because I am a member of the Libertarian party doesn't mean I support
all of their policies.

> Gee, if that's the case, since the primary skills needed from
> a slave were endurance and physical strength, how is it that the top
> competitors in weight lifting, pentathlon, and body building are all
> caucasian?

Because the NBA pays better.

> More stereotypes, Cecil. The vast majority of poor people
> simply CAN'T find work or support themselves without help.

Show me a poor man who had an 'A' average in high school and
who cannot get a job. Most were too lazy in high school to earn
'A's and most are still to lazy to work.

> Is it fair to cost one man a job to give it to someone else?

So you are for paying people to sit on their posteriors so there will
be more jobs for everyone else? I'm beginning to understand.

> Or the majority of the population of the US, given the points
> you raise. Which means you don't want to be elected to significant
> office either.

Yep, like Will Rogers, we would rather be right than be president.
--

cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3485. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:49:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C0FF604.EDDA854C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26433

Rick Adams wrote:
> Would you really care to implement the Chinese (actually,
> Communist Chinese, the Chinese in Taiwan have a very different
> perspective, of course) system here?

I would suggest providing welfare and public education only for
the first two children. I would suggest providing free tubal
ligations and vasectomies after two kids.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3486. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 22:49:45 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <dCSP7.288625$5A3.112334142@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Joe, Welcome to rec.radio.cb at it's finest. He is one of the guys that the posters of that NG looks up to, for what I don't know. He can say whatever he wants to you but don't try to say it back they wil be all over you, there are many hypocrites residing there, you have been warned.

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message news:71E8B5A34BC82906.72D2177CEF862180.E4ABE684AFB9FF66@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 14:15:02 GMT, "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
> wrote:
>
> >Hey Joe,
> >Fuck off and die!
>
> Creative. Did you think that one up yourself, or did your mommy tell
> it to you?
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3487. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:09:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <70658FF5BCD4F6FC.5AA778CDC657C0C6.11056F1018C939F7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26434

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 01:50:03 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> And few, if any, of the wiccan or pagan groups in this country today
>can trace their roots back to those ancient religions in Greece or
>Rome.

Some can--but for the most part that's true.

Your point being?

>Instead, like I said, these are modern day offshoots of satanic
>groups trying to legitimize their existence by claiming to be
>descendants of those ancient religions (when no such link to these
>religions exists).

That's totally absurd.

Simply because they may not be able to trace a direct lineage,
does NOT mean that they don't subscribe to the beliefs of the
religion. What on earth justifies the outrageous claim that they are
"satanic groups" instead of groups that have no link to Christianity
at all?

>And, while doing so, they engage in occult
>practices, witchcraft, and other activities commonly associated with
>satanism, while engaging in little or no activities commonly
>associated with the ancient wiccan or pagan religions.

Those activities are ONLY "associated with satanism" by
Christian churches--not by either the participants or the unbiased
observer.

If you want to base your definition on unsupported
superstitious accusations, go for it--but don't expect educated and
unbiased people to agree with those false claims.

Witchcraft, btw, is the Christian term for Wicca. Now would
you care to explain how it is you simultaneously claim that the
practitioners are not Wiccans but are Witches?

Sort of like claiming someone is not a Christian but IS a
Roman Catholic, isn't it?

>Sorry, Rick, it
>all comes down to an old saying - if is looks like a duck, walks like
>a duck, quacks like a duck, it...

If it looks like a superstitious falsehood, sounds like a superstitious falsehood, distorts the truth like a superstitious falsehood, it . . .

> By the way, you can see for yourself the connection between satanism
>and these groups (pagans and wiccans). Go to any internet search
>engine, enter "satanism," and watch how many wiccan and pagan web
>sites pop up on the list. If these groups have no link to satanism,
>why would so many mention satanism on their web sites?

Go to any internet search engine, enter "homosexual" and watch how many Christian web sites pop up on the list. If Christianity doesn't actively promote homosexuality, why would so many mention it on their web sites?

If you really feel that the presence of a number of sites which include a term demonstrates how valid that term is, then do a search on "sex." You'll be amazed to learn that sex is properly conducted with teenage girls and that all women are sluts who exist solely as receptacles for male organs. I'm sure Kim will be happy to know her "real" role in life, but after all--that's what the WEB says it is!

>> (snip) It is a completely false statement
>> perpetuated by the Christian church in an
>> attempt to hide the actual nature of the
>> religions. (snip)
>
> Well, sorry, my friend. I'm not the "Christian church." I'm a person
>with eyes that can see what is right in front of my face. Again, if is
>looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it...

Apparently, you are a person whose eyes see what that WANT to see instead of reality. Wicca has no connection to Satanism whatever--that would necessitate a tie to Christianity, which most Wiccans would (legitimately, I believe) find abhorrent.
>
>> (snip) The pentagram, for your information,
>> was a religious symbol in Egypt, Macedonia,
>> Sumeria, Greece, Rome, China, India, and
>> among the Norse peoples-- (snip)
>
> This isn't Egypt, Macedonia, Sumeria, Greece, Rome, China, or India,
>Rick. In this country, in modern times, the pentagram and penticle are
>used as satanic symbols.

No, Dwight. They aren't. They are CLAIMED to be satanic symbols, but only by the Christian Churches--and there is absolutely no reason to believe them over the people who USE those symbols.

If I state that the crucifix is a satanic symbol does it make it one? If not why does the claim of one religion have the ability to define the symbols of another that doesn't share it's beliefs?

Try using legitimate academic sources for your information
about the topic, Dwight, not prejudice and Christian propaganda.

>And both groups (wiccan and pagan) selected
>those symbols exactly because of their association to satanism. Once
>again, if is looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it...

And again, if you can't be troubled to take the time to learn
just how false that statement is, you simply don't have the integrity
to discuss a religious concept in the first place. If it lies like a
hypocrite, cites like a hypocrite, demands belief like a hypocrite, it
. . .

>> NONE of which groups "stole" it from
>> Christianity. (snip)
>
> ?? Did anyone say they did? I know I didn't.

You did.

Satanism was INVENTED by the Judeo-Christian religion. NO
religion other than that even believes in the EXISTANCE of a "Satan."
Thus any symbols claimed to belong to Satanism are, by necessity,
Christian in nature.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3488. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:10:24 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F6DFB340F47F80B1.3709B53C2DBB14AD.46FBFA9F22F4417A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26435

On Thu, 6 Dec 2001 08:37:17 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>> The area code for Hell is 734.
>
>...and it freezes over every year!

Yup.

According to the weather reports, it should start doing so
tomorrow.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3489. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:11:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <68673542FE96CBE5.05FE25B1C7AF220E.D830212EAB602323@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26436

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 01:56:50 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Well, to get the connection between the pentagram and satanism out
>of my head, you'd have to tell me to ignore several hundred years of
>history - that symbol has been used by self proclaimed satanists for
>at least that long (possibly longer).

History, Dwight?

Or religious propaganda?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3490. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:13:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <33139E42BBC95B9C.77B83852C75D1D72.581BC62A56AFA5E4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26438

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 02:36:30 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> And your last name rearranged spells "Sadam."

Were you hoping, perhaps, for it to be satan?

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3491. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:13:39 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <DYSP7.288630$5A3.112352903@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26437
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"W6DKN" <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote in message
> Until you can reference an actual case where a licensed ham has had "some
> rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the
> license", this is all just paranoid supposition. Relax...
>
> 73 de W6DKN

I agree totally W6DKN, I am sure there a few cops around the country who get over zealous over some things, but do these people honestly think a LEO wants to lose his job over harrasing a Ham or Cb operator. You have got to be kidding me, most police for starters have Mobile Video Recorders in their cars which records the auido and video from a traffic stop. These same cops are out there risking there lives so you can live a safe life, now there out here picking on radio operators etc. I don't know about the rest of you guys but where i am at the cops have more important things to do and when called upon to invesitgate a CB/rfi complaint I am sure they will do what they are trained to do. Before all this can happen towns/States must enacted ordinances etc for the cops to enforce along with these ordinances comes a set of guidelines a SOP(Standard Operating Procedure) must be followed, they will be trained in what to look for, if needed or they may call an expert in to help. You guys are acting like they will send these cops out tearing cars apart without any training in what to look for. Many Leo's are Hams what are you gonna lie to them about? Before a cop uses a gun he is trained with it, before he uses a radar he is trained in its use and the principles of operation, before he goes after gang members he is familiar with there "colors" tatoos, etc. Why will this be any different?
I can see the headlines now.

Rouge Cop Suspended with out pay for false arrest of a suspected "freebander" who had a rci 2950 hidden under his seat along with a Palomar 250. After an investigation was held the cop has been suspended indefinitely since the radio did not have a mike and the operator said he was only listening officer and wasn't able to transmit. But a further review of the suspects vehicle and a power mike turned up in the glove compartment. This is still under investigation, they are going to have an expert come in and check the radio with a Spectro- Goinometer this device will tell when the radio was last keyed and on what frequency.... Stay tuned for details...

3492. Re: TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:25:00 UTC
From: T <tcalof@escape.ca>
Message-ID: <tcalof-5C2DB6.17250006122001@enews.mts.net>
Source record: 26439
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <8f86ecaf.0112052315.3e80bf7f@posting.google.com>,
twithedsmaster@yahoo.com (Twithed's Master) wrote:

> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
> TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT

Your point?

3493. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:25:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <FC5470D7967145B1.B7911DC0B9595537.7623D44C875A6822@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26440

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 04:15:38 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Actually, most states still have them, but they're often not based
>on age anymore (the appearance of age discrimination). Instead,
>they're based on driving competency. Sadly, because these laws are
>dependant on the police officer detecting the problem driver, instead
>of some type of test, they often don't work until it is too late (an
>accident). And the result is exactly the example you gave.

I had precisely that kind of experience yesterday.

My wife and I were driving in Jackson, MI, and came to a stop
at a traffic circle. The circle is CLEARLY posted as being one-way (to
the right as you approach it), and I was in the left lane intending to
enter the circle in it's inner lane (the one that continues around the
circle--the outer one exits at the next road). On my right was a
Cadillac driven by a very elderly woman--who calmly turned left
directly in front of my car and proceeded around the traffic circle in
the wrong direction honking at the cars that were coming toward her!

THAT person doesn't belong behind the wheel of a motor
vehicle.

I feel sorry for those who, through age or infirmity, have
lost the skills or physical capabilities (vision, etc.) necessary to
drive a motor vehicle. But feeling sorry for them does NOT mean
permitting them to keep driving and endangering others--it means
trying to encourage the creation--and use--of better public
transportation facilities so that such individuals CAN remain
independent yet still not endanger the lives of others.

>> (snip) They were carrying guns and in most cases
>> their fathers were card-carrying NRA members.
>> Let's save the kids in the schools--we'll
>> declare the NRA a terrorist organization and
>> put all the members in prison for supporting
>> terrorism in the United States (snip)
>
>
> The NRA is a political lobbying group, not a group involved in
>terrorism. You would have a hard time proving such a charge in court
>and I certainly would not want to attempt the arrest of the ten
>million or so NRA members based solely on their membership in that
>organization. Somehow, I think you would end up with one heck of a
>fight on your hands (especially if a few million more gun owners join them).

Under the current law, there is no NEED to prove such organizations to be terrorist organizations. All the President needs to do is state that they are terrorist organizations and it immediately becomes a Federal crime to support that organization in any manner. Theoretically, Wimpus could declare the Democratic party a terrorist organization just before the 2004 general election, and they could not be elected to office (not so far fetched--Hitler did precisely the same thing under similar laws in Germany in 1933-34 with their leading parties). Of course he could face later impeachment (assuming the all-Republican congress was interested in impeaching him, of course), but he could do so legally and use the US armed forces and the DoJ to enforce his ruling.

What's scary is that's not something we can feel confident THIS President wouldn't do.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3494. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:26:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2B2EFCC19BD2211B.0B215F1AE6C8C007.A882E0AE8A8F553C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26441

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 04:24:57 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> My own religion? I didn't know I even had a religion. Care to elaborate?

Are you stating that you are not, and do not identify as, a
Christian?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3495. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:26:23 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C0FFEBC.FB60F89D@gte.net>
Source record: 26442
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > Until you can reference an actual case where a licensed ham has had "some
> > rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the
> > license", this is all just paranoid supposition. Relax...
> >
> > 73 de W6DKN
>
> I agree totally W6DKN, I am sure there a few cops around the country who get
> over zealous over some things, but do these people honestly think a LEO
> wants to lose his job over harrasing a Ham or Cb operator. You have got to
> be kidding me, most police for starters have Mobile Video Recorders in their
> cars which records the auido and video from a traffic stop. These same cops
> are out there risking there lives so you can live a safe life, now there out
> here picking on radio operators etc. I don't know about the rest of you guys
> but where i am at the cops have more important things to do and when called
> upon to invesitgate a CB/rfi complaint I am sure they will do what they are
> trained to do. Before all this can happen towns/States must enacted
> ordinances etc for the cops to enforce along with these ordinances comes a
> set of guidelines a SOP(Standard Operating Procedure) must be followed,
> they will be trained in what to look for, if needed or they may call an
> expert in to help. You guys are acting like they will send these cops out
> tearing cars apart without any training in what to look for. Many Leo's are
> Hams what are you gonna lie to them about? Before a cop uses a gun he is
> trained with it, before he uses a radar he is trained in its use and the
> principles of operation, before he goes after gang members he is familiar
> with there "colors" tatoos, etc. Why will this be any different?
> I can see the headlines now.
>
> Rouge Cop Suspended with out pay for false arrest of a suspected
> "freebander" who had a rci 2950 hidden under his seat along with a Palomar
> 250. After an investigation was held the cop has been suspended indefinitely
> since the radio did not have a mike and the operator said he was only
> listening officer and wasn't able to transmit. But a further review of the
> suspects vehicle and a power mike turned up in the glove compartment. This
> is still under investigation, they are going to have an expert come in and
> check the radio with a Spectro- Goinometer this device will tell when the
> radio was last keyed and on what frequency.... Stay tuned for details...

Who says that he would "arrest". What the
normal procedure would be is to take the
equipment, issue a court citation then let
the courts and the attorneys settle it out.

This is often what happens when the cop
is not totally familiar with the law or the

ham does not have his license on him.

What you should not do is argue as you are not going to win. The street is not the place to settle such issues, the courts are. And no cop is going to let you get out of control and argue with him. He will call back up and arrest you for resisting law enforcement (non compliance is a crime). You may get the radio back but you will pay a fine for being a jerk.

3496. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:29:09 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A6B45858D89DF4F4.0C2F51F00E234730.A6900C9F8C233837@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26443

On 06 Dec 2001 06:00:02 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Apparently you have no problem with "the end of civilization as we
>know it." This begs the question: If civilization as we know it does
>end, what kind of civilization would you like to take it's place?

One based on fact, not superstition (read religious dogma &
theology); concern for others not selfishness; dedicated to freedom
not oppression; and based on the concept that the role of the state is
to protect and defend, not to regulate and control consensual
behavior. It would be a civilization in which the poet, the writer,
and the artist (even the less successful ones) were as respected as
the rock star, the politician, or the preacher and on in which
prejudice, self-righteousness, and hypocrisy did not exist.

What kind would YOU like?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3497. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:31:49 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <FdTP7.146537$WW.9373558@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26444

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112061119.6c08fb5@posting.google.com...

>
> Something like CCC is one answer. If people can't find work where they
> are, with the skills they have, they should go where the work is.
> Cecil, how many times in your life have you moved to follow the work?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I know, Jim, we can sign up with the Reconstruction and Reclamation Corps,
the Reeks and Wrecks. And God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater and Kurt Vonnegut
fans everywhere.

3498. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:53:24 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <621D79B42CC29D70.1FF1F29E31F90169.F20D6A65EEB00E70@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26445

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 16:46:38 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>That's the entire point. The private sector would NOT be binding. How
>can the private sector enforce anything? Again, Mafia?

Arbitration is voluntary and private now, Cecil. How can IT be
enforced?

Look at it this way. Assume a lawsuit is to be filed that in
government run courts would cost 10% in fees and in private courts
would cost only 2%. It is your choice where to file the suit. Assume
you file it in private court (to which your opponent agrees--and since
it is just as much to his benefit as yours to save the difference in
the fee, should he lose, he is quite likely to do so). Now assume he
loses. He has two choices:

1. Pay the judgement and the 2% fee.

2. Refuse to pay, be sued in government court for the entire
amount of the judgement (including the 2% fee, the 10% government fee,
and further damages for breach of contract)--a suit effectively proven
by simply submitting the (binding) legal decision of the private court
and proof that it was not paid--and lose even MORE money.

Which do you think most people would choose?

>> And his children starve.
>
>If he/she cannot provide for his/her children, take them away and
>give them to someone who will provide for them (adoption).

Who pays for the cost of taking the children, arguing for a
termination of parental rights in court, and insuring that they are
placed with a suitable adoptive home? More, who pays the price that
will result from teaching children that love is unimportant to the
parent/child relationship, only economics matters?

I don't want to pay the second price there, Cecil, and the
first cost would be as high as it would to help the family stay
together in the first place.

Besides, you seem to feel it's easy to find such adoptive
homes. For healthy white babies maybe, but how about for older
minority children who may have nutrition related health problems to
boot?

Will YOU adopt a few inner city black kids? Will your
neighbor? Where are you going to place all those unwanted kids, in
orphanages as Newt Gingrich suggested--orphanages that cost far MORE
than we would spend to keep the family together and help them get on
their feet? Who pays for all that, Cecil, if you are eliminating
taxes?

>> Nothing wrong with that--except that what you are arguing IS
>> the Libertarian Party position--and you have consistently claimed to
>> be a practicing Libertarian.
>
>Just because I am a member of the Libertarian party doesn't mean I support
>all of their policies.

Ok, then take me up on my offer to switch sides and see if you
can argue the other side convincingly, as you state you can.

I'm willing to "play" and play is all this particular thread
exists for anyway.

>> Gee, if that's the case, since the primary skills needed from
>> a slave were endurance and physical strength, how is it that the top
>> competitors in weight lifting, pentathlon, and body building are all
>> caucasian?
>
>Because the NBA pays better.

But if you aren't genetically equipped for it, as you point
out . . .

>> More stereotypes, Cecil. The vast majority of poor people
>> simply CAN'T find work or support themselves without help.
>
>Show me a poor man who had an 'A' average in high school and
>who cannot get a job. Most were too lazy in high school to earn
>'A's and most are still to lazy to work.

Show me a RICH man who had an 'A' average in high school!

Even with grade inflation, an 'A' is supposed to represent
work that is far superior to that expected of the student. If an 'A'
is considered a norm, then we are setting our standards FAR too low. A
'C' is "average" and a person who at least achieves that average
should be well enough educated to compete in our society--he or she
represents the AVERAGE student (or should, if grading is based on
realistic expectations).

Sure, the person with the 'A' average will get a job most (not
all--there still has to BE a job to "get") of the time. So what? If
that person represents only the top 10% of the students (as he or she
should), then most people aren't going to be able to compete with him
or her. Is THAT the basis you use to determine if people are
worthwhile or not? According to that, my son's 3.88 GPA and my own
undergraduate one of 3.96 are not adequate (a 4.0 GPA is necessary for

an 'A' average--something a LOT easier to earn in graduate studies
than in undergrad or high school work). Sorry, Cecil, but you aren't
being very realistic there.

>> Is it fair to cost one man a job to give it to someone else?
>
>So you are for paying people to sit on their posteriors so there will
>be more jobs for everyone else? I'm beginning to understand.

Nope. I'm for spending money on programs to educate that
person so he WILL have a job, to care for the children of a single
parent so she can attend school or work, and to insure that those in
our society who are incapable for physical or mental reasons of
working are cared for in a civilized and compassionate manner.

People have called Islamics "barbarians" in this news group.
In the Islamic faith it is a crime to refuse food or shelter to a
person who asks for--and needs--it. Somehow, that seems a lot more
"civilized" than they system you call for to me.

>> Or the majority of the population of the US, given the points
>> you raise. Which means you don't want to be elected to significant
>> office either.
>
>Yep, like Will Rogers, we would rather be right than be president.

You'll also notice that Will Rogers ISN'T President (although
in the eighties we had one who thought he was ROY Rogers)--Wimpus is.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3499. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:56:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A2627698E1EEF2E8.993E949F83F53DAA.687ED882ACBEA1EE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26446

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 16:49:40 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>I would suggest providing welfare and public education only for
>the first two children. I would suggest providing free tubal
>ligations and vasectomies after two kids.

And if a third child is born, should we punish the child by
not assisting it? Are the "sins" of the parents to be visited on their
children?

I agree about offering free ligations and vasectomies--and I
wouldn't require two births (or poverty) for someone to receive them.
EVERY person who receives one contributes to a reduction in population
growth. On the other hand, if you're serious about limiting birth
among the poor, you need to ALSO offer free birth control, free
condoms in the schools, and free abortions as well. And those are
things our Religious Right will work very hard to prevent you from
doing.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3500. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-06 23:58:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2D604999866E7D2C.C8B5B7133C274EF9.CF7ACE10F5802E90@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26447

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 16:32:19 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> But according to Cecil we shouldn't be paying for school for
>> those who can't afford it either.
>
>We'd be doing them a favor. The public schools are a disgrace
>and a breeding ground for economic collectivism.

Yup!

But complete (versus functional) illiteracy isn't exactly the
answer either.

How about just improving the schools and eliminating the
aspects of public schooling that don't address legitimate educational
concerns (morality based education, sports beyond those used for
physical health, etc.) instead?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3501. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 00:03:52 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <3C5DF4B0B3B8DEB9.F79906022B8F9781.5A05844DCA2337CD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26448
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 23:13:39 GMT, "middlefiger4@home.comss"
<middlefinger4@home.com> wrote:

>Before a cop uses a gun he is
>trained with it,

I hope they're going to get better training in radio identification
than they get in gun handling; I don't want to have to call the chief
to get my toaster oven back...after the cop accidentally roasts his
hand in it.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3502. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 00:06:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C10081C.F9735325@uci.edu>
Source record: 26449

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 10:50:15 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >I've heard of trying to squeeze water from a stone. I'd have to think
> >that squeezing juice from a rope would have to be a pretty close second
> >to that. But I guess where there's a will there's a way.
>
> You don't make it from the part of the plant that rope is
> produced from (the stalk), you make it from the flowering tops.
>
> It's no more "odd" than dandelion tea or other herbal teas and
> wines. The flavor, btw, is not dissimilar to sake, but with a more
> "herbal" tang.
>
> Rick

Don't you think pot wine is even a little odd?

"Ahhh saay it's a joke, son"

3503. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 00:19:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C100B07.C3E60827@uci.edu>
Source record: 26450

Rick Adams wrote:
> Come to think of it, we didn't--he's President because
> of election fraud in the State where his brother is Governor, isn't
> he?

No. That's simply an underinformed misconception, regurgitated perpetually by liberal malcontents, against mountainous evidence to the contrary, in hopes that repetition will cause reality to invert itself. Shirley you knew that, Rick.

3504. Re: TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOTTRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN I

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 00:46:30 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <GjUP7.12638$MX1.4165098@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 26551
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"T" <tcalof@escape.ca> wrote in message
news:tcalof-5C2DB6.17250006122001@enews.mts.net...
> In article <8f86ecaf.0112052315.3e80bf7f@posting.google.com>,
> twithedsmaster@yahoo.com (Twithed's Master) wrote:
>
> > TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A
> > FAGGOT, TRAIN IS A FAGGOT
>
> Your point?

I think he is hoping to have sex with me.....Not happening! The only other thing i can think of is that with cold weather setting in for the winter he is implying that I am a bundle of wood and he wants me for his fireplace......Still not going to happen!
Train

3505. kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 01:17:10 UTC
From: Lightbulbs <taktango6000@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <qMUP7.34075$WC1.3486408@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26552
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

From the ARRL web:

FCC Focusing on Role of Former Licensee as Contest Op

NEWINGTON, CT, Dec 5, 2001--The FCC is looking into whether a South Carolina amateur broke any rules when he let former licensee Herb Schoenbohm, ex-KV4FZ, operate during a recent contest. Stephen S. Reichlyn, AA4V, rented and operated from Schoenbohm's station in the US Virgin Islands as AA4V/KP2 during the CQ World Wide SSB Contest the weekend of October 27-28.
After the FCC was alerted to the operation, Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth wrote Reichlyn on November 13. He requested further information on the role of the "former licensee" whose location and equipment Reichlyn had used. Although the letter did not mention Schoenbohm by name, Hollingsworth subsequently confirmed to the ARRL that Schoenbohm was, indeed, the "former licensee" in question.
Following a legal odyssey that lasted more than five years and ended at the doorstep of the US Supreme Court, the FCC was successful last year in its efforts to deny Schoenbohm's Amateur Radio license renewal application. The FCC had turned down Schoenbohm's application citing his 1992 felony conviction on federal fraud charges and on character issues. His interim operating authority expired earlier this year.

Hollingsworth's letter was prompted by an e-mail said to have been authored by Reichlyn that outlined Schoenbohm's role. The information in the e-mail--forwarded to the FCC by another amateur--suggested that Reichlyn may have let Schoenbohm operate while Reichlyn was absent or asleep and in violation of FCC rules governing third-party communications.
FCC rules consider an unlicensed individual who communicates via Amateur Radio to be a third party and require that a licensed control operator be present at the control point, "continuously monitoring and supervising the third party's participation." Such a third party also may not exchange messages with stations in countries with which the US does not have a third-party traffic agreement. That list includes the UK and most of Europe.
The FCC also may have to consider how its refusal to renew Schoenbohm's license affects his legal status as a third party. An individual whose license was revoked or suspended or surrendered for cancellation following revocation, suspension or fine--or who is under a cease-and-desist order relating to amateur operation--may not serve as a third party at an Amateur Radio station.

In his November 13 letter, Hollingsworth asked Reichlyn to list specific operating times and operators, to describe his "exact location" during times AA4V/KP2 was on the air and to detail when he was asleep while others operated. Hollingsworth also asked for a copy of the AA4V/KP2 contest log

and for records of any other transmissions made as AA4V/KP2 between October 1 and November 5.

Reichlyn responded November 18 with a five-page explanation and more than 150 log pages of his contest and non-contest operation from the US Virgin Islands this fall. The FCC provided copies of Reichlyn's letter and some of the log pages to the ARRL at the League's request.
Reichlyn confirmed that he had rented Schoenbohm's station for the event and that he and another operator planned to travel to the US Virgin Islands to participate in the contest. When the other operator had to back out at the last minute, Reichlyn opted to attempt a solo operation. During the contest, however, he asked Schoenbohm to fill in briefly on two occasions, Reichlyn said--for about an hour and a half on October 27 and again the next day for about a half hour. He said Schoenbohm "was fully supervised by me as I was resting in the same room" on both occasions.

Reichlyn said Schoenbohm agreed "reluctantly" to spell him when he was not feeling well and on the second occasion while he "ate and rested." He said no one but he and Schoenbohm operated during the event, and that, to his knowledge, Schoenbohm never used the station without his supervision and oversight.

Reichlyn said he "certainly would not have asked him [Schoenbohm] to help me" if he had any reason to believe it might violate FCC rules. He also pointed out that Schoenbohm would not be likely to risk any violations himself since he had taken an Amateur Radio exam since losing his license and was "awaiting a favorable ruling on his license application" from the FCC. Schoenbohm vowed last year to return to Amateur Radio. Hollingsworth confirmed that Schoenbohm's license application is pending within the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.
"It is now obvious to me that perhaps my choice of using Mr. Schoenbohm as a relief operator was poor but nonetheless, I would not have knowingly jeopardized my license to achieve a higher score in a radio contest or for any other reason."
Reichlyn, who said he's been licensed since 1967, told Hollingsworth that he would cooperate with the FCC in resolving the investigation. Hollingsworth told the ARRL that the case remains open and the inquiry continues.

---------- end bulletin ----------

As far as I am concerned this whole thing *stinks on ice* and Herbie is the smelly fish! There is no doubt in my mind that Herbie used this guy Reichlyn to do an "end run" to get back on the air to stir up shit. That's what Herb knows best how to do you know!

3506. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 01:47:42 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9up73g01b00@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26553

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:F6DFB340F47F80B1.3709B53C2DBB14AD.46FBFA9F22F4417A@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 6 Dec 2001 08:37:17 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >> The area code for Hell is 734.
> > >
> > >...and it freezes over every year!
> >
> > Yup.
> >
> > According to the weather reports, it should start doing so
> > tomorrow.
> >
> > Rick

Should have done so by now. Here in Pittsburgh, we've had record highs.

3507. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:08:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C10248A.1A47610A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26554

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 04:24:57 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > My own religion? I didn't know I even had a religion. Care to elaborate?
>
> Are you stating that you are not, and do not identify as, a
> Christian?
>
> Rick

I think that you've missed the humor, Rick. Dwight doesn't know of a
religion called "Stewartism".

Dave K8MN

3508. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:25:42 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c10270d.2124371@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26555
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 23:47:42 -0600, "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH"
<kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote:

>On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 04:08:35 GMT, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
>wrote:
>
>>On Tue, 04 Dec 2001 18:08:27 -0600, "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH"
>><kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote:
>
>>>If it's mobile, they only have to see some indication that it's not a
>>>legal rig from outside the vehicle. After that, they'll have probable
>>>cause to search.
>>
>>The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
>>a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
>
>Maybe not, but it's easy to walk into a truck stop that sells the
>things, take a few polaroids, and issue them to the beat officers for
>comparison. They're still not going to catch the guy with a modified
>'normal' rig, but they'll be able to spot the 'export' radios.

Just how many different LEGAL rigs are there
anyway? Must be hundreds since CBs have been
made for years by many diffenernt companies. Many
are out of buisness. My point is that there isn't
any COMPLETE list of "legal" CB rigs to begin
with.

>As far as other services, there's only one mobile FRS rig that I'm
>aware of, and for any service requiring a license, they can look at
>the license.

You do NOT need a license to have a rig that is legal
for other services. Many ham rigs, especially older
ones, can broadcast on CB frequencies without ANY
mods at all. Owning one is neither illegal, nor is it
prima facia evidence of any illegal operation.

>OTOH, if you're using an export CB as your mobile 10m rig, I'd
>recommend having a copy of the applicable sections of Part 97 in the
>glovebox anyway.

See the problem? Odds are the ordinance (assuming
it is true) is NOT targeted at mobile ops at all, but rather
the illegal home illegal CB operator...AND that is where

the access issue runs up against the search warrant
issue, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3509. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:29:09 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1028c1.2561068@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26556
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 15:10:31 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >>pass all the "laws" you want.....answer me one question.....how does it make
>> >>any difference? how is this new law going to be actively enforced?? local
>> >>atthorities still have to obtain a search warrant,with reasonable cause
>> >>submitted before a judge.
>> >
>> >If it's mobile, they only have to see some indication that it's not a
>> >legal rig from outside the vehicle. After that, they'll have probable
>> >cause to search.
>>
>> The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
>> a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
>
>Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
>plate on the back of the radio.

So now a citizen has to take a rado out of the car to allow
a cop to look for the acceptance tag? Not likly to
stand up in court as any reasonable request based
on probable cause.

> If it (type acceptance plate) is not there,
>then make the arrest.

Easy enough to peel one off another radio too :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3510. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:33:46 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1029d6.2837853@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26557
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 14:32:14 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> > >
>> > >
>> > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
>> > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
>> > > >
>> > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
>> > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
>> > > > then make the arrest.
>> > >
>> > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
>> > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
>> > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
>> > >
>> > > You're out to lunch on this one!
>> >
>> > That is what happens in my state with respect
>> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
>> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
>> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
>> > members.
>>
>> What state do you live in? Russia? Sure must suck
>> to be you! Here they look at you suspiciously
>> if you _don't_ have at least a deer rifle in the car!
>
>Indiana. We have one of the most pro gun set of
>laws in the country. One of the oldest personal
>protection permits. But you had better have a
>permit if you have a handgun in the vehicle.
>
>Rifles and shotguns are a bit different. Even a kid
>can have one, if he has written permission from his
>parents. But too many have gone to jail because
>dad left his handgun in the car.

All not relavant since the rules/laws for possession
of radios is not at all similar. Indeed, no state has a
law that requires having a license to have any of the
CB radios or FRS radios. A few (less than 10) states
prohibit having a radio receiver capable of receieving
police (public frequencies) in the car.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3511. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:37:59 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c102ae7.3111284@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26558
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 05 Dec 2001 15:17:31 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>>
>> Posted by a ham operator. Typical.
>>
>> If you're a ham (as I am), you really shouldn't be gloating over this.
>>
>> Do you think the average traffic cop can tell the difference between a CB
>> antenna and a ham antenna? Will he be able to tell your HR2600 10m mobile from
>> a Galaxy "export" CB? Doubtful.
>>
>> These new "local yokel" anti-CB laws are BAD NEWS for ALL operators of mobile
>> radio equipment. Just another excuse for unwarranted police harrassment.
>> Anyone with an antenna will now be suspect.
>
>He pulls you over. Sees the radio, asks for
>a ham license. In most states it is already
>illegal to have radios that can listen to police
>bands in cars if you do not have a license
>so they just "expand" the law a bit. No license
>then you and the car are off the street.
>
>Let the lawyers settle this. The police have
>radio techs who can determine if a radio
>is illegal.

So is that radio tech cop going to train all the beat
cops to "recognize" illegal CB rigs? Not likly.

>And the police might even start
>having military style signal intelligence units
>to monitor radio traffic, to include cell phones.

Not likly, too expensive and very little payback
in either positive public relations or in cash flow for
convictions. Local police forces just don't care
about this stuff...nor should they.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3512. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:39:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c102b1c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26560

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0F0327.267492CB@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > You guys must be a lot more "aware" of
> > situations where litigation is a
> > prohibitive for having business lunches.
> > I have female supervisors, married ones
> > at that, who have business lunches every
> > day with their married, male subordinates.
> > There are lunches, every day, where
> > married men and women go alone with each
> > other--just for the heck of it.
>
>
> And just wait until one of those women realises she can sue the
> company, and that 99% of the time the company will fire the male
> employee and settle with the woman, to see how fast that situation
> ends. It's going on from one end of the country to the other.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Sorry, Dwight. I think what you've got there is nothing more than a red herring. Imagination at best, paranoia at worst. There are female bosses, males bosses, everywhere, every day that must deal with the opposite sex as either their superior or employee.

Just today, my supervisor (a male) spent the better part of this afternoon behind closed doors with his manager (a woman). After she left, it was time to go home, but not before I spent a few moments with my supervisor (again, a man) behind closed doors. Imaginative, immature minds would call him a lucky man.

I don't believe anything is going on "from one end of the country to the other." Most of us are far more adult than that.

Kim W5TIT

3513. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:41:31 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c102bbd.3325004@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26559
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 05:21:15 GMT, "W6DKN" <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote:

>"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>news:MkzP7.102029$8n4.6420029@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
>> SO you want to have to go thru the hassle, take time to go to court, risk
>> having your equipment
>> damaged because some rambo cop was too gung ho (Ah am th' law 'round
>hyar,
>> boy) to take
>> time to examine your papers and find out that you are not doing anything
>> wrong? I don't think
>> so--not me. If some rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s)
>> while ignoring the license
>> I am trying to show him, I guarantee you I'll do everything I can to sue
>the
>> SOB and his agency
>> and cause him as much trouble as I can.
>>
>> Jerry
>
>Until you can reference an actual case where a licensed ham has had "some
>rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the
>license", this is all just paranoid supposition. Relax...

Until the FCC exempted ham transcievers, there were a handful
of states where that could and did happen...with both
mobile rigs and HTs in some cases. NJ changed its own law
several years before preemption by the FCC. Once the law
was changed, one case that had been pending against a
NJ ham was dropped.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3514. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:41:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c102bb1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26561

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0F149F.FFEC859@sccoast.net...
>
> By the way, you can see for yourself the connection between satanism
> and these groups (pagans and wiccans). Go to any internet search
> engine, enter "satanism," and watch how many wiccan and pagan web
> sites pop up on the list. If these groups have no link to satanism,
> why would so many mention satanism on their web sites?
>

Well, hands down...there's proof postive fer ya.

Good grief, Dwight.

Kim W5TIT

3515. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:42:48 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c102bea_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26563

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0F1635.C8E9B5FE@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > I think someone, maybe even you, was
> > making the point that something shaped
> > like a pentagram was satanic. The
> > Pentagon building, shaped as it is,
> > holds the foundation for a pentagram,
> > does it not?
>
>
> I never made any such claim. I said the pentagram itself was a
> satanic symbol.
>
>
> > It was a stab at trying to get the
> > equation of pentagram=satanic out of
> > the holder's head...because it's hogwash.
>
>
> Well, to get the connection between the pentagram and satanism out
> of my head, you'd have to tell me to ignore several hundred years of
> history - that symbol has been used by self proclaimed satanists for
> at least that long (possibly longer).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

It's also been used in religious, Masonic, etc., circles, so you'd better
dodge them too.

Kim W5TIT

3516. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:45:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c102c74_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26564

Man, you got that right, Dwight. Hrrrmpphhh.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C0F3AA6.3EAFBD72@sccoast.net...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > That's almost right. Ask MOST any Arab, and
> > he'll tell you that he was told by his imam
> > he should be angry and hateful. The reason?
> > Well it's because there's a great satan -
> > sorta like the boogie man, only meaner. You
> > see, he must rely on his religious leaders
> > for all his information because he's too
> > illiterate to discover the truth for himself.
> > Of course even if he can read, the Arab
> > press will tell him that he should be angry
> > and hateful.
>
>
> Sounds a little like our own country, doesn't it? Replace "imam"
> with "government," "religious leaders" with "political leaders," and
> the "Arab press" with the "American press."
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3517. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:46:55 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c102c6d.3500641@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 23:13:39 GMT, "middlefiger4@home.comss"
<middlefinger4@home.com> wrote:

>"W6DKN" <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote in message
>> Until you can reference an actual case where a licensed ham has had "some
>> rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the
>> license", this is all just paranoid supposition. Relax...
>> 73 de W6DKN
>
>I agree totally W6DKN, I am sure there a few cops around the country who get
>over zealous over some things, but do these people honestly think a LEO
>wants to lose his job over harrasing a Ham or Cb operator. You have got to
>be kidding me,

I generally agree with that which is why most every LEO wouldn't
even attempt to get involved in such silliness.

>most police for starters have Mobile Video Recorders in their
>cars which records the auido and video from a traffic stop. These same cops
>are out there risking there lives so you can live a safe life, now there out
>here picking on radio operators etc. I don't know about the rest of you guys
>but where i am at the cops have more important things to do and when called
>upon to invesitgate a CB/rfi complaint I am sure they will do what they are
>trained to do.

Ditto my above.

>Before all this can happen towns/States must enacted
>ordinances etc for the cops to enforce along with these ordinances comes a
>set of guidelines a SOP(Standard Operating Procedure) must be followed,
>they will be trained in what to look for, if needed or they may call an
>expert in to help. You guys are acting like they will send these cops out
>tearing cars apart without any training in what to look for.

Which is why most localities will NOT enact such ordinances...the
cost vs return on investment isn't worth it.

>Many Leo's are
>Hams what are you gonna lie to them about?

Very few cops are hams as a percent of all cops.

>Before a cop uses a gun he is
>trained with it, before he uses a radar he is trained in its use and the
>principles of operation, before he goes after gang members he is familiar
>with there "colors" tatoos, etc. Why will this be any different?

>I can see the headlines now.
>
> Rouge Cop Suspended with out pay for false arrest of a suspected
>"freebander" who had a rci 2950 hidden under his seat along with a Palomar
>250. After an investigation was held the cop has been suspended indefinitely
>since the radio did not have a mike and the operator said he was only
>listening officer and wasn't able to transmit. But a further review of the
>suspects vehicle and a power mike turned up in the glove compartment. This
>is still under investigation, they are going to have an expert come in and
>check the radio with a Spectro- Goinometer this device will tell when the
>radio was last keyed and on what frequency.... Stay tuned for details...

You make the case for exactly why the LEOs don't need or want
to get involved in FCC matters.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3518. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:48:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c102d56_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26566

"Sean G Gilley" <uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org> wrote in message
news:ff37aa44.0112061023.50d61cc4@posting.google.com...
> Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C0EF426.7EB131F5@sccoast.net>...
> > Sean G Gilley wrote:
> > > But I
> > > really believe that if two employees being
> > > involved in a civil lawsuit was commonplace,
> > > I would've heard about it. (snip)
> >
> >
> > Yea, like several thousand you did not hear about. According to an
> > Stars & Stripes article I read a few years ago, there have been over
> > 200 sexual harassment lawsuits brought against the military alone. And
> > I'd speculate there has been several thousand brought against
> > companies over the last few decades. And you've never heard of these
> > lawsuits? Where have you been, Sean?
>
> I meant within the companies that I worked for.
>
> However, by far, the majority of those cases have nothing to do with
> casual contact between peers -- or even casual contact between
> employer and employee. The majority of the cases brought for sexual
> harassment have to do with an employer or manager harassing an
> employee in some manner. That manner may include being asked out to
> lunch or something like that, but that sort of activity is rarely
> the base of the lawsuit.
>
> If there was a female empoyee at my company that I saw often or worked
> with often, I wouldn't be worried about hasassment for asking her to
> lunch with me any more than I'd worry about the same if I asked a
> male employee to go to lunch.
>
> That's what I thought we were discussing -- casual lunches and other
casual
> contacts between a male and female.
>
> Sean.

I think we are, too, Sean.

Kim W5TIT

3519. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:52:40 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c102db8.3832015@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26565
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 23:26:23 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> > Until you can reference an actual case where a licensed ham has had "some
>> > rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the
>> > license", this is all just paranoid supposition. Relax...
>> >
>> > 73 de W6DKN
>>
>> I agree totally W6DKN, I am sure there a few cops around the country who get
>> over zealous over some things, but do these people honestly think a LEO
>> wants to lose his job over harrasing a Ham or Cb operator. You have got to
>> be kidding me, most police for starters have Mobile Video Recorders in their
>> cars which records the auido and video from a traffic stop. These same cops
>> are out there risking there lives so you can live a safe life, now there out
>> here picking on radio operators etc. I don't know about the rest of you guys
>> but where i am at the cops have more important things to do and when called
>> upon to invesitgate a CB/rfi complaint I am sure they will do what they are
>> trained to do. Before all this can happen towns/States must enacted
>> ordinances etc for the cops to enforce along with these ordinances comes a
>> set of guidelines a SOP(Standard Operating Procedure) must be followed,
>> they will be trained in what to look for, if needed or they may call an
>> expert in to help. You guys are acting like they will send these cops out
>> tearing cars apart without any training in what to look for. Many Leo's are
>> Hams what are you gonna lie to them about? Before a cop uses a gun he is
>> trained with it, before he uses a radar he is trained in its use and the
>> principles of operation, before he goes after gang members he is familiar
>> with there "colors" tatoos, etc. Why will this be any different?
>> I can see the headlines now.
>>
>> Rouge Cop Suspended with out pay for false arrest of a suspected
>> "freebander" who had a rci 2950 hidden under his seat along with a Palomar
>> 250. After an investigation was held the cop has been suspended indefinitely
>> since the radio did not have a mike and the operator said he was only
>> listening officer and wasn't able to transmit. But a further review of the
>> suspects vehicle and a power mike turned up in the glove compartment. This
>> is still under investigation, they are going to have an expert come in and
>> check the radio with a Spectro- Goinometer this device will tell when the
>> radio was last keyed and on what frequency.... Stay tuned for details...
>
>Who says that he would "arrest". What the
>normal procedure would be is to take the
>equipment, issue a court citation then let
>the courts and the attorneys settle it out.

Cops don't last long if that's the way they
handle the job.

>This is often what happens when the cop
>is not totally familiar with the law

Cops that aren't familiar with particular laws don't
usually bother trying to enforce them.

>...or the ham does not have his license on him.

Hams don't need licenses to POSSESS ham
equipment.

>What you should not do is argue as you are
>not going to win. The street is not the place
>to settle such issues, the courts are. And no
>cop is going to let you get out of control and
>argue with him. He will call back up and arrest
>you for resisting law enforcement (non compliance
>is a crime). You may get the radio back but
>you will pay a fine for being a jerk.

No one is suggesting such resistance. The issue
is that there is no complete body of information that
would ever "guarantee" proper enfocement because there
are just too manny types of legal radios out there now.
The cops would rather write 5 speeding tickets than deal with
one convuluted "illegal" radio summons.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3520. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 02:55:20 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c102f04.4163898@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 14:42:55 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> SO you want to have to go thru the hassle, take time to go to court, risk
>> having your equipment damaged because some rambo cop was too gung ho (Ah am
>> th' law 'round hyar, boy) to take time to examine your papers and find out
>> that you are not doing anything wrong? I don't think so--not me. If some
>> rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the license
>> I am trying to show him, I guarantee you I'll do everything I can to sue the
>> SOB and his agency
>> and cause him as much trouble as I can.
>
>If you can not afford to have attorneys then
>you really should not be in either the radio
>hobby or in the shooting hobbies. Modern
>America requires that you have an attorney
>for everything you do.
>
>And the cops do not hassle decent people,
>especially if they know them. What cops
>go after are those who look like they are
>trouble makers.
>
>Drive a decent, newer car but not too expensive.

That is SICK! Why should the car I drive
impose ANY extra scrutiny of me as an individual...
unless the car itself is patently illegal to be on
the road.

>Dress well, a bit conservative. Wear short hair and
>avoid the hillbilly beard look.

Pathetic!

>Learn to speak as
>if you were college educated. Do that and the cops
>generally leave you alone.

How do the cops know how anyone speaks?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3521. Re: kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 03:07:57 UTC
From: The Better Amateur Radio Federation <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <319f0406015193daafabfa88b8465440@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 26568
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lightbulbs" <taktango6000@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:qMUP7.34075$WC1.3486408@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> From the ARRL web:

(massive BS snippage)
> --------------- end bulletin ---------------
>
> As far as I am concerned this whole thing *stinks on ice* and Herbie is
the smelly fish!
> There is no doubt in my mind that Herbie used this guy Reichlyn to do an
"end run" to get
> back on the air to stir up shit. That's what Herb knows best how to do
you know!
>
>

The B.A.R.F. position is this. It's no one's business! Why cant you guys
leave him alone! Some of you folks get hardons when you hear Herb!

Some of you people just enjoy beating dead horse's dont you?

--
Lloyd Davies,
B.A.R.F. Chief of Communications
http://www.angelfire.com/in/w9xn/
http://www.anglefire.com/al/sj61 - Under development

3522. USA bans 6th plank!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 03:23:29 UTC
From: Dave or Debby <truth@planetc.com>
Message-ID: <3c1038e2@news.planetc.com>
Source record: 26569
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

NO, you COMMUNISTS are on da way OUT of the world!!!!!!!!
Dave!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

"dweebo Spanka!" <oldkeykollekter@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b71d3652.0112040834.63c588b1@posting.google.com...
> MORE TO COME!!! YOU KEYCLOWNS ARE ON THE WAY OUT!
>
>
>
> N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:<3C0B8E50.56C82205@gte.net>...
> > RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
> >
> >
> >
> > Tacoma Washington may be the first city to prohibit Class D 11 meter C-B
> >
> > operators from using non-FCC certified transmitting equipment. Adopted
> > last September 12th but only now becoming widely known, Tacoma City
> > Ordinance 26851 amends Chapter 8.38 of their Municipal Code in two ways.
> >
> > First is Section 8.38.010 which directly prohibits use of non-approved
> > radio equipment by CB'ers. And if a CB'er breaks the new law he or she
> > is subject to Section
> >
> > 8.38.020. This makes using such a radio a misdemeanor punishable to a
> > fine of up to $500, and/or up to 6 month imprisonment.
> >
> >
> >
> > Tacoma enacted Ordinance 26851 based on an earlier amendment to the
> > Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which was adopted by Congress a
> > couple of years ago. As this was a Congressional action, not an FCC
> > action, any challenges by C-B operators to the new Tacoma local law
> > would have to go through the federal courts. As far as we can
> > determine, the new law is carefully crafted to affect only C-B operators
> >
> > and no other radio operators in the Tacoma area. (Various news sources)
> >
> >
> >
> > **
> > ftp://ftp.arnewsline.org/quincy/News/news.txt

3523. Re: kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 03:24:47 UTC
From: twiddle twat <capfoghuskyo@aol.com>
Message-ID: <3EWP7.8508$714.790416@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26570
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:319f0406015193daafabfa88b8465440@spamfreenews.com...
>
> Some of you folks get hardons when you hear Herb!
>
> Some of you people just enjoy beating dead horse's dont you?
> --
> Lloyd Davies,
> B.A.R.F. Chief of Communications
> http://www.angelfire.com/in/w9xn/
> http://www.anglefire.com/al/sj61 - Under development

Actually Lloyd, I get a
hardon when I see
things like this --> http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/Prc49/Ps46204mbsGG/index.html

MUCH BETTER than listing to the old fartknockers on ham radio, don't U agree??

3524. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 03:47:05 UTC
From: Pancho Hernandez <PHernandez@umashistorydept.con>
Message-ID: <9updvocsf0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26571
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9um6p0oh7@pita.alt.net...
> I wish that I'd have
> recorded it, because I would send it in. The station will be set up so I
can
> record very soon.
>
You are seriously misinformed if you think Riley Hollingsworth
would accept any tape recordings from you. You have been the
recipient of several warnings from Hollingsworth. Therefore my boy,
you must be very stupid indeed, if you think you have even a shred
of credibility with Hollingsworth. Put in simple language you might
be able to understand. You are a known repeat violator of FCC
rules and regulations my boy!!!!!! Now, would you like for us to
post all your warning letters from Hollingsworth? so everyone can
see what a fool you are Roger? Go back to playing on your CB
radio. That is more akin to your level of expertise butthole!!!!!!!!!!

3525. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 04:07:38 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <egXP7.4480$xy4.1674762434@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26574
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

What he is saying is correct. Most police
officers (while in their heart they think that what
they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
is merely an inconvenience to someone.
NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
thinks is right.

Landshark

--
"BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0FFEBC.FB60F89D@gte.net...
>
> Who says that he would "arrest". What the
> normal procedure would be is to take the
> equipment, issue a court citation then let
> the courts and the attorneys settle it out.
>
> This is often what happens when the cop
> is not totally familiar with the law or the
> ham does not have his license on him.
>
> What you should not do is argue as you are
> not going to win. The street is not the place
> to settle such issues, the courts are. And no
> cop is going to let you get out of control and
> argue with him. He will call back up and arrest
> you for resisting law enforcement (non compliance
> is a crime). You may get the radio back but
> you will pay a fine for being a jerk.
>
>
>

3526. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 04:09:13 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9C8DCD64ECBBBC06.36EA405524D49DF3.9F264AA8E825E332@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26572

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 16:06:52 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>Don't you think pot wine is even a little odd?

Actually, if pot was legal you would probably see a lot more
of it--and to be honest I'd very much prefer that to be the case. The
only _actual_ harm done to the body by pot results from inhaling the
smoke. By drinking pot wine, the ability to control the dosage that is
inherent in smoking it still remains (it doesn't if it is taken in
pill form as Marinol is today) and to use it in a social setting is
maintained, but the health risk is eliminated.

Btw, as I recall (it HAS been a _long_ time <sigh>), it goes
quite well with cheese and wine, and is a comfortable accompaniment to
seafood, particularly lobster and crab. Because it's fairly dry (i.e.,
similar to a white Bordeaux but, of course, not as rich in texture or
fruitiness) it doesn't overpower the delicate flavors of foods or
overcome the sweetness of warmed lemon-butter.

>"Ahhh saay it's a joke, son"

Nope--I save that line for the marijuana laws!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3527. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 04:11:55 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AA572B4FB22C1EC7.47D453CF94D51FD6.2BAC48DE64699925@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26573

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 16:19:19 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>No. That's simply an underinformed misconception, regurgitated
>perpetually by liberal malcontents, against mountainous evidence to the
>contrary, in hopes that repetition will cause reality to invert itself.
>Shirley you knew that, Rick.

Ok, then he's president because the people of the United
States were not presented any intelligent options and chose what they
(perhaps wrongly) perceived as the lesser of two evils--the way we
decide MOST elections in recent years.

It's a scary thought to realize that we've gone _downhill_
from Bill Clinton in our choice of dictators, er leaders.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3528. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 04:31:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <19DD021186F168A6.C09669506FA38733.C93E15CF68DC3FFD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26575

On Thu, 6 Dec 2001 20:41:50 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
>news:3C0F149F.FFEC859@sccoast.net...
>>
>> By the way, you can see for yourself the connection between satanism
>> and these groups (pagans and wiccans). Go to any internet search
>> engine, enter "satanism," and watch how many wiccan and pagan web
>> sites pop up on the list. If these groups have no link to satanism,
>> why would so many mention satanism on their web sites?
>>
>
>Well, hands down...there's proof postive fer ya.

Hey, Kim.

I just did a search (using Copernic Pro 2000 to be sure I hit
all the good engines) on "Kim" and "TIT."

I didn't know you were a busty twenty-something blonde breast
fighter in Detroit!

All these secrets being kept from us are FINALLY being
revealed by the TRUE LIGHT cast by the Internet search engines!

ALL HAIL GOOGLE--GOD OF KNOWLEDGE!

>Good grief, Dwight.

Be respectful, Kim. Dwight is a sports celebrity! From 1988 to
1993 he was one of the top five basketball scorers at Florida
International University (number one most of those years!) where he
proudly wore his number 15.

Cecil is going to have a fit over that one though, since the
pictures make it clear he's not only a basketball champ but he's black
as well.

What makes his success even more amazing is that he was born
(in Stockton, CA, btw) in 1948, making him 44 years old the last year
he was scoring champion--AND that he was already supporting a family
in 1971 yet was still able to start college on a basketball
scholarship in 1988!

Of course, he must not have completed his major, since he also
attended the University of Arkansas from 1992 to 1995 (put on a bit of
weight in his pictures there, too) when he became a professional

basketball player (I guess Cecil is going to use this to prove his point about the NBA) playing for Yugoslavia originally, then Poland and other nations.

Damn, Dwight, we didn't know we had such a sports hero among us! But, we do now--the Internet never lies!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3529. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 04:34:26 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <263E4311D2D15723.0F39600C9A1A473C.01942BAEA321ED60@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26576

On Thu, 6 Dec 2001 20:47:42 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>Should have done so by now. Here in Pittsburgh, we've had record highs.

Same here. Right now it's 38 outside--unseasonably warm, but
still as cold as Hell!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3530. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 04:39:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <41533AE385611E8B.B5A2361EBB87651E.D2EC66138F6E9A03@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26577

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 02:08:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I think that you've missed the humor, Rick. Dwight doesn't know of a
>religion called "Stewartism".

He should--it only took me a few minutes to get five hits on
"Stewartism" in Copernic, and he gets all his religious knowledge from
the Internet, so . . .

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3531. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 04:43:52 UTC
From: JR <radiobur@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F90FE.2D861CC0@mailcity.net>
Source record: 26578
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Hams don't need licenses to POSSESS ham
> equipment.

Let's see, if you are a ham then you have a license. What are you
trying to say?

3532. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 04:50:54 UTC
From: JR <radiobur@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C0F92A4.13705D1C@mailcity.net>
Source record: 26579
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

KC8JBO wrote:

>
> So are you COWARD. Seen* your* letters on the Rain report.

Which letters woger? Be specific now, exactly which of my letters
have you seen on the Rain report?

3533. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 05:30:26 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0112062130.7274ff8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26580
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Landshark" S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net wrote
> What he is saying is correct. Most police
>officers (while in their heart they think that what
>they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
>training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
>can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
>is merely an inconvenience to someone.
> NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
>one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
>tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
>say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
>thinks is right.
>
> Landshark

Good god, I've never heard such whining, paranoia, and blatant attempts at stampeding hams than I've heard from some of the more illegally-minded CBers in this thread.

The Tacoma ordinance was passed as a response to out-of-control outlaw CBers using huge illegal amplifiers causing consumer interference complaints. The FCC does not have a staff of 300,000 on the job so the local LEO's are forced to deal with it. (Don't forget WHO caused this situation to come about. Not the FCC. Not the cops. The outlaw CBers did. Without THEIR shenanigans there would BE no Tacoma Ordinance)

Somehow this has situation been "spun" into lots of wild predictions about pot-bellied cops hassling licensed amateurs about their mobile rigs.

If the cops in your area are as corrupt and dumb as some are saying (can't recognize one radio from another, can't recognize an amp, can't tell a ham license from a fishing license), then believe me, you got troubles that go FAR beyond radio enforcement. I'd move to another town.

-Aaron-

3534. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 06:11:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C105D7E.56103F7D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26581

Rick Adams wrote:
> Look at it this way. Assume a lawsuit is to be filed that in
> government run courts would cost 10% in fees and in private courts
> would cost only 2%.

There's no such thing as a private court of law. Law, by definition,
is the bailiwick of the government. The best a "private court"
would be able to do is a gentleman's agreement. But how would
you enforce the agreement without help from the government? Mafia?

> I don't want to pay the second price there, Cecil, ...

There's an easy solution. We will have a referendum. Everybody who
votes your way gets to pay for the desired result. Everybody who votes
my way doesn't have to pay anything. What do you think the vote would
be?

> Show me a RICH man who had an 'A' average in high school!

I'm rich compared to the average person on this planet and I was a
member of the National Honor Society.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3535. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 06:12:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C105DE0.7109F1C1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26582

Rick Adams wrote:
> And if a third child is born, should we punish the child by
> not assisting it? Are the "sins" of the parents to be visited on their
> children?

Yes. The problem will never be solved otherwise.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3536. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 06:15:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C105E8E.AB3AD69A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26583

Krell wrote:
>
> "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> > According to the weather reports, it should start doing so
> > tomorrow.
>
> Should have done so by now. Here in Pittsburgh, we've had record highs.

Here in East Texas the leaves are starting to change colors but
I ran the air conditioning today.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3537. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 08:12:55 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <bS_P7.842$K%4.176931@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 26584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Aaron H. Voobner" <voobner@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:fbc7a2.0112062130.7274ff8d@posting.google.com...

> Good god, I've never heard such whining, paranoia, and blatant
> attempts at stampeding hams than I've heard from some of the more
> illegally-minded CBers in this thread.
>
> The Tacoma ordinance was passed as a response to out-of-control outlaw
> CBers using huge illegal amplifiers causing consumer interference
> complaints. The FCC does not have a staff of 300,000 on the job so
> the local LEO's are forced to deal with it. (Don't forget WHO caused
> this situation to come about. Not the FCC. Not the cops. The outlaw
> CBers did. Without THEIR shenanigans there would BE no Tacoma
> Ordinance)
>
> Somehow this has situation been "spun" into lots of wild predictions
> about pot-bellied cops hassling licensed amateurs about their mobile
> rigs.
>
> If the cops in your area are as corrupt and dumb as some are saying
> (can't recognize one radio from another, can't recognize an amp, can't
> tell a ham license from a fishing license), then believe me, you got
> troubles that go FAR beyond radio enforcement. I'd move to another
> town.
>
> -Aaron-

Amen. Like the old saying goes, to all those that this law will affect, -
"You made your own bed, now lie in it" 'Nuff said...

73 de W6DKN

3538. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 09:21:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1089E2.83EFA656@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26585

Sean G Gilley wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote..
> >
> > Deterrence is only one aspect of the
> > death penalty - it also serves as just
> > punishment for a serious crime [...]
>
> Out of curiosity, could you explain why
> killing someone is a just punishment
> for a crime?

Well, killing someone who has wrongly killed certainly seems like an equitable, and therefore just, punishment. Why would you see that as unjust?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3539. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 09:34:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C108CD0.B87E7E1B@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26586

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
> ?
> > I don't "wish" to believe anything.
> > I want to see evidence and I've seen
> > none to support an argument for or
> > against.
>
> http://www.polyamory.org/
> http://www.nasca.com/
> http://www.ejhs.org/volume3/swing/body.htm
>
> Hope they help,

Well, not really that helpful. I was hoping for a little less biased information. The three sites you offered are all sites supporting polygamous relationships (which is a little like sending a person to KKK sites to find out the truth about KKK groups). Thanks anyway, though.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3540. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 09:43:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C108F0D.C007FCB8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26587

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart writes:
>
> > Add in an easy marriage license and you have
> > nothing but a recipe for failure. By the way,
> > for the kids reading, "recipe" is a cooking
> > term. :-)
>
> HAW!!
>
> For some odd reason, as a kid I was driven to
> learn how to do practical things. Still am. Like
> cooking, carpentry, raising vegetables,
> rebuilding cars, all sorts of stuff. Are there
> kids today like that?

No, certainly not all kids are like that. I was just using a gross exaggeration to be funny. In many way, the kids today do have a lot to be said in their favor, but that doesn't completely overshadow some of their limitations (such as in relationship skills). And, when discussing marriage, it is exactly those relationship skills that matter.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3541. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 09:49:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C10905D.F6715B13@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26588

N2EY wrote:
>
> In addition, it doesn't take a lawsuit to
> cause damage. All it takes is a complaint
> to do all sorts of damage.

Of course. As long as companies are afraid of a potential lawsuit,
and the negative publicy these lawsuits bring, they are going to overreact.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3542. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 10:03:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1093A0.87EF9C2A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26589

Sean G Gilley wrote:
>
> That's what I thought we were discussing -- casual
> lunches and other casual contacts between a male
> and female.

And that IS exactly what we're talking about, Sean. Many senior employees avoid casual lunches and other such contacts with junior opposite sex employees exactly because of the possible negative consequences. In fact, that has become SOP in many companies, backed up by stated company policies. And I would take that to the next step - relationships with equal employees with jobs dependent on mine. In other words, if my job had any bearing on that other person's job in any way whatsoever, that relationship would never go beyond casual conversations with other employees around (a lunch would be entirely out of the question).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3543. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 10:48:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C109E40.BF313194@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26590

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Sorry, Dwight. I think what you've got there
> is nothing more than a red herring. Imagination
> at best, paranoia at worst. There are female
> bosses, males bosses, everywhere, every day
> that must deal with the opposite sex as either
> their superior or employee.

Of course, they do, Kim. And, if they have any sense, they would be very careful in doing so. And most do have sense enough to do so.

> (snip) After she left, it was time to go home,
> but not before I spent a few moments with my
> supervisor (again, a man) behind closed doors.
> Imaginative, immature minds would call him a
> lucky man. (snip)

Okay, Kim. Lets take a look at that situation. If you went to work tomorrow and accused that boss of making sexual remarks, and even grabbing you, during that meeting (threatening to go to the press if the company didn't "protect" you), what do you think the company would do? I'm telling you right now, unless the company is foolish (sexual harassment lawsuits can attract national media exposure), they would almost immediately fire the manager and do just about anything to satisfy you.

And it doesn't matter if what you said is true. In fact, the company may not even believe you. At this point, it really doesn't matter. The company has two choices - fire the employee or face negative publicity that could hurt the company's reputation. Since employees are expendable, the company is obviously going to take that route (find an excuse to fire the manager). And, by the way, they would find an excuse (they don't want him to sue, so they'll find something wrong with his work performance or simply call it "budget cutbacks").

You don't even have to be the person making the complaint. Lets say another co-worker, who happens not to like you or the boss, makes a complaint that you two are spending too much time together and you're getting favorable treatment because of it. What is even worse, two or three other co-workers, friends of that co-worker, agrees with that complaint. Now what do you think the company is going to do? They have two choices - let you two continue to meet even if it causes friction in the workplace or end the friction in the workplace by ending your casual meetings around the workplace.

It doesn't even have to be a co-worker complaining. Lets say Betty (made up name) doesn't like the fact that her husband is meeting with too many woman who work with him at the local small town factory, so she gets up in front of her church Sunday morning and begins talking about all the "sluts" who work for that company and all the illicit relationships between co-workers at that company. To make matters worse, a newspaper reporter, also a member of the church, hears this and decides to do an article about it in the local newspaper. Now what do you think the company is going to do?

Now, I know you're convinced all these are simply outrageous examples made up to support my position, but let me assure you that each happened almost exactly as I described. In fact, I personally had to deal with each one of these cases myself. And you can add these to the many cases I've seen, or heard about, that I was not involved with in any way. So don't tell me this stuff is not going on because we're "far more adult than that," Kim. It is going on, and it is becoming more commonplace.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3544. Re: TWISTEDHED DEMANDS MORE RESPECT FOR FREEBAND BOOTLEGGERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 12:29:08 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112070429.72da0261@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26591

From: Twstedhead@webtv.net (Twstedhead@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: Important message!
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 1999/10/06

Many of us live for long distance DX. IF you have a problem with this mode of operating, tell me what frequency and time you will be on. If this poor kid can get you riled by asking to talk skip(GASP!) I can't wait till you hear me. Pick on someone your own size. I'm ready to key all over your whiny, sniveling ass!

Gettin' WAY-UP from the 'pile

3545. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 12:32:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C10B67B.E07CC4CB@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26592

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) Simply because they may not be able
> to trace a direct lineage, does NOT mean
> that they don't subscribe to the beliefs of
> the religion. (snip)

It's very simple, Rick. Most of the modern day pagans and wiccans have no idea what these ancient religions believed in or how they worshipped. There is no pagan or wiccan "bible" that dates back to that time period. And there is no lineage where the beliefs and practices of those religions were passed down from one generation to the next. Instead, many of the groups today have simply made up fantasy religions based on tidbits of what they've read in old literature, often written by persons not even involved in those ancient religions. In other words, these modern groups simply borrowed the names of those old religious and applied them to their modern day satanic nonsense.

> What on earth justifies the outrageous claim that
> they are "satanic groups" instead of groups that
> have no link to Christianity at all?

For one so opposed to religion, you seem to be obsessed with the religious meaning of the word "satanic" (one who worships satan). Get out a dictionary, my friend. Today that word means one who is devilish, satan-like, infernal, wicked, or evil. Today, the direct religious meaning is hardly used anymore outside religious circles.

> (snip) Those activities are ONLY "associated with
> satanism" by Christian churches--not by either
> the participants or the unbiased observer.

Nonsense. _I_ associate these activities (occult practices, witchcraft, etc) with satanism and I'm not a christian church, nor am I associated with a christian church. These practices have long been associated with satanism. Now you might like to change the name to hide the association, but I choose to call a spade a spade. In other words, it comes back to what I said in the previous message - if is looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it is a duck. What would you want to call it something else?

> (snip) Witchcraft, btw, is the Christian term for
> Wicca. Now would you care to explain how it is you
> simultaneously claim that the practitioners are
> not Wiccans but are Witches?

Where have I claimed they're witches? I said they engage in occult practices, witchcraft, and other activities commonly associated with satanism. All of which I personally think is a full load of BS. By the way, since you're always ranting against superstition, why are you so busy defending this obvious superstition? Or are you only opposed to christian superstition?

> (snip) If it looks like a superstitious falsehood,
> sounds like a superstitious falsehood, distorts
> the truth like a superstitious falsehood, it...

Well, you obviously don't like those who challenge your favorite superstition.

> (snip) Go to any internet search engine, enter
> "homosexual" and watch how many Christian web
> sites pop up on the list. If Christianity doesn't
> actively promote homosexuality, why would so many
> mention it on their web sites?

Okay, I did that, Rick. I popped over to AltaVista and entered "homosexual." Fourteen of the fifteen sites that came up on the first search page were sites promoting homosexuality. One was in another language. None were religious sites. In fact, I had to go through another search page and a half before I could find a single religious site mentioning homosexuality (the issue of homosexuality and the Boy Scouts).

> (snip) Try using legitimate academic sources for
> your information about the topic, Dwight, not
> prejudice and Christian propaganda.

Okay, I'm game, Rick. Provide me with a legitimate academic source. Not a web page - you've already said I shouldn't believe those.

> (snip) And again, if you can't be troubled to
> take the time to learn just how false that
> statement is, you simply don't have the integrity
> to discuss a religious concept in the first place.
> If it lies like a hypocrite, cites like a
> hypocrite, demands belief like a hypocrite, it..

Oh, here we go again. You don't like the views expressed, so you start resorting to name calling.

> (snip) Satanism was INVENTED by the Judeo-Christian
> religion. NO religion other than that even believes
> in the EXISTANCE of a "Satan." Thus any symbols
> claimed to belong to Satanism are, by necessity,
> Christian in nature.

What does that matter, Rick? If a person decides to play baseball, he doesn't stop being a baseball player because someone else invented the game. And he can call himself what he wants, but the entire world, not just those who invented the game, still knows he is a baseball player. The same is true for satanic groups. They can call themselves

whatever they want, but that still doesn't change the fact that
they're satanic groups.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3546. TWISTEDHED PROMOTES FREEBAND BOOTLEGGING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 12:35:32 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112070435.4196cbcc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26593

Written by: RS 1175ï¿½ (Florida, USA) e-mail: twistedhed@webtv.net

Original story published in the April 2000 issue of Sporadic Waves

DX Gone Crazy? International DX on the eleven meter free-band is there for the taking just about everyday on sideband. AM is also giving up rare contacts. But one of the better known frequencies for international DX contacts, 27.555 USB, once a jewel of pleasant listening and international contacts, has unfortunately deteriorated rapidly over the last few months, morphing itself into a vile cesspool, spewing forth all it's bile and waste, due to a small, intellectually-challenged, rapid group of angry, self-loathing and pathetic operators who have taken it upon themselves to take up a permanent-like residential status there, and in the process, completely abdicated any civil, polite conversation.

27.555 has long been an international world wide contact frequency. Standard protocol has always dictated one makes a contact and QSY's to another frequency for their conversation, thus leaving the call frequency open at all times for contacts. This small but nefarious group is attempting to jam, interfere, and prevent any DX contacts from being made on frequency. In case you haven't listened in on 555 as of late, the frequency has literally become a key down fest with language that one would be embarrassed to hear in the company of children, while only those blowing ridiculous amounts of power are being heard. Some incredibly rare and difficult DX contacts have effectively been nullified because so many operators are choosing to fight fire with fire....in other words, many are pumping up their wattage rather than surrender the frequency. While I can somewhat empathize with the operators who are attempting to defend this bit of DX space, especially the ones who are located outside of the U.S. and are permitted to transmit there, I can't seem to shake the old adage that keeps playing in my mind, "If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem."

Power wars are not going to solve anything. The frequency has so much trash on it that it is already beginning to sound like the frequencies many have attempted to elude. While 27.555 used to be an everyday stop during my channel surfing activities, it no longer is. Oh, I occasionally flip there in hopes that the channel may somehow have become civilized again, but as soon as I hear the hate and discontent, I no longer have the patience to listen for a far off exotic station just to have them get keyed on as they give the frequency they are QSYing to. It is easier to change the frequency.

Other operators around the world are also gravitating to nearby and other frequencies. In the last 2 weeks, I have heard France, Italy, Germany, the U.K., and Holland comment on what a sad state 27.555 has become due to the selfish and inconsiderate actions of a few. 27.415 to 27.595 is yielding great DX. It appears that operators are still making their contacts, they are just working a little harder to get them. Instead of relying strictly on 555, many long time ops who USED to utilize that frequency exclusively are found hovering close by. Since January, I have counted no less than 30 countries on frequencies close to 555. While 38 LSB(27.385) continues to be a productive DX channel, it mirrors 555 in language, harassment and abuse. Not surprisingly, the perpetrators on 38 claim the same geographical locale as the offenders on 555, which is more than likely true, as I noticed that when the skip conditions begin to fade from the blathering idiots on 555, the same occurs on 38.

(continued at http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page8.html)

3547. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 12:38:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C10B7EC.9B6AB3CF@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26594

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Damn, Dwight, we didn't know we had such a
> sports hero among us! But, we do now--the
> Internet never lies!

So your premise now is that all web sites are wrong (lying) and only you could possibly be right? Or is it only the sites that disagree with you? Sorry, my friend, but, based on what you've written so far, I would believe a web site done by a drunken sailor from Brazil before I would believe you.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3548. TWISTEDHED PROMOTES ILLEGAL CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 12:39:13 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112070439.3d576513@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26595
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Written by: RS 1175ï¿½ (Florida, USA) e-mail: twistedhed@webtv.net

Original story published in the April 2000 issue of Sporadic Waves

DX Gone Crazy? International DX on the eleven meter free-band is there for the taking just about everyday on sideband. AM is also giving up rare contacts. But one of the better known frequencies for international DX contacts, 27.555 USB, once a jewel of pleasant listening and international contacts, has unfortunately deteriorated rapidly over the last few months, morphing itself into a vile cesspool, spewing forth all it's bile and waste, due to a small, intellectually-challenged, rapid group of angry, self-loathing and pathetic operators who have taken it upon themselves to take up a permanent-like residential status there, and in the process, completely abdicated any civil, polite conversation.

27.555 has long been an international world wide contact frequency. Standard protocol has always dictated one makes a contact and QSY's to another frequency for their conversation, thus leaving the call frequency open at all times for contacts. This small but nefarious group is attempting to jam, interfere, and prevent any DX contacts from being made on frequency. In case you haven't listened in on 555 as of late, the frequency has literally become a key down fest with language that one would be embarrassed to hear in the company of children, while only those blowing ridiculous amounts of power are being heard. Some incredibly rare and difficult DX contacts have effectively been nullified because so many operators are choosing to fight fire with fire....in other words, many are pumping up their wattage rather than surrender the frequency. While I can somewhat empathize with the operators who are attempting to defend this bit of DX space, especially the ones who are located outside of the U.S. and are permitted to transmit there, I can't seem to shake the old adage that keeps playing in my mind, "If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem."

Power wars are not going to solve anything. The frequency has so much trash on it that it is already beginning to sound like the frequencies many have attempted to elude. While 27.555 used to be an everyday stop during my channel surfing activities, it no longer is. Oh, I occasionally flip there in hopes that the channel may somehow have become civilized again, but as soon as I hear the hate and discontent, I no longer have the patience to listen for a far off exotic station just to have them get keyed on as they give the frequency they are QSYing to. It is easier to change the frequency.

Other operators around the world are also gravitating to nearby and other frequencies. In the last 2 weeks, I have heard France, Italy, Germany, the U.K., and Holland comment on what a sad state 27.555 has become due to the selfish and inconsiderate actions of a few. 27.415 to 27.595 is yielding great DX. It appears that operators are still making their contacts, they are just working a little harder to get them. Instead of relying strictly on 555, many long time ops who USED to utilize that frequency exclusively are found hovering close by. Since January, I have counted no less than 30 countries on frequencies close to 555. While 38 LSB(27.385) continues to be a productive DX channel, it mirrors 555 in language, harassment and abuse. Not surprisingly, the perpetrators on 38 claim the same geographical locale as the offenders on 555, which is more than likely true, as I noticed that when the skip conditions begin to fade from the blathering idiots on 555, the same occurs on 38.

(continued at http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page8.html)

3549. Re: TWISTEDHED JUSTIFIES HIS "free banding"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 12:41:02 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112070441.104fa536@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26596
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Written by: RS 1175ï¿½ (Florida, USA) e-mail: twistedhed@webtv.net

Original story published in the April 2000 issue of Sporadic Waves

DX Gone Crazy? International DX on the eleven meter free-band is there for the taking just about everyday on sideband. AM is also giving up rare contacts. But one of the better known frequencies for international DX contacts, 27.555 USB, once a jewel of pleasant listening and international contacts, has unfortunately deteriorated rapidly over the last few months, morphing itself into a vile cesspool, spewing forth all it's bile and waste, due to a small, intellectually-challenged, rapid group of angry, self-loathing and pathetic operators who have taken it upon themselves to take up a permanent-like residential status there, and in the process, completely abdicated any civil, polite conversation.

27.555 has long been an international world wide contact frequency. Standard protocol has always dictated one makes a contact and QSY's to another frequency for their conversation, thus leaving the call frequency open at all times for contacts. This small but nefarious group is attempting to jam, interfere, and prevent any DX contacts from being made on frequency. In case you haven't listened in on 555 as of late, the frequency has literally become a key down fest with language that one would be embarrassed to hear in the company of children, while only those blowing ridiculous amounts of power are being heard. Some incredibly rare and difficult DX contacts have effectively been nullified because so many operators are choosing to fight fire with fire....in other words, many are pumping up their wattage rather than surrender the frequency. While I can somewhat empathize with the operators who are attempting to defend this bit of DX space, especially the ones who are located outside of the U.S. and are permitted to transmit there, I can't seem to shake the old adage that keeps playing in my mind, "If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem."

Power wars are not going to solve anything. The frequency has so much trash on it that it is already beginning to sound like the frequencies many have attempted to elude. While 27.555 used to be an everyday stop during my channel surfing activities, it no longer is. Oh, I occasionally flip there in hopes that the channel may somehow have become civilized again, but as soon as I hear the hate and discontent, I no longer have the patience to listen for a far off exotic station just to have them get keyed on as they give the frequency they are QSYing to. It is easier to change the frequency.

Other operators around the world are also gravitating to nearby and other frequencies. In the last 2 weeks, I have heard France, Italy, Germany, the U.K., and Holland comment on what a sad state 27.555 has become due to the selfish and inconsiderate actions of a few. 27.415 to 27.595 is yielding great DX. It appears that operators are still making their contacts, they are just working a little harder to get them. Instead of relying strictly on 555, many long time ops who USED to utilize that frequency exclusively are found hovering close by. Since January, I have counted no less than 30 countries on frequencies close to 555. While 38 LSB(27.385) continues to be a productive DX channel, it mirrors 555 in language, harassment and abuse. Not surprisingly, the perpetrators on 38 claim the same geographical locale as the offenders on 555, which is more than likely true, as I noticed that when the skip conditions begin to fade from the blathering idiots on 555, the same occurs on 38.

(continued at http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page8.html)

3550. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 12:41:36 UTC
From: Trouser Trout <pipedream@hotmail.comspa>
Message-ID: <20011207074139.221$c5@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 26597
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message > I agree Bill,what a crock of steaming dung this is. I'm not degrading cops,
> but I know a few of them and their not'college educated',themselves. They
> dress like me when their off-duty,jeans and a shirt.
>
> Do you live in some exclusive country club ?!?
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

Mopar,Of course they would dress like you they are no different than any of us. They also drink beer too.

3551. Re: ILLEGAL CB "10 Meter Base Station" USED BY TWISTEDHED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 12:42:27 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112070442.582db483@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26598
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Written by: RS 1175ï¿½ (Florida, USA) e-mail: twistedhed@webtv.net

Original story published in the April 2000 issue of Sporadic Waves

DX Gone Crazy? International DX on the eleven meter free-band is there for the taking just about everyday on sideband. AM is also giving up rare contacts. But one of the better known frequencies for international DX contacts, 27.555 USB, once a jewel of pleasant listening and international contacts, has unfortunately deteriorated rapidly over the last few months, morphing itself into a vile cesspool, spewing forth all it's bile and waste, due to a small, intellectually-challenged, rapid group of angry, self-loathing and pathetic operators who have taken it upon themselves to take up a permanent-like residential status there, and in the process, completely abdicated any civil, polite conversation.

27.555 has long been an international world wide contact frequency. Standard protocol has always dictated one makes a contact and QSY's to another frequency for their conversation, thus leaving the call frequency open at all times for contacts. This small but nefarious group is attempting to jam, interfere, and prevent any DX contacts from being made on frequency. In case you haven't listened in on 555 as of late, the frequency has literally become a key down fest with language that one would be embarrassed to hear in the company of children, while only those blowing ridiculous amounts of power are being heard. Some incredibly rare and difficult DX contacts have effectively been nullified because so many operators are choosing to fight fire with fire....in other words, many are pumping up their wattage rather than surrender the frequency. While I can somewhat empathize with the operators who are attempting to defend this bit of DX space, especially the ones who are located outside of the U.S. and are permitted to transmit there, I can't seem to shake the old adage that keeps playing in my mind, "If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem."

Power wars are not going to solve anything. The frequency has so much trash on it that it is already beginning to sound like the frequencies many have attempted to elude. While 27.555 used to be an everyday stop during my channel surfing activities, it no longer is. Oh, I occasionally flip there in hopes that the channel may somehow have become civilized again, but as soon as I hear the hate and discontent, I no longer have the patience to listen for a far off exotic station just to have them get keyed on as they give the frequency they are QSYing to. It is easier to change the frequency.

Other operators around the world are also gravitating to nearby and other frequencies. In the last 2 weeks, I have heard France, Italy, Germany, the U.K., and Holland comment on what a sad state 27.555 has become due to the selfish and inconsiderate actions of a few. 27.415 to 27.595 is yielding great DX. It appears that operators are still making their contacts, they are just working a little harder to get them. Instead of relying strictly on 555, many long time ops who USED to utilize that frequency exclusively are found hovering close by. Since January, I have counted no less than 30 countries on frequencies close to 555. While 38 LSB(27.385) continues to be a productive DX channel, it mirrors 555 in language, harassment and abuse. Not surprisingly, the perpetrators on 38 claim the same geographical locale as the offenders on 555, which is more than likely true, as I noticed that when the skip conditions begin to fade from the blathering idiots on 555, the same occurs on 38.

(continued at http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page8.html)

3552. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 12:52:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C10BB25.923CF31D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26599

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) I feel sorry for those who, through age
> or infirmity, have lost the skills or physical
> capabilities (vision, etc.) necessary to drive
> a motor vehicle. But feeling sorry for them does
> NOT mean permitting them to keep driving and
> endangering others--it means trying to encourage
> the creation--and use--of better public
> transportation facilities so that such individuals
> CAN remain independent yet still not endanger
> the lives of others.

What do you know - we finally agree on something. Having spent almost half my adult life living in Europe, I wish there was a better public transportation system in this country. And, when discussing public transportation, this (the elderly) is the one thing that is so often overlooked. In Europe, there are routine driving tests (reaction times, etc). When a person fails those tests, they lose the license. That means many older persons in those countries cannot drive, but there is an excellent public transportation system available to them. In fact, the system is so good, I often used it to go shopping because it was faster and far less hassle than dealing with traffic. Sadly, nothing similar exists in this country, so I have a much harder time accepting the notion of stripping the ability to drive from the elderly.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3553. Re: TWISTEDHED PROMOTES ILLEGAL CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 14:36:32 UTC
From: Lloyd <barfies@BARFxxzzxx.net>
Message-ID: <9uqk1v$87j$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26600
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

Doesn't KC8JBO operate on 27.555 USB ?????

"IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ce9e428e.0112070439.3d576513@posting.google.com...
> Written by: RS 1175 (Florida, USA) e-mail: twistedhed@webtv.net
>
> Original story published in the April 2000 issue of Sporadic Waves
>
>
> DX Gone Crazy? International DX on the eleven meter free-band is there
> for the taking just about everyday on sideband. AM is also giving up
> rare contacts. But one of the better known frequencies for
> international DX contacts, 27.555 USB, once a jewel of pleasant
> listening and international contacts, has unfortunately deteriorated
> rapidly over the last few months, morphing itself into a vile
> cesspool, spewing forth all it's bile and waste, due to a small,
> intellectually-challenged, rapid group of angry, self-loathing and
> pathetic operators who have taken it upon themselves to take up a
> permanent-like residential status there, and in the process,
> completely abdicated any civil, polite conversation.
>
> 27.555 has long been an international world wide contact frequency.
> Standard protocol has always dictated one makes a contact and QSY's to
> another frequency for their conversation, thus leaving the call
> frequency open at all times for contacts. This small but nefarious
> group is attempting to jam, interfere, and prevent any DX contacts
> from being made on frequency. In case you haven't listened in on 555
> as of late, the frequency has literally become a key down fest with
> language that one would be embarrassed to hear in the company of
> children, while only those blowing ridiculous amounts of power are
> being heard. Some incredibly rare and difficult DX contacts have
> effectively been nullified because so many operators are choosing to
> fight fire with fire....in other words, many are pumping up their
> wattage rather than surrender the frequency. While I can somewhat
> empathize with the operators who are attempting to defend this bit of
> DX space, especially the ones who are located outside of the U.S. and
> are permitted to transmit there, I can't seem to shake the old adage
> that keeps playing in my mind, "If you are not part of the solution,
> you are part of the problem."
>
> Power wars are not going to solve anything. The frequency has so much
> trash on it that it is already beginning to sound like the frequencies
> many have attempted to elude. While 27.555 used to be an everyday stop

> during my channel surfing activities, it no longer is. Oh, I
> occasionally flip there in hopes that the channel may somehow have
> become civilized again, but as soon as I hear the hate and discontent,
> I no longer have the patience to listen for a far off exotic station
> just to have them get keyed on as they give the frequency they are
> QSYing to. It is easier to change the frequency.
>
> Other operators around the world are also gravitating to nearby and
> other frequencies. In the last 2 weeks, I have heard France, Italy,
> Germany, the U.K., and Holland comment on what a sad state 27.555 has
> become due to the selfish and inconsiderate actions of a few. 27.415
> to 27.595 is yielding great DX. It appears that operators are still
> making their contacts, they are just working a little harder to get
> them. Instead of relying strictly on 555, many long time ops who USED
> to utilize that frequency exclusively are found hovering close by.
> Since January, I have counted no less than 30 countries on frequencies
> close to 555. While 38 LSB(27.385) continues to be a productive DX
> channel, it mirrors 555 in language, harassment and abuse. Not
> surprisingly, the perpetrators on 38 claim the same geographical
> locale as the offenders on 555, which is more than likely true, as I
> noticed that when the skip conditions begin to fade from the
> blathering idiots on 555, the same occurs on 38.
>
> (continued at http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page8.html)

3554. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 14:54:10 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C10D82D.C62F6F1E@gte.net>
Source record: 26501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >> > Until you can reference an actual case where a licensed ham has had "some
> >> > rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the
> >> > license", this is all just paranoid supposition. Relax...
> >> >
> >> > 73 de W6DKN
> >>
> >> I agree totally W6DKN, I am sure there a few cops around the country who get
> >> over zealous over some things, but do these people honestly think a LEO
> >> wants to lose his job over harrasing a Ham or Cb operator. You have got to
> >> be kidding me, most police for starters have Mobile Video Recorders in their
> >> cars which records the auido and video from a traffic stop. These same cops
> >> are out there risking there lives so you can live a safe life, now there out
> >> here picking on radio operators etc. I don't know about the rest of you guys
> >> but where i am at the cops have more important things to do and when called
> >> upon to invesitgate a CB/rfi complaint I am sure they will do what they are
> >> trained to do. Before all this can happen towns/States must enacted
> >> ordinances etc for the cops to enforce along with these ordinances comes a
> >> set of guidelines a SOP(Standard Operating Procedure) must be followed,
> >> they will be trained in what to look for, if needed or they may call an
> >> expert in to help. You guys are acting like they will send these cops out
> >> tearing cars apart without any training in what to look for. Many Leo's are
> >> Hams what are you gonna lie to them about? Before a cop uses a gun he is
> >> trained with it, before he uses a radar he is trained in its use and the
> >> principles of operation, before he goes after gang members he is familiar
> >> with there "colors" tatoos, etc. Why will this be any different?
> >> I can see the headlines now.
> >>
> >> Rouge Cop Suspended with out pay for false arrest of a suspected
> >> "freebander" who had a rci 2950 hidden under his seat along with a Palomar
> >> 250. After an investigation was held the cop has been suspended indefinitely
> >> since the radio did not have a mike and the operator said he was only
> >> listening officer and wasn't able to transmit. But a further review of the
> >> suspects vehicle and a power mike turned up in the glove compartment. This
> >> is still under investigation, they are going to have an expert come in and
> >> check the radio with a Spectro- Goinometer this device will tell when the
> >> radio was last keyed and on what frequency.... Stay tuned for details...
> >
> >Who says that he would "arrest". What the
> >normal procedure would be is to take the
> >equipment, issue a court citation then let
> >the courts and the attorneys settle it out.
>
> Cops don't last long if that's the way they

> handle the job.
>
> >This is often what happens when the cop
> >is not totally familiar with the law
>
> Cops that aren't familiar with particular laws don't
> usually bother trying to enforce them.
>
> >...or the ham does not have his license on him.
>
> Hams don't need licenses to POSSESS ham
> equipment.
>
> >What you should not do is argue as you are
> >not going to win. The street is not the place
> >to settle such issues, the courts are. And no
> >cop is going to let you get out of control and
> >argue with him. He will call back up and arrest
> >you for resisting law enforcement (non compliance
> >is a crime). You may get the radio back but
> >you will pay a fine for being a jerk.
>
> No one is suggesting such resistance. The issue
> is that there is no complete body of information that
> would ever "guarantee" proper enfocement because there
> are just too manny types of legal radios out there now.
> The cops would rather write 5 speeding tickets than deal with
> one convuluted "illegal" radio summons.

The normal procedure, when a police officer
is uncertain of a law, is to assume that the
civilian is in the wrong. As one cop told me,
you can always unarrest a guy. If he acts
like a jerk, well then "everyone is a sinner, it
is just a matter of finding the right sin".

Cops do survive doing this. Often they are
backed up by the courts. Now you might
live in small town where everyone knows
each other. But in medium to large
communities, the cops do not know everyone.
Unless you are very well politically connected,
you will not get the cop in trouble.

3555. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:01:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011207100121.13985.00000348@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 26502

In article <A6B45858D89DF4F4.0C2F51F00E234730.A6900C9F8C233837@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> One based on fact, not superstition (read religious dogma &
>theology); concern for others not selfishness; dedicated to freedom
>not oppression; and based on the concept that the role of the state is
>to protect and defend, not to regulate and control consensual
>behavior. It would be a civilization in which the poet, the writer,
>and the artist (even the less successful ones) were as respected as
>the rock star, the politician, or the preacher and on in which
>prejudice, self-righteousness, and hypocrisy did not exist.
>
> What kind would YOU like?
>
> Rick

Rick:

Actually, one pretty much the way you described it, but I don't find
too much different with the civilization we have now and your ideal.
Sure, we have problems, but we're human beings, and imperfect
by nature. The trick is to rise above our imperfection, and continually
strive to make things better. I'm not so sure that poets, authors,
and artists aren't already as respected as rock stars, politicians,
or preachers. Among those six groups of people, I admire individual
representatives of each group, and I'm pretty sure most people do.

My ideal civilization would be one in which individual initiative,
ingenuity, and integrity is valued above all other human traits, and
where we all enjoy equal freedom to excel as human beings
without the prejudice, self-righteousness, and hypocrisy you
abhor. I believe that the role of government must be limited as
you suggest, and that the primary source of social "safety nets"
lies wholly within the private sector, as a reflection of the genorosity
of the "haves" toward the "have nots," without bureaucratizing the
concept into a Welfare State which only stimulates laziness,
immorality, and dependency.

I say the government should not only stay out of our bedrooms, but
out of our corporate boardrooms as well. I believe that social
consciousness is a good thing, but that human behavior can't be
legislated. People need to be given the right kind of incentives to do
the right things, and doing the wrong things needs to be sanctioned
by negative social pressure, not government edict. I believe that we
need to be a nation of laws, but just enough laws to deal with the

worst of anti-social behavior -- not a law covering every possible human misery, real or imagined (are you reading this, Montgomery County?).

I think that if you read the volumes of my postings to this newsgroup and others, including my past contributions on Fidonet, that I've been pretty consistent in my thinking re: the above ideal civilization.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3556. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:06:24 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C10DB10.38F66182@gte.net>
Source record: 26503
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > What he is saying is correct. Most police
> >officers (while in their heart they think that what
> >they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
> >training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
> >can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
> >is merely an inconvenience to someone.
> > NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
> >one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
> >tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
> >say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
> >thinks is right.
> >
> > Landshark
>
> Good god, I've never heard such whining, paranoia, and blatant
> attempts at stampeding hams than I've heard from some of the more
> illegally-minded CBers in this thread.
>
> The Tacoma ordinance was passed as a response to out-of-control outlaw
> CBers using huge illegal amplifiers causing consumer interference
> complaints. The FCC does not have a staff of 300,000 on the job so
> the local LEO's are forced to deal with it. (Don't forget WHO caused
> this situation to come about. Not the FCC. Not the cops. The outlaw
> CBers did. Without THEIR shenanigans there would BE no Tacoma
> Ordinance)
>
> Somehow this has situation been "spun" into lots of wild predictions
> about pot-bellied cops hassling licensed amateurs about their mobile
> rigs.
>
> If the cops in your area are as corrupt and dumb as some are saying
> (can't recognize one radio from another, can't recognize an amp, can't
> tell a ham license from a fishing license), then believe me, you got
> troubles that go FAR beyond radio enforcement. I'd move to another
> town.

You are correct, in part. This did come
about because of out of control "outlaw
CBers". And for the most part the cops
will not hassle lawfully licensed hams.

However, and this goes for every community,
if the cop does stop you and does ask about
your radios then he might assume that you

are there to interfere with him. Newbie cops
can be a bit paranoid. They do not like any
civilian who acts out of the normal. And radio
nuts are like gun nuts, not normal. They have
a passion for their hobbies.

It is not that the cops are corrupt. It is that they
are fearful. Too many lose cannons in society.
Too many drug dealers, terrorists, and just pain
old farts with big mouths. Too many guys who
see themselves above the law.

All it takes is one shooting, like the one up in Goshen
last night, and every cop within 200 miles is on high
alert. Given what happened on Sept. 11th, they are
now looking for those who might be terrorists. And
a car full of ham gear looks very suspicious. Given
that many hams are gun owners as well, and you might
have a young cop who is going to over react.

Just look at Cincinnati. They take young men from the
suburbs who have been told all their lives to stay out of
certain neighborhoods, especially after dark and make them
cops. Then their first assignment is those exact neighborhoods.
Guess what? You have a fearful, inexperienced cop
in a place where he is totally out of his league. Guess
what happens? He winds up over reacting and shooting
some young black guy. Which results in a riot as it did
last spring.

Guys, you live in a too sheltered life.

3557. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:08:14 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C10DB80.38FAB023@gte.net>
Source record: 26504
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>
> >> SO you want to have to go thru the hassle, take time to go to court, risk
> >> having your equipment damaged because some rambo cop was too gung ho (Ah am th'
> law 'round hyar, boy) to take time to examine your papers and find out
> >> that you are not doing anything wrong? I don't think so--not me. If some
> >> rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the license
> >> I am trying to show him, I guarantee you I'll do everything I can to sue the
> >> SOB and his agency
> >> and cause him as much trouble as I can.
> >
> >If you can not afford to have attorneys then
> >you really should not be in either the radio
> >hobby or in the shooting hobbies. Modern
> >America requires that you have an attorney
> >for everything you do.
> >
> >And the cops do not hassle decent people,
> >especially if they know them. What cops
> >go after are those who look like they are
> >trouble makers.
> >
> >Drive a decent, newer car but not too expensive.
>
> That is SICK! Why should the car I drive
> impose ANY extra scrutiny of me as an individual...
> unless the car itself is patently illegal to be on
> the road.
>

It is called profiling. It happens to blacks
everyday.

>
> >Dress well, a bit conservative. Wear short hair and
> >avoid the hillbilly beard look.
>
> Pathetic!
>
> >Learn to speak as
> >if you were college educated. Do that and the cops
> >generally leave you alone.
>
> How do the cops know how anyone speaks?

The first time you open your mouth after
he stops you.

3558. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:10:54 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C10DC20.E5870439@gte.net>
Source record: 26506
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >
> > >> SO you want to have to go thru the hassle, take time to go to court,
> > >> risk having your equipment damaged because some rambo cop was too gung
> > >> ho (Ah am th' law 'round hyar, boy) to take time to examine your
> > >> papers and find out that you are not doing anything wrong? I don't
> > >> think so--not me. If some rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my
> > >> radio(s) while ignoring the license I am trying to show him, I
> > >> guarantee you I'll do everything I can to sue the SOB and his agency
> > >> and cause him as much trouble as I can.
> > >
> > >If you can not afford to have attorneys then
> > >you really should not be in either the radio
> > >hobby or in the shooting hobbies. Modern
> > >America requires that you have an attorney
> > >for everything you do.
> > >
> > >And the cops do not hassle decent people,
> > >especially if they know them. What cops
> > >go after are those who look like they are
> > >trouble makers.
> > >
> > >Drive a decent, newer car but not too expensive.
> >
> > That is SICK! Why should the car I drive
> > impose ANY extra scrutiny of me as an individual...
> > unless the car itself is patently illegal to be on
> > the road.
> >
> > >Dress well, a bit conservative. Wear short hair and
> > >avoid the hillbilly beard look.
> >
> > Pathetic!
> >
> > >Learn to speak as
> > >if you were college educated. Do that and the cops
> > >generally leave you alone.
> >
> > How do the cops know how anyone speaks?
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> I agree Bill,what a crock of steaming dung this is. I'm not degrading cops,

> but I know a few of them and their not'college educated',themselves. They
> dress like me when their off-duty,jeans and a shirt.
>
> Do you live in some exclusive country club ?!?

They may be working class. In my state, cops are
being hired with degrees especially in the big cities.

But cops do profile. College educated types are
often given a break, if they do not talk back.

Think about it, blacks are profiled all the time.
As are folks with long, dirty hair or beards.

3559. Re: kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:13:05 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uqne9$f9o$s@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26508
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

LARDAAAAASSSSSSSS LLLLLLLLOYD
"The Better Amateur Radio Federation" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:319f0406015193daafabfa88b8465440@spamfreenews.com...
>
> "Lightbulbs" <taktango6000@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:qMUP7.34075$WC1.3486408@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > From the ARRL web:
>
> (massive BS snippage)
> > --------------- end bulletin ---------------
> >
> > As far as I am concerned this whole thing *stinks on ice* and Herbie is
> the smelly fish!
> > There is no doubt in my mind that Herbie used this guy Reichlyn to do an
> "end run" to get
> > back on the air to stir up shit. That's what Herb knows best how to do
> you know!
> >
> >
>
> The B.A.R.F. position is this. It's no one's business! Why cant you
guys
> leave him alone! Some of you folks get hardons when you hear Herb!
>
> Some of you people just enjoy beating dead horse's dont you?

Lardass Lllllloyd gets hard ons from beating dead horses. And slurping
nutsacks.

3560. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:15:54 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C10DD4A.975EF245@gte.net>
Source record: 26505
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >> >RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
> >>
> >> Posted by a ham operator. Typical.
> >>
> >> If you're a ham (as I am), you really shouldn't be gloating over this.
> >>
> >> Do you think the average traffic cop can tell the difference between a CB
> >> antenna and a ham antenna? Will he be able to tell your HR2600 10m mobile from
> >> a Galaxy "export" CB? Doubtful.
> >>
> >> These new "local yokel" anti-CB laws are BAD NEWS for ALL operators of mobile
> >> radio equipment. Just another excuse for unwarranted police harrassment.
> >> Anyone with an antenna will now be suspect.
> >
> >He pulls you over. Sees the radio, asks for
> >a ham license. In most states it is already
> >illegal to have radios that can listen to police
> >bands in cars if you do not have a license
> >so they just "expand" the law a bit. No license
> >then you and the car are off the street.
> >
> >Let the lawyers settle this. The police have
> >radio techs who can determine if a radio
> >is illegal.
>
> So is that radio tech cop going to train all the beat
> cops to "recognize" illegal CB rigs? Not likly.
>
> >And the police might even start
> >having military style signal intelligence units
> >to monitor radio traffic, to include cell phones.
>
> Not likly, too expensive and very little payback
> in either positive public relations or in cash flow for
> convictions. Local police forces just don't care
> about this stuff...nor should they.

It does happen. And cops are going to be on edge
with the aftermath of Sept. 11th. A ham, with a
car full of radios, does look like a terrorist. Given
that hams are often gun owners, and you might
have a gung ho young cop who wants to make
a name for himself.

Besides profiling has been going on with blacks for sometime now. It is really bad on the east coast, from Boston right down to Florida. The cop does not know you. For all he knows, you are a trouble maker. Shooting your mouth off just makes it worst.

And remember, gun owners have had to deal with this for some time now.

3561. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:19:33 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uqnec$f9o$v@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26509
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jizz Recepticle" <radiobur@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C0F92A4.13705D1C@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> >
> > So are you COWARD. Seen* your* letters on the Rain report.
>
> Which [Poor poor Jizz recepticle]

The lady doth protest too much.

3562. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:21:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C10DE79.AF76A45A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26507

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I say the government should not only stay out of our bedrooms, ...

Changed your mind about homosexuals?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3563. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:25:04 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uqneg$f9o$12@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26510
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Bean -boy and taco bell worker
"Pancho Hernandez" <PHernandez@umashistorydept.con> wrote in message
news:9updvocsf0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9um6p0oh7@pita.alt.net...
> > I wish that I'd have
> > recorded it, because I would send it in. The station will be set up so I
> can
> > record very soon.
> >
> You are [Pathetic laming and sniveling]

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!

Wrong again, Bean boy!!! Riley WOULD accept tape recordings from me.
Or wav. files of N4CND's profanity on 3.901.

3564. Re: TWISTEDHED PROMOTES ILLEGAL CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:36:20 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uqpja$kh5$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26513
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Laaaaaardasssss Lllllllllllllllllllllloyd the nutsack slurping eternal technician
"Lloyd" <barfies@BARFxxzzxx.net> wrote in message
news:9uqk1v$87j$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Doesn't KC8JBO operate on 27.555 USB ?????

Quit humpin my leg, Lardasssssssss, and get back to slurping winos' nutsacks behind the dumpster.

> "IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:ce9e428e.0112070439.3d576513@posting.google.com...
> > Written by: RS 1175 (Florida, USA) e-mail: twistedhed@webtv.net
> >
> > Original story published in the April 2000 issue of Sporadic Waves
> >
> >
> > DX Gone Crazy? International DX on the eleven meter free-band is there
> > for the taking just about everyday on sideband. AM is also giving up
> > rare contacts. But one of the better known frequencies for
> > international DX contacts, 27.555 USB, once a jewel of pleasant
> > listening and international contacts, has unfortunately deteriorated
> > rapidly over the last few months, morphing itself into a vile
> > cesspool, spewing forth all it's bile and waste, due to a small,
> > intellectually-challenged, rapid group of angry, self-loathing and
> > pathetic operators who have taken it upon themselves to take up a
> > permanent-like residential status there, and in the process,
> > completely abdicated any civil, polite conversation.
> >
> > 27.555 has long been an international world wide contact frequency.
> > Standard protocol has always dictated one makes a contact and QSY's to
> > another frequency for their conversation, thus leaving the call
> > frequency open at all times for contacts. This small but nefarious
> > group is attempting to jam, interfere, and prevent any DX contacts
> > from being made on frequency. In case you haven't listened in on 555
> > as of late, the frequency has literally become a key down fest with
> > language that one would be embarrassed to hear in the company of
> > children, while only those blowing ridiculous amounts of power are
> > being heard. Some incredibly rare and difficult DX contacts have
> > effectively been nullified because so many operators are choosing to
> > fight fire with fire....in other words, many are pumping up their
> > wattage rather than surrender the frequency. While I can somewhat
> > empathize with the operators who are attempting to defend this bit of
> > DX space, especially the ones who are located outside of the U.S. and

> > are permitted to transmit there, I can't seem to shake the old adage
> > that keeps playing in my mind, "If you are not part of the solution,
> > you are part of the problem."
> >
> > Power wars are not going to solve anything. The frequency has so much
> > trash on it that it is already beginning to sound like the frequencies
> > many have attempted to elude. While 27.555 used to be an everyday stop
> > during my channel surfing activities, it no longer is. Oh, I
> > occasionally flip there in hopes that the channel may somehow have
> > become civilized again, but as soon as I hear the hate and discontent,
> > I no longer have the patience to listen for a far off exotic station
> > just to have them get keyed on as they give the frequency they are
> > QSYing to. It is easier to change the frequency.
> >
> > Other operators around the world are also gravitating to nearby and
> > other frequencies. In the last 2 weeks, I have heard France, Italy,
> > Germany, the U.K., and Holland comment on what a sad state 27.555 has
> > become due to the selfish and inconsiderate actions of a few. 27.415
> > to 27.595 is yielding great DX. It appears that operators are still
> > making their contacts, they are just working a little harder to get
> > them. Instead of relying strictly on 555, many long time ops who USED
> > to utilize that frequency exclusively are found hovering close by.
> > Since January, I have counted no less than 30 countries on frequencies
> > close to 555. While 38 LSB(27.385) continues to be a productive DX
> > channel, it mirrors 555 in language, harassment and abuse. Not
> > surprisingly, the perpetrators on 38 claim the same geographical
> > locale as the offenders on 555, which is more than likely true, as I
> > noticed that when the skip conditions begin to fade from the
> > blathering idiots on 555, the same occurs on 38.
> >
> > (continued at http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page8.html)
>
>

3565. ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:51:41 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C10E5AE.A320B276@gte.net>
Source record: 26511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

From Amateur Radio Newsline <http://www.arnewsline.org>
ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

The FCC's chief ham radio rules enforcer has told those attending the Ft. Wayne Indiana Hamfest that the time for on the air arguments has come to an end. Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC's Special Counsel for Amateur Radio enforcement told the forum that Amateur Radio road rage must stop now and that the bickering on our frequencies can do nothing but hurt Amateur Radio in the long run.

Hollingsworth also says its time for more hams to get involved in public

service. Jack Parker, W8ISH, of Amateur News Weekly, has that part of the story:
--

"Hollingsworth says that it is now time for hams to use frequencies responsibly. He adds that now, more than ever, is the best time for all

Amateur Radio groups to seek out and establish working relationships with local emergency response agencies.

Since September 11th, Amateur Radio and its potential has moved into a prominent position on the national front. But he stresses that we must move quickly at a local level to establish our place in the overall emergency response plan.

Reporting from the Ft. Wayne Hamfest, for amateur News Weekly, I'm Jack Parker, W8ISH."
--

Hollingsworth's views are echoed by many who are already involved in organizing ham radio emergency communications on a local level. They say you can never have to many well trained volunteers. (Amateur News Weekly)

**

What have in amateur radio is a bunch of
old farts who are grouchy as hell. Nothing
worst than someone old enough to know
better who acts like he is still in junior high!

3566. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 15:59:11 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C10E771.9B1CFEF9@gte.net>
Source record: 26514
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

> >> > > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> >> > > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> >> > > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> >> > > > > then make the arrest.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> >> > > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> >> > > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> >> > > >
> >> > > > You're out to lunch on this one!
> >> > >
> >> > That is what happens in my state with respect
> >> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> >> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> >> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
> >> > members.
> >>
> >> What state do you live in? Russia? Sure must suck
> >> to be you! Here they look at you suspiciously
> >> if you _don't_ have at least a deer rifle in the car!
> >
> >Indiana. We have one of the most pro gun set of
> >laws in the country. One of the oldest personal
> >protection permits. But you had better have a
> >permit if you have a handgun in the vehicle.
> >
> >Rifles and shotguns are a bit different. Even a kid
> >can have one, if he has written permission from his
> >parents. But too many have gone to jail because
> >dad left his handgun in the car.
>
> All not relavant since the rules/laws for possession
> of radios is not at all similar. Indeed, no state has a
> law that requires having a license to have any of the
> CB radios or FRS radios. A few (less than 10) states
> prohibit having a radio receiver capable of receieving
> police (public frequencies) in the car.

And how does that young cop know that you
are not some type of terrorist? All those radios
could be used to spy on the police so that you

can try to overthrow the US government.

That is how young cops think. It is worst in
LA or NYC, but it happens everywhere.

Look at how blacks are profiled. It seems that
"driving while black" is a crime in many big cities.

3567. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 16:02:28 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C10E833.B59D3FD4@gte.net>
Source record: 26512
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> >> >>pass all the "laws" you want.....answer me one question.....how does it make
> >> >>any difference? how is this new law going to be actively enforced?? local
> >> >>atthorities still have to obtain a search warrant,with reasonable cause
> >> >>submitted before a judge.
> >> >
> >> >If it's mobile, they only have to see some indication that it's not a
> >> >legal rig from outside the vehicle. After that, they'll have probable
> >> >cause to search.
> >>
> >> The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> >> a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> >
> >Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> >plate on the back of the radio.
>
> So now a citizen has to take a rado out of the car to allow
> a cop to look for the acceptance tag? Not likly to
> stand up in court as any reasonable request based
> on probable cause.
>
> > If it (type acceptance plate) is not there,
> >then make the arrest.
>
> Easy enough to peel one off another radio too :-)

Maybe what we need to do is register your radios
with the local police. After all, radio transmitters
could be used in espionage or terrorism. How
do the police know that you are not some right
wing nut planning to overthrow the government?

Or a left wing ecco terrorist? Or just an old fart
with too much attitude?

And probable cause can be manufactured.

3568. Re: ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 16:25:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C10ED7A.71894D9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26515
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N9NWO wrote:
> The FCC's chief ham radio rules enforcer has told those attending the
> Ft. Wayne Indiana Hamfest that the time for on the air arguments has
> come to an end.

Egads, we can't even argue over whether a dipole or a vertical is best?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3569. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 16:30:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011207113038.01446.00000134@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 26516

In article <3C108F0D.C007FCB8@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Dwight Stewart writes:
>>
>> > Add in an easy marriage license and you have
>> > nothing but a recipe for failure. By the way,
>> > for the kids reading, "recipe" is a cooking
>> > term. :-)
>>
>> HAW!!
>>
>> For some odd reason, as a kid I was driven to
>> learn how to do practical things. Still am. Like
>> cooking, carpentry, raising vegetables,
>> rebuilding cars, all sorts of stuff. Are there
>> kids today like that?
>
>
> No, certainly not all kids are like that.

I was just wondering. I note that many adults are not like that either.

Garrison Keillor did a wonderful piece about the difference between "farm"
people and "city" people. The terms refer to a state of mind rather than where
a person lives or was raised. "Farm" folks learn to do for themselves while
"city" people tend to specialize in a few things and depend on others for
everything else.

> I was just using a gross
>exaggeration to be funny.

It worked!

> In many way, the kids today do have a lot to
>be said in their favor, but that doesn't completely overshadow some of
>their limitations (such as in relationship skills). And, when
>discussing marriage, it is exactly those relationship skills that matter.
>
Right on target there!

Earlier generations operated under different conditions, though. For one thing,
people tended to marry within their own social/ethnic/geographic/religious
group far more in the past. For another, roles were more clearly defined.

Divorces were very difficult to get and carried an enormous social stigma, as well as being a financial meltdown.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3570. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 16:30:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011207113039.01446.00000135@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 26517

In article <3C10BB25.923CF31D@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> (snip) I feel sorry for those who, through age
>> or infirmity, have lost the skills or physical
>> capabilities (vision, etc.) necessary to drive
>> a motor vehicle. But feeling sorry for them does
>> NOT mean permitting them to keep driving and
>> endangering others--it means trying to encourage
>> the creation--and use--of better public
>> transportation facilities so that such individuals
>> CAN remain independent yet still not endanger
>> the lives of others.
>
>
> What do you know - we finally agree on something. Having spent
>almost half my adult life living in Europe, I wish there was a better
>public transportation system in this country. And, when discussing
>public transportation, this (the elderly) is the one thing that is so
>often overlooked. In Europe, there are routine driving tests (reaction
>times, etc). When a person fails those tests, they lose the license.
>That means many older persons in those countries cannot drive, but
>there is an excellent public transportation system available to them.
>In fact, the system is so good, I often used it to go shopping because
>it was faster and far less hassle than dealing with traffic. Sadly,
>nothing similar exists in this country, so I have a much harder time
>accepting the notion of stripping the ability to drive from the elderly.
>
Right on the money, Dwight.

It must be remembered that the USA once had extensive "public" transportation
infrastructure (actually, most transit was run by private companies). But most
of it disappeared because:

1) the government subsidized the private automobile by spending billions on
roads while refusing to fund transit
2) tax structures ate up transit profitability
3) transit companies were bought up by agents of the auto, oil and rubber
companies and intentionally destroyed
4) Americans' image of themselves and their country became one of auto
transportation for almost all purposes and suburban sprawl.

There was a TV commercial campaign some years back that used the slogan "it's not your car, it's your freedom". Scary.

The main reason the Europeans have such great transit systems is that they are willing to enact taxes and spend the money to have them. A liter of gasoline in Europe typically costs what a gallon costs here, even though the production costs are about the same. The difference is tax, much of which funds transit.

Try to imagine the reaction if the White House and Congress jointly proposed a $1 tax on each gallon of gasoline sold for private passenger car use, with the tax to be spent only for public surface transportation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3571. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 17:16:37 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9uqt9dpab1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 26518

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:AA572B4FB22C1EC7.47D453CF94D51FD6.2BAC48DE64699925@lp.airnews.net...
> It's a scary thought to realize that we've gone _downhill_
> from Bill Clinton in our choice of dictators, er leaders.
>
> Rick

Sorry to hear things aren't going well for you, and that your glass is so
philosophically empty. Personally, I'm glad George Bush is in charge.

3572. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 17:36:23 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <20BE4C7C07B6ED04.7054935558FD092F.784326E2ACFED0E1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 16:02:28 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>Maybe what we need to do is register your radios
>with the local police. After all, radio transmitters
>could be used in espionage or terrorism.

Or tormenting fast-food places that use 49MHz radios for the
drive-thru.

Then again, adding extra Special Sauce to someone's order could be
considered chemical warfare.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3573. Re: ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 17:43:17 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <EFB532FA15C772D2.9672E32B678B6263.48FAE5B7EA078316@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26520
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 15:51:41 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC's Special Counsel for
>Amateur Radio enforcement told the forum that Amateur Radio road rage
>must stop now

Now there's a threat; stop fighting or Riley's going to send you a
whole bunch of progressively slightly nastier letters. If you live
long enough for him to finally get tired of writing warnings to you,
then there may be an actual enforcement action.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3574. Re: ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 17:43:59 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <BE6DCDC4DE8DF082.A520221E08477A78.E278855816054FD9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26521
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 10:25:30 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>N9NWO wrote:
>> The FCC's chief ham radio rules enforcer has told those attending the
>> Ft. Wayne Indiana Hamfest that the time for on the air arguments has
>> come to an end.
>
>Egads, we can't even argue over whether a dipole or a vertical is best?

Depends on which one you're using for CW :)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3575. Re: ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 18:34:31 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C110BD5.7FE361CE@gte.net>
Source record: 26524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> >Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC's Special Counsel for
> >Amateur Radio enforcement told the forum that Amateur Radio road rage
> >must stop now
>
> Now there's a threat; stop fighting or Riley's going to send you a
> whole bunch of progressively slightly nastier letters. If you live
> long enough for him to finally get tired of writing warnings to you,
> then there may be an actual enforcement action.

At least he tries to be fair. He does
give you a chance. He does not have
to.

A few $10,000 fines and most of these
assholes will be off the air. Or in jail.

3576. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 18:37:44 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C110C97.714CBF2B@gte.net>
Source record: 26525
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> >Maybe what we need to do is register your radios
> >with the local police. After all, radio transmitters
> >could be used in espionage or terrorism.
>
> Or tormenting fast-food places that use 49MHz radios for the
> drive-thru.
>
> Then again, adding extra Special Sauce to someone's order could be
> considered chemical warfare.

What was that case a few years back where
the guy was arrested for interfering with
McDonald's drive thru?

3577. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 18:42:23 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <73B73524DEBE220E.770D50A4DC6C4D2E.D6986AA5C18AB0D5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26522

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 00:11:10 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>> Look at it this way. Assume a lawsuit is to be filed that in
>> government run courts would cost 10% in fees and in private courts
>> would cost only 2%.

>There's no such thing as a private court of law. Law, by definition,
>is the bailiwick of the government. The best a "private court"
>would be able to do is a gentleman's agreement. But how would
>you enforce the agreement without help from the government? Mafia?

Er, Cecil,

The Libertarians are the ones that want a privatized society,
remember?

I don't see what the difficulty in enforcement would be--it
works perfectly well with private arbitration now. So long as the law
defined the decision of a private court as binding on all parties, if
the losing side in a civil suit ended up defaulting on payment, the
higher priced government court could be used (at his expense) to
compel payment.

>> Show me a RICH man who had an 'A' average in high school!
>
>I'm rich compared to the average person on this planet

So is the typical stock clerk--the average for the planet is
pretty low.

>and I was a
>member of the National Honor Society.

But did you have an 'A' average?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3578. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 18:44:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <62E211A549470EDE.BD6E6785A6A3BD65.6B1AB451E6900C8B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26523

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 00:12:48 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> And if a third child is born, should we punish the child by
>> not assisting it? Are the "sins" of the parents to be visited on their
>> children?
>
>Yes. The problem will never be solved otherwise.

And _that_, Cecil, is a perfect example of why the Libertarian
Party will never attract enough new members to be a serious influence
on our political system.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3579. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 18:52:32 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A36B792A275E1F57.18A683152804F4E2.29F3FC213AD1F7D1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26526

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 04:34:04 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>> ?
>> > I don't "wish" to believe anything.
>> > I want to see evidence and I've seen
>> > none to support an argument for or
>> > against.
>>
>> http://www.polyamory.org/
>> http://www.nasca.com/
>> http://www.ejhs.org/volume3/swing/body.htm
>>
>> Hope they help,
>
>
> Well, not really that helpful. I was hoping for a little less biased
>information. The three sites you offered are all sites supporting
>polygamous relationships (which is a little like sending a person to
>KKK sites to find out the truth about KKK groups). Thanks anyway, though.

The third cite is a _research_ paper written by two
sociologists and the site itself is the home of the Electronic Journal
of Human sexuality, an electronic version of the traditional paper
bound version. That's hardly a biased source of information. In
addition you ignored the print references completely--do you obtain
ALL your information from the Internet?

Incidently, your analogy to the KKK, if true, would make it
pretty clear that if someone wants information on ham radio the LAST
place to look would be the ARRL site, since that's biased in favor of
it. The sites I listed _do_ contain some positive information about
poly and swinging, but they neither distort the facts they present nor
do they pretend to speak for everyone--only themselves. That's hardly
the behavior of the KKK.

If research paper citations, sites dedicated to polyamory and
swinging, and very sound paper bound citations aren't sufficient for
you, I guess you'll have to settle for them--outside of sending you to
religious sites where they will "prove" (by recourse to the bible, of
course, their ONLY source of information on the topic) that such
behavior is "sinful" and "wrong." Since that's pretty much what you

appear to believe, I'm sure you'll find those sites far more compatible.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3580. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 18:57:07 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D841CA89BDEDA32D.82206C0E47B55D34.368E527916190CE5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26527

On Fri, 7 Dec 2001 09:16:37 -0800, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>Sorry to hear things aren't going well for you, and that your glass is so
>philosophically empty. Personally, I'm glad George Bush is in charge.

Of what--the destruction of the US Constitution?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3581. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 19:11:00 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <99DB8CCD5A29D28A.D68CB5D81C427019.C416FC22376F0B6F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26528

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 07:32:43 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> It's very simple, Rick. Most of the modern day pagans and wiccans
>have no idea what these ancient religions believed in or how they
>worshipped. There is no pagan or wiccan "bible" that dates back to
>that time period. And there is no lineage where the beliefs and
>practices of those religions were passed down from one generation to
>the next. Instead, many of the groups today have simply made up
>fantasy religions based on tidbits of what they've read in old
>literature, often written by persons not even involved in those
>ancient religions. In other words, these modern groups simply borrowed
>the names of those old religious and applied them to their modern day
>satanic nonsense.

You really ARE hung up on anything that contradicts
Christianity being "Satanic" aren't you?

Dwight, can't you get it through your head that not everyone
in the world believes in the boogey-man? The majority of Christians
don't even believe in Satan--let alone those who are not even part of
the Christian religion in the first place.

I don't know where you're getting your (false) knowledge about
pagan religions--probably the web since you don't seem capable of
using any other source of information--but if you had demonstrated as
much knowledge of ham radio as you do of Wicca and pagan faiths, you
would have flunked your Novice test.

>> What on earth justifies the outrageous claim that
>> they are "satanic groups" instead of groups that
>> have no link to Christianity at all?
>
> For one so opposed to religion, you seem to be obsessed with the
>religious meaning of the word "satanic" (one who worships satan). Get
>out a dictionary, my friend. Today that word means one who is
>devilish, satan-like, infernal, wicked, or evil. Today, the direct
>religious meaning is hardly used anymore outside religious circles.

In the first place, the meaning of "Satanic" is very
clear--and since Satan is a creation of Judeo-Christian mythology and
appears in no other religion, it's pretty clear that the term
"Satanic" has relevance for the Christian (as well as Jew and Muslim,
of course) alone, not for those who are part of other religions.

In the second place, even if you DID use your own definition
of satanic, all you are claiming is that people who are Wiccans or
Pagans are really "devilish, satan-like, infernal, wicked, or evil"
people! What utter rubbish! Not only is that offensive to people who
practice those religions, it's just about as bigoted a religious
statement as you could make. I can't help the fact that you are so
hung up in the superstitious nonsense of Christianity that you
actually believe that kind of absurd crap, but claiming it in public
only makes you look like a fool. Learn something ABOUT those religions
before you claim to be an expert on them.

>> (snip) Those activities are ONLY "associated with
>> satanism" by Christian churches--not by either
>> the participants or the unbiased observer.
>
> Nonsense. _I_ associate these activities (occult practices,
>witchcraft, etc) with satanism and I'm not a christian church, nor am
>I associated with a christian church.

You do so through ignorance and superstition. I'm referring to
reality. They are NOT the same.

>These practices have long been
>associated with satanism.

Yup.

BY THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

So who cares how THEY define the behavior of other religions?
For someone who claims that biased sources are always poor sources of
information, you're certainly willing enough to use their views when
it suits your purposes.

>Now you might like to change the name to
>hide the association, but I choose to call a spade a spade. In other
>words, it comes back to what I said in the previous message - if is
>looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it is a
>duck. What would you want to call it something else?

I don't, Dwight. You do. I'm not _claiming_ that it's
"Satanism" or "Satanic," remember? You are.

Rick

>
>
>> (snip) Witchcraft, btw, is the Christian term for
>> Wicca. Now would you care to explain how it is you
>> simultaneously claim that the practitioners are
>> not Wiccans but are Witches?
>
>
> Where have I claimed they're witches? I said they engage in occult

>practices, witchcraft, and other activities commonly associated with
>satanism. All of which I personally think is a full load of BS. By the
>way, since you're always ranting against superstition, why are you so
>busy defending this obvious superstition? Or are you only opposed to
>christian superstition?
>
>
>> (snip) If it looks like a superstitious falsehood,
>> sounds like a superstitious falsehood, distorts
>> the truth like a superstitious falsehood, it...
>
>
> Well, you obviously don't like those who challenge your favorite superstition.
>
>
>> (snip) Go to any internet search engine, enter
>> "homosexual" and watch how many Christian web
>> sites pop up on the list. If Christianity doesn't
>> actively promote homosexuality, why would so many
>> mention it on their web sites?
>
>
> Okay, I did that, Rick. I popped over to AltaVista and entered
>"homosexual." Fourteen of the fifteen sites that came up on the first
>search page were sites promoting homosexuality. One was in another
>language. None were religious sites. In fact, I had to go through
>another search page and a half before I could find a single religious
>site mentioning homosexuality (the issue of homosexuality and the Boy Scouts).
>
>
>> (snip) Try using legitimate academic sources for
>> your information about the topic, Dwight, not
>> prejudice and Christian propaganda.
>
>
> Okay, I'm game, Rick. Provide me with a legitimate academic source.
>Not a web page - you've already said I shouldn't believe those.
>
>
>> (snip) And again, if you can't be troubled to
>> take the time to learn just how false that
>> statement is, you simply don't have the integrity
>> to discuss a religious concept in the first place.
>> If it lies like a hypocrite, cites like a
>> hypocrite, demands belief like a hypocrite, it..
>
>
> Oh, here we go again. You don't like the views expressed, so you
>start resorting to name calling.
>

>
>> (snip) Satanism was INVENTED by the Judeo-Christian
>> religion. NO religion other than that even believes
>> in the EXISTANCE of a "Satan." Thus any symbols
>> claimed to belong to Satanism are, by necessity,
>> Christian in nature.
>
>
> What does that matter, Rick? If a person decides to play baseball,
>he doesn't stop being a baseball player because someone else invented
>the game. And he can call himself what he wants, but the entire world,
>not just those who invented the game, still knows he is a baseball
>player. The same is true for satanic groups. They can call themselves
>whatever they want, but that still doesn't change the fact that
>they're satanic groups.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3582. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 19:15:11 UTC
From: Enrique Alejandro Martinez <pilotenrique@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <9ur4dn$h5h$1@onyx.indstate.edu>
Source record: 26530
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

Roger is a loser anyway. There is no sense even argueing with him here. His only responses are his lame racial slurs. I think its funny. He has a big mouth on the keyboard, but in person he would run away.
"Pancho Hernandez" <PHernandez@umashistorydept.con> wrote in message news:9updvocsf0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9um6p0oh7@pita.alt.net...
> > I wish that I'd have
> > recorded it, because I would send it in. The station will be set up so I
> can
> > record very soon.
> >
> You are seriously misinformed if you think Riley Hollingsworth
> would accept any tape recordings from you. You have been the
> recipient of several warnings from Hollingsworth. Therefore my boy,
> you must be very stupid indeed, if you think you have even a shred
> of credibility with Hollingsworth. Put in simple language you might
> be able to understand. You are a known repeat violator of FCC
> rules and regulations my boy!!!!!! Now, would you like for us to
> post all your warning letters from Hollingsworth? so everyone can
> see what a fool you are Roger? Go back to playing on your CB
> radio. That is more akin to your level of expertise butthole!!!!!!!!!!
>
>
>
>

3583. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 19:18:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C8CE8E9DF974C82C.8426634A826A06AD.0E8068ECD61F93BD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26529

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 07:38:54 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> Damn, Dwight, we didn't know we had such a
>> sports hero among us! But, we do now--the
>> Internet never lies!
>
>
> So your premise now is that all web sites are wrong (lying) and only
>you could possibly be right? Or is it only the sites that disagree
>with you? Sorry, my friend, but, based on what you've written so far,
>I would believe a web site done by a drunken sailor from Brazil before
>I would believe you.

Sorry, "Dribbles," but you got it wrong as usual.

YOU'RE the one who was claiming that Wiccan and Pagan
religions are really Satanic and attempting to "prove" it by referring
to web sites, remember? You made it very clear that the web sites were
the most accurate source of information.

Well, Dwight, if that's true for you it's equally true for
others--so since you insist that Wicca=Satanist based on your web
search, I guess I'll stick with my claim that Dwight Stewart is a
black, over weight, middle aged, former basketball player who studied
as an undergraduate from 1988 to 1995 (kind of _slow_, weren't you?)
then progressed through a series of one season contracts with "top"
competitors like Yugoslavia and Poland. After all, that's what the web
says and, as you make it clear, the web is always right.

Next time, do your research intelligently (someone can help
you with that part if you need them to--perhaps Cecil?) instead of
using a web search to "prove" your absurd claims, and perhaps others
will take the time to do the same as well.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3584. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 19:27:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AC6AD852A0C95786.D358EF19F56D2FD2.A418BABB466DB6AE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26531

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 07:52:41 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> What do you know - we finally agree on something. Having spent
>almost half my adult life living in Europe, I wish there was a better
>public transportation system in this country. And, when discussing
>public transportation, this (the elderly) is the one thing that is so
>often overlooked. In Europe, there are routine driving tests (reaction
>times, etc). When a person fails those tests, they lose the license.
>That means many older persons in those countries cannot drive, but
>there is an excellent public transportation system available to them.
>In fact, the system is so good, I often used it to go shopping because
>it was faster and far less hassle than dealing with traffic. Sadly,
>nothing similar exists in this country, so I have a much harder time
>accepting the notion of stripping the ability to drive from the elderly.

It's a difficult decision--but one we don't have a lot of
choice about. I can feel for the people who would then be left in a
very difficult situation--but at the same time allowing drivers on the
road who are a danger to others (and to themselves) is simply an
unacceptable alternative.

I live in a very rural area myself--and since I'm pushing
sixty (haven't got there yet--but it isn't that many more years until
I do) I'm aware of the fact that at some point I won't be able to
drive safely--particularly on high speed rural roads in a state where
Winter means snow, ice, and reduced visibility. By that time, I'll
have no choice but to have moved to an area where driving is either
inessential or only involves daytime driving in good weather on lower
speed roads (which most seniors can handle long after the ability to
drive safely at night or at higher speed is gone). Unfortunately,
that's a situation that most rural residents will face sooner or
later, and equally unfortunately far too many choose to keep driving
well past the point at which they are no longer safe on the roads with
the end result being a need for precisely the kind of laws they have
in Europe.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3585. Re: ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 19:35:32 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8S8Q7.147479$WW.9469991@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26532
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

$10,000 dollar NALs may well be part of the problem. If there is a choice, I would think most people would give another individual a second (or third or fourth) chance rather than hitting them with a $10,000 fine. What we need are some $100 or $200 fines for offenders with no serious previous records. Fines that, like traffic fines, would most likely not be forgiven. Some sort of progressive type fines. Even drunk drivers get a relatively 'modest' fine for first time offenders (like $500 to $1000 fine, plus lawyer costs, plus the fact their insurance will double for 10 years). After that, jail is a reality - as it should be. Once a pattern develops and a few low level fines are levied, once that big NAL hits, it is time to NOT forgive and forget. Just like the banks, take the house. Unfortunately, the FCC is being taken as a joke. Fact is, we NEED some sort of frequency allocating/enforcement organization so all can share the spectrum equitably.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C110BD5.7FE361CE@gte.net...
> >
> > >Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC's Special Counsel for
> > >Amateur Radio enforcement told the forum that Amateur Radio road rage
> > >must stop now
> >
> > Now there's a threat; stop fighting or Riley's going to send you a
> > whole bunch of progressively slightly nastier letters. If you live
> > long enough for him to finally get tired of writing warnings to you,
> > then there may be an actual enforcement action.
>
> At least he tries to be fair. He does
> give you a chance. He does not have
> to.
>
> A few $10,000 fines and most of these
> assholes will be off the air. Or in jail.
>
>

3586. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 19:39:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011207143921.01104.00000077@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 26533

In article <32E66B00688E1FAC.6E4880AD94FB3AFD.6ACF00FD3AD58309@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:07 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Work or do something else constructive, like going to school and making the
>>grade.
>
> But according to Cecil we shouldn't be paying for school for
>those who can't afford it either.

This is my plan, not Cecil's plan. I say taxes should pay for high quality free schools from pre-K through at least a bachelor's degree - for everyone that can make the grades.

>>The problem is that the benefits are not tied to responsible behaviors that
>>will lead the dependent person to become independent.
>
> Here I agree.

Then why do you support programs that do the exact opposite?

> But under the Libertarian Party the
>consideration isn't for changing the programs into ones that WILL
>work--it's on eliminating them w/o replacement.
>
You'll have to ask Cecil about that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3587. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 19:39:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011207143921.01104.00000078@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 26535

In article <FVPP7.212272$3d2.9554434@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Jim, N2EY wrote:
>
>> ....For example, most European religions have some sort of winter
>> equinox celebration because of the effects lack of daylight causes in many
>> people. For peoples with limited understanding of how the seasons and
>weather
>> work, and with limited artificial lighting, the loss of the Sun at the end
>of
>> December could be very disturbing. Equinox celebrations, whatever they are
>> called, remind us that the Light will return and spring will comne again.
>
>Yeah, but those were really WINTER SOLSTICE celebrations! <smirk>

DOH!!!!

Of course!
>
>Equinox celebrations were when the ancients would set their
>clocks ahead one hour, or behind one hour, and then get really
>confused for the next couple of weeks trying to remember whether
>it was "Spring back, Fall forward", "Spring ahead, Fall back" or
>"Move to Arizona".
>
Yup.

Guess who first seriously proposed daylight savings time?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3588. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 19:39:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011207143922.01104.00000079@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 26534

In article <F4096A0B6D435DBA.C34FB1B26A756925.A2B9BA49F174A979@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Which proves Cecil's point - HE may not get back what he put in, plus
>interest.
>
> True--but if Social Security did not exist, he would have paid
>that difference, probably plus some, into additional taxes to support
>welfare for those who _didn't_ have sufficient investments for their
>old age, or who were surviving children and spouses.

Only if those programs still existed and only the retirement part of SS were
eliminated, AND if your math is right. Which I doubt.
>
> You cite the fact the your investments would have been
>government insured--but that misses Cecil's entire point that NOTHING
>should be paid for by the government other than certain essential
>services.

Govt. bonds are only "insured" by the ability of the govt. to print more money
to cover them, and raise taxes in the process. That's not a bad thing.

>Your investments are insured by other people's tax dollars,
>and were it not for those there would be absolutely no guarantee that
>any investment, fund, bank or other financial institution would not
>simply go broke and leave you destitute.

So? That security is bought and paid for by the acceptance of lower interest
rates. It's the old risk-return game.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Rick

3589. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 19:53:37 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C111E41.BDCDDAB8@uci.edu>
Source record: 26536

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Man, you got that right, Dwight. Hrrrmpphhh.
>
> Kim W5TIT

You think Dwight is right that the United States is like Afghanistan?
Get real, Kim.

3590. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 20:26:50 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C11260A.B3F89A35@uci.edu>
Source record: 26537

Rick Adams wrote:

> Actually, if pot was legal you would probably see a lot more
> of it [pot wine]

Ya think?

3591. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 20:51:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C112BB5.1A3438D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26538

Rick Adams wrote:
> The Libertarians are the ones that want a privatized society,
> remember?

EGADS, Rick. Libertarians are not for a privatized government.
Libertarians are all for an armed forces, a police system,
and a court system, i.e. the systems necessary to protect
our inalienable rights.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3592. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 20:55:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C112CB9.D1B0BA35@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26539

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >> And if a third child is born, should we punish the child by
> >> not assisting it? Are the "sins" of the parents to be visited on their
> >> children?
> >>
> >Yes. The problem will never be solved otherwise.
>
> And _that_, Cecil, is a perfect example of why the Libertarian
> Party will never attract enough new members to be a serious influence
> on our political system.

Well, let me ask you this, Rick. Why are children born to American
parents more valuable human beings than children born to parents
in other countries? To be consistent, you have to advocate welfare
for all the children of the world, not just for American children.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3593. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 20:56:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C112D17.988E496D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26540

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
> >Sorry to hear things aren't going well for you, and that your glass is so
> >philosophically empty. Personally, I'm glad George Bush is in charge.
>
> Of what--the destruction of the US Constitution?

You wouldn't have that problem with a Libertarian government, Rick. :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

3594. Re: kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 21:13:01 UTC
From: bpnjensen@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <37af7e1c.0112071313.27189955@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26541
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message news:<319f0406015193daafabfa88b8465440@spamfreenews.com>...

> The B.A.R.F. position is this. It's no one's business! Why cant you guys
> leave him alone! Some of you folks get hardons when you hear Herb!
>
> Some of you people just enjoy beating dead horse's dont you?

Well, your position is stupid and erroneous. The "horse" obviously ain't dead, and this is the type of thing that can and may well affect amateur radio operators for decades to come. It's public record; it's a public activity; and the amateur radio public has every right, maybe even an obligation, to discuss it. Hopefully the discussion will focus on issues rather than personalities, but it is still a valid topic.

Bruce Jensen

3595. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 21:41:05 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9urjsh$k70$3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26608
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Illegal alien and soon to be turned into the INS for having an expired visa,
"Enrique Alejandro Martinez" <pilotenrique@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:9ur4dn$h5h$1@onyx.indstate.edu...

Hmmmmm the computer system administrator will just have to suspend your
internet acess for abusing the school's computer resources, bean boy.

> Roger is a loser anyway. There is no sense even argueing with him here.
His
> only responses are his lame racial slurs. I think its funny. He has a big
> mouth on the keyboard, but in person he would run away.

Get your ass over here if you can get gas for the Cordoba you drive, bean
boy.

> "Pancho Hernandez" <PHernandez@umashistorydept.con> wrote in message
> news:9updvocsf0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:9um6p0oh7@pita.alt.net...
> > > I wish that I'd have
> > > recorded it, because I would send it in. The station will be set up so
I
> > can
> > > record very soon.
> > >
> > You are seriously misinformed if you think Riley
> Hollingsworth
> > would accept any tape recordings from you. You have been the
> > recipient of several warnings from Hollingsworth. Therefore my boy,
> > you must be very stupid indeed, if you think you have even a shred
> > of credibility with Hollingsworth. Put in simple language you might
> > be able to understand. You are a known repeat violator of FCC
> > rules and regulations my boy!!!!!! Now, would you like for us to
> > post all your warning letters from Hollingsworth? so everyone can
> > see what a fool you are Roger? Go back to playing on your CB
> > radio. That is more akin to your level of expertise butthole!!!!!!!!!!
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

3596. Leland Scott inflicted with Twisteditis

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 21:53:02 UTC
From: amosz@cs.com
Message-ID: <9urdnu$hb0$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26543
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

>=A0 X no Arhive yes
>=A0=A0=A0=A0=A0=A0As
Leland must be the lead knob polisher
the way he grabs Twistyheds leg with his paws
>=A=A=A

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3597. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 21:58:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C113B9C.90118D88@uci.edu>
Source record: 26542

CAM wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> >
> > >Sorry to hear things aren't going well for you, and that your glass is so
> > >philosophically empty. Personally, I'm glad George Bush is in charge.
> >
> > Of what--the destruction of the US Constitution?
>
> You wouldn't have that problem with a Libertarian government, Rick. :-)

He only imagines that he has that problem even NOW.

3598. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 22:22:04 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <gibQ7.291568$5A3.113102643@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26544
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
>
> And how does that young cop know that you
> are not some type of terrorist?

Because he will ask/questions, you will answer the questions and he will find out your motives. Do you think They just slap the handcuffs on? And ask questions later.

>All those radios could be used to spy on the police so that you can try to >overthrow the US government.

Anything is possible. Look at 09-11-01.

> That is how young cops think. It is worst in
> LA or NYC, but it happens everywhere.

Can you cite any specific references or are you speaking as a young cop? or just talking out your backside.

> Look at how blacks are profiled. It seems that
> "driving while black" is a crime in many big cities.

Of course they are never doing anything wrong. The blacks are profiled because it has been constantly shown they commit more crimes as a race. Cops profile people everyday ...criminals...this is what they are trained to do. Perhaps you had better take a look at the statistics of the black population and there driving skills. If you were a cop and a car with 4 Catholic nuns or a car with 4 young black men drove by who would you think would draw attention to the police. Which car would the cop have a better chance of finding something illegal?
Past statistics show of course the young black males. Is that profiling I guess you could call it that. Lets use the same example with a car load of Mexicans and a car load of girls from a nearby college. Who would you pull over if you were a cop. The Mexicans because statistics show they are more likely to be illegal and not possess a drivers license. Is that profiling no that called doing your job. Any one with a towel on there head or of Middle east decent is getting stopped going in and out of NYC is that profiling?

3599. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 22:24:25 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C114199.31D70D6F@uci.edu>
Source record: 26546

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
> influence on their sexual "identity." Right.

I don't know if you've raised any daughters, Larry, but do you think
that your influence on them would have made them want to be men?

3600. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 22:27:17 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <9nbQ7.291571$5A3.113106068@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26545
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
> The normal procedure, when a police officer
> is uncertain of a law, is to assume that the
> civilian is in the wrong.

Yeah Ok just because you say it doesn't make it so. What do you know of normal police procedure? Sounds Like not much.

>As one cop told me, you can always unarrest a guy. If he acts like a jerk, >well then "everyone is a sinner, it is just a matter of finding the right sin".

You watch to much TV!

> Cops do survive doing this. Often they are
> backed up by the courts.

Yes the conspiracy theory!

3601. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 22:34:55 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <jubQ7.291577$5A3.113110981@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26547
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C10DB10.38F66182@gte.net...

> However, and this goes for every community,
> if the cop does stop you and does ask about
> your radios then he might assume that you
> are there to interfere with him.

Why would he assume this? What reason have you given him to think this?

>Newbie cops can be a bit paranoid. They do not like any
> civilian who acts out of the normal.

And neither do I but your proof of newbie cops is a highly exaggerated .

>And radio nuts are like gun nuts, not normal.

Yes you are proving this .

> It is not that the cops are corrupt. It is that they
> are fearful. Too many lose cannons in society.
> Too many drug dealers, terrorists, and just pain
> old farts with big mouths. Too many guys who
> see themselves above the law.
>
> All it takes is one shooting, like the one up in Goshen
> last night, and every cop within 200 miles is on high
> alert. Given what happened on Sept. 11th, they are
> now looking for those who might be terrorists. And
> a car full of ham gear looks very suspicious. Given
> that many hams are gun owners as well, and you might
> have a young cop who is going to over react.

What is your beef with "young cops" Young cops are more in tuned to
electronics etc than the old cops. Cops use 2 to 3 different radios, walkie
talkies and yes even scanners in the cars radios so they are not exactly
foreign to them

>
> Just look at Cincinnati. They take young men from the
> suburbs who have been told all their lives to stay out of
> certain neighborhoods, especially after dark and make them
> cops. Then their first assignment is those exact neighborhoods.
> Guess what? You have a fearful, inexperienced cop
> in a place where he is totally out of his league. Guess
> what happens? He winds up over reacting and shooting
> some young black guy. Which results in a riot as it did

> last spring.
>
> Guys, you live in a too sheltered life.

Sorry Charlie I deal with hundreds of cops a week I wouldnt call that sheltered.

3602. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 22:43:18 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <aCbQ7.291580$5A3.113117543@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26548
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
>
> It does happen. And cops are going to be on edge
> with the aftermath of Sept. 11th. A ham, with a
> car full of radios, does look like a terrorist.

Thats funny where have you heard that? I havent seen a bolo stating that.

>Given that hams are often gun owners, and you might
> have a gung ho young cop who wants to make
> a name for himself.

Can you cite and specific refrences that state how many Hams are gun owners
or are you shooting this off the top of your head again.

>
> Besides profiling has been going on with blacks
> for sometime now.

Yes as well as other criminal they are profiled daily. In order to make the
streets more safe.

> It is really bad on the east
> coast, from Boston right down to Florida. The
> cop does not know you. For all he knows, you
> are a trouble maker.

Nor do you know the cop, For all he knows you are a decent person unless you
give him a reason to think otherwise.

>Shooting your mouth off just makes it worst.
> And remember, gun owners have had to deal
> with this for some time now.

Had to deal with what shooting there mouth off?

3603. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 22:44:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C114648.D10C9D4A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26549

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> The third cite is a _research_ paper written
> by two sociologists and the site itself is
> the home of the Electronic Journal of Human
> sexuality, an electronic version of the
> traditional paper bound version. That's
> hardly a biased source of information. In
> addition you ignored the print references
> completely--do you obtain ALL your
> information from the Internet?

When that is all you've offered me, yes. And, again, sending me to sites supporting polygamous relationships, which offer only material supporting that, is hardly offering me an unbiased source. Likewise, the information on those sites is hardly worthwhile since it only presents only a single view (that supporting polygamous relationships).

> (snip) Incidently, your analogy to the KKK,
> if true, would make it pretty clear that if
> someone wants information on ham radio the LAST
> place to look would be the ARRL site, since
> that's biased in favor of it. (snip)

Actually, the KKK analogy is a valid one in this case. Like the KKK sites, or the ARRL site for that matter, the sites you offered present only one view, one position. That hardly makes those sites worthwhile if one wants the complete story about this issue. As for your mention of the ARRL site, if I wanted information about ham radio as an issue, I would indeed not visit ONLY that site. I would instead attempt to find sites that offered a more balanced view, or visit a range of sites with different views.

> (snip) outside of sending you to religious sites
> where they will "prove" (by recourse to the
> bible, of course, their ONLY source of
> information on the topic) that such behavior is
> "sinful" and "wrong." Since that's pretty much
> what you appear to believe, (snip)

Well, I certainly think that type of behavior is wrong, but I'm not basing that on any religious belief ("sinful"). In fact, I don't even understand why liberals always start screaming about religion everytime someone takes a moral stand against anything liberals support? Do liberals think it is impossible to have a moral belief without involving religion? Do all liberals think there are only two

alternatives - religion or everything goes? If that is what you think, you're wrong. It's not just religious fanatics who are opposed to the liberal nonsense in this country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3604. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 22:50:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnznph2.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 26550
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 11:36:23 -0600, Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:

>Then again, adding extra Special Sauce to someone's order could be
>considered chemical warfare.

In Southern California there used to be a brand of horseradish sauce
called "Atomic"....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3605. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 22:50:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnzo1k3.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 26601

On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 21:09:03 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>" ". "
> ", he added.
>
>Well, Phil,
>
>" ". That's my final word on the
>subject.

The contents of my first message was all that was necessary to add
to the discussion.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3606. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:00:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1149EA.21CCE1D6@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26602

N2EY wrote:
>
> (snip) Garrison Keillor did a wonderful piece
> about the difference between "farm" people and
> "city" people. The terms refer to a state of
> mind rather than where a person lives or was
> raised. "Farm" folks learn to do for themselves
> while "city" people tend to specialize in a
> few things and depend on others for everything
> else. (snip)

I read something similar to that, but I don't remember the author (remembering names is not my strong point). Anyway, this author was talking about politics, using something similar to that to explain the differences between those in the city and country. For example, he explained why those in the city see little use for a gun, while those in the country cannot imagine life without one. He argued that city folk tend to depend on law enforcement for their protection, while those in the country tend to depend on themselves for protection (realising that it may be some time before law enforcement might arrive on the scene). This difference, he concluded, explains the different trend in views on firearm ownership. Of course, he discussed many other political differences, but this can serve as an obvious example of the direction he was taking.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3607. Re: ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:15:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gnzpbi4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 26603
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 19:35:32 GMT, JAMES HAMPTON wrote:

>$10,000 dollar NALs may well be part of the problem. If there is a choice,
>I would think most people would give another individual a second (or third
>or fourth) chance rather than hitting them with a $10,000 fine. What we
>need are some $100 or $200 fines for offenders with no serious previous
>records. Fines that, like traffic fines, would most likely not be forgiven.

Blame the U S Attorneys' offices who will not start forced collection
action on agency administrative forfeitures (the things that the FCC
issues, for example) unless they are in the vicinity of $10K or
more. So the rule is - levy the legal maximum and plea bargain
down.

>Some sort of progressive type fines. Even drunk drivers get a relatively
>'modest' fine for first time offenders (like $500 to $1000 fine, plus lawyer
>costs, plus the fact their insurance will double for 10 years). After that,
>jail is a reality - as it should be. Once a pattern develops and a few low
>level fines are levied, once that big NAL hits, it is time to NOT forgive
>and forget. Just like the banks, take the house. Unfortunately, the FCC is
>being taken as a joke. Fact is, we NEED some sort of frequency
>allocating/enforcement organization so all can share the spectrum equitably.

What we need is better back-up of FCC actions by the US Attorneys'
offices.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3608. SAME OLD TWISTEDHED, EVEN BACK THEN!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:24:50 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112071524.1d8bc082@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26604

From: Twistedhed (Twistedhead@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: BIG FAT LINEAR FOR 11 METERS QUESTION
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-02-16 22:20:04 PST

Jay in the Mojave <jay123a@qnet.com> wrote:
>Hello QRN 2000:
>
>Yep, knowing what bait is, that can't be argued.
>For someone who chums and trolls a lot 2.
>
>But knowing how to set the bait, troll around as if not trolling, takes
>a little practice, ah!
>
>Jay in the Mojave

Jay, I get a charge out of how you stick up for us criminalistic outbander types and bash those stuck up hammies as soon as they show their ugly faces. If I could do anything for you I would. Perhaps a big kiss?

3609. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:27:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C11504E.7ACE1EFD@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26605

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
> >
> > (snip)
>
> (snip) In the first place, the meaning of "Satanic"
> is very clear--and since Satan is a creation of
> Judeo-Christian mythology and appears in no other
> religion, it's pretty clear that the term "Satanic"
> has relevance for the Christian (as well as Jew
> and Muslim, of course) alone, not for those who
> are part of other religions.

Yes, the meaning of "Satanic" (capital "s") is clear - it refers to the religious context of the word and is the one you continue to use in spite of my repeated objections. However, the meaning of "satanic" (lower case "s") seems much less clear to you - and it has nothing to do with "Satan."

> (snip) In the second place, even if you DID use
> your own definition of satanic, (snip)

I used the dictionary definition of the word, not my own definition.

> > Nonsense. _I_ associate these activities (occult
> > practices, witchcraft, etc) with satanism and I'm
> > not a christian church, nor am I associated with
> > a christian church.
>
> (snip) You do so through ignorance and superstition.
> I'm referring to reality. They are NOT the same.

And I say that the association with satanism is the reality.

> > These practices have long been associated with
> > satanism.
>
> Yup.
>
> BY THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

And by just about everyone else in this country, and around the world for that matter. Walk down any street in this country and ask people to identify the practices of satanism. About 99 percent, both religious and non-religious, would list these very things. That is the

reality, Rick. Of course, I suppose you'll now say the entire world it wrong.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3610. CBER TWISTEDHED GOT HIS EYE ON YO' BAND

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:28:51 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112071528.604477e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26606

From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: RE: Ham rigs on CB
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-03-23 22:44:57 PST

"Mike" <km6ab@pacbell.net> wrote:
>When I read some of the postings and replies from some hams it makes me
>embarrassed to admit I have a license. I have met many hams who are soooo
>socially immature that the most trivial infraction of any rule that will
>never affect them will take over their entire lives! And what's worse, it
>spills over to us reasonably normal folk and fuks up our day. I know that
>telling them to get a life will not make any difference as they will never
>get a clue. But saying GET A FUKING CLUE YOU FUKED UP HAM!!! makes ME feel a
>little better and is good medicine for me. The vast majority of hams are
>good, intelligent, reasonable people and it only takes the few wacked up
>ones to give an outstanding hobby a bad name. So please don't form a bad
>opinion about all hams. Lets just hope the socially impossible ones become
>the victims of school shootings so our children are spared.....
>73, luv ya all!
>Yur ham friend,
>Bob.
>
>

Right on mike!!! Some hams are SUCH tightasses. They don't realize that CBers
have already taken over 25 to 28 MHz and we will take 29MHz too and there's
not much they can do about except sit back and enjoy it.

3611. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:34:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1151FD.8730D2D1@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26607

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) YOU'RE the one who was claiming that
> Wiccan and Pagan religions are really Satanic
> and attempting to "prove" it by referring to
> web sites, remember? You made it very clear
> that the web sites were the most accurate
> source of information.

First of all, I did not attempt to use web sites to prove anything.
I simply pointed to those web sites as one piece of evidence to
support my position. Second, I have never claimed that web sites were
the most accurate source of information. That is just some false
nonsense you came up with to belittle me.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3612. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:43:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C115408.4B06E79F@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26609

N2EY wrote:
>
> (snip) Try to imagine the reaction if the White House
> and Congress jointly proposed a $1 tax on each gallon
> of gasoline sold for private passenger car use, with
> the tax to be spent only for public surface
> transportation.

LOL. I don't think there is a Senator or Congressman with the balls
to do it. Heck, I'm not even sure I would have the balls to do it if I
were in their situation. They haven't tarred and feathered anyone in
this country recently, but I'm sure some would serious think about it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3613. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:49:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C11555F.CAA8F4DA@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26610

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) Unfortunately, that's a situation that most
> rural residents will face sooner or later, and
> equally unfortunately far too many choose to keep
> driving well past the point at which they are no
> longer safe on the roads with the end result
> being a need for precisely the kind of laws they
> have in Europe.

And, law or no law, I'd probably be right out there driving with
them when I reach that age. Without some reasonable public
transportation, I'll be damned if some law is going to lock me up with
no way to go anywhere. I have no desire to be a recluse in a free country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3614. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:56:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C11572A.B52686A9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26611

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Are you stating that you are not, and do not identify
> as, a Christian?

Man, I haven't went to any church in at least 25 to 30 years. No, I would definately not call myself a christian (and I doubt many others, other than you, would call me that either).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3615. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-07 23:59:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1157B8.B713B0C2@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26612

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> I think that you've missed the humor, Rick.
> Dwight doesn't know of a religion called
> "Stewartism".

Wow, do they have a religion like that, Dave? I'll join.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3616. Re: kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:00:16 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112071600.72e7b3e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26613
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lightbulbs" <taktango6000@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<qMUP7.34075$WC1.3486408@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>...

>
> Reichlyn, who said he's been licensed since 1967, told Hollingsworth that he
> would cooperate with the FCC in resolving the investigation. Hollingsworth
> told the ARRL that the case remains open and the inquiry continues.
>
> --------------- end bulletin ---------------
>
> As far as I am concerned this whole thing *stinks on ice* and Herbie is the smelly fish!
> There is no doubt in my mind that Herbie used this guy Reichlyn to do an "end run" to get
> back on the air to stir up shit. That's what Herb knows best how to do you know!
>
>
A lot of these guys go off to Carribean spas for dx contest weekends
simply to roll up huge scores, my own club usually fields several of
'em per contest. It's a helluva lot easier to put an existing pile of
hardware on the air than it is to do a from-scratch dxpedition, path
of least resistance, etc. This guy Reichlyn oughta known better than
to latch up with Herbie just to save the effort of transporting and
putting together a station. Herby is nothing but trouble, ya stay away
from those types. Reichlyn obviously used some bad judgement in the
company he keeps but if in fact he did supervise all of Herby's
operations the FCC has no squawk on him. And you can bet that there is
no way Riley is ever gonna determine with any certainty that Reichlyn
was in fact asleep while Herby operated.
>
>
If there are Federal court orders which restrain Herby from operating
under any conditions it's his tits which are in the wringer again.
>
>
I have a buddy who was a permanent resident KV4 forty years ago when
he was a kid. I'm told that even back then Herby was toxic waste other
KV4s wanted nothing to do with.
>
>
w3rv

3617. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:03:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1158A3.16A0AAFC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26614

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Man, you got that right, Dwight. Hrrrmpphhh.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> You think Dwight is right that the United States
> is like Afghanistan?

No, I think Afghanistan is a lot like us and most other countries.
There are very few that don't attempt to use propaganda to further agendas.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3618. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:18:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C115C21.353BB5EE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26615

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> I think that you've missed the humor, Rick.
> Dwight doesn't know of a religion called
> "Stewartism".

Besides, he'll never get that type of humor, Dave. He seems to think only of christianity, when I was actually hoping that I was wealthier than I thought (religions make good money). Imagine if I actually had one of my own - and I don't think I would really care what they called it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3619. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:18:54 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C115C6E.A5274B5@uci.edu>
Source record: 26616

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Are you arguing that total trust is what you believe in, Cecil? That
> you would trust your wife alone with another man in any situation, and
> that any man who doesn't is simply insecure and doesn't trust his
> wife?

No. I think he's arguing that he wouldn't suspect his wife of
infidelity simply because she went out to lunch with her boss.

3620. Re: Dropping the code.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:22:35 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c115cab.1309896@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26617

On 30 Nov 2001 08:18:47 -0800, kb9rvb@arrl.net (Carl Zager) wrote:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20011111104320.12427.00001965@nso-cg.aol.com>...
>> I recall having to answer a lot of questions about repeaters when I
>> took my written exams for Tech, General, Advanced, and Extra. I
>> also had to answer a lot of questions about SSB, RTTY, and FM.
>> Why were these modes being "singled out?"
>
>Not to beat a dead horse, but ... is it possible to miss ALL the
>questions pertaining to SSB and still pass the test? RTTY? FM? And
>still pass the test?

The answer is an unequivacal YES!

>That, in itself, makes the code different.

True.

>...
>> However, without
>> the code tests, I never would have been able to use the Morse/CW
>> mode, a mode which has produced over 85% of my HF operating
>> achievements, and 99.999% of my overall enjoyment of ham radio.
>
>There are two premises and I don't think the second always has a
>direct connection to the first. Many people use packet exclusively,
>yet never had to take a test equivalent to the code test to gain 99%
>of their enjoyment of ham radio.
>
>Presence of the code test does provide an interesting stimulus. There
>are probably many who would not be operating CW, had they not had to
>study it. Some would ask why the same is not true for the other modes.
>Were folks required to study packet or SSB operation before using it,
>might not that serve as the same stimulus to increase the numbers
>using other modes? Yet, we don't test that way for any mode except CW.

And with the end of code testing, there will STILL be newcomers
to ham radio who will find morse interesting...of that I am certain.

>> The difference is, once I lost my childish, self-serving objections to
>> code testing -- based mainly on an immature fear of failure -- I saw
>> the code tests as just as useful and necessary as the testing on
>> any other mode. It's all about having the right attutude.
>
>I never approached the code in that manner. I came to General from

>Tech with the expressed purpose of using CW as the preferred mode in
>QRP operation. Had I gone to code only in order to gain HF phone
>privileges, I think I would've been, at the very least, puzzled by the
>requirement: Pass a code test to earn phone privileges?
>
>...
>
>> .... Code testing *does*
>> reinforce good operating technique, because you are tested in exactly
>> the same way you operate in CW and a variety of other modes.
>
>I must've missed that part. I recall copying a message in which the
>sender identified himself, said where he was from, said what equipment
>he was using, and reported the signal strength of the contact. I don't
>remember being required to send in CW. I don't remember very much at
>all about how to adjust the signal, about using "split" VFO's, about
>RIT or XIT or notch. I don't recall being asked how many CQ's I should
>send or whether I should send CQ CQ DE KB9RVB CQ over and over again.
>I don't recall anything at all about whether you should crank up your
>power to overwhelm everybody else on the frequency -- on the CW test.
>
>Had I finished my ham studies in my teens with many of my friends, I
>probably would've come in as a Novice w/ 5wpm and gained that
>operating experience that you refer to. But that methodology wasn't
>then and isn't now part of the code test. Operations in ham radio
>probably are the least covered aspect of the service.
>
>Yes, there are rules for operation -- and those are covered in all the
>study guides and on the tests. But what about the realities? What is
>the proper procedure for XYZ? What is the impact of ABC? These only
>come from actually getting out there and stumbling along, asking your
>"Elmer."
>
>Why is code different?
>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Returning the 73,
>Carl KB9RVB

3621. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:25:50 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c115d6d.1503221@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26618
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 15:59:11 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >> > > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
>> >> > > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
>> >> > > > >
>> >> > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
>> >> > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
>> >> > > > then make the arrest.
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
>> >> > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
>> >> > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > You're out to lunch on this one!
>> >> >
>> >> > That is what happens in my state with respect
>> >> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
>> >> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
>> >> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
>> >> > members.
>> >>
>> >> What state do you live in? Russia? Sure must suck
>> >> to be you! Here they look at you suspiciously
>> >> if you _don't_ have at least a deer rifle in the car!
>> >
>> >Indiana. We have one of the most pro gun set of
>> >laws in the country. One of the oldest personal
>> >protection permits. But you had better have a
>> >permit if you have a handgun in the vehicle.
>> >
>> >Rifles and shotguns are a bit different. Even a kid
>> >can have one, if he has written permission from his
>> >parents. But too many have gone to jail because
>> >dad left his handgun in the car.
>>
>> All not relavant since the rules/laws for possession
>> of radios is not at all similar. Indeed, no state has a
>> law that requires having a license to have any of the
>> CB radios or FRS radios. A few (less than 10) states
>> prohibit having a radio receiver capable of receieving
>> police (public frequencies) in the car.
>
>And how does that young cop know that you

>are not some type of terrorist?

He doesn't and he'd better not think having
a radio constitutes any probable cause to begin with.

>All those radios
>could be used to spy on the police so that you
>can try to overthrow the US government.

Even if true, what would you want...ban all
radios from cars?

>That is how young cops think. It is worst in
>LA or NYC, but it happens everywhere.

And that type of "young cop" attitude/behavior should
be stopped.

>Look at how blacks are profiled. It seems that
>"driving while black" is a crime in many big cities.

What's the relavence? Are you now saying anyone with a
radio is being profiled?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3622. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:28:10 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c115e53.1733215@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26619
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 04:43:52 GMT, JR <radiobur@mailcity.net> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> Hams don't need licenses to POSSESS ham
>> equipment.
>
>Let's see, if you are a ham then you have a license. What are you
>trying to say?

I should have said... hams don't need to show a license to own a ham
radio. The license is to OPERATE...it is not needed to buy
or own a ham radio.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3623. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:32:07 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c115ed8.1866925@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26620
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 6 Dec 2001 21:30:26 -0800, voobner@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner)
wrote:

>"Landshark" S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net wrote
>> What he is saying is correct. Most police
>>officers (while in their heart they think that what
>>they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
>>training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
>>can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
>>is merely an inconvenience to someone.
>> NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
>>one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
>>tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
>>say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
>>thinks is right.
>>
>> Landshark
>
>Good god, I've never heard such whining, paranoia, and blatant
>attempts at stampeding hams than I've heard from some of the more
>illegally-minded CBers in this thread.
>
>The Tacoma ordinance was passed as a response to out-of-control outlaw
>CBers using huge illegal amplifiers causing consumer interference
>complaints. The FCC does not have a staff of 300,000 on the job so
>the local LEO's are forced to deal with it. (Don't forget WHO caused
>this situation to come about. Not the FCC. Not the cops. The outlaw
>CBers did. Without THEIR shenanigans there would BE no Tacoma
>Ordinance)
>
>Somehow this has situation been "spun" into lots of wild predictions
>about pot-bellied cops hassling licensed amateurs about their mobile
>rigs.
>
>If the cops in your area are as corrupt and dumb as some are saying
>(can't recognize one radio from another, can't recognize an amp, can't
>tell a ham license from a fishing license), then believe me, you got
>troubles that go FAR beyond radio enforcement. I'd move to another
>town.
>
>-Aaron-

Aaron, is there truly a new law in Tacoma? No one has
actually found one to exist.

Additionally, I agree that the law, if it exists, is targeted at
illegal high power CB ops...from home locations...NOT from cars.
The high power home illegals are the ones that cause
constant ongoing interference. No one much
cares about an illegal power amp in an 18 wheeler rolling down I-5.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3624. Re: ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:38:44 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <7129BDAEC49CF990.44F6BB9ABBCBDDE9.067CB477F4AC9CEE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 18:34:31 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> Now there's a threat; stop fighting or Riley's going to send you a
>> whole bunch of progressively slightly nastier letters. If you live
>> long enough for him to finally get tired of writing warnings to you,
>> then there may be an actual enforcement action.
>
>At least he tries to be fair. He does
>give you a chance. He does not have
>to.

I can understand warnings for spurious emissions, accidental
out-of-band, etc. However, he's sending out multiple warnings on
blatantly intentional violations. Sure, there's the occasional
accidental oprofanity when someone has a near miss on the highway, and
sometimes people honestly forget to switch the VOX off before they
crank up the stereo, but http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/
shows several cases where there can hardly be any doubt that the
violation was not an accident.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3625. Re: ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:45:03 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <FAB8E5B2BED23112.B94B16B8D276746A.266D7BBC82C8890C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26622
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 19:35:32 GMT, "JAMES HAMPTON"
<j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>$10,000 dollar NALs may well be part of the problem.

$10k is the maximum. They can reduce it when the circumstances
warrant. However, I do agree that there should be an established
amount for first-time offenders. I'd say switch to a standard of one
warning, then a $100 fine.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3626. Re: kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 00:46:51 UTC
From: maha ahhaaa <nidashere3voor@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <%pdQ7.10757$714.1118666@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26623
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0112071600.72e7b3e9@posting.google.com...
> Reichlyn obviously used some bad judgement in the
> company he keeps but if in fact he did supervise all of Herby's
> operations the FCC has no squawk on him. And you can bet that there is
> no way Riley is ever gonna determine with any certainty that Reichlyn
> was in fact asleep while Herby operated.

Reichlyn is really one of Herbie's closet butt-buddies
or he genuinely was ignorant about fuzzy zipper's
sorrid past on ham radio. I find it very hard to believe that
one could be a ham since the late 60's, and yet not be
aware of the extraordinary controversey that kv4fz created
in the ham bands on a near-continous basis since
1978, which is as far back as my knowledge of the 8-ball goes.
What or where was Reichlyn living for the past few Years
not to know about Herb the turd ? In a freakin cave in
Afganistan with Osama Bin Laden perhaps ???

> I have a buddy who was a permanent resident KV4 forty years ago when
> he was a kid. I'm told that even back then Herby was toxic waste other
> KV4s wanted nothing to do with.

What else are we to expect from a guy who made his money in USVI politics?

3627. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 01:50:14 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <qleQ7.292510$5A3.113287076@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26624
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Bill, So long as I doesn't effect you you don't care right? How about if you live next to I-5 and are tired of the Hi-power mobiles...The law should be for anything car, house, tree fort, back alley.

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:3c115ed8.1866925@news.mindspring.com...
> On 6 Dec 2001 21:30:26 -0800, voobner@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner)
> wrote:
>
> >"Landshark" S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net wrote
> >> What he is saying is correct. Most police
> >>officers (while in their heart they think that what
> >>they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
> >>training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
> >>can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
> >>is merely an inconvenience to someone.
> >> NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
> >>one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
> >>tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
> >>say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
> >>thinks is right.
> >>
> >> Landshark
> >
> >Good god, I've never heard such whining, paranoia, and blatant
> >attempts at stampeding hams than I've heard from some of the more
> >illegally-minded CBers in this thread.
> >
> >The Tacoma ordinance was passed as a response to out-of-control outlaw
> >CBers using huge illegal amplifiers causing consumer interference
> >complaints. The FCC does not have a staff of 300,000 on the job so
> >the local LEO's are forced to deal with it. (Don't forget WHO caused
> >this situation to come about. Not the FCC. Not the cops. The outlaw
> >CBers did. Without THEIR shenanigans there would BE no Tacoma
> >Ordinance)
> >
> >Somehow this has situation been "spun" into lots of wild predictions
> >about pot-bellied cops hassling licensed amateurs about their mobile
> >rigs.
> >
> >If the cops in your area are as corrupt and dumb as some are saying
> >(can't recognize one radio from another, can't recognize an amp, can't
> >tell a ham license from a fishing license), then believe me, you got

> >troubles that go FAR beyond radio enforcement. I'd move to another
> >town.
> >
> >-Aaron-
>
> Aaron, is there truly a new law in Tacoma? No one has
> actually found one to exist.
>
> Additionally, I agree that the law, if it exists, is targeted at
> illegal high power CB ops...from home locations...NOT from cars.
> The high power home illegals are the ones that cause
> constant ongoing interference. No one much
> cares about an illegal power amp in an 18 wheeler rolling down I-5.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

3628. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:00:35 UTC
From: Angst <ToodleDoo@youtoo.col>
Message-ID: <9urs2a$470$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 26625
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9uo12vlfq0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
> news:3204442.23871@ncvillage.net...
> >
> > On Wed, 5 Dec 2001 15:42:51 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > Oh, I don't know.....he may be listening more than you think. He
got
> on
> > > 14.313 recently and talked to Dan.
> > >
> >
> > We can take care of things ourselves instead of waiting around for Mr.
> > No Show. I have a Collins KWM-2 all hooked up and ready to take Dimmy
> > out whenever he shows up and starts his profanity again.
>
> So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere with
> another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97, doesn't
it?
> BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.

And it was AMP who suggested making a midnight call to tear down towers and
antennas. Just goes to show, you put a CB'er on Ham Radio and he's still a
CB'er.

3629. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:06:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1174e6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26626

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C108CD0.B87E7E1B@sccoast.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote...
> > ?
> > > I don't "wish" to believe anything.
> > > I want to see evidence and I've seen
> > > none to support an argument for or
> > > against.
> >
> > http://www.polyamory.org/
> > http://www.nasca.com/
> > http://www.ejhs.org/volume3/swing/body.htm
> >
> > Hope they help,
>
>
> Well, not really that helpful. I was hoping for a little less biased
> information. The three sites you offered are all sites supporting
> polygamous relationships (which is a little like sending a person to
> KKK sites to find out the truth about KKK groups). Thanks anyway, though.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

I sure do wish people would be just a little less cynical about "sources."
Dwight, a site that supports polygamous relationships is probably full of
expert *opinions* from those who practice polygamy. Just as probably one of
the best sources for cancer information would be from a site sponsored by an
agency that supports cancer research, The American Cancer Society.

You, yourself, have offered sources of information that "support" your point
of view. I would tell you that camping is one of the most rewarding
vacation experiences anyone could ever have; and I could support that point
of view with not only my own experience, but the evidence on several
websites. I am sure there are websites that offer other experiences as the
most rewarding vacation experience. To take it to an even more serious
level, I *could* tell you that smoking pot and driving is far safer than
drinking and driving. I could also tell you that from personal experience,
and could probably find sources of information that support my point of
view.

Now, on political stuff, all bets are off. I am no more likely to be inspired to a different way of thinking about something because I read or listen to someone like, say, Rush Limbaugh; just as you would not be by reading something out of Sojourners Truth (think that was the name of the magazine) or National Public Radio.

My question to you is, if you are not willing to accept the information that is offered as part of an offer of education about a certain topic, then why even debate. And, the likelihood that you will find an absolute independent source for topics of discussion is nearly, if not, nil.

Kim W5TIT

3630. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:08:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c117560_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26627

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1093A0.87EF9C2A@sccoast.net...
> Sean G Gilley wrote:
> >
> > That's what I thought we were discussing -- casual
> > lunches and other casual contacts between a male
> > and female.
>
>
> And that IS exactly what we're talking about, Sean. Many senior
> employees avoid casual lunches and other such contacts with junior
> opposite sex employees exactly because of the possible negative
> consequences. In fact, that has become SOP in many companies, backed
> up by stated company policies. And I would take that to the next step
> - relationships with equal employees with jobs dependent on mine. In
> other words, if my job had any bearing on that other person's job in
> any way whatsoever, that relationship would never go beyond casual
> conversations with other employees around (a lunch would be entirely
> out of the question).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Ah, the politically "correct" life. I don't subscribe to it. If you guys
do, that's up to you. I'll never bend so far as to be ruled by the fearful.

Kim W5TIT

3631. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:20:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c117832_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26628

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C109E40.BF313194@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Sorry, Dwight. I think what you've got there
> > is nothing more than a red herring. Imagination
> > at best, paranoia at worst. There are female
> > bosses, males bosses, everywhere, every day
> > that must deal with the opposite sex as either
> > their superior or employee.
>
>
> Of course, they do, Kim. And, if they have any sense, they would be
> very careful in doing so. And most do have sense enough to do so.
>

Uh, they are. They *don't* go around necking at every turn in the hallways
or during their lunches or private meetings! For crying out loud. You
sound like you are either subservient to or support the very things that
nidiots have come up with for us all to fear so that our whole "relationship
building" bites the dust. Sorry, but I have never worked in a
company--though I've only worked for maybe 5--that yet admonishes private
lunches or meetings with the opposite sex. Make sure I never live where you
have, because I find a life like that, corporate or private, ridiculous to
say the least.

>
> > (snip) After she left, it was time to go home,
> > but not before I spent a few moments with my
> > supervisor (again, a man) behind closed doors.
> > Imaginative, immature minds would call him a
> > lucky man. (snip)
>
>
> Okay, Kim. Lets take a look at that situation. If you went to work
> tomorrow and accused that boss of making sexual remarks, and even
> grabbing you, during that meeting (threatening to go to the press if
> the company didn't "protect" you), what do you think the company would
> do? I'm telling you right now, unless the company is foolish (sexual
> harassment lawsuits can attract national media exposure), they would
> almost immediately fire the manager and do just about anything to
> satisfy you.
>

And, so. What shall we do? Shall we make managers have to have only same-sex employees? Do we have chaperones for every "private" meeting that must take place?! This is ludicrous, Dwight. I am not doubting that it happens, as you say it does. BUT, I have never, ever, ever worked in a company where it is "uncommon" for two people of the opposite sex to have closed door meetings, or to have lunch one-on-one together.

> And it doesn't matter if what you said is true. In fact, the company
> may not even believe you. At this point, it really doesn't matter. The
> company has two choices - fire the employee or face negative publicity
> that could hurt the company's reputation. Since employees are
> expendable, the company is obviously going to take that route (find an
> excuse to fire the manager). And, by the way, they would find an
> excuse (they don't want him to sue, so they'll find something wrong
> with his work performance or simply call it "budget cutbacks").

And, I say to you that if it were *that* easy, there'd be unscrupulous people all over the place doing it.

> You don't even have to be the person making the complaint. Lets say
> another co-worker, who happens not to like you or the boss, makes a
> complaint that you two are spending too much time together and you're
> getting favorable treatment because of it. What is even worse, two or
> three other co-workers, friends of that co-worker, agrees with that
> complaint. Now what do you think the company is going to do? They have
> two choices - let you two continue to meet even if it causes friction
> in the workplace or end the friction in the workplace by ending your
> casual meetings around the workplace.

See above. And, believe me, I'd welcome an end to meetings with bosses and other employees! Oh, I wouldn't call an employee review, job interview, etc. a "casual meeting."

> It doesn't even have to be a co-worker complaining. Lets say Betty
> (made up name) doesn't like the fact that her husband is meeting with
> too many woman who work with him at the local small town factory, so
> she gets up in front of her church Sunday morning and begins talking
> about all the "sluts" who work for that company and all the illicit
> relationships between co-workers at that company. To make matters
> worse, a newspaper reporter, also a member of the church, hears this
> and decides to do an article about it in the local newspaper. Now what
> do you think the company is going to do?

Then I'd say, now you're really letting your imagination run wild, Dwight. I just plain don't believe this is happening with such regularity that companies all over have policies to keep opposite sex meetings from happening. I don't believe it for one minute.

>
> Now, I know you're convinced all these are simply outrageous
> examples made up to support my position, but let me assure you that
> each happened almost exactly as I described. In fact, I personally had
> to deal with each one of these cases myself. And you can add these to
> the many cases I've seen, or heard about, that I was not involved with
> in any way. So don't tell me this stuff is not going on because we're
> "far more adult than that," Kim. It is going on, and it is becoming
> more commonplace.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

No, Dwight. I'll tell you in a heartbeat that it isn't going on and I do believe that we are all far more adult than that. *If* this was going on as much as you say, and *if* the prevailing attitude were to adjust company policies because of it, there would be such a stranglehold on the ability of companies to do business that it would be impossible to do business!!

And, as I said, I have never, ever seen it happen yet. Yet is the operative word, but it is also the one on which I base my opinion that you have nothing more than a red herring.

Kim W5TIT

3632. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:23:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1178ec_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26629

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C10B67B.E07CC4CB@sccoast.net...
>
> For one so opposed to religion, you seem to be obsessed with the
> religious meaning of the word "satanic" (one who worships satan). Get
> out a dictionary, my friend. Today that word means one who is
> devilish, satan-like, infernal, wicked, or evil. Today, the direct
> religious meaning is hardly used anymore outside religious circles.
>

You are labeling many of my Wiccan friends, Dwight. And, I can assure they
are no more devilish, satan-like, infernal, wicked, or evil than you or I.
And, the American Indian beliefs could also be labeled, as you say,
"satanic" yet has no founding at all in such rubbish.

Kim W5TIT

3633. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:24:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c11793a$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26630

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C10B7EC.9B6AB3CF@sccoast.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > Damn, Dwight, we didn't know we had such a
> > sports hero among us! But, we do now--the
> > Internet never lies!
>
>
> So your premise now is that all web sites are wrong (lying) and only
> you could possibly be right? Or is it only the sites that disagree
> with you? Sorry, my friend, but, based on what you've written so far,
> I would believe a web site done by a drunken sailor from Brazil before
> I would believe you.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

EWwwww, Dwight. Low blowin' now, eh? Hmmmm, just a week ago you were a
proponent of ending this thread so that the "hateful" stuff would stop. LOL

Kim W5TIT

3634. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:28:10 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1179ff_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26631

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C10BB25.923CF31D@sccoast.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > (snip) I feel sorry for those who, through age
> > or infirmity, have lost the skills or physical
> > capabilities (vision, etc.) necessary to drive
> > a motor vehicle. But feeling sorry for them does
> > NOT mean permitting them to keep driving and
> > endangering others--it means trying to encourage
> > the creation--and use--of better public
> > transportation facilities so that such individuals
> > CAN remain independent yet still not endanger
> > the lives of others.
>
>
> What do you know - we finally agree on something. Having spent
> almost half my adult life living in Europe, I wish there was a better
> public transportation system in this country. And, when discussing
> public transportation, this (the elderly) is the one thing that is so
> often overlooked. In Europe, there are routine driving tests (reaction
> times, etc). When a person fails those tests, they lose the license.
> That means many older persons in those countries cannot drive, but
> there is an excellent public transportation system available to them.
> In fact, the system is so good, I often used it to go shopping because
> it was faster and far less hassle than dealing with traffic. Sadly,
> nothing similar exists in this country, so I have a much harder time
> accepting the notion of stripping the ability to drive from the elderly.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

heh heh heh. I live rural enough that I get my blind friends behind the
wheel of my vehicles and let them drive. I crack up at the story of one of
my former blind friends who drove down a residential street (creeping, mind
you) while the sighted owner of the vehicle used her cane to knock against
the sides of parked vehicles so she would miss them...ROFLMAO

The whole neighborhood was laughing, as I hear. (Before you do gooders
jump--the cane did absolutely no damage to any of the vehicles). Neither
did the blind person...LOL

Kim W5TIT

3635. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:29:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c117a43_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26632

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011207100121.13985.00000348@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article
<A6B45858D89DF4F4.0C2F51F00E234730.A6900C9F8C233837@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> > One based on fact, not superstition (read religious dogma &
> >theology); concern for others not selfishness; dedicated to freedom
> >not oppression; and based on the concept that the role of the state is
> >to protect and defend, not to regulate and control consensual
> >behavior. It would be a civilization in which the poet, the writer,
> >and the artist (even the less successful ones) were as respected as
> >the rock star, the politician, or the preacher and on in which
> >prejudice, self-righteousness, and hypocrisy did not exist.
> >
> > What kind would YOU like?
> >
> > Rick
>
> Rick:
>
> Actually, one pretty much the way you described it, but I don't find
> too much different with the civilization we have now and your ideal.
> Sure, we have problems, but we're human beings, and imperfect
> by nature. The trick is to rise above our imperfection, and continually
> strive to make things better.

So. When ya gonna start, Larry?

Kim W5TIT

3636. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:32:21 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c117af9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26633

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:D841CA89BDEDA32D.82206C0E47B55D34.368E527916190CE5@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 7 Dec 2001 09:16:37 -0800, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >Sorry to hear things aren't going well for you, and that your glass is so
> >philosophically empty. Personally, I'm glad George Bush is in charge.
>
> Of what--the destruction of the US Constitution?
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

He (they) sure is/are on his (their) way, eh?

Kim W5TIT

3637. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:37:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c117c28_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26634

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:C8CE8E9DF974C82C.8426634A826A06AD.0E8068ECD61F93BD@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 07:38:54 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >>
> >> Damn, Dwight, we didn't know we had such a
> >> sports hero among us! But, we do now--the
> >> Internet never lies!
> >>
> >>
> > So your premise now is that all web sites are wrong (lying) and only
> >you could possibly be right? Or is it only the sites that disagree
> >with you? Sorry, my friend, but, based on what you've written so far,
> >I would believe a web site done by a drunken sailor from Brazil before
> >I would believe you.
>
> Sorry, "Dribbles," but you got it wrong as usual.
>
> YOU'RE the one who was claiming that Wiccan and Pagan
> religions are really Satanic and attempting to "prove" it by referring
> to web sites, remember? You made it very clear that the web sites were
> the most accurate source of information.
>
> Well, Dwight, if that's true for you it's equally true for
> others--so since you insist that Wicca=Satanist based on your web
> search, I guess I'll stick with my claim that Dwight Stewart is a
> black, over weight, middle aged, former basketball player who studied
> as an undergraduate from 1988 to 1995 (kind of _slow_, weren't you?)
> then progressed through a series of one season contracts with "top"
> competitors like Yugoslavia and Poland. After all, that's what the web
> says and, as you make it clear, the web is always right.
>
> Next time, do your research intelligently (someone can help
> you with that part if you need them to--perhaps Cecil?) instead of
> using a web search to "prove" your absurd claims, and perhaps others
> will take the time to do the same as well.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH

> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Not to mention that well thought out sources of information are far more respectable to offer than those conjured up out of thoughtless absurdity. I have even had favorable discussions of Wiccan practices and theology with Catholic priests, who are quite willing to accept the belief system, and *know* the difference between a satanic or demonic cult, or the occult, and pagan religions.

Kim W5TIT

3638. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:42:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c117d71_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26636

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C111E41.BDCDDAB8@uci.edu...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Man, you got that right, Dwight. Hrrrmpphhh.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> You think Dwight is right that the United States is like Afghanistan?
> Get real, Kim.

I don't think Dwight is saying the United States is like Afghanistan,
therefore I cannot possibly think he is right about it. I believe Dwight's
observation is that, depending on what side one is on, one always feels the
victim and one always is the offender.

Kim W5TIT

3639. Re: TWISTEDHED PROMOTES ILLEGAL CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:46:17 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112071846.69bb9b82@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26635
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: KC8JBO WILL LICK MY BOOTS
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
Date: 2001-04-14 17:32:05 PST

Because I say so!

HAHAHAHA!

Twistedhed
King Of rec.radio.cb

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:<9uqpja$kh5$0@pita.alt.net>...
> Laaaaaardasssss Lllllllllllllllllllllloyd the nutsack slurping eternal
> technician
> "Lloyd" <barfies@BARFxxzzxx.net> wrote in message
> news:9uqk1v$87j$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > Doesn't KC8JBO operate on 27.555 USB ?????
>
> Quit humpin my leg, Lardasssssssss, and get back to slurping winos' nutsacks
> behind the dumpster.
>
> > "IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:ce9e428e.0112070439.3d576513@posting.google.com...
> > > Written by: RS 1175 (Florida, USA) e-mail: twistedhed@webtv.net
> > >
> > > Original story published in the April 2000 issue of Sporadic Waves
> > >
> > >
> > > DX Gone Crazy? International DX on the eleven meter free-band is there
> > > for the taking just about everyday on sideband. AM is also giving up
> > > rare contacts. But one of the better known frequencies for
> > > international DX contacts, 27.555 USB, once a jewel of pleasant
> > > listening and international contacts, has unfortunately deteriorated
> > > rapidly over the last few months, morphing itself into a vile
> > > cesspool, spewing forth all it's bile and waste, due to a small,
> > > intellectually-challenged, rapid group of angry, self-loathing and
> > > pathetic operators who have taken it upon themselves to take up a
> > > permanent-like residential status there, and in the process,
> > > completely abdicated any civil, polite conversation.
> > >
> > > 27.555 has long been an international world wide contact frequency.
> > > Standard protocol has always dictated one makes a contact and QSY's to

> > > another frequency for their conversation, thus leaving the call
> > > frequency open at all times for contacts. This small but nefarious
> > > group is attempting to jam, interfere, and prevent any DX contacts
> > > from being made on frequency. In case you haven't listened in on 555
> > > as of late, the frequency has literally become a key down fest with
> > > language that one would be embarrassed to hear in the company of
> > > children, while only those blowing ridiculous amounts of power are
> > > being heard. Some incredibly rare and difficult DX contacts have
> > > effectively been nullified because so many operators are choosing to
> > > fight fire with fire....in other words, many are pumping up their
> > > wattage rather than surrender the frequency. While I can somewhat
> > > empathize with the operators who are attempting to defend this bit of
> > > DX space, especially the ones who are located outside of the U.S. and
> > > are permitted to transmit there, I can't seem to shake the old adage
> > > that keeps playing in my mind, "If you are not part of the solution,
> > > you are part of the problem."
> > >
> > > Power wars are not going to solve anything. The frequency has so much
> > > trash on it that it is already beginning to sound like the frequencies
> > > many have attempted to elude. While 27.555 used to be an everyday stop
> > > during my channel surfing activities, it no longer is. Oh, I
> > > occasionally flip there in hopes that the channel may somehow have
> > > become civilized again, but as soon as I hear the hate and discontent,
> > > I no longer have the patience to listen for a far off exotic station
> > > just to have them get keyed on as they give the frequency they are
> > > QSYing to. It is easier to change the frequency.
> > >
> > > Other operators around the world are also gravitating to nearby and
> > > other frequencies. In the last 2 weeks, I have heard France, Italy,
> > > Germany, the U.K., and Holland comment on what a sad state 27.555 has
> > > become due to the selfish and inconsiderate actions of a few. 27.415
> > > to 27.595 is yielding great DX. It appears that operators are still
> > > making their contacts, they are just working a little harder to get
> > > them. Instead of relying strictly on 555, many long time ops who USED
> > > to utilize that frequency exclusively are found hovering close by.
> > > Since January, I have counted no less than 30 countries on frequencies
> > > close to 555. While 38 LSB(27.385) continues to be a productive DX
> > > channel, it mirrors 555 in language, harassment and abuse. Not
> > > surprisingly, the perpetrators on 38 claim the same geographical
> > > locale as the offenders on 555, which is more than likely true, as I
> > > noticed that when the skip conditions begin to fade from the
> > > blathering idiots on 555, the same occurs on 38.
> > >
> > > (continued at http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page8.html)
> >
> >

3640. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:47:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c117e7f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26637

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C114648.D10C9D4A@sccoast.net...
>
> Well, I certainly think that type of behavior is wrong, but I'm not
> basing that on any religious belief ("sinful"). In fact, I don't even
> understand why liberals always start screaming about religion
> everytime someone takes a moral stand against anything liberals
> support? Do liberals think it is impossible to have a moral belief
> without involving religion? Do all liberals think there are only two
> alternatives - religion or everything goes? If that is what you think,
> you're wrong. It's not just religious fanatics who are opposed to the
> liberal nonsense in this country.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

I don't know why conservatives always have to start slinging that term
"liberal" around in the middle of a good argument. As though every person
deemed to be a liberal *always* thinks within the same parameters; and every
person deemed to be a conservative *always* thinks within the same
parameters. I would hope that most people are far more capable of thinking
than defining their principles as being aligned to a particular political
party. If so, call me a *COMPLETE* independent.

Kim W5TIT

3641. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:49:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c117f16_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26639

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C11504E.7ACE1EFD@sccoast.net...
>
> And by just about everyone else in this country, and around the
> world for that matter. Walk down any street in this country and ask
> people to identify the practices of satanism. About 99 percent, both
> religious and non-religious, would list these very things. That is the
> reality, Rick. Of course, I suppose you'll now say the entire world it
wrong.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

I sure would. If something is wrong, and if something is believed because
of wrong perceptions, wrongfully placed concepts, then it's still wrong.
Thank goodness our forefathers believed that.

Kim W5TIT

3642. NUTTY FREEBANDER TWISTEDHED SASSES N0BK

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:53:18 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112071853.22de96f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26638
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: Freeband Export Radios
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-04-08 00:46:05 PST

I have seen enough of your posts to know you usually make sense -- a lot more sense than you are making here.

"What about you, Dick? In rec.radio.cb you support freebanding and amps. Here you act snotty. Hmmm?"

1. Your tormentors have in general been Codeless Techs who seem to be in need of love. Below 28 MHz most of us old guys could not care less; I sure as hell don't.

"That's the Dick we know and love. Good boy. Don't step out of line again"

To some extent you are reaping the fallout of some interesting politics within the Amateur Service but we can't keep headcases from passing exams any more than you can prevent their buying radios.

"If you are an example of this you are a prime one. Enough said"

2. Beyond that, substitute 'methamphetamine' for 'freeband' and look at your post again. Lots of things exist that would not in an ideal world. Doesn't make them desirable.

"Realism is the mark of a true intellectual. Let us see if you can pass the test"

3. A gentleman, it is said, is one who ignores the trivial, is a cast-iron SOB about more important things, and has sense enough to know the difference. Lots of things exist in the 25-35 MHz range including the ten-meter ham band. Are we supposed to roll over and play dead?

"In a word, yes. The opposition is overwhelming. The old must go out and the new must come in. Your hobby is dying. If 10 and 12 meters must fall, you have no choice but to let it"

4. RESPECT is an interesting term. The black community picked up one version of it from cracker whites and it has gotten a number of them killed. Do you expect deference from outlawry?

"What about the outlawry of 3950 and 14310? Your slip is showing Dick"

If so, what is the
difference between a freebander and a pimp? Diana Ross notwithstanding,
R-E-S-P-E-C-T (sock it to me) is no way to run things.

"Simple. But we the enlightened do not expect you to understand. Freebanding
harms no one. Pimping does. Except when it is a ham turncoat like you lurking
in rec.radio.cb waiting to rat out CBers"

If you mean genuine admiration for achievement, for what might this be
extended?

"It might be extended to freebanders and those that want to operate radio
transceivers without the complications of licensing. A little respect is
in order to your betters"

If the idea is 'make nice' and don't state the obvious, take it up with
the chaplain.

"You and your dying hobby need a prayer, not me and mine"

In my football coaching days, I set as the ideal for respect having the
other team lurch toward the showers beat to shit but saying something
like, "And they beat the crap out of us within the rules". It is the
difference between competition and thuggery, the difference between a
boxer and a street brawler.

"Following rules does not a man make. If the Constitution prevents me from
talking on 24 MHz I want to see where it is written so"

5. No discussion of 'power' is complete without pointing out that it is
blessed useless in the lo-VHF frequencies. If 100 watts won't do it, fix
your antenna, learn to operate, or go home. Manhood problems are no
excuse for moose and dirty linears on either side of 28.

"Too bad for your POV Dick. What we want we will simply take. Time you learned
the rules, boy"

There is a basic lack of understanding: Given that a few weeks with Morse
Academy http://ah0a.org and some quick bathroom reading at irregular
intervals will make 28.3-28.5 legal in no time and some more reading while
picking up the kid at school will make all of ten meters legal, there
isn't just a lot of sense in freebanding, period, if communication is the
object of the exercise. So amateurs tend to suspect that freebanding has
much the same motivation as mis-aimed fog lites on a clear day, "Look at
me, I'm Sandra Dee, lousy with virginity." The lamps are known as
Virginity Lights in some circles; watch some dude with his 'kewl' pickup
(or the ubiquitous Blazer) howl when the arresting officer notes that on
the ticket.

"There you go again with the authority figures. They do not scare us, Dick.
Take off the bogeyman costume"

The essence of your argument is 'prepare to be overwhelmed'. OK, I am
prepared.

"I hope you are prepared for freebanding to prevail and spread to your precious hammie bands"

3643. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 02:54:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c118013_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26640

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C115408.4B06E79F@sccoast.net...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > (snip) Try to imagine the reaction if the White House
> > and Congress jointly proposed a $1 tax on each gallon
> > of gasoline sold for private passenger car use, with
> > the tax to be spent only for public surface
> > transportation.
>
>
> LOL. I don't think there is a Senator or Congressman with the balls
> to do it. Heck, I'm not even sure I would have the balls to do it if I
> were in their situation. They haven't tarred and feathered anyone in
> this country recently, but I'm sure some would serious think about it.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

I haven't been following this conversation, so not sure what the context is.
I do know that if the government were truthful about the $1 tax and we'd had
no prior experiences to the contrary, I'd be all for it. I'd also want the
money *equally* distributed on something like a per mile of government
highway in a state. In other words, a huge landsurface state may still only
end up with a small percentage of the money because of less federal highway
in that state. That is, if you are talking about highways being "public
surface transportation." If you are talking about busses and trains...yech,
forget it. Tried both and hate 'em. I'll pollute, thank you.

Kim W5TIT

3644. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 03:33:21 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <5SfQ7.1840$hQ3.79569007@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26641
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Oh don't worry about Aaron, Bill.
You have just been introduced to one
of the three rec.radio.cb trolls. He
claims to not even be a cb'er or ham,
but touts the agenda of a Crusade to rid
the airwaves of export radio's and amps
via the only source he knows.....
Rec.Radio.CB.
He even tries to quell free speech, just
discussing amps or export radios, he will
label you a federal criminal. If you have
your picture taken along side an export
radio or amp, he will label you a federal
criminal. Even if you said to have used
one, but are not now or plan to in the future
he will label you a criminal.
Yes a true believer in wiping out the worlds
supply of export radios and linears, just by
trolling Rec.Radio.Cb.

Landshark

--
"BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3c115ed8.1866925@news.mindspring.com...
> On 6 Dec 2001 21:30:26 -0800, voobner@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner)
> wrote:
>
> >"Landshark" S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net wrote
> >> What he is saying is correct. Most police
> >>officers (while in their heart they think that what
> >>they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
> >>training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
> >>can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
> >>is merely an inconvenience to someone.
> >> NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
> >>one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
> >>tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
> >>say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
> >>thinks is right.
> >>
> >> Landshark

> >
> >Good god, I've never heard such whining, paranoia, and blatant
> >attempts at stampeding hams than I've heard from some of the more
> >illegally-minded CBers in this thread.
> >
> >The Tacoma ordinance was passed as a response to out-of-control outlaw
> >CBers using huge illegal amplifiers causing consumer interference
> >complaints. The FCC does not have a staff of 300,000 on the job so
> >the local LEO's are forced to deal with it. (Don't forget WHO caused
> >this situation to come about. Not the FCC. Not the cops. The outlaw
> >CBers did. Without THEIR shenanigans there would BE no Tacoma
> >Ordinance)
> >
> >Somehow this has situation been "spun" into lots of wild predictions
> >about pot-bellied cops hassling licensed amateurs about their mobile
> >rigs.
> >
> >If the cops in your area are as corrupt and dumb as some are saying
> >(can't recognize one radio from another, can't recognize an amp, can't
> >tell a ham license from a fishing license), then believe me, you got
> >troubles that go FAR beyond radio enforcement. I'd move to another
> >town.
> >
> >-Aaron-
>
> Aaron, is there truly a new law in Tacoma? No one has
> actually found one to exist.
>
> Additionally, I agree that the law, if it exists, is targeted at
> illegal high power CB ops...from home locations...NOT from cars.
> The high power home illegals are the ones that cause
> constant ongoing interference. No one much
> cares about an illegal power amp in an 18 wheeler rolling down I-5.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

3645. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 03:33:55 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <PPfQ7.120129$8n4.8028971@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26642
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

And I will not argue with him on the scene. If he ignores my license, fails to find out, or know,
the procedure I will see the SOB in court IF he takes my equipment. He WILL get in trouble
because part of that equipment was purchased with Department of Defense funds. He damn well
better produce it in the same condition it was in prior to confiscation or he will answer to someone lots more "connected" than me. Don't tell me a cop is above the law he is sworn to enforce and, therefore, I "can't" get him in trouble for falsely taking private property because he ":thinks" the civilian is wrong.

I don't get into arguments with cops--I know better. But you better believe that whatever legal
avenues I have against a Rambo cop, I WILL use them. Hey, I am a vindictive person, what can
I say? LOL!

Jerry
K4KWH

Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
news:egXP7.4480$xy4.1674762434@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
> What he is saying is correct. Most police
> officers (while in their heart they think that what
> they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
> training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
> can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
> is merely an inconvenience to someone.
> NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
> one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
> tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
> say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
> thinks is right.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"
>
>
> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C0FFEBC.FB60F89D@gte.net...
> >

> > Who says that he would "arrest". What the
> > normal procedure would be is to take the
> > equipment, issue a court citation then let
> > the courts and the attorneys settle it out.
> >
> > This is often what happens when the cop
> > is not totally familiar with the law or the
> > ham does not have his license on him.
> >
> > What you should not do is argue as you are
> > not going to win. The street is not the place
> > to settle such issues, the courts are. And no
> > cop is going to let you get out of control and
> > argue with him. He will call back up and arrest
> > you for resisting law enforcement (non compliance
> > is a crime). You may get the radio back but
> > you will pay a fine for being a jerk.
> >
> >
> >
>
>

3646. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 04:01:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011207230108.25913.00000297@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 26643

In article <3C109E40.BF313194@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> It doesn't even have to be a co-worker complaining. Lets say Betty
>(made up name) doesn't like the fact that her husband is meeting with
>too many woman who work with him at the local small town factory, so
>she gets up in front of her church Sunday morning and begins talking
>about all the "sluts" who work for that company and all the illicit
>relationships between co-workers at that company. To make matters
>worse, a newspaper reporter, also a member of the church, hears this
>and decides to do an article about it in the local newspaper. Now what
>do you think the company is going to do?
>
> Now, I know you're convinced all these are simply outrageous
>examples made up to support my position, but let me assure you that
>each happened almost exactly as I described. In fact, I personally had
>to deal with each one of these cases myself. And you can add these to
>the many cases I've seen, or heard about, that I was not involved with
>in any way. So don't tell me this stuff is not going on because we're
>"far more adult than that," Kim. It is going on, and it is becoming
>more commonplace.

Dwight:

You are soooooo right, my friend. I spent all but the first three years of
my Air Force career in supervisory positions, and because I was in an
"administrative" career field, I worked with an unusually high percentage
of female Airmen. When I was a Passenger Service shift supervisor during
my first tour at Rhein Main AB, Germany, almost half of the workforce was
female -- both military and foreign national civilians. The one thing I
learned about them right away was very few of them were above using
their sex to "get over" on supervisors. A few of them had their own male
shift supervisors wrapped right around their fingers, and when they made
a change onto my shift, started having problems when that didn't work with
me -- and were all of a sudden expected to perform up to standard. That's
when the problems came, and I instinctively made certain that there were
no "closed door" counseling sessions, no "private" chats, no situation where
there was an unwitnessed exchange between myself and the female Airman
in question. As it turns out, this was a good policy, for I never had any
problems with accusations from female subordinates; unfortunately,
my own boss did!

In any and all workplaces where both sexes are represented, women,
and especially attractive women, have infinitely more power in any

given situation where they dealing with men. There is nothing "equal" about their position, and "equality" of treatment is the last thing they want. Those who aren't flaunting their sexual desirability for personal gain are using their "victim status" to gain an advantage. Sure, there are women who are competent professionals who keep "sexual politics" out of their business affairs, but the ones who don't wreck the general reputation of women as employees. I'm sure that Kim is now going to come up with some kind of typically inane, defensive response, but that doesn't my opinion -- one based on lengthy experience in working with women. Kim would say something like "grow up." I'd tell her to do the same!

The only way for a responsible professional to behave when dealing with a superior or subordinate of the opposite sex is to keep all interactions on a strictly professional level, and no "private" meetings, counseling sessions, planning sessions, or two person-only business trips.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3647. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 05:06:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c11a0bd_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26644

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011207230108.25913.00000297@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3C109E40.BF313194@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> >
> > It doesn't even have to be a co-worker complaining. Lets say Betty
> >(made up name) doesn't like the fact that her husband is meeting with
> >too many woman who work with him at the local small town factory, so
> >she gets up in front of her church Sunday morning and begins talking
> >about all the "sluts" who work for that company and all the illicit
> >relationships between co-workers at that company. To make matters
> >worse, a newspaper reporter, also a member of the church, hears this
> >and decides to do an article about it in the local newspaper. Now what
> >do you think the company is going to do?
> >
> > Now, I know you're convinced all these are simply outrageous
> >examples made up to support my position, but let me assure you that
> >each happened almost exactly as I described. In fact, I personally had
> >to deal with each one of these cases myself. And you can add these to
> >the many cases I've seen, or heard about, that I was not involved with
> >in any way. So don't tell me this stuff is not going on because we're
> >"far more adult than that," Kim. It is going on, and it is becoming
> >more commonplace.
>
> Dwight:
>
> You are soooooo right, my friend. I spent all but the first three years
of
> my Air Force career in supervisory positions, and because I was in an
> "administrative" career field, I worked with an unusually high percentage
> of female Airmen. When I was a Passenger Service shift supervisor during
> my first tour at Rhein Main AB, Germany, almost half of the workforce was
> female -- both military and foreign national civilians. The one thing I
> learned about them right away was very few of them were above using
> their sex to "get over" on supervisors. A few of them had their own male
> shift supervisors wrapped right around their fingers, and when they made
> a change onto my shift, started having problems when that didn't work with
> me -- and were all of a sudden expected to perform up to standard. That's
> when the problems came, and I instinctively made certain that there were
> no "closed door" counseling sessions, no "private" chats, no situation
where
> there was an unwitnessed exchange between myself and the female Airman
> in question. As it turns out, this was a good policy, for I never had any

> problems with accusations from female subordinates; unfortunately,
> my own boss did!
>
> In any and all workplaces where both sexes are represented, women,
> and especially attractive women, have infinitely more power in any
> given situation where they dealing with men. There is nothing "equal"
> about their position, and "equality" of treatment is the last thing they
> want. Those who aren't flaunting their sexual desirability for personal
> gain are using their "victim status" to gain an advantage. Sure, there
> are women who are competent professionals who keep "sexual
> politics" out of their business affairs, but the ones who don't wreck the
> general reputation of women as employees. I'm sure that Kim is now
> going to come up with some kind of typically inane, defensive
> response, but that doesn't my opinion -- one based on lengthy
> experience in working with women. Kim would say something like
> "grow up." I'd tell her to do the same!
>

Nope, I'd say that you've either been victimized by some very, very wicked women, or you love the imagination you carry on with. I'd also say that you are right within your usual abrasive character (you know, the one you call so goodhearted) to claim that women are only effective in the workplace because of a) their good looks, or b) their capability to make a man a victim. You're a joke, as usual, Larry.

>
> The only way for a responsible professional to behave when dealing
> with a superior or subordinate of the opposite sex is to keep all
> interactions on a strictly professional level, and no "private" meetings,
> counseling sessions, planning sessions, or two person-only
> business trips.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah, and you must work for a company that will never progress beyond the point they are at right now--as your business tactics are about as backwoods as could possibly be imagined.

Let me suggest to you, Larry, that you find some women who are of admirable character, rather whatever little sluts you must have been hanging around your entire life.

Kim W5TIT

3648. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 06:28:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C11B311.5A7FD91@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26645

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Thu, 06 Dec 2001 21:09:03 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> >" ". "
> > ", he added.
> >
> >Well, Phil,
> >
> >" ". That's my final word on the
> >subject.
>
> The contents of my first message was all that was necessary to add
> to the discussion.....

You do have a point, Phil, but I couldn't let the opportunity pass.

Dave K8MN

3649. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 06:42:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C11B63D.E4F8B0A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26646

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > I think that you've missed the humor, Rick.
> > Dwight doesn't know of a religion called
> > "Stewartism".
>
> Wow, do they have a religion like that, Dave? I'll join.

I think the sanest way to set up the basic tenets are to simply agree with the religious views of the last person who speaks, i.e. if Cecil tells you that you are going to hell for dancing or eating pork, you agree. If Rick Adams screams that there is no God, you agree. In this manner, you avoid all debate on religious matters.

Since we are now in a new millenium, you might consider spiffing up your place of worship. I suggest that you have, as an altar, a large home entertainment center. The focal point on the altar can be a large screen TV. For sacraments, try Jack Daniels and stale Cheetos. You'll also need "the book". I suggest some old copies of 73 magazine. From time to time you can pick up "the book" and read from the ravings of "St. Wayne".

I'm working on the method of eternal punishment for those who fail to follow the tenets of this new religion. I haven't gotten all the details worked out yet but I'm working on something like this:
You die and end up spending eternity at Kim's house...or maybe it just seems like it.

Let me know what you think.

Dave K8MN

3650. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 08:06:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6589BF799F545EE5.1098B80E19512A6C.883E5AEA99BED045@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26647

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 14:51:01 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> The Libertarians are the ones that want a privatized society,
>> remember?
>
>EGADS, Rick. Libertarians are not for a privatized government.
>Libertarians are all for an armed forces, a police system,
>and a court system, i.e. the systems necessary to protect
>our inalienable rights.

But they want to farm out everything else and run the
government services on a fee basis. If it is "fee" based rather than
supported by taxes, it's only reasonable that the private sector be
permitted to compete (after all, the free market IS the core principle
of Libertarian policy, right?)--which leads back to the situation I
listed originally.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3651. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 12:08:21 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <VonQ7.215150$3d2.9753787@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26648

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011207230108.25913.00000297@mb-dh.aol.com...
> In article <3C109E40.BF313194@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> >
> > It doesn't even have to be a co-worker complaining. Lets say Betty
> >(made up name) doesn't like the fact that her husband is meeting with
> >too many woman who work with him at the local small town factory, so
> >she gets up in front of her church Sunday morning and begins talking
> >about all the "sluts" who work for that company and all the illicit
> >relationships between co-workers at that company. To make matters
> >worse, a newspaper reporter, also a member of the church, hears this
> >and decides to do an article about it in the local newspaper. Now what
> >do you think the company is going to do?
> >
> > Now, I know you're convinced all these are simply outrageous
> >examples made up to support my position, but let me assure you that
> >each happened almost exactly as I described. In fact, I personally had
> >to deal with each one of these cases myself. And you can add these to
> >the many cases I've seen, or heard about, that I was not involved with
> >in any way. So don't tell me this stuff is not going on because we're
> >"far more adult than that," Kim. It is going on, and it is becoming
> >more commonplace.
>
> Dwight:
>
> You are soooooo right, my friend. I spent all but the first three years
of
> my Air Force career in supervisory positions, and because I was in an
> "administrative" career field, I worked with an unusually high
percentage
> of female Airmen. When I was a Passenger Service shift supervisor
during
> my first tour at Rhein Main AB, Germany, almost half of the workforce
was
> female -- both military and foreign national civilians. The one thing I
> learned about them right away was very few of them were above using
> their sex to "get over" on supervisors. A few of them had their own
male
> shift supervisors wrapped right around their fingers, and when they made
> a change onto my shift, started having problems when that didn't work
with
> me -- and were all of a sudden expected to perform up to standard.

That's
> when the problems came, and I instinctively made certain that there were
> no "closed door" counseling sessions, no "private" chats, no situation
where
> there was an unwitnessed exchange between myself and the female Airman
> in question. As it turns out, this was a good policy, for I never had
any
> problems with accusations from female subordinates; unfortunately,
> my own boss did!
>
> In any and all workplaces where both sexes are represented, women,
> and especially attractive women, have infinitely more power in any
> given situation where they dealing with men. There is nothing "equal"
> about their position, and "equality" of treatment is the last thing they
> want. Those who aren't flaunting their sexual desirability for personal
> gain are using their "victim status" to gain an advantage. Sure, there
> are women who are competent professionals who keep "sexual
> politics" out of their business affairs, but the ones who don't wreck
the
> general reputation of women as employees. I'm sure that Kim is now
> going to come up with some kind of typically inane, defensive
> response, but that doesn't my opinion -- one based on lengthy
> experience in working with women. Kim would say something like
> "grow up." I'd tell her to do the same!
>
>
> The only way for a responsible professional to behave when dealing
> with a superior or subordinate of the opposite sex is to keep all
> interactions on a strictly professional level, and no "private"
meetings,
> counseling sessions, planning sessions, or two person-only
> business trips.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Sure parallels my experience. Could not agree more.

When speakin' of the ladies,
they're as like as a row of pins,
for the Colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady
are sisters under the skins.

3652. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 13:19:45 UTC
From: Enrique Alejandro Martinez <pilotenrique@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <9ut41idr1@onyx.indstate.edu>
Source record: 26649
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well Military reject... Number one, I am a US citizen, so you can call the
INS. They will find all my papers in order. Call the computer admin, I am
not abusing anything. At least I use a real news server and not some anon
freebee like you COWARD. Get a life. You act like my 10 year old cousin.
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9urjsh$k70$3@pita.alt.net...
> Illegal alien and soon to be turned into the INS for having an expired
visa,
> "Enrique Alejandro Martinez" <pilotenrique@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:9ur4dn$h5h$1@onyx.indstate.edu...
>
> Hmmmmm the computer system administrator will just have to suspend your
> internet acess for abusing the school's computer resources, bean boy.
>
> > Roger is a loser anyway. There is no sense even argueing with him here.
> His
> > only responses are his lame racial slurs. I think its funny. He has a
big
> > mouth on the keyboard, but in person he would run away.
>
> Get your ass over here if you can get gas for the Cordoba you drive, bean
> boy.
>
>
>
> > "Pancho Hernandez" <PHernandez@umashistorydept.con> wrote in message
> > news:9updvocsf0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:9um6p0oh7@pita.alt.net...
> > > > I wish that I'd have
> > > > recorded it, because I would send it in. The station will be set up
so
> I
> > > can
> > > > record very soon.
> > > >
> > > You are seriously misinformed if you think Riley
> > Hollingsworth
> > > would accept any tape recordings from you. You have been the
> > > recipient of several warnings from Hollingsworth. Therefore my boy,
> > > you must be very stupid indeed, if you think you have even a shred
> > > of credibility with Hollingsworth. Put in simple language you might
> > > be able to understand. You are a known repeat violator of FCC

> > > rules and regulations my boy!!!!!! Now, would you like for us to
> > > post all your warning letters from Hollingsworth? so everyone can
> > > see what a fool you are Roger? Go back to playing on your CB
> > > radio. That is more akin to your level of expertise
butthole!!!!!!!!!!
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

3653. Re: ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 14:11:35 UTC
From: Tony B <user819401@chasonlinemail.org>
Message-ID: <9ut6tqsid0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:EFB532FA15C772D2.9672E32B678B6263.48FAE5B7EA078316@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 15:51:41 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>
> >Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC's Special Counsel for
> >Amateur Radio enforcement told the forum that Amateur Radio road rage
> >must stop now
>
> Now there's a threat; stop fighting or Riley's going to send you a
> whole bunch of progressively slightly nastier letters. If you live
> long enough for him to finally get tired of writing warnings to you,
> then there may be an actual enforcement action.

Yes, after Smiley Riley generates a mountain of worthless paper
to the perp, Smiley will stamp his feet and jump up and down.
Brings to mind a current open case in the Atlanta area. The perp
has a FCC enforcement record dating back to the late 70s on CB.
In 1990, the perp went world wide with a ham license. He immediately
came to the attention of FCC enforcement and has ever since been
collecting violation notices from the FCC, except for the times he's
been incarcerated. He responds to all violation notices with a simple,
"not me, fake tapes, someone else, I am being picked on unfairly,
etc.....ad nauseam." An engineer at Powder Springs said when
they closed the monitoring station, they forwarded a paper file on the
guy that was almost 12 inches thick! Smiley Riley's
credibility in this case is seriously questioned. A Congressional
Aide looked at the case and had some specific comments
about FCC inaction, saying the case was going to provide some
good ammo when the FCC comes begging Congress for this and
that.

3654. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 14:23:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c122323_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26701

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C11B63D.E4F8B0A@earthlink.net...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > I think that you've missed the humor, Rick.
> > > Dwight doesn't know of a religion called
> > > "Stewartism".
> >
> > Wow, do they have a religion like that, Dave? I'll join.
>
> I think the sanest way to set up the basic tenets are to simply agree
> with the religious views of the last person who speaks, i.e. if Cecil
> tells you that you are going to hell for dancing or eating pork, you
> agree. If Rick Adams screams that there is no God, you agree. In this
> manner, you avoid all debate on religious matters.
>
> Since we are now in a new millenium, you might consider spiffing up your
> place of worship. I suggest that you have, as an altar, a large home
> entertainment center. The focal point on the altar can be a large
> screen TV. For sacraments, try Jack Daniels and stale Cheetos. You'll
> also need "the book". I suggest some old copies of 73 magazine. From
> time to time you can pick up "the book" and read from the ravings of
> "St. Wayne".
>
> I'm working on the method of eternal punishment for those who fail to
> follow the tenets of this new religion. I haven't gotten all the
> details worked out yet but I'm working on something like this:
> You die and end up spending eternity at Kim's house...or maybe it just
> seems like it.
>
> Let me know what you think.
>
> Dave K8MN

You've obviously got a lot of work to do yet, then, Dave. An eternity at my house would be Heaven compared to one at Larry Roll's.

Kim W5TIT

3655. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 14:44:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C122742.5B95C7BD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26702

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >> The Libertarians are the ones that want a privatized society,
> >> remember?
> > >
> > >EGADS, Rick. Libertarians are not for a privatized government.
> > >Libertarians are all for an armed forces, a police system,
> > >and a court system, i.e. the systems necessary to protect
> > >our inalienable rights.
>
> But they want to farm out everything else and run the
> government services on a fee basis. If it is "fee" based rather than
> supported by taxes, it's only reasonable that the private sector be
> permitted to compete (after all, the free market IS the core principle
> of Libertarian policy, right?)--which leads back to the situation I
> listed originally.

The key is that, unlike your original situation, Libertarians do NOT
advocate privatizing the court system. There has been a suggestion
that the court system could provide income for the government through
the charging of fees thus lowering the tax burden. However, the court
system would still be a monopoly with no private competition allowed.
It is not reasonable to privatize the court system.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3656. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 14:46:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1227DE.A776FD2B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26703

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> You've obviously got a lot of work to do yet, then, Dave. An eternity at my
> house would be Heaven compared to one at Larry Roll's.

One man's hell is another man's heaven. I once knew a masochist
who was looking forward to hell. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3657. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 15:02:14 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <WXpQ7.5888$J%1.1956491403@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26704
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Jerry, calm down man, your blood
pressure, remember your heart! (Grin)
I'm sure that you will do the right
thing Jerry, but there is a sure way to
avoid this all together.....
..... Don't go to Tacoma.
Take care,

Landshark

--
"BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:PPfQ7.120129$8n4.8028971@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> And I will not argue with him on the scene. If he ignores my license,
fails
> to find out, or know,
> the procedure I will see the SOB in court IF he takes my equipment. He
WILL
> get in trouble
> because part of that equipment was purchased with Department of Defense
> funds. He damn well
> better produce it in the same condition it was in prior to confiscation or
> he will answer to someone lots more "connected" than me. Don't tell me a
> cop is above the law he is sworn to enforce and, therefore, I "can't" get
> him in trouble for falsely taking private property because he ":thinks"
the
> civilian is wrong.
>
> I don't get into arguments with cops--I know better. But you better
believe
> that whatever legal
> avenues I have against a Rambo cop, I WILL use them. Hey, I am a
vindictive
> person, what can
> I say? LOL!
>
> Jerry
> K4KWH
>
>
>
> Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message

> news:egXP7.4480$xy4.1674762434@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
> > What he is saying is correct. Most police
> > officers (while in their heart they think that what
> > they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
> > training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
> > can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
> > is merely an inconvenience to someone.
> > NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
> > one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
> > tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
> > say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
> > thinks is right.
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> >
> > --
> > "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"
> >
> >
> > "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
news:3C0FFEBC.FB60F89D@gte.net...
> > >
> > > Who says that he would "arrest". What the
> > > normal procedure would be is to take the
> > > equipment, issue a court citation then let
> > > the courts and the attorneys settle it out.
> > >
> > > This is often what happens when the cop
> > > is not totally familiar with the law or the
> > > ham does not have his license on him.
> > >
> > > What you should not do is argue as you are
> > > not going to win. The street is not the place
> > > to settle such issues, the courts are. And no
> > > cop is going to let you get out of control and
> > > argue with him. He will call back up and arrest
> > > you for resisting law enforcement (non compliance
> > > is a crime). You may get the radio back but
> > > you will pay a fine for being a jerk.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>
>

3658. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 15:40:29 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <NvqQ7.215279$3d2.9769896@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26705

> > Richard McCollum wrote

> > > Without having a clue how it happens, 141 Tech Pluses have been
renewed
> > > since der Tag including one in November. The last one expires in
December
> > > 2011.

> "Richard Plourde" wrote

> > Whats a "der Tag"?

"Richard McCollum" wrote

> The Day. Since the Tech Plus supposedly no longer existed

There was no such day. Technician Plus Licenses still exist.

Rich

3659. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 15:49:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011208104927.28268.00000199@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26706

In article <3C115408.4B06E79F@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> (snip) Try to imagine the reaction if the White House
>> and Congress jointly proposed a $1 tax on each gallon
>> of gasoline sold for private passenger car use, with
>> the tax to be spent only for public surface
>> transportation.
>
>
> LOL. I don't think there is a Senator or Congressman with the balls
>to do it. Heck, I'm not even sure I would have the balls to do it if I
>were in their situation. They haven't tarred and feathered anyone in
>this country recently, but I'm sure some would serious think about it.
>
Agreed. But think what the reaction would be!

In Europe and Japan, where the public transit is so good, the taxes on gasoline
are far more than $1 per gallon. We could have even better systems here in the
USA, but Americans aren't ready to pay the price - yet.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3660. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 15:49:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011208104927.28268.00000198@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26709

In article <106EDAA36CBDB0CF.FBB270E149FC9B39.475A7CE35203100A@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:09 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Yup. But ya don't see pentagrams on the Acropolis or in the Pantheon.
>
> You see them in ancient ruins in Northern Europe, in the
>Temples of India and Sri Lanka, in parts of Egypt, and in the ruins of
>Sumarian lands.

You originally included ancient Rome and Greece - now you leave 'em out.
>
>>The Roman and Greek "nature religions" tried for centuries to eradicate
>>Christianity and its source religion, Judaism. Do you know who Antiochus
>was?
>
> So?

Guess you don't know who Antiochus was.
>
> The Christians did a pretty good job of reversing that trend
>when it came to the Pagan faiths of Northern Europe--as well as the
>Jewish faith in Spain--or did the Inquisition slip past you unnoticed.

I knew about the Inquisition by the time I was 11.

There were also all sorts of persecutions of Jews in other countries besides
Spain, persecutions for heresy (Christian killing Christian in the name of
Christ), and the Crusades, which were often thinly disguised land grabs for
second sons.
>
>>Constantine changed all that.
>
> And a RC Pope restarted the killing.

Yup. The best argument for separation of church and state is the record of what
happens without it.
>
> Perhaps you can see a difference between a Roman killing a
>person for his or her religion and a Christian doing the same.

You are equating "Roman Catholic" with "Christian". They are not the same. One
is a subset of the other. Not all Christian religions have a history of killing
in the name of religion.

>Personally, I can't.

Then present the whole story. When the pagans were in power, they killed Christians. When the tables were turned, the killing continued. Paybacks.

Two wrongs don't make a right. But you present only the Christian wrong, never the pagan wrong.
>
> Speaking of killing people for their religion, here's a
>completely accurate description of an historically important person.
>See if you can identify him:

This isn't a class, you aren't the teacher.
>
> "<he> was both a passionate anti-Semite and a ferocious
>believer in absolute obedience to political authority. He wanted (his
>nation is named here) rid of the Jews and he advised that the be
>deprived of "All their cash and jewels and silver and gold" and
>furthermore, "that their synagogues or schools be set on fire, that
>their houses be broken up and destroyed . . . and they be put under a
>roof or stable, like the gypsies . . . in misery and captivity as they
>incessantly lament and complain to God about us"--advice that was
>later followed literally."
>
> He also referred to the peasants who opposed the government as
>"mad dogs," and employed a "coarseness and brutality of language
>unequaled in <nation> history."

The Jewish people have been persecuted by so many that there are plenty of candidates for that description. Offhand it sounds like Torquemada, but it could also be any of a number of popes, czars, kings, bishops, and other enemies of freedom. Hitler comes to mind, of course, but that's too obvious. Martin Luther turned against the Jews when he realized that they weren't going to convert to his version of Christianity. Lots of others. The country could be Germany, Russia, England, Spain or many others.

Heck, it could be somebody like JEdgar Hoover, but we don't have lots of Gypsies in the USA.

> Let's see how good your knowledge of history is. Who is the
>person I refer to above?
>
See above. There are many candidates.

The concepts of religious tolerance and separation of church and state are very new ones, historically speaking. Many who fled here to escape religious persecution (like the Puritans) turned into the persecutors when they became established in their new land.

Here's a question for you: When and where did the ideas of separation of church and state, and universal religious tolerance, first become established in the USA?

>>Most religions have feast days because people need them, spiritually and
>>psychologically. For example, most European religions have some sort of
>winter

>>equinox

Actually, solstice.

>celebration because of the effects lack of daylight causes in many
>>people. For peoples with limited understanding of how the seasons and
>weather
>>work, and with limited artificial lighting, the loss of the Sun at the end
>of
>>December could be very disturbing.

(Solstice)

>>celebrations, whatever they are
>>called, remind us that the Light will return and spring will comne again. It
>>was natural for the Christians to put Christmas on the first day when the
>>daylight gets noticeably longer using simple methods of measurement.
>
> Which "conveniently" fell directly on a Pagan festival day, of
>course, as did other Christian holy days.

So? The purpose was the same. The sun doesn't cooperate just because humans
convert. Having feast days on other days would be an admission that the pagan
religions had priority.
>
>>> The pentagram, for your information, was a religious symbol in
>>>Egypt, Macedonia, Sumeria, Greece, Rome, China, India, and among the
>>>Norse peoples--NONE of which groups "stole" it from Christianity.
>>
>>The Egyptians, Greeks and Romans hid it pretty well.
>
> Not particularly, if you examine the writings of the time (in
>Rome and Greece at least). It appears there with regularity. That it
>isn't used often in buildings is irrelevant--how many Christian
>churches do you see with a prominent image of a fish--the ORIGNIAL
>symbol of Christianity?

Plenty. Do you know WHY the fish was a symbol?

73 de Jim, N2EY

"Romanis ite domum? What is that supposed to mean??"

3661. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 15:49:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011208104928.28268.00000200@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26707

In article <3C1149EA.21CCE1D6@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> (snip) Garrison Keillor did a wonderful piece
>> about the difference between "farm" people and
>> "city" people. The terms refer to a state of
>> mind rather than where a person lives or was
>> raised. "Farm" folks learn to do for themselves
>> while "city" people tend to specialize in a
>> few things and depend on others for everything
>> else. (snip)
>
>
> I read something similar to that, but I don't remember the author
>(remembering names is not my strong point). Anyway, this author was
>talking about politics, using something similar to that to explain the
>differences between those in the city and country. For example, he
>explained why those in the city see little use for a gun, while those
>in the country cannot imagine life without one. He argued that city
>folk tend to depend on law enforcement for their protection, while
>those in the country tend to depend on themselves for protection
>(realising that it may be some time before law enforcement might
>arrive on the scene). This difference, he concluded, explains the
>different trend in views on firearm ownership. Of course, he discussed
>many other political differences, but this can serve as an obvious
>example of the direction he was taking.

That wasn't GK, but it's a logical extension.

I would say that "city" people see a firearm only as a weapon, and an
aggressive one. "Country" people see a firearm as a tool with many
uses. And in their respective settings, both can be right.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3662. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 15:49:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011208104929.28268.00000201@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26708

In article <3c118013_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
>news:3C115408.4B06E79F@sccoast.net...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> > (snip) Try to imagine the reaction if the White House
>> > and Congress jointly proposed a $1 tax on each gallon
>> > of gasoline sold for private passenger car use, with
>> > the tax to be spent only for public surface
>> > transportation.
>>
>>
>> LOL. I don't think there is a Senator or Congressman with the balls
>> to do it. Heck, I'm not even sure I would have the balls to do it if I
>> were in their situation. They haven't tarred and feathered anyone in
>> this country recently, but I'm sure some would serious think about it.
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>
>I haven't been following this conversation, so not sure what the context is.

It's about how Europe has excellent public transportation and the USA does not.

>I do know that if the government were truthful about the $1 tax and we'd had
>no prior experiences to the contrary, I'd be all for it.

I find that hard to believe.

>I'd also want the
>money *equally* distributed on something like a per mile of government
>highway in a state. In other words, a huge landsurface state may still only
>end up with a small percentage of the money because of less federal highway
>in that state.

That's a terrible formula. Using that method, the states with the most existing roads would get the most money, regardless of how much they contribute to the tax base or how much new road they actually need.

> That is, if you are talking about highways being "public
>surface transportation."

We were not. We were talking about alternatives to highways.

<If you are talking about busses and trains...yech,
>forget it.

There are folks who cannot drive, and others who should not yet do because of lack of alternatives.

> Tried both and hate 'em.

Why? Did you try any of the European or Japanese systems?

> I'll pollute, thank you.

Your pollution harms others. What gives you the right to do that?

America's dependence on imported petroleum has serious political consequences. We import far more today than during the 1970s.

Why is it OK for the govt. to subsidize certain modes of transportation to the detriment of others?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3663. Re: Jam the bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 16:19:05 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9utti6$s8g$4@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26719
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
news:23871.0000054@ncvillage.net...
>
> On Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:20:25 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> >
> > So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere with
> > another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97, doesn't
it?
> > BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.
>
> That's exactly what I'm saying. Just like the CBers, the FCC has
> abandoned enforcement of ham radio rules. If we don't take care of
> ourselves, nobody will. So I'm perfectly willing to jam Dimmy until he
> shuts up.

So you're part of the problem, instead of the solution. Vigilanteism went
out a long time ago, but, I suppose you're so backward that you still think
it's a viable defense.

> I'll jam you too if necessary. That's the way it has to be now.

cc: rholling@fcc.gov.

We'll see about that.

3664. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 16:24:28 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9utti9$s8g$6@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26720
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Enrique Alejandro Martinez" <pilotenrique@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:9ut41idr1@onyx.indstate.edu...
> Well Military reject...

Says the COWARD too chickenshit to enlist.

> Number one, I am a US citizen, so you can call the
> INS. They will find all my papers in order.

U.S. citizens don't have "paper" to get in order, fucknuts.
Having that expired visa from that shithole Honduras makes you even more
nervous, does it?

> Call the computer admin, I am not abusing anything.

Mwhahahaha...You'd better read your Internet Use agreement.

>At least I use a real news server and not some anon
> freebee like you COWARD. Get a life. You act like my 10 year old cousin.

This is before or after you sodomize him, Bean boy?

> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9urjsh$k70$3@pita.alt.net...
> > Illegal alien and soon to be turned into the INS for having an expired
> visa,
> > "Enrique Alejandro Martinez" <pilotenrique@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:9ur4dn$h5h$1@onyx.indstate.edu...
> >
> > Hmmmmm the computer system administrator will just have to suspend your
> > internet acess for abusing the school's computer resources, bean boy.
> >
> > > Roger is a loser anyway. There is no sense even argueing with him
here.
> > His
> > > only responses are his lame racial slurs. I think its funny. He has a
> big
> > > mouth on the keyboard, but in person he would run away.
> >
> > Get your ass over here if you can get gas for the Cordoba you drive,
bean
> > boy.
> >
> >
> >
> > > "Pancho Hernandez" <PHernandez@umashistorydept.con> wrote in message

> > > news:9updvocsf0@pita.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > news:9um6p0oh7@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > I wish that I'd have
> > > > > recorded it, because I would send it in. The station will be set
up
> so
> > I
> > > > > can
> > > > > record very soon.
> > > > >
> > > > You are seriously misinformed if you think Riley
> > > Hollingsworth
> > > > would accept any tape recordings from you. You have been the
> > > > recipient of several warnings from Hollingsworth. Therefore my
boy,
> > > > you must be very stupid indeed, if you think you have even a shred
> > > > of credibility with Hollingsworth. Put in simple language you
might
> > > > be able to understand. You are a known repeat violator of FCC
> > > > rules and regulations my boy!!!!!! Now, would you like for us
to
> > > > post all your warning letters from Hollingsworth? so everyone can
> > > > see what a fool you are Roger? Go back to playing on your CB
> > > > radio. That is more akin to your level of expertise
> butthole!!!!!!!!!!
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
>

3665. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 16:27:54 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uttib$s8g$8@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26721
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Angst" <ToodleDoo@youtoo.col> wrote in message
news:9urs2a$470$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9uo12vlfq0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
> > news:3204442.23871@ncvillage.net...
> > >
> > > On Wed, 5 Dec 2001 15:42:51 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Oh, I don't know........he may be listening more than you think. He
> got
> > on
> > > > 14.313 recently and talked to Dan.
> > > >
> > >
> > > We can take care of things ourselves instead of waiting around for Mr.
> > > No Show. I have a Collins KWM-2 all hooked up and ready to take Dimmy
> > > out whenever he shows up and starts his profanity again.
> >
> > So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere with
> > another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97, doesn't
> it?
> > BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.
>
> And it was AMP who suggested making a midnight call to tear down towers
and
> antennas. Just goes to show, you put a CB'er on Ham Radio and he's still a
> CB'er.

And N4CND has drove by AMP's house doing stuff as well. From the way
Oraasssss'
audio sounds, he should stick to CB.

3666. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 17:29:54 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <m6sQ7.255459$W8.9481433@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26710

"N2EY" wrote

> Here's a question for you: When and where did the ideas of separation of
church
> and state, and universal religious tolerance, first become established in
the
> USA?

You don't mean Philadelphia? Do you? ;-)

> Do you know WHY the fish was a symbol?

Fisher of men???

> "Romanis ite domum? What is that supposed to mean??"

I was thinking 'Romans are home' and so I searched on the net and found
this; I thought you'd like it...

What could this be from???? ;-)

CENTURION: What's this, then? 'Romanes Eunt Domus'? 'People called Romanes
they go the house'?
BRIAN: It-- it says, 'Romans, go home'.
CENTURION: No, it doesn't. What's Latin for 'Roman'? Come on!
BRIAN: Aah!
CENTURION: Come on!
BRIAN: 'R-- Romanus'?
CENTURION: Goes like...?
BRIAN: 'Annus'?
CENTURION: Vocative plural of 'annus' is...?
BRIAN: Eh. 'Anni'?
CENTURION: 'Romani'. 'Eunt'? What is 'eunt'?
BRIAN: 'Go'. Let--
CENTURION: Conjugate the verb 'to go'.
BRIAN: Uh. 'Ire'. Uh, 'eo'. 'Is'. 'It'. 'Imus'. 'Itis'. 'Eunt'.
CENTURION: So 'eunt' is...?
BRIAN: Ah, huh, third person plural, uh, present indicative. Uh, 'they go'.
CENTURION: But 'Romans, go home' is an order, so you must use the...?
BRIAN: The... imperative!
CENTURION: Which is...?
BRIAN: Umm! Oh. Oh. Um, 'i'. 'I'!
CENTURION: How many Romans?
BRIAN: Ah! 'I'-- Plural. Plural. 'Ite'. 'Ite'.
CENTURION: 'Ite'.
BRIAN: Ah. Eh.

CENTURION: 'Domus'?
BRIAN: Eh.
CENTURION: Nominative?
BRIAN: Oh.
CENTURION: 'Go home'? This is motion towards. Isn't it, boy?
BRIAN: Ah. Ah, dative, sir! Ahh! No, not dative! Not the dative, sir! No!
Ah! Oh, the... accusative! Accusative! Ah! 'Domum', sir! 'Ad domum'! Ah!
Oooh! Ah!
CENTURION: Except that 'domus' takes the...?
BRIAN: The locative, sir!
CENTURION: Which is...?!
BRIAN: 'Domum'.
CENTURION: 'Domum'.
BRIAN: Aaah! Ah.
CENTURION: 'Um'. Understand?
BRIAN: Yes, sir.
CENTURION: Now, write it out a hundred times.
BRIAN: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir. Hail Caesar, sir.
CENTURION: Hail Caesar. If it's not done by sunrise, I'll cut your balls
off.
BRIAN: Oh, thank you, sir. Thank you, sir. Hail Caesar and everything, sir!
Oh. Mmm! Finished!
ROMAN SOLDIER STIG: Right. Now don't do it again.
[CENTURIONS chase BRIAN]
MAN: Hey! Bloody Romans.

Now doesn't that say it all? ;-)

Rich

3667. K4ZDH on 14313

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 18:00:33 UTC
From: Smiley Riley <smiley@14313QRM.net>
Message-ID: <9utkb7ast0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26711
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Riley operated for about an hour today on 14313, around
11:30 a.m. EST, as all the 313 regulars lined up for a chance
to kiss the sheriff's butt.

Public relations? Hardly. Think again. Bureaucrats work on
Saturdays, only for special reasons.

As each 313 regular checked in, an employee in Columbia, MD,
sat in a quiet room, clicking a mouse a few times as each regular
checked in. Inside of less than 60 mins., government data bases
were fed SIT (Special Identification Techniques) data on
approximately 30 stations who are 313 regulars. New voice
samples, bearing & range, Signature Analysis Data for Radio
Fingerprinting, and other data now reside in a government data
base.

Looks like the BARFies will be jamming at their own risk.

3668. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 18:15:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1258AA.AE26A61E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26712
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Hans Brakob wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote =
> > Maybe he doesn't realize that the only CW-only ham frequencies
> > are located in the 2m band.
>
> I didn't realize that either (because it isn't true).

> There is another band with a "CW-only" segment.

My typing got ahead of my brain. Should have been "6m/2m band".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3669. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 18:42:36 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <SetQ7.94805$S93.5128475@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26713
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

LOL!!
Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
news:WXpQ7.5888$J%1.1956491403@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...

> ..... Don't go to Tacoma.
> Take care,
>
> Landshark
>
> --
> "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"
>
>
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:PPfQ7.120129$8n4.8028971@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > And I will not argue with him on the scene. If he ignores my license,
> fails
> > to find out, or know,
> > the procedure I will see the SOB in court IF he takes my equipment. He
> WILL
> > get in trouble
> > because part of that equipment was purchased with Department of Defense
> > funds. He damn well
> > better produce it in the same condition it was in prior to confiscation
or
> > he will answer to someone lots more "connected" than me. Don't tell me
a
> > cop is above the law he is sworn to enforce and, therefore, I "can't"
get
> > him in trouble for falsely taking private property because he ":thinks"
> the
> > civilian is wrong.
> >
> > I don't get into arguments with cops--I know better. But you better
> believe
> > that whatever legal
> > avenues I have against a Rambo cop, I WILL use them. Hey, I am a
> vindictive
> > person, what can
> > I say? LOL!
> >
> > Jerry
> > K4KWH

> >
> >
> >
> > Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
> > news:egXP7.4480$xy4.1674762434@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
> > > What he is saying is correct. Most police
> > > officers (while in their heart they think that what
> > > they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
> > > training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
> > > can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
> > > is merely an inconvenience to someone.
> > > NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
> > > one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
> > > tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
> > > say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
> > > thinks is right.
> > >
> > > Landshark
> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"
> > >
> > >
> > > "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
> news:3C0FFEBC.FB60F89D@gte.net...
> > > >
> > > > Who says that he would "arrest". What the
> > > > normal procedure would be is to take the
> > > > equipment, issue a court citation then let
> > > > the courts and the attorneys settle it out.
> > > >
> > > > This is often what happens when the cop
> > > > is not totally familiar with the law or the
> > > > ham does not have his license on him.
> > > >
> > > > What you should not do is argue as you are
> > > > not going to win. The street is not the place
> > > > to settle such issues, the courts are. And no
> > > > cop is going to let you get out of control and
> > > > argue with him. He will call back up and arrest
> > > > you for resisting law enforcement (non compliance
> > > > is a crime). You may get the radio back but
> > > > you will pay a fine for being a jerk.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >

> >
> >
>
>

3670. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 18:55:19 UTC
From: Trouser Trout <pipedream@hotmail.comspa>
Message-ID: <20011208135523.489$Gc@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 26714
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Don't go to San Francisco either Jerry. You may not like what you see.

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:SetQ7.94805$S93.5128475@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> LOL!!
> Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
> news:WXpQ7.5888$J%1.1956491403@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
>
> > ..... Don't go to Tacoma.
> > Take care,
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> > --
> > "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"
> >
> >
> > "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:PPfQ7.120129$8n4.8028971@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > > And I will not argue with him on the scene. If he ignores my license,
> > fails
> > > to find out, or know,
> > > the procedure I will see the SOB in court IF he takes my equipment.
He
> > WILL
> > > get in trouble
> > > because part of that equipment was purchased with Department of
Defense
> > > funds. He damn well
> > > better produce it in the same condition it was in prior to
confiscation
> or
> > > he will answer to someone lots more "connected" than me. Don't tell
me
> a
> > > cop is above the law he is sworn to enforce and, therefore, I "can't"
> get
> > > him in trouble for falsely taking private property because he
":thinks"
> > the
> > > civilian is wrong.
> > >
> > > I don't get into arguments with cops--I know better. But you better

> > believe
> > > that whatever legal
> > > avenues I have against a Rambo cop, I WILL use them. Hey, I am a
> > vindictive
> > > person, what can
> > > I say? LOL!
> > >
> > > Jerry
> > > K4KWH
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
> > > news:egXP7.4480$xy4.1674762434@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
> > > > What he is saying is correct. Most police
> > > > officers (while in their heart they think that what
> > > > they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
> > > > training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
> > > > can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
> > > > is merely an inconvenience to someone.
> > > > NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
> > > > one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
> > > > tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
> > > > say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
> > > > thinks is right.
> > > >
> > > > Landshark
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C0FFEBC.FB60F89D@gte.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > Who says that he would "arrest". What the
> > > > > normal procedure would be is to take the
> > > > > equipment, issue a court citation then let
> > > > > the courts and the attorneys settle it out.
> > > > >
> > > > > This is often what happens when the cop
> > > > > is not totally familiar with the law or the
> > > > > ham does not have his license on him.
> > > > >
> > > > > What you should not do is argue as you are
> > > > > not going to win. The street is not the place
> > > > > to settle such issues, the courts are. And no
> > > > > cop is going to let you get out of control and
> > > > > argue with him. He will call back up and arrest

> > > > > you for resisting law enforcement (non compliance
> > > > > is a crime). You may get the radio back but
> > > > > you will pay a fine for being a jerk.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>
>

3671. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 19:01:14 UTC
From: Trouser Trout <pipedream@hotmail.comspa>
Message-ID: <20011208140118.305$lp@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 26715
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Yes Bill just do a look up on Google of Landshark, or The Landshark, you will see he has trolled rec.radio.cb for the past 4-5 years, he has changed his habits this past month for fear of being turned into his ISP. Something he is fond of doing to other people but to no avail. But don't take my word for it like I said Google will reveal all you need to know abnout this guy. BTW, I am supposed to be kill filed from this guy and he still responds to my posts what does that tell you he wants to engage in conversation. He is really really mad about the posts he made in alt.sex... he made these posts a few years back and didn't know he would run into a buzzsaw to call him on it. I say hey fine If your into hooking up with Transsexuals go fo it, but don't be mad when you get caught. True Story!

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
news:5SfQ7.1840$hQ3.79569007@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> Oh don't worry about Aaron, Bill.
> You have just been introduced to one
> of the three rec.radio.cb trolls. He
> claims to not even be a cb'er or ham,
> but touts the agenda of a Crusade to rid
> the airwaves of export radio's and amps
> via the only source he knows.................
> Rec.Radio.CB.
> He even tries to quell free speech, just
> discussing amps or export radios, he will
> label you a federal criminal. If you have
> your picture taken along side an export
> radio or amp, he will label you a federal
> criminal. Even if you said to have used
> one, but are not now or plan to in the future
> he will label you a criminal.
> Yes a true believer in wiping out the worlds
> supply of export radios and linears, just by
> trolling Rec.Radio.Cb.
>
> Landshark

3672. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 20:11:51 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <buuQ7.215474$3d2.9797841@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26716

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:m6sQ7.255459$W8.9481433@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> "N2EY" wrote
>
> > Here's a question for you: When and where did the ideas of separation
of
> church
> > and state, and universal religious tolerance, first become established
in
> the
> > USA?
>
> You don't mean Philadelphia? Do you? ;-)
>

How about Rhode Island?

3673. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 20:13:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <HvuQ7.215475$3d2.9797858@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26717

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:NvqQ7.215279$3d2.9769896@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Richard McCollum wrote
>
> > > > Without having a clue how it happens, 141 Tech Pluses have been
> renewed
> > > > since der Tag including one in November. The last one expires in
> December
> > > > 2011.
>
> > "Richard Plourde" wrote
>
> > > Whats a "der Tag"?
>
> "Richard McCollum" wrote
>
> > The Day. Since the Tech Plus supposedly no longer existed
>
> There was no such day. Technician Plus Licenses still exist.
>
> Rich

Picky, picky. There are still 141 of them that were issued after the day
when they were supposedly no longer issued.

3674. Re: K4ZDH on 14313

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 20:20:27 UTC
From: Lemon Grove <portzbiski11@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <fCuQ7.12518$714.1316823@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26718
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Smiley Riley" <smiley@14313QRM.net> wrote in message news:9utkb7ast0@pita.alt.net...
> Riley operated for about an hour today on 14313, around
> 11:30 a.m. EST, as all the 313 regulars lined up for a chance
> to kiss the sheriff's butt.
>
> Public relations? Hardly. Think again. Bureaucrats work on
> Saturdays, only for special reasons.
>
> As each 313 regular checked in, an employee in Columbia, MD,
> sat in a quiet room, clicking a mouse a few times as each regular
> checked in. Inside of less than 60 mins., government data bases
> were fed SIT (Special Identification Techniques) data on
> approximately 30 stations who are 313 regulars. New voice
> samples, bearing & range, Signature Analysis Data for Radio
> Fingerprinting, and other data now reside in a government data
> base.
>
> Looks like the BARFies will be jamming at their own risk.

Nobody ever said that commensurate ham radio QRM'ers were either intellegent or rocket scientists.
And you are correct about Columbia, Md. You can be sure that in 95% of the cases when K4ZDH is "in QSO" on a ham frequency, that the Computers and GPS Satellites are making a list and checking it twice. So all you knuckleheads who jam and carry on (..including the fruit
cake who was QRM'ing 3.904, 3.910 and 3.914 last night for over an hour with digital sound bytes
and synthesizer noise - who we know is in ---) are all blued, screwed and tatooed.
Congratulations boys, your all now Charter Members of "The Baron of Grey Matter ARC"

3675. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 20:51:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C127D66.8A1B081B@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26722

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I don't know why conservatives always have to
> start slinging that term "liberal" around in
> the middle of a good argument. (snip)

Well, in this case, Kim, I used the word "liberal" exactly because Rick defined himself as a one in a previous message. In other words, according to his own statements, the word applies and therefore my question was valid.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3676. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 21:03:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011208160310.01446.00000195@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 26724

In article <428F28AB3315099B.7796FEA08D6E5593.8DB018FBD6E9BAD3@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 06 Dec 2001 05:03:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Ya missed the joke, Rick. Didn't watch SNL, huh?
>
> Not since the original version. I was more of a "Friday's"
>person myself.

Dana Carvey as "Church Lady" on the "Church Chat" skits. Everything he/she
didn't like turned out to be the work of "SATAN!!!!". Also pointed out that
Santa rearranged...

Rent the videos.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3677. UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 21:03:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011208160310.01446.00000196@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 26725

Was perusing a copy of CQ in the local MicroCenter when I came upon an article about UK restructuring.

Their existing classes are getting a bit more power & privs, and looks like 5 wpm for full access.

But the big news is a new class of license they call "Foundation". Idea is to have a license that can be had at the end of a one-day training session.

Privs include parts of almost all bands and modes except 10 meters.

Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.

BUT.....

No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.

Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person being tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an "A", the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then looks up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper. Sending test to be similar.

Waddya think, folks?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3678. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 21:03:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011208160311.01446.00000197@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 26723

In article <3C1227DE.A776FD2B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>> You've obviously got a lot of work to do yet, then, Dave. An eternity at
>my
>> house would be Heaven compared to one at Larry Roll's.
>
>One man's hell is another man's heaven. I once knew a masochist
>who was looking forward to hell. :-)
>--
Which means that, for him, it would be heaven.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3679. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 21:08:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C128165.B7A8A8AD@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26726

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I sure do wish people would be just a little less
> cynical about "sources." Dwight, a site that
> supports polygamous relationships is probably full
> of expert *opinions* from those who practice
> polygamy. Just as probably one of the best sources
> for cancer information would be from a site
> sponsored by an agency that supports cancer
> research, The American Cancer Society.

I'm not cynical about sources, Kim. I'm cynical about sources that only offer one perspective on a issue. In other words, a source that is not unbiased. For example, the American Cancer Society you mentioned is obviously not promoting cancer, therefore they are a good source of information. The sites Rick offered are promoting satanism.

> Now, on political stuff, all bets are off. I am no
> more likely to be inspired to a different way of
> thinking about something because I read or listen
> to someone like, say, Rush Limbaugh; just as you
> would not be by reading something out of
> Sojourners Truth (think that was the name of the
> magazine) or National Public Radio.

And I would add any site which attempts to propagandize to that list (which would include the sites Rick offered). I asked him for unbiased sources, not pro-satanism propaganda sites.

> My question to you is, if you are not willing to
> accept the information that is offered as part of
> an offer of education about a certain topic, then
> why even debate. And, the likelihood that you will
> find an absolute independent source for topics of
> discussion is nearly, if not, nil.

I don't accept the "offer of education" because (1) I don't need the education (I've studied this subject before), (2) the "education" offered covered no new ground (I've seen the stuff on those sites many times before), and (3) the "education" offered was nothing more than biased propaganda (not education).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3680. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 21:13:31 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%nvQ7.255664$W8.9501361@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26727

Let's be honest. When I was in the Navy, we had to memorize the entire baudot code. Didn't really need it, but reading a lot of uppercase got one to the point you really COULD read uppercase. Rules and regs (safety wouldn't hurt a bit either, both AC mains power as well as rf power) make for a good starting point. I'd be less concerned that an individual know CW than how to get communications going in an emergency.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011208160310.01446.00000196@mb-cs.aol.com...
> Was perusing a copy of CQ in the local MicroCenter when I came upon an
article
> about UK restructuring.
>
> Their existing classes are getting a bit more power & privs, and looks
like 5
> wpm for full access.
>
> But the big news is a new class of license they call "Foundation". Idea is
to
> have a license that can be had at the end of a one-day training session.
>
> Privs include parts of almost all bands and modes except 10 meters.
>
> Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
>
> BUT.....
>
> No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.
>
> Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person
being
> tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an
"A",
> the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then
looks
> up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper.
Sending
> test to be similar.
>
> Waddya think, folks?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3681. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 21:16:46 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <2rvQ7.148751$WW.9602015@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26728

"Richard McCollum" wrote

> Picky, picky. There are still 141 of them that were issued after the day
> when they were supposedly no longer issued.

Technician Plus is the same as Novice and Advanced... the FCC will honor the licenses as long they are renewed in the allotted time. The only difference is they aren't keeping the 'Novice' side of the Technician Plus in the database. This is a mute point because the computers would have to be 'brain-dead' to not be able to figure out whether the licensee is a Technician Class or a Technician Class with the 5 WPM element completed.

I had said about only 80 in the past 12 months.. I said that would mean there should be about 800 by the time they had all expired once under the new 'alignment'.

Rich

3682. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 21:18:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1283B9.C5D59A8B@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26729

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Ah, the politically "correct" life. I don't subscribe
> to it. If you guys do, that's up to you. I'll never
> bend so far as to be ruled by the fearful.

Then in many parts of this country, you're simply not going to find work today (beyond the basic sales clerk or laborer level). A growing number of employers are now resorting to job contracts with a long list of rules added and a battery of psychological tests (written and verbal) before you're even considered for the job. In other words, you either fit the politically correct agenda of the company or you're out the door. It's not that bad in the south yet, but it's coming.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3683. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 21:49:02 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112082148260.20076-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 26730

This reminds me of the petition to the FCC regarding Stewart Teaze's
"communicator" license and what a joke that was.

On 8 Dec 2001, N2EY wrote:
>Was perusing a copy of CQ in the local MicroCenter when I came upon an article
>about UK restructuring.
>
>Their existing classes are getting a bit more power & privs, and looks like 5
>wpm for full access.
>
>But the big news is a new class of license they call "Foundation". Idea is to
>have a license that can be had at the end of a one-day training session.
>
>Privs include parts of almost all bands and modes except 10 meters.
>
>Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
>
>BUT.....
>
>No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.
>
>Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person being
>tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an "A",
>the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then looks
>up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper. Sending
>test to be similar.
>
>Waddya think, folks?

3684. Re: Jam the bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 22:05:58 UTC
From: Tough Talk Roger <RogerTalksTough@harharharharidiot.com>
Message-ID: <9uu2ng$6c2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26731
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9utti6$s8g$4@pita.alt.net...
>
> "DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
> news:23871.0000054@ncvillage.net...
> >
> > On Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:20:25 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere with
> > > another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97,
doesn't
> it?
> > > BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.
> >
> > That's exactly what I'm saying. Just like the CBers, the FCC has
> > abandoned enforcement of ham radio rules. If we don't take care of
> > ourselves, nobody will. So I'm perfectly willing to jam Dimmy until he
> > shuts up.
>
> So you're part of the problem, instead of the solution. Vigilanteism went
> out a long time ago, but, I suppose you're so backward that you still
think
> it's a viable defense.
>
> > I'll jam you too if necessary. That's the way it has to be now.
>
> cc: rholling@fcc.gov.
>
> We'll see about that.
>
>
Talk tough Roger talk tough, I know it gets all your little
radio geek buddies excited. Boy what a collection of radio
fruits in the radio groups. We've come to get to know many
of them to where we can post stuff that gets them all
excited, like what violations they got from Riley and what
radio groups they're in on what freqs.

3685. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 22:19:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1291F1.911C56FC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26732

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> No, Dwight. I'll tell you in a heartbeat that it
> isn't going on and I do believe that we are all
> far more adult than that. *If* this was going on
> as much as you say, and *if* the prevailing attitude
> were to adjust company policies because of it, there
> would be such a stranglehold on the ability of
> companies to do business that it would be impossible
> to do business!!
>
> And, as I said, I have never, ever seen it happen yet.
> Yet is the operative word, but it is also the one on
> which I base my opinion that you have nothing more
> than a red herring.

Kim, I read the above to my wife and, after she was finished laughing, she asked where you have worked in your life that you've not seen this. In every single place she has ever worked, the companies had specific policies dealing with sexual harassment, which always include invitations for dates, private meetings, private lunches, and so forth. In fact, it is now a federal requirement for companies to have their policies about sexual harassment clearly posted for all to read. Where travel is likely, most companies had specific policies about socializing, accommodations, and so forth. And most companies gave their employees, especially the management staff, printed guidelines or classroom instruction about dealing with the opposite sex in the workplace - and all these she has read or seen warned against private meetings behind closed doors and socializing (lunches, etc) in or outside the workplace. In other words, her experiences in this regard have been exactly the same as mine.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3686. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 22:42:07 UTC
From: WV Fruit Cake <Woger@WVFruitCo.con>
Message-ID: <9uu4rd$bi7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26733
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9uttib$s8g$8@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Angst" <ToodleDoo@youtoo.col> wrote in message
> news:9urs2a$470$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:9uo12v$lfq$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3204442.23871@ncvillage.net...
> > > >
> > > > On Wed, 5 Dec 2001 15:42:51 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh, I don't know........he may be listening more than you think.
He
> > got
> > > on
> > > > > 14.313 recently and talked to Dan.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > We can take care of things ourselves instead of waiting around for
Mr.
> > > No Show. I have a Collins KWM-2 all hooked up and ready to take
Dimmy
> > > out whenever he shows up and starts his profanity again.
> > >
> > > So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere with
> > > another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97,
doesn't
> > it?
> > > BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.
> >
> > And it was AMP who suggested making a midnight call to tear down towers
> and
> > antennas. Just goes to show, you put a CB'er on Ham Radio and he's still
a
> > CB'er.
>
> And N4CND has drove by AMP's house doing stuff as well. From the way
> Oraasssss'
> audio sounds, he should stick to CB.
>
```

Roger, the two of them live in different states! How the hell can they drive by each other's house? Uh oh, sorry gotta run, there's a computer customer up front......back later.

3687. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 22:48:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C129899.DE455792@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26734

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> (snip) The one thing I learned about them right
> away was very few of them were above using
> their sex to "get over" on supervisors. (snip)

I'll agree with that up to a point. Yes, some certainly do use their sex to "get over," but I would not go so far as to say that "very few" are not above doing that. Of course, since we're each talking about personal experience, there is always room for difference. However, I've generally found the number doing that are relatively small (no more than about 10 to 15 percent). Sadly, there does always seem to be at least one in every crowd (or workplace in this case). And that one always seems to be the lightning rod for trouble (which may be why it seems more commonplace).

> (snip) I instinctively made certain that there were
> no "closed door" counseling sessions, no "private"
> chats, no situation where there was an unwitnessed
> exchange between myself and the female Airman in
> question. As it turns out, this was a good policy,
> for I never had any problems with accusations from
> female subordinates; unfortunately, my own boss did!

Actually, if the Air Force is like the Army today, that is likely to be official policy. Anyway, I've never had this problem myself either, but I've known two others who did - one I suspect was justified and the other totally false. And my wife had to make a sexual harassment charge against a previous boss once (he grabbed her from behind as she was sitting at her desk). Of course, she was a little more reasonable than existing policy (she asked that he be counseled and reassigned - which is what happened). Today, he would probably be immediately terminated (and his career ruined).

> The only way for a responsible professional to
> behave when dealing with a superior or subordinate
> of the opposite sex is to keep all interactions
> on a strictly professional level, and no
> "private" meetings, counseling sessions, planning
> sessions, or two person-only business trips.

Agreed. Not only is that the policy of many companies, it is just plain old common sense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3688. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 22:56:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C129A6A.B0CD79FD@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26735

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I sure would. If something is wrong, and if something
> is believed because of wrong perceptions, wrongfully
> placed concepts, then it's still wrong. Thank goodness
> our forefathers believed that.

Kim, you can say something is wrong all you want, but that does not make it wrong - it just makes it your opinion. And, my opinion, and that of many others, say it is not wrong.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3689. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 23:00:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C129B58.B435E0A4@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26736

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> You are labeling many of my Wiccan friends, Dwight.

No, I'm not "labeling" your friends, Kim. Like I said earlier,
"satanic" is the common name used by most everyone to describe the
people involved in those activities. I didn't invent the word to
describe them - it is the word commonly used in this country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3690. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 23:06:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C129CB0.B3BA5E3C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26737

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> EWwwww, Dwight. Low blowin' now, eh? Hmmmm, just
> a week ago you were a proponent of ending this
> thread so that the "hateful" stuff would stop. LOL

There was nothing hateful about anything I said, Kim. I simply told him, based on what he had written so far, I would believe any web site over him (including one written by a drunken sailor from Brazil). Now, that was certainly colorful (added for emphasis), but hardly hateful.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3691. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 23:10:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C129DBD.822EED37@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26738

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I haven't been following this conversation, so not
> sure what the context is. (snip) If you are talking
> about busses and trains...yech, forget it. Tried
> both and hate 'em. I'll pollute, thank you.

Yep, you haven't been following the conversation - a decent public transportation system (busses and trains) was exactly what we were talking about. And it wasn't about pollution - it was to address the transportation needs of the elderly in this country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3692. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 23:16:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C129F04.23E73874@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26739

N2EY wrote:
>
> (snip) In Europe and Japan, where the public transit
> is so good, the taxes on gasoline are far more than
> $1 per gallon. We could have even better systems here
> in the USA, but Americans aren't ready to pay the
> price - yet.

I agree with the "yet" added to the end of that. Based on the growing traffic jams in most major cities, I think it is only a matter of time. Sooner or later, we'll have to do something (or we'll all end up in traffic jams for most of our lives).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3693. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 23:20:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <TexQ7.215587$3d2.9815049@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26740

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011207230108.25913.00000297@mb-dh.aol.com...
> snup
>
> The only way for a responsible professional to behave when dealing
> with a superior or subordinate of the opposite sex is to keep all
> interactions on a strictly professional level, and no "private"
meetings,
> counseling sessions, planning sessions, or two person-only
> business trips.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, update me just a tad. The military has had regs on
superior/subordinate relationships since probably Cyrus the Great or
before. As an NCO you would probably get into deep do do lending money,
getting into poker games, etc. with people you supervised. Officers, of
course, had stricter rules re enlisted but got regularly drained by the CO
or his wife where the rules got 'bent' into a knot. NCO clubs had their
reasons for existing.

When you went to sergeanting school, what did they tell you about this
sort of thing?

Dick N&#65533;BK

3694. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 23:46:54 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c12a5e6.608141@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 26742
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Assuming your scenario...just how long would any one rig
cause your residence any interference?

The issue is NOT mobil activity...the issue is the
local neighbor running illegal/dirty amps on CB.

Bottom line on illegal mobiles is that no one will
even try to police it...Tacoma law or not.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

On Sat, 08 Dec 2001 01:50:14 GMT, "middlefiger4@home.comss"
<middlefinger4@home.com> wrote:

>Bill, So long as I doesn't effect you you don't care right? How about if you
>live next to I-5 and are tired of the Hi-power mobiles...The law should be
>for anything car, house, tree fort, back alley.
>
>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:3c115ed8.1866925@news.mindspring.com...
>> On 6 Dec 2001 21:30:26 -0800, voobner@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner)
>> wrote:
>>
>> >"Landshark" S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net wrote
>> >> What he is saying is correct. Most police
>> >>officers (while in their heart they think that what
>> >>they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
>> >>training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
>> >>can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
>> >>is merely an inconvenience to someone.
>> >> NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
>> >>one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
>> >>tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
>> >>say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
>> >>thinks is right.
>> >>
>> >> Landshark
>> >
>> >Good god, I've never heard such whining, paranoia, and blatant
>> >attempts at stampeding hams than I've heard from some of the more
>> >illegally-minded CBers in this thread.
>> >
>> >The Tacoma ordinance was passed as a response to out-of-control outlaw
>> >CBers using huge illegal amplifiers causing consumer interference

>> >complaints. The FCC does not have a staff of 300,000 on the job so
>> >the local LEO's are forced to deal with it. (Don't forget WHO caused
>> >this situation to come about. Not the FCC. Not the cops. The outlaw
>> >CBers did. Without THEIR shenanigans there would BE no Tacoma
>> >Ordinance)
>> >
>> >Somehow this has situation been "spun" into lots of wild predictions
>> >about pot-bellied cops hassling licensed amateurs about their mobile
>> >rigs.
>> >
>> >If the cops in your area are as corrupt and dumb as some are saying
>> >(can't recognize one radio from another, can't recognize an amp, can't
>> >tell a ham license from a fishing license), then believe me, you got
>> >troubles that go FAR beyond radio enforcement. I'd move to another
>> >town.
>> >
>> >-Aaron-
>>
>> Aaron, is there truly a new law in Tacoma? No one has
>> actually found one to exist.
>>
>> Additionally, I agree that the law, if it exists, is targeted at
>> illegal high power CB ops...from home locations...NOT from cars.
>> The high power home illegals are the ones that cause
>> constant ongoing interference. No one much
>> cares about an illegal power amp in an 18 wheeler rolling down I-5.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>
>

3695. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-08 23:47:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C12A673.CA66917A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26741

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> I think the sanest way to set up the basic tenets
> are to simply agree with the religious views of
> the last person who speaks, i.e. if Cecil tells
> you that you are going to hell for dancing or
> eating pork, you agree. If Rick Adams screams
> that there is no God, you agree. In this manner,
> you avoid all debate on religious matters.

But where is the controversy? Religions cannot exist without some controversy (christains have abortion, Muslims have the great Satan, etc). We gotta have some controversy. Wait, I've got it - the great CW debate!

> Since we are now in a new millenium, you might
> consider spiffing up your place of worship. I
> suggest that you have, as an altar, a large home
> entertainment center. The focal point on the altar
> can be a large screen TV. For sacraments, try Jack
> Daniels and stale Cheetos. You'll also need "the
> book". I suggest some old copies of 73 magazine.
> From time to time you can pick up "the book" and
> read from the ravings of "St. Wayne".

Hey, this religion is getting stranger by the moment (which means, I like it).

> I'm working on the method of eternal punishment for
> those who fail to follow the tenets of this new
> religion. I haven't gotten all the details worked
> out yet but I'm working on something like this: You
> die and end up spending eternity at Kim's house...
> or maybe it just seems like it.

Heh, heh. Sorry, but that was funny, Kim. By the way, Dave, we should bestow sainthood on anyone who can always figure out what Kim is talking about.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3696. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 00:34:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C12B1A5.C1ED148D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26743

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C11B63D.E4F8B0A@earthlink.net...
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > I think that you've missed the humor, Rick.
> > > > Dwight doesn't know of a religion called
> > > > "Stewartism".
> > >
> > > Wow, do they have a religion like that, Dave? I'll join.
> >
> > I think the sanest way to set up the basic tenets are to simply agree
> > with the religious views of the last person who speaks, i.e. if Cecil
> > tells you that you are going to hell for dancing or eating pork, you
> > agree. If Rick Adams screams that there is no God, you agree. In this
> > manner, you avoid all debate on religious matters.
> >
> > Since we are now in a new millenium, you might consider spiffing up your
> > place of worship. I suggest that you have, as an altar, a large home
> > entertainment center. The focal point on the altar can be a large
> > screen TV. For sacraments, try Jack Daniels and stale Cheetos. You'll
> > also need "the book". I suggest some old copies of 73 magazine. From
> > time to time you can pick up "the book" and read from the ravings of
> > "St. Wayne".
> >
> > I'm working on the method of eternal punishment for those who fail to
> > follow the tenets of this new religion. I haven't gotten all the
> > details worked out yet but I'm working on something like this:
> > You die and end up spending eternity at Kim's house...or maybe it just
> > seems like it.
> >
> > Let me know what you think.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You've obviously got a lot of work to do yet, then, Dave. An eternity at my
> house would be Heaven compared to one at Larry Roll's.

You simply misunderstood, Kim. The eternity spent at your house would
be the punishment for others. Perhaps, YOU can spend eternity at
Larry's.
```

Dave K8MN

3697. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 00:43:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C12B390.A281F3AF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26744
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

CAM wrote:
>
> Hans Brakob wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote =
> > > Maybe he doesn't realize that the only CW-only ham frequencies
> > > are located in the 2m band.
> >
> > I didn't realize that either (because it isn't true).
>
> > There is another band with a "CW-only" segment.
>
> My typing got ahead of my brain. Should have been "6m/2m band".

Don't you mean to say that you simply lied about it?

Dave K8MN

3698. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 01:19:00 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011208201900.20561.00001168@mb-bd.news.cs.com>
Source record: 26745

>Was perusing a copy of CQ in the local MicroCenter when I came upon an
>article
>about UK restructuring.
>
>Their existing classes are getting a bit more power & privs, and looks like 5
>wpm for full access.
>
>But the big news is a new class of license they call "Foundation". Idea is to
>have a license that can be had at the end of a one-day training session.
>
>Privs include parts of almost all bands and modes except 10 meters.
>
>Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
>
>BUT.....
>
>No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.
>
>Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person
>being
>tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an
>"A",
>the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then looks
>up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper. Sending
>test to be similar.
>
>Waddya think, folks?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Yuk!

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

3699. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 02:14:00 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <INzQ7.149063$WW.9626838@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26746

"N2EY" wrote
> Was perusing a copy of CQ in the local MicroCenter when I came upon an
article
> about UK restructuring.
>
> Their existing classes are getting a bit more power & privs, and looks
like 5
> wpm for full access.
>
> But the big news is a new class of license they call "Foundation". Idea is
to
> have a license that can be had at the end of a one-day training session.
>
> Privs include parts of almost all bands and modes except 10 meters.
>
> Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
>
> BUT.....
>
> No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.

So for it seems ok... depending on how much power they're allowed. Not allowing high power is vital to keep the newbies doing benign station operation and nothing else.

> Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person
being
> tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an
"A",
> the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then
looks
> up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper.
Sending
> test to be similar.

This testing scheme is way too complicated... I can't imagine people 'standing in line' to give the tests.

If nothing else at least our system is automated to a fair extent where the only work is really in the correction of the copy and multiple choice.

> Waddya think, folks?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3700. UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 02:50:14 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0112081850.45563723@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26747

N2EY says:

>Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
>
>BUT.....
>
>No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and
type-approved.

I am opposed to *any* appliance operator license in amateur radio.
Period.

Central to the justification for an Amateur Radio Service, and the
precious spectrum that it consumes, is the idea of technically
involved licensees. At the very soul of our Service is the fact that
we are licensed to experiment, invent, modify, re-engineer, tinker,
and improve the equipment that we use in our stations. Limiting a
class of licensees (especially beginners) to "sealed store bought"
equipment is a horrible idea. It consigns them to be nothing more
than glorified FRS/CB operators with multi-band privs.

This idea is the first step down a slippery slope to the extinction of
the Amateur Radio Service.

73, de Hans K0HB

73, Hans, K0HB

3701. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 03:17:20 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9uul3g09fd@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26750

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C129B58.B435E0A4@sccoast.net...
> No, I'm not "labeling" your friends, Kim. Like I said earlier,
> "satanic" is the common name used by most everyone to describe the
> people involved in those activities. I didn't invent the word to
> describe them - it is the word commonly used in this country.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

But you certainly don't have any problem repeating a commonly held
"Christian" misconception without knowing the facts.

3702. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 03:18:57 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9uul4809jf@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26749

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C129CB0.B3BA5E3C@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> There was nothing hateful about anything I said, Kim. I simply told
> him, based on what he had written so far, I would believe any web site
> over him (including one written by a drunken sailor from Brazil). Now,
> that was certainly colorful (added for emphasis), but hardly hateful.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Hate is easliy veiled.

You can stick a toothpick in a turd and call it a trophy, but it would still
be a turd.

3703. The Morsodist Religion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 03:24:37 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0112081924.551f6a9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26748

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> But where is the controversy? Religions cannot exist without some
> controversy (christains have abortion, Muslims have the great Satan,
> etc). We gotta have some controversy. Wait, I've got it - the great
> CW debate!

Dwight,

I'm shocked that you don't understand one of the great religions of Amateur Radio. Morsodism has been widely discussed here on rrap, but you're kind of an ignorant newcomer, so I'll fill you in.

So you want to be a Morsodist. It's not easy, you know: you'll have to impose the stiffest constraints on your mind, accepting authority without question -- you will be subject to jeers and persecutions at the hands of the Spawn of Oracle, and you will suffer during your entire lifetime trying to throw pearls before the swine. But in the end, you will receive your reward from the Almighty in Heaven, and you will have the satisfaction of seeing all others being tossed into the Lake of Fire.

But enough of that; you're not there yet. You must first prove yourself worthy of being a Morsodist.

Lesson One: Developing Your Psyche

Right now I would like you to relax. That's it -- just sit quietly and let your mind go blank. Concentrate on one thing and one thing only: concentrate on your thumb. Now that thumb is no ordinary run-of-the-mill thumb: what you see is THE THUMB. That Thumb is your world. Nothing besides that Thumb concerns you in the least. As far as you are concerned, that Thumb rules over all. The only thing that should be in your mind right now is your Thumb and its absolute authority over your life. Each and every line, ridge, wrinkle, and bit of cuticle is a Divine Mandate, eternal in its wisdom, power, and relevance. That Thumb was made by MORSE, and its sole purpose is to guide you to your Salvation.

Now, while still concentrating on that Thumb, begin to think about the world around you. Careful! Don't try to take in everything at once: start with the rest of your fingers, and slowly spread from there. See how your fingers are connected with and dominated by your Thumb. Now, slowly extend your perception to embrace your forfinger. It too was created by Morse, and it is all guided by the Thumb. Between your thumb and forefinger lie all the secrets of Morse. The rest of the universe is of no concern.

Lesson Two: Establishing Your Doctrine

Congratulations! You've come a long way, but you're not there yet. What I want you to do now is to go to the nearest book store and purchase a copy of the FCCRuleBook. Preferably, it should be bound in nice, shiny black leather, and should have gilt edges and a red silk ribbon. It should be fairly hefty in size, but not so large that you cannot hold it with one hand. Finally, it should have the words of Samuel in red letters, for as you know the Son of Morse only spoke using red letters.

Now that you have yourFCCRuleBook, read it, and read it thoroughly. I imagine that some of it will fit in perfectly with your beliefs and morals, since you have been inspired by Maxim to attempt this indoctrination into Morsodism. As you read, you must remember that your beliefs are the ONLY right beliefs, and all others are falsehoods and are totally incompatible with Morse Divine Truth.

Now you may be dismayed as you read through the FCCRuleBook to find that much of it is outside your beliefs, or may even contradict them. No problem! All you have to do is take a black marker pen and blot out those paragraphs which you don't like. Simplicity itself! Now don't you worry if it seems that more of the FCCRuleBook is blacked out than left behind: just remind yourself that the remaining words are emphasized all the more.

Lesson Three: Living a Morsodist Lifestyle

Well, I'm sure that you Novices are simply bursting with questions on how to apply your new-found faith to your lives. I am pleased by your enthusiasm: such zeal is a necessity if you want to begin to work your influence on this filthy and sinful world and mold it into a clean and upright one. Those Spawn of W5YI are simply itching to be preached at, whether they want it or not, so let's get cracking.

First, obtain for thyself some sort of access to the internet newsgroups, specifically any (and all) newsgroups in the "rec.radio.amateur.*" lineage. Never mind that only one of them, the "policy" group is fit for Morsodists like yourself; you must spread the word ALL the heathen Oracalists. Crosspost like crazy, verily even if attacked by Horrible Herman, the Lord High Newsgroup Purity Defender.

As you preach the word of Morse to others, you will inevitably run into those who not only doubt the veracity of your words, but who also pose trick arguments inspired by Lenny Liberal and his henchman, Crazy Carl, the head Oracalist, in an attempt to trap and discredit you. This lesson deals with some of the major swords wielded by various tempters, and gives you some ideas on how to parry those weapons.

Technobabble scholars: these vermin use their high-falootin' technical jargon and book-learning to pervert the words of the Morse and read things into Part 97 which aren't there. The FCCRuleBook was written by Morse for YOU to use, and contains EVERYTHING you need to know for

Salvation, plainly stated in black and white and red. There is nothing magic or mystical about it: it speaks out in the Words of Morse and speaks directly to YOU, as you have personally modified it to your belief set.

If other Spawn of Oracle say that the FCCRuleBook cannot speak the utter Truth because it is inconsistent in what it says, you can reply that there is no inconsistency in your FCCRuleBook: everything that you have in your FCCRuleBook perfectly supports your beliefs (remember Lesson Two). If they quote passages from the FCCRuleBook which they claim contradict your beliefs, you can reply that Oracle has inspired them to pervert the words of Morse and to twist their meaning around in order to try to subvert the Truth. If they say that you are being totally ignorant and irrational in your absolute belief in your Morsodist Doctrine, you can reply that they are being totally ignorant and irrational in their absolute refusal to believe in your Doctrine. And if they say that you are shutting your eyes to reality, you can reply that they are shutting their eyes to Morse.

Peace to all of you!

3704. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 03:55:50 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <ahBQ7.1988$SI1.265694341@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Thought you would like it.....

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:SetQ7.94805$S93.5128475@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com...
> LOL!!
> Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
> news:WXpQ7.5888$J%1.1956491403@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
>
> > ..... Don't go to Tacoma.
> > Take care,
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> > --
> > "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"
> >
> >
> > "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:PPfQ7.120129$8n4.8028971@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > > And I will not argue with him on the scene. If he ignores my license,
> > fails
> > > to find out, or know,
> > > the procedure I will see the SOB in court IF he takes my equipment.
He
> > WILL
> > > get in trouble
> > > because part of that equipment was purchased with Department of
Defense
> > > funds. He damn well
> > > better produce it in the same condition it was in prior to
confiscation
> or
> > > he will answer to someone lots more "connected" than me. Don't tell
me
> a
> > > cop is above the law he is sworn to enforce and, therefore, I "can't"
> get
> > > him in trouble for falsely taking private property because he
":thinks"

> > the
> > > civilian is wrong.
> > >
> > > I don't get into arguments with cops--I know better. But you better
> > believe
> > > that whatever legal
> > > avenues I have against a Rambo cop, I WILL use them. Hey, I am a
> > vindictive
> > > person, what can
> > > I say? LOL!
> > >
> > > Jerry
> > > K4KWH
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
> > > news:egXP7.4480$xy4.1674762434@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
> > > > What he is saying is correct. Most police
> > > > officers (while in their heart they think that what
> > > > they are doing is the right thing) won't have the proper
> > > > training for such an enforcement. Shooting a gun
> > > > can remove a life, but taking ones radio equipment
> > > > is merely an inconvenience to someone.
> > > > NEVER argue with a cop, as a friend that is
> > > > one says, "I'm God right then, are you going to
> > > > tell me I'm wrong?" He's right, no matter what you
> > > > say to him, if his mind is set, he will do what he
> > > > thinks is right.
> > > >
> > > > Landshark
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C0FFEBC.FB60F89D@gte.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > Who says that he would "arrest". What the
> > > > > normal procedure would be is to take the
> > > > > equipment, issue a court citation then let
> > > > > the courts and the attorneys settle it out.
> > > > >
> > > > > This is often what happens when the cop
> > > > > is not totally familiar with the law or the
> > > > > ham does not have his license on him.
> > > > >
> > > > > What you should not do is argue as you are

> > > > > not going to win. The street is not the place
> > > > > to settle such issues, the courts are. And no
> > > > > cop is going to let you get out of control and
> > > > > argue with him. He will call back up and arrest
> > > > > you for resisting law enforcement (non compliance
> > > > > is a crime). You may get the radio back but
> > > > > you will pay a fine for being a jerk.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>
>

3705. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 04:34:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C12E9CE.27B977C7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26652
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Hans Brakob wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote =
> > > > Maybe he doesn't realize that the only CW-only ham frequencies
> > > > are located in the 2m band.
> > >
> > > I didn't realize that either (because it isn't true).
> > >
> > > There is another band with a "CW-only" segment.
> > >
> > My typing got ahead of my brain. Should have been "6m/2m band".
>
> Don't you mean to say that you simply lied about it?

My brain didn't lie but my fingers did.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3706. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 04:41:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C12DE02.E8EEC8AC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26653

K0HB wrote:

> N2EY says:
>
> >Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
> >
> >BUT.....
> >
> >No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and
> type-approved.
>
> I am opposed to *any* appliance operator license in amateur radio.
> Period.
>
> Central to the justification for an Amateur Radio Service, and the
> precious spectrum that it consumes, is the idea of technically
> involved licensees. At the very soul of our Service is the fact that
> we are licensed to experiment, invent, modify, re-engineer, tinker,
> and improve the equipment that we use in our stations. Limiting a
> class of licensees (especially beginners) to "sealed store bought"
> equipment is a horrible idea. It consigns them to be nothing more
> than glorified FRS/CB operators with multi-band privs.
>
> This idea is the first step down a slippery slope to the extinction of
> the Amateur Radio Service.

Hans where da hell ya been for the last 30 years??? All that was way
back when there was not much other way to get a rig on the air. Today,
it's flash the plastic and yak. You haven't heard of the "Get your license
in a weekend" promotions by Gordo West et al? Comes with Moneyback
guarantee!
The transition to knowledge-free licensing, to go with the code free, has
been in progress for a LONG time, and will eventually culminate with DC to
daylight CB.
It's pretty well there already.

3707. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 04:45:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C12EC7B.572379DB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26654

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Hans where da hell ya been for the last 30 years???

Hey Dick, here's something I got from a URL on drudgereport.com.

"A SCIENTIST has observed homosexual behavior in
wild orang-utans for the first time, adding the great apes
to the long list of animals that take part in same sex
relationships. Homosexual behavior has been observed in almost
every species of animal including dolphins, hedgehogs,
kangaroos, sheep, whales, albatrosses, chimpanzees
and gorillas. Dr Fox published her observations in the
American Journal of Primatology."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3708. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:01:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c12f101_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26658

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011208104929.28268.00000201@mb-cr.aol.com...
>
> >I do know that if the government were truthful about the $1 tax and we'd
had
> >no prior experiences to the contrary, I'd be all for it.
>
> I find that hard to believe.
>
> >I'd also want the
> >money *equally* distributed on something like a per mile of government
> >highway in a state. In other words, a huge landsurface state may still
only
> >end up with a small percentage of the money because of less federal
highway
> >in that state.
>
> That's a terrible formula. Using that method, the states with the most
existing
> roads would get the most money, regardless of how much they contribute to
the
> tax base or how much new road they actually need.
>

When I thought the discussion was about road taxes, the above would make sense to me. The state with the most federal roads would need and get the most federal money to support those roads, right?

> > That is, if you are talking about highways being "public
> >surface transportation."
>
> We were not. We were talking about alternatives to highways.
>
> <If you are talking about busses and trains...yech,
> >forget it.
>
> There are folks who cannot drive, and others who should not yet do because
of
> lack of alternatives.
>

I think "public transportation" should be left mostly to local governments and people to decide if they want, and what type. I think that public transportation is subsidised, is it not (?), by federal tax dollars but is not chiefly funded by federal money.

> >
> > Tried both and hate 'em.
>
> Why? Did you try any of the European or Japanese systems?
>

Uh, I don't live in Europe or Japan. I live here in the United States. The NY subway system (back in the 70s) was pretty bad. Never took a bus up there, but I have down here in Dallas and it was not a pleasant or desirable experience at all.

> >
> > I'll pollute, thank you.
>
> Your pollution harms others. What gives you the right to do that?
>

I am a United States citizen?

>
> America's dependence on imported petroleum has serious political consequences.
> We import far more today than during the 1970s.
>

America's dependence on imported drugs has serious political consequences. America's dependence on foreign-made products has serious political and economic consequences. And on and on.

>
> Why is it OK for the govt. to subsidize certain modes of transportation to the
> detriment of others?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Don't know that it's "OK". It just happens that's a part of the "way it is."

Kim W5TIT

3709. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:03:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209000321.04115.00000112@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 26655

In article <m6sQ7.255459$W8.9481433@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote
>
>> Here's a question for you: When and where did the ideas of separation of
>church
>> and state, and universal religious tolerance, first become established in
>the
>> USA?
>
>You don't mean Philadelphia? Do you? ;-)

Actually, Pennsylvania. Philly is close enough, though.
>
>> Do you know WHY the fish was a symbol?
>
>Fisher of men???

Naw. "Icthys" was an abbreviation for a phrase that meant "Jesus Christ, Savior
of the world" or something like that. The simple fish symbol could be drawn
quickly, too.
>
>> "Romanis ite domum? What is that supposed to mean??"
>
>I was thinking 'Romans are home' and so I searched on the net and found
>this; I thought you'd like it...
>
>What could this be from???? ;-)

Ahhh - somebody here has some culture!

Monty Python's Life of Brian, which also gave us scenes like the old man being
stoned for saying "Jehovah" and the song "Always Look On The Bright Side Of
Life" (which would be reprised by Jack Nicholson in "As Good As It Gets").

You have to know the original to fully get the joke. The centurion has Brian in
various strangleholds and threatens him with the short sword. The dialogue is
familiar to anyone who had a real Latin teacher.
>_______________________
>
>CENTURION: What's this, then? 'Romanes Eunt Domus'? 'People called Romanes
>they go the house'?
>BRIAN: It-- it says, 'Romans, go home'.
>CENTURION: No, it doesn't. What's Latin for 'Roman'? Come on!
>BRIAN: Aah!

>CENTURION: Come on!
>BRIAN: 'R-- Romanus'?
>CENTURION: Goes like...?
>BRIAN: 'Annus'?
>CENTURION: Vocative plural of 'annus' is...?
>BRIAN: Eh. 'Anni'?
>CENTURION: 'Romani'. 'Eunt'? What is 'eunt'?
>BRIAN: 'Go'. Let--
>CENTURION: Conjugate the verb 'to go'.
>BRIAN: Uh. 'Ire'. Uh, 'eo'. 'Is'. 'It'. 'Imus'. 'Itis'. 'Eunt'.
>CENTURION: So 'eunt' is...?
>BRIAN: Ah, huh, third person plural, uh, present indicative. Uh, 'they go'.
>CENTURION: But 'Romans, go home' is an order, so you must use the...?
>BRIAN: The... imperative!
>CENTURION: Which is...?
>BRIAN: Umm! Oh. Oh. Um, 'i'. 'I'!
>CENTURION: How many Romans?
>BRIAN: Ah! 'I'-- Plural. Plural. 'Ite'. 'Ite'.
>CENTURION: 'Ite'.
>BRIAN: Ah. Eh.
>CENTURION: 'Domus'?
>BRIAN: Eh.
>CENTURION: Nominative?
>BRIAN: Oh.
>CENTURION: 'Go home'? This is motion towards. Isn't it, boy?
>BRIAN: Ah. Ah, dative, sir! Ahh! No, not dative! Not the dative, sir! No!
>Ah! Oh, the... accusative! Accusative! Ah! 'Domum', sir! 'Ad domum'! Ah!
>Oooh! Ah!
>CENTURION: Except that 'domus' takes the...?
>BRIAN: The locative, sir!
>CENTURION: Which is...?!
>BRIAN: 'Domum'.
>CENTURION: 'Domum'.
>BRIAN: Aaah! Ah.
>CENTURION: 'Um'. Understand?
>BRIAN: Yes, sir.
>CENTURION: Now, write it out a hundred times.
>BRIAN: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir. Hail Caesar, sir.
>CENTURION: Hail Caesar. If it's not done by sunrise, I'll cut your balls
>off.
>BRIAN: Oh, thank you, sir. Thank you, sir. Hail Caesar and everything, sir!
>Oh. Mmm! Finished!
>ROMAN SOLDIER STIG: Right. Now don't do it again.
>[CENTURIONS chase BRIAN]
>MAN: Hey! Bloody Romans.
>_____
>
>Now doesn't that say it all? ;-)

Well, I wasn't expecting the Spanish Inquisition!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3710. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:03:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209000322.04115.00000113@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 26656

In article <3C129F04.23E73874@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> (snip) In Europe and Japan, where the public transit
>> is so good, the taxes on gasoline are far more than
>> $1 per gallon. We could have even better systems here
>> in the USA, but Americans aren't ready to pay the
>> price - yet.
>
>
> I agree with the "yet" added to the end of that. Based on the
>growing traffic jams in most major cities, I think it is only a matter
>of time. Sooner or later, we'll have to do something (or we'll all end
>up in traffic jams for most of our lives).

I hope you're right. The answer that most Americans support is "build more
roads" which doesn't solve the problem.

What too many folks ignore is that we drive so many vehicles so many miles that
we have to import huge amounts of petrol to run them. Paying for that petrol
not only transfers huge amounts of American wealth overseas, but transfers some
of it to the very folks who want to destroy us.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3711. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:06:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C12F150.5974C9F3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26657

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > I think the sanest way to set up the basic tenets
> > are to simply agree with the religious views of
> > the last person who speaks, i.e. if Cecil tells
> > you that you are going to hell for dancing or
> > eating pork, you agree. If Rick Adams screams
> > that there is no God, you agree. In this manner,
> > you avoid all debate on religious matters.
>
> But where is the controversy? Religions cannot exist without some
> controversy (christains have abortion, Muslims have the great Satan,
> etc). We gotta have some controversy. Wait, I've got it - the great CW debate!

Well, you'll automatically have the anti-religious element upset over
the formation of the new religion. Toss in the code debate and you'll
have a real winner.

> > Since we are now in a new millenium, you might
> > consider spiffing up your place of worship. I
> > suggest that you have, as an altar, a large home
> > entertainment center. The focal point on the altar
> > can be a large screen TV. For sacraments, try Jack
> > Daniels and stale Cheetos. You'll also need "the
> > book". I suggest some old copies of 73 magazine.
> > From time to time you can pick up "the book" and
> > read from the ravings of "St. Wayne".
>
> Hey, this religion is getting stranger by the moment (which means, I
> like it).
>
> > I'm working on the method of eternal punishment for
> > those who fail to follow the tenets of this new
> > religion. I haven't gotten all the details worked
> > out yet but I'm working on something like this: You
> > die and end up spending eternity at Kim's house...
> > or maybe it just seems like it.
>
> Heh, heh. Sorry, but that was funny, Kim. By the way, Dave, we
> should bestow sainthood on anyone who can always figure out what Kim
> is talking about.

That is a problem, Dwight. Those who are beatified and awaiting their chance for sainthood are, well...dead.

Dave K8MN
on a break from the 160m contest...

3712. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:07:32 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c12f279_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26659

Never seen policies, other than "thou shalt not" and that's all that need be said. I'll be in my closed door meetings getting some real work done. I don't know what you guys are going to do.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C1291F1.911C56FC@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > No, Dwight. I'll tell you in a heartbeat that it
> > isn't going on and I do believe that we are all
> > far more adult than that. *If* this was going on
> > as much as you say, and *if* the prevailing attitude
> > were to adjust company policies because of it, there
> > would be such a stranglehold on the ability of
> > companies to do business that it would be impossible
> > to do business!!
> >
> > And, as I said, I have never, ever seen it happen yet.
> > Yet is the operative word, but it is also the one on
> > which I base my opinion that you have nothing more
> > than a red herring.
>
>
> Kim, I read the above to my wife and, after she was finished
> laughing, she asked where you have worked in your life that you've not
> seen this. In every single place she has ever worked, the companies
> had specific policies dealing with sexual harassment, which always
> include invitations for dates, private meetings, private lunches, and
> so forth. In fact, it is now a federal requirement for companies to
> have their policies about sexual harassment clearly posted for all to
> read. Where travel is likely, most companies had specific policies
> about socializing, accommodations, and so forth. And most companies
> gave their employees, especially the management staff, printed
> guidelines or classroom instruction about dealing with the opposite
> sex in the workplace - and all these she has read or seen warned
> against private meetings behind closed doors and socializing (lunches,
> etc) in or outside the workplace. In other words, her experiences in
> this regard have been exactly the same as mine.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3713. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:10:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c12f334_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26661

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C129A6A.B0CD79FD@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > I sure would. If something is wrong, and if something
> > is believed because of wrong perceptions, wrongfully
> > placed concepts, then it's still wrong. Thank goodness
> > our forefathers believed that.
>
>
> Kim, you can say something is wrong all you want, but that does not
> make it wrong - it just makes it your opinion. And, my opinion, and
> that of many others, say it is not wrong.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Why do you add the "and that of many others" above? Is that supposed to
make your opinion even more right? I could stand in a room full of people
and be the only one thinking something is wrong. Ask me if that will change
my mind as to whether *I* think it is wrong or not.

Kim W5TIT
Sorry you offended so many people by being so very right.

3714. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:13:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c12f3ce_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26662

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C129B58.B435E0A4@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > You are labeling many of my Wiccan friends, Dwight.
>
>
> No, I'm not "labeling" your friends, Kim. Like I said earlier,
> "satanic" is the common name used by most everyone to describe the
> people involved in those activities. I didn't invent the word to
> describe them - it is the word commonly used in this country.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Is that kind of like dodging any responsiblity for the way you feel and think about the Wiccan and other Pagan traditions? OK, so you did not personally come up with the popular thought that pagan traditions are satanic in nature. Do you subscribe to the opinion, or not?

Kim W5TIT

3715. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:14:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C12F33F.45D84202@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26660

K0HB wrote:
>
> N2EY says:
>
> >Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
> >
> >BUT.....
> >
> >No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and
> type-approved.
>
> I am opposed to *any* appliance operator license in amateur radio.
> Period.
>
> Central to the justification for an Amateur Radio Service, and the
> precious spectrum that it consumes, is the idea of technically
> involved licensees. At the very soul of our Service is the fact that
> we are licensed to experiment, invent, modify, re-engineer, tinker,
> and improve the equipment that we use in our stations. Limiting a
> class of licensees (especially beginners) to "sealed store bought"
> equipment is a horrible idea. It consigns them to be nothing more
> than glorified FRS/CB operators with multi-band privs.
>
> This idea is the first step down a slippery slope to the extinction of
> the Amateur Radio Service.

Throw in Plourde's idea of low power and you've guaranteed the
similarity to CB which Britain, after years of battling over the issue,
already has. This idea is nearly as bad as baked bean sandwiches,
grilled tomatoes, bangers, boiled coffee and blackened, cold toast which
the Brits also introduced. Remember: The Brits invented the toilet
seat but it took the French to invent the hole in the center.

Dave K8MN

3716. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:16:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c12f4a6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26663

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9uul3g09fd@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> news:3C129B58.B435E0A4@sccoast.net...
> > No, I'm not "labeling" your friends, Kim. Like I said earlier,
> > "satanic" is the common name used by most everyone to describe the
> > people involved in those activities. I didn't invent the word to
> > describe them - it is the word commonly used in this country.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> But you certainly don't have any problem repeating a commonly held
> "Christian" misconception without knowing the facts.
>
>

Thank you. Exactly.

Kim W5TIT

3717. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:17:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c12f4d6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26664

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9uul4809jf@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> news:3C129CB0.B3BA5E3C@sccoast.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > There was nothing hateful about anything I said, Kim. I simply told
> > him, based on what he had written so far, I would believe any web site
> > over him (including one written by a drunken sailor from Brazil). Now,
> > that was certainly colorful (added for emphasis), but hardly hateful.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Hate is easliy veiled.
>
> You can stick a toothpick in a turd and call it a trophy, but it would
still
> be a turd.
>
>

Er, with a toothpick in it. ;)

Kim W5TIT

3718. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:18:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c12f530_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26665

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C12A673.CA66917A@sccoast.net...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > I think the sanest way to set up the basic tenets
> > are to simply agree with the religious views of
> > the last person who speaks, i.e. if Cecil tells
> > you that you are going to hell for dancing or
> > eating pork, you agree. If Rick Adams screams
> > that there is no God, you agree. In this manner,
> > you avoid all debate on religious matters.
>
>
> But where is the controversy? Religions cannot exist without some
> controversy (christains have abortion, Muslims have the great Satan,
> etc). We gotta have some controversy. Wait, I've got it - the great CW
debate!
>
>
> > Since we are now in a new millenium, you might
> > consider spiffing up your place of worship. I
> > suggest that you have, as an altar, a large home
> > entertainment center. The focal point on the altar
> > can be a large screen TV. For sacraments, try Jack
> > Daniels and stale Cheetos. You'll also need "the
> > book". I suggest some old copies of 73 magazine.
> > From time to time you can pick up "the book" and
> > read from the ravings of "St. Wayne".
>
>
> Hey, this religion is getting stranger by the moment (which means, I
> like it).
>
>
> > I'm working on the method of eternal punishment for
> > those who fail to follow the tenets of this new
> > religion. I haven't gotten all the details worked
> > out yet but I'm working on something like this: You
> > die and end up spending eternity at Kim's house...
> > or maybe it just seems like it.
>
>
> Heh, heh. Sorry, but that was funny, Kim. By the way, Dave, we
> should bestow sainthood on anyone who can always figure out what Kim

> is talking about.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Funny? I thought it was rather easy and blase. But one man's junk is another man's treasure.

Oh, and all you gotta do is tell me to use shorter sentences so you can understand 'em.

Kim W5TIT

3719. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:21:17 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c12f5b2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26666

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C12B1A5.C1ED148D@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C11B63D.E4F8B0A@earthlink.net...
> > > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I think that you've missed the humor, Rick.
> > > > > Dwight doesn't know of a religion called
> > > > > "Stewartism".
> > > >
> > > > Wow, do they have a religion like that, Dave? I'll join.
> > >
> > > I think the sanest way to set up the basic tenets are to simply agree
> > > with the religious views of the last person who speaks, i.e. if Cecil
> > > tells you that you are going to hell for dancing or eating pork, you
> > > agree. If Rick Adams screams that there is no God, you agree. In
this
> > > manner, you avoid all debate on religious matters.
> > >
> > > Since we are now in a new millenium, you might consider spiffing up
your
> > > place of worship. I suggest that you have, as an altar, a large home
> > > entertainment center. The focal point on the altar can be a large
> > > screen TV. For sacraments, try Jack Daniels and stale Cheetos.
You'll
> > > also need "the book". I suggest some old copies of 73 magazine. From
> > > time to time you can pick up "the book" and read from the ravings of
> > > "St. Wayne".
> > >
> > > I'm working on the method of eternal punishment for those who fail to
> > > follow the tenets of this new religion. I haven't gotten all the
> > > details worked out yet but I'm working on something like this:
> > > You die and end up spending eternity at Kim's house...or maybe it just
> > > seems like it.
> > >
> > > Let me know what you think.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > You've obviously got a lot of work to do yet, then, Dave. An eternity
```

at my
> > house would be Heaven compared to one at Larry Roll's.
>
> You simply misunderstood, Kim. The eternity spent at your house would
> be the punishment for others. Perhaps, YOU can spend eternity at
> Larry's.
>
> Dave K8MN

Oh no no no. The thought of even a few moments in or near the Larry Roll apartmenthood is enough to make me work on sainthood.

Kim W5TIT

3720. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 05:37:45 UTC
From: K0HB <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <#uesCOHgBHA.1868@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 26667

Dick Carroll muttered

> Hans where da hell ya been for the last 30 years??? All that was way
> back when there was not much other way to get a rig on the air. Today,
> it's flash the plastic and yak.

I've been on the air. Where the hell have YOU been Richard (Cranium)??

There is more homebrewing and kitbuilding going on in amateur radio
today that there has been since the late 50's. But acknowledging that
fact would ruin your negative rant, wouldn't it?

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

3721. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 06:15:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209011515.07928.00000262@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 26669

In article <20011208104927.28268.00000199@mb-cr.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>In Europe and Japan, where the public transit is so good, the taxes on
>gasoline
>are far more than $1 per gallon. We could have even better systems here in
>the
>USA, but Americans aren't ready to pay the price - yet.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

One reason why Europe and Japan have extensive, well-used, and efficient public transit systems is because their geography, population density, and culture all work to make it practical. In the typical European or Japanese city, there simply isn't enough highway traffic capacity and parking space to accommodate anything but mass transit of the daily workforce/shopping/leisure traffic going to, from, and between the cities and outlying suburbs. Here in the USA, the distances are much longer, and our highway systems consume a vast amount of our urban/suburban real estate by comparison to EU/JA cities of similar size. Not to mention the fact that with the exception of people who live and work entirely within the boundaries of large cities, Americans are generally not disposed to giving up the autonomy and freedom of transporting themselves in their private automobiles.

One thing I would change is this crap of single-car travel when that car is a full-sized luxury SUV or sedan. I think compact 4-cylinder cars are a much better choice, and is the type I've driven most of my life. Of the dozen or so cars I've owned, the three largest were a '65 Ford LTD, an '83 Chevrolet Caprice Classic 4-DR sedan, and a '91 Ford Taurus. All the rest have been 4-cylinder, 4-door compact cars. My Toyota Corolla LE is every bit as comfortable, quiet, and safe as my '91 Taurus was, but it gets up to twice as many MPG in combined city/highway driving, and I can park it anywhere.

I think we Americans do need to re-think things like our daily transportation needs, and be more willing to accept vehicles that get the job done with a minimum of impact. Every time I see some young female YUPPIE driving all by her lonesome in an Excursion, I find myself wishing gasoline was five bucks a gallon! The problem is, people like her would pay that price -- and those of

us who get 40 mpg in our economy cars shouldn't have to!
Perhaps what we need are gasoline taxes based on vehicle size,
weight, and average fuel economy -- with confiscatory road
use surcharges for those practicing conspicuous consumption
with the SUV's, full-size crew-cab dually pickups (legitimate
business users excluded, of course), and other inefficient
vehicles.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3722. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 06:15:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209011516.07928.00000264@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 26668

In article <3C12B1A5.C1ED148D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You simply misunderstood, Kim. The eternity spent at your house would
>be the punishment for others. Perhaps, YOU can spend eternity at
>Larry's.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

What have I done to deserve THAT???

73 de Larry, K3LT

3723. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 06:15:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209011516.07928.00000263@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 26670

In article <TexQ7.215587$3d2.9815049@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>Larry, update me just a tad. The military has had regs on
>superior/subordinate relationships since probably Cyrus the Great or
>before. As an NCO you would probably get into deep do do lending money,
>getting into poker games, etc. with people you supervised. Officers, of
>course, had stricter rules re enlisted but got regularly drained by the CO
>or his wife where the rules got 'bent' into a knot. NCO clubs had their
>reasons for existing.
>
>When you went to sergeanting school, what did they tell you about this
>sort of thing?
>
>Dick Nï¿½BK

Dick:

Surprisingly little. In fact, I always thought that the Air Force NCO
Supervisory courses and NCO Academies were somewhat negligent
in providing detailed training on the topic of professional relationships
between the ranks. The Senior NCO Academy correspondence
course addressed the issue, but provided no specific "Thou Shalt
Nots" with regard to various possible inter-rank personal affairs.
The main guidance was that among enlisted personnel, it is OK to
"fraternize" as long as the two parties involved are not in each
other's chain-of-command, and have no possibility of becoming so.

This is not quite as simple as it sounds, however. I, as a Senior NCO,
may have an intimate relationship with a female Staff Sergeant who
is not in my career field. However, if she is assigned to my
squadron, and I am, for example, required to fill-in as the acting
First Sergeant (something I've done a number of times), she falls
within my supervisory span of control, and, legally, becomes
someone with whom I cannot fraternize. If she is a member of
a different squadron entirely, then there's less of a problem, as
long as our behavior toward each other is entirely professional
in substance and appearance when in each other's presence in
public and while wearing the uniform.

Early in my career, a female NCO and I did have a lengthy
relationship while we were both Staff Sergeants. We were
separated by different assignments, and brought back
"together" 10 years later, when she was a Technical Sergeant and
I was a Master Sergeant, in the same squadron, and the same

section! I was her Superintendent, her direct supervisor, and, therefore, she was no longer "fair game" for an intimate relationship. That problem resolved itself in a year and a half, after I retired!

The main focus of fraternization in the military is between officers and enlisted personnel -- and that is always a bad idea for both. I have known male officers who have married female enlisted personnel, but their careers seem to have suffered as a result of it. In fact, the best possible XYL for a married, male officer is a college educated civilian from a "good" (spelled high social class) family. Speaking for myself, I probably went a bit overboard trying to avoid the appearance, or the fact, of improper fraternization. Considering the problems I've seen others have, I'm glad I choose that particular personal policy.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3724. Re: kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 06:26:45 UTC
From: The Better Amateur Radio Federation <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <74032aae7057c1a9b87253f81579a287@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 26671
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"bpnjensen" <bpnjensen@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:37af7e1c.0112071313.27189955@posting.google.com...
> Well, your position is stupid and erroneous. The "horse" obviously
> ain't dead, and this is the type of thing that can and may well affect
> amateur radio operators for decades to come. It's public record; it's
> a public activity; and the amateur radio public has every right, maybe
> even an obligation, to discuss it. Hopefully the discussion will
> focus on issues rather than personalities, but it is still a valid
> topic.
>
> Bruce Jensen

This issue is this, Brucie. There are people that can't leave well enough alone. They can not stand the fact that Herb can get back on the air, even if it is to be in a contest. He was not bothering anybody. Who care anyway? Mr. Hollingsworth is a very corrupt man. He enforces the ham bands to what way his "masters" see fit. There have many people file complaints about QRM'ing of the Liberty Net, which go unanswered. But someone, who lost his ham ticket, by means that, in my opinion, were railroaded by a bunch of power-hungry and self-serving, garbage!

Herb gets on the air, just to get in a contest, and what happens? All hell breaks loose. It's a matter of Mr. Hollingsworth picking and choosing what rules get enforced and what should happen. As Hal Turner would suggest, Mr. Hollingsworth should resign in disgrace!

--
Lloyd Davies,
B.A.R.F. Chief of Communications
http://www.angelfire.com/in/w9xn/
http://www.anglefire.com/al/sj61 - Under development

3725. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 06:37:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1306B4.A192185E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26672

>
> >
> > Well, to get the connection between the pentagram and satanism out
> > of my head, you'd have to tell me to ignore several hundred years of
> > history - that symbol has been used by self proclaimed satanists for
> > at least that long (possibly longer).
> >
>
> It's also been used in religious, Masonic, etc., circles, so you'd better
> dodge them too.

Also on heavy metal music album/CD covers....

3726. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 06:39:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C130706.F06E2814@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26673

>
> > >Rearrabge the letters in "Santa" and you get "Satan". How convenient!
> >
> > devil spelled backward is "lived"

Devils are a hockey team in NJ.....

>
> >
> > evil spelled backward is "live"
> >
> > now consider god ...
> >
> > Rick <wondering who let the dog out preach, preach, preach...>
>
> Don't forget Stephen King's favorite aperitif - Red Rum.

3727. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 06:48:36 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C130944.F1EA01DC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26674

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>
>
> Uh, I don't live in Europe or Japan. I live here in the United States. The
> NY subway system (back in the 70s) was pretty bad.

I hear it's gotten better. I'm going to pay a visit to a friend in
Manhattan Island, and the only sensible way to do that from
northern NJ is to catch a bus to 42nd street and then take the
subway. I'll see how it is. No place to park.

3728. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 06:50:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1309C2.CD51CD38@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26675

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > (snip) In Europe and Japan, where the public transit
> > is so good, the taxes on gasoline are far more than
> > $1 per gallon. We could have even better systems here
> > in the USA, but Americans aren't ready to pay the
> > price - yet.
>
> I agree with the "yet" added to the end of that. Based on the
> growing traffic jams in most major cities, I think it is only a matter
> of time. Sooner or later, we'll have to do something (or we'll all end
> up in traffic jams for most of our lives).
>

Now if they had busses that actually went somewheres...
(like where I want to go when I want to go).

3729. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 06:53:02 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C12523B.4FEC6EFA@mailcity.net>
Source record: 26676
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

KC8JBO wrote:

>
> And N4CND has drove by AMP's house doing stuff as well. From the way
> Oraasssss'
> audio sounds, he should stick to CB.

"has driven", learn proper English woger.

3730. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 07:02:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C130C8E.EF97845E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26677

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > I think that you've missed the humor, Rick.
> > Dwight doesn't know of a religion called
> > "Stewartism".
>
> Besides, he'll never get that type of humor, Dave. He seems to think
> only of christianity, when I was actually hoping that I was wealthier
> than I thought (religions make good money).

I'll start a discount house of worship, next to Target and Kmart.... :-)

3731. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 07:11:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C130EAD.6E17C73E@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26678
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> >
> A Real Ham runs the mode that works on the specific freq at the
> specific time, if there's a new one on EME for instance and you need
> to log him a Real Ham runs the mode of the moment, doesn't matter if
> we're talking 2m or 160m.

EME in 160 meters? I suppose if two ham stations use balloon lifted
160 m yagis and operated 1KW CW when the Moon is directly
overhead..... Of course it would not work on a windy day.
Going directly up should help punch through the ionosphere. NO
fair hearing ground wave....

3732. I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 08:34:41 UTC
From: timnebo@aol.comLOL
Message-ID: <9uv7n1bhh1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26680
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

I dont see what is the big deal about this FCC crap I have been hearing. I have DXed all over the world on my TS-840 and amplifier both on ham bands and on freeband and I have yet to run into any hassles from the FCC. The only trouble I get is from stcuk up hams. Damn youd think they were afraid of there own shadow the way they go on about Riley this and Riley that. This is what I tell people who ask me about my radio setup: if you want to get started in the radio hobby and your smart why not do as I do and just jump in. The reason ham radio hobby is dieing is they made it too controlled. You dont need the code and who wants to give up their freedoms by giving the government more information they can use to violate your privacy anyway. I dont. Everyone knows the code will be dropped and then the test will be dropped for ham radio and finally there will be no more licenses. If more people just got on then the government would have to give up and let us do what we want regardless of there rules and we could speed the whole process up.

73 de Tim
Knight Patrol #82

WARNING
No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News Groups. Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3733. Two Can Play At This Game, Lelnad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 08:41:02 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9uv82ubma1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26679

"You think you can forge me in both hammie and cb room, Lelnad, but I am one step ahead of your pathetic distortions and lies. I have created this free newsserver account in order to give you something to think about. You see I could if I were so inclined use this account to forge YOU. Note that I said COULD, dear Lelnad, not DID, for I admit nothing without a quick backshuffling and the famous razzle-dazzle two step for which I am famous for. You may think you have cornered me with proof and substantiation, but all I need do is unleash a welter of words to bollix you and you come undone. Dogie was so beaten by my talent that he withdrew, tail between legs, to the darker reaches of the kennel. The one time he thought he was clever enough to send a tremor through my world was the lucky break that enabled him to post his disgusting mens undergarment for my receipt. I assure you it was the kennel club that did this and no one else for he as much as admitted it by his words scrawled on the garment itself. I will never reveal these words but know that I have the aformentioned lingerie displayed where I can see it daily as both a trophy and a reminder that I can send authorities to lock him up and throw away the key should I deign to. Now you Lelnad, observe this as a lesson if you please. There will be no more caterwauling and piffling and prodding as adjuncts to my posts. If you disagree with my proprietary opinions I ask you to take it to email and not involve the group in your anger-infused jealousy"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3734. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 09:18:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C132C5B.B6B13727@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26681

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C12B1A5.C1ED148D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You simply misunderstood, Kim. The eternity spent at your house would
> >be the punishment for others. Perhaps, YOU can spend eternity at
> >Larry's.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> What have I done to deserve THAT???

Come to think of it, that would be unfair.

Dave K8MN

3735. Re: A question to all.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 11:10:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112090310.79bffe25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26682

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.gnmr2zb.pminews@or.news.verio.net>...
> On 29 Nov 2001 23:13:45 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> To date this practice, they had lots of Gonset Gooney-Birds for us
> >> 2-meter guys who needed a portable or mobile rig over a long
> >> weekend. (Late 1950s)
> >>
> >>
> >Gooney BOXES, Benton Harbor LUNCHBOXES . . sheesh awready . .
>
> Weren't the Benton Harbor LunchBoxes products of Heath?
>
> I'm talking 1958......
>
>
Almost. One of the HeathHeads sites states that the HW-30 "Twoer" was
produced from 1960 thru 1971. The HW-29/29A "Sixer" was the six meter
Lunchbox, the HW-19 operated on ten. I think the kits were around $40.
The 5w Heath 'boxes were much less sophisticated than the Gonsets, the
rcvr was just a super-regen. But it was sensitive and proved to be
pretty effective for it's time for forty bucks. I ran a Twoer for
several years in the local dx spots net, maybe thirty dxcc hounds hung
out on 147.888 or some such with all sorts of claptrap AM rigs. The
Gonsets, the WW2 SCR-522s . . .
>
>
The Twoer was very easy to tune. The lower position of the tuning knob
listens to 144-146Mc., the upper position inhales every signal between
146 and 148Mc. Inclusive. Selectivity on 2m didn't much matter back
then, except for our spots net there was very little activity on 2m. I
daresay that the Twoer was one of the milestone radios which led the
stampede to 2m in that timeframe.
>
>
Those were interesting days on 2m. From the Lunchboxe-level AM rigs we
jumped to FM simplex via the great heaps of surplus commercial n'
cop's surplus tube-type rigs as the pros moved in herds to solid-state
equipment. Like my single channel castoff police 23 tube 90 pound
"floor-mounted" Motorola base abomination rig. Took up more cubic
space than three 75A4s do.
>
>
Shortly thereafter the likes of Ray Jeff started cranking out cheap

little 25w solid-state VHF Marine Band radios for the boating masses
which we boogered onto 2m. Jeez, ya could crystal up for a half dozen
or more channels on 2m with those, how good could VHF ham radio get?
'Twas a good day when I got my Ray Jeff up and running on 147.870 and
a municipal trash truck compacted my Motorola Monster into oblivion.
>
>
Then came the repeater wars. Turned out that some village idiots on
Long Island had picked 147.870 as the input freq for their machine.
And there we were a bunch of Philly-based HF dxers with mongo towers
topped with gain 2m antennas running simplex which pounded "their"
input freq . . "This is OUR problem??"
>
>
ohgawd . . .
>
>
w3rv

3736. Re: The Morsodist Religion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 11:36:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112090336.88f0af9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26683

k0hb@qwest.net (K0HB) wrote in message
news:<b7c5262e.0112081924.551f6a9a@posting.google.com>...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > But where is the controversy? Religions cannot exist without some
> > controversy (christains have abortion, Muslims have the great Satan,
> > etc). We gotta have some controversy. Wait, I've got it - the great
> > CW debate!
>
> Dwight,
>
> I'm shocked that you don't understand one of the great religions of
> Amateur Radio. Morsodism has been widely discussed here on rrap, but
> you're kind of an ignorant newcomer, so I'll fill you in.
>
> So you want to be a Morsodist. It's not easy, you know: you'll have to
> impose the stiffest constraints on your mind, accepting authority
> without question -- you will be subject to jeers and persecutions at
> the hands of the Spawn of Oracle, and you will suffer during your
> entire lifetime trying to throw pearls before the swine. But in the
> end, you will receive your reward from the Almighty in Heaven, and you
> will have the satisfaction of seeing all others being tossed into the
> Lake of Fire.
>
> But enough of that; you're not there yet. You must first prove
> yourself worthy of being a Morsodist.
>
> Lesson One: Developing Your Psyche
>
> Right now I would like you to relax. That's it -- just sit quietly and
> let your mind go blank. Concentrate on one thing and one thing only:
> concentrate on your thumb. Now that thumb is no ordinary
> run-of-the-mill thumb: what you see is THE THUMB. That Thumb is your
> world. Nothing besides that Thumb concerns you in the least. As far as
> you are concerned, that Thumb rules over all. The only thing that
> should be in your mind right now is your Thumb and its absolute
> authority over your life. Each and every line, ridge, wrinkle, and bit
> of cuticle is a Divine Mandate, eternal in its wisdom, power, and
> relevance. That Thumb was made by MORSE, and its sole purpose is to
> guide you to your Salvation.
>
> Now, while still concentrating on that Thumb, begin to think about the
> world around you. Careful! Don't try to take in everything at once:
> start with the rest of your fingers, and slowly spread from there. See

> how your fingers are connected with and dominated by your Thumb. Now,
> slowly extend your perception to embrace your forfinger. It too was
> created by Morse, and it is all guided by the Thumb. Between your
> thumb and forefinger lie all the secrets of Morse. The rest of the
> universe is of no concern.
>
> Lesson Two: Establishing Your Doctrine
>
> Congratulations! You've come a long way, but you're not there yet.
> What I want you to do now is to go to the nearest book store and
> purchase a copy of the FCCRuleBook. Preferably, it should be bound in
> nice, shiny black leather, and should have gilt edges and a red silk
> ribbon. It should be fairly hefty in size, but not so large that you
> cannot hold it with one hand. Finally, it should have the words of
> Samuel in red letters, for as you know the Son of Morse only spoke
> using red letters.
>
> Now that you have yourFCCRuleBook, read it, and read it thoroughly. I
> imagine that some of it will fit in perfectly with your beliefs and
> morals, since you have been inspired by Maxim to attempt this
> indoctrination into Morsodism. As you read, you must remember that
> your beliefs are the ONLY right beliefs, and all others are falsehoods
> and are totally incompatible with Morse Divine Truth.
>
> Now you may be dismayed as you read through the FCCRuleBook to find
> that much of it is outside your beliefs, or may even contradict them.
> No problem! All you have to do is take a black marker pen and blot out
> those paragraphs which you don't like. Simplicity itself! Now don't
> you worry if it seems that more of the FCCRuleBook is blacked out than
> left behind: just remind yourself that the remaining words are
> emphasized all the more.
>
> Lesson Three: Living a Morsodist Lifestyle
>
> Well, I'm sure that you Novices are simply bursting with questions on
> how to apply your new-found faith to your lives. I am pleased by your
> enthusiasm: such zeal is a necessity if you want to begin to work your
> influence on this filthy and sinful world and mold it into a clean and
> upright one. Those Spawn of W5YI are simply itching to be preached at,
> whether they want it or not, so let's get cracking.
>
> First, obtain for thyself some sort of access to the internet
> newsgroups, specifically any (and all) newsgroups in the
> "rec.radio.amateur.*" lineage. Never mind that only one of them, the
> "policy" group is fit for Morsodists like yourself; you must spread
> the word ALL the heathen Oracalists. Crosspost like crazy, verily even
> if attacked by Horrible Herman, the Lord High Newsgroup Purity
> Defender.
>
> As you preach the word of Morse to others, you will inevitably run

> into those who not only doubt the veracity of your words, but who also
> pose trick arguments inspired by Lenny Liberal and his henchman, Crazy
> Carl, the head Oracalist, in an attempt to trap and discredit you.
> This lesson deals with some of the major swords wielded by various
> tempters, and gives you some ideas on how to parry those weapons.
>
> Technobabble scholars: these vermin use their high-falootin' technical
> jargon and book-learning to pervert the words of the Morse and read
> things into Part 97 which aren't there. The FCCRuleBook was written by
> Morse for YOU to use, and contains EVERYTHING you need to know for
> Salvation, plainly stated in black and white and red. There is nothing
> magic or mystical about it: it speaks out in the Words of Morse and
> speaks directly to YOU, as you have personally modified it to your
> belief set.
>
> If other Spawn of Oracle say that the FCCRuleBook cannot speak the
> utter Truth because it is inconsistent in what it says, you can reply
> that there is no inconsistency in your FCCRuleBook: everything that
> you have in your FCCRuleBook perfectly supports your beliefs
> (remember Lesson Two). If they quote passages from the FCCRuleBook
> which they claim contradict your beliefs, you can reply that Oracle
> has inspired them to pervert the words of Morse and to twist their
> meaning around in order to try to subvert the Truth. If they say that
> you are being totally ignorant and irrational in your absolute belief
> in your Morsodist Doctrine, you can reply that they are being totally
> ignorant and irrational in their absolute refusal to believe in your
> Doctrine. And if they say that you are shutting your eyes to reality,
> you can reply that they are shutting their eyes to Morse.
>
> Peace to all of you!
>
>
Jesus Christ Hans Ham Radio is only a HOBBY!
>
>
w3rv

3737. Re: W4AMP on 14313 and 3901

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 12:15:38 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uvribmdc3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26687
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
news:2f31d7b3b89604b190735@ncvillage.net...
>
> On Sat, 8 Dec 2001 11:24:28 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> :
> : "Enrique Alejandro Martinez" <pilotenrique@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> : news:9ut41idr1@onyx.indstate.edu...
> : > Well Military reject...
> :
> : Says the COWARD too chickenshit to enlist.
> :
> : > Number one, I am a US citizen, so you can call the
> : > INS. They will find all my papers in order.
> :
> : U.S. citizens don't have "paper" to get in order, fucknuts.
> : Having that expired visa from that shithole Honduras makes you even more
> : nervous, does it?
>
> Naturalized citizens have papers which *prove* they are citizens,

No Shit, Sherlock.

> dimwit. These days, they carry them on their person in case John
> Ashcroft's jackbooted immigration thugs show up on their doorstep.

Poor babies. You sound like you came from one of those Cuban refugee boats
yourself, dumbass. Or are all North Carolinaians so hopped up on drugs like
you?

3738. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 12:20:56 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uvricmdc4@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26688
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Anonymous Coward" <Woger@WVFruitCo.con> wrote in message
news:9uu4rd$bi7$0@pita.alt.net...

Let's see you post by DT because you are suffering from the DT's.

> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9uttib$s8g$8@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Angst" <ToodleDoo@youtoo.col> wrote in message
> > news:9urs2a$470$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:9uo12vlfq0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > "DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3204442.23871@ncvillage.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > On Wed, 5 Dec 2001 15:42:51 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Oh, I don't know........he may be listening more than you think.
> He
> > > got
> > > > on
> > > > > > 14.313 recently and talked to Dan.
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > We can take care of things ourselves instead of waiting around for
> Mr.
> > > > No Show. I have a Collins KWM-2 all hooked up and ready to take
> Dimmy
> > > > out whenever he shows up and starts his profanity again.
> > > >
> > > So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere
with
> > > another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97,
> doesn't
> > it?
> > > > BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.
> > >
> > And it was AMP who suggested making a midnight call to tear down
towers
> > and
> > antennas. Just goes to show, you put a CB'er on Ham Radio and he's
still

> a
> > > CB'er.
> >
> > And N4CND has drove by AMP's house doing stuff as well. From the way
> > Oraasssss'
> > audio sounds, he should stick to CB.
> >
>
> Roger, the two of them live in different states!

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...You are one dumbass.

Orasss the profanity on 3.901 spewer and AMP both live in Georgia.
Although I don't know why anybody would want to.
Or why anybody would want to check into 3.901, the trash frequency full of hypocrites and jammers. Yes, the so-called "goodfellows" jam and get on unidentified.

> How the hell can they drive by each other's house?

Ummmm...with an automobile or truck???? Not every body is like you and has automobiles that actually run, instead of up on blocks in front of their house.

> Uh oh, sorry gotta run, there's a computer customer up front......back later.

And they depend upon *you* to sell them something?
How ironic.

3739. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 12:23:08 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uvridmdc5@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26689
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jizz Recepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C12523B.4FEC6EFA@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> >
> > And N4CND has drove by AMP's house doing stuff as well. From the way
> > Oraasssss'
> > audio sounds, he should stick to CB.
>
> "has driven", learn proper English woger.
^^

Follow your own advice, fuckwit.

1) Sentences begin with Capital letters.
2) You missed placement of a comma.
3) Proper nouns are capitalized, as well.
4) You are an ill-educated fuckwit.

HTH.

3740. Re: Jam the bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 12:39:10 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9uvriomdcd@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 26690
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Tough Tits Rumpranger" <RumprangerTwiddlesLittle
Boys@harharharharidiot.com> wrote in message
news:9uu2ng$6c2$0@pita.alt.net...

Poor Twatty Campbell.

> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9utti6$s8g$4@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
> > news:23871.0000054@ncvillage.net...
> > >
> > > On Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:20:25 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere
with
> > > > another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97,
> doesn't
> > it?
> > > > BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.
> > >
> > > That's exactly what I'm saying. Just like the CBers, the FCC has
> > > abandoned enforcement of ham radio rules. If we don't take care of
> > > ourselves, nobody will. So I'm perfectly willing to jam Dimmy until
he
> > > shuts up.
> >
> > So you're part of the problem, instead of the solution. Vigilanteism
went
> > out a long time ago, but, I suppose you're so backward that you still
> think
> > it's a viable defense.
> >
> > > I'll jam you too if necessary. That's the way it has to be now.
> >
> > cc: rholling@fcc.gov.
> >
> > We'll see about that.
> >
> >
> Talk tough Roger talk tough, I know it gets all your little
> radio geek buddies excited. Boy what a collection of radio
> fruits in the radio groups.

You'll fit right in.

> We've come to get to know many
> of them to where we can post stuff that gets them all
> excited, like what violations they got from Riley and what
> radio groups they're in on what freqs.

And too much of a COWARD to post non-anonymously.

3741. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 13:34:40 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <QLJQ7.216216$3d2.9884345@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26684

> >"N2EY" wrote

> >> Do you know WHY the fish was a symbol?

> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

> >Fisher of men???

"N2EY" wrote

> Naw. "Icthys" was an abbreviation for a phrase that meant "Jesus Christ, Savior
> of the world" or something like that. The simple fish symbol could be drawn
> quickly, too.

I'm right because Icthys is Greek for fish. Oteoicthys is all the bony fishes. DO you knonw what they call the rest of the fishes?

They called him that because he was the 'Fisher of Men' remember the most of the appostles were fishermen by trade.

> >> "Romanis ite domum? What is that supposed to mean??"

> >I was thinking 'Romans are home' and so I searched on the net and found
> >this; I thought you'd like it...

> >What could this be from???? ;-)

> Ahhh - somebody here has some culture!

That's right... ;-)

> Monty Python's Life of Brian, which also gave us scenes like the old man being
> stoned for saying "Jehovah" and the song "Always Look On The Bright Side Of
> Life" (which would be reprised by Jack Nicholson in "As Good As It Gets").
>
> You have to know the original to fully get the joke. The centurion has Brian in
> various strangleholds and threatens him with the short sword. The dialogue is
> familiar to anyone who had a real Latin teacher.

<snip>

> >Now doesn't that say it all? ;-)

> Well, I wasn't expecting the Spanish Inquisition!

NOT THE SPANISH INQISITION!!!

Rich

3742. Re: The Morsodist Religion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 13:38:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209083820.10655.00001381@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 26685

>Subject: The Morsodist Religion
>From: k0hb@qwest.net (K0HB)
>Date: 12/8/2001 9:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b7c5262e.0112081924.551f6a9a@posting.google.com>

>I'm shocked that you don't understand one of the great religions of
>Amateur Radio.

Damn....I thought Lennnie was back!

Whew!

Steve

3743. Re: kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 14:06:27 UTC
From: lecaky capacitors <mrogers3@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <DdKQ7.41384$WC1.4111424@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26686
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"The Big Assed Radio Federation" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:74032aae7057c1a9b87253f81579a287@spamfreenews.com...

(snip)

Lloyd, quit stiring up the shit. We know you like to stir up the
stink on newsgroups, and Donnie JYZ likes to stir it up on 14.313
Why don't the both of you get together amd share recipies for Prozac
or Luvox? The both of you need the eqv. of A.A.'s 12-step plan in place...

3744. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 14:29:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C13753A.1BE94729@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26691

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> Why do you add the "and that of many others" above?

That's an argumentum ad populum, Kim, a common logical
diversion. It's a variation of "everybody knows ...".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3745. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 14:34:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C13766D.A73F0C1D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26692

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Perhaps what we need are gasoline taxes based on vehicle size,
> weight, and average fuel economy -- with confiscatory road
> use surcharges for those practicing conspicuous consumption
> with the SUV's, full-size crew-cab dually pickups (legitimate
> business users excluded, of course), and other inefficient
> vehicles.

Larry Roll and Hillary Clinton agree so it must be right.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3746. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:04:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c137cda_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26693

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011209011515.07928.00000262@mb-fi.aol.com...
>
> I think we Americans do need to re-think things like our daily
> transportation needs, and be more willing to accept vehicles that
> get the job done with a minimum of impact. Every time I see some
> young female YUPPIE driving all by her lonesome in an Excursion,
> I find myself wishing gasoline was five bucks a gallon!
>

It might not bother that "young female YUPPIE" one bit if it were. How would *you* feel if it were? Did you ever at least pause long enough to think that the "young female YUPPIE" may live in a neighborhood where she is one of the moms who takes 6-8 kids to school every morning and picks them up in the afternoon, may be a team mom that is one of the providers of transportation, is part of family who stays within the United States for vacations and takes several trips a year with the family, etc.?

>
> The
> problem is, people like her would pay that price -- and those of
> us who get 40 mpg in our economy cars shouldn't have to!
>

For once, you say something I can agree with. But, I'd give credits for things like I mentioned above. Why not also, while your so busy being your usual abrasive self, cause bad things to happen to automobile manufacturers making such large "unneeded" vehicles, Larry?

>
> Perhaps what we need are gasoline taxes based on vehicle size,
> weight, and average fuel economy -- with confiscatory road
> use surcharges for those practicing conspicuous consumption
> with the SUV's, full-size crew-cab dually pickups (legitimate
> business users excluded, of course), and other inefficient
> vehicles.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Oh. So only business use is acceptable. I see.

Kim W5TIT

3747. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:05:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c137d06_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26694

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011209011516.07928.00000264@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3C12B1A5.C1ED148D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You simply misunderstood, Kim. The eternity spent at your house would
> >be the punishment for others. Perhaps, YOU can spend eternity at
> >Larry's.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> What have I done to deserve THAT???
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

More to the point, you've done nothing *not* to deserve that.

Kim W5TIT

3748. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:09:36 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9uvuoo01cgd@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26698

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C130944.F1EA01DC@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Uh, I don't live in Europe or Japan. I live here in the United States.
The
> > NY subway system (back in the 70s) was pretty bad.
>
> I hear it's gotten better. I'm going to pay a visit to a friend in
> Manhattan Island, and the only sensible way to do that from
> northern NJ is to catch a bus to 42nd street and then take the
> subway. I'll see how it is. No place to park.

During the week, they're terrible. At one stop, an oriental woman tried to
get on the train with a child in a stroller. She managed, but you could tell
that other passengers thought she was crazy.
On weekends the trains aren't too bad except around the Times Square area.

3749. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:10:32 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c137e31$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26695

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C1309C2.CD51CD38@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > (snip) In Europe and Japan, where the public transit
> > > is so good, the taxes on gasoline are far more than
> > > $1 per gallon. We could have even better systems here
> > > in the USA, but Americans aren't ready to pay the
> > > price - yet.
> >
> > I agree with the "yet" added to the end of that. Based on the
> > growing traffic jams in most major cities, I think it is only a matter
> > of time. Sooner or later, we'll have to do something (or we'll all end
> > up in traffic jams for most of our lives).
> >
>
> Now if they had busses that actually went somewheres...
> (like where I want to go when I want to go).
>

Whew, that's for sure. I know some folks working in downtown with me that,
if they decided to give DART (Dallas Area Rapid Transit [rapid being *their*
loosely used term*]) a try, would take about 2 1/2 hours to get to work!
Then, they'd have to leave a few hours early to get home at a decent hour.

Kim W5TIT

3750. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:13:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c137ec8$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26696

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C13753A.1BE94729@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > Why do you add the "and that of many others" above?
>
> That's an argumentum ad populum, Kim, a common logical
> diversion. It's a variation of "everybody knows ...".
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

ROFLMAO...that's what I was afraid of. "Everybody" being a body of ____ of
like thinkers...heh

Kim W5TIT

3751. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:16:17 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c137f8a$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26697

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C13766D.A73F0C1D@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Perhaps what we need are gasoline taxes based on vehicle size,
> > weight, and average fuel economy -- with confiscatory road
> > use surcharges for those practicing conspicuous consumption
> > with the SUV's, full-size crew-cab dually pickups (legitimate
> > business users excluded, of course), and other inefficient
> > vehicles.
>
> Larry Roll and Hillary Clinton agree so it must be right.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Yeah, this is one of those many other "less government" kind of ideas that so many always come up with. I think the idea of "less government" is more like "less-government-if-it-means-getting-rid-of-something-I-don't-like less government." Always seems like there are proponents of less this or that, depending on "what side of the aisle" they come from.

Kim W5TIT

3752. Re: I am licensed for a big shiny hook in my mouth!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:19:40 UTC
From: Exeunt <exeunt@redneck.gacracker.org>
Message-ID: <20011209151940.24780.qmail@gacracker.org>
Source record: 26699
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

- -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

"J M" <jdm@iland.net> wrote in message
news:3C137134.9F900F61@budweiser.com...

> Probably still living with Mommy,
> aren't you.
> The reason I ask is because I am a bald-faced sucker who follows up
> forges and trolls by >k00ky no-codes trying to trash radio groups! I have
> decided that I
> will help N8WWM and KC8LDO trash ALL hobby radio newsgroups!! Yahoooooo!!1!

timnebo@aol.comLOL <mailto:timnebo@aol.comLOL> wrote:
> > WARNING
> > No Code amateurs Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been
> > Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News Groups.
> > Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.

- -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: N/A

iQEVAwUBPBOEorNWQdO9GAGlAQFT+Qf/dc1FbEPOHNJQxLsmygDQn9LwDQUEOUVr
YoY5LxH57xtW2CMgkVJXqmmxaNN9oKLnFdwz+NAyK67p0/o1vLEuVIJcW1WqHVzQ
pkWGHLaql6ly2TnByWu/cm9TWvKTRuuduo5h9Nn3t5hHu55GvzQA1AlFN7U1rov/
+as6Oo+pP5rw1+y2srBhb0WYWt3TwHOVVZr6nELSoYX/4EKkiVWqtnMnfeWKV5Pd
/O0+iQmRJ42Ewl3GLGWVQv7v+sf/cdDkS9QZAOW/5CMMjHJmo8wxOakVMGcD5/8G
80LXRxcAOuqUulnHkzLpCdw0/6i9kNwrX4nXhcwpG+K6NU2a6K7RvQ==
=PJ/R
- -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

~~~
This PGP signature only certifies the sender and date of the message.
It implies no approval from the administrators of redneck.gacracker.org.
Date: Sun Dec 9 15:19:33 2001 GMT
From: exeunt@redneck.gacracker.org

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: 2.6.3a
Charset: noconv

iQCVAwUBPBOBCu1c/chWEzBdAQFVswQAjPbqHSVIt4SKIBRm3FIiV7DmcBEwcCgm
KTIietHFzhLTtz3d4fiddJBk/G02DVJyjoKTFgRNEmIwmWA8x9XbJLy64lKTVsUZ
uv7G73jQCmjFukKZ14222Uim8BSCXUfiQMGoY4KvAzJbKS5QspaEkzPl84V+Eh0Y
b0Vw0MgrZq4=
~~~

```
=U/BF
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3753. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:55:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209105500.15992.00000413@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26700

In article <#uesCOHgBHA.1868@cpimsnntpa02>, "K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
writes:

>
>(ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

Clever. My 12-year old niece signs her E-mail with the same "face."

73 de Larry, K3LT
No ï¿½-assed smiley faces here, ever!

3754. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:55:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209105501.15992.00000414@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26801

In article <%nvQ7.255664$W8.9501361@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>Let's be honest. When I was in the Navy, we had to memorize the entire
>baudot code. Didn't really need it, but reading a lot of uppercase got one
>to the point you really COULD read uppercase. Rules and regs (safety
>wouldn't hurt a bit either, both AC mains power as well as rf power) make
>for a good starting point. I'd be less concerned that an individual know CW
>than how to get communications going in an emergency.
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA

What better way to get comms going in an emergency than by
being proficient in Morse/CW?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3755. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 15:55:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209105501.15992.00000415@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26802

In article <20011208160310.01446.00000196@mb-cs.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>BUT.....
>
>No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.
>
>Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person
>being
>tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an
>"A",
>the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then looks
>up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper. Sending
>test to be similar.
>
>Waddya think, folks?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Sounds like the kind of dumbing-down I'd expect from a liberal, gun-grabbing, Socialized-Everything Welfare State. Nothing new here. Maggie would not approve. Neither would Victoria.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3756. UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License more info.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 16:08:59 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <f3171ugtucejrir6rp17b99bulf8hpfldd@4ax.com>
Source record: 26803

On 08 Dec 2001 21:03:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Was perusing a copy of CQ in the local MicroCenter when I came upon an article
>about UK restructuring.

This happened at Donnington Sept. 22 and you Morsecentrics are just
now finding out!
>
>Their existing classes are getting a bit more power & privs, and looks like 5
>wpm for full access.

Yup this is the way of the world for the moment and CW testing is
likely to go away entirely at the 2003 WRC meeting.
>
>But the big news is a new class of license they call "Foundation". Idea is to
>have a license that can be had at the end of a one-day training session.

Most of the sessions I was involved in planing were going to be an
entire weekend but it doesn't have to be this way.
>
>Privs include parts of almost all bands and modes except 10 meters.

Yup but at only 10 Watts
>
>Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.

Actually regulations, safety and proper operating practice. Good
operators have a real oportunity to teach by example.
>
>BUT.....
>
>No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.

Wrong no home-designed homebrew but commercial kits like TenTec and
Electrocraft are allowed.
>
>Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person being
>tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an "A",
>the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then looks
>up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper. Sending
>test to be similar.

True enough I think they actually referred to it as Morse
appreciation.
>
>Waddya think, folks?

I thought at the time and still think this is a great opportunity to get new hams off on the right foot. I had a chat with the President of the RSGB and suggested that Foundation Tutor/Testing groups recruit QRPers. They QRP crowd has a real understanding of how to make low power work and are the most credible proponents of CW as an operating mode.

To understand why the RA and RSGB wanted to do this you have to have an appreciation of the UK testing system. Tests are offered only at infrequent intervals and are very costly. Most written tests are proctored at Universities and cost L75 or over $100 US. The Foundation Licence (British spelling intentional) will allow recruitment and exposure to the hobby from this group some will fall away and some will advance through the system.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

3757. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 16:36:53 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <FqMQ7.2309$hz7.353076271@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26804
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

To all groups involved, this is a forge.
Also it was posted through Newsone with AOL as the
ISP.
This person has been doing this for over a year now on numerous groups
and web sights under many different screen nics. He has been a troll on
Rec.Radio.CB for over a
year now.
So please disregard any post made by this person , with
this ISP addy 152.163.201.187.

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

<timnebo@aol.comLOL> wrote in message news:9uv7n1bhh1@news.netmar.com...
> I dont see what is the big deal about this FCC crap I have been hearing. I
> have DXed all over the world on my TS-840 and amplifier both on ham bands
and
> on freeband and I have yet to run into any hassles from the FCC. The only
> trouble I get is from stcuk up hams. Damn youd think they were afraid of
> there own shadow the way they go on about Riley this and Riley that. This
is
> what I tell people who ask me about my radio setup: if you want to get
> started in the radio hobby and your smart why not do as I do and just jump
> in. The reason ham radio hobby is dieing is they made it too controlled.
You
> dont need the code and who wants to give up their freedoms by giving the
> government more information they can use to violate your privacy anyway. I
> dont. Everyone knows the code will be dropped and then the test will be
> dropped for ham radio and finally there will be no more licenses. If more
> people just got on then the government would have to give up and let us do
> what we want regardless of there rules and we could speed the whole
process
> up.
>
> 73 de Tim
> Knight Patrol #82
>
> WARNING
> No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been
> Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News
Groups.
> Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.

>
>
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
eb -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ gro
ups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
abuse@newsone.net

3758. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 16:50:11 UTC
From: John Siegel <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C139630.D666BAC2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26805

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <%nvQ7.255664$W8.9501361@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "JAMES
> HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Let's be honest. When I was in the Navy, we had to memorize the entire
> >baudot code. Didn't really need it, but reading a lot of uppercase got one
> >to the point you really COULD read uppercase. Rules and regs (safety
> >wouldn't hurt a bit either, both AC mains power as well as rf power) make
> >for a good starting point. I'd be less concerned that an individual know CW
> >than how to get communications going in an emergency.
> >
> >73 from Rochester, NY
> >Jim AA2QA
>
> What better way to get comms going in an emergency than by
> being proficient in Morse/CW?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
Oh I don't know. How about starting with an antenna, a receiver and a
transmitter.
73, John

3759. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 17:03:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209120329.27168.00000212@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26806

In article <INzQ7.149063$WW.9626838@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote
>> Was perusing a copy of CQ in the local MicroCenter when I came upon an
>article
>> about UK restructuring.
>>
>> Their existing classes are getting a bit more power & privs, and looks
>like 5
>> wpm for full access.
>>
>> But the big news is a new class of license they call "Foundation". Idea is
>to
>> have a license that can be had at the end of a one-day training session.
>>
>> Privs include parts of almost all bands and modes except 10 meters.
>>
>> Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
>>
>> BUT.....
>>
>> No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.
>
>So for it seems ok... depending on how much power they're allowed. Not
>allowing high power is vital to keep the newbies doing benign station
>operation and nothing else.

I think it's 5 W or so. No 10 meter privs, by the way, because of CB troubles
over there.
>
>> Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person
>being
>> tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an
>"A",
>> the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then
>looks
>> up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper.
>Sending
>> test to be similar.
>
>This testing scheme is way too complicated... I can't imagine people
>'standing in line' to give the tests.

The article was kinda vague on the details, but the idea was that they took the most liberal interpretation of the treaty wording "send and receive messages in Morse code". Seems like any sort of test that would demonstrate any sort of Morse skill would work for them. If a crib sheet or lookup chart helps the person being tested, it would be OK.

>If nothing else at least our system is automated to a fair extent where the >only work is really in the correction of the copy and multiple choice.

True, and giving the tests would be more work than taking them! But the idea is to make it super easy to get on the ham bands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3760. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 17:03:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209120331.27168.00000213@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 26807

In article <3c12f101_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011208104929.28268.00000201@mb-cr.aol.com...
>>
>> >I do know that if the government were truthful about the $1 tax and we'd
>had
>> >no prior experiences to the contrary, I'd be all for it.
>>
>> I find that hard to believe.
>>
>> >I'd also want the
>> >money *equally* distributed on something like a per mile of government
>> >highway in a state. In other words, a huge landsurface state may still
>only
>> >end up with a small percentage of the money because of less federal
>highway
>> >in that state.
>>
>> That's a terrible formula. Using that method, the states with the most
>existing
>> roads would get the most money, regardless of how much they contribute to
>the
>> tax base or how much new road they actually need.
>>
>
>When I thought the discussion was about road taxes, the above would make
>sense to me.

The discussion was always about gasoline taxes, not road taxes.

> The state with the most federal roads would need and get the
>most federal money to support those roads, right?

Wrong.

For one thing, we're not just talking about maintenance. There are also
improvements to be made.
For another, some roads need more maintenance than others, due to construction,
age, weather, traffic, and topography.
For a third, different states may have very different levels of tax
contribution per mile.

Suppose State A has lots of roads that are in like-new condition, a mild
climate, easy topography and relatively low gasoline consumption and road use.
State B has a few heavily used roads (half as much as State A) that are worn

out from heavy traffic and severe climate. State B also has a topography that makes road work very difficult.

And suppose State B generates twice as much gasoline tax revenue as State A. By your formula, State A would get twice as much money as State B.

>> > That is, if you are talking about highways being "public
>> >surface transportation."
>>
>> We were not. We were talking about alternatives to highways.
>>
>> <If you are talking about busses and trains...yech,
>> >forget it.
>>
>> There are folks who cannot drive, and others who should not yet do because
>of
>> lack of alternatives.
>>
>
>I think "public transportation" should be left mostly to local governments
>and people to decide if they want, and what type.

Why not the same for roads and airports?

>I think that public
>transportation is subsidised, is it not (?), by federal tax dollars but is
>not chiefly funded by federal money.

Depends on the system. There is also interstate transportation to consider.

>> > Tried both and hate 'em.
>>
>> Why? Did you try any of the European or Japanese systems?

>
>Uh, I don't live in Europe or Japan. I live here in the United States.

So? The question is about what can be done, not what is currently in existence here.

> The
>NY subway system (back in the 70s) was pretty bad. Never took a bus up
>there, but I have down here in Dallas and it was not a pleasant or desirable
>experience at all.
>
So your entire experience consists of a few subway rides 20+ years ago and your local bus system.
>> >
>> > I'll pollute, thank you.
>>
>> Your pollution harms others. What gives you the right to do that?
>
>I am a United States citizen?

I don't see "right to pollute" anywhere in the Constitution.
>
>> America's dependence on imported petroleum has serious political
>consequences.
>> We import far more today than during the 1970s.
>
>America's dependence on imported drugs has serious political consequences.

Which is one reason it's against the law and being fought at many levels.

>America's dependence on foreign-made products has serious political and
>economic consequences. And on and on.

So? Does that make it right?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3761. Re: kv4fz does an "end run" to get on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 17:04:52 UTC
From: bpnjensen@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <37af7e1c.0112090904.7a1e202d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26808
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Well, there you go, breaking your OWN rule! And I say, good. This
issue deserves to be talked about,a nd as I suggested, you're doin'
it.

And if you get to kick that horse, so do others.

P.S. I strongly oppose cruelty to animals of any sort.
Bruce Jensen
****

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:<74032aae7057c1a9b87253f81579a287@spamfreenews.com>...
> "bpnjensen" <bpnjensen@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:37af7e1c.0112071313.27189955@posting.google.com...
> > Well, your position is stupid and erroneous. The "horse" obviously
> > ain't dead, and this is the type of thing that can and may well affect
> > amateur radio operators for decades to come. It's public record; it's
> > a public activity; and the amateur radio public has every right, maybe
> > even an obligation, to discuss it. Hopefully the discussion will
> > focus on issues rather than personalities, but it is still a valid
> > topic.
> >
> > Bruce Jensen
>
> This issue is this, Brucie. There are people that can't leave well enough
> alone. They can not stand the fact that Herb can get back on the air, even
> if it is to be in a contest. He was not bothering anybody. Who care
> anyway? Mr. Hollingsworth is a very corrupt man. He enforces the ham bands
> to what way his "masters" see fit. There have many people file complaints
> about QRM'ing of the Liberty Net, which go unanswered. But someone, who
> lost his ham ticket, by means that, in my opinion, were railroaded by a
> bunch of power-hungry and self-serving, garbage!
>
> Herb gets on the air, just to get in a contest, and what happens? All hell
> breaks loose. It's a matter of Mr. Hollingsworth picking and choosing what
> rules get enforced and what should happen. As Hal Turner would suggest,
> Mr. Hollingsworth should resign in disgrace!

3762. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 17:13:43 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v061h02r5m@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26809

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011209105501.15992.00000414@mb-fc.aol.com...
> What better way to get comms going in an emergency than by
> being proficient in Morse/CW?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

How about knowing how to get the equipment up and operating?

3763. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 17:14:46 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v063f02ra0@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26810

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011209105500.15992.00000413@mb-fc.aol.com...
> Hansl:
>
> Clever. My 12-year old niece signs her E-mail with the same "face."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Which was probably invented ten years ago by an adult.

3764. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 17:55:27 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <jANQ7.149967$WW.9707220@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26811
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Don't worry, there are a LOT of forges. The screwballs are loose both on rec.radio.cb and rec.radio.amateur.whatever. Probably caused by some brain damage as a result of overexposure to RF.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message news:FqMQ7.2309$hz7.353076271@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> To all groups involved, this is a forge.
> Also it was posted through Newsone with AOL as the
> ISP.
> This person has been doing this for over a year now on numerous groups
> and web sights under many different screen nics. He has been a troll on
> Rec.Radio.CB for over a
> year now.
> So please disregard any post made by this person , with
> this ISP addy 152.163.201.187.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All
>
>
> <timnebo@aol.comLOL> wrote in message news:9uv7n1bhh1@news.netmar.com...
> > I dont see what is the big deal about this FCC crap I have been hearing. I
> > have DXed all over the world on my TS-840 and amplifier both on ham bands
> and
> > on freeband and I have yet to run into any hassles from the FCC. The only
> > trouble I get is from stcuk up hams. Damn youd think they were afraid of
> > there own shadow the way they go on about Riley this and Riley that. This
> is
> > what I tell people who ask me about my radio setup: if you want to get
> > started in the radio hobby and your smart why not do as I do and just jump
> > in. The reason ham radio hobby is dieing is they made it too controlled.
> You
> > dont need the code and who wants to give up their freedoms by giving the

> > government more information they can use to violate your privacy anyway.
I
> > dont. Everyone knows the code will be dropped and then the test will be
> > dropped for ham radio and finally there will be no more licenses. If
more
> > people just got on then the government would have to give up and let us
do
> > what we want regardless of there rules and we could speed the whole
> process
> > up.
> >
> > 73 de Tim
> > Knight Patrol #82
> >
> > WARNING
> > No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been
> > Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News
> Groups.
> > Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.
> >
> >
> >
> > ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
> eb -----
> > http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
gro
> ups
> > NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other
posts
> > made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
> abuse@newsone.net
>
>

3765. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 18:51:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209135123.15992.00000421@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26813

In article <m6sQ7.255459$W8.9481433@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>
>CENTURION: What's this, then? 'Romanes Eunt Domus'? 'People called Romanes
>they go the house'?
>BRIAN: It-- it says, 'Romans, go home'.
>CENTURION: No, it doesn't. What's Latin for 'Roman'? Come on!
>BRIAN: Aah!
>CENTURION: Come on!
>BRIAN: 'R-- Romanus'?
>CENTURION: Goes like...?
>BRIAN: 'Annus'?
>CENTURION: Vocative plural of 'annus' is...?
>BRIAN: Eh. 'Anni'?
>CENTURION: 'Romani'. 'Eunt'? What is 'eunt'?
>BRIAN: 'Go'. Let--
>CENTURION: Conjugate the verb 'to go'.
>BRIAN: Uh. 'Ire'. Uh, 'eo'. 'Is'. 'It'. 'Imus'. 'Itis'. 'Eunt'.
>CENTURION: So 'eunt' is...?
>BRIAN: Ah, huh, third person plural, uh, present indicative. Uh, 'they go'.
>CENTURION: But 'Romans, go home' is an order, so you must use the...?
>BRIAN: The... imperative!
>CENTURION: Which is...?
>BRIAN: Umm! Oh. Oh. Um, 'i'. 'I'!
>CENTURION: How many Romans?
>BRIAN: Ah! 'I'-- Plural. Plural. 'Ite'. 'Ite'.
>CENTURION: 'Ite'.
>BRIAN: Ah. Eh.
>CENTURION: 'Domus'?
>BRIAN: Eh.
>CENTURION: Nominative?
>BRIAN: Oh.
>CENTURION: 'Go home'? This is motion towards. Isn't it, boy?
>BRIAN: Ah. Ah, dative, sir! Ahh! No, not dative! Not the dative, sir! No!
>Ah! Oh, the... accusative! Accusative! Ah! 'Domum', sir! 'Ad domum'! Ah!
>Oooh! Ah!
>CENTURION: Except that 'domus' takes the...?
>BRIAN: The locative, sir!
>CENTURION: Which is...?!
>BRIAN: 'Domum'.
>CENTURION: 'Domum'.
>BRIAN: Aaah! Ah.
>CENTURION: 'Um'. Understand?

>BRIAN: Yes, sir.
>CENTURION: Now, write it out a hundred times.
>BRIAN: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir. Hail Caesar, sir.
>CENTURION: Hail Caesar. If it's not done by sunrise, I'll cut your balls
>off.
>BRIAN: Oh, thank you, sir. Thank you, sir. Hail Caesar and everything, sir!
>Oh. Mmm! Finished!
>ROMAN SOLDIER STIG: Right. Now don't do it again.
>[CENTURIONS chase BRIAN]
>MAN: Hey! Bloody Romans.

Rich:

Looks like A Bit O' Fry and Laurie to me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3766. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 18:51:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209135128.15992.00000422@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26812

In article <3C129DBD.822EED37@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> I haven't been following this conversation, so not
>> sure what the context is. (snip) If you are talking
>> about busses and trains...yech, forget it. Tried
>> both and hate 'em. I'll pollute, thank you.

Sooo -- Kim -- if you could just walk to the corner, board a bus that
took you to within a block of your workplace, shopping center, or
whatever, and got you back, all within a reasonable time frame (less
than 20 min. wait) -- you wouldn't use it? Even if the total cost to
you was a fraction of the cost of operating your personal automobile...
and considering the fact that you're already paying for the subsidized
portion of that public transit service through your state and federal taxes?
I know one thing for damn sure -- If I could make use of public transit
in getting myself to and from my work place (which IS the local transit
agency, BTW!), I would use it! The only thing that prevents me from
doing so is that the fixed-route busses in my city stop running at 6 PM,
and I work at least until 8:30 PM every day!

> Yep, you haven't been following the conversation - a decent public
>transportation system (busses and trains) was exactly what we were
>talking about. And it wasn't about pollution - it was to address the
>transportation needs of the elderly in this country.

The elderly have no problem in Delaware, because we are the only
state in the country with statewide, door-to-door Paratransit service!
Of course, Delaware is a small, low population-density state, and is
wealthy beyond reason for it's size...so providing this service is both
affordable, practical, and provides great benefits in reducing traffic
volume and pollution. In states where statewide Paratransit service
may not be practical or affordable, large cities could/should provide,
at the minimum, a Senior Citizen Affordable Taxi (SCAT) service,
offering half-fare taxi rides. There may also be free or low cost bus
transportation provided to/from Senior Citizen centers, with day trips
provided to take seniors to doctor's appointments, shopping,
sightseeing, movies, etc.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3767. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 19:14:26 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <79ADFB4079E2B1BA.C567A18992C90018.214B39D8291F9669@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26814

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 14:55:21 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Well, let me ask you this, Rick. Why are children born to American
>parents more valuable human beings than children born to parents
>in other countries? To be consistent, you have to advocate welfare
>for all the children of the world, not just for American children.

I do. But at the expense of _their_ governments, not ours.

You could as easily ask why are American lives more "valuable"
than those of human beings in other parts of the world? We're engaged
in a War in Afghanistan right now because approximately 5,000 of those
lives were lost--yet we certainly haven't become involved in wars
because an equivalent number (or even ten times that number) of people
were killed in other nations. We didn't go to war when the Chinese
invaded Tibet, we didn't do so when Pol Pot created the "Killing
Fields" in SE Asia, we didn't do so when Saddam Hussein was killing
Kurds, and we didn't do so when any of 100 OTHER mass killings took
place in other nations.

Question: How would a Libertarian government have responded to
September 11th--and how would it respond to a similar act in a nation
with whom we don't have a mutual defense treaty?

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3768. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 20:02:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c13c2ae_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26815

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011209135128.15992.00000422@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3C129DBD.822EED37@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >> I haven't been following this conversation, so not
> >> sure what the context is. (snip) If you are talking
> >> about busses and trains...yech, forget it. Tried
> >> both and hate 'em. I'll pollute, thank you.
>
> Sooo -- Kim -- if you could just walk to the corner, board a bus that
> took you to within a block of your workplace, shopping center, or
> whatever, and got you back, all within a reasonable time frame (less
> than 20 min. wait) -- you wouldn't use it?
>

If you are speaking directly to me, then the answer is no. A) At this point in my life (and I am hoping even when I am old) I would not live near a corner that is a bus stop, B) For me, part of the enjoyment of going anywhere is the drive there--whether I have passengers or not. The only time I really use ham radio is when I am driving; the only time I listen to broadcast radio is when I am driving; the only time I listen to audio books would be when I am driving; etc., C) I don't consider a 20 minute reasonable by any measure. *Maybe* five minutes, and that's even bad when it's pouring down rain, cold, or if I am stuck at a stop in a high crime area. As a woman, I wouldn't be caught at other than daylight hours standing around waiting for a bus--not even at a transit center.

If you are speaking figurativel, for the elderly, or those who cannot drive for whatever reason, I have no problems at all with my tax dollars supporting a public transportation system for them. I don't currently live within an area that uses public transportation (I am rural), so I am not currently taxed for public transportation. I also choose *not* to live in a metropolitan area.

>
> Even if the total cost to
> you was a fraction of the cost of operating your personal automobile...
>

I didn't just buy a new vehicle to have it sit in my driveway unused. I am very fortunate that the cost of vehicle operation is not a major concern to

me any more. It used to be when I was on welfare, and prior to my entry into the professional market several years ago. It no longer is.

> and considering the fact that you're already paying for the subsidized
> portion of that public transit service through your state and federal taxes?

No. Not even considerng that.

> I know one thing for damn sure -- If I could make use of public transit
> in getting myself to and from my work place (which IS the local transit
> agency, BTW!), I would use it!

Well, just as you used to accuse Ed Hare of having to say things that support the ARRL because he worked there, I think you're just saying the above because you fear reprisal from your employer if you say otherwise.

> The only thing that prevents me from
> doing so is that the fixed-route busses in my city stop running at 6 PM,
> and I work at least until 8:30 PM every day!

Then you must live within the area where public transportation serves. I do not and would not, hopefully. It would really depress me if I have to live in or near the city when I am old. I thoroughly dislike city life.

> > Yep, you haven't been following the conversation - a decent public
> >transportation system (busses and trains) was exactly what we were
> >talking about. And it wasn't about pollution - it was to address the
> >transportation needs of the elderly in this country.
>
> The elderly have no problem in Delaware, because we are the only
> state in the country with statewide, door-to-door Paratransit service!
> Of course, Delaware is a small, low population-density state, and is
> wealthy beyond reason for it's size...so providing this service is both
> affordable, practical, and provides great benefits in reducing traffic
> volume and pollution. In states where statewide Paratransit service
> may not be practical or affordable, large cities could/should provide,
> at the minimum, a Senior Citizen Affordable Taxi (SCAT) service,
> offering half-fare taxi rides. There may also be free or low cost bus
> transportation provided to/from Senior Citizen centers, with day trips
> provided to take seniors to doctor's appointments, shopping,
> sightseeing, movies, etc.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

How 'bout a half-way decent service for the elderly *and* disabled. One of the most humiliating experiences for our disabled in the DART area is that of the experience of ridership for the handicapped. Pitiful, it's pitiful.

Kim W5TIT

3769. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 20:21:43 UTC
From: timnebo@aol.comLOL
Message-ID: <9v0h4ncde1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26816
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

In article <9uv7n1bhh1@news.netmar.com>, <timnebo@aol.comLOL> writes:
>I dont see what is the big deal about this FCC crap I have been hearing. I
>have DXed all over the world on my TS-840 and amplifier both on ham bands
and
>on freeband and I have yet to run into any hassles from the FCC. The only
>trouble I get is from stcuk up hams. Damn youd think they were afraid of
>there own shadow the way they go on about Riley this and Riley that. This
is
>what I tell people who ask me about my radio setup: if you want to get
>started in the radio hobby and your smart why not do as I do and just jump
>in. The reason ham radio hobby is dieing is they made it too controlled. You
>dont need the code and who wants to give up their freedoms by giving the
>government more information they can use to violate your privacy anyway. I
>dont. Everyone knows the code will be dropped and then the test will be
>dropped for ham radio and finally there will be no more licenses. If more
>people just got on then the government would have to give up and let us do
>what we want regardless of there rules and we could speed the whole process
>up.
>
> 73 de Tim
> Knight Patrol #82
>
>WARNING
>No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been
>Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News Groups.
>Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.

Hey guys you can take this as a forge I dont really care. If you think me and
a lot of other freebanders give two shits about fcc and licenses then you
need to wake and take a listen on the bands. Ha ha yeah I use a modded ham
radio but never go off the cb band yeah right. What I say and what I do are
two diferent things. You old fart hams need to lighten up on freebanders
because we are soon going to overtake you and thats no joke.

73 de Tim
Knight Patrol #82

WARNING
No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been
Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News Groups.
Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups

NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3770. Re: Go Ahead, Send Me Another JOCKSTRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 20:36:25 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v0i09dch1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26818
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <EqMQ7.2308$tz7.353088675@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>,
Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> writes:
To all groups involved, this is a forge. Please check
for the WebTv signature that goes on all WebTv posts
Also it was posted through Newsone with AOL as the
ISP.
This person has been doing this for over a year now on numerous groups
and web sights under many different screen nics. He has been a troll on
Rec.Radio.CB for over a
year now.
So please disregard any post made by this person , with
this ISP addy 152.163.201.187.

Landshark

"Shark you have fallen for Nad's endearing confusion again. I indeed wrote the
jockstrap post and all that is contained therein. Hush now and let me work.
All shall be eventually revealed"

Twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:9uv4f0$9ur$1@news.netmar.com...
"You think you can forge me in both hammie and cb room, Lelnad, but I am one
step ahead of your pathetic distortions and lies. I have created this free
newsserver account in order to give you something to think about. You see I
could if I were so inclined use this account to forge YOU. Note that I said
COULD, dear Lelnad, not DID, for I admit nothing without a quick
backshuffling and the famous razzle-dazzle two step for which I am famous
for. You may think you have cornered me with proof and substantiation, but
all I need do is unleash a welter of words to bollix you and you come undone.
Dogie was so beaten by my talent that he withdrew, tail between legs, to the
darker reaches of the kennel. The one time he thought he was clever enough to
send a tremor through my world was the lucky break that enabled him to post
his disgusting mens undergarment for my receipt. I assure you it was the
kennel club that did this and no one else for he as much as admitted it by
his words scrawled on the garment itself. I will never reveal these words but
know that I have the aformentioned lingerie displayed where I can see it
daily as both a trophy and a reminder that I can send authorities to lock him
up and throw away the key should I deign to. Now you Lelnad, observe this as
a lesson if you please. There will be no more caterwauling and piffling and
prodding as adjuncts to my posts. If you disagree with my proprietary
opinions I ask you to take it to email and not involve the group in your
anger-infused jealousy"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups

NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3771. Attention HAMS, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 20:40:41 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v0i89$dl1$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26819
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"This is another myth that Lelnad and his gang of jealousy-infected
bretheren
perpetuate, that I have talked with "saucer men", I assure you, nothing is
further from the truth. The lies and anger-motivated constructions that
Lelnad, Dogie, the false Sparky, and Pipeboy dream up on a daily basis have
nothing whatsoever to do with my actual experiences in the realm of the
supernatural. Now this is all well documented mind you, I have contacted the
outer reaches of another dimension while calling skip on 555, and yes I am
well aware that the frequency falls outside the channels that the goverment
deems preferable for use, but I am not one of the unwashed unaware rabble of
citizenry, never have been, hence I am not subject to the same laws as
common, callow men. In college I was on the Deans List if that tells you
anything and my superior intellect won me the favors of many like-minded
individuals in both society and academia. But I shunned their transparent and
shallow attentions to pursue my own unglamorous but rewarding path in the
swamplands of the south. This unselfish pursuit and my canny native instincts
are what I believe has been responsible for opening the door to contact with
other dimensions in the continuum and my subsequent elevation to a cherished
confidante. If you doubt me then do so at your peril for there are many
things on heaven and earth that are not yet understood so you would do well
to pay your respect to an as yet undisproven phenomenon. Alas, here is the
meat of it; the beings I have communicated with by chance do in fact effect
transport by spherical means. Yes, some call it a saucer, but that is a
misnomer. If the media knew the truth then it would be the undoing of my
special status and the end of all social intercourse. Only on the freeband
does one learn of such truths. Lelnad and his gang of rogues may scoff, and I
say let them, for what does one expect from such unenlightened commoners but
an ignorant barbaric yawp in the face of such great wisdom"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3772. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 20:46:16 UTC
From: Trouser Trout <pipedream@hotmail.comspa>
Message-ID: <20011209154620.326$1H@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 26820
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Yes, Landshark knows all about forging people. A search of google will show
this.

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
news:FqMQ7.2309$hz7.353076271@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> To all groups involved, this is a forge.
> Also it was posted through Newsone with AOL as the
> ISP.
> This person has been doing this for over a year now on numerous groups
> and web sights under many different screen nics. He has been a troll on
> Rec.Radio.CB for over a
> year now.
> So please disregard any post made by this person , with
> this ISP addy 152.163.201.187.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All
>
>
> <timnebo@aol.comLOL> wrote in message news:9uv7n1bhh1@news.netmar.com...
> > I dont see what is the big deal about this FCC crap I have been hearing.
I
> > have DXed all over the world on my TS-840 and amplifier both on ham
bands
> and
> > on freeband and I have yet to run into any hassles from the FCC. The
only
> > trouble I get is from stcuk up hams. Damn youd think they were afraid of
> > there own shadow the way they go on about Riley this and Riley that.
This
> is
> > what I tell people who ask me about my radio setup: if you want to get
> > started in the radio hobby and your smart why not do as I do and just
jump
> > in. The reason ham radio hobby is dieing is they made it too controlled.
> You
> > dont need the code and who wants to give up their freedoms by giving the
> > government more information they can use to violate your privacy anyway.
I
> > dont. Everyone knows the code will be dropped and then the test will be

> > dropped for ham radio and finally there will be no more licenses. If
more
> > people just got on then the government would have to give up and let us
do
> > what we want regardless of there rules and we could speed the whole
> process
> > up.
> >
> > 73 de Tim
> > Knight Patrol #82
> >
> > WARNING
> > No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been
> > Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News
> Groups.
> > Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.
> >
> >
> >
> > ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
> eb -----
> > http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
gro
> ups
> > NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other
posts
> > made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
> abuse@newsone.net
>
>

3773. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 20:47:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13CDCE.8517C9FE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26817

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Never seen policies, other than "thou shalt not"
> and that's all that need be said. I'll be in my
> closed door meetings getting some real work
> done. I don't know what you guys are going to do.

Well, Kim, it's very simple - we leave the doors open. What is it you do in the workplace behind closed doors that you cannot possibly do behind open doors?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3774. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 20:55:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13CFC3.279415FE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26821

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Why do you add the "and that of many others" above?

It's a polite way of saying, "duh, everybody knows that - except you
of course."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3775. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 20:56:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13CFF7.CFE2866F@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26822

CAM wrote:
>
> That's an argumentum ad populum, Kim, a common logical
> diversion. It's a variation of "everybody knows ...".

See, Kim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3776. Where is KT4TR???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 20:58:20 UTC
From: haaaynorton@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209155820.20564.00001240@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 26823

Where is that sawed off, pot bellied, drunken, lying asshole???

"Something Stinks"
Ed Norton Sewer Expert

3777. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:03:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13D1B4.BA347D75@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26824

Krell wrote:
>
> But you certainly don't have any problem repeating
> a commonly held "Christian" misconception without
> knowing the facts.

Look, I couldn't give a flying leap who came up with it - it is now the widely accepted word used to describe people involved in those activities. And if you think you can change that situation be fussing at me about it, let me set you straight - I have no control over it, nor would I attempt to change it even if I did.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3778. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:04:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0380792F2B38EAE0.67AC83CCEA01E1AF.6022DCDBD7666DA1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26825

On 07 Dec 2001 19:39:21 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>This is my plan, not Cecil's plan. I say taxes should pay for high quality free
>schools from pre-K through at least a bachelor's degree - for everyone that can
>make the grades.

Here, I agree completely. The idea that you have to get in
debt (sometimes quite deeply) to pay for an education that will only
profit the nation through your increased earning potential and other
contributions likely from a good education, is ridiculous.

On the other hand, we DO need to insure that the money is well
spent--by a very radical overhaul of our school systems.

Right now, our schools are often violent, frequently a joke
academically, and only occasionally more interested in academics than
in sports standings. Those need to change.

As far as violence goes--we need alternative schools for those
who demonstrate that they pose a risk to other students in
conventional schools. Those alternative schools should have the same
academic requirements as other schools, but less opportunity for
violence (i.e., all classes in a single room with the _teachers_
changing rooms every period instead of the students, no sports or
other competitive activities (phys ed would consist of exercise and
health training alone), metal detectors, and on-premises juvenile
officers from the local police department. Youths who are caught in
ANY school in possession of a firearm would be permanently expelled
from any public school system below the college level--it would be up
to their parents to pay for a suitable private institution. The same
would apply to any youth who was convicted of committing a violent
felony or drug sales (including alcohol and tobacco) on school
premises.

With respect to academics, they HAVE to come first. Schools
should receive Federal (not state) accreditations based TOTALLY on
meeting rigid academic standards. Computer education, multiple lab
based science courses, modern educational resources, and teachers who
are qualified to teach (i.e., hold at least a Bachelors degree in the
specific field they are teaching, and meet rigid continuing education
requirements)--with a waiver of any requirement for course work in
education for anyone with a Master's or better and 2 years or more
experience teaching (K-12 or college level) in the field being taught
(at the High School level--elementary instruction would still require
ed courses). If a school can't afford both to meet those requirements
and support other activities such as organized sports, social

activities, band, etc., then the money MUST go to academics first.

Students who do not successfully demonstrate that they have passed all the requirements for a course the should be required to retake the course before they get any credit for it (the "grade" system needs to go--it's unworkable with the range of subjects--and be replaced by a credit system where you need "x" credits in Science, English, Geography, History, Math, etc., to graduate and your grade-level status is measured by the number of credits earned, not by how many years you've attended alone). Today, schools have to practically be "begged" by parents to hold a child back a year because he or she doesn't understand the material--and as a result we have HS grads who are functionally illiterate thorough out the USA. If we were on a credit based graduation plan, that would not be the case.

Personally, I favor a modified version of the German system. All children would the same type of school for the first eight years, after which (based on testing of subjects studied and personal interests) they would move on to either a "college prep" HS (where such requirements as four science course credits including Chemistry, Biology, Physics and an elective, math through Calculus I, 2 years of a foreign language, four courses in humanities including philosophy (or logic), world culture, literature, and an elective, four courses in Social Sciences--including Psychology, Sociology, Political Science and an elective, and similar requirements would stand; a "trade school" HS where students would study academic subjects for 1/2 day (with appx. 1/2 the requirements above, 2 sciences, humanities, & social sciences, Math through Intermediate Algebra, etc.) then spend the other 1/2 day studying a skilled trade (preferably with training and resources provided by the private sector as they are in Germany); and a "general" HS which would prepare people for entry level positions in business and industry (or for the military, etc.) and would consist of about 3/4 of the requirements given for the academic HS above, as well as a larger number of electives. Students who wished to enter the University, would have to either complete the academic program, or--if they choose/qualify for another program instead--would be required to make up those courses in which they are deficient in Community Colleges before being admitted as First Year University students.

At one time, the US ranked number ONE in the world for public education. According to the same (UN) studies, we now rank number SEVENTEEN! That's completely ridiculous--particularly since our graduate schools are STILL rated number one. As a college professor, I constantly encounter the problem in terms of under-prepared students who, despite high GPAs, manage to graduate from HS with major deficiencies in reading, writing, math, and most of all critical thinking skills. Over the years, I've seen the problem grow steadily worse, and the only answer our society seems to accept is the combination of grade inflation (at Harvard, a Professor MUST submit an explanation for his decision if he or she grades ANY student below a

3.5!) and "dumbed down" text books (the "concise" editions that are becoming more common in classrooms). That's a disgrace to our educational system, and offensive to any serious teacher--the main reason I've decided to retire early next year is because I refuse to "dumb down" my classes and it won't be much longer before that becomes an institutional requirement at my institution as well.

Of course, most of the problem is coming from the fact that we insist on using our schools as surrogate parents--they are expected to not only teach academics but to teach "morality," deal with personal problems, and never, ever, risk causing a student to lose self-esteem by holding him/her back in school (as if the inability to intelligently read and understand the instructions on a Campbell's Soup can--one definition of functional illiteracy--won't cause someone to lose self-esteem later in life!). Parents seldom hold their kids responsible for their grades--they blame the schools instead. And, of course, perish the thought that little Johnny might get expelled for a little thing like taking an AK-47 to class . . .

>>>The problem is that the benefits are not tied to responsible behaviors that
>>>will lead the dependent person to become independent.
>>
>> Here I agree.
>
>Then why do you support programs that do the exact opposite?

I don't.

We need to revise our programs to approach poverty intelligently. At a minimum we need to divide the poor into four groups:

1. Those who are only poor due to poor education or work skills. Here, supporting the person/family while they are making up for that deficit is a same and forward thinking approach. So long as the person demonstrates sound academic progress toward an agreed upon educational/training goal they would receive the necessary support--if they stopped, so would it. The entire process should be planned in advance (subject to change if recommended by educational counselors) and treated as a contract between the recipient and the state.

2. Those who are incapable of working or profiting from education. This would include the disabled, the mentally ill, the mentally challenged (i.e., retarded), etc. These are the people who legitimately CAN'T support themselves and they are a group we need to help without stripping them of dignity as is currently done by our social service programs.

3. The under employed. This group would consist of those who are sincerely trying, are employed, but simply don't have the earning capacity to be self-sufficient (i.e., the working poor). Here we need to both help the family sustain itself, and help the wage-earners to

improve their job skills and move into higher paying jobs as a result (i.e., education or specialized training).

4. The lazy or indolent. This is a broad category for those who seem to demonstrate no particular interest in getting off welfare and earning a living (i.e., the people we always have held up to us as "examples" of welfare types). Here we need to insure that the children are provided for--by placing them in alternative settings if nothing else works--and that's about it. Such families, if they want to remain together, would be required to either participate in training/educational programs (number 1 above), to put in at least 20 hours of community service work per week, or to demonstrate (through participation in job preparation programs) that they are actively seeking, and willing to accept, employment. Initially, such a family would be eligible for only 90 days of assistance unless one of the alternatives were met. After the 90 days, if they couldn't demonstrate that the basic needs of the children were being met, they would be referred to child protection services for further investigation and response.

In ALL cases, I believe in a universal access to medical treatment. There is simply no reason our nation should not consider the medical needs of all of our citizens to be a major priority. The simplest approach would be to use a list such as that developed in Oregon by doctors to determine what conditions would and would not be covered by Federal medical insurance (i.e., preventative medicine should be number ONE--beyond emergency medicine, of course--and cosmetic surgery--except in the case of accident or severe disfigurement--would not be covered) with an eye toward prevention of disease and alleviating suffering. Once a list has been made, the government could open bidding to major insurers, granting the contract to insure all citizens of the US for ALL of those conditions for a three year period to the lowest bidder who would be bound by both contract and criminal law to adhere to the conditions of their contract for the period. That would allow universal coverage w/o the inefficiency of government administration. The cost of the insurance would come from taxes on businesses, thus effectively spreading the cost across all areas of society. Because firms would no longer have to provide higher-cost medical insurance (they COULD offer "supplementary insurance" to cover areas not addressed by the government insurance), the savings realized would cover the tax costs, probably (due to the economies of scale resulting from insuring such a wide range of people) at far less cost than they were previously paying. Self employed people would pay the same tax and the poor would, of course, be covered by state aid.

What I don't support is the simple elimination of all programs, as the Libertarians would have. I don't _trust_ the private charities and churches to be able to take the place of the government in providing for the funding (it just isn't going to happen)--and I don't believe in just leaving people--particularly children--without a

lifeline. I don't like paying taxes any more than anyone else does,
but I'd rather pay them for sound social programs to reduce poverty
than to fund some useless pork barrel project that exists only to win
re-election for a congresscritter.

>> But under the Libertarian Party the
>>consideration isn't for changing the programs into ones that WILL
>>work--it's on eliminating them w/o replacement.
>>
>You'll have to ask Cecil about that.

Er, Jim.

I have been.

That's what this thread is about, remember?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3779. Re: Go Ahead, Send Me Another JOCKSTRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:12:02 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <CsQQ7.2766$0X6.383342742@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26827
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Forge:
America Online, Inc. (NETBLK-AOL-MTC)
10600 Infantry Ridge Road
Manassas, VA 20109
US

Netname: AOL-MTC
Netblock: 64.12.0.0 - 64.12.255.255

Coordinator:
America Online, Inc. (AOL-NOC-ARIN) domains@AOL.NET
703-265-4670

Domain System inverse mapping provided by:

DNS-01.NS.AOL.COM 152.163.159.232
DNS-02.NS.AOL.COM 205.188.157.232

Record last updated on 16-Dec-1999.
Database last updated on 8-Dec-2001 19:54:49 EDT.

This person, along with a couple others have been
doing troll activities for the past year. All they do is
accuse & harass and cause hate & discontent.

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

<Twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:9v0i09dch1@news.netmar.com...
> In article <EqMQ7.2308$tz7.353088675@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>,
> Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> writes:
> To all groups involved, this is a forge. Please check
> for the WebTv signature that goes on all WebTv posts
> Also it was posted through Newsone with AOL as the
> ISP.
> This person has been doing this for over a year now on numerous groups
> and web sights under many different screen nics. He has been a troll on
> Rec.Radio.CB for over a
> year now.
> So please disregard any post made by this person , with
> this ISP addy 152.163.201.187.
>
> Landshark
>

> "Shark you have fallen for Nad's endearing confusion again. I indeed wrote
the
> jockstrap post and all that is contained therein. Hush now and let me
work.
> All shall be eventually revealed"
>
>
> Twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:9uv4f0$9ur$1@news.netmar.com...
> "You think you can forge me in both hammie and cb room, Lelnad, but I am
one
> step ahead of your pathetic distortions and lies. I have created this free
> newsserver account in order to give you something to think about. You see
I
> could if I were so inclined use this account to forge YOU. Note that I
said
> COULD, dear Lelnad, not DID, for I admit nothing without a quick
> backshuffling and the famous razzle-dazzle two step for which I am famous
> for. You may think you have cornered me with proof and substantiation, but
> all I need do is unleash a welter of words to bollix you and you come
undone.
> Dogie was so beaten by my talent that he withdrew, tail between legs, to
the
> darker reaches of the kennel. The one time he thought he was clever enough
to
> send a tremor through my world was the lucky break that enabled him to
post
> his disgusting mens undergarment for my receipt. I assure you it was the
> kennel club that did this and no one else for he as much as admitted it by
> his words scrawled on the garment itself. I will never reveal these words
but
> know that I have the aformentioned lingerie displayed where I can see it
> daily as both a trophy and a reminder that I can send authorities to lock
him
> up and throw away the key should I deign to. Now you Lelnad, observe this
as
> a lesson if you please. There will be no more caterwauling and piffling
and
> prodding as adjuncts to my posts. If you disagree with my proprietary
> opinions I ask you to take it to email and not involve the group in your
> anger-infused jealousy"
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
eb -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
abuse@newsone.net

3780. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:12:03 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <DsQQ7.2767$9%6.383614125@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26826
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Forge. please see previous post for
explanation.

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

<timnebo@aol.comLOL> wrote in message news:9v0h4ncde1@news.netmar.com...
> In article <9uv7n1bhh1@news.netmar.com>, <timnebo@aol.comLOL> writes:
> >I dont see what is the big deal about this FCC crap I have been hearing.
I
> >have DXed all over the world on my TS-840 and amplifier both on ham bands
> and
> >on freeband and I have yet to run into any hassles from the FCC. The only
> >trouble I get is from stcuk up hams. Damn youd think they were afraid of
> >there own shadow the way they go on about Riley this and Riley that.
This
> is
> >what I tell people who ask me about my radio setup: if you want to get
> >started in the radio hobby and your smart why not do as I do and just
jump
> >in. The reason ham radio hobby is dieing is they made it too controlled.
You
> >dont need the code and who wants to give up their freedoms by giving the
> >government more information they can use to violate your privacy anyway.
I
> >dont. Everyone knows the code will be dropped and then the test will be
> >dropped for ham radio and finally there will be no more licenses. If more
> >people just got on then the government would have to give up and let us
do
> >what we want regardless of there rules and we could speed the whole
process
> >up.
> >
> > 73 de Tim
> > Knight Patrol #82
> >
> >WARNING
> >No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been
> >Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News
Groups.
> >Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.
>

> Hey guys you can take this as a forge I dont really care. If you think me
and
> a lot of other freebanders give two shits about fcc and licenses then you
> need to wake and take a listen on the bands. Ha ha yeah I use a modded ham
> radio but never go off the cb band yeah right. What I say and what I do
are
> two diferent things. You old fart hams need to lighten up on freebanders
> because we are soon going to overtake you and thats no joke.
>
> 73 de Tim
> Knight Patrol #82
>
> WARNING
> No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been
> Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News
Groups.
> Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
eb -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
abuse@newsone.net

3781. Re: Go Ahead, Send Me Another JOCKSTRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:21:42 UTC
From: Trouser Trout <pipedream@hotmail.comspa>
Message-ID: <20011209162146.058$ur@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 26828
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message

> This person, along with a couple others have been
> doing troll activities for the past year. All they do is
> accuse & harass and cause hate & discontent.
>
> Landshark

Kinda Like Landshark has been doing since 1996 in this NG. A quick search of google will reveal all to those that are interested. For all we know his gang of friends and he who like to forge posts could be the very same bunch doing this. Another search of google will reveal Landsharks past forging history. He or his group were caught (again) on Thanksgiving Day using the name No Fear ..igotdapower@google.com which they posted from a Google account thru AOL. He admitted that they do forge and pass around account names and passwords. His IP address was also plastered on the intial posts when the account was set up . Do not trust anything they say. They have be proven to be liars.

3782. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:22:26 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A75D1BB15FED0B25.F7BAFA66FF1CB303.E04FC8A2295CBB5F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26829

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 17:44:37 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> When that is all you've offered me, yes. And, again, sending me to
>sites supporting polygamous relationships, which offer only material
>supporting that, is hardly offering me an unbiased source. Likewise,
>the information on those sites is hardly worthwhile since it only
>presents only a single view (that supporting polygamous relationships).

1. I provided both biased and unbiased cites, you choose only
to mention the biased ones.

2. Even the biased ones are appropriate--you didn't ask what
everyone thought about it, you asked about the actual facts about the
lifestyles--and fairly obviously, apart from scientific research, the
logical place to find out about the lifestyles is from the people who
are actually involved in them. Who would you SUGGEST I cite, those who
oppose them? Why? How is it possible that THEY would know more about
what effects the experience has on a marriage (the core of the
question) than those who have EXPERIENCED it?

>> (snip) Incidently, your analogy to the KKK,
>> if true, would make it pretty clear that if
>> someone wants information on ham radio the LAST
>> place to look would be the ARRL site, since
>> that's biased in favor of it. (snip)
>
> Actually, the KKK analogy is a valid one in this case. Like the KKK
>sites, or the ARRL site for that matter, the sites you offered present
>only one view, one position. That hardly makes those sites worthwhile
>if one wants the complete story about this issue. As for your mention
>of the ARRL site, if I wanted information about ham radio as an issue,
>I would indeed not visit ONLY that site. I would instead attempt to
>find sites that offered a more balanced view, or visit a range of
>sites with different views.

But, of course, we're not discussing non-monogamous
relationships as an "issue." The relationships, unlike radio frequency
allocations or licensing laws, is not a public issue in the first
place--it's a matter of personal choice, just as the choice between
having children and not having children is. Thus the logical places to
learn about it are either from research (which I cited and you
ignored) or from those who have experienced the lifestyle. If you
wanted to learn what ham radio was all about you would ask hams, not
freebanders.

>> (snip) outside of sending you to religious sites
>> where they will "prove" (by recourse to the
>> bible, of course, their ONLY source of
>> information on the topic) that such behavior is
>> "sinful" and "wrong." Since that's pretty much
>> what you appear to believe, (snip)
>
> Well, I certainly think that type of behavior is wrong, but I'm not
>basing that on any religious belief ("sinful"). In fact, I don't even
>understand why liberals always start screaming about religion
>everytime someone takes a moral stand against anything liberals
>support?

Because, apart from religious prejudice, there IS no
legitimate reason to claim that the behavior is "wrong." It can be
shown NOT to have an adverse effect on its practitioners or their
children, thus it is not "wrong" in the sense of causing harm to
others. Beyond that, if you leave religious morality out of it what
grounds EXIST to view it as either "right" OR "wrong?"

Taking a "moral stand" indicates the application of a set of
moral values. In some cases those values come from the nature of the
act itself (i.e., we all tend to agree that rape, murder, etc., are
"wrong" because we share that moral value)--clearly this is NOT the
case when it comes to consensual relationships. In other cases we take
those values from the moral teachings or principles of others--most of
the time from those of organized religions. In the case of the
"morality" of various sexual lifestyles, the ONLY possible source for
the view that a relationship or consensual behavior is "immoral" is
religion.

> Do liberals think it is impossible to have a moral belief
>without involving religion? Do all liberals think there are only two
>alternatives - religion or everything goes?

I wouldn't know. As I keep repeating, and you appear
completely unable to remember, I'm NOT A LIBERAL!!!!!!!!!!

It may be convenient to keep ignoring those parts of messages
that don't fit your preconceptions, but it also marks you as being
rather shallow, intellectually.

> If that is what you think,
>you're wrong. It's not just religious fanatics who are opposed to the
>liberal nonsense in this country.

Yes, I know. I'm opposed to "liberal nonsense" too!

I just happen to support the right of people to make their own
lifestyle choices and to be treated with respect regardless of the
choices they make instead of condemning and looking down on them as
right wing fanatics tend to do.

That don't make me liberal--it makes me libertarian.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3783. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:26:05 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D90D2F33AD033FF9.191D4638FA80C7CF.E909579990A74C7B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26830

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 12:26:50 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>> Actually, if pot was legal you would probably see a lot more
>> of it [pot wine]
>
>Ya think?

Sure--there's a FEW of us here who do! ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3784. Re: Go Ahead, Send Me Another JOCKSTRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:29:35 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C13D75A.463F032B@spam.me.not>
Source record: 26831
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

IP's can be faked... and easily. Doesn't take a rocket scientist to do
it, either...
I'm not saying it wasn't them.. but I'm saying it's possible it was a
"frame job"...

-SSB

Trouser Trout wrote:
>
> "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
>
> > This person, along with a couple others have been
> > doing troll activities for the past year. All they do is
> > accuse & harass and cause hate & discontent.
> >
> > Landshark
>
> Kinda Like Landshark has been doing since 1996 in this NG. A quick search of
> google will reveal all to those that are interested. For all we know his
> gang of friends and he who like to forge posts could be the very same bunch
> doing this. Another search of google will reveal Landsharks past forging
> history. He or his group were caught (again) on Thanksgiving Day using the
> name No Fear ..igotdapower@google.com which they posted from a Google
> account thru AOL. He admitted that they do forge and pass around account
> names and passwords. His IP address was also plastered on the intial posts
> when the account was set up . Do not trust anything they say. They have be
> proven to be liars.

3785. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:31:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B5C1AD8F3958CE0D.B0612F7BB6221617.F3E0230622253E64@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26832

On 08 Dec 2001 04:01:08 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>The only way for a responsible professional to behave when dealing
>with a superior or subordinate of the opposite sex is to keep all
>interactions on a strictly professional level, and no "private" meetings,
>counseling sessions, planning sessions, or two person-only
>business trips.

Perhaps, Larry, if people like you would stop thinking of
women in terms of sex all the time and start thinking of them as
coworkers and equals instead, you might not have to fear those
meetings.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3786. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:34:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1BB9C7A38A46FFAC.5766D4EF7F932ED6.A34528D0317853B0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26833

On Fri, 7 Dec 2001 23:06:39 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Let me suggest to you, Larry, that you find some women who are of admirable
>character, rather whatever little sluts you must have been hanging around
>your entire life.

Shame on you, Kim.

That was a NASTY thing to say.

I think you owe an apology to all the sluts that read this
list who you just implied would be willing to associate with Larry
Roll.

Sluts have FAR more class than that!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3787. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:35:33 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C8CF035925203B67.E73448B3FCCFF06D.444942DF2468B32D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26834

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 14:56:55 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>> Of what--the destruction of the US Constitution?
>
>You wouldn't have that problem with a Libertarian government, Rick. :-)

True. But the mass starvation among the poor and disabled
would be just as destructive. ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3788. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:37:27 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C85FB6354CF4D59D.20AAC9A4DB4D29D1.50101C81E308AAF4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26835

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 13:58:52 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>He only imagines that he has that problem even NOW.

Do I?

Name a _single_ one of the rights enumerated in the first ten
Amendments to the Constitution (the Bill of Rights) that hasn't been
abrogated by a Republican government in which a member of the Bush
dynasty was either Vice President or President.

Just ONE!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3789. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:52:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13DCF1.92C7D468@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26836

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Is that kind of like dodging any responsiblity
> for the way you feel and think about the Wiccan
> and other Pagan traditions? OK, so you did not
> personally come up with the popular thought
> that pagan traditions are satanic in nature.
> Do you subscribe to the opinion, or not?

No, it is not a way to dodge responsibility - no more then using any other word is a way to dodge responsibility. And if you really want MY opinion about this, I think these people are all a bunch of frauds who have latched onto this nonsense to impress their ignorant friends. Wiccans cannot do what they claim (witchcraft) and modern pagans are not at all related to those early religions. In other words, these people are simply full of it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3790. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 21:58:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13DE83.D6107ED0@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26837

Krell wrote:
>
> Hate is easliy veiled.

And I think you and Kim are too quick to throwing the word "hate" around. I don't "hate" Rick. Heck, I don't even know the man. However, I do know what he has written, which is what I based my opinion on when I said I would believe any web site over him. Now, if you consider that hate, I suggest you get a dictionary and learn the true meaning of the word.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3791. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:07:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3696290E5C2050EA.304DAB87A74355A8.039FCE8965A55266@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26839

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 18:27:35 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Yes, the meaning of "Satanic" (capital "s") is clear - it refers to
>the religious context of the word and is the one you continue to use
>in spite of my repeated objections. However, the meaning of "satanic"
>(lower case "s") seems much less clear to you - and it has nothing to
>do with "Satan."

Would you care to even ATTEMPT to justify a statement that
stupid?

Satanism and satanism are NOT unrelated. Precisely where do
you think the "satan" part of "satanism" comes from--the easter bunny?

Satanism (big OR little "s") refers to behavior which opposes
christianity (guess that doesn't mean the same as Christianity either,
right?), is defined as "evil" by Christian teachings, and includes the
worship of a devil (which pagan and Wiccan religions do NOT even
believe in, let alone worship), acts that deliberately harm others
(again, against the teachings of pagans and wiccans), and the practice
of harmful occult activities (again, not practiced by pagans or
wiccans--unless you use the absurd christian claim that ALL such
practices are "harmful"--which again returns the definition to
christianity).

There IS one difference, of course. Satanism (big "S") is a
RELIGION while satanism (little "s") is the practice of that religion
or the application of its principles.

Dwight, for someone who can't even tell the difference between
"liberal" and "libertarian" as you've made clear in many messages, you
really aren't the person who should be making semantic claims of
accuracy.

>> (snip) In the second place, even if you DID use
>> your own definition of satanic, (snip)
>
> I used the dictionary definition of the word, not my own definition.

Provide the specific definition in its entirety and the source
of the quote.

To help you out a bit, here's the definition from the Oxford
English Dictionary (2ed)--considered by most people to be the
definitive source of definitions of the words in the English language:

==========

Satanism (_____________).
[f. Satan + -ism. Cf. F. satanisme (= sense 3 below).]

1. A satanic or diabolical disposition, doctrine, spirit, or contrivance.

1565 Harding Confut. Jewel ii. ii. 42 b, Meaning the time when Luther first brinced to Germanie the poisoned cuppe of his heresies, blasphemies, and sathanismes.

1639 Visct. Falkland Elegy on Donne Poems (Grosart) 36 So mild was Moses countenance, when he prayï¿½d For them whose Satanisme his power gainsaid.

1855 Bagehot Lit. Stud., Cowper (1879) I. 285 The whole burning soul breaks away into what is well called Satanismï¿½into wildness, and bitterness, and contempt.

1893 Goldw. Smith Ess. 2 That sort of social revolution which may be called Satanism, as it seeks, not to reconstruct, but to destroy.

1900 A. Lang in Daily News 27 June 6/2 With such a mixture of..loyalty, mysterious Satanism, and reputation for conquests over her sex..Bothwell must have fascinated the Queen.

2. The characteristics of the ï¿½Satanic schoolï¿½.

1822 Blackw. Mag. XI. 445 His Lakeism or his Satanism will not save the piece from being damned, if it be stupid.

1833 Fraserï¿½s Mag. VIII. 524 This scene of Byronï¿½s is really sublime, in spite of its Satanism.

3. The worship of Satan, alleged to have been practised in France in the latter part of the 19th century; the principles and rites of the Satanists.

1896 A. Lillie Worship Satan in Mod. France Pref. 18 There are five temples of Satanism in Paris itself... Satanism has the Bulletin au Diable and other organs.

=======

From the Encyclopedia Britannica:

=======

Satanism

also called Devil Worship, worship of Satan, or the devil, the personality or principle regarded by the Judeo-Christian tradition as embodying absolute evil in complete antithesis to God. This worship may be regarded as a gesture of extreme protest against Judeo-Christian spiritual hegemony. Satanic cults have been documented in Europe and America as far back as the 17th century, but theirï¿½

=======

And from the Encarta World Dictionary:

=======

Saï¿½tanï¿½ism [sï¿½yt'n ï¿½zzm] noun
Satan worship: the worship of Satan, especially as a parody of
Christian rites

=======

Sorry, Dwight. As usual, you're claims are well outside
reality.

>> > Nonsense. _I_ associate these activities (occult
>> > practices, witchcraft, etc) with satanism and I'm
>> > not a christian church, nor am I associated with
>> > a christian church.
>>
>> (snip) You do so through ignorance and superstition.
>> I'm referring to reality. They are NOT the same.
>
> And I say that the association with satanism is the reality.

Then demonstrate that with solid evidence, not your personal
interpretation of reality.

>> > These practices have long been associated with
>> > satanism.
>>
>> Yup.
>>
>> BY THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.
>
>
> And by just about everyone else in this country, and around the
>world for that matter. Walk down any street in this country and ask
>people to identify the practices of satanism. About 99 percent, both
>religious and non-religious, would list these very things. That is the
>reality, Rick. Of course, I suppose you'll now say the entire world it wrong.

I'll accept that ludicrous statement WHEN YOU PROVIDE PROOF,
not simply because you state it--you are wrong FAR too often for that.
If you claim "99 percent" of the people say that, then you must have
either talked to 99 percent of the population or you have read solid
scientific research that states 99 percent of the people believe
that--otherwise your claim is totally without the slightest
substantiation and can just be put down to more prejudice on your
part.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3792. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:07:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13E0A2.35A6C3AE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26838

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Sooo -- Kim -- if you could just walk to the
> corner, board a bus that took you to within
> a block of your workplace, shopping center, or
> whatever, and got you back, all within a
> reasonable time frame (less than 20 min. wait)
> -- you wouldn't use it?

Did anyone see the show about public transportation (subways) on the Discovery Channel yesterday (at least, I think it was the discovery channel). Anyway, they were talking about possible future trends in subways (a hybrid system with buses using underground routes). A great idea, but one that only larger cities could afford.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3793. Re: Go Ahead, Send Me Another JOCKSTRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:12:40 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <slRQ7.295181$5A3.114782513@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26840
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C13D75A.463F032B@spam.me.not...
> IP's can be faked... and easily. Doesn't take a rocket >scientist to do
it, either...

Yes, an men can walk on the moon too, and elephants can fly. Just like I
might not be in Pa and really in the Uk. I could be using subseven to post
from a client computer. Ya just never know

3794. Re: Go Ahead, Send Me Another JOCKSTRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:13:32 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <gmRQ7.295183$5A3.114782917@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26841
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C13D75A.463F032B@spam.me.not...
> IP's can be faked... and easily. Doesn't take a rocket scientist to do

Or is that a server?

3795. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:16:57 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <639A191D6682576F.47E76ABB0DAFC979.93DFDAA0FCED29CD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26843

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 18:49:13 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> (snip) Unfortunately, that's a situation that most
>> rural residents will face sooner or later, and
>> equally unfortunately far too many choose to keep
>> driving well past the point at which they are no
>> longer safe on the roads with the end result
>> being a need for precisely the kind of laws they
>> have in Europe.
>
>
> And, law or no law, I'd probably be right out there driving with
>them when I reach that age. Without some reasonable public
>transportation, I'll be damned if some law is going to lock me up with
>no way to go anywhere. I have no desire to be a recluse in a free country.

But you DO have the alternative (as do I) of moving to an area
where public transportation is available. Sorry, Dwight, but if you
choose to live apart from society that doesn't relieve you of the
responsibility for obeying laws created for the protection of others.
You might be willing to drive after you've reached an age where you
recognize you cannot do so safely--personally I'm not willing to risk
other lives in that manner. I don't want to have to give up driving
(and currently I'm a good driver--complete with only three tickets in
42 years of driving), but if I become a danger to others as I age, I
would have no choice but to do just that.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3796. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:18:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13E32A.D920113D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26842

N2EY wrote:
>
> I hope you're right. The answer that most Americans
> support is "build more roads" which doesn't solve
> the problem.

The problem with that is many cities are simply running out of space to build more roads. You can only stack roads so high, and pile on so many cars, before the whole thing becomes a waste of time and money. At a certain point, the only solution is going to be public transportation. Sadly, in the meantime, we're stuck with all the existing problems (fuel comsumption, pollution, traffic jams, road rage, and so forth).

I think we need some kind of hybrid system - low cost electric cars for short distances, with public transportation for longer distances (and low cost electric rental cars in every city for travelers). This gives people the freedom to travel locally, but ends many of the problems mentioned above.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3797. Re: Go Ahead, Send Me Another JOCKSTRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:20:12 UTC
From: Trouser Trout <pipedream@hotmail.comspa>
Message-ID: <20011209172016.128$it@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 26845
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C13D75A.463F032B@spam.me.not...
> IP's can be faked... and easily. Doesn't take a rocket scientist to do
> it, either...
> I'm not saying it wasn't them.. but I'm saying it's possible it was a
> "frame job"...
>
> -SSB

Yes anything is possible but he had admitted after getting caught that he
did make the post. Check out the post for your self, Like you said its not
rocket science.
How about when people accuse Doug or Leland or Aaron could someone be
forging Ip address's as well then blame them?

From: igotdapower@yahoo.com (No Fear)
Newsgroups: ba.test
Subject: 'test'
Date: 2 Oct 2001 07:42:07 -0700
Organization: http://groups.google.com/
Lines: 1
Message-ID: <cf9eb618.0110020642.6ac6e785@posting.google.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 64.169.135.55
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Trace: posting.google.com 1002033728 14873 127.0.0.1 (2 Oct 2001 14:42:08
GMT)
X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: 2 Oct 2001 14:42:08 GMT

test test test

3798. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:20:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13E391.30E2D0DE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26844

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Now if they had busses that actually went somewheres...
> (like where I want to go when I want to go).

Read my previous comments to Jim about the hybrid system - it solves
the problem of getting around from the bus stop to your final destination.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3799. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:23:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B815B546EE340A84.76A6B47205F92099.318662A5F3D31C08@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26846

On Fri, 7 Dec 2001 20:28:10 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>heh heh heh. I live rural enough that I get my blind friends behind the
>wheel of my vehicles and let them drive. I crack up at the story of one of
>my former blind friends who drove down a residential street (creeping, mind
>you) while the sighted owner of the vehicle used her cane to knock against
>the sides of parked vehicles so she would miss them...ROFLMAO
>
>The whole neighborhood was laughing, as I hear. (Before you do gooders
>jump--the cane did absolutely no damage to any of the vehicles). Neither
>did the blind person...LOL

Here in Michigan we have two rather "unique" laws:

1. The law requires all drive-up ATM machines to both; (1) be
located and marked in a manner that indicates they are to be used by
and accessible to the drivers of motor vehicles only (no walk-ups on
those machines are permitted by law--only the ones on or in the
buildings) and; (2) all such machines MUST be labeled in braille for
the visually impaired.

2. It is perfectly legal for a completely blind individual to
obtain a hunting permit--and to hunt--in Michigan. The only
stipulation is that the hunter MUST be accompanied by another licensed
hunter who will be responsible for insuring that the blind hunter is
firing at a legitimate target. The assistant, however, may (as a court
has ruled!) likewise be blind!

Go figure.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3800. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:24:37 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A14C93DF76A49EB3.C9CAACD50E948C7A.0C73B8034C76D838@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26847

On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 14:24:25 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> And their gay/lesbian parents are not going to have any
>> influence on their sexual "identity." Right.
>
>I don't know if you've raised any daughters, Larry, but do you think
>that your influence on them would have made them want to be men?

Maybe not, but his views on women and sex would have made them
track stars!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3801. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:40:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209174026.28268.00000266@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26848

In article <3C0FF153.95117983@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Cecil, how many times in your life have you moved to follow the work?
>
>Six times, as far as I can recall - two were interstate.

Thanks for proving my point.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3802. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:40:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209174026.28268.00000265@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26850

In article <FdTP7.146537$WW.9373558@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0112061119.6c08fb5@posting.google.com...
>
>>
>> Something like CCC is one answer. If people can't find work where they
>> are, with the skills they have, they should go where the work is.
>> Cecil, how many times in your life have you moved to follow the work?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I know, Jim, we can sign up with the Reconstruction and Reclamation Corps,
>the Reeks and Wrecks.

Ah, somebody got the reference.

> And God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater and Kurt Vonnegut
>fans everywhere.
>
Hi ho.

73 de Jim "Dandelion-14" N2EY

3803. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:40:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209174027.28268.00000267@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26849

In article <3C130706.F06E2814@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>
>> > >Rearrabge the letters in "Santa" and you get "Satan". How convenient!
>> >
>> > devil spelled backward is "lived"
>
>Devils are a hockey team in NJ.....
>
The Jacksonville Jaguars are usually called "Jags"

The Tampa Bay Buccaneers are usually called the "Bucs"

And the members of the Tennessee team.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

3804. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:40:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011209174028.28268.00000268@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 26751

In article <QLJQ7.216216$3d2.9884345@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>> >"N2EY" wrote
>
>> >> Do you know WHY the fish was a symbol?
>
>> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:
>
>> >Fisher of men???
>
>"N2EY" wrote
>
>> Naw. "Icthys" was an abbreviation for a phrase that meant "Jesus Christ,
>Savior
>> of the world" or something like that. The simple fish symbol could be
>drawn
>> quickly, too.
>
>I'm right because Icthys is Greek for fish. Oteoicthys is all the bony
>fishes. DO you knonw what they call the rest of the fishes?

Nope.
>
>They called him that because he was the 'Fisher of Men' remember the most of
>the appostles were fishermen by trade.

Upon reflection, I recall that Jesus said to His apostles that he would make
them fishers of men. So your answer is correct.
>
>> >> "Romanis ite domum? What is that supposed to mean??"
>
>> >I was thinking 'Romans are home' and so I searched on the net and found
>> >this; I thought you'd like it...
>
>> >What could this be from???? ;-)
>
>> Ahhh - somebody here has some culture!
>
>That's right... ;-)
>
>> Monty Python's Life of Brian, which also gave us scenes like the old man
>being
>> stoned for saying "Jehovah" and the song "Always Look On The Bright Side
>Of

>> Life" (which would be reprised by Jack Nicholson in "As Good As It Gets").
>>
>> You have to know the original to fully get the joke. The centurion has
>Brian in
>> various strangleholds and threatens him with the short sword. The dialogue
>is
>> familiar to anyone who had a real Latin teacher.
>
><snip>
>
>> >Now doesn't that say it all? ;-)

Yup.
>
>> Well, I wasn't expecting the Spanish Inquisition!
>
>NOT THE SPANISH INQISITION!!!
>
The best known phrase is:

"NOBODY EXPECTS THE SPANISH INQUISITION!!!"

followed by scenes of torture involving a (dish) rack, being poked with soft cushions, and being forced to sit in "the comfy chair".

Best of the bunch, however, has to be "Monty Python's Meaning Of Life".

73 de Jim, N2EY

Also worthy of a peek are the "Blackadder" series....

3805. Re: My Biggest Kill File - for THIS newsgroup

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:41:44 UTC
From: leaky oil filled capacitors <itmrogers3@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <IMRQ7.15304$714.1591979@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26752
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Carl Miller" <cmiller@trellis.net> wrote in message
news:00011109115138.OUI03.cmiller@trellis.net...
> I just noticed that the Amateur Radio newsgroups have contributed more
> to my kill file than all the other newsgroups I read put together. I
> just can't believe how many lame-assed jerks are attracted to these
> groups. Incredible!

Carl my friend, this is the direct result of R. Hollingsworth's
cracking down on the infamous 14.313 vs 14.300 "Booer
War" of 1978-1996. It lasted that long (18 years!!) and dragged in
just about every single nut case on ham radio, like as if you
dumped ten gallons of honey into a bathtub in woods full of black bears.
Unfortunatly when Reily cleaned up this incredible mess, the people who *lived for* this
RF mayhem suddenly had no outlet for their frustrations. Enter the
internet and Newsgroups! The rest is, shall we say, history?

Someone could write 2 books on it. Believe me. One version would
provide material for Comedy Central Networks or The Jerry Springer
Show, while the other would make an excellent paper for study by
the American College of Psychiatric Medicine.

3806. Re: The Morsodist Religion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:56:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13EBED.3DA2502@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26753

K0HB wrote:
>
> I'm shocked that you don't understand one of
> the great religions of Amateur Radio. (snip)

Good grief, Hans, you have too much time on your hands. I got tired just trying to read all of that. And, you covered so much, I wouldn't even know where to begin to respond to it. I thought I've seen religious fanatics before, but you take the cake, my friend. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3807. happy holidays

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 22:58:19 UTC
From: webdoc@mailandnews.com
Message-ID: <de9751ca.0112091458.7dcf84bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26754
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I would like to take the time away from my work in NYC with the
American Red Cross to wish everyone a safe and happy holiday season. I
missed the test last month :/ I got lost on the subway while
transfering to another train, so I'll try again this month. a
co-worker gave me an early gift when they heard I was going to take my
test, it's a small simple 2m HT. It will be enough to get me started
once I get my ticket. I have done some searching and found some of the
local repeaters, and have them programmed in so I can listen to whats
going on. And don't worry, I am not stupid enough to hit the key w/o
having a ticket.

Until next time
73's to you and yours from me and mine.

Keith Hosman

3808. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 23:01:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13ED30.18FCDC0D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26755

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > (snip) By the way, Dave, we should bestow sainthood
> > on anyone who can always figure out what Kim is
> > talking about.
>
> That is a problem, Dwight. Those who are beatified and
> awaiting their chance for sainthood are, well...dead.

That sounds about right, Dave. Nobody alive can always understand what Kim is talking about.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3809. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 23:03:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C13ED80.D699D9D2@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26756

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> I'll start a discount house of worship, next
> to Target and Kmart.... :-)

Rmart? "R" for religion?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3810. Re: happy holidays

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 23:21:07 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <DISQ7.2829$sc3.400757827@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26757
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

A Merry Christmas & Happy New Year
to You Doc. May you and the family get
everything you asked for.

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

"Keith Hosman Red Cross Disaster Services" <webdoc@mailandnews.com> wrote in
message news:de9751ca.0112091458.7dcf84bf@posting.google.com...
> I would like to take the time away from my work in NYC with the
> American Red Cross to wish everyone a safe and happy holiday season. I
> missed the test last month :/ I got lost on the subway while
> transfering to another train, so I'll try again this month. a
> co-worker gave me an early gift when they heard I was going to take my
> test, it's a small simple 2m HT. It will be enough to get me started
> once I get my ticket. I have done some searching and found some of the
> local repeaters, and have them programmed in so I can listen to whats
> going on. And don't worry, I am not stupid enough to hit the key w/o
> having a ticket.
>
> Until next time
> 73's to you and yours from me and mine.
>
> Keith Hosman

3811. Re: Go Ahead, Send Me Another JOCKSTRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-09 23:21:07 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <DISQ7.2828$2e3.400858243@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26758
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Now I love this, I've been forging
for 5+ years. This guy is truly
demented or on drugs. You sir are
a troll, if anyone would like to see
his 60+ alias to see what kind of
troll he really is, please e-mail
S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net. I will
be more than happy to give them to you.
I also love "the gang" theory.....
LOL!!!

Landshark

PS, he seem to be defending the original post
so much, you would think he did it from his
AOL Account.
Just for the other newsgroups, I kill filed
this person some 2 months ago and all he
can think about is me. Practically every post
has some sort of reference to me, it's a shame,
you would think they would have something
better to do, like talk on the radio.

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C13D75A.463F032B@spam.me.not...
> IP's can be faked... and easily. Doesn't take a rocket scientist to do
> it, either...
> I'm not saying it wasn't them.. but I'm saying it's possible it was a
> "frame job"...
>
> -SSB
>
> Trouser Trout wrote:
> >
> > "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
> >
> > > This person, along with a couple others have been
> > > doing troll activities for the past year. All they do is
> > > accuse & harass and cause hate & discontent.
> > >
> > > Landshark

> >
> > Kinda Like Landshark has been doing since 1996 in this NG. A quick
search of
> > google will reveal all to those that are interested. For all we know his
> > gang of friends and he who like to forge posts could be the very same
bunch
> > doing this. Another search of google will reveal Landsharks past forging
> > history. He or his group were caught (again) on Thanksgiving Day using
the
> > name No Fear ..igotdapower@google.com which they posted from a Google
> > account thru AOL. He admitted that they do forge and pass around account
> > names and passwords. His IP address was also plastered on the intial
posts
> > when the account was set up . Do not trust anything they say. They have
be
> > proven to be liars.

3812. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 00:43:33 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v10e202i9s@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26761

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C13D1B4.BA347D75@sccoast.net...
> Look, I couldn't give a flying leap who came up with it - it is now
> the widely accepted word used to describe people involved in those
> activities. And if you think you can change that situation be fussing
> at me about it, let me set you straight - I have no control over it,
> nor would I attempt to change it even if I did.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

This only proves that you will adhere to any lie that suits your own bias. I think I'll save this for future reference. You do more damage to your credibility with this statement than any of us could ever do.

3813. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 00:59:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8OTQ7.150465$WW.9749379@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26759

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011209174026.28268.00000265@mb-cr.aol.com...
> In article <FdTP7.146537$WW.9373558@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:9f4bfe89.0112061119.6c08fb5@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>
> >> Something like CCC is one answer. If people can't find work where
they
> >> are, with the skills they have, they should go where the work is.
> >> Cecil, how many times in your life have you moved to follow the work?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I know, Jim, we can sign up with the Reconstruction and Reclamation
Corps,
> >the Reeks and Wrecks.
>
> Ah, somebody got the reference.
>
> > And God Bless You, Mr. Rosewater and Kurt Vonnegut
> >fans everywhere.
> >
> Hi ho.
>
> 73 de Jim "Dandelion-14" N2EY
>

The older I get the more I appreciate surrealism and that is really what
Vonnegut, Monty Python, and Joseph Heller did. The resulting feeling is
far more interesting than the plot. Same with Bob Dylan (Desolation Row
is a good example). A naked Yossarian in a tree is not really the issue
and this is why both Heller's and Vonnegut's books make really crappy
movies.
Monty Python movies in print would also stink up the joint. Dali was so
surrealistic he almost did not have to paint to prove it.

Dick, N&#65533;BK. Gimme eat, give everybody eat!!

3814. Re: The Morsodist Religion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 01:05:59 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0112091705.4c5a6958@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26760

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message

> > And if they say that you are shutting your eyes to reality,
> > you can reply that they are shutting their eyes to Morse.
> >
> > Peace to all of you!
> >
> >

> Jesus Christ Hans Ham Radio is only a HOBBY!

> w3rv

Verily I sayeth unto thee, not if thou do-eth it right!
Takest thou heed, lest the wrath of Carroll and Roll
decendeth upon thy head with holy vigor.

May the Morse be with thee,

de Hans, K0HB

3815. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 01:45:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209204556.15992.00000437@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26762

In article <9v061h02r5m@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20011209105501.15992.00000414@mb-fc.aol.com...
>> What better way to get comms going in an emergency than by
>> being proficient in Morse/CW?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>How about knowing how to get the equipment up and operating?

For those of use who use CW, that's never a problem! Since we had
the discipline to learn and gain useful proficiency in a useful
communications skill, we are also quite self-sufficient in learning
about our equipment, setting it up properly, and getting the most out
of it. You think being a Real Ham means plugging the boxes in
correctly, getting the mic plugged into the correct receptacle, and
coordinating the action of the PTT switch with your mouth. Big
Steenking Deal! My 8-year old nephew can do that!

The continuing problem with you no-coders is you persist on making
fools of yourselves by taking credit for high technical skill for doing
simple things that anyone with the ability to read can figure out for
themselves in a couple of minutes. Ham radio, at the entry level, is
not a technically challenging hobby anymore, and nobody who
gets into it at the entry level ever does anything more technically
involved than unboxing a store-bought appliance and hooking it up
correctly. I, OTOH, built several functional receivers and transmitters
long before I ever owned a piece of store-bought gear. I've forgotten
more about electronics than most of today's Extra-class hams ever
knew. Ham Radio these days is nothing but glorified CB, and the
lack of quality of on-the-air operation these days demonstrates this
fact very well, indeed! So don't bother to talk to me about technical
knowledge, Krell. Most new hams these days, when faced with a
real "emergency" communications challenge, couldn't get a message
across their backyard fence!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3816. Re: The Morsodist Religion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 01:50:30 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <GxUQ7.150522$WW.9753071@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26763

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:b7c5262e.0112091705.4c5a6958@posting.google.com...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>
> > > And if they say that you are shutting your eyes to reality,
> > > you can reply that they are shutting their eyes to Morse.
> > >
> > > Peace to all of you!
> > >
> > >
>
> > Jesus Christ Hans Ham Radio is only a HOBBY!
>
> > w3rv
>
> Verily I sayeth unto thee, not if thou do-eth it right!
> Takest thou heed, lest the wrath of Carroll and Roll
> decendeth upon thy head with holy vigor.
>
> May the Morse be with thee,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

No, Hans, No! Not the Holy Hand Grenade.

3817. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License more info.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 01:59:13 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112091759.41235797@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26764

Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<f3171ugtucejrir6rp17b99bulf8hpfldd@4ax.com>...
> On 08 Dec 2001 21:03:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>

>

> >Waddya think, folks?
>
> I thought at the time and still think this is a great opportunity to
> get new hams off on the right foot. I had a chat with the President
> of the RSGB and suggested that Foundation Tutor/Testing groups
> recruit QRPers. They QRP crowd has a real understanding of how
> to make low power work and are the most credible proponents of
> CW as an operating mode.
>
Sounds like a very interesting experiment but I have reservations
about effects of the ten watt limit at least on HF. The JAs have a
similar limit on their entry-level license and something like 500,000
of them have dropped out of ham radio. Most of the loss has been
attributed to the availability of cell phones but a lot of it has also
been attributed to their ten watt limit in a country where the average
residence is very cramped by U.S. standards. Which is to say that the
combination of semi-qrp and no HF antenna space makes HF ops more work
than they're worth in some large number of instances. The great
majority of Brits don't have much acreage either.
>
>
> To understand why the RA and RSGB wanted to do this you have to
> have an appreciation of the UK testing system. Tests are offered only
> at infrequent intervals and are very costly. Most written tests are
> proctored at Universities and cost L75 or over $100 US.
>
>
At least ya don't have to be knighted too. That's ridiculous, the
Brits neeed to vote the bums out . .
>
>
w3rv

3818. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 02:04:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <51E1C6FB38CF2747.57A1A32FD0348FD8.1CFB2D08B7FEE88F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26765

On Sat, 08 Dec 2001 08:44:18 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>The key is that, unlike your original situation, Libertarians do NOT
>advocate privatizing the court system. There has been a suggestion
>that the court system could provide income for the government through
>the charging of fees thus lowering the tax burden. However, the court
>system would still be a monopoly with no private competition allowed.
>It is not reasonable to privatize the court system.

Yet you want to privatize prisons, law enforcement, fire
departments, social security, and other programs.

What's the matter--the Libertarians can't stick to their
principles when they smell a profit? ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3819. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 02:08:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AC06DE177FD71ACE.4A593F301257533D.339247F83242FCF2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26766

On Sat, 08 Dec 2001 15:51:51 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> I don't know why conservatives always have to
>> start slinging that term "liberal" around in
>> the middle of a good argument. (snip)
>
>
> Well, in this case, Kim, I used the word "liberal" exactly because
>Rick defined himself as a one in a previous message. In other words,
>according to his own statements, the word applies and therefore my
>question was valid.

No, Dwight, I did NOT identify myself as a "liberal." I am a
libertarian--if you are too stupid to know the difference, try looking
in a book (that's one of those things with covers, pages, and printed
words in case you don't have any experience with them).

I _agreed_ that I would accept the "sixties liberal"
definition of my earlier years--so what? That does NOT define me as a
political liberal, which is the form you are discussing here. But, of
course, you already know that--your only reason for using the term is
to distract from the fact that you can't argue on the issues
themselves (with evidence greater than your personal opinions) so you
prefer to distract from them with meaningless babble.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3820. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 02:20:30 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1200815ACF53777A.C39BB3E8A83E4591.E19C72FDEEFDD3FA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26767

On Sat, 08 Dec 2001 16:08:59 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> I sure do wish people would be just a little less
>> cynical about "sources." Dwight, a site that
>> supports polygamous relationships is probably full
>> of expert *opinions* from those who practice
>> polygamy. Just as probably one of the best sources
>> for cancer information would be from a site
>> sponsored by an agency that supports cancer
>> research, The American Cancer Society.
>
>
> I'm not cynical about sources, Kim. I'm cynical about sources that
>only offer one perspective on a issue. In other words, a source that
>is not unbiased. For example, the American Cancer Society you
>mentioned is obviously not promoting cancer, therefore they are a good
>source of information. The sites Rick offered are promoting satanism.

Let me get this straight. The sites I provided dealing with
polyamory, swinging, and the sociological research surrounding those
issues are satanic?

Dwight, you have satanism on the brain. Go get exorcised and
come back with at least a small amount of insight into what you are
talking about.

Incidently, to carry your cancer analogy further, you claim
that the ACS site is not promoting cancer so it is not biased. BUT if
I am interested in knowing about PREVENTING or TREATING cancer, since
the ACS site DOES have a bias toward those actions, it clearly is NOT
the right source of information--I need to find sites that oppose
prevention and treatment instead, right?

No?

Then why is it if information about polyamory or swinging is
desired, sites that support (SUPPORT Dwight, not promote) these topics
are any less appropriate?

Oh, I forgot. It's because you don't AGREE with those sites,
right?

>> Now, on political stuff, all bets are off. I am no
>> more likely to be inspired to a different way of

>> thinking about something because I read or listen
>> to someone like, say, Rush Limbaugh; just as you
>> would not be by reading something out of
>> Sojourners Truth (think that was the name of the
>> magazine) or National Public Radio.
>
>
> And I would add any site which attempts to propagandize to that list
>(which would include the sites Rick offered). I asked him for unbiased
>sources, not pro-satanism propaganda sites.

I didn't provide you ANY sites dealing with wicca or paganism,
you idiot--I provided (at your demand) sites dealing with polyamory
and swinging--as Kim CORRECTLY pointed out in her first paragraph.

Out of respect for the other readers, at least TRY to pay
attention to what you are talking about.

Show me ONE SITE I provided an url for that has anything to do
with satanism, wicca, or pagan faiths AT ALL!

>> My question to you is, if you are not willing to
>> accept the information that is offered as part of
>> an offer of education about a certain topic, then
>> why even debate. And, the likelihood that you will
>> find an absolute independent source for topics of
>> discussion is nearly, if not, nil.
>
> I don't accept the "offer of education" because (1) I don't need the
>education (I've studied this subject before),

Which one? The one you THINK you are talking about, or the one
everyone else is talking about?

You ASKED for sites, Dwight, now that they were provided you
claim you "don't need the education." Then why ask in the first place?

Also, you claim you have "studied this subject before." Which
subject, Dwight? Open marriage (of which you CLEARLY know nothing) or
Wicca (of which you ALSO know nothing)? Or something altogether
different that no one but you even thinks we're talking about?

>(2) the "education"
>offered covered no new ground (I've seen the stuff on those sites many
>times before),

Really?

Is that why you keep referring to poly sites as "satanic" in
this post?

Maybe you should have taken the time to READ what was on the
sites you claim you've "seen many times before."

>and (3) the "education" offered was nothing more than
>biased propaganda (not education).

How can you tell--you don't know enough about the subject to
compare the two. You don't even accept a legitimate sociological
research paper as unbiased--what do you need, something that agrees
with your sick view of human relations before you'll say something is
unbiased?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3821. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 02:21:58 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EF80FDFEE3C68AC2.91C3CABAECA2D66D.33833E40DB73424F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26768

On Sun, 09 Dec 2001 15:47:12 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Well, Kim, it's very simple - we leave the doors open. What is it
>you do in the workplace behind closed doors that you cannot possibly
>do behind open doors?

Discuss confidential business.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3822. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 02:53:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C141641.BD653D4D@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26769

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Hans where da hell ya been for the last 30 years???
>
> Hey Dick, here's something I got from a URL on drudgereport.com.
>
> "A SCIENTIST has observed homosexual behavior in
> wild orang-utans for the first time, adding the great apes
> to the long list of animals that take part in same sex
> relationships. Homosexual behavior has been observed in almost
> every species of animal including dolphins, hedgehogs,
> kangaroos, sheep, whales, albatrosses, chimpanzees
> and gorillas. Dr Fox published her observations in the
> American Journal of Primatology."

Ya suppose the good Dr Foxx is a charter member of Lesbos Unlimited and is trying her dead level best to proved it "normal"? Seems to be fashionable amongst them. You Too?

3823. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 02:56:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C1416D9.83EF4642@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26770

One thing more - Just because one claims to be a scientist means just that-that's their claim. History is loaded with phony scientists "proving" whatever they want proved.

3824. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:10:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E9AC04CD975C8D90.5809AFC9ED0370D6.8F9CEAD6C1B7D06B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26771

On 08 Dec 2001 15:49:27 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>You originally included ancient Rome and Greece - now you leave 'em out.

No, I stated that Rome and Greece were places where the pagan faiths (which people here have claimed are "new age inventions") originated.

Incidently, I was driving home last night and noticed several houses with what were "supposed" to be christmas decorations up. But many of those had five pointed stars (pentagrams!!!) on the trees, the house, or other places. Obviously, therefore, christmas is a cover for satanism, right?

>>
>>>The Roman and Greek "nature religions" tried for centuries to eradicate
>>>Christianity and its source religion, Judaism. Do you know who Antiochus
>>was?
>>
>> So?
>
>Guess you don't know who Antiochus was.

As it happens, I do. Are you referring to Antiochus the first, second, or third (also known as Antiochus the Great)?

What I _don't_ know is what someone who lived 2000+ years ago in the Middle East has to do with wicca and paganism in the modern day. Antiochus (pick your number) was a political figure, not a religious one.

>> The Christians did a pretty good job of reversing that trend
>>when it came to the Pagan faiths of Northern Europe--as well as the
>>Jewish faith in Spain--or did the Inquisition slip past you unnoticed.
>
>I knew about the Inquisition by the time I was 11.

Which Inquisition?

Certainly not the one where pagans were being slaughtered by christians in an effort to stamp out their religion (you know, the one that uses pentagrams as one of its symbols?)--and (of course) steal their land and property.

Perhaps the one in Spain where it was the Jews who were the target. Or the French one where it was a too-powerful sect of christians. But certainly not the one in Northern Europe.

>There were also all sorts of persecutions of Jews in other countries besides
>Spain, persecutions for heresy (Christian killing Christian in the name of
>Christ), and the Crusades, which were often thinly disguised land grabs for
>second sons.

Yup! And the same holds true for the persecution of "witches"
and pagans as well.

>>>Constantine changed all that.
>>
>> And a RC Pope restarted the killing.
>
>Yup. The best argument for separation of church and state is the record of what
>happens without it.

Then how can you--or anyone else who believes that (as I do)
support the concept of morals laws which can ONLY be based on
religious values?

>> Perhaps you can see a difference between a Roman killing a
>>person for his or her religion and a Christian doing the same.
>
>You are equating "Roman Catholic" with "Christian". They are not the same. One
>is a subset of the other. Not all Christian religions have a history of killing
>in the name of religion.

And not all Romans killed Christians either. So what? The
analogy still is valid.

>>Personally, I can't.
>
>Then present the whole story. When the pagans were in power, they killed
>Christians. When the tables were turned, the killing continued. Paybacks.

So you agree that paganism (which uses the pentagram as a
symbol) predates christianity, right?

In that case, how can paganism POSSIBLY be satanic? It existed
before satan was INVENTED by the christians.

>Two wrongs don't make a right. But you present only the Christian wrong, never
>the pagan wrong.

I'll make you a deal--if YOU will acknowledge that pagan (and
by extension, wiccan) faiths predate christianity and therefore have
nothing at all to do with satanism, I'll gladly agree that some pagan
states have acted in the same manner towards christians that
christians have acted toward them. Bear in mind, however, that I am
referring to pagan STATES, not specific pagan religions which had
nothing at all to do with the killing of christians--that was a
political action on the part of the Romans not a religious one.

>> Speaking of killing people for their religion, here's a
>>completely accurate description of an historically important person.
>>See if you can identify him:

>
>This isn't a class, you aren't the teacher.

Can't identify him, huh?

>> "<he> was both a passionate anti-Semite and a ferocious
>>believer in absolute obedience to political authority. He wanted (his
>>nation is named here) rid of the Jews and he advised that the be
>>deprived of "All their cash and jewels and silver and gold" and
>>furthermore, "that their synagogues or schools be set on fire, that
>>their houses be broken up and destroyed . . . and they be put under a
>>roof or stable, like the gypsies . . . in misery and captivity as they
>>incessantly lament and complain to God about us"--advice that was
>>later followed literally."
>>
>> He also referred to the peasants who opposed the government as
>>"mad dogs," and employed a "coarseness and brutality of language
>>unequaled in <nation> history."
>
>The Jewish people have been persecuted by so many that there are plenty of
>candidates for that description. Offhand it sounds like Torquemada, but it
>could also be any of a number of popes, czars, kings, bishops, and other
>enemies of freedom. Hitler comes to mind, of course, but that's too obvious.
>Martin Luther turned against the Jews when he realized that they weren't going
>to convert to his version of Christianity. Lots of others. The country could be
>Germany, Russia, England, Spain or many others.

Very good. Martin Luther is correct. Sort of sounds like
Hitler, doesn't he?

BTW, for the totally out-of-touch-with-reality among us
(that's you Dwight, read this), Martin Luther is the FOUNDER of the
protestant form of christianity. The quote comes from Shirer's "The
Rise And Fall of the Third Reich" and points out that Luther was a
VERY strong influence on Hitler's thinking and doctrine.

>Heck, it could be somebody like JEdgar Hoover, but we don't have lots of
>Gypsies in the USA.

Naw. Hoover was too busy molesting young boys with his
pedophile lover Purvey [sp?] to bother with Jews and Gypsies.

>> Let's see how good your knowledge of history is. Who is the
>>person I refer to above?
>>
>See above. There are many candidates.

You got him correctly.

See! You CAN pass academic tests! You get a star on your
paper!

Whoops! I forgot. I can't put that there--it's a satanic
symbol.

Never mind.

>The concepts of religious tolerance and separation of church and state are very
>new ones, historically speaking. Many who fled here to escape religious
>persecution (like the Puritans) turned into the persecutors when they became
>established in their new land.

True.

>Here's a question for you: When and where did the ideas of separation of church
>and state, and universal religious tolerance, first become established in the
>USA?

Among the Native Americans, actually.

If you are looking for the first time the term "separation of
church and state" was used, otoh, the phrase, "a wall of separation
between church and state," was coined by President Thomas Jefferson in
a carefully crafted letter to the Danbury Baptists in 1802, when they
had asked him to explain the First Amendment.

Finally, if you are looking for the first PRACTICE of
religious tolerance in the US--among whites, of course (the Native
Americans DID practice it for quite a while before whites considered
the concept, but since they were pagans that probably doesn't count to
you), depending on your interpretation of "religious tolerance" you
probably are referring to either New York, Pennsylvania, or Maryland
(probably Pennsylvania). If you want to be more specific, I'll be glad
to do so as well.

>>>Most religions have feast days because people need them, spiritually and
>>>psychologically. For example, most European religions have some sort of
>>winter
>>>equinox
>
>Actually, solstice.

That's not me you are quoting--it's someone else in the
thread.

>>celebration because of the effects lack of daylight causes in many
>>>people. For peoples with limited understanding of how the seasons and
>>weather
>>>work, and with limited artificial lighting, the loss of the Sun at the end
>>of
>>>December could be very disturbing.
>
>(Solstice)

Same here.

>>>celebrations, whatever they are
>>>called, remind us that the Light will return and spring will comne again. It
>>>was natural for the Christians to put Christmas on the first day when the
>>>daylight gets noticeably longer using simple methods of measurement.
>>
>> Which "conveniently" fell directly on a Pagan festival day, of
>>course, as did other Christian holy days.
>
>So? The purpose was the same. The sun doesn't cooperate just because humans
>convert. Having feast days on other days would be an admission that the pagan
>religions had priority.

Weak.

>>>> The pentagram, for your information, was a religious symbol in
>>>>Egypt, Macedonia, Sumeria, Greece, Rome, China, India, and among the
>>>>Norse peoples--NONE of which groups "stole" it from Christianity.
>>>
>>>The Egyptians, Greeks and Romans hid it pretty well.
>>
>> Not particularly, if you examine the writings of the time (in
>>Rome and Greece at least). It appears there with regularity. That it
>>isn't used often in buildings is irrelevant--how many Christian
>>churches do you see with a prominent image of a fish--the ORIGNIAL
>>symbol of Christianity?
>
>Plenty. Do you know WHY the fish was a symbol?

Because there's something fishy about the religion? Because it
stinks? Because it eats anything smaller than itself w/o reservation?
Because it's pretty dumb?

Yes, as it happens, I DO know why the fish was a symbol.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3825. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:13:56 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <55D97E2ACB0E3038.FC8E69B7B8BC17C6.5097E427BEB0C82A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26772

On Sat, 08 Dec 2001 17:56:17 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> I sure would. If something is wrong, and if something
>> is believed because of wrong perceptions, wrongfully
>> placed concepts, then it's still wrong. Thank goodness
>> our forefathers believed that.
>
>
> Kim, you can say something is wrong all you want, but that does not
>make it wrong - it just makes it your opinion. And, my opinion, and
>that of many others, say it is not wrong.

Gee, that sounds like the argument many of us have been making
about her call sign.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3826. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:14:48 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v198i030ms@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26776

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011209204556.15992.00000437@mb-fc.aol.com...
> For those of use who use CW, that's never a problem! Since we had
> the discipline to learn and gain useful proficiency in a useful
> communications skill, we are also quite self-sufficient in learning
> about our equipment, setting it up properly, and getting the most out
> of it. You think being a Real Ham means plugging the boxes in
> correctly, getting the mic plugged into the correct receptacle, and
> coordinating the action of the PTT switch with your mouth. Big
> Steenking Deal! My 8-year old nephew can do that!

So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate, there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high speed code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet, he drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)

3827. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:15:54 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <73523A871B7311E5.DCE97C10C949B0DD.F71F37C62F33825E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26773

On Sat, 08 Dec 2001 18:00:17 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> You are labeling many of my Wiccan friends, Dwight.
>
>
> No, I'm not "labeling" your friends, Kim. Like I said earlier,
>"satanic" is the common name used by most everyone to describe the
>people involved in those activities. I didn't invent the word to
>describe them - it is the word commonly used in this country.

Not everyone, Dwight.

Only the ignorant.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3828. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:18:46 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A01E2C0D5B5FD8EA.9ABB07AA6C8A0F13.FC7BEB875AD457C9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26774

On Sun, 09 Dec 2001 16:52:03 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Wiccans cannot do what they claim (witchcraft) and modern pagans are
>not at all related to those early religions. In other words, these
>people are simply full of it.

What they "claim" genius is that they worship a different set
of gods than you do. Why CAN'T they do that?

Dwight, try to learn SOMETHING about a subject before you
claim to know about it--otherwise you just sound stupid.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3829. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:20:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2FDD04E9F7DE9795.04EB014D0EB60B8F.22A5D31CD68DC8F4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26775

On Sat, 8 Dec 2001 22:18:57 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>You can stick a toothpick in a turd and call it a trophy, but it would still
>be a turd.

Shit on a stick?

Hey, Dwight!

A new cuisine for you to try.

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3830. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:31:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c142d73_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26777

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C13CDCE.8517C9FE@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Never seen policies, other than "thou shalt not"
> > and that's all that need be said. I'll be in my
> > closed door meetings getting some real work
> > done. I don't know what you guys are going to do.
>
>
> Well, Kim, it's very simple - we leave the doors open. What is it
> you do in the workplace behind closed doors that you cannot possibly
> do behind open doors?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

I don't question why I am called in to Managers' and Supervisors' offices for closed door meetings although, many times, the topic involves things that other employees should not be hearing (hiring decisions, termination decisions, outsourcing decistions, etc.).

I do what I'm told at work, Dwight. I've *never* experienced a male or female boss acting wrongly. As I said, I suppose that the companies I've worked at have all employed some very adult people--because we all seem to be competent to have closed door meetings without any problems.

Kim W5TIT

3831. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:32:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c142db6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26779

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C13CFC3.279415FE@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Why do you add the "and that of many others" above?
>
>
> It's a polite way of saying, "duh, everybody knows that - except you
> of course."
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Yeah, and we all know your defintion of "everybody."

Kim W5TIT

3832. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:33:20 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c142ddd$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26780

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C13D1B4.BA347D75@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > But you certainly don't have any problem repeating
> > a commonly held "Christian" misconception without
> > knowing the facts.
>
>
> Look, I couldn't give a flying leap who came up with it - it is now
> the widely accepted word used to describe people involved in those
> activities. And if you think you can change that situation be fussing
> at me about it, let me set you straight - I have no control over it,
> nor would I attempt to change it even if I did.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

So, you see Krell, Dwight *enjoys* spreading rumors.

Kim W5TIT

3833. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:34:34 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <013E602DE634ED7F.728E71F50A93391A.E22A1CD3DBCFA789@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26778

On 09 Dec 2001 05:03:22 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>What too many folks ignore is that we drive so many vehicles so many miles that
>we have to import huge amounts of petrol to run them. Paying for that petrol
>not only transfers huge amounts of American wealth overseas, but transfers some
>of it to the very folks who want to destroy us.

You'll notice, however, that the congress is unwilling to
legalize the most efficient form of fuel available (hemp oil) for
production on American farms (we have to import it from Canada if we
want it). Hemp fuel, first introduced by Henry Ford in 1936 (in an
automobile built over 40% out of hemp itself), is non-polluting, a
renewable resource, lower in cost than petroleum products, readily
extracted from the plant, and can be produced anywhere in the USA.
Even the Farm Bureau (arguably one of the most conservative
organizations in the US) has voted unanimously to encourage congress
to legalize it as a cash crop.

If we REALLY want to reduce dependance on petroleum imports,
that would be a safe, sane, and forward thinking solution (modern cars
CAN be converted to run on it--in fact several concept cars are on the
roads running on it now)--but that's asking WAY too much of our
congress critters.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3834. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:34:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c142e3b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26781

I think I pretty much understand, Rick. Dwight doesn't know your
"everybody." ROFLMAO!!!

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:A75D1BB15FED0B25.F7BAFA66FF1CB303.E04FC8A2295CBB5F@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 17:44:37 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > When that is all you've offered me, yes. And, again, sending me to
> >sites supporting polygamous relationships, which offer only material
> >supporting that, is hardly offering me an unbiased source. Likewise,
> >the information on those sites is hardly worthwhile since it only
> >presents only a single view (that supporting polygamous relationships).
>
> 1. I provided both biased and unbiased cites, you choose only
> to mention the biased ones.
>
> 2. Even the biased ones are appropriate--you didn't ask what
> everyone thought about it, you asked about the actual facts about the
> lifestyles--and fairly obviously, apart from scientific research, the
> logical place to find out about the lifestyles is from the people who
> are actually involved in them. Who would you SUGGEST I cite, those who
> oppose them? Why? How is it possible that THEY would know more about
> what effects the experience has on a marriage (the core of the
> question) than those who have EXPERIENCED it?
>
> >> (snip) Incidently, your analogy to the KKK,
> >> if true, would make it pretty clear that if
> >> someone wants information on ham radio the LAST
> >> place to look would be the ARRL site, since
> >> that's biased in favor of it. (snip)
> >
> > Actually, the KKK analogy is a valid one in this case. Like the KKK
> >sites, or the ARRL site for that matter, the sites you offered present
> >only one view, one position. That hardly makes those sites worthwhile
> >if one wants the complete story about this issue. As for your mention
> >of the ARRL site, if I wanted information about ham radio as an issue,
> >I would indeed not visit ONLY that site. I would instead attempt to
> >find sites that offered a more balanced view, or visit a range of
> >sites with different views.
>
> But, of course, we're not discussing non-monogamous
> relationships as an "issue." The relationships, unlike radio frequency

> allocations or licensing laws, is not a public issue in the first
> place--it's a matter of personal choice, just as the choice between
> having children and not having children is. Thus the logical places to
> learn about it are either from research (which I cited and you
> ignored) or from those who have experienced the lifestyle. If you
> wanted to learn what ham radio was all about you would ask hams, not
> freebanders.
>
> >> (snip) outside of sending you to religious sites
> >> where they will "prove" (by recourse to the
> >> bible, of course, their ONLY source of
> >> information on the topic) that such behavior is
> >> "sinful" and "wrong." Since that's pretty much
> >> what you appear to believe, (snip)
> >
> > Well, I certainly think that type of behavior is wrong, but I'm not
> >basing that on any religious belief ("sinful"). In fact, I don't even
> >understand why liberals always start screaming about religion
> >everytime someone takes a moral stand against anything liberals
> >support?
>
> Because, apart from religious prejudice, there IS no
> legitimate reason to claim that the behavior is "wrong." It can be
> shown NOT to have an adverse effect on its practitioners or their
> children, thus it is not "wrong" in the sense of causing harm to
> others. Beyond that, if you leave religious morality out of it what
> grounds EXIST to view it as either "right" OR "wrong?"
>
> Taking a "moral stand" indicates the application of a set of
> moral values. In some cases those values come from the nature of the
> act itself (i.e., we all tend to agree that rape, murder, etc., are
> "wrong" because we share that moral value)--clearly this is NOT the
> case when it comes to consensual relationships. In other cases we take
> those values from the moral teachings or principles of others--most of
> the time from those of organized religions. In the case of the
> "morality" of various sexual lifestyles, the ONLY possible source for
> the view that a relationship or consensual behavior is "immoral" is
> religion.
>
> > Do liberals think it is impossible to have a moral belief
> >without involving religion? Do all liberals think there are only two
> >alternatives - religion or everything goes?
>
> I wouldn't know. As I keep repeating, and you appear
> completely unable to remember, I'm NOT A LIBERAL!!!!!!!!!!
>
> It may be convenient to keep ignoring those parts of messages
> that don't fit your preconceptions, but it also marks you as being
> rather shallow, intellectually.
>

> > If that is what you think,
> >you're wrong. It's not just religious fanatics who are opposed to the
> >liberal nonsense in this country.
>
> Yes, I know. I'm opposed to "liberal nonsense" too!
>
> I just happen to support the right of people to make their own
> lifestyle choices and to be treated with respect regardless of the
> choices they make instead of condemning and looking down on them as
> right wing fanatics tend to do.
>
> That don't make me liberal--it makes me libertarian.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3835. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:37:48 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c142eeb_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26783

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C13DCF1.92C7D468@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Is that kind of like dodging any responsiblity
> > for the way you feel and think about the Wiccan
> > and other Pagan traditions? OK, so you did not
> > personally come up with the popular thought
> > that pagan traditions are satanic in nature.
> > Do you subscribe to the opinion, or not?
>
>
> No, it is not a way to dodge responsibility - no more then using any
> other word is a way to dodge responsibility. And if you really want MY
> opinion about this, I think these people are all a bunch of frauds who
> have latched onto this nonsense to impress their ignorant friends.
> Wiccans cannot do what they claim (witchcraft) and modern pagans are
> not at all related to those early religions. In other words, these
> people are simply full of it.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Dwight, your hole of ignorance on this topic is so large now, that you've fallen in and can't get out. You are so very ignorant of these topics it's really not even worth going any farther with you... Go have a safe open door meeting.

Kim W5TIT

3836. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:43:20 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <sbWQ7.150695$WW.9767493@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26782
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Thanks, Landshark. Geeze, when will everyone lighten up? You and yours be sure and have a merry Christmas too!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message news:DsQQ7.2767$9%6.383614125@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> Forge. please see previous post for
> explanation.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All
>
>
> <timnebo@aol.comLOL> wrote in message news:9v0h4ncde1@news.netmar.com...
> > In article <9uv7n1bhh1@news.netmar.com>, <timnebo@aol.comLOL> writes:
> > >I dont see what is the big deal about this FCC crap I have been hearing.
> I
> > >have DXed all over the world on my TS-840 and amplifier both on ham bands
> > and
> > >on freeband and I have yet to run into any hassles from the FCC. The only
> > >trouble I get is from stcuk up hams. Damn youd think they were afraid of
> > >there own shadow the way they go on about Riley this and Riley that.
> This
> > is
> > >what I tell people who ask me about my radio setup: if you want to get
> > >started in the radio hobby and your smart why not do as I do and just
> jump
> > >in. The reason ham radio hobby is dieing is they made it too controlled.
> You
> > >dont need the code and who wants to give up their freedoms by giving the
> > >government more information they can use to violate your privacy anyway.
> I

> > >dont. Everyone knows the code will be dropped and then the test will be
> > >dropped for ham radio and finally there will be no more licenses. If
more
> > >people just got on then the government would have to give up and let us
> do
> > >what we want regardless of there rules and we could speed the whole
> process
> > >up.
> > >
> > > 73 de Tim
> > > Knight Patrol #82
> > >
> > >WARNING
> > >No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have
Been
> > >Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News
> Groups.
> > >Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.
> >
> > Hey guys you can take this as a forge I dont really care. If you think
me
> and
> > a lot of other freebanders give two shits about fcc and licenses then
you
> > need to wake and take a listen on the bands. Ha ha yeah I use a modded
ham
> > radio but never go off the cb band yeah right. What I say and what I do
> are
> > two diferent things. You old fart hams need to lighten up on freebanders
> > because we are soon going to overtake you and thats no joke.
> >
> > 73 de Tim
> > Knight Patrol #82
> >
> > WARNING
> > No Code amatuers Douglas Adair N8WWM and Leland C Scott KC8LDO Have Been
> > Forging My Email Address While Posting To Several Web Sites And News
> Groups.
> > Just Do As I Do And Ignore Them.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
> eb -----
> > http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
> groups
> > NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other
posts
> > made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
> abuse@newsone.net
>
>

3837. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:45:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1430b3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26784

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C13ED30.18FCDC0D@sccoast.net...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > (snip) By the way, Dave, we should bestow sainthood
> > > on anyone who can always figure out what Kim is
> > > talking about.
> >
> > That is a problem, Dwight. Those who are beatified and
> > awaiting their chance for sainthood are, well...dead.
>
>
> That sounds about right, Dave. Nobody alive can always understand
> what Kim is talking about.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Dwight, *everybody* knows that people do not always understand each other.
Good grief.

Kim W5TIT

3838. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:46:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c143100_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26785

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9v10e202i9s@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> news:3C13D1B4.BA347D75@sccoast.net...
> > Look, I couldn't give a flying leap who came up with it - it is now
> > the widely accepted word used to describe people involved in those
> > activities. And if you think you can change that situation be fussing
> > at me about it, let me set you straight - I have no control over it,
> > nor would I attempt to change it even if I did.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> This only proves that you will adhere to any lie that suits your own bias.
I
> think I'll save this for future reference. You do more damage to your
> credibility with this statement than any of us could ever do.
>
>

Absolutely. (Dwight and Dave won't understand if I go any further).

Kim W5TIT

3839. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:53:42 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1432a5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26786

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:1200815ACF53777A.C39BB3E8A83E4591.E19C72FDEEFDD3FA@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sat, 08 Dec 2001 16:08:59 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> >Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >> I sure do wish people would be just a little less
> >> cynical about "sources." Dwight, a site that
> >> supports polygamous relationships is probably full
> >> of expert *opinions* from those who practice
> >> polygamy. Just as probably one of the best sources
> >> for cancer information would be from a site
> >> sponsored by an agency that supports cancer
> >> research, The American Cancer Society.
> >>
> >>
> > I'm not cynical about sources, Kim. I'm cynical about sources that
> >only offer one perspective on a issue. In other words, a source that
> >is not unbiased. For example, the American Cancer Society you
> >mentioned is obviously not promoting cancer, therefore they are a good
> >source of information. The sites Rick offered are promoting satanism.
>
> Let me get this straight. The sites I provided dealing with
> polyamory, swinging, and the sociological research surrounding those
> issues are satanic?
>

ROFLMAO...

>
> Dwight, you have satanism on the brain. Go get exorcised and
> come back with at least a small amount of insight into what you are
> talking about.
>
> Incidently, to carry your cancer analogy further, you claim
> that the ACS site is not promoting cancer so it is not biased. BUT if
> I am interested in knowing about PREVENTING or TREATING cancer, since
> the ACS site DOES have a bias toward those actions, it clearly is NOT
> the right source of information--I need to find sites that oppose
> prevention and treatment instead, right?
>
> No?
>
> Then why is it if information about polyamory or swinging is

> desired, sites that support (SUPPORT Dwight, not promote) these topics
> are any less appropriate?
>
> Oh, I forgot. It's because you don't AGREE with those sites,
> right?
>
> >> Now, on political stuff, all bets are off. I am no
> >> more likely to be inspired to a different way of
> >> thinking about something because I read or listen
> >> to someone like, say, Rush Limbaugh; just as you
> >> would not be by reading something out of
> >> Sojourners Truth (think that was the name of the
> >> magazine) or National Public Radio.
> >
> >
> > And I would add any site which attempts to propagandize to that list
> >(which would include the sites Rick offered). I asked him for unbiased
> >sources, not pro-satanism propaganda sites.
>
> I didn't provide you ANY sites dealing with wicca or paganism,
> you idiot--I provided (at your demand) sites dealing with polyamory
> and swinging--as Kim CORRECTLY pointed out in her first paragraph.
>

Hey, Dwight and Dave are totally confused and can't tell what I am saying.
Uh, here Dwight is totally confused on topics, apparently. Am I responsible
for that? <BEG>.

>
> Out of respect for the other readers, at least TRY to pay
> attention to what you are talking about.
>
> Show me ONE SITE I provided an url for that has anything to do
> with satanism, wicca, or pagan faiths AT ALL!
>
> >> My question to you is, if you are not willing to
> >> accept the information that is offered as part of
> >> an offer of education about a certain topic, then
> >> why even debate. And, the likelihood that you will
> >> find an absolute independent source for topics of
> >> discussion is nearly, if not, nil.
> >
> > I don't accept the "offer of education" because (1) I don't need the
> >education (I've studied this subject before),
>
> Which one? The one you THINK you are talking about, or the one
> everyone else is talking about?
>

The word Dwight prefers, Rick, is 'everybody.' Of course, that's *his*
everybody, not yours, or mine, or anyone else's.

>
> You ASKED for sites, Dwight, now that they were provided you
> claim you "don't need the education." Then why ask in the first place?
>
> Also, you claim you have "studied this subject before." Which
> subject, Dwight? Open marriage (of which you CLEARLY know nothing) or
> Wicca (of which you ALSO know nothing)? Or something altogether
> different that no one but you even thinks we're talking about?
>
> >(2) the "education"
> >offered covered no new ground (I've seen the stuff on those sites many
> >times before),
>
> Really?
>
> Is that why you keep referring to poly sites as "satanic" in
> this post?
>
> Maybe you should have taken the time to READ what was on the
> sites you claim you've "seen many times before."
>
> >and (3) the "education" offered was nothing more than
> >biased propaganda (not education).
>
> How can you tell--you don't know enough about the subject to
> compare the two. You don't even accept a legitimate sociological
> research paper as unbiased--what do you need, something that agrees
> with your sick view of human relations before you'll say something is
> unbiased?
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Oh, goodness... Now I've got the giggles. Who's confused? Dwight, you, or me?

Kim W5TIT

3840. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:54:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1432db_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26787

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:EF80FDFEE3C68AC2.91C3CABAECA2D66D.33833E40DB73424F@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 09 Dec 2001 15:47:12 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > Well, Kim, it's very simple - we leave the doors open. What is it
> >you do in the workplace behind closed doors that you cannot possibly
> >do behind open doors?
>
> Discuss confidential business.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Dwight's company must not have any of that.

Kim W5TIT

3841. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 03:55:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c14330d$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26788

History's also loaded with folks who claim to know about religions who do not.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dickc58@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:3C1416D9.83EF4642@worldnet.att.net...
> One thing more - Just because one claims to be a scientist means just
> that-that's their claim. History is loaded with phony scientists
> "proving" whatever they want proved.
>
>
>

3842. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 04:02:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <664166C7DBDD1F15.5BA0A8356030743E.6D7910B71599D923@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26789

On 09 Dec 2001 22:40:27 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <3C130706.F06E2814@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
>>>
>>> > >Rearrabge the letters in "Santa" and you get "Satan". How convenient!
>>> >
>>> > devil spelled backward is "lived"
>>
>>Devils are a hockey team in NJ.....
>>
>The Jacksonville Jaguars are usually called "Jags"
>
>The Tampa Bay Buccaneers are usually called the "Bucs"
>
>And the members of the Tennessee team.....

Always lose?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

3843. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 04:10:12 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c143686_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 26790

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:013E602DE634ED7F.728E71F50A93391A.E22A1CD3DBCFA789@lp.airnews.net...
> On 09 Dec 2001 05:03:22 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >What too many folks ignore is that we drive so many vehicles so many
miles that
> >we have to import huge amounts of petrol to run them. Paying for that
petrol
> >not only transfers huge amounts of American wealth overseas, but
transfers some
> >of it to the very folks who want to destroy us.
>
> You'll notice, however, that the congress is unwilling to
> legalize the most efficient form of fuel available (hemp oil) for
> production on American farms (we have to import it from Canada if we
> want it). Hemp fuel, first introduced by Henry Ford in 1936 (in an
> automobile built over 40% out of hemp itself), is non-polluting, a
> renewable resource, lower in cost than petroleum products, readily
> extracted from the plant, and can be produced anywhere in the USA.
> Even the Farm Bureau (arguably one of the most conservative
> organizations in the US) has voted unanimously to encourage congress
> to legalize it as a cash crop.
>
> If we REALLY want to reduce dependance on petroleum imports,
> that would be a safe, sane, and forward thinking solution (modern cars
> CAN be converted to run on it--in fact several concept cars are on the
> roads running on it now)--but that's asking WAY too much of our
> congress critters.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Yes, and while I am not up on all the alternative fuels and ideas for
alternative fuels, I am aware that public policy and government process
usually don't coincide with each other on the matter.

I know and admire the folks who continue to try for sound environmental policies and themselves live and sacrifice a great deal to feel their part i n helping out. I gave up. I'm more selfish than they are, obviously.

Kim W5TIT

3844. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 04:40:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209234014.15992.00000443@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26793

In article <3c137e31$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Whew, that's for sure. I know some folks working in downtown with me that,
>if they decided to give DART (Dallas Area Rapid Transit [rapid being *their*
>loosely used term*]) a try, would take about 2 1/2 hours to get to work!
>Then, they'd have to leave a few hours early to get home at a decent hour.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Hmmm -- interesting. However, I don't believe it! In any case, if it
really did take someone 2ï¿½ hours to get to work, then I'd say that
person was more than justified in driving instead of using public
transit. Perhaps some kind of Park and Ride scheme, where the
commuter parked at an outlying bus/train transfer station and rode the
rest of the way in, would be the answer. I'm sure DART has such
a program in effect; most large transit agencies do.

BTW -- I work for the other "DART." My company is called the
Delaware Transit Corporation, but we go by our original name,
DART First State -- DART meaning "Delaware Administration for
Regional Transit." Read all about us at www.dartfirststate.com.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3845. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 04:40:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209234015.15992.00000444@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26791

In article <B815B546EE340A84.76A6B47205F92099.318662A5F3D31C08@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> 2. It is perfectly legal for a completely blind individual to
>obtain a hunting permit--and to hunt--in Michigan. The only
>stipulation is that the hunter MUST be accompanied by another licensed
>hunter who will be responsible for insuring that the blind hunter is
>firing at a legitimate target. The assistant, however, may (as a court
>has ruled!) likewise be blind!
>
> Go figure.
>
> Rick

Hmmm. I think I'd better cancel that deer hunting trip in Michigan!
I don't want to end up tied to the fender of some Michigan blind
hunter's car, as he's driving home from the field!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3846. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 04:40:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209234015.15992.00000445@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26792

In article <C85FB6354CF4D59D.20AAC9A4DB4D29D1.50101C81E308AAF4@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>He only imagines that he has that problem even NOW.
>
> Do I?
>
> Name a _single_ one of the rights enumerated in the first ten
>Amendments to the Constitution (the Bill of Rights) that hasn't been
>abrogated by a Republican government in which a member of the Bush
>dynasty was either Vice President or President.
>
> Just ONE!

Rick:

As far as I know, neither the Bush administration or the Reagan administration
has abrogated anyone's Right To Keep And Bear Arms. As a matter of
fact, it could be said that the Reagan administration, with George Bush
as VP, went a bit overboard in trying to guarantee the Right To Keep And
Bear Arms for the Nicauraguan Contra rebels!

That's ONE!!!

BTW -- I don't know how to check this, but I'm pretty sure the Bush's
haven't forced anyone to house any military troops in their homes, either!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3847. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 04:42:04 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <w2XQ7.150758$WW.9773970@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26794

Larry, I had the opportunity to get comms going in a pinch in the Navy. The problem was that the 'trained' radiomen did not understand front end overloading of a receiver! They reported the station on Rota as 'loud, but garbled'. We got comms going on SSB just fine (that was a first for me - calling 'sparkplug one this is KG6AAY, but, heck, it WAS an emergency and I wan't in charge anyways). However, I must admit after reading (and posting) to the CB newsgroup, that I am rethinking my position on CW. I think we need to turn 10 and 12 meters into CW only (with a bit at the top for the existing 10 meter FM repeaters). AM and SSB will not bother CW communications (even given a 10 dB advantage) and will quickly point out the imposters. Just a thought.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011209105501.15992.00000414@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <%nvQ7.255664$W8.9501361@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "JAMES
> HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Let's be honest. When I was in the Navy, we had to memorize the entire
> >baudot code. Didn't really need it, but reading a lot of uppercase got one
> >to the point you really COULD read uppercase. Rules and regs (safety
> >wouldn't hurt a bit either, both AC mains power as well as rf power) make
> >for a good starting point. I'd be less concerned that an individual know CW
> >than how to get communications going in an emergency.
> >
> >73 from Rochester, NY
> >Jim AA2QA
>
> What better way to get comms going in an emergency than by
> being proficient in Morse/CW?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

3848. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 04:50:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209235008.15992.00000446@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26795

In article <3c142eeb_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Dwight, your hole of ignorance on this topic is so large now, that you've
>fallen in and can't get out. You are so very ignorant of these topics it's
>really not even worth going any farther with you... Go have a safe open
>door meeting.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Dwight:

Wow -- Kim just called you "ignorant!" Man, THAT really hurts!
I'm surprised she didn't include a scathing ROTFLMAO!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3849. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 04:50:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011209235008.15992.00000447@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 26796

In article <9v198i030ms@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
>there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
>bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high speed
>code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
>in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet, he
>drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)
>

Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3850. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 04:59:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112092059.26fa77af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26797
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3C130EAD.6E17C73E@ix.netcom.com>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >
> > >
> > > A Real Ham runs the mode that works on the specific freq at the
> > > specific time, if there's a new one on EME for instance and you need
> > > to log him a Real Ham runs the mode of the moment, doesn't matter if
> > > we're talking 2m or 160m.
>
> EME in 160 meters? I suppose if two ham stations use balloon lifted
> 160 m yagis and operated 1KW CW when the Moon is directly
> overhead..... Of course it would not work on a windy day.
> Going directly up should help punch through the ionosphere. NO
> fair hearing ground wave....
>
>
Aw c'mon, gimmee a break Casey! I missed inserting one lousy period in
my diatribe, go play with a radio.

3851. Re: Attention HAMS, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:03:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C144210.AD8512C6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26798

What was the callsign of the operator aboard the UFO?
Is he good in the callbook? Send him a QSL card?

:-)

3852. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:11:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1443EE.3E08C6A8@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26799

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Never seen policies, other than "thou shalt not"
> > and that's all that need be said. I'll be in my
> > closed door meetings getting some real work
> > done. I don't know what you guys are going to do.
>
> Well, Kim, it's very simple - we leave the doors open. What is it
> you do in the workplace behind closed doors that you cannot possibly
> do behind open doors?
>

They always close the door when you get layed off.
Also when it's review time (where the boss has to
find something you suck at, no matter how good
you are.).

3853. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:16:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C14451C.3F477C32@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26800

>
> >
> >> Well, I wasn't expecting the Spanish Inquisition!
> >
> >NOT THE SPANISH INQISITION!!!
> >
> The best known phrase is:
>
> "NOBODY EXPECTS THE SPANISH INQUISITION!!!"
>
> followed by scenes of torture involving a (dish) rack, being poked with soft
> cushions, and being forced to sit in "the comfy chair".
>

And there was the scene at the end of the show where the inquisidor
gets cut off in the middle of his line....

3854. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:23:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1446ED.D809169@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26851

```
>
>
> >Two wrongs don't make a right.

But 3 wrongs raised to the 4th power DO make a right. :-)

>
>
> See! You CAN pass academic tests! You get a star on your
> paper!
>
> Whoops! I forgot. I can't put that there--it's a satanic
> symbol.
>

We're in big trouble now. There's a certain country that
has 50 of them on its flag. Wait, that's *our* country.
Oh sh*t.....

<darwin><
" "
```

3855. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:27:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1447D6.907EB8AD@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26852

> modern pagans are
> not at all related to those early religions.

Thought the pagans were a motorcycle club....

3856. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:30:00 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <sLXQ7.150799$WW.9779321@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26853

Although not directed at me, I must answer this one. I do NOT work in feet.
If you wish to work in meters-kilograms-seconds or
centimeters-grams-seconds, fine. Just leave me out of the British units,
thanks. What ever you may think, stones and slugs leave me cold. Besides,
radio is a little teensie bit more than constucting a dipole.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9v198i030ms@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011209204556.15992.00000437@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > For those of use who use CW, that's never a problem! Since we had
> > the discipline to learn and gain useful proficiency in a useful
> > communications skill, we are also quite self-sufficient in learning
> > about our equipment, setting it up properly, and getting the most out
> > of it. You think being a Real Ham means plugging the boxes in
> > correctly, getting the mic plugged into the correct receptacle, and
> > coordinating the action of the PTT switch with your mouth. Big
> > Steenking Deal! My 8-year old nephew can do that!
>
> So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
> there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high speed
> code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
> in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet, he
> drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)
>
>
>
>

3857. Re: Attention HAMS, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:30:55 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <jMXQ7.150801$WW.9779425@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26854

Don't sweat it. It's a forge.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C144210.AD8512C6@ix.netcom.com...
>
> What was the callsign of the operator aboard the UFO?
> Is he good in the callbook? Send him a QSL card?
>
> :-)
>

3858. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:35:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1449AE.DE159B95@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26855

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
Sooo -- Kim -- if you could just walk to the corner, board a bus that

> took you to within a block of your workplace, shopping center, or
> whatever, and got you back, all within a reasonable time frame (less
> than 20 min. wait) -- you wouldn't use it? Even if the total cost to
> you was a fraction of the cost of operating your personal automobile...
> and considering the fact that you're already paying for the subsidized
> portion of that public transit service through your state and federal taxes?
> I know one thing for damn sure -- If I could make use of public transit
> in getting myself to and from my work place (which IS the local transit
> agency, BTW!), I would use it! The only thing that prevents me from
> doing so is that the fixed-route busses in my city stop running at 6 PM,
> and I work at least until 8:30 PM every day!

They won't let you drive your bus to your home? I suppose
it'd be too big to fit in the driveway anyway.

I wonder who won that bus they gave away when one
of the TV networks showed the movie "Speed" back
in 1996? And if they still have it.

3859. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:39:06 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <C9D7E7BF83420912.23DCDA8B92444475.CB1CBB6D20029623@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26858

On 10 Dec 2001 04:50:08 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <9v198i030ms@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
>writes:
>
>>Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
>>in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet, he
>>drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)
>>
>
>Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!

Yes, but what constant do you use to get it in furlongs? :)

(We should start really confusing the crap out of people; refer to
bands by their wavelengths in, say, cubits. For UHF, we can use
barleycorns)

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3860. Re: The Morsodist Religion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:45:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C144C0C.1AB1BB10@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26856

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:b7c5262e.0112091705.4c5a6958@posting.google.com...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >
> > > > > And if they say that you are shutting your eyes to reality,
> > > > > you can reply that they are shutting their eyes to Morse.
> > > > >
> > > > > Peace to all of you!
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > >
> > > > Jesus Christ Hans Ham Radio is only a HOBBY!
> > >
> > > > w3rv
> > >
> > Verily I sayeth unto thee, not if thou do-eth it right!
> > Takest thou heed, lest the wrath of Carroll and Roll
> > decendeth upon thy head with holy vigor.
> >
> > May the Morse be with thee,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >
> No, Hans, No! Not the Holy Hand Grenade.

And thou shall count to 3. Thou shall not count to 2
unless thou shall then proceed on to 3. 4 is right
out.

++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
"Man with hole in pocket feel cocky."

3861. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:47:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C144C81.56784D74@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26857

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > I'll start a discount house of worship, next
> > to Target and Kmart.... :-)
>
> Rmart? "R" for religion?
>
>

Heard Bill Sau Hargous beat me to it. He also started "Holyland USA" in Delreo TX, the first religious amusement park....

3862. Re: Smiley Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:49:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C144CFB.6E6E970F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26859
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
>
>
> > Uh oh, sorry gotta run, there's a computer customer up front......back
> later.
>
> And they depend upon *you* to sell them something?
> How ironic.
```

Guess he must work for either Fry's, CompUSA, or Radio Shack....

3863. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:52:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C144D76.9B39492B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26860

Krell wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011209204556.15992.00000437@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > For those of use who use CW, that's never a problem! Since we had
> > the discipline to learn and gain useful proficiency in a useful
> > communications skill, we are also quite self-sufficient in learning
> > about our equipment, setting it up properly, and getting the most out
> > of it. You think being a Real Ham means plugging the boxes in
> > correctly, getting the mic plugged into the correct receptacle, and
> > coordinating the action of the PTT switch with your mouth. Big
> > Steenking Deal! My 8-year old nephew can do that!
>
> So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
> there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high speed
> code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
> in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet, he
> drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)

Uhhh...Krell? 468 is the number generally used. I've seen the 492
figure used for inverted vee antennas. Go sit in the corner with the
old timer.

Dave K8MN

3864. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 05:58:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C144F16.B76C94FD@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26861

Dick Carroll wrote:

> One thing more - Just because one claims to be a scientist means just
> that-that's their claim. History is loaded with phony scientists
> "proving" whatever they want proved.

Like those clowns who came up with "creationism" to get
their religious views into public schools. God wasn't going
to try to tell some ignorant shephards
all about evolution and the Big Bang,
so we ended up with some lame story about Adam and Eve
and apples, etc. Besides, if Adam and Eve were the first
humans, how could they have grandchildern without
their childern doing incest?

In the Catholic church, we don't get bothered by the
theory of evolution.

3865. Re: Attention HAMS, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 06:01:33 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <B84B21FB4CA5ECFC.DA48D0DB0568B644.ABBBA88DFFC77309@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26864

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 00:03:12 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>What was the callsign of the operator aboard the UFO?

Why bother? There are plenty of Uncouth Farting Objects on the
regular bands.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3866. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 06:02:07 UTC
From: stewartx@sccoast.net
Message-ID: <6be98d7d.0112092202.44dc429e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26862

Rick Adams wrote...
>
> But you DO have the alternative (as do I) of
> moving to an area where public transportation
> is available. (snip)

So your suggested solution to the transportation needs of the
elderly is to simply tell them to move where public transportation is
available. Nice guy.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3867. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 06:02:52 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C14500C.90B11EDE@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26863
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Trouser Trout wrote:

> Yes, Landshark knows all about forging people. A search of google will show
> this.
>

"Candygram!"

3868. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 06:22:23 UTC
From: stewartx@sccoast.net
Message-ID: <6be98d7d.0112092222.ac89878@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26865

> Rick Adams wrote
>
> (snip) Provide the specific definition in
> its entirety and the source of the quote.

I've already done so, Rick. The fact that you don't like the
definition is not my problem.

> (snip) I'll accept that ludicrous statement
> WHEN YOU PROVIDE PROOF, not simply because
> you state it--you are wrong FAR too often
> for that. (snip)

Prove it for yourself, Rick. Like I said, walk down any street in
this country and ask people to identify the practices of satanism. I'm
certain 99 percent, both religious and non-religious, would list these
very things (witchcraft, occult, etc). Your choice to argue with me
rather than proving it for yourself strongly suggests you're afraid of
the results.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3869. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 07:11:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C14601F.41A3DC0E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26866

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> No, Dwight, I did NOT identify myself as a
> "liberal." I am a libertarian--if you ar
> too stupid to know the difference, try looking
> in a book (that's one of those things with
> covers, pages, and printed words in case you
> don't have any experience with them). I _agreed_
> that I would accept the "sixties liberal"
> definition of my earlier years--so what?

Well, your political views would certainly not be described by anyone as conservative, so we'll call you a liberal Libertarian instead. Will that make you feel better?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3870. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 07:57:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C146ACF.B9CB6FB1@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26867

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) But, of course, we're not discussing non-
> monogamous relationships as an "issue." The
> relationships, unlike radio frequency allocations
> or licensing laws, is not a public issue in the
> first place--it's a matter of personal choice,
> just as the choice between having children and
> not having children is. (snip)

Nonsense. You didn't claim it was "personal" when you brought it up as an issue for discussion in this public newsgroup. And you're not going to get away with calling it "personal" now that someone has disagreed with your comments about it in this public newsgroup.

> Because, apart from religious prejudice,
> there IS no legitimate reason to claim that the
> behavior is "wrong." (snip)

You really are amazing, Rick. Now you think you have the right to decide what is ligitimate and non-ligitimate when it comes to people's opinions, morals, and social ethics.

> (snip) Beyond that, if you leave religious morality
> out of it what grounds EXIST to view it as either
> "right" OR "wrong?"

A personal belief that it is wrong, Rick. Just like I believe murder is wrong, theft is wrong, and rape is wrong, I also believe non-monogamous relationships are wrong. Are we not allowed to have a personal belief without justifying it with something besides our own personal gut feelings on the matter?

> Taking a "moral stand" indicates the application of
> a set of moral values. (snip) In the case of the
> "morality" of various sexual lifestyles, the ONLY
> possible source for the view that a relationship
> or consensual behavior is "immoral" is religion.

Absurd, Rick. Morality is nothing more than the rightness or wrongness of an action. In other words, no religion is required for morility to exist. And morality (the rightness or wrongness of an action) is commonplace even where religion plays no part. For example, most people in this country believe that "consensual" sex between an adult and a child is wrong, but very few base that on religion. Nor is that belief based on the "nature of the act itself." Instead, it is based on a belief that children have to be protected from an manipulative adult.

> I wouldn't know. As I keep repeating, and you
> appear completely unable to remember, I'm NOT
> A LIBERAL!!!!!!!!!!

Of course you're a liberal, Rick. Nobody in their right mind would call you a conservative. And you're way out there on the left even when compared to the average Libertarian.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3871. Re: Jam the bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 08:00:50 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <SYZQ7.150916$WW.9789945@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26868
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Heck, do what I did 35 years ago when W2OY tried to jam me. Be nice.
Reduce your bandwidth. Any idea as to what 40 WPM of CW will do to an AM
(or SSB) signal? I had a nice 30 minute chat after Mike sat on the
frequency. I can assure you, his blood pressure likely doubled. I still
had a solid QSO for half an hour and didn't even hear him. Nice thing about
CW - it's legal anywhere within the amateur bands.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9uvriomdcd@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Tough Tits Rumpranger" <RumprangerTwiddlesLittle
> Boys@harharharharidiot.com> wrote in message
> news:9uu2ng$6c2$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Poor Twatty Campbell.
>
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:9utti6$s8g$4@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "DT" <DT2314@ncvillage.net> wrote in message
> > > news:23871.0000054@ncvillage.net...
> > > > >
> > > > On Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:20:25 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > So you're saying you're advocating illegal jamming to interfere
> with
> > > > > another ham's QSO. That says a lot about your following Part 97,
> > doesn't
> > > > it?
> > > > > BTW, N4CND was the one using profanity, not W4AMP.
> > > > >
> > > > That's exactly what I'm saying. Just like the CBers, the FCC has
> > > > abandoned enforcement of ham radio rules. If we don't take care of
> > > > ourselves, nobody will. So I'm perfectly willing to jam Dimmy until
> he
> > > > shuts up.
> > >
> > So you're part of the problem, instead of the solution. Vigilanteism
> went
> > > out a long time ago, but, I suppose you're so backward that you still
> > think
> > > it's a viable defense.

> > >
> > > > I'll jam you too if necessary. That's the way it has to be now.
> > >
> > > cc: rholling@fcc.gov.
> > >
> > > We'll see about that.
> > >
> > >
> > Talk tough Roger talk tough, I know it gets all your little
> > radio geek buddies excited. Boy what a collection of radio
> > fruits in the radio groups.
>
> You'll fit right in.
>
>
> > We've come to get to know many
> > of them to where we can post stuff that gets them all
> > excited, like what violations they got from Riley and what
> > radio groups they're in on what freqs.
>
> And too much of a COWARD to post non-anonymously.
>
>

3872. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 08:03:41 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9v1q7s$1n3$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 26869
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C14500C.90B11EDE@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Trouser Trout wrote:
>
> > Yes, Landshark knows all about forging people. A search of google will
show
> > this.
> >
>
> "Candygram!"
>

"Mrs. Mhfhmr?"

--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/
chown -R us /yourbase

3873. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 08:04:57 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9v1qgb$712$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 26870
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<timnebo@aol.comLOL> wins a Tom Ridge Bobblehead Doll for writing in part:

>
> 73 de Tim
> Knight Patrol #82

Forgery or not, I think they're so cute when they make up their own
nicknames like that.

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

Willie <willie@waylonsplace.net> wrote in alabama.sports.auburn: "Because I
know your THE AUTHORITY."

3874. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 08:55:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C147844.D5C00D0A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26871

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> (snip) Let me get this straight. The sites I
> provided dealing with polyamory, swinging, and
> the sociological research surrounding those
> issues are satanic?

Sorry, I had just finished responding to six or seven messages from you about satanism when I wrote that. Of course, it doesn't really make any difference which topic is discussed when it comes to the core of Kim's comments - the accuracy or reliability of information sources. In other words, I addressed her core argument, not the peripherial context.

> I didn't provide you ANY sites dealing with wicca
> or paganism, you idiot--I provided (at your demand)
> sites dealing with polyamory and swinging--as Kim
> CORRECTLY pointed out in her first paragraph.

Idiot? Look, fool, are you going to sit there and claim that you've never overlooked a minor point while addressing a core argument? It doesn't matter whether we're talking about satanisn or non-monogamous relationships when it comes to Kim's argument about the accuracy or reliability of information sources. And, since you obviously knew exactly which sites I was referring to, why would you make such a big issue out of a simple oversite other than to continue your efforts to belittle?

> (snip) Which subject, Dwight? Open marriage (snip) or
> Wicca (snip)

Either one, Rick. I know this is going to surprise you, but your ramblings are not the first I've read on either of these topics. Indeed, most of your comments are nothing more than the repetitive garbage I've read in these newsgroups at least a dozen times before. And, since I've been around for a few years, these newsgroups are not the first time I've seen either of these topic either.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3875. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 09:04:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C147A54.17ECF8D5@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26872

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> ROFLMAO...

What are you laughing about, Kim? I've always been polite enough not to belittle you when you've posted messages that were unrelated the topic being discussed. Heck, at least my message addressed the core issue you raised (the accuracy or reliability of information sources), even if it didn't specifically address the context. Can you honestly say all your messages have even done that? Be careful with your answer, because you just posted a message out of a discussion context last night (public transportation for the elderly).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3876. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 09:12:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C147C56.CFFF9F64@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26873

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > Well, Kim, it's very simple - we leave the doors
> > open. What is it you do in the workplace behind
> > closed doors that you cannot possibly do behind
> > open doors?
>
> Discuss confidential business.

Do you yell when you discuss confidential business, Rick? I've discussed highly classified military information with co-workers without having to hide behind closed doors. What are you discussing that is so secret it cannot possibly be discussed with the door open?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3877. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 09:33:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C14810D.2AFA5CD7@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26874

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> I do what I'm told at work, Dwight. I've *never*
> experienced a male or female boss acting wrongly.
> As I said, I suppose that the companies I've
> worked at have all employed some very adult
> people--because we all seem to be competent to
> have closed door meetings without any problems.

Well, Kim, there is little reason to continue with this - those are your experiences and these are mine (and both are equally legitimate). But I will end with this simple observation - as soon as a complaint is made at your company, or your company hears of something similar in your area, those doors at your company will fly open and remain that way. As I said, it is happening all around the country and your company is pressing it's luck by not paying attention to that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3878. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 09:41:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C148318.61A433F9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26875

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Yeah, and we all know your defintion of "everybody."

Well, what is your definition, Kim? My "everybody" is far more inclusive than your concept of "everybody" - your concept seems limited to just you and Rick.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3879. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 09:46:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C148416.9DDE5F22@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26876

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Gee, that sounds like the argument many of us
> have been making about her call sign.

Does that "us" include me, or are you just lumping me in with everyone else you dislike, Rick? I was defending Kim's choice of callsign long before I ever saw your first message in this newsgroup.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3880. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 10:17:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C148B64.EDA602A1@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26877

Krell wrote:
>
> This only proves that you will adhere to
> any lie that suits your own bias. I think
> I'll save this for future reference. You
> do more damage to your credibility with
> this statement than any of us could
> ever do.

You know, with these constant attacks, my patience is running very thin. I'm not a liar and I don't really give a darn that you think about my credibility. What the heck does my inability to change the English language have to do with my credibility, Krell? You can hear the word "satanic" applied to these people every single day in this country - in books, magazines, movies, music, news stories, conversations, classroom discussions, political debates, and so on. How can I change that? How is my credibility lowered because I don't comply with your (or Kim's or Rick's) made up standard as opposed to the common standard used everyday throughout this country? I'm not a dictator. And, even if I were, I would not promote politically correct double-speak by telling people the words they're allowed and not allowed to use. You three, on the other hand, seem to be rolling in political correctness- they're not satanic, they're wiccans and pagans. What utter nonsense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3881. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 10:35:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C148F8A.D11845BC@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26878

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> So, you see Krell, Dwight *enjoys* spreading rumors.

What rumors, Kim? If you're going to accuse someone by name of something like this, then at least have the integrity to explain your accusation. As I told Krell, you can hear the word "satanic" applied to these people every single day in this country - in books, magazines, movies, music, news stories, conversations, and so on. So how am I spreading "rumors" by repeating the common application of that word as it is used in this English language? Furthermore, Ms. Politically Correct (they not satanic - they're wiccans and pagans), what gives you the thought that you have a right to dictate what words are used in this language? Have you been taking double speak lessons from the book, "1984?"

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3882. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 10:46:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C14922F.DBF2308E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26879

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> What they "claim" genius is that they worship a different set
> of gods than you do. Why CAN'T they do that?

Of course, they "can" do that (that is not saying they ARE doing that, by the way). But that is not all they "claim," is it, Rick? Most wiccans also claim they can do magic (or "magick," as some of them like to use) and other such nonsense? Do you really believe they can, Rick?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3883. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 10:54:34 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Kv0R7.151027$WW.9802948@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26880

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011209235008.15992.00000447@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <9v198i030ms@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell"
<krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
> >there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> >bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high
speed
> >code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
> >in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet,
he
> >drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)
> >
>
> Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

All he knows how to build are quads.

3884. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 11:06:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1496C3.2EE716AD@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26881

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Dwight, your hole of ignorance on this topic
> is so large now, that you've fallen in and
> can't get out. You are so very ignorant of
> these topics it's really not even worth going
> any farther with you... (snip)

Oh, don't leave now, Kim. We've just getting started? If you really believe this wiccan nonsense (which you seem to based on the outrage you expressed above), why don't you ask your wiccan friends if they can do "magick" like so many other wiccans claim? And if they say they can, why don't you ask them to cast a spell to reflect the ill feelings I'm expressing towards them back at me? Of course, if they claim wiccans can't cast spells or do magick, I'll gladly provide you with a long list of books about wiccan "spells and magick." Please, girl, don't even call me ignorant if you're foolish enough to believe in this nonsense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3885. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 11:09:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C14979F.F9F1DE97@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26882

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Wow -- Kim just called you "ignorant!"
> Man, THAT really hurts! I'm surprised
> she didn't include a scathing ROTFLMAO!!!

Oh, I'm simply crushed, Larry. I don't think I'll be able to sleep tonight. By the way, she threw in the "ROTFLMAO" in another message. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3886. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 11:14:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1498D3.3E1D025C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26883

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> Not everyone, Dwight. Only the ignorant.

Well, since that use is so common in this country, Rick, you just called about 90 percent of the population "ignorant." Of course, that is pretty typical for a liberal - liberals always believe they're right while everyone else is "wrong" or "ignorant."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3887. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 11:40:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C149EBC.89342FD8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26884

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> You'll notice, however, that the congress is
> unwilling to legalize the most efficient form
> of fuel available (hemp oil) (snip)

Do you realize how large the fuel demand is in this country, Rick? Crop based fuels are way too inefficient. For example, even if we turned over every bit of the agricultural land in this country to grow a fuel replacement (including all the lands currently used for food production), there is not enough agricultural land available to grow enough of anything to replace more than a small percent of the fuel consumed in this country each year. If we remove the land currently used for food production, there is not enough land left to make even a small dent in the problem. Crop based fuels, even with a crop that can grow most anywhere, is not the answer.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3888. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 11:45:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C14A014.7148E0E5@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26885

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote...
>
> > That sounds about right, Dave. Nobody alive
> > can always understand what Kim is talking about.
>
>
> Dwight, *everybody* knows that people do not
> always understand each other. Good grief.

Huh? What are you trying to say, Kim?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3889. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 13:03:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011210080317.02371.00000167@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 26889

In article <8OTQ7.150465$WW.9749379@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>The older I get the more I appreciate surrealism and that is really what
>Vonnegut, Monty Python, and Joseph Heller did.

Yup. But I've been a fan of them since I was a teenager. Perhaps I was "born
old"?

> The resulting feeling is
>far more interesting than the plot.

The plot exists as a way to get there.

> Same with Bob Dylan (Desolation Row
>is a good example).

Dylan lost it for me when he became so cool that noone could understand a
single word he was singing.

>A naked Yossarian in a tree is not really the issue
>and this is why both Heller's and Vonnegut's books make really crappy
>movies.

Yup. Plus any decent movie version would be way too long to be practical.

>Monty Python movies in print would also stink up the joint.

Actually, their scripts are all available online and in books. But of course
one imagines the movie/TV show when reading the scripts.

>Dali was so
>surrealistic he almost did not have to paint to prove it.

Waddya mean, "almost"?
>
>Dick, Nï¿½BK. Gimme eat, give everybody eat!!
>
No mention of surrealism would be complete without the Firesign Theater, who
are still together and performing. They recently marked their 35th anniversary
by their first TV special (brought to you by Ralph Spoilsport Motors,
Loosener's Castor Oil Flakes, and Bear Whizz Beer ("It's in the water!").

FT are best when listened to, however - true FM radio audio revolutionaries.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3890. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 13:03:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011210080318.02371.00000168@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 26887

In article <3C1447D6.907EB8AD@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> modern pagans are
>> not at all related to those early religions.
>
>Thought the pagans were a motorcycle club....
>
Yup - quite well known in these parts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3891. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 13:03:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011210080318.02371.00000169@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 26888

In article <3C14451C.3F477C32@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>And there was the scene at the end of the show where the inquisidor
>gets cut off in the middle of his line....

Was that Cardinal Biggles, Cardinal Fang or

3892. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 13:03:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011210080320.02371.00000170@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 26886

In article <013E602DE634ED7F.728E71F50A93391A.E22A1CD3DBCFA789@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 09 Dec 2001 05:03:22 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>What too many folks ignore is that we drive so many vehicles so many miles
>that
>>we have to import huge amounts of petrol to run them. Paying for that petrol
>>not only transfers huge amounts of American wealth overseas, but transfers
>some
>>of it to the very folks who want to destroy us.
>
> You'll notice, however, that the congress is unwilling to
>legalize the most efficient form of fuel available (hemp oil) for
>production on American farms (we have to import it from Canada if we
>want it).

"The most efficient form of fuel available"?? How so? Efficiency is largely a function of how a fuel is used.

Can "hemp fuel" be used in modern cars without modification of their fuel systems? How complex is the production process? And how much would the stuff cost at the pump if legalized?

> Hemp fuel, first introduced by Henry Ford in 1936 (in an
>automobile built over 40% out of hemp itself), is non-polluting,

Hold it right there. If it's a hydrocarbon fuel, it produces greenhouse gases like CO2 when burned. If it's used in an internal combustion engine, the process produces other pollutants like nitrogen oxides (NOx) and unburned hydrocarbons (HC).These can be reduced by proper engine and emission control design, but no way is the fuel "non-polluting".

>a renewable resource,

Yup. Like biodiesel, methanol, and wood chips. There are cars and trucks running today on refined vegetable oil. (look up "biodiesel" on any search engine). The problem is that the raw vegetable oil itself, before processing and taxation, costs more than gasoline after processing and taxation. Biodiesel is only practical when there is a source of cheap or free vegetable oil - like waste oil from restaurants.

> lower in cost than petroleum products,

I doubt it. Is it used in Canada? How much does it cost there?

How many gallons of this fuel can be derived from an acre of hemp grown for the purpose? How much fuel must be used to run the machinery that grows the hemp?

> readily
>extracted from the plant,

What is the exact process?

>and can be produced anywhere in the USA.

At what cost?

>Even the Farm Bureau (arguably one of the most conservative
>organizations in the US) has voted unanimously to encourage congress
>to legalize it as a cash crop.

That's nice. You got any hard evidence to back up any of this?

> If we REALLY want to reduce dependance on petroleum imports,
>that would be a safe, sane, and forward thinking solution (modern cars
>CAN be converted to run on it--in fact several concept cars are on the
>roads running on it now)--but that's asking WAY too much of our
>congress critters.

Not really. The trouble with alternative energy solutions is that they are ignored by most of the public.

More than 20 years ago, VW was selling cars that got over 40 mpg in the CITY and well over 50 MPG on the highway. The diesel technology they use has been improved to the point that modern TDIs do even better, both in performance and mileage. But they are a tiny part of the market because most Americans won't buy them.

It will be interesting to see if the Honda Insight and other hybrids do very well in the American market.

Part of the problem is that fuel is so cheap here that it's not a factor in most new-car purchases. A driver who buys a 15 mpg SUV and puts 15,000 miles on it per year will spend $1500 on fuel per year if the fuel costs $1.50. Replacing the gas guzzler with a 30 mpg econobox saves only $750/yr. Considering the price of a new car and the other operating costs, the $750 is chump change for many drivers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3893. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 13:30:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011210083002.08604.00000777@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 26890

>Subject: Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 12/9/2001 9:55 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011209105501.15992.00000415@mb-fc.aol.com>

>
>Sounds like the kind of dumbing-down I'd expect from a liberal,
>gun-grabbing, Socialized-Everything Welfare State.

Speaking of the anti-gun cowrds, has anyone noticed they have been
politely silent since Sept 11th.....

Or are they all down town getting thiers before it's tooo late...?!?!?

Steve

3894. Re: state police license for mobile R/T

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 14:17:34 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <2u3R7.635$Cc1.107995@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 26891

I have myself pursued the MSP permit for my ham gear. I fully understand the ramifications of MCL 750.508 and still felt the need to get the permit. Can you guys honestly tell me that EVERY officer has either a copy of that law with them OR for that matter has a clear understanding of it? Better safe than sorry, and the damned permit only cost me an envelope, stamp and two pieces of paper.

Ryan KC8PMX

<brokenemail@brokenemail.ccm> wrote in message
news:u0qfmi8outhh47@corp.supernews.com...
> Thanks for the reply. So it is a 'get out of jail free' card so to
> say. I agree that having it busy blaring out police calls while he is
> getting your information is a bit like pulling on superman's cape.
>
> I re-read the law MCL 750.508 and you are correct.
>
> Many Thanks,
>
> Wes
>
> KC8SPR
>
> W E S S at G T I I dot C O M
>
>
>
>
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> >
> ><brokenemail@brokenemail.ccm> wrote in message
> >news:u0pmnq911j8c42@corp.supernews.com...
> >> Howdy,
> >> I just got my Technician's license a few days ago (KC8SPR) and
> >> have a hand held for 2m and 70cm as my sole radio. The gent that kept
> >> proding me along to get my license told me that I needed a Michigan
> >> State Police permit to monitor police frequencies in a vehicle.
> >
> >He's dead wrong. You do not need a permit. Your Ham license is enough to
> >grant you the right to monitor all public service frequencies. What he
may
> >have really meant to suggest is getting a signed letter from the Michigan
> >State Police stating you have the right to have a radio in your vehicle
that

> >can receive public service frequencies such as police and fire. The
reason
> >is a few Hams from time to time have found themselves being ticketed, and
> >their radios confiscated by police offices who don't know the law, and or
> >are to lazy to check back with HQ to verify the facts first. They then
have
> >to go through the expense of going to court to get their equipment back.
> >
> >If you don't have a letter then the next best thing is a copy of the
> >applicable state statue, which specifically exempts Hams etc., and the
small
> >copy of your license, which is at the bottom of the main full size
ticket.
> >Keep both with you at all times when out and about monitoring those
public
> >service frequencies.
> >
> >If you're ever stopped and questioned about the radio receiving police
> >calls, be very polite, explain the facts to the officer, then show them
> >either the letter and or the applicable state statue with the copy of
your
> >Ham license. Normally that's the end of it.
> >
> >Of course the really prudent thing to do is to keep the volume down, or
turn
> >off the rig, so the police officer can't hear it, thus saving you the
hassle
> >of answering those questions in the first place.
>

3895. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 14:21:59 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v2gbk02f7j@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26892

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011209235008.15992.00000447@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <9v198i030ms@enews2.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
> >there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> >bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high speed
> >code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
> >in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet,
he
> >drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)
> >
>
> Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

That's based on standard K factor of .95. I've cut antennas using 492 and
they've worked fine.

3896. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 14:41:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v2hff02gj5@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26893

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C148B64.EDA602A1@sccoast.net...
> You know, with these constant attacks, my patience is running very thin.
I'm
> not a liar and I don't really give a darn that you think about my
credibility.

Then I guess you don't expect anyone to take you seriously.

> What the heck does my inability to change the English language have to do
with
> my credibility, Krell? You can hear the word "satanic" applied to these
people
> every single day in this country - in books, magazines, movies, music,
news
> stories, conversations, classroom discussions, political debates, and so
on. How

Strange that I haven't heard anything, other than from certain "Christians."
How about posting some references of these books, magazines, etc.

> can I change that? How is my credibility lowered because I don't comply
with
> your (or Kim's or Rick's) made up standard as opposed to the common
standard

You insist on believing something that is a lie. When presented with facts,
you still adhere to what you've been told. You will only believe that which
enforces your own bias.

> used everyday throughout this country? I'm not a dictator. And, even if I
were,
> I would not promote politically correct double-speak by telling people the
words
> they're allowed and not allowed to use. You three, on the other hand, seem
to be
> rolling in political correctness- they're not satanic, they're wiccans and
> pagans. What utter nonsense.

Satan is not mentioned anywhere in their beliefs or rituals, so how can they
possibly be satanic (or "Satanic")?

3897. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 14:42:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v2hib02gni@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26894

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C148F8A.D11845BC@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > So, you see Krell, Dwight *enjoys* spreading rumors.
>
>
> What rumors, Kim? If you're going to accuse someone by name of something
like
> this, then at least have the integrity to explain your accusation. As I
told
> Krell, you can hear the word "satanic" applied to these people every
single day
> in this country - in books, magazines, movies, music, news stories,

Again, name some specific examples. IOW, put up or shut up.

3898. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 15:27:15 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net>
Message-ID: <nv4R7.2952$VX1.526714049@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 26895
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

LOL!
Thanks Robert, appreciate a little humor.

Landshark

--
"BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C14500C.90B11EDE@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Trouser Trout wrote:
>
> > Yes, Landshark knows all about forging people. A search of google will
show
> > this.
> >
>
> "Candygram!"
>

3899. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 15:43:52 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112100743.391a52c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26896

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C1283B9.C5D59A8B@sccoast.net>...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Ah, the politically "correct" life. I don't subscribe
> > to it. If you guys do, that's up to you. I'll never
> > bend so far as to be ruled by the fearful.
>
>
> Then in many parts of this country, you're simply not going to find
> work today (beyond the basic sales clerk or laborer level). A growing
> number of employers are now resorting to job contracts with a long
> list of rules added and a battery of psychological tests (written and
> verbal) before you're even considered for the job. In other words, you
> either fit the politically correct agenda of the company or you're out
> the door. It's not that bad in the south yet, but it's coming.

I've worked in three very large companies and a couple smaller ones.
While in some of those companies there was training on how to treat and
interact with others, I've never been subjected to any psychological
tests. Further, I don't know of anyone who rigorously avoided contact
in the way you talk about it. And I'm *not* at the sales clerk or
laborer level. And I'm not in the south, as well.

I'm not saying it doesn't happen, but I think it's less common than you
seem to feel.

Sean.

3900. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 15:55:18 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112100755.6f4104e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26897

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C1089E2.83EFA656@sccoast.net>...
> Sean G Gilley wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote..
> > >
> > > Deterrence is only one aspect of the
> > > death penalty - it also serves as just
> > > punishment for a serious crime [...]
> >
> > Out of curiosity, could you explain why
> > killing someone is a just punishment
> > for a crime?
>
>
> Well, killing someone who has wrongly killed certainly seems like an
> equitable, and therefore just, punishment. Why would you see that as unjust?

So, if a hit and run accident causes the loss of a leg and one
kidney to a victim, then then driver that caused that accident
should therefor have his leg amputated and one kidney removed?

An "eye for an eye" is not what our system of justice is based
upon. If it were, then scenerios like the above would be common.

Nor is it what most western religions teach.

Sean.

3901. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 15:55:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C14DAE8.11249ACC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26898

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >Well, let me ask you this, Rick. Why are children born to American
> >parents more valuable human beings than children born to parents
> >in other countries? To be consistent, you have to advocate welfare
> >for all the children of the world, not just for American children.
>
> I do. But at the expense of _their_ governments, not ours.

But Rick, their governments often just let them die of starvation.
Don't you care about anybody except Americans? Why does an accident
of birth make an American child more valuable than a child in
Botswana? Why are you such an elitist?

The bottom line is that the Libertarian view of poor people in the
US is *exactly* the same as your view of poor people in other countries.
You say the poor people in other countries are someone else's
responsibility. Libertarians agree with you and extend that same
identical concept to poor people in this country. The difference
is quantitative, not qualitative.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3902. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:01:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C14DC3D.B7423B05@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26899

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Never seen policies, other than "thou shalt not"
> > and that's all that need be said. I'll be in my
> > closed door meetings getting some real work
> > done. I don't know what you guys are going to do.
>
> Well, Kim, it's very simple - we leave the doors open. What is it
> you do in the workplace behind closed doors that you cannot possibly
> do behind open doors?

You have got to be kidding, Larry. Would you like the whole company
to know how you did on your yearly review? Would you like the whole
company to know about the latest technological secrets? A host of
things need to be kept confidential. Leaving a door open during a
confidential meeting at Intel was grounds for termination.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3903. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:04:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C14DD06.266BF9E6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26900

Rick Adams wrote:
> Right now, our schools are often violent, frequently a joke
> academically, and only occasionally more interested in academics than
> in sports standings. Those need to change.

The problem is those things cannot change as long as the government
is running things. The government is the cause of those things.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3904. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:10:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C14DE6B.52D1246B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26952

Rick Adams wrote:
> Yet you want to privatize prisons, law enforcement, fire
> departments, social security, and other programs.

Libertarians DO NOT want to privatize any governmental function
required to protect the inalienable rights of citizens. That
includes law enforcement. I really wish you would alleviate
your ignorance of what Libertarians believe.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3905. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:10:26 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C14DE91.E5716688@gte.net>
Source record: 26955
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > The normal procedure, when a police officer
> > is uncertain of a law, is to assume that the
> > civilian is in the wrong.
>
> Yeah Ok just because you say it doesn't make it so. What do you know of
> normal police procedure? Sounds Like not much.
>

I work for a governmental agency.
Plus I have a number of friends who
are LEOs who I serve with in the
military reserves.

I know procedure. And I know rookie
cops. When in doubt, arrest.

>
> >As one cop told me, you can always unarrest a guy. If he acts like a
> jerk, >well then "everyone is a sinner, it is just a matter of finding the
> right sin".
>
> You watch to much TV!
>

That came from a buddy who is
a Chicago cop and how is a captain
in the Army Reserves.

> > Cops do survive doing this. Often they are
> > backed up by the courts.
>
> Yes the conspiracy theory!

You have not been in court lately, have you?
The cops see their main duty in getting people
into court. At that point they see that they have
done their job and it is the courts' job to determine
who was correct.

Cops are very hard nosed these days. What I
am trying to get across is that the average cop
does not know who you are, does not care. If
you give him any grief over your "rights", he calls
in back up, arrests you and then lets the courts
settle. This is exactly what most of my cop buddies

say that they will do if they are uncertain about
a law. They see it as court problem, not theirs.

3906. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:10:54 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <i85R7.290107$W8.9721109@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26951

> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

> >NOT THE SPANISH INQISITION!!!
> >
> The best known phrase is:
>
> "NOBODY EXPECTS THE SPANISH INQUISITION!!!"
>
> followed by scenes of torture involving a (dish) rack, being poked with
soft
> cushions, and being forced to sit in "the comfy chair".

And, of course, they had some sweet little old lady sitting there taking the
'abuse'...

> Also worthy of a peek are the "Blackadder" series....

"I have a cunning plan, my lord..."

also poetry...

"Row row row your boat
Gently down the stream
Belts off, trousers down,
Isn't life a scream!"

and...

EDMUND
a poem by Queenie*

When the night is dark,
And the dogs go 'bark';
When the clouds are black,
And the ducks go 'quack';
When the sky is blue,
And the cows go 'mooo';
Think of lovely Queenie,
She'll be thinking of you.

(* William Shakespeare helped with the title)

I was going to quote my favorite... but the shmucks around here wouldn't
like the use of that word... ;-)

Rich

3907. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:15:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C14DF98.34881B34@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26954

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> What are you discussing that is so secret it cannot
> possibly be discussed with the door open?

The HP/Intel shared computer architecture? Discuss that with
an open door and you will be escorted to the open door without
delay.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3908. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:16:26 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C14DFFB.BC29D225@gte.net>
Source record: 26953
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> And I will not argue with him on the scene. If he ignores my license, fails
> to find out, or know, the procedure I will see the SOB in court IF he takes my
> equipment. He WILL get in trouble because part of that equipment was
> purchased with Department of Defense funds. He damn well better produce it in
> the same condition it was in prior to confiscation or he will answer to
> someone lots more "connected" than me. Don't tell me a cop is above the law
> he is sworn to enforce and, therefore, I "can't" get him in trouble for
> falsely taking private property because he ":thinks" the civilian is wrong.
>
> I don't get into arguments with cops--I know better. But you better believe
> that whatever legal avenues I have against a Rambo cop, I WILL use them. Hey,
> I am a vindictive person, what can I say? LOL!
>
> Jerry
> K4KWH

Before you go off half cocked, go talk to
your attorney. I think that you might get
an education. For one thing, you would
have a hard time winning a wrongful arrest
lawsuit. The cops will add other charges so
that they will get you on something which
makes you less creditable in front of the
court and the jury.

If you have not noticed, any time that the cops
arrest someone, they have multiple charges so
that they are guaranteed that they will get the
guy on something!!

3909. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:22:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C14E150.B735FAB3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26957

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Hans where da hell ya been for the last 30 years???
> > >
> > Hey Dick, here's something I got from a URL on drudgereport.com.
> > >
> > "A SCIENTIST has observed homosexual behavior in
> > wild orang-utans for the first time, adding the great apes
> > to the long list of animals that take part in same sex
> > relationships. Homosexual behavior has been observed in almost
> > every species of animal including dolphins, hedgehogs,
> > kangaroos, sheep, whales, albatrosses, chimpanzees
> > and gorillas. Dr Fox published her observations in the
> > American Journal of Primatology."
>
> Ya suppose the good Dr Foxx is a charter member of Lesbos Unlimited and
> is trying her dead level best to proved it "normal"? Seems to be
> fashionable amongst them. You Too?

Everytime you get caught with your pants down, you resort to
ad hominem attacks. You are just too predictable, Dick. I
certainly hope you wake up to reality before you die.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3910. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:24:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112100824.41cfdc2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26956

"K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com> wrote in message news:<#uesCOHgBHA.1868@cpimsnntpa02>...

>
> There is more homebrewing and kitbuilding going on in amateur radio
> today that there has been since the late 50's.
>
On a ham per-capita basis?? I very much doubt that, the totals might
be up but ham radio has also grown fivefold +/- since the late 50s.
Kit-building does not qualify as the "tinkering" and "experimenting"
techo ham radio of yore, not even close. Pop the plastic, follow the
yellow brick road and ya have a minimalist's delight at best.
>
>
Where is all this "homebrewing"?? Get yer eyes tested, I don't see any
such thing. Hombrewing can't touch the bang for the buck the Japs are
delivering via HRO & AES and without getting wrapped into soddering
arns. 50s ham radio is dead and gone and so is it's set of necessities
which were the *only* reasons
hams homeberewed more of their gear back then. Diddling licensing
requirements ain't gonna fix your disatisfaction with the lack of
soddering arn activity today. That's just the way it is.
>
>
> (ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
w3rv

3911. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:24:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C14E1B9.9DF71B2E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26959

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> One thing more - Just because one claims to be a scientist means just
> that-that's their claim. History is loaded with phony scientists
> "proving" whatever they want proved.

That's right, Dick, reject all science with which you don't agree.
You are the reincarnation of one of the guys who put Galileo under
house arrest for asserting that the earth was not the center of
the universe.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3912. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:25:11 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C14E1FA.9C51912D@gte.net>
Source record: 26958
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
>
>
> > However, and this goes for every community,
> > if the cop does stop you and does ask about
> > your radios then he might assume that you
> > are there to interfere with him.
>
> Why would he assume this? What reason have you given him to think this?
>

I give the average cop no reason to expect such
behavior from me. For one thing, I work for a
governmental agency. But guys like you, over
weight and looking like rednecks, scare the shit
out of them. And the typical ham often does not
look like an urban professional.

> >Newbie cops can be a bit paranoid. They do not like any
> > civilian who acts out of the normal.
>
> And neither do I but your proof of newbie cops is a highly exaggerated .
>

I work with them. Are you are cop? What
big city do you live in?

And when was the last time you have been
in court? I get to watch court cases.

>
> >And radio nuts are like gun nuts, not normal.
>
> Yes you are proving this .
>
> > It is not that the cops are corrupt. It is that they
> > are fearful. Too many lose cannons in society.
> > Too many drug dealers, terrorists, and just pain
> > old farts with big mouths. Too many guys who
> > see themselves above the law.
> >
> > All it takes is one shooting, like the one up in Goshen
> > last night, and every cop within 200 miles is on high
> > alert. Given what happened on Sept. 11th, they are
> > now looking for those who might be terrorists. And
> > a car full of ham gear looks very suspicious. Given
```

> > that many hams are gun owners as well, and you might
> > have a young cop who is going to over react.
>
> What is your beef with "young cops" Young cops are more in tuned to
> electronics etc than the old cops. Cops use 2 to 3 different radios, walkie
> talkies and yes even scanners in the cars radios so they are not exactly
> foreign to them
>

The average cop is not all that technical. Most are
former high school athletes. They are more into the
action than the technology. Also the average cop is
somewhat isolated from the rest of us. Too easy to
sit in the air conditioned squad car than getting out
and talking to folks (community policing).

But most do not like you having a radio that can
listen to them. They would love to have all police
communications encrypted.

> >
> > Just look at Cincinnati. They take young men from the
> > suburbs who have been told all their lives to stay out of
> > certain neighborhoods, especially after dark and make them
> > cops. Then their first assignment is those exact neighborhoods.
> > Guess what? You have a fearful, inexperienced cop
> > in a place where he is totally out of his league. Guess
> > what happens? He winds up over reacting and shooting
> > some young black guy. Which results in a riot as it did
> > last spring.
> >
> > Guys, you live in a too sheltered life.
>
> Sorry Charlie I deal with hundreds of cops a week I wouldnt call that
> sheltered.

Give examples? How big a department are
you dealing with? I deal with state police and
two local departments that each have over
2000 LEO's.

3913. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:31:24 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C14E36B.BE76C0BA@gte.net>
Source record: 26961
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >
> > It does happen. And cops are going to be on edge
> > with the aftermath of Sept. 11th. A ham, with a
> > car full of radios, does look like a terrorist.
>
> Thats funny where have you heard that? I havent seen a bolo stating that.
>
> >Given that hams are often gun owners, and you might
> > have a gung ho young cop who wants to make
> > a name for himself.
>
> Can you cite and specific refrences that state how many Hams are gun owners
> or are you shooting this off the top of your head again.
>

In my state, Indiana, the average ham radio
operator also has a concealed weapons permit.
Most of the hams I know have one. And I
have see the same practice in other states.
However the west coast does seem to have
more hams who are anti gun. But in my experience,
hams are also big into guns.

>
> >
> > Besides profiling has been going on with blacks
> > for sometime now.
>
> Yes as well as other criminal they are profiled daily. In order to make the
> streets more safe.
>
> > It is really bad on the east
> > coast, from Boston right down to Florida. The
> > cop does not know you. For all he knows, you
> > are a trouble maker.
>
> Nor do you know the cop, For all he knows you are a decent person unless you
> give him a reason to think otherwise.
>

Ask your cop buddies. Cops do not think that
way. They assume that every traffic stop is
going to go bad. In fact most cops I know say
that it is dangerous to assume that anyone they

meet is "decent". They see too many bad guys.
Besides even decent folks have a bad day.

> >Shooting your mouth off just makes it worst.
> > And remember, gun owners have had to deal
> > with this for some time now.
>
> Had to deal with what shooting there mouth off?

Shooting your mouth off refers to defending your rights
if pulled over by a cop. That is the last thing they want
to hear. That is sure way to wind up in front of a judge.

3914. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:33:46 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C14E40F.51A14E01@gte.net>
Source record: 26960
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

> >> >> > > > > The police have near zero ability to determine what is or isn't
> >> >> > > > > a legal rig for any service...CB, ham, FRS, private radio, etc.
> >> >> > > > >
> >> >> > > > > Actually they can. It is the type acceptance
> >> >> > > > > plate on the back of the radio. If it is not there,
> >> >> > > > > then make the arrest.
> >> >> > > >
> >> >> > > Bullshit. None of my ham radios have a "type acceptance plate"
> >> >> > > on the back, or anywhere else. Neither do yours. Lot's of
> >> >> > > folks besides me drive my vehicles. Should they be arrested?
> >> >> > >
> >> >> > > You're out to lunch on this one!
> >> >> >
> >> >> > That is what happens in my state with respect
> >> >> > to firearms. If you do not have a license, and
> >> >> > are caught with a firearms in a vehicle, then
> >> >> > you are arrested. That even goes for family
> >> >> > members.
> >> >>
> >> >> What state do you live in? Russia? Sure must suck
> >> >> to be you! Here they look at you suspiciously
> >> >> if you _don't_ have at least a deer rifle in the car!
> >> >
> >> >Indiana. We have one of the most pro gun set of
> >> >laws in the country. One of the oldest personal
> >> >protection permits. But you had better have a
> >> >permit if you have a handgun in the vehicle.
> >> >
> >> >Rifles and shotguns are a bit different. Even a kid
> >> >can have one, if he has written permission from his
> >> >parents. But too many have gone to jail because
> >> >dad left his handgun in the car.
> >>
> >> All not relavant since the rules/laws for possession
> >> of radios is not at all similar. Indeed, no state has a
> >> law that requires having a license to have any of the
> >> CB radios or FRS radios. A few (less than 10) states
> >> prohibit having a radio receiver capable of receieving
> >> police (public frequencies) in the car.
> >
> >And how does that young cop know that you
> >are not some type of terrorist?
>

> He doesn't and he'd better not think having
> a radio constitutes any probable cause to begin with.
>
> >All those radios
> >could be used to spy on the police so that you
> >can try to overthrow the US government.
>
> Even if true, what would you want...ban all
> radios from cars?
>
> >That is how young cops think. It is worst in
> >LA or NYC, but it happens everywhere.
>
> And that type of "young cop" attitude/behavior should
> be stopped.
>
> >Look at how blacks are profiled. It seems that
> >"driving while black" is a crime in many big cities.
>
> What's the relavence? Are you now saying anyone with a
> radio is being profiled?

Given the events of Sept 11th, yes.

3915. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:49:18 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <il5R7.290121$W8.9722709@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26962

> Krell writes:

> >So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
> >there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> >bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high speed
> >code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
> >in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet,
he
> >drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011209235008.15992.00000447@mb-

> Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!

Larry, that's for the driven element of a yagi.

Hey Krell...

"Do you believe in 'Deja Vu'???" ;-)

Rich

3916. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 16:57:41 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <9Q5R7.290130$W8.9724346@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26963

"JAMES HAMPTON" wrote

> Although not directed at me, I must answer this one. I do NOT work in
feet.
> If you wish to work in meters-kilograms-seconds or
> centimeters-grams-seconds, fine. Just leave me out of the British units,
> thanks. What ever you may think, stones and slugs leave me cold.
Besides,
> radio is a little teensie bit more than constucting a dipole.

Okay then... for you the answer is 149.9... ;-)

Rich

> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:9v198i030ms@enews2.newsguy.com...
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20011209204556.15992.00000437@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > > For those of use who use CW, that's never a problem! Since we had
> > > the discipline to learn and gain useful proficiency in a useful
> > > communications skill, we are also quite self-sufficient in learning
> > > about our equipment, setting it up properly, and getting the most out
> > > of it. You think being a Real Ham means plugging the boxes in
> > > correctly, getting the mic plugged into the correct receptacle, and
> > > coordinating the action of the PTT switch with your mouth. Big
> > > Steenking Deal! My 8-year old nephew can do that!
> >
> > So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
> > there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> > bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high
speed
> > code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
> > in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet,
he
> > drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)

3917. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 17:08:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112100908.71ff5a44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26964

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<8OTQ7.150465$WW.9749379@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...

> The older I get the more I appreciate surrealism and that is really what
> Vonnegut, Monty Python, and Joseph Heller did. The resulting feeling is
> far more interesting than the plot.

For nice examples of near-current media surrealism:

- The TV series "Ally McBeal" has done some really good stuff with
special effects expressing how the characters feel. The earlier
seasons had more of this.

- Just saw the film "Amelie" which has some great cinematic surreal
touches.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3918. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 17:09:10 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <kb9tmp@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9v2q9j$t7q$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 26965

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C144F16.B76C94FD@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > One thing more - Just because one claims to be a scientist means just
> > that-that's their claim. History is loaded with phony scientists
> > "proving" whatever they want proved.
>
> Like those clowns who came up with "creationism" to get
> their religious views into public schools. God wasn't going
> to try to tell some ignorant shephards
> all about evolution and the Big Bang,
> so we ended up with some lame story about Adam and Eve
> and apples, etc. Besides, if Adam and Eve were the first
> humans, how could they have grandchildern without
> their childern doing incest?
>
> In the Catholic church, we don't get bothered by the
> theory of evolution.
>

I'd rather have Adam and Eve as grandparents than to
have Bonzo and Cheetah the Chimp as ancestors!!!
--

'73' From KB9TMP

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com
_____

3919. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 17:12:17 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <R16R7.290145$W8.9724563@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26966

> Krell wrote:

> > So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
> > there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> > bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high
speed
> > code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
> > in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet,
he
> > drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)

"Dave Heil" wrote

> Uhhh...Krell? 468 is the number generally used. I've seen the 492
> figure used for inverted vee antennas. Go sit in the corner with the
> old timer.

Uhhh... Heil? 468 is the number used for a FOLDED dipole. Actually, 491.8
is the CORRECT value.

Rich

3920. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 17:20:51 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <T96R7.290152$W8.9725945@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26967

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112100908.71ff5a44@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<8OTQ7.150465$WW.9749379@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
>
> > The older I get the more I appreciate surrealism and that is really
what
> > Vonnegut, Monty Python, and Joseph Heller did. The resulting feeling
is
> > far more interesting than the plot.
>
> For nice examples of near-current media surrealism:
>
> - The TV series "Ally McBeal" has done some really good stuff with
> special effects expressing how the characters feel. The earlier
> seasons had more of this.
>
> - Just saw the film "Amelie" which has some great cinematic surreal
> touches.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Unfortunately, Ally McBeal in general has slid off the scale into the
toilet.

3921. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 17:24:41 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <td6R7.290155$W8.9725644@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26968

> Dick Carroll wrote:

> > One thing more - Just because one claims to be a scientist means just
> > that-that's their claim. History is loaded with phony scientists
> > "proving" whatever they want proved.

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C144F16.B76C94FD@ix.netcom.com...

> In the Catholic church, we don't get bothered by the
> theory of evolution.

True, and concerning the study of the creation of the universe. Pope John Paul II told Stephen Hawking that his studies of this were just fine. Although, he did say, he shouldn't get involved in what took place before the big bang!!! ;-) (sounds reasonable to me)

Stephen Hawking has answered the question, what happened before the big bang, to be like examining what's north of the north pole. (It just isn't going to happen)

Rich

3922. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 17:27:14 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <A2EEDB88BE7FB038.87868B44DAFA681D.DF994CBA2B9B4235@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26970

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 17:12:17 GMT, "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net>
wrote:

>Uhhh... Heil? 468 is the number used for a FOLDED dipole. Actually, 491.8
>is the CORRECT value.

Taken directly from the current Tech question pool:
T9A01 @N9A01 (D)
How do you calculate the length (in feet) of a half-wavelength dipole
antenna?
D. Divide 468 by the antenna's operating frequency (in MHz) [468/f
(in MHz)]

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3923. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 17:34:00 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <cm6R7.290167$W8.9727029@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26969

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C148318.61A433F9@sccoast.net...

> Well, what is your definition, Kim? My "everybody" is far more inclusive
than
> your concept of "everybody" - your concept seems limited to just you and
Rick.

Your 'everybody' is simply said, naive.

Rich

You people are boring me to tears. :^

3924. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 17:54:30 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <qF6R7.290175$W8.9728322@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26971

> Richard McCollum writes

> >Dali was so
> >surrealistic he almost did not have to paint to prove it.

"N2EY" wrote

> Waddya mean, "almost"?

When I see a picture of him I always think... "This guy IS surrealism personified" A true caricature of himself. ;-)

I have a Salvador Dali screensaver and people just sit a watch it...

I have a complaint... why is it we can buy calendars with impressionism themes but NEVER with surrealism themes.

> No mention of surrealism would be complete without the Firesign Theater, who
> are still together and performing. They recently marked their 35th anniversary
> by their first TV special (brought to you by Ralph Spoilsport Motors,
> Loosener's Castor Oil Flakes, and Bear Whizz Beer ("It's in the water!").

I saw the show last week. nice to see what they look like. I had a few of their albums and they stayed close to the material but added quite a few new things too...

> FT are best when listened to, however - true FM radio audio revolutionaries.

"If you lived here you'd be home now..."

Rich

3925. Is this politically Correct???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 17:57:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <HI6R7.157348$WW.9830415@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26972

In view of the ongoing discussion of Kim's juvenile callsign, let me relate the unfortunate case of Central Missouri State at Warrensburg. For a number of good geographical reasons, their male sports teams have been known since Custer was a 1st lieutenant or so as Mules.

Now a mule is the sterile offspring of a union between a mare horse and a male donkey. While I guess that there are technically male and female mules, the discussion is rather pointless. So what do you do when Mulette just don't cut it?

After what had to be a bruising discussion, CMS female sports teams are known as Jennies -- a female donkey is a jenny. But that has the effect of making the male teams Jackasses. Is this PC???

Next we will deal with the burning case of the Pittsburgh (KS) State Gorillas when Girlilla won't do the job.

Dick N&#65533;BK

3926. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 18:17:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112101017.4f4fdaab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26973

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C149EBC.89342FD8@sccoast.net>...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > You'll notice, however, that the congress is
> > unwilling to legalize the most efficient form
> > of fuel available (hemp oil) (snip)

At least 10 states are considering farm bills to permit growing
"industrial" hemp.

> Do you realize how large the fuel demand is in this country, Rick? Crop based
> fuels are way too inefficient.

I looked for info on the web but as yet have not found anything that
states how many barrels/acre can be obtained by bioenergy farming. It
should be noted that many analyses compute yield by counting the
entire biomass harvested, most of which does not yield liquid fuel.

>For example, even if we turned over every bit of
> the agricultural land in this country to grow a fuel replacement (including all
> the lands currently used for food production), there is not enough agricultural
> land available to grow enough of anything to replace more than a small percent
> of the fuel consumed in this country each year. If we remove the land currently
> used for food production, there is not enough land left to make even a small
> dent in the problem.

Most of the land currently used for food production can't be used for
energ production without impacting food supplies and prices. Just not
an option.

> Crop based fuels, even with a crop that can grow most
> anywhere, is not the answer.

Not "the" answer, but maybe part of "an" answer.

It should be noted that most biofuel efforts are in the area of
biodiesel, which has several advantages over conventional petrodiesel
fuels. And many of the disadvantages, too. But the main problems are
glossed over:

1) how much would a gallon of mass-produced biodiesel cost at the
pump?
2) how many acres of land would have to be in biofuel production to
make a significant dent in petroleum imports?
3) how do you get Americans to use biofuels in large enough quantities
to matter?

You are right to be skeptical. I'm old enough to remember when we were promised things like George Jetson aircars and nuclear power that would be "too cheap to meter".

The problems of energy supply, and their solutions are complex, and many Americans want quick/simple/cheap answers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3927. Re: Is this politically Correct???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 18:23:01 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <947R7.290190$W8.9730289@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26974

Richard McCollum wrote

> After what had to be a bruising discussion, CMS female sports teams are
> known as Jennies -- a female donkey is a jenny. But that has the effect
> of making the male teams Jackasses. Is this PC???

Do you remember the old Jenny gas stations? The slogan was... "it kicks"
(or some such)...
If we went there, for gas, we would just say... "I'm going to the town
pump"... tell me was that PC??? ;-)

Rich

3928. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 18:40:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C150185.D6E5CF5D@uci.edu>
Source record: 26976

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:3C111E41.BDCDDAB8@uci.edu...
> >
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Man, you got that right, Dwight. Hrrrmpphhh.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > You think Dwight is right that the United States is like Afghanistan?
> > Get real, Kim.

> I don't think Dwight is saying the United States is like Afghanistan,
> therefore I cannot possibly think he is right about it.

He said all you have to do is replace the names, and one is the same as
the other.

> I believe Dwight's
> observation is that, depending on what side one is on, one always feels the
> victim and one always is the offender.

That's nice - and very imaginative.

3929. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 18:41:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1501E8.44833CCF@uci.edu>
Source record: 26975

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 13:58:52 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >He only imagines that he has that problem even NOW.
>
> Do I?
>
> Name a _single_ one of the rights enumerated in the first ten
> Amendments to the Constitution (the Bill of Rights) that hasn't been
> abrogated by a Republican government in which a member of the Bush
> dynasty was either Vice President or President.
>
> Just ONE!
>
> Rick

What in the hell are you talking about, Rick? Do you know? I sure
don't.

3930. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 18:59:31 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <nC7R7.217787$3d2.10032174@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26977

> > Robert Casey, wa2ise, wrote:

> > > I'll start a discount house of worship, next
> > > to Target and Kmart.... :-)

> Heard Bill Sau Hargous beat me to it. He also
> started "Holyland USA" in Delreo TX, the first
> religious amusement park....

Heh, heh. Is Don Imus still doing that bit? It
was pretty funny when I first heard it back in the
70's.

The proper name for the religious institution is:

The Church of the Gooey Death
and Discount House of Worship

where it was touted that "One dollar 'offered' there
was the same as two dollars at your regular retail
religious outlet".

The Right Reverend Doctor Billy Sol Hargis got his
name from combining those of Billy Sol Estes, a notorious
West-Texas agricultural-loan-fraud perpetrator with
that of a certain Oklahoma right-wing radio evangelist
named Hargis who was caught 'in flagrante delicto'
with one of his young male followers.

Del Rio, Texas is just across the Rio Grande from
Villa Acuna, Coahuila, Mexico, home to radio station
XERA which, during the late 30's, ran an output power
of about 900 kW and touted 'Doc' Brinkley's goat-gland
operation as a cure for male impotence.

Lotsa historical allusions in the creation of the
character.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

3931. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 19:08:11 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <EK7R7.109456$S93.5817695@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26978
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Maybe so. There are still laws against unlawful search and seizure. And, as I said before, in reference to the seizure of my radio equipment, he will be in deep doo doo when he confiscates my radio that was purchased with DoD funds. ASSuming that a civilian is in the wrong is a sure way to get sued for false arrest. While I have never been arrested in my life, nor have I ever given a LEO a reason to hassle me, I have been talked to in a most disrespectful manner, and treated like I didn't know what I was about. A cop is NOT the arbitor of truth; just because he "thinks" you did something doesn't make it so. I am, however, somewhat vindictive, a trait I inherited from my Dad's side. I cannot STAND to be acused of something I did not do, nor to be falsely hassled, inconvenienced, or unfairly caused to lose time or money. While most people would not pursue the matter, I, OTH, would be searching the law for a way to get the SOB back legally. With the military VHF radio I have in addition to my ham equipment, having that "stolen" at gunpoint WOULD be something the LEO would wish he had never done. While the LEO has "friends" in the courts, I have friends in the military and at the State level (if the seizure takes place in my state). I would NOT let the matter rest.

73

Jerry

N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C14DE91.E5716688@gte.net...
> > > The normal procedure, when a police officer
> > > is uncertain of a law, is to assume that the
> > > civilian is in the wrong.
> >
> > Yeah Ok just because you say it doesn't make it so. What do you know of
> > normal police procedure? Sounds Like not much.
> >
>
> I work for a governmental agency.
> Plus I have a number of friends who
> are LEOs who I serve with in the
> military reserves.

>
> I know procedure. And I know rookie
> cops. When in doubt, arrest.
>
>
> >
> > >As one cop told me, you can always unarrest a guy. If he acts like a
> > jerk, >well then "everyone is a sinner, it is just a matter of finding
the
> > right sin".
> >
> > You watch to much TV!
> >
>
> That came from a buddy who is
> a Chicago cop and how is a captain
> in the Army Reserves.
>
>
> > > Cops do survive doing this. Often they are
> > > backed up by the courts.
> >
> > Yes the conspiracy theory!
>
> You have not been in court lately, have you?
> The cops see their main duty in getting people
> into court. At that point they see that they have
> done their job and it is the courts' job to determine
> who was correct.
>
> Cops are very hard nosed these days. What I
> am trying to get across is that the average cop
> does not know who you are, does not care. If
> you give him any grief over your "rights", he calls
> in back up, arrests you and then lets the courts
> settle. This is exactly what most of my cop buddies
> say that they will do if they are uncertain about
> a law. They see it as court problem, not theirs.
>
>

3932. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 19:12:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C150924.625E2F45@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26979

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > Robert Casey wrote:
> > >
> > > I'll start a discount house of worship, next
> > > to Target and Kmart.... :-)
> > >
> > > Rmart? "R" for religion?
> > >
> > >
>
> Heard Bill Sau Hargous beat me to it. He also
> started "Holyland USA" in Delreo TX, the first
> religious amusement park....

Actually, Don Imus may have come up with the idea as early as late 1971. One of his KEXL (San Antonio) bits (as the Right Reverend Billy Sol Hargis, Church of the Gooey Death, Del Rio, Texas) exhorted listeners to send for info on opening a drive through church and baptismal car wash.

Dave K8MN

3933. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 19:14:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C150997.679458AD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26980

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote...
> >
> > But you DO have the alternative (as do I) of
> > moving to an area where public transportation
> > is available. (snip)
>
> So your suggested solution to the transportation needs of the
> elderly is to simply tell them to move where public transportation is
> available. Nice guy.

It isn't original with Rick. The late Sam Kinnison advised folks to
stop sending food to Ethiopa. His answer was to send suitcases and
airline tickets so the hungry could come to where the food is.

Dave K8MN

3934. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 19:22:28 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <UX7R7.157416$WW.9836013@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26981

"Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:nC7R7.217787$3d2.10032174@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> > > Robert Casey, wa2ise, wrote:
>
> > > > I'll start a discount house of worship, next
> > > > to Target and Kmart.... :-)
>
> > Heard Bill Sau Hargous beat me to it. He also
> > started "Holyland USA" in Delreo TX, the first
> > religious amusement park....
>
> Heh, heh. Is Don Imus still doing that bit? It
> was pretty funny when I first heard it back in the
> 70's.
>
> The proper name for the religious institution is:
>
> The Church of the Gooey Death
> and Discount House of Worship
>
> where it was touted that "One dollar 'offered' there
> was the same as two dollars at your regular retail
> religious outlet".
>
> The Right Reverend Doctor Billy Sol Hargis got his
> name from combining those of Billy Sol Estes, a notorious
> West-Texas agricultural-loan-fraud perpetrator with
> that of a certain Oklahoma right-wing radio evangelist
> named Hargis who was caught 'in flagrante delicto'
> with one of his young male followers.
>
> Del Rio, Texas is just across the Rio Grande from
> Villa Acuna, Coahuila, Mexico, home to radio station
> XERA which, during the late 30's, ran an output power
> of about 900 kW and touted 'Doc' Brinkley's goat-gland
> operation as a cure for male impotence.
>
> Lotsa historical allusions in the creation of the
> character.
>
>
>
> --

> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona

As the resident genius on radio preachers, can you identify this one (I can't):

The Railway Express agent position in El Paso was for years the worst because of a preacher named O. O. ????????? who claimed to do resurrections. Every morning the agent would present a half-dozen or so coffins which would be duly refused and he had to ship granny back where she came from. Tammy Faye got her start with this dude so it can't have been all that long ago.

Dick NBK

3935. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 19:25:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C150C33.EF7FF739@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26982

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > Krell writes:
>
> > >So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
> > >there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> > >bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high speed
> > >code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
> > >in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet,
> he
> > >drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011209235008.15992.00000447@mb-
>
> > Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!
>
> Larry, that's for the driven element of a yagi.
>
> Hey Krell...
>
> "Do you believe in 'Deja Vu'???" ;-)

Rich, the 468 figure is for a dipole. The yagi DE length can be very
different, i.e. when applying a hair pin match.

Go sit in the corner with Krell and the other guy.

Dave K8MN

3936. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 19:26:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C150C80.B3092979@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26983

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > Krell wrote:
>
> > > So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring debate,
> > > there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> > > bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high
> speed
> > > code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a frequency
> > > in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in feet,
> he
> > > drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote
>
> > Uhhh...Krell? 468 is the number generally used. I've seen the 492
> > figure used for inverted vee antennas. Go sit in the corner with the
> > old timer.
>
> Uhhh... Heil? 468 is the number used for a FOLDED dipole. Actually, 491.8
> is the CORRECT value.

As I said earlier: Go sit in the corner with the other two.

Dave K8MN

3937. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 19:27:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C150CA5.8F265F4B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26984

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH wrote:
>
> On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 17:12:17 GMT, "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Uhhh... Heil? 468 is the number used for a FOLDED dipole. Actually, 491.8
> >is the CORRECT value.
>
> Taken directly from the current Tech question pool:
> T9A01 @N9A01 (D)
> How do you calculate the length (in feet) of a half-wavelength dipole
> antenna?
> D. Divide 468 by the antenna's operating frequency (in MHz) [468/f
> (in MHz)]
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

Thank you.

Dave K8MN

3938. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 19:34:52 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <C78R7.109624$S93.5823321@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26985
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government funds and does NOT come
under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be using, then he WILL be in trouble. First of
all, just my Amateur license alone exempts me from his jurisdiction. HE HAS NO AUTHORITY
TO SEIZE OR ARREST BASED ON MY USE OF RADIO ALONE. IF I act like a smartass,
a jerk, or threaten and cuss him, yes, disorderly conduct, and other charges could be added to
haul me in. Secondly, the State authorities are not going to be happy to find themselves involved
in a USAF CID investigation as to what happened to the equipment. Have YOU ever been in
military logistics? I have. Have you ever seen a property audit where there was suspected mis-
appropriation of materiel? Trust me, it ain't a pretty sight. My supervisor, a Captain, once screened and signed for a lot of small 110V generators. They were not supposed to be placed on
open requisition. USAF CID swooped down on our Hq to inventory those generators, and we had to return them. It, however, was not our mistake; it was the mistake of the LGO at the materiel yard, but it didn't make us feel any better; we went around with a high pucker factor for over 2 weeks while they audited us!

I know you are in denial (seems to me you must have a VERY close association with LEOs or ARE one), but the incident with the young ham in Kentucky illustrated this very thing: the way the
laws are written, both on scanners and local CB enforcement, cops have NO jurisdiction over hams. If he has a question about a radio, the license is to stop him in his tracks. If he pursues the issue, the court WILL overrule him: it HAS to. As long as I do not resist him in any way, and the issue is strictly radio, then he has not one leg to stand on. It ":might" be risky to bring bogus charges in order to facilitate an arrest. That could cause an investigation of the department and bring questions of corruption and over-zealous cops. I also have a cousin and some friends that work in the national news media. I wouldn't hesitate to have "certain" news personalities bring adverse publicity to said department; like I said--I am very vindictive when wronged.

73

Jerry

N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C14DFFB.BC29D225@gte.net...
> > And I will not argue with him on the scene. If he ignores my license,
fails
> > to find out, or know, the procedure I will see the SOB in court IF he
takes my
> > equipment. He WILL get in trouble because part of that equipment was
> > purchased with Department of Defense funds. He damn well better produce
it in
> > the same condition it was in prior to confiscation or he will answer to
> > someone lots more "connected" than me. Don't tell me a cop is above the
law
> > he is sworn to enforce and, therefore, I "can't" get him in trouble for
> > falsely taking private property because he ":thinks" the civilian is
wrong.
> >
> > I don't get into arguments with cops--I know better. But you better
believe
> > that whatever legal avenues I have against a Rambo cop, I WILL use them.
Hey,
> > I am a vindictive person, what can I say? LOL!
> >
> > Jerry
> > K4KWH
>
> Before you go off half cocked, go talk to
> your attorney. I think that you might get
> an education. For one thing, you would
> have a hard time winning a wrongful arrest
> lawsuit. The cops will add other charges so
> that they will get you on something which
> makes you less creditable in front of the
> court and the jury.
>
> If you have not noticed, any time that the cops
> arrest someone, they have multiple charges so
> that they are guaranteed that they will get the
> guy on something!!
>
>

3939. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 20:05:21 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C151581.A41CACB9@uci.edu>
Source record: 26987

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > I hope you're right. The answer that most Americans
> > support is "build more roads" which doesn't solve
> > the problem.
>
> The problem with that is many cities are simply running out of space
> to build more roads. You can only stack roads so high, and pile on so
> many cars, before the whole thing becomes a waste of time and money.
> At a certain point, the only solution is going to be public
> transportation. Sadly, in the meantime, we're stuck with all the
> existing problems (fuel comsumption, pollution, traffic jams, road
> rage, and so forth).

> I think we need some kind of hybrid system - low cost electric cars
> for short distances, with public transportation for longer distances
> (and low cost electric rental cars in every city for travelers). This
> gives people the freedom to travel locally, but ends many of the
> problems mentioned above.

The best solution is the transporter they have on Star Trek - or -
eliminate the need for anyone to go anywhere. Otherwise, we can expect
to have only what best serves our needs.

3940. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 20:08:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C151620.A5441928@uci.edu>
Source record: 26988

Rick Adams wrote:
> You'll notice, however, that the congress is unwilling to
> legalize the most efficient form of fuel available (hemp oil) for
> production on American farms (we have to import it from Canada if we
> want it). Hemp fuel, first introduced by Henry Ford in 1936 (in an
> automobile built over 40% out of hemp itself), is non-polluting, a
> renewable resource, lower in cost than petroleum products, readily
> extracted from the plant, and can be produced anywhere in the USA.
> Even the Farm Bureau (arguably one of the most conservative
> organizations in the US) has voted unanimously to encourage congress
> to legalize it as a cash crop.

You've got one of those suits made entirely from hemp, don't you Rick.
;-)

3941. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 20:08:12 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <2CD77A301AF336CE.E4D9F3159D905A58.691D7393E0612A2F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 26986
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 14:34:52 -0500, "Jerry Oxendine"
<joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:

>IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government funds
>and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be
>using, then he WILL be in trouble.

If it is on the list, I suspect the DOD would have some rather nasty
words for his superiors.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3942. When are you birds gonna admit I was right?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 20:20:06 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0112101220.211e17b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26989

Until a wholesale revamping of the licensing structure is made, reinstituting incentive licensing, and bringing the US Amateur Radio Service into the modern era, and attracting younger members by focusing on modern communication methods and privileges...

1) Amateur membership will continue to decline(told ya that the spike in membership, right after the overdue restructuring regarding the demphasis of the archaic Morse Code, was just temporary).

2) There will eventually be more Extras than Generals(now - all of you birds who couldn't see the trend in the 2nd degree equation, and disagreed with me so vehemently will now have to admit I was right on this one too, because even from the 1st degree linear trends it is now obvious!).

Eventually, something like my Communicator/Colt license proposals WILL be implemented... mark my words.

Stewart - N0MHS

3943. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 21:02:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1522F1.B614A6FF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26990

```
"Jim Bromley, K7JEB" wrote:
> Del Rio, Texas is just across the Rio Grande from
> Villa Acuna, Coahuila, Mexico, home to radio station
> XERA which, during the late 30's, ran an output power
> of about 900 kW and touted 'Doc' Brinkley's goat-gland
> operation as a cure for male impotence.

Hey Jim, are you sure that wasn't XERF?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

3944. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 21:10:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1524D3.7660E5A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26991

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> For those of use who use CW, that's never a problem! Since we had
> the discipline to learn and gain useful proficiency in a useful
> communications skill, we are also quite self-sufficient in learning
> about our equipment, setting it up properly, and getting the most out
> of it.

Actually, the FCC has gone on record as seeing no correlation between
Morse code skill and self-sufficiency or any other positive attribute.
Morse code skill stands alone and is uncorrelated to anything else.
Virtually all of the troublemakers on HF are coded hams. The great
majority of NALs are given to coded hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3945. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 21:17:06 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v38ma023lo@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26993

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C150C33.EF7FF739@earthlink.net...
> Richard Plourde wrote:
> >
> > > Krell writes:
> >
> > > >So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring
debate,
> > > >there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> > > >bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high
speed
> > > >code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a
frequency
> > > >in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in
feet,
> > he
> > > >drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20011209235008.15992.00000447@mb-
> >
> > > Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!
> >
> > Larry, that's for the driven element of a yagi.
> >
> > Hey Krell...
> >
> > "Do you believe in 'Deja Vu'???" ;-)
>
> Rich, the 468 figure is for a dipole. The yagi DE length can be very
> different, i.e. when applying a hair pin match.
>
> Go sit in the corner with Krell and the other guy.
>
> Dave K8MN

492 is for a *true* half-wavelength. It's 468 when multiplied by the .95
constant, which has become an accept standard. I've seen 462 used when
making a folded dipole from 300-ohm twin lead.

So I guess you're sitting in the corner with the rest of us, if you insist
that yours is the only right answer.

3946. Re: Where is KT4TR???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 21:28:27 UTC
From: Frank Todd <k3eko@nospam.nidhog.net>
Message-ID: <%N9R7.4564$7y.12352@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 26992

Why do u want to know? Are you in love with him?

Frank K3EKO

"Ed Norton" <haaaynorton@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011209155820.20564.00001240@mb-mm.aol.com...
> Where is that sawed off, pot bellied, drunken, lying asshole???
>
> "Something Stinks"
> Ed Norton Sewer Expert

3947. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 21:36:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C152AE4.41E9F043@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26994

WW - KB9TMP wrote:
> I'd rather have Adam and Eve as grandparents than to
> have Bonzo and Cheetah the Chimp as ancestors!!!

Thus divorcing yourself from the beautiful experience of being linked to all life on earth. It gives me extreme pleasure to know I share 90% of my DNA with my dog and 50% on my DNA with a banana. I am kin to the trees that I climbed as a child. Actually, Homo sapiens are one of four surviving great apes, who share ancestors with the chimps but are obviously not direct descendants of the chimps. After all, we and chimps are 1% different and are only genetic cousins.

Just as Copernicus and Galileo shot down the religious beliefs concerning the position of the earth in the universe, DNA will shoot down the religious beliefs concerning our divine immaculate creation. If God had a hand in it at all, it was a pretty small hand. Multiplying the brain size by two times was a pretty small change in the DNA.

If God did create Homo sapiens, He didn't create us from dust unless that dust contained some primate DNA. He created us from a Homo genus that already existed. And He sure as hell didn't do it 120 hours after He created the heavens and the earth.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3948. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 21:39:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C152B9E.B3472A0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26995

Richard Plourde wrote:
> Uhhh... Heil? 468 is the number used for a FOLDED dipole. Actually, 491.8
> is the CORRECT value.

Depends on the VF of the wire. Bare copper wire is different from insulated
copper wire. Both are different from free space.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3949. On the ignorance of learned men (Was:Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 21:49:01 UTC
From: K0HB <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <uihIYRcgBHA.1620@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 26996

From KB9TMP

> Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> -Peer's Law

I don't know who "Peer" is, but that isn't "Peer's Law". It is a direct quote from the Book of Bokonon, the "Bible" of the religion Bokononism.

In Cat's Cradle, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., created a new religion, Bokononism. The holy scripture of Bokononism was the ever-growing "Books of Bokonon", written by Bokonon -- a British Episcopalian Negro from the island of Tobago whose real name was Lionel Boyd Johnson -- as a way to distract the people of San Lorenzo from their pitiful lives. What is sacred to Bokononists? Not God; just one thing: man.

Here is another excerpt from the first Book of Bokonon, roughly equivalent to "Genesis".

In the beginning, God created the earth, and he looked upon it in His cosmic loneliness.

And God said, "Let Us make living creatures out of mud, so the mud can see what We have done." And God created every living creature that now moveth, and one was man. Mud as man alone could speak. God leaned close as mud as man sat up, looked around, and spoke. Man blinked. "What is the purpose of all this?" he asked politely.

"Everything must have a purpose?" asked God.

"Certainly," said man.

"Then I leave it to you to think of one for all this," said God.

And He went away.

Now I suppose all the Christians here will descend on me, saying "Hans will go
to hell." Well, it's their hell, not mine, so they can go to hell. I don't have the proper instructions.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

The Last Rites of the Bokononism

(Each line is said once by the person giving the rites and
then repeated by the dying person.)

God made mud.

God got lonesome.

So God said to some of the mud, "Sit up!"

"See all I've made," said God, "the hills, the sea, the sky, the stars."

And I was some of the mud that got to sit up and look around.

Lucky me, lucky mud.

I, mud, sat up and saw what a nice job God had done.

Nice going, God.

Nobody but you could have done it, God! I certainly couldn't have.
I feel very unimportant compared to You.

The only way I can feel the least bit important is to think of all the
mud that didn't even get to sit up and look around.

I got so much, and most mud got so little.

Thank you for the honor!

Now mud lies down again and goes to sleep.

What memories for mud to have!

What interesting other kinds of sitting-up mud I met!

I loved everything I saw!

Good night.

I will go to heaven now.

I can hardly wait...

3950. Re: Where is KT4TR???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 22:01:18 UTC
From: dafirebottle@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011210170118.16610.00001409@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 26997

>Subject: Re: Where is KT4TR???
>From: "Frank Todd" k3eko@nospam.nidhog.net
>Date: Mon, Dec 10, 2001 3:28 PM
>Message-id: <%N9R7.4564$7y.12352@rwcrnsc54>
>
>Why do u want to know? Are you in love with him?
>
>Frank K3EKO

Well well, if it isn't Big Al's lap puppet Frankie the Toad.

I don't think Ed is in love with 'ol tingly rectum, he just wants to flush the turd out.

Now, go away little boy you annoy me.

Firebottle

3951. Re: Go Ahead, Send Me Another JOCKSTRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 22:01:56 UTC
From: voobner@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <fbc7a2.0112101401.3dae9e59@posting.google.com>
Source record: 26998
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jeez Sharkie, how come we didn't see any of this *righteous outrage*
and elaborate traces when they were forging Leland Scott in the recent
"Damn Code" thread?

-Aaron-

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGloboil.Net> wrote in message
news:<CsQQ7.2766$0X6.383342742@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> Forge:
> America Online, Inc. (NETBLK-AOL-MTC)
> 10600 Infantry Ridge Road
> Manassas, VA 20109
> US
>
> Netname: AOL-MTC
> Netblock: 64.12.0.0 - 64.12.255.255
>
> Coordinator:
> America Online, Inc. (AOL-NOC-ARIN) domains@AOL.NET
> 703-265-4670
>
> Domain System inverse mapping provided by:
>
> DNS-01.NS.AOL.COM 152.163.159.232
> DNS-02.NS.AOL.COM 205.188.157.232
>
> Record last updated on 16-Dec-1999.
> Database last updated on 8-Dec-2001 19:54:49 EDT.
>
> This person, along with a couple others have been
> doing troll activities for the past year. All they do is
> accuse & harass and cause hate & discontent.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

3952. here I am

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 22:17:00 UTC
From: kt4truntdrunk@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011210171700.16610.00001414@mb-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 26999

Who's looking for me?

I've been in an alcholic dry out clinic.

Drunken Bobby KT4TR

3953. Re: Where is KT4TR???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 22:36:17 UTC
From: leaky oil filled capacitors <itmrogers3@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <BNaR7.1259$5K4.170225@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27000

"Firebottle" <dafirebottle@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011210170118.16610.00001409@mb-bj.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Where is KT4TR???
> >From: "Frank Todd" k3eko@nospam.nidhog.net
> >Date: Mon, Dec 10, 2001 3:28 PM
> >Message-id: <%N9R7.4564$7y.12352@rwcrnsc54>
> >
> >Why do u want to know? Are you in love with him?
> >
> >Frank K3EKO
>
> Well well, if it isn't Big Al's lap puppet Frankie the Toad.
>
> I don't think Ed is in love with 'ol tingly rectum, he just wants to flush the
> turd out.
>
> Now, go away little boy you annoy me.
>
> Firebottle

Now now now! You be nice to Frankie Mr. Firebottle.
I like cute little twinks like Frankie ooooohhhhhh!

3954. the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 22:46:12 UTC
From: leaky oil filled capacitors <itmrogers3@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <UWaR7.1287$5K4.173096@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 26901
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Was listening to K1MAN's bulletin broadcast
and heard Barry's ac4vo's fine comments to
Glen. Barry appears to be a gentleman and articulate
arbitrator. Good job Barry! While his interview was playing
btwn 3-4PM Central time though, some nutcase comes up
with music playing and all the other stuff to try to
re-ignite this dumb radio war! Sheesh! Can't you music
playing cb'er a-holes turn the radio OFF for a few weeks?
Let this thing work! We don't need a repeat performance of
something like the old 14.313 Wars again cause it will only
spread all over 20 then onto 75.

3955. Re: Attention HAMS, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 22:52:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C153C9E.825251EE@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26902

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:

> Don't sweat it. It's a forge.
>

I realize that, I'm just goofing on him....
I suppose you're goofing on me.....

73s Bob

3956. Re: When are you birds gonna admit I was right?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 22:54:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C153D2F.4C895760@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26903

>
> 2) There will eventually be more Extras than Generals

Isn't that what the FCC would hope for/expect? That
most hams would eventually learn enough to upgrade
to the top. And they didn't dumbdown the writtens....

3957. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 22:56:55 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C153DD6.25A71427@gte.net>
Source record: 26904
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> Maybe so. There are still laws against unlawful search and seizure. And,
> as I said before, in reference to the seizure of my radio equipment, he will
> be in deep doo doo when he confiscates my radio that was purchased with DoD
> funds. ASSuming that a civilian is in the wrong is a sure way to get sued for
> false arrest. While I have never been arrested in my life, nor have I ever
> given a LEO a reason to hassle me, I have been talked to in a most
> disrespectful manner, and treated like I didn't know what I was about. A cop
> is NOT the arbitor of truth; just because he "thinks" you did something
> doesn't make it so. I am, however, somewhat vindictive, a trait I inherited
> from my Dad's side. I cannot STAND to be acused of something I did not do,
> nor to be falsely hassled, inconvenienced, or unfairly caused to lose time or
> money. While most people would not pursue the matter, I, OTH, would be
> searching the law for a way to get the SOB back
> legally. With the military VHF radio I have in addition to my ham equipment,
> having that "stolen" at gunpoint WOULD be something the LEO would wish he had
> never done. While the LEO has "friends" in the courts, I have friends in the
> military and at the State level (if the seizure takes place in my state). I
> would NOT let the matter rest.
>

Unless you are very rich, you may not have
the political connections to really make a
difference. And it would take a bundle of
money to pursue a court battle.

Again, talk this over with your attorneys.
I think that you might get "an education".

3958. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:03:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C153F3E.82DD8D5E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26905

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> He said all you have to do is replace the names,
> and one is the same as the other.

That's right, Jim - within the CONTEXT of what you said about propaganda. I said nothing about the countries being the same in any other way.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3959. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:04:52 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C153FB1.42DF2CD1@gte.net>
Source record: 26906
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government funds
> and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be using,
> then he WILL be in trouble. First of all, just my Amateur license alone
> exempts me from his jurisdiction. HE HAS NO AUTHORITY TO SEIZE OR ARREST
> BASED ON MY USE OF RADIO ALONE. IF I act like a smartass, a jerk, or threaten
> and cuss him, yes, disorderly conduct, and other charges could be added to
> haul me in. Secondly, the State authorities are not going to be happy to
> find themselves involved in a USAF CID investigation as to what happened to
> the equipment. Have YOU ever been in military logistics? I have. Have you
> ever seen a property audit where there was suspected mis-appropriation of
> materiel? Trust me, it ain't a pretty sight. My supervisor, a Captain, once
> screened and signed for a lot of small 110V generators. They were not
> supposed to be placed on open requisition. USAF CID swooped down on our Hq to
> inventory those
> generators, and we had to return them. It, however, was not our mistake; it
> was the mistake of the LGO at the materiel yard, but it didn't make us feel
> any better; we went around with a high pucker factor for over 2
> weeks while they audited us!
>
> I know you are in denial (seems to me you must have a VERY close association
> with LEOs or ARE one), but the incident with the young ham in Kentucky
> illustrated this very thing: the way the laws are written, both on scanners
> and local CB enforcement, cops have NO jurisdiction over hams. If he has a
> question about a radio, the license is to stop him in his tracks. If he
> pursues the issue, the court WILL overrule him: it HAS to. As long as I do
> not resist him in any way, and the issue is strictly radio, then he has not
> one leg to stand on. It ":might" be risky
> to bring bogus charges in order to facilitate an arrest. That could cause an
> investigation of the department and bring questions of corruption and
> over-zealous cops. I also have a cousin and some friends that work in the
> national news media. I wouldn't hesitate to have "certain" news personalities
> bring adverse publicity to said department; like I said--I am very vindictive
> when wronged.

You might win. Then your superiors in the CAP
might find that you are "political liability" and drop
you like a hot rock.

I am well aware of military logistics. I was the NCOIC
for command group at KKMC for LTG Pagonis (22nd
SUPCOM) during the Gulf War. Property book accounting
was a big issue, especially after the combat phase.

The problem is that you have an idealistic view of the law. In reality, it does not work that way. If he feels it justified, a cop can just impound your vehicle, radios and all. They do it to drug dealers all the time.

What you have to learn is that cops do not see you as any different than any street punk. To most cops, all civilians are dangerous. Unless you live in a small county, most cops do not know who you are or "how important" you are. You are just someone they stop and they will approach you as if you are a possible murder. It is safer that way.

3960. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:07:12 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C15403F.46BA3B1@gte.net>
Source record: 26908
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government funds
> >and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be
> >using, then he WILL be in trouble.
>
> If it is on the list, I suspect the DOD would have some rather nasty
> words for his superiors.

These days, DOD often rolls for the local
community. If you are uniform then a superior
will relieve the local jail of your person then
confine you to quarters. As you folks are
civilians who are a bit less than reservists,
you really do not have that much "covering
fire".

Again, you guys really need to talk to your
lawyers to understand how modern American
courts really work.

3961. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:08:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C154058.F2A1728A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26909

>
> > Then in many parts of this country, you're simply not going to find
> > work today (beyond the basic sales clerk or laborer level). A growing
> > number of employers are now resorting to job contracts with a long
> > list of rules added and a battery of psychological tests

Do companies even bother with those, considering how easy it is to
"throw" them? I remember long ago having to take one of those
tests, and questions like "Do you steal stuff?", "Do you
cheat?", and such. Any moron would know what answer to
give if they really wanted the job.

Nowdays, companies do "behavioral interviewing". Which just
turns out to be a method used to see if the job turns you on, and
be interested in it. If the job doesn't turn me on, I really don't
want to waste my time anyway. I can't do work that sucks...
I'd rather do something I'm into, I'll get better raises etc.

3962. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:08:30 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <OfbR7.297670$5A3.115599360@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 26907
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message

> I work for a governmental agency.

Which means your an expert on Police procedure across the country?

> Plus I have a number of friends who
> are LEOs who I serve with in the
> military reserves.

> I know procedure. And I know rookie
> cops. When in doubt, arrest.

Again this is just your over exagerated opinion, nothing more. I think elephants can fly to but hey thats my opinion. What procedure do you know? So now you know all rookie cops, simply amazing are you psycotic ... Opps typo I mean psychic.....

>
> >

> That came from a buddy who is
> a Chicago cop and how is a captain
> in the Army Reserves.

More opinions and heresay! With no basis for fact.

> You have not been in court lately, have you?

Yes as a matter of fact i have.How about you?

> The cops see their main duty in getting people
> into court. At that point they see that they have
> done their job and it is the courts' job to determine
> who was correct.

It is the Cops job to enforce the laws that are out in our society, It is there job to get criminals off the streets, if they had the choice they would rather not have to go to court or arrest anyone.

>
> Cops are very hard nosed these days. What I
> am trying to get across is that the average cop
> does not know who you are, does not care. If
> you give him any grief over your "rights", he calls
> in back up, arrests you and then lets the courts
> settle.

They also are under alot of scrutiny these days, in NJ the State Police are under a lot of scrutiny all motor vehicle stops are video recorded and the stops are reviewed by the federal Government. So "they" are not arresting people who complain about their rights. They are arresting people because they violated a Law. Most cops are well aware of what peoples rights are within the letter of the law. Do exceptions happen of course they do but the brush you are painting with is far to wide and just your opinion.

This is exactly what most of my cop buddies
> say that they will do if they are uncertain about
> a law. They see it as court problem, not theirs.

This says it all :: snipped fron N9NWO's qrz page.

I have served for over 30 years in politics. I have been a precinct committeeman, a delegate to the State Party convention several times and just finished a term as a member of my local township board.

3963. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:10:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1540E8.72D11E82@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26910

>
> Do you yell when you discuss confidential business, Rick? I've discussed
> highly classified military information with co-workers without having to hide
> behind closed doors. What are you discussing that is so secret it cannot
> possibly be discussed with the door open?
>

Salaries? Doing that out in the open really pisses off management.
Once when I got downsized, I told everyone what salary I was
paid. A little payback.... ;-)

3964. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:13:24 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u1ag92np0v5h3c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 26911
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

what? i missed the war? damnit! how did K1MAN come up with the idea of these bulletins anyway?

> some nutcase comes up with music playing and all the other stuff to try to
> re-ignite this dumb radio war!

lol. um, what kind of music was it? hopefully something like led zeppelin. :p

> something like the old 14.313 Wars again cause it will only
> spread all over 20 then onto 75.

tell us more about these wars! i had no idea they existed till a few days ago... what happened on 14.313? spill the beans. maybe i should get my license and cause 'a great distrubance in the force'... do Obi Wan proud.

phil :)

'some jack#$$ keeps playing led zeppelin'

3965. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:18:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1542B7.B547B016@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 26912

Jim Kelley wrote:

>
>
> The best solution is the transporter they have on Star Trek

Now if Bell Labs could actually develop such a machine.
It would look like a phone booth, including a touchtone
keypad you'd use to dial the phone number of where you
want to go. Then you'd be beamed there.

But don't think of what obscene phone calls would turn into... :-)

3966. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:20:32 UTC
From: Your Friend Bill <"Remove The NO In The Reply Address"@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <3C154340.CDBE7E16@coqui.net>
Source record: 26913
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

phil wrote:
>
> what? i missed the war? damnit! how did K1MAN come up with the idea of these
> bulletins anyway?
>
> > some nutcase comes up with music playing and all the other stuff to try to
> > re-ignite this dumb radio war!
>
> lol. um, what kind of music was it? hopefully something like led zeppelin.
> :p
>
> > something like the old 14.313 Wars again cause it will only
> > spread all over 20 then onto 75.
>
> tell us more about these wars! i had no idea they existed till a few days
> ago... what happened on 14.313? spill the beans. maybe i should get my
> license and cause 'a great distrubance in the force'... do Obi Wan proud.
>
> phil :)

14.313 (and a sizable chunk of 75 meters) were turned over to the
'Citizens Radio Service" about the time SSB became into popular
use...and have gone downhill from there.

:-)
Bill

3967. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:27:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1544BB.296B7FD4@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26914

Sean G Gilley wrote:
>
> I've worked in three very large companies and
> a couple smaller ones. While in some of those
> companies there was training on how to treat
> and interact with others, I've never been
> subjected to any psychological tests. Further,
> I don't know of anyone who rigorously avoided
> contact in the way you talk about it. And I'm
> *not* at the sales clerk or laborer level. And
> I'm not in the south, as well.

When you applied for the job, you were not asked about your opinions about working with others, your experiences working in certain situations, how you would handle certain situations, and so forth? These are all psychological test questions designed to reveal your physical (nervous, etc) and verbal (confident, evasive, etc) reactions. And I would find it very hard to believe an employer would hire you for anything more than a laborer position without knowing exactly how you would deal with his customers and employees. Likewise, since it is now federal law, I would be equally surprised if your company had no specific sexual harassment guidelines as a condition of employment.

You said some companies had training on "how to treat and interact with others." None of that training addressed workplace dating and sexual harassment? If you were hired in a management position, you were not expected to be aware of the laws and issues concerning sexual harassment in the workplace? This (workplace law, including sexual harassment) is basic training in most college business courses today.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3968. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:47:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C15496C.BF25B965@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26915

CAM wrote:
>
> The HP/Intel shared computer architecture? Discuss
> that with an open door and you will be escorted to
> the open door without delay.

Yes, often executives will get together as a group to discuss company business behind closed doors, but rarely are two employees expected to meet behind closed doors to discuss such things. In fact, if we're talking about product development, private discussions about such information would be looked at with suspicion in most companies. Indeed, that (two employees meeting privately) is one of several key things security personnel are taught to look for.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3969. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-10 23:57:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C154BEF.6CF6EC10@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26916

CAM wrote:
>
> You have got to be kidding, Larry. Would you like
> the whole company to know how you did on your
> yearly review? Would you like the whole company to
> know about the latest technological secrets? A host
> of things need to be kept confidential. Leaving a
> door open during a confidential meeting at Intel
> was grounds for termination.

First of all, you responded to me, not Larry, Cecil. Anyway, do you talk so loudly when discussing a yearly review - so loudly the "whole company" would know? And what "technological secrets" would you discuss that the employees just outside your door, often your own staff working on that very technology, would not be allowed to hear? And I seriously doubt your claim about Intel?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3970. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 00:07:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C154E47.59645791@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26917

Krell wrote:
>
> Then I guess you don't expect anyone to take
> you seriously.

When it comes to you, I most certainly don't expect that, Krell.

> Strange that I haven't heard anything, other
> than from certain "Christians." How about
> posting some references of these books,
> magazines, etc.

Then you've been living in a cage for the last several decades.

> You insist on believing something that is a
> lie.

It is not a lie, Krell.

> When presented with facts, you still adhere to
> what you've been told. You will only believe
> that which enforces your own bias.

It is a "fact" that this (using the word "satanic" to describe those who claim to engage in these practices) is common usage in the English language. What I've been told by you, Kim, and Rick, goes directly against that fact.

> Satan is not mentioned anywhere in their beliefs
> or rituals, so how can they possibly be satanic
> (or "Satanic")?

Already answered several times, Krell - they claim to engage in practices that are described as "satanic" in this culture.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3971. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 00:09:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C154EBA.F07EA50E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26918

Krell wrote:
>
> Again, name some specific examples. IOW, put up or shut up.

Do your own research, Krell. I have no time for someone who is too blind to see what is widely available right in front of their own face.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3972. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 00:12:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C154F3F.96718046@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26919

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> The best solution is the transporter they have
> on Star Trek (snip)

Exactly. Sadly, problems like this are much easier to solve on television than they are in real life.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3973. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 00:21:43 UTC
From: radiosigs <radiosigs@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9v3n0g$g6g$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 26923
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Better watch out there friend or you'll be asked to contribute to Herbie's
latest defense fund. It's coming.

In article <u1ag92np0v5h3c@corp.supernews.com>, "phil" <phil@phil.com>
wrote:

> what? i missed the war? damnit! how did K1MAN come up with the idea of these
> bulletins anyway?
>
>> some nutcase comes up with music playing and all the other stuff to try to
>> re-ignite this dumb radio war!
>
> lol. um, what kind of music was it? hopefully something like led zeppelin.
> :p
>
>> something like the old 14.313 Wars again cause it will only
>> spread all over 20 then onto 75.
>
> tell us more about these wars! i had no idea they existed till a few days
> ago... what happened on 14.313? spill the beans. maybe i should get my
> license and cause 'a great distrubance in the force'... do Obi Wan proud.
>
> phil :)
>
> 'some jack#$$ keeps playing led zeppelin'
>
>
>

3974. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 00:30:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C15536F.42973A21@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26920

N2EY wrote:
>
> You are right to be skeptical. I'm old enough to
> remember when we were promised things like George
> Jetson aircars and nuclear power that would be
> "too cheap to meter".

The reason I'm so skeptical is because my wife just finished a report addressing the projected food production growth versus consumption in the near future. Based on her report, with expanded farm lands and better production methods, food production is expected to grow by about 11% by the year 2050. Yet, at the same time, food consumption of this growing population is expected to increase by at least 40%. In other words, we are not about to start taking farm land to grow fuels - we'll need all we have just to grow food.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3975. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 00:39:08 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1555AC.F7309FDC@uci.edu>
Source record: 26921

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > He said all you have to do is replace the names,
> > and one is the same as the other.
>
> That's right, Jim - within the CONTEXT of what you said about propaganda. I
> said nothing about the countries being the same in any other way.

Nobody (i.e. press, religious leaders, government leaders) is telling me
to be hateful and angry. Who is telling you to be that way?

3976. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 01:12:10 UTC
From: K0HB <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <OU8W#CegBHA.1232@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 26922

Bright Dwight said:

> Yes, often executives will get together as a group to discuss
> company business behind closed doors, but rarely are two
> employees expected to meet behind closed doors to discuss
> such things. In fact, if we're talking about product development,
> private discussions about such information would be looked
> at with suspicion in most companies.

"Most companies"?????? You're completely mis-informed.

I manage a product development group consisting of more than 30
engineers, 40 technicians, and several dozen support people.
Persons of both genders populate all levels of this group. In their
day-to-day tasks there are occasions where small groups (often
as small as two) collaborate in relative secrecy on many development
projects. In a professional environment this is not "viewed with
suspicion" as you claim, and mixed-gender development teams are
not unusual nor are they subject to special scrutiny. Discrimination and
restrictive rules based on gender are a mark of a dark-ages company,
not a modern enterprise.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

3977. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 01:30:52 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1f47txx.jibj4rbnld52N%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 26924
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote:

> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3C14500C.90B11EDE@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> > Trouser Trout wrote:
> >
> > > Yes, Landshark knows all about forging people. A search of google will
> show
> > > this.
> > >
> >
> > "Candygram!"
> >
>
> "Mrs. Mhfhmr?"

Mrs. Mahellmahey.....

--
Do infants enjoy infancy as much as
adults enjoy adultery?□ - George Carlin□□□□□□□□□□□□

3978. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 01:46:44 UTC
From: Your Friend Bill <"Remove The NO In The Reply Address"@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <3C156584.B4EB927D@coqui.net>
Source record: 26925
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

radiosigs wrote:
>
> Better watch out there friend or you'll be asked to contribute to Herbie's
> latest defense fund. It's coming.

Why would he need a defense fund? Maybe because he's gambling away his
own cash at Divi Carina Bay most every night? Ask him about that.
-Bill

3979. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 02:29:57 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v3r0401o4p@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26926

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C154E47.59645791@sccoast.net...
> > Satan is not mentioned anywhere in their beliefs
> > or rituals, so how can they possibly be satanic
> > (or "Satanic")?
>
>
> Already answered several times, Krell - they claim to engage in
practices that
> are described as "satanic" in this culture.

The only thing that they claim is the fact that they acknowledge certain
"Christians" call them satanic.
It doesn't mean they really are.

3980. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 02:32:18 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v3r4g01ofc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 26927

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C154EBA.F07EA50E@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > Again, name some specific examples. IOW, put up or shut up.
>
>
> Do your own research, Krell. I have no time for someone who is too blind
to
> see what is widely available right in front of their own face.

OK. You asked for it. Here's a link I found...

http://skepdic.com/wicca.html

3981. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 02:50:33 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <6qeR7.139726$8n4.10306298@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26928
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

You must not be reading my post--I won't HAVE to do anything: USAF will do it FOR me. DOD equipment is issued on a Form 37. All I have to do is tell the CID investigators WHO
confiscated it, and THEY will be on the LEO like stink on sh**.

Jerry

9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C153DD6.25A71427@gte.net...
> > Maybe so. There are still laws against unlawful search and seizure. And,
> > as I said before, in reference to the seizure of my radio equipment, he will
> > be in deep doo doo when he confiscates my radio that was purchased with DoD
> > funds. ASSuming that a civilian is in the wrong is a sure way to get sued for
> > false arrest. While I have never been arrested in my life, nor have I ever
> > given a LEO a reason to hassle me, I have been talked to in a most
> > disrespectful manner, and treated like I didn't know what I was about. A cop
> > is NOT the arbitor of truth; just because he "thinks" you did something
> > doesn't make it so. I am, however, somewhat vindictive, a trait I inherited
> > from my Dad's side. I cannot STAND to be acused of something I did not do,
> > nor to be falsely hassled, inconvenienced, or unfairly caused to lose time or
> > money. While most people would not pursue the matter, I, OTH, would be
> > searching the law for a way to get the SOB back
> > legally. With the military VHF radio I have in addition to my ham equipment,
> > having that "stolen" at gunpoint WOULD be something the LEO would wish he had
> > never done. While the LEO has "friends" in the courts, I have friends in the
> > military and at the State level (if the seizure takes place in my state). I
> > would NOT let the matter rest.
> >
>
> Unless you are very rich, you may not have
> the political connections to really make a
> difference. And it would take a bundle of

> money to pursue a court battle.
>
> Again, talk this over with your attorneys.
> I think that you might get "an education".
>
>

3982. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 02:56:07 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <rBeR7.114613$S93.5957864@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26929
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Hehe! Don't worry--it will NOT be on the LEO's list as an "illegal CB".
Actually it is a Tait
2000 built for USAF/CAP and other military uses. SHHHH! Don't tell the
LEO, but it has
our state's HP VHF frequency in it! But it is legal. It is NOT a radio the
cop wants to swipe.

73

Jerry
K4KWH

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:2CD77A301AF336CE.E4D9F3159D905A58.691D7393E0612A2F@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 14:34:52 -0500, "Jerry Oxendine"
> <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
> >IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government funds
> >and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be
> >using, then he WILL be in trouble.
>
> If it is on the list, I suspect the DOD would have some rather nasty
> words for his superiors.
>
>
>
> Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
> kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

3983. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 03:20:31 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <kYeR7.114824$S93.5968376@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26930
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Now, tell me this> If I am driving my personal car, not speeding, not violating any laws, in uniform or not, and a LEO decides to become "curious" about my radio equipment, he will have NO leg to stand on. First line of defense--the Amateur license. Most cops DO know what Amateur Radio is. I have already been asked about this at license checks. Now, let's say the LEO decides that this is not good enough for him, and at the time, I happen to have the Tait radio on state rescue.
In spite of courteous efforts to explain what it is, the LEO decides that he is going to confiscate my radios and does so. The first call will go to Col. Charles Layno in Greensboro, NC. He or I will then put in a call to Maxwell AFB, Al explaining what happened. I will then sit back and wait.
YOU can think what you like, and all the civilian "contacts" in the world will not stop what happens next. The LEO's supervisor WILL get a call from Maxwell "requesting" the equipment be returned.
It will be made clear that their department WILL return the radio without delay. You are not understanding; the equipment is NOT civilian--it is charged out on a DOD Form and is accountable to the HQ to which it is assigned. It would be the SAME thing if a cop stopped a Marine convoy and "confiscated" the radios out of a Humvee. CID would NOT let it go. I would do nothing--I'd be out of the loop sitting on the sidelines just waiting for the sh** to hit the fan AND laughing my a** off at the cop

Your attitude seems to be that cops can do anything and get away with it. That *may* be true up to a point. On the news tonight, for example, there is a police chief in hot water in a nearby town. Seems he answered a call to a ruckus involving a group of teens. One of the teens was not involved in the fights that broke out, and was leaving the scene as the chief drove up. The kid was halfway inside his car when the chief rushed up, grabbed the kid and flung him down onto the pavement injuring him. Now the cop says it was the kid resisting arrest. But there were 20 witnesses that say the cop just ran up and grabbed the boy and threw him to the ground. The fight was inside the recreation center. If the cop is guilty I hope the guy is fired and is never allowed to work in law enforcement again. IF the kid DID resist arrest, or become

belligerent, then HE should
have to pay.

Jerry

N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C15403F.46BA3B1@gte.net...
> > >IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government
funds
> > >and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be
> > >using, then he WILL be in trouble.
> >
> > If it is on the list, I suspect the DOD would have some rather nasty
> > words for his superiors.
>
> These days, DOD often rolls for the local
> community. If you are uniform then a superior
> will relieve the local jail of your person then
> confine you to quarters. As you folks are
> civilians who are a bit less than reservists,
> you really do not have that much "covering
> fire".
>
> Again, you guys really need to talk to your
> lawyers to understand how modern American
> courts really work.
>
>
>

3984. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 03:54:06 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <RrfR7.115254$S93.5981725@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 26931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

As far as my own county is concerned, I have lived here since 1967. I know just about everybody around here that counts. I have NEVER been arrested in my entire life. I have a very conservative appearance with no long hair or mustache. My clothes are always clean--unless I am working on an old car. I know lots of the cops here including the county Sheriff, many city cops, and my ex-brother-in-law who is on the force. My car tag even states "USAF Auxiliary, NC Wing CAP XXX You are still missing something here. What I am telling you is: sure, the cop can take my stuff. Now if I don't give him grief in any way, do not resist his efforts to seize the radio equipment, the only recourse is to show him the Amateur license and the Property tag on the non-civilian radio, YES, he can take my stuff: do you think I am going to resist a cop with a gun? But IF you think Maxwell AFB is going to sit there and let that cop KEEP that equipment, you're loonier than 40 hells! Again, if you think the local yokels will stare down the CID audit team, you are nuts. It WILL be returned.

I have been involved in the organization since 1964. Now if I decide to embarrass the LEO, I don't need to bring said organization into the picture; all I need is a copy of the FCC regulations that preempt Bubba's authority and an accurate account of what happened. You see, I won't HAVE to involve them: USAF/CAP will take care of the confiscated equipment issue. I will make the cop look stupid and embarrass his department over the Amateur issue by causing a TV reporter to come snooping around, asking questions, and putting them on national TV. Prior to that, being briefed on the FCC preemption, a judge would likely strike any charge of "illegal radios and return them.

NOW! Having beat this horse to death, I have to say that this is a very unlike situation. Most cops are professionals and conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner. They are not stupid and will not put themselves into a situation that could cause them embarrassment. Many cops are even hams, and as such, understand--even

know-- the rules and how they apply to
hams. It is the rogue, the big headed rookie, the guy with the swelled
head, the one whose psyco-
logical profile misled his testers that could cause this trouble. They
don't usually last long tending to
get themselves in trouble. Hey, I've been thru MANY license checks,
especially after Sept 11,
and have been merely asked what were the radios for. Most of them were
already familiar with
ham radio--even CAP--and have never had a problem. I know the rogue cops
are out there be-
cause I've been stopped by one--even though I was NOT speeding or doing
anything out of the
ordinary. He was most discourteous, cut me off when I attempted to ask a
question, wouldn't let
me talk at all. The stop was a mistake--the car he was looking for was a
sedan: I was in a station
wagon--just the same color. But he took his mistake out on ME. It is the
rogue who would decide that his authority cannot be challenged, and he is
the one I would take on thru legal and military
channels if his "error" involved the seizing of DOD equipment. That is all
I am saying. And here,
this thread ends as far as I am concerned--no need to keep this up.

73

Jerry
K4KWH

N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C153FB1.42DF2CD1@gte.net...
> > IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government
funds
> > and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be
using,
> > then he WILL be in trouble. First of all, just my Amateur license alone
> > exempts me from his jurisdiction. HE HAS NO AUTHORITY TO SEIZE OR
ARREST
> > BASED ON MY USE OF RADIO ALONE. IF I act like a smartass, a jerk, or
threaten
> > and cuss him, yes, disorderly conduct, and other charges could be added
to
> > haul me in. Secondly, the State authorities are not going to be happy
to
> > find themselves involved in a USAF CID investigation as to what happened
to
> > the equipment. Have YOU ever been in military logistics? I have. Have
you
> > ever seen a property audit where there was suspected mis-appropriation
of
> > materiel? Trust me, it ain't a pretty sight. My supervisor, a Captain,
once

> > screened and signed for a lot of small 110V generators. They were not
> > supposed to be placed on open requisition. USAF CID swooped down on our
Hq to
> > inventory those
> > generators, and we had to return them. It, however, was not our
mistake; it
> > was the mistake of the LGO at the materiel yard, but it didn't make us
feel
> > any better; we went around with a high pucker factor for over 2
> > weeks while they audited us!
> >
> > I know you are in denial (seems to me you must have a VERY close
association
> > with LEOs or ARE one), but the incident with the young ham in Kentucky
> > illustrated this very thing: the way the laws are written, both on
scanners
> > and local CB enforcement, cops have NO jurisdiction over hams. If he has
a
> > question about a radio, the license is to stop him in his tracks. If he
> > pursues the issue, the court WILL overrule him: it HAS to. As long as I
do
> > not resist him in any way, and the issue is strictly radio, then he has
not
> > one leg to stand on. It ":might" be risky
> > to bring bogus charges in order to facilitate an arrest. That could
cause an
> > investigation of the department and bring questions of corruption and
> > over-zealous cops. I also have a cousin and some friends that work in
the
> > national news media. I wouldn't hesitate to have "certain" news
personalities
> > bring adverse publicity to said department; like I said--I am very
vindictive
> > when wronged.
>
> You might win. Then your superiors in the CAP
> might find that you are "political liability" and drop
> you like a hot rock.
>
> I am well aware of military logistics. I was the NCOIC
> for command group at KKMC for LTG Pagonis (22nd
> SUPCOM) during the Gulf War. Property book accounting
> was a big issue, especially after the combat phase.
>
> The problem is that you have an idealistic view of the
> law. In reality, it does not work that way. If he feels
> it justified, a cop can just impound your vehicle, radios
> and all. They do it to drug dealers all the time.
>
> What you have to learn is that cops do not see you

> as any different than any street punk. To most cops,
> all civilians are dangerous. Unless you live in a small
> county, most cops do not know who you are or "how
> important" you are. You are just someone they stop
> and they will approach you as if you are a possible
> murder. It is safer that way.
>

3985. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 04:16:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C158898.ECD40898@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26932

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> In fact, if we're talking about product
> development, private discussions about such information would be looked at with
> suspicion in most companies.

You simply don't know what you are talking about, Dwight. At Intel,
a logic designer meets with a process designer quite often in
a one-on-one meeting. Most companies trust their employees.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3986. Re: On the ignorance of learned men (Was:Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 04:21:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1589BC.3AE13EEF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 26933

K0HB wrote:
> "Everything must have a purpose?" asked God.
> "Certainly," said man.
> "Then I leave it to you to think of one for all this," said God.
> And He went away.

Reminds me somewhat of "Letters From Earth" by Mark Twain.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

3987. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 05:03:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011211000326.10110.00000324@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 26935

In article <3696290E5C2050EA.304DAB87A74355A8.039FCE8965A55266@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On Fri, 07 Dec 2001 18:27:35 -0500, Dwight Stewart
><stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
>> Yes, the meaning of "Satanic" (capital "s") is clear - it refers to
>>the religious context of the word and is the one you continue to use
>>in spite of my repeated objections. However, the meaning of "satanic"
>>(lower case "s") seems much less clear to you - and it has nothing to
>>do with "Satan."
>
> Would you care to even ATTEMPT to justify a statement that
>stupid?
>
Maybe the Devil made him do it.

(a tip of the hat to Flip Wilson as Geraldine Jones)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3988. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 05:03:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011211000328.10110.00000325@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 26937

In article <E9AC04CD975C8D90.5809AFC9ED0370D6.8F9CEAD6C1B7D06B@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 08 Dec 2001 15:49:27 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>>>>The Roman and Greek "nature religions" tried for centuries to eradicate
>>>>Christianity and its source religion, Judaism. Do you know who Antiochus
>>>was?
>>>
>>> So?
>>
>>Guess you don't know who Antiochus was.
>
> As it happens, I do. Are you referring to Antiochus the first,
>second, or third (also known as Antiochus the Great)?

Any of 'em will do. Point is, some pagans were trying to wipe out Christianity
and its source religion (Judaism).
>
> What I _don't_ know is what someone who lived 2000+ years ago
>in the Middle East has to do with wicca and paganism in the modern
>day.

Same thing that those ancients have to do with wiccans and pagans today.

>Antiochus (pick your number) was a political figure, not a
>religious one.

Tell that to Judah the Maccabee & Co.
>
>>> The Christians did a pretty good job of reversing that trend
>>>when it came to the Pagan faiths of Northern Europe--as well as the
>>>Jewish faith in Spain--or did the Inquisition slip past you unnoticed.
>>
>>I knew about the Inquisition by the time I was 11.
>
> Which Inquisition?

The one nobody expects. Also, persecution of Jews in Italy, Germany, Poland,
Russia, and elsewhere in Europe.
>
> Certainly not the one where pagans were being slaughtered by
>christians in an effort to stamp out their religion (you know, the one
>that uses pentagrams as one of its symbols?)--and (of course) steal
>their land and property.

You mean manifest destiny?
>
> Perhaps the one in Spain where it was the Jews who were the
>target. Or the French one where it was a too-powerful sect of
>christians. But certainly not the one in Northern Europe.

All sorts of 'em. Then there are the Vikings and their escapades in the British Isles. They were pagans, I believe.

>>>>Constantine changed all that.
>>>
>>> And a RC Pope restarted the killing.
>>
>>Yup. The best argument for separation of church and state is the record of
>what
>>happens without it.
>
> Then how can you--or anyone else who believes that (as I do)
>support the concept of morals laws which can ONLY be based on
>religious values?

Leges sine moribus vanae.

You are presuming your conclusion. Morals laws can be based on things other than purely religious values.

The problem really comes down to this: How does a society decide what laws to enact? The American system is to go with the views of the majority, with various checks and balances to avoid radical changes and remind the people of certain basic concepts. The alternative is minority rule.
>
>>> Perhaps you can see a difference between a Roman killing a
>>>person for his or her religion and a Christian doing the same.
>>
>>You are equating "Roman Catholic" with "Christian". They are not the same.
>One
>>is a subset of the other. Not all Christian religions have a history of
>killing
>>in the name of religion.
>
> And not all Romans killed Christians either. So what? The
>analogy still is valid.

No, it isn't.
>
>>>Personally, I can't.
>>
>>Then present the whole story. When the pagans were in power, they killed
>>Christians. When the tables were turned, the killing continued. Paybacks.
>
> So you agree that paganism (which uses the pentagram as a
>symbol) predates christianity, right?

Various forms of paganism go all the way back to prehistory. I dunno about the use of pentagrams.
>
> In that case, how can paganism POSSIBLY be satanic?

Lots of ways. I never gave an opinion on it.

>It existed
>before satan was INVENTED by the christians.

Who says Satan was invented by Christians? You're presuming your conclusion, again.

>>> "<he> was both a passionate anti-Semite and a ferocious
>>>believer in absolute obedience to political authority. He wanted (his
>>>nation is named here) rid of the Jews and he advised that the be
>>>deprived of "All their cash and jewels and silver and gold" and
>>>furthermore, "that their synagogues or schools be set on fire, that
>>>their houses be broken up and destroyed . . . and they be put under a
>>>roof or stable, like the gypsies . . . in misery and captivity as they
>>>incessantly lament and complain to God about us"--advice that was
>>>later followed literally."
>>>
>>> He also referred to the peasants who opposed the government as
>>>"mad dogs," and employed a "coarseness and brutality of language
>>>unequaled in <nation> history."
>>
>>The Jewish people have been persecuted by so many that there are plenty of
>>candidates for that description. Offhand it sounds like Torquemada, but it
>>could also be any of a number of popes, czars, kings, bishops, and other
>>enemies of freedom. Hitler comes to mind, of course, but that's too obvious.
>>Martin Luther turned against the Jews when he realized that they weren't
>going
>>to convert to his version of Christianity. Lots of others. The country could
>be
>>Germany, Russia, England, Spain or many others.
>
> Very good. Martin Luther is correct. Sort of sounds like
>Hitler, doesn't he?

The Third Reich tapped into a very old tradition of anti-semitism.
>
> BTW, for the totally out-of-touch-with-reality among us
>(that's you Dwight, read this), Martin Luther is the FOUNDER of the
>protestant form of christianity.

No, he wasn't. He was a Roman Catholic priest who was disillusioned with the Roman church and successfully started one form of protestantism.

Breakaways from Rome predate ML. Like the Eastern Orthodox folks. And lots of others who were denounced as heretics and persecuted.

>The quote comes from Shirer's "The
>Rise And Fall of the Third Reich" and points out that Luther was a

>VERY strong influence on Hitler's thinking and doctrine.
>
I think modern day Lutherans have gotten beyond that, though.

> You got him correctly.

Of course.
>
> See! You CAN pass academic tests!

Getting my degrees required some of that.

> You get a star on your paper!

Didja know that George Washington wanted six pointed stars on the first
American flag? Betsy Ross convinced him to use five pointed ones because a five
pointed star could be made by a single scissors cut of properly-folded cloth.

>>The concepts of religious tolerance and separation of church and state are
>very
>>new ones, historically speaking. Many who fled here to escape religious
>>persecution (like the Puritans) turned into the persecutors when they became
>>established in their new land.
>
> True.

Salem witch trials, too.
>
>>Here's a question for you: When and where did the ideas of separation of
>church
>>and state, and universal religious tolerance, first become established in
>the
>>USA?
>
> Among the Native Americans, actually.

Which ones? Incas, Mayas, Lakota?
>
> If you are looking for the first time the term "separation of
>church and state" was used, otoh, the phrase, "a wall of separation
>between church and state," was coined by President Thomas Jefferson in
>a carefully crafted letter to the Danbury Baptists in 1802, when they
>had asked him to explain the First Amendment.

The idea is much older, however.
>
> Finally, if you are looking for the first PRACTICE of
>religious tolerance in the US-

>depending on your interpretation of "religious tolerance" you
>probably are referring to either New York, Pennsylvania, or Maryland
>(probably Pennsylvania). If you want to be more specific, I'll be glad
>to do so as well.

Pennsylvania, 1680
>
>>>>Most religions have feast days because people need them, spiritually and
>>>>psychologically. For example, most European religions have some sort of
>>>winter
>>>>equinox
>>
>>Actually, solstice.
>
>>>celebration because of the effects lack of daylight causes in many
>>>>people. For peoples with limited understanding of how the seasons and
>>>weather
>>>>work, and with limited artificial lighting, the loss of the Sun at the end
>>>of
>>>>December could be very disturbing.
>>
>>(Solstice)

>>>>celebrations, whatever they are
>>>>called, remind us that the Light will return and spring will comne again.
>It
>>>>was natural for the Christians to put Christmas on the first day when the
>>>>daylight gets noticeably longer using simple methods of measurement.
>>>
>>> Which "conveniently" fell directly on a Pagan festival day, of
>>>course, as did other Christian holy days.
>>
>>So? The purpose was the same. The sun doesn't cooperate just because humans
>>convert. Having feast days on other days would be an admission that the
>pagan
>>religions had priority.
>
> Weak.

Nope. Simple truth.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3989. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 05:03:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011211000329.10110.00000326@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 26934

In article <6be98d7d.0112092202.44dc429e@posting.google.com>,
stewartx@sccoast.net (Dwight Stewart) writes:

>Rick Adams wrote...
>>
>> But you DO have the alternative (as do I) of
>> moving to an area where public transportation
>> is available. (snip)
>
>
> So your suggested solution to the transportation needs of the
>elderly is to simply tell them to move where public transportation is
>available. Nice guy.
>
Sounds like a classic case of NIMBY, Dwight.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3990. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 05:03:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011211000329.10110.00000327@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 26936

In article <3C15536F.42973A21@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> You are right to be skeptical. I'm old enough to
>> remember when we were promised things like George
>> Jetson aircars and nuclear power that would be
>> "too cheap to meter".
>
> The reason I'm so skeptical is because my wife just finished a report
>addressing the projected food production growth versus consumption in the
>near future.

Sounds pretty serious and definitive.

>Based on her report, with expanded farm lands and better production
>methods, food production is expected to grow by about 11% by the year 2050.
>Yet,
>at the same time, food consumption of this growing population is expected to
>increase by at least 40%.

Sounds like I better get going on the garden. And a diet.

>In other words, we are not about to start taking
>farm
>land to grow fuels - we'll need all we have just to grow food.

I dunno. How much land is there in the USA that would be suitable for farming
but is not used?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3991. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 05:12:01 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u1b59ifs4bn8e7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 26938
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> Better watch out there friend or you'll be asked to contribute to Herbie's
> latest defense fund. It's coming.

wow, i'm lost here... do you know K1MAN? i did not hear any of his bulletins yet... what is the bulletin about?

phil :)

3992. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 05:24:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C15989E.3A427B9A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 26939

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C150C33.EF7FF739@earthlink.net...
> > Richard Plourde wrote:
> > >
> > > > Krell writes:
> > >
> > > > >So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring
> debate,
> > > > >there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He was
> > > > >bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of high
> speed
> > > > >code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a
> frequency
> > > > >in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in
> feet,
> > > he
> > > > >drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492, BTW)
> > >
> > > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > > news:20011209235008.15992.00000447@mb-
> > >
> > > > Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!
> > >
> > > Larry, that's for the driven element of a yagi.
> > >
> > > Hey Krell...
> > >
> > > "Do you believe in 'Deja Vu'???" ;-)
> >
> > Rich, the 468 figure is for a dipole. The yagi DE length can be very
> > different, i.e. when applying a hair pin match.
> >
> > Go sit in the corner with Krell and the other guy.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> 492 is for a *true* half-wavelength. It's 468 when multiplied by the .95
> constant, which has become an accept standard. I've seen 462 used when
> making a folded dipole from 300-ohm twin lead.
>
> So I guess you're sitting in the corner with the rest of us, if you insist
> that yours is the only right answer.

I'm not sitting there with you guys until you provide proof that the ARRL Handbook, The Radio Handbook, the ARRL Antenna book and the question pool are incorrect.

The "true" half wave length disallowing for anything else would be 500 divided by frequency.

Dave K8MN

3993. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 06:43:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C15AAEB.4DB302F1@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26940

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Nobody (i.e. press, religious leaders,
> government leaders) is telling me to
> be hateful and angry. (snip)

So you just woke up one morning angry enough to hate Arabs on your own? Of course we've been influenced by the media and government, Jim. Without that influence, we probably wouldn't associate "terrorism" with the Arabs (99 percent are not involved in terrorism). And more of us would probably realise that almost no evidence has been offered to show a connection between Bin Laden and the WTC attack. Or the Taliban and the WTC attack. Nobody is saying one can't be angry, Jim. Just be honest about it, and honest about the source.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3994. Re: A Radio Project For Africa

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:03:01 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v4ejljit1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26945
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <2001129-535-541464@foorum.com>, H. I. NABRI
<nabrihussein@hotmail.com> writes:
As an NGO working in the field of Human Rights in Africa we are developing
plans for the creation of a Radio in Africa.

"If it does not concern a freeband activation I am not interested"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3995. CB DX on 12 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:05:16 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v4ens$jl4$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26946

"Hammies are hereby put on notice that CB DX operation will commence on
24.850 on 12/18/01"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3996. Re: Help !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:08:16 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v4etgjor1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26943

Leland KC8LD0 <Leland_member@newsguy.com> writes:
I can't understand CW,can I blow a VE for the upgrade ?

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

"Lelnad I always thought you were of that persuasion. You ought to try
sniffing jock straps as I do. Less worrisome and so much less risk of AIDS"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3997. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:11:00 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v4f2kjrn1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26944

Throw in Plourde's idea of low power and you've guaranteed the
similarity to CB which Britain, after years of battling over the issue,
already has. This idea is nearly as bad as baked bean sandwiches,
grilled tomatoes, bangers, boiled coffee and blackened, cold toast which
the Brits also introduced. Remember: The Brits invented the toilet
seat but it took the French to invent the hole in the center.

Dave K8MN

"Ah another CB-hater I see. Take your place in the kennel beside nad and his
hounds"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3998. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:12:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C15BFD1.D145FF3C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26941

CAM wrote:
>
> You simply don't know what you are talking about,
> Dwight.

I know exactly what I'm talking about, Cecil. You're the one who can't keep the story straight (see below).

> At Intel, a logic designer meets with a
> process designer quite often in a one-on-one
> meeting. Most companies trust their employees.

If those companies trust those employees, why would they need to discuss project only behind closed doors? You're trying to have it both ways, Cecil. One moment, you say companies don't trust their employees enough to talk with the doors open. Now, the next moment, you say most companies trust their employees, so closed door meetings are no problem. Look, I don't think we disagree as much as it appears - we're just not being clear about what we're discussing. So, lets set the record straight.

First of all, we have the companies where security is not a major issue - they're not working on anything where security, or sensitivity of product development, is a strong consideration. Obviously, this category of companies would include most in this country. And these were the companies I was talking about when I asked Rick what he was "discussing that is so secret it cannot possibly be discussed with the door open?" Obviously, for companies where security is not a major issue, there is little "need" for meetings behind closed doors - most business could be discussed with the doors open.

At this point, you introduced a second category of companies into the discussion - those with a concern about sensitive product development ("HP/Intel shared computer architecture"). Actually, to be completely clear about this category of companies, we need to break it down further - those companies with just mild security considerations (consumer products, etc) and those truly obsessed with security (military contractors, etc).

Of the first of these companies (those with mild security considerations), you're going to see a hybrid mix of security measures - open door meetings in some situations, closed door meetings in other situations, and both lax and firm security when it comes to their employees. In other words, security is more of a company desire in a given situation than a real requirement. This is most likely the case with Intel. While Intel may desire to keep information about it's shared computer architecture under wraps, it also fully realizes the information is going to get out eventually. In other words, they may try to keep things under wraps, but they have not desire to go overboard with security.

Finally, there is the second group of these companies (those truly obsessed with security). These are the companies who would hire security personnel (not security guards - security personnel to insure security of company information and product information). And I was talking about these companies when I said "private discussions about such information would be looked at with suspicion in most companies."

Now that we have a better understanding of the groups of companies we're talking about (those with little or no security considerations, those with mild security considerations, and those obsessed with security), this conversation might make a little more sense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3999. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:14:01 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v4f89jtt1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26950
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

Barry appears to be a gentleman and articulate
arbitrator. Good job Barry! While his interview was playing
btwn 3-4PM Central time though, some nutcase comes up
with music playing and all the other stuff to try to
re-ignite this dumb radio war! Sheesh! Can't you music
playing cb'er a-holes turn the radio OFF for a few weeks?
Let this thing work! We don't need a repeat performance of
something like the old 14.313 Wars again cause it will only
spread all over 20 then onto 75

"I resent the CB-slander. I am an accomplished freebander and not one of the
common unwashed. I am sure we on 27.555 can give whoever is on your 313
channel a run for their money. Go away son and get some real radio
experience and then call a break for me when the skips running"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4000. Re: state police license for mobile R/T

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:17:37 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v4ff1$k0m$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 27001

If you're ever stopped and questioned about the radio receiving police calls, be very polite, explain the facts to the officer, then show them either the letter and or the applicable state statue with the copy of your Ham license. Normally that's the end of it.

"Typical Lelnad wussiness. We freeband Cbers just pull out our chrome plated Colt Python and be done with the foolishness"

Of course the really prudent thing to do is to keep the volume down, or turn off the rig, so the police officer can't hear it, thus saving you the hassle of answering those questions in the first place.

"The only hassle is you hammies and your stuck up attitudes toward anyone who breaks trivial CB rules. Time to go back to the kennel with dogie where you belong"

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4001. Re: state police license for mobile R/T

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:19:45 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v4fj1$k21$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 26949

I just got my Technician's license a few days ago (KC8SPR) and
have a hand held for 2m and 70cm as my sole radio.

"Freebanders are way ahead of you"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4002. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:30:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C15C3ED.EBF91159@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26942

Krell wrote:
>
> OK. You asked for it. Here's a link I found...
>
> http://skepdic.com/wicca.html

Krell, in response to my comments about magazines, books, and so forth, that use the word "satanic" to describe people who claim to practice those activities, you asked me to name some specific examples. When I refused, you post the link above to a web site claiming that I asked for it. I asked for no such thing - you were the one asking. And if a web site fulfills your need for the name of a specific book, magazine, or so forth, then you should be very happy with yourself (you asked and answered your own question).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4003. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:38:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C15C5D8.A02E619C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26947

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart writes:
>
> > So your suggested solution to the transportation
> > needs of the elderly is to simply tell them to
> > move where public transportation is available.
> > Nice guy.
>
> Sounds like a classic case of NIMBY, Dwight.

Exactly, Jim. On a side note (not directed solely at you, Jim), Europe has an excellent public transportation system. If anyone wants to pay for this "elderly" person to move where public transportation is available, I'll gladly take another trip to Europe for a few years. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4004. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 08:41:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C15C696.E4EC411E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 26948

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Most companies"?????? (snip)

"Most companies" in the context of the discussion with Cecil, Hans. See my response to Cecil's message for clarification.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4005. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 10:06:11 UTC
From: stewartx@sccoast.net
Message-ID: <6be98d7d.0112110206.42cb0c02@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27002

> Sean G Gilley) wrote...
>
> So, if a hit and run accident causes the loss
> of a leg and one kidney to a victim, then
> then driver that caused that accident should
> therefor have his leg amputated and one
> kidney removed?

Never said it should apply to every situation, Sean. Murder is a unique enough crime, and an absolute enough crime, to warrant a unique way of dealing with it's punishment.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4006. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 10:47:37 UTC
From: stewartx@sccoast.net
Message-ID: <6be98d7d.0112110247.740ac9b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27003

n2ey@aol.com wrote...
>
> Dwight Stewart writes:
>
> > Based on her report, with expanded farm lands
> > and better production methods, food production
> > is expected to grow by about 11% by the year
> > 2050. Yet, at the same time, food consumption
> > of this growing population is expected to
> > increase by at least 40%.
>
> Sounds like I better get going on the garden.
> And a diet.

Well, I wouldn't get too nervous yet. There seems to be a serious effort being made to address the problem. To some extent, this problem has been on the horizon for years (I can remember reading about it twenty years ago). It's just that we're now approaching the breaking point, so only now is it getting more attention than in the past.

> I dunno. How much land is there in the USA that
> would be suitable for farming but is not used?

That I don't know, and I don't think her report specifically addressed that (I don't remember seeing it). But I'll ask her about it in the morning. In the meantime, we can speculate. How many trees are we willing to cut down to clear potential farm lands? And, of course, some of the problem can be reduced if we develop a taste for crops that can grow in less ideal places. Seaweed burgers, anyone?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4007. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 11:00:35 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <nHlR7.158306$WW.9921352@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27004

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011211000329.10110.00000327@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <3C15536F.42973A21@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> You are right to be skeptical. I'm old enough to
> >> remember when we were promised things like George
> >> Jetson aircars and nuclear power that would be
> >> "too cheap to meter".
> >>
> > The reason I'm so skeptical is because my wife just finished a report
> >addressing the projected food production growth versus consumption in
the
> >near future.
>
> Sounds pretty serious and definitive.
>
> >Based on her report, with expanded farm lands and better production
> >methods, food production is expected to grow by about 11% by the year
2050.
> >Yet,
> >at the same time, food consumption of this growing population is
expected to
> >increase by at least 40%.
>
> Sounds like I better get going on the garden. And a diet.
>
> >In other words, we are not about to start taking
> >farm
> >land to grow fuels - we'll need all we have just to grow food.
>
> I dunno. How much land is there in the USA that would be suitable for
farming
> but is not used?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

It's called the Malthusian Limit (of population) and is about 200 years
old. Parson Malthus earned Political Economy the name of 'dismal
science'. Much like global warming, it is a problem better faced when it
happens.

4008. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 11:24:03 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <n1mR7.218488$3d2.10122718@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27005

Richard McCollum, Nï¿½BK, asked:

> As the resident genius on radio preachers, can you identify this one (I
> can't):
>
> The Railway Express agent position in El Paso was for years the worst
> because of a preacher named O. O. ????????? who claimed to do
> resurrections. Every morning the agent would present a half-dozen or so
> coffins which would be duly refused and he had to ship granny back where
> she came from. Tammy Faye got her start with this dude so it can't have
> been all that long ago.

Man, you got me there. If this happened in El Paso
about the time Tammy Faye Baker graduated from Bible
college, I was already a decade gone from there.

El Paso did have its own 'border blaster' in the form
of XELO on 800 kHz with an output power of 150 kW. They
were notable for routing all their per-inquiry mail
through the small post office in Clint, Texas, a wide
place in U.S. Highway 80 about 20 miles down the river
from E.P.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4009. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 11:27:53 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v4qgo02mhu@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27007

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C15989E.3A427B9A@earthlink.net...
> I'm not sitting there with you guys until you provide proof that the
> ARRL Handbook, The Radio Handbook, the ARRL Antenna book and the
> question pool are incorrect.

The ARRL handbook I have is the 1997 edition. Page 20.4. Left-hand column.
Top of the page. formula #1.

4010. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 11:37:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v4r2a02ndo@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27008

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C15C3ED.EBF91159@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > OK. You asked for it. Here's a link I found...
> >
> > http://skepdic.com/wicca.html
>
>
> Krell, in response to my comments about magazines, books, and so forth,
that
> use the word "satanic" to describe people who claim to practice those
> activities, you asked me to name some specific examples. When I refused,
you
> post the link above to a web site claiming that I asked for it. I asked
for no
> such thing - you were the one asking. And if a web site fulfills your need
for
> the name of a specific book, magazine, or so forth, then you should be
very
> happy with yourself (you asked and answered your own question).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

No, Dwight. You refused to post references to your stupid and erroneous claims. You then told me to do my own research. You asked for it whether you realize it or not. You probably never even looked at the link, which wouldn't be a surprise. You're content to believe lies the religious right has been spewing for years.

4011. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 11:38:10 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <CemR7.218491$3d2.10122846@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27006

I wrote:

>> Del Rio, Texas is just across the Rio Grande from
>> Villa Acuna, Coahuila, Mexico, home to radio station
>> XERA....

Cecil, W5DXP, asked:

> Hey Jim, are you sure that wasn't XERF?

I'm not sure about the exact dates, but the
evolution went something like this:

XER (? - 1931)
XERA (1931 - 1940)
XERF (1940 - present)

A lively account of the history of the station
can be found at:

http://www.ominous-valve.com/xerf.html

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4012. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 13:03:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011211080313.04115.00000154@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 27009

In article <A40CCDA44AD350FE.7B9BEFE3F243D58C.0DFB18090AD4DAB1@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 06 Dec 2001 12:20:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>The present SS+IRS system is regressive for many people, because once a
>certain
>>level of income is reached they max out the SS contributions.
>
> Here, at least, we agree!
>
>>> It may be your responsibility, but what if you don't meet that
>>>responsibility? Is it reasonable that the state ignore the needs of
>>>children because their fathers and mothers didn't demonstrate sound
>>>financial planning?
>
>>Is it reasonable that the state take over the responsibilities of parents,
>>thereby penalizing those who are responsible?
>
> If those parents are not capable for providing for the needs
>of their children it HAS to be the responsibility of the state to do
>so.

WHY? Who says the state, and only the state, HAS to step in?

>The alternative is to perpetuate precisely the kind of poverty
>that is affecting them in the first place.

Instead, perpetuate increase the pattern of irresponsibility and dependency on
the govt.

I'm NOT saying govt. has no role. I'm saying that responsible behavior must be
coupled to the support.

>No child should be punished
>for the mistakes or failings of his or her parents

Why not? Who gets to pay to fill in the gap?

>--but the
>Libertarian approach would do precisely that.
>
I'm not advocating the Libertarian approach.

>>> Consider, also, the age I listed. Assuming the _average_
>>>couple marry soon after graduation from college (and even the
>>>Libertarian party can't possibly expect people to wait until they are

>>>financially solvent to marry and start raising a family--that is
>>>simply unrealistic and, in many ways, undesirable).
>>
>>WHOA!!! WHY is it unrealisitc and undesirable? I know MANY couples who
>waited
>>and worked until they were reasonably situated financially before taking on
>>more responsibilities.
>
> Unrealistic because it defies the social conventions of our
>society.

Says who? I knwo plenty of people whose social convention is to be responsible.

>Unless our society agrees that marriage is NOT a socially
>desirable prerequisite to sex and living together, it must either
>encourage marriage as a young adult or expect people to violate social
>convention anyway--a self-defeating concept.

Ever hear of contraception? People can get married and even have sex without
having a pack of kids they cannot support.
>
> Undesirable because women who are over thirty at their first
>birth have increased likelihood of problem pregnancies and the
>children have increased likelihood of birth defects or retardation
>(those odd increase as a woman ages).

The studies I read say 35, not 30.

All that means is that if people want kids they need to plan for them early on.

> In addition, the younger parent
>is better able to relate to the needs of the child,

BULL. Pure BULL.

>and is far more
>likely to survive long enough him/her self to insure the child has
>adequate care and education to reach a successful adulthood.

Sorry, that doesn't compute. Life expectancy is now about 77 in the USA. People
who have kids in their 30s will see those kids reach college age before they
reach their '60s.

The discussion was about people who can't even support themselves having kids,
btw.
>
> It depends on how you define "reasonably situated
>financially." Do you mean that the person was well established in a
>career path, or that the person had sufficient investments to support
>his/her family if he/she were to die suddenly? Does it assume that if
>the person's career is halted by disability or a change in our
>national economy (i.e., the high tech jobs that disappeared in the
>Seattle area following the down scaling of SDI and Boeing's problems)

>he or she can still support him or her-self and their family on
>investment income? Your definition of "reasonably situated" may be
>very different from that of someone else.

I mean that a couple has achieved a level of income, education, stability AND maturity sufficient for them to support their own needs AND to have enough of a surplus to support one or more children BEFORE they decide to have any.

>If you mean that the person
>has reason to believe that unless something occurs that is
>unforeseeable at that time (early death, disability, etc.) his or her
>career is secure enough to raise a family, I may agree that this is
>the right time to start a family.

That's all I expect. See above.

>But more than that is absurd to expect of people.

Many think that it's absurd to expect anyhting of people.

>>WHY?? Many people today are not ready to have any children by the time they
>are
>>30.
>
> Nonsense.

No, simple fact. Let's look at a typical timeline:

HS grad: 18
College grad: 22
Grad school: 24
First professional job: 25
Marriage: late 20s

At this rate, a person MIGHT be ready to have kids before 30 if everything goes according to schedule - including meeting a suitable spouse. And if the person is mature enough to raise the kids. For many people today, all of those criteria are not in place by age 30.

> Most people today DO have children by that age.

They do? Who are "most people"?

>Thus, by definition, they are "ready" to do so.

Your critical thinking skills are lacking in this area, Rick. Lots of people who are not ready have kids anyway. It's a major source of social problems.
>
>>>Are you seriously suggesting that the average couple
>>>could reasonably be expected to have made adequate arrangements for
>>>the care of the children and assistance for the surviving partner if
>>>they die at this age?

Sure.

> Cecil, that just isn't realistic!
>
I'm not Cecil.

>>Sure it is. Many people do just that. It's what life insurance, mortgage
>>insurance and relatives/friends are for.
>
> Leave relatives/friends out of it--to base any sort of program
>on the obligation others may feel to assist a family member or friend,
>simply imposes an unfair obligation on that person.

More bull. Part of being ready to have kids is building a social network that
includes things like who would be guardians in the event of untimely parental
death.
>
> As far as insurance goes--if you agree that a person has an
>obligation to pay for that, why is it any different than paying taxes
>to fund a reserve that will provide help for ANYONE in that spot
>instead?

Taxes are mandatory. And the person paying them has little control over the
benefits.

> Is it the fault of the child that the insurance doesn't exist?

Nope. But is it the responsibility of everyone to provide insurance for
everyone else's kids?
>
>>Anyone who has dependent kids should have a will. And in the will the
>guardians
>>of the children should be spelled out in advance (with their consent, of
>>course) so that if both parents die or are incapacitated the children will
>be
>>cared for by people who the parents trusted.
>
> That, of course, has nothing to do with the Libertarian
>perspective on social support programs, the subject of the sub-thread.

So? It's an important issue.
>
>>Term life insurance for healthy people of the age you specify is not
>expensive,
>>either.
>
> But it IS a matter of choice.

Taxes are not.

> Expensive is relative. It's not
>expensive to buy $100,000 in term life if you make an average income.
>What if you are struggling to get by on minimum wage? Or if you have a
>family history of heart disease? Or any of a dozen other reasons that
>insurance costs could cut into badly needed money for food, shelter,
>education, etc.?

See above. If a person can't afford to support themselves, how are they
supposed to support children?

>Are you arguing that the minimum wage worker has no
>right to have children because he can't support them if he dies or is
>disabled? That would be a pretty classist position to take for anyone
>(of course, it IS the Libertarian Party position, but . . .).
>
No, it's a REALISTIC position.

>>All Cecil is proposing is that people take some responsibility.
>
> No, he's proposing that all social support programs be
>eliminated if they operate at the taxpayer's expense. Ask him.

Cecil?
>
>>>>Not my problem. I do not desire to protect people from themselves and
>>>>I would appreciate that same consideration for myself.
>>>
>>> No one is trying to "Protect people from themselves."
>>
>>Sure they are. SS protects people from using the money to make poor
>investment
>>choices. That's why it started in the first place.
>
> It also protects people who don't have the time to build up an
>investment portfolio, people who don't have enough income to invest,
>and the spouses and children of people who don't have adequate
>investments to support them if they die.

Which is "protecting them from themselves". QED

73 de Jim, N2EY

4013. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 13:32:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112110532.7d81d737@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27010

stewartx@sccoast.net (Dwight Stewart) wrote in message
news:<6be98d7d.0112110247.740ac9b1@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com wrote...
> >
> > Dwight Stewart writes:
> >
> > > Based on her report, with expanded farm lands
> > > and better production methods, food production
> > > is expected to grow by about 11% by the year
> > > 2050. Yet, at the same time, food consumption
> > > of this growing population is expected to
> > > increase by at least 40%.
> >
> > Sounds like I better get going on the garden.
> > And a diet.
>
> Well, I wouldn't get too nervous yet. There seems to be a serious
> effort being made to address the problem. To some extent, this problem
> has been on the horizon for years (I can remember reading about it
> twenty years ago). It's just that we're now approaching the breaking
> point, so only now is it getting more attention than in the past.

I recall a "green revolution" in the 1970s where improved strains of
rice and other crops increased production. One of the real benefits of
the space program has been an improved understanding of climate and
weather conditions on earth. Lots of little things can add up.

But as you say, there IS a limit.

> > I dunno. How much land is there in the USA that
> > would be suitable for farming but is not used?

> That I don't know, and I don't think her report specifically
> addressed that (I don't remember seeing it). But I'll ask her about it
> in the morning.

Thanks. For many years, farmland has fallen victim to suburban sprawl
and "development". That trend will eventually have to end.

In addition, many of the crops grown today are used to feed cattle.
Many mor people could be fed from the same land if the crops were used
to feed people.

>In the meantime, we can speculate. How many trees are
> we willing to cut down to clear potential farm lands?

Won't work on a large scale because the trees are needed for paper,
lumber and their anti-pollution properties.

> And, of course,
> some of the problem can be reduced if we develop a taste for crops
> that can grow in less ideal places.

Yup. See above on cattle feed.

>Seaweed burgers, anyone?

Has anybody trademarked the name "Soylent" yet?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4014. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 14:06:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112110606.68127a8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27011

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C15C5D8.A02E619C@sccoast.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart writes:
> >
> > > So your suggested solution to the transportation
> > > needs of the elderly is to simply tell them to
> > > move where public transportation is available.
> > > Nice guy.
> >
> > Sounds like a classic case of NIMBY, Dwight.
>
>
> Exactly, Jim.

There's also the "BANANA" idea that is one cause of California's
electricity troubles. ("BANANA" = "Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere
Near Anything")

> On a side note (not directed solely at you, Jim), Europe has an
> excellent public transportation system.

I understand that in Paris and its suburbs one cannot get more than a
certain distance (500 meters?) from a Metro station. And the Paris
Metro system has been constantly (except for war years) expanded and
modernized to meet the needs of the City of Light.

For longer trips, the TGV trains operate at about 200 mph. They
reached 326 mph in tests (not a typo).

> If anyone wants to pay for this
> "elderly" person to move where public transportation is available, I'll gladly
> take another trip to Europe for a few years. :-)

Works for me!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4015. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 14:12:05 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <kb9tmp@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9v545b$2ej$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 27012

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3C152AE4.41E9F043@IEEE.org...
> WW - KB9TMP wrote:
> > I'd rather have Adam and Eve as grandparents than to
> > have Bonzo and Cheetah the Chimp as ancestors!!!
>
> Thus divorcing yourself from the beautiful experience of
> being linked to all life on earth. It gives me extreme
> pleasure to know I share 90% of my DNA with my dog and
> 50% on my DNA with a banana. I am kin to the trees that
> I climbed as a child. Actually, Homo sapiens are one of
> four surviving great apes, who share ancestors with the
> chimps but are obviously not direct descendants of the
> chimps. After all, we and chimps are 1% different and are
> only genetic cousins.
>
> Just as Copernicus and Galileo shot down the religious
> beliefs concerning the position of the earth in the
> universe, DNA will shoot down the religious beliefs
> concerning our divine immaculate creation. If God
> had a hand in it at all, it was a pretty small hand.
> Multiplying the brain size by two times was a pretty
> small change in the DNA.
>
> If God did create Homo sapiens, He didn't create us from
> dust unless that dust contained some primate DNA. He created
> us from a Homo genus that already existed. And He sure as hell
> didn't do it 120 hours after He created the heavens and the earth.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

And to quote "Scotty" from Star Trek TV/Movie fame;
"Aye, and if my grandmother had wheels she'd be a wagon!"
--

'73' From KB9TMP

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com

4016. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 14:59:48 UTC
From: K0HB <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <OVrDYRlgBHA.1992@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 27013

Dwight says:

> "Most companies" in the context of the discussion
> with Cecil, Hans. See my response to Cecil's message
> for clarification.

I saw your "clarification" to Cecil. I laughed a LOT!
It was a classic case of confusion and ignorance about
how the modern product development process works.

Secrecy is paramount, or companies cease to exist,
and that is ESPECIALLY true in enterprises which develop
consumer products.

Kellogg's would _love_ to know what new cereal is being
formulated at General Mills, Avon would _love_ to know
what the new perfume from Chanel will be this season,
Ford desperately wants to know what the next model
SUV from Dodge will look like, and nobody yet knows
the Colonels Secret Recipe. The kind of secrecy and
security used by these companies makes Osama bin
Laden's itinerary look like a pubic bus companies route
schedule.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

4017. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 15:59:54 UTC
From: K0HB <HHBrakob@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <#nlu8ylgBHA.2124@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 27014

>At this rate, a person MIGHT be ready to have kids before 30 if everything goes
>according to schedule - including meeting a suitable spouse. And if the person
>is mature enough to raise the kids. For many people today, all of those
>criteria are not in place by age 30.

Unrealistic, Jim, completely unrealistic poppycock.

K0CKB and I have raised 5 children to successful maturity; all of them are college educated and are now successfully raising their own families.

All five of those kids were born before I was 31 and before K0CKB was 28. Our timetable is typical of our peers, then and now, in successful middle-class America.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4018. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 16:12:53 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C157868.37EA71D3@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27015

Twistedhed@webtv.net wrote:
>> Sheesh! Can't you music playing cb'er a-holes turn the radio OFF for a few weeks?

> "I resent the CB-slander. I am an accomplished freebander

The second statement confirms the first statement. Calling
operating illegally and accomplishment, what a statement, and
there is no 'freeband'.

4019. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 16:32:37 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <FyqR7.291063$W8.9838406@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27016

> > > > > Krell wrote...

> > > > > >So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring
> > debate,
> > > > > > >there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He
was
> > > > > > >bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of
high
> > speed
> > > > > > >code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a
> > frequency
> > > > > > >in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in
> > feet,
> > > > > he
> > > > > > >drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492,
BTW)

> > > > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote...

> > > > > > Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!

> > > Richard Plourde wrote...

> > > > Larry, that's for the driven element of a yagi.

> > > > Hey Krell...

> > > > "Do you believe in 'Deja Vu'???" ;-)

> > Dave Heil wrote...

> > > Rich, the 468 figure is for a dipole. The yagi DE length can be very
> > > different, i.e. when applying a hair pin match.
> > >
> > > Go sit in the corner with Krell and the other guy.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> Krell wrote:

> > 492 is for a *true* half-wavelength. It's 468 when multiplied by the .95
> > constant, which has become an accept standard. I've seen 462 used when
> > making a folded dipole from 300-ohm twin lead.

> > So I guess you're sitting in the corner with the rest of us, if you
insist
> > that yours is the only right answer.

"Dave Heil" wrote

> I'm not sitting there with you guys until you provide proof that the
> ARRL Handbook, The Radio Handbook, the ARRL Antenna book and the
> question pool are incorrect.

> The "true" half wave length disallowing for anything else would be 500
> divided by frequency.

You're close, Dave, the 'true' half wavelength disallowing for anything else would be 491.8
divided by frequency in MHz

I quote the ARRL Antenna Book 16th Edition Chapter 2 Antenna Fundamentals.

Equation 1 -> Lamda = 299,800,000/f(hertz)
...Lamda is wavelength in meters

Eguation 2 -> length = 491.8/f(MHz)
length 'is the length in feet of a half wavelength for a frequency f (in megahertz), when the wave travels at the velocity of light. This equation is the basis upon which several significant lengths in antenna work lie. It represents the length of a half wavelength in free space, when no factors that modify the speed of propagation exist.'

Equation 3 -> length = 149.9/f(MHz)
...length is in meters with this equation

Equation 6 -> length = 491.8 X 0.95/f(MHz) approximately equal to 467/f(MHz)

It comes out to 467.21/f(MHz) ;-)

The 468 number, which unfortunately shows up in a poorly worded question on the exams, is the number with the 5% 'fudge factor' slowdown of the velocity of the propagation. This number is referred to later in the book (note: Equation 6) when a factor (K) is applied. This crudely compensates for the wavelength/diameter ratio's effect (and also the effect of the insulators at the ends) on the resultant velocity. OBTW, the book says this 'correction' is only good up to 30 MHz. And later, as you know, it says 'the length should be "pruned" to resonance'.

Rich

4020. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 16:54:49 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9v5dr5$93n$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 27017

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C15AAEB.4DB302F1@sccoast.net...
> So you just woke up one morning angry enough to hate Arabs on your own?

You are one seriously deluded individual.

Of
> course we've been influenced by the media and government, Jim. Without
that
> influence, we probably wouldn't associate "terrorism" with the Arabs (99
percent
> are not involved in terrorism).

Did you just wake up one morning with that info? I heard it on the news.

> And more of us would probably realise that
> almost no evidence has been offered to show a connection between Bin Laden
and
> the WTC attack. Or the Taliban and the WTC attack.

I suppose magic fairies might have planned it - or aliens even.

4021. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 17:13:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C163EAA.FBAD6A50@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27018

Twistedhed@webtv.net wrote:
>
> Throw in Plourde's idea of low power and you've guaranteed the
> similarity to CB which Britain, after years of battling over the issue,
> already has. This idea is nearly as bad as baked bean sandwiches,
> grilled tomatoes, bangers, boiled coffee and blackened, cold toast which
> the Brits also introduced. Remember: The Brits invented the toilet
> seat but it took the French to invent the hole in the center.
>
> Dave K8MN
>
> "Ah another CB-hater I see. Take your place in the kennel beside nad and his
> hounds"

Nope. As I pointed out to you in reply to the e-mail you sent me, I
don't hate CBer's. I just don't think most of 'em know much about how
radio works, how to operate, propagation or antennas. Both Britain and
the U.S. already have Citizens Band services. Neither country needs
another.

Dave K8MN

4022. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 17:15:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112110915.576ad84e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27019

"K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com> wrote in message news:<#nIu8ylgBHA.2124@cpimsnntpa04>...
> >At this rate, a person MIGHT be ready to have kids before 30 if everything
> goes
> >according to schedule - including meeting a suitable spouse. And if the
> person
> >is mature enough to raise the kids. For many people today, all of those
> >criteria are not in place by age 30.
>
> Unrealistic, Jim, completely unrealistic poppycock.

How is it unrealistic, Hans? I wrote:

"For many people today, all of these criteria are not in place by age
30".

Doesn't mean the things on the list can't be done today.
>
> K0CKB and I have raised 5 children to successful maturity; all of
> them are college educated and are now successfully raising their
> own families.

That's great! I am delighted but not surprised. But that's one data
point for your family and five for your kids.
>
> All five of those kids were born before I was 31 and before K0CKB
> was 28.

Which means they were all born more than three decades ago, when
things were a bit different than today. Do all of your kids have 5
kids too?

> Our timetable is typical of our peers, then and now, in
> successful middle-class America.

Maybe where you are and the people you know, but for many people today
the situation is quite different. A lot depends on how you define
"middle class", too.

For example, how much did a bachelor's degree (say, BSEE at a good
school) cost for the class of 1962 vs. the class of 2002, in terms of
hours of minimum-wage work? How about a three-bedroom house in a
decent neighborhood? Good used car and insurance for same?

Most important of all - did you have kids before you were ready and
able to take care of them? That's the real point of the discussion.

Yes, there are folks today who do as you did. But for many others it's just not in the cards until they are older.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4023. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 17:32:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011211123239.19213.00000607@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27020

In article <3C1524D3.7660E5A5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> For those of use who use CW, that's never a problem! Since we had
>> the discipline to learn and gain useful proficiency in a useful
>> communications skill, we are also quite self-sufficient in learning
>> about our equipment, setting it up properly, and getting the most out
>> of it.
>
>Actually, the FCC has gone on record as seeing no correlation between
>Morse code skill and self-sufficiency or any other positive attribute.
>Morse code skill stands alone and is uncorrelated to anything else.
>Virtually all of the troublemakers on HF are coded hams. The great
>majority of NALs are given to coded hams.

Hmmm. I see. Is there any correlation, then, between technical skill and having no Morse code skills whatsoever? Among licensed hams, that is -- obviously. IOW -- is a licensed amateur who has not been required to gain useful proficiency in Morse code MORE likely to have advanced technical skills? If you say it is, please provide fully attributed references to reputable academic studies which offer quantifiable proof of same. If you can't or won't provide the proof, then you're all wet, as usual.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4024. Re: Attention HAMS, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 17:40:42 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <uyrR7.158534$WW.9944145@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27021

Nah, but I am slowly getting a bit smarter thanks to a couple of guys from the newsgroups. I was amazed what adding one addy to the kill file did. Heck, it even removed all message headers from the chucklehead. I've just added a few more. The newsgroups are starting to look decent.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C153C9E.825251EE@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
>
> > Don't sweat it. It's a forge.
> >
>
> I realize that, I'm just goofing on him....
> I suppose you're goofing on me.....
>
> 73s Bob
>

4025. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 17:46:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C16467D.1F38289F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27022

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C15989E.3A427B9A@earthlink.net...
> > I'm not sitting there with you guys until you provide proof that the
> > ARRL Handbook, The Radio Handbook, the ARRL Antenna book and the
> > question pool are incorrect.
>
> The ARRL handbook I have is the 1997 edition. Page 20.4. Left-hand column.
> Top of the page. formula #1.

Yep, it is the same as in the 1999 ARRL Handbook. That is for the
design of a half-wave in "free space". Where the hell are you putting
YOUR antennas?

Now go down the page a bit and you'll see two formulae next to each
other. Note the extra "x 0.95" step in the use of the "492" figure.
Adjacent to it is the formula 468/f(MHz).

Dave K8MN

4026. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 17:59:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C164975.14298DED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27023

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > > > > > Krell wrote...
>
> > > > > > >So code proficiency = technical skill? During the restructuring
> > > debate,
> > > > > > >there was an old-timer that had been an Extra class forever. He
> was
> > > > > > >bad-mouthing the no-code techs, and the planned elimination of
> high
> > > speed
> > > > > > >code testing. Yet when asked what constant you would divide a
> > > frequency
> > > > > > >in Mhz into in order to obtain the length of a halfwave dipole in
> > > feet,
> > > > > > he
> > > > > > >drew a complete blank. This shoots down your theory. (It's 492,
> BTW)
>
> > > > > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote...
>
> > > > > > Hmmm. 468 always seemed to work for me!
>
> > > > > Richard Plourde wrote...
>
> > > > > Larry, that's for the driven element of a yagi.
>
> > > > > Hey Krell...
>
> > > > > "Do you believe in 'Deja Vu'???" ;-)
>
> > > Dave Heil wrote...
>
> > > > > Rich, the 468 figure is for a dipole. The yagi DE length can be very
> > > > > different, i.e. when applying a hair pin match.
> > > > >
> > > > > Go sit in the corner with Krell and the other guy.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > Krell wrote:
>
> > > > 492 is for a *true* half-wavelength. It's 468 when multiplied by the .95
> > > > constant, which has become an accept standard. I've seen 462 used when

> > > making a folded dipole from 300-ohm twin lead.
>
> > > So I guess you're sitting in the corner with the rest of us, if you
> insist
> > > that yours is the only right answer.
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote
>
> > I'm not sitting there with you guys until you provide proof that the
> > ARRL Handbook, The Radio Handbook, the ARRL Antenna book and the
> > question pool are incorrect.
>
> > The "true" half wave length disallowing for anything else would be 500
> > divided by frequency.
>
> You're close, Dave, the 'true' half wavelength disallowing for anything else
> would be 491.8
> divided by frequency in MHz
>
> I quote the ARRL Antenna Book 16th Edition Chapter 2 Antenna Fundamentals.
> ---------------
>
> Equation 1 -> Lamda = 299,800,000/f(hertz)
> ...Lamda is wavelength in meters
>
> Eguation 2 -> length = 491.8/f(MHz)
> length 'is the length in feet of a half wavelength for a frequency f (in
> megahertz), when the wave travels at the velocity of light. This equation is
> the basis upon which several significant lengths in antenna work lie. It
> represents the length of a half wavelength in free space, when no factors
> that modify the speed of propagation exist.'
>
> Equation 3 -> length = 149.9/f(MHz)
> ...length is in meters with this equation
>
> Equation 6 -> length = 491.8 X 0.95/f(MHz) approximately equal to
> 467/f(MHz)
> ---------------
>
> It comes out to 467.21/f(MHz) ;-)
>
> The 468 number, which unfortunately shows up in a poorly worded question on
> the exams, is the number with the 5% 'fudge factor' slowdown of the velocity
> of the propagation. This number is referred to later in the book (note:
> Equation 6) when a factor (K) is applied. This crudely compensates for the
> wavelength/diameter ratio's effect (and also the effect of the insulators at
> the ends) on the resultant velocity. OBTW, the book says this 'correction'
> is only good up to 30 MHz. And later, as you know, it says 'the length
> should be "pruned" to resonance'.

"Crudely compensates"? It compensates and does it without the extra step allowing for K factor and insulators. The pruning could take place using either the formula with the extra step or the 468/f formula depending on height above ground or surrounding objects. The 468/f formula has been in use for decades and is the commonly used formula. I don't know many folks cutting dipoles for 1.2 GHz.

Dave K8MN

4027. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 18:04:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dickc58@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3BE80FCD.9F4604A2@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27024

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Not enough blacks on the police force. Not enough Morse code
> > > operators on the ham bands. It's the same concept.
> >
> > Only to you.
>
> Nope, not only to me. They are both attempts at social engineering
> things that cannot be achieved in a free market.

Social engineering in a technical hobby (at least supposed to be one).
Right.
"Free market" in the same. You just can't get past the idea that
communicators are
supposed to train themselves to communicate, and those who don't or
won't simply are not qualified. There IS *NO* market involved. Never
was. But of course you whiners will see to it that your whines are
honored, however ignorant that makes you look.

4028. 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 18:04:59 UTC
From: Speaker to Animal Crackers <flashboinnng1@aol.com>
Message-ID: <fVrR7.3693$vK1.358764@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27025
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Listened all morning to a group of truckers
on 28.115 mHz (AM). Even had
one who's wife was on the "base rig" talking with
her OM mobile about how to make out the bills and novel ways
she thought of to make "Xmas money".

Is this is what you get when you mass-sell 10 meter
radios at/by Radio Shack and others? Wonder how many
were running Uniden 2510's, 2600's or HTX's.

Is 28.115 is the new Channel Ninteen ?.
Is the cow out of the barn door?
A while later a ham came up on the freq in AM
to try an *politely* inform them there were in violation
of FCC rules. They just laughed, Thought it was very funny.
One guy told the ham, who exercized much restraint and
gentlemanly composure in his speech
to: "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"
complete with an roger-beep and echo-effects microphone.

Nice eh?
Gives you the warm & fuzzies?

I'm curious what's the FCC will do?

How about 2 meters?
Is that the next band to be trashed by these
morons who buy ham gear at R.S. or WalMart
and operate without a licence ?

4029. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 18:08:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112111008.632d4dde@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27026

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0112100824.41cfdc2@posting.google.com>...
> "K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com> wrote in message news:<#uesCOHgBHA.1868@cpimsnntpa02>...
>
> > There is more homebrewing and kitbuilding going on in amateur radio
> > today that there has been since the late 50's.
> >
> On a ham per-capita basis?? I very much doubt that, the totals might
> be up but ham radio has also grown fivefold +/- since the late 50s.

I don't even think the totals are up on an absolute basis. How many
hams built Heathkit or Johnson rigs in the late 1950s? Or SB/HW sets
in the '60s?

> Kit-building does not qualify as the "tinkering" and "experimenting"
> techo ham radio of yore, not even close. Pop the plastic, follow the
> yellow brick road and ya have a minimalist's delight at best.

A lot can be learned from building kits - been there done that. No way
is it the same as designing/building from scratch - been there done
that too.
> >
> Where is all this "homebrewing"?? Get yer eyes tested, I don't see any
> such thing.

There's a few of us around. Key word is "few".

> Hombrewing can't touch the bang for the buck the Japs are
> delivering via HRO & AES and without getting wrapped into soddering
> arns.

Yup, at least as far as rigs are concerned. Unless ya want something
that nobody makes, or is so simple that it's cheaper and easier to do
it yerself. Like some antennas.

> 50s ham radio is dead and gone and so is it's set of necessities
> which were the *only* reasons
> hams homeberewed more of their gear back then.

BINGO!

The main driving force was money, or lack thereof. Back in them days a
big chunk of the price of any manufactured electronics was the labor
cost of hand wiring and assembly. Look up the price of a kit EFJ rig
vs. manufactured one - big savings for some hours at the bench. If ya
had a source of cheap parts (surplus, old TVs and BC receivers) a rig
that was not much different than the manufactured ones could be had

for some "solder equity".

Surplus conversion was a whole 'nother game that's all but gone. $100 ARC-5s are not unusual anymore.

Heathkit actually killed off a lot of homebrewing by simple economics. Several years back I took out the old 1959 Newark catalog and started figuring out the price of a simple 50 watt MOPA rig similar to the DX-20. Didn't take too long because the catalog cost of the big parts easily beat the '20s $36 price tag.

Then there's the whole time factor.

> Diddling licensing
> requirements ain't gonna fix your disatisfaction with the lack of
> soddering arn activity today. That's just the way it is.

Absolutely. Them that wants to build will do so for a variety of reasons.

When's the last time you worked a US ham with a 100% homebrew station who did not have a "mainstream" rig also? (Besides me, I mean - and it ain't true for me anymore).

73 de Jim, N2EY

4030. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 18:24:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112111024.5e89bff8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27027

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:<qF6R7.290175$W8.9728322@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > Richard McCollum writes
>
> > >Dali was so
> > >surrealistic he almost did not have to paint to prove it.
>
> "N2EY" wrote
>
> > Waddya mean, "almost"?
>
> When I see a picture of him I always think... "This guy IS surrealism
> personified" A true caricature of himself. ;-)

Yup.

There's a saying around these parts:

"Some people ya don't have to parody. Just quote 'em".

Same principle applies.
>
> I have a Salvador Dali screensaver and people just sit a watch it...

I'm gonna download me an "Amelie" screensaver and see what it does.
>
> I have a complaint... why is it we can buy calendars with impressionism
> themes but NEVER with surrealism themes.

Kinda surreal, ain't it?
>
> > No mention of surrealism would be complete without the Firesign Theater,
> who
> > are still together and performing. They recently marked their 35th
> anniversary
> > by their first TV special (brought to you by Ralph Spoilsport Motors,
> > Loosener's Castor Oil Flakes, and Bear Whizz Beer ("It's in the water!").
>
> I saw the show last week. nice to see what they look like.

I taped it. Somehow it's better listened to than watched. The whole
concept of FT is an audio-only thing, like Prairie Home Companion.

All hail (Groucho) Marx and (John) Lennon...

> I had a few of
> their albums

I am most familiar with "I Think We're All Bozos On This Bus" and only
recently discovered the full meaning of the title.

1970s FM radio here in Philly played them all the time.

They never covered either of Fudd's Laws of Opposition in physics
class but they are quite useful in practice.

> and they stayed close to the material but added quite a few new
> things too...

Should I take the old Antelope Freeway or the Cheney-Letterman
Quadruple Bypass?
>
> > FT are best when listened to, however - true FM radio audio
> revolutionaries.
>
> "If you lived here you'd be home now..."
>
I spell my name - DANGER!

73 de Jim "what's all this brouhaha?" N2EY

still waiting for the electrician

4031. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 18:45:36 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <#NzBiPngBHA.2124@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 27028

N2EY wants to know:

> When's the last time you worked a US ham with a 100% homebrew
> station who did not have a "mainstream" rig also? (Besides me, I
> mean - and it ain't true for me anymore).

Get real! We aren't talking about "100% homebrew " here (nor were
we back in the 50's). We're talking about tinkering and experimenting,
which can include some homebrewing "from scratch", some modification
of store bought equipment, some 'conversion from other service', some
kitbuilt, some fixing of what got broken, and obviously some unchanged
since it came out of the box. That's the mix in most active amateur shacks
today, just as it was back in the 50's.

I know a LOT of active hams and, except for a few very new ones, I don't
know of a SINGLE shack that contains 100% factory made/factory original
equipment. Not ONE.

Killing that spirit with a "manufactured type-accepted rig only" license
would
doom the Amateur Radio Service to extinction, and all your ill-founded
pontificating about "there ain't no more homebrewers" will only speed the
date. Shame on you.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

4032. Re: I dont need a license to transmit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 19:26:33 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9v5mk7$e57$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27029
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

"Fred Garvin" <Garvin@Truss.net> wrote in message
news:1f47txx.jibj4rbnld52N%Garvin@Truss.net...
> Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C14500C.90B11EDE@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > Trouser Trout wrote:
> > >
> > > > Yes, Landshark knows all about forging people. A search of google
will
> > show
> > > > this.
> > > >
> > >
> > > "Candygram!"
> > >
> >
> > "Mrs. Mhfhmr?"
>
> Mrs. Mahellmahey.....
>

"Jehovah's Witnesses..."

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"I have sold more books about physics than Madonna has about sex."
- Stephen Hawking

4033. Re: 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 19:32:36 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C15A738.C121D19@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27030
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Speaker to Animal Crackers wrote:

> One guy told the ham, who exercized much restraint and
> gentlemanly composure in his speech
> to: "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"
> complete with an roger-beep and echo-effects microphone.
>
> Nice eh?
> Gives you the warm & fuzzies?
>

Typical response of the cb mentality. Most have an IQ equal to
half their shoe size.

4034. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 19:44:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C16623B.9D45ACBA@uci.edu>
Source record: 27031

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C15C5D8.A02E619C@sccoast.net>...
> > On a side note (not directed solely at you, Jim), Europe has an
> > excellent public transportation system.

> I understand that in Paris and its suburbs one cannot get more than a
> certain distance (500 meters?) from a Metro station. And the Paris
> Metro system has been constantly (except for war years) expanded and
> modernized to meet the needs of the City of Light.

Yes, just got back from there. It only takes about an hour to walk
across the city between the walls where 2 millions of the residents
live. Out here you'd barely get started down Imperial in that amount of
time.

4035. Re: 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 20:06:52 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <wHtR7.33795$ER5.385052@rwcrnsc52>
Source record: 27032
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

This is nothing new. Ranger a Uniden both put out ten meter radios that were, by design, easily modified to cover 11 meters and below. A simple jumper and these frequencies are available and, on the Ranger at least, press a couple of buttons and the readout displays channels. Following on there lead, lots of radios of various different brands are now being sold with these capabilities. To keep them legal for sale, they are marketed and enabled for ten meters but are easily modified. A lot of them come standard with things like roger beeps. It is rare to find them sold by ham radio dealers but in the CB shops, they are the hot thing. This has been going on for years and the FCC basically ignores it. They tried to control the CBers once and they couldn't do it so they are hesitant to try again. If you would like to see a full range of these radios, go here: http://www.copper.com/ They list over twenty five different models and, for another $30.00 at the time of purchase, they will modify them for 11 meters. In some areas, 2 meters is just as bad. 2 meters has been adopted as the standard air to ground communications for hang gliders, many of whom are not licensed. Several years ago, the major ham radio manufacturers decided that they would no longer worry about selling there equipment to only ham equipment dealers. Consequently, a lot of truckers are now using the HF bands instead of CBs. Equipment is available at most truck stop CB shops. If you listen around the ham bands or close to it, it is not uncommon to hear truckers.
--
CW
KC7NOD
Web Page http://www.kc7nod.20m.com

"Speaker to Animal Crackers" <flashboinnng1@aol.com> wrote in message news:fVrR7.3693$vK1.358764@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Listened all morning to a group of truckers
> on 28.115 mHz (AM). Even had
> one who's wife was on the "base rig" talking with
> her OM mobile about how to make out the bills and novel ways
> she thought of to make "Xmas money".
>
> Is this is what you get when you mass-sell 10 meter
> radios at/by Radio Shack and others? Wonder how many
> were running Uniden 2510's, 2600's or HTX's.
>
> Is 28.115 is the new Channel Ninteen ?.
> Is the cow out of the barn door?
> A while later a ham came up on the freq in AM
> to try an *politely* inform them there were in violation
> of FCC rules. They just laughed, Thought it was very funny.

> One guy told the ham, who exercized much restraint and
> gentlemanly composure in his speech
> to: "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"
> complete with an roger-beep and echo-effects microphone.
>
> Nice eh?
> Gives you the warm & fuzzies?
>
> I'm curious what's the FCC will do?
>
> How about 2 meters?
> Is that the next band to be trashed by these
> morons who buy ham gear at R.S. or WalMart
> and operate without a licence ?
>
>

4036. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 20:11:38 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <_LtR7.31967$wL4.119158@rwcrnsc51>
Source record: 27033

Accomplished freebander = hasn't been caught yet.
<Twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:9v4f89jtt1@news.netmar.com...
>
> "I resent the CB-slander. I am an accomplished freebander and not one of
the
> common unwashed. I am sure we on 27.555 can give whoever is on your 313
> channel a run for their money. Go away son and get some real radio
> experience and then call a break for me when the skips running"
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
eb -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
abuse@newsone.net

4037. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 21:32:38 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v5tuo012f0@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27036

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C16467D.1F38289F@earthlink.net...
> Krell wrote:

> Now go down the page a bit and you'll see two formulae next to each
> other. Note the extra "x 0.95" step in the use of the "492" figure.
> Adjacent to it is the formula 468/f(MHz).
>
Dave K8MN

Wow! That's just what I posted in my response to Larry Troll when he used the 468 figure!

4038. Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 21:51:33 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9v5ukajpv1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 27034

Here's something to think about. The other night I had a guy honestly ask me, out side of a 7-eleven store, if I was some kind of secret agent or something while pointing to the antenna farm on top of my van. I said no, and then explained I was a Ham Radio operator. Seems he has heard the term before. I talked with him for about 10 minutes trying to explain what we do etc., and I had several vendor's glossy literature for some Ham Radio gear, a 706MKIIG and Kenwood's new HT put away inside of the van for cases like this, I gave him as examples of the kind of equipment we can use. He was pleased as heck with the radio literature, and wanted to know if CW was used too, which I said yes. I also gave him the URL for the ARRL web site for more info. This guy really did seem to be interested so I am thinking maybe having a small PR packet we can hand out to people who are not afraid to ask us about all those weird antennas really isn't a bad idea. I read about another Ham in a news group, a while back, who was doing something like this to promote the hobby. Now when they get home they will have something to look at and not forget about it. Then maybe they will take the time to look up the ARRL on the web.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

4039. Re: 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 21:57:18 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u1d0adp01ds924@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 27035
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

> "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"

this is just CB lingo for 'goodmorning'.

phil :p

4040. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 22:12:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1684D6.92CAD11C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27037

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
> >
> > And more of us would probably realise that
> > almost no evidence has been offered to show
> > a connection between Bin Laden and the WTC
> > attack. Or the Taliban and the WTC attack.
>
> I suppose magic fairies might have planned it
> - or aliens even.

I don't know who planned it, Jim. And neither do you. But I do know we have a concept of justice in this country where a person is innocent until proven guilty. And if I truly believe in the rightness of that concept, then it has to apply to all - not just those I choose to apply it to today. If Bin Laden is guilty, then he should get exactly what is coming to him. But, so far, I've seen nothing to prove his guilt.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4041. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 22:14:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C168528.2ADB8E64@uci.edu>
Source record: 27039

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote...
> > >
> > > And more of us would probably realise that
> > > almost no evidence has been offered to show
> > > a connection between Bin Laden and the WTC
> > > attack. Or the Taliban and the WTC attack.
> >
> > I suppose magic fairies might have planned it
> > - or aliens even.
>
> I don't know who planned it, Jim. And neither do you. But I do know we have a
> concept of justice in this country where a person is innocent until proven
> guilty. And if I truly believe in the rightness of that concept, then it has to
> apply to all - not just those I choose to apply it to today. If Bin Laden is
> guilty, then he should get exactly what is coming to him. But, so far, I've seen
> nothing to prove his guilt.

Have you seen him come out with his hands up?

4042. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 22:17:27 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1685F7.94E9C792@uci.edu>
Source record: 27040

Osama Bin Laden Apologist Dwight Stewart wrote:

> I don't know who planned it, Jim. And neither do you. But I do know we have a
> concept of justice in this country where a person is innocent until proven
> guilty. And if I truly believe in the rightness of that concept, then it has to
> apply to all - not just those I choose to apply it to today. If Bin Laden is
> guilty, then he should get exactly what is coming to him. But, so far, I've seen
> nothing to prove his guilt.

Now you're making me feel real sorry for him. I think I'm gonna cry.
I'm sure he's a real nice guy once you get to know him.

NOT!

4043. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 22:17:56 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C15CDAF.21EC94C6@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27038

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> If Bin Laden is
> guilty, then he should get exactly what is coming to him. But, so far, I've seen
> nothing to prove his guilt.
>
Then you must be dumber than dumb.

4044. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 22:49:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C168D6B.9B914A1E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27041

Krell wrote:
>
> No, Dwight. You refused to post references to
> your stupid and erroneous claims. You then
> told me to do my own research. You asked for
> it whether you realize it or not. You probably
> never even looked at the link, which wouldn't
> be a surprise. You're content to believe
> lies the religious right has been spewing
> for years.

Stupid claims, Krell? I claimed these people cannot actually do magic. Are you saying they can? I claimed these people are frauds. The fact they cannot do magic when they claim they can proves that. I claimed modern day "pagans" are not descendants of those ancient pagan religions. Do you have some evidence to dispute this? I claimed most people in this country would describe their beliefs and practices as "satanic." Do you have some evidence to dispute that? So far, I've seen a lot of talk about how my claims are wrong, but not a shred of evidence to support that talk.

If you really believe this wiccan nonsense, Krell, show me they can do magic and cast spells by having one do so to me. I've asked for such proof over and over, yet nothing has happened so far. In the end, this entire wiccan nonsense is stupid, and so is anyone who would defend it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4045. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 22:56:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C168F04.48FC283B@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27042

N2EY wrote:
>
> There's also the "BANANA" idea that is one
> cause of California's electricity troubles.
> ("BANANA" = "Build Absolutely Nothing
> Anywhere Near Anything")

I'm still waiting for California to fall into the ocean - that will really end their electricity troubles. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4046. Re: 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 22:57:15 UTC
From: greg <greg@valkyrie.net>
Message-ID: <3c168f47_2@athena.netset.com>
Source record: 27043
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

how much does it cost for the bag of marbals to put in your mouth for cb
talk trainning ?? :)

> They list over twenty five different models and, for another $30.00 at the
> time of purchase, they will modify them for 11 meters. In some areas,

Help fight mailbots with these in your tagline:
tosspam@aol.com abuse@aol.com abuse@yahoo.com abuse@hotmail.com
abuse@msn.com abuse@sprintmail.com abuse@earthlink.net uce@ftc.gov
abuse@info.cep.cniba-u.ac.jp

4047. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 23:00:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C168FF7.255B439A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27044

K0HB wrote:
>
> Secrecy is paramount, or companies cease to exist,
> and that is ESPECIALLY true in enterprises which
> develop consumer products.

Not in the companies I've seen, Hans. Security can range from almost non-existant to very strong. But, in general, they can be grouped into the three categories I listed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4048. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 23:02:28 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C16909A.5215455F@gte.net>
Source record: 27078
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> You must not be reading my post--I won't HAVE to do anything: USAF will do
> it FOR me. DOD equipment is issued on a Form 37. All I have to do is tell
> the CID investigators WHO confiscated it, and THEY will be on the LEO like
> stink on sh**.
>

Think again. First the cops would just the
car and the radios. Then when the CID
folks show up, they will explain how you
lipped off to the cops that you were some
type of hot shot Air Force type. At that
point, the investigation might be about your
fitness to serve.

>
> > > Maybe so. There are still laws against unlawful search and seizure.
> And, as I said before, in reference to the seizure of my radio equipment, he
>
> will be in deep doo doo when he confiscates my radio that was purchased with
>
> DoD funds. ASSuming that a civilian is in the wrong is a sure way to get
> sued for false arrest. While I have never been arrested in my life, nor
> have I
> ever given a LEO a reason to hassle me, I have been talked to in a most
> > > disrespectful manner, and treated like I didn't know what I was about.
> A cop is NOT the arbitor of truth; just because he "thinks" you did
> something
> > > doesn't make it so. I am, however, somewhat vindictive, a trait I
> inherited from my Dad's side. I cannot STAND to be acused of something I
> did not do, nor to be falsely hassled, inconvenienced, or unfairly caused to
> lose
> time or money. While most people would not pursue the matter, I, OTH, would
> be
> > > searching the law for a way to get the SOB back
> > > legally. With the military VHF radio I have in addition to my ham
> equipment, having that "stolen" at gunpoint WOULD be something the LEO would
> wish he had never done. While the LEO has "friends" in the courts, I have
> friends
> in the military and at the State level (if the seizure takes place in my
> state). I would NOT let the matter rest.
> > >
> >
> > Unless you are very rich, you may not have
> > the political connections to really make a

> > difference. And it would take a bundle of
> > money to pursue a court battle.
> >
> > Again, talk this over with your attorneys.
> > I think that you might get "an education".
> >
> >

4049. Re: 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 23:02:30 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C16901E.99A91DAA@spam.me.not>
Source record: 27045
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

...apparently the same as it cost for your spelling lessons...

It's marbles, not marbals; and training, not trainning.

hukd on fonix wurkd 4 u, 2?

Itts knought phunnie too bie ay baad spelar.

Sheesh.

-SSB

greg wrote:
>
> how much does it cost for the bag of marbals to put in your mouth for cb
> talk trainning ?? :)
>
> > They list over twenty five different models and, for another $30.00 at the
> > time of purchase, they will modify them for 11 meters. In some areas,
>
> Help fight mailbots with these in your tagline:
> tosspam@aol.com abuse@aol.com abuse@yahoo.com abuse@hotmail.com
> abuse@msn.com abuse@sprintmail.com abuse@earthlink.net uce@ftc.gov
> abuse@info.cep.cniba-u.ac.jp

4050. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 23:11:12 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1692A2.94275F87@gte.net>
Source record: 27079
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > I work for a governmental agency.
>
> Which means your an expert on Police procedure across the country?
>

No. But you are living in dream land.

>
> > Plus I have a number of friends who
> > are LEOs who I serve with in the
> > military reserves.
>
> > I know procedure. And I know rookie
> > cops. When in doubt, arrest.
>
> Again this is just your over exagerated opinion, nothing more. I think
> elephants can fly to but hey thats my opinion. What procedure do you know?
> So now you know all rookie cops, simply amazing are you psycotic ... Opps
> typo I mean psychic.....
>

And are you a police officer? Are you
an attorney? NO. You are a Private
Fucking Civilian (PFC) with little contact
with the current system.

Understand this. The police and the
military are your superiors. Their lives
are far more valuable than yours. And
they are the only thing that is keeping this
country together. There lives are living
sacrifices, their deaths atone for your
screw ups.

And no cop is going to take your lip,
that you are some big bad ass ham
operator. In his mind, he does not
care about your rights. He cares
about making home every night.

>
> > That came from a buddy who is
> > a Chicago cop and how is a captain
> > in the Army Reserves.
>

> More opinions and heresay! With no basis for fact.
>
> > You have not been in court lately, have you?
>
> Yes as a matter of fact i have.How about you?
>

As a matter of my duties, yes.

What charges were you brought
up on?

>
> > The cops see their main duty in getting people
> > into court. At that point they see that they have
> > done their job and it is the courts' job to determine
> > who was correct.
>
> It is the Cops job to enforce the laws that are out in our society, It is
> there job to get criminals off the streets, if they had the choice they
> would rather not have to go to court or arrest anyone.
>
> >
> > Cops are very hard nosed these days. What I
> > am trying to get across is that the average cop
> > does not know who you are, does not care. If
> > you give him any grief over your "rights", he calls
> > in back up, arrests you and then lets the courts
> > settle.
>
> They also are under alot of scrutiny these days, in NJ the State Police are
> under a lot of scrutiny all motor vehicle stops are video recorded and the
> stops are reviewed by the federal Government. So "they" are not arresting
> people who complain about their rights. They are arresting people because
> they violated a Law. Most cops are well aware of what peoples rights are
> within the letter of the law. Do exceptions happen of course they do but the
> brush you are painting with is far to wide and just your opinion.
>

No, but they do not want to hear about
your fucking rights. They could care less.
If they pull you over, they can take your
car if you do not have proof that you
are federally licensed to operate a radio.

>
> This is exactly what most of my cop buddies
> > say that they will do if they are uncertain about
> > a law. They see it as court problem, not theirs.
>
> This says it all :: snipped fron N9NWO's qrz page.
>

> I have served for over 30 years in politics. I have been a precinct
> committeeman, a delegate to the State Party convention several times and
> just finished a term as a member of my local township board.

And your service to "king and country"?
I do have 30 years of political service.
I have put judges on the bench, congressmen
in office, have worked on political campaigns
from the local to federal level.

Plus 20 years of military service, to include
a year in the Gulf War and another year
with the Bosnian mess.

What have you done with your miserable
two bit life?

4051. Re: 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 23:14:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <prwR7.158829$WW.9967755@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27046
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"greg" <greg@valkyrie.net> wrote in message
news:3c168f47_2@athena.netset.com...

Just like there ain't no such thing as a free lunch, there ain't no topic
worth this number of newsgroups.

Dick N&#65533;BK

4052. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 23:14:58 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C169383.3783E724@gte.net>
Source record: 27080
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> Now, tell me this> If I am driving my personal car, not speeding, not
> violating any laws, in uniform or not, and a LEO decides to become "curious"
> about my radio equipment, he will have NO leg to stand on. First line of
> defense--the Amateur license. Most cops DO know what Amateur Radio is. I have
> already been asked about this at license checks. Now, let's say the LEO
> decides that this is not good enough for him, and at the time, I happen to
> have the Tait radio on state rescue.
> In spite of courteous efforts to explain what it is, the LEO decides that he
> is going to confiscate my radios and does so. The first call will go to Col.
> Charles Layno in Greensboro, NC. He or I will then put in a call to Maxwell
> AFB, Al explaining what happened. I will then sit back and wait. YOU can
> think what you like, and all the civilian "contacts" in the world will not
> stop what happens
> next. The LEO's supervisor WILL get a call from Maxwell "requesting" the
> equipment be returned. It will be made clear that their department WILL
> return the radio without delay. You are not understanding; the equipment is
> NOT civilian--it is
> charged out on a DOD Form and is accountable to the HQ to which it is
> assigned. It would be the SAME thing if a cop stopped a Marine convoy and
> "confiscated" the radios out of a Humvee. CID would NOT let it go. I would
> do nothing--I'd be out of the loop sitting on the sidelines just waiting for
> the sh** to hit the fan AND laughing my a** off at the cop
>
> Your attitude seems to be that cops can do anything and get away with it.
> That *may* be true up to a point. On the news tonight, for example, there is
> a police chief in hot water in a nearby town. Seems he answered a call to a
> ruckus involving a group of teens. One of the teens was not involved in the
> fights that broke out, and was leaving the scene as the chief drove up. The
> kid was halfway inside his car when the chief rushed up, grabbed the kid and
> flung him down onto the pavement injuring him. Now the cop says it was the
> kid resisting arrest. But there were 20 witnesses that say the cop just ran
> up and grabbed the boy and threw him to the ground. The fight was inside the
> recreation center. If the cop is guilty I hope the guy is fired and is never
> allowed to work in law enforcement again. IF the kid DID resist arrest, or
> become belligerent, then HE should have to pay.
>

The point is that if you off half cocked about your "rights"
and how you are some big shot ham operator/CAP big
wig, you are in the wrong. That is not the way to deal
with cops. Your lack of respect towards them is shameful.

The police and military are your superiors.

4053. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 23:19:05 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C16947B.C9669F83@gte.net>
Source record: 27081
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> As far as my own county is concerned, I have lived here since 1967. I know
> just about everybody around here that counts. I have NEVER been arrested in
> my entire life. I have a very conservative appearance with no long hair or
> mustache. My clothes are always clean--unless I am working on an old car. I
> know lots of the cops here including the county Sheriff, many city cops, and
> my ex-brother-in-law who is on the force. My car tag even states "USAF
> Auxiliary, NC Wing CAP XXX You are still missing something here. What I am
> telling you is: sure, the cop can take my stuff. Now if I don't give him
> grief in any way, do not resist his efforts to seize the radio equipment, the
> only recourse is to show him the Amateur license and the Property tag on the
> non- civilian radio, YES, he can take my stuff: do you think I am going to
> resist a cop with a gun? But IF you think Maxwell AFB is going to sit there
> and let that cop KEEP that equipment, you're loonier than 40 hells! Again, if
> you think the local yokels will stare down the CID audit team, you
> are nuts. It WILL be returned.
>
> I have been involved in the organization since 1964. Now if I decide to
> embarrass the LEO, I don't need to bring said organization into the picture;
> all I need is a
> copy of the FCC regulations that preempt Bubba's authority and an accurate
> account of what happened. You see, I won't HAVE to involve them: USAF/CAP
> will take care of the confiscated equipment issue. I will make the cop look
> stupid and embarrass his department over the Amateur issue by causing a TV
> reporter to come snooping around, asking questions, and putting them on
> national TV. Prior
> to that, being briefed on the FCC preemption, a judge would likely strike any
> charge of "illegal radios and return them.
>
> NOW! Having beat this horse to death, I have to say that this is a very unlike
> situation. Most cops are professionals and conduct themselves in a
> respectful, courteous manner. They are not stupid and will not put themselves
> into a situation that could cause them embarrassment. Many cops are even
> hams, and as such, understand--even know-- the rules and how they apply to
> hams. It is the rogue, the big headed rookie, the guy with the swelled head,
> the one whose psyco-logical profile misled his testers that could cause this
> trouble. They don't usually last long tending to get themselves in trouble.
> Hey, I've been thru MANY license checks,
> especially after Sept 11, and have been merely asked what were the radios
> for. Most of them were already familiar with ham radio--even CAP--and have
> never had a problem. I know the rogue cops are out there be- cause I've been
> stopped by one--even though I was NOT speeding or doing anything out of the
> ordinary. He was most discourteous, cut me off when I attempted to ask a
> question, wouldn't let

> me talk at all. The stop was a mistake--the car he was looking for was a
> sedan: I was in a station wagon--just the same color. But he took his mistake
> out on ME. It is the rogue who would decide that his authority cannot be
> challenged, and he is
> the one I would take on thru legal and military channels if his "error"
> involved the seizing of DOD equipment. That is all I am saying. And here,
> this thread ends as far as I am concerned--no need to keep this up.
>

The way you were going at it was that you
were making it out that you were some big
shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
fucking rights and you were going to TELL
that cop were to get off.

4054. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-11 23:47:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C169B12.CA8BBE41@uci.edu>
Source record: 27047

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Stupid claims, Krell? I claimed these people cannot actually do magic. Are you
> saying they can?

Maybe some of them are magicians?

From what I can tell, they seem to be using kind of a loose, existential
definition of the term, Dwight.

4055. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 01:11:39 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v6arn02fvf@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27048

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C168D6B.9B914A1E@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> Stupid claims, Krell? I claimed these people cannot actually do magic.
Are you
> saying they can? I claimed these people are frauds. The fact they cannot
do
> magic when they claim they can proves that. I claimed modern day "pagans"
are

It's "magick." Not, "magic." Try posting "magic" in a pagan/Wiccan newsgroup
and watch what happens.

> not descendants of those ancient pagan religions. Do you have some
evidence to
> dispute this? I claimed most people in this country would describe their
beliefs
> and practices as "satanic." Do you have some evidence to dispute that? So
far,
> I've seen a lot of talk about how my claims are wrong, but not a shred of
> evidence to support that talk.

Did you even LOOK at the link I posted? Obviously not.

> If you really believe this wiccan nonsense, Krell, show me they can do
magic
> and cast spells by having one do so to me. I've asked for such proof over
and
> over, yet nothing has happened so far. In the end, this entire wiccan
nonsense
> is stupid, and so is anyone who would defend it.

Wiccan spell rituals are no different than a native American rain dance, or
Christians praying for miracles. Who are you to say which one is right or
wrong?

4056. Three Cheers For N0BK

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 01:39:10 UTC
From: "Scott upplus@hotSPAMmail.com"
Message-ID: <9v6cfuomo1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 27049

Always there is a problem with hams coming in rec.radio.cb and telling us CBers whats legal and whats not. Blah blah blah. FCC this and FCC that. Not Dick. Dick is "our" kind of ham. When he hears us talking about illegal stuff he doesnt call us criminals. He is a ham and he gets a kick out of how we run 4500 watts in a mobile. This makes us feel pretty good about ourselves. And with a little prompting we can get him to school us on how to slide our PLL's onto 10 meters or bias a pair of 4-1000's on channel 19.

Go Beer Keg!!! You RULE!!!!!

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4057. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 02:07:40 UTC
From: "long dong sliver esq." <stopond300@amishonlinel.com>
Message-ID: <MZyR7.4075$5K4.445664@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27050
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"phil" <phil@phil.com> wrote in message news:u1b59ifs4bn8e7@corp.supernews.com...
> > Better watch out there friend or you'll be asked to contribute to Herbie's
> > latest defense fund. It's coming.
>
> wow, i'm lost here... do you know K1MAN? i did not hear any of his bulletins
> yet... what is the bulletin about?

Primarilly this ----> http://fotm.rotten.com/fotm/

;) I'm sure you get the idea ;)

4058. Re: 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 02:21:04 UTC
From: greg <greg@valkyrie.net>
Message-ID: <3c16bf0c_3@athena.netset.com>
Source record: 27051
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

and who in the hell are you english COP ?

--
Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C16901E.99A91DAA@spam.me.not...
> ...apparently the same as it cost for your spelling lessons...
>
> It's marbles, not marbals; and training, not trainning.
>
> hukd on fonix wurkd 4 u, 2?
>
> Itts knought phunnie too bie ay baad spelar.
>
> Sheesh.
>
> -SSB
>
> greg wrote:
> >
-u.ac.jp

4059. Re: Three Cheers For N0BK

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 02:21:35 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <PazR7.159030$WW.9984993@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27052

The Mad Forger Strikes again. Does not deserve a reply or denial. Prove
it Bozo

Dick N&#65533;BK

<Scott (Unit-69) upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:9v6cfuomo1@news.netmar.com...
> Always there is a problem with hams coming in rec.radio.cb and telling
us
> CBers whats legal and whats not. Blah blah blah. FCC this and FCC that.
Not
> Dick. Dick is "our" kind of ham. When he hears us talking about illegal
stuff
> he doesnt call us criminals. He is a ham and he gets a kick out of how
we run
> 4500 watts in a mobile. This makes us feel pretty good about ourselves.
And
> with a little prompting we can get him to school us on how to slide our
PLL's
> onto 10 meters or bias a pair of 4-1000's on channel 19.
>
> Go Beer Keg!!! You RULE!!!!!
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
eb -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other
posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email

abuse@newsone.net

4060. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 02:22:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C16BF4E.957575C7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27053

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > At Intel, a logic designer meets with a
> > process designer quite often in a one-on-one
> > meeting. Most companies trust their employees.
>
> If those companies trust those employees, why would they need to discuss
> project only behind closed doors?

They obviously trust some key employees more than other non-key employees.
You simply don't know what you are talking about. At Intel, *every* day,
there are thousands of one-on-ones (what Intel calls them) behind closed
doors. I worked in a group unrelated to microprocessors and would have
been unable to obtain the specs for the Pentium4. You have no idea of
the secrecy surrounding the latest designs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4061. Re: Three Cheers For N0BK

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 02:35:47 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7ozR7.219357$3d2.10182929@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27054

Dick, thanks again. I've added more to my block sender list. Each addition and the newsgroup thins out before my eyes. My blood pressure is 120 over 80.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:PazR7.159030$WW.9984993@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> The Mad Forger Strikes again. Does not deserve a reply or denial. Prove
> it Bozo
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
> <Scott (Unit-69) upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
> news:9v6cfuomo1@news.netmar.com...
> > Always there is a problem with hams coming in rec.radio.cb and telling
> us
> > CBers whats legal and whats not. Blah blah blah. FCC this and FCC that.
> Not
> > Dick. Dick is "our" kind of ham. When he hears us talking about illegal
> stuff
> > he doesnt call us criminals. He is a ham and he gets a kick out of how
> we run
> > 4500 watts in a mobile. This makes us feel pretty good about ourselves.
> And
> > with a little prompting we can get him to school us on how to slide our
> PLL's
> > onto 10 meters or bias a pair of 4-1000's on channel 19.
> >
> > Go Beer Keg!!! You RULE!!!!!
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

> >
> >
> >
> > ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
> eb -----
> > http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
> groups
> > NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other
> posts
> > made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
> abuse@newsone.net
>
>

4062. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 02:38:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C16C32B.DC519BB1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27055

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Social engineering in a technical hobby (at least supposed to be one).
> Right.

The Federal Government requires HF hams to know Morse code. That's
social engineering, Dick. All governmental requirements are social
engineering. If the feds were not trying to engineer society, there
would be no need for federal requirements.

> "Free market" is the same.

From Websters: "market - trade or traffic" Haven't you ever heard
of CW traffic, Dick? CW is in competition with the other modes.
A lot of hams choose not to buy CW or your arguments about CW.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4063. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 02:41:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C16C3BE.75761E33@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27056

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> If Bin Laden is
> guilty, then he should get exactly what is coming to him. But, so far, I've seen
> nothing to prove his guilt.

The smoking gun is supposed to be released to the public tomorrow.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4064. Re: 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 02:45:31 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C16C461.E3FBBDB6@spam.me.not>
Source record: 27057
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

No, just a guy who found it funny that you were making a fool of
yourself while making fun of someone else, and decided to poke a little
fun myself. Whassamattah? You can dish it out, but you can't take it?
::smirk::

-SSB

greg wrote:
>
> and who in the hell are you english COP ?
>
> --
> Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> news:3C16901E.99A91DAA@spam.me.not...
> > ...apparently the same as it cost for your spelling lessons...
> >
> > It's marbles, not marbals; and training, not trainning.
> >
> > hukd on fonix wurkd 4 u, 2?
> >
> > Itts knought phunnie too bie ay baad spelar.
> >
> > Sheesh.
> >
> > -SSB
> >
> > greg wrote:
> > >
> -u.ac.jp

4065. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 02:49:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C16C5D4.B146839A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27058

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Actually, the FCC has gone on record as seeing no correlation between
> >Morse code skill and self-sufficiency or any other positive attribute.
> >Morse code skill stands alone and is uncorrelated to anything else.
> >Virtually all of the troublemakers on HF are coded hams. The great
> >majority of NALs are given to coded hams.
>
> Hmmm. I see. Is there any correlation, then, between technical
> skill and having no Morse code skills whatsoever?

Actually, the great majority of people with PhD degrees in
EE/Electronics don't know Morse code. Like the FCC said, Morse
code skill proves Morse code skill. It doesn't prove anything
else including technical skill. If Morse code skill were
correlated with technical skill, it would be a requirement
in the technical curriculum of universities but you know
it is not required.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4066. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 03:16:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011211221659.13985.00000822@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 27060

In article <#NzBiPngBHA.2124@cpimsnntpa04>, "K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
writes:

>
>Get real! We aren't talking about "100% homebrew " here (nor were
>we back in the 50's). We're talking about tinkering and experimenting,
>which can include some homebrewing "from scratch", some modification
>of store bought equipment, some 'conversion from other service', some
>kitbuilt, some fixing of what got broken, and obviously some unchanged
>since it came out of the box. That's the mix in most active amateur shacks
>today, just as it was back in the 50's.
>
>I know a LOT of active hams and, except for a few very new ones, I don't
>know of a SINGLE shack that contains 100% factory made/factory original
>equipment. Not ONE.

Hansl:

Well, then, you obviously know very few post No Code Tech hams, and
virtually no Post Restructuring hams! Most of those I know have nothing
but 100% store-bought-off-the-shelf shacks, some of them even down
to the "dipole in a bag" and coax with pre-installed connectors. Even
in my own shack, there is very little homebrewed/kit-built gear. I've
got a homebrewed PSK31 interface, a kit-built version of the same thing,
a kit-built Mic-E APRS unit, and a kit-built artificial ground unit. That's
it. Granted, all my coax and other cables are self-constructed using
connectors from hamfest parts bins, but that's no big deal. I just wish
a few more of the new dumbed-down hams would at least try to do
that much -- but I pretty much gave up on the future of ham radio when
a local No-code tech offered me a steak dinner if I'd come over to his
house and wire his packet TNC to his computer for him! I asked him
why he didn't just open up the instruction booklet and do it himself -- and
he said he was afraid to mess it up! Know what this guy does for
a living? He's an electrician!

>Killing that spirit with a "manufactured type-accepted rig only" license
>would
>doom the Amateur Radio Service to extinction, and all your ill-founded
>pontificating about "there ain't no more homebrewers" will only speed the
>date. Shame on you.

I'm sure there are a few homebrewers remaining in what's left of the ARS,
but I don't believe that doubling their numbers would do anything to
prevent us from accelerating down the slippery slope leading to our
inevitable extinction. The quantum reduction in licensing standards has
created the impression that ham radio is nothing more than a glorified

version of CB with more bands, modes, and power. When the remaining miniscule 5 WPM code testing requirement is dropped, we probably will see a slight increase in numbers of licensees, but there will be an attendant reduction in the quality of operating skill seen and heard on-the-air.

>(ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½) 73, de Hans, K0HB

It must be nice to be so easily amused!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4067. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 03:17:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011211221700.13985.00000823@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 27059

In article <9f4bfe89.0112110606.68127a8b@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>I understand that in Paris and its suburbs one cannot get more than a
>certain distance (500 meters?) from a Metro station. And the Paris
>Metro system has been constantly (except for war years) expanded and
>modernized to meet the needs of the City of Light.

I have my doubts that even in Paris, you can find Metro stations spaced less than 1/3 of a mile apart! That may occur in a few places along major routes, but not everywhere in Paris and it's suburbs! Were that so, the entire city would have to be suspended by the subterranean structure of the train stations below.

>For longer trips, the TGV trains operate at about 200 mph. They
>reached 326 mph in tests (not a typo).

Hmmm. A bit more than half the speed of a typical 230 gr. FMJ round coming out the muzzle of a .45 automatic! No wonder they call it a "bullet" train! I wonder how they keep that thing on the tracks at that speed -- I'll ass-u-&-me that the wheels actually lock onto the track with some kind of flange.

>> If anyone wants to pay for this
>> "elderly" person to move where public transportation is available, I'll
>gladly
>> take another trip to Europe for a few years. :-)
>
>Works for me!
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

I think this country will be more or less forced to solve the problems of the elderly, since they are the fastest growing demographic group of Americans.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4068. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 03:32:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C16CFC7.2D3537AF@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27061

K0HB wrote:

> N2EY wants to know:
>
> > When's the last time you worked a US ham with a 100% homebrew
> > station who did not have a "mainstream" rig also? (Besides me, I
> > mean - and it ain't true for me anymore).
>
> Get real! We aren't talking about "100% homebrew " here (nor were
> we back in the 50's). We're talking about tinkering and experimenting,
> which can include some homebrewing "from scratch", some modification
> of store bought equipment, some 'conversion from other service', some
> kitbuilt, some fixing of what got broken, and obviously some unchanged
> since it came out of the box. That's the mix in most active amateur shacks
> today, just as it was back in the 50's.
>

I imagine that back in the 50's, a novice would use a receiver that
was a modified 5 tube AM radio (aka AA5). Change the antenna
coil, local oscillator coil, and add some regeneration to the IF to
make a crude BFO, to make a CW receiver. And using parts
scanvened from a dead TV set, build a transmitter. The horizontal
output tube would be the RF out tube. Use one of the signal
triodes as a crystal controlled oscillator, and a signal pentode
as a keyed buffer/driver.

Many starving high school and college students probably
had stations like this.

4069. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 03:53:21 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C16D4B1.2D607834@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27062

>
>
> Thanks. For many years, farmland has fallen victim to suburban sprawl
> and "development". That trend will eventually have to end.

That only happens near large cities. Most farms are out in the
middle of nowhere.

>
>
> In addition, many of the crops grown today are used to feed cattle.
> Many more people could be fed from the same land if the crops were used
> to feed people.

I have heard claims that American farmers grow enough stuff to
feed half the world. And that we routinely sell and give away
food just to get rid of it. Food Stamps were developed as
a scheme for getting rid of excess food.

>
>
> >In the meantime, we can speculate. How many trees are
> > we willing to cut down to clear potential farm lands?
>
> Won't work on a large scale because the trees are needed for paper,
> lumber and their anti-pollution properties.
>
> > And, of course,
> > some of the problem can be reduced if we develop a taste for crops
> > that can grow in less ideal places.
>
> Yup. See above on cattle feed.
>
> >Seaweed burgers, anyone?
>
> Has anybody trademarked the name "Soylent" yet?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4070. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 04:56:52 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <eLZmEIsgBHA.856@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 27063

Dwight says:

> I don't know who planned it, Jim. And neither do you. But I do know
> we have a concept of justice in this country where a person is innocent
> until proven guilty.

Out here in the plains we also have a concept where you don't have
to prove a rattlesnake is going to bite you before you are entitled to
kill the sonuvabitch.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4071. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 06:28:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C16F908.DF1F1AAC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27064

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C16467D.1F38289F@earthlink.net...
> > Krell wrote:
>
> > Now go down the page a bit and you'll see two formulae next to each
> > other. Note the extra "x 0.95" step in the use of the "492" figure.
> > Adjacent to it is the formula 468/f(MHz).
> >
> Dave K8MN
>
> Wow! That's just what I posted in my response to Larry Troll when he used
> the 468 figure!

Wow! I have to confess that I don't read all of your posts.

Dave K8MN

4072. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 07:10:29 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9v6vt3$gp0$3@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27065
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote:

> Until you can reference an actual case where a licensed ham has had "some
> rambo, fat-bellied dep'ty sheriff takes my radio(s) while ignoring the
> license", this is all just paranoid supposition. Relax...

I don't think that it was a deputy sheriff, but there was a young Ham
that had his radio confiscated - simply because the officer thought it
was capable of monitoring the police frequencies.

After a lot of hassle and publicity, I believe he got his radio back.

So, it does happen.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4073. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 12:08:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011212070842.01870.00000249@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27066

In article <3C16CFC7.2D3537AF@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>I imagine that back in the 50's, a novice would use a receiver that
>was a modified 5 tube AM radio (aka AA5). Change the antenna
>coil, local oscillator coil, and add some regeneration to the IF to
>make a crude BFO, to make a CW receiver.

A few may have done that, but it was the hard way and the results rarely worth the effort.

A much better approach was to get a WW2 surplus "ARC-5" receiver (also called "Command sets" or "SCR-274N") These were small six-tube superhets with very good performance for their size, weight, complexity and cost in the surplus market. Each tuned a single band. The most common ones were the 6-9 MHz, 3-6 MHz, and 0.19-0.55 MHz versions.

They typically cost $5-$15 depending on condition. Add a tuning knob, gain control, BFO switch and 'phone jack, connect a power supply and you have a pretty decent receiver. Tuning rate was kinda fast and the selectivity was not very good but it was bettr than any AA5 set, and safer.

The really slick move was to build a simple 1 or 2 tube crystal controlled converter from an old AA5 set and some 25 cent surplus xtals, which would then feed a 0.19-0.55 MHz set. Better selectivity, better tuning rate and calibration, and you could cover more bands.

Complete receiving setup for under $25

> And using parts
>scanvened from a dead TV set, build a transmitter. The horizontal
>output tube would be the RF out tube. Use one of the signal
>triodes as a crystal controlled oscillator, and a signal pentode
>as a keyed buffer/driver.

No need for three stages. Use the audio output tube (usually a 6K6 or 6V6) as a crystal oscillator, and the sweep tube (6BG6 or whatever) as the final. Simple and effective on 80 and 40 meters.

Some folks converted the ARC-5 transmitters, too. Total cost well under $20.
>
>Many starving high school and college students probably
>had stations like this.
>
Yup. Often careful watching of what the neighbors put out on the trash could result in all sorts of treasures.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4074. Re: Morse not anymore needed to use HF-see further

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 12:34:07 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <39IR7.109$YE4.19833@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 27067
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,alt.ham-radio.morse,rec.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"b888" <b888@lcix.net> wrote in message
news:u1d5tq5dfp5jf2@corp.supernews.com...
> Well said.
> People still use sailboats, steam engines, propeller aircraft,
> drive classic cars, and do a million other things that are not
> "state of the art" but there still useful and fun. I feal sorry for
> those who have never felt the thrill of that first solid cw copy.
> Or who have no Idea how to loadup a "hollow state" rig.
> The easy way out is the booring way out.
> WB3DSJ

You are correct sir! Some may love CW and some may not. Some may love the digital modes. Some may not. Some may love homebrewing. (and so on and so on) There are many facets of this hobby that are enjoyable to a variety of different people. All a license means is that you are allowed to do whatever is allowed by that license class.

Those that chose to (forgive the word) *bitch* about the either the dropping of the code requirement to a lesser level, or the possibility of it dropping of it entirely, probably are not the same people who became proactively involved in the protest of those conditions. I am sure that at least 80% of all licensed hams have not bothered to write all the "powers that be" (i.e. congressmen, senators etc) about ham radio, and in defense of ham radio. We can sit and hope and pray that ARRL *may* work hard to defend us, but can you imagine if our elected officials, from the local level, all the way up to the federal level recieved tons of letters in defense of amateur radio? I personally write at least quarterly each year, (as well as fire fighting related mails especially after 9-11-01) and strongly encourage others to do so too.

Another way to win support? Invite your elected officials to your club meetings, ARES/RACES meetings (or similar groups) and share with them the experience. This has a two-fold benefit. It allows the ham public to actually meet the officials, and of course the officials to actually be able to meet the ham public and hear their concerns, and to see what we are doing .

Amateur Radio is a pro-active hobby/service, not a sit back and watch hobby. Get involved!

[first paragrah directed at respondee to my earlier post, other paragraphs are to everyone else.]

Ryan KC8PMX

>
> KC8PMX wrote in message ...
> >People who want to use Morse code still will, and those who don't, won't.
> >Any changes in the laws short of a law outright banning morse code
> operation
> >won't stop those who wish to use the HF frequencies.
> >
> >Ryan
> >KC8PMX
> >
> >
> >"Marruk" <mphaannospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >news:4ytO7.18262$Qm6.2451580@zwoll1.home.nl...
> >> Mose not anymore needed to use HF.
> >>
> >> Hi OMs,
> >>
> >> In Guatamala it is decided that a morse exam is not anymore needed to
use
> >> the HF bands.
> >> I guess this is good for the sellers of HF equipment and it will get
the
> >> band a lot more used for phone dx.
> >> But I dont think it will be very good for Morsecode as a whole.
> >> Hope to see you in 2003 on HF when it will be officially released in
the
> >> Netherlands.
> >>
> >> PE1PAE
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
>
>

4075. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 12:34:09 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <59IR7.111$YE4.19833@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 27068

Actually, this is something more of us need to prompt our clubs and organizations that we pay dues to, to create or help supply the contents of whatever packet you are referring to. Sounds like, overall, a positive-gain investment. I like the idea actually.

Ryan KC8PMX

> more info. This guy really did seem to be interested so I am thinking maybe
> having a small PR packet we can hand out to people who are not afraid to ask
> us about all those weird antennas really isn't a bad idea. I read about
> another Ham in a news group, a while back, who was doing something like this
> to promote the hobby. Now when they get home they will have something to
> look at and not forget about it. Then maybe they will take the time to look
> up the ARRL on the web.
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LD0
>
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "
>
>
>

4076. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 13:26:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011212082608.08621.00000909@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 27069

>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>From: "Jerry Oxendine" joxendi@bellsouth.net
>Date: 12/10/2001 9:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <kYeR7.114824$S93.5968376@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>

>It would be the SAME thing if a cop stopped a
>Marine convoy and "confiscated" the radios out of a Humvee.

In 1982 a California Highway Patrolman near Oceanside, CA, decided to try
and issue a speeding citation to a bus that was carrying us to the rifle range.
He demanded to be allowed to search the bus.

He didn't succeed.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4077. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 14:45:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C176D75.F062E850@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27070

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The quantum reduction in licensing standards has
> created the impression that ham radio is nothing more than a glorified
> version of CB with more bands, modes, and power.

A quantum reduction should be undetectable, Larry. From Webster's:
"quantum - one of the small subdivisions of a quantized physical
magnitude" The above "impression" appears to be all in your mind.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4078. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 14:49:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C176E7A.84B225B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27071

Robert Casey wrote:
> Many starving high school and college students probably
> had stations like this.

Many others, like me, had ARC-5's and BC-45x surplus rigs.
I even had a triple conversion tunable IF receiver made out
of two BC-45x receivers.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4079. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 15:53:00 UTC
From: radiosigs <radiosigs@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9v7ufrpng1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27072
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

First off Barry Carver, AC4VO, is truly a gentleman but made a mistake by negotiating with Baxter. All Barry did was to lend his intentional interference, credibility. Want to clean up 14.275? Get Baxter off the air!

Regarding the noise, I'm in NNJ and it was just 5/2 here but strong enough to blast through to all parts of this country. My reports of a weak signal have been corroborated by WA2ECA and K2EDQ, both Jerseyans. That racket is coming from no more than 50 miles from me and it's the same loony who's been pulling the same stuff for years on 14.313.

Doc,AF2Y

"leaky oil filled capacitors" <itmrogers3@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:UWaR7.1287$5K4.173096@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Was listening to K1MAN's bulletin broadcast
> and heard Barry's ac4vo's fine comments to
> Glen. Barry appears to be a gentleman and articulate
> arbitrator. Good job Barry! While his interview was playing
> btwn 3-4PM Central time though, some nutcase comes up
> with music playing and all the other stuff to try to
> re-ignite this dumb radio war! Sheesh! Can't you music
> playing cb'er a-holes turn the radio OFF for a few weeks?
> Let this thing work! We don't need a repeat performance of
> something like the old 14.313 Wars again cause it will only
> spread all over 20 then onto 75.
>
>

4080. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 16:59:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C177FB0.A0AE55D5@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27073

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:

. He was

> pleased as heck with the radio literature, and wanted to know if CW was used
> too, which I said yes

Then you gave him a demonstration of a CW contact, right?????

4081. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 17:02:54 UTC
From: drpfrench@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011212120254.04555.00001752@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 27074

>Actually, this is something more of us need to prompt our clubs and
>organizations that we pay dues to, to create or help supply the contents of
>whatever packet you are referring to. Sounds like, overall, a positive-gain
>investment. I like the idea actually.

The ARRL has a selection of hand outs listed on the ARRL web site. OUr club has a good supply of these for Kids Day events, and Field Day Etc. THe Archie comix are also a good hand out for kids.

4082. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 17:14:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112120914.35d377ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27075

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C176E7A.84B225B@IEEE.org>...
> Robert Casey wrote:
> > Many starving high school and college students probably
> > had stations like this.
>
> Many others, like me, had ARC-5's and BC-45x surplus rigs.
> I even had a triple conversion tunable IF receiver made out
> of two BC-45x receivers.

In QST for August, 1959 there is an article titled "An ARC-5 Triple Superhet" by VE3DPC, Frank S. Gue. Neat setup using the three-receiver rack and one each of the BC-453, BC-454 and BC-455. The BC-454 and BC-455 were modified to become tunable converters feeding the BC-453.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4083. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 17:23:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112120923.2c81e14e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27076

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3C16D4B1.2D607834@ix.netcom.com>...
> >
> > Thanks. For many years, farmland has fallen victim to suburban sprawl
> > and "development". That trend will eventually have to end.
>
> That only happens near large cities. Most farms are out in the
> middle of nowhere.

From what I've read and seen, modern American farming is mostly a low
margin industry. IOW, a slight advantage in production cost can make
the difference between success and failure.

When a developer offers a farmer big bucks for the land, it's hard to
say no.

> > In addition, many of the crops grown today are used to feed cattle.
> > Many more people could be fed from the same land if the crops were used
> > to feed people.
>
> I have heard claims that American farmers grow enough stuff to
> feed half the world.

2.5 billion or so people? I'd like to see credible numbers on that.

> And that we routinely sell and give away
> food just to get rid of it. Food Stamps were developed as
> a scheme for getting rid of excess food.

Partly. Food stamps are a way of helping low income people other than
cash handouts.

The discussion evolved from claims about biofuels - specifically fuels
derived from hemp. But nobody has presented credible numbers to back
up their claims.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4084. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 17:31:04 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <2087B91633643430.86FAEDD81389CBFE.C44F70E8E2C7512C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27077

On Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:51:33 -0500, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

>Here's something to think about. The other night I had a guy honestly ask
>me, out side of a 7-eleven store, if I was some kind of secret agent or
>something while pointing to the antenna farm on top of my van.

Amazing how people seem to think a secret agent would have glaringly
obvious equipment stuck to the top of his vehicle.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

4085. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 19:29:27 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <1CDA63BCC3BB9349.A5124575CB9E5072.9992B666C7335910@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27082
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Tue, 11 Dec 2001 23:11:12 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>In his mind, he does not
>care about your rights. He cares
>about making home every night.

Then he needs to take that badge off and go work at a Taco Bell.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

4086. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 20:20:01 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <RZOR7.300551$5A3.117072489@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27083
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C16909A.5215455F@gte.net...
> Think again. First the cops would just the
> car and the radios. Then when the CID
> folks show up, they will explain how you
> lipped off to the cops that you were some
> type of hot shot Air Force type. At that
> point, the investigation might be about your
> fitness to serve.

I think you should think again Most all traffic stops in real citys and states are video and audio recorded. So unless he(Jerry) did actually say anything I don't think the officer will perjure himself, and risk losing his good paying " I am Superior to you " job all over a possible radio violation. So far towns, cities, states etc can do anything until they write some type of Laws regarding this issue. Congress only gave local jurisdiction the ability to police this the police will have some type of idea of the laws they will be enforcing. Otherwise they will call for back-up, defer to a higher ranking supervisor, something to releave liabilty from them when possible, they cannot go about and won't go about blindly enforcing Laws. I
just don't see it happen that way in this day in age when people are as lawsuit crazy against LEO's.

4087. Re: New Galaxy DX-2547 with EXTRAS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 20:25:31 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v8efrvej1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 27085
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Genocide2RF357 <genocide2rf357@aol.com> writes:
This is a radio that a guy in my town has nice unit as I own one

http://cgi.ebay.com/aw-cgi/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=1308893468&r=0&t=0&
showTutorial=0&ed=1008656671&indexURL=0&rd=1

"This is exactly the type of modifiable radio that we must fight to keep in
circulation. Our ability to use the freeband should not be impinged upon by
busybodies like Lelnad and his litter who stick thier nose where it does not
belong. Genocide your friend smartly avoided the ebay restrictions by
hinting at the "extras" instead of spelling them out. Good job"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4088. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 20:25:40 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <83PR7.300553$5A3.117073969@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27084
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
>
> The way you were going at it was that you
> were making it out that you were some big
> shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
> fucking rights and you were going to TELL
> that cop were to get off.

And the way your were going at it was all cops are bad guys who don't care
about you or your rights. Especially the rookie who will arrest you first
and ask questions later because he is unsure of the law.

4089. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 20:28:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C17BE00.CFD085FC@uci.edu>
Source record: 27086

CAM wrote:
>
> Many others, like me, had ARC-5's and BC-45x surplus rigs.
> I even had a triple conversion tunable IF receiver made out
> of two BC-45x receivers.

A friend of mine calls them radios that stink in the dark. :-)

4090. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 20:53:37 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <ltPR7.300557$5A3.117080825@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27087
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message

> > Which means your an expert on Police procedure across the country?

> No.

I didn't think you were either. At least from your posts.

> And are you a police officer? Are you
> an attorney? NO. You are a Private
> Fucking Civilian (PFC) with little contact
> with the current system.

Don't believe everything your small mind thinks up. You don't know who or what I am and what systems I have contact with. Again all I see from you is opinions Just like a true politician full of shit as usual.

> Understand this. The police and the
> military are your superiors.

Says who You?

>Their lives are far more valuable than yours.

Again says who some 2 bit local politican from bumfuct indiana?

> And no cop is going to take your lip,
> that you are some big bad ass ham
> operator. In his mind, he does not
> care about your rights. He cares
> about making home every night.

He had better care about my rights they are just as important as his. So all cops walk around with attitudes is what you are saying. Is it screw Joe Public? Does he think he is "Above The Law" Does every cop feel this way ? Perhaps Daniel Marvin can answer a few questions.

> As a matter of my duties, yes.

What are you now a court clerk LOL

> What charges were you brought
> up on?

Pissing on some 1/2 assed politican from Indiana. Charges were dropped once the Tin was flashed. :wink wink : we stick togther...

> And your service to "king and country"?
> I do have 30 years of political service.

When should we be impressed? How were you were into politics when you were in the military for 20 years, did you serve the Saudi Government? were you on the Bosnia Township commitie? Did you help get Helmut Klerk elected? Can't be 2 places at once Ya know.

> I have put judges on the bench, congressmen
> in office, have worked on political campaigns
> from the local to federal level.

You personally have done this? I thought Congressmen were elected officials. But, what does politics and political campaigns have to do with police enforcement. You are losing me

> Plus 20 years of military service, to include
> a year in the Gulf War and another year
> with the Bosnian mess.

This makes you an expert on police across the country namely all rookies?

> What have you done with your miserable
> two bit life?
>
>

4091. What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 21:30:41 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <_VPR7.160049$8n4.11746618@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27088

Fellow Amateurs,

Like many of you, I have steamed and thought over the problem of the illegal intrusions onto our 10 and 12 meter bands. Just today, I sent the following letter to my Congressional Representative, Mrs Sue Myrick. I plan to send it to Senator Helms, or his replacement, as well. I ask that each of you do the same thing. You may feel free to copy and paste the fol-lowing letter and send it to as many Reps and Senators as you see fit. The more people in Washington that see this, the more aware they will be that there is a problem. We CANNOT sit by, grumbling expecting someone else to do something about this. FCC has not the funds
to undertake but a token effort to combat this growing problem. The time to stop this is NOW,
and we can't stop it sitting around steaming about it, trying to QRM the illegals with CW, or
illegally yelling at them to GET TH' HELL OFF HERE, YOU'RE ILLEGAL! It is NOT working, and the only way to draw attention to this is for US to act at the grass roots level.
This MAY be a good time to do this due to the fact that Amateur Radio has been VERY active
in conjuction with the rescue and cleanup efforts in New York and at the Pentagon, and favor-
able attention has been garnered among both ES and Government officials. This IS important,
because, as these yokels dip their "toes" in the waters (radio spectrum) and find no sharks to bite, it's only going to get worse. Let's do our part to stop it NOW.

73

Jerry
K4KWH

Dear Mrs. Myrick,

I am writing to brief you on a problem that is not yet readily apparent, but is going to cause difficulty in the future. Perhaps, due to the current international situation, it may not be the best time to do this. However, knowledge is power, and you must have the knowledge in order to deal with a problem.

First, a little background. Last year, President Clinton signed into public law, a Bill (#2346, I think)to permit local governments to deal with interference caused by Citizens Band Radio operators. On the surface, it would appear that this would be a good idea. However, due to a lack of publicity, very few local gov'ts have taken advantage of this law.

Basically, what it said was that local gov'ts could enact parallel ordinances that would allow, with the advice of the Fderal Communications Commission, local law enforcement to respond to complaints from citizens regarding CB radios coming in over their TVs and stereos due to illegal power and the operators "messing" with their radios in an attempt to achieve higher power. Yet, the problems continue in spite of this law which was brought about, I believe, by the efforts of Mr. Feingold of Wisconsin and Mr. Ehlers of Michigan whose constituents were having much difficulty in this area.

In addition to this problem there is another "tide" of concern to those of us who attempt to use radio legally and in accordance with law. That is, that these CB operators are straying far from the allocated 40 channels by using radios that are easy to modify and due to their promotion by unscrupulous dealers and CB shops. Most of these so-called "export" radios aren't legal for sale or use by the general public, are sold under the guise of being "ham" radios and do not meet certification by FCC. They are easily found in truck stops and wayside CB shops. These outlets also sell high powered "boosters" or amplifiers that increase the CB station's output power WAY beyond the 4 watts permitted to the CB service. Consequently, the interference is being compounded by the use of such radios and because of their being promoted to the CB market. Greed, of course, drives the sales of these radios and , indeed, having a "10 meter"
radio is a kind of status symbol among these rogue operators.

And thus has arisen another problem that concerns a segment of the population, including me. You see, as you may well know, truckers have long used CB as a tool in their trade;
finding directions, avoiding "smokey bear" (cops), and just plain company. The promotion of these illegal radios has caused these truckers to begin to operate up in the 10 meter Amateur Band causing interference to hams. In a segment of that band that is not even allocated for it, they use voice modes where only Morse code and digital communications is allowed to the hams that are licensed to use it. This illegal use of CB radio is a cause of much interference, loss of privileges to those who DO have the right to be there, and is a precursor to much more worrisome things to come IF it is not stopped. Moreover, the licensed hams cannot talk to them to politely inform them that they are operating illegally because it is illegal to converse with
an illegal station; i.e, the ham would get into trouble for doing it. So our hands are tied. Besides even if a ham DID tell the truckers that they ought not to be there, the poor ham will be treated to a profane diatribe, ridiculed, and told to go do ugly things to himself. (Yes, some hams HAVE said something to them out of frustration)

Why is this important when, to many non-radio types, it would seem to be a trivial matter? In truth, it is NOT trivial. It is like a slow tide that creeps inland slowly so that it is not noticed until it has flooded the farm, so to speak. Thousands and thousands of Americans use radio everyday. The government and the military depend on radio. The radio spectrum is divided up and regulated by the government in such a way as to provide the

best and maximum use of the frequencies by the maximum number of people. These regulations act sort of like "fences" that make good neighbors and keep each others' "cows" out of eath others' cornfields. And these "fences" depend upon the users respect for the law and willingness to abide by the boundar-
ies set by the government. Unfortunately, we have a group of people (Citizens Band Operators) that are not willing to abide by these rules, so, thusly, we have a tide that is creeping into neighbors' cornfields. It is a slow process, and it may not seem important that CBers are invading the hams' turf, but I would like to point out the untiring, readily available, and indispen-sible service of Amateur Radio Operators during times of National and International Emergen-cies and in the aftermath of September 11th. The even MORE important ramifications of allowing this trend of illegal activity to continue are that these people, testing the waters, as it were, with their radio "toes" to see if they meet resistance, will continue to expand their operations beyond the Amateur allocations and into those of public, private, and military domains where their interference will cause great harm--even loss of life. Not only that, with the spread of such illegal activity, it would become more difficult to separate the CBers from, say, a terrorist who, using the popular jargon, could "disquise' his messages in amongst the illegal operators. What about aviation operations. International aviation uses High Frequency for contact over long distances. What if a Mayday call were missed because of some yokel calling "Break skipland"? Therefore, I submit that the time is NOW to stop this lawless intrusion onto radio frequencies by CB radio operators. It is time to STOP the interference already caused by these people before somebody's life is lost because of this! Would you want YOUR flight from England to be lost because someone thought his hobby was so important that he has a "right" to transmit anywhere he likes?

Some years ago, in the rush to downsize the US government, much funding was taken from the FCC which hampered their efforts to cope with the growing popularity of CB radio. Yet, while the popularity of CB has somewhat stabilized or reduced, the massive growth of the telecom-munications industry has limited FCC's ability to enforce the regulations governing the CB Radio service. Only the most flagrant violations are being dealt with to the detriment of
other users of radio now and in the future. The most obvious solution is to restore funding to FCC--even if it is only on a temporary basis-to permit them to deal with this problem.

Here are several more:

1) Change the law to allow FCC to keep the fines they collect, or, at least, part of them to fund their enforcement efforts.

2) Eliminate the 27 MHZ CB Service altogether. Set a 5 or 7 year "sunset" date for the mfrs and users to change over to the new VHF Multiple Use Radio Service or the Family Radio Service. After all, these newer public radio services offer quiet, interference-free LOCAL communications, and coupled with very tight restrictions on the bandwidth (the area of frequencies the

radios will cover from the mfr). Couple this with swift, rigid enforcement for those that refuse to give up their use of 27 mhz where they can range widely up and down the bands talking to stations overseas, (mimicking the ham band without bothering to obtain license)and cause havoc on the HF bands.

3) Amend the current local enforcement law to allow DOT officers at weight stations to randomly inspect trucks for illegal radio equipment according to a list provided by FCC and with FCC technical assistance. The Truckers' Associations effectively lobbied against this when Mr. Ehlers introduced HR2346. It wouldn't have to be done routinely, but at random so that the truckers wouldn't know when it might occur AND allow the officers to search the truck for "hidey holes" where the trucker could hide his illegal radio until he was away from the inspection station.

4) Allow, or request that local officers visit truckstops and CB shops in their area and check for illegal radios--again with a list provided by FCC.

5) Provide for a schedule of fines for the discovery of such illegal radios and amplifiers steep enough to discourage such use and sale.

6) When purchasing radios from such outlets, (Radio Shack sells some) capable of operation or modification to do so between 24 and 35 MHZ, a license MUST be produced by the
buyer. Fines to the seller that is caught selling without doing so. We do it for cigarettes, liquor, and guns, why not for those "export" radios that are now being rampantly sold by dealers and over the internet. It could even be taken to mean ANY Amateur HF or VHF radio.

Ms. Myrick, I know this is long. but I BEG you to take the time to look into this. Talk to Mr. Feingold and Mr. Ehlers. Contact Billy Tauzin, who is on the powerful Commerce Committee (oversees the FCC) and see what could be done. We, the amateurs, we the citizen who is trying to watch television, we the company, indeed, we the people who are being interfered with NEED your help. PLEASE don't ignore this issue. Please HELP us.

Most cordially and thankfully,

Jerry Oxendine
Amateur Radio Station K4KWH
2007 Lee Street
Gastonia, NC 28054

4092. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 21:32:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011212163233.24808.00001402@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27089

>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>From: N9NWO 2121d@gte.net
>Date: 12/11/2001 5:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C16947B.C9669F83@gte.net>

>The way you were going at it was that you
>were making it out that you were some big
>shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
>f****** rights and you were going to TELL
>that cop were to get off.

You are so far off base that if this was baseball, you'd be tagged out.

But that's nothing we aren't used to in this forum, so carrry on deluding
yourself.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4093. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 21:41:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011212164103.24808.00001403@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27090

>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>From: N9NWO 2121d@gte.net
>Date: 12/11/2001 5:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C169383.3783E724@gte.net>

>The police and military are your superiors.

Will the person standing closest to the light switch nearest N9NWO please switch it on?

The Police AND the Armed Forces serve at the pleasure of the civilian government...Period.

Respect demonstrated towards a Police Officer or a member of the Armed Forces is respect for the system that spawns it, not the agency itself. That means respect for our laws and our society. Not any one man or woman.

Police forces and the Armed Forces of the United States are constituted by the common consent of the electorate...not the other way around.

73
Steve, K4YZ

THEY are under more scrutiny and

4094. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 21:53:58 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C17D1F6.40C2EB06@uci.edu>
Source record: 27092

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Unfortunately, Ally McBeal in general has slid off the scale into the
> toilet.

Sounds like an unfortunate bathroom accident. :-)

4095. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 22:01:16 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C171B8D.2330DBAA@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27091

Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> Fellow Amateurs,
>
> Like many of you, I have steamed and thought over the problem of the illegal
> intrusions onto our 10 and 12 meter bands. Just today, I sent the following
> letter to my Congressional Representative, Mrs Sue Myrick. I plan to send
> it to Senator Helms, or his replacement, as well.

Please run this through a spell checker before you send it, and
don't abbreviate government.

4096. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 22:20:17 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <#h48Ss1gBHA.1256@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 27093

N9NWO rared up on his hind legs and said:

> The police and military are your superiors.

Horse-shit.

Pure extra fine Grade-A Horse-Shit.

The police and military are my hired help. They work for me,
which makes _me_ their superior.

Do you live in the old USSR or Iraq or some such dictatorship?

73, de Hans, K0HB

4097. Re: the K1MAN vs 14.275 war is over.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 22:26:02 UTC
From: phil <phil@phil.com>
Message-ID: <u1fmbp3u3c3ge1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 27094
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

i was just listening to K1MAN at ~2220 UTC... someone keeps buzzing the tower :)

phil :p

4098. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 23:16:17 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <%sRR7.162837$8n4.11985732@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27095

I re-read every word. There are no spelling errors. If you're referring to the hyphens, it's because of the way my browser copies and pastes. I just didn't want to go back and edit it
for here. The one that was sent is corect. Anymore questions?

J
JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C171B8D.2330DBAA@mailcity.net...
>
>
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
> >
> > Fellow Amateurs,
> >
> > Like many of you, I have steamed and thought over the problem of the illegal
> > intrusions onto our 10 and 12 meter bands. Just today, I sent the following
> > letter to my Congressional Representative, Mrs Sue Myrick. I plan to send
> > it to Senator Helms, or his replacement, as well.
>
> Please run this through a spell checker before you send it, and
> don't abbreviate government.

4099. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 23:45:21 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c17eb92.5178511@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27096
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Tue, 11 Dec 2001 23:02:28 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> You must not be reading my post--I won't HAVE to do anything: USAF will do
>> it FOR me. DOD equipment is issued on a Form 37. All I have to do is tell
>> the CID investigators WHO confiscated it, and THEY will be on the LEO like
>> stink on sh**.
>
>Think again. First the cops would just the
>car and the radios. Then when the CID
>folks show up, they will explain how you
>lipped off to the cops that you were some
>type of hot shot Air Force type. At that
>point, the investigation might be about your
>fitness to serve.

Which is why I strongly endorse and support that
all police cars be equipped with both audio and video
recording equipment to document exactly what
happened. I have seen the absolute value in
these in both protecting the public against rogue
cops and protecting police against false accusations of
police brutality.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4100. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 23:46:58 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9v8q6p01lkf@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27099

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C17D1F6.40C2EB06@uci.edu...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Unfortunately, Ally McBeal in general has slid off the scale into the
> > toilet.
>
> Sounds like an unfortunate bathroom accident. :-)

Yeah! What was she doing with a scale on the toilet anyway?

4101. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 23:48:03 UTC
From: Twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <9v8qbj$9ed$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 27098

PLEASE don't ignore this issue. Please HELP us.

"Unfortunately it will be ignored just as it has been ignored for years. Nothing will change as a result of your current campaign of muckraking. The government has much more important things to do than chase after violators of an offense comparable to jaywalking. I neglected to forsee that you would not have the intelligence to realize that no one cares about a few rogue operators on 10 meters save for the hysterical yapping mongrels such as AA and Nad. I am disappointed you have chosen to join their kennel, Jerry. Your fellow hammie operators don't give a hoot about what goes on in the CB band and never have. Plus you cannot show proof that these 10 meter incidents are more than just isolated exceptions.....and how do you know these incidents are not CBers but hams bootlegging? Because of such irrational thinking you are destined to join the kill files of Usenet users everywhere. The CB room does not want you anymore and neither do your ham bretheren"

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4102. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-12 23:48:33 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c17ec85.5422087@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27097
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Still no copy of the supposed new law posted
or obtained by anyone. Apparanetly this
"new law" may just be a false alarm.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4103. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 00:11:16 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <GmSR7.137144$S93.6529592@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27100
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This is my final post on this subject. I will NOT smart off to the cops. I will attempt to show
the LEO the documentation (licenses, copy of Form 37, copy of the Federal Law exempting
hams, etc) most politely. If they do not accept that, then after I get clear of the cops, I will
make the appropriate phone calls from my home away from the cops' earshot and explain
what happened. I am NOT an AF hotshot. I am merely a civilian member of the USAF Auxiliary, also known as the Civil Air Patrol. Now, regardless of my attitude towards the
cops, if you think that the auditors are just going to let the LEOs keep the equipment that
was paid for with Federal money, you're just plain nuts. I may, or may not, be in uniform;
either way I will keep my mouth shut and answer questions as they are asked. Remember
the concept of prefessionalism? Having been in this organization and having qualified in,
not only communications, but logistics, for 37 years, you honestly think I don't know the
rules governing DOD property as well as the rules governing USAF/CAP Communications?

Now, such a situation IS unlikely--I said that before--but there ARE rogue cops out there that
think their sh** doesn't stink; give 'em a badge and a gun, they think they are God. They are the ones who have NO business being cops. I have never been arrested in my life--not even
as a teen--it's been 21 years since I have even had a speeding ticket. The secret to that (DUH!) is to conduct yourself like a mature adult, don't hang around any one place too long,
keep your nose clean, conduct your affairs legally, get to know the people that count in your town and mind your own business. Even people like that can get hassled by rogue cops and
nothing the person did is at fault--it's just that the concrete-headed cop cannot see past the
shadow cast by his swelled head. BTW, I saw last night on "DATELINE" where several black
men served various sentences up to 8 years for crimes they didn't commit. Seems the police
department (Chicago) put pressure on their lab technician to falsify the lab results on DNA, Blood, and Semen to get a conviction. The conviction was

overturned, but not until the men
had served up to 8 years of undeserved prison time. They are suing each and
every one of
the LEOS involved in this sham conviction, and I hope they BURN the cops.
Don't tell me
the cops are so squeaky clean and are above the law. And if the cops
wrongly seize radio
equipment, they WILL face difficulty. The law is very clear; local LEOS
are not authorized to
"police" Amateur and other licensed services. Period. If they take/seize
equipment other than
CB, they will have to return or replace it.

73

Jerry

Bill Sohlbillsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3c17eb92.5178511@news.mindspring.com...
> On Tue, 11 Dec 2001 23:02:28 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>
> >> You must not be reading my post--I won't HAVE to do anything: USAF
will do
> >> it FOR me. DOD equipment is issued on a Form 37. All I have to do is
tell
> >> the CID investigators WHO confiscated it, and THEY will be on the LEO
like
> >> stink on sh**.
> >
> >Think again. First the cops would just the
> >car and the radios. Then when the CID
> >folks show up, they will explain how you
> >lipped off to the cops that you were some
> >type of hot shot Air Force type. At that
> >point, the investigation might be about your
> >fitness to serve.
>
> Which is why I strongly endorse and support that
> all police cars be equipped with both audio and video
> recording equipment to document exactly what
> happened. I have seen the absolute value in
> these in both protecting the public against rogue
> cops and protecting police against false accusations of
> police brutality.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

4104. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 01:04:27 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C17467C.567C65FC@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27101

Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> I re-read every word. There are no spelling errors. If you're referring to
> the hyphens, it's because of the way my browser copies and pastes. I just
> didn't want to go back and edit it
> for here. The one that was sent is corect. Anymore questions?
>
>

Then you need to go back to school.
Second paragraph..."Fderal Communications Commission". Should be
Federal.

Fourth paragraph..."an illegal station; i.e, the ham". Should be
i.e.,

Sixth paragarph..."keep each others' "cows" out of eath others'
cornfields". should be each not eath.

Same paragraph.., "using the popular jargon, could "disquise' his
messages in amongst the illegal operators". Should be disguise,
there is no q in disguise.

Seventh paragraph..."Some years ago, in the rush to downsize". It
should be down-size or down size, it is not one word.

Item 2, spell out manufacturers, don't use abbreviations. mhz
should be MHz.

Item 4, truck stop is two words.

Item 6, here you used MHZ, all caps, not consistent with item 2.

If you want Mrs. Myrick to take your letter seriously, you need to
be a bit more neat with you writing. When her secretary sees your
letter it will probably go to file 13 as he/she doesn't want to
waste Mrs. Myricks time trying to read a letter full of
mis-spellings and grammatical errors.

Any more questions?

4105. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 01:06:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.go93oz9.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27102
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 12 Dec 2001 20:20:01 GMT, middlefiger4@home.comss wrote:

>
>So far towns, cities, states etc can do anything until they
>write some type of Laws regarding this issue.

You did mean "can't", right ??

>Congress only gave local
>jurisdiction the ability to police this the police will have some type of
>idea of the laws they will be enforcing. Otherwise they will call for
>back-up, defer to a higher ranking supervisor, something to releave liabilty
>from them when possible, they cannot go about and won't go about blindly
>enforcing Laws.

This communications lawyer sees it from the viewpoint that The
Congress gave the local police no more authority than the FCC has,
just the ability to enforce the FCC's "unlicrensed CB" regulations.

This means no random stops and searches, no forced entries without a
court order (warrant), no "confiscation", no excess fines above the
monetary penalties that the FCC can levy, no jail time for Rule
violations, and no making up their own rules about stuff that does
not appear in the FCC Rules.

>I just don't see it happen that way in this day in age when people are as
>lawsuit crazy against LEO's.

You are so right.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

4106. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 01:10:56 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C174802.E3091C30@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27103

Twistedhed@webtv.net wrote:
> Plus you cannot show proof that these 10 meter incidents are
> more than just isolated exceptions.....

The regularity of illegal AM transmissions on certain 10 meter frequencies are plenty of proof that these are not just isolated exceptions.

>and how do you know these
> incidents are not CBers but hams bootlegging? \

It should be obvious to the most casual observer that the constant AM transmissions on 28.085 and other frequencies in the 10 meter CW band are not hams bootlegging but truckers operating illegally. Why would a ham 'bootleg' on 10 meters? How can a licensed ham bootleg on the ham bands?

4107. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 02:07:49 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011212210749.10740.00001534@mb-fk.news.cs.com>
Source record: 27105

>He was
>
>> pleased as heck with the radio literature, and wanted to know if CW was
>used
>> too, which I said yes
>
> Then you gave him a demonstration of a CW contact, right?????
>

Ouch!

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4108. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 02:08:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C180D7C.76757601@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27104

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Osama Bin Laden Apologist Dwight Stewart wrote:

Now, why would you write that, Jim? I said nothing to defend Bin Laden, or to justify his alleged actions. I simply promoted the Constitutional concept of innocent until proven guilty. Is this country so far gone, just mentioning innocent until proven guilty is enough to make a person the enemy? Are you that far gone, Jim?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4109. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 02:24:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C18114A.234E6098@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27106

CAM wrote:
>
> The smoking gun is supposed to be released to
> the public tomorrow.

And I'm very much looking forward to it. What I've heard about the video so far from various news reports is hardly impressive. For example, one report said Bin Laden is heard talking about his surprise over how much damage was done. Well, a lot of people were surprised at how much damage was done.

On a side note, I'm surprised this, something news reports say was just discovered, is the first evidence of guilt we've been offered. Does that mean we've had no evidence up to this point?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4110. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 02:34:18 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <ePmAC63gBHA.1584@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 27107

Jerry Oxendine wrote to his congress-critter:

> 6) When purchasing radios from such outlets, (Radio Shack sells some)
> capable of operation or modification to do so between 24 and 35 MHZ, a
> license MUST be produced by the buyer. Fines to the seller that is
> caught selling without doing so.

Every so often a guy like Jerry comes up with the mistaken idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of amateur radio equipment and supplies. These are the folks who suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out under the nose of the impressionable public. I suspect they don't like the idea that soldering guns and schematics are openly sold to those without the proper credentials also.

. . .While it is easy, on the surface, to agree with their goal (keeping amateur equipment out of the hands of bootleggers), I feel the attitude that amateur equipment should be treated as some sort of controlled substance is short-sighted and in fact damaging to our service.

. . .I live in a large metropolitan area. We have one full line amateur store in town. There are no other similar stores in the whole state. In the four states which border us, there are 2 more amateur radio stores. THAT'S IT! In 5 states, there are only 3 stores! In the whole country, my guess is that there are less than four dozen stores selling amateur radio equipment, antennas, and supplies! It is as though we were some secret society, bent on concealing our presence from the world.

. . .Not all that many years ago, there were at least 6 electronic stores here in town which sold amateur equipment (not exclusively, but they all had a good selection). Add to that two Heathkit stores, and even the Sears stores sold amateur transceivers for awhile. (Yes, Virginia, right there along with the Craftsman sockets and Silvertone TV sets.) In the same era, Radio Row in NYC was blocks of wall-to-wall storefronts catering to electronics experimenters. Popular Science magazine had a regular column about amateur radio, and occasional construction articles. Every second little town had an amateur radio club. Amateur Radio was a populist, Joe SixPack kind of hobby.

. . .During those years it was easy for a person to get interested in being an amateur, to shop around for the best

deal on equipment, and to meet an Elmer. We were visible to the public, and well regarded.

. . .Then somewhere along the line came the magic of 1-800 shopping, amateur radio marketing became streamlined, and radio stores disappeared from Hometown America. With the demise of the local radio store, all the Elmers disappeared into their shacks and newcomers flounder around in fancy four-color ads in back of CQ and QST magazine, trying to decide how to be a ham. Clubs floundered, in part due to the loss of hams around the coffee pot in the back of the local electronics part store.

. . .Rather than continuing to restrict the availability of amateur equipment, as though we were selling assault weapons or recreational pharmaceuticals, I vote for opening up the market. Let's have radios for sale in the strip malls alongside the video games, Lionel trains, and mountain bikes. And it won't hurt if a few of us put on our Elmer-suits and lurk around to spot the likely recruits.

When they outlaw ham gear, only outlaws will be hams.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
> >Frisbeetarianism: The belief that when you die,
> >your soul goes up the on roof and gets stuck.

> What roof would this be?

The Roof of the Universe. And in the Last Days, when the Great Frisbee that shineth in the sky hath gone out, then shalt the Almighty Thrower ascend the Ladder of Life and collect the souls of those who have flown free, and take them The Eternal Park, where we shall sail upon the Spring Breezes for ever and ever, and be Fetched by the Holy Dog. Amen.

4111. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 02:52:38 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <uwyVSE4gBHA.1760@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 27108

Dwight said:

> I said nothing to defend Bin Laden, or to justify his
> alleged actions. I simply promoted the Constitutional
> concept of innocent until proven guilty.

You ACLU guys just don't get it, do you! A foreign terrorist, who openly has declared his intent to do whatever possible to destroy our homeland and our way of life, has no right to protection under our Constitution. None.

It is God's responsibility to judge Bin Laden. It is our responsibility to arrange the meeting.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4112. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 03:09:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011212220906.14755.00000680@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 27109

In article <3C16C5D4.B146839A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Actually, the FCC has gone on record as seeing no correlation between
>> >Morse code skill and self-sufficiency or any other positive attribute.
>> >Morse code skill stands alone and is uncorrelated to anything else.
>> >Virtually all of the troublemakers on HF are coded hams. The great
>> >majority of NALs are given to coded hams.
>>
>> Hmmm. I see. Is there any correlation, then, between technical
>> skill and having no Morse code skills whatsoever?
>
>Actually, the great majority of people with PhD degrees in
>EE/Electronics don't know Morse code. Like the FCC said, Morse
>code skill proves Morse code skill. It doesn't prove anything
>else including technical skill. If Morse code skill were
>correlated with technical skill, it would be a requirement
>in the technical curriculum of universities but you know
>it is not required.

Cecil:

Invalid response. I said "among licensed radio amateurs" or words to
that effect. I want to know if there is a correlation to a lack of Morse
code skill and technical skill solely within the ARS, nowhere else.
Confine your answer to the topic we're talking about -- amateur radio.
I realize you don't need to be a licensed radio amateur to be a PhD in
EE -- but all the PhD EE's I've known are also licensed Extra Class,
code proficient, code using, code loving hams -- and most of the No-
Code techs I know are trailer trash from the bottom half of their
high school class, with no further education, no ambition to learn
anything useful, but a universally buring desire to gain the individual
power of a microphone in their hands...without being bothered to learn
useful comm skills like Morse/CW.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4113. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 03:10:02 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <e_UR7.220531$3d2.10310511@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27110

Jerry, personally, I have tried to avoid causing hate and discontent in the rec.radio.cb newsgroup; however, your point is very well made. I am hoping that as we continue in the decline of the current sunspot cycle, a lot of the problem will go away. I assume (a most dangerous assumption, perhaps) that a lot of the DX chasers will die out for several years. Unfortunately, I do suspect that a lot of truckers will be using 10 (as did the taxicabs in NYC some years ago). What might be interesting besides trying to get assistance to the FCC to pick up enforcement (such as inspecting at truck stops as they inspected the NYC taxicabs), is to attempt to get the ARRL to start complaining to Radio Shack, Ranger (sorry, not sure of the full corporate name), and others which are manufacturing 10 and 10/12 meter radios which are easy to convert to 11. I don't know the status of the new Radio Shack 10 meter radio. Has it sucessfully been converted to 11 yet? I know there had been a problem with the FCC and Radio Shack over that with their earlier 10 meter radio. Frankly, I don't believe these radios are truely being aimed at the amateur market. I did see in a recent QST an ad for a 150 watt SSB/AM 10 meter only radio. I can't imagine buying a 10 meter only radio. For a few hundred more, one can get a reasonable lower end transceiver covering at LEAST 160 through 10 meters. What does the IC706MK2 cost? Ok, maybe 3 times what that 150 watt 10 meter only rig costs. However, you get coverage from 160 through 2 meters plus 440! I had almost considered a 10 or 10/12 meter rig as I want to get back on HF (besides 2 roofs, boiler, and several other things setting me back over 10 grand). If I spend a few hundred on something like that, I'll be unhappy - and now I've got to save a few hundred more to get something useful. What might work is to have various amateurs record a lot of the conversations, including frequency, time of day, etc. Send it to the ARRL. See what the FCC has confiscated in the few busts they have made. Copy adds from CB sites and newsgroups. Put the whole thing together and have the ARRL pull a multiBILLION dollar lawsuit against the manufacturers of those devices. Even assuming a large reduction in the amount, if Radio Shack had to ante up 50 million they might well rethink who they sell to. We might not need more legislation. Perhaps they might feel they want to see a valid license before selling the 10 meter only gear.

You are correct. Despite some folks feeling that regulations are 'big government', we need regulation. Who wants to turn on the Dallas Cowboys only to hear 'AUDIOOOOO' blaring from their speakers?

This isn't a hate directed at CBers. A lot of them are great folk. Unfortunately, a small but vocal minority seem to be giving the impression that if you don't hear anything on any particular frequency at a particular time, you can use it. Now, if I could just find one such individual and find out when his favorite TV station shuts off so I can set up my station and transmit 'AUDIOOOO' all day...

Sorry, this isn't meant as a rant, but there IS a problem.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:_VPR7.160049$8n4.11746618@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> Fellow Amateurs,
>
> Like many of you, I have steamed and thought over the problem of the
illegal
> intrusions onto our 10 and 12 meter bands.

<<remaining cut for brevity>>

4114. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 03:49:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C182512.F1AB4ACB@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27111

CAM wrote:
>
> They obviously trust some key employees more than
> other non-key employees. You simply don't know
> what you are talking about. At Intel, *every* day,
> there are thousands of one-on-ones (what Intel
> calls them) behind closed doors. I worked in a
> group unrelated to microprocessors and would have
> been unable to obtain the specs for the Pentium4.
> You have no idea of the secrecy surrounding the
> latest designs.

Well, I obviously don't know about Intel's security, Cecil, so lets discuss companies in general. That is, unless you want to tell us about Intel's security so we can discuss it.

Anyway, in general, companies like Intel tend to go for medium security - some variation of security guards as key entrances, employee ID badges, employee non-disclosure agreements, security cameras, a few badge swipe doors at key interior doors, and occasional bag checks as employees exit the building.

Companies obsessed with security take all this to the next level - far more security guards, employee ID badges remotely scanned as employees move through building, tightly monitored security cameras, finger print interior doors, x-ray machines for bags entering or exiting building, and so forth. And, of course, key military installations take this to an even higher level.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4115. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 04:02:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C182827.E7F7391D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27112

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Maybe some of them are magicians?

Oh, never say that around wiccans, Jim. They hate any association with magicians. In fact, many even their spell magic differently ("magick") to set it apart from "entertainment" magic.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4116. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 04:04:53 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <FNVR7.220610$3d2.10316829@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27113

Hans, my concern (and I responded in another thread) is the 10 meter only and the 10 and 12 meter radios. I doubt more legislation will help. A lot of recording by hams with dates and times and perusing of FCC records as to what equipment was being used and I'd love to see a multibillion dollar lawsuit by the ARRL against the makers of said equipment. A lot of research first, then claims for loss of service, one ham was rammed I believe by one of the illegals. No, we don't need legislation. Let a major lawsuit let the manufacturers figure it out. No, you don't want to try and regulate everything. Someone studying for a ticket may want a transceiver (do they make seperate receivers and transmitters anymore?). The crux of the situation, in my opinion, is the 10 meter only and the 10 / 12 meter radios. Oh yes, and the 'export' radios. Anyone with half a brain knows what is going on. You want a 5 watt radio or a 25 watt radio (no mention of regulations or licensing, of course). Now, Ranger has a 150 watt SSB 10 meter rig. What is the ratio of CBers vs hams who are buying that radio? Nothing like the almighty dollar, right? Heck, it is a legal 10 meter radio. What percentage of amateurs might be interested in a 10 meter only radio? A few. A very few. How many CBers might be interested in it? I'm not saying sue for sure, just start collecting facts and put the problem where it belongs - with the manufacturers/distributors of the equipment causing the problem. This isn't quite the same as the gun question. The question, to me at least, is just WHAT market these devices are REALLY aimed at?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
"K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message
news:ePmAC63gBHA.1584@cpimsnntpa03...
> Jerry Oxendine wrote to his congress-critter:
>
> > 6) When purchasing radios from such outlets, (Radio Shack sells some)
> > capable of operation or modification to do so between 24 and 35 MHZ, a
> > license MUST be produced by the buyer. Fines to the seller that is
> > caught selling without doing so.
>
> Every so often a guy like Jerry comes up with the mistaken
> idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of
> amateur radio equipment and supplies. These are the folks who
> suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a
> license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that
> Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out
> under the nose of the impressionable public. I suspect they

> don't like the idea that soldering guns and schematics are
> openly sold to those without the proper credentials also.
>
> . . .While it is easy, on the surface, to agree with their
> goal (keeping amateur equipment out of the hands of
> bootleggers), I feel the attitude that amateur equipment
> should be treated as some sort of controlled substance is
> short-sighted and in fact damaging to our service.
>
> . . .I live in a large metropolitan area. We have one full
> line amateur store in town. There are no other similar stores
> in the whole state. In the four states which border us, there
> are 2 more amateur radio stores. THAT'S IT! In 5 states, there
> are only 3 stores! In the whole country, my guess is that there
> are less than four dozen stores selling amateur radio equipment,
> antennas, and supplies! It is as though we were some secret
> society, bent on concealing our presence from the world.
>
> . . .Not all that many years ago, there were at least 6
> electronic stores here in town which sold amateur equipment
> (not exclusively, but they all had a good selection). Add to
> that two Heathkit stores, and even the Sears stores sold amateur
> transceivers for awhile. (Yes, Virginia, right there along with
> the Craftsman sockets and Silvertone TV sets.) In the same era,
> Radio Row in NYC was blocks of wall-to-wall storefronts catering
> to electronics experimenters. Popular Science magazine had a
> regular column about amateur radio, and occasional construction
> articles. Every second little town had an amateur radio club.
> Amateur Radio was a populist, Joe SixPack kind of hobby.
>
> . . .During those years it was easy for a person to get
> interested in being an amateur, to shop around for the best
> deal on equipment, and to meet an Elmer. We were visible to
> the public, and well regarded.
>
> . . .Then somewhere along the line came the magic of 1-800
> shopping, amateur radio marketing became streamlined, and
> radio stores disappeared from Hometown America. With the demise
> of the local radio store, all the Elmers disappeared into their
> shacks and newcomers flounder around in fancy four-color ads in
> back of CQ and QST magazine, trying to decide how to be a ham.
> Clubs floundered, in part due to the loss of hams around the
> coffee pot in the back of the local electronics part store.
>
> . . .Rather than continuing to restrict the availability of
> amateur equipment, as though we were selling assault weapons
> or recreational pharmaceuticals, I vote for opening up the market.
> Let's have radios for sale in the strip malls alongside the video
> games, Lionel trains, and mountain bikes. And it won't hurt if a
> few of us put on our Elmer-suits and lurk around to spot the

> likely recruits.
>
> When they outlaw ham gear, only outlaws will be hams.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> --
> > >Frisbeetarianism: The belief that when you die,
> > >your soul goes up the on roof and gets stuck.
>
> > What roof would this be?
>
> The Roof of the Universe. And in the Last Days,
> when the Great Frisbee that shineth in the sky
> hath gone out, then shalt the Almighty Thrower
> ascend the Ladder of Life and collect the souls
> of those who have flown free, and take them The
> Eternal Park, where we shall sail upon the Spring
> Breezes for ever and ever, and be Fetched by the
> Holy Dog. Amen.
>
>
>
>

4117. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 04:16:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C182B64.A0E32D94@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27114

Krell wrote:
>
> It's "magick." Not, "magic." Try posting "magic"
> in a pagan/Wiccan newsgroup and watch what happens.

Already said that days ago, Krell. In fact, I just pointed that out
to Jim.

> Did you even LOOK at the link I posted? Obviously
> not.

Yes, I did. And the questions still stand.

> Who are you to say which one is right or wrong?

And who are you to say any are right or wrong? It's called an
opinion, Krell. You have one and I have one. You obviously have no
hesitation expressing yours, so don't fuss about me expressing mine.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4118. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 04:20:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C182C7C.8927B257@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27115

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Well, I obviously don't know about Intel's security, Cecil, so lets
> discuss companies in general. That is, unless you want to tell us
> about Intel's security so we can discuss it.

The subject is one-on-one meetings behind closed doors, Dwight,
not general security. Intel has thousands of one-on-one meetings
behind closed doors every day.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4119. Glenn Baxter on the Glenn Baxter show on a Glenn Baxter Wednesday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 04:28:31 UTC
From: hotlineamerica@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011212232831.22677.00003504@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27116

It's Glenn Baxter on the Glenn Baxter show on a Glenn Baxter Wednesday. And let's not forget that this guy is endorsed by the behometh IARN, not to speak of the AARU. Impeccable credentials.

Naturally, his editorials defaming Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC and others are not necessarily the opinions of the IARN nor the AARU. Trouble is, Baxter, IARN & AARU are one in the same.

Bob Sherin, W4ASX
Miami, Florida

4120. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 04:31:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C182F2F.6E96890E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27117

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Actually, the great majority of people with PhD degrees in
> >EE/Electronics don't know Morse code. Like the FCC said, Morse
> >code skill proves Morse code skill. It doesn't prove anything
> >else including technical skill. If Morse code skill were
> >correlated with technical skill, it would be a requirement
> >in the technical curriculum of universities but you know
> >it is not required.
>
> Invalid response. I said "among licensed radio amateurs" or words to
> that effect.

That's an invalid sample, Larry. If you want to know if there is any
correlation between two things in the general population, you cannot
chose a closed set and expect the sample to be valid. What you are
attempting to do is like deciding how many black people go to church
by sampling the attendees of white churches. But let's play your
silly game with selected sets.

The average technical level of all members of the IEEE is higher
than the average technical level of all members of the ARS.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4121. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 04:37:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C183064.FD671521@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27118

K0HB wrote:
>
> A foreign terrorist, who openly has
> declared his intent to do whatever possible
> to destroy our homeland and our way of
> life, has no right to protection under our
> Constitution. None.

It's not just the law of our own Constitution, Hans. It's also international law, and the law in most "civilized" nations. Most countries don't judge a person by what he says, but by what he actually does.

> It is God's responsibility to judge Bin
> Laden. It is our responsibility to
> arrange the meeting.

Spoken like a patriot, Hans. Our forefathers would be proud of such sentiments.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4122. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 04:52:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.go9dyub.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27119

On 13 Dec 2001 03:09:06 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>... most of the No-
>Code techs I know are trailer trash from the bottom half of their
>high school class, with no further education, no ambition to learn
>anything useful, but a universally buring desire to gain the individual
>power of a microphone in their hands...without being bothered to learn
>useful comm skills like Morse/CW.

The vast majority of No-Code-Techs who are in my radio club - the
largest one in the state - are good folks. Some of them are at a
technical level far above average, but for personal reasons are
content to keep their license level just about where it is. Some
are using it as an entry-level license and are workijg on learning
and using Morse.

You must be hanging around with the wrong crowd, Larry.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4123. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 04:58:13 UTC
From: stewartx@sccoast.net
Message-ID: <6be98d7d.0112122058.1554b871@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27120

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
> > > I dunno. How much land is there in the USA that
> > > would be suitable for farming but is not used?
> >
> > That I don't know, and I don't think her report
> > specifically addressed that (I don't remember
> > seeing it). But I'll ask her about it in the morning.

No, it didn't cover that, Jim. Her report mainly centered on the
extent of the problem.

> In addition, many of the crops grown today are used
> to feed cattle. Many more people could be fed from
> the same land if the crops were used to feed people.

Actually, to a great extent, we've already moved away from grain fed
cattle. Most farmers today are relying on natural grass supplemented
by hay. In the future, we'll probably see more use of genetically
altered grass designed to grow faster, meaning even less use of hay.

> Has anybody trademarked the name "Soylent" yet?

Sounds just yummie.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4124. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:17:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183d79_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27129

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:6be98d7d.0112092222.ac89878@posting.google.com...
> > Rick Adams wrote
> >
> > (snip) Provide the specific definition in
> > its entirety and the source of the quote.
>
>
> I've already done so, Rick. The fact that you don't like the
> definition is not my problem.
>
>
> > (snip) I'll accept that ludicrous statement
> > WHEN YOU PROVIDE PROOF, not simply because
> > you state it--you are wrong FAR too often
> > for that. (snip)
>
>
> Prove it for yourself, Rick. Like I said, walk down any street in
> this country and ask people to identify the practices of satanism. I'm
> certain 99 percent, both religious and non-religious, would list these
> very things (witchcraft, occult, etc). Your choice to argue with me
> rather than proving it for yourself strongly suggests you're afraid of
> the results.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Dwight, I haven't been looking at any newsgroup postings for a few days now, so this may have already been mulled over.

For you to advocate a policy just because it is "what everyone else believes" is absolutely ludicrous. Each person that I have ever met who truly believes there is something satanic about paganism is a person I end up giving whatever little education I've gotten myself on the topic. And, each time, their mind is at least a little more enlightened as to what paganism and neo-religions are about.

Paganism is *not* about witchcraft (which is actually also a falsely "dreaded" concept, for witchcraft in its true form is the "craft of white magic"). For you or anyone else to support the ongoing misrepresentation about what paganism is really all about is akin to allowing others to believe whatever they will about race, color, etc.

Kim W5TIT

4125. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:18:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183d7a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27126

You have such a convenient way of backpedaling, Dwight. But, at least you
do it with style.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C147844.D5C00D0A@sccoast.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > (snip) Let me get this straight. The sites I
> > provided dealing with polyamory, swinging, and
> > the sociological research surrounding those
> > issues are satanic?
>
>
> Sorry, I had just finished responding to six or seven messages from you
about
> satanism when I wrote that. Of course, it doesn't really make any
difference
> which topic is discussed when it comes to the core of Kim's comments - the
> accuracy or reliability of information sources. In other words, I
addressed her
> core argument, not the peripherial context.
>
>
> > I didn't provide you ANY sites dealing with wicca
> > or paganism, you idiot--I provided (at your demand)
> > sites dealing with polyamory and swinging--as Kim
> > CORRECTLY pointed out in her first paragraph.
>
>
> Idiot? Look, fool, are you going to sit there and claim that you've
never
> overlooked a minor point while addressing a core argument? It doesn't
matter
> whether we're talking about satanisn or non-monogamous relationships when
it
> comes to Kim's argument about the accuracy or reliability of information
> sources. And, since you obviously knew exactly which sites I was referring
to,
> why would you make such a big issue out of a simple oversite other than to
> continue your efforts to belittle?
>
>
> > (snip) Which subject, Dwight? Open marriage (snip) or

> > Wicca (snip)
>
>
> Either one, Rick. I know this is going to surprise you, but your
ramblings are
> not the first I've read on either of these topics. Indeed, most of your
comments
> are nothing more than the repetitive garbage I've read in these newsgroups
at
> least a dozen times before. And, since I've been around for a few years,
these
> newsgroups are not the first time I've seen either of these topic either.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4126. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:19:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183d7b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27127

Dwight, it was funny. I laughed. So sue me.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C147A54.17ECF8D5@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > ROFLMAO...
>
>
> What are you laughing about, Kim? I've always been polite enough not to
> belittle you when you've posted messages that were unrelated the topic
being
> discussed. Heck, at least my message addressed the core issue you raised
(the
> accuracy or reliability of information sources), even if it didn't
specifically
> address the context. Can you honestly say all your messages have even done
that?
> Be careful with your answer, because you just posted a message out of a
> discussion context last night (public transportation for the elderly).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4127. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:20:41 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183d7d$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27124

You're unrealistic, Dwight. Absolutely unrealistic.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C147C56.CFFF9F64@sccoast.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > > Well, Kim, it's very simple - we leave the doors
> > > open. What is it you do in the workplace behind
> > > closed doors that you cannot possibly do behind
> > > open doors?
> >
> > Discuss confidential business.
>
>
> Do you yell when you discuss confidential business, Rick? I've discussed
> highly classified military information with co-workers without having to
hide
> behind closed doors. What are you discussing that is so secret it cannot
> possibly be discussed with the door open?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4128. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:21:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183d7e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27128

Uh huh. When Hell freezes over, Dwight.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C14810D.2AFA5CD7@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > I do what I'm told at work, Dwight. I've *never*
> > experienced a male or female boss acting wrongly.
> > As I said, I suppose that the companies I've
> > worked at have all employed some very adult
> > people--because we all seem to be competent to
> > have closed door meetings without any problems.
>
>
> Well, Kim, there is little reason to continue with this - those are your
> experiences and these are mine (and both are equally legitimate). But I
will end
> with this simple observation - as soon as a complaint is made at your
company,
> or your company hears of something similar in your area, those doors at
your
> company will fly open and remain that way. As I said, it is happening all
around
> the country and your company is pressing it's luck by not paying attention
to that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4129. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:22:20 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183d7f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27123

Yes, he was. He was at that.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C148416.9DDE5F22@sccoast.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > Gee, that sounds like the argument many of us
> > have been making about her call sign.
>
>
> Does that "us" include me, or are you just lumping me in with everyone
else
> you dislike, Rick? I was defending Kim's choice of callsign long before I
ever
> saw your first message in this newsgroup.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4130. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:24:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183d80_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27122

HEARING the word uttered, Dwight, as opposed to it being *REALITY* are two entirely different things! I *HEAR* many things every day. Does that mean I must believe every one of them and pass them on to others as truth?! Give me a fu*$#&@ break.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C148F8A.D11845BC@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > So, you see Krell, Dwight *enjoys* spreading rumors.
>
>
> What rumors, Kim? If you're going to accuse someone by name of something like
> this, then at least have the integrity to explain your accusation. As I told
> Krell, you can hear the word "satanic" applied to these people every single day
> in this country - in books, magazines, movies, music, news stories,
> conversations, and so on. So how am I spreading "rumors" by repeating the common
> application of that word as it is used in this English language? Furthermore,
> Ms. Politically Correct (they not satanic - they're wiccans and pagans), what
> gives you the thought that you have a right to dictate what words are used in
> this language? Have you been taking double speak lessons from the book, "1984?"
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4131. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:28:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183d81_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27125

My kid used to believe he was big-time tough street dude. He'd claim all kinds of things to his pals. Until he met some big-time tough street dudes one day. People in my generation used to claim that they were "real" hippies. Then, they'd smack on McDonald's french fries while they talked about riding ski mobile all over the woods that night.

People who claim to be using magic in the same breath as they are saying they are Wiccan, Dwight, are nothing but dreamers and are as ignorant of the practice as you are. The closest Wiccan may get to using magic is in using the equivalent of "mantras" for prayer. You used a key word that you need focus on, Dwight, speaking of mantras. The word is "nonsense."

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C14922F.DBF2308E@sccoast.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > What they "claim" genius is that they worship a different set
> > of gods than you do. Why CAN'T they do that?
>
>
> Of course, they "can" do that (that is not saying they ARE doing that, by the
> way). But that is not all they "claim," is it, Rick? Most wiccans also claim
> they can do magic (or "magick," as some of them like to use) and other such
> nonsense? Do you really believe they can, Rick?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4132. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:28:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C182F3E.9A7866DD@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27121

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Come to think of it, we didn't--he's President because
> > of election fraud in the State where his brother is Governor, isn't
> > he?
>
> No. That's simply an underinformed misconception, regurgitated
> perpetually by liberal malcontents, against mountainous evidence to the
> contrary, in hopes that repetition will cause reality to invert itself.
> Shirley you knew that, Rick.

Nope. Rick's loaded up with underinformed misconceptions.

4133. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:30:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183dd8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27130

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1496C3.2EE716AD@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Dwight, your hole of ignorance on this topic
> > is so large now, that you've fallen in and
> > can't get out. You are so very ignorant of
> > these topics it's really not even worth going
> > any farther with you... (snip)
>
>
> Oh, don't leave now, Kim. We've just getting started? If you really
believe
> this wiccan nonsense (which you seem to based on the outrage you expressed
> above), why don't you ask your wiccan friends if they can do "magick" like
so
> many other wiccans claim? And if they say they can, why don't you ask them
to
> cast a spell to reflect the ill feelings I'm expressing towards them back
at me?
> Of course, if they claim wiccans can't cast spells or do magick, I'll
gladly
> provide you with a long list of books about wiccan "spells and magick."
Please,
> girl, don't even call me ignorant if you're foolish enough to believe in
this nonsense.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

For goodness sake, Dwight. Why don't you find some *real* Wiccan people to
talk to instead of whatever idiots you've been talking to?

Kim W5TIT

4134. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:32:02 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183e41_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27131

Dwight's always loved labels. It must be that he just plain didn't like the labels that good 'ol Dick was using for his Islamic friends. I'd forgotten just how vastly knowledgeable Dwight is on nearly any topic.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C1498D3.3E1D025C@sccoast.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > Not everyone, Dwight. Only the ignorant.
>
>
> Well, since that use is so common in this country, Rick, you just called about
> 90 percent of the population "ignorant." Of course, that is pretty typical for a
> liberal - liberals always believe they're right while everyone else is "wrong"
> or "ignorant."
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4135. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:33:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183e7d$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27132

heh heh heh. Maybe *those* are the Pagans casting all the magic!

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011210080318.02371.00000168@mb-cc.aol.com...
> In article <3C1447D6.907EB8AD@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >> modern pagans are
> >> not at all related to those early religions.
> > >
> > >Thought the pagans were a motorcycle club....
> > >
> > Yup - quite well known in these parts.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

4136. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:37:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c183f89_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27133

"Sean G Gilley" <uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org> wrote in message
news:ff37aa44.0112100743.391a52c@posting.google.com...
> Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C1283B9.C5D59A8B@sccoast.net>...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Ah, the politically "correct" life. I don't subscribe
> > > to it. If you guys do, that's up to you. I'll never
> > > bend so far as to be ruled by the fearful.
> > >
> > >
> > Then in many parts of this country, you're simply not going to find
> > work today (beyond the basic sales clerk or laborer level). A growing
> > number of employers are now resorting to job contracts with a long
> > list of rules added and a battery of psychological tests (written and
> > verbal) before you're even considered for the job. In other words, you
> > either fit the politically correct agenda of the company or you're out
> > the door. It's not that bad in the south yet, but it's coming.
>
> I've worked in three very large companies and a couple smaller ones.
> While in some of those companies there was training on how to treat and
> interact with others, I've never been subjected to any psychological
> tests. Further, I don't know of anyone who rigorously avoided contact
> in the way you talk about it. And I'm *not* at the sales clerk or
> laborer level. And I'm not in the south, as well.
>
> I'm not saying it doesn't happen, but I think it's less common than you
> seem to feel.
>
> Sean.

DITTO. My company sponsors and we all must participate in "Diversity
Training" every year. We also, each year, must sign a Code of Conduct
agreement. That's in addition to signing, every year, the statement that we
know and understand the company policies. I don't where it is that the rest
of these folks work, but where I work, we take all this very seriously.
Taken seriously, there is no room for the shenanigans of pussy footing
around with closed door meetings, lunches and travel with opposite sex peers
or subordinates.

Kim W5TIT

4137. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:42:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1840cc_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27134

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C1540E8.72D11E82@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > Do you yell when you discuss confidential business, Rick? I've
discussed
> > highly classified military information with co-workers without having to
hide
> > behind closed doors. What are you discussing that is so secret it cannot
> > possibly be discussed with the door open?
> >
>
> Salaries? Doing that out in the open really pisses off management.
> Once when I got downsized, I told everyone what salary I was
> paid. A little payback.... ;-)
>

Hoo hoo hoo...I've done that...LOL

Kim W5TIT

4138. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:45:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c18416c$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27135

In every office situation I've been in, an open door means people can be interrupted and that there is nothing being discussed that is of a confidential nature. A closed door means exactly the opposite.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C154BEF.6CF6EC10@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > You have got to be kidding, Larry. Would you like
> > the whole company to know how you did on your
> > yearly review? Would you like the whole company to
> > know about the latest technological secrets? A host
> > of things need to be kept confidential. Leaving a
> > door open during a confidential meeting at Intel
> > was grounds for termination.
>
>
> First of all, you responded to me, not Larry, Cecil. Anyway, do you talk so
> loudly when discussing a yearly review - so loudly the "whole company" would
> know? And what "technological secrets" would you discuss that the employees just
> outside your door, often your own staff working on that very technology, would
> not be allowed to hear? And I seriously doubt your claim about Intel?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4139. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:47:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1841f7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27136

"K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com> wrote in message
news:OU8W#CegBHA.1232@cpimsnntpa03...
> Bright Dwight said:
>
> > Yes, often executives will get together as a group to discuss
> > company business behind closed doors, but rarely are two
> > employees expected to meet behind closed doors to discuss
> > such things. In fact, if we're talking about product development,
> > private discussions about such information would be looked
> > at with suspicion in most companies.
>
> "Most companies"?????? You're completely mis-informed.
>
> I manage a product development group consisting of more than 30
> engineers, 40 technicians, and several dozen support people.
> Persons of both genders populate all levels of this group. In their
> day-to-day tasks there are occasions where small groups (often
> as small as two) collaborate in relative secrecy on many development
> projects. In a professional environment this is not "viewed with
> suspicion" as you claim, and mixed-gender development teams are
> not unusual nor are they subject to special scrutiny. Discrimination and
> restrictive rules based on gender are a mark of a dark-ages company,
> not a modern enterprise.
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

Thank you, Hans. Exactly. (Man, was I ever wrong about you...I still apologize).

Kim W5TIT

4140. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:52:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1842f3$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27138

Wow, kewl site, Krell!

Kim W5TIT

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9v3r4g01ofc@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> news:3C154EBA.F07EA50E@sccoast.net...
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > Again, name some specific examples. IOW, put up or shut up.
> >
> >
> > Do your own research, Krell. I have no time for someone who is too
blind
> to
> > see what is widely available right in front of their own face.
>
> OK. You asked for it. Here's a link I found...
>
> http://skepdic.com/wicca.html
>
>

4141. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:54:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C18355D.1A5DAFC8@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27137

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > A foreign terrorist, who openly has
> > declared his intent to do whatever possible
> > to destroy our homeland and our way of
> > life, has no right to protection under our
> > Constitution. None.
>
> It's not just the law of our own Constitution, Hans. It's also
> international law, and the law in most "civilized" nations. Most
> countries don't judge a person by what he says, but by what he
> actually does.
>
> > It is God's responsibility to judge Bin
> > Laden. It is our responsibility to
> > arrange the meeting.
>
> Spoken like a patriot, Hans. Our forefathers would be proud of such sentiments.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Our forefathers would have pronounced you a nutcase long ago.

4142. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:54:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c18441a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27139

I hear the sound of a ten-speed (going backwards).

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C15BFD1.D145FF3C@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > You simply don't know what you are talking about,
> > Dwight.
>
>
> I know exactly what I'm talking about, Cecil. You're the one who can't
keep
> the story straight (see below).
>
>
> > At Intel, a logic designer meets with a
> > process designer quite often in a one-on-one
> > meeting. Most companies trust their employees.
>
>
> If those companies trust those employees, why would they need to discuss
> project only behind closed doors? You're trying to have it both ways,
Cecil. One
> moment, you say companies don't trust their employees enough to talk with
the
> doors open. Now, the next moment, you say most companies trust their
employees,
> so closed door meetings are no problem. Look, I don't think we disagree as
much
> as it appears - we're just not being clear about what we're discussing.
So, lets
> set the record straight.
>
> First of all, we have the companies where security is not a major
issue -
> they're not working on anything where security, or sensitivity of product
> development, is a strong consideration. Obviously, this category of
companies
> would include most in this country. And these were the companies I was
talking
> about when I asked Rick what he was "discussing that is so secret it
cannot
> possibly be discussed with the door open?" Obviously, for companies where

> security is not a major issue, there is little "need" for meetings behind
closed
> doors - most business could be discussed with the doors open.
>
> At this point, you introduced a second category of companies into the
> discussion - those with a concern about sensitive product development
("HP/Intel
> shared computer architecture"). Actually, to be completely clear about
this
> category of companies, we need to break it down further - those companies
with
> just mild security considerations (consumer products, etc) and those truly
> obsessed with security (military contractors, etc).
>
> Of the first of these companies (those with mild security
considerations),
> you're going to see a hybrid mix of security measures - open door meetings
in
> some situations, closed door meetings in other situations, and both lax
and firm
> security when it comes to their employees. In other words, security is
more of a
> company desire in a given situation than a real requirement. This is most
likely
> the case with Intel. While Intel may desire to keep information about it's
> shared computer architecture under wraps, it also fully realizes the
information
> is going to get out eventually. In other words, they may try to keep
things
> under wraps, but they have not desire to go overboard with security.
>
> Finally, there is the second group of these companies (those truly
obsessed
> with security). These are the companies who would hire security personnel
(not
> security guards - security personnel to insure security of company
information
> and product information). And I was talking about these companies when I
said
> "private discussions about such information would be looked at with
suspicion in
> most companies."
>
> Now that we have a better understanding of the groups of companies we're
> talking about (those with little or no security considerations, those with
mild
> security considerations, and those obsessed with security), this
conversation
> might make a little more sense.
>

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4143. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 05:59:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1844a3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27140

```
Competitive Intelligence--the new emerging technology.

Kim W5TIT
```

"K0HB" <HHBrakob@email.msn.com> wrote in message
news:OVrDYRlgBHA.1992@cpimsnntpa04...
> Dwight says:
>
> > "Most companies" in the context of the discussion
> > with Cecil, Hans. See my response to Cecil's message
> > for clarification.
>
> I saw your "clarification" to Cecil. I laughed a LOT!
> It was a classic case of confusion and ignorance about
> how the modern product development process works.
>
> Secrecy is paramount, or companies cease to exist,
> and that is ESPECIALLY true in enterprises which develop
> consumer products.
>
> Kellogg's would _love_ to know what new cereal is being
> formulated at General Mills, Avon would _love_ to know
> what the new perfume from Chanel will be this season,
> Ford desperately wants to know what the next model
> SUV from Dodge will look like, and nobody yet knows
> the Colonels Secret Recipe. The kind of secrecy and
> security used by these companies makes Osama bin
> Laden's itinerary look like a pubic bus companies route
> schedule.
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

4144. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 06:01:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c18454b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27141

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C168D6B.9B914A1E@sccoast.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > No, Dwight. You refused to post references to
> > your stupid and erroneous claims. You then
> > told me to do my own research. You asked for
> > it whether you realize it or not. You probably
> > never even looked at the link, which wouldn't
> > be a surprise. You're content to believe
> > lies the religious right has been spewing
> > for years.
>
>
> Stupid claims, Krell? I claimed these people cannot actually do magic.
Are you
> saying they can? I claimed these people are frauds. The fact they cannot
do
> magic when they claim they can proves that. I claimed modern day "pagans"
are
> not descendants of those ancient pagan religions. Do you have some
evidence to
> dispute this? I claimed most people in this country would describe their
beliefs
> and practices as "satanic." Do you have some evidence to dispute that? So
far,
> I've seen a lot of talk about how my claims are wrong, but not a shred of
> evidence to support that talk.
>
> If you really believe this wiccan nonsense, Krell, show me they can do
magic
> and cast spells by having one do so to me. I've asked for such proof over
and
> over, yet nothing has happened so far. In the end, this entire wiccan
nonsense
> is stupid, and so is anyone who would defend it.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Well, you're right about one thing--it would definitely be stupid to defend
something that is not true. Just as stupid as it is to *BELIEVE* something
that is not true.

Kim W5TIT

4145. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 06:03:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1845a8_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27142

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9v6arn02fvf@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> news:3C168D6B.9B914A1E@sccoast.net...
> > Krell wrote:
> > Stupid claims, Krell? I claimed these people cannot actually do magic.
> Are you
> > saying they can? I claimed these people are frauds. The fact they
cannot
> do
> > magic when they claim they can proves that. I claimed modern day
"pagans"
> are
>
> It's "magick." Not, "magic." Try posting "magic" in a pagan/Wiccan
newsgroup
> and watch what happens.
>
> > not descendants of those ancient pagan religions. Do you have some
> evidence to
> > dispute this? I claimed most people in this country would describe their
> beliefs
> > and practices as "satanic." Do you have some evidence to dispute that?
So
> far,
> > I've seen a lot of talk about how my claims are wrong, but not a shred
of
> > evidence to support that talk.
>
> Did you even LOOK at the link I posted? Obviously not.
>
> > If you really believe this wiccan nonsense, Krell, show me they can do
> magic
> > and cast spells by having one do so to me. I've asked for such proof
over
> and
> > over, yet nothing has happened so far. In the end, this entire wiccan
> nonsense
> > is stupid, and so is anyone who would defend it.
>
> Wiccan spell rituals are no different than a native American rain dance,
or
> Christians praying for miracles. Who are you to say which one is right or

> wrong?
>
>

Especially when they're all right! ;)

Kim W5TIT

4146. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 06:12:04 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1847b6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27144

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C182512.F1AB4ACB@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > They obviously trust some key employees more than
> > other non-key employees. You simply don't know
> > what you are talking about. At Intel, *every* day,
> > there are thousands of one-on-ones (what Intel
> > calls them) behind closed doors. I worked in a
> > group unrelated to microprocessors and would have
> > been unable to obtain the specs for the Pentium4.
> > You have no idea of the secrecy surrounding the
> > latest designs.
>
>
> Well, I obviously don't know about Intel's security, Cecil, so lets
> discuss companies in general. That is, unless you want to tell us
> about Intel's security so we can discuss it.
>
> Anyway, in general, companies like Intel tend to go for medium
> security - some variation of security guards as key entrances,
> employee ID badges, employee non-disclosure agreements, security
> cameras, a few badge swipe doors at key interior doors, and occasional
> bag checks as employees exit the building.
>
> Companies obsessed with security take all this to the next level -
> far more security guards, employee ID badges remotely scanned as
> employees move through building, tightly monitored security cameras,
> finger print interior doors, x-ray machines for bags entering or
> exiting building, and so forth. And, of course, key military
> installations take this to an even higher level.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

OK, Dwight. "Types" of companies I have worked for: factory where
upholstered aircraft interiors is manufactured; engineering firm where water
purification systems are designed; environmental consulting and construction
materials testing firm; transportation company (moving company, where I was
on the management team); another environmental company; and my current
company--a utility. In each and every one I have not only been in
one-on-one meetings with members of the opposite sex, it is commonplace for
such meetings to occur. I have not ever had to travel, but many of my

coworkers have--with members of the opposite sex. I have had to have meetings with subordinates who were members of the opposite sex, and held those meetings behind closed doors.

Most of the companies I mention above are those that I have worked for here in the South. I don't know where it is that you seem to have this experience where employees cannot be trusted to act as responsible adults, but remind me never to move there.

Kim W5TIT

4147. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 06:17:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C183A92.2DB9C5CE@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27143

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > One thing more - Just because one claims to be a scientist means just
> > that-that's their claim. History is loaded with phony scientists
> > "proving" whatever they want proved.
>
> That's right, Dick, reject all science with which you don't agree.
> You are the reincarnation of one of the guys who put Galileo under
> house arrest for asserting that the earth was not the center of
> the universe.
> --

You're too much of an ignoramus to read what I wrote. If you believe what everone who claims to be a scientist delivers as research resulting in hard fact, that's your shortcoming, not mine. Of course science has never changed "its" mind about anything. Right. And no homosexual "scientist" ever set out to prove that homosexuality is normal. You idiot.

4148. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 06:18:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c184914_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27146

Didya read up on that, too, little Dicky?

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C18355D.1A5DAFC8@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > K0HB wrote:
> > >
> > > A foreign terrorist, who openly has
> > > declared his intent to do whatever possible
> > > to destroy our homeland and our way of
> > > life, has no right to protection under our
> > > Constitution. None.
> >
> > It's not just the law of our own Constitution, Hans. It's also
> > international law, and the law in most "civilized" nations. Most
> > countries don't judge a person by what he says, but by what he
> > actually does.
> >
> > > It is God's responsibility to judge Bin
> > > Laden. It is our responsibility to
> > > arrange the meeting.
> >
> > Spoken like a patriot, Hans. Our forefathers would be proud of such
sentiments.
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Our forefathers would have pronounced you a nutcase long ago.
>

4149. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 06:22:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C183BCD.8F600EEA@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27145

K0HB wrote:

> Dick Carroll muttered
>
> > Hans where da hell ya been for the last 30 years??? All that was way
> > back when there was not much other way to get a rig on the air. Today,
> > it's flash the plastic and yak.
>
> I've been on the air. Where the hell have YOU been Richard (Cranium)??
>
> There is more homebrewing and kitbuilding going on in amateur radio
> today that there has been since the late 50's.

Well, Hansass'le, you really believe a few Elcrafts and Warblers constitute the equvalent of Heathkit, Eico and E.F. Johnson? (I assume you do know that John son rigs were sold as kits, and when one was ordered "factory wired" an employee took the kit home and wired it for extra pay on his own time). Ha! Dream on!

> But acknowledging that
> fact would ruin your negative rant, wouldn't it?

If facts be negative, so be it.

4150. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 08:15:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112130015.511ae25b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27147

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3C16CFC7.2D3537AF@ix.netcom.com>...
>
>
>
> I imagine that back in the 50's, a novice would use a receiver that
> was a modified 5 tube AM radio (aka AA5). Change the antenna
> coil, local oscillator coil, and add some regeneration to the IF to
> make a crude BFO, to make a CW receiver.
>
>
Long before I got my Novice ticket around '53 I got schmart and
purloined a big AM and "shortwave" duoband console radio from an
indulgent old-maid aunt, the thing tuned from above the BC band to
around 8Mc. I forget exactly how I pulled it off but I boogered
another BC radio to spit out enough 455Kc +/- energy so that when I
positioned it next to the big console radio it gave me a half-assed
BFO. Turning the BFO on/off was a matter of twisting the AC switch on
the "BFO" radio. I think it wuz Mom's little wood-boxed Philco kitchen
radio. Whatever it was she was really pissed when she couldn't listen
to the Don McNeal (McNeil?)Breakfast Club with the thing so I had to
fix it and just listen to the Tower of Babble on 75m AM with Auntie's
beast box. If anybody out there in RadioLand thinks that anything has
changed one bit on 75m in the last half century I got a CLUE for YOU!
>
>
Off topic comment. Having scratch-built a flock of rcvrs ranging from
xtal sets to some decent small superhets before I got myself licensed
(at 5wpm Gawd forbid) I decided that Hallicrappers, Hammarlund,
Collins etc. were a much better idea on a bang-for-the-buck basis if
the ham has half a capitalist-oriented brain and places any dollar
value whatsoever on his labor time as it relates to the realties of
homebrewing his stupid radios.
>
>
Thus it was that I decided that when I passed the Novice exam I had
the usual six weeks between passing the test and having my license
shoved thru the mail slot by Mr. Umberger to come up with enough coin
to pop for a reasonably decent catalog manufactued radio. Which would
get the job DONE without any more dorking around with soddering arns
on my part.
>
>
So how to generate that coin? The usual marketing/priorities/tradeoffs

study. I came up with a scam which worked tits. Some newly moneyed native ethnics were in the process of overwhelming a staid old neighborhood within walking (two miles) from my neighborhood. A big thing back then wuz having yer address boldly painted on yer curb, white background, black numbers and the ethnics were all over it. It was a "suburban" kinda traditional thing and they were hellbent to become "suburban".
>
>
I've always been kinda graphics artsy-fartsy, I could do rawther masterful quick brush-stroked nummers on curbs even at age 12 or so fer chrisake, pizza cake, so I jumped on their wallets. My trick was to do the first nummer on the block and post facto ring the bell and ask for a "donation". Which I always got since I was a groveling non-ethnic serving their pre-yuppy era hot buttons. Then I moved to the next house and told 'em the folks next door have their nummer on their curb and I can do your's too. "How much did they pay you?" "A quarter, Sir" "Humpf, OK, here's a two quarters, do mine too. Sez self to self, "yeah, I'm on the right track" . .
>
By the time I got outta jr. high school at 3pm, gathered up my paint and brushes and hoofed the two miles to my goldmine it wuz 4pm in some very cold month and I froze my damned fingers off painting house nummers on curbs until I simply ran outta light maybe 5:30pm or so. Took me something like three days to raise 135 bucks, 4.5 hours total plus the outbound "commute" time?? Something like that. Took some flack from Mom for being late for dinner. By the time I terminated the scam mostly by being worn out and frozen I wuz getting two bucks a pop. In 1953.
>
>
So anyway Aunt Kathleen, may she rest in peace begorra was a Sears & Roebuck operative in Chicago who got me ten bucks off on an S-40B, I shipped her the $109.95, Sears dropped it on the front porch a few days later and off I went. Forget what I did with the rest of the 135 bucks. Prolly pissed it away on milkshakes for some broad or another. Hormones are just a bitch when yer a radio kid, dx on one hand, broads on the other hand . . .
>
>
The S-40B was a seriously fer-crap radio but it greatly exceeded the performance of any radio I'd ever built myself and it got me an 80m Novice WAS for openers. And when Mr. Umberger slid my General thru the slot and I swished down to 3.505 and called CQ late that nite g5zk came right back at me and I HEARD him. I ain't built a rcvr since.
>
>
What I done was trade three days of freezing fingers to the bone in exchange for a radio which woulda taken me Lord only knows how many *more* hours for me to replicate with chassis punches and the

soddering arn. Lotta bullshit, ya use yer talents to crank the coin at a decent hourly rate then convert that coin to radios and get on the air NOW. Has to to with understanding ROIs. Once again NOTHING basic has really changed in the past half century.
>
>
>And using parts
> scanvened from a dead TV set, build a transmitter. The horizontal
> output tube would be the RF out tube. Use one of the signal
> triodes as a crystal controlled oscillator, and a signal pentode
> as a keyed buffer/driver.
>
> Many starving high school and college students probably
> had stations like this.
>
>
Transmitters were the easy part. I trashpicked an RCA model 625 TV rcvr on the way home from school one day, good stiff 450vdc @ 400 mils+, yahoo, just right for my $5 Radio Row 80m ARC-5 TX, plug 'n play radio.
>
>
w3rv

4151. AMP SALE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 08:39:40 UTC
From: "Train cbmods"@optonline.net
Message-ID: <9v9pgc$o9g$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 27149
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.swap

As a public service to the NG, I will be offering to sell mobil amps to those wishing to buy them. This is not done out of greed but out of necessity to thwart the losers in the NG who think they have taken over OUR nice little group and can use it to harass and belittle as they see fit. To offer sale of these items is just the thing needed in a public forum to mess with these nil-minded simpletons.

Amps such as Texas Star, Palomar, Cobra,Messenger, Gray, Galaxy, X-Force and so on. These will be sold for a limited time and at a VERY small profit IF ANY !

This is not a money thing so much as it is an access thing.

Since these self appointed radio/computer gods have declared knowledge an illegal thing also, I might just make the entire Secret CB book series available on CD along with a CD of amplifier schematics for base and mobil amps. Why is it that when these morons just think they are getting somewhere in their fight somebody like me comes along and pisses on their parade? BECAUSE THEY NEED IT AND DESERVE IT!!!!!!!!!

E-Mail me with your needs......
Train
tra1n@aol.com
train@cbmods.com
cbmods@optonline.net

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4152. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 08:42:28 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9v9pljodg10@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27148
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>> Yeah Ok just because you say it doesn't make it so. What do you know of
>> normal police procedure? Sounds Like not much.

> I work for a governmental agency.
> Plus I have a number of friends who
> are LEOs who I serve with in the
> military reserves.

> I know procedure. And I know rookie
> cops. When in doubt, arrest.

Maybe in your neck of the woods. Here, if in doubt, "Call the Sergeant".
If the Sergeant doesn't know, he calls the Watch Captain. If he doesn't
know, then it is time to call a DA.

It is far better to use up a bit of time than to arrest someone without
cause. False arrest lawsuits can be costly, especially when it is over
something as trivial as possession of a radio.

Your buddies are why some some cops have a bad reputation. Do you feel
it is better to hang a few innocent people, just to make sure a murderer
does not go free? After all, it is just a matter of degree before you say
"Oops - our mistake.".

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4153. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 08:51:05 UTC
From: "Train cbmods"@optonline.net
Message-ID: <9v9q5poih1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 27152
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <ePmAC63gBHA.1584@cpimsnntpa03>Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
>> 6) When purchasing radios from such outlets, (Radio Shack sells some)
>> capable of operation or modification to do so between 24 and 35 MHZ, a
>> license MUST be produced by the buyer. Fines to the seller that is
>> caught selling without doing so.

I have no use for or reason to operate legally.

There are thousands of us who will continue to operate as we see fit without regard to whatever some schmuck like you or your little click of over-opinionated morons have to say about it. You can cry all you like but those of us who can, will and those of you who can't......Will continue to cry about it.

Train

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4154. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 08:53:22 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9v9qa0odg11@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27150
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>>
>> They also are under alot of scrutiny these days, in NJ the State Police are
>> under a lot of scrutiny all motor vehicle stops are video recorded and the
>> stops are reviewed by the federal Government. So "they" are not arresting
>> people who complain about their rights. They are arresting people because
>> they violated a Law. Most cops are well aware of what peoples rights are
>> within the letter of the law. Do exceptions happen of course they do but the
>> brush you are painting with is far to wide and just your opinion.
>>

> No, but they do not want to hear about
> your fucking rights. They could care less.
> If they pull you over, they can take your
> car if you do not have proof that you
> are federally licensed to operate a radio.

Sounds like you are a police officer - and one who does not have the
bloodiest idea what was written in that law. The law does NOT allow
confiscation of the vehicle - and probably not even searching the
radio (vehicle) without a warrant.

If I have a CB radio, I am federally licensed to operate that radio.
Just because there is no physical license means nothing. Second, there
is no federal law prohibiting owning Ham gear - even if you are not a
Ham. Look it all up, if you don't believe me. The relevant sections of
the FCC statutes are not that long or complex. If you cannot understand
the legalese - ask one of the DA's.

> And your service to "king and country"?
> I do have 30 years of political service.
> I have put judges on the bench, congressmen
> in office, have worked on political campaigns
> from the local to federal level.

Meaningless. A lot of drug dealers have accomplished the same
things.

> Plus 20 years of military service, to include
> a year in the Gulf War and another year
> with the Bosnian mess.

Bah! The Gulf War was a playground. So was Bosnia. Ask any GI
who served in Vietnam, Korea or on the front lines in WW II.

> What have you done with your miserable
> two bit life?

None if your business. I certainly did not waste it "kingmaking".
Politicians are one of the major problems we have in this country,
and many other countries as well.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4155. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 08:59:16 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9v9ql3odg12@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27151
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> The point is that if you off half cocked about your "rights"
> and how you are some big shot ham operator/CAP big
> wig, you are in the wrong. That is not the way to deal
> with cops. Your lack of respect towards them is shameful.

And you are an example of why people mouth off to cops. A police officer deserves no more respect than any other citizen. They also should treat others with respect until given sufficient reason to do otherwise. Mouthing off is NOT a sufficient reason.

> The police and military are your superiors.

No, they are our employees - although there are those (and you appear to be one of them) who are deluded into thinking otherwise.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4156. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 09:03:02 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9v9qs5odg13@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27153
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> The way you were going at it was that you
> were making it out that you were some big
> shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
> fucking rights and you were going to TELL
> that cop were to get off.

An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
into such a situation in the first place.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4157. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 09:47:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213044727.13406.00001903@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27154

>Subject: Re: some sobering numbers
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 12/12/2001 10:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C183064.FD671521@sccoast.net>

>It's not just the law of our own Constitution, Hans. It's also
>international law, and the law in most "civilized" nations. Most
>countries don't judge a person by what he says, but by what he
>actually does.

Sorry...that can get you in trouble too, Dwight.

Maybe OBL wasn't the one who did the deed, but he's threatened it so many times as to make him liable for it.

Where I live, if you are heard making a threat of bodily harm, that can get you arrested.

If you make a threat of bodily harm, and someone else does it, who do you think they are going to come looking for?

Military tribunals have the support of law...both American and International.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4158. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 11:28:04 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9va39101fs0@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27155

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C182B64.A0E32D94@sccoast.net...
> > Who are you to say which one is right or wrong?
>
>
> And who are you to say any are right or wrong? It's called an
> opinion, Krell. You have one and I have one. You obviously have no
> hesitation expressing yours, so don't fuss about me expressing mine.

I have no problem with opinions. This newsgroup has more than I care to count. But when someone posts an opinion that is based on flawed information, I will most certainly "fuss about it."

4159. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 13:02:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213080258.01493.00000206@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27166

In article <3C16BF4E.957575C7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> > At Intel, a logic designer meets with a
>> > process designer quite often in a one-on-one
>> > meeting. Most companies trust their employees.
>>
>> If those companies trust those employees, why would they need to discuss
>> project only behind closed doors?
>
>They obviously trust some key employees more than other non-key employees.
>You simply don't know what you are talking about. At Intel, *every* day,
>there are thousands of one-on-ones (what Intel calls them) behind closed
>doors. I worked in a group unrelated to microprocessors and would have
>been unable to obtain the specs for the Pentium4. You have no idea of
>the secrecy surrounding the latest designs.

The civilian concept of "secrecy" and the govt./military concept of "secrecy"
can be quite different.

But one basic concept is common to both of them: sensitive information is
compartmentalized on a "need to know" basis. Cecil and his group could not get
info about the P4 because they didn't need that info to do their jobs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4160. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 13:02:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213080259.01493.00000207@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27165

In article <3C182827.E7F7391D@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>Jim Kelley wrote:
>>
>> Maybe some of them are magicians?
>
>
> Oh, never say that around wiccans, Jim. They hate any association
>with magicians. In fact, many even their spell magic differently
>("magick") to set it apart from "entertainment" magic.
>
Where's James Randi when ya need him?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4161. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 13:32:23 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9vaa3u$1sn$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 27167

"Drpfrench" <drpfrench@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011212120254.04555.00001752@mb-mr.aol.com...
> >Actually, this is something more of us need to prompt our clubs and
> >organizations that we pay dues to, to create or help supply the contents
of
> >whatever packet you are referring to. Sounds like, overall, a
positive-gain
> >investment. I like the idea actually.
>
> The ARRL has a selection of hand outs listed on the ARRL web site. OUr
club has
> a good supply of these for Kids Day events, and Field Day Etc. THe Archie
comix
> are also a good hand out for kids.

I've copied the what is Ham Radio, and the getting started in Ham Radio etc. sections off the ARRL web site. That's what I'm going to use for the handout material the next time I'm asked. I keep the copies in the center console in my van so I don't forget them at home. I've been asked only a few times, but the last one was they only time I had anything to show people. I think I'm a little better prepared for the next time.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

4162. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 13:40:21 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9vaait$239$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 27168

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C177FB0.A0AE55D5@townsqr.com...
>
>
> "Leland C. Scott" wrote:
>
>
> . He was
>
> > pleased as heck with the radio literature, and wanted to know if CW was
used
> > too, which I said yes
>
> Then you gave him a demonstration of a CW contact, right?????

That would have been nice, however I didn't have the control head for my 706MKIIG clipped in to the van so I couldn't even show him the radio much less a QSO. The party store is only 5 minutes from apartment, and wasn't worth the effort to clip it in for a couple of minutes use. The main body is bolted to a 3/16" thick aluminum plate, which is itself screwed to the under side of the rear bench seat as an anti-theft measure. So there wasn't much in that department to show either.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

4163. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 13:45:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112130545.48e32a1e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27156

"K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message news:<ePmAC63gBHA.1584@cpimsnntpa03>...

> Every so often a guy like Jerry comes up with the mistaken
> idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of
> amateur radio equipment and supplies. These are the folks who
> suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a
> license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that
> Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out
> under the nose of the impressionable public. I suspect they
> don't like the idea that soldering guns and schematics are
> openly sold to those without the proper credentials also.

Maybe. Or maybe they don't like the fact that outfits like

http://www.copper.com

sell stuff clearly intended for illegal use.
>
> . . .While it is easy, on the surface, to agree with their
> goal (keeping amateur equipment out of the hands of
> bootleggers), I feel the attitude that amateur equipment
> should be treated as some sort of controlled substance is
> short-sighted and in fact damaging to our service.

It hasn't worked for the past 23 years, either.
>
> . . .I live in a large metropolitan area. We have one full
> line amateur store in town. There are no other similar stores
> in the whole state. In the four states which border us, there
> are 2 more amateur radio stores. THAT’S IT! In 5 states, there
> are only 3 stores! In the whole country, my guess is that there
> are less than four dozen stores selling amateur radio equipment,
> antennas, and supplies! It is as though we were some secret
> society, bent on concealing our presence from the world.

Times have changed, Hans. You wanna go against "progress"?
>
> . . .Not all that many years ago, there were at least 6
> electronic stores here in town which sold amateur equipment
> (not exclusively, but they all had a good selection). Add to
> that two Heathkit stores, and even the Sears stores sold amateur
> transceivers for awhile. (Yes, Virginia, right there along with
> the Craftsman sockets and Silvertone TV sets.)

Exactly when was this, Hans? I bought my HW-2036 at a Heathkit store
way back in 1977 - almost a quarter century ago. I can't remember

exactly when those stores disappeared, but it was long ago.

In fact the whole concept of "radio store" has disappeared. When I was starting out in the mid-1960s in Upper Darby, PA (once home of B&W), there was a Lafayette store, a Resco store, and Kass Electronics within a three mile radius. None were primarily ham radio but all had ham stuff available, and through them you could order almost anything you needed. All are long gone, victims of the electronics revolution of the 1970s. All we have now are Radio Shack stores. None of them has a back room or a coffee pot.

> In the same era,
> Radio Row in NYC was blocks of wall-to-wall storefronts catering
> to electronics experimenters.

They tore down Radio Row in NYC to build the World Trade Center. That was in the '60s.

Most US hams today were first licensed long after that era.

> Popular Science magazine had a
> regular column about amateur radio, and occasional construction
> articles. Every second little town had an amateur radio club.
> Amateur Radio was a populist, Joe SixPack kind of hobby.

Yup - even though there were far fewer hams per-capita back then than today. (~250,000 back in the 1960s, two-and-a-half times that today)
>
> . . .During those years it was easy for a person to get
> interested in being an amateur, to shop around for the best
> deal on equipment, and to meet an Elmer. We were visible to
> the public, and well regarded.

We also had little or no competition in the electronic communication hobby universe. And life was very different than today. I know, I was there.

> . . .Then somewhere along the line came the magic of 1-800
> shopping, amateur radio marketing became streamlined, and
> radio stores disappeared from Hometown America. With the demise
> of the local radio store, all the Elmers disappeared into their
> shacks and newcomers flounder around in fancy four-color ads in
> back of CQ and QST magazine, trying to decide how to be a ham.
> Clubs floundered, in part due to the loss of hams around the
> coffee pot in the back of the local electronics part store.

Yup. Think about WHY that change happened. It wasn't the 1-800 numbers, but other forces, much more sweeping. The whole society has gradually changed. You want details, I got 'em.

> . . .Rather than continuing to restrict the availability of
> amateur equipment, as though we were selling assault weapons
> or recreational pharmaceuticals, I vote for opening up the market.

It's wide open now, Hans.

> Let’s have radios for sale in the strip malls alongside the video
> games, Lionel trains, and mountain bikes. And it won’t hurt if a
> few of us put on our Elmer-suits and lurk around to spot the
> likely recruits.

Works for me.
>
> When they outlaw ham gear, only outlaws will be hams.

Being an outlaw is the problem. And it's not a new problem.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4164. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:20:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C18B911.80B02656@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27170

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> Paganism is *not* about witchcraft (which is actually also a falsely
> "dreaded" concept, for witchcraft in its true form is the "craft of white
> magic").

My dictionary defines a "pagan" as someone who is not a Christian, Jew,
or Muslim and/or anyone who believes in polytheism. Worshiping the
Sun God would be a pagan act. Worshiping the Earth Mother would be a
pagan act.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4165. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:24:36 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9vad5q$34a$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 27171

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011212210749.10740.00001534@mb-fk.news.cs.com...
> >He was
> >
> >> pleased as heck with the radio literature, and wanted to know if CW was
> >used
> >> too, which I said yes
> >
> > Then you gave him a demonstration of a CW contact, right?????
> >
>
> Ouch!

The "ouch" part was last night when I was driving around to get some fast food about 10 PM. I was monitoring 3 Hams on 2m sideband. During the 5 minutes I was monitoring I must have heard the "F---" word used once, and the "S---" word several times. I broke in to their QSO and commented about the "language" I was hearing, and "suggested" maybe they could watch it a bit since many people monitor the band, but may not actively TX. I made my point, ID'ed, and cleared. You can likely guess what their comments where to me. After I cleared one Ham used the "A--" word several times while one of the other two jokingly made a comment about watching out for the "repeater cops". I didn't write down the callsigns, but I do remember one was a 2x2 call, and the other two I don't think I heard them even ID.

That QSO was one I would NOT have wanted somebody to hear as an example of Ham Radio in action, nor would some of the crap I hear on 75m either. Fortunately that was the only really bad QSO, on 2m SSB or FM, I've heard in my 2 years in Ham Radio. Just about everything else is something I wouldn't mind having somebody's kids hear. I do remember RH's talk at the Fort Wayne Hamfest, where he played a tape of that group on 75m, 3940 to 3950 KHz, and said that is the sort of thing that will ruin Ham Radio. He also said it was also something the FCC can't do much about, and highly suggested that we Amateurs apply a bit of peer pressure to those operators to clean up their act as a part of the self policing function of the service.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

4166. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:29:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C18BB30.E672965D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27173

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:
> Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
>
> "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> me running, try to keep up. "

Saw a well-endowed lady the other day with a T-Shirt that said:
"If only these were brains".
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4167. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:31:09 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9vadi2$35g$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 27172

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:2087B91633643430.86FAEDD81389CBFE.C44F70E8E2C7512C@lp.airnews.net...
> On Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:51:33 -0500, "Leland C. Scott"
> <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> >Here's something to think about. The other night I had a guy honestly ask
> >me, out side of a 7-eleven store, if I was some kind of secret agent or
> >something while pointing to the antenna farm on top of my van.
>
> Amazing how people seem to think a secret agent would have glaringly
> obvious equipment stuck to the top of his vehicle.

Who cares? It was his way of breaking the ice to talk with a total stranger.
The worst thing I could have done would have been to make him feel stupid. I
didn't want to do that. After all who hasn't asked a dumb question at one
time or another?

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

--
"1500Kbs cable modem
MediaOne Roadrunner."

4168. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:34:08 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C18BC7F.16A2A77E@gte.net>
Source record: 27178
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>
> >> You must not be reading my post--I won't HAVE to do anything: USAF will do
> >> it FOR me. DOD equipment is issued on a Form 37. All I have to do is tell
> >> the CID investigators WHO confiscated it, and THEY will be on the LEO like
> >> stink on sh**.
> >
> >Think again. First the cops would just the
> >car and the radios. Then when the CID
> >folks show up, they will explain how you
> >lipped off to the cops that you were some
> >type of hot shot Air Force type. At that
> >point, the investigation might be about your
> >fitness to serve.
>
> Which is why I strongly endorse and support that
> all police cars be equipped with both audio and video
> recording equipment to document exactly what
> happened. I have seen the absolute value in
> these in both protecting the public against rogue
> cops and protecting police against false accusations of
> police brutality.

Bill, I am not talking about rogue cops or
even police brutality. Rather it is the cop
who is a professional, who keeps his cool,
but is not going to let some ham tell him that
the cop has no right to inspect his radios
and plays the hot shot. No cop will put up
with that.

The average cop is trained to suspect everyone.
Even other cops. They are trained that they
are superior, the "force" of government, the
thin blue line that keeps us a civilized society.
And it is almost universal that the biggest goal
that a cop will have is to make it home alive
every night.

If there is a question about a radio, it is just easier
to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
courts settle. I have said this over and over. This
includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
chief's problem, and not theirs.

This does not mean that they will keep the radios forever,
as the AF CAP chap suggested. When the AF types come,
it will go in front of a judge. And remember, this is only if
there is question that the street officer can not settle quickly.

Too many Americans are jerks, assholes. They believe that
they have a right to do anything, and everything. That they
have NO responsibility to society or their fellow man. And
the cops want that attitude to end.

4169. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:35:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C18BCA6.5C784CE9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27174

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 13 Dec 2001 03:09:06 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >... most of the No-
> >Code techs I know are trailer trash from the bottom half of their
> >high school class, with no further education, no ambition to learn
> >anything useful, but a universally buring desire to gain the individual
> >power of a microphone in their hands...without being bothered to learn
> >useful comm skills like Morse/CW.
>
> The vast majority of No-Code-Techs who are in my radio club - the
> largest one in the state - are good folks. Some of them are at a
> technical level far above average, but for personal reasons are
> content to keep their license level just about where it is.

Half the nocode techs at Intel are engineers or technicians who
simply don't choose to learn Morse code. At least one has a
PhD degree in EE. I'd like to see Larry tangle with Dr. Williamson
on a technical basis.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4170. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:41:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C18BDFC.29BF2F15@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27175

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You're too much of an ignoramus to read what I wrote. If you believe what
> everone who claims to be a scientist delivers as research resulting in hard
> fact, that's your shortcoming, not mine. Of course science has never
> changed "its" mind about anything. Right. And no homosexual "scientist"
> ever set out to prove that homosexuality is normal. You idiot.

The observation that Orangutans are homosexual was an accidental
sighting, Dick. You really think someone would spend months in the
Borneo jungle studying Orangutans for the sole purpose of observing
homosexual behavior? You are so far removed from reality that
I don't see how you manage to post here.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4171. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:45:11 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C18BF1A.F0AEA9F5@gte.net>
Source record: 27176
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >So far towns, cities, states etc can do anything until they
> >write some type of Laws regarding this issue.
>
> You did mean "can't", right ??
>
> >Congress only gave local
> >jurisdiction the ability to police this the police will have some type of
> >idea of the laws they will be enforcing. Otherwise they will call for
> >back-up, defer to a higher ranking supervisor, something to releave liabilty
> >from them when possible, they cannot go about and won't go about blindly
> >enforcing Laws.
>
> This communications lawyer sees it from the viewpoint that The
> Congress gave the local police no more authority than the FCC has,
> just the ability to enforce the FCC's "unlicrensed CB" regulations.
>
> This means no random stops and searches, no forced entries without a
> court order (warrant), no "confiscation", no excess fines above the
> monetary penalties that the FCC can levy, no jail time for Rule
> violations, and no making up their own rules about stuff that does
> not appear in the FCC Rules.
>
> >I just don't see it happen that way in this day in age when people are as
> >lawsuit crazy against LEO's.
>
> You are so right.

What you have to understand is that many hams feel
that the cops have NO right to inspect them, to ask
questions. I am not talking about rogue cops but rather
the officer who is professional and whose biggest goal
every day is to make it home alive.

These officers want video of every traffic stop. Too
many Americans are jerks, assholes. They have "rights"
and no one, not even the police (in their mind) have the
right to tell them how to live. And too many hams are
big jerks.

This AF CAP chap just does not get it. Let the AF CID
come, as far as they are concerned that is a matter for the
courts. Once the cop does his job, the investigation, he is
more than happy to let the courts deal with it. And that
includes lawsuits. That is the chief's worry, not his. As it

is, too many file false lawsuits every day against cops. It has become a cost of doing business.

Again, the average cop sees most of this a matter for the courts. If he has question, his automatic response is to throw it over to the courts to decide. That is the professional thing to do. And if some ham becomes an asshole and argues with him, he wants video tape to take to court.

4172. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:47:10 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C18BF96.D1C76341@gte.net>
Source record: 27177
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>
> > And are you a police officer? Are you
> > an attorney? NO. You are a Private
> > Fucking Civilian (PFC) with little contact
> > with the current system.
>
> Don't believe everything your small mind thinks up. You don't know who or
> what I am and what systems I have contact with. Again all I see from you is
> opinions Just like a true politician full of shit as usual.
>
> > Understand this. The police and the
> > military are your superiors.
>
> Says who You?
>
> >Their lives are far more valuable than yours.
>
> Again says who some 2 bit local politican from bumfuct indiana?
>
> > And no cop is going to take your lip,
> > that you are some big bad ass ham
> > operator. In his mind, he does not
> > care about your rights. He cares
> > about making home every night.
>
> He had better care about my rights they are just as important as his. So all
> cops walk around with attitudes is what you are saying. Is it screw Joe
> Public? Does he think he is "Above The Law" Does every cop feel this way ?
> Perhaps Daniel Marvin can answer a few questions.

We give cops guns because their lives are more
valuable. Mayors and governors have bodyguards
for the same reasons.

4173. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:52:02 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C18C0AE.C64042F@gte.net>
Source record: 27182
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >> They also are under alot of scrutiny these days, in NJ the State Police are
> >> under a lot of scrutiny all motor vehicle stops are video recorded and the
> >> stops are reviewed by the federal Government. So "they" are not arresting
> >> people who complain about their rights. They are arresting people because
> >> they violated a Law. Most cops are well aware of what peoples rights are
> >> within the letter of the law. Do exceptions happen of course they do but the
> >> brush you are painting with is far to wide and just your opinion.
> >>
>
> > No, but they do not want to hear about
> > your fucking rights. They could care less.
> > If they pull you over, they can take your
> > car if you do not have proof that you
> > are federally licensed to operate a radio.
>
> Sounds like you are a police officer - and one who does not have the
> bloodiest idea what was written in that law. The law does NOT allow
> confiscation of the vehicle - and probably not even searching the
> radio (vehicle) without a warrant.
>
> If I have a CB radio, I am federally licensed to operate that radio.
> Just because there is no physical license means nothing. Second, there
> is no federal law prohibiting owning Ham gear - even if you are not a
> Ham. Look it all up, if you don't believe me. The relevant sections of
> the FCC statutes are not that long or complex. If you cannot understand
> the legalese - ask one of the DA's.
>

And if you argue with a cop then you are just
another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
the office to shoot everyone.

>
> > And your service to "king and country"?
> > I do have 30 years of political service.
> > I have put judges on the bench, congressmen
> > in office, have worked on political campaigns
> > from the local to federal level.
>
> Meaningless. A lot of drug dealers have accomplished the same
> things.
>

> > Plus 20 years of military service, to include
> > a year in the Gulf War and another year
> > with the Bosnian mess.
>
> Bah! The Gulf War was a playground. So was Bosnia. Ask any GI
> who served in Vietnam, Korea or on the front lines in WW II.
>

Vietnam was joke. We did it right in the Gulf
War. And we are doing in Afghanistan what
we should have done in Vietnam.

Even Korea was a cluster fuck. As far as WWII,
yes they were great, not the bunch of wimps that
the average Baby Boomer has become.

>
> > What have you done with your miserable
> > two bit life?
>
> None if your business. I certainly did not waste it "kingmaking".
> Politicians are one of the major problems we have in this country,
> and many other countries as well.

You are nothing more than a taxpayer, with
no choice in the matter. All a politician is
a voter who is more involved in the system.

4174. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:54:06 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C18C138.A3619486@gte.net>
Source record: 27179
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >> Yeah Ok just because you say it doesn't make it so. What do you know of
> >> normal police procedure? Sounds Like not much.
>
> > I work for a governmental agency.
> > Plus I have a number of friends who
> > are LEOs who I serve with in the
> > military reserves.
>
> > I know procedure. And I know rookie
> > cops. When in doubt, arrest.
>
> Maybe in your neck of the woods. Here, if in doubt, "Call the Sergeant".
> If the Sergeant doesn't know, he calls the Watch Captain. If he doesn't
> know, then it is time to call a DA.
>
> It is far better to use up a bit of time than to arrest someone without
> cause. False arrest lawsuits can be costly, especially when it is over
> something as trivial as possession of a radio.
>
> Your buddies are why some some cops have a bad reputation. Do you feel
> it is better to hang a few innocent people, just to make sure a murderer
> does not go free? After all, it is just a matter of degree before you say
> "Oops - our mistake.".
>

Lawsuits are just a cost in doing business. People
file false charges against the police everyday. As
I said, the average cop looks to the courts to settle
questions. If a ham wants to be an asshole and argue
with the cops then he had better expect to stand in
front of the judge.

4175. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:55:22 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <evVLGY#gBHA.1688@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27180

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Well, Hansass'le, you really believe a few Elcrafts and Warblers
constitute
> the equvalent of Heathkit, Eico and E.F. Johnson? (I assume you do know
that
> John son rigs were sold as kits, and when one was ordered "factory wired"
an
> employee took the kit home and wired it for extra pay on his own time).

Being from southern MN, I know all about EF Johnson, but you'd really need to stretch to consider that as "homebrewed". Sorry, Dick, your rant just doesn't persuade me. This "factory appliances only" license is a bad idea.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

4176. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:56:05 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C18C1AE.717EAF19@gte.net>
Source record: 27181
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
>
> > The point is that if you off half cocked about your "rights"
> > and how you are some big shot ham operator/CAP big
> > wig, you are in the wrong. That is not the way to deal
> > with cops. Your lack of respect towards them is shameful.
>
> And you are an example of why people mouth off to cops. A police
> officer deserves no more respect than any other citizen. They also
> should treat others with respect until given sufficient reason to
> do otherwise. Mouthing off is NOT a sufficient reason.
>
> > The police and military are your superiors.
>
> No, they are our employees - although there are those (and you
> appear to be one of them) who are deluded into thinking otherwise.

Not your employees. The mayor hired them, not you.
You are but a taxpayer and you have no choice in paying
taxes. Unless you have the money and position to get
mayors elected then you will have a hard time influencing
the average big city mayor.
```

4177. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 14:58:00 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C18C221.646DAB4@gte.net>
Source record: 27183
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>
> > The way you were going at it was that you
> > were making it out that you were some big
> > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
> > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
> > that cop were to get off.
>
> An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
> into such a situation in the first place.

The average cop tries to be professional, to keep
cool. All he wants is to make it home alive each
night. If you become a jerk, shouting about your
fucking rights, then that cop wants a video tape
so he can show the courts what a big jerk you are.

4178. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 15:14:00 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112130714.4fe153f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27157

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C1544BB.296B7FD4@sccoast.net>...
> When you applied for the job, you were not asked about your opinions about
> working with others, your experiences working in certain situations, how you
> would handle certain situations, and so forth? These are all psychological test
> questions designed to reveal your physical (nervous, etc) and verbal (confident,
> evasive, etc) reactions.

Like, "Can I work independantly?", or "Can you work in a team?" I was almost
certainly asked both of those questions. However, the majority of the
questions had to do with my experience. I honestly *don't* remember exactly
what was asked for any but my current position, and it was even barely
an interview.

> And I would find it very hard to believe an employer
> would hire you for anything more than a laborer position without knowing exactly
> how you would deal with his customers and employees.

I'm in a technical field, with a proven record in solving technical
problems in a timely and correct manner. It probably also helps that
I run a non-competing technical business on the side -- something that
has impressed *every* manager I've interviewed with since I started.
It may be that someone with a proven record of close to twenty years
of success in thier field doesn't get asked the sort of questions you're
talking about.

> Likewise, since it is now
> federal law, I would be equally surprised if your company had no specific sexual
> harassment guidelines as a condition of employment.
>
> You said some companies had training on "how to treat and interact with
> others." None of that training addressed workplace dating and sexual harassment?

One company I've worked for in the past fifteen years had such training,
and it was mandatory. And yes, it did address those things. In that
company, it was frowned upon -- but not prohibited -- for a person to date
anyone for whom they did professional reviews or for whom they made
career affecting choices. (Peer review excepted.) I believe I mentioned
that earlier.

No other company for whom I've worked has stated such a policy to me.

> If you were hired in a management position, you were not expected to be aware of
> the laws and issues concerning sexual harassment in the workplace? This
> (workplace law, including sexual harassment) is basic training in most college
> business courses today.

Technical, not management. *Don't* want to be management.

Sean.

4179. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 15:24:44 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112130724.25377b97@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27158

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C1291F1.911C56FC@sccoast.net>...
> In fact, it is now a federal requirement for companies to
> have their policies about sexual harassment clearly posted for all to
> read. Where travel is likely, most companies had specific policies
> about socializing, accommodations, and so forth. And most companies
> gave their employees, especially the management staff, printed
> guidelines or classroom instruction about dealing with the opposite
> sex in the workplace - and all these she has read or seen warned
> against private meetings behind closed doors and socializing (lunches,
> etc) in or outside the workplace. In other words, her experiences in
> this regard have been exactly the same as mine.

I just pulled out my company's policy book. The entire section on
Harassment is less than a page long. It explains what harassment is,
and it explains what steps you can take if you feel you are being
harassed.

It *does* *not* warn against private meetings, socializing, or anything
else.

Sean.

4180. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 15:28:43 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112130728.b4100ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27159

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C13CDCE.8517C9FE@sccoast.net>...
> Well, Kim, it's very simple - we leave the doors open. What is it
> you do in the workplace behind closed doors that you cannot possibly
> do behind open doors?

There are many reasons why a meeting might need to be conducted
behind closed doors. The most common reason I've seen is that the
meeting has a rather loud, uh, discussion, and keeping the doors
closed means that the people in the cubes outside the doors are
less disturbed.

Another reason might be the people outside are loud.

A more important reason is that the discussion is about matters having
to do with something proprietary, and the discussion needs to be
private.

We hold meetings behind closed doors all the time. It's a normal thing
to do around here.

Sean.

4181. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 15:43:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011213104336.18921.00000171@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 27186

In article <3C182F2F.6E96890E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>The average technical level of all members of the IEEE is higher
>than the average technical level of all members of the ARS.

Cecil:

Well, Harumph...I would damn well hope so!

Now that we have THAT cleared up, back to my question: "What is the correlation between Morse code skill and technical skill, among [the closed set of] licensed Amateur Radio operators?"

73 de Larry, K3LT

4182. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 15:43:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011213104336.18921.00000172@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 27189

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.go9dyub.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>
>>... most of the No-
>>Code techs I know are trailer trash from the bottom half of their
>>high school class, with no further education, no ambition to learn
>>anything useful, but a universally buring desire to gain the individual
>>power of a microphone in their hands...without being bothered to learn
>>useful comm skills like Morse/CW.
>
> The vast majority of No-Code-Techs who are in my radio club - the
> largest one in the state - are good folks. Some of them are at a
> technical level far above average, but for personal reasons are
> content to keep their license level just about where it is. Some
> are using it as an entry-level license and are workijg on learning
> and using Morse.
>
> You must be hanging around with the wrong crowd, Larry.

Phil:

I wouldn't say I'm necessarily hanging with the wrong crowd, because
I generally don't "hang" with but a selected few of the local hams in
my area. And I used two limiters in my statement above -- "most" and
"I know." I did not state or imply that all No-Code Techs everywhere
are technically inept, unmotivated, lazy people. Just the majority of
the ones I met personally. They're essentially people seeking an
alternative to CB radio, and were attracted to ham radio mainly by the
reduction in the difficulty of the licensing requirements. These are
not people who are going to invent the next version of PSK-31. They're
going to buy an HT, get on the repeaters and complain about the 5
WPM code test, then when that's gone, buy an HF-to-Microwave-all-
in-one-box rig, an antenna, and then ask me to hook it all up for them!
I'm going to tell them to RTFB, and they'll get discouraged and give up
on ham radio entirely. Nothing new here.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4183. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 15:43:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011213104337.18921.00000173@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 27187

In article <3c1840cc_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> Salaries? Doing that out in the open really pisses off management.
>> Once when I got downsized, I told everyone what salary I was
>> paid. A little payback.... ;-)
>>
>
>Hoo hoo hoo...I've done that...LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Nobody expects you to do anything that demonstrates any
personal integrity; therefore you don't need to make any such
public confessions!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4184. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 15:43:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011213104337.18921.00000174@mb-mv.aol.com>
Source record: 27188

In article <3c18416c$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>In every office situation I've been in, an open door means people can be
>interrupted and that there is nothing being discussed that is of a
>confidential nature. A closed door means exactly the opposite.
>
>Kim W5TIT

I've said it before, and I'll say it again -- any manager who has a private, "confidential" conversation in his private office, behind closed doors, with a female subordinate, is a damn fool. There is nothing in the world like a company secret so sensitive in nature that it cannot be shared between at least three people; and in very small companies, there would not be any secrets of such a sensitive nature in any case. A closed door, with a male superior and a female subordinate behind it, is nothing more or less than an opportunity for that female to make any kind of accusation about that male -- and whether it is true or not, it will be believed by law enforcement, the press, the superiors of the male manager involved, the company's customers and stockholders, and the criminal justice establishment.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4185. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 15:54:56 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112130754.274a9af4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27161

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C148B64.EDA602A1@sccoast.net>...
> You three, on the other hand, seem to be
> rolling in political correctness- they're not satanic, they're wiccans and
> pagans. What utter nonsense.

Do you also use the term "satanic" to refer to Buddists and Taoists? If
so, then I agree that you are using the term, for you, correctly.

If, on the other hand, if you do not use that term to refer to those
religions, then I tend to believe that you are either misinformed or
choosing to misuse the term. There is a religion whose followers call
themselves "satanists". The Wiccan religion, however, does not believe
themselves to be satanists, nor do they actually believe in satan, so it
would be very hard for them to be satanists. What the general public means
when they say "satanists" is about ritual sacrifice, devil worship, etc --
all things that Wiccans do not believe.

The only real reason that Wicca is associated with satan, that I can tell,
is that they call themselves witches. It's probably a bad thing to call
themselves, because of one mistranslated verse in the bible, but they
don't associate themselves with the devil or satan, they don't worship evil.

If all followers of non-Christian religions are satanists, then fine, no
reason to argue with your choice of words. But if you *do* differenciate
between the non-Christian religions, why not differenciate between the
true satanists and those who follow a peaceful religion called Wicca?

Sean.

4186. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 16:16:33 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <057414B23892154F.7B5BE360FC3204AF.D34655804DF727D1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27191

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 09:24:36 -0500, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

>That QSO was one I would NOT have wanted somebody to hear as an example of
>Ham Radio in action, nor would some of the crap I hear on 75m either.

Carry a cheap microcassette recorder in the glovebox. I usually keep
a digital recorder handy, just in case.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

4187. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 16:43:44 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C18229F.38A0E394@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27192

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:
>
>
> The "ouch" part was last night when I was driving around to get some fast
> food about 10 PM. I was monitoring 3 Hams on 2m sideband. During the 5
> minutes I was monitoring I must have heard the "F---" word used once, and
> the "S---" word several times.

Unfortunately there are cb types with the cb mentality on ham
radio.

4188. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 17:14:27 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9van4f$6um$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 27193

"JR" <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C18229F.38A0E394@mailcity.net...
>
>
> "Leland C. Scott" wrote:
> >
> >
> > The "ouch" part was last night when I was driving around to get some
fast
> > food about 10 PM. I was monitoring 3 Hams on 2m sideband. During the 5
> > minutes I was monitoring I must have heard the "F---" word used once,
and
> > the "S---" word several times.
>
> Unfortunately there are cb types with the cb mentality on ham
> radio.

I don't think it was a case of "CB mentality" as such. There is not that much 2m SSB activity are by me so it's real easy to forget one is Tx'ing on a public frequency. I think these guys felt they were pretty safe on side band from being over heard by the majority of Hams who have only 2m FM rigs, or the public with FM only scanners. With the rapidly falling prices of rigs like the IC-706MKIIG, and the FT-100D, more Hams will have easy access to all mode equipment, so assuming one is on 2m side band as being semi private is no longer a "safe" assumption. Also now the manufactures are including SSB RX modes on some handheld scanners and HT's too. I know it's easy to slip[once in a while, and if somebody broke in to a QSO of mine and said something to me about it I would at least be polite enough to give them an ear and consider maybe they're right.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LD0

Saw this on a Tee-shirt:

"I am a bomb technician. If you see
me running, try to keep up. "

4189. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 17:17:19 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9vana4$6ur$1@news.bignet.net>
Source record: 27194

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C18BB30.E672965D@IEEE.org...
> "Leland C. Scott" wrote:
> > Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
> >
> > "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> > me running, try to keep up. "
>
> Saw a well-endowed lady the other day with a T-Shirt that said:
> "If only these were brains".

Same idea where other people claim some have them, brains, where they sit
too. 8-))

Merry Xmas, 73's de,

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

4190. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 17:19:46 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C18E332.FD9604E0@uci.edu>
Source record: 27195

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Maybe some of them are magicians?
>
> Oh, never say that around wiccans, Jim.

Why? Are they as humorless as you are?

4191. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 17:22:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C18E3BC.3CF0E801@uci.edu>
Source record: 27197

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > A foreign terrorist, who openly has
> > declared his intent to do whatever possible
> > to destroy our homeland and our way of
> > life, has no right to protection under our
> > Constitution. None.
>
> It's not just the law of our own Constitution, Hans. It's also
> international law, and the law in most "civilized" nations. Most
> countries don't judge a person by what he says, but by what he
> actually does.

I think Hans said it best: you guys just don't get it.

4192. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 17:35:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C18E6FF.E1C675AB@uci.edu>
Source record: 27199

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Maybe some of them are magicians?
>
> Oh, never say that around wiccans, Jim.

I said it to you, Dwight, and you are quite obviously not a Wiccan.

> They hate any association
> with magicians. In fact, many even their spell magic differently
> ("magick") to set it apart from "entertainment" magic.

I know. But "magic" is practiced by magicians, and "magic" is the word
you used previously, and the one to which I responded.

4193. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 17:46:21 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C18E96D.42607287@uci.edu>
Source record: 27202

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> "What is the
> correlation between Morse code skill and technical skill, among [the
> closed set of] licensed Amateur Radio operators?"

Is this an essay question, or are you hoping for a numeric response????

4194. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 17:51:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C18EA98.F20B751B@uci.edu>
Source record: 27201

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> I said nothing to defend Bin
> Laden, or to justify his alleged actions.

I can think of no larger purpose being served by your comments.

> I simply promoted the
> Constitutional concept of innocent until proven guilty.

Our Constitutional rights do not apply to soldiers of the enemy. Why
should they?

> Are you that far gone, Jim?

No, but it's so nice of you to ask.

4195. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB Gear

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 18:56:23 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <up0xyeAhBHA.1644@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 27209

N9NWO thinks that:

> Too many Americans are jerks, assholes. They have "rights"
> and no one, not even the police (in their mind) have the
> right to tell them how to live.

And they're absolutely correct.

No one (and ESPECIALLY NOT the police) has the right to tell
an American how to live. It's a principle that our fine country
was founded upon. If that makes us all jerks and assholes,
then I guess you will just have to consider us all jerks and
assholes.

Same to you!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4196. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 19:05:27 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <aU6S7.30267$AR6.644269@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27210
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

One final time: Show me where I said anything about resisting, smarting off, or telling a cop he
cannot inspect. It is after he takes the equipment, mistakenly, that the AF folks get involved. I
don't give cops trouble. I never even have opportunity to; I rarely come into contact with them. For this to happen would be rare because most cops are just as nice to you as you are to them. "Yes sir" and "No sir" are the order of the day. That doesn't say having my equipment
taken wouldn't piss me off--it would--, BUT I DO know how to control that anger and handle the matter thru legal channels. NEVER did I say anything about challenging the cop on the scene.

A couple summers ago (you are in Indiana, right?), I was motoring along I-40 near Hickory,
NC talking to some friends on 10 meter AM (29.000). OF all things, here came an Indiana
sheriff overtaking me in the left lane. As soon as he saw me talking, and all the ham antennas,
he abruptly slowed down, following just behind and to the left. I wondered what an Indiana
county sheriff was doing in NC, but they eventually pulled alongside, giving me a VERY evil eye like they would just LOVE to stop me.. The driver reached down and seemed to be flipping thru "channels" (CB?) as if trying to listen to me. Failing to hear the transmissions, they
also seemed to be suspicious, BUT they had no jurisdiction, and since I was doing nothing
apparently illegal, they sped away. It was sort of funny. IF I'd had a cell phone, I'd have called
NCHP and had them stopped for speeding. LMAO!

73

Jerry
K4KWH
like

N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C18BF1A.F0AEA9F5@gte.net...
> > >So far towns, cities, states etc can do anything until they
> > >write some type of Laws regarding this issue.
> >
> > You did mean "can't", right ??
> >
> > >Congress only gave local
> > >jurisdiction the ability to police this the police will have some type

of
> > >idea of the laws they will be enforcing. Otherwise they will call for
> > >back-up, defer to a higher ranking supervisor, something to releave
liabilty
> > >from them when possible, they cannot go about and won't go about
blindly
> > >enforcing Laws.
> >
> > This communications lawyer sees it from the viewpoint that The
> > Congress gave the local police no more authority than the FCC has,
> > just the ability to enforce the FCC's "unlicrensed CB" regulations.
> >
> > This means no random stops and searches, no forced entries without a
> > court order (warrant), no "confiscation", no excess fines above the
> > monetary penalties that the FCC can levy, no jail time for Rule
> > violations, and no making up their own rules about stuff that does
> > not appear in the FCC Rules.
> >
> > >I just don't see it happen that way in this day in age when people are
as
> > >lawsuit crazy against LEO's.
> >
> > You are so right.
>
> What you have to understand is that many hams feel
> that the cops have NO right to inspect them, to ask
> questions. I am not talking about rogue cops but rather
> the officer who is professional and whose biggest goal
> every day is to make it home alive.
>
> These officers want video of every traffic stop. Too
> many Americans are jerks, assholes. They have "rights"
> and no one, not even the police (in their mind) have the
> right to tell them how to live. And too many hams are
> big jerks.
>
> This AF CAP chap just does not get it. Let the AF CID
> come, as far as they are concerned that is a matter for the
> courts. Once the cop does his job, the investigation, he is
> more than happy to let the courts deal with it. And that
> includes lawsuits. That is the chief's worry, not his. As it
> is, too many file false lawsuits every day against cops. It
> has become a cost of doing business.
>
> Again, the average cop sees most of this a matter for the
> courts. If he has question, his automatic response is to
> throw it over to the courts to decide. That is the professional
> thing to do. And if some ham becomes an asshole and
> argues with him, he wants video tape to take to court.
>

4197. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 19:21:06 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <_c7S7.1942$er5.80933@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27212

Damn it! Ever heard of typos? I missed it, OK? SHEESH. Is that the only
way you
can equate yourself or relate to other people? Find me a thread where I go
around correcting
others' spelling. IF I didn't have any better thing to do than that, I'd
just quit. I rarely misspell
a word, but I make typos sometimes, so SUE me. Gehen sie du Teufel mein
puppa!

J

JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C17467C.567C65FC@mailcity.net...
>
>
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
> >
> > I re-read every word. There are no spelling errors. If you're
referring to
> > the hyphens, it's because of the way my browser copies and pastes. I
just
> > didn't want to go back and edit it
> > for here. The one that was sent is corect. Anymore questions?
> >
> >
>
> Then you need to go back to school.
> Second paragraph..."Fderal Communications Commission". Should be
> Federal.
>
> Fourth paragraph..."an illegal station; i.e, the ham". Should be
> i.e.,
>
> Sixth paragarph..."keep each others' "cows" out of eath others'
> cornfields". should be each not eath.
>
> Same paragraph.., "using the popular jargon, could "disquise' his
> messages in amongst the illegal operators". Should be disguise,
> there is no q in disguise.
>
> Seventh paragraph..."Some years ago, in the rush to downsize". It
> should be down-size or down size, it is not one word.
>
> Item 2, spell out manufacturers, don't use abbreviations. mhz
> should be MHz.

>
> Item 4, truck stop is two words.
>
> Item 6, here you used MHZ, all caps, not consistent with item 2.
>
> If you want Mrs. Myrick to take your letter seriously, you need to
> be a bit more neat with you writing. When her secretary sees your
> letter it will probably go to file 13 as he/she doesn't want to
> waste Mrs. Myricks time trying to read a letter full of
> mis-spellings and grammatical errors.
>
> Any more questions?

4198. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 19:24:00 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <kf7S7.607$IC2.326574@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 27213
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote in message
news:9v9qa0odg11@quark.scn.rain.com...
> In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> <<< SNIP >>
> If I have a CB radio, I am federally licensed to operate that radio.
> <<< SNIP >>>

And when was this license issued? If it's legit, why are you not found in
the FCC ULS?

73 de W6DKN

4199. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 19:41:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C190454.E44DCF1E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27215

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Now that we have THAT cleared up, back to my question: "What is the
> correlation between Morse code skill and technical skill, among [the
> closed set of] licensed Amateur Radio operators?"

You still don't get it? No valid conclusion can be drawn from that answer because there is no nocode extra license. The entry level license is the only nocode license. Entry level people are, on the average, less technical than top level people. But all the top level people were forced by governmental regulation to know Morse code. Thus any conclusion you would draw would be invalid because, in the ARS, technical skill and Morse code skill *are* forced to be correlated through governmental regulations.

You are still trying to determine the church attendance of black people by sampling only white churches. Please read what the FCC had to say about the subject. They said Morse code skill is unrelated to technical skill.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4200. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 19:53:51 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <7I7S7.30767$AR6.660339@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27219

Considering your reply, I must have hit a nerve. Sorry you feel that way, but if that is the way you feel, so be it. I am not going to sit idly by, in spite of my perceived errors by certain ones on this group, and just do nothing while illegals usurp what I WORKED for. Now if other hams want to sit, criticize, whine, and point fingers, that's up to them. What The CBers do down on the 40 channels is not my business. They can "10-4 thar" each other til the cows come home and key each other out. I am NOT "muckraking", as you call it; I am responding to what I perceive as a threat. I am responding the same way I would if someone pitched a tent down in the corner of my lot. 1) He is a trespasser. 2) He has no right to be there--even if I never use that corner of my lot--it is still freakin' MINE and should/will be available to me if and when I CHOOSE to use it. And 3) His presence is unwelcome, like it or not. The 10 meter issue affects ME; Eleven meters does not. And if I happen to stumble upon something that gets the right peoples' attention (it already has gotten some attention, so it's not like it is a total non-issue.), I am going to DO it. This is an issue where a battle line must be drawn somewhere. I am willing to bet that, if the 11 meter crowd is not turned back at 10 and 12 meters, then it will be on to 17 meters, then 30, and 20 and 40. Let's face it, what this vocal, militant minority wants is the total, unrestricted, undisciplined and, unlicensed use of all spectrum and to hell with everybody else. While the rest of us sit around snapping, whining, and picking apart each other's motives, grammar and spelling, the illegals get exactly what they want with a big laugh at us to boot!

For those of you who are so much better in grammar and spelling and so much smarter than I am, tell you what: YOU take that letter, revise it to your "standard" of appropriate syntax, grammar and spelling, and send it to YOUR representatives. If enough people DO something, instead of sit around on their penquin butts, the issue will get attention. It does not even MAT-TER how smart we are, it matters that we TRY. SO DO IT. Revise the letter and send it.

To TW, I am sorry you feel that way, again. But right is right, and wrong is wrong. You spend all the time you like on 27.555--I'll never bother you. I have never attacked you or talked badly of you or any one person on the groups. In truth, the 10 meter issue is the offspring of

"freebanding"-------those who were willing to push the envelope and test the waters. If this is
not addressed, it will continue to expand. I truly believe that. If I am wrong? GOOD! I would love to be wrong. I wish I were wrong about 10 meters. But as I write this I have been
listening to a CBer complete with his beeping and squeaking for 45 minutes. All ya gotta do is
just go up to 28.085 and just listen for awhile. Pay attention: AM, SSB, ANY PHONE MODE IS NOT ALLOWED IN THAT SEGMENT OF 10 METERS!! It is so easy to pick out, it's almost funny. I have never heard a ham using echo, beeps, squeaks and fart noises--
even the bad hams.

73

Jerry
K4KWH

To the rest of you who this issue affects, I say

<Twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:9v8qbj$9ed$1@news.netmar.com...
> PLEASE don't ignore this issue. Please HELP us.
>
> "Unfortunately it will be ignored just as it has been ignored for years.
> Nothing will change as a result of your current campaign of muckraking. The
> government has much more important things to do than chase after violators of
> an offense comparable to jaywalking. I neglected to forsee that you would not
> have the intelligence to realize that no one cares about a few rogue
> operators on 10 meters save for the hysterical yapping mongrels such as AA
> and Nad. I am disappointed you have chosen to join their kennel, Jerry. Your
> fellow hammie operators don't give a hoot about what goes on in the CB band
> and never have. Plus you cannot show proof that these 10 meter incidents are
> more than just isolated exceptions.....and how do you know these
> incidents are not CBers but hams bootlegging? Because of such irrational
> thinking you are destined to join the kill files of Usenet users everywhere.
> The CB room does not want you anymore and neither do your ham bretheren"
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
eb -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
abuse@newsone.net

4201. Re: AMP SALE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 19:58:28 UTC
From: "Train cbmods"@optonlineNOSPAM.com
Message-ID: <9vb194$g7p$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 27216
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.pirate

In article <lm1S7.12683$161.5428397@news02.optonline.net>, Train
<cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> writes:
>I guess we'll see how many losers there are who will reply to this
>troll.......and a FAKED troll at that.
>My IP is static at 128.*********
>Have fun with it!
>Train

Let me clarify something. The original posts are NOT fake as you can see
below. They are VERY real. Do a search and you will see. I've been very
NAUGHTY this year :)

Train

Subject: Re: Question Fer Dick M.
Date: Sat, 16 Jun 2001 11:50:00 GMT
From: "Train" <cbmods@optonline.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb

darn it........I have newsranger blocked and missed this post so I'll
address it now...........Eat shit and die! Who sells what or who's buying is
of no concern to you.......You just need a reason to cry like the little
child you are. Grow up! Your little click isn't going to even put a dent in
what gets sold for CB radio legal or otherwise.
Being in radio as long as I have and knowing the people I know........It's
going to be a long long time before slime like you will ever be able to do a
damned thing to anyone selling radio stuff. I have more radio info on CD's
and a larger database than most of you clowns would ever dream of and if
need be ALL WILL BE PUT ON A WEBSITE. Everything from schematics for amps
that we were building in the 70's and 80's to every last page of master
editions.....secret cb.....green, gray, black books.........You name it and
I got it. Nothing you sleazy little shits can do will EVER stop people from
getting information they need. Bet on it!

--
Train
tra1n@aol.com
cbmods@optonline.com
train@cbmods.com

==========

Subject: MOBIL AMP SALE
Date: Sat, 14 Apr 2001 19:09:40 GMT
From: "Train" <cbmods@optonline.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb

As a public service to the NG, I will be offering to sell mobil amps to those wishing to buy them. This is not done out of greed but out of necessity to thwart the losers in the NG who think they have taken over OUR nice little group and can use it to harass and belittle as they see fit. To offer sale of these items is just the thing needed in a public forum to mess with these nil-minded simpletons. Amps such as Texas Star, Palomar, Cobra, Messenger, Gray, Galaxy, X-Force and so on. These will be sold for a limited time and at a VERY small profit IF ANY !

This is not a money thing so much as it is an access thing.

Since these self appointed radio/computer gods have declared knowledge an illegal thing also, I might just make the entire Secret CB book series available on CD along with a CD of amplifier schematics for base and mobil amps. Why is it that when these morons just think they are getting somewhere in their fight somebody like me comes along and pisses on their parade? BECAUSE THEY NEED IT AND DESERVE IT!!!!!!!!!

E-Mail me with your needs......
Train
tra1n@aol.com
train@cbmods.com
cbmods@optonline.net

==========

From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
Date: Sun, May 20, 2001 5:59 PM
Message-id: <5CTN6.10757$MR1.2346125@news02.optonline.net>

I have no use for or reason to operate legally.

There are thousands of us who will continue to operate as we see fit without regard to whatever some schmuck like you or your little click of over-opinionated morons have to say about it. You can cry all you like but those of us who can, will and those of you who can't......Will continue to cry about it.
Train

==========
Subject: Re: Ameritron AL80A
From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
Date: Fri, Jun 22, 2001 11:40 AM
Message-id: <n8GY6.43556$Lk1.4150780@news02.optonline.net>

"Gary" <gharrel101@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:9gm24u$34ju$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com...
> I have an Ameritron AL80A. How can I modify it for use on 11 Meters? It
> has the ability to tune to the high end of 10 Meters. Any information

>would be useful.

You Know damn well it can be easily done.......Breakout that golden
screwdriver and get to it!

--
Train
tra1n@aol.com
cbmods@optonline.com
train@cbmods.com

==========

Subject: Re: RCI 2990 For Sale
From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
Date: Thu, Jul 12, 2001 12:48 PM
Message-id: <K0h37.32$qs5.155619@news02.optonline.net>

Get a friggin life you loser!
You have got to be the most lame useless pile-o-shit we have in the group.
We all know your BS line by now and I for one am sick of your fascist
bullshit!

Blow your FCC crap out your ass!

--
Train
tra1n@aol.com
cbmods@optonline.com
train@cbmods.com

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4202. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 20:00:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213150037.13711.00000033@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 27217

>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>From: N9NWO 2121d@gte.net
>Date: 12/13/2001 8:34 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C18BC7F.16A2A77E@gte.net>

>Rather it is the cop
>who is a professional, who keeps his cool,
>but is not going to let some ham tell him that
>the cop has no right to inspect his radios
>and plays the hot shot. No cop will put up
>with that.

He had better. The law states that unless the officer makes a felony stop
with probable cause, it's an illegal search. A misdemeanor won't cut it, and
unless he wants to be terribly embarrased in court, he's NOT going to do it.

Yes, he can hold you and get a warrant, but you, the private citizen,
still have recourse. If he can't provide the aforementioned cause, NO SEARCH.

>The average cop is trained to suspect everyone.

Who says?

>They are trained that they
>are superior, the "force" of government, the
>thin blue line that keeps us a civilized society.

No, they are not. They are specifially taught that they are provided
certain powers of arrest, but that those powers are granted at the discretion
of the people, and that abuse of those powers can just as quickly land the
officer in jail as any HE may effect an arrest for.

Gone are the days of "any ole excuse will do", even in the deep south.

>And it is almost universal that the biggest goal
>that a cop will have is to make it home alive
>every night.

Correct. And even more reason that he's not going to pick a fight over
something as silly as this.

>If there is a question about a radio, it is just easier
>to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
>courts settle.

Probable cause. If he "takes" ANYTHING without probable cause, he's in
deep trouble. And communities are painfully aware of civil law suits against
thier police departments.

>This
>includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
>a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
>chief's problem, and not theirs.

Oh? From which bodily orifice did you extract this bit of ignorance?

>They believe that
>they have a right to do anything, and everything. That they
>have NO responsibility to society or their fellow man. And
>the cops want that attitude to end.

You may be correct, but "it ain't happenin' ". The genie is out of the bottle and you can expect that police departments that used to act with near impunity when it came to search and seizures are under significant scrutiny...Even in the post 9-11 enviroment.

And Gerry...You need to get a 605 in...ASAP.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4203. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 20:02:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213150253.13711.00000035@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 27218

>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>From: N9NWO 2121d@gte.net
>Date: 12/13/2001 8:54 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C18C138.A3619486@gte.net>

>If a ham wants to be an asshole and argue
>with the cops then he had better expect to stand in
>front of the judge.

You need to remember that there will be TWO people in front of that judge...The guy who's gear got snatched and the snatching officer. It's NOT a one-sided affair.

>Lawsuits are just a cost in doing business.

In what community do you live that the local government has such a cavalier attitude?

73

Steve, K4YZ

4204. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 20:03:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C190978.3652C42B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27220

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I've said it before, and I'll say it again -- any manager who has a
> private, "confidential" conversation in his private office, behind
> closed doors, with a female subordinate, is a damn fool.

It is company policy at Intel to have such private meetings behind
closed doors. To have such a private meeting in public is insane
and is against company policy.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4205. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 20:07:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213150702.13711.00000036@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 27221

>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>From: "Jerry Oxendine" joxendi@bellsouth.net
>Date: 12/13/2001 1:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <aU6S7.30267$AR6.644269@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>

>One final time: Show me where I said anything about resisting, smarting
>off, or telling a cop he
>cannot inspect.

It wasn't there, Jerry. This guy's got a police-power fetish. Methinks
him a lost reincarnated sole of Gestapo-controlled Germany of the 30's.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4206. Re: AMP SALE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 20:08:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C190AC6.85DB5455@uci.edu>
Source record: 27222

Is there any way the r.r.a.p. newsgroup server could be configured in a
smart enough way as to filter-out posts that also have CB newsgroups in
the header?
Seems a reasonable thing to do.

"\"Train\" cbmods"@optonlineNOSPAM.com wrote:
>
> In article <lm1S7.12683$161.5428397@news02.optonline.net>, Train
> <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> writes:
> >I guess we'll see how many losers there are who will reply to this
> >troll.......and a FAKED troll at that.
> >My IP is static at 128.*********
> >Have fun with it!
> >Train
>
> Let me clarify something. The original posts are NOT fake as you can see
> below. They are VERY real. Do a search and you will see. I've been very
> NAUGHTY this year :)
>
> Train
>
> --
>
> Subject: Re: Question Fer Dick M.
> Date: Sat, 16 Jun 2001 11:50:00 GMT
> From: "Train" <cbmods@optonline.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
>
> darn it........I have newsranger blocked and missed this post so I'll
> address it now...........Eat shit and die! Who sells what or who's buying is
> of no concern to you.......You just need a reason to cry like the little
> child you are. Grow up! Your little click isn't going to even put a dent in
> what gets sold for CB radio legal or otherwise.
> Being in radio as long as I have and knowing the people I know........It's
> going to be a long long time before slime like you will ever be able to do a
> damned thing to anyone selling radio stuff. I have more radio info on CD's
> and a larger database than most of you clowns would ever dream of and if
> need be ALL WILL BE PUT ON A WEBSITE. Everything from schematics for amps
> that we were building in the 70's and 80's to every last page of master
> editions.....secret cb.....green, gray, black books.........You name it and
> I got it. Nothing you sleazy little shits can do will EVER stop people from
> getting information they need. Bet on it!
>
> --

> Train
> tra1n@aol.com
> cbmods@optonline.com
> train@cbmods.com
>
> ==========
>
> Subject: MOBIL AMP SALE
> Date: Sat, 14 Apr 2001 19:09:40 GMT
> From: "Train" <cbmods@optonline.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
>
> As a public service to the NG, I will be offering to sell mobil amps to
> those wishing to buy them. This is not done out of greed but out of
> necessity to thwart the losers in the NG who think they have taken over OUR
> nice little group and can use it to harass and belittle as they see fit. To
> offer sale of these items is just the thing needed in a public forum to mess
> with these nil-minded simpletons. Amps such as Texas Star, Palomar, Cobra,
> Messenger, Gray, Galaxy, X-Force and so on. These will be sold for a limited
> time and at a VERY small profit IF ANY !
>
> This is not a money thing so much as it is an access thing.
>
> Since these self appointed radio/computer gods have declared knowledge an
> illegal thing also, I might just make the entire Secret CB book series
> available on CD along with a CD of amplifier schematics for base and mobil
> amps. Why is it that when these morons just think they are getting somewhere
> in their fight somebody like me comes along and pisses on their parade?
> BECAUSE THEY NEED IT AND DESERVE IT!!!!!!!!!
>
> E-Mail me with your needs......
> Train
> tra1n@aol.com
> train@cbmods.com
> cbmods@optonline.net
>
> ==========
>
> From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
> Date: Sun, May 20, 2001 5:59 PM
> Message-id: <5CTN6.10757$MR1.2346125@news02.optonline.net>
>
> I have no use for or reason to operate legally.
>
> There are thousands of us who will continue to operate as we see fit without
> regard to whatever some schmuck like you or your little click of
> over-opinionated morons have to say about it. You can cry all you like but
> those of us who can, will and those of you who can't......Will continue to
> cry about it.
> Train

>
> ========================
> Subject: Re: Ameritron AL80A
> From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
> Date: Fri, Jun 22, 2001 11:40 AM
> Message-id: <n8GY6.43556$Lk1.4150780@news02.optonline.net>
>
> "Gary" <gharrel101@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:9gm24u$34ju$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com...
> > I have an Ameritron AL80A. How can I modify it for use on 11 Meters? It
> > has the ability to tune to the high end of 10 Meters. Any information
> >would be useful.
>
> You Know damn well it can be easily done.......Breakout that golden
> screwdriver and get to it!
>
> --
> Train
> tra1n@aol.com
> cbmods@optonline.com
> train@cbmods.com
>
> ==
>
> Subject: Re: RCI 2990 For Sale
> From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
> Date: Thu, Jul 12, 2001 12:48 PM
> Message-id: <K0h37.32$qs5.155619@news02.optonline.net>
>
> Get a friggin life you loser!
> You have got to be the most lame useless pile-o-shit we have in the group.
> We all know your BS line by now and I for one am sick of your fascist
> bullshit!
>
> Blow your FCC crap out your ass!
>
> --
> Train
> tra1n@aol.com
> cbmods@optonline.com
> train@cbmods.com
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4207. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 20:18:20 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C190D29.1ED7F29A@gte.net>
Source record: 27224
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> One final time: Show me where I said anything about resisting, smarting off,
> or telling a cop he cannot inspect. It is after he takes the equipment,
> mistakenly, that the AF folks get involved. I don't give cops trouble. I
> never even have opportunity to; I rarely come into contact with them. For
> this to happen would be rare because most cops are just as nice to you as you
> are to them. "Yes sir" and "No sir" are the
> order of the day. That doesn't say having my equipment taken wouldn't piss me
> off--it would--, BUT I DO know how to control that anger and handle the matter
> thru legal channels. NEVER did I say anything about challenging the cop on
> the scene.
>

You made out like you are some type of bad
ass. What you are saying is what I have been
trying to communicate. Politeness will get you
far with most cops.

However, if it does go to the point that the equipment
and/or the car are impounded then the courts will settle
it. All your AF types will do is go in front of the judge
and make their case, as you would as well. The cops
will not try to keep the equipment. Their only goal is
to allow the judge the opportunity to rule. If the situation
is unclear, it may well go in front of a judge. Your AF
types will be called as witnesses.

Bottom line. Do not argue with a cop. He will win.
By that I mean, he will have you in front of a judge.
Whether he wins the case is another matter. But he
will put you through enough hassle that you may very
well not want to go through it again.

>
> A couple summers ago (you are in Indiana, right?), I was motoring along I-40
> near Hickory, NC talking to some friends on 10 meter AM (29.000). OF all
> things, here came an Indiana sheriff overtaking me in the left lane. As soon
> as he saw me talking, and all the ham antennas, he abruptly slowed down,
> following just behind and to the left. I wondered what an Indiana county
> sheriff was doing in NC, but they eventually pulled alongside, giving me a
> VERY evil eye like they would just LOVE to stop me.. The driver reached down
> and seemed to be flipping thru "channels" (CB?) as if trying to listen to me.
> Failing to hear the transmissions, they also seemed to be suspicious, BUT
> they had no jurisdiction, and since I was doing nothing

> apparently illegal, they sped away. It was sort of funny. IF I'd had a cell
> phone, I'd have called NCHP and had them stopped for speeding. LMAO!

Sheriff deputies go out of state to retrieve
prisoners who are being extradited.

4208. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 20:47:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1913BE.949544F5@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27225

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > I simply promoted the Constitutional
> > concept of innocent until proven guilty.
>
> Our Constitutional rights do not apply to
> soldiers of the enemy. Why should they?
>
> > Are you that far gone, Jim?

It's not just our Constitutional rights, Jim. As I said earlier, it is also a matter of international law - covering "soldiers of the enemy." And I assure you that if any of our soldiers had been captured by the Taliban, we would be screaming for their rights under international law.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4209. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 20:59:44 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vb4ov0ga8@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27163

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C18BDFC.29BF2F15@IEEE.org...
> The observation that Orangutans are homosexual was an accidental
> sighting, Dick. You really think someone would spend months in the
> Borneo jungle studying Orangutans for the sole purpose of observing
> homosexual behavior? You are so far removed from reality that
> I don't see how you manage to post here.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Maybe he's nothing more than a common troll and our mistake is falling for
it.

4210. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 20:59:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1916AC.2F3AF0AE@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27227

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> Military tribunals have the support of law...
> both American and International.

Fine, Steve, then try him in a military tribunal. I don't care where he is tried - I just want to see evidence to prove his guilt conclusively before we rush off to kill him. Without that, we leave this whole thing open for endless speculation.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4211. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:01:29 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vb4s70gdl@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27164

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C18E96D.42607287@uci.edu...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > "What is the
> > correlation between Morse code skill and technical skill, among [the
> > closed set of] licensed Amateur Radio operators?"
>
> Is this an essay question, or are you hoping for a numeric response????

It's 42 - (with respect to the late Douglas Adams)

4212. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:03:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213160301.24724.00000269@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 27228

In article <20011211221700.13985.00000823@mb-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <9f4bfe89.0112110606.68127a8b@posting.google.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>I understand that in Paris and its suburbs one cannot get more than a
>>certain distance (500 meters?) from a Metro station. And the Paris
>>Metro system has been constantly (except for war years) expanded and
>>modernized to meet the needs of the City of Light.
>
>I have my doubts that even in Paris, you can find Metro stations spaced
>less than 1/3 of a mile apart!

I've never been there. My info is based on a report in an industry journal.

>That may occur in a few places along
>major routes, but not everywhere in Paris and it's suburbs!

Have you been there and checked it out?

>Were that
>so, the entire city would have to be suspended by the subterranean
>structure of the train stations below.
>
Nope. 500 meters works out to 546 yards, a little less than 1/3 mile. The
stations can be well over that distance apart and you will never be more than
500 meters from a station.

>>For longer trips, the TGV trains operate at about 200 mph. They
>>reached 326 mph in tests (not a typo).
>
>Hmmm. A bit more than half the speed of a typical 230 gr. FMJ round
>coming out the muzzle of a .45 automatic!

Yup. 190-200 mph is the usual operating speed. They built new dedicated rights
of way for the TGV and connected the ends to the existing stations in major
cities.

> No wonder they call it a
>"bullet" train!

The French don't call it that, from what I hear. The Japanese do. But the JA
trains poke along at 165 mph or so..

>I wonder how they keep that thing on the tracks at that
>speed -- I'll ass-u-&-me that the wheels actually lock onto the track

>with some kind of flange.

The track is maintained to very high standards and the rolling stock is
designed for the speed. But the basic wheel/rail profile is the same as other
railroads. No reason for it to be.
>
>>> If anyone wants to pay for this
>>> "elderly" person to move where public transportation is available, I'll
>>gladly
>>> take another trip to Europe for a few years. :-)
>>
>>Works for me!
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I think this country will be more or less forced to solve the problems
>of the elderly, since they are the fastest growing demographic group
>of Americans.

Yup. The question is "how" and "when".

73 de Jim, N2EY

4213. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:06:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C19184F.DF71396C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27229

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> You have such a convenient way of backpedaling,
> Dwight. But, at least you do it with style.

It's not backpedaling, Kim. It was a simple mistake, for which I
apologized for. But the mistake did not change the points I raised
because they addressed your core argument instead of the peripherial context.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4214. Re: Glenn Baxter on the Glenn Baxter show on a Glenn Baxter Wednesday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:12:11 UTC
From: balls balls balls <humpamelon2day@aol.com>
Message-ID: <LQ8S7.1320$mF.140048@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27231

Glen Baxter is a mental patient who desperatly needs
a regimine of Prozac or Luxox.

This guy's got an ego the size of the State of Montana
and want's to be the next w2nsd. The only reason he
probably does this shit is to keep a 501-C3 tax status
on his AARA so he can get an abatement for his
real estate holdings.

I think if someone digs deep enough you'll find the money trail. What the heck? The ARRL
does the
same thing
to get free money from the tax man!

"HotlineAmerica" <hotlineamerica@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011212232831.22677.00003504@mb-fc.aol.com...
> It's Glenn Baxter on the Glenn Baxter show on a Glenn Baxter Wednesday. And
> let's not forget that this guy is endorsed by the behometh IARN, not to speak
> of the AARU. Impeccable credentials.
>
> Naturally, his editorials defaming Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC and others are
> not necessarily the opinions of the IARN nor the AARU. Trouble is, Baxter,
> IARN & AARU are one in the same.
>
> Bob Sherin, W4ASX
> Miami, Florida
>
>

4215. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:17:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C191ADF.4E79D894@uci.edu>
Source record: 27162

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > > I simply promoted the Constitutional
> > > concept of innocent until proven guilty.
> >
> > Our Constitutional rights do not apply to
> > soldiers of the enemy. Why should they?
> >
> > > Are you that far gone, Jim?
>
> It's not just our Constitutional rights, Jim.

You just got done saying you simply promoted the Constitutional
concept...
Now you're shifting gears again.

> As I said earlier, it
> is also a matter of international law - covering "soldiers of the
> enemy."

Yes, there's the Geneva convention. Otherwise, enemy soldiers are fair
game for target practice. Got the concept?

> And I assure you that if any of our soldiers had been captured
> by the Taliban, we would be screaming for their rights under
> international law.

Do you think they would receive it?

4216. Re: When are you birds gonna admit I was right?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:18:28 UTC
From: balls balls balls <humpamelon2day@aol.com>
Message-ID: <EW8S7.1329$mF.141462@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27160

Another Wayne green wanabee in the making here...?

It's just a freakin hobby. Who cares! When it loses it's luster
you go somewhere else. I like train shows myself.

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0112101220.211e17b2@posting.google.com...
> Until a wholesale revamping of the licensing structure is made,
> reinstituting incentive licensing, and bringing the US Amateur Radio
> Service into the modern era, and attracting younger members by
> focusing on modern communication methods and privileges...
>
> 1) Amateur membership will continue to decline(told ya that the spike
> in membership, right after the overdue restructuring regarding the
> demphasis of the archaic Morse Code, was just temporary).
>
> 2) There will eventually be more Extras than Generals(now - all of you
> birds who couldn't see the trend in the 2nd degree equation, and
> disagreed with me so vehemently will now have to admit I was right on
> this one too, because even from the 1st degree linear trends it is now
> obvious!).
>
> Eventually, something like my Communicator/Colt license proposals WILL
> be implemented... mark my words.
>
> Stewart - N0MHS
>

4217. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:29:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C191D84.63EF3F87@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27169

CAM wrote:
>
> The subject is one-on-one meetings behind closed
> doors, Dwight, not general security. Intel has
> thousands of one-on-one meetings behind closed
> doors every day.

But you're using Intel's security to defend your argument about one-on-one meetings. Why else would you bring Intel into the discussion? So, since we cannot all possibly know about Intel's policies concerning security, either leave Intel out or give us some specifics about their security.

Actually, in reality, Intel's position on one-on-one meetings is not the final word on this issue. I said most companies are now adopting policies about closed door meetings, not all companies are. In other words, Intel's policy does change my premise that more and more companies are starting to cut back on private closed door meetings to reduce the threat of sexual harassment lawsuits. So, unless you can establish that Intel's position is the same as all other companies, lets again leave Intel out of the discusion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4218. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:37:21 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <lc9S7.161485$WW.10173361@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27184

N9NWO posts:

> And are you a police officer? Are you
> an attorney? NO. You are a Private
> Fucking Civilian (PFC) with little contact
> with the current system.
>
> Understand this. The police and the
> military are your superiors. Their lives
> are far more valuable than yours. And
> they are the only thing that is keeping this
> country together. There lives are living
> sacrifices, their deaths atone for your
> screw ups.

and:

> And your service to "king and country"?
> I do have 30 years of political service.
> I have put judges on the bench, congressmen
> in office, have worked on political campaigns
> from the local to federal level.
>
> Plus 20 years of military service, to include
> a year in the Gulf War and another year
> with the Bosnian mess.
>
> What have you done with your miserable
> two bit life?

You know, it was a while ago, but didn't we fight
a revolutionary war against a bunch of military/
political/religious elitists who thought they were
inherently better than the common man, knew what
was best for him and saw themselves as society's
bulwark against chaos and anarchy.

Oh, and by the way, this is the United States of
America. We don't have a king to serve.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4219. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License more info.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:38:18 UTC
From: N2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <a91752a9.0112131338.4b906a67@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27185

Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<f3171ugtucejrir6rp17b99bulf8hpfldd@4ax.com>...
> On 08 Dec 2001 21:03:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Was perusing a copy of CQ in the local MicroCenter when I came upon an article
> >about UK restructuring.
>
> This happened at Donnington Sept. 22 and you Morsecentrics are just
> now finding out!

Been kinda busy on this side of the pond. Don't shoot the messenger.
> >
> >Their existing classes are getting a bit more power & privs, and looks like 5
> >wpm for full access.
>
> Yup this is the way of the world for the moment and CW testing is
> likely to go away entirely at the 2003 WRC meeting.

Coulda told ya that 2 years ago.
> >
> >But the big news is a new class of license they call "Foundation". Idea is to
> >have a license that can be had at the end of a one-day training session.
>
> Most of the sessions I was involved in planing were going to be an
> entire weekend but it doesn't have to be this way.

Found a website with more info. Looks like a 10 hour session - that's
a LONG day!
> >
> >Privs include parts of almost all bands and modes except 10 meters.
>
> Yup but at only 10 Watts

Few weeks ago I worked Hawaii and Alaska from EPA in a contest with 5
watts. At 10 watts I work stations all over the world with a wire
antenna. I use Morse, though.
> >
> >Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
>
> Actually regulations, safety and proper operating practice. Good
> operators have a real oportunity to teach by example.

Works for me.
> >
> >BUT.....
> >

> >No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.
>
> Wrong no home-designed homebrew but commercial kits like TenTec and
> Electrocraft are allowed.

I stand corrected. Revise above to read "no homebrewing".
> >
> >Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person being
> >tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an "A",
> >the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then looks
> >up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper. Sending
> >test to be similar.
>
> True enough I think they actually referred to it as Morse
> appreciation.

Right.

Point is the test stretches the treaty definition till it squeaks.
> >
> >Waddya think, folks?
>
> I thought at the time and still think this is a great opportunity to
> get new hams off on the right foot. I had a chat with the President
> of the RSGB and suggested that Foundation Tutor/Testing groups
> recruit QRPers. They QRP crowd has a real understanding of how
> to make low power work and are the most credible proponents of
> CW as an operating mode.

Indeed.
>
> To understand why the RA and RSGB wanted to do this you have to
> have an appreciation of the UK testing system. Tests are offered only
> at infrequent intervals and are very costly. Most written tests are
> proctored at Universities and cost L75 or over $100 US. The Foundation
> Licence (British spelling intentional) will allow recruitment and
> exposure to the hobby from this group some will fall away and some
> will advance through the system.

There's the real problem. The test is too expensive and too hard to
access.

How much does it cost (on average) to attend a training course, take
the test, and get a full privileges license?

As I understand it, the old UK "Novice" licenses required the
prospective ham to attend an approved training course. Passing the
test isn't enough - the course is MANDATORY. Wonder how that would go
over on this side of the pond?

Both US and UK ham radio have had little or no growth over the past
several years. US licenses have hovered around 680,000 and UK licenses
around 45,000 for quite a while. (My numbers may not be exact, but

they are in the neighborhood.) Maybe the Foundation license will make a big difference, or maybe it won't. The much-ballyhooed restructuring over here in 2000 hasn't made much of a difference in new licenses, only in upgrades.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4220. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:47:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1921CE.B08C2FAA@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27190

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Most of the companies I mention above are those
> that I have worked for here in the South. I don't
> know where it is that you seem to have this
> experience where employees cannot be trusted to
> act as responsible adults, but remind me never
> to move there.

We've been over all that before, Kim. That is your experience and this is mine. I'm not saying your experience is wrong. I'm simply saying that, based on my experience, more and more companies are beginning to get more restrictive on closed door meetings. In fact, based on my experience, some companies are now taking that to an extreme - no closed door meetings and no private meetings at all. Why do you insist my experience it wrong - that only yours is right?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4221. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:56:40 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <su9S7.303393$5A3.117925195@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27196
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
> And if you argue with a cop then you are just
> another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
> alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
> your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
> the office to shoot everyone.

I hope all Leo's don't think the way you do, they would be pulling guns on every stop and everyone woul be getting patted down for walking down the street.
.

4222. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 21:58:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C192469.733B8C28@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27198

CAM wrote:
>
> It is company policy at Intel to have such private
> meetings behind closed doors. To have such a private
> meeting in public is insane and is against company
> policy.

Cecil, you insist on bringing Intel into the discussion. If you want to discuss Intel, please provide us with a copy of that company's policy so we can all discuss it. But, regardless, that company's policies are not the final word on this issue. It is simply the policy of one company (which tells us nothing about this issue in general - this issue at companies in general).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4223. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:01:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C192516.344C38E8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27200

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> In every office situation I've been in, (snip)

What does that matter, Kim? We're talking about a growing trend in
this country, not your exclusive experiences at some companies.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4224. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:02:22 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <Oz9S7.303397$5A3.117928977@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27203
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message

> Lawsuits are just a cost in doing business. People
> file false charges against the police everyday. As
> I said, the average cop looks to the courts to settle
> questions. If a ham wants to be an asshole and argue
> with the cops then he had better expect to stand in
> front of the judge.

If a cop wanted to take my radio I would tell him he is wrong, I don't have to argue with him to tell him this. And If he didn't take my word for it I would let him take the radios and know I will have my chance to have him look silly in a court of Law. Then the judge will tell him to learn the letter of the law and stop wasting the courts time. Cops don't want this as well so they will try to make sure they know what they are doing.

4225. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:02:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213170235.06803.00000029@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 27204

>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR
>From: N9NWO 2121d@gte.net
>Date: 12/13/2001 2:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C190D29.1ED7F29A@gte.net>

>You made out like you are some type of bad
>ass.

Where?

>By that I mean, he will have you in front of a judge.

Remember...he will be too...and if his search/seizure was bogus, guess what...?!?!

>But he
>will put you through enough hassle that you may very
>well not want to go through it again.

And if his search/seizure was bogus, guess what? He may be going through something HE may not want to go through again...School.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4226. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:05:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213170554.06803.00000030@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 27205

>Subject: Re: some sobering numbers
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 12/13/2001 2:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C1916AC.2F3AF0AE@sccoast.net>

>I just want to see evidence to prove his guilt
>conclusively before we rush off to kill him.

Why?

Remeber the final scene of "The Postman Always Rings Twice"? As theya re about to lead the guy off to the chair, they reveal that they know he's innnocent of the crime he was convicted of, yet they will still fry him on the others which he knows he's guilty of.

If we just pulled him out of a cave and strung him up today, he'd still be guilty of heinous crimes against humanity, no matter how many times he was tried.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4227. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:08:48 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011213170854.137$k8@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27207
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message

> We give cops guns because their lives are more
> valuable.

They get guns because they uphold the law, and persuassion and force is needed to accomplish this. A cops life is no more valuable than any average citizen, and this is said with the ut most respect to LEO's

>Mayors and governors have bodyguards for the same reasons.
>
>
>

4228. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:08:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1926D3.3378FA09@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27206

CAM wrote:
>
> My dictionary defines a "pagan" as someone who is
> not a Christian, Jew, or Muslim and/or anyone who
> believes in polytheism. Worshiping the Sun God
> would be a pagan act. Worshiping the Earth Mother
> would be a pagan act.

My dictionary defines a pagan as "one who has no religion." Since worshiping the sun god, or worshiping the earth mother, are religions, they would not be pagan acts.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4229. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:10:01 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C186F1A.6D7A0929@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27208

Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> Damn it! Ever heard of typos? I missed it, OK? SHEESH. Is that the only
> way you
> can equate yourself or relate to other people? Find me a thread where I go
> around correcting
> others' spelling. IF I didn't have any better thing to do than that, I'd
> just quit. I rarely misspell
> a word, but I make typos sometimes, so SUE me. Gehen sie du Teufel mein
> puppa!
>
>

I would not go around correcting your spelling here on the NG, but
a letter being sent to a Congressional Representative should have
correct spelling and no grammatical errors. You said you read it
again and still did not catch the obvious errors, that is why you
need someone else to proofread it for you. If you cannot even
spell simple words and use correct grammar, you can't expect
someone to take you seriously.

4230. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:13:39 UTC
From: uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org
Message-ID: <ff37aa44.0112131413.61ff26a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27211

> In article <3C109E40.BF313194@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:
>
> >
> > It doesn't even have to be a co-worker complaining. Lets say Betty
> >(made up name) doesn't like the fact that her husband is meeting with
> >too many woman who work with him at the local small town factory, so
> >she gets up in front of her church Sunday morning and begins talking
> >about all the "sluts" who work for that company and all the illicit
> >relationships between co-workers at that company. To make matters
> >worse, a newspaper reporter, also a member of the church, hears this
> >and decides to do an article about it in the local newspaper. Now what
> >do you think the company is going to do?

Uh, sue the newspaper?

A company that cared about it's employees would investigate matters and
handle things in a manner appropriate to what was actually going on.

A newspaper that printed things that were not verified could get themselves
into trouble, as well.

If I were a named individual in the newspaper, I can guarentee that I wouldn't
take it lightly.

Sean.

4231. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:17:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1928ED.43A24798@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27214

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > They hate any association with magicians. In fact,
> > many even their spell magic differently ("magick")
> > to set it apart from "entertainment" magic.
>
> I know. But "magic" is practiced by magicians, and
> "magic" is the word you used previously, and the
> one to which I responded.

Okay, so I obviously missed your point. What was it? Are you fussing about my use of the word "magic?" Just as many wiccans use that spelling as the other.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4232. Re: Glenn Baxter on the Glenn Baxter show on a Glenn Baxter Wednesday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:24:24 UTC
From: John Siegel <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C192A80.E43CED90@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27223

While I can think of nothing positive to say about K1MAN's operation, I
would never dream of jamming it. However I have heard his reasoning on
why he thinks his "bulletins" are legal. (I put "bulletin" in quotes
because only a small fraction of his time is bulletins in my opinion.)
If I follow his logic then I could
Post a schedule on some web site somehwere
Set that schedule to be 10 minutes before his (whatever that is)
Accuse him of a felony when he starts trnsmitting on top of my
"bulletins" ten minutes later.
Doesn't make a whole lot of sense does it?
73, John

balls balls balls wrote:
>
> Glen Baxter is a mental patient who desperatly needs
> a regimine of Prozac or Luxox.
>
> This guy's got an ego the size of the State of Montana
> and want's to be the next w2nsd. The only reason he
> probably does this shit is to keep a 501-C3 tax status
> on his AARA so he can get an abatement for his
> real estate holdings.
>
> I think if someone digs deep enough you'll find the money trail. What the heck? The ARRL
does the
> same thing
> to get free money from the tax man!
>
> "HotlineAmerica" <hotlineamerica@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011212232831.22677.00003504@mb-fc.aol.com...
> > It's Glenn Baxter on the Glenn Baxter show on a Glenn Baxter Wednesday. And
> > let's not forget that this guy is endorsed by the behometh IARN, not to speak
> > of the AARU. Impeccable credentials.
> >
> > Naturally, his editorials defaming Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC and others are
> > not necessarily the opinions of the IARN nor the AARU. Trouble is, Baxter,
> > IARN & AARU are one in the same.
> >
> > Bob Sherin, W4ASX
> > Miami, Florida
> >
> >

4233. I am part of the problem!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:25:02 UTC
From: "Train cbmods"@optonline.net
Message-ID: <9vb9ru$lj7$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 27226

No wonder Cbers are going after 10 meters. My behavior encourages a "who gives a shit" attitude to the rules. Just look at some of my posts below.

Train

==========

Subject: Re: Question Fer Dick M.
Date: Sat, 16 Jun 2001 11:50:00 GMT
From: "Train" <cbmods@optonline.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb

darn it........I have newsranger blocked and missed this post so I'll address it now.....Eat shit and die! Who sells what or who's buying is of no concern to you.......You just need a reason to cry like the little child you are. Grow up! Your little click isn't going to even put a dent in what gets sold for CB radio legal or otherwise.
Being in radio as long as I have and knowing the people I know........It's going to be a long long time before slime like you will ever be able to do a damned thing to anyone selling radio stuff. I have more radio info on CD's and a larger database than most of you clowns would ever dream of and if need be ALL WILL BE PUT ON A WEBSITE. Everything from schematics for amps that we were building in the 70's and 80's to every last page of master editions.....secret cb.....green, gray, black books.........You name it and I got it. Nothing you sleazy little shits can do will EVER stop people from getting information they need. Bet on it!

--
Train
tra1n@aol.com
cbmods@optonline.com
train@cbmods.com

==========

Subject: MOBIL AMP SALE
Date: Sat, 14 Apr 2001 19:09:40 GMT
From: "Train" <cbmods@optonline.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb

As a public service to the NG, I will be offering to sell mobil amps to those wishing to buy them. This is not done out of greed but out of necessity to thwart the losers in the NG who think they have taken over OUR nice little group and can use it to harass and belittle as they see fit. To offer sale of these items is just the thing needed in a public forum to mess with these nil-minded simpletons. Amps such as Texas Star, Palomar, Cobra, Messenger, Gray, Galaxy, X-Force and so on. These will be sold for a limited

time and at a VERY small profit IF ANY !

This is not a money thing so much as it is an access thing.

Since these self appointed radio/computer gods have declared knowledge an illegal thing also, I might just make the entire Secret CB book series available on CD along with a CD of amplifier schematics for base and mobil amps. Why is it that when these morons just think they are getting somewhere in their fight somebody like me comes along and pisses on their parade? BECAUSE THEY NEED IT AND DESERVE IT!!!!!!!!!

E-Mail me with your needs......
Train
tra1n@aol.com
train@cbmods.com
cbmods@optonline.net

==========

From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
Date: Sun, May 20, 2001 5:59 PM
Message-id: <5CTN6.10757$MR1.2346125@news02.optonline.net>

I have no use for or reason to operate legally.

There are thousands of us who will continue to operate as we see fit without regard to whatever some schmuck like you or your little click of over-opinionated morons have to say about it. You can cry all you like but those of us who can, will and those of you who can't......Will continue to cry about it.
Train

==========
Subject: Re: Ameritron AL80A
From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
Date: Fri, Jun 22, 2001 11:40 AM
Message-id: <n8GY6.43556$Lk1.4150780@news02.optonline.net>

"Gary" <gharrel101@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:9gm24u$34ju$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com...
> I have an Ameritron AL80A. How can I modify it for use on 11 Meters? It
> has the ability to tune to the high end of 10 Meters. Any information
>would be useful.

You Know damn well it can be easily done.......Breakout that golden screwdriver and get to it!

--
Train
tra1n@aol.com
cbmods@optonline.com
train@cbmods.com

==========

Subject: Re: RCI 2990 For Sale
From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
Date: Thu, Jul 12, 2001 12:48 PM
Message-id: <K0h37.32$qs5.155619@news02.optonline.net>

Get a friggin life you loser!
You have got to be the most lame useless pile-o-shit we have in the group.
We all know your BS line by now and I for one am sick of your fascist
bullshit!

Blow your FCC crap out your ass!

--
Train
tra1n@aol.com
cbmods@optonline.com
train@cbmods.com

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4234. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB Gear

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:34:49 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <u$SQ3YChBHA.1868@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27230

N9NWO says:

> And are you a police officer? Are you
> an attorney? NO. You are a Private
> Fucking Civilian (PFC) with little contact
> with the current system.
>
> Understand this. The police and the
> military are your superiors. Their lives
> are far more valuable than yours.

If this is your true opinion, then you are indeed a dangerous person and I earnestly pray that you are not in _ANY_ position, even a part-time school crossing guard, which allows you to assert your "authority". If you are in such a position, then the citizens of your community should consider the risk they have placed themselves in by your continued service in any capacity of authority.

The police and military have my respect and gratitude (and I spent 21 years bearing arms to protect America), but they are not superior to any other citizen. Period.

Hans, K0HB

4235. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:35:45 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C192D41.F8DB1958@uci.edu>
Source record: 27232

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Cecil, you insist on bringing Intel into the discussion. If you want
> to discuss Intel, please provide us with a copy of that company's
> policy so we can all discuss it.

Or.....you could just take his word for it and leave it at that.

4236. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:46:56 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <T7aS7.31949$AR6.722388@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27233
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Maybe they delivered one?? The car was empty except for the 2 deputies.
Anyway, if looks
could kill, I'd be dead. BTW, I've driven all over Indiana and never had
any trouble. Most
folks are extremely nice.

73

Jerry

N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C190D29.1ED7F29A@gte.net...
>
>
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> > One final time: Show me where I said anything about resisting,
smarting off,
> > or telling a cop he cannot inspect. It is after he takes the equipment,
> > mistakenly, that the AF folks get involved. I don't give cops trouble.
I
> > never even have opportunity to; I rarely come into contact with them.
For
> > this to happen would be rare because most cops are just as nice to you
as you
> > are to them. "Yes sir" and "No sir" are the
> > order of the day. That doesn't say having my equipment taken wouldn't
piss me
> > off--it would--, BUT I DO know how to control that anger and handle the
matter
> > thru legal channels. NEVER did I say anything about challenging the cop
on
> > the scene.
> >
>
> You made out like you are some type of bad
> ass. What you are saying is what I have been
> trying to communicate. Politeness will get you
> far with most cops.
>
> However, if it does go to the point that the equipment
> and/or the car are impounded then the courts will settle
> it. All your AF types will do is go in front of the judge
> and make their case, as you would as well. The cops
> will not try to keep the equipment. Their only goal is

> to allow the judge the opportunity to rule. If the situation
> is unclear, it may well go in front of a judge. Your AF
> types will be called as witnesses.
>
> Bottom line. Do not argue with a cop. He will win.
> By that I mean, he will have you in front of a judge.
> Whether he wins the case is another matter. But he
> will put you through enough hassle that you may very
> well not want to go through it again.
>
>
>
> >
> > A couple summers ago (you are in Indiana, right?), I was motoring along
I-40
> > near Hickory, NC talking to some friends on 10 meter AM (29.000). OF
all
> > things, here came an Indiana sheriff overtaking me in the left lane. As
soon
> > as he saw me talking, and all the ham antennas, he abruptly slowed down,
> > following just behind and to the left. I wondered what an Indiana
county
> > sheriff was doing in NC, but they eventually pulled alongside, giving me
a
> > VERY evil eye like they would just LOVE to stop me.. The driver reached
down
> > and seemed to be flipping thru "channels" (CB?) as if trying to listen
to me.
> > Failing to hear the transmissions, they also seemed to be suspicious,
BUT
> > they had no jurisdiction, and since I was doing nothing
> > apparently illegal, they sped away. It was sort of funny. IF I'd had a
cell
> > phone, I'd have called NCHP and had them stopped for speeding. LMAO!
>
> Sheriff deputies go out of state to retrieve
> prisoners who are being extradited.
>

4237. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 22:49:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C19306C.1CDC6318@uci.edu>
Source record: 27234

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Okay, so I obviously missed your point. What was it?

As I said before, "From what I can tell, they seem to be using kind of a loose, existential definition of the term, Dwight."

4238. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 23:01:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C193327.C5B89C9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27235

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> (snip) People who claim to be using magic in the
> same breath as they are saying they are Wiccan,
> Dwight, are nothing but dreamers and are as
> ignorant of the practice as you are. The closest
> Wiccan may get to using magic is in using the
> equivalent of "mantras" for prayer. (snip)

So you're claiming that all these books that describe wiccan spells
and magic were writtin by wiccans "ignorant of the practice," Kim?

- 21st Century Wicca, Jennifer Hunter, Citadel Press.
- Earth Magic, Marion Weinstein, Earth Magic Productions.
- Natural Magic, Doreen Valiente, Hale/Phoenix Publishing.
- Positive Magic, Marion Weinstein, Pocket Books.
- Power of the Witch, Laurie Cabot, Dell Publishing
- Practical Solitary Magic, Nancy B. Watson, Samuel Weiser
- The Spiral Dance, Starhawk, Harper & Row.
- The Witches Way, Stewart Farrar, Hale
- Wicca: Solitary Practitioner, Scott Cunningham, Llewellyn.
- A Book of Pagan Rituals, Herman Slater, Samuel Weiser.
- A Witches' Bible Compleat, Janet Farrar, Magickal Childe.
- Buckland's Complete Witchcraft, Raymond Buckland, Llewellyn.
- Drawing Down the Moon, Margot Adler, Beacon Press.
- Lid Off the Cauldron: A Handbook, Patricia Crowther, Mueller.
- Paganism Today, G. Harvey /C. Hardman, eds 1995 Thorsons.
- The Witch's God, Janet Farrar, Phoenix Publishing
- Psychic Self-Defense, Dion Fortune, Samuel Weiser.
- The Complete Art of Witchcraft, Sybil Leek, World Publishing.
- The Magickal Year, Diana Ferguson, Samuel Weiser.
- The Pagan Path, J. and S. Farrar, Phoenix Publishing.
- Witchcraft for Tomorrow, Doreen Valiente, Hale/Phoenix.

All those books describe wiccan spells and magic, Kim. And, given a
few minutes more, I could probably double that list. So, obviously,
wiccans do claim they can do spells and magic. So why would you claim
that spells and magic are not part of the wiccan nonsense?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4239. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 23:07:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C193460.207566E3@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27236

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> For goodness sake, Dwight. Why don't you find some *real* Wiccan people to
> talk to instead of whatever idiots you've been talking to?

First of all, I don't believe there are "real" Wiccans to talk to.
However, if we're going to talk about the claims of today's
self-proclaimed wiccans, their own written words are enough for me.

- 21st Century Wicca, Jennifer Hunter, Citadel Press.
- Earth Magic, Marion Weinstein, Earth Magic Productions.
- Natural Magic, Doreen Valiente, Hale/Phoenix Publishing.
- Positive Magic, Marion Weinstein, Pocket Books.
- Power of the Witch, Laurie Cabot, Dell Publishing
- Practical Solitary Magic, Nancy B. Watson, Samuel Weiser
- The Spiral Dance, Starhawk, Harper & Row.
- The Witches Way, Stewart Farrar, Hale
- Wicca: Solitary Practitioner, Scott Cunningham, Llewellyn.
- A Book of Pagan Rituals, Herman Slater, Samuel Weiser.
- A Witches' Bible Compleat, Janet Farrar, Magickal Childe.
- Buckland's Complete Witchcraft, Raymond Buckland, Llewellyn.
- Drawing Down the Moon, Margot Adler, Beacon Press.
- Lid Off the Cauldron: A Handbook, Patricia Crowther, Mueller.
- Paganism Today, G. Harvey /C. Hardman, eds 1995 Thorsons.
- The Witch's God, Janet Farrar, Phoenix Publishing
- Psychic Self-Defense, Dion Fortune, Samuel Weiser.
- The Complete Art of Witchcraft, Sybil Leek, World Publishing.
- The Magickal Year, Diana Ferguson, Samuel Weiser.
- The Pagan Path, J. and S. Farrar, Phoenix Publishing.
- Witchcraft for Tomorrow, Doreen Valiente, Hale/Phoenix.

All those books describe wiccan spells and magic, Kim. And, given a
few minutes more, I could probably double that list. So, obviously,
wiccans do claim they can do spells and magic.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4240. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 23:16:42 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <NzaS7.32041$AR6.746668@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27237

Like I said GEHEN SIE DU TEUFEL.....or Assayez-vous en merde!

Jack Hamilton <jfh@acm.org> wrote in message
news:eb3i1u8r7d8t7stmq87p2ekpk43k1bqii9@4ax.com...
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:
>
> >Damn it! Ever heard of typos? I missed it, OK? SHEESH. Is that the
only
> >way you
> >can equate yourself or relate to other people? Find me a thread where I
go
> >around correcting
> >others' spelling. IF I didn't have any better thing to do than that, I'd
> >just quit. I rarely misspell
> >a word, but I make typos sometimes, so SUE me. Gehen sie du Teufel mein
> >puppa!
>
> I think you missed the point.
>
> You are not doing amateur radio a favor by making amateur radio
> operators look like illiterate buffoons.
>
>

4241. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 23:19:54 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1937BB.6C3864D9@gte.net>
Source record: 27238
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> Maybe they delivered one?? The car was empty except for the 2 deputies.
> Anyway, if looks could kill, I'd be dead. BTW, I've driven all over Indiana
> and never had any trouble. Most folks are extremely nice.
>

We have both extremes. At one end are
those who are just fed up with the excesses
of society and want to rein in everything. They
see society as out of control.

At the other end are the cops, like many in
Indianapolis, who use outlaw CB's to talk
to each other and to coordinate their stories
when there has been an incident.

But it might have been that they just wanted
to yell at you on the radio.

4242. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 23:22:09 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C193843.BF09AF0C@gte.net>
Source record: 27239
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > And if you argue with a cop then you are just
> > another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
> > alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
> > your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
> > the office to shoot everyone.
>
> I hope all Leo's don't think the way you do, they would be pulling guns on
> every stop and everyone woul be getting patted down for walking down the
> street.
> .

Cops do think this way. They may hide it behind
their mask of professionalism (they call it putting
on the "game face"). Remember cops are mostly
ex high school jocks. And remember they do see
a number of their fellow officers getting killed every
year. They have to assume that every traffic stop
could go bad.

4243. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 23:23:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C193867.84E28E7@uci.edu>
Source record: 27241

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> All those books describe wiccan spells and magic, Kim. And, given a
> few minutes more, I could probably double that list. So, obviously,
> wiccans do claim they can do spells and magic.

I guess Wiccans don't believe that the first two people on Earth all of a sudden one day magically appeared here. Or that the wives of their male progeny also somehow as if by magic, inexplicably appeared out of thin air.

4244. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 23:25:24 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1938FB.CC4D479F@gte.net>
Source record: 27240
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > Lawsuits are just a cost in doing business. People
> > file false charges against the police everyday. As
> > I said, the average cop looks to the courts to settle
> > questions. If a ham wants to be an asshole and argue
> > with the cops then he had better expect to stand in
> > front of the judge.
>
> If a cop wanted to take my radio I would tell him he is wrong, I don't have
> to argue with him to tell him this. And If he didn't take my word for it I
> would let him take the radios and know I will have my chance to have him
> look silly in a court of Law. Then the judge will tell him to learn the
> letter of the law and stop wasting the courts time. Cops don't want this as
> well so they will try to make sure they know what they are doing.

That is a risk that the average cop is willing
to take. As far as he is concerned, getting
you in front of judge is his primary job. Even
if you win, it will cost you a huge amount of
money, and time. Costly enough that you will
think twice the next time. He does not have
to get you thrown in jail in order to change
your attitude. Normally the court procedures,
and it can take a year or more to settle a case,
are enough to make a decent citizen more
careful in how they live their lives.

4245. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-13 23:33:32 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <DPaS7.32121$AR6.794024@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27242

If my syntax, grammar, and image presented on behalf of Amateur Radio
bothers you so much,
produce a callsign! I don't hide mine. I don't hide my name, either. It
sounds like the reason
for ridiculing me is that you have another interest in this issue; that of
discouraging ANY efforts
to stop the illegals. Maybe YOU are one of the truckers who operate up
there? Hmmmmm?

Produce a callsign, and I *might* take your criticism seriously. If you are
a ham, instead of being one of the whiners and do-nothings, REVISE the
letter to YOUR liking and send it to
YOUR Representative(s). Hey, you can even take credit for it being YOUR
idea. I don't
CARE how it's done--I just hope it gets done. I may be entirely alone in
this, but I want those
truckers OUT of 10 meters and , whether I am a literate writer or not, I
will NOT stop trying to
get something done. That's more than YOU are apparently doing...but then
you sound like you
are on the side of the illegals.

Jerry
K4KWH
Jack Hamilton <jfh@acm.org> wrote in message
news:9g3g1usdl2e3mfemggab973fdv1buvrb84@4ax.com...
> JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote:
>
> >If you want Mrs. Myrick to take your letter seriously, you need to
> >be a bit more neat with you writing. When her secretary sees your
> >letter it will probably go to file 13 as he/she doesn't want to
> >waste Mrs. Myricks time trying to read a letter full of
> >mis-spellings and grammatical errors.
>
> I agree with you; if I received a letter full of grammatical errors I'd
> assume that there were logical errors as well, and if there were
> spelling errors I'd assume factual errors.
>
>
>
>

4246. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 00:02:25 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vbffj010q4@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27244

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C193327.C5B89C9@sccoast.net...
> - 21st Century Wicca, Jennifer Hunter, Citadel Press.
> - Earth Magic, Marion Weinstein, Earth Magic Productions.
> - Natural Magic, Doreen Valiente, Hale/Phoenix Publishing.
> - Positive Magic, Marion Weinstein, Pocket Books.
> - Power of the Witch, Laurie Cabot, Dell Publishing
> - Practical Solitary Magic, Nancy B. Watson, Samuel Weiser
> - The Spiral Dance, Starhawk, Harper & Row.
> - The Witches Way, Stewart Farrar, Hale
> - Wicca: Solitary Practitioner, Scott Cunningham, Llewellyn.
> - A Book of Pagan Rituals, Herman Slater, Samuel Weiser.
> - A Witches' Bible Compleat, Janet Farrar, Magickal Childe.
> - Buckland's Complete Witchcraft, Raymond Buckland, Llewellyn.
> - Drawing Down the Moon, Margot Adler, Beacon Press.
> - Lid Off the Cauldron: A Handbook, Patricia Crowther, Mueller.
> - Paganism Today, G. Harvey /C. Hardman, eds 1995 Thorsons.
> - The Witch's God, Janet Farrar, Phoenix Publishing
> - Psychic Self-Defense, Dion Fortune, Samuel Weiser.
> - The Complete Art of Witchcraft, Sybil Leek, World Publishing.
> - The Magickal Year, Diana Ferguson, Samuel Weiser.
> - The Pagan Path, J. and S. Farrar, Phoenix Publishing.
> - Witchcraft for Tomorrow, Doreen Valiente, Hale/Phoenix.
>
> All those books describe wiccan spells and magic, Kim. And, given a
> few minutes more, I could probably double that list. So, obviously,
> wiccans do claim they can do spells and magic. So why would you claim
> that spells and magic are not part of the wiccan nonsense?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Great. You can list a bunch of books. The next question would be how many of
them have you actually read.

4247. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 00:06:00 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vbfm90113j@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27246

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1926D3.3378FA09@sccoast.net...

> My dictionary defines a pagan as "one who has no religion." Since
> worshiping the sun god, or worshiping the earth mother, are religions,
> they would not be pagan acts.

That would be closer to the definition of an agnostic.

4248. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 00:14:59 UTC
From: Tazanator <tazanator1@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <7wbS7.20905$7y.231436@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 27243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Well I will say sorry about the course language, but there is a bigger picture on this.

I have studied and recieved a lowly tech lic for starters. However having driven semi's for years I can *try* to relate the truckers side. CB 19 has degenerated way down to the point of people harrassing truckers (listen sometime a bulk of the noise is from base stations especial around big cities) most of the "sesame Street" gang is kids playing and talking big.

Due to this depressing talk to drivers, many have left the CB buying ham radios for the extra cost so they can "get away" from the base stations (I was told that a long time ago CB was just like 80 meters is today...many truckers miss that peaceful feeling you enjoy (I only have a tech so 2 meters is my place)) while it is wrong many don't care due to the way they were treated on channel 19 (Penn state has a kid on 19 with a 250 watt base that must have a dictionary of every swear word that he just keeps reading at truckers)

As far as the FCC many state scales have fcc trained weigh masters that do check (you pull on to the scale and are asked to key up the CB) sometimes they find them often they don't. I belive that the truckers could bring a revival to the ham comunity, just from the numbers point of view, and I started down ham meeting another ham trucker...HE HAD A HUGE ANT (screw driver)ON THAT TRUCK!!! made me wonder what he was talking to!

While it is a privalage to us ... a little tact here could gain you a friend and the ham community more clout. Sence I got my ticket many of the guys I used to run with have seen me use the 2 meter repeater system (they loved the michigan linked repeater system...all over the state with only an HT) and the phone patches, many have started borrowing my books to study for the test.

To start them on the road just help them out ... many would love to have the ANT checked by an MFJ analizer (they pay up to $20 for it) and as you teach them how to get the best out of the CB talk about the ham structure many will listen and think about it....many of my friends have started studying

(by the way it supposed to be 28.665 for the new 19)

--

IT IS THE SOLDIER

IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the reporter,
Who has given us freedom of the press.
IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the poet,

Who has given us freedom of speech.
IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the campus organizer,
Who has given us freedom to demonstrate.
IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the lawyer,
Who has given us the right to a fair trial.
IT IS THE SOLDIER, who salutes the flag,
Who serves under the flag and,
Whose coffin is draped by the flag,
Who allows the protester to burn the flag.

Author, Charles M. Province

****
By US Code Title 47, Sec.227(a)(2)(B), a computer/modem/printer meets
the definition of a telephone fax machine. By Sec.227(b)(1)(C), it is
unlawful to send any unsolicited advertisement to such equipment. By
Sec.227(b)(3)(C), a violation of the aforementioned Section is
punishable by action to recover actual monetary loss, or $500, whichever
is greater, for each violation.
****

think I'm full of it look yourself!
http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/47/227.html

"Speaker to Animal Crackers" <flashboinnng1@aol.com> wrote in message
news:fVrR7.3693$vK1.358764@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Listened all morning to a group of truckers
> on 28.115 mHz (AM). Even had
> one who's wife was on the "base rig" talking with
> her OM mobile about how to make out the bills and novel ways
> she thought of to make "Xmas money".
>
> Is this is what you get when you mass-sell 10 meter
> radios at/by Radio Shack and others? Wonder how many
> were running Uniden 2510's, 2600's or HTX's.
>
> Is 28.115 is the new Channel Ninteen ?.
> Is the cow out of the barn door?
> A while later a ham came up on the freq in AM
> to try an *politely* inform them there were in violation
> of FCC rules. They just laughed, Thought it was very funny.
> One guy told the ham, who exercized much restraint and
> gentlemanly composure in his speech
> to: "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"
> complete with an roger-beep and echo-effects microphone.
>
> Nice eh?
> Gives you the warm & fuzzies?
>
> I'm curious what's the FCC will do?
>

> How about 2 meters?
> Is that the next band to be trashed by these
> morons who buy ham gear at R.S. or WalMart
> and operate without a licence ?
>
>

4249. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 00:30:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C19482D.67AB19B3@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27245

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> Now that we have THAT cleared up, back to my question: "What is the
> correlation between Morse code skill and technical skill, among [the
> closed set of] licensed Amateur Radio operators?"

The statistics are a bit clouded. When you look at the numbers of
hams who have passed the higher level written tests, we can only
know of those who also passed the code tests. We don't know
the numbers
of those candidates who feel that they can pass the writtens but not
code, or code but not writtens.

The FCC requires, for extra let's say, the passing of written tests
and a code test. For any sensible analysis, we'd need numbers
of people holding say a Morse code w/o written "extra" license, and
another set of people who hold a written only "extra". As the FCC
doesn't give out such licenses, we can't know what we need to know
to analyze the correlation between code and theory.

4250. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 00:38:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C194A08.FB1EAFC2@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27247

K0HB wrote:

>
>
> Being from southern MN, I know all about EF Johnson, but you'd really need
> to stretch to consider that as "homebrewed". Sorry, Dick, your rant just
> doesn't persuade me. This "factory appliances only" license is a bad idea.
>

A major reason for the way the FCC and other countries do up their
rules is the ease of enforcement. Why do they say have extra only
subbands instead of say power level restrictions? Because someone
at an FCC field site operating a receiver can easily see what frequency
you are on, where he can't really tell how much power you're putting
out. For all he knows, you might just have a small rig and a yagi
pointed at him.

4251. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 00:42:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C194B09.B527E1D9@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27248

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> Competitive Intelligence--the new emerging technology.
>

Nothing new there. Happens from time to time.
Most usual way is to hire someone just layed off
from the other company.

4252. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 00:45:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C194BA3.D8FD9EC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27249

>
> Saw a well-endowed lady the other day with a T-Shirt that said:
> "If only these were brains".

Another tee shirt had the words "tune" and "load"
positioned on the breasts.

4253. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 00:53:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C194D76.26AD2037@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27250

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> Like I said GEHEN SIE DU TEUFEL.....or Assayez-vous en merde!

And your mama too! :-)

Why would you expect him to know whatever foreign language
that is in, and be able to translate it? All that I can tell, it's
not English, or Chinese for that matter. Just that whatever
language it is, is supported by the ASCII character set.

4254. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 01:03:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011213200332.03703.00000382@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 27251

In article <3C176D75.F062E850@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> The quantum reduction in licensing standards has
>> created the impression that ham radio is nothing more than a glorified
>> version of CB with more bands, modes, and power.
>
>A quantum reduction should be undetectable, Larry.

Just the opposite. A quantum, by definition, IS detectable.

> From Webster's:
>"quantum - one of the small subdivisions of a quantized physical
>magnitude"

Which means it must be detectable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4255. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 01:38:36 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <TEcS7.32783$AR6.971107@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27252

I don't care. He thinks I am stupid anyway. While my language skills have lauguished due to
many years and lack of use, at least I DO know more than one.
Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C194D76.26AD2037@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> > Like I said GEHEN SIE DU TEUFEL.....or Assayez-vous en merde!
>
> And your mama too! :-)
>
> Why would you expect him to know whatever foreign language
> that is in, and be able to translate it? All that I can tell, it's
> not English, or Chinese for that matter. Just that whatever
> language it is, is supported by the ASCII character set.
>

4256. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 01:50:43 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <TVcS7.303770$5A3.118120344@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27253
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C193843.BF09AF0C@gte.net...
>
> Cops do think this way.

I know some do lets hope it's a minority.

They may hide it behind
> their mask of professionalism (they call it putting
> on the "game face"). Remember cops are mostly
> ex high school jocks.

I have heard that before, not sure if was from you.

> They have to assume that every traffic stop could go bad.

That is true, but they also must assess the situation from there training
they ask questions and have to quickly read "people" because each stop
presents a different situation. So when a policeman makes a stop he needs to
be in control of the situation in case a stop does go bad he can defend
himself. He is not there to make friends he is there to uphold the law some
people take exception to that.

>
>
>

4257. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 01:55:28 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <0234752DC201460B.0EDE363A2FA9CB02.CB4FD997C837CC3F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27254
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:47:10 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>We give cops guns because their lives are more
>valuable.

So a CHL makes the license holder more important?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

4258. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 03:35:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C19737A.79E98242@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27255

CAM wrote:
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > On 13 Dec 2001 03:09:06 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > >... most of the No-
> > >Code techs I know are trailer trash from the bottom half of their
> > >high school class, with no further education, no ambition to learn
> > >anything useful, but a universally buring desire to gain the individual
> > >power of a microphone in their hands...without being bothered to learn
> > >useful comm skills like Morse/CW.
> >
> > The vast majority of No-Code-Techs who are in my radio club - the
> > largest one in the state - are good folks. Some of them are at a
> > technical level far above average, but for personal reasons are
> > content to keep their license level just about where it is.
>
> Half the nocode techs at Intel are engineers or technicians who
> simply don't choose to learn Morse code. At least one has a
> PhD degree in EE. I'd like to see Larry tangle with Dr. Williamson
> on a technical basis.

...not as much as I'd like to see the famed Dr. Williamson in a 25 wpm
CW ragchew with Larry.

Dave K8MN

4259. Re: Morse not anymore needed to use HF-see further

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 03:46:21 UTC
From: Web <WebFx27@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <hCeS7.15523$161.7241951@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 27256
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,alt.ham-radio.morse,rec.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I aggree

Web

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:39IR7.109$YE4.19833@newshog.newsread.com...
>
> "b888" <b888@lcix.net> wrote in message
> news:u1d5tq5dfp5jf2@corp.supernews.com...
> > Well said.
> > People still use sailboats, steam engines, propeller aircraft,
> > drive classic cars, and do a million other things that are not
> > "state of the art" but there still useful and fun. I feal sorry for
> > those who have never felt the thrill of that first solid cw copy.
> > Or who have no Idea how to loadup a "hollow state" rig.
> > The easy way out is the booring way out.
> > WB3DSJ
>
> You are correct sir! Some may love CW and some may not. Some may love
the
> digital modes. Some may not. Some may love homebrewing. (and so on and
so
> on) There are many facets of this hobby that are enjoyable to a variety
of
> different people. All a license means is that you are allowed to do
> whatever is allowed by that license class.
>
> Those that chose to (forgive the word) *bitch* about the either the
dropping
> of the code requirement to a lesser level, or the possibility of it
dropping
> of it entirely, probably are not the same people who became proactively
> involved in the protest of those conditions. I am sure that at least 80%
of
> all licensed hams have not bothered to write all the "powers that be"
(i.e.
> congressmen, senators etc) about ham radio, and in defense of ham radio.
> We can sit and hope and pray that ARRL *may* work hard to defend us, but
can
> you imagine if our elected officials, from the local level, all the way up
> to the federal level recieved tons of letters in defense of amateur radio?
> I personally write at least quarterly each year, (as well as fire fighting
> related mails especially after 9-11-01) and strongly encourage others to
do

> so too.
>
> Another way to win support? Invite your elected officials to your club
> meetings, ARES/RACES meetings (or similar groups) and share with them the
> experience. This has a two-fold benefit. It allows the ham public to
> actually meet the officials, and of course the officials to actually be
able
> to meet the ham public and hear their concerns, and to see what we are
doing
> .
>
> Amateur Radio is a pro-active hobby/service, not a sit back and watch
hobby.
> Get involved!
>
> [first paragrah directed at respondee to my earlier post, other paragraphs
> are to everyone else.]
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
>
> >
> > KC8PMX wrote in message ...
> > >People who want to use Morse code still will, and those who don't,
won't.
> > >Any changes in the laws short of a law outright banning morse code
> > operation
> > >won't stop those who wish to use the HF frequencies.
> > >
> > >Ryan
> > >KC8PMX
> > >
> > >
> > >"Marruk" <mphaannospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > >news:4ytO7.18262$Qm6.2451580@zwoll1.home.nl...
> > >> Mose not anymore needed to use HF.
> > >>
> > >> Hi OMs,
> > >>
> > >> In Guatamala it is decided that a morse exam is not anymore needed to
> use
> > >> the HF bands.
> > >> I guess this is good for the sellers of HF equipment and it will get
> the
> > >> band a lot more used for phone dx.
> > >> But I dont think it will be very good for Morsecode as a whole.
> > >> Hope to see you in 2003 on HF when it will be officially released in
> the
> > >> Netherlands.
> > >>

> > >> PE1PAE
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4260. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:26:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c198073_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27257

Wonder how many more "let's leave that one out" we can come up with. Let's see, Im mentioned 5 or 6? companies I've worked for in a previous post. We'll leave them out, too. My husband's company has closed door meetings routinely. Leave them out. Oh, just called my sister, a postal worker. Yep, closed door one-on-ones every day...leave them out, too.

Hmmmm, we could get a pretty substantial list going. Would that qualify as an "everybody," Dwight?

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C191D84.63EF3F87@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > The subject is one-on-one meetings behind closed
> > doors, Dwight, not general security. Intel has
> > thousands of one-on-one meetings behind closed
> > doors every day.
>
>
> But you're using Intel's security to defend your argument about
> one-on-one meetings. Why else would you bring Intel into the
> discussion? So, since we cannot all possibly know about Intel's
> policies concerning security, either leave Intel out or give us some
> specifics about their security.
>
> Actually, in reality, Intel's position on one-on-one meetings is not
> the final word on this issue. I said most companies are now adopting
> policies about closed door meetings, not all companies are. In other
> words, Intel's policy does change my premise that more and more
> companies are starting to cut back on private closed door meetings to
> reduce the threat of sexual harassment lawsuits. So, unless you can
> establish that Intel's position is the same as all other companies,
> lets again leave Intel out of the discusion.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4261. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:28:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1980f5$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27259

I don't insist that your experience is wrong, Dwight. Not at all. You said "it is happening all over the country" in one of your posts. I am challenging you every step of the way on that, because *my* experience is different from yours, if that is now how we are doing this.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C1921CE.B08C2FAA@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > Most of the companies I mention above are those
> > that I have worked for here in the South. I don't
> > know where it is that you seem to have this
> > experience where employees cannot be trusted to
> > act as responsible adults, but remind me never
> > to move there.
>
>
> We've been over all that before, Kim. That is your experience and
> this is mine. I'm not saying your experience is wrong. I'm simply
> saying that, based on my experience, more and more companies are
> beginning to get more restrictive on closed door meetings. In fact,
> based on my experience, some companies are now taking that to an
> extreme - no closed door meetings and no private meetings at all. Why
> do you insist my experience it wrong - that only yours is right?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4262. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:29:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c198137$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27260

Oh, OK, so now *your* experiences are more valid than mine. You're a greater charlatan than Dave, Dwight. End of discussion...with you.

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C192516.344C38E8@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > In every office situation I've been in, (snip)
>
>
> What does that matter, Kim? We're talking about a growing trend in
> this country, not your exclusive experiences at some companies.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4263. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:31:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1980B4.ECDF1F9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27258

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The subject is one-on-one meetings behind closed
> > doors, Dwight, not general security. Intel has
> > thousands of one-on-one meetings behind closed
> > doors every day.
>
> But you're using Intel's security to defend your argument about
> one-on-one meetings. Why else would you bring Intel into the
> discussion?

Simply because that is where I worked for the last 13 years of my career. But IBM and DELL are similar. In fact, most of the large Silicon Valley companies have similar policies. Private meetings are to be held in private, not in public. Your lack of business acumen is showing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4264. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:33:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c19820a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27264

Dwight, your listed books are probably a combination of good and crappy authors, I have no idea. I'll dismiss your sources as quickly as you dismiss others. How's that feel?

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3C193327.C5B89C9@sccoast.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > (snip) People who claim to be using magic in the
> > same breath as they are saying they are Wiccan,
> > Dwight, are nothing but dreamers and are as
> > ignorant of the practice as you are. The closest
> > Wiccan may get to using magic is in using the
> > equivalent of "mantras" for prayer. (snip)
>
>
> So you're claiming that all these books that describe wiccan spells
> and magic were writtin by wiccans "ignorant of the practice," Kim?
>
> - 21st Century Wicca, Jennifer Hunter, Citadel Press.
> - Earth Magic, Marion Weinstein, Earth Magic Productions.
> - Natural Magic, Doreen Valiente, Hale/Phoenix Publishing.
> - Positive Magic, Marion Weinstein, Pocket Books.
> - Power of the Witch, Laurie Cabot, Dell Publishing
> - Practical Solitary Magic, Nancy B. Watson, Samuel Weiser
> - The Spiral Dance, Starhawk, Harper & Row.
> - The Witches Way, Stewart Farrar, Hale
> - Wicca: Solitary Practitioner, Scott Cunningham, Llewellyn.
> - A Book of Pagan Rituals, Herman Slater, Samuel Weiser.
> - A Witches' Bible Compleat, Janet Farrar, Magickal Childe.
> - Buckland's Complete Witchcraft, Raymond Buckland, Llewellyn.
> - Drawing Down the Moon, Margot Adler, Beacon Press.
> - Lid Off the Cauldron: A Handbook, Patricia Crowther, Mueller.
> - Paganism Today, G. Harvey /C. Hardman, eds 1995 Thorsons.
> - The Witch's God, Janet Farrar, Phoenix Publishing
> - Psychic Self-Defense, Dion Fortune, Samuel Weiser.
> - The Complete Art of Witchcraft, Sybil Leek, World Publishing.
> - The Magickal Year, Diana Ferguson, Samuel Weiser.
> - The Pagan Path, J. and S. Farrar, Phoenix Publishing.
> - Witchcraft for Tomorrow, Doreen Valiente, Hale/Phoenix.
>
> All those books describe wiccan spells and magic, Kim. And, given a
> few minutes more, I could probably double that list. So, obviously,

> wiccans do claim they can do spells and magic. So why would you claim
> that spells and magic are not part of the wiccan nonsense?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4265. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:34:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C19813C.D2E129B8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27261

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > It is company policy at Intel to have such private
> > meetings behind closed doors. To have such a private
> > meeting in public is insane and is against company
> > policy.
>
> Cecil, you insist on bringing Intel into the discussion. If you want
> to discuss Intel, please provide us with a copy of that company's
> policy so we can all discuss it. But, regardless, that company's
> policies are not the final word on this issue. It is simply the policy
> of one company (which tells us nothing about this issue in general -
> this issue at companies in general).

Intel is one of the most successful companies of all time. Many Silicon Valley companies copy their policies. You are simply showing your gross ignorance and lack of business acumen.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4266. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:34:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c19824b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27265

ROFLMAO...^5 I couldn't think of how to put that, Jim. Well said.

Kim W5TIT

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C193867.84E28E7@uci.edu...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > All those books describe wiccan spells and magic, Kim. And, given a
> > few minutes more, I could probably double that list. So, obviously,
> > wiccans do claim they can do spells and magic.
>
> I guess Wiccans don't believe that the first two people on Earth all of
> a sudden one day magically appeared here. Or that the wives of their
> male progeny also somehow as if by magic, inexplicably appeared out of
> thin air.

4267. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:35:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C198195.16505394@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27262

```
Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > My dictionary defines a "pagan" as someone who is
> > not a Christian, Jew, or Muslim and/or anyone who
> > believes in polytheism. Worshiping the Sun God
> > would be a pagan act. Worshiping the Earth Mother
> > would be a pagan act.
>
> My dictionary defines a pagan as "one who has no religion." Since
> worshiping the sun god, or worshiping the earth mother, are religions,
> they would not be pagan acts.

According to my dictionary, Buddhists and Hindus are pagans.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4268. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:35:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1982a4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27266

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C194B09.B527E1D9@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Competitive Intelligence--the new emerging technology.
> >
>
> Nothing new there. Happens from time to time.
> Most usual way is to hire someone just layed off
> from the other company.
>

Yep. But, God forbid any closed door meeting to confirm company secrets...
(I love an intertwined thread ;)

Kim W5TIT

4269. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:37:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C198206.C6F88720@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27263

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > Cecil, you insist on bringing Intel into the discussion. If you want
> > to discuss Intel, please provide us with a copy of that company's
> > policy so we can all discuss it.
>
> Or.....you could just take his word for it and leave it at that.

I suspect Dwight is telling us, in so many words, that he has never
worked for a large successful technology company and is totally
ignorant of such.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4270. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:41:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1982EA.5337951F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27267

Robert Casey wrote:
> > Saw a well-endowed lady the other day with a T-Shirt that said:
> > "If only these were brains".
>
> Another tee shirt had the words "tune" and "load"
> positioned on the breasts.

Oh no, Robert. You used the "b" word. You know you will bring
down the wrath of Larry Roll for doing that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4271. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:45:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1983D4.6E4E263A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27268

```
Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> > Military tribunals have the support of law...
> > both American and International.
>
> Fine, Steve, then try him in a military tribunal. I don't care where
> he is tried - I just want to see evidence to prove his guilt
> conclusively before we rush off to kill him.

Been watching CNN today, Dwight? Looks like proof to me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4272. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:52:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C198587.D5F2F719@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27269

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >A quantum reduction should be undetectable, Larry.
>
> Just the opposite. A quantum, by definition, IS detectable.

Depends on the detector. An analog voltmeter cannot detect a quantum
(one electron) change.

> > From Webster's:
> >"quantum - one of the small subdivisions of a quantized physical
> >magnitude"
>
> Which means it must be detectable.

Only if using the proper instrument. Larry uses a skin flute.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4273. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:54:07 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1985EF.B47466CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27270

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Half the nocode techs at Intel are engineers or technicians who
> > simply don't choose to learn Morse code. At least one has a
> > PhD degree in EE. I'd like to see Larry tangle with Dr. Williamson
> > on a technical basis.
>
> ...not as much as I'd like to see the famed Dr. Williamson in a 25 wpm
> CW ragchew with Larry.

I'll loan him my SCS PTC2e. How does Larry like 100wpm?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4274. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 04:56:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C198660.2C7D7EC8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27271

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> > Like I said GEHEN SIE DU TEUFEL.....or Assayez-vous en merde!
>
> And your mama too! :-)
>
> Why would you expect him to know whatever foreign language
> that is in, and be able to translate it? All that I can tell, it's
> not English, or Chinese for that matter. Just that whatever
> language it is, is supported by the ASCII character set.

German? Spanish?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4275. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 05:27:28 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <f2003cbd80736c14924aa5ab674bb54c.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 27272

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1916AC.2F3AF0AE@sccoast.net...

> Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > Military tribunals have the support of law...
> > both American and International.
>
>
> Fine, Steve, then try him in a military tribunal. I don't care where
> he is tried - I just want to see evidence to prove his guilt
> conclusively before we rush off to kill him.

We have mounted a war on terrorism. OBL is a terrorist by his
own admission (many times over). Even if he was not involved
in the 9-11 events, he is still a soldier in the army we are
at war with, therefor he need only appear in someones crosshairs.
No tribunal needed, and no trial needed. Nothing else needed except
a steady eye on the sight picture, and a nice crisp squeeze of the
trigger, just like any other soldier in this war.

It is up to God to judge him. It is up to us to arrange
the meeting.

With all kind wishes,

Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas12poolc101.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.23.101]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4276. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 05:38:25 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C18D82F.D83E8856@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27273

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Fine, Steve, then try him in a military tribunal. I don't care where
> he is tried - I just want to see evidence to prove his guilt
> conclusively before we rush off to kill him. Without that, we leave
> this whole thing open for endless speculation.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Did you see the tape Dwight? Did someone hit you with a 2X4 to get
your attention? I guess you are going to be one who thinks it was
all a fabrication.

4277. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 06:07:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1989C8.464DC3DD@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27274

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Rick Adams wrote:
> > You'll notice, however, that the congress is unwilling to
> > legalize the most efficient form of fuel available (hemp oil) for
> > production on American farms (we have to import it from Canada if we
> > want it). Hemp fuel, first introduced by Henry Ford in 1936 (in an
> > automobile built over 40% out of hemp itself), is non-polluting, a
> > renewable resource, lower in cost than petroleum products, readily
> > extracted from the plant, and can be produced anywhere in the USA.
> > Even the Farm Bureau (arguably one of the most conservative
> > organizations in the US) has voted unanimously to encourage congress
> > to legalize it as a cash crop.
>
> You've got one of those suits made entirely from hemp, don't you Rick.
> ;-)

Doncha think he has already smoked it all up, a few threads at a time??

4278. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 06:20:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C198CDC.C5B9D20F@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27275

```
Whats it to ya, floppy titty?

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> Didya read up on that, too, little Dicky?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C18355D.1A5DAFC8@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > > K0HB wrote:
> > > >
> > > > A foreign terrorist, who openly has
> > > > declared his intent to do whatever possible
> > > > to destroy our homeland and our way of
> > > > life, has no right to protection under our
> > > > Constitution. None.
> > >
> > > It's not just the law of our own Constitution, Hans. It's also
> > > international law, and the law in most "civilized" nations. Most
> > > countries don't judge a person by what he says, but by what he
> > > actually does.
> > >
> > > > It is God's responsibility to judge Bin
> > > > Laden. It is our responsibility to
> > > > arrange the meeting.
> > >
> > > Spoken like a patriot, Hans. Our forefathers would be proud of such
> sentiments.
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > Our forefathers would have pronounced you a nutcase long ago.
> >
```

4279. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 06:32:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C198FB6.60B5A043@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27276

Robert Casey wrote:

> K0HB wrote:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > Being from southern MN, I know all about EF Johnson, but you'd really need
> > > to stretch to consider that as "homebrewed". Sorry, Dick, your rant just
> > > doesn't persuade me. This "factory appliances only" license is a bad idea.
> > >
>
> A major reason for the way the FCC and other countries do up their
> rules is the ease of enforcement. Why do they say have extra only
> subbands instead of say power level restrictions? Because someone
> at an FCC field site operating a receiver can easily see what frequency
> you are on, where he can't really tell how much power you're putting
> out. For all he knows, you might just have a small rig and a yagi
> pointed at him.

You have just given a description of how the FCC would reason if they were making the rules today, instead of 35 year ago. That was not, however, the thinking at the time.

4280. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 06:35:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C199063.97E01764@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27277

CAM wrote:

> "Leland C. Scott" wrote:
> > Saw this on a Tee-shirt:
> >
> > "I am a bomb technician. If you see
> > me running, try to keep up. "
>
> Saw a well-endowed lady the other day with a T-Shirt that said:
> "If only these were brains".

Would that be topless "Nothing above the neck" Kim?

4281. Re: AMP SALE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 07:15:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1999BC.A616373@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27278

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Is there any way the r.r.a.p. newsgroup server could be configured in a
> smart enough way as to filter-out posts that also have CB newsgroups in
> the header?
> Seems a reasonable thing to do.
>

I don't know, but if you can imagine a time when there was NONE of this sort of trash, instead of a world pervaded with it, you can begin to understand why some of us who've been around a long time are so distressed about where it has gone.

Dick

>
> "\"Train\" cbmods"@optonlineNOSPAM.com wrote:
> >
> > In article <lm1S7.12683$161.5428397@news02.optonline.net>, Train
> > <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> writes:
> > >I guess we'll see how many losers there are who will reply to this
> > >troll.......and a FAKED troll at that.
> > >My IP is static at 128.*********
> > >Have fun with it!
> > >Train
> >
> > Let me clarify something. The original posts are NOT fake as you can see
> > below. They are VERY real. Do a search and you will see. I've been very
> > NAUGHTY this year :)
> >
> > Train
> >
> > --
> >
> > Subject: Re: Question Fer Dick M.
> > Date: Sat, 16 Jun 2001 11:50:00 GMT
> > From: "Train" <cbmods@optonline.net>
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> >
> > darn it........I have newsranger blocked and missed this post so I'll
> > address it now...........Eat shit and die! Who sells what or who's buying is
> > of no concern to you.......You just need a reason to cry like the little
> > child you are. Grow up! Your little click isn't going to even put a dent in
> > what gets sold for CB radio legal or otherwise.
> > Being in radio as long as I have and knowing the people I know........It's
> > going to be a long long time before slime like you will ever be able to do a

> > damned thing to anyone selling radio stuff. I have more radio info on CD's
> > and a larger database than most of you clowns would ever dream of and if
> > need be ALL WILL BE PUT ON A WEBSITE. Everything from schematics for amps
> > that we were building in the 70's and 80's to every last page of master
> > editions.....secret cb.....green, gray, black books.....You name it and
> > I got it. Nothing you sleazy little shits can do will EVER stop people from
> > getting information they need. Bet on it!
> >
> > --
> > Train
> > tra1n@aol.com
> > cbmods@optonline.com
> > train@cbmods.com
> >
> > ==================================
> >
> > Subject: MOBIL AMP SALE
> > Date: Sat, 14 Apr 2001 19:09:40 GMT
> > From: "Train" <cbmods@optonline.net>
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> >
> > As a public service to the NG, I will be offering to sell mobil amps to
> > those wishing to buy them. This is not done out of greed but out of
> > necessity to thwart the losers in the NG who think they have taken over OUR
> > nice little group and can use it to harass and belittle as they see fit. To
> > offer sale of these items is just the thing needed in a public forum to mess
> > with these nil-minded simpletons. Amps such as Texas Star, Palomar, Cobra,
> > Messenger, Gray, Galaxy, X-Force and so on. These will be sold for a limited
> > time and at a VERY small profit IF ANY !
> >
> > This is not a money thing so much as it is an access thing.
> >
> > Since these self appointed radio/computer gods have declared knowledge an
> > illegal thing also, I might just make the entire Secret CB book series
> > available on CD along with a CD of amplifier schematics for base and mobil
> > amps. Why is it that when these morons just think they are getting somewhere
> > in their fight somebody like me comes along and pisses on their parade?
> > BECAUSE THEY NEED IT AND DESERVE IT!!!!!!!!!
> >
> > E-Mail me with your needs......
> > Train
> > tra1n@aol.com
> > train@cbmods.com
> > cbmods@optonline.net
> >
> > ============================
> >
> > From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
> > Date: Sun, May 20, 2001 5:59 PM
> > Message-id: <5CTN6.10757$MR1.2346125@news02.optonline.net>

> >
> > I have no use for or reason to operate legally.
> >
> > There are thousands of us who will continue to operate as we see fit without
> > regard to whatever some schmuck like you or your little click of
> > over-opinionated morons have to say about it. You can cry all you like but
> > those of us who can, will and those of you who can't......Will continue to
> > cry about it.
> > Train
> >
> > ========================
> > Subject: Re: Ameritron AL80A
> > From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
> > Date: Fri, Jun 22, 2001 11:40 AM
> > Message-id: <n8GY6.43556$Lk1.4150780@news02.optonline.net>
> >
> > "Gary" <gharrel101@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:9gm24u$34ju$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com...
> > > I have an Ameritron AL80A. How can I modify it for use on 11 Meters? It
> > > has the ability to tune to the high end of 10 Meters. Any information
> > >would be useful.
> >
> > You Know damn well it can be easily done.......Breakout that golden
> > screwdriver and get to it!
> >
> > --
> > Train
> > tra1n@aol.com
> > cbmods@optonline.com
> > train@cbmods.com
> >
> > ==
> >
> > Subject: Re: RCI 2990 For Sale
> > From: "Train" cbmods@optonline.net
> > Date: Thu, Jul 12, 2001 12:48 PM
> > Message-id: <K0h37.32$qs5.155619@news02.optonline.net>
> >
> > Get a friggin life you loser!
> > You have got to be the most lame useless pile-o-shit we have in the group.
> > We all know your BS line by now and I for one am sick of your fascist
> > bullshit!
> >
> > Blow your FCC crap out your ass!
> >
> > --
> > Train
> > tra1n@aol.com
> > cbmods@optonline.com
> > train@cbmods.com

> >
> > ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
> > http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
> > NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> > made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4282. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB Gear

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 07:20:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C199ADF.9E357213@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27279

K0HB wrote:

> N9NWO says:
>
> > And are you a police officer? Are you
> > an attorney? NO. You are a Private
> > Fucking Civilian (PFC) with little contact
> > with the current system.
> >
> > Understand this. The police and the
> > military are your superiors. Their lives
> > are far more valuable than yours.
>
> If this is your true opinion, then you are indeed a dangerous
> person and I earnestly pray that you are not in _ANY_
> position, even a part-time school crossing guard, which
> allows you to assert your "authority". If you are in such a
> position, then the citizens of your community should consider
> the risk they have placed themselves in by your continued
> service in any capacity of authority.
>
> The police and military have my respect and gratitude (and
> I spent 21 years bearing arms to protect America), but they
> are not superior to any other citizen. Period.
>

The outfit I worked for had as its motto "Service and Protection".
Most all who worked there stayed pretty close to that theme, at least in
the absence of unusally adverse circmstances. Of course the guard has
changed there, too, but I'd like to believe that most public servants
still think they really are just that.

4283. ARNewsline 1269 - Dec 7 2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 10:41:02 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011214054102.07244.00000339@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 27280

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1269 - DEC 7, 2001

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1269 with a release date of Friday, December 7, 2001 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

The FCC says no to a Winter Olympics special call sign and a new Extra class exam starts next summer. Learn what's in it on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1269 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE 2002 WINTER OLYMPICS: FCC SAYS NO TO SPECIAL CALL SIGN

An idea for a special events call sign to celebrate the 2002 Winter Olympics has drawn a negative response from the FCC. Tom Schaefer, NY4I, of Sandy, Utah, had requested that the agency allow amateurs Utah hams to substitute the number 2002 or 02 for the 7 in their callsign. This, for the time period preceding and up to though the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City. But after mulling it over for a few months the Schaefer says the agency responded with a definite no:

--
Schaefer Here:
In-Q: I wrote a letter...
Out-Q:...as a different prefix.

The letter to Schaefer was signed by D'wana R. Terry. Terry is Chief of the Public Safety and Private Wireless Division of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau. Among the reasons Terry stated in refusing the special call sign request was that the block of special event callsigns requested did not fall into the commission's special event callsign format. Also, that the request was inconsistent with International Radio Regulations. Schaefer says that he is disappointed at the FCC decision to deny, and also a bit surprised:

--
Schaefer Here
In-Q: The letter I...
Out-Q:...unable to do that.

Does this mean that there will be no ham radio involvement in the 2002 Winter Olympic Games? Not by a long shot. According to Schaefer members of the local ARES groups will be assisting in providing communications for the event. And

there’s a good chance that someone will pick up the ball and get some sort of special call sign using the established call sign administrator program.

By the way, you can hear more with Tom Schaefer NY4I about ham radio at the Winter Olympics on this weeks RAIN Report. Its on the web in Real Audio and Windows Media at www.rainreport.com and by telephone at 847-827-7246. That’s 847-827-RAIN. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE ARCTIC WINTER GAMES

Another event called the Arctic Winter Games are also in their planning stages. In this case, ham radio is an important part of the event. Q-New Graham Kemp, VK4BB, tells us the who, the what and the where:

--
Greenland and the call-sign OX1AWG is on the air from Nuuk Greenland as a participant of the Arctic Winter Games going to be held in Iqaluit Nunavit and Nuuk Greenland 17th - 23rd of March 2002.

OX3HX, Rene tells us any Hams bringing a valid License original will be welcome to use the local club station OX3NUK for a small fee. If you would like to have your own OX3-call, ship a copy of the license but they need to have the papers 3 weeks in advance. Hams who like to operate OX/Home call or OX1AWG are welcome too, and have only to show up with original valid license.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Im Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News Australia.
--

For those planning to visit Greenland for the games, Rene Witkowsky, OX3HX will be available at one of the many Help Booths around the city. (Q-News)

**

DX RECORD: 73 KHZ DISTANCE RECORD INCREASED

Yet another new low frequency record has been achieved on the 73 kHz band. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, has more:

--
“On the 21st of November, just before midnight UTC, W1TAG received extremely slow CW from G3AQC. This was the first time that a complete callsign had been copied, though partial calls were identified the previous night.

The opening lasted around two hours and was the culmination of several weeks of testing. At a distance of 5291 kilometers, G3AQC smashed his own record of 4408 kilometers when his 73kHz transmissions were received by VE1ZJ last June. He was running 200 milliwatts ERP.

The transmission was in Differential Frequency CW, where the dots and dashes are the same length but on slightly different frequencies, and with no space between them.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH”
--

The Differential Frequency C-W communications system used for this contact holds the promise of extending this record even further. (GB2RS)

**

BREAK 1

This is ham radio news coming to you from the United States of America. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on great bulletin stations around the world this week honoring the Antelope Valley Amateur Radio Club Wednesday Night Net serving Lancaster California.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: EXPEDITION 4 HEADS TO THE ISS

Amateur Radio is keeping an eye one space this week. On the International Space Station to be more exact, as we witness a changing if the guard. The third group of Astronauts and Cosmonauts headed by Frank Culbertson, is getting ready to come home. They’ll be back on Earth December 16th, after being in orbit since last August.

Expedition 4, Yuri Orufrienko, Dan Bursch and Carl Walz will take over and be up there until next May. Onufrienko once operated from the Mir Space Station; Bursch is KD5PNU and Walz is KC5TIE. So hams can look forward to contacts with them.

Amateur Radio on the International Space Station; ARISS; will continue on the air with two meter voice and packet. Voice contacts with schools all over the world have been well served and those exciting contacts will continue at a rate of one or two a week once the new crew settles in.

In addition to operating ham gear, the new crew has also carried new Amateur Radio antennas to the station. They were designed and built in Italy to Russian specifications, then space-qualified and shipped to the United States.

The Astronauts plan at least eight space walks, two of which will be used to install those antennas outside the crew quarters. They should provide a wide range of frequencies and vastly improved coverage of the ham bands for the ARISS station.

The space station call, while flying over the United States is NA1SS. The 2 meter downlink frequency is 145.80 MHz. Look for the new crew on the air from orbit in the near future. ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO TESTING IN THE USA: NEW EXTRA CLASS EXAM QUESTION POOL RELEASED

If you are planning to upgrade to Extra class, now might be the time to do it. This is because a new and somewhat more difficult Extra Class exam will go into

effect next summer. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details:

--
The National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators Question Pool Committee has released a revised and expanded set of Element 4 Amateur Extra questions. Use of these questions begins next summer and replace the current Extra class question pool released back on April 15, 2000. That’s the day Amateur Radio ''restructuring'' became effective.

The new Element 4 pool expands the number of questions by more than 20 percent. The new test pool has 806 questions as opposed to 665 in the current Extra class pool. It also contains more technical material. In fact, more than half of the questions cover electrical principles, circuits, signals and emissions.

The 50 questions in an Extra class examination are drawn from the question pool. FCC rules say that an applicant must correctly answer at least 37 questions of the 50 to receive a passing grade.

The new Extra class question pool becomes effective July 1, 2002, and must be used to generate all Extra class written examinations administered on or after that date. The questions are available on the ARRL Web site and will remain valid through June 30, 2005.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP.
--

The Question Pool Committee now will turn its attention to developing an outline for the Technician class Element 2 question pool. A draft version is scheduled for public release and
comment next spring. The ARRL website address is http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/pools.html to find the Question Pool. (ARRL Bulletin, NCVEC)

**

HAM RADIO TESTING IN THE U-K: UPGRADING MORSE TESTS UNDERWAY

Meantime overseas, the United Kingdom is in the process of administering a lot of slow speed Morse code exams. This, following the an announcement by that nations telecommunications agency that U-K Full and Intermediate Class B license-holders can operate on the High Frequency bands under the new Foundation license by simply passing a code test.

Called a Morse Assessment exam, the Radio Society of Great Britain is arranging for sessions to be held nation-wide. The RSGB hopes that at least two sessions per region will take place between now and the end of December.

The RSGB says that these tests are open to both members and non-members of the society. So far twelve sites have been approved for training and testing of the new U-K Foundation License. (GB2RS)

**

ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ROAD RAGE MUST STOP

The FCC's chief ham radio rules enforcer has told those attending the Ft. Wayne Indiana Hamfest that the time for on the air arguments has come to an end. Riley Hollingsworth, the FCC's Special Counsel for Amateur Radio enforcement told the forum that Amateur Radio road rage must stop now and that the bickering on our frequencies can do nothing but hurt Amateur Radio in the long run.

Hollingsworth also says its time for more hams to get involved in public service. Jack Parker, W8ISH, of Amateur News Weekly, has that part of the story:

--
"Hollingsworth says that it is now time for hams to use frequencies responsibly. He adds that now, more than ever, is the best time for all Amateur Radio groups to seek out and establish working relationships with local emergency response agencies.

Since September 11th, Amateur Radio and its potential has moved into a prominent position on the national front. But he stresses that we must move quickly at a local level to establish our place in the overall emergency response plan.

Reporting from the Ft. Wayne Hamfest, for amateur News Weekly, I'm Jack Parker, W8ISH."
--

Hollingsworth's views are echoed by many who are already involved in organizing ham radio emergency communications on a local level. They say you can never have to many well trained volunteers. (Amateur News Weekly)

**

SPECTRUM USE: FCC OPENS UP MORE SPECTRUM TO COMMERCIAL USERS

The government has moved to eliminate a cap on how much spectrum any one wireless company can own in a given market. The decision opens the way for mergers between major carriers and allows them to provide more mobile services such as high-speed Internet access.

The Federal Communications Commission had previously limited the amount of spectrum that an operator could own in a particular geographic area, in an effort to prevent a single giant company from squelching competition in that market. But in a recent 3 to 1 vote, the agency decided to immediately raise the amount of bandspace a company can own from 45 MHz to 55 MHz. This is an increase of more than 20 percent. The FCC plans to completely eliminate the limit in January 2003. (FCC)

**

HAMVENTION 2002: TIME TO NOMINATE REMINDER

Another reminder that the Dayton Amateur Radio Association has opened the nominating period for the 2002 Dayton Hamvention Awards. There are three

awards presented each year. They are the Radio Amateur of the Year, Special Achievement, and Technical Excellence.

All amateurs Novice through Extra are eligible. Awards are decided by the Awards Committee, based partially upon the information received. Magazine articles, newsletters, newspaper clippings, videos and the like are appreciated but cannot be returned. The deadline for nominations is January 31, 2002. Nominations can be submitted by US Mail to Post Office Box 964, Dayton Ohio 45401 or by completing the convenient e-form on the web at www.hamvention.org. (DARA)

**

NEW HAM TECHNOLOGY: THE ELECRAFT RIG CONCEPT DESIGN CONTEST

Want to design the ham rig of the future and maybe win a prize? Well, Elecraft says that it will be giving three of its new EC1 project enclosures to those who submit the most interesting suggested designs concepts.
--
Eric Swartz WA6HQQ: “There’s quite a strong building and homebrewing community inside of the QRP’ers -- the low power operators -- these days. In fact, that is how we got our start.

We have broadened our audience past that and have pulled a lot of hams from the mainstream higher power groups to it also, but those guys (the QRP operators - ed.) build an awful lot of stuff. We are continually seeing folks talking about new project ideas and new things to design. It is quite a fertile group of people so I think we are just kind of servicing that need.”
--

Elecraft says its taking this rather unusual step to away to help stimulate the creative process within the ham radio community. According to Elecraft’s Wayne Burdick, N6KR and Eric Swartz, WA6HHQ, design concepts submitted can be for virtually any ham-related application, but they must be compatible with the Elecraft EC1 enclosure. The EC1 is the same size and color as the K1 transceiver. No schematics are required and designers are under no obligation or expectation to actually build the proposed projects. More information on this unique design contest along with all the rules is on the web at www.elecraft.com. (Elecraft)

**

ELECTRONIC BUSINESS: AILING POLOROID FILES CHAPTER 11

Polaroid has been known to generations of consumers for its instant cameras and film, and more recently as a supplier of digital imaging products. Now Poloroid has filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection.

According to news reports, the company was unable to keep up with the new digital technologies of the photography world. It also has struggled with nearly $1 billion in debt. (Published reports)

**

BREAK 2

News never goes home for the holidays and neither do we. We are the amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world at our only official website - www.arnewsline.org.

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: BRAIN DISEASE SUPERCOMPUTER

The University of California at San Diego will coordinate a consortium of interests banding together to build the first nationwide computer network for studying diseases of the brain. The network will enable researchers to share information on neurological diseases such as multiple sclerosis, schizophrenia, Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease. The National Center for Research Resources, part of the National Institutes of Health, awarded the consortium more than $20 million for the project, which will enable researchers to share brain images via a high-speed network. (UCSD release)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: FREE UPDATED TRACKING SOFTWARE

An updated version of the PREDICT satellite tracking and orbital prediction program is now available. This latest updated corrects some errors that have caused instability under certain conditions in the past. The program's documentation has also been updated, and new versions in Portable Document File and HTML have been added. PREDICT is free software.

The latest DOS version may be downloaded from ftp://ftp.amsat.org/amsat/software/PC/tracking/predict2.zip >. Further information on PREDICT software is available at http://www.qsl.net/kd2bd/predict.html.

Also, new Linux version is currently being prepared for release as well. (KD2BD)

**

INTERNATIONAL - SOUTH AFRICA: NO HT’S IN THIS CAR

Radio Amateurs in South Africa can no longer use a hand held radio in a vehicle unless its attached to a hands free operating system. This is the result of a new law that says that no person will drive a vehicle on a public road while holding a cellular telephone or any other communications device in one or both hands.

To operate mobile, hams and non hams alike now must use a radio permanently mounted in the vehicle and adapted to hands free operation. The law permits mobile radio operators to use such devices as a permanently mounted microphone and speaker or other specialized gear to comply. (SARL, Q-News)

**

INTERNATIONAL-UK: MARCONI 100TH ANNIVERSARY

The 100th anniversary of the reception of the first trans-Atlantic radio signal by Guilermo Marconi at Signal Hill in St. John's, Newfoundland, takes place on Wednesday the December 12th. In celebration, a number of United Kingdom special event stations will be active to commemorate the event.

Most of the operations will take place on the 12th of December itself. Even Great Britain’s Radiocommunications Agency is getting into the act. It will be operating GB100WT from its laboratory site at Whyteleafe, Surrey, during part of December including, they hope, the full 24 hours of the 12th of December. The Radiocommunications Agency expects to be operational on the High Frequency bands as well as 2 meters and 70 centimeters. The station will be operated by Radiocommunications Agency staff in addition to members of local radio clubs and will welcome QSOs with stations worldwide. (RSGB)

**

RADIOSPORTS: WRTC-2002 REMINDER AND UPDATE

A reminder that the next World Team Radiosport Championship will take place next July in Finland. The games will be hosted by the Finnish Amateur Radio Society and the Contest Club of Finland. WRTC brings together over fifty two man teams made up of the best contest operators from around the world. The actual on-the-air competition pits two man teams operating from a common geographic area using identical equipment, power and antennas.

To get a good idea of what goes on at the World Radiosport Team Championship games, film-maker Dave Bell has produced a half hour documentary video titled “The Ham Radio Olympics.” Its priced at only $19.95 and is available on video CD or VHS tape from the American Radio Relay League. More information is on the web at www.arrl.org. (WRTC, ARRL, W6AQ)

**

DX

In D-X, word that wore torn Afghanistan is back on the air following the ouster of Taliban forces from most of that nation. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, is back with the details:
--
Graham Kemp VK4BB:

“World traveller Peter Casier, ON6TT (5X1T), has been in Afghanistan for the last few days and has now obtained permission to operate in this worn torn nation.

On November 21 he was QRV as YA/ON6TT/M operating in a convoy. The foreign ministry of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (Northern Alliance) issued the call YA5T, which can be used on all bands by Peter, ON6TT, Matts, SM7PKK, and Robert, S53R.

Wayne Mills, N7NG, will have to look at the permission, once it is received. His initial reaction was that it should be good for DXCC. Peter will hopefully be contacting Wayne and submitting the documentation. Meantime, look out for these three operating as YA5T.”
--

And late word from the ARRL’s DXCC Desk is that it has already received acceptable documentation for YA5T and has approved it for credit. (Q-News)

Several DX newsletters report that N6TJ is active as ZD8Z from Ascension Island again. He is expected to be there through the 18th of December. QSL as directed on the air. (OPDX, Modern DX’er)

Lastly, word that high seas have forced the Ducie Island DXpedition team to abandon its already-delayed effort to reach that DXCC entity located in the South Pacific. According to the RSGB, the team was some 80 nautical miles from its destination and facing high seas when the decision was taken to turn around and head back to Pitcairn Island. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: STRANGE SCIENCE - FAT BIRDS FLY BETTER

About twice a year we bring you stories about radio tagged migratory birds. In most cases its those ever elusive Burrowing Owls. Now we have a totally different kind of bird story. It still involves radio tracking, but this time to see if bigger birds or smaller birds have a better chance to survive in flight. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Joe Moell, KO0V has more:

--
European scientists have discovered what seems like a contradiction about migrating birds. They found that the fatter the bird, the more efficiently it appears to fly.

Researchers at Lund University in Sweden have studied several small species including the Red Knot. In our hemisphere, these 20-ounce wading shorebirds travel 18,000 miles every year, to the tip of South America and back to the Arctic. On the way north, they stop on the shores of New Jersey to feast on the eggs of horseshoe crabs, to build up energy for the last 2000 miles of their northward trip, which they make non-stop. On these binges, the Red Knots can double their normal body weight.

Over the past few years a number of European Red Knots were radio tagged and tracked by the Swedes as they prepared for a similar trip between the British Isles and the Russian Arctic. The study indicates that building up of fat deposits to be burned as fuel during the migration is more than worth the energy that it takes to carry the additional weight. The heavier birds apparently use their muscles more efficiently. Just why this is so remains a mystery. Even stranger is that the results seem to 'fly in the face' of a central theory of aerodynamics -- no pun intended of course.

So what does this have to do with ham radio? Well, it points out that research always seems to yield unexpected results, and it gives me a chance to remind you that dozens of ham operators in western states are listening for the VHF radio tags on endangered Burrowing Owls this winter. You could help out too. Find out by visiting my Web site -- www.homingin.com. Who knows, maybe a ham will make a similar startling discovery about the migration habits of these unique critters. That's homingin -- one word -- for the Web site, homingin.com.

For Amateur Radio Newsline, in southern California, this is Joe Moell - K-zero-Oscar-Victor saying, "no jokes about birdbrains, please."
--

All of this really goes to show that the more mankind uses science to discover the secrets of Mother Nature, the more amazed man is at what he learns. (Ecology Today)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Roy Neal, K6DUE, saying God Bless America, 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2001. All rights reserved.

4284. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 11:08:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <t4lS7.222101$3d2.10468010@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27281

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C1989C8.464DC3DD@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > You'll notice, however, that the congress is unwilling to
> > > legalize the most efficient form of fuel available (hemp oil) for
> > > production on American farms (we have to import it from Canada if we
> > > want it). Hemp fuel, first introduced by Henry Ford in 1936 (in an
> > > automobile built over 40% out of hemp itself), is non-polluting, a
> > > renewable resource, lower in cost than petroleum products, readily
> > > extracted from the plant, and can be produced anywhere in the USA.
> > > Even the Farm Bureau (arguably one of the most conservative
> > > organizations in the US) has voted unanimously to encourage congress
> > > to legalize it as a cash crop.
> >
> > You've got one of those suits made entirely from hemp, don't you Rick.
> > ;-)
>
> Doncha think he has already smoked it all up, a few threads at a time??
>

While I don't see hemp as the solution to all problems known and unknown
you do have to admit present laws have only had the effect of producing
some very potent pot. With it growing wild thru this area the only real
danger to civilization is the kids trying to dry it in a pillow case down
at the local laundromat. Sets the lint trap on fire.

4285. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 12:24:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011214072453.04232.00000125@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27282

>Subject: Re: some sobering numbers
>From: "Hans Brakob" k0hb@qwest.net
>Date: 12/13/2001 11:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f2003cbd80736c14924aa5ab674bb54c.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>

>Even if he was not involved
>in the 9-11 events, he is still a soldier in the army we are
>at war with, therefor he need only appear in someones crosshairs.

"Honest, Sir...He had surrendered and we were coming in REAAAAL peaceful
like and his head just exploded!"

4286. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB Gear

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 12:27:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011214072701.04232.00000126@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27283

>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB Gear
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@bitbucket73.com
>Date: 12/13/2001 4:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <u$SQ3YChBHA.1868@cpimsnntpa02>

> ...(and
>I spent 21 years bearing arms to protect America...

An authority freak like that is probably arming bears, Hans...Watch out!1

73

Steve, K4YZ

4287. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 13:03:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011214080303.01870.00000308@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27285

In article <i85R7.290107$W8.9721109@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>> "NOBODY EXPECTS THE SPANISH INQUISITION!!!"
>>
>> followed by scenes of torture involving a (dish) rack, being poked with
>soft
>> cushions, and being forced to sit in "the comfy chair".
>
>And, of course, they had some sweet little old lady sitting there taking the
>'abuse'...

Quite comfy, really.
>
>> Also worthy of a peek are the "Blackadder" series....
>
>"I have a cunning plan, my lord..."

Just don't say "Macbeth"...
>
>also poetry...
>
>"Row row row your boat
> Gently down the stream
> Belts off, trousers down,
> Isn't life a scream!"
>
>and...
>
>EDMUND
>a poem by Queenie*
>
>When the night is dark,
>And the dogs go 'bark';
>When the clouds are black,
>And the ducks go 'quack';
>When the sky is blue,
>And the cows go 'mooo';
>Think of lovely Queenie,
>She'll be thinking of you.
>
>(* William Shakespeare helped with the title)

BALDRICK!!
>

>I was going to quote my favorite... but the shmucks around here wouldn't
>like the use of that word... ;-)

What word?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4288. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 13:03:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011214080304.01870.00000309@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27286

In article <T96R7.290152$W8.9725945@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>> For nice examples of near-current media surrealism:
>>
>> - The TV series "Ally McBeal" has done some really good stuff with
>> special effects expressing how the characters feel. The earlier
>> seasons had more of this.
>>
>> - Just saw the film "Amelie" which has some great cinematic surreal
>> touches.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Unfortunately, Ally McBeal in general has slid off the scale into the
>toilet.

Or the hole.

Which is why I recommend the early seasons over the recent ones.

There is a neat website (I think it's www.jumpthe shark.com) where TV series of all vintages are analyzed for when they "jumped the shark" (meaning when they went from good to bad). "Ally" was dealt a real blow by the drug problems of RDJ, forcing a sudden change in scripts and story direction.

--

Go see "Amelie". Not a lot of surrealism, but excellently done.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4289. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 13:03:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011214080305.01870.00000310@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27284

In article <3C168F04.48FC283B@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> There's also the "BANANA" idea that is one
>> cause of California's electricity troubles.
>> ("BANANA" = "Build Absolutely Nothing
>> Anywhere Near Anything")
>
>
> I'm still waiting for California to fall into the ocean - that will really
>end
>their electricity troubles. :-)
>
Be warned - other states are "deregulating" electricity. Hopefully, they are
learning from CA's mistakes.

Look what happened to Enron.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4290. It's Time To Demand A Re-Vamp of the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 13:34:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011214083429.04232.00000127@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27287

After careful consideration of several events lately, I think it's time to start approaching our representatives and demand that a "kinder, gentler" FCC be replaced by the autocratic nonsense that proliferates today.

The FCC of today is a joke. In this authors opinion, it has a long way to go to pull itself out of the shoulder-shrugging, responsibility shirking, hand-washing, pass-the-buck attitude of the 70's and 80's.

First of all, the below cited item is one of the "could have said yes but said no "because we can"" instances where the FCC is just a bit too impressed with itself to cooperate with the users of the spectrum.

QUOTE: (from ARNewsline)

THE 2002 WINTER OLYMPICS: FCC SAYS NO TO SPECIAL CALL SIGN

An idea for a special events call sign to celebrate the 2002 Winter Olympics has drawn a negative response from the FCC. Tom Schaefer, NY4I, of Sandy, Utah, had requested that the agency allow amateurs Utah hams to substitute the number 2002 or 02 for the 7 in their callsign. This, for the time period preceding and up to though the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City. But after mulling it over for a few months the Schaefer says the agency responded with a definite no:

UNQUOTE

Never mind that even third-world nations do that very thing (allow temproary changes in calls for Olympic events, or that it would have not required anything more than a blanket STA for the period requested...Heck no...Why allow Amateurs to celebrate one of the truly (or at least as close as it will ever get) de-politicised international events that we can take pride in? ESPECIALLY in the wake of recent events... ! ! !

Example: "We, the FCC, hereby allow any licensed Amateur Radio Operator living within the State of Utah to substitute the figures "2002" for the number "7" in thier callsign for the period of (dates of the event) in recognition of the Olympics. Operators residing in Utah with a numeral other than "7" may substitute thier numeral with the original numeral plus "02", ie K4YZ would be K402YZ. Only stations with a permanent mailing address in Utah may participate. Have a nice day".

See how easy that was? Took some GS-5 stenographer 2 minutes to type up and another 30 minutes to get posted to the Federal Register or other authorized media.

Second is my aversion to the FCC being allowed to exert it's Victorian opinions on who they consider to be of "good character" to be a "Commission

Licensee"...I speak of persons who may have commited a crime in the past, NOT related to radio, and are now prohibited or are sanctioned in thier quest for a license, regardless of which radio service it may be in.

I was always of the opinion and understanding that once time was served, one's "debt to society" was paid and they were reassimilated into that society. We are obviously NOT that society if we continue to punish people AFTER their time is served.

Next is my concern on the Agency's obvious lack of concern on maintaining a balance between the needs of ALL citizens versus corporations which would seek to make a profit from the finite resources of the electromagnetic spectrum. Again, this author does not believe that the FCC always acts in the best interests of the citizenry, but rather manufacturers and other corporate entities who can talk the smoother line.

Evidence the FRS and MURS services, the 220-222mHz debacle, and the recent attempt to liberalize Part 15 radiation limits. NONE of these acts were mandated by the needs of industry to meet an ongoing consumer need...they were done to provide the opportunity to CREATE a market for thier wares.

THAT is wrong.

Next, I would like to know how the FCC comes up with these horrific fines. While I will be the first to demand that violators be punished and sanctioned, even those acts should be within reason and by the order of a court AFTER due process of law...NOT because the FCC says "Because I Said So"....NAL's are un-Constitutional, in my non-law-school opinion.

Lastly, I object in no uncertain terms to the passing of responsibility of radiocommunication regulatory enforcement to agencies OTHER than the FCC or other appropriately trained federal agency. (ie: local police or sheriff's agencies) Yes, local police should have the authority to intervene in cases where a CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER exists...to me, this means some jerk jamming local emergency services, navigation aids or law enforcement communications, or being able to take action against persons who are using radio to commit felonies or actively harass other citizens. This would be no more different than a cop arresting someone who just buzzed the Mayor's house. The FAA regulates avaition, but no one would dare suggest that a threat to safety was inappropriate for local law enforcement to take action on.

As much as I would like to see the "freeband" mess cleaned up, the passing of laws that allows local law enforcement to do this is wrong. As pointed out by others, it is just one more obligation that already over-burdened officers must now familiarize themselves with, and leaves the door open for misunderstanding and confusion with law abiding users of the radio spectrum.

There are other matters that I see occuring with the FCC that give me cause, both as a licensee and as a citizen, to be concerned for the welfare of spectrum management within the United States. It's time to clean house.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4291. Re: It's Time To Demand A Re-Vamp of the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 13:38:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011214083805.04232.00000128@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27288

>Subject: It's Time To Demand A Re-Vamp of the FCC
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 12/14/2001 7:34 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011214083429.04232.00000127@mb-mw.aol.com>

A correction.....

>After careful consideration of several events lately, I think it's time to
>start approaching our representatives and demand that a "kinder, gentler" FCC
>be replaced by the autocratic nonsense that proliferates today.

Should read: "...a kinder, gentler FCC SHOULD replace the autocratic
nonsense that proliferates today."

Sorry...

73

Steve, K4YZ

4292. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 15:04:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011214100444.25913.00000991@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 27289

In article <3C18E96D.42607287@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> "What is the
>> correlation between Morse code skill and technical skill, among [the
>> closed set of] licensed Amateur Radio operators?"
>
>Is this an essay question, or are you hoping for a numeric response????

Jim:

The former.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4293. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 15:04:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011214100444.25913.00000990@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 27290

In article <3C1985EF.B47466CB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>> > Half the nocode techs at Intel are engineers or technicians who
>> > simply don't choose to learn Morse code. At least one has a
>> > PhD degree in EE. I'd like to see Larry tangle with Dr. Williamson
>> > on a technical basis.
>>
>> ...not as much as I'd like to see the famed Dr. Williamson in a 25 wpm
>> CW ragchew with Larry.
>
>I'll loan him my SCS PTC2e. How does Larry like 100wpm?

Cecil:

I am incapable of manually sending/receiving CW at 100 wpm. If you're going to loan Doc Williamson a SCS PTC2e, then you would have to provide me with one also, in order to be fair. However, somehow I don't think you had fairness in mind -- did you?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4294. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 15:14:43 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1A1789.E7F94707@gte.net>
Source record: 27291
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >We give cops guns because their lives are more
> >valuable.
>
> So a CHL makes the license holder more important?

There is a pecking order. Governors and mayors are
the most valuable then powerful men then professionals
like doctors and lawyers. The Police are just under mayors.

Look there are so many elite who see the police and
the military as a bunch of losers who are there to die
for them. People like you who make huge amounts
of money and live in big fancy houses. I have them
in my community. The military is not allowed to recruit
in the local high school as their kids are going to college
and the military is for those who can't really make it.

People like you see themselves as too valuable to get
their hands dirty. Sorry but your life is not worth that
of a police officer, a fire fighter or a soldier.

4295. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 15:23:55 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <fQoS7.295266$W8.10167355@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27292

>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET) wrote:
>> All those books describe wiccan spells and magic, Kim. And, given a
>> few minutes more, I could probably double that list. So, obviously,
>> wiccans do claim they can do spells and magic.

> Jim Kelley (AC6XG) replied:
> I guess Wiccans don't believe that the first two people on Earth all of
> a sudden one day magically appeared here. Or that the wives of their
> male progeny also somehow as if by magic, inexplicably appeared out of
> thin air.

Nah, they know that kind of thing is just a technological trick done
with Star-Trek-like matter transporters. ;-)

Given Clarke's law ("Sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable
from magic"), and looking at what we do at the dawn of the 21st century
with wireless telephones, computer networks and "smart" bombs, both the
Wiccans and Christians of those early days would come away convinced
that we are all consorting with the devil on a connect-time-minute by
connect-time-minute basis.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4296. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 16:52:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1A2DD6.6F33A43C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27293

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Half the nocode techs at Intel are engineers or technicians who
> > > simply don't choose to learn Morse code. At least one has a
> > > PhD degree in EE. I'd like to see Larry tangle with Dr. Williamson
> > > on a technical basis.
> >
> > ...not as much as I'd like to see the famed Dr. Williamson in a 25 wpm
> > CW ragchew with Larry.
>
> I'll loan him my SCS PTC2e. How does Larry like 100wpm?

Probably as much as a basketball player likes some clown in cherry
picker on the basketball court. Both are farcial.

Dave K8MN

4297. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 17:06:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1A2443.E09EDBF8@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27294
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote:

>Are you now saying anyone with a

> > radio is being profiled?
>
> Given the events of Sept 11th, yes.

That's odd. The only radios used by the terrorists on Sept 11 were the same ones
the pilots use.
Any cop who suddenly starts profiling anyone with a mobile radio because of Sept 11
is a
paranoia-ridden loose cannon.(there are some of those)
The terrorists made extensive use of cellphones. So they should
be profiling cellphone users instead. Now THAT would keep 'em busy.

Dick
Retired Public Safety communicater

4298. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 17:30:19 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <738D5A26AE5597D0.E9CC54C10A63B588.794A486E4664F819@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27295
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 14 Dec 2001 15:14:43 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>People like you who make huge amounts
>of money and live in big fancy houses.

Shit! I must have been forgetting to pick up my paycheck for the last
two months! And I guess it's time to evict the clog-dancing bitch
that's been homesteading the upper floor of my big fancy house that
looks a hell of a lot like a one-bedroom apartment.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

4299. Re: It's Time To Demand A Re-Vamp of the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 17:35:58 UTC
From: paul harris <paul@sandwitch.org>
Message-ID: <4A8A59F2BDCDD311BFC800508BA36AC80BB3331B@www.premiersi.com>
Source record: 27298

So, what's stopping them from putting "/2002" on the end of their call?

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011214083429.04232.00000127@mb-mw.aol.com...
> After careful consideration of several events lately, I think it's
time to
> start approaching our representatives and demand that a "kinder, gentler"
FCC
> be replaced by the autocratic nonsense that proliferates today.
>
> The FCC of today is a joke. In this authors opinion, it has a long
way to
> go to pull itself out of the shoulder-shrugging, responsibility shirking,
> hand-washing, pass-the-buck attitude of the 70's and 80's.
>
> First of all, the below cited item is one of the "could have said yes
but
> said no "because we can"" instances where the FCC is just a bit too
impressed
> with itself to cooperate with the users of the spectrum.
>
> QUOTE: (from ARNewsline)
>
> THE 2002 WINTER OLYMPICS: FCC SAYS NO TO SPECIAL CALL SIGN
>
> An idea for a special events call sign to celebrate the 2002 Winter
Olympics
> has drawn a negative response from the FCC. Tom Schaefer, NY4I, of Sandy,
> Utah, had requested that the agency allow amateurs Utah hams to substitute
the
> number 2002 or 02 for the 7 in their callsign. This, for the time period
> preceding and up to though the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City.
But
> after mulling it over for a few months the Schaefer says the agency
responded
> with a definite no:
>
> UNQUOTE
>
> Never mind that even third-world nations do that very thing (allow
> temproary changes in calls for Olympic events, or that it would have not
> required anything more than a blanket STA for the period requested...Heck
> no...Why allow Amateurs to celebrate one of the truly (or at least as
close as

> it will ever get) de-politicised international events that we can take
pride
> in? ESPECIALLY in the wake of recent events... ! ! !
>
> Example: "We, the FCC, hereby allow any licensed Amateur Radio
Operator
> living within the State of Utah to substitute the figures "2002" for the
number
> "7" in thier callsign for the period of (dates of the event) in
recognition of
> the Olympics. Operators residing in Utah with a numeral other than "7"
may
> substitute thier numeral with the original numeral plus "02", ie K4YZ
would be
> K402YZ. Only stations with a permanent mailing address in Utah may
> participate. Have a nice day".
>
> See how easy that was? Took some GS-5 stenographer 2 minutes to type
up
> and another 30 minutes to get posted to the Federal Register or other
> authorized media.
>
> Second is my aversion to the FCC being allowed to exert it's
Victorian
> opinions on who they consider to be of "good character" to be a
"Commission
> Licensee"...I speak of persons who may have commited a crime in the past,
NOT
> related to radio, and are now prohibited or are sanctioned in thier quest
for a
> license, regardless of which radio service it may be in.
>
> I was always of the opinion and understanding that once time was
served,
> one's "debt to society" was paid and they were reassimilated into that
society.
> We are obviously NOT that society if we continue to punish people AFTER
their
> time is served.
>
> Next is my concern on the Agency's obvious lack of concern on
maintaining
> a balance between the needs of ALL citizens versus corporations which
would
> seek to make a profit from the finite resources of the electromagnetic
> spectrum. Again, this author does not believe that the FCC always acts in
the
> best interests of the citizenry, but rather manufacturers and other
corporate
> entities who can talk the smoother line.

>
> Evidence the FRS and MURS services, the 220-222mHz debacle, and the
recent
> attempt to liberalize Part 15 radiation limits. NONE of these acts were
> mandated by the needs of industry to meet an ongoing consumer need...they
were
> done to provide the opportunity to CREATE a market for thier wares.
>
> THAT is wrong.
>
> Next, I would like to know how the FCC comes up with these horrific
fines.
> While I will be the first to demand that violators be punished and
sanctioned,
> even those acts should be within reason and by the order of a court AFTER
due
> process of law...NOT because the FCC says "Because I Said So"....NAL's are
> un-Constitutional, in my non-law-school opinion.
>
> Lastly, I object in no uncertain terms to the passing of
responsibility of
> radiocommunication regulatory enforcement to agencies OTHER than the FCC
or
> other appropriately trained federal agency. (ie: local police or
sheriff's
> agencies) Yes, local police should have the authority to intervene in
cases
> where a CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER exists...to me, this means some jerk
jamming
> local emergency services, navigation aids or law enforcement
communications, or
> being able to take action against persons who are using radio to commit
> felonies or actively harass other citizens. This would be no more
different
> than a cop arresting someone who just buzzed the Mayor's house. The FAA
> regulates avaition, but no one would dare suggest that a threat to safety
was
> inappropriate for local law enforcement to take action on.
>
> As much as I would like to see the "freeband" mess cleaned up, the
passing
> of laws that allows local law enforcement to do this is wrong. As pointed
out
> by others, it is just one more obligation that already over-burdened
officers
> must now familiarize themselves with, and leaves the door open for
> misunderstanding and confusion with law abiding users of the radio
spectrum.
>
> There are other matters that I see occuring with the FCC that give me

> cause, both as a licensee and as a citizen, to be concerned for the
welfare of
> spectrum management within the United States. It's time to clean house.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

4300. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 17:36:44 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1A38CF.DAA1D844@gte.net>
Source record: 27297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

>
> >Are you now saying anyone with a
>
> > > radio is being profiled?
> >
> > Given the events of Sept 11th, yes.
>
> That's odd. The only radios used by the terrorists on Sept 11 were the same ones
> the pilots use. Any cop who suddenly starts profiling anyone with a mobile radio
> because of Sept 11 is a paranoia-ridden loose cannon.(there are some of those) The
> terrorists made extensive use of cellphones. So they should
> be profiling cellphone users instead. Now THAT would keep 'em busy.

Come up to Chicago and listen to the people
using ham gear to send CW number messages.
Speculation is that it is Serbs and Bosnians in
the region doing some form of espionage. But
then it could be the Nation of Islam.

And what if you were using ham gear to co-ordinate
criminal activity? How is a cop going to know who
you are, or if you are good guy or a bad guy? Every
one a cops meets could be a criminal. He never knows.

4301. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 17:39:01 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1A395C.5B6948C3@gte.net>
Source record: 27296
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >People like you who make huge amounts
> >of money and live in big fancy houses.
>
> Shit! I must have been forgetting to pick up my paycheck for the last
> two months! And I guess it's time to evict the clog-dancing bitch
> that's been homesteading the upper floor of my big fancy house that
> looks a hell of a lot like a one-bedroom apartment.

Well, I live in a college town. With lots of people
who have Ph.ds and masters degrees and see themselves
as too valuable to serve in the military. That is for the
"little people" to do. They honestly believe that the cops
are there to die for them. As if they were the president
or something.

4302. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 18:41:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1A47E5.B2BD7B02@uci.edu>
Source record: 27299

CAM wrote:
> I suspect Dwight is telling us, in so many words, that he has never
> worked for a large successful technology company and is totally
> ignorant of such.

Well, that's kinda what I got out of it. Personally, I can't imagine not being able to close the door when discussing a delicate topic with someone in the office.

(Intel being bery bery good, to me right now.)

4303. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 19:59:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gocbtjl.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27301
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:34:08 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>If there is a question about a radio, it is just easier
>to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
>courts settle. I have said this over and over. This
>includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
>a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
>chief's problem, and not theirs.

It becomes THEIR problem when (a) a civilian complaint is filed with the department for misconduct and (b) they are a named defendant in a Sect. 1983 suit - damages (and attorney fees) for violation of civil rights under color of authority.

All the LEOs whom I know (and I know a bunch - I am a retired Federal agent) are very concerned that they do not achieve that sort of "fame". It's a career-stopper and a wallet-emptier.

The watchword is "think twice before acting".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

4304. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 19:59:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gocc9wm.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27300
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:45:11 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>Again, the average cop sees most of this a matter for the
>courts. If he has question, his automatic response is to
>throw it over to the courts to decide. That is the professional
>thing to do.

If he has questions the professional thing to do is to refer it to his supervisory manager - Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, all the way up the chain. Making those decisions was what we got paid the "big bucks" for. One of them either has the right answer or will get it from the on-call DA.

Been there - done that.

The ham will be very lucky if s/he is in Phoenix and the on-call DA is my "baby" brother who just happens to have the call sign KE7DX....

>And if some ham becomes an asshole and
>argues with him, he wants video tape to take to court.

Whatever works.....I used to just stand there and smile because I knew that I was right. That's what intensive training was all about.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4305. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 19:59:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gocdh9n.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27302
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 19:24:00 GMT, W6DKN wrote:

>> <<< SNIP >>
>> If I have a CB radio, I am federally licensed to operate that radio.
>> <<< SNIP >>>
>
>And when was this license issued? If it's legit, why are you not found in
>the FCC ULS?

CB is one of the Radio Services licensed by "blanket authorization"
as specified in Section 307(e)(1) of the Comm Act rather than by
individual licenses.

Operation in compliance with FCC Rules Part 95 is authorized
without "individual licenses". At the discretion of the FCC,
operation in violation of Part 95 may be considered "unlicensed
operation".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4306. Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 20:04:40 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1A5B59.75806518@psu.edu>
Source record: 27303

Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
things? 8^)

Or maybe the newsgroup needs renamed to
alt.one.step.closer.to.extinction , with only one free association thread.

- mike -

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <i85R7.290107$W8.9721109@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:
>
> >> "NOBODY EXPECTS THE SPANISH INQUISITION!!!"
> >>
> >> followed by scenes of torture involving a (dish) rack, being poked with
> >soft
> >> cushions, and being forced to sit in "the comfy chair".
> >>
> >And, of course, they had some sweet little old lady sitting there taking the
> >'abuse'...
>

4307. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 20:56:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gocgvao.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27304
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 14 Dec 2001 17:36:44 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>Come up to Chicago and listen to the people
>using ham gear to send CW number messages.
>Speculation is that it is Serbs and Bosnians in
>the region doing some form of espionage. But
>then it could be the Nation of Islam.

The last time we DFed HF numbers station signals they turned out to
be coming from a well-fenced and patrolled US military compound in
Warrington, VA sending traffic for Guess-Who.

Your taxpayer dollars at work. Have they moved the facility ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4308. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 21:03:50 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <RJtS7.37105$AR6.1941461@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27305
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Hi Phil,
Nice to "see" you. Can't disagree with you--especially the very LAST
statement you made.
It applies to me as well. Nothing like getting up in the morning and
deciding to tackle an
antenna project you've been putting off......! LOL!

Jerry
K4KWH

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gocbtjl.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:34:08 GMT, N9NWO wrote:
>
> >If there is a question about a radio, it is just easier
> >to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
> >courts settle. I have said this over and over. This
> >includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
> >a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
> >chief's problem, and not theirs.
>
> It becomes THEIR problem when (a) a civilian complaint is filed with
> the department for misconduct and (b) they are a named defendant in
> a Sect. 1983 suit - damages (and attorney fees) for violation of
> civil rights under color of authority.
>
> All the LEOs whom I know (and I know a bunch - I am a retired
> Federal agent) are very concerned that they do not achieve that sort
> of "fame". It's a career-stopper and a wallet-emptier.
>
> The watchword is "think twice before acting".
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> Retired and loving every minute of it....
> Work was getting in the way of my hobbies
>
>

4309. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 21:39:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1A7196.E20D00B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27306

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C1985EF.B47466CB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM wrote:
> >> > Half the nocode techs at Intel are engineers or technicians who
> >> > simply don't choose to learn Morse code. At least one has a
> >> > PhD degree in EE. I'd like to see Larry tangle with Dr. Williamson
> >> > on a technical basis.
> >>
> >> ...not as much as I'd like to see the famed Dr. Williamson in a 25 wpm
> >> CW ragchew with Larry.
> >>
> >I'll loan him my SCS PTC2e. How does Larry like 100wpm?
>
> I am incapable of manually sending/receiving CW at 100 wpm. If you're
> going to loan Doc Williamson a SCS PTC2e, then you would have to
> provide me with one also, in order to be fair. However, somehow I don't
> think you had fairness in mind -- did you?

Dave initiated the unfair stuff. I'm just trying to level the field.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4310. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 21:41:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1A71FC.5013EAAE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27307

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I'll loan him my SCS PTC2e. How does Larry like 100wpm?
>
> Probably as much as a basketball player likes some clown in cherry
> picker on the basketball court. Both are farcial.

PACTOR II is farcial?
--
cheers, Cecil, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4311. Re: Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 21:46:08 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1A7320.44A1EF85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27308

mike coslo wrote:
> Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
> any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
> things? 8^)

Whatsamatta Mike, don't you like a challenge? :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4312. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 21:50:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011214165011.04115.00000292@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 27309

In article <0380792F2B38EAE0.67AC83CCEA01E1AF.6022DCDBD7666DA1@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 07 Dec 2001 19:39:21 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>This is my plan, not Cecil's plan.

I's a very cunning plan, too.

>>I say taxes should pay for high quality free
>>schools from pre-K through at least a bachelor's degree - for everyone that
>>can make the grades.

> Here, I agree completely. The idea that you have to get in
>debt (sometimes quite deeply) to pay for an education that will only
>profit the nation through your increased earning potential and other
>contributions likely from a good education, is ridiculous.

There is no guarantee that more education will result in beneficial paybacks to
society. But that's the way to bet. Free, appropriate public education for all
is both an investment in the future and a payback for the past.
>
>On the other hand, we DO need to insure that the money is well
>spent--by a very radical overhaul of our school systems.

>Right now, our schools are often violent, frequently a joke
>academically, and only occasionally more interested in academics than
>in sports standings. Those need to change.

Yup. But first you have to understand why some schools are like that (not all
of them are). And you have to see what the "good" schools do that the "bad"
schools don't.
>
>As far as violence goes--we need alternative schools for those
>who demonstrate that they pose a risk to other students in
>conventional schools. Those alternative schools should have the same
>academic requirements as other schools, but less opportunity for
>violence (i.e., all classes in a single room with the _teachers_
>changing rooms every period instead of the students, no sports or
>other competitive activities (phys ed would consist of exercise and
>health training alone), metal detectors, and on-premises juvenile
>officers from the local police department.

When I was a kid there were references to "reform school". We were told that
problem kids got sent there to be straightened out. They were described as a
cross between prison and boot camp. We were ignorant enough to believe the
stories.

>Youths who are caught in
>ANY school in possession of a firearm would be permanently expelled
>from any public school system below the college level--it would be up
>to their parents to pay for a suitable private institution.

And if the parents can't or won't pay for it? What if a 10 year old kid that's been endlessly bullied brings one of his parents' small pistols to school without their permission?

What about knives, iron pipes, and other weapons?

>The same
>would apply to any youth who was convicted of committing a violent
>felony or drug sales (including alcohol and tobacco) on school
>premises.

How about simple possession? Would the sale of a single cigarette get a kid kicked out of school for life?

>With respect to academics, they HAVE to come first.

Nope. Order and discipline have to come first.

>Schools
>should receive Federal (not state) accreditations based TOTALLY on
>meeting rigid academic standards.

Measured by what criteria? How the students do, or what material is covered?

Would there be different levels of the same material? In my high school, we had four "tracks", plus AP (advanced placement, good for college credit). "One size fits all" doesn't work because the gifted kids are bored outa their minds and the kids with needs are struggling.

>Computer education, multiple lab
>based science courses, modern educational resources, and teachers who
>are qualified to teach (i.e., hold at least a Bachelors degree in the
>specific field they are teaching, and meet rigid continuing education
>requirements)--with a waiver of any requirement for course work in
>education for anyone with a Master's or better and 2 years or more
>experience teaching (K-12 or college level) in the field being taught
>(at the High School level--elementary instruction would still require
>ed courses).

Who is gonna pay for all that?

>If a school can't afford both to meet those requirements
>and support other activities such as organized sports, social
>activities, band, etc., then the money MUST go to academics first.

And if cutting those activities doesn't yield enough money?

What about art, music, and special ed?
>
>Students who do not successfully demonstrate that they have
>passed all the requirements for a course the should be required to

>retake the course before they get any credit for it (the "grade"
>system needs to go--it's unworkable with the range of subjects--and be
>replaced by a credit system where you need "x" credits in Science,
>English, Geography, History, Math, etc., to graduate and your
>grade-level status is measured by the number of credits earned, not by
>how many years you've attended alone).

So every course would be pass-fail? Bad idea. Very bad idea.

>Today, schools have to
>practically be "begged" by parents to hold a child back a year because
>he or she doesn't understand the material--and as a result we have HS
>grads who are functionally illiterate thorough out the USA. If we were
>on a credit based graduation plan, that would not be the case.

Grades are still a good idea. A "D" would mean you just barely made the
requirements, "C" means OK, "B" means better-than- average, and A means
outstanding. Or something like that.
>
>Personally, I favor a modified version of the German system.
>All children would the same type of school for the first eight years,
>after which (based on testing of subjects studied and personal
>interests) they would move on to either a "college prep" HS (where
>such requirements as four science course credits including Chemistry,
>Biology, Physics and an elective, math through Calculus I, 2 years of
>a foreign language, four courses in humanities including philosophy
>(or logic), world culture, literature, and an elective, four courses
>in Social Sciences--including Psychology, Sociology, Political Science
>and an elective, and similar requirements would stand; a "trade
>school" HS where students would study academic subjects for 1/2 day
>(with appx. 1/2 the requirements above, 2 sciences, humanities, &
>social sciences, Math through Intermediate Algebra, etc.) then spend
>the other 1/2 day studying a skilled trade (preferably with training
>and resources provided by the private sector as they are in Germany);
>and a "general" HS which would prepare people for entry level
>positions in business and industry (or for the military, etc.) and
>would consist of about 3/4 of the requirements given for the academic
>HS above, as well as a larger number of electives.

Why can't all of this be available in one school? Why predestine a kid at the
end of 8th grade?

And what of the schools in communities where "industry" cannot offer enough
apprenticeships?

>Students who wished
>to enter the University, would have to either complete the academic
>program, or--if they choose/qualify for another program instead--would
>be required to make up those courses in which they are deficient in
>Community Colleges before being admitted as First Year University
>students.

That part works OK.
>
> At one time, the US ranked number ONE in the world for public
>education. According to the same (UN) studies, we now rank number
>SEVENTEEN!

First you have to understand WHY.

For one thing, the US has one of the shortest school days and shortest school years in the developed world. For example, Japanese 8th graders have spent more time in class than many American HS seniors. Why are both the school day and school year in the USA so short?

For another thing, most public schools are underfunded for the job they are expected to do. One of the reasons sports are so important is that they bring in the dough, plain and simple.

Most other developed countries have relatively homogenous populations. The USA doesn't.

>That's completely ridiculous--particularly since our
>graduate schools are STILL rated number one.

Think about WHY.

>As a college professor, I
>constantly encounter the problem in terms of under-prepared students
>who, despite high GPAs, manage to graduate from HS with major
>deficiencies in reading, writing, math, and most of all critical
>thinking skills.

I have had tenured professors with major deficiencies in reading, writing, math, critical thinking and most of all TEACHING skills.

>Over the years, I've seen the problem grow steadily
>worse, and the only answer our society seems to accept is the
>combination of grade inflation (at Harvard, a Professor MUST submit an
>explanation for his decision if he or she grades ANY student below a
>3.5!) and "dumbed down" text books (the "concise" editions that are
>becoming more common in classrooms).

Think about WHY. How much does it cost to go to Harvard?

>That's a disgrace to our
>educational system, and offensive to any serious teacher--the main
>reason I've decided to retire early next year is because I refuse to
>"dumb down" my classes and it won't be much longer before that becomes
>an institutional requirement at my institution as well.

We don't have an "educational system" in this country. What we have is a patchwork quilt of public school districts, private schools, colleges, universities, accrediting bodies, regulations, unfunded mandates, and other jury rigged stuff. If the electric power system were run that way, the whole country's electricity would make California's rolling brownouts look good.
>

>Of course, most of the problem is coming from the fact that we
>insist on using our schools as surrogate parents--they are expected to
>not only teach academics but to teach "morality," deal with personal
>problems, and never, ever, risk causing a student to lose self-esteem
>by holding him/her back in school (as if the inability to
>intelligently read and understand the instructions on a Campbell's
>Soup can--one definition of functional illiteracy--won't cause someone
>to lose self-esteem later in life!).

Schools HAVE to act "in loco parentis". There's no escaping it.

>Parents seldom hold their kids
>responsible for their grades--they blame the schools instead.

Often, the parents are right. Often they are wrong.

>And, of
>course, perish the thought that little Johnny might get expelled for a
>little thing like taking an AK-47 to class . . .

First you gotta know WHY Johnny did it.

But what about other behaviors? Suppose a girl in one of your proposed schools gets preggers - does she get kicked out? What about the father of the child? What if she gets an abortion?

If you allow the girl to stay but kick out the cigarette seller, you're saying irresponsible sex is OK but selling one cigarette is not. If you allow her to stay if she gets an abortion but kick her out if she has the baby, you are promoting abortion. If you do the reverse, you're promoting the reverse. And then there's the father, if he is even known. All sorts of issues. But no matter what you do the school is teaching values.

> We need to revise our programs to approach poverty
>intelligently. At a minimum we need to divide the poor into four
>groups:
>
> 1. Those who are only poor due to poor education or work
>skills. Here, supporting the person/family while they are making up
>for that deficit is a same and forward thinking approach. So long as
>the person demonstrates sound academic progress toward an agreed upon
>educational/training goal they would receive the necessary support--if
>they stopped, so would it. The entire process should be planned in
>advance (subject to change if recommended by educational counselors)
>and treated as a contract between the recipient and the state.

A contract between the recipient of the benefits and the providers. OK so far
>
> 2. Those who are incapable of working or profiting from
>education. This would include the disabled, the mentally ill, the
>mentally challenged (i.e., retarded), etc. These are the people who
>legitimately CAN'T support themselves and they are a group we need to
>help without stripping them of dignity as is currently done by our

>social service programs.

I disagree that they are stripped of dignity. But I agree with the rest. Some folks just can't take care of themselves, and a safety net is needed.

The field of mental health is a particularly tricky one. Under current laws, a person cannot be involuntarily committed to a mental-health institution for more than a short time unless a court decides the person is a real and immediate danger to him/herself or others. End result is revolving door commitments.

But what constitutes "a real and immediate danger" and "mental illness"? Those things are value judgements. Is heroin or crack addiction a mental illness or a "lifestyle choice"?
>
> 3. The under employed. This group would consist of those who
>are sincerely trying, are employed, but simply don't have the earning
>capacity to be self-sufficient (i.e., the working poor). Here we need
>to both help the family sustain itself, and help the wage-earners to
>improve their job skills and move into higher paying jobs as a result
>(i.e., education or specialized training).

Really just a subset of 1).
>
> 4. The lazy or indolent. This is a broad category for those
>who seem to demonstrate no particular interest in getting off welfare
>and earning a living (i.e., the people we always have held up to us as
>"examples" of welfare types). Here we need to insure that the children
>are provided for--by placing them in alternative settings if nothing
>else works--and that's about it. Such families, if they want to remain
>together, would be required to either participate in
>training/educational programs (number 1 above), to put in at least 20
>hours of community service work per week, or to demonstrate (through
>participation in job preparation programs) that they are actively
>seeking, and willing to accept, employment. Initially, such a family
>would be eligible for only 90 days of assistance unless one of the
>alternatives were met. After the 90 days, if they couldn't demonstrate
>that the basic needs of the children were being met, they would be
>referred to child protection services for further investigation and
>response.

In other words, they need to get their act together or lose their kids and starve.
>
> In ALL cases, I believe in a universal access to medical
>treatment.

Paid for how and by whom?

A crack-addicted HIV positive woman in premature labor shows up at a big-city ER. Hospital admits her, baby is born with all sorts of problems. Woman signs herself out as soon as she can walk out of the hospital. Hospital spends a

quarter million or more on her and the baby, who either dies or winds up with multiple chronic health problems. Who pays for all that care? What happens ten months later when she shows up again in the same condition?

The above scenario is not hypothetical. Ask K4YZ.

>There is simply no reason our nation should not consider
>the medical needs of all of our citizens to be a major priority.

Agreed. But there's a catch.

> The
>simplest approach would be to use a list such as that developed in
>Oregon by doctors to determine what conditions would and would not be
>covered by Federal medical insurance (i.e., preventative medicine
>should be number ONE--beyond emergency medicine, of course-

Whoa. Let's be clear what you are saying:

Emergency medicine is #1
Prevention is #2

>-and
>cosmetic surgery--except in the case of accident or severe
>disfigurement--would not be covered) with an eye toward prevention of
>disease and alleviating suffering. Once a list has been made, the
>government could open bidding to major insurers, granting the contract
>to insure all citizens of the US for ALL of those conditions for a
>three year period to the lowest bidder who would be bound by both
>contract and criminal law to adhere to the conditions of their
>contract for the period.

And if nobody bids, or the bids are very high? The contract you are describing is so big no insurer would go after it. It would need to be broken down regionally, at least.

>That would allow universal coverage w/o the
>inefficiency of government administration. The cost of the insurance
>would come from taxes on businesses, thus effectively spreading the
>cost across all areas of society.

No, it would concentrate the cost onto businesses alone. Unless there is some sort of value scale, organic food growers could wind up paying the same rates as tobacco companies. Does that make sense?

> Because firms would no longer have
>to provide higher-cost medical insurance (they COULD offer
>"supplementary insurance" to cover areas not addressed by the
>government insurance), the savings realized would cover the tax costs,
>probably (due to the economies of scale resulting from insuring such a
>wide range of people) at far less cost than they were previously
>paying.

Maybe. Maybe not. Businesses today don't have to provide medical insurance at all. They do it to attract workers. Your plan would make it mandatory and drive many businesses under.

>Self employed people would pay the same tax and the poor
>would, of course, be covered by state aid.

Paid for by....?

Now here's the catch:

First off, somebody somewhere has to make value judgements on all of this. For example, who is really disabled and who is faking? Who is really trying to get work and who is just lazy? What constitutes an emergency medical condition? What constitutes "disfigurement" enough to be covered?

Somebody has to make VALUE JUDGEMENTS on all these and many more issues.

What about irresponsible behavior by those covered by your proposed universal medical insurance? In the medical and life insurance systems I know, tobacco users pay higher premiums than nonusers because of the health implications of tobacco use. This acts as an incentive for tobbaco users to change their behavior. But as I read your proposed system, everyone would get the same care regardless of their behavior.

Of course a person cannot be held responsible for medical conditions that are not a direct result of their own irresponsible behavior. But what about those conditions which ARE a result of such behavior?

I just read an article in the Philadelphia Inquirer about the fattening of America. The number and percentage of overweight adults and children has been rising steadily for more than 10years (overweight being defined as 30 or more pounds above the recommended weight for a given height). The health implications of being overweight are well documented. Weight-related and -impacted health problems get progressively worse as one gets older, and the US population is, indeed, aging.

By any rational measure, being overweight should have health insurance cost implications, because it is behavior-caused. Would your system reward those who keep their weight down? How?
>
> What I don't support is the simple elimination of all
>programs, as the Libertarians would have.

We agree on that!

>I don't _trust_ the private
>charities and churches to be able to take the place of the government
>in providing for the funding (it just isn't going to happen)--and I
>don't believe in just leaving people--particularly children--without a
>lifeline.

Sure. But somebody has to decide where the safety net is, and what happens if a person simply won't take responsibility for themselves.

>I don't like paying taxes any more than anyone else does,
>but I'd rather pay them for sound social programs to reduce poverty
>than to fund some useless pork barrel project that exists only to win
>re-election for a congresscritter.

Then you have to convice the congresscritter that he won't get reelected by playing the game that way.

How you gonna insure responsibility at all levels, Rick?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4313. Re: Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 21:52:32 UTC
From: mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1A74A0.E6F6DFAD@psu.edu>
Source record: 27310

I'm challenged enough to begin with! 8^P Maybe I should wait until
after the asprin kicks in to read the newsgroup.

- mike -

CAM wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote:
> > Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
> > any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
> > things? 8^)
>
> Whatsamatta Mike, don't you like a challenge? :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4314. Re: Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 22:11:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1A790A.2EF67DF5@uci.edu>
Source record: 27311

Hi Mike,

I started just sorting by date rather than by thread. As you pointed out, the name of the thread is superfluous to the actual topic anyway. I cleaned out all the older posts, and just follow the latest ones. As ham radio newsgroups go, r.r.a.antenna is the one with the most actual ham radio related topics. This group is really just another of the many argument clinics available on the internet.

Besides, as Dave Barry says: "There is a very fine line between "hobby" and "mental illness." :-)

mike coslo wrote:
>
> I'm challenged enough to begin with! 8^P Maybe I should wait until
> after the asprin kicks in to read the newsgroup.
>
> - mike -
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > mike coslo wrote:
> > > Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
> > > any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
> > > things? 8^)
> >
> > Whatsamatta Mike, don't you like a challenge? :-)
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP

4315. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 22:24:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1A7C3E.6A881DE8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27312

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'll loan him my SCS PTC2e. How does Larry like 100wpm?
> >
> > Probably as much as a basketball player likes some clown in cherry
> > picker on the basketball court. Both are farcial.
>
> PACTOR II is farcial?

Your statements are. I thought "Doc" Williamson didn't want you
bandying his name about.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

4316. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-14 23:55:22 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1a9093.2222442@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27313
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 14 Dec 2001 17:36:44 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >Are you now saying anyone with a
>>
>> > > radio is being profiled?
>> >
>> > Given the events of Sept 11th, yes.
>>
>> That's odd. The only radios used by the terrorists on Sept 11 were the same ones
>> the pilots use. Any cop who suddenly starts profiling anyone with a mobile radio
>> because of Sept 11 is a paranoia-ridden loose cannon.(there are some of those) The
>> terrorists made extensive use of cellphones. So they should
>> be profiling cellphone users instead. Now THAT would keep 'em busy.
>
>Come up to Chicago and listen to the people
>using ham gear to send CW number messages.
>Speculation is that it is Serbs and Bosnians in
>the region doing some form of espionage. But
>then it could be the Nation of Islam.

Assuming there's any truth to the CW number
message transmissions originating in Chicago, the
FCC would have no problem tracking the source
transmitter. Now the question must be...how do
YOU (N9NWO) know they are ham gear?

>And what if you were using ham gear to co-ordinate
>criminal activity? How is a cop going to know who
>you are, or if you are good guy or a bad guy? Every
>one a cops meets could be a criminal. He never knows.

So what, the ownership of ham gear is NOT against
ANY law. Cops that confiscate equipment without justification
are not needed on any police force.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4317. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 00:06:00 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1a91c4.2527654@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:45:11 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >So far towns, cities, states etc can do anything until they
>> >write some type of Laws regarding this issue.
>>
>> You did mean "can't", right ??
>>
>> >Congress only gave local
>> >jurisdiction the ability to police this the police will have some type of
>> >idea of the laws they will be enforcing. Otherwise they will call for
>> >back-up, defer to a higher ranking supervisor, something to releave liabilty
>> >from them when possible, they cannot go about and won't go about blindly
>> >enforcing Laws.
>>
>> This communications lawyer sees it from the viewpoint that The
>> Congress gave the local police no more authority than the FCC has,
>> just the ability to enforce the FCC's "unlicrensed CB" regulations.
>>
>> This means no random stops and searches, no forced entries without a
>> court order (warrant), no "confiscation", no excess fines above the
>> monetary penalties that the FCC can levy, no jail time for Rule
>> violations, and no making up their own rules about stuff that does
>> not appear in the FCC Rules.
>>
>> >I just don't see it happen that way in this day in age when people are as
>> >lawsuit crazy against LEO's.
>>
>> You are so right.
>
>What you have to understand is that many hams feel
>that the cops have NO right to inspect them, to ask
>questions.

Inspect the person? The equipment? In either
case...WHY? On what basis?

IF I was stopped for any reason and a cop asked me what
was the radio on my dash, I'd simply say it is my
amateur radio and that should be the end of it.

> I am not talking about rogue cops but rather
>the officer who is professional and whose biggest goal
>every day is to make it home alive.

I support those guys and gals and they don't pull nutty
confiscations or mobile stops without probable cause.

>These officers want video of every traffic stop.

So do I. It is a great tool that protects both the
police and the public from false accusations by either.

> They have "rights"
>and no one, not even the police (in their mind) have the
>right to tell them how to live.

We all have rights and YES, the cops d NOT have the
right to tell me or anyone else how to live. Law enforcement
(study those two words) is to ONLY enforce the laws, not
to dictate how anyone lives as long as the person is
obeyng the law.

>And too many hams are big jerks.

Too many (isert any description) are jerks too.

>This AF CAP chap just does not get it. Let the AF CID
>come, as far as they are concerned that is a matter for the
>courts. Once the cop does his job, the investigation, he is
>more than happy to let the courts deal with it. And that
>includes lawsuits. That is the chief's worry, not his.

It absoultely is the cops worry when the cop strays
from proper procedure and enforcement.

>As it
>is, too many file false lawsuits every day against cops. It
>has become a cost of doing business.

Whuch is why video tape is such a great idea.

>Again, the average cop sees most of this a matter for the
>courts. If he has question, his automatic response is to
>throw it over to the courts to decide. That is the professional
>thing to do.

That becomes irrisponsible if it happens TOO often and
the police don't win.

>And if some ham becomes an asshole and
>argues with him, he wants video tape to take to court.

Again, I fully support the use of video.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4318. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 00:13:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1a94ec$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27315

Jealous, eh? At least I got sumpthin' to flop. Figured you ain't been
readin' much lately.

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C198CDC.C5B9D20F@townsqr.com...
> Whats it to ya, floppy titty?
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Didya read up on that, too, little Dicky?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C18355D.1A5DAFC8@townsqr.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > A foreign terrorist, who openly has
> > > > > declared his intent to do whatever possible
> > > > > to destroy our homeland and our way of
> > > > > life, has no right to protection under our
> > > > > Constitution. None.
> > > >
> > > > It's not just the law of our own Constitution, Hans. It's also
> > > > international law, and the law in most "civilized" nations. Most
> > > > countries don't judge a person by what he says, but by what he
> > > > actually does.
> > > >
> > > > > It is God's responsibility to judge Bin
> > > > > Laden. It is our responsibility to
> > > > > arrange the meeting.
> > > >
> > > > Spoken like a patriot, Hans. Our forefathers would be proud of
such
> > sentiments.
> > > >
> > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > Our forefathers would have pronounced you a nutcase long ago.

> > >
>

4319. Re: Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 00:15:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1a956b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27316

We like it just the way it is... Keep up.

Kim W5TIT

"mike coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3C1A5B59.75806518@psu.edu...
> Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
> any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
> things? 8^)
>
> Or maybe the newsgroup needs renamed to
> alt.one.step.closer.to.extinction , with only one free association thread.
>
>
> - mike -
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <i85R7.290107$W8.9721109@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> > "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:
> >
> > >> "NOBODY EXPECTS THE SPANISH INQUISITION!!!"
> > >>
> > >> followed by scenes of torture involving a (dish) rack, being poked
with
> > >soft
> > >> cushions, and being forced to sit in "the comfy chair".
> > >
> > >And, of course, they had some sweet little old lady sitting there
taking the
> > >'abuse'...
> >

4320. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 00:20:41 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1a94da.3317574@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27317
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:34:08 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>>
>> >> You must not be reading my post--I won't HAVE to do anything: USAF will do
>> >> it FOR me. DOD equipment is issued on a Form 37. All I have to do is tell
>> >> the CID investigators WHO confiscated it, and THEY will be on the LEO like
>> >> stink on sh**.
>> >
>> >Think again. First the cops would just the
>> >car and the radios. Then when the CID
>> >folks show up, they will explain how you
>> >lipped off to the cops that you were some
>> >type of hot shot Air Force type. At that
>> >point, the investigation might be about your
>> >fitness to serve.
>>
>> Which is why I strongly endorse and support that
>> all police cars be equipped with both audio and video
>> recording equipment to document exactly what
>> happened. I have seen the absolute value in
>> these in both protecting the public against rogue
>> cops and protecting police against false accusations of
>> police brutality.
>
>Bill, I am not talking about rogue cops or
>even police brutality. Rather it is the cop
>who is a professional, who keeps his cool,
>but is not going to let some ham tell him that
>the cop has no right to inspect his radios
>and plays the hot shot.

INSPECT for WHAT reason. The radio in
the car is NOT illegal. The cop as NO need
to ask. If asked, I'd tell him what my radio is
and that's the end of it. What else would he
need or want to do?

>No cop will put up with that.

After telling the cop the radio is a ham rig (or CB,
or FRS, or private mobile, or whatever, just what
more could the cop ask?

>The average cop is trained to suspect everyone.
>Even other cops. They are trained that they

>are superior, the "force" of government, the
>thin blue line that keeps us a civilized society.
>And it is almost universal that the biggest goal
>that a cop will have is to make it home alive
>every night.

That is not the training I am aware of. Cops may have
the powerm but their application of that power must
be tempered with restraint and rational reasoning...or
they will end up off the force in many cases.

>If there is a question about a radio,

WHAT could be questioned?

>it is just easier
>to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
>courts settle. I have said this over and over.

Yes you have and you fail to see that any cop
that developes a histry of bad arrests, court
losses, etc won't go far as a cop.

> This
>includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
>a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
>chief's problem, and not theirs.

Believe it or not, cops can end up being criminally
prosecuted for departures from proper enforcement.

>This does not mean that they will keep the radios forever,
>as the AF CAP chap suggested. When the AF types come,
>it will go in front of a judge. And remember, this is only if
>there is question that the street officer can not settle quickly.

I repeat...what could be in question that the local cop
would have any role in or knowledge of?

>Too many Americans are jerks, assholes.

If they aren't breaking the law then so what?

>They believe that
>they have a right to do anything, and everything.

Again, unless they are breaking a law, so what...it
isn't a police matter.

>That they
>have NO responsibility to society or their fellow man.

Yet again, unless they are breaking a law, so what...it
isn't a police matter.
>

> And the cops want that attitude to end.

So do many others, but it ain't a police matter UNLESS
laws are being broken.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>

4321. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 00:25:05 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1a97f4.4112480@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27318
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:47:10 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> > And are you a police officer? Are you
>> > an attorney? NO. You are a Private
>> > Fucking Civilian (PFC) with little contact
>> > with the current system.
>>
>> Don't believe everything your small mind thinks up. You don't know who or
>> what I am and what systems I have contact with. Again all I see from you is
>> opinions Just like a true politician full of shit as usual.
>>
>> > Understand this. The police and the
>> > military are your superiors.
>>
>> Says who You?
>>
>> >Their lives are far more valuable than yours.
>>
>> Again says who some 2 bit local politican from bumfuct indiana?
>>
>> > And no cop is going to take your lip,
>> > that you are some big bad ass ham
>> > operator. In his mind, he does not
>> > care about your rights. He cares
>> > about making home every night.
>>
>> He had better care about my rights they are just as important as his. So all
>> cops walk around with attitudes is what you are saying. Is it screw Joe
>> Public? Does he think he is "Above The Law" Does every cop feel this way ?
>> Perhaps Daniel Marvin can answer a few questions.
>
>We give cops guns because their lives are more
>valuable. Mayors and governors have bodyguards
>for the same reasons.

We allow police to be armed, not because their lives are more valuable
than anyone else, but simply because the police are far more
likly to be confronted with the need to defend themselves against
a felon. The police face that every day they are on duty.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4322. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 00:33:19 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1a99e5.4608724@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27319
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:56:05 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> > The point is that if you off half cocked about your "rights"
>> > and how you are some big shot ham operator/CAP big
>> > wig, you are in the wrong. That is not the way to deal
>> > with cops. Your lack of respect towards them is shameful.
>>
>> And you are an example of why people mouth off to cops. A police
>> officer deserves no more respect than any other citizen. They also
>> should treat others with respect until given sufficient reason to
>> do otherwise. Mouthing off is NOT a sufficient reason.
>>
>> > The police and military are your superiors.
>>
>> No, they are our employees - although there are those (and you
>> appear to be one of them) who are deluded into thinking otherwise.
>
>Not your employees. The mayor hired them, not you.
>You are but a taxpayer and you have no choice in paying
>taxes. Unless you have the money and position to get
>mayors elected then you will have a hard time influencing
>the average big city mayor.

The police, mayor, and every other city, county,
sate or town employees are PUBLIC servants. They
serve all of us. That is apparently a concept N9NWO
is either unfamiliar with or unwilling to accept (IMHO).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4323. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 00:36:08 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1a9a66.4738079@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27320
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 13 Dec 2001 00:21:50 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>"middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com> wrote:
>> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
>> >
>> > The way you were going at it was that you
>> > were making it out that you were some big
>> > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
>> > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
>> > that cop were to get off.
>>
>> And the way your were going at it was all cops are bad guys who don't
>> care about you or your rights. Especially the rookie who will arrest you
>> first and ask questions later because he is unsure of the law.
>>
>Arrest now,ask questions later,is a revenue producer. Even more so now,
>every town crys broke. Coincedence? I think not!

False arrests are EXPENSIVE to government. An arrest
generates NO revenue. Only a conviction MIGHT
generate revenue (usually traffic fines). Criminal
charges rarely result in any significant revenue gain
to government at all. The prosecution costs alone
are an expense.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4324. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 00:44:58 UTC
From: "Peter J. Bertini" <commquart@home.com>
Message-ID: <e2xS7.104044$Y6.10304882@news1.rdc1.ct.home.com>
Source record: 27321
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

We've had a lot of truckers using 2 meter repeaters in this area.

They have always been good operators from what I've seen, and I've
a repeater owner/operator/trustee for 31 years.

Pete

"Tazanator" <tazanator1@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:7wbS7.20905$7y.231436@rwcrnsc54...
> Well I will say sorry about the course language, but there is a bigger
> picture on this.
>
> I have studied and recieved a lowly tech lic for starters. However having
> driven semi's for years I can *try* to relate the truckers side. CB 19
has
>

4325. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 01:23:22 UTC
From: kmartin@pyrzqxgl.org
Message-ID: <137f7fad.0112141723.49879634@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27322

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:<013E602DE634ED7F.728E71F50A93391A.E22A1CD3DBCFA789@lp.airnews.net>...
> Even the Farm Bureau (arguably one of the most conservative
> organizations in the US) has voted unanimously to encourage congress
> to legalize it [hemp] as a cash crop.

I am quite certain that the foregoing is a false statement.

Kelly

4326. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 01:38:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AABC2.4A5F0481@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27323

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Wonder how many more "let's leave that one out"
> we can come up with. Let's see, Im mentioned 5
> or 6? companies I've worked for in a previous
> post. We'll leave them out, too. (snip)

Kim, the reason we don't look at specific companies is because any one of us can only have experience with a very limited number (hardly a valid sampling). In other words, our very limited experience at various companies means little when discussing national trends. And that is exactly why I've avoided mentioning specific companies as examples.

So, yes, our experiences do have some worth, but we also have to look business publications, recommendations of the experts in business law, recommendations of government agencies concerned with this, and so forth. And, whether you like it or not, the trend is towards more restrictions on private relationships between co-workers (twenty years ago, most companies didn't even have sexual harassment policies).

Finally, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4327. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 01:41:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AAC75.D32717A1@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27324

CAM wrote:
>
> Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> in public.

Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend is
towards more restrictions on intimate activities between co-workers.

As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4328. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 01:44:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AAD41.110E2959@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27325

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> You said "it is happening all over the country" in
> one of your posts.

No, I said it is a trend that is happening all over the country,
Kim. I never said it was happening in every company.

As I said before, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving
this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun
and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4329. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 01:49:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AAE6A.B0E4B053@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27326

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Or.....you could just take his word for it and leave
> it at that.

I never have challenged his word on it, Jim. I'm trying to talk
about companies in general. Cecil keeps centering solely on Intel.
Intel is not companies in general (and it is absurd to suggest that
all companies are like Intel, which seems to be the point to his argument).

As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4330. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 01:57:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AB023.9E99CE58@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27327

CAM wrote:
>
> Intel is one of the most successful companies of
> all time. Many Silicon Valley companies copy
> their policies. (snip)

Nonsense. Now you're showing your ignorance, Cecil. "Many," indeed most, of the silicon valley companies are not even aware of Intel's policies, nor would they care to know. And the same could be said for the overwhelming majority of companies in this country. Intel is only one company in one industry - it does not define business policies in America.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4331. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:02:57 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <o6yS7.38909$AR6.2153443@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27328
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Don't "they" say that the worst weather is the best for antenna parties.
Right now, I'm rebuilding my 3" screwdriver unit. I got rear ended a couple
weeks ago--didn't hurt the
car, just dented the lower mast some on the antenna. It needed rebuilding
anyway. I built it about 6 years ago. I turned me a nice 3" loading coil
with some nice tinned copper (#14)
amd used a drill in a vice to spin the wire on the coil. This one was a
prototype. That thing
rocks on 75 meters and 40 meter AM. SHHHHHH! Don't be telling Dick
McCollum I've
been running "Ancient Mary". LOL!

73

Jerry
<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011214183715.457$ml@newsreader.com...
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> > Hi Phil,
> > Nice to "see" you. Can't disagree with you--especially the very LAST
> > statement you made.
> > It applies to me as well. Nothing like getting up in the morning and
> > deciding to tackle an
> > antenna project you've been putting off......! LOL!
> >
> > Jerry
> > K4KWH
> >>
> I hear ya Jerry,I've been too busy to buy the antenna,then I'll have to
let
> it sit around till it's below zero out, before getting around to the
> install part. These things take time ;-)
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

4332. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:03:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AB1B0.7B9EFDF9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27330

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Oh, OK, so now *your* experiences are more valid
> than mine. You're a greater charlatan than Dave,
> Dwight. End of discussion...with you.

Kim, is your memory really that short? I've already told you several times that your experiences are just as valid as mine. It's just that your experiences alone are not enough to rule out my experiences (just like mine are not enough to rule out yours). In other words, we have to look elsewhere instead of just centering on the limited experiences of one or two people in this newsgroup. That's why I brought up government agencies, sexual harassment laws, and so forth, earlier (before you and Cecil decided the world ended at your own experiences).

To repeat once again, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4333. Glenn Baxter Writes Riley...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:05:59 UTC
From: "Frankie Todd"
Message-ID: <9veb79iqu0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 27329
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Boy. First Glenn jams the Hams with his illegal transmissions, and NOW
he has the audacity to respond below to Riley after getting a warning letter
on Dec. 11, 2001. Here's hoping Glenn's license ain't long for this world.
:::::::::::::::::: :::::::::::::::::: ::::::::::::::::::::
From: Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., K1MAN
14 December 2001 2:47 P.M.

W. Riley Hollingsworth, Esq.
Special Counsel, Enforcement Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Gettysburg, Pa. 17325-7245

Mr. Hollingsworth:

This is in reference to your "warning letter" to me dated 11 December
2001. I was accurately advised about your letter to me and its exact
contents by both Keith Lamonica, W7DXX, and Dick Leavitt, W2CSQ, on 11
December 2001. This is an ethical violation of FCC ex parte rules of
procedure and supports my public allegations that you are a sleazy and
cheap politician as well as an unethical (alleged) attorney not fit
for employment by the United States Government.

Your letter illegally threatens me with a "license revocation or
renewal hearing" because I have (and fully intend to continue) filed
sworn affidavits with the U.S. Attorney regarding alleged criminal
violations of Sections 333 and 501 of the 1934 Communications Act.

My filing of these sworn affidavits are protected by the First
Amendment to the United Stated Constitution protecting free speech as
well as the Fourth Amendment regarding my absolute right to petition
the government for a redress of grievances.

Further, your letter, itself, and you openly encouraging radio
amateurs to "talk over" my radio transmissions, is also a criminal
violation of Section 501 as well as criminal obstruction of justice,
and I am taking legal steps to assure that you are vigorously
prosecuted and also removed from your employment at the FCC. I am
also taking legally sanctioned steps to assure that you are disbarred
as a licensed attorney (if, in fact, you are licensed to practice law
in any state.

For your information, K1MAN is fully licensed to transmit information
bulletins per a published schedule, and the K1MAN Bulletin Service is
specifically recognized to be lawful in a letter from FCC Chief of
Special Services, Robert H. Mc Namara, to Kenneth Black, G4WNE, dated

2 November 1989 (reference 7240-F). If you are really an attorney, and we question whether you are, you will understand the legal doctrine of res judicata that applies in this matter.

Finally, you have publicly lied to radio amateurs that you had something to do with putting my station, K1MAN, off the air in 1999 which, of course, is totally false. You have total immunity for this sort of defamation and libel, as you well know, and you take full public relations advantage of this government immunity. You are, however, a public disgrace to the Amateur Radio Service, to the Commission, to the legal profession, and to the United States of America.

We look forward to seeing you in court.

(signed)

Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., K1MAN
Registered Professional Engineer

cc: FCC Chairman Powell
U.S. Attorney, Bangor, Maine
Senator Susan Collins
Senator Olympia Snow
American Bar Association
W5YI
WA6ITF
ARRL
W2CSQ
W7DXX
Distribution

4334. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:08:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AB2C5.55DE0448@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27331

CAM wrote:
>
> According to my dictionary, Buddhists and Hindus are pagans.

That's alright - according to the difinitions, I'm a pagan too.

In case you haven't read this before, please note that, after
tonight, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two
months). It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again
when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4335. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:13:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AB3E1.19FDD6AA@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27332

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> As I said before, "From what I can tell, they seem
> to be using kind of a loose, existential definition
> of the term, Dwight."

There are dozens of books on the subject of wiccan spells and magic, Jim. When they say magic, they mean it just like you and I would if we used the word.

As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4336. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:17:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AB4E0.F19C68CB@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27334

Krell wrote:
>
> Great. You can list a bunch of books. The next
> question would be how many of them have you
> actually read.

Enough to be convinced that it is all a bunch of BS.

As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4337. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:21:22 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <CsyS7.163770$WW.10303476@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27333
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:o6yS7.38909$AR6.2153443@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
>
> Don't "they" say that the worst weather is the best for antenna parties.
> Right now, I'm rebuilding my 3" screwdriver unit. I got rear ended a
couple
> weeks ago--didn't hurt the
> car, just dented the lower mast some on the antenna. It needed
rebuilding
> anyway. I built it about 6 years ago. I turned me a nice 3" loading
coil
> with some nice tinned copper (#14)
> amd used a drill in a vice to spin the wire on the coil. This one was a
> prototype. That thing
> rocks on 75 meters and 40 meter AM. SHHHHHH! Don't be telling Dick
> McCollum I've
> been running "Ancient Mary". LOL!
>
> 73
>
> Jerry

Take your nostalgia trip. Just don't think it is the state of the art.

My only real problem with Antique Modulation is that it is so easily
upgemessed by idiots; see outlaw CB.

Dick

4338. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:22:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AB601.588BED59@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27337

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> Dwight, your listed books are probably a combination
> of good and crappy authors, I have no idea. I'll
> dismiss your sources as quickly as you dismiss
> others. How's that feel?

They're not my sources, Kim. They're books that directly contradict what you've said, written by people you yourself told me to get my information from. But, of course, since they prove you wrong, I'm not surprised you would attempt to dismiss them.

And, once again, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4339. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:23:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1AB423.28815664@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27335

Jim Kelley wrote:
> (Intel being bery bery good, to me right now.)

I'm glad I exercised my stock options in 1998. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4340. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:27:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1AB50C.16F429FF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27336

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> > in public.
>
> Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend is
> towards more restrictions on intimate activities between co-workers.

Private asexual meetings are not meant to be "intimate activities",
Dwight. What kind of free love fruitcake companies have you worked
for anyway?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4341. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:29:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1AB57E.1E1CF451@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27338

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> I never have challenged his word on it, Jim. I'm trying to talk
> about companies in general. Cecil keeps centering solely on Intel.
> Intel is not companies in general (and it is absurd to suggest that
> all companies are like Intel, which seems to be the point to his argument).

Most Fortune 500 companies are like Intel. I visited quite a few of
them in my 13 years as a marketing engineer at Intel.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4342. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:31:45 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <EDyS7.90986$er5.564443@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27343
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Damn, Richard,

You caught me before the ink was even dry! LOL! I don't run AM all that much, but I DO
like to take that little trip down memory lane once in a while. It so happens that my IC706
does quite a good job on AM and, coupled with one of my SD units on mobile I can do supris-ingly well with all of 40 watts. I have a 706 at home as well, and sometimes I come down to
the shack in the morning with a nice cup of coffee and get in on the East Coast AM groups on
7290. This is how I amused myself 2 days ago when I took my Dad to the doc. Pennsylvania,
New Joisey (I mean Jersey), and Virginia were easy hops. I don't think 7290, 3885, and 29.000 really bother anyone. I think there is room for everybody, and I never understand why
so many people think they must have the same fire hydrant to tee tee on when it is so easy to
just move up or down a few kcs (forgive the lapse), and I've even heard the SSB guys raise cain about the AM folks. I checked just below the SSBers, and there was plenty of room, but
NEEEEWWWWWOOOOOOOOOO, they just wanted to have something to bitch about! I don't get on AM every day and I don't drool over Vikings, Globe Kings, and Scouts, and
51S1s. I just like to get on and remember the old days of glowing filaments and revving dyna-
motors and revving engines to keep the battery up.

73

Jerry

Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:CsyS7.163770$WW.10303476@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:o6yS7.38909$AR6.2153443@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> >
> > Don't "they" say that the worst weather is the best for antenna parties.
> > Right now, I'm rebuilding my 3" screwdriver unit. I got rear ended a
> couple
> > weeks ago--didn't hurt the
> > car, just dented the lower mast some on the antenna. It needed
> rebuilding

> > anyway. I built it about 6 years ago. I turned me a nice 3" loading
> coil
> > with some nice tinned copper (#14)
> > amd used a drill in a vice to spin the wire on the coil. This one was a
> > prototype. That thing
> > rocks on 75 meters and 40 meter AM. SHHHHHH! Don't be telling Dick
> > McCollum I've
> > been running "Ancient Mary". LOL!
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Jerry
>
> Take your nostalgia trip. Just don't think it is the state of the art.
>
> My only real problem with Antique Modulation is that it is so easily
> upgemessed by idiots; see outlaw CB.
>
> Dick
>
>

4343. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:33:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1AB695.27FAC468@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27339

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Intel is one of the most successful companies of
> > all time. Many Silicon Valley companies copy
> > their policies. (snip)
>
> Nonsense. Now you're showing your ignorance, Cecil. "Many," indeed
> most, of the silicon valley companies are not even aware of Intel's
> policies, nor would they care to know.

You have got to be kidding, Dwight. Andy Grove is widely read and
often imitated. What cellar have you been living in? Many companies
have copied Intel's MBO and MBP management techniques. Andy Grove
teaches college courses on Intel's management techniques.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4344. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:38:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AB9BD.648EC450@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27341

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
> >
> > I just want to see evidence to prove his guilt
> > conclusively before we rush off to kill him.
>
> Why?

Already answered in the previous message - right after the sentence you quoted above.

As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4345. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:42:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1AB88F.6B6FCFF2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27340

Dave Heil wrote:
> I thought "Doc" Williamson didn't want you
> bandying his name about.

I've told him about the PCTA jerks on this newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4346. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 02:59:14 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vee70021ae@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27346

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1AAC75.D32717A1@sccoast.net...
> As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
> leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
> been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
> return. Take care.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

I'm sure you'll pick up where you left off.

4347. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 03:00:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1ABEEF.DA39ECD0@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27342

CAM wrote:
>
> Been watching CNN today, Dwight? Looks like
> proof to me.

Well, it was interesting, Cecil. But I'm afraid it's not enough. It would have been helpful if something was disclosed on that tape which was not known to anyone watching CNN. As it is, the tape could be explained away as the ramblings of old men trying to impress their friends with their own importance.

The only part that stood out as real evidence (something that could only be known to those involved) was the part where bin Laden was talking about the terrorists on the planes and said "...we did not reveal the operation to them until they are there and just before they boarded the planes." However, even that falls apart if NSA can't show an international phone call in that time window. If not, that could be explained away as made up also.

Anyway, I'd love to talk about it some more, but events are going to take me away from the computer for a few weeks. So, as I've said before, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks. It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4348. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 03:03:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1ABFB1.E90F8F65@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27344

JR wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Fine, Steve, then try him in a military tribunal. I don't care where
> > he is tried - I just want to see evidence to prove his guilt
> > conclusively before we rush off to kill him. Without that, we leave
> > this whole thing open for endless speculation.
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
>
> Did you see the tape Dwight? Did someone hit you with a 2X4 to get
> your attention? I guess you are going to be one who thinks it was
> all a fabrication.

Nope, not a fabrication, JR. Just way too easily explained away. See my comments to Cecil for an explination.

By the way, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you when I return. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4349. Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 03:10:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AC13E.3B2FA19@sccoast.net>
Source record: 27345

I just wanted to be the first to get those greetings in this year.
In case I've missed anybody (Larry, Richard, Krell, Mike, Rick, and
others), I just wanted to point out again that I'll be leaving this
newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and
I'll look forward to talking with everyone when I return. Until then,
take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4350. A Holiday Gift to r.r.a.p.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 03:25:23 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <u9XNvfRhBHA.1808@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27347

W5NET said:

> By the way, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving this
> newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months).

"See Virginia, didn't I tell you there really is a Santa Claus?"

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

4351. Re: 28.115 is the new Ch-19

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 03:43:03 UTC
From: radiofun <radiofun@charter.net>
Message-ID: <u1lhsg50d7q31e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 27348
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

I hear them on 28.085 too. Very sad!

"Speaker to Animal Crackers" <flashboinnng1@aol.com> wrote in message
news:fVrR7.3693$vK1.358764@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Listened all morning to a group of truckers
> on 28.115 mHz (AM). Even had
> one who's wife was on the "base rig" talking with
> her OM mobile about how to make out the bills and novel ways
> she thought of to make "Xmas money".
>
> Is this is what you get when you mass-sell 10 meter
> radios at/by Radio Shack and others? Wonder how many
> were running Uniden 2510's, 2600's or HTX's.
>
> Is 28.115 is the new Channel Ninteen ?.
> Is the cow out of the barn door?
> A while later a ham came up on the freq in AM
> to try an *politely* inform them there were in violation
> of FCC rules. They just laughed, Thought it was very funny.
> One guy told the ham, who exercized much restraint and
> gentlemanly composure in his speech
> to: "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"
> complete with an roger-beep and echo-effects microphone.
>
> Nice eh?
> Gives you the warm & fuzzies?
>
> I'm curious what's the FCC will do?
>
> How about 2 meters?
> Is that the next band to be trashed by these
> morons who buy ham gear at R.S. or WalMart
> and operate without a licence ?
>
>

4352. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:21:35 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad0a1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27349

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1AAC75.D32717A1@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> > in public.
>
>
> Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend is
> towards more restrictions on intimate activities between co-workers.
>
> As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
> leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
> been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
> return. Take care.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Dwight, you can't have it both ways. You keep saying "we" must rely on our "own experience" then you say that the "trend" is "towards more restrictions...blah, blah, blah." WHERE?

I'll continue to do business at my place, where adults act and are expected to act like adults. If you want to continue to work for the kiddie companies where no trust is granted or obtained, you just keep right on.

Kim W5TIT

4353. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:26:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad1dd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27350

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1AAE6A.B0E4B053@sccoast.net...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Or.....you could just take his word for it and leave
> > it at that.
>
>
> I never have challenged his word on it, Jim. I'm trying to talk
> about companies in general.
>

Yeah. *COUGH* Companies in general, with a trend toward mass movement to a few companies across the nation who are taking on new ways of doing business by disallowing such despicable behavior as female and male adults having to deal with other in a closed door meeting. You know, *that* huge general clearly defined undefined trend.

>
> Cecil keeps centering solely on Intel.
> Intel is not companies in general (and it is absurd to suggest that
> all companies are like Intel, which seems to be the point to his
argument).
>

BUT we need to rely on our own experience, right? And, we surely can't speak for all companies, just companies in general--you know, the ones in general who are trending...toward, uh, what was it you were saying? OH YEAH...the general tendency of companies in the United States, in general, who are trending toward...uh, what was it you were saying? OH YEAH...

> As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
> leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
> been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
> return. Take care.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Maybe now we can make some sense of the issue. Although, I think most of us logical, adult, in-general adults believe that Dwight's opinion is pretty skewed and we, in general, believe that it's quite OK for men and women to have meetings between each other. :)

Kim W5TIT

4354. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:27:32 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad214_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27351

Oh buhruther....

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1AB023.9E99CE58@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Intel is one of the most successful companies of
> > all time. Many Silicon Valley companies copy
> > their policies. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense. Now you're showing your ignorance, Cecil. "Many," indeed
> most, of the silicon valley companies are not even aware of Intel's
> policies, nor would they care to know. And the same could be said for
> the overwhelming majority of companies in this country. Intel is only
> one company in one industry - it does not define business policies in
America.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4355. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:29:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad26c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27352

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1AB2C5.55DE0448@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > According to my dictionary, Buddhists and Hindus are pagans.
>
>
> That's alright - according to the difinitions, I'm a pagan too.
>
> In case you haven't read this before, please note that, after
> tonight, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two
> months). It's been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again
> when I return. Take care.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Well, sorry to say that rather than looking forward to talking with you again, Dwight, I'll enjoy the respit from mental masturbation.

Kim W5TIT

4356. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:30:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad2d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27353

```
"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C1AB50C.16F429FF@IEEE.org...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> > > in public.
> >
> > Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend is
> > towards more restrictions on intimate activities between co-workers.
>
> Private asexual meetings are not meant to be "intimate activities",
> Dwight. What kind of free love fruitcake companies have you worked
> for anyway?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT
```

4357. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:32:11 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad31c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27354

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C1AB695.27FAC468@IEEE.org...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Intel is one of the most successful companies of
> > > all time. Many Silicon Valley companies copy
> > > their policies. (snip)
> >
> > Nonsense. Now you're showing your ignorance, Cecil. "Many," indeed
> > most, of the silicon valley companies are not even aware of Intel's
> > policies, nor would they care to know.
>
> You have got to be kidding, Dwight. Andy Grove is widely read and
> often imitated. What cellar have you been living in? Many companies
> have copied Intel's MBO and MBP management techniques. Andy Grove
> teaches college courses on Intel's management techniques.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

BUT, CECIL!!!! Andy's experience, and your experience, are *not* the
experience of Dwight. Don't you understand? :|

;) Kim W5TIT

4358. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:34:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad394_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27355

OK, so we've been talking to a fruitcake (Dwight) for the past little bit.
WHEW, he *needs* whatever break he thinks he is going on .... WHEW...

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1ABEEF.DA39ECD0@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Been watching CNN today, Dwight? Looks like
> > proof to me.
>
>
> Well, it was interesting, Cecil. But I'm afraid it's not enough. It
> would have been helpful if something was disclosed on that tape which
> was not known to anyone watching CNN. As it is, the tape could be
> explained away as the ramblings of old men trying to impress their
> friends with their own importance.
>
> The only part that stood out as real evidence (something that could
> only be known to those involved) was the part where bin Laden was
> talking about the terrorists on the planes and said "...we did not
> reveal the operation to them until they are there and just before they
> boarded the planes." However, even that falls apart if NSA can't show
> an international phone call in that time window. If not, that could be
> explained away as made up also.
>
> Anyway, I'd love to talk about it some more, but events are going to
> take me away from the computer for a few weeks. So, as I've said
> before, I'll be leaving this newsgroup for several weeks. It's been
> fun and I'll look forward to talking with you when I return. Take care.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4359. Re: Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:34:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad3bf$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27356

Puhleeze don't let the door hit you in the ass...

Kim W5TIT

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1AC13E.3B2FA19@sccoast.net...
>
> I just wanted to be the first to get those greetings in this year.
> In case I've missed anybody (Larry, Richard, Krell, Mike, Rick, and
> others), I just wanted to point out again that I'll be leaving this
> newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and
> I'll look forward to talking with everyone when I return. Until then,
> take care.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4360. Re: A Holiday Gift to r.r.a.p.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:44:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011214234436.07928.00000863@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27357

In article <u9XNvfRhBHA.1808@cpimsnntpa02>, "K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
writes:

>
>> By the way, please note that, after tonight, I'll be leaving this
>> newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months).
>
>"See Virginia, didn't I tell you there really is a Santa Claus?"

Hansl:

No, that was Dwight that said he was leaving for a while, not Kim
or Cecil!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4361. Re: Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:44:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011214234436.07928.00000864@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27359

In article <3C1A5B59.75806518@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
>any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
>things? 8^)
>
> Or maybe the newsgroup needs renamed to
>alt.one.step.closer.to.extinction , with only one free association thread.
>
>
> - mike -

Mike:

I'm the one who started this thread, and it is supposed to be about the sexually suggestive, inappropriate, and self-serving Vanity call sign of Kim Walker, W5TIT -- and the reply she received from Riley Hollingsworth when she made a vain attempt to trick him into endorsing her choice with the lame excuse that it is her "First Amendment right" to do so. This thread has now grown to over 1,000 postings, probably 3/4 of them having nothing to do with the original topic!

Hey guys --- ever see that subject line in your newsreader? Did you know you can change what it says there? And a good time to do so is when you're making a posting that has nothing to do with whatever thread you've been reading at the time!

And to think of all the time's I've been accused of being computer-illiterate because I use AOL! Sheez!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4362. Re: Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:44:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011214234437.07928.00000865@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27358

In article <3C1AC13E.3B2FA19@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>
> I just wanted to be the first to get those greetings in this year.
>In case I've missed anybody (Larry, Richard, Krell, Mike, Rick, and
>others), I just wanted to point out again that I'll be leaving this
>newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and
>I'll look forward to talking with everyone when I return. Until then,
>take care.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

Whatever takes you away from here for that time, I wish you
a very safe and happy holiday season, safe journeys, and hope
to see you here again upon your return!

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4363. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:45:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad630_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27360

Ya make less and less sense every day, Larry. Comfortably numb?

I guess you're pretty much the only one...oh, let's not leave Dicky out...who thinks my callsign is important enough an issue to have its own thread. You are also pretty much the only one who mentions my callsign in this thread. The rest of us have had some very neat conversations about lots of other, more important, issues.

Kim W5TIT

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011214234436.07928.00000864@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3C1A5B59.75806518@psu.edu>, mike coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> > Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
> >any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
> >things? 8^)
> >
> > Or maybe the newsgroup needs renamed to
> >alt.one.step.closer.to.extinction , with only one free association thread.
> >
> >
> > - mike -
>
> Mike:
>
> I'm the one who started this thread, and it is supposed to be about
> the sexually suggestive, inappropriate, and self-serving Vanity call
> sign of Kim Walker, W5TIT -- and the reply she received from Riley
> Hollingsworth when she made a vain attempt to trick him into
> endorsing her choice with the lame excuse that it is her "First
> Amendment right" to do so. This thread has now grown to over
> 1,000 postings, probably 3/4 of them having nothing to do with the
> original topic!
>
> Hey guys --- ever see that subject line in your newsreader? Did you
> know you can change what it says there? And a good time to do
> so is when you're making a posting that has nothing to do with
> whatever thread you've been reading at the time!
>
> And to think of all the time's I've been accused of being computer-
> illiterate because I use AOL! Sheez!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

>

4364. Re: Glenn Baxter Writes Riley...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:47:17 UTC
From: "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
Message-ID: <9vekkk01u5u@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

No doubt Riley is hiding under his desk, quaking in his boots. Then, maybe he's sharing this letter with his boss and both of them are laughing their asses off.

--
- - -

Regards,
Joe S.

"Frankie Todd" <Anon@Anon..com> wrote in message news:9veb79iqu0@pita.alt.net...
> Boy. First Glenn jams the Hams with his illegal transmissions, and NOW
> he has the audacity to respond below to Riley after getting a warning letter
> on Dec. 11, 2001. Here's hoping Glenn's license ain't long for this world.
> :::::::::::::::::: :::::::::::::::::: ::::::::::::::::::::
> From: Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., K1MAN
> 14 December 2001 2:47 P.M.
>
> W. Riley Hollingsworth, Esq.
> Special Counsel, Enforcement Bureau
> Federal Communications Commission
> Gettysburg, Pa. 17325-7245
>
> Mr. Hollingsworth:
>
> This is in reference to your "warning letter" to me dated 11 December
> 2001. I was accurately advised about your letter to me and its exact
> contents by both Keith Lamonica, W7DXX, and Dick Leavitt, W2CSQ, on 11
> December 2001. This is an ethical violation of FCC ex parte rules of
> procedure and supports my public allegations that you are a sleazy and
> cheap politician as well as an unethical (alleged) attorney not fit
> for employment by the United States Government.
>
> Your letter illegally threatens me with a "license revocation or
> renewal hearing" because I have (and fully intend to continue) filed
> sworn affidavits with the U.S. Attorney regarding alleged criminal
> violations of Sections 333 and 501 of the 1934 Communications Act.
>
> My filing of these sworn affidavits are protected by the First
> Amendment to the United Stated Constitution protecting free speech as
> well as the Fourth Amendment regarding my absolute right to petition
> the government for a redress of grievances.

>
> Further, your letter, itself, and you openly encouraging radio
> amateurs to "talk over" my radio transmissions, is also a criminal
> violation of Section 501 as well as criminal obstruction of justice,
> and I am taking legal steps to assure that you are vigorously
> prosecuted and also removed from your employment at the FCC. I am
> also taking legally sanctioned steps to assure that you are disbarred
> as a licensed attorney (if, in fact, you are licensed to practice law
> in any state.
>
> For your information, K1MAN is fully licensed to transmit information
> bulletins per a published schedule, and the K1MAN Bulletin Service is
> specifically recognized to be lawful in a letter from FCC Chief of
> Special Services, Robert H. Mc Namara, to Kenneth Black, G4WNE, dated
> 2 November 1989 (reference 7240-F). If you are really an attorney,
> and we question whether you are, you will understand the legal
> doctrine of res judicata that applies in this matter.
>
> Finally, you have publicly lied to radio amateurs that you had
> something to do with putting my station, K1MAN, off the air in 1999
> which, of course, is totally false. You have total immunity for this
> sort of defamation and libel, as you well know, and you take full
> public relations advantage of this government immunity. You are,
> however, a public disgrace to the Amateur Radio Service, to the
> Commission, to the legal profession, and to the United States of
> America.
>
> We look forward to seeing you in court.
>
>
>
> (signed)
>
> Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., K1MAN
> Registered Professional Engineer
>
>
> cc: FCC Chairman Powell
> U.S. Attorney, Bangor, Maine
> Senator Susan Collins
> Senator Olympia Snow
> American Bar Association
> W5YI
> WA6ITF
> ARRL
> W2CSQ
> W7DXX
> Distribution
>
>

>

4365. Re: Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:55:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011214235518.07928.00000867@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27361

In article <3c1ad3bf$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Puhleeze don't let the door hit you in the ass...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

You're a fine one to talk...I'm sure the door to your trailer is in
splinters!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4366. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:55:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011214235518.07928.00000868@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27362

In article <3c1ad1dd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>Maybe now we can make some sense of the issue. Although, I think most of us
>logical, adult, in-general adults believe that Dwight's opinion is pretty
>skewed and we, in general, believe that it's quite OK for men and women to
>have meetings between each other. :)
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

If you think you're so adult in your behavior, why did you show such
childishly poor judgment in selecting your vanity call sign?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4367. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:56:57 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad8ea$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27363

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011214235518.07928.00000868@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3c1ad1dd_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Maybe now we can make some sense of the issue. Although, I think most of
us
> >logical, adult, in-general adults believe that Dwight's opinion is pretty
> >skewed and we, in general, believe that it's quite OK for men and women
to
> >have meetings between each other. :)
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> If you think you're so adult in your behavior, why did you show such
> childishly poor judgment in selecting your vanity call sign?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I think it's one of the most adult things I've ever done, Larry. It's
entertained you for about 2 years. :)

Kim W5TIT

4368. Re: Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 04:58:47 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ad95d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27364

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011214235518.07928.00000867@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article <3c1ad3bf$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >Puhleeze don't let the door hit you in the ass...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> You're a fine one to talk...I'm sure the door to your trailer is in
> splinters!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Not at all. The way to avoid that happening, Larry, is not to let the door slam all the time--you know, the way it does when ya get one of the gals into yer...uh, luxurious apartment (the one you keep throwing money into but will never own. The one that has no land with it).

Kim W5TIT

4369. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 06:42:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <852F0BF91EE54F07.4893E3AE10BC19DB.FF9C52FBDFD01936@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27366

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 10:10:19 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> Yet you want to privatize prisons, law enforcement, fire
>> departments, social security, and other programs.
>
>Libertarians DO NOT want to privatize any governmental function
>required to protect the inalienable rights of citizens. That
>includes law enforcement. I really wish you would alleviate
>your ignorance of what Libertarians believe.

In other words, the state will _still_ control the criminal
justice system, and will act as a monopoly in setting fees. Don't like
them, tough?

Sounds like a convenient way to cover up still charging the
same taxes to me--a pile of manure by any other name . . .

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4370. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 06:50:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AF2C8.B8A79FBF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27367

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I thought "Doc" Williamson didn't want you
> > bandying his name about.
>
> I've told him about the PCTA jerks on this newsgroup.

That's interesting. I thought you told us that he didn't want you
bandying his name about. Was that incorrect?

Dave K8MN

4371. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 06:54:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AF3A9.FE9E3D78@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27368

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> news:3C1AAC75.D32717A1@sccoast.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> > > in public.
> > >
> > >
> > > Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend is
> > > towards more restrictions on intimate activities between co-workers.
> > >
> > > As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
> > > leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
> > > been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
> > > return. Take care.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
>
> Dwight, you can't have it both ways. You keep saying "we" must rely on our
> "own experience" then you say that the "trend" is "towards more
> restrictions...blah, blah, blah." WHERE?
>
> I'll continue to do business at my place, where adults act and are expected
> to act like adults. If you want to continue to work for the kiddie
> companies where no trust is granted or obtained, you just keep right on.

I've worked in a lot of places, Kim. I've never worked anywhere that
had a bunch of wiccans and druids hunched over the water cooler.

Dave K8MN

4372. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 06:57:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <06D97509588BBA6A.47C3BF6D8FF12D9C.BBEC78EB8449B590@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27369

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 09:55:20 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> >Well, let me ask you this, Rick. Why are children born to American
>> >parents more valuable human beings than children born to parents
>> >in other countries? To be consistent, you have to advocate welfare
>> >for all the children of the world, not just for American children.
>>
>> I do. But at the expense of _their_ governments, not ours.
>
>But Rick, their governments often just let them die of starvation.
>Don't you care about anybody except Americans? Why does an accident
>of birth make an American child more valuable than a child in
>Botswana? Why are you such an elitist?

I'm not--on the other hand, I'm not jingoistic, either. It
isn't the function of the US to interfere in the actions of other
sovereign nations (unless those nations pose a direct threat to the
US, of course). I may feel for the citizens in such nations, but I
don't claim that I--or my country--have a right to intervene in their
internal affairs. If a nation steps across a clear line of humanity
(as did the Nazis with the death camps, and as have other nations
including Cambodia under Pol Pot) I support foreign intervention--but
even there not by the US alone, but by a group of nations working
together (and sharing the costs equally, btw, I'm tired of funding
every so-called coalition we join).

>The bottom line is that the Libertarian view of poor people in the
>US is *exactly* the same as your view of poor people in other countries.

I don't live in other countries, Cecil, and neither do you. If
the Libertarian party was in another nation and preached the same
policy, I would disagree with it, consider it classist and inhumane,
but I would have no legitimate concern in seeing it NOT come to power
since I'm not a citizen of that country.

I _am_ however a citizen of the USA, and as such I DO have a
legitimate concern in the political platforms of US parties--the
Libertarians included. To me, for any American party to take the
attitude that if children can't be supported by their parents that's
THEIR problem, not that of the state is so completely self-centered
and materialistic that it defies comprehension. I can understand a
poor country not being able to demonstrate compassion for its

children, but if the US with its affluence reaches that point of materialism and selfishness, we'll have reached the point that any decent person would be ashamed to admit he or she was an American. If that's what the Libertarian Party stands for, it's by far the most offensive political party ever formed in this nation--despite having the most rational views on personal liberty of any modern party.

>You say the poor people in other countries are someone else's
>responsibility. Libertarians agree with you and extend that same
>identical concept to poor people in this country. The difference
>is quantitative, not qualitative.

No it's not, Cecil. The US has no RIGHT to interfere in the affairs of other sovereign nations--any more than they have any right to interfere in OUR affairs. But we not only have a right to care for our poor, we have a moral obligation to do so at home. I'm sorry that Libertarians are so blinded by their hate for anything that might cost them a few precious dollars (except for monopolistic fees for government services, of course) that they have come to care more for money than for the lives of children.

Thanks for opening my eyes to the Libertarian platform, Cecil--it will help when I go to the polls to know that regardless of how positive a Libertarian candidate seems, his real position is one that I can't possibly support with my vote.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4373. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 06:58:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <961C0CEA4DC55A5C.3D6F0E8F8E9BE76A.F7F89478FD8232E2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27370

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 10:04:22 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> Right now, our schools are often violent, frequently a joke
>> academically, and only occasionally more interested in academics than
>> in sports standings. Those need to change.
>
>The problem is those things cannot change as long as the government
>is running things. The government is the cause of those things.

Perhaps instead of telling us what you would like to see torn
down if the Libertarians were in power, you might want to enlighten us
as to what it would be replaced with--and why THAT would insure
improvements.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4374. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 06:59:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <134432C779624582.54453387F1C8AE31.225AF35D340B6F47@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27372

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 02:11:59 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> No, Dwight, I did NOT identify myself as a
>> "liberal." I am a libertarian--if you ar
>> too stupid to know the difference, try looking
>> in a book (that's one of those things with
>> covers, pages, and printed words in case you
>> don't have any experience with them). I _agreed_
>> that I would accept the "sixties liberal"
>> definition of my earlier years--so what?
>
>
> Well, your political views would certainly not be described by anyone as
>conservative, so we'll call you a liberal Libertarian instead. Will that make
>you feel better?

Sure--as long as you don't mind the corresponding
"conservative fascist" designation yourself. Fair enough?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4375. Re: Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 06:59:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AF4E6.504D04F1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27371

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3c1ad3bf$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Puhleeze don't let the door hit you in the ass...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> You're a fine one to talk...I'm sure the door to your trailer is in
> splinters!

Maybe not. She's been ROTF laughing her AO for quite some time. I know
these things take time but she could be down to normal by the new year.

Dave K8MN

4376. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 07:11:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1AEA4D.59AC8B99@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27373

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> Ya make less and less sense every day, Larry. Comfortably numb?
>
> I guess you're pretty much the only one...oh, let's not leave Dicky
> out...who thinks my callsign is important enough an issue to have its own
> thread. You are also pretty much the only one who mentions my callsign in
> this thread. The rest of us have had some very neat conversations about
> lots of other, more important, issues.

Watever you tink, Topless.

4377. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 08:07:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1B04D0.7220F470@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27374

CAM wrote:

> Robert Casey wrote:
> > > Saw a well-endowed lady the other day with a T-Shirt that said:
> > > "If only these were brains".
> >
> > Another tee shirt had the words "tune" and "load"
> > positioned on the breasts.
>
> Oh no, Robert. You used the "b" word. You know you will bring
> down the wrath of Larry Roll for doing that.

Just now I heard the "T" word on the FM broadcast band.
Something about "tit for tat". :-)

4378. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 08:30:34 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vf1n9snk8@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27375
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> We give cops guns because their lives are more
> valuable. Mayors and governors have bodyguards
> for the same reasons.

Wrong. We allow officers to carry firearms because many criminals
also carry firearms. It might be necessary to use the firearm in
the process of apprehending the felon.

The officer would be just as likely to use the firearm to protect
some innocent person.

I can carry a firearm. Does that make ME "more valuable" than those
who cannot? Not in my view.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4379. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 08:34:52 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vf1vcsnk9@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27376
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> There is a pecking order. Governors and mayors are
> the most valuable then powerful men then professionals
> like doctors and lawyers. The Police are just under mayors.

If I were injured, I would feel that a doctor was far more important
than some political hack who happened to get elected to office.

> Look there are so many elite who see the police and
> the military as a bunch of losers who are there to die
> for them. People like you who make huge amounts
> of money and live in big fancy houses. I have them
> in my community. The military is not allowed to recruit
> in the local high school as their kids are going to college
> and the military is for those who can't really make it.

> People like you see themselves as too valuable to get
> their hands dirty. Sorry but your life is not worth that
> of a police officer, a fire fighter or a soldier.

How do you know what we do for our livings?

In my opinion, it is elitist attitudes like yours that are part of
the problems we face in this country.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4380. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 08:38:05 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vf25dsnk10@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27377
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> And if you argue with a cop then you are just
> another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
> alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
> your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
> the office to shoot everyone.

I would not give an officer a rough time. Why should I? But if
he wants to examine my automobile or radios, then he better have
a search warrant. If he feels one is necessary, then the watch
officer can certainly see that one is obtained in short order.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4381. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 09:13:23 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vf47jsnk14@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27378
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote:
> "Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote in message
> news:9v9qa0odg11@quark.scn.rain.com...
>> In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> <<< SNIP >>
>> If I have a CB radio, I am federally licensed to operate that radio.
>> <<< SNIP >>>

> And when was this license issued? If it's legit, why are you not found in
> the FCC ULS?

Read the regulations covering CB. It is immaterial that no identification
number or registration are required.

There are FCC regulations covering my usage of the CB band, this I am
licensed by the FCC. Just ask them.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4382. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 09:18:57 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vf4i0snk15@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> Lawsuits are just a cost in doing business. People
> file false charges against the police everyday. As
> I said, the average cop looks to the courts to settle
> questions. If a ham wants to be an asshole and argue
> with the cops then he had better expect to stand in
> front of the judge.

And arrests that get the officer and police into lawsuits
or get unfavorable publicity in the newspapers means that the
officer can pretty much kiss his chances for promotion goodby.
He will probably even be canned if it happens often enough.

There used to be a couple of officers in my city with attitudes
like you display here. They are no longer on the force. Nor are
they in the phone directory any more - so may have moved on.

The average office looks to his superior officers to settle
questions. It is not a case of "Arrest em all, and let the courts
sort them out" - which is what you claim is common.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4383. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 09:21:36 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vf4n0snk16@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27380
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> That is a risk that the average cop is willing
> to take. As far as he is concerned, getting
> you in front of judge is his primary job. Even
> if you win, it will cost you a huge amount of
> money, and time. Costly enough that you will
> think twice the next time. He does not have
> to get you thrown in jail in order to change
> your attitude. Normally the court procedures,
> and it can take a year or more to settle a case,
> are enough to make a decent citizen more
> careful in how they live their lives.

I really hope you are just a troll - or an aberration.

Fortunately, officers with such an attitude around here
fairly quickly become ex-officers.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4384. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 09:52:53 UTC
From: WG <nojunk@mail.com>
Message-ID: <V3FS7.10094$m54.2460407@news0.telusplanet.net>
Source record: 27381
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

I have been a ham for 10 years now and a CBer for over 20 years and I have noticed a degradation of CB to the point that no one uses it anymore. If you are on the road ham is the best way to go. With the new IRLP system you can tone up repeaters almost any ware in the world, (http://www.irlp.net/) with just a hand-held. One thing that all CBers should ask themselves before they key up, is what they are talking about fit for family listening. Would you want your wife, girlfriend or kids listening to that? Also that they can be tracked in under 6 seconds and the transmitter fingerprint system works very well. The reason that the governments of the world permit this to continue is that the cost to go to trial is prohibitive. I do know that Industry Canada and the FCC will act on complaints especially if the dirty radio gets into the commercial or police bands. I have played around with radio tracking using the Doppler shift radio tracking system on CB and it is unbelievable how fast you can drive right up to someone's door or follow a dirty trucker into a truck stop and have a talk with him face to face.

"Tazanator" <tazanator1@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:7wbS7.20905$7y.231436@rwcrnsc54...
> Well I will say sorry about the course language, but there is a bigger
> picture on this.
>
> I have studied and recieved a lowly tech lic for starters. However having
> driven semi's for years I can *try* to relate the truckers side. CB 19
has
> degenerated way down to the point of people harrassing truckers (listen
> sometime a bulk of the noise is from base stations especial around big
> cities) most of the "sesame Street" gang is kids playing and talking big.
>
> Due to this depressing talk to drivers, many have left the CB buying ham
> radios for the extra cost so they can "get away" from the base stations (I
> was told that a long time ago CB was just like 80 meters is today...many
> truckers miss that peaceful feeling you enjoy (I only have a tech so 2
> meters is my place)) while it is wrong many don't care due to the way they
> were treated on channel 19 (Penn state has a kid on 19 with a 250 watt
base
> that must have a dictionary of every swear word that he just keeps reading
> at truckers)
>
> As far as the FCC many state scales have fcc trained weigh masters that do
> check (you pull on to the scale and are asked to key up the CB) sometimes
> they find them often they don't. I belive that the truckers could bring a
> revival to the ham comunity, just from the numbers point of view, and I
> started down ham meeting another ham trucker...HE HAD A HUGE ANT (screw

> driver)ON THAT TRUCK!!! made me wonder what he was talking to!
>
> While it is a privalage to us ... a little tact here could gain you a
friend
> and the ham community more clout. Sence I got my ticket many of the guys
I
> used to run with have seen me use the 2 meter repeater system (they loved
> the michigan linked repeater system...all over the state with only an HT)
> and the phone patches, many have started borrowing my books to study for
the
> test.
>
> To start them on the road just help them out ... many would love to have
the
> ANT checked by an MFJ analizer (they pay up to $20 for it) and as you
teach
> them how to get the best out of the CB talk about the ham structure many
> will listen and think about it....many of my friends have started studying
>
> (by the way it supposed to be 28.665 for the new 19)
>
> --
>
> IT IS THE SOLDIER
>
> IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the reporter,
> Who has given us freedom of the press.
> IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the poet,
> Who has given us freedom of speech.
> IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the campus organizer,
> Who has given us freedom to demonstrate.
> IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the lawyer,
> Who has given us the right to a fair trial.
> IT IS THE SOLDIER, who salutes the flag,
> Who serves under the flag and,
> Whose coffin is draped by the flag,
> Who allows the protester to burn the flag.
>
> Author, Charles M. Province
>
> **
> By US Code Title 47, Sec.227(a)(2)(B), a computer/modem/printer meets
> the definition of a telephone fax machine. By Sec.227(b)(1)(C), it is
> unlawful to send any unsolicited advertisement to such equipment. By
> Sec.227(b)(3)(C), a violation of the aforementioned Section is
> punishable by action to recover actual monetary loss, or $500, whichever
> is greater, for each violation.
> **
>
> think I'm full of it look yourself!

> http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/47/227.html
>
> "Speaker to Animal Crackers" <flashboinnng1@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:fVrR7.3693$vK1.358764@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > Listened all morning to a group of truckers
> > on 28.115 mHz (AM). Even had
> > one who's wife was on the "base rig" talking with
> > her OM mobile about how to make out the bills and novel ways
> > she thought of to make "Xmas money".
> >
> > Is this is what you get when you mass-sell 10 meter
> > radios at/by Radio Shack and others? Wonder how many
> > were running Uniden 2510's, 2600's or HTX's.
> >
> > Is 28.115 is the new Channel Ninteen ?.
> > Is the cow out of the barn door?
> > A while later a ham came up on the freq in AM
> > to try an *politely* inform them there were in violation
> > of FCC rules. They just laughed, Thought it was very funny.
> > One guy told the ham, who exercized much restraint and
> > gentlemanly composure in his speech
> > to: "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"
> > complete with an roger-beep and echo-effects microphone.
> >
> > Nice eh?
> > Gives you the warm & fuzzies?
> >
> > I'm curious what's the FCC will do?
> >
> > How about 2 meters?
> > Is that the next band to be trashed by these
> > morons who buy ham gear at R.S. or WalMart
> > and operate without a licence ?
> >
> >
>
>

4385. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 11:33:14 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vfcaq0hrf@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27382

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C1AF3A9.FE9E3D78@earthlink.net...

> I've worked in a lot of places, Kim. I've never worked anywhere that
> had a bunch of wiccans and druids hunched over the water cooler.
>
> Dave K8MN

How would you know if they didn't say anything about it? Most people don't
proselytize about their religious beliefs.

4386. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 11:36:28 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vfcgr0hvm@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27383

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011214235518.07928.00000868@mb-fi.aol.com...

> If you think you're so adult in your behavior, why did you show such
> childishly poor judgment in selecting your vanity call sign?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Maybe it's a clever troll, and you're an easy mark.

4387. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 12:32:41 UTC
From: Professor <bgriffey@core.com>
Message-ID: <3c1b4471$0$30975$1dc6e903@news.corecomm.net>
Source record: 27384
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Boy do I wish that was true.
I'd actually be able to hold a conversation out there...

--

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
Professor
||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

"WG" <nojunk@mail.com> wrote in message
news:V3FS7.10094$m54.2460407@news0.telusplanet.net...
> I have been a ham for 10 years now and a CBer for over 20 years and I have
> noticed a degradation of CB to the point that no one uses it anymore.

4388. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 12:47:18 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <941F6796A3C3B7E9.BE6077ED623EEAD9.8AE81711733B53ED@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27385

On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 06:54:36 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I've worked in a lot of places, Kim. I've never worked anywhere that
>had a bunch of wiccans and druids hunched over the water cooler.

How would you know? I've worked in at least three places that had
that situation on a daily basis, except that it was the coffee
machine. (Water coolers were removed to make the bottled water
vending machine more profitable at one, and because maintenance was
just too lazy to change the jugs at the others)

Well, OK, at one of those it was a bunch of Asatruar huddled in the
smoking area, but close enough.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

4389. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 13:52:56 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1b51d9.2953583@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27386
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 08:38:05 +0000 (UTC), Bill Nelson
<billn@spock.peak.org> wrote:

>In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>
>> And if you argue with a cop then you are just
>> another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
>> alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
>> your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
>> the office to shoot everyone.
>
>I would not give an officer a rough time. Why should I? But if
>he wants to examine my automobile or radios, then he better have
>a search warrant. If he feels one is necessary, then the watch
>officer can certainly see that one is obtained in short order.
>Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

Actually, obtaining a search warrant isn't all that quick or easy.
Assume the following scenario...

1. Officer Obey stops John Q Motorist for some traffic violation.
2. Upon viewing the vehicle's interior, Officer Obey sees a
radio mounted in the car.
3. Officer Obey asks the motorist about the radio
4. John Q Motorist politely tells officer Obey the radio
is a ham rig (or CB, or whatever).
5. Officer Obey then requests permission to search the
vehicle and/or examine the radio itself.
6. John Q Motorist declines (politely) to allow search
of the vehicle and/or the radio.

OK so far?

Now Officer Obey requires a search warrant to search
the car or further examine the radio. Just how does the Officer
obtain that warrant then? The process involves at least
the following:

1. Detaining the vehicle and occupant for an unspecified time
2. Officer Obey would need to have his police supervisory
people contact a judge and inform the judge as to WHY
a search warrant is needed (i.e. probable cause, etc.)
(most local municipalities don't always
have a judge just sitting around to do these things)

Judges do NOT routinely issue search warrants just
to make local police happy. IF some subsequent search
uncovers a criminal act. then there had better be sound
reasons for the search warrant in the first place. If
the search uncovers nothing...the reason for the warrant
had better stand up to challange via a civil lawsuit.

If any cop builds a record of "bogus" stops and bogus
requests for search warrants, that cop's credibility in the force
goes out the window and you can bet the judge(s)
(as do police management) know
who those bad credibility cops are.

Good policing does not require arrogance or "attitude"
on the part of police. Attitude cops give all cops a bad
name and they undermine the service of the good cops
who know and work as proffesionals within the constraints
of our constitution and legal system.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4390. Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 14:24:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1b5d71_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27387

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011213104336.18921.00000171@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3C182F2F.6E96890E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >The average technical level of all members of the IEEE is higher
> >than the average technical level of all members of the ARS.
>
> Cecil:
>
> Well, Harumph...I would damn well hope so!
>
> Now that we have THAT cleared up, back to my question: "What is the
> correlation between Morse code skill and technical skill, among [the
> closed set of] licensed Amateur Radio operators?"
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry,

According to the FCC "none." AndI find the FCC to be a FAR
more credible source of information/opinion on this matter than
you, so why don't you stop ranting?

This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
what I can see.

Get a life ...

BTW, just to put some icing on the cake for you, I finally got
around to finding time in my work/travel schedule to go to a
VE session and upgrade to Extra :-)
(missed 1 out of 50 on the test ... I read one question/answers
too fast and accidentally marked the wrong letter when I
actually knew the correct answer ... really made me mad at
myself ... but that's what I get for finishing the test in 10 minutes :-)

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052

Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4391. Re: some sobering numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 14:41:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215094109.08633.00000288@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27388

>Subject: Re: some sobering numbers
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 12/14/2001 8:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C1AB9BD.648EC450@sccoast.net>

>As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
>leaving this newsgroup for several weeks

A.M.F.

Steve

4392. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 14:44:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1b62a0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27390

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C1AF3A9.FE9E3D78@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C1AAC75.D32717A1@sccoast.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> > > > in public.
> > >
> > >
> > > Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend is
> > > towards more restrictions on intimate activities between co-workers.
> > >
> > > As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
> > > leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
> > > been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
> > > return. Take care.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> >
> > Dwight, you can't have it both ways. You keep saying "we" must rely on
our
> > "own experience" then you say that the "trend" is "towards more
> > restrictions...blah, blah, blah." WHERE?
> >
> > I'll continue to do business at my place, where adults act and are
expected
> > to act like adults. If you want to continue to work for the kiddie
> > companies where no trust is granted or obtained, you just keep right on.
>
> I've worked in a lot of places, Kim. I've never worked anywhere that
> had a bunch of wiccans and druids hunched over the water cooler.
>
> Dave K8MN

I wouldn't know, because we don't discuss those things at work. Again,
company policy and professional etiquette would dictate that certain things
are just not for the "office."

Also, in *this* part of this thread the discussion is about one-on-one
meetings behind closed doors with members of the opposite sex.

Kim W5TIT

4393. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 14:46:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1b6321$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27391

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C1B04D0.7220F470@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Robert Casey wrote:
> > > > > Saw a well-endowed lady the other day with a T-Shirt that said:
> > > > > "If only these were brains".
> > > >
> > > > Another tee shirt had the words "tune" and "load"
> > > > positioned on the breasts.
> > >
> > > Oh no, Robert. You used the "b" word. You know you will bring
> > > down the wrath of Larry Roll for doing that.
> >
> Just now I heard the "T" word on the FM broadcast band.
> Something about "tit for tat". :-)
>

Just one of each?! :)

Kim W5TIT

4394. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 14:47:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215094749.08633.00000289@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27389

>Subject: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse@fast.net
>Date: 12/15/2001 8:24 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c1b5d71_2@news7.fast.net>

>This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
>and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
>what I can see.

And you expected...WHAT...from RRAP...?!?!

Welcome home.

Steve, K4YZ

4395. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 14:49:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1b63cd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27392

```
"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vfcgr0hvm@enews3.newsguy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011214235518.07928.00000868@mb-fi.aol.com...
>
> > If you think you're so adult in your behavior, why did you show such
> > childishly poor judgment in selecting your vanity call sign?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Maybe it's a clever troll, and you're an easy mark.
>
>

Oh, now you've gone and done it! ;)

Kim W5TIT
```

4396. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 14:58:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1b65e4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27393

"Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote in message
news:9vf1vcsnk9@quark.scn.rain.com...
> In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>
> > There is a pecking order. Governors and mayors are
> > the most valuable then powerful men then professionals
> > like doctors and lawyers. The Police are just under mayors.
>
> If I were injured, I would feel that a doctor was far more important
> than some political hack who happened to get elected to office.
>
> > Look there are so many elite who see the police and
> > the military as a bunch of losers who are there to die
> > for them. People like you who make huge amounts
> > of money and live in big fancy houses. I have them
> > in my community. The military is not allowed to recruit
> > in the local high school as their kids are going to college
> > and the military is for those who can't really make it.
>
> > People like you see themselves as too valuable to get
> > their hands dirty. Sorry but your life is not worth that
> > of a police officer, a fire fighter or a soldier.
>
> How do you know what we do for our livings?
>
> In my opinion, it is elitist attitudes like yours that are part of
> the problems we face in this country.
>
> --
> Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
>

ABSOLUTELY! And, most cops don't think they are better than anyone else.
It's the ones that do that make it so rough for the industry (and while I
used the word "most" in my last sentence, there are still lots who do think
they are more important).

Each and every one of us is nearly, if not exactly, as important as the
next. We all have our "things" to do, work to do, families to raise,
neighborhoods to live in, communities to vote and pay taxes in, etc. Not
one of us is doing something more important than the next.

And, please don't use the excuse that cops or firefighters put themselves in
harm's way more than anyone else. When I get in my vehicle every day to go
to work, statistics say that I am more likely to be injured or die than any

other industry-related statistic! Add rain, snow or ice to that scenario and it's pretty darned dangerous just getting to work.

Kim W5TIT

Not posted to other groups I don't read

4397. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 15:24:57 UTC
From: WILLIAM FRAZIER <KC7REK@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <O01$$yXhBHA.1864@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 27394
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

You folks are comparing apples and oranges. First a City, such as Tacoma or any other city, for that matter, can not or will not pass any law, ordinance or other bill that prohibits what the Federal Government allows.

Second, the idea that a local city or county police officer would have jurisdiction over radios on a military base is completely false. Only the CID or the MP's can enforce laws on a military reservation. Only with the permission of the Base Commander can LEOs enter the base to enforce civilian laws.

Third, the enforcement of federal law lies with the FBI. They are the enforcement branch of the FCC and only they can confiscate radio equipment that the FCC has ordered confiscated.

Forth, upon entering a military base, you no longer have the same rights or privileges that you enjoy off the base. You must obey military law and are subject to military rules and regulations, which you must agree to before entering the base or you will NOT be permitted to enter.

As I live within 50 miles of Ft. Lewis, Mc Chord Air Force Base (Tacoma), 10 mile of the Bremerton Naval Shipyard (Puget Sound Naval Shipyard), 35 miles of Naval Air Station Whidbey Island and 5 miles of the US Navy Nuclear Submarine Base Bangor, I am quite familiar with the rules, regulations and laws of what you can and can't do in, on or around these bases. I'm here to tell you that no such law or ordinance has ever been enacted nor has any LEO ever, to my knowledge, stopped or detained a radio operator for using there radio equipment in any manner allowed by law.

William F. (Bill) Frazier, KC7REK
Silverdale, WA

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C1A2443.E09EDBF8@townsqr.com...
>
>
> N9NWO wrote:
>
> >Are you now saying anyone with a
>
> > > radio is being profiled?
> >
> > Given the events of Sept 11th, yes.
>
> That's odd. The only radios used by the terrorists on Sept 11 were the same ones

> the pilots use.
> Any cop who suddenly starts profiling anyone with a mobile radio because
of Sept 11
> is a
> paranoia-ridden loose cannon.(there are some of those)
> The terrorists made extensive use of cellphones. So they should
> be profiling cellphone users instead. Now THAT would keep 'em busy.
>
> Dick
> Retired Public Safety communicater
>
>

4398. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 15:51:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B7179.A5162903@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27395

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> BUT, CECIL!!!! Andy's experience, and your experience, are *not* the
> experience of Dwight.

Thank God!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4399. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 15:55:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B7254.A97A0EA1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27396

Rick Adams wrote:
> In other words, the state will _still_ control the criminal
> justice system, and will act as a monopoly in setting fees. Don't like
> them, tough?

You haven't been listening, Rick. The court system would charge fees
to guarantee the enforcement of contracts. Entities who entered into
contracts without paying the fees would be operating under gentlemen's
agreements and would have no legal recourse if the contract was
violated. Most entities would choose to pay the fees.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4400. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 15:58:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1B65C7.E5928C6F@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27397
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Bill Nelson wrote:

> In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>
> > And if you argue with a cop then you are just
> > another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
> > alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
> > your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
> > the office to shoot everyone.
>
> I would not give an officer a rough time. Why should I? But if
> he wants to examine my automobile or radios, then he better have
> a search warrant. If he feels one is necessary, then the watch
> officer can certainly see that one is obtained in short order.

Arguing with a cop is stupid. If he had no reason for stopping you, he wouldn't have. Discussing the situation politely is another matter, and if that doesn't help, and it may not, you'd better plan on taking your complaint to another level and having your stuff together when you do. Even then don't expect to overcome a discretionary if arbritary decision made by a cop on the street. He will have so much discretionary authority that will be upheld all the way, if it comes to that. Your best course is to do everything he says at the time with no hint of opposition, and any question you have of his actions needs to be posed in a friendly, non-irritated manner. Most cops are reasonable people, and want no hassles -you'd probably not believe how many they have to put up with in the normal course of things-, but when one acts to become an added irritant when he has been stopped it's a sure path to more trouble than you already have, if any. Many times cops just want to set someone straight without the hassle of paperwork, and will let it go with a warning, if the situation justifies it.. You'd be surprised at all the paperwork involved in even a simple traffic arrest.
I can't imagine any rational cop wanting to take on a radio possession case without some other serious factor being involved. I doubt they'd want to do it a second time. But what the hey, I've been out of the loop for several years. Maybe new cops are different, like some new hams.

4401. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 16:00:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B7392.8D5DAA6E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27398

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I thought "Doc" Williamson didn't want you
> > > bandying his name about.
> > >
> > I've told him about the PCTA jerks on this newsgroup.
>
> That's interesting. I thought you told us that he didn't want you
> bandying his name about. Was that incorrect?

I NEVER said that, Dave. Your thoughts are screwed up, as usual.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4402. Re: "...one step closer to extinction "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 16:17:44 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <e1zHSPYhBHA.1848@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27399

Kim said:

> Also, in *this* part of this thread the discussion is about one-on-one
> meetings behind closed doors with members of the opposite sex.

Using the term "the opposite sex" automatically charges your ideas
with emotion and unprofessionalism. A professional will use the term
"persons of different gender". What the hell is "opposite" about it, and
what has "sex" to do with it?

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

4403. Re: "...one step closer to extinction.-courts"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 16:40:52 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <o2LS7.165121$WW.10376544@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27400

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C1B7254.A97A0EA1@IEEE.org...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > In other words, the state will _still_ control the criminal
> > justice system, and will act as a monopoly in setting fees. Don't like
> > them, tough?
>
> You haven't been listening, Rick. The court system would charge fees
> to guarantee the enforcement of contracts. Entities who entered into
> contracts without paying the fees would be operating under gentlemen's
> agreements and would have no legal recourse if the contract was
> violated. Most entities would choose to pay the fees.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

We've been here before in history. In Islam, somewhat also in Jewish communities, it was customary to submit a commercial dispute to the local imam or ayatollah who was paid for his wisdom by both sides -- you didn't waste a good judge hearing trivial cases.

Henry II was so enamoured of this system that he took it back to England and put the church to work in Chancery, Equity, or Courts of the King's Concience to settle issues that the 19 writs of Courts of Law could not handle. Became the basis of English commercial law which has been one reason the English-speaking world leads the commercial planet.

The Chancellor's troops set about setting rules (if you lost at Law, don't come to Equity; come to court with clean hands, we are not in the business of settling disputes among thieves, etc.) and generally did a lot of good work before the Law people finally caught up.

An awful lot of law has to do with setting a standard where there is not one and little comes to recommend any particular one. The classic here is the case of an offer and acceptance by mail; who bears the risk of crummy mail service? Adams vs Linsell if memory serves.

Perhaps more of legal practice is burying the dead: bankruptcy, probate, divorce, etc. The nature of things is for each to try like hell to get his own to the detriment of both the estate and other creditors. Often the actions of particular creditors damages everyone including the particular creditor so it helps to have a ref with a very loud whistle. The poor bastard who gets Enron will have a hell of a time taking a vacation for many years.

There has to be an element of coercion involved. The problem for the Libertarian is to establish the mechanism and finance it (seems to be the

issue here) without it taking over. The classic problem of who watches the watchers.

And a lot of regulatory time is spent establishing a playing field in which the biggest SOB in the valley does not enjoy an advantage.

My personal favorite is a substantial strengthening of the rights of a jury (Viking in origin BTW). In criminal cases, the Scottish system in which a verdict of 'innocent' as opposed to 'not proven' causes all sorts of complications to the prosecution. In civil cases, a verdict of Horseshit and a five-lash public flogging of the plaintiff's attorney would have salutory effects. There is no question that a certain amount of extortion of large companies is going on via the judicial system in which a law firm specializes in suing Denny's etc. can keep it up for years with little risk; OK, raise the risk level.

And do not neglect the feedback loop. An airplane crash causes all sorts of investigation to be sure it does not happen again. Why should not a wrongful conviction produce exactly the same sort of cavalry charge?

I rather enjoy in a perverse sort of way the present constipation of the Federal courts with drug cases. One cannot really blame the FCC when you can't interest a Federal DA in anything that is under $10K and does not confiscate something.

Dick N&#65533;BK

4404. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 16:55:38 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <egLS7.16871$bs2.3412125@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 27401
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Will this cross posted bullshit thread ever die?
Train

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3c1b51d9.2953583@news.mindspring.com...
> On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 08:38:05 +0000 (UTC), Bill Nelson
> <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote:
>
> >In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
> >
> >> And if you argue with a cop then you are just
> >> another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
> >> alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
> >> your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
> >> the office to shoot everyone.
> >
> >I would not give an officer a rough time. Why should I? But if
> >he wants to examine my automobile or radios, then he better have
> >a search warrant. If he feels one is necessary, then the watch
> >officer can certainly see that one is obtained in short order.
> >Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
>
> Actually, obtaining a search warrant isn't all that quick or easy.
> Assume the following scenario...
>
> 1. Officer Obey stops John Q Motorist for some traffic violation.
> 2. Upon viewing the vehicle's interior, Officer Obey sees a
> radio mounted in the car.
> 3. Officer Obey asks the motorist about the radio
> 4. John Q Motorist politely tells officer Obey the radio
> is a ham rig (or CB, or whatever).
> 5. Officer Obey then requests permission to search the
> vehicle and/or examine the radio itself.
> 6. John Q Motorist declines (politely) to allow search
> of the vehicle and/or the radio.
>
> OK so far?
>
> Now Officer Obey requires a search warrant to search
> the car or further examine the radio. Just how does the Officer
> obtain that warrant then? The process involves at least
> the following:
>

> 1. Detaining the vehicle and occupant for an unspecified time
> 2. Officer Obey would need to have his police supervisory
> people contact a judge and inform the judge as to WHY
> a search warrant is needed (i.e. probable cause, etc.)
> (most local municipalities don't always
> have a judge just sitting around to do these things)
>
> Judges do NOT routinely issue search warrants just
> to make local police happy. IF some subsequent search
> uncovers a criminal act. then there had better be sound
> reasons for the search warrant in the first place. If
> the search uncovers nothing...the reason for the warrant
> had better stand up to challange via a civil lawsuit.
>
> If any cop builds a record of "bogus" stops and bogus
> requests for search warrants, that cop's credibility in the force
> goes out the window and you can bet the judge(s)
> (as do police management) know
> who those bad credibility cops are.
>
> Good policing does not require arrogance or "attitude"
> on the part of police. Attitude cops give all cops a bad
> name and they undermine the service of the good cops
> who know and work as proffesionals within the constraints
> of our constitution and legal system.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

4405. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:03:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215120310.01870.00000330@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27405

In article <#NzBiPngBHA.2124@cpimsnntpa04>, "K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
writes:

>N2EY wants to know:
>
>> When's the last time you worked a US ham with a 100% homebrew
>> station who did not have a "mainstream" rig also? (Besides me, I
>> mean - and it ain't true for me anymore).
>
>Get real!

I am real. I asked a simple question.

> We aren't talking about "100% homebrew " here (nor were
>we back in the 50's). We're talking about tinkering and experimenting,
>which can include some homebrewing "from scratch", some modification
>of store bought equipment, some 'conversion from other service', some
>kitbuilt, some fixing of what got broken, and obviously some unchanged
>since it came out of the box. That's the mix in most active amateur shacks
>today, just as it was back in the 50's.

The claim was that there is MORE "homebrewing and kitbuilding" today than in
the 1950s. Homebrewing is defined as building from scratch, and kitbuilding is
defined as assembling a kit of parts prepared by others, using the provided
instructions. "Some modification of store bought equipment, some 'conversion
from other service', some fixing of what got broken, and obviously some
unchanged since it came out of the box" are not included.

If you doubt my qualifications, I refer you to QST for June, 1989, page 62.
>
>I know a LOT of active hams and, except for a few very new ones, I don't
>know of a SINGLE shack that contains 100% factory made/factory original
>equipment. Not ONE.

That wasn't the question nor the claim. If you are going to get worked up over
every homebrew jumper cable or dipole you see, then you will wet yourself with
excitement if you ever visit my shack.

How many homebrew RIGS have you seen or worked in the past year? Receivers,
transmitters or transceivers? (Besides mine).
>
>Killing that spirit with a "manufactured type-accepted rig only" license
>would
>doom the Amateur Radio Service to extinction,

The same was said about no-code-test ham licenses. Did they doom the ARS to
extinction?

Nobody wants to kill the spirit, Hans. Least of all me.

For the record, the "Foundation" license allows kits if they are approved as meeting govt. regs. The concern is simply that the technical skills of Foundation class hams would not be adequate to homebuild from scratch.

> and all your ill-founded
>pontificating about "there ain't no more homebrewers" will only speed the
>date.

Who said that? Not me. I'm living proof we homebrewers still exist. There just aren't many of us building actual RIGS, for reasons W3RV clearly explained.

>Shame on you.

For telling the truth?

And by the way, for the record:

I don't think a "no-homebrew" license is a good thing for the ARS at all.

73 de Jim, "Definitive Expert" N2EY

4406. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:03:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215120312.01870.00000332@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27402

In article <3C1AB88F.6B6FCFF2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> I thought "Doc" Williamson didn't want you
>> bandying his name about.
>
>I've told him about the PCTA jerks on this newsgroup.

Did you tell him about the NCTA jerks on this newsgroup, too?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4407. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:03:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215120312.01870.00000333@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27403

In article <3C0FF1F3.EAA60EFC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> But according to Cecil we shouldn't be paying for school for
>> those who can't afford it either.
>
>We'd be doing them a favor. The public schools are a disgrace
>and a breeding ground for economic collectivism.
>--
Not all of them are a disgrace, Cecil. Most of the public schools I know are excellent.

What makes them "a breeding ground for economic collectivism"??

73 de Jim, N2EY

4408. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:03:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215120312.01870.00000331@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27406

In article <3C198FB6.60B5A043@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Robert Casey wrote:
>
>> K0HB wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >
>> > Being from southern MN, I know all about EF Johnson, but you'd really
>need
>> > to stretch to consider that as "homebrewed". Sorry, Dick, your rant just
>> > doesn't persuade me. This "factory appliances only" license is a bad
>idea.
>> >
>>
>> A major reason for the way the FCC and other countries do up their
>> rules is the ease of enforcement. Why do they say have extra only
>> subbands instead of say power level restrictions? Because someone
>> at an FCC field site operating a receiver can easily see what frequency
>> you are on, where he can't really tell how much power you're putting
>> out. For all he knows, you might just have a small rig and a yagi
>> pointed at him.
>
> You have just given a description of how the FCC would reason if they were
>making the rules today, instead of 35 year ago. That was not, however, the
>thinking at the time.
>
OK, I'll bite. What WAS the thinking at the time?

The original setup for "incentive licensing" was that it took an Advanced or
Extra to work 'phone on the hambands between 3 and 25 MHz. In late 1952 the FCC
suddenly tossed out that scheme (no NPRM, no comments, no nuthin', just an
announcement) and gave all US hams except Novices and Techs all privileges.

5 years later (1958, right after Sputnik) the FCC started asking for ideas
about how to get more hams to upgrade. (There were about 4,000 Extras out of
220,000 US hams then). Nothing really definitive surfaced until 1963, when the
ARRL proposed going back to the old system - Advanced or Extra for 'phone
between 3 and 25 MHz.

FCC mulled that over, asked for ideas, and a whole pile of them flooded in. The
FCC plan was a mix of those ideas, including the idea of
subbands-by-license-class. I remember that one of the reasons was that
frequency could be easily measured to tell if a ham was operating within

his/her license privileges. The subbands reserved for Extras and Advanceds were the best DX spots, too.

If that's not right, what was the thinking 35 years ago?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4409. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:03:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215120313.01870.00000334@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27404

In article <3C16623B.9D45ACBA@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
>news:<3C15C5D8.A02E619C@sccoast.net>...
>> > On a side note (not directed solely at you, Jim), Europe has an
>> > excellent public transportation system.
>
>> I understand that in Paris and its suburbs one cannot get more than a
>> certain distance (500 meters?) from a Metro station. And the Paris
>> Metro system has been constantly (except for war years) expanded and
>> modernized to meet the needs of the City of Light.
>
>Yes, just got back from there.

COOL!!!

>It only takes about an hour to walk
>across the city between the walls where 2 millions of the residents
>live. Out here you'd barely get started down Imperial in that amount of
>time.

Did you get to ride the Metro much?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4410. Re: Glenn Baxter Writes Riley...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:11:13 UTC
From: Norman FongVu <cornyoung44@aol.com>
Message-ID: <RuLS7.4551$O7.469651@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27408
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Frankie Todd" <Anon@Anon..com> wrote in message news:9veb79iqu0@pita.alt.net...
> Boy. First Glenn jams the Hams with his illegal transmissions, and NOW
> he has the audacity to respond below to Riley after getting a warning letter
> on Dec. 11, 2001. Here's hoping Glenn's license ain't long for this world.

Right on Frankie my boy!
This complete xmas fruitcake with nuts in Maine is confused
if he want's to become the next Herbert W Armstrong or Wayne
Green. Probably wants to be both with Arthur Godfrey tossed in.
Just one look at his website and one can see that the
elevator don't go to the top floors.

4411. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:11:41 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <hvLS7.309256$5A3.119405019@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27407
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

William No one said any law was enacted to allow LEO's the ability to confiscate equipment on a MIL base. But Tacoma did pass a law, they have no more authority than the FCC does with regards to these matters. you can basically say the FCC deputized these people to carry out there job's for them, at least regarding CB enforcement.

"WILLIAM FRAZIER" <KC7REK@email.msn.com> wrote in message news:O01$$yXhBHA.1864@cpimsnntpa04...
> You folks are comparing apples and oranges. First a City, such as Tacoma or
> any other city, for that matter, can not or will not pass any law, ordinance
> or other bill that prohibits what the Federal Government allows.
>
> Second, the idea that a local city or county police officer would have
> jurisdiction over radios on a military base is completely false. Only the
> CID or the MP's can enforce laws on a military reservation. Only with the
> permission of the Base Commander can LEOs enter the base to enforce civilian
> laws.
>
> Third, the enforcement of federal law lies with the FBI. They are the
> enforcement branch of the FCC and only they can confiscate radio equipment
> that the FCC has ordered confiscated.
>
> Forth, upon entering a military base, you no longer have the same rights or
> privileges that you enjoy off the base. You must obey military law and are
> subject to military rules and regulations, which you must agree to before
> entering the base or you will NOT be permitted to enter.
>
> As I live within 50 miles of Ft. Lewis, Mc Chord Air Force Base (Tacoma), 10
> mile of the Bremerton Naval Shipyard (Puget Sound Naval Shipyard), 35 miles
> of Naval Air Station Whidbey Island and 5 miles of the US Navy Nuclear
> Submarine Base Bangor, I am quite familiar with the rules, regulations and
> laws of what you can and can't do in, on or around these bases. I'm here to
> tell you that no such law or ordinance has ever been enacted nor has any LEO
> ever, to my knowledge, stopped or detained a radio operator for using there

> radio equipment in any manner allowed by law.
>
> William F. (Bill) Frazier, KC7REK
> Silverdale, WA
>
>
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C1A2443.E09EDBF8@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > N9NWO wrote:
> >
> > >Are you now saying anyone with a
> >
> > > > radio is being profiled?
> > >
> > > Given the events of Sept 11th, yes.
> >
> > That's odd. The only radios used by the terrorists on Sept 11 were the
> same ones
> > the pilots use.
> > Any cop who suddenly starts profiling anyone with a mobile radio because
> of Sept 11
> > is a
> > paranoia-ridden loose cannon.(there are some of those)
> > The terrorists made extensive use of cellphones. So they should
> > be profiling cellphone users instead. Now THAT would keep 'em busy.
> >
> > Dick
> > Retired Public Safety communicater
> >
> >
>
>

4412. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:12:44 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <gwLS7.309257$5A3.119405657@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27409
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Only when you take your own advise.

"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:egLS7.16871$bs2.3412125@news02.optonline.net...
> Will this cross posted bullshit thread ever die?
> Train

4413. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:14:35 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%xLS7.165243$WW.10379570@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27410

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011215120312.01870.00000331@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3C198FB6.60B5A043@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> >> K0HB wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Being from southern MN, I know all about EF Johnson, but you'd
really
> >need
> >> > to stretch to consider that as "homebrewed". Sorry, Dick, your
rant just
> >> > doesn't persuade me. This "factory appliances only" license is a
bad
> >idea.
> >> >
> >>
> >> A major reason for the way the FCC and other countries do up their
> >> rules is the ease of enforcement. Why do they say have extra only
> >> subbands instead of say power level restrictions? Because someone
> >> at an FCC field site operating a receiver can easily see what
frequency
> >> you are on, where he can't really tell how much power you're putting
> >> out. For all he knows, you might just have a small rig and a yagi
> >> pointed at him.
> >
> > You have just given a description of how the FCC would reason if they
were
> >making the rules today, instead of 35 year ago. That was not, however,
the
> >thinking at the time.
> >
> OK, I'll bite. What WAS the thinking at the time?
>
> The original setup for "incentive licensing" was that it took an
Advanced or
> Extra to work 'phone on the hambands between 3 and 25 MHz. In late 1952
the FCC
> suddenly tossed out that scheme (no NPRM, no comments, no nuthin', just

an
> announcement) and gave all US hams except Novices and Techs all
privileges.
>
> 5 years later (1958, right after Sputnik) the FCC started asking for
ideas
> about how to get more hams to upgrade. (There were about 4,000 Extras
out of
> 220,000 US hams then). Nothing really definitive surfaced until 1963,
when the
> ARRL proposed going back to the old system - Advanced or Extra for
'phone
> between 3 and 25 MHz.
>
> FCC mulled that over, asked for ideas, and a whole pile of them flooded
in. The
> FCC plan was a mix of those ideas, including the idea of
> subbands-by-license-class. I remember that one of the reasons was that
> frequency could be easily measured to tell if a ham was operating within
> his/her license privileges. The subbands reserved for Extras and
Advanceds were
> the best DX spots, too.
>
> If that's not right, what was the thinking 35 years ago?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Wasn't it part of the Great Post-Sputnik we are behind the World technically caper? Lots of strange things came out of that mentality.

Dick BK

4414. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:20:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215122015.03163.00000366@mb-cr.aol.com>
Source record: 27411

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)

>>This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
>>and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
>>what I can see.

> And you expected...WHAT...from RRAP...?!?!

How about a congratulations for a fellow ham who has upgraded?

Congratuations, Carl.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4415. Re: Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:29:57 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011215122957.05942.00000327@mb-fl.news.cs.com>
Source record: 27412

>I just wanted to be the first to get those greetings in this year.
>In case I've missed anybody (Larry, Richard, Krell, Mike, Rick, and
>others), I just wanted to point out again that I'll be leaving this
>newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and
>I'll look forward to talking with everyone when I return. Until then,
>take care.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
The same to you, Dwight. May all on the NG have a warm and happy holiday
season...and a GREAT new year.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4416. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:39:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1B8AC5.F5931DC6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27413

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C1AF3A9.FE9E3D78@earthlink.net...
>
> > I've worked in a lot of places, Kim. I've never worked anywhere that
> > had a bunch of wiccans and druids hunched over the water cooler.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> How would you know if they didn't say anything about it? Most people don't
> proselytize about their religious beliefs.

Here's five bucks. Go buy a sense of humor.

Dave K8MN

4417. Re: "...one step closer to extinction "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:40:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1b8a41_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27415

"K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message
news:e1zHSPYhBHA.1848@cpimsnntpa02...
> Kim said:
>
> > Also, in *this* part of this thread the discussion is about one-on-one
> > meetings behind closed doors with members of the opposite sex.
>
> Using the term "the opposite sex" automatically charges your ideas
> with emotion and unprofessionalism. A professional will use the term
> "persons of different gender". What the hell is "opposite" about it, and
> what has "sex" to do with it?
>
> (���) 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Damn! Is this anything like the "I'm offended that you're offended"
argument :} ?

Kim W5TIT

4418. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:45:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1B8C3D.8E72802A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27414

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011213104336.18921.00000171@mb-mv.aol.com...
> > In article <3C182F2F.6E96890E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >The average technical level of all members of the IEEE is higher
> > > >than the average technical level of all members of the ARS.
> > >
> > > Cecil:
> > >
> > > Well, Harumph...I would damn well hope so!
> > >
> > > Now that we have THAT cleared up, back to my question: "What is the
> > > correlation between Morse code skill and technical skill, among [the
> > > closed set of] licensed Amateur Radio operators?"
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> > Larry,
> >
> > According to the FCC "none." AndI find the FCC to be a FAR
> > more credible source of information/opinion on this matter than
> > you, so why don't you stop ranting?
> >
> > This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
> > and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
> > what I can see.
> >
> > Get a life ...
> >
> > BTW, just to put some icing on the cake for you, I finally got
> > around to finding time in my work/travel schedule to go to a
> > VE session and upgrade to Extra :-)
> > (missed 1 out of 50 on the test ... I read one question/answers
> > too fast and accidentally marked the wrong letter when I
> > actually knew the correct answer ... really made me mad at
> > myself ... but that's what I get for finishing the test in 10 minutes :-)

A professional engineer should have aced the test. See what happens
when your smugness gets the best of you? I'll be listening for your

"experimentation" on 20m SSB.

Dave K8MN

4419. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:48:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1B8CEF.4E14C7AB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27416

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C1AF3A9.FE9E3D78@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C1AAC75.D32717A1@sccoast.net...
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> > > > > in public.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend is
> > > > towards more restrictions on intimate activities between co-workers.
> > > >
> > > > As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
> > > > leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
> > > > been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
> > > > return. Take care.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > >
> > >
> > > Dwight, you can't have it both ways. You keep saying "we" must rely on
> our
> > > "own experience" then you say that the "trend" is "towards more
> > > restrictions...blah, blah, blah." WHERE?
> > >
> > > I'll continue to do business at my place, where adults act and are
> expected
> > > to act like adults. If you want to continue to work for the kiddie
> > > companies where no trust is granted or obtained, you just keep right on.
> >
> > I've worked in a lot of places, Kim. I've never worked anywhere that
> > had a bunch of wiccans and druids hunched over the water cooler.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I wouldn't know, because we don't discuss those things at work. Again,
> company policy and professional etiquette would dictate that certain things
> are just not for the "office."
```

>
> Also, in *this* part of this thread the discussion is about one-on-one
> meetings behind closed doors with members of the opposite sex.

No, *this* part of the thread is about wiccans and druids hunched over water coolers. That's the part you responded to.

I understand about that "not for the office" stuff. I hope you don't bring up the discussion about your callsign there either. Save that for when you're at the ballpark shouting the "F" word.

Dave K8MN

4420. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:51:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1B8D9A.DA1F9786@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27417

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I thought "Doc" Williamson didn't want you
> > > > bandying his name about.
> > >
> > > I've told him about the PCTA jerks on this newsgroup.
> >
> > That's interesting. I thought you told us that he didn't want you
> > bandying his name about. Was that incorrect?
>
> I NEVER said that, Dave. Your thoughts are screwed up, as usual.

Sure you did, Cecil. It must have been during one of your sacramental
wines experiences and you've forgotten. You're slipping, old boy.

Dave K8MN

4421. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 17:51:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1b8ce7_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27418

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C1B8CEF.4E14C7AB@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C1AF3A9.FE9E3D78@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C1AAC75.D32717A1@sccoast.net...
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> > > > > > in public.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend
is
> > > > > towards more restrictions on intimate activities between
co-workers.
> > > > >
> > > > > As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
> > > > > leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
> > > > > been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
> > > > > return. Take care.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > Dwight, you can't have it both ways. You keep saying "we" must rely
on
> > our
> > > > "own experience" then you say that the "trend" is "towards more
> > > > restrictions...blah, blah, blah." WHERE?
> > > >
> > > > I'll continue to do business at my place, where adults act and are
> > expected
> > > > to act like adults. If you want to continue to work for the kiddie
> > > > companies where no trust is granted or obtained, you just keep right
on.
> > >
> > > I've worked in a lot of places, Kim. I've never worked anywhere that
> > > had a bunch of wiccans and druids hunched over the water cooler.
```

> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I wouldn't know, because we don't discuss those things at work. Again,
> > company policy and professional etiquette would dictate that certain
things
> > are just not for the "office."
> >
> > Also, in *this* part of this thread the discussion is about one-on-one
> > meetings behind closed doors with members of the opposite sex.
>
> No, *this* part of the thread is about wiccans and druids hunched over
> water coolers. That's the part you responded to.
>
> I understand about that "not for the office" stuff. I hope you don't
> bring up the discussion about your callsign there either. Save that for
> when you're at the ballpark shouting the "F" word.
>
> Dave K8MN

No, actually my callsign's been discussed at the office. You see, it is a callsign--and has nothing to do with sex, color, race, religion, or national origin. They get it. Some hams don't.

I don't go to the ballpark, I told you. I do go to stuffy dinners and banquets, though. I just whisper "fuck" at those.

Are you aware that by saying "the 'F' word" you've as much as said and used it, Dave? At least be truthful with yourself.

Kim W5TIT

4422. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:04:44 UTC
From: The Packrat<redacted> <spam@n7uic.net>
Message-ID: <0hMS7.2351$X94.136930@rwcrnsc52>
Source record: 27419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Fingerprinting is only good for FM.

"WG" <nojunk@mail.com> wrote in message
news:V3FS7.10094$m54.2460407@news0.telusplanet.net...
> I have been a ham for 10 years now and a CBer for over 20 years and I have
> noticed a degradation of CB to the point that no one uses it anymore. If
you
> are on the road ham is the best way to go. With the new IRLP system you
can
> tone up repeaters almost any ware in the world, (http://www.irlp.net/)
> with just a hand-held. One thing that all CBers should ask themselves
before
> they key up, is what they are talking about fit for family listening.
Would
> you want your wife, girlfriend or kids listening to that? Also that they
can
> be tracked in under 6 seconds and the transmitter fingerprint system works
> very well. The reason that the governments of the world permit this to
> continue is that the cost to go to trial is prohibitive. I do know that
> Industry Canada and the FCC will act on complaints especially if the dirty
> radio gets into the commercial or police bands. I have played around with
> radio tracking using the Doppler shift radio tracking system on CB and it
is
> unbelievable how fast you can drive right up to someone's door or follow a
> dirty trucker into a truck stop and have a talk with him face to face.
>
> "Tazanator" <tazanator1@attbi.com> wrote in message
> news:7wbS7.20905$7y.231436@rwcrnsc54...
> > Well I will say sorry about the course language, but there is a bigger
> > picture on this.
> >
> > I have studied and recieved a lowly tech lic for starters. However
having
> > driven semi's for years I can *try* to relate the truckers side. CB 19
> has
> > degenerated way down to the point of people harrassing truckers (listen
> > sometime a bulk of the noise is from base stations especial around big
> > cities) most of the "sesame Street" gang is kids playing and talking
big.
> >
> > Due to this depressing talk to drivers, many have left the CB buying ham
> > radios for the extra cost so they can "get away" from the base stations
(I

> > was told that a long time ago CB was just like 80 meters is today...many
> > truckers miss that peaceful feeling you enjoy (I only have a tech so 2
> > meters is my place)) while it is wrong many don't care due to the way
they
> > were treated on channel 19 (Penn state has a kid on 19 with a 250 watt
> base
> > that must have a dictionary of every swear word that he just keeps
reading
> > at truckers)
> >
> > As far as the FCC many state scales have fcc trained weigh masters that
do
> > check (you pull on to the scale and are asked to key up the CB)
sometimes
> > they find them often they don't. I belive that the truckers could bring
a
> > revival to the ham comunity, just from the numbers point of view, and I
> > started down ham meeting another ham trucker...HE HAD A HUGE ANT (screw
> > driver)ON THAT TRUCK!!! made me wonder what he was talking to!
> >
> > While it is a privalage to us ... a little tact here could gain you a
> friend
> > and the ham community more clout. Sence I got my ticket many of the
guys
> I
> > used to run with have seen me use the 2 meter repeater system (they
loved
> > the michigan linked repeater system...all over the state with only an
HT)
> > and the phone patches, many have started borrowing my books to study for
> the
> > test.
> >
> > To start them on the road just help them out ... many would love to have
> the
> > ANT checked by an MFJ analizer (they pay up to $20 for it) and as you
> teach
> > them how to get the best out of the CB talk about the ham structure many
> > will listen and think about it....many of my friends have started
studying
> >
> > (by the way it supposed to be 28.665 for the new 19)
> >
> > --
> >
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER
> >
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the reporter,
> > Who has given us freedom of the press.
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the poet,

> > Who has given us freedom of speech.
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the campus organizer,
> > Who has given us freedom to demonstrate.
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the lawyer,
> > Who has given us the right to a fair trial.
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, who salutes the flag,
> > Who serves under the flag and,
> > Whose coffin is draped by the flag,
> > Who allows the protester to burn the flag.
> >
> > Author, Charles M. Province
> >
> > **
> > By US Code Title 47, Sec.227(a)(2)(B), a computer/modem/printer meets
> > the definition of a telephone fax machine. By Sec.227(b)(1)(C), it is
> > unlawful to send any unsolicited advertisement to such equipment. By
> > Sec.227(b)(3)(C), a violation of the aforementioned Section is
> > punishable by action to recover actual monetary loss, or $500, whichever
> > is greater, for each violation.
> > **
> >
> > think I'm full of it look yourself!
> > http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/47/227.html
> >
> > "Speaker to Animal Crackers" <flashboinnng1@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:fVrR7.3693$vK1.358764@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > Listened all morning to a group of truckers
> > > on 28.115 mHz (AM). Even had
> > > one who's wife was on the "base rig" talking with
> > > her OM mobile about how to make out the bills and novel ways
> > > she thought of to make "Xmas money".
> > >
> > > Is this is what you get when you mass-sell 10 meter
> > > radios at/by Radio Shack and others? Wonder how many
> > > were running Uniden 2510's, 2600's or HTX's.
> > >
> > > Is 28.115 is the new Channel Ninteen ?.
> > > Is the cow out of the barn door?
> > > A while later a ham came up on the freq in AM
> > > to try an *politely* inform them there were in violation
> > > of FCC rules. They just laughed, Thought it was very funny.
> > > One guy told the ham, who exercized much restraint and
> > > gentlemanly composure in his speech
> > > to: "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"
> > > complete with an roger-beep and echo-effects microphone.
> > >
> > > Nice eh?
> > > Gives you the warm & fuzzies?
> > >
> > > I'm curious what's the FCC will do?

> > >
> > > How about 2 meters?
> > > Is that the next band to be trashed by these
> > > morons who buy ham gear at R.S. or WalMart
> > > and operate without a licence ?
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4423. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:14:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B9306.B1B42F4B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Arguing with a cop is stupid. If he had no reason for stopping you, he
> wouldn't have.

You mean that the lady who was raped and murdered by a California
highway patrolman should not have argued with him?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4424. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:34:50 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B97CA.AE44C4EA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27421

Rick Adams wrote:
> It isn't the function of the US to interfere in the actions of other
> sovereign nations ...

Libertarians believe that exact principle should be applied within
the US. It isn't the function of the US to interfere in the actions
of law-abiding US citizens. Face it, Rick, you believe that American
children are worth more than foreign children. If you didn't, you
would advocate helping all the children of the world instead of
just a select few within the US. Libertarians believe about poor
people in this country just what you believe about poor people in
other countries.

> If that's what the Libertarian Party stands for, it's by far the most
> offensive political party ever formed in this nation--despite having
> the most rational views on personal liberty of any modern party.

Libertarians believe that individual lives belong to the individuals.
Therefore, Libertarians believe in voluntary charitable donations
to assist the poor and needy instead of having it forced upon the
citizens by governmental fiat.

> The US has no RIGHT to interfere in the
> affairs of other sovereign nations--any more than they have any right
> to interfere in OUR affairs.

The US has every RIGHT to give out foreign aid, Rick. There's not
many governments that would turn down American foreign aid aimed
at the poor people of the world. To be consistent, you are going
to have to advocate US governmental foreign aid for ALL the poor
people of the world unless you are willing to admit that you believe
that American children are worth more than foreign children.

> Thanks for opening my eyes to the Libertarian platform,
> Cecil--it will help when I go to the polls to know that regardless of
> how positive a Libertarian candidate seems, his real position is one
> that I can't possibly support with my vote.

Be a social communist if you want. When you enslave the producers
and reward the nonproducers, you get predictable results. Welfare
has the potential to bring this country down. I'm not going to wish
you luck on that project.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4425. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:36:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B9819.12D82B06@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27422

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >> But according to Cecil we shouldn't be paying for school for
> >> those who can't afford it either.
> > >
> > >We'd be doing them a favor. The public schools are a disgrace
> > >and a breeding ground for economic collectivism.
> > >--
> > Not all of them are a disgrace, Cecil. Most of the public schools I know are
> > excellent.
> >
> > What makes them "a breeding ground for economic collectivism"??

The NEA.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4426. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:41:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B993E.F896B4A9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27424

Rick Adams wrote:
> Perhaps instead of telling us what you would like to see torn
> down if the Libertarians were in power, you might want to enlighten us
> as to what it would be replaced with--and why THAT would insure
> improvements.

Everything falls out from the premise that an individual's life and the
products of that life belong to that individual. He should have the
freedom to decide how the products of his life are spent. Otherwise,
he is just a slave.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4427. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:41:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215134123.01870.00000335@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 27423

In article <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112082148260.20076-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>,
"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>This reminds me of the petition to the FCC regarding Stewart Teaze's
>"communicator" license and what a joke that was.

Except this is real.

The UK Foundation class offers far more privileges than his proposed "Colt"
idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>On 8 Dec 2001, N2EY wrote:
>>Was perusing a copy of CQ in the local MicroCenter when I came upon an
>article
>>about UK restructuring.
>>
>>Their existing classes are getting a bit more power & privs, and looks like
>5
>>wpm for full access.
>>
>>But the big news is a new class of license they call "Foundation". Idea is
>to
>>have a license that can be had at the end of a one-day training session.
>>
>>Privs include parts of almost all bands and modes except 10 meters.
>>
>>Written test is 20 multiple guess questions, mostly on regs.
>>
>>BUT.....
>>
>>No homebrewing or kits - all gear must be manufactured and type-approved.
>>
>>Code test to be a "familiarity" test. No speed specified, and the person
>being
>>tested can use "aids" like crib sheets. For example, the examiner sends an
>"A",
>>the person being tested writes down a dot and dash on scrap paper, then
>looks
>>up "dot dash" on a crib sheet and writes down "A" on the test paper. Sending
>>test to be similar.
>>
>>Waddya think, folks?
>

4428. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:44:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B9A0D.6A51118C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27425

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> > And you expected...WHAT...from RRAP...?!?!
>
> How about a congratulations for a fellow ham who has upgraded?
> Congratuations, Carl.

Yep, congratulations. The average technical skill of the Extra
class just inched up a notch. Now who was it who was recently
ragging on Carl for not upgrading?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4429. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:47:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B9AC7.4EA217B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27426

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > That's interesting. I thought you told us that he didn't want you
> > > bandying his name about. Was that incorrect?
> >
> > I NEVER said that, Dave. Your thoughts are screwed up, as usual.
>
> Sure you did, Cecil.

You're lying again, Dave. Wish you wouldn't do that. He has no
problem with being truthfully mentioned on this newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4430. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:50:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1B9B73.118CB4FA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27427

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C1AB88F.6B6FCFF2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >> I thought "Doc" Williamson didn't want you
> >> bandying his name about.
> > >
> >I've told him about the PCTA jerks on this newsgroup.
>
> Did you tell him about the NCTA jerks on this newsgroup, too?

You mean all the people who believe in freedom of choice of modes
in a hobby in a free society? He could pass a 5wpm Morse code exam
but he has no need for HF privileges.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4431. Re: Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 18:55:46 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <S0NS7.165375$WW.10389508@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27428

mike coslo wrote

> Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
> any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
> things? 8^)
>
> Or maybe the newsgroup needs renamed to
> alt.one.step.closer.to.extinction , with only one free association thread.

Sure Mike... you go first we'll follow you...

Rich

Hey Jim, I guess he doesn't like us talking about 'torturing' little old
ladies... ;-)

>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <i85R7.290107$W8.9721109@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> > "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:
> >
> > >> "NOBODY EXPECTS THE SPANISH INQUISITION!!!"
> > >>
> > >> followed by scenes of torture involving a (dish) rack, being poked
with
> > >soft
> > >> cushions, and being forced to sit in "the comfy chair".
> > >
> > >And, of course, they had some sweet little old lady sitting there
taking the
> > >'abuse'...
> >

4432. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 19:07:24 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011215140736.079$xR@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Cecil, I have seen that show many time which is it New Detectives or
something like that?

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C1B9306.B1B42F4B@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Arguing with a cop is stupid. If he had no reason for stopping you, he
> > wouldn't have.
>
> You mean that the lady who was raped and murdered by a California
> highway patrolman should not have argued with him?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4433. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 19:44:55 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <5932300D0E96DA4A.C78643F5C3E4F6A0.BE97C56E6DD68734@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27430

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 04:12:49 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Do you yell when you discuss confidential business, Rick? I've discussed
>highly classified military information with co-workers without having to hide
>behind closed doors. What are you discussing that is so secret it cannot
>possibly be discussed with the door open?

If you discuss classified information in a setting where it is
possible to be overheard (an office with the door open IS such a
setting) you are guilty of a major felony. Don't believe it? Report to
the military security officer in contact with your firm that you have
done precisely that and see how quickly you find out that you violated
the law.

Contrast that with the potential of sexual harassment
accusations, and I'd say that your practice is both a lot more
personally risky--and a lot more harmful to our country (I don't know
what kind of classified military material you deal with--but if it
could benefit an enemy of this country [as could most such material]
you are risking treason to protect yourself from possible harassment
charges).

Extend your argument to the next level, Dwight. If it's
reasonable for YOU to talk about classified material with the door
open, in order to prevent having to have closed-door sessions with an
opposite sex coworker, then the same must hold true for others. I can
just see a department head with NSA or the CIA insisting that a
subordinate leave the door to the office open while discussing a top
secret (or higher classification) document with him or her, can't you?

If it's safe for an intelligence officer (or any other
government supervisor) to meet privately with a subordinate, why isn't
it ok for you--or is it not the situation you distrust, but your own
reactions to being alone with a woman in a closed room?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4434. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 19:58:54 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9D098EB62797AF86.63281AF19F2AE617.A869FD9813F0BAFF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27431

On Tue, 11 Dec 2001 03:12:43 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> First of all, we have the companies where security is not a major issue -
>they're not working on anything where security, or sensitivity of product
>development, is a strong consideration. Obviously, this category of companies
>would include most in this country. And these were the companies I was talking
>about when I asked Rick what he was "discussing that is so secret it cannot
>possibly be discussed with the door open?" Obviously, for companies where
>security is not a major issue, there is little "need" for meetings behind closed
>doors - most business could be discussed with the doors open.

You certainly live in a different country than I do if you
don't think companies have more security interests than those. What
about market projections, expansion plans, new advertising campaigns,
personnel counseling (with alcoholics, etc.), promotion lists,
departmental restructuring, etc.? Maybe your local hardware store
doesn't need to have closed-door meetings, but virtually any medium to
large organization certainly does.

> At this point, you introduced a second category of companies into the
>discussion - those with a concern about sensitive product development ("HP/Intel
>shared computer architecture"). Actually, to be completely clear about this
>category of companies, we need to break it down further - those companies with
>just mild security considerations (consumer products, etc) and those truly
>obsessed with security (military contractors, etc).

He introduced that category in response to your own
message--and in YOUR message you stated that you hold open door
conversations concerning classified military information. Sounds to me
as though YOU opened the door to that topic.

> Finally, there is the second group of these companies (those truly obsessed
>with security). These are the companies who would hire security personnel (not
>security guards - security personnel to insure security of company information
>and product information). And I was talking about these companies when I said
>"private discussions about such information would be looked at with suspicion in
>most companies."

But, of course, no one in his or her right mind would WANT to
work for a firm that was "obsessed with security." You would spend the
entire day knowing that you were being watched by people who expected
you to violate their trust--hardly a stress-free work place.

> Now that we have a better understanding of the groups of companies we're
>talking about (those with little or no security considerations, those with mild

>security considerations, and those obsessed with security), this conversation
>might make a little more sense.

Ok:

Those with no security considerations will STILL have
confidential information discussed (salary reviews, personnel needs,
advertising campaigns, recruiting efforts, etc.) that will require
closed-door meetings.

Those with mild security considerations will have all the
above plus concerns with product, information, or military security
issues and will require closed-door meetings.

Those with an obsession with security, on the other hand,
often will not PERMIT closed-door meetings between only two employees
because they don't trust those employees not to act against the best
interests of the firm.

Clearly, based on your statements about not having closed door
meetings as a matter of policy, you must work for one of the latter
firms. Good luck--I turned down a pretty good offer from EDS several
years ago because they were just that kind of firm. It's nice to see
that some people don't object to working for employers who don't trust
them, since we need the services of those firms just as much as we
need the services of more rationally managed firms.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4435. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 19:59:32 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C1AF375.B21B56A7@mailcity.net>
Source record: 27432
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"The Packratï¿½" wrote:
>
> Fingerprinting is only good for FM.
>

Any transmitter can be fingerprinted.

4436. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 20:07:03 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8B0F59A742F36CAD.5F376A2E027CC402.C395FE644BBA55BB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27433

On 13 Dec 2001 15:43:37 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Nobody expects you to do anything that demonstrates any
>personal integrity; therefore you don't need to make any such
>public confessions!

What does integrity have to do with it?

If someone is paid a given salary, how on earth can it be
unethical or lacking in integrity to tell others how much that salary
is?

It is the COMPANY which demands employees keep their salaries
confidential that demonstrates a lack of integrity. The ONLY reason
for taking that position is because they are paying some people more
to do a given job than they are paying others for the same work. If
their pay scale was based on equal pay for equal work they wouldn't
CARE if people told others what they earned. Look at the government;
if you are civil service all that is necessary is to know your pay
level (which is open information, since your position in an agency is
determined by it). All "G5s," for example, receive precisely the same
salary. They don't have to hide it because their employer isn't
cheating anyone else out of a fair pay by concealing it.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4437. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 20:09:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <67C5046EDA39A524.3F8D880ECCCFC8AA.EF475C74F9D03B78@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27434

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 04:33:00 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> I do what I'm told at work, Dwight. I've *never*
>> experienced a male or female boss acting wrongly.
>> As I said, I suppose that the companies I've
>> worked at have all employed some very adult
>> people--because we all seem to be competent to
>> have closed door meetings without any problems.
>
>
> Well, Kim, there is little reason to continue with this - those are your
>experiences and these are mine (and both are equally legitimate). But I will end
>with this simple observation - as soon as a complaint is made at your company,
>or your company hears of something similar in your area, those doors at your
>company will fly open and remain that way. As I said, it is happening all around
>the country and your company is pressing it's luck by not paying attention to that.

On the other hand, as soon as the military finds out that
people at your firm are discussing classified military information
with OPEN doors, those doors will slam SHUT very quickly.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4438. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 20:22:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215152244.12113.00000340@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 27435

>Subject: Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 12/15/2001 11:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011215120312.01870.00000332@mb-fz.aol.com>

>Did you tell him about the NCTA jerks on this newsgroup, too?

Isn't that covered by the Fifth Amendment, Jim?

73

Steve, K4YZ

4439. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 20:26:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215152604.12113.00000343@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 27436

>Subject: Re: From a former Trucker
>From: "The Packratï¿½" spam@n7uic.net
>Date: 12/15/2001 12:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <0hMS7.2351$X94.136930@rwcrnsc52>

>Fingerprinting is only good for FM.

Who told you that? There are definate telltales even in an SSB signal
that get you snagged. Not as easy, but do-able.

Steve, K4YZ

4440. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 20:37:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <26119E8DEA4F8A2B.3C1F85CC0FFC9B9B.4D248FAA9DCE0AD2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27437

On 10 Dec 2001 04:40:15 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>As far as I know, neither the Bush administration or the Reagan administration
>has abrogated anyone's Right To Keep And Bear Arms. As a matter of
>fact, it could be said that the Reagan administration, with George Bush
>as VP, went a bit overboard in trying to guarantee the Right To Keep And
>Bear Arms for the Nicauraguan Contra rebels!

1. Under the recent anti-terrorism legislation, no weapon
purchased from the military as surplus may be maintained in an
operable state. If the weapon is already operable, the owner is
required to either have it rendered incapable of firing (and provide
proof) or turn the weapon in to the government w/o compensation. That
includes not just fully automatic or high powered military hardware
but everything from M1 carbines (VERY common today as inexpensive
hunting rifles), military issue Colt .45 automatic pistols (commonly
bought at surplus and refitted with match quality barrels and
actions), etc.

2. Also under the anti-terrorism legislation, the government
has the absolute right to seize ANYONE'S firearms w/o a warrant as
long as they claim the seizure is for the purpose of preventing
terrorism--and they do NOT have to prove that claim.

3. The seize at Waco was based on a claim that the Branch
Davidians had a fully automatic machine gun on the premises (the
so-called child abuse justification not only was disproven before the
raid, but it was a state matter not one meeting the requirements for
federal intervention)--DESPITE the fact that even if such a weapon HAD
been present (it wasn't) it would not have been illegal because one of
the residents had a federal firearms license to OWN one.

4. In several states (Michigan and Montana among them) federal
agents have infiltrated Militia groups because they promote a right to
bear arms and practice together with those weapons (and, no, I'm NOT a
militia supporter).

5. Several jurisdictions (including Washington DC, which is
administered under FEDERAL law, and thus completely subject to
Constitutional limitations) have banned certain classes of otherwise
legal firearms (Baltimore even banned "Saturday Night Specials"
defining them as handguns selling for less than a given price new).

6. School "gun free" zones extend 1,000 feet (approx 1/5 of a
mile) in all directions from a school. Legally, it is a criminal

offense to bring a firearm into that zone--even if it includes your HOME!

I won't even bother with the changes in gun laws that the combination of Brady and the drug war have lead to in the US--the simple fact remains that the government DOES limit the right to bear arms in substantial ways.

>That's ONE!!!

Nice try--and far closer than most of the other amendments.

>BTW -- I don't know how to check this, but I'm pretty sure the Bush's >haven't forced anyone to house any military troops in their homes, either!

1. Eminent domain has been used to take property from people that is used to build or expand military bases which in turn house military troops.

2. Under anti-terrorism legislation, the government has the right to place armed agents (equal to military troops in modern terms) in occupied dwellings in order to affect anti-terrorism activities involving other sites (i.e., FBI agents in a private home watching a suspect's home across the street) even if the owner of the dwelling specifically forbids such use!

Good try, Larry, but that was then--this is now.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4441. Re: Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 20:40:03 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <DyOS7.297513$W8.10311306@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27438

> mike coslo writes:

> > Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
> >any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
> >things? 8^)

Larry Roll K3LT wrote

> I'm the one who started this thread, and it is supposed to be about
> the sexually suggestive, inappropriate, and self-serving Vanity call
> sign of Kim Walker, W5TIT -- and the reply she received from Riley
> Hollingsworth when she made a vain attempt to trick him into
> endorsing her choice with the lame excuse that it is her "First
> Amendment right" to do so. This thread has now grown to over
> 1,000 postings, probably 3/4 of them having nothing to do with the
> original topic!
>
> Hey guys --- ever see that subject line in your newsreader? Did you
> know you can change what it says there? And a good time to do
> so is when you're making a posting that has nothing to do with
> whatever thread you've been reading at the time!
>
> And to think of all the time's I've been accused of being computer-
> illiterate because I use AOL! Sheez!

Hey Larry and Mike...

Posting about the topics of newsgoups is not the topic of this thread... can the chatter and take it somewhere else... :^

Rich

4442. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 20:50:08 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <4IOS7.297529$W8.10312252@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27439

> > > CAM wrote:

> > > > Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> > > > in public.

Dwight's having trouble with this 'cancept'.

> > Dwight Stewart wrote

> > > Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend is
> > > towards more restrictions on intimate activities between co-workers.

That's what makes the closed door meetings more tolerable for all cancerned.

> Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> > Dwight, you can't have it both ways. You keep saying "we" must rely on
our
> > "own experience" then you say that the "trend" is "towards more
> > restrictions...blah, blah, blah." WHERE?

He's painted himself into a corner now we have to wait two months for the
paint to dry.. ;-)

> > I'll continue to do business at my place, where adults act and are
expected
> > to act like adults. If you want to continue to work for the kiddie
> > companies where no trust is granted or obtained, you just keep right on.

It's falling on deaf ears... Kim...

> I've worked in a lot of places, Kim. I've never worked anywhere that
> had a bunch of wiccans and druids hunched over the water cooler.

Bubble, bubble, toil and trouble... ;-)

Rich...

4443. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 21:04:35 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <DVOS7.297544$W8.10313450@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27440

> > > Robert Casey wrote:

> > > > > Saw a well-endowed lady the other day with a T-Shirt that said:
> > > > > "If only these were brains".

> > CAM wrote:

> > > > Another tee shirt had the words "tune" and "load"
> > > > positioned on the breasts.

> > > Oh no, Robert. You used the "b" word. You know you will bring
> > > down the wrath of Larry Roll for doing that.

> Robert Casey wrote

> > Just now I heard the "T" word on the FM broadcast band.
> > Something about "tit for tat". :-)

Kim-W5TIT wrote

> Just one of each?! :)

Kim..

Are you saying it isn't...
"T" shirt...
but...
"T's"-shirt??? ;-)

Rich

4444. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 21:19:40 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <M7PS7.297563$W8.10314937@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com> wrote in message
news:hvLS7.309256$5A3.119405019@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> William No one said any law was enacted to allow LEO's the ability to
> confiscate equipment on a MIL base. But Tacoma did pass a law, they have
no
> more authority than the FCC does with regards to these matters. you can
> basically say the FCC deputized these people to carry out there job's for
> them, at least regarding CB enforcement.

Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.

Rich

4445. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 21:27:07 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011215162723.086$7w@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27442
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

They sure did, why do you say they haven't?

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message news:M7PS7.297563
> Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.
>
> Rich
>
>

4446. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 21:36:28 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <wnPS7.297581$W8.10316726@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27443
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

> Richard Plourde wrote

> > Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.

"Shrimp Biskit" wrote

> They sure did, why do you say they haven't?

No one has been able to provide PROOF that the law had been passed.

Search the Tacoma web sites and see if any 'proof' exists. It just didn't happen, plain and simple.

Rich

4447. USA using Radio DF'ing to find Bin Laden

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 22:11:09 UTC
From: "P. Atredes esq" <eggnog40@aol.com>
Message-ID: <1UPS7.5098$O7.528097@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27444
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

interesting story!

click here: http://www.washtimes.com/national/20011215-68264047.htm

4448. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 23:16:08 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <YQQS7.310110$5A3.119634853@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27445
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Well Richard you can take the Lazy mans way out, perhaps the web page wasn't updated yet. But I have all the proof I need I called the City of Tacoma personally and the Law was passed on sept 18. Now you can say it isn't so but it indeed has passed. From what was described a loud mouth CBer was interfering with TV's, telephones etc in the City of Tacoma and he wouldn't stop so they passed a law to make him stop.

Call for yourself I am sure the Clerk there will wonder why the sudden interest in Tacoma's Law. But what the heck she was nice as pie to me

City of Tacoma
1-253-591-5171

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:wnPS7.297581$W8.10316726@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Richard Plourde wrote
>
> > > Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.
>
> "Shrimp Biskit" wrote
>
> > They sure did, why do you say they haven't?
>
> No one has been able to provide PROOF that the law had been passed.
>
> Search the Tacoma web sites and see if any 'proof' exists. It just didn't
> happen, plain and simple.
>
> Rich
>
>
>

4449. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-15 23:30:31 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <g_QS7.82337$AR6.3360226@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 27446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

That scenario actually happened in Monroe, NC about 4 years ago. Seems
there was a cop
there who took a liking to a young lady who worked in a restaurant. She
was, indeed, movie
star beautiful and also very married. The cop waited for her to get off one
Friday night, followed her, and stopped her. He raped and murdered her for
which he was convicted
and sentenced to life in prison--I think he should've gotten the death
penalty.

Jerry
Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote in message
news:20011215140736.079$xR@news.newsreader.com...
> Cecil, I have seen that show many time which is it New Detectives or
> something like that?
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C1B9306.B1B42F4B@IEEE.org...
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Arguing with a cop is stupid. If he had no reason for stopping you,
he
> > > wouldn't have.
> >
> > You mean that the lady who was raped and murdered by a California
> > highway patrolman should not have argued with him?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
>

4450. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 00:19:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goekj2u.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27447
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 07:24:57 -0800, WILLIAM FRAZIER wrote:

>Third, the enforcement of federal law lies with the FBI. They are the
>enforcement branch of the FCC and only they can confiscate radio equipment
>that the FCC has ordered confiscated.

Sorry to tell that the above is not correct.

The FBI is most certainly not the enforcement branch of the FCC nor
vice-versa. The FCC has its own Enforcement Bureau and take it from
me, the FCC/EB does not want to hand any of its cases to the FBI if
it can avoid it because dealing with the FBI is a one-way street
(there is no give, only take, maybe the last legacy of JEdgar Hoover).

Radio equipment is not "confiscated" because it is not contraband.
It is seized (big legal difference) and can be forfeited to the
government only by court order after an evidnetiary hearing which
the U S Attorney must request within sixty days, and in which
the owner of interest has the opportunity to show that his/her
interest in the equipment was not related to the violation.

Seizure of radio equipment for non-compliance with communications
law requires an order of the Federal District Court on application
of the FCC showing probable cause, and is carried out by any
Federal officer authorized to execute court orders, usually the U S
Marshal Service or some other Federal agency on request of the
Marshal Service.

Conversely, any Federal or local LEO (including the FBI) can seize
radio equipment as evidence of a non-communications-law crime which
they have jurisdiction to deal with, the same as any other evidence
(court order or the Seven Magic Exemptions).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4451. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 00:19:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goelatv.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27448

On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 09:24:59 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
>and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
>what I can see.

Welcome back to The Zoo....and congrats on the upgrade.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

4452. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 00:21:01 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112151621.4c9ff34f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"WG" <nojunk@mail.com> wrote in message
news:<V3FS7.10094$m54.2460407@news0.telusplanet.net>...
> I have been a ham for 10 years now and a CBer for over 20 years and I have
> noticed a degradation of CB to the point that no one uses it anymore. If you
> are on the road ham is the best way to go. With the new IRLP system you can
> tone up repeaters almost any ware in the world, (http://www.irlp.net/)
> with just a hand-held. One thing that all CBers should ask themselves before
> they key up, is what they are talking about fit for family listening. Would
> you want your wife, girlfriend or kids listening to that? Also that they can
> be tracked in under 6 seconds and the transmitter fingerprint system works
> very well. The reason that the governments of the world permit this to
> continue is that the cost to go to trial is prohibitive. I do know that
> Industry Canada and the FCC will act on complaints especially if the dirty
> radio gets into the commercial or police bands. I have played around with
> radio tracking using the Doppler shift radio tracking system on CB and it is
> unbelievable how fast you can drive right up to someone's door or follow a
> dirty trucker into a truck stop and have a talk with him face to face.
>
> "Tazanator" <tazanator1@attbi.com> wrote in message
> news:7wbS7.20905$7y.231436@rwcrnsc54...
> > Well I will say sorry about the course language, but there is a bigger
> > picture on this.
> >
> > I have studied and recieved a lowly tech lic for starters. However having
> > driven semi's for years I can *try* to relate the truckers side. CB 19
> has
> > degenerated way down to the point of people harrassing truckers (listen
> > sometime a bulk of the noise is from base stations especial around big
> > cities) most of the "sesame Street" gang is kids playing and talking big.
> >
> > Due to this depressing talk to drivers, many have left the CB buying ham
> > radios for the extra cost so they can "get away" from the base stations (I
> > was told that a long time ago CB was just like 80 meters is today...many
> > truckers miss that peaceful feeling you enjoy (I only have a tech so 2
> > meters is my place)) while it is wrong many don't care due to the way they
> > were treated on channel 19 (Penn state has a kid on 19 with a 250 watt
> base
> > that must have a dictionary of every swear word that he just keeps reading
> > at truckers)
> >
> > As far as the FCC many state scales have fcc trained weigh masters that do
> > check (you pull on to the scale and are asked to key up the CB) sometimes
> > they find them often they don't. I belive that the truckers could bring a

> > revival to the ham comunity, just from the numbers point of view, and I
> > started down ham meeting another ham trucker...HE HAD A HUGE ANT (screw
> > driver)ON THAT TRUCK!!! made me wonder what he was talking to!
> >
> > While it is a privalage to us ... a little tact here could gain you a
> friend
> > and the ham community more clout. Sence I got my ticket many of the guys
> I
> > used to run with have seen me use the 2 meter repeater system (they loved
> > the michigan linked repeater system...all over the state with only an HT)
> > and the phone patches, many have started borrowing my books to study for
> the
> > test.
> >
> > To start them on the road just help them out ... many would love to have
> the
> > ANT checked by an MFJ analizer (they pay up to $20 for it) and as you
> teach
> > them how to get the best out of the CB talk about the ham structure many
> > will listen and think about it....many of my friends have started studying
> >
> > (by the way it supposed to be 28.665 for the new 19)
> >
> > --
> >
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER
> >
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the reporter,
> > Who has given us freedom of the press.
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the poet,
> > Who has given us freedom of speech.
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the campus organizer,
> > Who has given us freedom to demonstrate.
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the lawyer,
> > Who has given us the right to a fair trial.
> > IT IS THE SOLDIER, who salutes the flag,
> > Who serves under the flag and,
> > Whose coffin is draped by the flag,
> > Who allows the protester to burn the flag.
> >
> > Author, Charles M. Province
> >
> > **
> > By US Code Title 47, Sec.227(a)(2)(B), a computer/modem/printer meets
> > the definition of a telephone fax machine. By Sec.227(b)(1)(C), it is
> > unlawful to send any unsolicited advertisement to such equipment. By
> > Sec.227(b)(3)(C), a violation of the aforementioned Section is
> > punishable by action to recover actual monetary loss, or $500, whichever
> > is greater, for each violation.
> > **

> >
> > think I'm full of it look yourself!
> > http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/47/227.html
> >
> > "Speaker to Animal Crackers" <flashboinnng1@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:fVrR7.3693$vK1.358764@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > Listened all morning to a group of truckers
> > > on 28.115 mHz (AM). Even had
> > > one who's wife was on the "base rig" talking with
> > > her OM mobile about how to make out the bills and novel ways
> > > she thought of to make "Xmas money".
> > >
> > > Is this is what you get when you mass-sell 10 meter
> > > radios at/by Radio Shack and others? Wonder how many
> > > were running Uniden 2510's, 2600's or HTX's.
> > >
> > > Is 28.115 is the new Channel Ninteen ?.
> > > Is the cow out of the barn door?
> > > A while later a ham came up on the freq in AM
> > > to try an *politely* inform them there were in violation
> > > of FCC rules. They just laughed, Thought it was very funny.
> > > One guy told the ham, who exercized much restraint and
> > > gentlemanly composure in his speech
> > > to: "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"
> > > complete with an roger-beep and echo-effects microphone.
> > >
> > > Nice eh?
> > > Gives you the warm & fuzzies?
> > >
> > > I'm curious what's the FCC will do?
> > >
> > > How about 2 meters?
> > > Is that the next band to be trashed by these
> > > morons who buy ham gear at R.S. or WalMart
> > > and operate without a licence ?
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

i remember in the old days every once in a while, somebody would get
one of those radio direction finder gizmos and try and find somebody
for whatever reason. i always thought that people who do stuff like
that , have entirely too much time on their hands.....

4453. Re: Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 01:16:30 UTC
From: mjc5 <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1BF5EE.FCD5C301@psu.edu>
Source record: 27501

Umm, actually I did change the thread. See the new title? 8^)

`- Mike -

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> mike coslo wrote
>
> > Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
> > any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
> > things? 8^)
> >
> > Or maybe the newsgroup needs renamed to
> > alt.one.step.closer.to.extinction , with only one free association thread.
>
> Sure Mike... you go first we'll follow you...
>
> Rich
>
> Hey Jim, I guess he doesn't like us talking about 'torturing' little old
> ladies... ;-)

4454. Re: Clean up yer threads, was Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 01:18:02 UTC
From: mjc5 <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1BF64A.9D21986A@psu.edu>
Source record: 27450

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > mike coslo writes:
>
> > > Hey folks, we got about 5 different topics going on under this thread.
> > >any chance of breaking them off so us unwashed can follow the darn
> > >things? 8^)
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote
>
> > I'm the one who started this thread, and it is supposed to be about
> > the sexually suggestive, inappropriate, and self-serving Vanity call
> > sign of Kim Walker, W5TIT -- and the reply she received from Riley
> > Hollingsworth when she made a vain attempt to trick him into
> > endorsing her choice with the lame excuse that it is her "First
> > Amendment right" to do so. This thread has now grown to over
> > 1,000 postings, probably 3/4 of them having nothing to do with the
> > original topic!
> >
> > Hey guys --- ever see that subject line in your newsreader? Did you
> > know you can change what it says there? And a good time to do
> > so is when you're making a posting that has nothing to do with
> > whatever thread you've been reading at the time!
> >
> > And to think of all the time's I've been accused of being computer-
> > illiterate because I use AOL! Sheez!
>
> Hey Larry and Mike...
>
> Posting about the topics of newsgoups is not the topic of this thread... can
> the chatter and take it somewhere else... :^
>
> Rich

I just knew someone was gonna com in and bust my chops for this!

- Mike -

4455. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 01:39:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1bfb7c_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27502

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011215122015.03163.00000366@mb-cr.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> >>This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
> >>and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
> >>what I can see.
>
> > And you expected...WHAT...from RRAP...?!?!
>
> How about a congratulations for a fellow ham who has upgraded?
>
> Congratuations, Carl.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Thanks, Ed.

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4456. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 01:40:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1bfbe0$1_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27503

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.goelatv.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 09:24:59 -0500, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
> >and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
> >what I can see.
>
> Welcome back to The Zoo....and congrats on the upgrade.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Thanks, Phil ...

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4457. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 01:45:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1bfcd3_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27504

I accidentally clicked the "reply as e-mail" button ... haven't
been on usenet in so long I've forgotten where some of
the differences between Outlook Express' news reader and
the Outlook 2k I normally use for everything else ...

an Jim replied by e-mail with the following:

Carl,

Didja post this to rrap? I was a little surprised to get it as email. The
group oughta know your position on this. I'll answer it there if you meant
to
post it, otherwise I'll answer on the next go-round.

73 de Jim, N2EY

In a message dated 12/15/01 12:13:41 PM Eastern Standard Time,
wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:

> ---- Original Message -----
> From: "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Sent: Saturday, December 15, 2001 12:03 PM
> Subject: Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License
>
> [snip]
>
> >
> > And by the way, for the record:
> >
> > I don't think a "no-homebrew" license is a good thing for the ARS at
all.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, "Definitive Expert" N2EY
>
> Jim,
>
> I agree wholeheartedly ... a license which *requires* the use of "factory
> built" gear is counter to the technical educational aspect of ham radio.
>
> It could also, as an "unintended consequence" result in some sort of
> "type acceptance" requirement and THAT would be REALLY bad for
> the ARS.
>

4458. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 01:50:38 UTC
From: Tom Sevart <n2uhcNOSPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vguks$er173$1@ID-52518.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 27505
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"The Packrat" <spam@n7uic.net> wrote in message
news:0hMS7.2351$X94.136930@rwcrnsc52...
> Fingerprinting is only good for FM.
>

No it's not. Any transmitter, regardless of mode, can be fingerprinted. We did it in the military.

Tom

4459. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 02:10:40 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vgvqa0rh0@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27506
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Professor" <bgriffey@core.com> wrote in message
news:3c1b4471$0$30975$1dc6e903@news.corecomm.net...
> Boy do I wish that was true.
> I'd actually be able to hold a conversation out there...
>
> --
>
> |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
> Professor
> |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
>
>
> "WG" <nojunk@mail.com> wrote in message
> news:V3FS7.10094$m54.2460407@news0.telusplanet.net...
> > I have been a ham for 10 years now and a CBer for over 20 years and I
have
> > noticed a degradation of CB to the point that no one uses it anymore.

I had to laugh at this. This is almost like the Yogi Berra response as to why he didn't go to a certain popular restaurant. He said, "Because it's so crowded, no one ever goes there anymore!"

4460. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 02:21:13 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vh0bs0sim@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27510

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c1b5d71_2@news7.fast.net...

> Larry,
>
> According to the FCC "none." AndI find the FCC to be a FAR
> more credible source of information/opinion on this matter than
> you, so why don't you stop ranting?
>
> This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
> and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
> what I can see.
>
> Get a life ...

Carl,

Great to see you back on the newsgroup again.

Yes, Larry will probably being sulking about April 15, 2000 forever. (We now have Kim, W5TIT, being a boil on his behind and taking pleasure in it, but that's another topic)

4461. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 02:38:31 UTC
From: k0hb@qwest.net
Message-ID: <b7c5262e.0112151838.3dbeb182@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27507

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> I finally got around to finding time in my work/travel
> schedule to go to a VE session and upgrade to Extra

Excellent.

Hope to hear you in the upcoming ARRL DX test.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4462. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 02:45:32 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vh1gg$7s5$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 27508

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:3C1AB023.9E99CE58@sccoast.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Intel is one of the most successful companies of
> > all time. Many Silicon Valley companies copy
> > their policies. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense. Now you're showing your ignorance, Cecil

Why don't you just take Cecil's word for it and leave it at that?

4463. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 02:50:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vh1pd$84b$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 27509

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011213160301.24724.00000269@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <20011211221700.13985.00000823@mb-md.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >I have my doubts that even in Paris, you can find Metro stations spaced
> >less than 1/3 of a mile apart!
>
> I've never been there. My info is based on a report in an industry
journal.

Most Metro stops are less than a minute apart.

4464. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 03:23:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1c13da_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27511

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:9vh1pd$84b$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011213160301.24724.00000269@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > In article <20011211221700.13985.00000823@mb-md.aol.com>,
> yodoc@aol.comnospam
> > (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> > >I have my doubts that even in Paris, you can find Metro stations spaced
> > >less than 1/3 of a mile apart!
> >
> > I've never been there. My info is based on a report in an industry
> journal.
>
> Most Metro stops are less than a minute apart.
>

Having been to Paris recently, I can vouch for the fact that,
in many parts of the metro system, the stops are very close
together.

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4465. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 03:26:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1C1452.484DAD62@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27512

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C1B8CEF.4E14C7AB@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C1AF3A9.FE9E3D78@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C1AAC75.D32717A1@sccoast.net...
> > > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Private meetings are to be held in private, not
> > > > > > > in public.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Between members of the opposite sex, that is changing. The trend
> is
> > > > > > towards more restrictions on intimate activities between
> co-workers.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > As I've told others, please note that, after tonight, I'll be
> > > > > > > leaving this newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's
> > > > > > > been fun and I'll look forward to talking with you again when I
> > > > > > > return. Take care.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dwight, you can't have it both ways. You keep saying "we" must rely
> on
> > > > our
> > > > > > "own experience" then you say that the "trend" is "towards more
> > > > > > restrictions...blah, blah, blah." WHERE?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'll continue to do business at my place, where adults act and are
> > > expected
> > > > > > to act like adults. If you want to continue to work for the kiddie
> > > > > > companies where no trust is granted or obtained, you just keep right
> on.
> > > > >
```

> > > > I've worked in a lot of places, Kim. I've never worked anywhere that
> > > > had a bunch of wiccans and druids hunched over the water cooler.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > I wouldn't know, because we don't discuss those things at work. Again,
> > > company policy and professional etiquette would dictate that certain
> things
> > > are just not for the "office."
> > >
> > > Also, in *this* part of this thread the discussion is about one-on-one
> > > meetings behind closed doors with members of the opposite sex.
> >
> > No, *this* part of the thread is about wiccans and druids hunched over
> > water coolers. That's the part you responded to.
> >
> > I understand about that "not for the office" stuff. I hope you don't
> > bring up the discussion about your callsign there either. Save that for
> > when you're at the ballpark shouting the "F" word.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> No, actually my callsign's been discussed at the office. You see, it is a
> callsign--and has nothing to do with sex, color, race, religion, or national
> origin. They get it. Some hams don't.

So basically, nothing is really off limits at the office.

> I don't go to the ballpark, I told you. I do go to stuffy dinners and
> banquets, though. I just whisper "fuck" at those.

Don't leave out the part about getting your jollies by typing it fairly
frequently here, Kim. By the way, YOU were the individual who
originally brought up using the term at a ball game. If you don't go,
why'd you use that particular example?

> Are you aware that by saying "the 'F' word" you've as much as said and used
> it, Dave? At least be truthful with yourself.

That is certainly an interesting point of view. I don't agree with
it--honestly.

See, I told you what this part of the thread is about.

Dave K8MN

4466. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 03:26:42 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215222642.13552.00000489@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 27513

>> Social engineering in a technical hobby (at least supposed to be one).
>> Right.
>
>The Federal Government requires HF hams to know Morse code. That's
>social engineering, Dick. All governmental requirements are social
>engineering. If the feds were not trying to engineer society, there
>would be no need for federal requirements.

Isn't it the ITU that requires HF hams to know Morse code? The FCC just follows that edict because the USA is a signatory to the treaty. Take care and 73.

Mark

4467. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 03:26:47 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vh3u0$91l$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 27517

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011215120313.01870.00000334@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article <3C16623B.9D45ACBA@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:
> >It only takes about an hour to walk
> >across the city between the walls where 2 millions of the residents
> >live. Out here you'd barely get started down Imperial in that amount of
> >time.

> Did you get to ride the Metro much?

Sure. We bought about 10 tickets a day between the two of us, and one ticket will get you anywhere in the city you want to go. They actually have two separate commuter systems now - the Metro and the RER. The RER doesn't have as many stops as the Metro, but serves all the major destinations, and a few you can't get to on the Metro (like Versailles). We stayed up in the Opera district (the 9th Arrondissment) and found it was easier just to walk to the left bank and the Louvre. Took about 15 or 20 minutes, and helped us to walk off some of the meals. The train only crosses the river in a few places, so the route from one side to the other is a little circuitous. There was a strike on one of the lines one day. Not many trains were running. When it finally came into the station is looked like the old college prank of stuffing 20 people into a phone booth. We got on anyway. I laughed the whole time (although I think I was the only one laughing). ;-)

It was a great trip.

73 de ac6xg

4468. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 03:28:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1C14C4.1760B15B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27514

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > That's interesting. I thought you told us that he didn't want you
> > > > bandying his name about. Was that incorrect?
> > >
> > > I NEVER said that, Dave. Your thoughts are screwed up, as usual.
> >
> > Sure you did, Cecil.
>
> You're lying again, Dave. Wish you wouldn't do that. He has no
> problem with being truthfully mentioned on this newsgroup.

Sure you did, Cecil. Fess up.

Dave K8MN
```

4469. Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 03:28:59 UTC
From: senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu
Message-ID: <senecal-1512011928590001@d71-096.solano1.ucdavis.edu>
Source record: 27515
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi all,

I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?

Thanks!

-Josh Senecal, KG6IBF

--
senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu (remove the obvious bit from the address)

"Your most valuable asset is rampant ignorance."
-Dogbert

4470. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 03:29:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1C1500.BBB0A352@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27516

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C1AB88F.6B6FCFF2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > >Dave Heil wrote:
> > >> I thought "Doc" Williamson didn't want you
> > >> bandying his name about.
> > >
> > >I've told him about the PCTA jerks on this newsgroup.
> >
> > Did you tell him about the NCTA jerks on this newsgroup, too?
>
> You mean all the people who believe in freedom of choice of modes
> in a hobby in a free society? He could pass a 5wpm Morse code exam
> but he has no need for HF privileges.

Then what's his beef...or yours?

Dave K8MN

4471. Re: Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 03:34:18 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011215223418.13552.00000490@mb-mm.aol.com>
Source record: 27518

>I just wanted to be the first to get those greetings in this year.
>In case I've missed anybody (Larry, Richard, Krell, Mike, Rick, and
>others), I just wanted to point out again that I'll be leaving this
>newsgroup for several weeks (one to two months). It's been fun and
>I'll look forward to talking with everyone when I return. Until then,
>take care.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Hi Dwight,

Seasons greeting to you also, as well as the rest of the newsgroup. Take care and 73.

Mark

4472. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 03:53:43 UTC
From: Doug & Lisa Cook <twoeyedox@aol.com>
Message-ID: <u1o6o2l93qrb88@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 27519
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I packed my Kenwood TH-F6A in my backpack alongside my laptop. It passed through the xray and airport security without a hitch.

Doug
KD5PDN

4473. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:09:32 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1c1e20.18300420@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27520
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 16:27:07 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
<pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:

>They sure did, why do you say they haven't?
>
>"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message news:M7PS7.297563
>> Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.

Because no one has been able to produce a copy
of the law. If you have a copy, please post the
text...and/or tell the rest of us where to obtain a copy.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4474. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:17:58 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1c1fe5.18753486@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27521

On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 17:45:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:
>A professional engineer should have aced the Extra test.

Why? 1/4 or more of the questions involve totally
non-technical subjects (VE credentials, amateur space
operations rules, etc.)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4475. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:24:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1c2251_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27522

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011215222642.13552.00000489@mb-mm.aol.com...
> >> Social engineering in a technical hobby (at least supposed to be one).
> >> Right.
> >
> >The Federal Government requires HF hams to know Morse code. That's
> >social engineering, Dick. All governmental requirements are social
> >engineering. If the feds were not trying to engineer society, there
> >would be no need for federal requirements.
>
> Isn't it the ITU that requires HF hams to know Morse code? The FCC just
follows
> that edict because the USA is a signatory to the treaty. Take care and 73.
>
> Mark

Mark,

You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.

That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
way in most of the world, too.

Ham radio has a chance of surviving and even becoming more healthy
in the future after all ...

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.

Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4476. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:32:25 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <ttVS7.310529$5A3.119810518@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27523
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

City of Tacoma
1-253-591-5171

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3c1c1e20.18300420@news.mindspring.com...
> On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 16:27:07 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
> <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:
>
> >They sure did, why do you say they haven't?
> >
> >"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message news:M7PS7.297563
> >> Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.
>
> Because no one has been able to produce a copy
> of the law. If you have a copy, please post the
> text...and/or tell the rest of us where to obtain a copy.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

4477. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:47:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1C275D.A0B21CCF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27524

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Anyway, do you talk so
> loudly when discussing a yearly review - so loudly the "whole company" would
> know?

I do have a voice that projects a great distance caused by singing lessons.

> And what "technological secrets" would you discuss that the employees just
> outside your door, often your own staff working on that very technology, would
> not be allowed to hear?

There is industrial espionage going on all the time. Some employees sell
industrial secrets to competitors. It wouldn't surprise me to find spies
planted in high tech companies.

> And I seriously doubt your claim about Intel?

Ask anyone who has worked there, Dwight, and they will back me up. You
seem to be quite ignorant of how leading edge high tech companies function.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4478. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:49:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1C27E4.503544AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27525

Rick Adams wrote:
> Name a _single_ one of the rights enumerated in the first ten
> Amendments to the Constitution (the Bill of Rights) that hasn't been
> abrogated by a Republican government in which a member of the Bush
> dynasty was either Vice President or President.

OTOH, please point out anywhere in the Constitution where it grants
the government the power to establish a welfare state.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4479. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:49:54 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vh9290pd5@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27528

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011215222642.13552.00000489@mb-mm.aol.com...
> >The Federal Government requires HF hams to know Morse code. That's
> >social engineering, Dick. All governmental requirements are social
> >engineering. If the feds were not trying to engineer society, there
> >would be no need for federal requirements.
>
> Isn't it the ITU that requires HF hams to know Morse code? The FCC just
follows
> that edict because the USA is a signatory to the treaty. Take care and 73.
>
> Mark

It was only social engineering when higher code speeds were required for
access to HF. This created a caste system, and was truely social
engineering.

4480. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:52:03 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vh96a0pka@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27533

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:9vh1pd$84b$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011213160301.24724.00000269@mb-mr.aol.com...
> > In article <20011211221700.13985.00000823@mb-md.aol.com>,
> yodoc@aol.comnospam
> > (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> > >I have my doubts that even in Paris, you can find Metro stations spaced
> > >less than 1/3 of a mile apart!
> >
> > I've never been there. My info is based on a report in an industry
> journal.
>
> Most Metro stops are less than a minute apart.

Sounds similar to Toronto's subway system.

4481. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:52:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1C2894.233D7D4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27526

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> >> Of what--the destruction of the US Constitution?
> > >
> > >You wouldn't have that problem with a Libertarian government, Rick. :-)
> >
> > True. But the mass starvation among the poor and disabled
> > would be just as destructive. ;-)

"Mass starvation"? Shirley, you jest. Exactly where in the Constitution
does it grant the government the power to establish a welfare state?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4482. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 04:54:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vh9b70pst@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27532

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c1c13da_1@news7.fast.net...
> Having been to Paris recently, I can vouch for the fact that,
> in many parts of the metro system, the stops are very close
> together.
>
> 73,
>
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

Are they done renovating Notre Dame Cathedral yet?

4483. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 05:02:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1C2B02.E1DB2AC6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27527

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > That's interesting. I thought you told us that he didn't want you
> > > > > bandying his name about. Was that incorrect?
> > > >
> > > > I NEVER said that, Dave. Your thoughts are screwed up, as usual.
> > >
> > > Sure you did, Cecil.
> >
> > You're lying again, Dave. Wish you wouldn't do that. He has no
> > problem with being truthfully mentioned on this newsgroup.
>
> Sure you did, Cecil. Fess up.

Would proof be too much to ask? I know what you are talking about
and as usual, you are remembering wrongly. I certainly wish you
would do something about your reading comprehension and/or faulty
memory.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4484. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 05:05:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1C2BB7.B39E506A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27530

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > You mean all the people who believe in freedom of choice of modes
> > in a hobby in a free society? He could pass a 5wpm Morse code exam
> > but he has no need for HF privileges.
>
> Then what's his beef...or yours?

He has no beef. Mine is the idea presented by the PCTA folk that all
nocode techs are technical dumb $hits. One would think a PhD in EE
would be good enough proof to the contrary.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4485. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 05:07:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goez4yw.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27529

Rick Adams wrote:

> Name a _single_ one of the rights enumerated in the first ten
> Amendments to the Constitution (the Bill of Rights) that hasn't been
> abrogated by a Republican government in which a member of the Bush
> dynasty was either Vice President or President.

First of all, the function of the first ten Amendments to the U S
Constitution is to set limits on the Federal government, not to
enumerate rights which exist without those Amendments.

Anyhow, when did the Feds under the Bush Dynasty violate the Third
Amendment ?

--
Phil Kane

4486. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 05:08:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1C2C42.79AB4D03@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27531

Mark Pearsal wrote:
>
> >> Social engineering in a technical hobby (at least supposed to be one).
> >> Right.
> >
> >The Federal Government requires HF hams to know Morse code. That's
> >social engineering, Dick. All governmental requirements are social
> >engineering. If the feds were not trying to engineer society, there
> >would be no need for federal requirements.
>
> Isn't it the ITU that requires HF hams to know Morse code? The FCC just follows
> that edict because the USA is a signatory to the treaty. Take care and 73.

The treaty specifies a procedure for opting out of sections of the treaty.
The federal government has elected not to opt out.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4487. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 05:33:40 UTC
From: Eddie Haskell <Wiseguy@Cleaver.com>
Message-ID: <UmWS7.42318$fo5.7343874@typhoon.we.rr.com>
Source record: 27534
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I travel with a VX5-R, a Garmin E-Map, a Timeport P-935 and a Ericsson Cellular phone.Also usually have a Alinco DJ-X10 scanner. I have flown to Hawaii MANY times with the equipment and back east to Quincy,Il. You will not be hassled about having it, just be ready to turn any of it on so they can see they are real.....Eddie

"Joshua Senecal" <senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu> wrote in message news:senecal-1512011928590001@d71-096.solano1.ucdavis.edu...
> Hi all,
>
> I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
> carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
> having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current
> situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
> them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
>
> Thanks!
>
> -Josh Senecal, KG6IBF
>
> --
> senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu (remove the obvious bit from the address)
>
> "Your most valuable asset is rampant ignorance."
> -Dogbert

4488. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 05:35:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1C32B6.61CF878F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27535
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If asked, tell them it's a cell phone. They won't know.....

4489. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 07:24:12 UTC
From: WG <nojunk@mail.com>
Message-ID: <w_XS7.11287$m54.3166504@news0.telusplanet.net>
Source record: 27536
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

That is what you think But think again.
"The Packrat" <spam@n7uic.net> wrote in message
news:0hMS7.2351$X94.136930@rwcrnsc52...
> Fingerprinting is only good for FM.
>
> "WG" <nojunk@mail.com> wrote in message
> news:V3FS7.10094$m54.2460407@news0.telusplanet.net...
> > I have been a ham for 10 years now and a CBer for over 20 years and I
have
> > noticed a degradation of CB to the point that no one uses it anymore. If
> you
> > are on the road ham is the best way to go. With the new IRLP system you
> can
> > tone up repeaters almost any ware in the world, (http://www.irlp.net/)
> > with just a hand-held. One thing that all CBers should ask themselves
> before
> > they key up, is what they are talking about fit for family listening.
> Would
> > you want your wife, girlfriend or kids listening to that? Also that they
> can
> > be tracked in under 6 seconds and the transmitter fingerprint system
works
> > very well. The reason that the governments of the world permit this to
> > continue is that the cost to go to trial is prohibitive. I do know that
> > Industry Canada and the FCC will act on complaints especially if the
dirty
> > radio gets into the commercial or police bands. I have played around
with
> > radio tracking using the Doppler shift radio tracking system on CB and
it
> is
> > unbelievable how fast you can drive right up to someone's door or follow
a
> > dirty trucker into a truck stop and have a talk with him face to face.
> >
> > "Tazanator" <tazanator1@attbi.com> wrote in message
> > news:7wbS7.20905$7y.231436@rwcrnsc54...
> > > Well I will say sorry about the course language, but there is a bigger
> > > picture on this.
> > >
> > > I have studied and recieved a lowly tech lic for starters. However
> having

> > > driven semi's for years I can *try* to relate the truckers side. CB
19
> > has
> > > degenerated way down to the point of people harrassing truckers
(listen
> > > sometime a bulk of the noise is from base stations especial around big
> > > cities) most of the "sesame Street" gang is kids playing and talking
> big.
> > >
> > > Due to this depressing talk to drivers, many have left the CB buying
ham
> > > radios for the extra cost so they can "get away" from the base
stations
> (I
> > > was told that a long time ago CB was just like 80 meters is
today...many
> > > truckers miss that peaceful feeling you enjoy (I only have a tech so 2
> > > meters is my place)) while it is wrong many don't care due to the way
> they
> > > were treated on channel 19 (Penn state has a kid on 19 with a 250 watt
> > base
> > > that must have a dictionary of every swear word that he just keeps
> reading
> > > at truckers)
> > >
> > > As far as the FCC many state scales have fcc trained weigh masters
that
> do
> > > check (you pull on to the scale and are asked to key up the CB)
> sometimes
> > > they find them often they don't. I belive that the truckers could
bring
> a
> > > revival to the ham comunity, just from the numbers point of view, and
I
> > > started down ham meeting another ham trucker...HE HAD A HUGE ANT
(screw
> > > driver)ON THAT TRUCK!!! made me wonder what he was talking to!
> > >
> > > While it is a privalage to us ... a little tact here could gain you a
> > friend
> > > and the ham community more clout. Sence I got my ticket many of the
> guys
> > I
> > > used to run with have seen me use the 2 meter repeater system (they
> loved
> > > the michigan linked repeater system...all over the state with only an
> HT)
> > > and the phone patches, many have started borrowing my books to study

for
> > the
> > > test.
> > >
> > > To start them on the road just help them out ... many would love to
have
> > the
> > > ANT checked by an MFJ analizer (they pay up to $20 for it) and as you
> > teach
> > > them how to get the best out of the CB talk about the ham structure
many
> > > will listen and think about it....many of my friends have started
> studying
> > >
> > > (by the way it supposed to be 28.665 for the new 19)
> > >
> > > --
> > >
> > > IT IS THE SOLDIER
> > >
> > > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the reporter,
> > > Who has given us freedom of the press.
> > > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the poet,
> > > Who has given us freedom of speech.
> > > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the campus organizer,
> > > Who has given us freedom to demonstrate.
> > > IT IS THE SOLDIER, not the lawyer,
> > > Who has given us the right to a fair trial.
> > > IT IS THE SOLDIER, who salutes the flag,
> > > Who serves under the flag and,
> > > Whose coffin is draped by the flag,
> > > Who allows the protester to burn the flag.
> > >
> > > Author, Charles M. Province
> > >
> > >
****
> > > By US Code Title 47, Sec.227(a)(2)(B), a computer/modem/printer meets
> > > the definition of a telephone fax machine. By Sec.227(b)(1)(C), it is
> > > unlawful to send any unsolicited advertisement to such equipment. By
> > > Sec.227(b)(3)(C), a violation of the aforementioned Section is
> > > punishable by action to recover actual monetary loss, or $500,
whichever
> > > is greater, for each violation.
> > > **********
> > >
> > > think I'm full of it look yourself!
> > > http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/47/227.html
> > >

> > > "Speaker to Animal Crackers" <flashboinnng1@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:fVrR7.3693$vK1.358764@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > > Listened all morning to a group of truckers
> > > > on 28.115 mHz (AM). Even had
> > > > one who's wife was on the "base rig" talking with
> > > > her OM mobile about how to make out the bills and novel ways
> > > > she thought of to make "Xmas money".
> > > >
> > > > Is this is what you get when you mass-sell 10 meter
> > > > radios at/by Radio Shack and others? Wonder how many
> > > > were running Uniden 2510's, 2600's or HTX's.
> > > >
> > > > Is 28.115 is the new Channel Ninteen ?.
> > > > Is the cow out of the barn door?
> > > > A while later a ham came up on the freq in AM
> > > > to try an *politely* inform them there were in violation
> > > > of FCC rules. They just laughed, Thought it was very funny.
> > > > One guy told the ham, who exercized much restraint and
> > > > gentlemanly composure in his speech
> > > > to: "f--- off 4-wheel hampster mobile!"
> > > > complete with an roger-beep and echo-effects microphone.
> > > >
> > > > Nice eh?
> > > > Gives you the warm & fuzzies?
> > > >
> > > > I'm curious what's the FCC will do?
> > > >
> > > > How about 2 meters?
> > > > Is that the next band to be trashed by these
> > > > morons who buy ham gear at R.S. or WalMart
> > > > and operate without a licence ?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4490. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 10:14:07 UTC
From: on4bam@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3c1c7278.6307605@212.100.160.123>
Source record: 27537
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 16 Dec 2001 00:35:50 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>If asked, tell them it's a cell phone. They won't know.....

Unless one of the guys is a ham.. then try to explain why you lied...
maybe a concerned passenger may notice and tell the security guy you
lied..
I never had any problems with my stuff. I carry a backpack with
camera, laptop, TS-50 and handheld.. if asked I just say what it is.
Once had a search of our luggage at LAX (days after the TWA flight
crashed near NY) and when they asked what the antenna tuner was I said
I was a ham.. they closed the suitcase and didn't even search our
second suitcase.. Not only did they know what a ham is, they knew
'we' could be trusted :-)

Bye Maurice
--
Hamradio: ON4BAM / M0CIL http://www.qsl.net/on4bam
Pix and travelstories from Alaska, Scotland
South Africa, Iceland, Faroe Isl. and IOTA activations
webmaster http://www.f-tguesthousehuahin.com/ thailand

4491. Re: Morse not anymore needed to use HF-see further

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 10:25:05 UTC
From: "Jesus, EA4AQY" <jesus.guardon@navegalia.com>
Message-ID: <3c1c769a@news.airtel.net>
Source record: 27538
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,alt.ham-radio.morse,rec.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And me too. But don't think about keyers are finished. We still should make
noise on tha bands...
"Web" <WebFx27@hotmail.com> escribi&#65533; en el mensaje
news:hCeS7.15523$161.7241951@news02.optonline.net...
> I aggree
>
> Web
>
>
> "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> news:39IR7.109$YE4.19833@newshog.newsread.com...
> >
> > "b888" <b888@lcix.net> wrote in message
> > news:u1d5tq5dfp5jf2@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Well said.
> > > People still use sailboats, steam engines, propeller aircraft,
> > > drive classic cars, and do a million other things that are not
> > > "state of the art" but there still useful and fun. I feal sorry for
> > > those who have never felt the thrill of that first solid cw copy.
> > > Or who have no Idea how to loadup a "hollow state" rig.
> > > The easy way out is the booring way out.
> > > WB3DSJ
> >
> > You are correct sir! Some may love CW and some may not. Some may love
> the
> > digital modes. Some may not. Some may love homebrewing. (and so on and
> so
> > on) There are many facets of this hobby that are enjoyable to a variety
> of
> > different people. All a license means is that you are allowed to do
> > whatever is allowed by that license class.
> >
> > Those that chose to (forgive the word) *bitch* about the either the
> dropping
> > of the code requirement to a lesser level, or the possibility of it
> dropping
> > of it entirely, probably are not the same people who became proactively
> > involved in the protest of those conditions. I am sure that at least
80%
> of
> > all licensed hams have not bothered to write all the "powers that be"
> (i.e.

> > congressmen, senators etc) about ham radio, and in defense of ham
radio.
> > We can sit and hope and pray that ARRL *may* work hard to defend us, but
> can
> > you imagine if our elected officials, from the local level, all the way
up
> > to the federal level recieved tons of letters in defense of amateur
radio?
> > I personally write at least quarterly each year, (as well as fire
fighting
> > related mails especially after 9-11-01) and strongly encourage others
to
> do
> > so too.
> >
> > Another way to win support? Invite your elected officials to your club
> > meetings, ARES/RACES meetings (or similar groups) and share with them
the
> > experience. This has a two-fold benefit. It allows the ham public to
> > actually meet the officials, and of course the officials to actually be
> able
> > to meet the ham public and hear their concerns, and to see what we are
> doing
> > .
> >
> > Amateur Radio is a pro-active hobby/service, not a sit back and watch
> hobby.
> > Get involved!
> >
> > [first paragrah directed at respondee to my earlier post, other
paragraphs
> > are to everyone else.]
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> >
> > >
> > > KC8PMX wrote in message ...
> > > >People who want to use Morse code still will, and those who don't,
> won't.
> > > >Any changes in the laws short of a law outright banning morse code
> > > operation
> > > >won't stop those who wish to use the HF frequencies.
> > > >
> > > >Ryan
> > > >KC8PMX
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >"Marruk" <mphaannospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message

> > > >news:4ytO7.18262$Qm6.2451580@zwoll1.home.nl...
> > > >> Mose not anymore needed to use HF.
> > > >>
> > > >> Hi OMs,
> > > >>
> > > >> In Guatamala it is decided that a morse exam is not anymore needed
to
> > use
> > > >> the HF bands.
> > > >> I guess this is good for the sellers of HF equipment and it will
get
> > the
> > > >> band a lot more used for phone dx.
> > > >> But I dont think it will be very good for Morsecode as a whole.
> > > >> Hope to see you in 2003 on HF when it will be officially released
in
> > the
> > > >> Netherlands.
> > > >>
> > > >> PE1PAE
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4492. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 12:15:15 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <nf0T7.166786$WW.10477292@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27539

Bill Nelson posted:

>>I would not give an officer a rough time. Why should I? But if
>>he wants to examine my automobile or radios, then he better have
>>a search warrant. If he feels one is necessary, then the watch
>>officer can certainly see that one is obtained in short order.

Bill Sohl, K2UNK replied:

> Actually, obtaining a search warrant isn't all that quick or easy.
> Assume the following scenario...
> (snipped)

They could always send for the trained dog that
sniffs out non-type-accepted radio equipment.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4493. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 13:46:59 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vipv2hmi1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27565
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Anonymous COWARD
"Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:098341038FE.16JKS38762@houston-hunks.com...
>
> The Salvation Army

SLee's familiar with the Salvation Army, since he spent several years there
at the Shelter in Dallas. This was after he was convicted on Domestic
battery charges and had a restraining order in place to keep him from
beating up his mother again.

4494. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 14:10:44 UTC
From: "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <1103_1008511844@news.fuse.net>
Source record: 27540
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Thanks for the info. Now I will triple my annual contribution to the Salvation Army just like the way I have started sending money to the Boy Scouts.

On 16 Dec 2001 11:32:07 GMT, SLee@houston-hunks.com (Stagger Lee) wrote:
>
> The Salvation Army dared to be different from Disney, and a movement to
> harass them through their Christmas pots was started in Flint, MI and in
> Glen Dale, WV. You can read all about it at the following URL:
>
> http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/ap/20011214/us/salvation_army_gays_1.html

---
J. Duffy Beischel - Amateur Radio WB8NUT

Member of: ARRL, NRA, Kiwanis, Republican Party, Masons, and Shriners
and the vast Right Wing conspiracy to get the Clintons

"If the government owned all the guns, would we still be a free people?"

4495. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 14:12:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216091245.12109.00000504@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 27541

>Subject: Re: Airline travel with a rig?
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 12/15/2001 11:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C1C32B6.61CF878F@ix.netcom.com>
>
>If asked, tell them it's a cell phone. They won't know.....

And if they DO know and THEY know you are lying.........???

4496. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 14:33:28 UTC
From: Gerald Schmitt <KK5YY@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <4obp1ucq30c57ppa7f2f49lrkeh9t8e56t@4ax.com>
Source record: 27542
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 19:28:59 -0800, senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu
(Joshua Senecal) wrote:

>Hi all,
>
>I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
>carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
>having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current
>situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
>them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
>
>Thanks!
>
>-Josh Senecal, KG6IBF

Hi Josh,

I fly several times a week and always take my equipment in my
carry on. I usually have a complete APRS station, GPS, THD-7
etc. and usually another HT or my FT-817. I don't bother to
carry my license except to Europe where I need it for CEPT
operations. I've never had a serious issue. Currently they
seem to be most interested in laptops which they insist be
removed from the case for Xray.

73 Jerry KK5YY

4497. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 15:15:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1CBA67.66B7AB7E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27543

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > That's interesting. I thought you told us that he didn't want you
> > > > > > bandying his name about. Was that incorrect?
> > > > >
> > > > > I NEVER said that, Dave. Your thoughts are screwed up, as usual.
> > > >
> > > > Sure you did, Cecil.
> > >
> > > You're lying again, Dave. Wish you wouldn't do that. He has no
> > > problem with being truthfully mentioned on this newsgroup.
> >
> > Sure you did, Cecil. Fess up.
>
> Would proof be too much to ask? I know what you are talking about
> and as usual, you are remembering wrongly. I certainly wish you
> would do something about your reading comprehension and/or faulty
> memory.

If you know what I am talking about, why keep us in the dark? After all, it was quite some time ago. Since Dr. "No" has no need for HF access, what is his beef? If he has none, why do you keep trotting him out?

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

4498. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 15:19:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C1CBB5A.991E74C6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27544

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > You mean all the people who believe in freedom of choice of modes
> > > in a hobby in a free society? He could pass a 5wpm Morse code exam
> > > but he has no need for HF privileges.
> >
> > Then what's his beef...or yours?
>
> He has no beef. Mine is the idea presented by the PCTA folk that all
> nocode techs are technical dumb $hits. One would think a PhD in EE
> would be good enough proof to the contrary.

The only proof needed is that the guy pass an amateur radio licensing exam. His PhD in EE has no bearing at all other than giving him an edge in theory. I don't recall any idea presented by "PCTA folk" which is as you claim. Are you basing your claim in the statements of one or two individuals? If it is, you aren't being honest.

Dave K8MN

4499. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 15:28:00 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011216102800.19611.00000281@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 27545

>> Isn't it the ITU that requires HF hams to know Morse code? The FCC just
>follows
>> that edict because the USA is a signatory to the treaty. Take care and 73.
>>
>> Mark
>
>Mark,
>
>You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
>in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
>and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.
>
>That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
>the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
>ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
>reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
>way in most of the world, too.
>
>Ham radio has a chance of surviving and even becoming more healthy
>in the future after all ...
>
>73,
>
>--
>Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

Hi Carl,

I'm not convinced that dropping the code altogether as a reqirement for HF access is related in any way, shape, or form to "surviving and even becoming more healthy in the future after all ..." I believe Mark himself said that "there's something to be said for tradition."

The required speed was reduced to 5-wpm, not an insurmountable obstacle for anybody. I might be open to dropping the code requirement altogether if the written test pool questions and answers were NOT published, only study "guides." Just my humble $0.02.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4500. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 15:59:10 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1cc4d0_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27546

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011216102800.19611.00000281@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >> Isn't it the ITU that requires HF hams to know Morse code? The FCC just
> >follows
> >> that edict because the USA is a signatory to the treaty. Take care and
73.
> >>
> >> Mark
> >
> >Mark,
> >
> >You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
> >in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
> >and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.
> >
> >That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
> >the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
> >ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
> >reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
> >way in most of the world, too.
> >
> >Ham radio has a chance of surviving and even becoming more healthy
> >in the future after all ...
> >
> >73,
> >
> >--
> >Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
>
> Hi Carl,
>
> I'm not convinced that dropping the code altogether as a reqirement for HF
> access is related in any way, shape, or form to "surviving and even
becoming
> more healthy in the future after all

Even the IARU Resolution states that maintaining Morse testing is
not consistent with a healthy future for the ARS ...

> ..." I believe Mark himself said that
> "there's something to be said for tradition."

"Maintaining traditions" is NOT a legitimate regulatory function.
If Morse enthusiasts want to keep Morse usage alive, it's up to
them to promote it for its own sake, not to insist that governments

force it down everyone's throats via regulatory fiat.

> The required speed was reduced to 5-wpm, not an insurmountable obstacle
for
> anybody.

The point is that many folks simply don't have any interest in
Morse, though they might be VERY interested in other aspects
of ham radio, technically qualified, and able to contribute a
great deal ... Morse proficiency has NOTHING to do with one's
ability to be a valuable member of our "fraternity."

> I might be open to dropping the code requirement altogether if the
> written test pool questions and answers were NOT published, only study
> "guides." Just my humble $0.02.

Open question pools are a fact of life. I personally have no problem
with them, since I think that it's FAR easier to learn the basic under-
lying principles to be able to derive the correct answers than to
"memorize" hundreds and hundreds of question/answer pairs.

In fact, I'd have no problem with an "open book" exam using some
reasonable reference, such as "The Radio Amateur's Handbook."
I'm far more interested in folks demonstrating that they can solve
problems as they come up, rather than insisting that everyone
carry every possible formula in their heads. As an EE, I frequently
refer to references for useful information.

Once again, the license should be viewed as a permit to do things,
based on demonstrating a reasonable ability to operate safely and
without causing interference problems ... not as some sort of
"graduation certificate."

Removing UNNECESSARY, IRRELEVANT barriers to entry is key
to recruiting more (good) hams ... and we need to do so, both to
replace OTs as they become SKs, and also to actually grow in
numbers to enhance our ability to retain the rather large amounts
of very valuable spectrum to which we enjoy access.

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4501. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 16:28:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216112823.07260.00000654@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 27547

I see Dip Shit Carl is back,and I see you are still having trouble upgrading from that Elite Tech Plus License. Carl I thought the CODE was the Problem? What a Losser

4502. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 16:28:57 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ccca0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27548

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:5932300D0E96DA4A.C78643F5C3E4F6A0.BE97C56E6DD68734@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 04:12:49 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > Do you yell when you discuss confidential business, Rick? I've
discussed
> >highly classified military information with co-workers without having to
hide
> >behind closed doors. What are you discussing that is so secret it cannot
> >possibly be discussed with the door open?
>
> If you discuss classified information in a setting where it is
> possible to be overheard (an office with the door open IS such a
> setting) you are guilty of a major felony. Don't believe it? Report to
> the military security officer in contact with your firm that you have
> done precisely that and see how quickly you find out that you violated
> the law.
>
> Contrast that with the potential of sexual harassment
> accusations, and I'd say that your practice is both a lot more
> personally risky--and a lot more harmful to our country (I don't know
> what kind of classified military material you deal with--but if it
> could benefit an enemy of this country [as could most such material]
> you are risking treason to protect yourself from possible harassment
> charges).
>
> Extend your argument to the next level, Dwight. If it's
> reasonable for YOU to talk about classified material with the door
> open, in order to prevent having to have closed-door sessions with an
> opposite sex coworker, then the same must hold true for others. I can
> just see a department head with NSA or the CIA insisting that a
> subordinate leave the door to the office open while discussing a top
> secret (or higher classification) document with him or her, can't you?
>
> If it's safe for an intelligence officer (or any other
> government supervisor) to meet privately with a subordinate, why isn't
> it ok for you--or is it not the situation you distrust, but your own
> reactions to being alone with a woman in a closed room?
>
> Rick
>
> --
>

> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Maybe the folks who believe like Dwight are just wanting policies that will
make them behave? :o

Kim W5TIT

4503. Re: Promoting the hobby. Are we ready for the questions from the public?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 16:34:41 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ccdf7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27549

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:DVOS7.297544$W8.10313450@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > > Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > > > > > Saw a well-endowed lady the other day with a T-Shirt that said:
> > > > > > "If only these were brains".
>
> > > CAM wrote:
>
> > > > > Another tee shirt had the words "tune" and "load"
> > > > > positioned on the breasts.
>
> > > > Oh no, Robert. You used the "b" word. You know you will bring
> > > > down the wrath of Larry Roll for doing that.
>
> > Robert Casey wrote
>
> > > Just now I heard the "T" word on the FM broadcast band.
> > > Something about "tit for tat". :-)
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote
>
> > Just one of each?! :)
>
> Kim..
>
> Are you saying it isn't...
> "T" shirt...
> but...
> "T's"-shirt??? ;-)
>
> Rich
>
>

<BEG> Good one, I'm grinning... ;)

Kim W5TIT

4504. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 16:44:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1cd035_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27554

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C1C275D.A0B21CCF@IEEE.org...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > Anyway, do you talk so
> > loudly when discussing a yearly review - so loudly the "whole company"
would
> > know?
>
> I do have a voice that projects a great distance caused by singing
lessons.
>
> > And what "technological secrets" would you discuss that the employees
just
> > outside your door, often your own staff working on that very technology,
would
> > not be allowed to hear?
>
> There is industrial espionage going on all the time. Some employees sell
> industrial secrets to competitors. It wouldn't surprise me to find spies
> planted in high tech companies.
>
> > And I seriously doubt your claim about Intel?
>
> Ask anyone who has worked there, Dwight, and they will back me up. You
> seem to be quite ignorant of how leading edge high tech companies
function.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I'd back this down right to the basest levels of argument, and those are
that Supervisors and Managers need the flexibility to discuss *anything*
behind closed doors with whole groups or individuals, whichever the case;
then, the same flexibility needs to be available for employees to approach
their Supervisors and Managers about things they don't want their co-workers
to hear being discussed by them. Any company who is stupid enough to
historically keep advancing people to the level of Supervisors and Managers
who would then abuse the granted confidentiality by wrongful actions behind
closed doors is a company that a) people are downright stupid to be working
for, and b) is a company that won't long be in business. Lastly, the same
for a company's hiring methods that would historically hire employees that
abuse private meetings.

Period.

Kim W5TIT

4505. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 16:45:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011216114510.15992.00000923@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27550

In article <3C1B9B73.118CB4FA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>You mean all the people who believe in freedom of choice of modes
>in a hobby in a free society? He could pass a 5wpm Morse code exam
>but he has no need for HF privileges.

Cecil:

I'm guessing that when the 5 WPM code testing requirement
is dropped, 'ole Doc Williamson will suddenly develop a "need"
for HF privileges! Funny how that works, isn't it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4506. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 16:45:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011216114511.15992.00000924@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27551

In article <3C1B9A0D.6A51118C@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Yep, congratulations. The average technical skill of the Extra
>class just inched up a notch. Now who was it who was recently
>ragging on Carl for not upgrading?

Cecil:

Carl's been a ham long enough to enroll in QCWA, has made his
living as a professional electrical engineer, and just now finally got
his Extra, only after the requirements have been dumbed-down to
insignificance? Nobody has to "rag" on Carl -- he's done a better
job of making a fool of himself than anyone else here ever could!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4507. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 16:45:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011216114512.15992.00000925@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27553

In article <3c1b5d71_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

>> Now that we have THAT cleared up, back to my question: "What is the
>> correlation between Morse code skill and technical skill, among [the
>> closed set of] licensed Amateur Radio operators?"
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Larry,
>
>According to the FCC "none."

Carl:

Welcome back, OM! And I don't remember axing what the steenking
FCC thought about the topic!

>And I find the FCC to be a FAR
>more credible source of information/opinion on this matter than
>you, so why don't you stop ranting?

And I don't -- so I won't!

>This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
>and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
>what I can see.

You expected, maybe, … what?

>Get a life ...

I've got one, but thanks anyway!

>BTW, just to put some icing on the cake for you, I finally got
>around to finding time in my work/travel schedule to go to a
>VE session and upgrade to Extra :-)

Well, congratulations! You finally lived long enough to make
it all the way! Of course, I've had my extra for over 18 years
now, so I have seniority over you!

>(missed 1 out of 50 on the test ... I read one question/answers
>too fast and accidentally marked the wrong letter when I
>actually knew the correct answer ... really made me mad at
>myself ... but that's what I get for finishing the test in 10 minutes :-)

Hmmm. I took my test 18 years ago, aced it (code and written), and the whole thing took me less than half an hour! And I've never spent a single day of my life as a professional engineer!

Well, anyway, Congratulations! I'm sure that you can now go ahead and invent all that neat stuff you've been talking about for so many years, now that you're finally the ham radio equal of an 8-year old girl from some small town in New York!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4508. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 16:45:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011216114513.15992.00000926@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27552

In article <8B0F59A742F36CAD.5F376A2E027CC402.C395FE644BBA55BB@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> It is the COMPANY which demands employees keep their salaries
>confidential that demonstrates a lack of integrity. The ONLY reason
>for taking that position is because they are paying some people more
>to do a given job than they are paying others for the same work. If
>their pay scale was based on equal pay for equal work they wouldn't
>CARE if people told others what they earned. Look at the government;
>if you are civil service all that is necessary is to know your pay
>level (which is open information, since your position in an agency is
>determined by it). All "G5s," for example, receive precisely the same
>salary. They don't have to hide it because their employer isn't
>cheating anyone else out of a fair pay by concealing it.
>
> Rick

Rick:

Not all GS-5's make the same money. There are different "step"
levels within each Civil Service paygrade, and longevity points
which increase pay within the grade/step level. When I was a Master
Sergeant stationed at the Air Force Academy, I supervised three
GS-5's, none of which made the same as the others. I also had a
GS-6 who made less than one of the more senior GS-5's.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4509. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 16:53:23 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011216115323.19619.00000302@mb-mt.news.cs.com>
Source record: 27555

>Even the IARU Resolution states that maintaining Morse testing is
>not consistent with a healthy future for the ARS ...

I think political pressure had more to do with that than "altruistic" concern
for AR's future.

>"Maintaining traditions" is NOT a legitimate regulatory function.
>If Morse enthusiasts want to keep Morse usage alive, it's up to
>them to promote it for its own sake, not to insist that governments
>force it down everyone's throats via regulatory fiat.

Point taken, but I'd hardly consider 5-wpm as having "Morse proficiency" forced
down anybody's throat.

>The point is that many folks simply don't have any interest in
>Morse, though they might be VERY interested in other aspects
>of ham radio, technically qualified, and able to contribute a
>great deal ... Morse proficiency has NOTHING to do with one's
>ability to be a valuable member of our "fraternity."

I'm not sure if this is an entirely valid analogy, but here it goes. When I was
going through my certification for my FAA airframe and powerplant licenses, I
wasn't very (...read not at all!) interested in 'Dope & Fabric.' However, I was
required to learn the "basics" and pass the courses. In the final analysis anf
with 20/20 hindsight...there's an intrinsic "value" to the big picture that is
more readily appreciated as an accomplishment rather than an obstacle. It's not
an exact analogy, but I hope it conveys the correct "spirit" with which it was
meant. I think that "tradition" has MORE than halfway met contemporary
"aspirations" re. the AR's future with the reduction in code speed.

>In fact, I'd have no problem with an "open book" exam using some
>reasonable reference, such as "The Radio Amateur's Handbook."
>I'm far more interested in folks demonstrating that they can solve
>problems as they come up, rather than insisting that everyone
>carry every possible formula in their heads. As an EE, I frequently
>refer to references for useful information.

Perhaps, but that "feels" like "giving it away." I thought priviliges were
"earned."

>Removing UNNECESSARY, IRRELEVANT barriers to entry

I hear CW all over the place. I'd hardly classify a founding aspect of AR
that's still in wide use as irrelevant. This is all just my opinion and really
doesn't amount to a hill of beans.

BTW, congratulations on your upgrade. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4510. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 17:03:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <e$a4RNlhBHA.1900@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27556

WA2ISE said:

> If asked, tell them it's a cell phone. They won't know.....

Those folks are responsible for the safety of the aircraft and all
the souls who fly in it, and you'd recommend that we _lie_ to
them???????? Especially after 9-11??????? What else would
you lie to them about?

What a sorry-assed Richard Cranium you are!!!!!

For the original poster, just let them know what it is if they
ask, and accept the call they make. They may require that
it be carried as checked luggage. They have enough
worries without hassling with a hobbiest about his unusual
carry-on.

Hans, K0HB

4511. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 17:03:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216120327.03703.00000416@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 27558

In article <20011215152244.12113.00000340@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 15 Dec 2001 20:22:44 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License
>>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>Date: 12/15/2001 11:03 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20011215120312.01870.00000332@mb-fz.aol.com>
>
>>Did you tell him about the NCTA jerks on this newsgroup, too?
>
> Isn't that covered by the Fifth Amendment, Jim?

I thought it was the Fifth Dimension.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4512. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 17:03:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216120327.03703.00000415@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 27559

In article <%xLS7.165243$WW.10379570@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

(big snip of N2EY incentive licensing history rant)

>>The
>> FCC plan was a mix of those ideas, including the idea of
>> subbands-by-license-class. I remember that one of the reasons was that
>> frequency could be easily measured to tell if a ham was operating within
>> his/her license privileges. The subbands reserved for Extras and
>Advanceds were
>> the best DX spots, too.
>>
>> If that's not right, what was the thinking 35 years ago?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Wasn't it part of the Great Post-Sputnik we are behind the World
>technically caper? Lots of strange things came out of that mentality.

I for one think it was. The USA prided itself on being at the top of the technological ziggurat after WW2. Americans invented the bomb, color TV, filter cigarettes and automatic transmissions. An American broke the sound barrier, etc., etc.

Then the backward ignorant Rooskies do things like Sputnik and Muttnik and photographing the far side of the moon. U-2 gets shot down by a weapon we don't even know exists. Berlin Wall, "we will bury you", Cuban missiles, etc. Meanwhile many of our rockets blow up on the pad.

FCC looks at US hams in the late 1940s - early 1950s and sees lots of homebrew/converted surplus rigs, lots of new stuff (NBFM, SSB, HF mobile, TVI reduction). FCC looks again 10-15 years later and sees lots more manufactured rigs, lots less homebrew/conversion, and a turf war over AM vs. SSB. FCC figgers giving everything to Conditionals and above maybe wasn't such a hot idea.

The rest is history.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4513. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 17:03:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216120328.03703.00000417@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 27557

In article <3C1B9B73.118CB4FA@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3C1AB88F.6B6FCFF2@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >Dave Heil wrote:
>> >> I thought "Doc" Williamson didn't want you
>> >> bandying his name about.
>> >
>> >I've told him about the PCTA jerks on this newsgroup.
>>
>> Did you tell him about the NCTA jerks on this newsgroup, too?
>
>You mean all the people who believe in freedom of choice of modes
>in a hobby in a free society?

I mean those who behave like jerks - on either side of the argument.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4514. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 17:03:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216120328.03703.00000418@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 27560

In article <3c1bfcd3_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

>In a message dated 12/15/01 12:13:41 PM Eastern Standard Time,
>wa6vse-shack@fast.net writes:
>
>> ---- Original Message -----
>> From: "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com>
>> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>> Sent: Saturday, December 15, 2001 12:03 PM
>> Subject: Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License
>>
>> [snip]
>>
>> >
>> > And by the way, for the record:
>> >
>> > I don't think a "no-homebrew" license is a good thing for the ARS at
>all.
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, "Definitive Expert" N2EY
>>
>> Jim,
>>
>> I agree wholeheartedly ... a license which *requires* the use of "factory
>> built" gear is counter to the technical educational aspect of ham radio.

Yup. But the UK folks think it's a good idea because it "lowers the barrier" to
getting a ham license.

It is my understanding that UK written license tests are a very different
ballgame than here. They cost L75 - about $100 US! They are not given very
often, and the actual Q&A are secret. Prospective UK hams are REQUIRED to
attend an approved training course before being allowed to take any tests. How
do ya think that would play over here?
>>
>> It could also, as an "unintended consequence" result in some sort of
>> "type acceptance" requirement and THAT would be REALLY bad for
>> the ARS.

We have type acceptance already. Manufactured rigs have to be FCC certified for
ham use. So do kits. Certain designs cannot be certified, not because of any
technical reason, but because of abuse by users of OTHER radio services. That's
why you don't see any kit or manufactured amplifiers for HF QRP rigs.

Of course this doesn't stop the sale of illegal amps for other services, but that's another story.

The Foundation class does allow kits - just no building from scratch or designing.

--

One of the main arguments for code test reduction/elimination was that hams don't "have to" use code, so whay should they "have to" learn it just to get the license. The Foundation class applies this argument to the technical part of the written test: Hams don't "have to" homebrew, should why should they "have to" learn so much technical stuff just to get the license? Those who want to homebrew can learn it and get the necessary license.

Remember that many more hams today use Morse than build their own transmitters, receivers and transceivers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4515. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 17:44:09 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vime20iu1@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27563

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011216114511.15992.00000924@mb-fc.aol.com...
> Carl's been a ham long enough to enroll in QCWA, has made his
> living as a professional electrical engineer, and just now finally got
> his Extra, only after the requirements have been dumbed-down to
> insignificance? Nobody has to "rag" on Carl -- he's done a better
> job of making a fool of himself than anyone else here ever could!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

It took a lot more skill, ambition, and perseverance to do what Carl did
with regards to restructuring, than what was required to learn an antiquated
and worthless endcoding scheme at a high rate of speed.

4516. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 17:47:32 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vimke0jar@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27564

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011216112823.07260.00000654@mb-dh.aol.com...
> I see Dip Shit Carl is back,and I see you are still having trouble
upgrading
> from that Elite Tech Plus License. Carl I thought the CODE was the
Problem?
> What a Losser

You don't read very well, do you? Carl already wrote that he upgraded to
Extra.

4517. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 18:00:17 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net>
Message-ID: <Ri5T7.9295$aS5.1655985259@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 27562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Actually it has Richard,
I don't like my little friend Dog Biskit, but
he is correct. If you check the minutes for
Sept. 18th you will see it was passed
unanimously. As for it being caused by
a CB'er, well think of the source for that
information.

Landshark

--
"BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:wnPS7.297581$W8.10316726@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Richard Plourde wrote
>
> > > Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.
>
> "Shrimp Biskit" wrote
>
> > They sure did, why do you say they haven't?
>
> No one has been able to provide PROOF that the law had been passed.
>
> Search the Tacoma web sites and see if any 'proof' exists. It just didn't
> happen, plain and simple.
>
> Rich
>
>
>

4518. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 18:00:18 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net>
Message-ID: <Si5T7.9296$AQ5.1655880836@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 27561
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Hi Bill,
Here you go:

http://www.cityoftacoma.org/54council/Agendas/2001/ca010918.pdf

Ordinance # 26851

If the link doesn't work go to the Agenda page and bring
it up for Sept. 18th.

Landshark

--
"BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3c1c1e20.18300420@news.mindspring.com...
> On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 16:27:07 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
> <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:
>
> >They sure did, why do you say they haven't?
> >
> >"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message news:M7PS7.297563
> >> Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.
>
> Because no one has been able to produce a copy
> of the law. If you have a copy, please post the
> text...and/or tell the rest of us where to obtain a copy.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

4519. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 18:57:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1cee98_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27566

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011216112823.07260.00000654@mb-dh.aol.com...
> I see Dip Shit Carl is back,and I see you are still having trouble
upgrading
> from that Elite Tech Plus License. Carl I thought the CODE was the
Problem?
> What a Losser

First, learn how to spell insulting terms before you use them ...

Second, I'm an Extra ... missed one out of 50 on the test, due to
a stupid mistake on my part (reading the question/answers too
fast and marked the wrong letter, despite knowing the correct
answer) ... but 98% ain't bad ... did YOU do that well?

No need to answer ... I don't intend to respond to your flame
bait any further ...

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4520. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:06:50 UTC
From: paul friedman <pfriedman8426@mediaone.net>
Message-ID: <eh6T7.5097$yC.323593@typhoon.mn.mediaone.net>
Source record: 27567
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Shouldn't be a problem. Make sure the battery is charged as you might be
asked to turn it on.

Paul AB0SI

"Joshua Senecal" <senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu> wrote in message
news:senecal-1512011928590001@d71-096.solano1.ucdavis.edu...
> Hi all,
>
> I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
> carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
> having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current
> situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
> them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
>
> Thanks!
>
> -Josh Senecal, KG6IBF
>
> --
> senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu (remove the obvious bit from the address)
>
> "Your most valuable asset is rampant ignorance."
> -Dogbert

4521. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:08:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1cf140_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27568

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011216115323.19619.00000302@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> >Even the IARU Resolution states that maintaining Morse testing is
> >not consistent with a healthy future for the ARS ...
>
> I think political pressure had more to do with that than "altruistic"
concern
> for AR's future.

From talking with IARU officials and people representing them
at the ITU, I disagree. I believe the IARU finally has woken up
to the realities we will face (spectrum pressures, etc.) in the
future and is acting accordingly.

> >"Maintaining traditions" is NOT a legitimate regulatory function.
> >If Morse enthusiasts want to keep Morse usage alive, it's up to
> >them to promote it for its own sake, not to insist that governments
> >force it down everyone's throats via regulatory fiat.
>
> Point taken, but I'd hardly consider 5-wpm as having "Morse proficiency"
forced
> down anybody's throat.

Any time you require someone to jump through a hoop, just for
the sake of jumping through it, that's forcing something down
someone's throad IMNSHO.

> >The point is that many folks simply don't have any interest in
> >Morse, though they might be VERY interested in other aspects
> >of ham radio, technically qualified, and able to contribute a
> >great deal ... Morse proficiency has NOTHING to do with one's
> >ability to be a valuable member of our "fraternity."
>
> I'm not sure if this is an entirely valid analogy, but here it goes. When
I was
> going through my certification for my FAA airframe and powerplant
licenses, I
> wasn't very (...read not at all!) interested in 'Dope & Fabric.' However,
I was
> required to learn the "basics" and pass the courses. In the final analysis
anf
> with 20/20 hindsight...there's an intrinsic "value" to the big picture
that is
> more readily appreciated as an accomplishment rather than an obstacle.
It's not

> an exact analogy, but I hope it conveys the correct "spirit" with which it
was
> meant. I think that "tradition" has MORE than halfway met contemporary
> "aspirations" re. the AR's future with the reduction in code speed.

I think the "Dope & Fabric" analogy is a bit different ... as an FAA
licensee, other people's lives are dependent on the quality of your
work, and there are still some "vintage" planes built that way, AFAIK.

I don't see folks getting a sense of accomplishment in being forced
to learn Morse when they have no interest in it, or intention to use it.

> >In fact, I'd have no problem with an "open book" exam using some
> >reasonable reference, such as "The Radio Amateur's Handbook."
> >I'm far more interested in folks demonstrating that they can solve
> >problems as they come up, rather than insisting that everyone
> >carry every possible formula in their heads. As an EE, I frequently
> >refer to references for useful information.
>
> Perhaps, but that "feels" like "giving it away." I thought priviliges were
> "earned."

What I'm suggesting is that demonstrating the ability to solve the
applicable problems could be seen as sufficient to demonstrate
the requisite level of qualification to earn the privileges. I am NOT
suggesting that the privileges should be "given away." Also, consider
my previous comments that the license should be viewed as a permit
to do things, not as some sort of "graduation certificate," and that
the value is in what it allows you to do, not what you had to do to get
it.

> >Removing UNNECESSARY, IRRELEVANT barriers to entry
>
> I hear CW all over the place. I'd hardly classify a founding aspect of AR
> that's still in wide use as irrelevant.

I'm not saying that the MODE is irrelevant ... certainly it is used, but it
is just one of many modes, which licensees are free to choose to use
or not ... what is irrelevant is requiring a demonstration of proficiency
in manual Morse in order to obtain a license in the 1st place.

> This is all just my opinion and really
> doesn't amount to a hill of beans.

You have every right to your opinion and it has just as much value
as anyone else's (even if I disagree with it ... :-)

> BTW, congratulations on your upgrade. :-)

Thanks and 73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>

<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4522. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:18:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1CF36A.A7B8AF4E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27569

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm guessing that when the 5 WPM code testing requirement
> is dropped, 'ole Doc Williamson will suddenly develop a "need"
> for HF privileges!

You're on, Larry. Are you willing to put your money where your
mouth is? say $100?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4523. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:23:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1CF4A0.A1DEF29D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27570

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Carl's been a ham long enough to enroll in QCWA, has made his
> living as a professional electrical engineer, and just now finally got
> his Extra, only after the requirements have been dumbed-down to
> insignificance?

May I remind you that the FCC sees NO relationship between Morse
code skill and anything else in the world, including intelligence.
The present Extra written exam is probably harder than the pre-
restructuring exam as it combines the Advanced and Extra questions.
All that has happened is that an outdated requirement has been
dropped but feel free to delude yourself to your heart's content.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4524. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:28:00 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011216142814.159$BS@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27571
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

All you have to do is call and ask why the law was passed then Landturd,
they will tell you the same thing they told me because of a Overpowered CB
operator. It sure wasn't because of a ham, otherwise perhaps they would have
banned amateur radio but as you see it is CB Radio Enforcement. Coming to a
Town near you.
BTW, I don't like Landshark either he is a proven liar.

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote in message
news:Ri5T7.9295$aS5.1655985259@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com...
> Actually it has Richard,
> I don't like my little friend Dog Biskit, but
> he is correct. If you check the minutes for
> Sept. 18th you will see it was passed
> unanimously. As for it being caused by
> a CB'er, well think of the source for that
> information.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN BECAUSE THEY ARE MORE FREE"
>
>
> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
> news:wnPS7.297581$W8.10316726@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Richard Plourde wrote
> > >
> > > > > Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.
> > >
> > > "Shrimp Biskit" wrote
> > >
> > > > They sure did, why do you say they haven't?
> > >
> > > No one has been able to provide PROOF that the law had been passed.
> > >
> > > Search the Tacoma web sites and see if any 'proof' exists. It just
didn't
> > happen, plain and simple.
> > >
> > > Rich
> > >
> > >

> >
>
>

4525. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:29:19 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vj9as$4v$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27590
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net> wrote in message
news:1103_1008511844@news.fuse.net...
> Thanks for the info. Now I will triple my annual contribution to the
Salvation Army just like the way I have started sending money to the Boy
Scouts.

He forgot to tell you he (SLee) was the one taking the money...guess he had
to feed that heroin habit.

4526. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:29:56 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011216143009.971$vc@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27572
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Ordinance No. 26851
Amending Title 8 of the Municipal Code relative to the use of citizens band radio
equipment by adding a new chapter to be known as Chapter 8.38 "Prohibited Use of Non-FCC Certificated Transmitting Equipment in the Citizens Band."

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:3c1c1e20.18300420@news.mindspring.com...
> On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 16:27:07 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
> <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:
>
> >They sure did, why do you say they haven't?
> >
> >"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message news:M7PS7.297563
> >> Hey... Tacoma DIDn't pass any law. Now, knock off the crap.
>
> Because no one has been able to produce a copy
> of the law. If you have a copy, please post the
> text...and/or tell the rest of us where to obtain a copy.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

4527. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:32:57 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011216143311.160$mo@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27573
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote in message
news:Ri5T7.9295$aS5.1655985259@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com...
> Actually it has Richard,
> I don't like my little friend Dog Biskit, but
> he is correct.

As Usual... But you are incorrect I am not your friend I don't associate
with know homosexuals.

4528. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:55:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1CEEEE.3B57E669@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27574

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3C198FB6.60B5A043@townsqr.com>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> >> K0HB wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Being from southern MN, I know all about EF Johnson, but you'd really
> >need
> >> > to stretch to consider that as "homebrewed". Sorry, Dick, your rant just
> >> > doesn't persuade me. This "factory appliances only" license is a bad
> >idea.
> >> >
> >>
> >> A major reason for the way the FCC and other countries do up their
> >> rules is the ease of enforcement. Why do they say have extra only
> >> subbands instead of say power level restrictions? Because someone
> >> at an FCC field site operating a receiver can easily see what frequency
> >> you are on, where he can't really tell how much power you're putting
> >> out. For all he knows, you might just have a small rig and a yagi
> >> pointed at him.
> >
> > You have just given a description of how the FCC would reason if they were
> >making the rules today, instead of 35 year ago. That was not, however, the
> >thinking at the time.
> >
> OK, I'll bite. What WAS the thinking at the time?
>

OK, when Conditionals & up had access to all frequencies, most everyone who
worked a lot of DX did it in the lower 25kc of the HF bands, including me, a
Conditional at the time. The lower 25 kc segment was considered prime real estate,
and when privileges were modified by license class, that was a benefit of achieving
Extra class status. And before the year was out, I had a 260-miles-one-way-from-
the-FCC-office Extra, and I was back at work on the lower 25's.
Power had nothing to do with it. As far as FCC is concerned, no ham is authorized
to use power levels above that necessary to achieve the intended communication.
FCC has always been able to look up licensees they hear on the air in their
database.

Dick

4529. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 19:57:12 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011216145712.14930.00000393@mb-fp.news.cs.com>
Source record: 27575

>From talking with IARU officials and people representing them
>at the ITU, I disagree. I believe the IARU finally has woken up
>to the realities we will face (spectrum pressures, etc.) in the
>future and is acting accordingly.

I certainly can't argue with the threat of "use it (en masse) or lose it" wrt
spectrum allocations.

>Any time you require someone to jump through a hoop, just for
>the sake of jumping through it, that's forcing something down
>someone's throad IMNSHO.

I agree with that, I just don't equate 5-wpm with "jumping through a hoop."
Perhaps the 20-wpm qualifies.

>I think the "Dope & Fabric" analogy is a bit different ... as an FAA
>licensee, other people's lives are dependent on the quality of your
>work, and there are still some "vintage" planes built that way, AFAIK.

I found that out the hard way when I did volunteer work at a local museum upon
graduation. Damn Stearman! <ggg>

>I don't see folks getting a sense of accomplishment in being forced
>to learn Morse when they have no interest in it, or intention to use it.

I think the sense of accomplishment comes with having fulfilled the
requirements for "earning the privileges" that gain them access to the portion
of radio spectrum where they may engage in whatever activities interest them
the most.

>What I'm suggesting is that demonstrating the ability to solve the
>applicable problems could be seen as sufficient to demonstrate
>the requisite level of qualification to earn the privileges. I am NOT
>suggesting that the privileges should be "given away." Also, consider
>my previous comments that the license should be viewed as a permit
>to do things, not as some sort of "graduation certificate," and that
>the value is in what it allows you to do, not what you had to do to get
>it.

I suppose...sort of like the UK Foundation ticket. I can see your point. :-)

>I'm not saying that the MODE is irrelevant ... certainly it is used, but it
>is just one of many modes, which licensees are free to choose to use
>or not ... what is irrelevant is requiring a demonstration of proficiency
>in manual Morse in order to obtain a license in the 1st place.

Isn't that what the No-code Technician license is for?

>You have every right to your opinion and it has just as much value
>as anyone else's (even if I disagree with it ... :-)

Thanks, my take as well. I've enjoyed more civil discussion with folks I've disagreed with than I can shake a stick at. ;-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4530. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 20:05:32 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9viun60165c@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27577

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c1cee98_1@news7.fast.net...
> First, learn how to spell insulting terms before you use them ...
>
> Second, I'm an Extra ... missed one out of 50 on the test, due to
> a stupid mistake on my part (reading the question/answers too
> fast and marked the wrong letter, despite knowing the correct
> answer) ... but 98% ain't bad ... did YOU do that well?
>
> No need to answer ... I don't intend to respond to your flame
> bait any further ...
>
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

This is typical from Bruce. I am far from being a perfect typist. God knows I make my share of typos. What makes me laugh is that certain code proponents that will be quick to point out the slightest grammatical error or spelling mistake, yet won't say a word about Bruce's pathetic posts. It's probably a last ditch effort to say something when they can't present any other argument.

4531. Re: Jam the bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 20:10:11 UTC
From: webdoc@mailandnews.com
Message-ID: <de9751ca.0112161210.3624edc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27576
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<SYZQ7.150916$WW.9789945@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> Heck, do what I did 35 years ago when W2OY tried to jam me. Be nice.
> Reduce your bandwidth. Any idea as to what 40 WPM of CW will do to an AM
> (or SSB) signal? I had a nice 30 minute chat after Mike sat on the
> frequency. I can assure you, his blood pressure likely doubled. I still
> had a solid QSO for half an hour and didn't even hear him. Nice thing about
> CW - it's legal anywhere within the amateur bands.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

While I am in NYC with the American Red Cross, I am planning to take the test to get my ticket, and a friend gave me an early X-mas gift of a nice little 2 meter HT. So I have been listening to the chatter on the NYC area repeaters and heard some beligerant fool jamming the one repeater for a few days. Some people just need to grow up I guess, if someone does something to offend me, my radio and computer both have a nice little feature called the on/off switch. No need to jam, all that does is compound the situation.

Keith Hosman

4532. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 20:10:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9viv010171g@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27579

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c1cf140_2@news7.fast.net...

> From talking with IARU officials and people representing them
> at the ITU, I disagree. I believe the IARU finally has woken up
> to the realities we will face (spectrum pressures, etc.) in the
> future and is acting accordingly.

I would think that HF spectrum would be safe. In fact, in the past two decades, hams have gotten more HF spectrum in the 12, 17, and 30 meter bands. VHF and up are what I'm concerned about. Commercial interests would love to get the paws on the 2 meter band.

4533. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 20:25:39 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <u#4jW#mhBHA.1580@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 27578

N2EY says:

> We have type acceptance already.

In a single category, HF amplifiers, this is true. But there is no
blanket "type acceptance" applied to US Amateur Radio, nor
any restriction of modification of amplifiers by hams, not any
restriction on designing our own from scratch.

> Manufactured rigs have to be FCC certified for ham use.
> So do kits.

The is _not_ "type acceptance". They are certified only to the
extent that they meet Part 15 requirements like any other consumer
electronic device (such as your garage door opener) and it has
nothing to do with "type acceptance" under Part 97.

> Hams don't "have to" homebrew, should why should they
> "have to" learn so much technical stuff just to get the license?
> Those who want to homebrew can learn it and get the necessary
> license.

This is the same mantra sung by NCI's ex Executive Director,
W5YI. He has stated publicly that he feels that since people
who acquire entry level ham tickets invariably purchase their
equipment assembled these days, and send them in for
repairs when broken, they no longer need to possess the
knowledge needed to build good "home-brew" stations, nor
the knowledge to determine if their repairs/adjustments result
in proper on-the-air signals. Because of this fact, he thinks that
the majority of questions regarding math and theory (knowledge
mainly needed to build/repair/adjust equipment) should
be removed from entry level tests, and simply replaced with
questions on operating technique and regulations. If he had
his way, math and theory questions would only be part of
Amateur Extra examinations.

Can you say "Tech Free General" and "No Tech Technician"?

I can just hear some "Tech Free General" on 17 meters
saying "My equipment CAN'T be splattering, it's type accepted
and besides, I'm not required to have the technical knowledge
how to curesplatter anyhow."

How do you square that silly notion with Part 97.1(b), (c)
and (d).

The QCAO would love you guys are members!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4534. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 20:49:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216154941.05640.00000736@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27580

>Second, I'm an Extra .

Well look A$$ Wipe, maybe you ought to inform QRZ, they still have you as a
Tech

4535. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 20:51:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216155135.05640.00000739@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27581

>despite knowing the correct
>answer) ... but 98% ain't bad ... did YOU do that well?
>

No I didnt do 98%, I did 100%, total test time 3 Minutes

4536. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 20:52:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216155233.05640.00000740@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27582

>No need to answer ... I don't intend to respond to your flame
>bait any further ...
>
>--

Then why did you respond in the First Place A$$ Wipe???

4537. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 20:54:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216155436.05640.00000741@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27583

>NCI-1052
>Executive Director, No Code International
>Fellow, The Radio Club of America
>Senior Member, IEEE
>Member, TAPR
>Member, ARRL

You missed 1 Carl, you forgot" Member CBs are us"

4538. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 20:56:43 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216155643.05640.00000743@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27584

>What makes me laugh is that certain code
>proponents that will be quick to point out the slightest grammatical error
>or spelling mistake, yet won't say a word about Bruce's pathetic posts.
>It's probably a last ditch effort to say something when they can't present
>any other argument.

Another losser I see, for your info I could care less about CW, its the Stupid
Written that is a Joke

4539. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 21:58:22 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vj5an02adu@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27585

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011216155643.05640.00000743@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >What makes me laugh is that certain code
> >proponents that will be quick to point out the slightest grammatical
error
> >or spelling mistake, yet won't say a word about Bruce's pathetic posts.
> >It's probably a last ditch effort to say something when they can't
present
> >any other argument.
>
> Another losser I see, for your info I could care less about CW, its the
Stupid
> Written that is a Joke

I rest my case.

4540. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 22:45:46 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1d241c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27586

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011216145712.14930.00000393@mb-fp.news.cs.com...
>
[snip]
>
> >What I'm suggesting is that demonstrating the ability to solve the
> >applicable problems could be seen as sufficient to demonstrate
> >the requisite level of qualification to earn the privileges. I am NOT
> >suggesting that the privileges should be "given away." Also, consider
> >my previous comments that the license should be viewed as a permit
> >to do things, not as some sort of "graduation certificate," and that
> >the value is in what it allows you to do, not what you had to do to get
> >it.
>
> I suppose...sort of like the UK Foundation ticket. I can see your point.
:-)

I was not refering to the UK Foundation ticket ... on the contrary, I was
talking about US classes, up to and including Extra ... even the Extra
is not a "graduation certificate" ... it's just a permit to do things ...
the
fact that it conveys more privileges is based on the fact that one has
demonstrated a higher degree of technical knowledge, so it lets you
do more.

73.
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4541. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 22:50:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1d2537_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27587

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011216154941.05640.00000736@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >Second, I'm an Extra .
>
> Well look A$$ Wipe, maybe you ought to inform QRZ, they still have you as
a
> Tech

No, they have me as a Tech Plus ... I would have thought an Extra like you
would
know that there is a lag between passing the test and when the change
appears
in the FCC database, and a slightly longer lag before the change appears in
the
callsign servers. However, from the time the test is passed and a CSCE
issued,
the privileges are available to the licensee.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4542. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 22:51:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1d257a$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27588

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011216155135.05640.00000739@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >despite knowing the correct
> >answer) ... but 98% ain't bad ... did YOU do that well?
> >
>
> No I didnt do 98%, I did 100%, total test time 3 Minutes

I *doubt* that ... your level of literacy, demonstrated over several
years, definitely casts doubt on that claim :-)

Carl

4543. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 23:00:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1d2793_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27589

"K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message
news:u#4jW#mhBHA.1580@cpimsnntpa03...
> N2EY says:
>
> > We have type acceptance already.
>
> In a single category, HF amplifiers, this is true. But there is no
> blanket "type acceptance" applied to US Amateur Radio, nor
> any restriction of modification of amplifiers by hams, not any
> restriction on designing our own from scratch.
>
> > Manufactured rigs have to be FCC certified for ham use.
> > So do kits.
>
> The is _not_ "type acceptance". They are certified only to the
> extent that they meet Part 15 requirements like any other consumer
> electronic device (such as your garage door opener) and it has
> nothing to do with "type acceptance" under Part 97.
>
> > Hams don't "have to" homebrew, should why should they
> > "have to" learn so much technical stuff just to get the license?
> > Those who want to homebrew can learn it and get the necessary
> > license.
>
> This is the same mantra sung by NCI's ex Executive Director,
> W5YI. He has stated publicly that he feels that since people
> who acquire entry level ham tickets invariably purchase their
> equipment assembled these days, and send them in for
> repairs when broken, they no longer need to possess the
> knowledge needed to build good "home-brew" stations, nor
> the knowledge to determine if their repairs/adjustments result
> in proper on-the-air signals. Because of this fact, he thinks that
> the majority of questions regarding math and theory (knowledge
> mainly needed to build/repair/adjust equipment) should
> be removed from entry level tests, and simply replaced with
> questions on operating technique and regulations. If he had
> his way, math and theory questions would only be part of
> Amateur Extra examinations.

Hans, Fred's views (however accurately or not you've paraphrased
them) are his personal views and NOT "NCI Policy." I can assure
you (and all of the other readers that a majority of the NCI Board
does NOT feel as you have insinuated above by stating what you
believe Fred's views to be. We are No CODE International,

not No Test International, nor No Theory International. The vast
majority of the NCI Board (myself included) firmly support technical
proficiency, in fact, increased emphasis on technical proficiency,
in the ARS.

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4544. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 23:11:51 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vjddrdkr0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27595
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"paul friedman" <pfriedman8426@mediaone.net> wrote in message
news:eh6T7.5097$yC.323593@typhoon.mn.mediaone.net...
> Shouldn't be a problem. Make sure the battery is charged as you might be
> asked to turn it on.
>
> Paul AB0SI

I believe you have to ask the plane's Captain if it's ok also.

97.11a.

> "Joshua Senecal" <senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu> wrote in message
> news:senecal-1512011928590001@d71-096.solano1.ucdavis.edu...
> > Hi all,
> >
> > I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
> > carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
> > having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the
current
> > situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
> > them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
> >
> > Thanks!
> >
> > -Josh Senecal, KG6IBF
> >
> > --
> > senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu (remove the obvious bit from the address)
> >
> > "Your most valuable asset is rampant ignorance."
> > -Dogbert
>
>

4545. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 23:18:08 UTC
From: Better Than Roger <"Har Har"@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <9vja4l$2qs$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27591
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9vj9as$4v$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net> wrote in message
> news:1103_1008511844@news.fuse.net...
> > Thanks for the info. Now I will triple my annual contribution to the
> Salvation Army just like the way I have started sending money to the Boy
> Scouts.
>
> He forgot to tell you he (SLee) was the one taking the money...guess he
had
> to feed that heroin habit.
>

Hey, Woger. Yer buddies over at Lambda miss you.
>

4546. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 23:24:02 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <#merBiohBHA.436@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27592

WA6VSE says:

> Hans, Fred's views (however accurately or not you've paraphrased
> them) are his personal views and NOT "NCI Policy."

I'm sure that's true, and I didn't insinuate otherwise.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4547. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-16 23:24:13 UTC
From: thou old greeze monkey <hjohinsie14300@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <x2aT7.7576$O7.809474@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27593
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9vj9as$4v$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net> wrote in message
> news:1103_1008511844@news.fuse.net...
> > Thanks for the info. Now I will triple my annual contribution to the
> Salvation Army just like the way I have started sending money to the Boy
> Scouts.
>
> He forgot to tell you he (SLee) was the one taking the money...guess he had
> to feed that heroin habit.

the note above reminds me of some of the same ole slimeballs I see each
and every year at the Dayton Hamvention. I usually visit the Pizza --- and
sure enough when a group gets up to leave, some stinkin slimeball ham
says he has to go hit the men's room, waits for everyone to go out to
the parking lot, then goes back to the table to pocket half the cash tip they left
for the waitress. Usually the resturant personnel are so busy their don't see it
but I've see this in ad least 3 resturants during lunch or dinner during Hamvention.
Usual technique is they take out a ten to "make change" with the tip, cop a quick
glance, then pocket part of the tip like they made change and left the ten....
Does this happen around other hamfests? Boy oh boy we got some real
cheap slimeballs in this hobby.

4548. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 00:11:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216191130.28796.00001053@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27594

>I rest my case.
>

Bite it

4549. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 00:16:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216191610.28796.00001056@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27596

>No, they have me as a Tech Plus ... I would have thought an Extra like you
>would
>know that there is a lag between passing the test and when the change
>appears
>in the FCC database, and a slightly longer lag before the change appears in
>the
>callsign servers.

Oh I see, it took you Months to memorize enough Questions to pass.
By the way, now that you have Welfare Status on HF, where are all these great Technical Things that you were going to bring to HF???? Or have you forgotten about those comments?

4550. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 00:19:43 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216191943.28796.00001061@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27597

>I *doubt* that ... your level of literacy, demonstrated over several
>years, definitely casts doubt on that claim :-)
>
>Carl
>

You can doubt all you want, I could care less what you think. What I do know is that it has taken you Months and Months to obtain your Welfare HF Status. What was the problen Carl to many Qustions for you to Memorize in 1 setting??

4551. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 00:21:01 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vjean$g3l$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27598
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Buttfucking Them Randylittlekids" <Har Har@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:9vja4l$2qs$0@dosa.alt.net...

Poor Joanie "cocksucking expert' Shitball Kimball....

>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vj9as$4v$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net> wrote in message
> > news:1103_1008511844@news.fuse.net...
> > > Thanks for the info. Now I will triple my annual contribution to the
> > Salvation Army just like the way I have started sending money to the Boy
> > Scouts.
> >
> > He forgot to tell you he (SLee) was the one taking the money...guess he
> had
> > to feed that heroin habit.
> >
>
> Hey, Woger. Yer buddies over at Lambda miss you.

Yeah? Well, go ahead and fill in for me, since you're more experienced with
their meetings anyways, choad swallower.

4552. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 00:22:06 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vjeap$g3l$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27599
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"thou old greeze monkey" <hjohinsie14300@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:x2aT7.7576$O7.809474@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vj9as$4v$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net> wrote in message
> > news:1103_1008511844@news.fuse.net...
> > > Thanks for the info. Now I will triple my annual contribution to the
> > Salvation Army just like the way I have started sending money to the Boy
> > Scouts.
> >
> > He forgot to tell you he (SLee) was the one taking the money...guess he
had
> > to feed that heroin habit.
>
> the note above reminds me of some of the same ole slimeballs I see each
> and every year at the Dayton Hamvention. I usually visit the Pizza --- and
> sure enough when a group gets up to leave, some stinkin slimeball ham
> says he has to go hit the men's room, waits for everyone to go out to
> the parking lot, then goes back to the table to pocket half the cash tip
they left
> for the waitress. Usually the resturant personnel are so busy their don't
see it
> but I've see this in ad least 3 resturants during lunch or dinner during
Hamvention.
> Usual technique is they take out a ten to "make change" with the tip, cop
a quick
> glance, then pocket part of the tip like they made change and left the
ten....
> Does this happen around other hamfests? Boy oh boy we got some real
> cheap slimeballs in this hobby.

Maybe that's the attraction for them.....being cheap....

4553. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 00:34:57 UTC
From: chris <k4rch@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vjehm$p4e$1@bob.news.rcn.net>
Source record: 27600
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You only need permission if you are going to transmit during the flight.

Chris

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9vjddrdkr0@dosa.alt.net...
>
>
> I believe you have to ask the plane's Captain if it's ok also.
>
> 97.11a.

4554. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 00:54:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goggway.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27452

On 16 Dec 2001 16:45:13 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>>if you are civil service all that is necessary is to know your pay
>>level (which is open information, since your position in an agency is
>>determined by it). All "G5s," for example, receive precisely the same
>>salary. They don't have to hide it because their employer isn't
>>cheating anyone else out of a fair pay by concealing it.

>Not all GS-5's make the same money. There are different "step"
>levels within each Civil Service paygrade, and longevity points
>which increase pay within the grade/step level. When I was a Master
>Sergeant stationed at the Air Force Academy, I supervised three
>GS-5's, none of which made the same as the others. I also had a
>GS-6 who made less than one of the more senior GS-5's.

Not only that, there are location and hardship differentials.
Engineers GS-5 are on a different "ladder" than Clerk-Typists GS-5,
for instance, as are Engineers in New York City versus same-grade
Engineers in Grand Island, Nebraska.

Not only are the "ladder" rates public information, so is the exact
Position and Job Title, Duty Station, Grade/Step and salary of any
Civil Service employee.

One of the joys of swimming in Uncle Sam's fishbowl.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4555. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 00:55:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gogh5iz.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27451
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 16 Dec 2001 00:35:50 -0500, Robert Casey wrote:

>If asked, tell them it's a cell phone. They won't know.....

Nowadays they may very well make you prove it works as you have described. They hane been doing that with cameras for years, and I've had to prove that my turned-off scanner works as a scanner and not a transmitter when it is turned on.

The worst "security scan" that I've had with carry-on luggage was a piece of finished gemstone (green malechite) the size of an egg...must have looked like a hand grenade on the X-ray. And that was almost 15 years ago.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4556. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 00:55:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goghz90.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27453

On 16 Dec 2001 17:03:28 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>It is my understanding that UK written license tests are a very different
>ballgame than here. They cost L75 - about $100 US! They are not given very
>often, and the actual Q&A are secret. Prospective UK hams are REQUIRED to
>attend an approved training course before being allowed to take any tests. How
>do ya think that would play over here?

During the "privatization" discussions at the FCC staff level back
in the 80s, more than one staffer suggested that if we are forced to
"privatize" testing, we should adopt what was then the European
system of a national amateur radio club giving the tests, including
mandatory training sessions and membership in said club as the
Europeans were doing.

I still feel that the FCC should be back in the testing business
and was very forthright about that in my comments submitted in the
Restructuring proceeding.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4557. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 01:00:01 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1d4392_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27454

"K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message
news:#merBiohBHA.436@cpimsnntpa02...
> WA6VSE says:
>
> > Hans, Fred's views (however accurately or not you've paraphrased
> > them) are his personal views and NOT "NCI Policy."
>
> I'm sure that's true, and I didn't insinuate otherwise.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

FB, Hans ... I didn't mean to infer that you had bad intentions, but
felt compelled to clarify for other readers.

Happy holidays,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4558. Re: "...one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 01:44:34 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <OtqVjwphBHA.1752@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27455

KE8HH says:

> The ONLY reason for taking that position is because they are paying some
people
> more to do a given job than they are paying others for the same work. If
their pay
> scale was based on equal pay for equal work they wouldn't CARE if people
told
> others what they earned.

Hogwash! People get paid what they get paid because of their value to their employer. Using my engineering group for an example, our company has 4 "grades" of RF engineers. Engineer I, Engineer II, Senior Engineer, and Principal
Engineer. Each of those "grades" has a salary range "midpoint", and guidelines
allow me to pay each person between 80% and 140% of their grade "midpoint".

As an example, the "midpoint" for a Senior Engineer is currently $71,485. That
means I can pay an incumbent between $57,476 and $100,079. They all know the possible range of salary, and they also know that top performers will be paid
above midpoint, adequate performers will be paid near midpoint, and low performers .... well, you get the idea. In other words, they control their own
salary potential. What a novel idea, huh?

While all Senior Engineer incumbents do roughly the same sort of work, some are more skilled at that work than others, some are more experienced, some have auxiliary skills or talents, some are better visionaries, some were
hired because they had certain technology backgrounds that were needed in my group (and I needed to pay a certain salary to attract them away from their
former position), some are assigned more technologically demanding tasks, some are pursuing more risky development lines, etc., etc., etc. And yes, some are paid less because they have not yet demonstrated a higher value to our group.

If I "averaged it out" and paid them all the same salary, then my competitors
would benefit from my turnover as my most valuable Engineers departed for situations where their skills were properly compensated. I'd be stuck with the "performs adequately" remainder.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4559. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 01:48:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1D41CF.5BC36ED1@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27456
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote:

> > >IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government funds
> > >and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be
> > >using, then he WILL be in trouble.
> >
> > If it is on the list, I suspect the DOD would have some rather nasty
> > words for his superiors.
>
> These days, DOD often rolls for the local
> community. If you are uniform then a superior
> will relieve the local jail of your person then
> confine you to quarters. As you folks are
> civilians who are a bit less than reservists,
> you really do not have that much "covering
> fire".
>
> Again, you guys really need to talk to your
> lawyers to understand how modern American
> courts really work.

This guy is an out-and-out troll. He couldn't be that uninformed.

4560. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 01:50:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1d502a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27458

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C1D41CF.5BC36ED1@townsqr.com...
>
>
> N9NWO wrote:
>
> > > >IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government
funds
> > > >and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be
> > > >using, then he WILL be in trouble.
> > >
> > > If it is on the list, I suspect the DOD would have some rather nasty
> > > words for his superiors.
> >
> > These days, DOD often rolls for the local
> > community. If you are uniform then a superior
> > will relieve the local jail of your person then
> > confine you to quarters. As you folks are
> > civilians who are a bit less than reservists,
> > you really do not have that much "covering
> > fire".
> >
> > Again, you guys really need to talk to your
> > lawyers to understand how modern American
> > courts really work.
>
> This guy is an out-and-out troll. He couldn't be that uninformed.
>

That saying, "takes one to know one" comes to mind here...LOL

Kim W5TIT

4561. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 01:53:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1D5020.1DA0592E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27457

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> We are No CODE International,
> not No Test International, nor No Theory International. The vast
> majority of the NCI Board (myself included) firmly support technical
> proficiency, in fact, increased emphasis on technical proficiency,
> in the ARS.

Hey Carl, wonder how they would like a technical exam that you would
have a hard time with? :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4562. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 01:58:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1D513C.7D079503@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27459
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:
> The worst "security scan" that I've had with carry-on luggage was a
> piece of finished gemstone (green malechite) the size of an
> egg...must have looked like a hand grenade on the X-ray. And that
> was almost 15 years ago.

They confiscated my soldering tool - you know the kind that has a
sharp point on each end for removing solder splashes from PC boards.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4563. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 02:03:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1D451C.FD2B3154@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27460
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Bill Nelson wrote:

> In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>
> > The way you were going at it was that you
> > were making it out that you were some big
> > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
> > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
> > that cop were to get off.
>
> An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
> into such a situation in the first place.

The police he describes are a bunch of untrained, juvenile loose cannons. The many I knew would not begin to enforce a new law without learning the law in detail, and many minor narrowly- focused laws such as this one would prety well be ignored without a formal complaint having been signed by a victim. Then there might be an investigation which might lead to an arrest if it proved to be warrented.

Most cops are not fools. Fools don't normally enjoy long tenure as police officers.

4564. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 02:48:18 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216214818.10592.00001235@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 27461

>Mark,
>
>You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
>in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
>and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.

There's a bit more to be read "between" the lines.

>That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
>the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
>ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
>reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
>way in most of the world, too.

Gee, I hope not. It's at 5-wpm now, that's a significant reduction. Access to the entire HF spectrum can now be had with what used to get you onto the Novice sub-bands. But to each their own. If they drop it, so be it. If not, well I guess that's ok too.

>Ham radio has a chance of surviving and even becoming more healthy
>in the future after all ...

Ham radio was never in danger. It'll still be "dying" long after our grandchildren go for their tickets. Take care and 73.

Mark

4565. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 02:50:47 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216215047.10592.00001236@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 27462

>I might be open to dropping the code requirement altogether if the
>written test pool questions and answers were NOT published, only study
>"guides."

Now there's a thought!

Mark

4566. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 02:58:52 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216215852.10592.00001238@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 27464

>> ..." I believe Mark himself said that
>> "there's something to be said for tradition."

That was me alright.

>"Maintaining traditions" is NOT a legitimate regulatory function.

Regulatory function...isn't amateur radio more than just "regulatory." There's a pseudo-culture that's rooted in...tradition. Reduce it...but don't eliminate it.

>If Morse enthusiasts want to keep Morse usage alive, it's up to
>them to promote it for its own sake, not to insist that governments
>force it down everyone's throats via regulatory fiat.

It's not about keeping Morse alive. I think it's about standards.

>Open question pools are a fact of life. I personally have no problem
>with them, since I think that it's FAR easier to learn the basic under-
>lying principles to be able to derive the correct answers than to
>"memorize" hundreds and hundreds of question/answer pairs.

I think they're revamping the pools as we speak. (write)

>In fact, I'd have no problem with an "open book" exam using some
>reasonable reference, such as "The Radio Amateur's Handbook."
>I'm far more interested in folks demonstrating that they can solve
>problems as they come up, rather than insisting that everyone
>carry every possible formula in their heads. As an EE, I frequently
>refer to references for useful information.
>

I'm inclined to agree. I've known open book exams that were much harder than some that simply required memorization. Take care and 73.

Mark

4567. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 02:59:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216215921.05696.00000875@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 27463

>Hey Carl, wonder how they would like a technical exam that you would
>have a hard time with? :-)
>--
>cheers, CAM

It sure looks like he most have had a hard time with the written, his Call still shows up as a Tech plus. Guess there are 2 many Questions for him to Memorize

4568. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 03:06:50 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vjnd507gc@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27466

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011216191943.28796.00001061@mb-fc.aol.com...
> You can doubt all you want, I could care less what you think. What I do
know is
> that it has taken you Months and Months to obtain your Welfare HF Status.
What
> was the problen Carl to many Qustions for you to Memorize in 1 setting??

Why, then, do you even bother to post if you say you don't care what people
think?

4569. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 03:14:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <5qdT7.227698$3d2.10791368@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27465

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011216215047.10592.00001236@mb-mg.aol.com...
> >I might be open to dropping the code requirement altogether if the
> >written test pool questions and answers were NOT published, only study
> >"guides."
>
> Now there's a thought!
>
> Mark

Any licensing structure has two almost mutually exclusive goals that have been wrestled with for years.

The license to get started has no particularly good reason to be difficult. Rules, regs, safety, etc. It is not a graduation certificate as has been observed but a license to practice.

If one decides there should be some demarcation between the tyro and the pro then it is legitimate to both test and require some experience. We did that for years with the old Class A (one year licensed before you could take it) and Class B-C tickets and required one or two years for the Extra at various times. This is the subject of another debate,

My point is that you cannot do them both at the same time on the same $10.

Dick N�BK

4570. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 03:45:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216224529.07211.00001040@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 27467

>Why, then, do you even bother to post if you say you don't care what people
>think?
>
>

To keep them Guessing

4571. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 04:08:16 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1d6fb4_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27468

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011216215852.10592.00001238@mb-mg.aol.com...
> >> ..." I believe Mark himself said that
> >> "there's something to be said for tradition."
>
> That was me alright.
>
> >"Maintaining traditions" is NOT a legitimate regulatory function.
>
> Regulatory function...isn't amateur radio more than just "regulatory."
There's
> a pseudo-culture that's rooted in...tradition. Reduce it...but don't
eliminate
> it.

We're talking about licensing requirements ... that's PURELY a
regulatory function. "Tradition" has NOTHING to do with *legitimate*
regulatory goals ... it's not the FCC's job to preserve amateur
"tradition" ... the FCC's job is to regulate the use of the spectrum
in the public interest. End of story.

> >If Morse enthusiasts want to keep Morse usage alive, it's up to
> >them to promote it for its own sake, not to insist that governments
> >force it down everyone's throats via regulatory fiat.
>
> It's not about keeping Morse alive. I think it's about standards.

Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
three basic motivations 1) "I had to do it, so everyone else should,
too."; 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of contacts
will dry up; and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
using "their" bands. All 3 of those are pure rubbish.

> >Open question pools are a fact of life. I personally have no problem
> >with them, since I think that it's FAR easier to learn the basic under-
> >lying principles to be able to derive the correct answers than to
> >"memorize" hundreds and hundreds of question/answer pairs.
>
> I think they're revamping the pools as we speak. (write)

Yes, the new Extra pool is done and must be used by June 1, 2002.
My understanding is that the intent of the QPC was to make it more
modern and comprehensive.

> >In fact, I'd have no problem with an "open book" exam using some
> >reasonable reference, such as "The Radio Amateur's Handbook."
> >I'm far more interested in folks demonstrating that they can solve
> >problems as they come up, rather than insisting that everyone
> >carry every possible formula in their heads. As an EE, I frequently
> >refer to references for useful information.
> >
>
> I'm inclined to agree. I've known open book exams that were much harder
than
> some that simply required memorization. Take care and 73.
>
> Mark

73,
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4572. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 04:23:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011216232356.20069.00000837@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 27469

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wa6vse@fast.net
>Date: 12/16/01 10:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3c1d6fb4_1@news7.fast.net>
>
>"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011216215852.10592.00001238@mb-mg.aol.com...
>> >> ..." I believe Mark himself said that
>> >> "there's something to be said for tradition."
>>
>> That was me alright.
>>
>> >"Maintaining traditions" is NOT a legitimate regulatory function.
>>
>> Regulatory function...isn't amateur radio more than just "regulatory."
>There's
>> a pseudo-culture that's rooted in...tradition. Reduce it...but don't
>eliminate
>> it.
>
>We're talking about licensing requirements ... that's PURELY a
>regulatory function. "Tradition" has NOTHING to do with *legitimate*
>regulatory goals ... it's not the FCC's job to preserve amateur
>"tradition" ... the FCC's job is to regulate the use of the spectrum
>in the public interest. End of story.
>
>> >If Morse enthusiasts want to keep Morse usage alive, it's up to
>> >them to promote it for its own sake, not to insist that governments
>> >force it down everyone's throats via regulatory fiat.
>>
>> It's not about keeping Morse alive. I think it's about standards.
>
>Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
>three basic motivations 1) "I had to do it, so everyone else should,
>too."; 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
>not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of contacts
>will dry up; and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
>using "their" bands. All 3 of those are pure rubbish.
>
>> >Open question pools are a fact of life. I personally have no problem
>> >with them, since I think that it's FAR easier to learn the basic under-
>> >lying principles to be able to derive the correct answers than to
>> >"memorize" hundreds and hundreds of question/answer pairs.
>>

>> I think they're revamping the pools as we speak. (write)
>
>Yes, the new Extra pool is done and must be used by June 1, 2002.
>My understanding is that the intent of the QPC was to make it more
>modern and comprehensive.
>
>> >In fact, I'd have no problem with an "open book" exam using some
>> >reasonable reference, such as "The Radio Amateur's Handbook."
>> >I'm far more interested in folks demonstrating that they can solve
>> >problems as they come up, rather than insisting that everyone
>> >carry every possible formula in their heads. As an EE, I frequently
>> >refer to references for useful information.
>> >
>>
>> I'm inclined to agree. I've known open book exams that were much harder
>than
>> some that simply required memorization. Take care and 73.
>>
>> Mark
>
>73,
>--
>Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
><mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
><http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
>---
>NCI-1052
>Executive Director, No Code International
>Fellow, The Radio Club of America
>Senior Member, IEEE
>Member, TAPR
>Member, ARRL
>CBs are us-1001
>Cant Pass A Dumbed Down Written Test in 6 Months-1001
>Senior Member,Bubba Internatioal-1
>Founder and Director 10-4 International

4573. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 04:33:58 UTC
From: Donnie <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net>
Message-ID: <9vjsja$84m$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 27470
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9vipv2hmi1@dosa.alt.net...
> Anonymous COWARD
> "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> news:098341038FE.16JKS38762@houston-hunks.com...
> >
> > The Salvation Army
>
> SLee's familiar with the Salvation Army, since he spent several years
there
> at the Shelter in Dallas. This was after he was convicted on Domestic
> battery charges and had a restraining order in place to keep him from
> beating up his mother again.
>

Woger, Stagger Lee is a friend of mine. Because you talked mean
to him, I am putting you on my Black List.

Donnie

4574. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 04:45:45 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <uVMSvVrhBHA.1644@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 27471

WA6VSE said:

> All 3 of those are pure rubbish.

Carl,

Is everything you disagree with "pure rubbish". I don't happen to agree with any of the 3 motives you list, but I do know some well intentioned people who still believe Morse testing is a good idea.

Dismissing their opinion as "pure rubbish" is bad manners. I had hope you'd acquired some manners in your sabbatical from rrap, but alas my dear old Granny was right when she said "Hope in one hand and shit in the other -- tell me which gets full first."

Hans

4575. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 04:51:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CA0010F0A27050CD.F5CC2D330B7244AE.06DB7FA6286671D4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27472

On 9 Dec 2001 22:22:23 -0800, stewartx@sccoast.net (Dwight Stewart) wrote:

> Prove it for yourself, Rick. Like I said, walk down any street in
>this country and ask people to identify the practices of satanism. I'm
>certain 99 percent, both religious and non-religious, would list these
>very things (witchcraft, occult, etc). Your choice to argue with me
>rather than proving it for yourself strongly suggests you're afraid of
>the results.

Then, by all means, let's eliminate ANY trace of prejudice in providing the answer.

Walk down any street in any Islamic nation (which represents 20% of the population of the Earth, and thus makes a very fair sample of the population) and ask the same question. If they define it as including pentagrams, wiccan faiths, etc., I'll be glad to agree with you.

On the other hand, if they define it as being an American citizen, you'll just have to live with that as well.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4576. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:01:00 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DA8D1F89169A9AE3.6914EF5875137C69.5698B107FC1E9049@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27473

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 05:35:05 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> What rumors, Kim? If you're going to accuse someone by name of something like
>this, then at least have the integrity to explain your accusation. As I told
>Krell, you can hear the word "satanic" applied to these people every single day
>in this country - in books, magazines, movies, music, news stories,
>conversations, and so on. So how am I spreading "rumors" by repeating the common
>application of that word as it is used in this English language? Furthermore,
>Ms. Politically Correct (they not satanic - they're wiccans and pagans), what
>gives you the thought that you have a right to dictate what words are used in
>this language? Have you been taking double speak lessons from the book, "1984?"

Dwight, the majority of the populations of Iran, Syria,
Lebanon, Iraq, and several other nations view the policies of the
United States Government as satanic--and the United States itself as
"the Great Satan."

Since you clearly believe that simply because a group of
people claim something is satanic, the definition is the appropriate
one, clearly you--as an American citizen--are BY DEFINITION a
satanist!

Now, since you practice a religion abhorrent to most of the
members of this list (don't believe it? Ask how many of the people
here will state that they DON'T find satanism--and
satanists--offensive to them), why don't you just go away and practice
your perversions in private?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4577. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:01:57 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E955A5EC3F1D6C33.0860DCD26822A8B3.5BECA4EEE1C79892@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27474

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 19:09:51 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Krell wrote:
>>
>> Again, name some specific examples. IOW, put up or shut up.
>
>
> Do your own research, Krell. I have no time for someone who is too blind to
>see what is widely available right in front of their own face.

His usual answer when he can't support his dishonest claims,
Krell, just take it as a given he doesn't know what he's talking about
but he refuses it admit it.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4578. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:03:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217000332.24724.00000349@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 27476

In article <u#4jW#mhBHA.1580@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
writes:

>N2EY says:
>
>> We have type acceptance already.
>
>In a single category, HF amplifiers, this is true. But there is no
>blanket "type acceptance" applied to US Amateur Radio, nor
>any restriction of modification of amplifiers by hams, not any
>restriction on designing our own from scratch.

Yep - unless a ham wishes to sell an amplifier or kit of parts for one. Then we
are limited to one per calendar year. If I come up with a neat design for, say,
an outboard amplifier for the Elecraft K2, I can only sell one per year to
other hams - even if I sell them at cost. Even internal amplifiers must be
type-accepted.
>
>> Manufactured rigs have to be FCC certified for ham use.
>> So do kits.
>
>The is _not_ "type acceptance". They are certified only to the
>extent that they meet Part 15 requirements like any other consumer
>electronic device (such as your garage door opener) and it has
>nothing to do with "type acceptance" under Part 97.

Thanks for the clarification, Hans. While I did distinguish between type
acceptance and certification, I can see where that distinction is not very
clear in my original posting.
>
>> Hams don't "have to" homebrew, should why should they
>> "have to" learn so much technical stuff just to get the license?
>> Those who want to homebrew can learn it and get the necessary
>> license.
>
>This is the same mantra sung by NCI's ex Executive Director,
>W5YI. He has stated publicly that he feels that since people
>who acquire entry level ham tickets invariably purchase their
>equipment assembled these days, and send them in for
>repairs when broken, they no longer need to possess the
>knowledge needed to build good "home-brew" stations, nor
>the knowledge to determine if their repairs/adjustments result
>in proper on-the-air signals. Because of this fact, he thinks that
>the majority of questions regarding math and theory (knowledge
>mainly needed to build/repair/adjust equipment) should

>be removed from entry level tests, and simply replaced with
>questions on operating technique and regulations. If he had
>his way, math and theory questions would only be part of
>Amateur Extra examinations.

Yup. That's his personal idea, of course. There are others singing that tune - for example, Stewart Teaze, N0MHS, who actually petitioned the FCC for a "Colt" license that had the same basic idea but way too many limitations. Stew's main mistakes, as I see it, were that his timing was bad (just after the 2000 restructuring) and the proposed license gave far too limited privileges.

But imagine mixing Stew's "Colt" idea with Fred's concept and the UK Foundation class. End result could be a "Communicator" class. You can bet the rig manufacturers will support it. You know how many times Kenwood's comments were referred to by the FCC in its R&O on 98-143?
>
>Can you say "Tech Free General" and "No Tech Technician"?
>
Sure. Once upon a time, the same thing would have been said about "no code test ham license".

>I can just hear some "Tech Free General" on 17 meters
>saying "My equipment CAN'T be splattering, it's type accepted
>and besides, I'm not required to have the technical knowledge
>how to curesplatter anyhow."

So? We have hams TODAY who put "power mikes" on their VHF/UHF FM gear and then get perplexed and angry when hams using adjacent channel repeaters complain about too much deviation.

CBers and other radio service users run SSB and FM with no technical testing at all.

All a type-accepted "Communicator" rig would need is a decent limiter to avoid splatter. You think such a feature couldn't be incorporated in a DSP system?
>
>How do you square that silly notion with Part 97.1(b), (c)
>and (d).

Don't have to. Who says EVERY ham MUST be a homebrewer? Remember, approved kits would be OK for Foundation classers.
>
>The QCAO would love you guys are members!
>
Not me. I'm the homebrewer in this bunch - or almost any bunch of hams.

I'm simply pointing out that this is the wave of the future. The code test debate is a dead duck, over, finito. FCC and almost all other countries have gone to 5 wpm for full HF privs. UK is going even farther. Support for code testing is almost nil among IARU member societies AND regualtory agencies like the FCC. 2003 is a little over a year away.

Back in 1991, FCC removed code testing for ham licenses above 30 MHz. There was a surge of new licenses...then the number of new hams dropped back to pre-1991 levels. Then came the April 15, 2000 restructuring, and another surge...but the level of growth is slowing again already. Next stop, no code test for any ham license and an accompanying brief surge and fade.

Once the code test is history, ol' Fred will need a new windmill to tilt at. 'Specially when the long term growth numbers don't change. My friend W1RFI has made the following point many times: Today, if a prospective ham asks "what do I need to study for the entry-level ham license?" he/she gets handed a 200 page book to study. Kinda intimidating for the non-technical types.

You watch, it'll happen. Fred and Stew aren't going away. The number of ham homebrewers is far far less than the number of hams who use CW. Yet Morse testing is now considered unnecessary by the FCC and many others except to meet treaty requirements.

How are you and I going to defend the idea that EVERY new ham MUST know a bunch of technical stuff when almost all new (an old) hams simply buy a rig and plug it in? 'Specially when the manufacturers and Freddites are pointing the other way?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4579. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:03:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217000333.24724.00000350@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 27475

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.goghz90.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 16 Dec 2001 17:03:28 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>It is my understanding that UK written license tests are a very different >>ballgame than here. They cost L75 - about $100 US! They are not given very >>often, and the actual Q&A are secret. Prospective UK hams are REQUIRED to >>attend an approved training course before being allowed to take any tests.
>How
>>do ya think that would play over here?
>
> During the "privatization" discussions at the FCC staff level back
> in the 80s, more than one staffer suggested that if we are forced to
> "privatize" testing, we should adopt what was then the European
> system of a national amateur radio club giving the tests, including
> mandatory training sessions and membership in said club as the
> Europeans were doing.

To quote Johnny Carson:

"I did not know that!!"

Just imagine what the reaction would be if the FCC were to announce that ALL new hams, regardless of other licensing or experience, had to join the ARRL AND attend an approved series of classes before being allowed to try the test. The code test debate and the incentive licensing fracas would be minor spats by comparison...

> I still feel that the FCC should be back in the testing business
> and was very forthright about that in my comments submitted in the
> Restructuring proceeding.
>
I'm with ya, Phil, but would they ever actually do it after 17 years of getting the unpaid labor of volunteers?

I think the "Golden Age" of FCC testing was in the late 1970s, when tests were not only given in the FCC offices, but at many hamfests and other gatherings. I remember a 1978 club meeting of the Drumlins ARC where an FCC field official told us that all we needed was a certain number of examinees (I think it was 10) and they'd send an examiner with all the papers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4580. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:24:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BF0F1CCDEF372990.1B18FF8B954F020E.FBE7BA8AFD924D72@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27477

On Tue, 11 Dec 2001 17:49:34 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Stupid claims, Krell? I claimed these people cannot actually do magic. Are you
>saying they can? I claimed these people are frauds. The fact they cannot do
>magic when they claim they can proves that.

Ok--then let's judge Christians on the same basis exactly.

Prayer is the Christian form of "Magick" (magic without the
"k" refers to stage tricks). Except for the name there is no essential
difference in the two. Both seek to gain "divine intercession" in a
secular matter of interest to the adherent.

Despite previous claims to the contrary, a comprehensive study
recently released by the Mayo Clinic has demonstrated conclusively
that prayer does NOT have any effect on recovery from a serious
illness (in this case, heart attacks). The prayer, in this case, was
conducted by a combination of sincere (and devout) Christian church
goers and Christian ministers (the "magicians" of the religion).

Since this carefully controlled test has validated something
most people already knew--that praying for something does NOT make it
happen--it is clear that people cannot actually affect change through
prayer. Thus, by YOUR argument, this proves they are frauds.

> I claimed modern day "pagans" are
>not descendants of those ancient pagan religions.

No, Dwight. You claimed "pagans."

Even if you limit it to modern ones, however, unless you claim
that they base their beliefs on Christianity (absurd) rather than on
the old religions, the effect is still the same--they practice a
religion that does NOT include a "satan," and thus CANNOT be
practicing "satanism."

> Do you have some evidence to
>dispute this?

Why should anyone bother to provide you evidence of anything?
You not only ignore it when it IS presented, but you lack the
integrity to provide evidence to support your own claims as well.

> I claimed most people in this country would describe their beliefs
>and practices as "satanic."

And I dispute that--although even if it WERE true it would
make no difference. Most people in this country think the US
Government is covering up information about UFOs (67% of the
population), most people in this country believe that Christ was born
on December 25th (a complete absurdity--read the biblical narrative),
most people in this country believe a LOT of erroneous "facts." Their
beliefs neither make those "Facts" true, nor do they serve as the
basis for the definition of words.

Use a _dictionary_ of the English Language as your source,
Dwight--I quoted several of them ALL of which demonstrated you were
incorrect. Isn't it a bit stupid to claim that you know more about the
meaning of words than the Oxford English Dictionary?

> Do you have some evidence to dispute that?

Do you have any to SUPPORT it?

Not just "everyone says." That's bull and we BOTH know it.
Give me a citation of a study where a statistically significant
percentage of the US population were studied and found to equate Wicca
and paganism with satanism. Not just your "most people would . . ."
PROOF that they would.

You demand WE prove our statements--start proving your own or
at least admit that you make them up as you go along--as many of us
are well aware is the case.

> So far,
>I've seen a lot of talk about how my claims are wrong, but not a shred of
>evidence to support that talk.

I've posted plenty. Where is YOUR evidence, Dwight? Or is it
easier to make a claim if you don't have to prove you aren't lying?

> If you really believe this wiccan nonsense, Krell, show me they can do magic
>and cast spells by having one do so to me. I've asked for such proof over and
>over, yet nothing has happened so far. In the end, this entire wiccan nonsense
>is stupid, and so is anyone who would defend it.

I'll make you a deal. As soon as you prove that prayer works
I'll do the same for magick. And don't claim it "isn't your religion"
because you are demanding that someone who is not a Wiccan use THEIR
practices to provide YOU "proof."

Can't do it?

Gee, Dwight, I guess (again by YOUR statements) that "this
entire Christian nonsense is stupid, and so is anyone who would defend
it."

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4581. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:27:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1D8238.E58FA0B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27478

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Hey Carl, wonder how they would like a technical exam that you would
> >have a hard time with? :-)
>
> It sure looks like he most have had a hard time with the written, his Call
> still shows up as a Tech plus. Guess there are 2 many Questions for him to
> Memorize

Say Bruce, do you understand about CSCEs?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4582. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:35:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <96B060B878A9D914.3BF1069C450E18A3.CE39FAADE62AE028@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27479

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 05:46:24 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> What they "claim" genius is that they worship a different set
>> of gods than you do. Why CAN'T they do that?
>
>
> Of course, they "can" do that (that is not saying they ARE doing that, by the
>way). But that is not all they "claim," is it, Rick? Most wiccans also claim
>they can do magic (or "magick," as some of them like to use) and other such
>nonsense? Do you really believe they can, Rick?

Do you believe that Christians can cause miracles by prayer,
Dwight? That's at fundamental tenet of the Christian faith. Unless you
can find some basis for defining that as even slightly more probable
than the practice of magick, the only conclusion that can be made is
that Christianity consists of EXACTLY as much nonsense as Wicca.

Magick in wiccan or occult senses is not about "Making things
happen," Dwight, it's about personal change. The "magick" ritual has
precisely the same significance that communion has in a Christian
ritual--it causes the practitioner to draw closer to his or her deity.
"Spells," and similar nonsense are in the same class as the practices
of some small Christian cults that handle rattlesnakes, flog
themselves, or speak in tongues--and have the same relationship to the
religion itself that Christianity has to Sunday Bingo sessions.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4583. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:40:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3D5D607A0D710230.9597210326313887.A29EF94A49CBC9D3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27480

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 06:06:00 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Oh, don't leave now, Kim. We've just getting started? If you really believe
>this wiccan nonsense (which you seem to based on the outrage you expressed
>above), why don't you ask your wiccan friends if they can do "magick" like so
>many other wiccans claim? And if they say they can, why don't you ask them to
>cast a spell to reflect the ill feelings I'm expressing towards them back at me?
>Of course, if they claim wiccans can't cast spells or do magick, I'll gladly
>provide you with a long list of books about wiccan "spells and magick." Please,
>girl, don't even call me ignorant if you're foolish enough to believe in this nonsense.

Hey, Dwight . . .

I'm 85% deaf (totally in the left ear, 15% hearing in the
right).

I'll let you know when your prayers restore my hearing to
normal (after all, I lost it serving in the military, so your
"patriotism" should make it mandatory for you to help me out even if
you wouldn't do so otherwise).

Can't do it?

Does that mean that you aren't "foolish enough to believe in
this nonsense (Christianity)," or that you set different standards for
someone ELSE'S religion?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4584. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:40:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1D782B.7A03484F@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27481

W1RFI wrote:

> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>
> >>This is the first time I've been on this newsgroup in over a year
> >>and your ranting, whining rhetoric hasn't changed one bit from
> >>what I can see.
>
> > And you expected...WHAT...from RRAP...?!?!
>
> How about a congratulations for a fellow ham who has upgraded?
>
> Congratuations, Carl.
>

Yeah, Congratulations on the downgraded "upgrade", Carl. I guess you do
it however and whenever you can.

4585. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:42:07 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4BFD2AEA224767DA.D29500873639B3AF.3B941EC048070DCF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27482

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 06:14:50 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> Not everyone, Dwight. Only the ignorant.
>
>
> Well, since that use is so common in this country, Rick, you just called about
>90 percent of the population "ignorant." Of course, that is pretty typical for a
>liberal - liberals always believe they're right while everyone else is "wrong"
>or "ignorant."

Care to prove that "90%" figure, Dwight? Or shall we just
assume that--like most of your "factual" claims--it came from your own
imagination?

Fascists DO have a problem with the meaning of words, don't
you?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4586. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:44:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CC8B6BA766BBE4F2.CE838FA50BA88729.FF175065083F3FA7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27483

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 18:18:15 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>But don't think of what obscene phone calls would turn into... :-)

No problem--just use call forwarding and send them to the
local jail.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4587. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:46:17 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6CF305A6BB24AD00.2A8D56BE9C30DBF7.10DB203E54E84989@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27484

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 19:12:04 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Jim Kelley wrote:
>>
>> The best solution is the transporter they have
>> on Star Trek (snip)
>
>
> Exactly. Sadly, problems like this are much easier to solve on television than
>they are in real life.

Actually, scientists HAVE successfully constructed (and
demonstrated) a transporter of that nature.

Unfortunately, it's only capable of moving a sub-atomic
particle--it would take the power of a black hole to move something as
large as a toothpick, never mind a human being--but it DOES exist in
the real world.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4588. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 05:55:42 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B8D767B3AD28C334.43B42F552DD52A1B.DEAB1CB9DE085F04@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27485

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 06:40:09 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> Do you realize how large the fuel demand is in this country, Rick? Crop based
>fuels are way too inefficient. For example, even if we turned over every bit of
>the agricultural land in this country to grow a fuel replacement (including all
>the lands currently used for food production), there is not enough agricultural
>land available to grow enough of anything to replace more than a small percent
>of the fuel consumed in this country each year. If we remove the land currently
>used for food production, there is not enough land left to make even a small
>dent in the problem. Crop based fuels, even with a crop that can grow most
>anywhere, is not the answer.

Funny, according to the research done by the Farm Bureau, it
would be _easily_ possible to produce enough hemp oil to fuel all
motor vehicles in the United States without the slightest negative
impact on other agricultural land use. In addition, we would also have
produced enough fiber hemp to replace our entire wood based paper
industry with a paper source that is environmentally friendly (wood
pulp paper uses a bleaching process harmful to the environment) as
well as far more durable and less subject to aging effects. We would
also have enough fiber left over to produce quite a number of the
40,000+ products that can be manufactured from hemp--as they are in
parts of Europe and in Canada today.

Hemp, in a good industrial variety, grows 14-18' tall, 6" in
diameter, and in exceptionally dense plantings. Because it is so
adaptable to conditions it can be grown in every state in the US
(including Alaska), requires virtually no care or harmful insecticides
or herbicides, returns over 80% of its nutrients to the soil (the
leaves and branches which represent most of the bulk of the plant
aren't used industrially and are simply ploughed back into the soil),
is highly resistant to diseases and harsh weather conditions, and can
provide between two and four harvests per year, depending on the area
where it is grown.

Combine that with the current concept of gas/electric cars
(i.e., the Honda) that can achieve 100mpg efficiency and you have a
DEFINITE replacement for petroleum products for motor vehicle use.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4589. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:00:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C18FDA77B5BC0A73.C1293EEA4A052CE7.5E35E7E5D40DCBB8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27486

On 10 Dec 2001 10:17:35 -0800, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>I looked for info on the web but as yet have not found anything that
>states how many barrels/acre can be obtained by bioenergy farming. It
>should be noted that many analyses compute yield by counting the
>entire biomass harvested, most of which does not yield liquid fuel.

At one time, the University of Mississippi web site had links
to some studies that might provide the info you're looking for. If
not, try http://www.drcnet.org/ It's an anti-drug-war site, but it has
an outstanding drug library (which presents BOTH sides of the issues)
including excellent scientific articles and studies on industrial
hemp.

>Most of the land currently used for food production can't be used for
>energ production without impacting food supplies and prices. Just not
>an option.

True. But hemp will easily grow on land that is simply not
suited for other agricultural uses and thus can augment, rather than
replace, the food crops a farmer can raise.

>The problems of energy supply, and their solutions are complex, and
>many Americans want quick/simple/cheap answers.

Naw,

Just quick, luxurious, cars! ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4590. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:07:15 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <nYfT7.299322$W8.10484327@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27487

Dick Carroll wrote

> Yeah, Congratulations on the downgraded "upgrade", Carl. I guess you do
> it however and whenever you can.

WAFA!!!

Rich

4591. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:12:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1D7FAE.781AC7B9@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27488

Dave Heil wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > You mean all the people who believe in freedom of choice of modes
> > > > in a hobby in a free society? He could pass a 5wpm Morse code exam
> > > > but he has no need for HF privileges.
> > >
> > > Then what's his beef...or yours?
> >
> > He has no beef. Mine is the idea presented by the PCTA folk that all
> > nocode techs are technical dumb $hits. One would think a PhD in EE
> > would be good enough proof to the contrary.
>
> The only proof needed is that the guy pass an amateur radio licensing
> exam. His PhD in EE has no bearing at all other than giving him an edge
> in theory. I don't recall any idea presented by "PCTA folk" which is as
> you claim. Are you basing your claim in the statements of one or two
> individuals? If it is, you aren't being honest.

Dave. Cecil is obfuscating as usual. No one ever even suggested that all nol code techs are technical illiterates, but it is pretty well certain that the vast majority are, and that is no surprise since they aren't required to be anything more. The test allows them licenses in that state.

4592. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:14:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B577A097853B9C11.77509315A12579D0.20141418C0CB5AE6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27489

On 10 Dec 2001 13:03:20 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Yup. Like biodiesel, methanol, and wood chips. There are cars and trucks
>running today on refined vegetable oil. (look up "biodiesel" on any search
>engine). The problem is that the raw vegetable oil itself, before processing
>and taxation, costs more than gasoline after processing and taxation. Biodiesel
>is only practical when there is a source of cheap or free vegetable oil - like
>waste oil from restaurants.

Er, Jim.

Hemp oil IS a vegetable oil, remember? And according to
agro-chemists it's one of the most efficient ones available for fuel
use (it's also one of the healthiest for food use--far more so than
soybean oil, its nearest competitor).

As far as costs are concerned, assuming the development of
sufficient processing facilities and farms the estimated at-the-pump
cost of hemp fuel should be in the neighborhood of $0.49/gallon US
(assuming it isn't taxed out of the market, of course). Since it can
be produced domestically, no transportation expenses (or oil spill
risks) exist with respect to its use, and taxation at a reasonable
rate would still keep the price to the consumer well below
$1.00/gallon US. To me that's pretty reasonable, particularly as it
would make us independent of foreign imports.

>I doubt it. Is it used in Canada? How much does it cost there?

It won't be used widely anywhere until the automobiles are
manufactured to use it (see your own comments about biodiesel)--and
that isn't going to happen until it is permitted in the US, thus
opening a vital market.

Of all nations, we have the greatest ability to produce
industrial hemp--not only are our agricultural sciences at least as
advanced as those used anywhere on earth, but we have a tremendous
amount of arable land suitable to hemp production--and could thus
produce fuel at a reasonable price, encouraging the production of hemp
based vehicles (both Ford and GM have patents on engines designed to
use hemp fuel, btw, I don't know about Chrysler or the major foreign
manufacturers, but it's reasonable to assume they have the same--thus
production of autos designed for the fuel wouldn't be a major barrier
to its implementation).

>How many gallons of this fuel can be derived from an acre of hemp grown for the
>purpose? How much fuel must be used to run the machinery that grows the hemp?

Those answers should be available on the site I cited above.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4593. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:15:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1D8048.58B45C0A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27490

Bert Craig wrote:

> >> Isn't it the ITU that requires HF hams to know Morse code? The FCC just
> >follows
> >> that edict because the USA is a signatory to the treaty. Take care and 73.
> >>
> >> Mark
> >
> >Mark,
> >
> >You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
> >in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
> >and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.
> >
> >That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
> >the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
> >ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
> >reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
> >way in most of the world, too.
> >
> >Ham radio has a chance of surviving and even becoming more healthy
> >in the future after all ...
> >
> >73,
> >
> >--
> >Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
>
> Hi Carl,
>
> I'm not convinced that dropping the code altogether as a reqirement for HF
> access is related in any way, shape, or form to "surviving and even becoming
> more healthy in the future after all ..." I believe Mark himself said that
> "there's something to be said for tradition."
>
> The required speed was reduced to 5-wpm, not an insurmountable obstacle for
> anybody. I might be open to dropping the code requirement altogether if the
> written test pool questions and answers were NOT published, only study
> "guides." Just my humble $0.02.

Ah, Bert, you just made a lifelong enemy. They don't call him Karl the
Intractable for nothing.

4594. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:15:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C8CF4693544421A8.57F4CCC572113555.AB58CB5CEF2EE0B9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27491

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 12:08:00 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>> You'll notice, however, that the congress is unwilling to
>> legalize the most efficient form of fuel available (hemp oil) for
>> production on American farms (we have to import it from Canada if we
>> want it). Hemp fuel, first introduced by Henry Ford in 1936 (in an
>> automobile built over 40% out of hemp itself), is non-polluting, a
>> renewable resource, lower in cost than petroleum products, readily
>> extracted from the plant, and can be produced anywhere in the USA.
>> Even the Farm Bureau (arguably one of the most conservative
>> organizations in the US) has voted unanimously to encourage congress
>> to legalize it as a cash crop.
>
>You've got one of those suits made entirely from hemp, don't you Rick.

Nope--but I have a book printed on it.

You probably do as well--most Bibles are printed on hemp paper
imported from France.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4595. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:21:02 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F38AF8181D9256CC.BEAA214C5E5C5524.BCE28091E67A0AAD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27493

On 9 Dec 2001 22:02:07 -0800, stewartx@sccoast.net (Dwight Stewart)
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote...
>>
>> But you DO have the alternative (as do I) of
>> moving to an area where public transportation
>> is available. (snip)
>
>
> So your suggested solution to the transportation needs of the
>elderly is to simply tell them to move where public transportation is
>available. Nice guy.

It applies to me as well, Dwight. I'm 56 and well aware that
at some point I will have to either move somewhere with public
transportation or make some sort of arrangements for transportation.
That's not something I look forward to, but I'm realistic enough to
know that there is neither the money nor the incentive for the
government to extend public transportation to small, rural, areas such
as the one where I live.

There's nothing self-centered about stating a fact--and it's
certainly not self-serving to say that seniors need to move in
preference to risking other lives (as you state you would do if you
were in a rural location) by driving after they are no longer capable
of doing so safely--particularly since, unlike yourself, I expect to
have the same thing apply to me as well when I reach that age.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4596. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:21:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1D819C.DAA5657C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27492

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011216102800.19611.00000281@mb-mt.news.cs.com...
> > >> Isn't it the ITU that requires HF hams to know Morse code? The FCC just
> > >follows
> > >> that edict because the USA is a signatory to the treaty. Take care and
> 73.
> > >>
> > >> Mark
> > >
> > >Mark,
> > >
> > >You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
> > >in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
> > >and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.
> > >
> > >That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
> > >the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
> > >ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
> > >reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
> > >way in most of the world, too.
> > >
> > >Ham radio has a chance of surviving and even becoming more healthy
> > >in the future after all ...
> > >
> > >73,
> > >
> > >--
> > >Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> >
> > Hi Carl,
> >
> > I'm not convinced that dropping the code altogether as a reqirement for HF
> > access is related in any way, shape, or form to "surviving and even
> becoming
> > more healthy in the future after all
>
> Even the IARU Resolution states that maintaining Morse testing is
> not consistent with a healthy future for the ARS ...
>
> > ..." I believe Mark himself said that
> > "there's something to be said for tradition."
>

> "Maintaining traditions" is NOT a legitimate regulatory function.
> If Morse enthusiasts want to keep Morse usage alive, it's up to
> them to promote it for its own sake, not to insist that governments
> force it down everyone's throats via regulatory fiat.
>
> > The required speed was reduced to 5-wpm, not an insurmountable obstacle
> for
> > anybody.
>
> The point is that many folks simply don't have any interest in
> Morse, though they might be VERY interested in other aspects
> of ham radio, technically qualified, and able to contribute a
> great deal ... Morse proficiency has NOTHING to do with one's
> ability to be a valuable member of our "fraternity."
>
> > I might be open to dropping the code requirement altogether if the
> > written test pool questions and answers were NOT published, only study
> > "guides." Just my humble $0.02.
>
> Open question pools are a fact of life. I personally have no problem
> with them, since I think that it's FAR easier to learn the basic under-
> lying principles to be able to derive the correct answers than to
> "memorize" hundreds and hundreds of question/answer pairs.
>
> In fact, I'd have no problem with an "open book" exam using some
> reasonable reference, such as "The Radio Amateur's Handbook."
> I'm far more interested in folks demonstrating that they can solve
> problems as they come up, rather than insisting that everyone
> carry every possible formula in their heads. As an EE, I frequently
> refer to references for useful information.
>
> Once again, the license should be viewed as a permit to do things,
> based on demonstrating a reasonable ability to operate safely and
> without causing interference problems ... not as some sort of
> "graduation certificate."
>
> Removing UNNECESSARY, IRRELEVANT barriers to entry is key
> to recruiting more (good) hams ... and we need to do so, both to
> replace OTs as they become SKs, and also to actually grow in
> numbers to enhance our ability to retain the rather large amounts
> of very valuable spectrum to which we enjoy access.

Well Carl, it's clear that your "Horseshit" quotient is just as high as ever.

4597. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:25:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A21D29869CCDA043.930CE5AF1F2805F5.4E8DC1A9B159C528@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27494

On 10 Dec 2001 04:40:15 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <B815B546EE340A84.76A6B47205F92099.318662A5F3D31C08@lp.airnews.net>,
>Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
>>
>> 2. It is perfectly legal for a completely blind individual to
>>obtain a hunting permit--and to hunt--in Michigan. The only
>>stipulation is that the hunter MUST be accompanied by another licensed
>>hunter who will be responsible for insuring that the blind hunter is
>>firing at a legitimate target. The assistant, however, may (as a court
>>has ruled!) likewise be blind!
>>
>> Go figure.
>>
>> Rick
>
>Hmmm. I think I'd better cancel that deer hunting trip in Michigan!
>I don't want to end up tied to the fender of some Michigan blind
>hunter's car, as he's driving home from the field!

And, of course, stopping on the way home at an ATM (with the
required braille keys for the driver to use) to pick up the money for
the new braille version of "Guns & Ammo."

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4598. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:31:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4F429E4228DEEA01.72EC318EB7665B53.095480A78FADC70C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27495

On Tue, 11 Dec 2001 03:41:45 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>K0HB wrote:
>>
>> "Most companies"?????? (snip)
>
>
> "Most companies" in the context of the discussion with Cecil, Hans. See my
>response to Cecil's message for clarification.

In other words, when Dwight says "most" you have to know who
he is responding to before you can tell if he means "most" or "most"
or . . .

Wait a minute . . .

Most companies means MOST COMPANIES no matter WHO you are
talking to.

But, of course, most idiots don't know that . . .

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4599. Re: Is this politically Correct???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:35:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <685B78429948E0A5.BC765ADBF0F55BAF.446F72FAB51A7FE4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27496

On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 17:57:59 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>In view of the ongoing discussion of Kim's juvenile callsign, let me
>relate the unfortunate case of Central Missouri State at Warrensburg. For
>a number of good geographical reasons, their male sports teams have been
>known since Custer was a 1st lieutenant or so as Mules.
>
>Now a mule is the sterile offspring of a union between a mare horse and a
>male donkey. While I guess that there are technically male and female
>mules, the discussion is rather pointless. So what do you do when Mulette
>just don't cut it?
>
>After what had to be a bruising discussion, CMS female sports teams are
>known as Jennies -- a female donkey is a jenny. But that has the effect
>of making the male teams Jackasses. Is this PC???

Actually, if they are stupid enough to go along with it, the
name doesn't HAVE to be "PC," it's appropriate.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4600. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 06:39:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1D85D4.6797C09A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27497

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C1D41CF.5BC36ED1@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > N9NWO wrote:
> >
> > > > >IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government
> funds
> > > > > >and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be
> > > > > >using, then he WILL be in trouble.
> > > > >
> > > > > If it is on the list, I suspect the DOD would have some rather nasty
> > > > > words for his superiors.
> > > >
> > > These days, DOD often rolls for the local
> > > community. If you are uniform then a superior
> > > will relieve the local jail of your person then
> > > confine you to quarters. As you folks are
> > > civilians who are a bit less than reservists,
> > > you really do not have that much "covering
> > > fire".
> > >
> > > Again, you guys really need to talk to your
> > > lawyers to understand how modern American
> > > courts really work.
> >
> > This guy is an out-and-out troll. He couldn't be that uninformed.
> >
>
> That saying, "takes one to know one" comes to mind here...LOL

Whatever you think, Topless. That makes the totally unsupportable assumption
that you CAN.

4601. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 07:09:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C1D8CE1.A190536A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27498

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
> three basic motivations 1) "I had to do it, so everyone else should,
> too."; 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
> not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of contacts
> will dry up; and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
> using "their" bands. All 3 of those are pure rubbish.

Yep, all three are the purest of rubbish, wholly generated within your
tormented, twisted mind. What radiotelegraphy actually is, instead, is the
most basic method of radiocommunications yet devised, or likely ever to be
devised. Even tho it is a hundred years old.
It wouldn't matter if it was done in Morse or Swahili. It is bottom line
radio at its finest..

It is said that if one repeats the same lies long enougn he will finally
convince himself they are true. I see you still are trying your damnedest to
to convince yourself, still repeating the same old false mantra in falsetto at
the same DB level.
Keep it up, maybe someday you'll finally get it done, and finally convince
yourself. But you're not doing so well on anyone else.

Of all the organizations that one could be Executive Director to,
....

Oh well, it takes all kinds.

4602. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 07:12:21 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1D4DD4A30C88D722.B8D5F89894CB7071.AA1FEA71EB52B167@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27499

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 03:10:02 GMT, "JAMES HAMPTON"
<j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>I don't know the status of the new
>Radio Shack 10 meter radio. Has it sucessfully been converted to 11 yet? I
>know there had been a problem with the FCC and Radio Shack over that with
>their earlier 10 meter radio. Frankly, I don't believe these radios are
>truely being aimed at the amateur market. I did see in a recent QST an ad
>for a 150 watt SSB/AM 10 meter only radio. I can't imagine buying a 10
>meter only radio.

Without getting into the rest of the discussion, I'll point
out that there _are_ quite a few hams (myself included) who own 10m
mobile rigs (I have one of the newer Radio Shack rigs and to the best
of my knowledge it can't be easily converted to operate out-of-band as
the old model could--although I haven't had any reason to try to find
out if it could, so I might easily be wrong there). Some of us buy
them because they are very low priced (and for man hams--particularly
new ones--price is very important), some of us buy them because we
want a cheap spare HF rig for emergency use, and some just because
they serve the purpose adequately for the limited amount of mobile
operations we conduct. In my case, the RS rig was cheap, easy to
convert to QRP operations (I have it attenuated to about 0.4W
output--one of my interests is low-power HF), works well (I only lack
about 8 countries for a 10m DXCC--all QRP voice contacts!), has a
built-in automatic 10m repeater split, and it's not expensive enough
to have a serious worry about theft (which isn't a great problem in my
area in the first place). In addition, it's small enough to fit the
confined space of a small car (Chevy Cavalier LS), something most
inexpensive multi-band HF rigs won't do (the higher priced ones such
as an FT-100D, of course, will fit just as well).

> For a few hundred more, one can get a reasonable lower
>end transceiver covering at LEAST 160 through 10 meters. What does the
>IC706MK2 cost? Ok, maybe 3 times what that 150 watt 10 meter only rig
>costs. However, you get coverage from 160 through 2 meters plus 440! I had
>almost considered a 10 or 10/12 meter rig as I want to get back on HF
>(besides 2 roofs, boiler, and several other things setting me back over 10
>grand).

If it will be your only HF rig, a 10m mobile probably isn't
the best choice (assuming you can afford a better rig--not all hams
can), but if it's a second, or third rig it's a different matter. I
use an FT-920 as my main rig and so a 10m rig is fine for mobile use.
If I could only use one rig for both purposes, I'd either have an

FT-100D or an FT-847 that I could carry back and forth.

>Copy adds from CB
>sites and newsgroups. Put the whole thing together and have the ARRL pull a
>multiBILLION dollar lawsuit against the manufacturers of those devices.

Why blame the manufacturers?

Would you sue Colt and Ruger because people use their guns to
kill others?

Prosecute the people who misuse the equipment, not the
manufacturers. There _are_ legitimate uses for 10m equipment--it's no
more realistic to sue those manufacturers than it is to sue Yaesu,
whose FT-101 series of HF rigs is probably the most converted (to 11m
use) of any ham radio manufactured. Even my FT-920 can be converted to
transmit in the 11m band (anywhere in the entire General coverage
range, for that matter, including the 47Mhz cordless telephone band)
with little trouble--yet I doubt that Yaesu would be found liable if
someone were to make that conversion and interrupt telephone
communications in their area.

>Even assuming a large reduction in the amount, if Radio Shack had to ante up
>50 million they might well rethink who they sell to. We might not need more
>legislation. Perhaps they might feel they want to see a valid license
>before selling the 10 meter only gear.

But you don't NEED a license to purchase a ham rig--nor should
you need one. Most hams buy their first rig while still studying for
their license--or after taking their test and waiting for the license
to come in. It's totally unreasonable to take that privilege away from
them because a relatively small number of people choose to violate the
law. Instead, the focus should be on enforcement of existing laws
against out-of-band operations.

Of course, until the funding is available to prosecute MAJOR
problems such as the 3950 obscenity-fest, etc., expecting enforcement
over the less serious out-of-band violations is pretty optimistic, but
. . .

>You are correct. Despite some folks feeling that regulations are 'big
>government', we need regulation. Who wants to turn on the Dallas Cowboys
>only to hear 'AUDIOOOOO' blaring from their speakers?

Who wants to turn on the Dallas Cowboys in the first place
(the Dallas Cowboys Cheerleaders, excepted, of course :-)?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4603. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 07:59:47 UTC
From: twstedhed@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217025947.12142.00000420@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 27500

<< Why blame the manufacturers?

Would you sue Colt and Ruger because people use their guns to
kill others?

Prosecute the people who misuse the equipment, not the
manufacturers. There _are_ legitimate uses for 10m equipment--it's no
more realistic to sue those manufacturers than it is to sue Yaesu,
whose FT-101 series of HF rigs is probably the most converted (to 11m
use) of any ham radio manufactured. Even my FT-920 can be converted to
transmit in the 11m band (anywhere in the entire General coverage
range, for that matter, including the 47Mhz cordless telephone band)
with little trouble--yet I doubt that Yaesu would be found liable if
someone were to make that conversion and interrupt telephone
communications in their area. >>

"You get it Rick, others don't, too bad for them. I agree don't limit access to
anything in any way. Leave it to the individual to obey or not to obey the
laws, heh heh heh. The freeband hobby is growing year by year, 10 meter radios
are now sold openly in truck stops, and 10/11 Meter DX clubs are surpassing ham
clubs, all as it should be. Thank you Rick for your support, wish all hammies
were like you"

4604. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 10:11:59 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vkgdepho1@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27601
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb WILLIAM FRAZIER <KC7REK@email.msn.com> wrote:
> You folks are comparing apples and oranges. First a City, such as Tacoma or
> any other city, for that matter, can not or will not pass any law, ordinance
> or other bill that prohibits what the Federal Government allows.

I disagree. If federal law allows state rights in the matter, then they
certainly can and do pass such laws. A good example are the anti-firearms
laws in many states.

> Third, the enforcement of federal law lies with the FBI. They are the
> enforcement branch of the FCC and only they can confiscate radio equipment
> that the FCC has ordered confiscated.

Actually, it is federal marshals who have the law enforcement capability
when it comes to FCC matters. The FBI has a more limited focus.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4605. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 11:28:12 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vkkp901jdo@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27603

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:BF0F1CCDEF372990.1B18FF8B954F020E.FBE7BA8AFD924D72@lp.airnews.net...
> On Tue, 11 Dec 2001 17:49:34 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > Stupid claims, Krell? I claimed these people cannot actually do magic.
Are you
> >saying they can? I claimed these people are frauds. The fact they cannot
do
> >magic when they claim they can proves that.
>
> Ok--then let's judge Christians on the same basis exactly.
>
> Prayer is the Christian form of "Magick" (magic without the
> "k" refers to stage tricks). Except for the name there is no essential
> difference in the two. Both seek to gain "divine intercession" in a
> secular matter of interest to the adherent.

<snip>

I've already pointed this out to him. "Magick" is no different than a native American rain dance or praying for a miracle. Besides, Dwight is gone from the newsgroup for about a month. He'll probably have forgotten about this by the time he returns.

4606. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 11:33:17 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vkl2p01jov@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27604

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011216215047.10592.00001236@mb-mg.aol.com...
> >I might be open to dropping the code requirement altogether if the
> >written test pool questions and answers were NOT published, only study
> >"guides."
>
> Now there's a thought!
>
> Mark

Then you would have Dick Bash return to publish his brand of "study guide."

4607. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 11:48:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217064814.06380.00000444@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 27602

>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>> Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
>> three basic motivations 1) "I had to do it, so everyone else should,
>> too."; 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
>> not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of contacts
>> will dry up; and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
>> using "their" bands. All 3 of those are pure rubbish.

Or (4), where voice communication is difficult if not impossible due to propagation, interference or language disparities.....

Oooops...That's ONE of the reasons to KEEP it. I keep forgetting that instead of discussing valuable means of COMMUNICATION, we are discussing quick, effortless ways to load the bands up with "numbers" everyone says we allegedly need to "keep" our bands.

Of course, the NCI warlords COULD be involved in SERIOUS radio policy, like lobbying heavily for the Spectrum Protection Act (now in it's third or fourth permeation), but they are just happy enough to take thier chances on that and deal away Morse Code testing to load up the bands.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4608. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 13:02:29 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunkmail_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3C1DECE5.2E45@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 27606
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Krell wrote:
>
> "Professor" <bgriffey@core.com> wrote in message
> news:3c1b4471$0$30975$1dc6e903@news.corecomm.net...
> > Boy do I wish that was true.
> > I'd actually be able to hold a conversation out there...
> >
> > --
> >
> > ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
> > Professor
> > ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||
> >
> >
> > "WG" <nojunk@mail.com> wrote in message
> > news:V3FS7.10094$m54.2460407@news0.telusplanet.net...
> > > I have been a ham for 10 years now and a CBer for over 20 years and I
> have
> > > noticed a degradation of CB to the point that no one uses it anymore.
>
> I had to laugh at this. This is almost like the Yogi Berra response as to
> why he didn't go to a certain popular restaurant. He said, "Because it's so
> crowded, no one ever goes there anymore!"

It sounds silly on the surface, but if you look at the underlying
meaning, it's more like "It's so crowded (with chatter, lowlives, and
interference), that no one (decent, interesting people) use it anymore".

Being a CB veteran of over 30 years, I can say with some certainty, that
while the QUANTITY of users on CB may be still fairly high, the QUALITY
of the people has certainly dropped.

Dave
"Sandbagger"

4609. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 13:19:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217081915.14766.00000591@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 27605

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Well, anyway, Congratulations! I'm sure that you can now go
>ahead and invent all that neat stuff you've been talking about for
>so many years . . .

Put a lobster on which of the two of you invent something neat first?

>now that you're finally the ham radio equal of
>an 8-year old girl from some small town in New York!

I wonder if anyone could explain what this means? It looks like a gratuitous
insult to me.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

4610. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 13:22:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217082255.14766.00000592@mb-df.aol.com>
Source record: 27607

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Yeah, Congratulations on the downgraded "upgrade", Carl. I guess you do
>it however and whenever you can

Those who can't build things up tear things down. It has been the modus operandi of our lowest common denominator for years. Is THAT what learning code teaches people to become?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4611. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 13:39:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217083914.07199.00000940@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 27608

> Is THAT what learning
>code teaches people to become?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

No thats what belonging to ARRL brings

4612. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 14:13:03 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0112170613.1c3db010@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27609

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<3C1D8048.58B45C0A@townsqr.com>...
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
> > >> Isn't it the ITU that requires HF hams to know Morse code? The FCC just
> follows
> > >> that edict because the USA is a signatory to the treaty. Take care and 73.
> > >>
> > >> Mark
> > >
> > >Mark,
> > >
> > >You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
> > >in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
> > >and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.
> > >
> > >That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
> > >the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
> > >ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
> > >reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
> > >way in most of the world, too.
> > >
> > >Ham radio has a chance of surviving and even becoming more healthy
> > >in the future after all ...
> > >
> > >73,
> > >
> > >--
> > >Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> >
> > Hi Carl,
> >
> > I'm not convinced that dropping the code altogether as a reqirement for HF
> > access is related in any way, shape, or form to "surviving and even becoming
> > more healthy in the future after all ..." I believe Mark himself said that
> > "there's something to be said for tradition."
> >
> > The required speed was reduced to 5-wpm, not an insurmountable obstacle for
> > anybody. I might be open to dropping the code requirement altogether if the
> > written test pool questions and answers were NOT published, only study
> > "guides." Just my humble $0.02.
>
> Ah, Bert, you just made a lifelong enemy. They don't call him Karl the
> Intractable for nothing.

Aw Dick,

I didn't mean to make any enemies. I was under the impression that No-Code Int'l had "won" the battle when the No-code Tech license was adopted. I personally always knew (and accepted)that Morse code was, is, will forever be part of AR's heritage and as such, should be included among the most basic skill-sets required for certain (But not necessarilly all) levels of access. To not acknowledge that and still want it to be dropped altogether is, in my view, somewhat akin to being given $10.00 and complaining that it should've been $20.00, kinda ingracious. This is not a knock on the pro "No-code" crowd, they're certainly entitled to their views and opinions. I just choose not to believe that certain AR privileges are inalienable rights. We disagree but Carl's been polite with me and I really can't ask for more.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4613. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 14:26:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E00AE.866046FB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27610

Rick Adams wrote:
> True. But hemp will easily grow on land that is simply not
> suited for other agricultural uses and thus can augment, rather than
> replace, the food crops a farmer can raise.

If I am not mistaken, there are sub-species of hemp that are not
illegal but trying to convince the local drug gestapo that one
is growing legal hemp is not very rewarding. Eradication of
wild hemp has failed in many parts of the country.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4614. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 14:36:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E02FC.6CA33648@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27611

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Dave. Cecil is obfuscating as usual. No one ever even suggested that all
> no code techs are technical illiterates, ...

You, Bruce, and Larry sure have, Dick. When you say "nocode techs are technical illiterates", it implies "all". If you didn't mean "all", you should have said "some". It is true that some nocode techs are technical illiterates. It is also true that some extras are technical illiterates. Your personal technical literacy is only half vast. The percentage of technical illiterates is higher in the nocode tech class simply because it is the lowest entry level class, not because it is nocode. If the tech license required 20wpm Morse code and the extra was nocode, the technical literacy levels would not change.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4615. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 14:54:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011217095414.15992.00001015@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27613

In article <3C1CF36A.A7B8AF4E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I'm guessing that when the 5 WPM code testing requirement
>> is dropped, 'ole Doc Williamson will suddenly develop a "need"
>> for HF privileges!
>
>You're on, Larry. Are you willing to put your money where your
>mouth is? say $100?

Cecil:

That was a guess, not a wager. If it were, neither of us could collect
until the good Dr. Williamson went SK, and then it would be necessary
to prove/disprove he had/had not ever been on HF -- assuming he
outlived the 5 WPM code testing requirement. Therefore, it would be
quite illogical to make such a wager. As great a logical genius as
you purport to be, I'm surprised you didn't consider that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4616. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 14:54:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011217095415.15992.00001016@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27612

In article <9vime20iu1@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Carl's been a ham long enough to enroll in QCWA, has made his
>> living as a professional electrical engineer, and just now finally got
>> his Extra, only after the requirements have been dumbed-down to
>> insignificance? Nobody has to "rag" on Carl -- he's done a better
>> job of making a fool of himself than anyone else here ever could!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>It took a lot more skill, ambition, and perseverance to do what Carl did
>with regards to restructuring, than what was required to learn an antiquated
>and worthless endcoding scheme at a high rate of speed.

Krell:

Carl gets the credit for restructuring? Since when?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4617. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 14:54:55 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vl3n7glt1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 27621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:faggot.lee.sticks.his.fingers.in.underage.girls.cunts@houston-hunks.com
...
>
> On Sun, 16 Dec 2001 19:22:06 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> :
> : Maybe that's the attraction for them.....being cheap....
> :
> And then there's your technique: Reach into the Salvation Army kettle
> and help yourself.

And your technique is reaching into your daughter's cunt and helping
yourself.

4618. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 14:55:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E0758.875D2BA6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27614

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What radiotelegraphy actually is, instead, is the
> most basic method of radiocommunications yet devised, or likely ever to be
> devised. Even tho it is a hundred years old.
> It wouldn't matter if it was done in Morse or Swahili. It is bottom line
> radio at its finest..

"Basic" is not "finest", Dick. If "basic" were "finest" there wouldn't
be any need for any other modes including JPL's deep space modes. Do
you also advocate that everyone learn to ride a mule before being allowed
on the highways in a motor vehicle? A mule is basic transportation and often
gets through where no motor vehicle can go but I wouldn't call a mule
the "finest" transportation.

CW is a highly specialized skill intensive mode. As in all other areas
of progress, less specialized, less skill intensive modes have become
more popular than the originals. If you were serious about your concepts
of "basic" equals "finest", you would replace your computer keyboard with
eight toggle switches.

> It is said that if one repeats the same lies long enougn he will finally
> convince himself they are true.

You are certainly an expert on the subject as that's your main method
of communications.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4619. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 14:56:36 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vl3n9glt2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 27622
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"Donnie" <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net> wrote in message
news:9vjsja$84m$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vipv2hmi1@dosa.alt.net...
> > Anonymous COWARD
> > "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > news:098341038FE.16JKS38762@houston-hunks.com...
> > >
> > > The Salvation Army
> >
> > SLee's familiar with the Salvation Army, since he spent several years
> there
> > at the Shelter in Dallas. This was after he was convicted on Domestic
> > battery charges and had a restraining order in place to keep him from
> > beating up his mother again.
> >
>
> Woger, Stagger Lee is a friend of mine.

I bet you know him in the "biblical sense," too.

> Because you talked mean
> to him, I am putting you on my Black List.
>
> Donnie

Take your list and stick it up your ass, "Dumbass Donnie." The real Dumbass
Donnie doesn't get on the newsgroups, COWARD.

4620. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 14:57:31 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vl3nbglt3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 27623
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"chris" <k4rch@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vjehm$p4e$1@bob.news.rcn.net...
> You only need permission if you are going to transmit during the flight.
>
> Chris

Oh, ok. I've never taken a rig on a flight like that.

> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vjddrdkr0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> >
> > I believe you have to ask the plane's Captain if it's ok also.
> >
> > 97.11a.
>
>

4621. Re: What can each of us do about the 10 meter issue?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 15:00:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E089C.80E981D1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27615

Rick Adams wrote:
> Without getting into the rest of the discussion, I'll point
> out that there _are_ quite a few hams (myself included) who own 10m
> mobile rigs (I have one of the newer Radio Shack rigs and to the best
> of my knowledge it can't be easily converted to operate out-of-band as
> the old model could--although I haven't had any reason to try to find
> out if it could, so I might easily be wrong there).

Most ham rigs can be modified to work out of band. I saw a trucker
with an IC-706 (like mine) the other day. I asked if he was a ham.
He said yes. I asked what his callsign was. He said callsigns are
not required anymore.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4622. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 15:06:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E09DA.8B06C0A1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27616

Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> >> Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
> >> three basic motivations 1) "I had to do it, so everyone else should,
> >> too."; 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
> >> not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of contacts
> >> will dry up; and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
> >> using "their" bands. All 3 of those are pure rubbish.
>
> Or (4), where voice communication is difficult if not impossible due to
> propagation, interference or language disparities.....
>
> Oooops...That's ONE of the reasons to KEEP it. I keep forgetting that
> instead of discussing valuable means of COMMUNICATION, we are discussing quick,
> effortless ways to load the bands up with "numbers" everyone says we allegedly
> need to "keep" our bands.

Actually, what is being discussed is freedom of choice of modes in a
hobby in a free society. There is absolutely nothing prohibiting someone
who wants to take full advantage of CW's many advantages from becoming
skillful in the mode. What is wrong with live and let live?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4623. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 15:08:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E0A6E.4B78A940@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27617

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >now that you're finally the ham radio equal of
> >an 8-year old girl from some small town in New York!
>
> I wonder if anyone could explain what this means? It looks like a gratuitous
> insult to me.

It means that Larry admits to being the ham radio equal of an 8-year
old girl for many years. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4624. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 15:15:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E0C04.3DCB5576@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27618

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> I'm guessing that when the 5 WPM code testing requirement
> >> is dropped, 'ole Doc Williamson will suddenly develop a "need"
> >> for HF privileges!
> >
> >You're on, Larry. Are you willing to put your money where your
> >mouth is? say $100?
>
> That was a guess, not a wager.

As usual, you guessed wrong. I would bet that Dr. Williamson's
HT nicads are dead and gone at this very moment.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4625. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 15:34:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011217103447.15992.00001017@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27620

In article <20011217081915.14766.00000591@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Well, anyway, Congratulations! I'm sure that you can now go
>>ahead and invent all that neat stuff you've been talking about for
>>so many years . . .
>
>Put a lobster on which of the two of you invent something neat first?

Ed:

You're on! I'll bet you one lobster dinner that Carl invents something neat before I do! After all, Carl's the professional engineer -- not me! I'm just an ordinary amateur radio operator, with non-professional technical skills, who was capable of rising to Amateur Extra class under the most stringent testing regime ever place in the history of the ARS! However, I'll bet you that if I had been a professional electronics engineer, I wouldn't have spent most of my lifetime as a Technician-class radio amateur, waiting for the code testing requirements to be dumbed-down to insignificance!

>>now that you're finally the ham radio equal of
>>an 8-year old girl from some small town in New York!
>
>I wonder if anyone could explain what this means? It looks like a gratuitous
>insult to me.

No, it's just that a few years ago I read about an 8-year old girl from somewhere in New York who passed her 20 WPM code test and attained Amateur Extra class! Of course, she's older now...but at least Carl can now claim to be her "equal!" The only question is, why could some kid in the third grade do it, when he couldn't?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4626. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 15:34:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011217103448.15992.00001018@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27619

In article <A21D29869CCDA043.930CE5AF1F2805F5.4E8DC1A9B159C528@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>>Hmmm. I think I'd better cancel that deer hunting trip in Michigan!
>>I don't want to end up tied to the fender of some Michigan blind
>>hunter's car, as he's driving home from the field!
>
> And, of course, stopping on the way home at an ATM (with the
>required braille keys for the driver to use) to pick up the money for
>the new braille version of "Guns & Ammo."

Rick:

Not to mention "Car and Driver," "Motor Trend," and "Flying!" You
also forgot to mention that he was going to stop by the golf course
on his way home! Is it true that all the road signs in Michigan are
also in Braille?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4627. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:10:02 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <9vl5a1$8b5$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 27639

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011216114512.15992.00000925@mb-fc.aol.com...
> In article <3c1b5d71_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>

<SNIP>

>
> >BTW, just to put some icing on the cake for you, I finally got
> >around to finding time in my work/travel schedule to go to a
> >VE session and upgrade to Extra :-)
>
> Well, congratulations! You finally lived long enough to make
> it all the way! Of course, I've had my extra for over 18 years
> now, so I have seniority over you!
>

<SNIP>

>
> Well, anyway, Congratulations! I'm sure that you can now go
> ahead and invent all that neat stuff you've been talking about for
> so many years, now that you're finally the ham radio equal of
> an 8-year old girl from some small town in New York!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

This also means that YOU have been the "equal of an 8-year old girl"
for the last 18 years also.
--

'73' From KB9TMP

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com

4628. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:10:37 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E1929.94EEE17B@gte.net>
Source record: 27624
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > We give cops guns because their lives are more
> > valuable. Mayors and governors have bodyguards
> > for the same reasons.
>
> Wrong. We allow officers to carry firearms because many criminals
> also carry firearms. It might be necessary to use the firearm in
> the process of apprehending the felon.
>
> The officer would be just as likely to use the firearm to protect
> some innocent person.
>
> I can carry a firearm. Does that make ME "more valuable" than those
> who cannot? Not in my view.

Over a felon, you are more valuable.

4629. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:13:10 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E19C2.BB320516@gte.net>
Source record: 27625
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
>
> > There is a pecking order. Governors and mayors are
> > the most valuable then powerful men then professionals
> > like doctors and lawyers. The Police are just under mayors.
>
> If I were injured, I would feel that a doctor was far more important
> than some political hack who happened to get elected to office.
>
> > Look there are so many elite who see the police and
> > the military as a bunch of losers who are there to die
> > for them. People like you who make huge amounts
> > of money and live in big fancy houses. I have them
> > in my community. The military is not allowed to recruit
> > in the local high school as their kids are going to college
> > and the military is for those who can't really make it.
>
> > People like you see themselves as too valuable to get
> > their hands dirty. Sorry but your life is not worth that
> > of a police officer, a fire fighter or a soldier.
>
> How do you know what we do for our livings?
>
> In my opinion, it is elitist attitudes like yours that are part of
> the problems we face in this country.

Sorry, I am only showing what the attitudes
are among the educated elite in this country.
Politicians see themselves as extremely valuable
to society. And they have the authority and power
to enforce that belief. They use the police as
their muscle to enforce their will on the public.

Doctors see themselves as more valuable than
most working class (blue collar) individuals. So
do many college professors.
```

4630. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:21:13 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E1BA0.4308C769@gte.net>
Source record: 27633
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >> And if you argue with a cop then you are just
> >> another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
> >> alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
> >> your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
> >> the office to shoot everyone.
> >
> >I would not give an officer a rough time. Why should I? But if
> >he wants to examine my automobile or radios, then he better have
> >a search warrant. If he feels one is necessary, then the watch
> >officer can certainly see that one is obtained in short order.
> >Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
>
> Actually, obtaining a search warrant isn't all that quick or easy.
> Assume the following scenario...
>
> 1. Officer Obey stops John Q Motorist for some traffic violation.
> 2. Upon viewing the vehicle's interior, Officer Obey sees a
> radio mounted in the car.
> 3. Officer Obey asks the motorist about the radio
> 4. John Q Motorist politely tells officer Obey the radio
> is a ham rig (or CB, or whatever).
> 5. Officer Obey then requests permission to search the
> vehicle and/or examine the radio itself.
> 6. John Q Motorist declines (politely) to allow search
> of the vehicle and/or the radio.
>
> OK so far?
>
> Now Officer Obey requires a search warrant to search
> the car or further examine the radio. Just how does the Officer
> obtain that warrant then? The process involves at least
> the following:
>
> 1. Detaining the vehicle and occupant for an unspecified time
> 2. Officer Obey would need to have his police supervisory
> people contact a judge and inform the judge as to WHY
> a search warrant is needed (i.e. probable cause, etc.)
> (most local municipalities don't always
> have a judge just sitting around to do these things)
>
> Judges do NOT routinely issue search warrants just
> to make local police happy. IF some subsequent search
> uncovers a criminal act. then there had better be sound

> reasons for the search warrant in the first place. If
> the search uncovers nothing...the reason for the warrant
> had better stand up to challange via a civil lawsuit.
>
> If any cop builds a record of "bogus" stops and bogus
> requests for search warrants, that cop's credibility in the force
> goes out the window and you can bet the judge(s)
> (as do police management) know
> who those bad credibility cops are.
>
> Good policing does not require arrogance or "attitude"
> on the part of police. Attitude cops give all cops a bad
> name and they undermine the service of the good cops
> who know and work as proffesionals within the constraints
> of our constitution and legal system.

The courts have ruled that the police, with proper
probable cause, can search a vehicle to include the
trunk. You gave them that power when you obtained
a drivers license. Now anything in a locked case most
have a search warrant if you do not give your permission.
If you refuse, they can tow the car until they have a
warrant.

Much of this has been worked out due the drug traffickers.

Go over to Alt.Law-Enforcement. Traffic stops and searches
are a popular topic there. You would be surprised how often
someone is stopped, who has no drugs yet has to go through
such treatment. All it takes a police dog walking around your
car and signaling that there are drugs there. A lot of good, decent
folks have been subject to such treatment.

Just because you are good guy, in your mind, does not mean
that someday a very professional cop will put you through this.
There are too many folks, even older folks, who look just like
you, who are now in the drug traffic.

4631. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:22:19 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E1BE7.6A0EB59D@gte.net>
Source record: 27626
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >
> > > And if you argue with a cop then you are just
> > > another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
> > > alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
> > > your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
> > > the office to shoot everyone.
> >
> > I would not give an officer a rough time. Why should I? But if
> > he wants to examine my automobile or radios, then he better have
> > a search warrant. If he feels one is necessary, then the watch
> > officer can certainly see that one is obtained in short order.
>
> Arguing with a cop is stupid. If he had no reason for stopping you, he
> wouldn't have. Discussing the situation politely is another matter, and
> if that doesn't help, and it may not, you'd better plan on taking your
> complaint to another level and having your stuff together when you do.
> Even then don't expect to overcome a discretionary if arbritary decision
> made by a cop on the street. He will have so much discretionary
> authority that will be upheld all the way, if it comes to that. Your
> best course is to do everything he says at the time with no hint of
> opposition, and any question you have of his actions needs to be posed
> in a friendly, non-irritated manner. Most cops are reasonable people,
> and want no hassles -you'd probably not believe how many they have to
> put up with in the normal course of things-, but when one acts to become
> an added irritant when he has been stopped it's a sure path to more
> trouble than you already have, if any. Many times cops just want to set
> someone straight without the hassle of paperwork, and will let it go
> with a warning, if the situation justifies it.. You'd be surprised at
> all the paperwork involved in even a simple traffic arrest.
> I can't imagine any rational cop wanting to take on a radio
> possession case without some other serious factor being involved. I
> doubt they'd want to do it a second time. But what the hey, I've been
> out of the loop for several years. Maybe new cops are different, like
> some new hams.

Thanks. You made my points.

4632. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:28:41 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E1D64.78F53ADC@gte.net>
Source record: 27627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
>
> > That is a risk that the average cop is willing
> > to take. As far as he is concerned, getting
> > you in front of judge is his primary job. Even
> > if you win, it will cost you a huge amount of
> > money, and time. Costly enough that you will
> > think twice the next time. He does not have
> > to get you thrown in jail in order to change
> > your attitude. Normally the court procedures,
> > and it can take a year or more to settle a case,
> > are enough to make a decent citizen more
> > careful in how they live their lives.
>
> I really hope you are just a troll - or an aberration.
>
> Fortunately, officers with such an attitude around here
> fairly quickly become ex-officers.
>

What I am describing is fairly normal. My guess is
that you have had minimum contact with the courts
over the years. The drug traffic has changed things
to a great deal. Cops are far more hard nosed these
days. Very professional but hard nosed. They assume
that everyone is a criminal who might kill them. And
the one time that they do let their guard down, the asshole
is a criminal who does try to take them out.

The average cop hears a ton of horror stories about
cops getting killed. Their training re-inforces such thinking.
What they want is to go home alive at the end of each
day.

And most see their job as done once they have put you
in front of a judge. After that it is the courts responsibility.

Go read Alt.Law-Enforcement for a few weeks.
```

4633. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:29:37 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E1D9D.E4781ACE@gte.net>
Source record: 27628
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>
> > Lawsuits are just a cost in doing business. People
> > file false charges against the police everyday. As
> > I said, the average cop looks to the courts to settle
> > questions. If a ham wants to be an asshole and argue
> > with the cops then he had better expect to stand in
> > front of the judge.
>
> And arrests that get the officer and police into lawsuits
> or get unfavorable publicity in the newspapers means that the
> officer can pretty much kiss his chances for promotion goodby.
> He will probably even be canned if it happens often enough.
>
> There used to be a couple of officers in my city with attitudes
> like you display here. They are no longer on the force. Nor are
> they in the phone directory any more - so may have moved on.
>
> The average office looks to his superior officers to settle
> questions. It is not a case of "Arrest em all, and let the courts
> sort them out" - which is what you claim is common.

Do not bet on that.

Go read Alt.Law-Enforcement and Talk.Politics.Guns
for a few weeks.

4634. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:31:50 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E1E21.224020F0@gte.net>
Source record: 27635
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >> > The point is that if you off half cocked about your "rights"
> >> > and how you are some big shot ham operator/CAP big
> >> > wig, you are in the wrong. That is not the way to deal
> >> > with cops. Your lack of respect towards them is shameful.
> >>
> >> And you are an example of why people mouth off to cops. A police
> >> officer deserves no more respect than any other citizen. They also
> >> should treat others with respect until given sufficient reason to
> >> do otherwise. Mouthing off is NOT a sufficient reason.
> >>
> >> > The police and military are your superiors.
> >>
> >> No, they are our employees - although there are those (and you
> >> appear to be one of them) who are deluded into thinking otherwise.
> >
> >Not your employees. The mayor hired them, not you.
> >You are but a taxpayer and you have no choice in paying
> >taxes. Unless you have the money and position to get
> >mayors elected then you will have a hard time influencing
> >the average big city mayor.
>
> The police, mayor, and every other city, county,
> sate or town employees are PUBLIC servants. They
> serve all of us. That is apparently a concept N9NWO
> is either unfamiliar with or unwilling to accept (IMHO).

Nice dream. It does not happen.
After a couple of terms in office,
most Mayors seem themselves
as lords of fiefdom. They twist
the city council to the point that
they might as well be elected dictators
(the council is more like a rubber
stamp for their policies). I have
seen it happen all across the country.

4635. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:32:30 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E1E4A.9D205E3C@gte.net>
Source record: 27629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > > >IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US government funds
> > > >and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO would be
> > > >using, then he WILL be in trouble.
> > >
> > > If it is on the list, I suspect the DOD would have some rather nasty
> > > words for his superiors.
> >
> > These days, DOD often rolls for the local
> > community. If you are uniform then a superior
> > will relieve the local jail of your person then
> > confine you to quarters. As you folks are
> > civilians who are a bit less than reservists,
> > you really do not have that much "covering
> > fire".
> >
> > Again, you guys really need to talk to your
> > lawyers to understand how modern American
> > courts really work.
>
> This guy is an out-and-out troll. He couldn't be that uninformed.

Maybe it is you who is living in the dream
world.

4636. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:34:47 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E1ED3.DC8620F1@gte.net>
Source record: 27630
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >> > The way you were going at it was that you
> >> > were making it out that you were some big
> >> > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
> >> > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
> >> > that cop were to get off.
> >>
> >> And the way your were going at it was all cops are bad guys who don't
> >> care about you or your rights. Especially the rookie who will arrest you
> >> first and ask questions later because he is unsure of the law.
> >>
> >Arrest now,ask questions later,is a revenue producer. Even more so now,
> >every town crys broke. Coincedence? I think not!
>
> False arrests are EXPENSIVE to government. An arrest
> generates NO revenue. Only a conviction MIGHT
> generate revenue (usually traffic fines). Criminal
> charges rarely result in any significant revenue gain
> to government at all. The prosecution costs alone
> are an expense.

About 6% of all court cases make to trial.
The rest are settled, often by peal bargaining.
Too many folks see it as too much work and
expense to fight a court battle. Especially the
poor, who peal bargain at the highest rate.

Go read Alt.Law-Enforcement and Talk.Politics.Guns
for a few weeks.

4637. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:38:41 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011217113855.100$Hx@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27631
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Federal Law allowed towns the opportunity to craft laws and enforce them the same way the FCC could. They cannot make up there own set of rules to enforce, they can enforce only existing FCC laws, but they can be no different than what the FCC rules are in place regarding CB .

"Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote in message news:9vkgdepho1@quark.scn.rain.com...
> In rec.radio.cb WILLIAM FRAZIER <KC7REK@email.msn.com> wrote:
> > You folks are comparing apples and oranges. First a City, such as Tacoma or
> > any other city, for that matter, can not or will not pass any law, ordinance
> > or other bill that prohibits what the Federal Government allows.
>
> I disagree. If federal law allows state rights in the matter, then they
> certainly can and do pass such laws. A good example are the anti-firearms
> laws in many states.
>
> > Third, the enforcement of federal law lies with the FBI. They are the
> > enforcement branch of the FCC and only they can confiscate radio equipment
> > that the FCC has ordered confiscated.
>
> Actually, it is federal marshals who have the law enforcement capability
> when it comes to FCC matters. The FBI has a more limited focus.
>
> --
> Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
>

4638. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:38:54 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E1FC8.A6B31CE5@gte.net>
Source record: 27634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >
> > > The way you were going at it was that you
> > > were making it out that you were some big
> > > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
> > > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
> > > that cop were to get off.
> >
> > An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
> > into such a situation in the first place.
>
> The police he describes are a bunch of untrained, juvenile loose
> cannons. The many I knew would not begin to enforce a new law without
> learning the law in detail, and many minor narrowly- focused laws such
> as this one would prety well be ignored without a formal complaint
> having been signed by a victim. Then there might be an investigation
> which might lead to an arrest if it proved to be warrented.
>
> Most cops are not fools. Fools don't normally enjoy long tenure as
> police officers.

The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
of young, inexperienced officers out there.

No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city attorney
can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.

These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
officers. They are very professional. But if they do not know
what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts settle
it.

4639. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:40:46 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011217114059.194$Cx@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

A usenet forum is not indicitave of what the "average cop " thinks.

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C1E1D64.78F53ADC@gte.net...
> >
> > > That is a risk that the average cop is willing
> > > to take. As far as he is concerned, getting
> > > you in front of judge is his primary job. Even
> > > if you win, it will cost you a huge amount of
> > > money, and time. Costly enough that you will
> > > think twice the next time. He does not have
> > > to get you thrown in jail in order to change
> > > your attitude. Normally the court procedures,
> > > and it can take a year or more to settle a case,
> > > are enough to make a decent citizen more
> > > careful in how they live their lives.
> >
> > I really hope you are just a troll - or an aberration.
> >
> > Fortunately, officers with such an attitude around here
> > fairly quickly become ex-officers.
> >
>
> What I am describing is fairly normal. My guess is
> that you have had minimum contact with the courts
> over the years. The drug traffic has changed things
> to a great deal. Cops are far more hard nosed these
> days. Very professional but hard nosed. They assume
> that everyone is a criminal who might kill them. And
> the one time that they do let their guard down, the asshole
> is a criminal who does try to take them out.
>
> The average cop hears a ton of horror stories about
> cops getting killed. Their training re-inforces such thinking.
> What they want is to go home alive at the end of each
> day.
>
> And most see their job as done once they have put you
> in front of a judge. After that it is the courts responsibility.
>
> Go read Alt.Law-Enforcement for a few weeks.
>
>

4640. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 16:50:54 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011217115439.243$Pm@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27636
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C1D451C.FD2B3154@townsqr.com...
>
> > An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
> > into such a situation in the first place.
>
> The police he describes are a bunch of untrained, juvenile loose
> cannons. The many I knew would not begin to enforce a new law without
> learning the law in detail, and many minor narrowly- focused laws such
> as this one would prety well be ignored without a formal complaint
> having been signed by a victim. Then there might be an investigation
> which might lead to an arrest if it proved to be warrented.
>
> Most cops are not fools. Fools don't normally enjoy long tenure as
> police officers.

Dick you are 100% correct. I think he is a politician that a few local cops
had a hard on for.

4641. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 17:28:25 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E2B64.C371EE50@gte.net>
Source record: 27637
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>

No, but it will let you see some of the problems
out there. Actually, what you see in Alt.Law-Enforcement
is all the druggies bitching about how the cops do exactly
what you guys say that they are not doing.

> A usenet forum is not indicitave of what the "average cop " thinks.
>
>
> > >
> > > > That is a risk that the average cop is willing
> > > > to take. As far as he is concerned, getting
> > > > you in front of judge is his primary job. Even
> > > > if you win, it will cost you a huge amount of
> > > > money, and time. Costly enough that you will
> > > > think twice the next time. He does not have
> > > > to get you thrown in jail in order to change
> > > > your attitude. Normally the court procedures,
> > > > and it can take a year or more to settle a case,
> > > > are enough to make a decent citizen more
> > > > careful in how they live their lives.
> > >
> > > I really hope you are just a troll - or an aberration.
> > >
> > > Fortunately, officers with such an attitude around here
> > > fairly quickly become ex-officers.
> > >
> >
> > What I am describing is fairly normal. My guess is
> > that you have had minimum contact with the courts
> > over the years. The drug traffic has changed things
> > to a great deal. Cops are far more hard nosed these
> > days. Very professional but hard nosed. They assume
> > that everyone is a criminal who might kill them. And
> > the one time that they do let their guard down, the asshole
> > is a criminal who does try to take them out.
> >
> > The average cop hears a ton of horror stories about
> > cops getting killed. Their training re-inforces such thinking.
> > What they want is to go home alive at the end of each
> > day.
> >
> > And most see their job as done once they have put you

> > in front of a judge. After that it is the courts responsibility.
> >
> > Go read Alt.Law-Enforcement for a few weeks.
> >
> >

4642. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 17:33:53 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E2CAB.A3BAF551@gte.net>
Source record: 27638
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > > An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
> > > into such a situation in the first place.
> >
> > The police he describes are a bunch of untrained, juvenile loose
> > cannons. The many I knew would not begin to enforce a new law without
> > learning the law in detail, and many minor narrowly- focused laws such
> > as this one would prety well be ignored without a formal complaint
> > having been signed by a victim. Then there might be an investigation
> > which might lead to an arrest if it proved to be warrented.
> >
> > Most cops are not fools. Fools don't normally enjoy long tenure as
> > police officers.
>
> Dick you are 100% correct. I think he is a politician that a few local cops
> had a hard on for.

No, I am a buddy of a lot of local cops.
And I understand them. Try to understand
this. Most cops these days played high
school football or baseball. They are jocks.
And think like a jock. They can get very
juvenile when off duty and not wearing their
"game face" (professional attitude). You
should hear the wife of one friend, who is
a LT in the narcotics section, complain how
her husband and his fellow officers act. And
he is over 50!

The drug trade has changed law enforcement.
They are very professional, while on duty. But
they are also very hard nosed. And they assume
the worst in you. And they are often right.

4643. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 18:47:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1E3DB1.23CD2E30@uci.edu>
Source record: 27640

Krell wrote:
> Are they done renovating Notre Dame Cathedral yet?

As of 12/2/01 they still had some scaffolding up behind the left tower. But the entire facade has been renovated. All the black has been removed. It looks great.

They're painting the Eifel tower a new lighter color. Looks really neat.

4644. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 18:52:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1E3F00.5DCBBB8C@uci.edu>
Source record: 27641

```
Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 12:08:00 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >> You'll notice, however, that the congress is unwilling to
> >> legalize the most efficient form of fuel available (hemp oil) for
> >> production on American farms (we have to import it from Canada if we
> >> want it). Hemp fuel, first introduced by Henry Ford in 1936 (in an
> >> automobile built over 40% out of hemp itself), is non-polluting, a
> >> renewable resource, lower in cost than petroleum products, readily
> >> extracted from the plant, and can be produced anywhere in the USA.
> >> Even the Farm Bureau (arguably one of the most conservative
> >> organizations in the US) has voted unanimously to encourage congress
> >> to legalize it as a cash crop.
> >
> >You've got one of those suits made entirely from hemp, don't you Rick.
>
> Nope--but I have a book printed on it.
>
> You probably do as well--most Bibles are printed on hemp paper
> imported from France.
>
> Rick

Ya think the Book of Mormon is printed on hemp paper? I've got one of
those around somewhere. I wonder what they do with the buds?
```

4645. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 19:21:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E45C3.B98A3784@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27642

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> After all, Carl's the professional engineer -- not me!

So when are you going to get off your lazy ass and get an
engineering degree, Larry? While Carl has been doing
professional engineering, you have wasted your time
doing what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4646. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 19:24:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E4684.6F4BA07E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27643
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote:
> About 6% of all court cases make to trial.
> The rest are settled, often by peal bargaining.

Take off your clothes and you don't get a ticket?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4647. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 19:27:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1E472C.B38EA6EB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote:
> The drug trade has changed law enforcement.

Yep, when I first met my ex-wife, she was getting free
pot from her policeman boyfriend in San Jose, CA.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4648. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 19:36:45 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <hPrT7.19563$Z03.9473310@news1.rdc1.mi.home.com>
Source record: 27645
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> They confiscated my soldering tool - you know the kind that has a
> sharp point on each end for removing solder splashes from PC boards.

Nobody move, or I'll remove the components from the nav system PCBS!

:)

4649. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 20:29:29 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1e55b5_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27646

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message
news:uVMSvVrhBHA.1644@cpimsnntpa04...
>
> WA6VSE said:
>
> > All 3 of those are pure rubbish.
>
> Carl,
>
> Is everything you disagree with "pure rubbish". I don't happen to
> agree with any of the 3 motives you list, but I do know some well
> intentioned people who still believe Morse testing is a good idea.
>
> Dismissing their opinion as "pure rubbish" is bad manners. I had
> hope you'd acquired some manners in your sabbatical from rrap, but
> alas my dear old Granny was right when she said "Hope in one hand
> and shit in the other -- tell me which gets full first."
>
> Hans

Hans,

I expressed *MY* opinion as to the validity of the 3 motives I
listed. Am I to understand that I am not allowed to express
my opinion???

BTW ... I see I still have to PGP sign posts to keep twits like
WA8ULX from altering them ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.

<http://www.nocode.org>

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPB5Vnpe+N6+q84HiEQKfbACdEPVoYm6koQlLSoKzCwPQYtq8ieAAn23l
6N8XoP0KJmrnAh93GEY+MDoK
=6gQZ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4650. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 20:38:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1E57BA.3D556846@uci.edu>
Source record: 27648

Hi Carl,

Do you really think PGP keeps people from altering posts?

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message
> news:uVMSvVrhBHA.1644@cpimsnntpa04...
> >
> > WA6VSE said:
> >
> > > All 3 of those are pure rubbish.
> >
> > Carl,
> >
> > Is everything you disagree with "pure rubbish". I don't happen to
> > agree with any of the 3 motives you list, but I do know some well
> > intentioned people who still believe Morse testing is a good idea.
> >
> > Dismissing their opinion as "pure rubbish" is bad manners. I had
> > hope you'd acquired some manners in your sabbatical from rrap, but
> > alas my dear old Granny was right when she said "Hope in one hand
> > and shit in the other -- tell me which gets full first."
> >
> > Hans
>
> Hans,
>
> I expressed *MY* opinion as to the validity of the 3 motives I
> listed. Am I to understand that I am not allowed to express
> my opinion???

Opinions are best prefaced or appended with the words 'I think', or 'in
my opinion'.

> BTW ... I see I still have to PGP sign posts to keep twits like
> WA8ULX from altering them ...
>
> - --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> <mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
> <http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

> - --
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3
>
> iQA/AwUBPB5Vnpe+N6+q84HiEQKfbACdEPVoYm6koQlLSoKzCwPQYtq8ieAAn23l
> 6N8XoP0KJmrnAh93GEY+MDoK
> =6gQZ
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4651. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 20:39:16 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1e5803_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27647

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011217081915.14766.00000591@mb-df.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >Well, anyway, Congratulations! I'm sure that you can now go
> >ahead and invent all that neat stuff you've been talking about for
> >so many years . . .
>
> Put a lobster on which of the two of you invent something neat
first?
>
> >now that you're finally the ham radio equal of
> >an 8-year old girl from some small town in New York!
>
> I wonder if anyone could explain what this means? It looks like a
gratuitous
> insult to me.
>
> 73,
> Ed, W1RFI

Ed,

Perhaps Larry would like to review the a list of the patents I've
been granted ... most of which would be directly applicable to
ham radio? If so, he's free to go to one of the patent search
engines and pay a few bucks to download the .pdfs ... I'd be
VERY interested to see how much (if any) he'd actually understand :-)

73,
Carl

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPB5X7Ze+N6+q84HiEQLcGgCfS64vefXcM6vDRDhKIZmWD2Pobi8AoKkw
127I2GRr1Mi2ADxWLZV5aPzU
=EHk4
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4652. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:04:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217170454.05628.00000800@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27649

>I see I still have to PGP sign posts to keep twits like
>WA8ULX from altering them ...
>

Twit, I have your TWIT, come and get it.
It has taken you at least 6 months to upgrade, so tell us how many times did
you fail?

4653. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:06:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217170650.05628.00000801@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27650

>Do you really think PGP keeps people from altering posts?
>

Of course he does, remember hes the Guy who sees Guns on his Monitor and goes nuts.

4654. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:08:19 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1E6CD2.143EA2EE@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27751
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

chris wrote:

> You only need permission if you are going to transmit during the flight.
>

Be aware that receivers' local oscillators have been alleged to
interfere with airplane radios and equipment......

4655. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:09:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217170934.05628.00000802@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27752

> most of which would be directly applicable to
>ham radio?

Dont you like this "MOST OF WHICH" yea right Carl

4656. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:24:51 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C1E709F.F2D6814A@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 27753
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO trolled:
> Doctors see themselves as more valuable than
> most working class (blue collar) individuals. So
> do many college professors.

I bit and responded with:

Therefore, computer technicians are really the most
valuable people on the planet. Since you are pond scum
compared to me, I command you to STFU!

4657. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:28:52 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E71D1.B4004BEB@gte.net>
Source record: 27755
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > Doctors see themselves as more valuable than
> > most working class (blue collar) individuals. So
> > do many college professors.
>
> I bit and responded with:
>
> Therefore, computer technicians are really the most
> valuable people on the planet. Since you are pond scum
> compared to me, I command you to STFU!

And some Ph.D. at an university will treat you like
you are pond scum. Look at how network techs
get treated. Make the wrong comments to the
some female employee and you are out the door.
Companies treat network techs like they were
expendable. At least the Ph.D. usually has tenure.
Even cops have a merit board.

4658. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:32:30 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011217173243.714$n5@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27754
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message

> No, I am a buddy of a lot of local cops.
> And I understand them. Try to understand
> this. Most cops these days played high
> school football or baseball.

I am a buddies with and have a working relationship with hundreds of State police and local Leo's from at least 5 different states on the East Coast they are just ordinary guys like you and me, Some big, some small, some fat some thin, some with muscles, some with big bellys. Some like sports, Some don't. Some drink beer, Some drink more Beer.

> They are jocks. And think like a jock. They can get very
> juvenile when off duty and not wearing their
> "game face" (professional attitude).

Again, not all of them are jocks. They are just like anyone else when they are off-duty they like to do the same things as anyone else does.

>You
> should hear the wife of one friend, who is
> a LT in the narcotics section, complain how
> her husband and his fellow officers act. And
> he is over 50!

I have a good friend who is a LT at a local dept. He likes to go out to a few taprooms and have a good time he is not married thats his business. If you didn't know him you wouldn't know he was a cop let alone a LT going for the Chiefs Position that is opening up.

> The drug trade has changed law enforcement.
> They are very professional, while on duty. But
> they are also very hard nosed. And they assume
> the worst in you. And they are often right.

Racial profiling has changed things as well.

4659. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:34:05 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E72FD.3AC2EEC4@gte.net>
Source record: 27756
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >> >
> >> >Think again. First the cops would just the
> >> >car and the radios. Then when the CID
> >> >folks show up, they will explain how you
> >> >lipped off to the cops that you were some
> >> >type of hot shot Air Force type. At that
> >> >point, the investigation might be about your
> >> >fitness to serve.
> >>
> >> Which is why I strongly endorse and support that
> >> all police cars be equipped with both audio and video
> >> recording equipment to document exactly what
> >> happened. I have seen the absolute value in
> >> these in both protecting the public against rogue
> >> cops and protecting police against false accusations of
> >> police brutality.
> >
> >Bill, I am not talking about rogue cops or
> >even police brutality. Rather it is the cop
> >who is a professional, who keeps his cool,
> >but is not going to let some ham tell him that
> >the cop has no right to inspect his radios
> >and plays the hot shot.
>
> INSPECT for WHAT reason. The radio in
> the car is NOT illegal. The cop as NO need
> to ask. If asked, I'd tell him what my radio is
> and that's the end of it. What else would he
> need or want to do?
>
> >No cop will put up with that.
>
> After telling the cop the radio is a ham rig (or CB,
> or FRS, or private mobile, or whatever, just what
> more could the cop ask?
>
> >The average cop is trained to suspect everyone.
> >Even other cops. They are trained that they
> >are superior, the "force" of government, the
> >thin blue line that keeps us a civilized society.
> >And it is almost universal that the biggest goal
> >that a cop will have is to make it home alive
> >every night.

>
> That is not the training I am aware of. Cops may have
> the powerm but their application of that power must
> be tempered with restraint and rational reasoning...or
> they will end up off the force in many cases.
>
> >If there is a question about a radio,
>
> WHAT could be questioned?
>
> >it is just easier
> >to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
> >courts settle. I have said this over and over.
>
> Yes you have and you fail to see that any cop
> that developes a histry of bad arrests, court
> losses, etc won't go far as a cop.
>
> > This
> >includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
> >a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
> >chief's problem, and not theirs.
>
> Believe it or not, cops can end up being criminally
> prosecuted for departures from proper enforcement.
>
> >This does not mean that they will keep the radios forever,
> >as the AF CAP chap suggested. When the AF types come,
> >it will go in front of a judge. And remember, this is only if
> >there is question that the street officer can not settle quickly.
>
> I repeat...what could be in question that the local cop
> would have any role in or knowledge of?
>
> >Too many Americans are jerks, assholes.
>
> If they aren't breaking the law then so what?
>
> >They believe that
> >they have a right to do anything, and everything.
>
> Again, unless they are breaking a law, so what...it
> isn't a police matter.
>
> >That they
> >have NO responsibility to society or their fellow man.
>
> Yet again, unless they are breaking a law, so what...it
> isn't a police matter.
> >

> > And the cops want that attitude to end.
>
> So do many others, but it ain't a police matter UNLESS
> laws are being broken.

You just do not get it, do you?

It is more about your attitude than anything.
Get an attitude with a cop, he will find things
to write tickets for.

Some cops do not care about ham equipment.
Some cops do. It depends whether the state
has a law over radio usage like we are now
seeing with Cell Phones.

The real point is that if the officer does decide
to take the radio, he will be damned use that
he can justify doing so.

4660. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:39:42 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E7450.48CC9528@gte.net>
Source record: 27757
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >If there is a question about a radio, it is just easier
> >to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
> >courts settle. I have said this over and over. This
> >includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
> >a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
> >chief's problem, and not theirs.
>
> It becomes THEIR problem when (a) a civilian complaint is filed with
> the department for misconduct and (b) they are a named defendant in
> a Sect. 1983 suit - damages (and attorney fees) for violation of
> civil rights under color of authority.
>
> All the LEOs whom I know (and I know a bunch - I am a retired
> Federal agent) are very concerned that they do not achieve that sort
> of "fame". It's a career-stopper and a wallet-emptier.
>
> The watchword is "think twice before acting".

No cop will take a radio unless he thinks he has
a good reason to justify doing so. If he can justify
his actions then filing complaints will have little effect.

Look at Chicago. Anybody can file a complaint.
Even file anonymously. Every cop in Chicago has
a file full of complaints. It is looked at as being part
of the job.

And look at how Cincinnati dealt with the riots
last spring. The complaint process so favors the
civilian that the cops just have given up. They gets
so many points, they just move on to a surrounding
suburb.

In many cities the complaint process is so flawed that
it is meaningless. There are so many false complaints
that the cops just ignore the system, look at it as a part
of doing business.

4661. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:42:47 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E750E.C85B13D5@gte.net>
Source record: 27758
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> >> >So far towns, cities, states etc can do anything until they
> >> >write some type of Laws regarding this issue.
> >>
> >> You did mean "can't", right ??
> >>
> >> >Congress only gave local
> >> >jurisdiction the ability to police this the police will have some type of
> >> >idea of the laws they will be enforcing. Otherwise they will call for
> >> >back-up, defer to a higher ranking supervisor, something to releave liabilty
> >> >from them when possible, they cannot go about and won't go about blindly
> >> >enforcing Laws.
> >>
> >> This communications lawyer sees it from the viewpoint that The
> >> Congress gave the local police no more authority than the FCC has,
> >> just the ability to enforce the FCC's "unlicrensed CB" regulations.
> >>
> >> This means no random stops and searches, no forced entries without a
> >> court order (warrant), no "confiscation", no excess fines above the
> >> monetary penalties that the FCC can levy, no jail time for Rule
> >> violations, and no making up their own rules about stuff that does
> >> not appear in the FCC Rules.
> >>
> >> >I just don't see it happen that way in this day in age when people are as
> >> >lawsuit crazy against LEO's.
> >>
> >> You are so right.
> >
> >What you have to understand is that many hams feel
> >that the cops have NO right to inspect them, to ask
> >questions.
>
> Inspect the person? The equipment? In either
> case...WHY? On what basis?
>
> IF I was stopped for any reason and a cop asked me what
> was the radio on my dash, I'd simply say it is my
> amateur radio and that should be the end of it.
>
> > I am not talking about rogue cops but rather
> >the officer who is professional and whose biggest goal
> >every day is to make it home alive.
>
> I support those guys and gals and they don't pull nutty

> confiscations or mobile stops without probable cause.
>
> >These officers want video of every traffic stop.
>
> So do I. It is a great tool that protects both the
> police and the public from false accusations by either.
>
> > They have "rights"
> >and no one, not even the police (in their mind) have the
> >right to tell them how to live.
>
> We all have rights and YES, the cops d NOT have the
> right to tell me or anyone else how to live. Law enforcement
> (study those two words) is to ONLY enforce the laws, not
> to dictate how anyone lives as long as the person is
> obeyng the law.
>
> >And too many hams are big jerks.
>
> Too many (isert any description) are jerks too.
>
> >This AF CAP chap just does not get it. Let the AF CID
> >come, as far as they are concerned that is a matter for the
> >courts. Once the cop does his job, the investigation, he is
> >more than happy to let the courts deal with it. And that
> >includes lawsuits. That is the chief's worry, not his.
>
> It absoultely is the cops worry when the cop strays
> from proper procedure and enforcement.
>
> >As it
> >is, too many file false lawsuits every day against cops. It
> >has become a cost of doing business.
>
> Whuch is why video tape is such a great idea.
>
> >Again, the average cop sees most of this a matter for the
> >courts. If he has question, his automatic response is to
> >throw it over to the courts to decide. That is the professional
> >thing to do.
>
> That becomes irrisponsible if it happens TOO often and
> the police don't win.
>
> >And if some ham becomes an asshole and
> >argues with him, he wants video tape to take to court.
>
> Again, I fully support the use of video.

And what is proper enforcement? After all guys like you have been caught trafficking drugs. So have nice little old grandmas. How is a cop going to know. He has to assume the worst.

4662. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:45:18 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E75A5.329D7DAB@gte.net>
Source record: 27759
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

> >> >Are you now saying anyone with a
> >>
> >> > > radio is being profiled?
> >> >
> >> > Given the events of Sept 11th, yes.
> >>
> >> That's odd. The only radios used by the terrorists on Sept 11 were the same ones
> the pilots use. Any cop who suddenly starts profiling anyone with a mobile radio
> because of Sept 11 is a paranoia-ridden loose cannon.(there are some of those) The
> terrorists made extensive use of cellphones. So they should
> >> be profiling cellphone users instead. Now THAT would keep 'em busy.
> >
> >Come up to Chicago and listen to the people
> >using ham gear to send CW number messages.
> >Speculation is that it is Serbs and Bosnians in
> >the region doing some form of espionage. But
> >then it could be the Nation of Islam.
>
> Assuming there's any truth to the CW number
> message transmissions originating in Chicago, the
> FCC would have no problem tracking the source
> transmitter. Now the question must be...how do
> YOU (N9NWO) know they are ham gear?
>
> >And what if you were using ham gear to co-ordinate
> >criminal activity? How is a cop going to know who
> >you are, or if you are good guy or a bad guy? Every
> >one a cops meets could be a criminal. He never knows.
>
> So what, the ownership of ham gear is NOT against
> ANY law. Cops that confiscate equipment without justification
> are not needed on any police force.

How can a cop take a car for a traffic stop
if he only suspects drugs? Yet it is done all
the time. If he can justify it, that is all that matters.

4663. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 22:48:37 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1E766C.B35BF873@gte.net>
Source record: 27760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>
> >Third, the enforcement of federal law lies with the FBI. They are the
> >enforcement branch of the FCC and only they can confiscate radio equipment
> >that the FCC has ordered confiscated.
>
> Sorry to tell that the above is not correct.
>
> The FBI is most certainly not the enforcement branch of the FCC nor
> vice-versa. The FCC has its own Enforcement Bureau and take it from
> me, the FCC/EB does not want to hand any of its cases to the FBI if
> it can avoid it because dealing with the FBI is a one-way street
> (there is no give, only take, maybe the last legacy of JEdgar Hoover).
>
> Radio equipment is not "confiscated" because it is not contraband.
> It is seized (big legal difference) and can be forfeited to the
> government only by court order after an evidnetiary hearing which
> the U S Attorney must request within sixty days, and in which
> the owner of interest has the opportunity to show that his/her
> interest in the equipment was not related to the violation.
>
> Seizure of radio equipment for non-compliance with communications
> law requires an order of the Federal District Court on application
> of the FCC showing probable cause, and is carried out by any
> Federal officer authorized to execute court orders, usually the U S
> Marshal Service or some other Federal agency on request of the
> Marshal Service.
>
> Conversely, any Federal or local LEO (including the FBI) can seize
> radio equipment as evidence of a non-communications-law crime which
> they have jurisdiction to deal with, the same as any other evidence
> (court order or the Seven Magic Exemptions).

The US Marshal's office seems to help the FCC
when they need "muscle".

While most forfeitures are done via the courts,
the drug laws have made that a bit fuzzy.

4664. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 23:03:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1e79d9$1_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27761

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C1E57BA.3D556846@uci.edu...
> Hi Carl,
>
> Do you really think PGP keeps people from altering posts?

No, Jim ... it doesn't stop them from altering them, but it
can prove that they were altered ...

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPB55xZe+N6+q84HiEQIrywCeN30gtd7uG+/2jV9irGC8qVIs7bQAnjiZ
2CNQrAA84xGTOti0hWZoUFyG
=vQ+n
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4665. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 23:04:59 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vltjh0j3m@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27762
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C1E4684.6F4BA07E@IEEE.org...
> N9NWO wrote:
> > About 6% of all court cases make to trial.
> > The rest are settled, often by peal bargaining.
>
> Take off your clothes and you don't get a ticket?

Reminds me of an Ohio judge in the late 70s that was accused of accepting
sexual favors in exchange for lesser punishments. A local DJ coined the
slogan, "You get me off, and I'll get you off."

4666. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 23:10:18 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vlttf0jr6@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27763

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011217170934.05628.00000802@mb-fo.aol.com...
> > most of which would be directly applicable to
> >ham radio?
>
> Dont you like this "MOST OF WHICH" yea right Carl

Can't you write a sentence in something other than "cave man?"

4667. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 23:20:06 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vlufr0l4p@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27764

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011217170454.05628.00000800@mb-fo.aol.com...

> Twit, I have your TWIT, come and get it.
> It has taken you at least 6 months to upgrade, so tell us how many times
did
> you fail?

Take it easy, Bruce. We all know how you get when you mix Wild Turkey and
decaf.

4668. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 23:55:43 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <9vm0j6akm1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 27766

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:9vlttf0jr6@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011217170934.05628.00000802@mb-fo.aol.com...
> > > most of which would be directly applicable to
> > >ham radio?
> >
> > Dont you like this "MOST OF WHICH" yea right Carl
>
> Can't you write a sentence in something other than "cave man?"
>
>
Maybe he's one of those "knuckle draggers" that Larry is always talking about. : 0
--

'73' From KB9TMP

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com
_____

4669. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-17 23:56:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217185658.28792.00001171@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27765

>Can't you write a sentence in something other than "cave man?"
>

Not when Im trying to talk to CAVE MEN

4670. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 00:06:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1e897c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27768

Well, better yet, how 'bout every day when I am labeled as someone who will bring the ARS one step closer to extinction. I guess people like Dwight would jump on that bandwagon, just because I can "hear the words 'one step closer to extinction'" applied to me every single day in this newsgroup (read: country). :o

Dwight's one of a crowd, I'd say, believing and following as he feels is popular.

Kim W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message news:DA8D1F89169A9AE3.6914EF5875137C69.5698B107FC1E9049@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 05:35:05 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> > What rumors, Kim? If you're going to accuse someone by name of something like
> >this, then at least have the integrity to explain your accusation. As I told
> >Krell, you can hear the word "satanic" applied to these people every single day
> >in this country - in books, magazines, movies, music, news stories,
> >conversations, and so on. So how am I spreading "rumors" by repeating the common
> >application of that word as it is used in this English language? Furthermore,
> >Ms. Politically Correct (they not satanic - they're wiccans and pagans), what
> >gives you the thought that you have a right to dictate what words are used in
> >this language? Have you been taking double speak lessons from the book, "1984?"
>
> Dwight, the majority of the populations of Iran, Syria,
> Lebanon, Iraq, and several other nations view the policies of the
> United States Government as satanic--and the United States itself as
> "the Great Satan."
>
> Since you clearly believe that simply because a group of
> people claim something is satanic, the definition is the appropriate
> one, clearly you--as an American citizen--are BY DEFINITION a
> satanist!
>
> Now, since you practice a religion abhorrent to most of the

> members of this list (don't believe it? Ask how many of the people
> here will state that they DON'T find satanism--and
> satanists--offensive to them), why don't you just go away and practice
> your perversions in private?
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4671. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 00:11:12 UTC
From: He Said What? <"Har Har Hardy Har"@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <9vm1j9scn0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27767
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9vl3n9glt2@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Donnie" <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net> wrote in message
> news:9vjsja$84m$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:9vipv2hmi1@dosa.alt.net...
> > > Anonymous COWARD
> > > "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > > news:098341038FE.16JKS38762@houston-hunks.com...
> > > >
> > > > The Salvation Army
> > >
> > > SLee's familiar with the Salvation Army, since he spent several years
> > there
> > > at the Shelter in Dallas. This was after he was convicted on Domestic
> > > battery charges and had a restraining order in place to keep him from
> > > beating up his mother again.
> > >
> >
> > Woger, Stagger Lee is a friend of mine.
>
> I bet you know him in the "biblical sense," too.
>
> > Because you talked mean
> > to him, I am putting you on my Black List.
> >
> > Donnie
>
> Take your list and stick it up your ass, "Dumbass Donnie." The real
Dumbass
> Donnie doesn't get on the newsgroups, COWARD.
>
However, the real Dumbass Roger does....

4672. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 00:12:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1e8ade_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27769

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C1D85D4.6797C09A@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C1D41CF.5BC36ED1@townsqr.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > N9NWO wrote:
> > >
> > > > >IF the confiscation involves equipment purchased with US
government
> > funds
> > > > > >and does NOT come under the "list" of equipment that the LEO
would be
> > > > > >using, then he WILL be in trouble.
> > > > >
> > > > > If it is on the list, I suspect the DOD would have some rather
nasty
> > > > > words for his superiors.
> > > >
> > > > These days, DOD often rolls for the local
> > > > community. If you are uniform then a superior
> > > > will relieve the local jail of your person then
> > > > confine you to quarters. As you folks are
> > > > civilians who are a bit less than reservists,
> > > > you really do not have that much "covering
> > > > fire".
> > > >
> > > > Again, you guys really need to talk to your
> > > > lawyers to understand how modern American
> > > > courts really work.
> > >
> > > This guy is an out-and-out troll. He couldn't be that uninformed.
> > >
> >
> > That saying, "takes one to know one" comes to mind here...LOL
>
> Whatever you think, Topless. That makes the totally unsupportable
assumption
> that you CAN.
>
```

I certainly CAN, and you're one. Of many.

Kim W5TIT

4673. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 00:56:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217195631.05826.00000708@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 27770

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I'm just an ordinary amateur radio operator, with non-professional
>technical skills, who was capable of rising to Amateur Extra class
>under the most stringent testing regime
><blabbage snipped>

So do I presume that it is your feeling of inferiority to Carl that causes you
to try to tear him down to make yourself look better?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4674. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 00:58:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217195814.05826.00000709@mb-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 27771

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> The only question is, why
>could some kid in the third grade do it, when he couldn't?

I am sure that I could find a lot of things that some kid in the third grade did that you didn't, Larry, if I were to feel it important enough to look. Perhaps, though, your self esteem would improve if you stopped rating your and others' accomplishments to those of children.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

4675. Re: "....one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 01:14:44 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <ewXudE2hBHA.1396@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 27772

Rick Adams <adamsr@voyager.net> writes:

> Look at the government; if you are civil service all that is
> necessary is to know your pay Level (which is open
> information, since your position in an agency is
> determined by it). All "G5s," for example, receive
> precisely the same salary.

Bureaucracy breeds mediocrity, and mediocrity returns the favor.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4676. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 01:17:45 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vm5fo$l7s$1@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27773
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>> Again, I fully support the use of video.

> And what is proper enforcement? After all guys
> like you have been caught trafficking drugs. So
> have nice little old grandmas. How is a cop going
> to know. He has to assume the worst.

The police I know are not like that. They assume the person is
a generally law abiding citizen, until they have reason to believe
otherwise.

Of course, they take proper precautions when approaching an unknown
vehicle or person.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4677. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 01:21:06 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vm5m0$l7s$2@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27774
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>>
>> I can carry a firearm. Does that make ME "more valuable" than those
>> who cannot? Not in my view.

> Over a felon, you are more valuable.

That is irrelevant. We were not talking about felons - we were talking
about the ordinary citizen.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4678. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 01:24:57 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <JVwT7.229608$3d2.10900867@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27775

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011217195631.05826.00000708@mb-mf.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >I'm just an ordinary amateur radio operator, with non-professional
> >technical skills, who was capable of rising to Amateur Extra class
> >under the most stringent testing regime
> ><blabbage snipped>
>
> So do I presume that it is your feeling of inferiority to Carl that
causes you
> to try to tear him down to make yourself look better?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Strikes me as a bit of a cheap shot, Ed, which as you know I have jumped Larry for as well. The verbiage above fairly invites one so you only get one soggy noodle.

The part of this hobby that always has amazed me are the status games played -- although no one touches RC modelers in that league. We both have been around long enough to have seen it with seniority callsigns, etc. I once was president of a club which took great pride in having achievements outside of Amateur Radio; we also had the biggest percentage of Advanced and Extras in metro St. Louis. When a couple of docs got clinical with the Federal Venereal Disease Control Officer on our repeater some of the locals got a bit tight about it and we told them to calmly unhook the gas pipe and take a deep breath; life is more important than radio. The FVDC was also a good consultant on alcohol stills BTW. Repeaters were made to talk on. Radio is to meet interesting people.

Seems to me that both parties have carefully defined areas in which they can be numero uno and have piled up the sandbags to defend their bailiwicks. I have a life to lead which happens to include radio and electronics to a declining extent; the sandbags are eyesores but even this, like last nite's dinner, will pass.

sri oms qrm 73

de Dick NBK

4679. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 01:45:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217204559.27168.00000415@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 27776

In article <B577A097853B9C11.77509315A12579D0.20141418C0CB5AE6@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 10 Dec 2001 13:03:20 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Yup. Like biodiesel, methanol, and wood chips. There are cars and trucks
>>running today on refined vegetable oil. (look up "biodiesel" on any search
>>engine). The problem is that the raw vegetable oil itself, before processing
>>and taxation, costs more than gasoline after processing and taxation.
>Biodiesel
>>is only practical when there is a source of cheap or free vegetable oil -
>like
>>waste oil from restaurants.
>
> Hemp oil IS a vegetable oil, remember?

If you say so, Rick. Thus it has all the advantages and disadvantages named
above.

> And according to
>agro-chemists it's one of the most efficient ones available for fuel
>use

"Efficient" in what sense? How many gallons per acre, how many gallons per ton
of raw harvested crop, how many gallons per dollar spent to grow it?

Ya gotta define yer terms.

> (it's also one of the healthiest for food use--far more so than
>soybean oil, its nearest competitor).
>
For food purposes, soybean oil is pretty bad stuff. Canola oil is better and
olive oil is better than canola. Flaxseed oil is tops but is very expensive and
not as easy to cook with.

> As far as costs are concerned, assuming the development of
>sufficient processing facilities and farms

Whoa! Don't Assume that at all!!

To make any sort of sizable dent in the US consumption of petrofuels, any
biofuel must be produced in millions-of-gallons-per-day quantities, at least.
That means BIG investments in farms and refining facilities. Those facilites
don't just grow out of the ground.

>the estimated at-the-pump
>cost of hemp fuel should be in the neighborhood of $0.49/gallon US

>(assuming it isn't taxed out of the market, of course).

Show your source. I think the raw production cost would be much higher. Here's why:

Take a stroll down any supermarket aisle and price the absolute cheapest vegetable oil you can find. It's a lot more than 49 cents a gallon, and there is practically no tax on it because it's a food item. And it cannot be used as an engine fuel without additional procesing. Hemp oil is no different.

Get an actual pilot plant running and see what the actual production costs are. Thye biodiesel folks have done so.

>Since it can
>be produced domestically, no transportation expenses (or oil spill
>risks) exist with respect to its use,

Wrong. It still must be transported domestically, and that's a major cost for any fuel.

Production and distribution costs of any fuel cannot be dismissed so lightly.

The lack of toxicity is a major plus. But that's true of any biodiesel fuel.

> and taxation at a reasonable
>rate would still keep the price to the consumer well below
>$1.00/gallon US.

What is "a reasonable rate" of taxation? US fuel taxes are used mostly for road construction and maintenance. Use of biofuel doesn't reduce road maintenance.

>To me that's pretty reasonable, particularly as it
>would make us independent of foreign imports.

I think reducing/eliminating petrol imports should be a top priority for a number of reasons. Biofuels is one part of the solution to that problem. But I'm also realistic enough to know that it's not going to be quick, cheap or easy.
>
>>I doubt it. Is it used in Canada? How much does it cost there?
>
> It won't be used widely anywhere until the automobiles are
>manufactured to use it

The cars to use it are available today, and have been for decades. I know - I drove the same Rabbit Diesel for 17 years. Wonderful car. 43 mpg over its life, which was spent mostly in the worst possible driving conditions. On the highway the thing would do well over 50 mpg.

VW now sells TDIs that are even better. But the US market doesn't want them, even with fuel at $1.50 gallon and up at times.

> (see your own comments about biodiesel)--and
>that isn't going to happen until it is permitted in the US, thus
>opening a vital market.

>
You're not seeing the real problem, Rick.

In an earlier post you wrote that cars could be "converted" to use hemp fuel. That implies that the hemp fuel is a gasoline replacement.

But in reality what we're talking about biodiesel, which means the "conversion" entails replacing the entire engine and much of the fuel system. And the result is a diesel car.

The real problem is getting Americans to accept diesel cars. They've been around for decades but haven't made much of a dent in market share.

If you're talking about some other type of hemp fuel, what is it? Alcohol?

> Of all nations, we have the greatest ability to produce
>industrial hemp--not only are our agricultural sciences at least as
>advanced as those used anywhere on earth, but we have a tremendous
>amount of arable land suitable to hemp production--

This may or may not be true. What matters is how many gallons per acre can be produced, and at what cost.

>and could thus
>produce fuel at a reasonable price, encouraging the production of hemp
>based vehicles (both Ford and GM have patents on engines designed to
>use hemp fuel, btw, I don't know about Chrysler or the major foreign
>manufacturers, but it's reasonable to assume they have the same--thus
>production of autos designed for the fuel wouldn't be a major barrier
>to its implementation).

Technology companies patent everything they can. Most patents don't make a dime, but they look real good on the inventor's resume.

As I have said before - the barrier is getting people to buy the cars.
>
>>How many gallons of this fuel can be derived from an acre of hemp grown for
>the
>>purpose? How much fuel must be used to run the machinery that grows the
>hemp?
>
> Those answers should be available on the site I cited above.

They are not. I looked carefully, and it's just not there. Please post the info, or a link, if you can find it. I couldn't.

As I've said many times, I'm a proponent of reducing and eliminating our dependence on imported oil. Biofuels is one part of the solution. But the idea that "hemp fuel" is a quick, cheap and easy answer is far from proven.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4680. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 02:10:38 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011217211050.145$g0@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27777
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
> And what is proper enforcement?

> After all guys
> like you have been caught trafficking drugs.

And guys like you have also been accused of child pornography does that mean you are into it to?

> So have nice little old grandmas.

So have 20 year police veterans

> How is a cop going to know. He has to assume the >worst.

He uses his training, and experiance Cops that assume the worse with no probable cause don't stay cops for too long. Or wind up in the Court system fighting civil suits.

4681. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 03:10:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011217221002.12884.00001033@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 27778

>Take it easy, Bruce. We all know how you get when you mix Wild Turkey and
>decaf.

You must have the wrong Bruce, I dont drink.

4682. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 04:02:24 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vmf1701ibe@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27784

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011217221002.12884.00001033@mb-cu.aol.com...
> >Take it easy, Bruce. We all know how you get when you mix Wild Turkey and
> >decaf.
>
> You must have the wrong Bruce, I dont drink.

Could of fooled me.

4683. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 04:05:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011217230525.13039.00001124@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 27779

In article <9vl5a1$8b5$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>, "WW - KB9TMP"
<NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> writes:

>
>This also means that YOU have been the "equal of an 8-year old girl"
>for the last 18 years also.
>--
>
>'73' From KB9TMP

Actually, she has only been my "equal" as a ham for a few years.
However, she still maintains "seniority" as an Extra over Carl! Moreover,
I wouldn't be a bit surprised to learn that she became a professional
engineer herself someday!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4684. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 04:05:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011217230526.13039.00001125@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 27782

In article <3C1E45C3.B98A3784@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> After all, Carl's the professional engineer -- not me!
>
>So when are you going to get off your lazy ass and get an
>engineering degree, Larry?

Cecil:

Never -- that's not what I aspire to be!

>While Carl has been doing
>professional engineering, you have wasted your time
>doing what?

Serving my country -- sacrificing the best and most productive years of my adult life to support the effort necessary to defeat the Evil Empire of the Soviet Union, bring the threat of Soviet Communist hegemony to an end, and make the world much safer from nuclear holocaust. All of my fellow Cold War Era veterans did the same thing, and I don't consider that to have been a waste of our time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4685. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 04:05:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011217230526.13039.00001126@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 27783

In article <3c1e5803_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

>
>Ed,
>
>Perhaps Larry would like to review the a list of the patents I've
>been granted ... most of which would be directly applicable to
>ham radio? If so, he's free to go to one of the patent search
>engines and pay a few bucks to download the .pdfs ... I'd be
>VERY interested to see how much (if any) he'd actually understand :-)
>
>73,
>Carl

Carl:

I have, many times in the past, stipulated to your high level of
professional engineering expertise and accomplishment. I am a True
Believer in Carl the Magnificent as a technical wizard par excellence!
However, the licensed amateur professional electronics engineers
I know are also code-proficient, CW-loving, long-time Amateur
Extra Class licensees, all of whom are sick to death of the dumbing-
down of the ARS -- the Morse code testing requirements in
particular.

Now that you have finally achieved Nickle Extra status, go ahead
and feel free to impress us with your genius! It is the thing you've
always dreamed of, and through NCI you helped fight a winning
battle to achieve it, instead of investing in the effort required to
learn a useful communications skill. So go ahead, now that the
shackles are off, get to work experimenting on the HF bands!
Whatever you invent, I'm probably one of those who will gladly
buy it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4686. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 04:05:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011217230527.13039.00001128@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 27780

In article <20011217195814.05826.00000709@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>> The only question is, why
>>could some kid in the third grade do it, when he couldn't?
>
>I am sure that I could find a lot of things that some kid in the third grade
>did that you didn't, Larry, if I were to feel it important enough to look.
>Perhaps, though, your self esteem would improve if you stopped rating your
>and
>others' accomplishments to those of children.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Hey, man, don't look at me -- Carl was the one who had to put out the brag about finally getting his Nickle Extra! I just made a simple, factual observation.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4687. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 04:05:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011217230527.13039.00001127@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 27781

In article <20011217195631.05826.00000708@mb-mf.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>I'm just an ordinary amateur radio operator, with non-professional
>>technical skills, who was capable of rising to Amateur Extra class
>>under the most stringent testing regime
>><blabbage snipped>
>
>So do I presume that it is your feeling of inferiority to Carl that causes
>you
>to try to tear him down to make yourself look better?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Sorry, no cigar! I have absolutely no feelings of "inferiority" (or anything else) to Carl. I respect his *professional* technical skills, but fail to understand why he had to go so long without HF privileges, just because of the measly 13 and 20 WPM code tests! He forced the issue of having recently passed his Nickle Extra, and I merely observed that as a ham, he now has made an achievement which has been previously accomplished by third-graders under the Pre-Restructuring licensing requirements! What did I say that was incorrect or inappropriate? I *did* congratulate him, after all!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4688. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 04:46:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1ECA31.697A5B24@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27785

>
> Perhaps Larry would like to review the a list of the patents I've
> been granted ... most of which would be directly applicable to
> ham radio? If so, he's free to go to one of the patent search
> engines and pay a few bucks to download the .pdfs ... I'd be
> VERY interested to see how much (if any) he'd actually understand :-)

You can do it for free at:
http://www.uspto.gov/patft/index.html

4689. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 04:54:54 UTC
From: Donnie <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net>
Message-ID: <9vmi68$g05$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27786
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9vipv2hmi1@dosa.alt.net...
> Anonymous COWARD
> "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> news:098341038FE.16JKS38762@houston-hunks.com...
> >
> > The Salvation Army
>
> SLee's familiar with the Salvation Army, since he spent several years
there
> at the Shelter in Dallas. This was after he was convicted on Domestic
> battery charges and had a restraining order in place to keep him from
> beating up his mother again.
>
>

Poor confused Wittle Woger Wabbit! He is so afwaid
of the girls. Little Woger breaks out in tears when a real
live girl looks at him. Little Wogey then goes home to play
with his blow up doll.

4690. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 04:56:24 UTC
From: Donnie <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net>
Message-ID: <9vmi92$g56$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27787
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9vl3n7glt1@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
>
news:faggot.lee.sticks.his.fingers.in.underage.girls.cunts@houston-hunks.com
> ...
> >
> > On Sun, 16 Dec 2001 19:22:06 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > :
> > : Maybe that's the attraction for them.....being cheap....
> > :
> > And then there's your technique: Reach into the Salvation Army kettle
> > and help yourself.
>
> And your technique is reaching into your daughter's cunt and helping
> yourself.

>
Blow up dolls are on sale this Christmas Wogey!

4691. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:03:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218000337.10110.00000775@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 27790

In article <3c1d6fb4_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

>"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011216215852.10592.00001238@mb-mg.aol.com...
>> >> ..." I believe Mark himself said that
>> >> "there's something to be said for tradition."
>>
>> That was me alright.
>>
>> >"Maintaining traditions" is NOT a legitimate regulatory function.
>>
>> Regulatory function...isn't amateur radio more than just "regulatory."
>There's
>> a pseudo-culture that's rooted in...tradition. Reduce it...but don't
>eliminate
>> it.
>
>We're talking about licensing requirements ... that's PURELY a
>regulatory function.

True. But what constitutes a "regulatory function" is open to debate.

> "Tradition" has NOTHING to do with *legitimate*
>regulatory goals ...

Yes, it does, if the tradition helps the ARS. For example, hams have a
tradition of being self-policing and keeping within the rules even when nobody
is looking. Now you might say "that's not a tradition, it's just the right
thing to do", but in fact it survives because the tradition survives. I know of
at least one other radio service where no such tradition exists, and the result
is a mess because there's no way the FCC can police a large service adequately.

> it's not the FCC's job to preserve amateur
>"tradition" ...

Depends what the tradition is.

>the FCC's job is to regulate the use of the spectrum
>in the public interest.

And if preserving a tradition serves the public interest....

>End of story.
>
Nope. Just the beginning.

>> >If Morse enthusiasts want to keep Morse usage alive, it's up to
>> >them to promote it for its own sake, not to insist that governments
>> >force it down everyone's throats via regulatory fiat.

If technically-inclined enthusiasts want to keep technical knowledge alive,
it's up to them to promote it for its own sake, not to insist that governments
force it down everyone's throats via regulatory fiat.
>>
>> It's not about keeping Morse alive. I think it's about standards.
>
>Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
>three basic motivations

Whoa there! Keep Morse alive or keep the TEST alive??

The TEST is all but gone. It's basically on 5 wpm life support until 2003 or
so. The UK has even gotten around the 5 wpm thing.

Let's look at these supposed reasons. I'm sure some folks agree with them, but
not everyone who supports Morse. And its test:

>1) "I had to do it, so everyone else should, too.";

This can be interpreted to mean "everybody should have to do what I did". But
it can also mean "I learned a lot from it, and others will, too".

Who better to judge than those who have learned something?

> 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
>not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of contacts
>will dry up;

Maybe.

> and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
>using "their" bands.

Has it worked? Nope.

>All 3 of those are pure rubbish.

No, they're just an incomplete list. Here are some more:

4) License tests should cover the things hams do. Hams use Morse, so ham radio
license tests should cover Morse.

5) Under some conditions, Morse will be usable when the other popular amateur
radio modes (analog voice) aren't usable.

6) For some reason, operating violations cited by the FCC of hams using Morse
are far lower than those cited by the FCC of hams using voice modes. The
difference is far more than can be explained by the relative popularity of the
various modes.
>
>> >Open question pools are a fact of life. I personally have no problem
>> >with them, since I think that it's FAR easier to learn the basic under-

>> >lying principles to be able to derive the correct answers than to
>> >"memorize" hundreds and hundreds of question/answer pairs.

For many people, the opposite is true. All depends on the person and the subject.

Memorization of hundreds of question answer pairs isn't necessary, anyway. All that's needed is enough word-association capability to find the one right answer out of four on enough questions to pass.

Many of the questions can only be answered by memorization.
>>
>> I think they're revamping the pools as we speak. (write)
>
>Yes, the new Extra pool is done and must be used by June 1, 2002.
>My understanding is that the intent of the QPC was to make it more
>modern and comprehensive.

Three questions have already been removed from the new pool because of errors that got through the entire QPC process. Including FCC approval.
>
>> >In fact, I'd have no problem with an "open book" exam using some
>> >reasonable reference, such as "The Radio Amateur's Handbook."

Me too. But it's not going to happen. Too hard to enforce. FCC has "traditionally" (for the past 40 years at least) depended entirely on multiple choice tests. For almost 20 years they have used open Q&A pools.

>> >I'm far more interested in folks demonstrating that they can solve
>> >problems as they come up, rather than insisting that everyone
>> >carry every possible formula in their heads.

FCC disagrees. This is the same FCC, by the way, that thinks code tests "serve no regulatory purpose" other than treaty compliance. It's also the very same FCC that reduced the number of WRITTEN tests, and their size. For example, it used to take two separate written tests totalling 90 questions to upgrade from General to Extra. Now it takes only one test of 50 questions. The Tech written has been similarly reduced. FCC obviously doesn't think more, or even the same number, of written tests or questions serves any regulatory purpose.

I know that you and I and many others told the FCC that the written tests needed to be better, but the FCC simply ignored those comments and went in the exact opposite direction.

Every argument used against the Morse test can, and will be, used against the written test. It's already happening in the UK. Some folks like W5YI and N0MHS want the same thing here. After all, why MUST technical knowledge be shoved down the throats of those not interested in it? Why must prospective hams master a 200 page "study guide" just to use an HT, and even more just to use a QRP PSK31 rig on 3579 kHz?

Far more hams use Morse on the air than design/build their own rigs. I do both, by the way.

Some time back, there was a thread on here about Smith Chart knowledge. It illustrated the point perfectly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4692. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:03:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218000338.10110.00000776@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 27788

In article <3C1D8238.E58FA0B7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>WA8ULX wrote:
>>
>> >Hey Carl, wonder how they would like a technical exam that you would
>> >have a hard time with? :-)
>>
>> It sure looks like he most have had a hard time with the written, his Call
>> still shows up as a Tech plus. Guess there are 2 many Questions for him to
>> Memorize
>
>Say Bruce, do you understand about CSCEs?

Obviously not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4693. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:03:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218000338.10110.00000777@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 27789

In article <20011217081915.14766.00000591@mb-df.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>now that you're finally the ham radio equal of
>>an 8-year old girl from some small town in New York!
>
>I wonder if anyone could explain what this means? It looks like a gratuitous
>insult to me.

If anyone should be insulted, it's the 8 year old girl.

She's not from New York, by the way. I've worked her - very good op. But too mature for rrap.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4694. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:06:09 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1ECEC1.63CEE6D5@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27791

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>
>
> Perhaps Larry would like to review the a list of the patents I've
> been granted

I found # 6,288,618 Logic-based architecture for FSK modulation and
demodulation
6,281,823 Direct digital synthesis using a sine weighted DAC
6,265,948 Image rejection in logic-based architecture for FSK
modulation and
demodulation
6,209,112 Apparatus and method for reducing power consumption of an
error-correcting
decoder
6,198,353 Phase locked loop having direct digital synthesizer dividers
and improved phase
detector
6,078,799 System and method for calibrating single sideband receiver
reject image product

All are utility patents (the real thing). Congrads. I have a few myself
mostly in television.

4695. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:12:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1ED045.660EF966@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27792

>
> >It took a lot more skill, ambition, and perseverance to do what Carl did
> >with regards to restructuring, than what was required to learn an antiquated
> >and worthless endcoding scheme at a high rate of speed.
>

Antiquated, yes. Not worthless, but not the best way to get information
thru. Ask JPL sometime. They communicate with space probes past
the planet Pluto. But for a minimun of equipment, and a trained person,
CW does work pretty well. But nowdays it's cheaper to buy modems
than it is to pay for training a person to send and receive code. That's
why noone except the ARS uses it anymore.

4696. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:19:04 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1ed0c3.24115176@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27795
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 22:42:47 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >> >So far towns, cities, states etc can do anything until they
>> >> >write some type of Laws regarding this issue.
>> >>
>> >> You did mean "can't", right ??
>> >>
>> >> >Congress only gave local
>> >> >jurisdiction the ability to police this the police will have some type of
>> >> >idea of the laws they will be enforcing. Otherwise they will call for
>> >> >back-up, defer to a higher ranking supervisor, something to releave liabilty
>> >> >from them when possible, they cannot go about and won't go about blindly
>> >> >enforcing Laws.
>> >>
>> >> This communications lawyer sees it from the viewpoint that The
>> >> Congress gave the local police no more authority than the FCC has,
>> >> just the ability to enforce the FCC's "unlicrensed CB" regulations.
>> >>
>> >> This means no random stops and searches, no forced entries without a
>> >> court order (warrant), no "confiscation", no excess fines above the
>> >> monetary penalties that the FCC can levy, no jail time for Rule
>> >> violations, and no making up their own rules about stuff that does
>> >> not appear in the FCC Rules.
>> >>
>> >> >I just don't see it happen that way in this day in age when people are as
>> >> >lawsuit crazy against LEO's.
>> >>
>> >> You are so right.
>> >
>> >What you have to understand is that many hams feel
>> >that the cops have NO right to inspect them, to ask
>> >questions.
>>
>> Inspect the person? The equipment? In either
>> case...WHY? On what basis?
>>
>> IF I was stopped for any reason and a cop asked me what
>> was the radio on my dash, I'd simply say it is my
>> amateur radio and that should be the end of it.
>>
>> > I am not talking about rogue cops but rather
>> >the officer who is professional and whose biggest goal
>> >every day is to make it home alive.

>>
>> I support those guys and gals and they don't pull nutty
>> confiscations or mobile stops without probable cause.
>>
>> >These officers want video of every traffic stop.
>>
>> So do I. It is a great tool that protects both the
>> police and the public from false accusations by either.
>>
>> > They have "rights"
>> >and no one, not even the police (in their mind) have the
>> >right to tell them how to live.
>>
>> We all have rights and YES, the cops d NOT have the
>> right to tell me or anyone else how to live. Law enforcement
>> (study those two words) is to ONLY enforce the laws, not
>> to dictate how anyone lives as long as the person is
>> obeyng the law.
>>
>> >And too many hams are big jerks.
>>
>> Too many (isert any description) are jerks too.
>>
>> >This AF CAP chap just does not get it. Let the AF CID
>> >come, as far as they are concerned that is a matter for the
>> >courts. Once the cop does his job, the investigation, he is
>> >more than happy to let the courts deal with it. And that
>> >includes lawsuits. That is the chief's worry, not his.
>>
>> It absoultely is the cops worry when the cop strays
>> from proper procedure and enforcement.
>>
>> >As it
>> >is, too many file false lawsuits every day against cops. It
>> >has become a cost of doing business.
>>
>> Whuch is why video tape is such a great idea.
>>
>> >Again, the average cop sees most of this a matter for the
>> >courts. If he has question, his automatic response is to
>> >throw it over to the courts to decide. That is the professional
>> >thing to do.
>>
>> That becomes irrisponsible if it happens TOO often and
>> the police don't win.
>>
>> >And if some ham becomes an asshole and
>> >argues with him, he wants video tape to take to court.
>>
>> Again, I fully support the use of video.

>
>And what is proper enforcement?

There is more than enough detail written in police
procedures to make that determination if it goes
to a court case or a civilian complaint.

>After all guys
>like you have been caught trafficking drugs.

Absolutely false...because guys like me do NOT do
drugs.

>So
>have nice little old grandmas. How is a cop going
>to know. He has to assume the worst.

Such cops probably never rise to be truly good cops (IMHO).
If because they "assume the worst" they trample the rights
of the public, especially those people who have done nothing,
then the careers of those cops won't amount to much.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>
>

4697. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:19:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218001944.10760.00000599@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 27793

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 12/17/2001 9:06 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C1E09DA.8B06C0A1@IEEE.org>

> What is wrong with live and let live?

What's wrong indeed.

Steve

4698. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:20:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218002056.10760.00000600@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 27794

>Subject: Re: Radio Policy
>From: "Krell" krell1215@yahoo.com
>Date: 12/17/2001 5:33 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9vkl2p01jov@enews2.newsguy.com>

>
>Then you would have Dick Bash return to publish his brand of "study guide."

We already do...Gordon "Dick Bash" West and Fred "Dick Bash" Maia.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4699. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:25:31 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1ed1f3.24419122@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27796
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 22:39:42 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >If there is a question about a radio, it is just easier
>> >to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
>> >courts settle. I have said this over and over. This
>> >includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
>> >a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
>> >chief's problem, and not theirs.
>>
>> It becomes THEIR problem when (a) a civilian complaint is filed with
>> the department for misconduct and (b) they are a named defendant in
>> a Sect. 1983 suit - damages (and attorney fees) for violation of
>> civil rights under color of authority.
>>
>> All the LEOs whom I know (and I know a bunch - I am a retired
>> Federal agent) are very concerned that they do not achieve that sort
>> of "fame". It's a career-stopper and a wallet-emptier.
>>
>> The watchword is "think twice before acting".
>
>No cop will take a radio unless he thinks he has
>a good reason to justify doing so.

EXACTLTY! And just what do you think a good reason
to do so would be? The answer to that question is the
heart of the issue that I and others have been trying
to get you to understand and articulate just what and
when such a "taking" or confiscation" would have
any merit at all.

>If he can justify
>his actions then filing complaints will have little effect.

Agreed and we await your answer as to when/why such
a justifyed taking might be.

>Look at Chicago. Anybody can file a complaint.
>Even file anonymously. Every cop in Chicago has
>a file full of complaints. It is looked at as being part
>of the job.
>
>And look at how Cincinnati dealt with the riots
>last spring. The complaint process so favors the
>civilian that the cops just have given up. They gets
>so many points, they just move on to a surrounding

>suburb.
>
>In many cities the complaint process is so flawed that
>it is meaningless. There are so many false complaints
>that the cops just ignore the system, look at it as a part
>of doing business.

Your experience is either very limited or you have
no clue as to what really goes on with such situations
and complaints in many jurisdictions. Maybe Chicago
and Cinncinnati are screwed up...but that's not
the norm.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4700. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:29:49 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1ed3e1.24913238@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27797
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 16:21:13 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >> And if you argue with a cop then you are just
>> >> another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
>> >> alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
>> >> your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
>> >> the office to shoot everyone.
>> >
>> >I would not give an officer a rough time. Why should I? But if
>> >he wants to examine my automobile or radios, then he better have
>> >a search warrant. If he feels one is necessary, then the watch
>> >officer can certainly see that one is obtained in short order.
>> >Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
>>
>> Actually, obtaining a search warrant isn't all that quick or easy.
>> Assume the following scenario...
>>
>> 1. Officer Obey stops John Q Motorist for some traffic violation.
>> 2. Upon viewing the vehicle's interior, Officer Obey sees a
>> radio mounted in the car.
>> 3. Officer Obey asks the motorist about the radio
>> 4. John Q Motorist politely tells officer Obey the radio
>> is a ham rig (or CB, or whatever).
>> 5. Officer Obey then requests permission to search the
>> vehicle and/or examine the radio itself.
>> 6. John Q Motorist declines (politely) to allow search
>> of the vehicle and/or the radio.
>>
>> OK so far?
>>
>> Now Officer Obey requires a search warrant to search
>> the car or further examine the radio. Just how does the Officer
>> obtain that warrant then? The process involves at least
>> the following:
>>
>> 1. Detaining the vehicle and occupant for an unspecified time
>> 2. Officer Obey would need to have his police supervisory
>> people contact a judge and inform the judge as to WHY
>> a search warrant is needed (i.e. probable cause, etc.)
>> (most local municipalities don't always
>> have a judge just sitting around to do these things)
>>
>> Judges do NOT routinely issue search warrants just

>> to make local police happy. IF some subsequent search
>> uncovers a criminal act. then there had better be sound
>> reasons for the search warrant in the first place. If
>> the search uncovers nothing...the reason for the warrant
>> had better stand up to challange via a civil lawsuit.
>>
>> If any cop builds a record of "bogus" stops and bogus
>> requests for search warrants, that cop's credibility in the force
>> goes out the window and you can bet the judge(s)
>> (as do police management) know
>> who those bad credibility cops are.
>>
>> Good policing does not require arrogance or "attitude"
>> on the part of police. Attitude cops give all cops a bad
>> name and they undermine the service of the good cops
>> who know and work as proffesionals within the constraints
>> of our constitution and legal system.
>
>The courts have ruled that the police, with proper
>probable cause, can search a vehicle to include the
>trunk. You gave them that power when you obtained
>a drivers license. Now anything in a locked case most
>have a search warrant if you do not give your permission.
>If you refuse, they can tow the car until they have a
>warrant.
>
>Much of this has been worked out due the drug traffickers.
>
>Go over to Alt.Law-Enforcement. Traffic stops and searches
>are a popular topic there. You would be surprised how often
>someone is stopped, who has no drugs yet has to go through
>such treatment. All it takes a police dog walking around your
>car and signaling that there are drugs there. A lot of good, decent
>folks have been subject to such treatment.
>
>Just because you are good guy, in your mind, does not mean
>that someday a very professional cop will put you through this.
>There are too many folks, even older folks, who look just like
>you, who are now in the drug traffic.

How someone looks is NOT suffiecient probable cause.
In the end, any search must be justified as to what
the probable cause was.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4701. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:34:31 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1ed4ea.25178788@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27798
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 16:34:47 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >> > The way you were going at it was that you
>> >> > were making it out that you were some big
>> >> > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
>> >> > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
>> >> > that cop were to get off.
>> >>
>> >> And the way your were going at it was all cops are bad guys who don't
>> >> care about you or your rights. Especially the rookie who will arrest you
>> >> first and ask questions later because he is unsure of the law.
>> >>
>> >Arrest now,ask questions later,is a revenue producer. Even more so now,
>> >every town crys broke. Coincedence? I think not!
>>
>> False arrests are EXPENSIVE to government. An arrest
>> generates NO revenue. Only a conviction MIGHT
>> generate revenue (usually traffic fines). Criminal
>> charges rarely result in any significant revenue gain
>> to government at all. The prosecution costs alone
>> are an expense.
>
>About 6% of all court cases make to trial.
>The rest are settled, often by plea bargaining.
>Too many folks see it as too much work and
>expense to fight a court battle. Especially the
>poor, who peal bargain at the highest rate.

And it is also not uncommon for civil cases
against the police for unwarranted search/seizure
to be settled out-of-court by the city making an
offer to the plaintiff.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4702. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:47:27 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1ed657.25542958@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27799
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 16:38:54 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>> >
>> > > The way you were going at it was that you
>> > > were making it out that you were some big
>> > > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
>> > > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
>> > > that cop were to get off.
>> >
>> > An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
>> > into such a situation in the first place.
>>
>> The police he describes are a bunch of untrained, juvenile loose
>> cannons. The many I knew would not begin to enforce a new law without
>> learning the law in detail, and many minor narrowly- focused laws such
>> as this one would prety well be ignored without a formal complaint
>> having been signed by a victim. Then there might be an investigation
>> which might lead to an arrest if it proved to be warrented.
>>
>> Most cops are not fools. Fools don't normally enjoy long tenure as
>> police officers.
>
>The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
>Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
>out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
>of young, inexperienced officers out there.

>No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
>court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city attorney
>can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.

Cops don't tend to care much about the "feel good" laws
that some towns enanct. Why should they when the
cut and dried basic criminal laws and traffic enforcement
easily take their time. As another poster noted here,
the CB type law that Tacoma passed won't be enforced
except by action initiated by a resident's complaint. The
same is true for most nuisance laws. If none of the
neighbors care that Mr. Smith's dog barks for hours, then
the cops sure aren't going to.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
>officers. They are very professional.

If they are professional, then they won't take
knee jerk actions just because they are inexperienced.
5 years of service had better be more than enough experience
for any cop anywhere to have honed his skills and
knowledge.

>But if they do not know
>what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts settle
>it.

You say that and it is absolute rubbish. Maybe it is
so in some backwoods towns in your area, but it sure
isn't the case in the northeast, nor in many other
areas I have either lived or traveled in. Police brass,
municipal attornies, judges and elected officials do NOT
take lightly to heavy handed police actions that end up in
lost court cases and or in civil suits for false arrest.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4703. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 05:56:43 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3c1ed9c0.26416309@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 27800

On 17 Dec 2001 02:48:18 GMT, radiohead11m@aol.com (Mark Pearsal)
wrote:

>>Mark,
>>You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
>>in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
>>and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.
>
>There's a bit more to be read "between" the lines.

Too bad the FCC didn't spell it out then. As it is, there simply
isn't anything there between the lines.

>>That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
>>the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
>>ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
>>reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
>>way in most of the world, too.
>
>Gee, I hope not.

On what basis would the FCC have to retain even the 5wpm code
test if/when the ITU requirement goes away? If you can't
articulate a clear and compelling reason to retain code
now except for the treaty requirement, then on what basis
would you argue for its retention?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4704. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:12:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goio6i4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27651

On 17 Dec 2001 05:03:32 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>The is _not_ "type acceptance". They are certified only to the
>>extent that they meet Part 15 requirements like any other consumer
>>electronic device (such as your garage door opener) and it has
>>nothing to do with "type acceptance" under Part 97.
>
>Thanks for the clarification, Hans. While I did distinguish between type
>acceptance and certification, I can see where that distinction is not very
>clear in my original posting.

Now to muddy the waters somewhat.

A while ago the FCC changed its equipment authorization rules (FCC
Rules Part 2 Subpart J) to eliminate the previous categories,
shuffle around which equipment requires what type of authorization,
and to establish just two categories of equipment authorization -
Verification, where the manufacturer of importer self-declares that
the equipment meets the required technical specs, and Certifcation,
where a formal application is submitted (electronic filing only)
with test results (see below) and a Grant of Certification and FCC
ID number are issued if found in compliance.

"Verification" replaces the former procedures of Verification and
Notification, and "Certification" replaces the former procedures of
Type-Approval, Type-Acceptance and Certification.

Receivers (and computers) are now Verified, and transmitters are
Certified (where the Rules require same, that is).

To make things even more fun, the Commish' then privatized the
process by creating Telecommunication Certification Bodies to issue
Grants of Certifcation and FCC ID Numbers, thereby allowing the
Commish' to wiggle out of even more of its regulatory obligations.
TCBs must meet serious technical qualifications provided by FCC and
NIST rules including calibrated test ranges.

Ain't bureaucracy wonderful?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4705. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:12:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goioqo5.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27653

On 17 Dec 2001 05:03:33 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>> During the "privatization" discussions at the FCC staff level back
>> in the 80s, more than one staffer suggested that if we are forced to
>> "privatize" testing, we should adopt what was then the European
>> system of a national amateur radio club giving the tests, including
>> mandatory training sessions and membership in said club as the
>> Europeans were doing.
>
>Just imagine what the reaction would be if the FCC were to announce
>that ALL new hams, regardless of other licensing or experience, had to
>join the ARRL AND attend an approved series of classes before being
>allowed to try the test. The code test debate and the incentive
>licensing fracas would be minor spats by comparison...

Which is why it never was adopted by the "headquarters" types who
never gave exams in the first place...the Germans or Dutch or French
never had any problems with that system.....

>> I still feel that the FCC should be back in the testing business
>> and was very forthright about that in my comments submitted in the
>> Restructuring proceeding.
>>
>I'm with ya, Phil, but would they ever actually do it after 17 years
>of getting the unpaid labor of volunteers?

Don't get me started on how much of its responsibilities the
Commish' managed to wiggle away from with a straight face.....

>I think the "Golden Age" of FCC testing was in the late 1970s, when
>tests were not only given in the FCC offices, but at many hamfests and
>other gatherings. I remember a 1978 club meeting of the Drumlins ARC
>where an FCC field official told us that all we needed was a certain
>number of examinees (I think it was 10) and they'd send an examiner
>with all the papers.

The folks who liked the establishment of the VE system the best were
those non-technical examiners who were very uncomfortable dealing
with some of the geeks who appeared at the exam points. Most of
them became office administrative assistants (super secretaries)
which matched their qualifications and interests much better.

(Not to give the wrong impression, most of the examiners just
loved working with people.)

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4706. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:12:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goip6e7.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27654
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 13:24:52 -0600, CAM wrote:

>N9NWO wrote:
>> About 6% of all court cases make to trial.
>> The rest are settled, often by peal bargaining.
>
>Take off your clothes and you don't get a ticket?

No, ring a bell and not get a ticket......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4707. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:12:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goipse8.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27652
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 22:28:52 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>And some Ph.D. at an university will treat you like
>you are pond scum. Look at how network techs
>get treated. Make the wrong comments to the
>some female employee and you are out the door.
>Companies treat network techs like they were
>expendable.

They are. Around here, there are far more network techs on the
"available" board than working. Both my son and stepson are,
fortunately, working in the field....so far.

"Brother, can you spare a dime...."

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4708. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:12:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goir2g9.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27655
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 22:48:37 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>The US Marshal's office seems to help the FCC when they need "muscle".

The Marshal Service is the enforcement arm of the Federal Courts.
They will only do things in accordance with court orders (warrants).

My job with the FCC for over 20 years included preparing and
approving such warrant applications for court issuance, examining
the evidence supporting the warrant for sufficiency, and supervising
and training FCC field agents to do the job right the first time.

>While most forfeitures are done via the courts,
>the drug laws have made that a bit fuzzy.

The law that govern radio equipment seizures and forfeitures is
very clear on what, how, and who. These are detailed in Section
510 of the Comm Act (Title 47, U.S. Code, Sect. 510).

Drug seizures go under different rules.

Any LEO who does not know the difference thoroughly and immediately
does not deserve to be on the street attempting to enforce radio
laws.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4709. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:22:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1EE09E.C139F096@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27656
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 13:24:52 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >N9NWO wrote:
> >> About 6% of all court cases make to trial.
> >> The rest are settled, often by peal bargaining.
> > >
> > >Take off your clothes and you don't get a ticket?
> >
> No, ring a bell and not get a ticket......

Or maybe laugh really hard and not get a ticket?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4710. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:24:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1EE122.2B30BA39@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27657

Bill Sohl wrote:
> On what basis would the FCC have to retain even the 5wpm code
> test if/when the ITU requirement goes away? If you can't
> articulate a clear and compelling reason to retain code
> now except for the treaty requirement, then on what basis
> would you argue for its retention?

The easiest thing to do is nothing?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4711. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:38:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1EE448.4A5E3DE9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27658

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I respect his *professional* technical skills, but fail to
> understand why he had to go so long without HF privileges, just
> because of the measly 13 and 20 WPM code tests!

Obviously, for him HF privileges were not worth the effort of
achieving and testing at 13 or 20wpm. Extra privileges were never
worth the effort of achieving and testing at 20wpm for me. HF
privileges are obviously important to you. HF privileges are
not important for a lot of hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4712. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:40:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1EE4FB.B4EE1F9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27659

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Hey, man, don't look at me -- Carl was the one who had to put out
> the brag about finally getting his Nickle Extra! I just made a simple,
> factual observation.

And everyone couldn't help but notice that you have the same license
as that 8 year old girl. You are like her in another way - she also
doesn't have an engineering degree.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4713. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:43:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1EE595.30E202B5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27660

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >So when are you going to get off your lazy ass and get an
> >engineering degree, Larry?
>
> Never -- that's not what I aspire to be!

And for many years Carl and I didn't aspire to hold extra
class licenses.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4714. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:44:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C1EE5E1.F3056E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27661

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> However, she still maintains "seniority" as an Extra over Carl! Moreover,
> I wouldn't be a bit surprised to learn that she became a professional
> engineer herself someday!

Unlike you. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4715. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 06:52:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goit7wb.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27662

On 18 Dec 2001 01:45:59 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>As I've said many times, I'm a proponent of reducing and eliminating
>our dependence on imported oil. Biofuels is one part of the solution.
>But the idea that "hemp fuel" is a quick, cheap and easy answer is far
>from proven.

You and I can become billionaires if we can develop an engine that
runs on urine.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4716. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 11:21:14 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vn8o109a4@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27663

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011217230527.13039.00001127@mb-ch.aol.com...
> Ed:
>
> Sorry, no cigar! I have absolutely no feelings of "inferiority" (or
anything
> else) to Carl. I respect his *professional* technical skills, but fail to
> understand why he had to go so long without HF privileges, just
> because of the measly 13 and 20 WPM code tests! He forced the issue
> of having recently passed his Nickle Extra, and I merely observed that
> as a ham, he now has made an achievement which has been previously
> accomplished by third-graders under the Pre-Restructuring licensing
> requirements! What did I say that was incorrect or inappropriate? I
> *did* congratulate him, after all!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Yes. A back-handed complement is still a complement.

4717. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 12:11:08 UTC
From: krill <radioisnot4everyone@nowhere.org>
Message-ID: <MPG.1688fd85c5cee636989716@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27664

In article <3C1ECEC1.63CEE6D5@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
says...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Perhaps Larry would like to review the a list of the patents I've
> > been granted
>
> I found # 6,288,618 Logic-based architecture for FSK modulation and
> demodulation
> # 6,281,823 Direct digital synthesis using a sine weighted DAC
> # 6,265,948 Image rejection in logic-based architecture for FSK
> modulation and
> demodulation
> # 6,209,112 Apparatus and method for reducing power consumption of an
> error-correcting
> decoder
> # 6,198,353 Phase locked loop having direct digital synthesizer dividers
> and improved phase
> detector
> # 6,078,799 System and method for calibrating single sideband receiver
> reject image product
>
> All are utility patents (the real thing). Congrads. I have a few myself
> mostly in television.

all useful patents for portable telephones NOT AMATEUR RADIO though.
Carl helps design those GREAT $9.95 portable phones that Lucent sells.
Interesting to note that his INTEREST in amateur radio (according to his
web-site) involves the same frequencies as baby monitors and portable
phones. BTW, not to change the subject, is it my imagination or does
Carl actually sound like a white Mike Tyson? Whas up with dat?

Anyway, Carl's name is on all the patents, all done with the help of
teams of employees and co-workers, which means he was the boss. No great
shake except that everyone else who probably did the actual work is
delegated to historical obscurity OH well, the pointy haired boss gets
all the credit while the Dilberts get squat.

Be interesting to see which patents that actually are related to amateur
radio, as in actual use in all those store bought rigs I see in the
catalogs.

REAL RIGS GLOW IN THE DARK

4718. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 12:16:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218071657.24724.00000387@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 27665

In article <3C1ED045.660EF966@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> >It took a lot more skill, ambition, and perseverance to do what Carl did
>> >with regards to restructuring, than what was required to learn an
>antiquated
>> >and worthless endcoding scheme at a high rate of speed.
>>
>
>Antiquated, yes. Not worthless, but not the best way to get information
>thru.

"Best way" depends on the situation.

>Ask JPL sometime. They communicate with space probes past
>the planet Pluto.

Yup. But they don't use HF or even VHF to do so. The equipment used is kinda
pricey and involved by amateur standards, too.

>But for a minimun of equipment, and a trained person,
>CW does work pretty well. But nowdays it's cheaper to buy modems
>than it is to pay for training a person to send and receive code. That's
>why noone except the ARS uses it anymore.

There are some uses of Morse on radio by nonamateurs. But in general it's a
very minor use, because the economics aren't there.

Same thing has happened to sailing vessels, piston-engine aircraft, and many
other things.

The question is this: Should ham exams be based on what hams do, or what
nonamateur radio services do?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4719. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 12:20:39 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vnho1cgm0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27672
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"He Said What?" <Har Har Hardy Har@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:9vm1j9scn0@dosa.alt.net...

Awww, how cute this ANONYMOUS COWARD is a pro wrassling fan.....shows his
mental abilities....probably thinks it's all REAL, too.

> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vl3n9glt2@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Donnie" <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net> wrote in message
> > news:9vjsja$84m$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:9vipv2hmi1@dosa.alt.net...
> > > > Anonymous COWARD
> > > > "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:098341038FE.16JKS38762@houston-hunks.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > The Salvation Army
> > > > >
> > > > SLee's familiar with the Salvation Army, since he spent several
years
> > > there
> > > > at the Shelter in Dallas. This was after he was convicted on
Domestic
> > > > battery charges and had a restraining order in place to keep him
from
> > > > beating up his mother again.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Woger, Stagger Lee is a friend of mine.
> > >
> > I bet you know him in the "biblical sense," too.
> >
> > > Because you talked mean
> > > to him, I am putting you on my Black List.
> > >
> > > Donnie
> >
> > Take your list and stick it up your ass, "Dumbass Donnie." The real
> Dumbass
> > Donnie doesn't get on the newsgroups, COWARD.
> >
> However, the real Dumbass Roger does....

So does the real DUMBASS ANONYMOUS NO-BALLS COWARD.....

4720. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 12:22:19 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vnho3cgm1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

"Dicksucker" <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net> wrote in message
news:9vmi68$g05$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vipv2hmi1@dosa.alt.net...
> > Anonymous COWARD
> > "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > news:098341038FE.16JKS38762@houston-hunks.com...
> > >
> > > The Salvation Army
> >
> > SLee's familiar with the Salvation Army, since he spent several years
> there
> > at the Shelter in Dallas. This was after he was convicted on Domestic
> > battery charges and had a restraining order in place to keep him from
> > beating up his mother again.
> >
> >
>
> Poor confused Wittle Woger Wabbit! He is so afwaid
> of the girls. Little Woger breaks out in tears when a real
> live girl looks at him. Little Wogey then goes home to play
> with his blow up doll.

Poor anonymous coward! He's afraid to post under his real name or callsign,
'cause he knows all the hams he's said this shit to would beat his lard ass.
Now run along and play with the sheep and little boys you love to fuck.

4721. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 12:23:04 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vnho7cgm2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27674
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

"Dicksucker" <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net> wrote in message
news:9vmi92$g56$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vl3n7glt1@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> >
>
news:faggot.lee.sticks.his.fingers.in.underage.girls.cunts@houston-hunks.com
> > ...
> > >
> > > On Sun, 16 Dec 2001 19:22:06 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> > > :
> > > : Maybe that's the attraction for them.....being cheap....
> > > :
> > > And then there's your technique: Reach into the Salvation Army kettle
> > > and help yourself.
> >
> > And your technique is reaching into your daughter's cunt and helping
> > yourself.
>
> >
> Blow up dolls are on sale this Christmas Wogey!

Good, you may finally get a piece of ass!

4722. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 12:39:38 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <eOGT7.316421$5A3.121757323@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27666
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Bill I have to agree we do things different in the NorthEast Corridor.

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3c1ed657.25542958@news.mindspring.com...
> On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 16:38:54 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>
> >> >
> >> > > The way you were going at it was that you
> >> > > were making it out that you were some big
> >> > > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
> >> > > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
> >> > > that cop were to get off.
> >> >
> >> > An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
> >> > into such a situation in the first place.
> >>
> >> The police he describes are a bunch of untrained, juvenile loose
> >> cannons. The many I knew would not begin to enforce a new law without
> >> learning the law in detail, and many minor narrowly- focused laws such
> >> as this one would prety well be ignored without a formal complaint
> >> having been signed by a victim. Then there might be an investigation
> >> which might lead to an arrest if it proved to be warrented.
> >>
> >> Most cops are not fools. Fools don't normally enjoy long tenure as
> >> police officers.
> >
> >The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
> >Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
> >out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
> >of young, inexperienced officers out there.
>
> >No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
> >court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city attorney
> >can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.
>
> Cops don't tend to care much about the "feel good" laws
> that some towns enanct. Why should they when the
> cut and dried basic criminal laws and traffic enforcement
> easily take their time. As another poster noted here,
> the CB type law that Tacoma passed won't be enforced
> except by action initiated by a resident's complaint. The
> same is true for most nuisance laws. If none of the
> neighbors care that Mr. Smith's dog barks for hours, then

> the cops sure aren't going to.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
> >These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
> >officers. They are very professional.
>
> If they are professional, then they won't take
> knee jerk actions just because they are inexperienced.
> 5 years of service had better be more than enough experience
> for any cop anywhere to have honed his skills and
> knowledge.
>
> >But if they do not know
> >what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts settle
> >it.
>
> You say that and it is absolute rubbish. Maybe it is
> so in some backwoods towns in your area, but it sure
> isn't the case in the northeast, nor in many other
> areas I have either lived or traveled in. Police brass,
> municipal attornies, judges and elected officials do NOT
> take lightly to heavy handed police actions that end up in
> lost court cases and or in civil suits for false arrest.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

4723. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 13:03:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218080323.24724.00000388@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 27667

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.goit7wb.pminews@or.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:

>On 18 Dec 2001 01:45:59 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>As I've said many times, I'm a proponent of reducing and eliminating
>>our dependence on imported oil. Biofuels is one part of the solution.
>>But the idea that "hemp fuel" is a quick, cheap and easy answer is far
>>from proven.
>
> You and I can become billionaires if we can develop an engine that
> runs on urine.....
>
Ever start up a first-generation VW diesel in cold weather? Car vibrates so much when cold that it'll shake the fillings right outa your teeth. And it sounds like it's running on guess what. Once it warms up, it will always get you there.

I still miss that car.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4724. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 13:12:29 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2001.12.18.08.12.28.821480.25807@arrl.org>
Source record: 27668

On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 01:52:51 -0500, Phil Kane wrote:
>
> You and I can become billionaires if we can develop an engine that
> runs on urine.....

I can see it now...

Officer: What's that six-pack doing on the seat beside you?

Driver: Well, I've got a long way to drive today.

4725. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 13:26:01 UTC
From: rick@falgouts.com
Message-ID: <3c1f4369.14280718@news.msy.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 27669
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

How do you peal bargain ha ha ha ha
>
>>N9NWO wrote:
>>> About 6% of all court cases make to trial.
>>> The rest are settled, often by peal bargaining.
>>
>>
>
>

BusDriver

Davemade X-Force Twin Killers

4726. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 13:29:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218082957.01977.00000683@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 27670

>Could of fooled me.

Doesnt surprise me, Im sure you can be fooled rather easily.

4727. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 13:31:12 UTC
From: ve2vfd@remove.rac.this.ca.now
Message-ID: <3c1f43d7.3408570@news.aei.net>
Source record: 27671
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 16 Dec 2001 00:35:50 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>If asked, tell them it's a cell phone. They won't know.....

Bad idea... I would not lie to these people.

Quite simply say it's ham radio gear and you have a federal license to
own and operate it.

If the person checking happens to be a ham then you don't get caught
lying, and if he isn't he'll know you're legally entitled to the gear.

Personally I've carried a handheld IC-W31 in my carry on several times
when flying to the UK and never had a problem.

Pat
ve2vfd

4728. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 15:15:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218101546.06380.00000631@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 27675

>Subject: Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
>Date: 12/18/2001 12:12 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.goio6i4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>

>Now to muddy the waters somewhat.
>
> A while ago the FCC changed its equipment authorization rules (FCC
> Rules Part 2 Subpart J) to eliminate the previous categories,
> shuffle around which equipment requires what type of authorization,
> and to establish just two categories of equipment authorization -

Remember what I said about the FCC washing it's hands and throwing them in the air?

>Verification, where the manufacturer of importer self-declares that
> the equipment meets the required technical specs

There ya go....Seems now it's an ingrained practice.

This is part of the reason we have trashy "Part 15" devices in the community and WE (Amateurs) have to defend ourselves against "interference" claims.

> and Certifcation,
> where a formal application is submitted (electronic filing only)
> with test results (see below) and a Grant of Certification and FCC
> ID number are issued if found in compliance.

Gee...let's see...Do I want to just SAY it's OK, or do I want to spend hundreds if not thousands of dollars to get that little tag?

And oh...by the way...If I get "busted" selling this non-compliant device, I will just change the model number and the "label" that I am marketing it under and re-introduce it under a different name until THAT is busted.

>To make things even more fun, the Commish' then privatized the
> process by creating Telecommunication Certification Bodies to issue
> Grants of Certifcation and FCC ID Numbers, thereby allowing the
> Commish' to wiggle out of even more of its regulatory obligations.

I wonder when they started that?

>Ain't bureaucracy wonderful?

Seems to me they are making it the most unbureaucratic bureaucracy by trashing all the programs, Phil. Twenty five years ago if I saw an FCC type-acceptance label on something, it MEANT something...Now I see any

reference on a device to an FCC "approval", I really doubt that it's met ANY kind of standards or testing.

Steve, K4YZ

4729. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 16:10:09 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <BTJT7.171144$WW.10726842@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27676

> W1RFI writes:

> >So do I presume that it is your feeling of inferiority to Carl that causes
> >you
> >to try to tear him down to make yourself look better?

Larry Roll K3LTwrote

> Sorry, no cigar! I have absolutely no feelings of "inferiority" (or anything
> else) to Carl. I respect his *professional* technical skills, but fail to
> understand why he had to go so long without HF privileges, just
> because of the measly 13 and 20 WPM code tests! He forced the issue
> of having recently passed his Nickle Extra, and I merely observed that
> as a ham, he now has made an achievement which has been previously
> accomplished by third-graders under the Pre-Restructuring licensing
> requirements! What did I say that was incorrect or inappropriate? I
> *did* congratulate him, after all!

Larry...

The problem is what you believe is wrong... you think everyone has the same talents as you and when they don't execise those talents they are somehow inferior.

If you don't think that some humans have a proclivity or predilection (and some humans don't have a proclivity or predilection) for playing a piano well or tapping out Morse code with abandon then you've lived a sheltered life.

If you don't think there are a lot of humans out there that don't have the same proclivity or predilections as you do then I give up and you will always be considered a lost cause.

Rich

4730. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 16:18:02 UTC
From: Boatanchor Bob NA4G <na4g@weedcon1.cropsci.ncsu.edu>
Message-ID: <9vnq7qcdd1@uni00nw.unity.ncsu.edu>
Source record: 27677

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>> >It took a lot more skill, ambition, and perseverance to do what Carl did
>> >with regards to restructuring, than what was required to learn an antiquated
>> >and worthless endcoding scheme at a high rate of speed.

> Antiquated, yes. Not worthless, but not the best way to get information
> thru. Ask JPL sometime. They communicate with space probes past
> the planet Pluto. But for a minimun of equipment, and a trained person,
> CW does work pretty well. But nowdays it's cheaper to buy modems
> than it is to pay for training a person to send and receive code. That's
> why noone except the ARS uses it anymore.

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

When was the last time you listened in on 476? Ol' CLA is still running
CW tfc lists and that sort of thing. Granted, CLA is not much, but it
still is there, if you care to listen. There are even a few others, too.
CW is anything but dead. It is just not as common, anymore, though.

Bob/NA4G

4731. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 16:55:07 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <OOq51R#hBHA.1916@cpimsnntpa04>
Source record: 27678

N2EY said:

> This can be interpreted to mean "everybody should have to do
> what I did". But it can also mean "I learned a lot from it, and others
> will, too".

All sorts of ways to interpret it. Here's one from the Book of Bokonon:

"Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way."

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

4732. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 16:57:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vns6o$k7v$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 27680

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:6CF305A6BB24AD00.2A8D56BE9C30DBF7.10DB203E54E84989@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 10 Dec 2001 19:12:04 -0500, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> >Jim Kelley wrote:
> >>
> >> The best solution is the transporter they have
> >> on Star Trek (snip)
> >>
> >>
> > Exactly. Sadly, problems like this are much easier to solve on
television than
> >they are in real life.
>
> Actually, scientists HAVE successfully constructed (and
> demonstrated) a transporter of that nature.
>
> Unfortunately, it's only capable of moving a sub-atomic
> particle--

What kind of "sub-atomic particle"?

4733. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 17:06:11 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vnsmqkfl1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 27679

Carl R. Stevenson <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c1d2793_1@news7.fast.net...
> Hans, Fred's views (however accurately or not you've paraphrased
> them) are his personal views and NOT "NCI Policy."

Is that a boolean "NOT"? ;-)

Aren't "homebrew licenses" illegal?

4734. "ham radio fun" goes off the deep end an into the loo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 17:19:54 UTC
From: cousin kink <tbobonnsoppls@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_UKT7.14058$mF.1467096@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27681
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Take a listen to the latest www.rainreport.com

R.H. made a "triple-play" in the 9th Inning for xmas.
Bases are loaded on 14.313, 3.860 and 14.275 - you'll
just have to listen 4-urself to see. :)

(amusing bit stolen from alt.consumer.pest.control)

> We have something quite a bit more fun at my house for blowing the
> crap out of ground-based rodent critters. My roomate used to work at a
> Napa Vineyard winery supplier, and they had all kinds of neat tools of destruction.
>
> By far the favorite is a nifty little bit of hardware called the
> "Rodex 4000". This is a five foot shaft with a rubber bung on the
> end, 50 feet worth of hose that connects to a propane/oxygen
> tank. Stick bung in offending hole in the ground, hit the gas
> button for 60 seconds, and then hit the igniter. The boom is
> quite impressive...like something from out of a Roadrunner
> vs Coyote Looney Toon Cartoon.
> No more gopher problem to say the least,
> and I'd assume it works just as well on yellowjackets?
>
> The Rodex 4000 in action...
>
> http://www.billingsgazette.com/region/20000323_r1asq.html
>
> Of course I could think of other uses for this fun device!
>

Finally, the Quote of the day:

"Man mu&#65533; den Menschen vor allem nach seinen Lastern
beurteilen. Tugenden k&#65533;nnen vorget&#65533;uscht sein. Laster
sind echt.

("One should judge a man mainly from his depravities.
Virtues can be faked. Depravities are real.")

4735. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 17:39:12 UTC
From: He Said What? <"Har Har Hardy Har"@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <9vnv07$s7f$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27682
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9vnho3cgm1@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Dicksucker" <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net> wrote in message
> news:9vmi68$g05$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:9vipv2hmi1@dosa.alt.net...
> > > Anonymous COWARD
> > > "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > > news:098341038FE.16JKS38762@houston-hunks.com...
> > > >
> > > > The Salvation Army
> > >
> > > SLee's familiar with the Salvation Army, since he spent several years
> > there
> > > at the Shelter in Dallas. This was after he was convicted on Domestic
> > > battery charges and had a restraining order in place to keep him from
> > > beating up his mother again.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Poor confused Wittle Woger Wabbit! He is so afwaid
> > of the girls. Little Woger breaks out in tears when a real
> > live girl looks at him. Little Wogey then goes home to play
> > with his blow up doll.
>
> Poor anonymous coward! He's afraid to post under his real name or
callsign,
> 'cause he knows all the hams he's said this shit to would beat his lard
ass.
> Now run along and play with the sheep and little boys you love to fuck.
>
Ya don't suppose he'd hide behind the curtains like YOU did when just one
single Ham came calling?
And you call others a coward?

--
I've learned that the greater a person's sense
of guilt, the greater his or her need to cast blame on others.

4736. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 18:51:43 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1F9068.A8B070A9@gte.net>
Source record: 27683
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> >The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
> >Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
> >out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
> >of young, inexperienced officers out there.
>
> >No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
> >court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city attorney
> >can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.
>
> Cops don't tend to care much about the "feel good" laws
> that some towns enanct. Why should they when the
> cut and dried basic criminal laws and traffic enforcement
> easily take their time. As another poster noted here,
> the CB type law that Tacoma passed won't be enforced
> except by action initiated by a resident's complaint. The
> same is true for most nuisance laws. If none of the
> neighbors care that Mr. Smith's dog barks for hours, then
> the cops sure aren't going to.
>
>
> >These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
> >officers. They are very professional.
>
> If they are professional, then they won't take
> knee jerk actions just because they are inexperienced.
> 5 years of service had better be more than enough experience
> for any cop anywhere to have honed his skills and
> knowledge.
>
> >But if they do not know
> >what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts settle
> >it.
>
> You say that and it is absolute rubbish. Maybe it is
> so in some backwoods towns in your area, but it sure
> isn't the case in the northeast, nor in many other
> areas I have either lived or traveled in. Police brass,
> municipal attornies, judges and elected officials do NOT
> take lightly to heavy handed police actions that end up in
> lost court cases and or in civil suits for false arrest.
>

Look at the lady arrested for having the fake
grenade:

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A52423-2001Dec16.html

Gun control really helped here, didn't it?

One fellow in Talk.Politics.Guns commented:
The spin the cops are putting on this story is amazing. Their public statements have all concerned whether or not "petty theft charges" would be filed against the woman, who apparently picked up the ordinary looking shopping bag BY MISTAKE as it came out of the X-ray machine.

Yesterday afternoon the feds finally said there was "insufficient evidence" to charge her with theft. No mention of the fact that they SCREWED UP by letting the bag slip through their fingers. They're making every effort to make it look like the passenger's fault.

Now why is she not filing wrongful arrest
charges against the police? Would such
a lawsuit stop the police from over reaching
in the next incident on an airliner?

And what makes you think that you are
safe from the police over reaching in the
current setting of paranoia over terrorism.

4737. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 18:53:05 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1F90BE.56C19FAF@gte.net>
Source record: 27684
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> How do you peal bargain ha ha ha ha
>

Ok, ok. Typo Plea, not peal

> >>> About 6% of all court cases make to trial.
> >>> The rest are settled, often by peal bargaining.
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > >
>
> BusDriver
>
> Davemade X-Force Twin Killers

4738. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 18:56:32 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1F9183.90F89252@gte.net>
Source record: 27685
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

> >> >> And if you argue with a cop then you are just
> >> >> another asshole. All he wants is to make it home
> >> >> alive each night. For all he knows, you just murdered
> >> >> your wife or have been fired and is heading back to
> >> >> the office to shoot everyone.
> >> >
> >> >I would not give an officer a rough time. Why should I? But if
> >> >he wants to examine my automobile or radios, then he better have
> >> >a search warrant. If he feels one is necessary, then the watch
> >> >officer can certainly see that one is obtained in short order.
> >> >Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
> >>
> >> Actually, obtaining a search warrant isn't all that quick or easy.
> >> Assume the following scenario...
> >>
> >> 1. Officer Obey stops John Q Motorist for some traffic violation.
> >> 2. Upon viewing the vehicle's interior, Officer Obey sees a
> >> radio mounted in the car.
> >> 3. Officer Obey asks the motorist about the radio
> >> 4. John Q Motorist politely tells officer Obey the radio
> >> is a ham rig (or CB, or whatever).
> >> 5. Officer Obey then requests permission to search the
> >> vehicle and/or examine the radio itself.
> >> 6. John Q Motorist declines (politely) to allow search
> >> of the vehicle and/or the radio.
> >>
> >> OK so far?
> >>
> >> Now Officer Obey requires a search warrant to search
> >> the car or further examine the radio. Just how does the Officer
> >> obtain that warrant then? The process involves at least
> >> the following:
> >>
> >> 1. Detaining the vehicle and occupant for an unspecified time
> >> 2. Officer Obey would need to have his police supervisory
> >> people contact a judge and inform the judge as to WHY
> >> a search warrant is needed (i.e. probable cause, etc.)
> >> (most local municipalities don't always
> >> have a judge just sitting around to do these things)
> >>
> >> Judges do NOT routinely issue search warrants just
> >> to make local police happy. IF some subsequent search
> >> uncovers a criminal act. then there had better be sound

> >> reasons for the search warrant in the first place. If
> >> the search uncovers nothing...the reason for the warrant
> >> had better stand up to challange via a civil lawsuit.
> >>
> >> If any cop builds a record of "bogus" stops and bogus
> >> requests for search warrants, that cop's credibility in the force
> >> goes out the window and you can bet the judge(s)
> >> (as do police management) know
> >> who those bad credibility cops are.
> >>
> >> Good policing does not require arrogance or "attitude"
> >> on the part of police. Attitude cops give all cops a bad
> >> name and they undermine the service of the good cops
> >> who know and work as proffesionals within the constraints
> >> of our constitution and legal system.
> >
> >The courts have ruled that the police, with proper
> >probable cause, can search a vehicle to include the
> >trunk. You gave them that power when you obtained
> >a drivers license. Now anything in a locked case most
> >have a search warrant if you do not give your permission.
> >If you refuse, they can tow the car until they have a
> >warrant.
> >
> >Much of this has been worked out due the drug traffickers.
> >
> >Go over to Alt.Law-Enforcement. Traffic stops and searches
> >are a popular topic there. You would be surprised how often
> >someone is stopped, who has no drugs yet has to go through
> >such treatment. All it takes a police dog walking around your
> >car and signaling that there are drugs there. A lot of good, decent
> >folks have been subject to such treatment.
> >
> >Just because you are good guy, in your mind, does not mean
> >that someday a very professional cop will put you through this.
> >There are too many folks, even older folks, who look just like
> >you, who are now in the drug traffic.
>
> How someone looks is NOT suffiecient probable cause.
> In the end, any search must be justified as to what
> the probable cause was.

From Talk.Politics.Guns
about the lady with the hand fake
hand grenade:
American Airlines Flight Delayed

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A52423-2001Dec16.html

>Gun control really helped here, didn't it?

The spin the cops are putting on this story is amazing. Their public statements have all concerned whether or not "petty theft charges" would be filed against the woman, who apparently picked up the ordinary looking shopping bag BY MISTAKE as it came out of the X-ray machine.

Yesterday afternoon the feds finally said there was "insufficient evidence" to charge her with theft. No mention of the fact that they SCREWED UP by letting the bag slip through their fingers. They're making every effort to make it look like the passenger's fault.

Do you think that she will file a lawsuit against the police for false arrest? Do you think that it will have any effect in this climate of paranoia over terrorism?

4739. Re: RADIO LAW vs police procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 19:02:14 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1F92D2.30F96BD7@gte.net>
Source record: 27686
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

> >> >If there is a question about a radio, it is just easier
> >> >to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
> >> >courts settle. I have said this over and over. This
> >> >includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
> >> >a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
> >> >chief's problem, and not theirs.
> >>
> >> It becomes THEIR problem when (a) a civilian complaint is filed with
> >> the department for misconduct and (b) they are a named defendant in
> >> a Sect. 1983 suit - damages (and attorney fees) for violation of
> >> civil rights under color of authority.
> >>
> >> All the LEOs whom I know (and I know a bunch - I am a retired
> >> Federal agent) are very concerned that they do not achieve that sort
> >> of "fame". It's a career-stopper and a wallet-emptier.
> >>
> >> The watchword is "think twice before acting".
> >
> >No cop will take a radio unless he thinks he has
> >a good reason to justify doing so.
>
> EXACTLTY! And just what do you think a good reason
> to do so would be? The answer to that question is the
> heart of the issue that I and others have been trying
> to get you to understand and articulate just what and
> when such a "taking" or confiscation" would have
> any merit at all.
>
> >If he can justify
> >his actions then filing complaints will have little effect.
>
> Agreed and we await your answer as to when/why such
> a justifyed taking might be.
>
> >Look at Chicago. Anybody can file a complaint.
> >Even file anonymously. Every cop in Chicago has
> >a file full of complaints. It is looked at as being part
> >of the job.
> >
> >And look at how Cincinnati dealt with the riots
> >last spring. The complaint process so favors the
> >civilian that the cops just have given up. They gets
> >so many points, they just move on to a surrounding

> >suburb.
> >
> >In many cities the complaint process is so flawed that
> >it is meaningless. There are so many false complaints
> >that the cops just ignore the system, look at it as a part
> >of doing business.
>
> Your experience is either very limited or you have
> no clue as to what really goes on with such situations
> and complaints in many jurisdictions. Maybe Chicago
> and Cinncinnati are screwed up...but that's not
> the norm.

Things have changed. Look at LAPD and the
Ramparts division. Or the Chicago cops gunning
down three unarmed blacks last year. Or the situation
in NYC where 4 cops put 41 rounds into an unarmed
man.

I think that it is you who is out of touch

Look at this from Talk.Politics.Guns
about the woman who had the fake
grenade on an aircraft:

>American Airlines Flight Delayed

<snip>

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A52423-2001Dec16.html

>Gun control really helped here, didn't it?

The spin the cops are putting on this story is amazing. Their public
statements have all concerned whether or not "petty theft charges"
would be filed against the woman, who apparently picked up the
ordinary looking shopping bag BY MISTAKE as it came out of the X-ray
machine.

Yesterday afternoon the feds finally said there was "insufficient
evidence" to charge her with theft. No mention of the fact that they
SCREWED UP by letting the bag slip through their fingers. They're
making every effort to make it look like the passenger's fault.
--

Will she even bother to file a lawsuit over false
arrest? Do the police even care? Especially in
this climate of paranoia over terrorism?

And what makes you think that you are exempt?

4740. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 19:05:23 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1F93A7.98B68824@gte.net>
Source record: 27687
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

Bill Nelson wrote:

> >> Again, I fully support the use of video.
>
> > And what is proper enforcement? After all guys
> > like you have been caught trafficking drugs. So
> > have nice little old grandmas. How is a cop going
> > to know. He has to assume the worst.
>
> The police I know are not like that. They assume the person is
> a generally law abiding citizen, until they have reason to believe
> otherwise.
>
> Of course, they take proper precautions when approaching an unknown
> vehicle or person.

God lord are you naive.

Look at this story about a lady who
had a fake grenade. Do you think
that she will file a lawsuit? Do you
really think that it will change anything?

>American Airlines Flight Delayed

<snip>

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A52423-2001Dec16.html

>Gun control really helped here, didn't it?

The spin the cops are putting on this story is amazing. Their public
statements have all concerned whether or not "petty theft charges"
would be filed against the woman, who apparently picked up the
ordinary looking shopping bag BY MISTAKE as it came out of the X-ray
machine.

Yesterday afternoon the feds finally said there was "insufficient
evidence" to charge her with theft. No mention of the fact that they
SCREWED UP by letting the bag slip through their fingers. They're
making every effort to make it look like the passenger's fault.
--

4741. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 19:09:09 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C1F9488.66A911B2@gte.net>
Source record: 27688
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

>
> >The US Marshal's office seems to help the FCC when they need "muscle".
>
> The Marshal Service is the enforcement arm of the Federal Courts.
> They will only do things in accordance with court orders (warrants).
>
> My job with the FCC for over 20 years included preparing and
> approving such warrant applications for court issuance, examining
> the evidence supporting the warrant for sufficiency, and supervising
> and training FCC field agents to do the job right the first time.
>
> >While most forfeitures are done via the courts,
> >the drug laws have made that a bit fuzzy.
>
> The law that govern radio equipment seizures and forfeitures is
> very clear on what, how, and who. These are detailed in Section
> 510 of the Comm Act (Title 47, U.S. Code, Sect. 510).
>
> Drug seizures go under different rules.
>
> Any LEO who does not know the difference thoroughly and immediately
> does not deserve to be on the street attempting to enforce radio
> laws.

Unless the two become one and the same,
such as drug runner who uses ham gear (and
has a license).

Look at this from Talk.Politics.Guns
about the woman who had the fake
grenade. Do you think that she will
file a lawsuit? Do you really think that
it will effect the police?

>American Airlines Flight Delayed

<snip>

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A52423-2001Dec16.html

>Gun control really helped here, didn't it?

The spin the cops are putting on this story is amazing. Their public
statements have all concerned whether or not "petty theft charges"
would be filed against the woman, who apparently picked up the

ordinary looking shopping bag BY MISTAKE as it came out of the X-ray machine.

Yesterday afternoon the feds finally said there was "insufficient evidence" to charge her with theft. No mention of the fact that they SCREWED UP by letting the bag slip through their fingers. They're making every effort to make it look like the passenger's fault.
--

4742. Re: RADIO LAW vs police procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 20:20:55 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <CDC4DCD13A483DC3.FA71E6EFEFF15474.3191876787702ECB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 19:02:14 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

>Things have changed. Look at LAPD and the
>Ramparts division. Or the Chicago cops gunning
>down three unarmed blacks last year. Or the situation
>in NYC where 4 cops put 41 rounds into an unarmed
>man.

Didn't they miss with about 20 of those?

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

4743. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 20:40:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1FA9AD.9B3DD642@uci.edu>
Source record: 27690
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

Donnie wrote:
> Poor confused Wittle Woger Wabbit! He is so afwaid
> of the girls. Little Woger breaks out in tears when a real
> live girl looks at him. Little Wogey then goes home to play
> with his blow up doll.

What are you, nine?

4744. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-18 20:47:43 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C1FAB6F.418060D3@uci.edu>
Source record: 27691

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I respect his *professional* technical skills, but fail to
> > understand why he had to go so long without HF privileges, just
> > because of the measly 13 and 20 WPM code tests!

> Obviously, for him HF privileges were not worth the effort of
> achieving and testing at 13 or 20wpm. Extra privileges were never
> worth the effort of achieving and testing at 20wpm for me. HF
> privileges are obviously important to you. HF privileges are
> not important for a lot of hams.

I'm not sure I understand why someone wouldn't want ALL of the
privileges available. I've never worked 12 meters or 160 meters for
example, but I like knowing I'm not restricted from using those bands.

4745. Re: RADIO LAW vs police procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 00:00:11 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <a3mv1ukg9i9nn2209sr20riq2hh0ggjbmo@4ax.com>
Source record: 27692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 14:20:55 -0600, an orbiting mind control laser caused
"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> to write:

>On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 19:02:14 GMT, N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>
>>Things have changed. Look at LAPD and the
>>Ramparts division. Or the Chicago cops gunning
>>down three unarmed blacks last year. Or the situation
>>in NYC where 4 cops put 41 rounds into an unarmed
>>man.
>
>Didn't they miss with about 20 of those?

22 to be exact. Not exactly a passing grade.

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

4746. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 00:18:23 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <prmv1ugeea7qgco3i92rs5otlm0evihra0@4ax.com>
Source record: 27693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

```
>> The law that govern radio equipment seizures and forfeitures is
>> very clear on what, how, and who. These are detailed in Section
>> 510 of the Comm Act (Title 47, U.S. Code, Sect. 510).
>>
>> Drug seizures go under different rules.
>>
>> Any LEO who does not know the difference thoroughly and immediately
>> does not deserve to be on the street attempting to enforce radio
>> laws.

Yeah, well someone needs to explain it to the NY State Police.

A few years back they were interpreting their scanner laws in such a way as
to be able to arrest your non-ham wife if she happened to be driving the
car with all your mobile gear installed, and BTW impounding the car. Even
if all your gear was straight ham stuff and no scanner involved.

Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm to the
point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides to
demonstrate diminished capacity.

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html
```

4747. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 00:22:35 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vomka$3r7$2@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27694
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> Bill Nelson wrote:

>> >> Again, I fully support the use of video.
>>
>> > And what is proper enforcement? After all guys
>> > like you have been caught trafficking drugs. So
>> > have nice little old grandmas. How is a cop going
>> > to know. He has to assume the worst.
>>
>> The police I know are not like that. They assume the person is
>> a generally law abiding citizen, until they have reason to believe
>> otherwise.
>>
>> Of course, they take proper precautions when approaching an unknown
>> vehicle or person.

> God lord are you naive.

No, I am human. The same is true of the police I know. We do not seem
to have an neanderthals on the force.

> Look at this story about a lady who
> had a fake grenade. Do you think
> that she will file a lawsuit? Do you
> really think that it will change anything?

This is immaterial. There are laws against such things at an
airport. Anyone stupid enough to try to run a grenade, fake or
not, through the x-ray machine is asking for trouble.

And it certainly is reason to arrest the person - unlike the case
where the CB radio in my vehicle MIGHT be capable of operating out
of band. Without evidence of such operation, there is no justification
for searching the vehicle or examining the radio.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4748. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 00:22:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gok5f5f.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27696

On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 08:12:29 -0500, Jon Bloom wrote:

>> You and I can become billionaires if we can develop an engine that
>> runs on urine.....
>
>I can see it now...
>
>Officer: What's that six-pack doing on the seat beside you?
>
>Driver: Well, I've got a long way to drive today.

It is well known that one does not buy beer, only rents it.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4749. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 00:22:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gok5nhg.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27695

On 18 Dec 2001 13:03:23 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>> You and I can become billionaires if we can develop an engine that
>> runs on urine.....
>>
>Ever start up a first-generation VW diesel in cold weather? Car vibrates so
>much when cold that it'll shake the fillings right outa your teeth. And it
>sounds like it's running on guess what. Once it warms up, it will always get
>you there.
>
>I still miss that car.

My first-generation VW was a '53 European-equipped bug - the 36 hp
engine died on us so we dropped a 40 horse in it and it outraced
lots of others on the road. My '63 Bug (US style) lasted until
1986 when the floor and body finally rusted out.

They don;t make them like that any more. Thank God.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4750. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 00:25:29 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vompp$3r7$3@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27697
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>>So
>>have nice little old grandmas. How is a cop going
>>to know. He has to assume the worst.

> Such cops probably never rise to be truly good cops (IMHO).
> If because they "assume the worst" they trample the rights
> of the public, especially those people who have done nothing,
> then the careers of those cops won't amount to much.

This guy apparently associates with the dregs of the police forces.
His statement that most police last less than 5 years is completely
outside my personal experience with the police I have encountered
in various cities around the country.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4751. Re: Morse not anymore needed to use HF-see further

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 00:53:33 UTC
From: EZ <ezkeyl1@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <hyRT7.125187$OW.40808036@typhoon.hawaii.rr.com>
Source record: 27698
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,alt.ham-radio.morse,rec.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I'm an active duty military member, been a "ditty bopper" for over 15 years.
I can tell you, alot of countries are still out there using Morse code for
tactical
and strategic purposes. Long live Morse!

Ezee

"Jesus, EA4AQY" <jesus.guardon@navegalia.com> wrote in message
news:3c1c769a@news.airtel.net...
> And me too. But don't think about keyers are finished. We still should
make
> noise on tha bands...
> "Web" <WebFx27@hotmail.com> escribi&#65533; en el mensaje
> news:hCeS7.15523$161.7241951@news02.optonline.net...
> > I aggree
> >
> > Web
> >
> >
> > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> > news:39IR7.109$YE4.19833@newshog.newsread.com...
> > >
> > > "b888" <b888@lcix.net> wrote in message
> > > news:u1d5tq5dfp5jf2@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > Well said.
> > > > People still use sailboats, steam engines, propeller aircraft,
> > > > drive classic cars, and do a million other things that are not
> > > > "state of the art" but there still useful and fun. I feal sorry for
> > > > those who have never felt the thrill of that first solid cw copy.
> > > > Or who have no Idea how to loadup a "hollow state" rig.
> > > > The easy way out is the booring way out.
> > > > WB3DSJ
> > >
> > > You are correct sir! Some may love CW and some may not. Some may
love
> > the
> > > digital modes. Some may not. Some may love homebrewing. (and so on
and
> > so
> > > on) There are many facets of this hobby that are enjoyable to a
variety
> > of
> > > different people. All a license means is that you are allowed to do

> > > whatever is allowed by that license class.
> > >
> > > Those that chose to (forgive the word) *bitch* about the either the
> > dropping
> > > of the code requirement to a lesser level, or the possibility of it
> > dropping
> > > of it entirely, probably are not the same people who became
proactively
> > > involved in the protest of those conditions. I am sure that at least
> 80%
> > of
> > > all licensed hams have not bothered to write all the "powers that be"
> > (i.e.
> > > congressmen, senators etc) about ham radio, and in defense of ham
> radio.
> > > We can sit and hope and pray that ARRL *may* work hard to defend us,
but
> > can
> > > you imagine if our elected officials, from the local level, all the
way
> up
> > > to the federal level recieved tons of letters in defense of amateur
> radio?
> > > I personally write at least quarterly each year, (as well as fire
> fighting
> > > related mails especially after 9-11-01) and strongly encourage others
> to
> > do
> > > so too.
> > >
> > > Another way to win support? Invite your elected officials to your club
> > > meetings, ARES/RACES meetings (or similar groups) and share with them
> the
> > > experience. This has a two-fold benefit. It allows the ham public to
> > > actually meet the officials, and of course the officials to actually
be
> > able
> > > to meet the ham public and hear their concerns, and to see what we are
> > doing
> > > .
> > >
> > > Amateur Radio is a pro-active hobby/service, not a sit back and watch
> > hobby.
> > > Get involved!
> > >
> > > [first paragrah directed at respondee to my earlier post, other
> paragraphs
> > > are to everyone else.]
> > >

> > > Ryan KC8PMX
> > >
> > >
> > > >
> > > > KC8PMX wrote in message ...
> > > > >People who want to use Morse code still will, and those who don't,
> > won't.
> > > > > >Any changes in the laws short of a law outright banning morse code
> > > > > operation
> > > > > >won't stop those who wish to use the HF frequencies.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Ryan
> > > > > >KC8PMX
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >"Marruk" <mphaannospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > > > >news:4ytO7.18262$Qm6.2451580@zwoll1.home.nl...
> > > > > >> Mose not anymore needed to use HF.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> Hi OMs,
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> In Guatamala it is decided that a morse exam is not anymore
needed
> to
> > > > use
> > > > > >> the HF bands.
> > > > > >> I guess this is good for the sellers of HF equipment and it will
> get
> > > the
> > > > > >> band a lot more used for phone dx.
> > > > > >> But I dont think it will be very good for Morsecode as a whole.
> > > > > >> Hope to see you in 2003 on HF when it will be officially released
> in
> > > the
> > > > > >> Netherlands.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> PE1PAE
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >

4752. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 01:17:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vopq001pc1@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27700

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011218082957.01977.00000683@mb-ba.aol.com...
> >Could of fooled me.
>
> Doesnt surprise me, Im sure you can be fooled rather easily.

If, by that, you mean you have MA in English, then I guess you've fooled all
of us.

4753. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 01:29:44 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <c4ST7.1908$Hz.665078@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 27699
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote in message
news:9vomka$3r7$2@quark.scn.rain.com...
> <<< SNIP >>>
> And it certainly is reason to arrest the person - unlike the case
> where the CB radio in my vehicle MIGHT be capable of operating out
> of band. Without evidence of such operation, there is no justification
> for searching the vehicle or examining the radio.

But there IS evidence. According to FCC rules, use is implied if the
equipment is hooked up and fully functional - whether or not you happen to
be transmitting at the time.

73 de W6DKN

4754. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 01:36:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c1fef5d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 27851

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"krill" <radioisnot4everyone@nowhere.org> wrote in message
news:MPG.1688fd85c5cee636989716@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3C1ECEC1.63CEE6D5@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
> says...
> >
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > Perhaps Larry would like to review the a list of the patents
I've
> > > been granted
> >
> > I found # 6,288,618 Logic-based architecture for FSK modulation
and
> > demodulation
> > # 6,281,823 Direct digital synthesis using a sine weighted DAC
> > # 6,265,948 Image rejection in logic-based architecture for FSK
> > modulation and
> > demodulation
> > # 6,209,112 Apparatus and method for reducing power consumption
of an
> > error-correcting
> > decoder
> > # 6,198,353 Phase locked loop having direct digital synthesizer
dividers
> > and improved phase
> > detector
> > # 6,078,799 System and method for calibrating single sideband
receiver
> > reject image product
> >
> > All are utility patents (the real thing). Congrads. I have a few
myself
> > mostly in television.
>
> all useful patents for portable telephones NOT AMATEUR RADIO though.

So FSK is not useful in amateur radio? Ever heard of RTTY? Packet?

Never heard of a DDS being used in ham radio? Seems I just tore an
article out of a recent QST on a DDS-based VFO ...

Improved FEC (that's Forward Error Correction) techniques? Seen
articles on that in ham publications, too ...

Improved image reject techniques for SSB? Since the future is in
software-defined radios, DSP, etc., it seems to me that your assertion
that these inventions have no applicability to ham radio is absurd.

[snip garbage about phones ... my employer doesn't make
phones, we make integrated circuits and wireless LAN devices]

> Anyway, Carl's name is on all the patents, all done with the help of

> teams of employees and co-workers, which means he was the boss. No
great
> shake except that everyone else who probably did the actual work is
> delegated to historical obscurity OH well, the pointy haired boss
gets
> all the credit while the Dilberts get squat.

I was either the sole inventor or a principle co-inventor on all of
the
patents Bob listed ... I *am* a "DIlbert" (but my tie hangs right on
those
rare occasions when I wear one :-)

> Be interesting to see which patents that actually are related to
amateur
> radio, as in actual use in all those store bought rigs I see in the
> catalogs.

Most of the patents Robert listed above (plus some he seems to
have inadvertently missed) would be directly applicable to improving
the performance of those rigs you see in the catalogs ...

> REAL RIGS GLOW IN THE DARK

That one line in caps says volumes about where you're coming
from (and where you're stuck ...)

Carl - wa6vse
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPB/uz5e+N6+q84HiEQLoYACg1v0aiLPhGifPaydA3Oaa9AQK4mcAoP+I
LdR756NRImrcjXe/egUj6/ID
=mrYB
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4755. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 01:42:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ff17b$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27852

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011217230526.13039.00001125@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3C1E45C3.B98A3784@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> After all, Carl's the professional engineer -- not me!
> >
> >So when are you going to get off your lazy ass and get an
> >engineering degree, Larry?
>
> Cecil:
>
> Never -- that's not what I aspire to be!
>
> >While Carl has been doing
> >professional engineering, you have wasted your time
> >doing what?
>
> Serving my country -- sacrificing the best and most productive years
> of my adult life to support the effort necessary to defeat the Evil
> Empire of the Soviet Union, bring the threat of Soviet Communist
> hegemony to an end, and make the world much safer from nuclear
> holocaust. All of my fellow Cold War Era veterans did the same thing,
> and I don't consider that to have been a waste of our time.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

YEAH, he did all that so *he* could have all the stage as the one who acts
like a little dictator! Competition is tough, you know. ROFLMAO... ;)

Kim W5TIT

4756. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 01:47:02 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c1ff26d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27853

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.goit7wb.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On 18 Dec 2001 01:45:59 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >As I've said many times, I'm a proponent of reducing and eliminating
> >our dependence on imported oil. Biofuels is one part of the solution.
> >But the idea that "hemp fuel" is a quick, cheap and easy answer is far
> >from proven.
>
> You and I can become billionaires if we can develop an engine that
> runs on urine.....
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Especially if it could be done by stinking up the air less than our
current public transportation buses. :o

Kim W5TIT

4757. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 02:08:10 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <eEST7.171558$WW.10773399@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27854

> Carl R. Stevenson wrote

> > Hans, Fred's views (however accurately or not you've paraphrased
> > them) are his personal views and NOT "NCI Policy."

Jim Kelley wrote

> Is that a boolean "NOT"? ;-)

Exclusive OR... ;-)

> Aren't "homebrew licenses" illegal?

We all have 'homebrew licenses' but not 'homebrew' licenses... ;-)

Rich

4758. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 02:11:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1FF750.4C6A5B90@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27855

krill wrote:

>
>
> Anyway, Carl's name is on all the patents, all done with the help of
> teams of employees and co-workers, which means he was the boss. No great
> shake except that everyone else who probably did the actual work is
> delegated to historical obscurity OH well, the pointy haired boss gets
> all the credit while the Dilberts get squat.
>
>

Like some of the patents I have, a few are by himself, and
some are with a bunch of people. And most bosses know
better than to try to elbow into his guys' patents or else
it eventually will bite him in the ass. (All that has to happen
is several complaints to the boss's boss and the boss is
in trouble). I did let my boss into one I have, but he
did contribute a small amount to it, but I took top billing.

>
>
> REAL RIGS GLOW IN THE DARK

Yes, vintage rigs are fun, but modern state of the art ones
perform better assuming it's not an el-cheapo.

4759. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 02:13:31 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <ubBo3JDiBHA.1456@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27856

W5TIT said:

> YEAH, he did all that so *he* could have all the stage as
> the one who acts like a little dictator! Competition is
> tough, you know. ROFLMAO... ;)

I'm not sure what that is intended to mean, but it doesn't sound complimentary to Larry's faithful service to his country.

Perhaps you can think of something more important that he, I, Steve, and several other veterans here should have been doing in our youth, rather than serving in the armed forces?

Or perhaps you want to apologize.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4760. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 02:21:42 UTC
From: "Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net>
Message-ID: <E485FC731ABDD778.25A9C3AF0A37B12D.B7E3D4E2629277E4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27857
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 00:22:35 +0000 (UTC), Bill Nelson
<billn@spock.peak.org> wrote:

>This is immaterial. There are laws against such things at an
>airport. Anyone stupid enough to try to run a grenade, fake or
>not, through the x-ray machine is asking for trouble.

Except that she didn't try to run it through; it was a training device
owned by the airport for testing the security screeners. How it got
into her bag hasn't been determined yet.

Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH
kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net

4761. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 02:28:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C1FFB60.9472A794@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27858

N2EY wrote:

>
> FCC disagrees. This is the same FCC, by the way, that thinks code tests "serve
> no regulatory purpose" other than treaty compliance. It's also the very same
> FCC that reduced the number of WRITTEN tests, and their size. For example, it
> used to take two separate written tests totalling 90 questions to upgrade from
> General to Extra. Now it takes only one test of 50 questions. The Tech written
> has been similarly reduced. FCC obviously doesn't think more, or even the same
> number, of written tests or questions serves any regulatory purpose.

I don't think that it's meaningful to compare numbers of questions. Which
is easier to pass, a test of 90 easy questions, or a test of 50 hard questions
(assume you have all the time you want)? If the VECs just say deleted the
easy questions and thus gave you the toughest 50 of the old 90 questions,
would you score as high (ignoring that it is a pass-fail environment)?

You know that there are CW only subbands that no code techs can use?
50 to 50.1, and 144 to 144.1 MHz.

4762. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 02:44:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218214438.24724.00000393@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 27860

In article <3c1cf140_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

(Bert Craig wrote):
>> Point taken, but I'd hardly consider 5-wpm as having "Morse proficiency"
>forced
>> down anybody's throat.
>
>Any time you require someone to jump through a hoop, just for
>the sake of jumping through it, that's forcing something down
>someone's throad IMNSHO.

Let's hold onto that thought for a moment....
>
>> >The point is that many folks simply don't have any interest in
>> >Morse, though they might be VERY interested in other aspects
>> >of ham radio, technically qualified, and able to contribute a
>> >great deal

True. It's also true that, many folks simply don't have any interest in
technical subjects, though they might be VERY interested in other aspects of
ham radio, and may be highly qualified and able to contribute a great deal.

>> > ... Morse proficiency has NOTHING to do with one's
>> >ability to be a valuable member of our "fraternity."

Completely untrue. All else being equal, a Morse-proficient ham is more
knowledgeable, more skilled and more qualified than a ham who is not
Morse-proficient. (note the phrase "all else being equal").

Morse proficiency, by itself, does not GUARANTEE that an individual will be a
valuable member of the amateur radio community.

>I don't see folks getting a sense of accomplishment in being forced
>to learn Morse when they have no interest in it, or intention to use it.

I do see it. It happened to me, and I've seen it happen to others.

When I first became interested in ham radio, all I wanted to do was get on 75
meter AM and join the conversations I heard there as an SWL. I learned the code
to get the license, and used it as a Novice to get up to 13 wpm for the
General. It was just a means to an end.

But a funny thing happened along the way. After actually USING the mode a
while, I began to understand how useful it was. By the time I hit 13 wpm I had
all but forgotten about 'phone because Morse was so much fun.

I never did get a General - I went right to Advanced, then on to Extra when the 2 year wait was over. I finally got on 75 meter AM about 30 years as a ham.

Many others have stories similar to mine. Does this mean ALL hams, or even all HF-licensed hams, MUST learn the code? Of course not! But it disproves the claim made above.

>> >In fact, I'd have no problem with an "open book" exam using some
>> >reasonable reference, such as "The Radio Amateur's Handbook."
>> >I'm far more interested in folks demonstrating that they can solve
>> >problems as they come up, rather than insisting that everyone
>> >carry every possible formula in their heads.
>>
>> Perhaps, but that "feels" like "giving it away." I thought priviliges were
>> "earned."
>
>What I'm suggesting is that demonstrating the ability to solve the
>applicable problems could be seen as sufficient to demonstrate
>the requisite level of qualification to earn the privileges.

In other words, it's OK by you to force prospective hams to jump through the hoops YOU like, and shove technical proficiency beyond that necessary to obey the rules down their throats even if they have no interest in the subject.

Remember:

"Any time you require someone to jump through a hoop, just for the sake of jumping through it, that's forcing something down someone's throad IMNSHO."

>I am NOT
>suggesting that the privileges should be "given away."

Let's say the code tests disappear completely in 2003. Suppose FCC simply waives Element 1 as soon as the ITU drops S25.5, saying that ratification of the treaty by the US is expected. What should the US license structure look like then?

>Also, consider
>my previous comments that the license should be viewed as a permit
>to do things, not as some sort of "graduation certificate," and that
>the value is in what it allows you to do, not what you had to do to get
>it.

It is a fact of human nature that a thing's "value" is dependent on many factors. What can be done with a thing is only one factor. What it took to get the thing is another. How difficult it would be to replace it is yet another.

>> >Removing UNNECESSARY, IRRELEVANT barriers to entry
>>
>> I hear CW all over the place. I'd hardly classify a founding aspect of AR
>> that's still in wide use as irrelevant.
>
>I'm not saying that the MODE is irrelevant ...

Yes, you are. You're saying that there should be no real test of a mode which is widely used in amateur radio, and which can only be effectively tested by a skills test.

>certainly it is used, but it
>is just one of many modes, which licensees are free to choose to use
>or not ... what is irrelevant is requiring a demonstration of proficiency
>in manual Morse in order to obtain a license in the 1st place.

The same can be said for "technical proficiency" beyond that necessary to obey the rules. Here's proof: The Technician license requires passing a single 35 question multiple choice written test. Techs are allowed to use all authorized amateur frequencies and modes above 30 MHz, AND to design/build/repair/modify equipment to do so.

Yet if a Tech wants full HF/MF privileges, he/she must pass two more written tests totalling more than twice as many questions as the original 35. Why? Obviously there should be some testing of knowledge of HF/MF propagation and regulations, but that's about it.

If the FCC accepts passing a 35 question test as being adequate proof of "technical proficiency" to design/build/repair/modify and OPERATE a 1.5 kW output transmitter on any authorized mode or frequency ABOVE 30 MHz, why is a demonstration of more "technical proficiency" required to do exactly the same things BELOW 30 MHz? Sounds like irrelevant hoop time.

Applying your logic to the written test, one cannot escape the following conclusion:

Certainly "technical proficiency" is useful, but it is just one of many parts of amateur radio, which licensees are free to choose to use or not ... what is irrelevant is requiring a demonstration of "technical proficiency" beyond that necessary to comply with the regulations in order to obtain a license in the 1st place.

--

For the record, I support better written tests. I think both code and written tests have a place in amateur radio licensing. I commented in detail to the FCC on the subject in connection with 98-143.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4763. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 02:44:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218214439.24724.00000394@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 27859

In article <3c1ed9c0.26416309@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>On 17 Dec 2001 02:48:18 GMT, radiohead11m@aol.com (Mark Pearsal)
>wrote:
>
>>>Mark,
>>>You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
>>>in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
>>>and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.
>>
>>There's a bit more to be read "between" the lines.
>
>Too bad the FCC didn't spell it out then. As it is, there simply
>isn't anything there between the lines.

That's because the FCC didn't put it there.

Fact is the FCC has been pushing for reduction/elimination of code testing for a long time. Know when the first serious nocodetest ham license was proposed? 1975. And it was an FCC idea. So many hams were against it that the FCC dropped the idea, only to revive it about 1983 - and again the reaction in the amateur community was negative. In 1990 it became clear that the FCC wasn't going to take "no" for an answer, and we got the dropping of the code test for a Tech license in early 1991.
>
>>>That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
>>>the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
>>>ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
>>>reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
>>>way in most of the world, too.
>>
>>Gee, I hope not.

That's basically the way it is. Many of the countries with sizable amateur radio populations are going to 5 wpm for all privileges, or have already gone that way. The UK is going even farther, with its "Foundation" license. This trend has been going on for a long time - it's not something new.
>
>On what basis would the FCC have to retain even the 5wpm code
>test if/when the ITU requirement goes away?

The fact that a majority of those who bother to comment think it's a good idea. But the FCC has already made its position clear.

> If you can't
>articulate a clear and compelling reason to retain code
>now except for the treaty requirement, then on what basis
>would you argue for its retention?

Clear and compelling reasons for code test retention were presented to the FCC in the comments associated with 98-143 (the recent restructuring). FCC decided to ignore them. FCC isn't infallible or divinely inspired to do what's best for ham radio. In the same restructuring, the number and size of the WRITTEN tests was also reduced, despite widepread comments to the contrary.

--

The important policy questions now are this: What should amateur radio licensing be like if/when the code test disappears entirely? How should existing licensees be "grandfathered"? How do we get from "here" to "there"? Are there other changes that should happen at the same time?

Some folks think that just two or even one class of license is all that's needed. Others see no need for any change - just remove Element 1 and leave the rest alone. There are lots of options, but the time to discuss them is now, because if we don't come up with a workable, clear, detailed plan ahead of time, we're going to get some kind of hodgepodge that is just the same old stuff warmed over.

K0HB has suggested just two license classes - an easy-to-get one for newcomers and a full privilege license. I've suggested some very different ideas. W5YI and N0MHS think we need to de-technicalize the entry level exams.

Waddya think, folks?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4764. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 03:03:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C200373.1F593EDC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27861

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > I respect his *professional* technical skills, but fail to
> > > understand why he had to go so long without HF privileges, just
> > > because of the measly 13 and 20 WPM code tests!
>
> > Obviously, for him HF privileges were not worth the effort of
> > achieving and testing at 13 or 20wpm. Extra privileges were never
> > worth the effort of achieving and testing at 20wpm for me. HF
> > privileges are obviously important to you. HF privileges are
> > not important for a lot of hams.
>
> I'm not sure I understand why someone wouldn't want ALL of the
> privileges available.

Because they are not worth the effort? Do you have a PhD degree?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4765. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 03:42:09 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <u203o1lshqoua3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 27862
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Quite simply say it's ham radio gear and you have a federal license to
> own and operate it.

VERY bad idea. That comes off confrontational.

Just tell them it's HAM radio gear, you have a license, and you need it
at your destination.

No way imply at ALL any operation at ANY time, even 'just' receive,
aboard a commercial carrier. You do NOT have any right to do that
AT ALL under the FAR.

Mike

4766. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:20:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vp4sf$ar5$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27864

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011218214439.24724.00000394@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3c1ed9c0.26416309@news.mindspring.com>,
billsohl@mindspring.com
> (Bill Sohl) writes:
>
> >On 17 Dec 2001 02:48:18 GMT, radiohead11m@aol.com (Mark Pearsal)
> >wrote:
> >
> >>>Mark,
> >>>You're absolutely correct. In fact, the ONLY reason the FCC gave
> >>>in its Report and Order for keeping a 5 wpm Morse test for General
> >>>and Extra was the requirement in S25.5 of the ITU Radio Regulations.
> >>
> >>There's a bit more to be read "between" the lines.
> >
> >Too bad the FCC didn't spell it out then. As it is, there simply
> >isn't anything there between the lines.
>
> That's because the FCC didn't put it there.
>
> Fact is the FCC has been pushing for reduction/elimination of code testing
for
> a long time. Know when the first serious nocodetest ham license was
proposed?
> 1975. And it was an FCC idea. So many hams were against it that the FCC
dropped
> the idea, only to revive it about 1983 - and again the reaction in the
amateur
> community was negative. In 1990 it became clear that the FCC wasn't going
to
> take "no" for an answer, and we got the dropping of the code test for a
Tech
> license in early 1991.

And it was pretty clear the same applied to all code testing EXCEPT for
5 wpm in the R&O issued for restructuring by the FCC.

> >>>That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
> >>>the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
> >>>ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
> >>>reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
> >>>way in most of the world, too.
> >>
> >>Gee, I hope not.

>
> That's basically the way it is. Many of the countries with sizable amateur
> radio populations are going to 5 wpm for all privileges, or have already
gone
> that way. The UK is going even farther, with its "Foundation" license.
This
> trend has been going on for a long time - it's not something new.
> >
> >On what basis would the FCC have to retain even the 5wpm code
> >test if/when the ITU requirement goes away?
>
> The fact that a majority of those who bother to comment think it's a good
idea.
> But the FCC has already made its position clear.

Nope...the retention of regulations/requirements is not at all aa function
of any majority. The FCC will, in the end, do what it (the FCC) deems
to be appropriate having considered whatever the comments are.

> > If you can't
> >articulate a clear and compelling reason to retain code
> >now except for the treaty requirement, then on what basis
> >would you argue for its retention?
>
> Clear and compelling reasons for code test retention were presented to the
FCC
> in the comments associated with 98-143 (the recent restructuring). FCC
decided
> to ignore them.

The FCC didn't ignore them...the FCC in issuing its ruling clearly found
them to be anything but clear or compelling.

> FCC isn't infallible or divinely inspired to do what's best for
> ham radio. In the same restructuring, the number and size of the WRITTEN
tests
> was also reduced, despite widepread comments to the contrary.

Your point?

> --
> The important policy questions now are this: What should amateur radio
> licensing be like if/when the code test disappears entirely? How should
> existing licensees be "grandfathered"? How do we get from "here" to
"there"?
> Are there other changes that should happen at the same time?

IF the FCC ended all code testing, what would need to be grandfathered at
all?

> Some folks think that just two or even one class of license is all that's
> needed. Others see no need for any change - just remove Element 1 and
leave the

> rest alone.

I expect the latter to be the path the FCC will follow. The restructuring in 2000 created no problems in simply doing that (i.e. just remove Element 1)

> There are lots of options, but the time to discuss them is now,
> because if we don't come up with a workable, clear, detailed plan ahead of
> time, we're going to get some kind of hodgepodge that is just the same old
> stuff warmed over.

Just eliminate Element 1. Pretty simple and already in place.

> K0HB has suggested just two license classes - an easy-to-get one for newcomers
> and a full privilege license. I've suggested some very different ideas. W5YI
> and N0MHS think we need to de-technicalize the entry level exams.

You have my decision above.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4767. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:22:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gokc9dh.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27863
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 19:18:23 -0500, Frank Ney wrote:

>Yeah, well someone needs to explain it to the NY State Police.

But in all honesty, one of the country's experts in combating
cellular phone fraud is Dan Delaney, a detective lieutenant in the
NY State Police in Long Island. We've done several seminars
together in years past.

>A few years back they were interpreting their scanner laws in such a way as
>to be able to arrest your non-ham wife if she happened to be driving the
>car with all your mobile gear installed, and BTW impounding the car. Even
>if all your gear was straight ham stuff and no scanner involved.

That's a prima facie case of ignorance.

>Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm to the
>point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
>47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides to
>demonstrate diminished capacity.

Remember what I was ranting and raving about when the legislation
(Finegold Bill) was making its way through The Congress?

If the "scanner law" (as well as the "radio interception" law) is
properly drafted, it would be specific that it covered equipment
being used in the commission of a crime or in furtherance of some
illegal purpose, as California's law states.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4768. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:26:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vp506$76q$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27865
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C1F9068.A8B070A9@gte.net...
> > >The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
> > >Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
> > >out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
> > >of young, inexperienced officers out there.
> >
> > >No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
> > >court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city attorney
> > >can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.
> >
> > Cops don't tend to care much about the "feel good" laws
> > that some towns enanct. Why should they when the
> > cut and dried basic criminal laws and traffic enforcement
> > easily take their time. As another poster noted here,
> > the CB type law that Tacoma passed won't be enforced
> > except by action initiated by a resident's complaint. The
> > same is true for most nuisance laws. If none of the
> > neighbors care that Mr. Smith's dog barks for hours, then
> > the cops sure aren't going to.
> >
> >
> > >These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
> > >officers. They are very professional.
> >
> > If they are professional, then they won't take
> > knee jerk actions just because they are inexperienced.
> > 5 years of service had better be more than enough experience
> > for any cop anywhere to have honed his skills and
> > knowledge.
> >
> > >But if they do not know
> > >what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts settle
> > >it.
> >
> > You say that and it is absolute rubbish. Maybe it is
> > so in some backwoods towns in your area, but it sure
> > isn't the case in the northeast, nor in many other
> > areas I have either lived or traveled in. Police brass,
> > municipal attornies, judges and elected officials do NOT
> > take lightly to heavy handed police actions that end up in
> > lost court cases and or in civil suits for false arrest.
> >
>

> Look at the lady arrested for having the fake
> grenade:

I can easily see where a fake grenade can get anyone in trouble.
That is a far cry from a radio that is not at all illegal in any shape
or form.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4769. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:33:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vp5crpr1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27867
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"W6DKN" <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote in message
news:c4ST7.1908$Hz.665078@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
>
> "Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote in message
> news:9vomka$3r7$2@quark.scn.rain.com...
> > <<< SNIP >>>
> > And it certainly is reason to arrest the person - unlike the case
> > where the CB radio in my vehicle MIGHT be capable of operating out
> > of band. Without evidence of such operation, there is no justification
> > for searching the vehicle or examining the radio.
>
> But there IS evidence. According to FCC rules, use is implied if the
> equipment is hooked up and fully functional - whether or not you happen to
> be transmitting at the time.

BUT use of a CB is legal for anyone. The issue becomes one in
which there is NO proof that the radio is capable of illegal
power or pirate frequencies. Indeed, the concept of pirate
frequencies is, in itself, contrary to the CB enforcement by
a municipality such as Tacoma. Likewise, having any ham rig
is NOT implication by FCC rules that illegal use was made
of that ham rig.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4770. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:33:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011218233341.26008.00001365@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 27866

> W5YI
>and N0MHS think we need to de-technicalize the entry level exams.
>

This will happen, the Code Bs was just the first shot to more Dumbing Down.
I figure in 3 to 5 Years there will not even be a Test.
Lets face it Ham Radio as we know it is dead, they might as well change the
Name to CB instead of Ham Radio, because thats where its headed, if its not
there already.

4771. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:36:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vp5ir$o8c$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27868
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"Joe Bramblett, KD5NRH" <kd5nrh@kd5nrh.net> wrote in message
news:E485FC731ABDD778.25A9C3AF0A37B12D.B7E3D4E2629277E4@lp.airnews.net...
> On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 00:22:35 +0000 (UTC), Bill Nelson
> <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote:
>
> >This is immaterial. There are laws against such things at an
> >airport. Anyone stupid enough to try to run a grenade, fake or
> >not, through the x-ray machine is asking for trouble.
>
> Except that she didn't try to run it through; it was a training device
> owned by the airport for testing the security screeners. How it got
> into her bag hasn't been determined yet.

BUT, the possession of such a device is probable cause in almost
anyone's mind to stop and possibly arrest. Not so for a legal
radio. Even the claimed "illegal" CB radios can be used by hams
on ham frequencies as long as the signal meets FCC requirements...
and...again, mere possession does NOT constitute proof of illegal use.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4772. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:43:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vp5vvfgj1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27869
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gokc9dh.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 19:18:23 -0500, Frank Ney wrote:
>
> >Yeah, well someone needs to explain it to the NY State Police.
>
> But in all honesty, one of the country's experts in combating
> cellular phone fraud is Dan Delaney, a detective lieutenant in the
> NY State Police in Long Island. We've done several seminars
> together in years past.
>
> >A few years back they were interpreting their scanner laws in such a way
as
> >to be able to arrest your non-ham wife if she happened to be driving the
> >car with all your mobile gear installed, and BTW impounding the car.
Even
> >if all your gear was straight ham stuff and no scanner involved.
>
> That's a prima facie case of ignorance.
>
> >Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm to the
> >point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
> >47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides to
> >demonstrate diminished capacity.
>
> Remember what I was ranting and raving about when the legislation
> (Finegold Bill) was making its way through The Congress?
>
> If the "scanner law" (as well as the "radio interception" law) is
> properly drafted, it would be specific that it covered equipment
> being used in the commission of a crime or in furtherance of some
> illegal purpose, as California's law states.
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

The revised scanner law in NJ does exactly that too. The radio
reception violation ONLY applies if the reception is being
done as part of a criminal act. The law also specifically exempts
radar detectors as being considered illegal reception. It is a good
law that does only what it is intended to do. The old law was
used by some police to detain people or to charge them
when nothing else could stick. The old law forbade any
radio in a vehicle capable of recieveing police or government
frequencies.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4773. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:46:21 UTC
From: Eddie Haskell <Wiseguy@Cleaver.com>
Message-ID: <xYUT7.47370$fo5.8974640@typhoon.we.rr.com>
Source record: 27870
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Just stick the damn thing in your luggage and enjoy the trip!.....Jeez.....

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C1E6CD2.143EA2EE@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> chris wrote:
>
> > You only need permission if you are going to transmit during the flight.
> >
>
> Be aware that receivers' local oscillators have been alleged to
> interfere with airplane radios and equipment......
>

4774. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:47:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goki6fk.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27871
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 01:29:44 GMT, W6DKN wrote:

>But there IS evidence. According to FCC rules, use is implied if the
>equipment is hooked up and fully functional - whether or not you happen to
>be transmitting at the time.

Almost but not quite.

Use is implied for equipment hooked up or capable of being hooked up
if there is extrinsic evidence that the device was used - either
"before and after" off-the-air signal level measurments showing that
mysteriously the level went down after the FCC agent knocked on the
door (another agent monitoring with a spectrum analyzer) or
complaints of interference that mysteriously goes away when the
station is operated at 4 watts.

FCC agents aren't fools.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4775. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 04:58:41 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vp6q0$257$1@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27872
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote:

>> And it certainly is reason to arrest the person - unlike the case
>> where the CB radio in my vehicle MIGHT be capable of operating out
>> of band. Without evidence of such operation, there is no justification
>> for searching the vehicle or examining the radio.

> But there IS evidence. According to FCC rules, use is implied if the
> equipment is hooked up and fully functional - whether or not you happen to
> be transmitting at the time.

Wrong. Read the regulations.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4776. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 05:03:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011219000358.10110.00000848@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 27873

In article <3C1FFB60.9472A794@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>
>> FCC disagrees. This is the same FCC, by the way, that thinks code tests
>"serve
>> no regulatory purpose" other than treaty compliance. It's also the very
>same
>> FCC that reduced the number of WRITTEN tests, and their size. For example,
>it
>> used to take two separate written tests totalling 90 questions to upgrade
>from
>> General to Extra. Now it takes only one test of 50 questions. The Tech
>written
>> has been similarly reduced. FCC obviously doesn't think more, or even the
>same
>> number, of written tests or questions serves any regulatory purpose.
>
>I don't think that it's meaningful to compare numbers of questions.

I think it IS meaningful. And how about the number of tests?

> Which
>is easier to pass, a test of 90 easy questions, or a test of 50 hard
>questions
>(assume you have all the time you want)?

90 "easy" questions, of course.

But the old step from General to Extra was two separate tests (50 for Advanced,
40 for Extra). Now it's just one 50 question test.

> If the VECs just say deleted the
>easy questions and thus gave you the toughest 50 of the old 90 questions,
>would you score as high (ignoring that it is a pass-fail environment)?

Probably not - but that's NOT what was done. And it IS a pass-fail environment.
The person who passes with the absolute minimum number of right answers gets
the exact same license as the person who gets 100% correct.

Given the same pool of questions, which is a better test of knowledge: a single
50 question test, or a 50 question test and a 40 question test, both of which
must be passed?
>
>You know that there are CW only subbands that no code techs can use?

Oh yes. Known that since long before Techs could use them. I even know why they exist.

>50 to 50.1, and 144 to 144.1 MHz.

Yup. Didja know that the 2 meter one useta be 147.9-148?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4777. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 06:13:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112182213.68483e09@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27874

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message news:<3c1d4392_2@news7.fast.net>...
> "K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message
> news:#merBiohBHA.436@cpimsnntpa02...
> > WA6VSE says:
> >
> > > Hans, Fred's views (however accurately or not you've paraphrased
> > > them) are his personal views and NOT "NCI Policy."
> >
> > I'm sure that's true, and I didn't insinuate otherwise.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> FB, Hans ... I didn't mean to infer that you had bad intentions, but
> felt compelled to clarify for other readers.
>
> Happy holidays,
>
>
. . . a newfound huggy-kissy Squiggy is upon us: I think I'm gonna throw up.

> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
>
>
w3rv

4778. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 10:16:58 UTC
From: tnom@mucks.net
Message-ID: <dtp02usm226nvclkhnrn3djes6ugftt79a@4ax.com>
Source record: 27875
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 01:29:44 GMT, "W6DKN" <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote:

>
>"Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote in message
>news:9vomka$3r7$2@quark.scn.rain.com...
>> <<< SNIP >>>
>> And it certainly is reason to arrest the person - unlike the case
>> where the CB radio in my vehicle MIGHT be capable of operating out
>> of band. Without evidence of such operation, there is no justification
>> for searching the vehicle or examining the radio.
>
>But there IS evidence. According to FCC rules, use is implied if the
>equipment is hooked up and fully functional - whether or not you happen to
>be transmitting at the time.
>
>73 de W6DKN
>
Not completely true. When an amplifier is "hooked up and fully
functional" your statement may be true, but a "hooked up and fully
functional" A.R.S. radio is not evidence of illegal operation.

4779. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 12:11:35 UTC
From: krill <radioisnot4everyone@nowhere.org>
Message-ID: <MPG.168a4eef5c1485c5989717@news.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27876

In article <3c1fef5d_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse@fast.net says...
>
>
> So FSK is not useful in amateur radio? Ever heard of RTTY? Packet?

So you are claiming that the circuitry in my Yaesu and Icom radios are made using YOUR PATENTS?? You must be a wealthy man or at least your company is/was/maybe

>
> Never heard of a DDS being used in ham radio? Seems I just tore an
> article out of a recent QST on a DDS-based VFO ...

So you are claiming that the circuitry in my Yaesu and Icom radios are made using YOUR PATENTS?? You must be a wealthy man or at least your company is/was/maybe

>
> Improved FEC (that's Forward Error Correction) techniques? Seen
> articles on that in ham publications, too ...

So you are claiming that the circuitry in my Yaesu and Icom radios are made using YOUR PATENTS?? You must be a wealthy man or at least your company is/was/maybe

>
> Improved image reject techniques for SSB? Since the future is in
> software-defined radios, DSP, etc., it seems to me that your assertion
> that these inventions have no applicability to ham radio is absurd.

So you are claiming that the circuitry in my Yaesu and Icom radios are made using YOUR PATENTS?? You must be a wealthy man or at least your company is/was/maybe
No my assertion is that YOUR patents have not been used in any amateur radio, only very cheap, mass produced cordless phones

Your insinuation that YOUR patents are part of the current "crop" of amateur radio is doubtful ul at best, an outright fabrication at the least.

>
> [snip garbage about phones ... my employer doesn't make
> phones, we make integrated circuits and wireless LAN devices]

Actually Carl, I know your employer and they DO design cordless phones and them farm out the manufacture to the Asian rim countries because they labor is cheap. BTW, ever stop by the bar in the bowling alley across

the street and east of you for lunch? They have great roast beef
platters.

>
> > Anyway, Carl's name is on all the patents, all done with the help of
>
> > teams of employees and co-workers, which means he was the boss. No
> great
> > shake except that everyone else who probably did the actual work is
> > delegated to historical obscurity OH well, the pointy haired boss
> gets
> > all the credit while the Dilberts get squat.
>
> I was either the sole inventor or a principle co-inventor on all of
> the
> patents Bob listed ... I *am* a "DIlbert" (but my tie hangs right on
> those
> rare occasions when I wear one :-)

If you say.

>
> > Be interesting to see which patents that actually are related to
> amateur
> > radio, as in actual use in all those store bought rigs I see in the
> > catalogs.
>
> Most of the patents Robert listed above (plus some he seems to
> have inadvertently missed) would be directly applicable to improving
> the performance of those rigs you see in the catalogs ...

Not **would be** Carl..which of them ARE?? You made the claim now chose
to put the transmission into reverse? Which of your patents ARE directly
involved in amateur radio?

>
> > REAL RIGS GLOW IN THE DARK
>
> That one line in caps says volumes about where you're coming
> from (and where you're stuck ...)

Really?? Why is that Carl? Have we met? I think not for I'd remember
that Mike Tyson high pitched voice for sure.

My hobby is rebuilding, from the ground up, very old RCA radios from the
20's through the 40's. I can repair the entire radio including the wood
cabinetry. I remake any parts that need it, except for the tubes and the
old batteries, those I find at hamfests and flea markets.

I own some real nice late model amateur gear (you know, the type of stuff
that your patents WOULD be applicable for) A couple 706's, one for the
car, one for 6 meter in the home. A new Yaesu HF rig for DX and
contesting..oh I'm sorry, according to some your google posts, you

consider people like me the bane of HF. Seems that you insist that people like me are going to cause the loss of HF, all the while that people like you are causing the loss of VHF/UHF, etc

speaks volumes about you and where you're coming from

4780. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 12:46:39 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vq6odhoe2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 27878
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

```
"He Said What?" <Har Har Hardy Har@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:9vnv07$s7f$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vnho3$cgm$1@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "Dicksucker" <Donnie@mailtoanonymous.net> wrote in message
> > news:9vmi68$g05$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:9vipv2$hmi$1@dosa.alt.net...
> > > > Anonymous COWARD
> > > > "Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:098341038FE.16JKS38762@houston-hunks.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > The Salvation Army
> > > >
> > > > SLee's familiar with the Salvation Army, since he spent several
years
> > > there
> > > > at the Shelter in Dallas. This was after he was convicted on
Domestic
> > > > battery charges and had a restraining order in place to keep him
from
> > > > beating up his mother again.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > Poor confused Wittle Woger Wabbit! He is so afwaid
> > > of the girls. Little Woger breaks out in tears when a real
> > > live girl looks at him. Little Wogey then goes home to play
> > > with his blow up doll.
> >
> > Poor anonymous coward! He's afraid to post under his real name or
callsign,
> > 'cause he knows all the hams he's said this shit to would beat his lard
ass.
> > Now run along and play with the sheep and little boys you love to fuck.
> >
> Ya don't [IKYABWAI]

No, but I hear you slurp nutsacks behind dumpsters and are too CHICKENSHIT
to post under your real name, COWARD.
```

4781. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 12:48:09 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vq6ofhoe3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 27879
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3C1FA9AD.9B3DD642@uci.edu...
>
>
> Donnie wrote:
> > Poor confused Wittle Woger Wabbit! He is so afwaid
> > of the girls. Little Woger breaks out in tears when a real
> > live girl looks at him. Little Wogey then goes home to play
> > with his blow up doll.
>
> What are you, nine?

You're being to optimistic, Jim. This anonymous coward has spent his
formative years being shuffled from foster home to foster home and just
can't get out of those "special education" classes.

4782. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 13:14:21 UTC
From: ve2vfd@remove.rac.this.ca.now
Message-ID: <3c2091f2.2486561@news.aei.net>
Source record: 27877
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 22:42:09 -0500, "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com>
wrote:

>No way imply at ALL any operation at ANY time, even 'just' receive,
>aboard a commercial carrier. You do NOT have any right to do that
>AT ALL under the FAR.

You must be reading something I never wrote into my message...

Where does it even hint at operating the radio IN a plane? I would
assume no ham operator is actually stupid enough to even think about
doing that! Geeez.

Pat
ve2vfd

4783. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 14:28:36 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C20A440.5912A12C@gte.net>
Source record: 27880
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

```
>
> > > >The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
> > > >Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
> > > >out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
> > > >of young, inexperienced officers out there.
> > >
> > > >No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
> > > >court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city attorney
> > > >can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.
> > >
> > > Cops don't tend to care much about the "feel good" laws
> > > that some towns enanct. Why should they when the
> > > cut and dried basic criminal laws and traffic enforcement
> > > easily take their time. As another poster noted here,
> > > the CB type law that Tacoma passed won't be enforced
> > > except by action initiated by a resident's complaint. The
> > > same is true for most nuisance laws. If none of the
> > > neighbors care that Mr. Smith's dog barks for hours, then
> > > the cops sure aren't going to.
> > >
> > >
> > > >These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
> > > >officers. They are very professional.
> > >
> > > If they are professional, then they won't take
> > > knee jerk actions just because they are inexperienced.
> > > 5 years of service had better be more than enough experience
> > > for any cop anywhere to have honed his skills and
> > > knowledge.
> > >
> > > >But if they do not know
> > > >what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts settle
> > > >it.
> > >
> > > You say that and it is absolute rubbish. Maybe it is
> > > so in some backwoods towns in your area, but it sure
> > > isn't the case in the northeast, nor in many other
> > > areas I have either lived or traveled in. Police brass,
> > > municipal attornies, judges and elected officials do NOT
> > > take lightly to heavy handed police actions that end up in
> > > lost court cases and or in civil suits for false arrest.
> > >
> >
```

> > Look at the lady arrested for having the fake
> > grenade:
>
> I can easily see where a fake grenade can get anyone in trouble.
> That is a far cry from a radio that is not at all illegal in any shape
> or form.

You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
who feel that the public does not have a right to own
such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
CB, scanners as well as things like guns.

There is the feeling that the public can not be trusted,
that too many use technology for crime or to try to
overthrow the government. Many would prefer that only
those who are paid on a professional basis should be allowed
to have access to radios or weapons.

4784. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 14:31:26 UTC
From: Robert Frenchu <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com>
Message-ID: <d5912uc7klu4a18ag5auanbgrcetd2jqoo@4ax.com>
Source record: 27881
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote <3C20A440.5912A12C@gte.net> in talk.politics.guns. :

>You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
>who feel that the public does not have a right to own
>such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
>CB, scanners as well as things like guns.

Cite

4785. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 14:45:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C20A80D.6518D54@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27882

WA8ULX wrote:
> This will happen, the Code Bs was just the first shot to more Dumbing Down.
> I figure in 3 to 5 Years there will not even be a Test.
> Lets face it Ham Radio as we know it is dead, they might as well change the
> Name to CB instead of Ham Radio, because thats where its headed, if its not
> there already.

The big difference between the CBS and the ARS is licenses and call-
signs. A person cannot do much communicating on the ham bands without
a callsign and he stands to be identified, fined, or maybe lose his
license if he misbehaves. Illegal operators don't care if they have
a license or not. Why don't you see hordes of illegal SSB operators
in the middle of the SSB portion of the ham bands?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4786. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 14:55:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112190655.77dec7d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27883

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3C12F33F.45D84202@earthlink.net>...

> This idea is nearly as bad as baked bean sandwiches,
> grilled tomatoes, bangers, boiled coffee and blackened, cold toast which
> the Brits also introduced. Remember: The Brits invented the toilet
> seat but it took the French to invent the hole in the center.

But they sure are funny.

http://www.portadownnews.com

73 de Jim, N2EY

4787. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 15:50:12 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C20B762.826744E0@gte.net>
Source record: 27884
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 19:18:23 -0500, Frank Ney wrote:
>
> >Yeah, well someone needs to explain it to the NY State Police.
>
> But in all honesty, one of the country's experts in combating
> cellular phone fraud is Dan Delaney, a detective lieutenant in the
> NY State Police in Long Island. We've done several seminars
> together in years past.
>
> >A few years back they were interpreting their scanner laws in such a way as
> >to be able to arrest your non-ham wife if she happened to be driving the
> >car with all your mobile gear installed, and BTW impounding the car. Even
> >if all your gear was straight ham stuff and no scanner involved.
>
> That's a prima facie case of ignorance.
>
> >Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm to the
> >point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
> >47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides to
> >demonstrate diminished capacity.
>
> Remember what I was ranting and raving about when the legislation
> (Finegold Bill) was making its way through The Congress?
>
> If the "scanner law" (as well as the "radio interception" law) is
> properly drafted, it would be specific that it covered equipment
> being used in the commission of a crime or in furtherance of some
> illegal purpose, as California's law states.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Remember the same thing happens to
folks with guns in cars. Even if they are
legal.

4788. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 16:34:25 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011219113425.14760.00000702@mb-bj.news.cs.com>
Source record: 27885

>W5YI
>and N0MHS think we need to de-technicalize the entry level exams.

Hi Jim,

Does the current entry-level exam realistically get any less "technical?" I remember it as being mostly rules and band limits.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

4789. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 16:39:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011219113920.24451.00000114@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 27886

>Why don't you see hordes of illegal SSB operators
>in the middle of the SSB portion of the ham bands?
>--
>cheers, CAM

You already do, check 10Meters and then 2 Meters.
This thing Ham radio is going the same way that Cb went back when they had Call Signs.
You guys dont get it, the No-Code guys have gotten there way, and now the next step is the No Theory Guys, and they will get there way.
You guys fought so hard to get No-Code, but in the process you opened the door and there is no Shutting it now.
Within 3 to 5 Years testing will be history, and the most you will do is fill out an Application.
Lets stop kidding are self, call it what its becoming, its becoming nothing more than a CB Service.

4790. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 17:30:42 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <694U7.232221$3d2.11089073@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27887

> K0HB has suggested just two license classes - an easy-to-get
> one for newcomers and a full privilege license. I've suggested
> some very different ideas. W5YI and N0MHS think we need to
> de-technicalize the entry level exams.

> Waddya think, folks?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

On the theory that fiscal_responsibility=high_moral_character,
I propose we restructure amateur radio licensing along the
lines of credit-worthiness, granting Extra-class licenses only
to those with an 'excellent' credit rating issued by one of
the major credit-reporting companies. Such individuals would
have a great deal at stake in our society, would not want to
jeopardize it with irresponsible behavior, and could be
trusted with full amateur privileges. Those less responsible
would be limited to the higher bands that have less favorable
propagation characteristics and thus offer fewer opportunities
for abuse.

Hope this helps.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

4791. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 17:43:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vqj82$1mc$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 27888

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C200373.1F593EDC@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > I respect his *professional* technical skills, but fail to
> > > > understand why he had to go so long without HF privileges, just
> > > > because of the measly 13 and 20 WPM code tests!
> >
> > > Obviously, for him HF privileges were not worth the effort of
> > > achieving and testing at 13 or 20wpm. Extra privileges were never
> > > worth the effort of achieving and testing at 20wpm for me. HF
> > > privileges are obviously important to you. HF privileges are
> > > not important for a lot of hams.
> >
> > I'm not sure I understand why someone wouldn't want ALL of the
> > privileges available.
>
> Because they are not worth the effort?

What effort?

> Do you have a PhD degree?

Is that the same as an amateur radio license?

4792. HEY tnom

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 17:44:20 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <e63d86f3.0112190944.2d86fee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27889
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

You are still a faggot boy...musta been on a trucksop tour...havent
seen your queer ass posting here lately.

tnom@mucks.net wrote in message news:<dtp02usm226nvclkhnrn3djes6ugftt79a@4ax.com>...
> On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 01:29:44 GMT, "W6DKN" <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote in message
> >news:9vomka$3r7$2@quark.scn.rain.com...
> >> <<< SNIP >>>
> >> And it certainly is reason to arrest the person - unlike the case
> >> where the CB radio in my vehicle MIGHT be capable of operating out
> >> of band. Without evidence of such operation, there is no justification
> >> for searching the vehicle or examining the radio.
> >
> >But there IS evidence. According to FCC rules, use is implied if the
> >equipment is hooked up and fully functional - whether or not you happen to
> >be transmitting at the time.
> >
> >73 de W6DKN
> >
> Not completely true. When an amplifier is "hooked up and fully
> functional" your statement may be true, but a "hooked up and fully
> functional" A.R.S. radio is not evidence of illegal operation.

4793. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 17:57:08 UTC
From: Big Al <Big_Al@anonynose.edu>
Message-ID: <9vqkd4$dv0$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 27890
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

```
"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:9vqitu$1gt$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:9vq6of$hoe$3@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C1FA9AD.9B3DD642@uci.edu...
> > >
> > >
> > > Donnie wrote:
> > > > Poor confused Wittle Woger Wabbit! He is so afwaid
> > > > of the girls. Little Woger breaks out in tears when a real
> > > > live girl looks at him. Little Wogey then goes home to play
> > > > with his blow up doll.
> > >
> > > What are you, nine?
> >
> > You're being to optimistic, Jim. This anonymous coward has spent his
> > formative years being shuffled from foster home to foster home and just
> > can't get out of those "special education" classes.
>
> Your posts are equally disgraceful.
>

Roger's posts are not only disgraceful, they are
sickening, the work of a very sick mind! HO HO that's why
Roger has a NG in his very own name alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
HO HO Gimme a call on the big rig when ya get home boy!
HO HO
```

4794. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 18:38:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C20DE89.2ABE8739@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27891

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Why don't you see hordes of illegal SSB operators
> >in the middle of the SSB portion of the ham bands?
>
> You already do, check 10Meters and then 2 Meters.

I have never heard an unidentified operator on the Madison County
2m repeater. I've heard some of the freebanders in the 10m CW
portion of the band but I have never heard them in the 10m SSB
portion. If there were hordes, I would have heard some.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4795. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 18:43:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C20DFCF.870C403@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27892

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Because they are not worth the effort?
>
> What effort?

The effort of getting out of a warm water bed and driving four hours
round trip in a thunderstorm.

> > Do you have a PhD degree?
>
> Is that the same as an amateur radio license?

A Ph.D. degree is to a BS degree as a tech license is to an extra license.
Any holder of a BS degree who doesn't have a Ph.D. degree is a hypocrite
for ragging on a tech+ who doesn't have an extra license.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4796. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 19:10:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011219141046.05966.00000073@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 27893

>If there were hordes, I would have heard some.
>--

Check you RX, maybe your Ant also

4797. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 19:51:43 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vqqp1$546$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 27894

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C20DFCF.870C403@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Because they are not worth the effort?
> >
> > What effort?
>
> The effort of getting out of a warm water bed and driving four hours
> round trip in a thunderstorm.

Life's a bitch, and then you die. Christmas shopping requires more effort.

> A Ph.D. degree is to a BS degree as a tech license is to an extra license.

You think it takes 8 years of research and study to pass a 50 question exam?

> Any holder of a BS degree who doesn't have a Ph.D. degree is a hypocrite
> for ragging on a tech+ who doesn't have an extra license.

Eliteist. One costs a 100 thousand more to obtain than the other.

4798. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 19:53:07 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <4mr12ugsohaasgcfd1f95k3lh9b0dlasnf@4ax.com>
Source record: 27895
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 06:31:26 -0800, an orbiting mind control laser caused
Robert Frenchu <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> to write in
talk.politics.guns :

>>You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
>>who feel that the public does not have a right to own
>>such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
>>CB, scanners as well as things like guns.
>
>Cite

Well, for once he is right about that. In Los Angeles I had deputies on
transit detail give me a hard time about operating 2m on the green line,
and that was with me being a carded member of DCS (the RACES earthquake
unit that's run by LASD) and with an earphone installed. The same deputies
didn't blink at all the cell phones in operation on the same train.

I got the impression that transit detail is only one step up from Bunco and
two steps up from Vice.

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

4799. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 20:32:05 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B8517C8980A24DAD.5C132683181D7AF4.7CDD2479F2C29DAD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27896

On Sat, 10 Nov 2001 01:45:53 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> Bottom line as I see it is, if you don't like 'em, don't look at 'em.
>
>She's 47, 5'5", 210 lbs. That takes care of number 1.

Why?

Are you prejudiced against large women or women over 40?

>> If you don't like her callsign, don't answer her when you hear her
>> calling CQ.

>That takes care of number 2.

Sounds reasonable to me!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4800. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 20:45:33 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <420B958A0269BB4F.5E77D600C740311B.FF462350DC33B9C0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27897

On 07 Nov 2001 03:10:15 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I don't have any idea what you're talking about. My call sign doesn't
>spell a damn thing. Kim's does.

Actually, since "LT" is taken universally as the abbreviation
for "light" (as in reduced in features or capabilities), just as "TIT"
is taken as slang for a breast, your call sign has just as much
"meaning" as does Kim's.

Her's refers to a part of her traditionally viewed as a key
component of female beauty, and the ultimate symbol of motherhood
(which is CERTAINLY "family oriented."). In the mind of the person who
seeks out sexual content in everything (and, of course, finds sexual
content obscene instead of natural and beautiful), her sign refers to
a secondary sexual characteristic that some men (usually single ones
with inadequate sex lives) treat as a fetish object (something on
which they focus disproportionate interest--as you do on Kim's
breasts).

Your's refers to a lack of important features, often those
that separate an "immature" or "functionally limited" object from a
fully featured one. In short, a "light weight" model or one short on
capability.

Let's recap: Kim either epitomizes the true meaning of
motherhood or is objectified by sex-starved puritanical single men and
you are a light weight who lacks adequate capabilities.

Yup! NOW I understand why you are so fixated on Kim's
tits--lack of adequate capabilities and normal functions DOES usually
lead to fetishism, after all.

> Whatever stupid phoenitics you make
>of it doesn't give my call sign any meaning other than a legal station
>identification. Get Mr. Hollingsworth to agree with you, and I'll certainly
>take his comments under advisement, as I've already told Kim.

Kim took them under advisement, too, Larry. She simply
rejected their premise after having evaluated them. That's what taking
something under advisement means--not blindly following the opinion of
others.

Unlike yourself, she doesn't view Riley as being morally or
intellectually superior to her. Sorry that your "light weight" status
has obligated you to view him in that manner personally.

Rick (Kindly Eat Eight Hairy Hamburgers)

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4801. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 20:48:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EC6AE56176C35C29.DEE6722370582690.849DC8965EF65E70@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27898

On 08 Nov 2001 15:32:43 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
>inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.
>I don't recall ever calling it "obscene."

And many of us don't recall ever seeing the ARS legally
defined as "family-oriented." That's the FRS (Family Radio Service),
Larry, you're getting confused as usual.

Now go get yourself an FRS handheld and talk to people you can
relate to--the neighborhood kids (if they can stand you in their
'hood, of course).

Rick (King Edward Ate Horatio Hornblower)

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4802. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 20:51:05 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3F7F89779D2A0F35.D28D63EB28211DB6.EAA03272D9273766@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27899

On 11 Nov 2001 02:18:28 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I tried that, but the pages got too soggy. My new callbook CD seems
>to tolerate being washed with lukewarm water a tiny amount of
>dish detergent, but for some odd reason, it doesn't change Kim's dirty
>call sign! Why is that?

Because soap can't clean your mind, Larry, and that's where
the "dirt" is, not in her sign.

Rick (Kindly Eustice Ate Horrible Humans)

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4803. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 20:54:08 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E5812239B6D4F3EF.84B9582FCA41FEA9.846BA16DDBE8637F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27900

On Sun, 11 Nov 2001 22:20:15 GMT, JJ <radiobuff@mailcity.net> wrote:

>It is a matter of class and taste, some people never acquire
>either.

Confession time, Larry?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4804. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 20:57:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <07FCEDD2A7002958.53A48EBF5EC318A6.4A0979901B50C1D6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27801

On 06 Nov 2001 12:13:24 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Riley cannot change the FCC's policy directly. His statements in his email were
>his personal opinion as a ham.

And THAT is precisely the point!

It IS his "personal opinion," not a view that either carries
any more weight than that of any other ham, or one that has any more
probability of being correct than that of Cecil, Dwight, or myself
(ANYONE has more probability of being correct than Rolly-Polly Larry).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4805. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 21:03:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.golrb3r.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27803
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 13:14:21 GMT, VE2VFD Pat wrote:

>Where does it even hint at operating the radio IN a plane? I would
>assume no ham operator is actually stupid enough to even think about
>doing that! Geeez.

You'd be surprised at the number of hams in these groups who brag
that they have done so "and nothing happened".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4806. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 21:03:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.golr05q.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27802

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 12:38:01 -0600, CAM wrote:

>I have never heard an unidentified operator on the Madison County
>2m repeater.

I've heard plenty of them in California and Oregon -- most are
licensed, though, and believe that voice and first-name recognition
is a sufficient equivalent.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4807. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 21:20:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6C47C2D7430A04AA.E3DA7DAA1C33A160.1D56B0B180689DE4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27804

On 15 Nov 2001 04:19:48 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is *patently*
>objectionable!

No, Larry. It is "patently objectionable" to YOU--not to
everyone.

Don't confuse your own fixations with fact.

>I'm sure that kind of thing happens, but since I know how to use CW and a
>handful of digital modes, I generally don't run into that type of on-the-air
>behavior.

How do you treat newbies to CW, Larry? Do you drop down to
their speed so they can gain on-the-air experience at 5WPM or so--or
do you (as Dick has stated that he does in the past) simply ignore
them until they can send at a decent speed and communicate
efficiently? As a cw fanatic, do you voluntarily participate in voice
conversations in the tech & general bands and try to encourage new
hams both to explore cw and to enjoy ham radio--or do you live in your
lofty (and out-of-date) cw world where only those you feel "worthy"
(translation: capable of high speed cw) are acceptable to communicate
with?

Do you refrain from racist, sexist, or otherwise prejudiced
statements here in an amateur radio oriented news group so that
non-hams (or new hams) won't form bad impressions of the ARS--or do
you limit your morality to those areas you PERSONALLY are "offended"
by?

In short, before you complain about someone else's behavior,
Larry, clean up your OWN act!

>I think that before you do that, you'd better take a close look at who
>decided to choose a sexually provocative callsign which is demeaning to
>hams in general, and female hams in particular!

It's only demeaning to women in the minds of men who view them
as sex objects, Larry. To me, and to most people who have posted in
this thread, neither Kim's call sign nor the idea of women's breasts
are at all offensive. Perhaps "K0CK" would be more pleasing to your
tastes.

>Again, you are not the one to be making such statements. In case you haven't
>noticed, *you* are the Captain of a burning, sinking ship.

Gee--that sounds like a pretty good description of you and
Dick Carroll when it comes to code testing to me.

> If I were you, I'd
>be looking for a life raft! I'm sure you can find one at the ULS web site!

Yeah, by now she probably needs one--thanks to your posts it
IS getting pretty deep in here.

Rick (Kuwaiti Emirs Ate Hasidic Heroines)

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4808. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 21:23:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <789EDEACB4F1FD66.4A0EF3DDCC800E3A.84FA97A5FF1B77CE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27805

On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 05:57:20 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Are you this predictable in bed?

Sure he is, Kim.

He memorized a sex manual.

In.

Out.

Repeat if necessary.

>Also, I assure you that I am not as attached to my callsign as you are,
>Larry. Not at all. I'll concentrate on seeing how long I can keep this
>thread alive. Bet it goes to about...let's see, March? That's about how
>long you last every year.

That can't be right, Kim.

March is WELL over 15 seconds from now!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4809. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 21:27:06 UTC
From: Lenny Stover <mppd5107@the-police.com>
Message-ID: <OC7U7.8240$Xs4.1280375@feed.centurytel.net>
Source record: 27806
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

> > >The courts have ruled that the police, with proper
> > >probable cause, can search a vehicle to include the
> > >trunk.

Close, very close. All it takes is a "reasonable suspicion" to search a vehicle. "Probable cause" is the standard used to make an arrest.

> > > You gave them that power when you obtained
> > > a drivers license.

Actually, the USSC ruled that police can perform warrantless searches of vehicles. Permission to search is not a requisite for obtaining a driver's license. We don't need permission if we have a reasonable suspicion.

> > > Now anything in a locked case most
> > >have a search warrant if you do not give your permission.
> > >If you refuse, they can tow the car until they have a
> > >warrant.

Bzzzzt.......wrong. If it is withinn the driver's reach, I can ask him to open the locked case without a warrant. If he refuses, then we go for a warrant, where I must be able to articulate my reasonable suspicion.

> > >Go over to Alt.Law-Enforcement. Traffic stops and searches
> > >are a popular topic there. You would be surprised how often
> > >someone is stopped, who has no drugs yet has to go through
> > >such treatment. All it takes a police dog walking around your
> > >car and signaling that there are drugs there. A lot of good, decent
> > >folks have been subject to such treatment.

However, we must be able to demonstrate the reliablilty of the dog. If the dog continues to hit on vehicles that do not contain controlled substances, then the dog is useless when we get in court and a search is challenged.

> > >Just because you are good guy, in your mind, does not mean
> > >that someday a very professional cop will put you through this.
> > >There are too many folks, even older folks, who look just like
> > >you, who are now in the drug traffic.

Absolutely correct.

> > How someone looks is NOT suffiecient probable cause.
> > In the end, any search must be justified as to what
> > the probable cause was.

Not "probable cause"......"reasonable suspicion."

4810. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 21:29:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <EA52057F3A9A84CF.E50686FD4781F6B3.1BF9E2F15743B0DE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27808

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001 18:07:08 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

> All those books describe wiccan spells and magic, Kim. And, given a
>few minutes more, I could probably double that list. So, obviously,
>wiccans do claim they can do spells and magic.

The Bible.

The Koran.

The Torah.

All of THOSE books talk about "performing miracles through
prayer" which is exactly the same thing as magic (magick is an
internal process akin to meditation, not spells and magic).

I guess those in the Judeo-Christian tradition make the same
claims, too.

At least Wiccan's don't practice bigotry and hate--THOSE are
reserved for their detractors.

BTW, the definitive work on the origins and beliefs of
paganism is Frazier's "Golden Bough," not the "pop" books you cite.
Would you accept works by Falwell, Robertson, Oral Roberts, or Tammy
Baker as representing the "legitimate" views of Christianity--or "A
Course in Miracles" and "Success Through Prayer" as representing its
practices?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4811. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 21:30:00 UTC
From: Lenny Stover <mppd5107@the-police.com>
Message-ID: <JE7U7.8241$Xs4.1280389@feed.centurytel.net>
Source record: 27807
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote

> And it certainly is reason to arrest the person - unlike the case
> where the CB radio in my vehicle MIGHT be capable of operating out
> of band. Without evidence of such operation, there is no justification
> for searching the vehicle or examining the radio.

No cop is his right mind is going to attempt to make an arrest or even
become concerned because your CB "slides" above 40 or below 1.

4812. Re: RADIO LAW vs police procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 21:34:44 UTC
From: Lenny Stover <mppd5107@the-police.com>
Message-ID: <8J7U7.8242$Xs4.1280670@feed.centurytel.net>
Source record: 27809
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote

> > >Look at Chicago. Anybody can file a complaint.
> > >Even file anonymously. Every cop in Chicago has
> > >a file full of complaints. It is looked at as being part
> > >of the job.

Like my Lieutenant used to say, "If you aint catching no beefs, you aint
doin your job."

> > >In many cities the complaint process is so flawed that
> > >it is meaningless. There are so many false complaints
> > >that the cops just ignore the system, look at it as a part
> > >of doing business.

Yep.

4813. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 22:24:14 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7C675AACFD8F3A2B.108F330199F6C161.5F67135A2F8866E6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27810

On Fri, 14 Dec 2001 15:23:55 GMT, "Jim Bromley, K7JEB"
<j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>Given Clarke's law ("Sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable
>from magic"), and looking at what we do at the dawn of the 21st century
>with wireless telephones, computer networks and "smart" bombs, both the
>Wiccans and Christians of those early days would come away convinced
>that we are all consorting with the devil on a connect-time-minute by
>connect-time-minute basis.

Given all the claims about "magic" and Wicca, it might help to
DEFINE the word according to the Occult traditions (after all,
Christians expect non-Christians to accept THEIR definitions of
"prayer," "God," etc.). Here, according to Aleister Crowley (widely
regarded as an authority on the subject) is the definition of
"Magick:"

========

I) DEFINITION.

Magick is the Science and Art of causing Change to occur in conformity
with Will.

(Illustration: It is my Will to inform the World of certain facts
within my knowledge. I therefore take "magickal weapons", pen, ink,
and paper; I write "incantations"---these sentences---in the "magickal
language" ie, that which is understood by the people I wish to
instruct; I call forth "spirits", such as printers, publishers,
booksellers and so forth and constrain them to convey my message to
those people. The composition and distribution of this book is thus an
act of Magick by which I cause Changes to take place in conformity
with my Will.)

In one sense Magick may be defined as the name given to Science by the
vulgar.

========

This may sound absurd, but only because it is expressed in
unfamiliar terminology. If, for example, I were to state that I had a
sched for a CW QSO with a ZB8 at 1435 ZULU on 14.105 anyone here would
clearly understand what I was communicating--but someone unfamiliar
with amateur radio (as most people here are unfamiliar with the
magick) it would make no sense at all!

Most practitioners of magick either use it as a meditation or
as a means of spiritual growth. However, the form that is being
referred to in this thread by Dwight is a superstitious form that
involves "spells" and "charms" and has no more relationship to the
actual religious practices than do the silly depictions of witchcraft
in the Harry Potter books.

Sure, there are books that present magick as being "evil" and
"manipulative" in nature. Try reading the "Malleus Mallificarium" (the
"Witches's Hammer" written by a RC Pope) sometime for a great
depiction of the beliefs of Christianity about witchcraft (i.e., if
you can't torture someone into admitting she is a witch, it's because
"Satan" is keeping her from speaking and you should put her to death;
of course if she DOES confess from the torture, the punishment is ALSO
death, but . . .).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4814. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 22:25:49 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9A34C2400E71DD62.DF6FD2B28B778F4A.CC1A621A9D4D713B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27811

On Fri, 14 Dec 2001 06:07:15 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
wrote:

> Doncha think he has already smoked it all up, a few threads at a time??

Haven't done that since the early seventies, Dick. Right now I
don't drink OR smoke.

Are you still escaping into a bottle, or have you finally
replaced your barf bags with depends?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4815. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 23:03:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F32C67986015B1A3.96B12AF8113BFE47.2E2AE6FA8F6ABAD5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27813

On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 08:57:41 -0800, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>What kind of "sub-atomic particle"?

I couldn't tell you, offhand. I saw a mention of the research
in the newspaper, and heard a reference to it on a NOVA show Chris was
watching while I was on the air, but I don't know enough about it (or
physics, for that matter) to say.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4816. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 23:06:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3BC22BF5C65BA329.3EA9B85F8C074742.916088F75209F9B0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27814

On Mon, 17 Dec 2001 08:26:54 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>If I am not mistaken, there are sub-species of hemp that are not
>illegal but trying to convince the local drug gestapo that one
>is growing legal hemp is not very rewarding. Eradication of
>wild hemp has failed in many parts of the country.

There are subspecies that do not contain THC in any usable
concentrations (you'd have to smoke a kilo to get a mild buzz--and
that would probably be from suffocation)--but the entire species of
plant (actually all three species; Cannabis Sativa, Cannabis Indica,
and Cannabis Ruderialis [sp??]) is illegal for cultivation in the USA.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4817. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 23:22:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C21212C.ECBB69F8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27815

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C20DFCF.870C403@IEEE.org...
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > Because they are not worth the effort?
> > >
> > > What effort?
> >
> > The effort of getting out of a warm water bed and driving four hours
> > round trip in a thunderstorm.
>
> Life's a bitch, and then you die. Christmas shopping requires more effort.

Exerting effort for something that is worth nothing to one makes one
a masochist. Are you a masochist?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

4818. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 23:28:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <05CC461F98FB8716.ED6F031291429B65.97EA10CFFB8C5672@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27816

On 18 Dec 2001 01:45:59 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>> Hemp oil IS a vegetable oil, remember?
>
>If you say so, Rick. Thus it has all the advantages and disadvantages named
>above.

Essentially, yes, although those vary from one form of oil to
another as I'm sure you know (for example, it takes a vastly greater
amount of acreage to produce a given amount of soy bean or peanut oil
than it does to produce the same quantity of hemp oil, due to the size
of the hemp plant and the percentage of the plant suitable for oil
production).

>"Efficient" in what sense? How many gallons per acre, how many gallons per ton
>of raw harvested crop, how many gallons per dollar spent to grow it?

Efficient in the sense of having very high energy/volume
potential, of being inexpensive to produce (no pesticides, herbicides,
or [in most cases] irrigation are needed), and in the sense of
providing a high per-acre yield.

You can get the precise yield figures from some of the sources
I previously cited, or from such sites on the Inet as the Farm Bureau
home page, the Hemp Council home page, or HEMP Canada.

>For food purposes, soybean oil is pretty bad stuff. Canola oil is better and
>olive oil is better than canola. Flaxseed oil is tops but is very expensive and
>not as easy to cook with.

According to nutritionists, hemp oil has a very high
percentage of essential nutriants--more so than any other currently
used vegetable oil--and appears to be completely non-allergeric as
well. Peanut oil isn't too far from it nutritionally, but there are a
number of people allergic to it, and it isn't as nutritionally
valuable as hemp oil on a gallon for gallon basis--nor is it as easily
(or inexpensively) produced.

>> As far as costs are concerned, assuming the development of
>>sufficient processing facilities and farms
>
>Whoa! Don't Assume that at all!!

Why?

Can you name a single product which, once in demand, did not
inspire precisely that type of developments?

>To make any sort of sizable dent in the US consumption of petrofuels, any
>biofuel must be produced in millions-of-gallons-per-day quantities, at least.
>That means BIG investments in farms and refining facilities. Those facilites
>don't just grow out of the ground.

Nope. But neither do investment opportunities with the
potential yield of hemp production and processing. Create a market and
you'll have plenty of investors willing to put up the money.

>Show your source. I think the raw production cost would be much higher. Here's
>why:

I DID provide my sources--refer to them.

>Take a stroll down any supermarket aisle and price the absolute cheapest
>vegetable oil you can find. It's a lot more than 49 cents a gallon, and there
>is practically no tax on it because it's a food item. And it cannot be used as
>an engine fuel without additional procesing. Hemp oil is no different.

And how much would the price on that vegetable oil be if it
were produced in the kind of quantities that hemp oil would be
produced in?

Economies of scale are VERY important in an area such as that.
And as far as taxation goes, if people are stupid enough to permit
their congresscritters to pass high taxes on the product, they have no
one to blame but themselves if they have to pay the price at the
pumps.

At least with hemp oil, there would be enough producers (it
isn't that expensive to produce) that a monopoly couldn't form--which
would keep prices reasonable.

>Get an actual pilot plant running and see what the actual production costs are.
>Thye biodiesel folks have done so.

Glad to as soon as you get me the necessary permits from the
government to do so. I'd LOVE to own the first hemp oil production
facility in the USA--and the patents that went with that as well, of
course.

>>Since it can
>>be produced domestically, no transportation expenses (or oil spill
>>risks) exist with respect to its use,
>
>Wrong. It still must be transported domestically, and that's a major cost for
>any fuel.

Not compared to international shipments with the cost of
transportation AND tariffs or duties added to it.

>Production and distribution costs of any fuel cannot be dismissed so lightly.

Still cheaper than petroleum, the key point.

>The lack of toxicity is a major plus. But that's true of any biodiesel fuel.

True--although some have more potential for ecological damage
than others.

>What is "a reasonable rate" of taxation? US fuel taxes are used mostly for road
>construction and maintenance. Use of biofuel doesn't reduce road maintenance.

No, but it reduces AIR pollution, which effects a savings for
government and industry (as well as for the medical field). In
addition, while US taxes may be used mostly for road construction and
maintenance, that doesn't necessarily hold true for STATE taxes on
fuels--often those go to pet projects of the legislators.

>I think reducing/eliminating petrol imports should be a top priority for a
>number of reasons. Biofuels is one part of the solution to that problem. But
>I'm also realistic enough to know that it's not going to be quick, cheap or
>easy.

I can agree with the "quick" part--but cheap and easy are
relative. Hemp oil production would take time to get going, but once
established would be both cheap AND easy.

>The cars to use it are available today, and have been for decades. I know - I
>drove the same Rabbit Diesel for 17 years. Wonderful car. 43 mpg over its life,
>which was spent mostly in the worst possible driving conditions. On the highway
>the thing would do well over 50 mpg.

And it will run--unmodified--on vegetable fuel?

Since when?

>You're not seeing the real problem, Rick.
>
>In an earlier post you wrote that cars could be "converted" to use hemp fuel.
>That implies that the hemp fuel is a gasoline replacement.
>
>But in reality what we're talking about biodiesel, which means the "conversion"
>entails replacing the entire engine and much of the fuel system. And the result
>is a diesel car.
>
>The real problem is getting Americans to accept diesel cars. They've been
>around for decades but haven't made much of a dent in market share.
>
>If you're talking about some other type of hemp fuel, what is it? Alcohol?

Hemp oil can be converted to a form that will run in standard
internal combustion engines (with suitable modifications to the fuel
systems) as easily as it can be converted to a form that will run in
standard diesel cars with similar modifications. Ford Motors has just
such engine designs patented (and has demonstrated prototypes of hemp
run vehicles both in the past [the first was in 1936] and in recent
years).

>> Of all nations, we have the greatest ability to produce
>>industrial hemp--not only are our agricultural sciences at least as

>>advanced as those used anywhere on earth, but we have a tremendous
>>amount of arable land suitable to hemp production--
>
>This may or may not be true. What matters is how many gallons per acre can be
>produced, and at what cost.

And according to Farm Bureau studies, the answer to those
questions is one that makes development of hemp fuel economically
feasible.

>>and could thus
>>produce fuel at a reasonable price, encouraging the production of hemp
>>based vehicles (both Ford and GM have patents on engines designed to
>>use hemp fuel, btw, I don't know about Chrysler or the major foreign
>>manufacturers, but it's reasonable to assume they have the same--thus
>>production of autos designed for the fuel wouldn't be a major barrier
>>to its implementation).
>
>Technology companies patent everything they can. Most patents don't make a
>dime, but they look real good on the inventor's resume.

Perhaps--but the fact that they HAVE developed engines made to
run on this fuel indicates that it's not a difficult task to do so.

>As I have said before - the barrier is getting people to buy the cars.

Make them flashy--American car buyers are rather superficial
(can you say "SUV?").

>> Those answers should be available on the site I cited above.
>
>They are not. I looked carefully, and it's just not there. Please post the
>info, or a link, if you can find it. I couldn't.

I'll try to find some and post them by the weekend if
possible. Sorry, I thought the sites I listed would have included
them.

>As I've said many times, I'm a proponent of reducing and eliminating our
>dependence on imported oil. Biofuels is one part of the solution. But the idea
>that "hemp fuel" is a quick, cheap and easy answer is far from proven.

It never will be proven until trials are permitted, Jim. And
that requires the government to change its rulings on the production
of hemp agriculturally.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4819. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 23:31:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3E4E8EE81A6F4F56.D17785F1A95A8BF9.5A11414C5EDEF47F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27817

On 17 Dec 2001 15:34:48 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Not to mention "Car and Driver," "Motor Trend," and "Flying!" You
>also forgot to mention that he was going to stop by the golf course
>on his way home! Is it true that all the road signs in Michigan are
>also in Braille?

They only look that way--it comes from blind hunters with
shotguns.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4820. Re: RADIO LAW vs police procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 23:34:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.golw5at.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27818
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 15:34:44 -0600, Lenny Stover wrote:

>Like my Lieutenant used to say, "If you aint catching no beefs, you aint
>doin your job."

Mine used to say "Do not under any circumstances embarrass the
department by doing stupid things". Even if the complaint was
no-merit, you caught hell from him if he felt (as he usually did)
that you could have handled it so as to avoid the situation.

He wasn't called "Iron-A** Bailey" for nothing.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4821. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 23:34:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.golvwps.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27819
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 15:30:00 -0600, Lenny Stover wrote:

>> And it certainly is reason to arrest the person - unlike the case
>> where the CB radio in my vehicle MIGHT be capable of operating out
>> of band. Without evidence of such operation, there is no justification
>> for searching the vehicle or examining the radio.
>
>No cop is his right mind is going to attempt to make an arrest or even
>become concerned because your CB "slides" above 40 or below 1.

Unless the municipality has a "Finegold Bill" ordinance and the
officer is assigned to investigate complaints which bear on
out-of-band operation. And even then, arrest is not an option.
Citation into court is.

Random stops? No way.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4822. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-19 23:34:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.golxh8u.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27820

On 13 Dec 2001 00:15:05 -0800, Brian Kelly wrote:

>If anybody out there in RadioLand thinks that anything has
>changed one bit on 75m in the last half century I got a CLUE for YOU!

So right. The very first ham QSO that I heard in 1950 on a homebrew 1-tube (double triode) regen receiver was some always-remembered but never-identified local ham berating another on 20 meters AM with "Hey you lop-eared jackass, get off this band".

Times haven't changed.

>Collins etc. were a much better idea on a bang-for-the-buck basis if
>the ham has half a capitalist-oriented brain and places any dollar
>value whatsoever on his labor time as it relates to the realties of
>homebrewing his stupid radios.

I feel that same way about computers, but I still get a charge out of swapping out cards and peripherals and playing system janitor with exotic operating systems rather than meekly accepting those abortions that Pie-Faced Billy calls an OS.

>So how to generate that coin? The usual marketing/priorities/tradeoffs
>study. I came up with a scam which worked tits.

Oh, if I could have found a way to access those specific items at that age.....but I was a radio geek instead.

Mine was to find and replace burned-out tubes in neighborhood radios and TV sets and bring them back from the dead. My first windfall was invested in a K+E Log-Log-Duplex-Vector slide rule, which was my Guide and Savior through the next six years of HS and engineering school (still have it and still know how to work it). Then I turned my attention to ham gear. Many years later I turned my attention to girls. Shudda' been the other way around.

>Transmitters were the easy part. I trashpicked an RCA model 625 TV
>rcvr on the way home from school one day, good stiff 450vdc @ 400
>mils+, yahoo, just right for my $5 Radio Row 80m ARC-5 TX, plug 'n
>play radio.

Oh for the good old days......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4823. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 00:06:35 UTC
From: drp@drproctor.com
Message-ID: <5B3DA2BE76A08186.20E722E7F9437203.689B7DE4335D93C0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27812
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 15:27:06 -0600, "Lenny Stover"
<mppd5107@the-police.com> wrote:

>Actually, the USSC ruled that police can perform warrantless searches of
>vehicles. Permission to search is not a requisite for obtaining a driver's
>license. We don't need permission if we have a reasonable suspicion.

It has to be articulable and excludes areas where there is a
"reasonable expectation of privacy", where you need a warrant.. This
includes locked containers and (if memory serves) things like
backpacks, etc.
>
>Bzzzzt.......wrong. If it is withinn the driver's reach, I can ask him to
>open the locked case without a warrant.

You can ask any damn thing you want. But you cannot
search such areas without a warrant, except with the drivers
permission. And the "drivers reach" business is a specific
exception for the safety of the officer, so he can search for
weapons.

True, if he just happens to find contraband, he can
arest for that. BTW, occasionally, this legal fiction
matters--- e.g., in theory you can't search an unlocked container
(such as a band-aid box) if it is too small to hold a weapon.

snip..

>However, we must be able to demonstrate the reliablilty of the dog. If the
>dog continues to hit on vehicles that do not contain controlled substances,
>then the dog is useless when we get in court and a search is challenged.

The dogs are notorious for false positives. In fact,
there is a bit of a fuss on this right now in San Francisco, where
they are using sniffer dogs on BART. Although this is hard to
explain to the judge (who likely never heard of "conditioning" and
doesn't want to consider all this science stuff), the dog learns to
respond to cues from his handler as well as what he smells. Dogs
can't be cross-examined by a pesky defense attorney and are assumed to
have no hidden agendas.

Dr P

4824. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 00:26:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c213126_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27822

"Sean G Gilley" <uem@mycroft.cmhnet.org> wrote in message
news:ff37aa44.0112130724.25377b97@posting.google.com...
> Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message
news:<3C1291F1.911C56FC@sccoast.net>...
> > In fact, it is now a federal requirement for companies to
> > have their policies about sexual harassment clearly posted for all to
> > read. Where travel is likely, most companies had specific policies
> > about socializing, accommodations, and so forth. And most companies
> > gave their employees, especially the management staff, printed
> > guidelines or classroom instruction about dealing with the opposite
> > sex in the workplace - and all these she has read or seen warned
> > against private meetings behind closed doors and socializing (lunches,
> > etc) in or outside the workplace. In other words, her experiences in
> > this regard have been exactly the same as mine.
>
> I just pulled out my company's policy book. The entire section on
> Harassment is less than a page long. It explains what harassment is,
> and it explains what steps you can take if you feel you are being
> harassed.
>
> It *does* *not* warn against private meetings, socializing, or anything
> else.
>
> Sean.

Mine either. I don't think my company puts leashes on their employees and
tells them how to run business. :)

Kim W5TIT

4825. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 00:28:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c213199_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27821

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011213104337.18921.00000173@mb-mv.aol.com...
> In article <3c1840cc_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >> Salaries? Doing that out in the open really pisses off management.
> >> Once when I got downsized, I told everyone what salary I was
> >> paid. A little payback.... ;-)
> >>
> >
> >Hoo hoo hoo...I've done that...LOL
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Nobody expects you to do anything that demonstrates any
> personal integrity; therefore you don't need to make any such
> public confessions!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh, you're so cute when you're being envious, Larry!

Kim W5TIT

4826. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 00:35:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c213327$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27823

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:789EDEACB4F1FD66.4A0EF3DDCC800E3A.84FA97A5FF1B77CE@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 15 Nov 2001 05:57:20 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Are you this predictable in bed?
>
> Sure he is, Kim.
>
> He memorized a sex manual.
>
> In.
>
> Out.
>
> Repeat if necessary.
>

OHGAWD...I laughed my ass off, Rick! Good one.

Kim W5TIT (and in this case, I wonder if "in" would even be achieved)
ROFLMAO

4827. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 01:03:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011219200315.06877.00000542@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 27825

In article <9viv010171g@enews4.newsguy.com>, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
>news:3c1cf140_2@news7.fast.net...
>
>> From talking with IARU officials and people representing them
>> at the ITU, I disagree. I believe the IARU finally has woken up
>> to the realities we will face (spectrum pressures, etc.) in the
>> future and is acting accordingly.
>
>I would think that HF spectrum would be safe.

The threats to HF are in other areas. One is the increasingly unreasonable
restrictions on antennas. Another is the proliferation of various newfangled
"broadband" stuff like DSL. The providers of those services do NOT want to have
to meet strict RF emission requirements. They also don't want to have to deal
with lots of ham RF geting into their unshielded lines.

Perhaps the worst threat is invasion by freebanders.

SWBC still has lots of support in the developing world. Maybe WRC 2003 will
straighten out the 40 meter mess.

>In fact, in the past two
>decades, hams have gotten more HF spectrum in the 12, 17, and 30 meter
>bands.

WARC 79 gave us those bands. That was 22 years ago, beforfe most of today's
hams were licensed.

>VHF and up are what I'm concerned about. Commercial interests would
>love to get the paws on the 2 meter band.
>
Most of the rest of the world has only 144-146, and no 220 band at all. We're
in a Catch-22 situation on VHF-UHF, though, unless we get zillions of new hams
using those bands. Which ain't gonna happen anytime soon.

The Catch-22 situation is this: Most operation on amateur VHF/UHF is FM voice.
To use 2m as an example, we use 15 kHz channel spacing, which is derived from
1960s commercial methods.

Our spectrum competitors can point to 2 meters and say "if those hams would use
more spectrum-efficent modes, they wouldn't need 4 MHz". But if we convert to
more spectrum-efficent modes, much of 2 meters will be unused. End result is
loss of spectrum.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4828. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 01:03:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011219200316.06877.00000543@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 27826

In article <9vp4sf$ar5$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011218214439.24724.00000394@mb-mr.aol.com...

>> Fact is the FCC has been pushing for reduction/elimination of code testing
>for
>> a long time. Know when the first serious nocodetest ham license was
>proposed?
>> 1975. And it was an FCC idea. So many hams were against it that the FCC
>dropped
>> the idea, only to revive it about 1983 - and again the reaction in the
>amateur
>> community was negative. In 1990 it became clear that the FCC wasn't going
>to
>> take "no" for an answer, and we got the dropping of the code test for a
>Tech
>> license in early 1991.
>
>And it was pretty clear the same applied to all code testing EXCEPT for
>5 wpm in the R&O issued for restructuring by the FCC.

Exactly. The point is that the FCC has wanted to reduce/eliminate code testing
for a long time. I think that a BIG part of the reason is to attract cbers and
freebanders away from those activities and towards licensed operation.
>
>> >>>That will go away at WRC-03 ... the ARRL an IARU are now supporting
>> >>>the "suppression" (elimination) of S25.5. Once the requirement in the
>> >>>ITU Radio Regulations goes away, there will be no (valid) regulatory
>> >>>reason for the FCC to keep ANY Morse testing. It's shaping up that
>> >>>way in most of the world, too.
>> >>
>> >>Gee, I hope not.
>>
>> That's basically the way it is. Many of the countries with sizable amateur
>> radio populations are going to 5 wpm for all privileges, or have already
>gone
>> that way. The UK is going even farther, with its "Foundation" license.
>This
>> trend has been going on for a long time - it's not something new.
>> >
>> >On what basis would the FCC have to retain even the 5wpm code
>> >test if/when the ITU requirement goes away?
>>

>> The fact that a majority of those who bother to comment think it's a good
>idea.
>> But the FCC has already made its position clear.
>
>Nope...

The FCC made its position clear long ago.

>the retention of regulations/requirements is not at all aa function
>of any majority. The FCC will, in the end, do what it (the FCC) deems
>to be appropriate having considered whatever the comments are.

Even thought the majority of those who bother to voice an opinion disagree.
>
>> > If you can't
>> >articulate a clear and compelling reason to retain code
>> >now except for the treaty requirement, then on what basis
>> >would you argue for its retention?
>>
>> Clear and compelling reasons for code test retention were presented to the
>FCC
>> in the comments associated with 98-143 (the recent restructuring). FCC
>decided
>> to ignore them.
>
>The FCC didn't ignore them...the FCC in issuing its ruling clearly found
>them to be anything but clear or compelling.

Same thing as ignoring them. The FCC's position was developed long before
98-143.
>
>> FCC isn't infallible or divinely inspired to do what's best for
>> ham radio. In the same restructuring, the number and size of the WRITTEN
>tests
>> was also reduced, despite widepread comments to the contrary.
>
>Your point?

Just what it says. The mere fact that the FCC does something doesn't mean it's
"right" or in the best interest of the ARS.

The FCC's actions on the code tests are held up by some as "proof" of the
rightness of the nocodetest cause, while the actions of the FCC towrds the
written test are conveniently ignored.

>> The important policy questions now are this: What should amateur radio
>> licensing be like if/when the code test disappears entirely? How should
>> existing licensees be "grandfathered"? How do we get from "here" to
>"there"?
>> Are there other changes that should happen at the same time?
>
>IF the FCC ended all code testing, what would need to be grandfathered at

>all?

Not much, unless other changes are made. Would all Techs get Novice/Tech Plus HF?
>
>> Some folks think that just two or even one class of license is all that's
>> needed. Others see no need for any change - just remove Element 1 and
>leave the
>> rest alone.
>
>I expect the latter to be the path the FCC will follow.

No doubt. But is that the best thing for the ARS?

>The restructuring
>in 2000 created no problems in simply doing that (i.e. just remove Element
>1)

I don't understand. The 2000 restructuring did not remove Element 1. FCC also refused a sunset clause.
>
>> There are lots of options, but the time to discuss them is now,
>> because if we don't come up with a workable, clear, detailed plan ahead of
>> time, we're going to get some kind of hodgepodge that is just the same old
>> stuff warmed over.
>
>Just eliminate Element 1. Pretty simple and already in place.

But is that what's best for the ARS?
>
>> K0HB has suggested just two license classes - an easy-to-get one for
>newcomers
>> and a full privilege license. I've suggested some very different ideas.
>W5YI
>> and N0MHS think we need to de-technicalize the entry level exams.
>
>You have my decision above.

Noted, Bill. What do others think?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4829. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 01:03:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011219200317.06877.00000544@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 27824

In article <3C20A80D.6518D54@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>WA8ULX wrote:
>> This will happen, the Code Bs was just the first shot to more Dumbing Down.
>> I figure in 3 to 5 Years there will not even be a Test.
>> Lets face it Ham Radio as we know it is dead, they might as well change
>the
>> Name to CB instead of Ham Radio, because thats where its headed, if its not
>> there already.
>
>The big difference between the CBS and the ARS is licenses and call-
>signs.

There's a lot more difference than those two things, Cecil.

I can remember when CB (other than 100 milliwatt walkie talkie CB and radio control CB) required both a license and callsigns. Was there no big difference between the ARS and the CRS back then?

>A person cannot do much communicating on the ham bands without
>a callsign

Tell it to the illegal invaders on 10, 12 and 2 meters.

>and he stands to be identified, fined, or maybe lose his
>license if he misbehaves.

If he has a license to begin with.

>Illegal operators don't care if they have a license or not.

Some of them do, some of them don't.

>Why don't you see hordes of illegal SSB operators
>in the middle of the SSB portion of the ham bands?

Because most people listen to amateur SSB rather than look at it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4830. Re: Jam the bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 01:19:29 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <B0bU7.232743$3d2.11125812@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27827
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Actually, with the new rigs, one should be able to eliminate the CW interference. Two QSOs could occupy the same place (assuming, of course, a really good notch filter - with DSP, quite possible). I have never deliberately interfered with any stations. That one time, W2OY was strong both at my QTH in Pittsford, NY, and at the other guy's QTH. There is no way he did not know we were there. You'd have to ask some old timers who were active back in the 60s and before about Mike, W2OY. He was quite a work of art. My understanding is, however, that he was just 'breaking stones' and he was really a decent guy in person. He used to call CQ with something like 'CQ CQ, no lids, kids, space cadets or school bus riders. No wet-bottom boys. Only class A operators on this frequency, from W2OY'. He was something. Jamming on FM repeaters is something else. Obviously, only the strongest signal gets repeated. There is no way for 2 signals to occupy the same place at the same time. Forget that one. Fortunately, I've never heard that (at least on the 440 repeaters in our area - some of which are linked to 2 meters).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Keith Hosman Red Cross Disaster Services" <webdoc@mailandnews.com> wrote in message news:de9751ca.0112161210.3624edc4@posting.google.com...
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:<SYZQ7.150916$WW.9789945@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > Heck, do what I did 35 years ago when W2OY tried to jam me. Be nice.
> > Reduce your bandwidth. Any idea as to what 40 WPM of CW will do to an AM
> > (or SSB) signal? I had a nice 30 minute chat after Mike sat on the
> > frequency. I can assure you, his blood pressure likely doubled. I still
> > had a solid QSO for half an hour and didn't even hear him. Nice thing about
> > CW - it's legal anywhere within the amateur bands.
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
>
> While I am in NYC with the American Red Cross, I am planning to take
> the test to get my ticket, and a friend gave me an early X-mas gift of
> a nice little 2 meter HT. So I have been listening to the chatter on
> the NYC area repeaters and heard some beligerant fool jamming the one
> repeater for a few days. Some people just need to grow up I guess, if
> someone does something to offend me, my radio and computer both have a
> nice little feature called the on/off switch. No need to jam, all that

> does is compound the situation.
>
>
> Keith Hosman

4831. Re: "...one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 01:28:17 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <R8bU7.232758$3d2.11126349@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27828

Yes, Hans, you'd loose your best engineers. Look at the bright side: for every good engineer that left, you'd have at least half a dozen under-performers from other companies knocking your door down for mid-level pay! :-)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

ps - pay for performance. What a novel idea these days!

"K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message news:OtqVjwphBHA.1752@cpimsnntpa02...
> KE8HH says:
>
> > The ONLY reason for taking that position is because they are paying some
> people
> > more to do a given job than they are paying others for the same work.
If
> their pay
> > scale was based on equal pay for equal work they wouldn't CARE if people
> told
> > others what they earned.
>
> Hogwash! People get paid what they get paid because of their value to
their
> employer. Using my engineering group for an example, our company has 4
> "grades" of RF engineers. Engineer I, Engineer II, Senior Engineer, and
> Principal
> Engineer. Each of those "grades" has a salary range "midpoint", and
> guidelines
> allow me to pay each person between 80% and 140% of their grade
"midpoint".
>
> As an example, the "midpoint" for a Senior Engineer is currently $71,485.
> That
> means I can pay an incumbent between $57,476 and $100,079. They all know
> the possible range of salary, and they also know that top performers will
be
> paid
> above midpoint, adequate performers will be paid near midpoint, and low
> performers .... well, you get the idea. In other words, they control
their
> own
> salary potential. What a novel idea, huh?
>

> While all Senior Engineer incumbents do roughly the same sort of work,
> some are more skilled at that work than others, some are more experienced,
> some have auxiliary skills or talents, some are better visionaries, some
> were
> hired because they had certain technology backgrounds that were needed in
> my group (and I needed to pay a certain salary to attract them away from
> their
> former position), some are assigned more technologically demanding tasks,
> some are pursuing more risky development lines, etc., etc., etc. And
yes,
> some are paid less because they have not yet demonstrated a higher value
to
> our group.
>
> If I "averaged it out" and paid them all the same salary, then my
> competitors
> would benefit from my turnover as my most valuable Engineers departed for
> situations where their skills were properly compensated. I'd be stuck
with
> the "performs adequately" remainder.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

4832. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 02:14:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011219211404.01104.00000802@mb-cu.aol.com>
Source record: 27829

In article <3c1ff26d_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>*Especially* if it could be done by stinking up the air less than our
>current public transportation buses. :o
>

Kim:

Each public transit bus has the potential to take hundreds of private
automobiles off the road every day. The savings in pollution are
enormous. My company offers free bus rides during days when the
low-level ozone is high -- typical during the hottest days of the Summer.
Public transportation is an important factor in maintaining clean air,
reducing traffic congestion, and providing efficient movement of
daily commuters to and from work, shopping, and routine errands.
Perhaps you should encourage more people to use your local
public transit system, rather than complaining about the relatively
small amount of pollution coming from a single vehicle which is
replacing many others!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Paratransit Specialist,
Delaware Transit Corporation (DART)
www.dartfirststate.com
Member, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 842

4833. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 02:29:53 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <B2cU7.232885$3d2.11132889@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27830

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011219211404.01104.00000802@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3c1ff26d_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >*Especially* if it could be done by stinking up the air less than our
> >current public transportation buses. :o
> >
>
> Kim:
>
> Each public transit bus has the potential to take hundreds of private
> automobiles off the road every day. The savings in pollution are
> enormous. My company offers free bus rides during days when the
> low-level ozone is high -- typical during the hottest days of the
Summer.
> Public transportation is an important factor in maintaining clean air,
> reducing traffic congestion, and providing efficient movement of
> daily commuters to and from work, shopping, and routine errands.
> Perhaps you should encourage more people to use your local
> public transit system, rather than complaining about the relatively
> small amount of pollution coming from a single vehicle which is
> replacing many others!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Paratransit Specialist,
> Delaware Transit Corporation (DART)
> www.dartfirststate.com
> Member, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 842
>

You also did not mention that when current rules already in place come to
pass, including making diesel fuel look like Amoco Clear, computer control
of engines, etc. Dr. Diesel's wonderous invention will be cleaner than
your car.

Of course it will reduce the number of engine makers to perhaps two: Ford
is out of diesels choosing to work with International. Cummins is kaput.
Leaves Cat and GM of which I know zip.

Kim, be glad you live where it is warm; a fuel-efficient diesel will not
maintain 170 degrees at idle on a 20 degree day in the Marvelous
Midcontinent. Adds a whole new meaning to freezing your butt off.

Dick, N&#65533;BK part-time diesel driver.

4834. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 02:35:09 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <e2FaJ8PiBHA.1648@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27831

KE8HH got it wrong again, and said:

> Actually, since "LT" is taken universally as the abbreviation
> for "light" (as in reduced in features or capabilities),

No, it isn't "taken universally" that way at all. For example,
many makers of finer automobiles over the years have
applied "LT" as the marqu&#65533; of their "Luxury Touring" editions.

My "LT" model has many features not found on the next lower
models, such as heated leather seating, enhanced
entertainment system, built-in telecommunications and
GPS facilities, "3-zone" climate comfort, improved
sound-proofing, deep tinted glass, electronic traction
control, electronic ride control, heated outside mirrors,
theft deterrent system, automatic day/night rear view
mirror, tire pressure monitoring, and many other features.

So rather than "reduced in features and capabilities"
as you erroneously claim, "LT" often stands for "greatly
enhanced features and capabilities".

In other words, you're just flat-out wrong (again).

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4835. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 03:22:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vrljs$b1q$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C20B762.826744E0@gte.net...
>
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 19:18:23 -0500, Frank Ney wrote:
> >
> > >Yeah, well someone needs to explain it to the NY State Police.
> >
> > But in all honesty, one of the country's experts in combating
> > cellular phone fraud is Dan Delaney, a detective lieutenant in the
> > NY State Police in Long Island. We've done several seminars
> > together in years past.
> >
> > >A few years back they were interpreting their scanner laws in such a
way as
> > >to be able to arrest your non-ham wife if she happened to be driving
the
> > >car with all your mobile gear installed, and BTW impounding the car.
Even
> > >if all your gear was straight ham stuff and no scanner involved.
> >
> > That's a prima facie case of ignorance.
> >
> > >Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm to
the
> > >point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
> > >47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides to
> > >demonstrate diminished capacity.
> >
> > Remember what I was ranting and raving about when the legislation
> > (Finegold Bill) was making its way through The Congress?
> >
> > If the "scanner law" (as well as the "radio interception" law) is
> > properly drafted, it would be specific that it covered equipment
> > being used in the commission of a crime or in furtherance of some
> > illegal purpose, as California's law states.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> Remember the same thing happens to
> folks with guns in cars. Even if they are

> legal.

There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies rather than ever offering one justification of probable cause to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4836. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 03:23:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2159C5.8E6C57BA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27833

N2EY wrote:
> I can remember when CB (other than 100 milliwatt walkie talkie CB and radio
> control CB) required both a license and callsigns. Was there no big difference
> between the ARS and the CRS back then?

Nope, both services were relatively well behaved back then.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4837. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 03:26:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vrlv6$91a$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27834
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C20A440.5912A12C@gte.net...
> >
> > > > >The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
> > > > >Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
> > > > >out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
> > > > >of young, inexperienced officers out there.
> > > >
> > > > >No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
> > > > >court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city
attorney
> > > > >can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.
> > > >
> > > > Cops don't tend to care much about the "feel good" laws
> > > > that some towns enanct. Why should they when the
> > > > cut and dried basic criminal laws and traffic enforcement
> > > > easily take their time. As another poster noted here,
> > > > the CB type law that Tacoma passed won't be enforced
> > > > except by action initiated by a resident's complaint. The
> > > > same is true for most nuisance laws. If none of the
> > > > neighbors care that Mr. Smith's dog barks for hours, then
> > > > the cops sure aren't going to.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
> > > > >officers. They are very professional.
> > > >
> > > > If they are professional, then they won't take
> > > > knee jerk actions just because they are inexperienced.
> > > > 5 years of service had better be more than enough experience
> > > > for any cop anywhere to have honed his skills and
> > > > knowledge.
> > > >
> > > > >But if they do not know
> > > > >what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts
settle
> > > > >it.
> > > >
> > > > You say that and it is absolute rubbish. Maybe it is
> > > > so in some backwoods towns in your area, but it sure
> > > > isn't the case in the northeast, nor in many other
> > > > areas I have either lived or traveled in. Police brass,
> > > > municipal attornies, judges and elected officials do NOT
> > > > take lightly to heavy handed police actions that end up in

> > > > lost court cases and or in civil suits for false arrest.

> > > Look at the lady arrested for having the fake
> > > grenade:
> >
> > I can easily see where a fake grenade can get anyone in trouble.
> > That is a far cry from a radio that is not at all illegal in any shape
> > or form.
>
> You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
> who feel that the public does not have a right to own
> such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
> CB, scanners as well as things like guns.

That is hogwash. I haven't seen any such "growing
numbers" opposed to CBs, radios, etc. Indeed, there
has been NO movement to ban scanners at all...rather
some states (e.g. NJ) have relaxed old laws which
did ban scanners in autos.

> There is the feeling that the public can not be trusted,
> that too many use technology for crime or to try to
> overthrow the government. Many would prefer that only
> those who are paid on a professional basis should be allowed
> to have access to radios or weapons.

More hogwash. Even if there is some such sentiment,
there hasn't been any support for that attitude in the press,
the legislatures, etc.

Bill K2UNK

4838. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 03:47:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011219224752.07928.00001230@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27837

In article <420B958A0269BB4F.5E77D600C740311B.FF462350DC33B9C0@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>I don't have any idea what you're talking about. My call sign doesn't
>>spell a damn thing. Kim's does.
>
> Actually, since "LT" is taken universally as the abbreviation
>for "light" (as in reduced in features or capabilities), just as "TIT"
>is taken as slang for a breast, your call sign has just as much
>"meaning" as does Kim's.

(The rest of Rick's sexually-obsessive tirade deleted for the purpose
of reducing the stink in the room)

My callsign wasn't chosen in order to spell out anything. The letters
"LT" are abbreviations for things like "left," "Lieutenant," or, as
you say, "light," but they wern't intended to mean any of those things,
or anything else you can dream of. No mature, sexually-fulfilled
woman I've ever known would dream of demeaning herself with such
a juvenile, immature, and horrendously gauche Vanity call sign. Kim
obviously has serious negative self-image issues, and feels the need
to call attention to the only part of her anatomy which she does think
is "adequate." As I have stated repeatedly, I have no fixation on
her whatsoever, and, in fact, I am starting to pity her!

>> Whatever stupid phoenitics you make
>>of it doesn't give my call sign any meaning other than a legal station
>>identification. Get Mr. Hollingsworth to agree with you, and I'll certainly
>>take his comments under advisement, as I've already told Kim.
>
> Kim took them under advisement, too, Larry. She simply
>rejected their premise after having evaluated them. That's what taking
>something under advisement means--not blindly following the opinion of
>others.
>
> Unlike yourself, she doesn't view Riley as being morally or
>intellectually superior to her. Sorry that your "light weight" status
>has obligated you to view him in that manner personally.

The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually" superior to
Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have solicited
his opinion in the first place. The fact that Kim doesn't recognize this fact
is merely a typical state of denial common to many people who know all
too well that they are, always have been, and always will be relegated
to the lowest common denominator of social acceptance, due to their

indecorous behavior. This is common of poorly-educated people from the southern part of the country. What I'd like to know is…what's YOUR excuse?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4839. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 03:47:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011219224753.07928.00001232@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27835

In article <3F7F89779D2A0F35.D28D63EB28211DB6.EAA03272D9273766@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> Because soap can't clean your mind, Larry, and that's where
>the "dirt" is, not in her sign.
>
> Rick (Kindly Eustice Ate Horrible Humans)

Hmmm -- two sets of phonetics in a row dealing with cannabalism --
and you say *I* have a dirty mind! Pot --> Kettle --> Black!

(Now Rick will complain about me making a racist comment!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

4840. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 03:47:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011219224753.07928.00001231@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27839

In article <EC6AE56176C35C29.DEE6722370582690.849DC8965EF65E70@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
>>inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.
>>I don't recall ever calling it "obscene."
>
> And many of us don't recall ever seeing the ARS legally
>defined as "family-oriented." That's the FRS (Family Radio Service),
>Larry, you're getting confused as usual.
>
> Now go get yourself an FRS handheld and talk to people you can
>relate to--the neighborhood kids (if they can stand you in their
>'hood, of course).
>
> Rick (King Edward Ate Horatio Hornblower)

Rick:

I have two FRS radio's --- Icom 4008's. Neat little rigs. Me and a friend of mine use them for personal comms at local hamfests, and I use them when vacationing with my family in the Adirondacks. I've never used them for communicating with anyone I didn't know -- just my friends and family. So, you're right about FRS being "family-oriented," but you're incorrect about the ARS NOT being "family-oriented." Is the "family-oriented" nature of the ARS that was one of the prime arguments for reducing and/or eliminating the code testing requirements, and largely responsible for the "No-Code test" Technician-class license -- the theory being that eliminating the 5 WPM code test would allow families to use 2-meters to coordinate their activities more effectively than they could on CB. The "family" nature of the ARS has been wielded like a sledgehammer all throughout the debate leading to our present-day dumbed-down licensing requirements. FRS just got there a bit sooner. Once the 5-WPM code testing requirement is eliminated, there will be very little difference in public perception between the ARS and the FRS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4841. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 03:47:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011219224754.07928.00001233@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27836

In article <07FCEDD2A7002958.53A48EBF5EC318A6.4A0979901B50C1D6@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>Riley cannot change the FCC's policy directly. His statements in his email
>were
>>his personal opinion as a ham.
>
> And THAT is precisely the point!
>
> It IS his "personal opinion," not a view that either carries
>any more weight than that of any other ham, or one that has any more
>probability of being correct than that of Cecil, Dwight, or myself
>(ANYONE has more probability of being correct than Rolly-Polly Larry).
>
> Rick

Rick:

Mr. Hollingsworth is probably the one ham in the United States who
is most qualified to render an opinion, such as he did, on the matter of
Kim's ill-conceived Vanity call sign. The fact that Mr. Hollingsworth is the
FCC attorney in charge of enforcement of the rules and regulations also
gives him unique insight into those actions hams take which can can
be harmful to the overall public image of the ARS. You don't find his
opinion to be in keeping with your own liberal (or libertarian, if you prefer
--
but they're the same to me) viewpoints, and his position *does* grant
him a high degree of credibility -- which you find inconvenient. All you
have going for you is your liberal elitist self-importance. You are in no
position to judge the "weight" of Mr. Hollingsworth's opinion. There is
more to life than having everything "our way" each and every time -- and
K4ZDH stated that very clearly to Kim. I know you don't understand
this concept, but there are a lot of us out here who do.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4842. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 03:47:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011219224757.07928.00001234@mb-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 27838

In article <6C47C2D7430A04AA.E3DA7DAA1C33A160.1D56B0B180689DE4@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 15 Nov 2001 04:19:48 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>wrote:
>
>>Your callsign doesn't merely "seem" to be objectionable -- it is *patently*
>>objectionable!
>
> No, Larry. It is "patently objectionable" to YOU--not to
>everyone.
>
> Don't confuse your own fixations with fact.

Rick:

Wow -- you're only now replying to a posting that is a month-and-a-half
old? Oh, well…

No, it is not my fixation, not by any means. I guarantee you that I spend
almost none of my busy day thinking of Kim and her "Tugboat Annie"
style callsign.

>>I'm sure that kind of thing happens, but since I know how to use CW and a
>>handful of digital modes, I generally don't run into that type of on-the-air
>>behavior.
>
> How do you treat newbies to CW, Larry? Do you drop down to
>their speed so they can gain on-the-air experience at 5WPM or so

Absolutely -- and as recently as last weekend's 10-Meter contest. In fact,
I spent most of my time working the Novice/Technician segment of the
10-Meter band during the contest, and many nice QSO's, and, as a
result, my own QSO rate was very low. No matter, I enjoyed myself, and
hopefully, helped some "newbies" have an enjoyable experience on CW.

>--or
>do you (as Dick has stated that he does in the past) simply ignore
>them until they can send at a decent speed and communicate
>efficiently?

I don't recall ever seeing Dick say that he did that, so you'll forgive me
if I don't take your word for it. And no, I don't "ignore" any fellow CW
operators.

>As a cw fanatic, do you voluntarily participate in voice
>conversations in the tech & general bands and try to encourage new

>hams both to explore cw and to enjoy ham radio--or do you live in your
>lofty (and out-of-date) cw world where only those you feel "worthy"
>(translation: capable of high speed cw) are acceptable to communicate
>with?

I don't use any voice modes on HF from my station, due to my "low-profile"
operating conditions. I live in an apartment building, on the top floor,
with no adequate ground, and using indoor dipoles and a delta loop on my
balcony. I operate strictly low-power, CW and digital modes (mainly RTTY
and PSK), no phone due to problems with it getting into the building's
cable system. I have a better setup at my vacation property in the
Adirondacks, and occasionally use HF phone from there.

> Do you refrain from racist, sexist, or otherwise prejudiced
>statements here in an amateur radio oriented news group so that
>non-hams (or new hams) won't form bad impressions of the ARS--or do
>you limit your morality to those areas you PERSONALLY are "offended"
>by?

Invalid question. This is a Usenet newsgroup -- NOT amateur radio. My
behavior here and on-the-air are two separate and distinct things; here I
have more freedom to not suffer fools gladly; on-the-air I must. In this
newsgroup, I am not speaking for the Amateur Radio Service; I am
strictly offering my own opinions on whichever subjects present themselves.
On the air, I am bound, to a certain extent, by the FCC rules and a
higher level of operational decorum. Here, the gloves come off -- and
I *will* call a spade a spade (take that anyway you want -- you are
committed to thinking the worst of me anyway, because I don't march in
lockstep with your own Politically Correct groupthink).

> In short, before you complain about someone else's behavior,
>Larry, clean up your OWN act!

Unlike yourself and a certain few others on this newsgroup, Rick, I am
not *acting.* I am being myself. And I'm doing so just as "cleanly" as
anyone else. Your only problem is that I don't agree with you -- and like
all good liberals, you can tolerate anything -- except a difference of
opinion!

>>I think that before you do that, you'd better take a close look at who
>>decided to choose a sexually provocative callsign which is demeaning to
>>hams in general, and female hams in particular!
>
> It's only demeaning to women in the minds of men who view them
>as sex objects, Larry. To me, and to most people who have posted in
>this thread, neither Kim's call sign nor the idea of women's breasts
>are at all offensive. Perhaps "K0CK" would be more pleasing to your
>tastes.

I wouldn't know about that, Rick, because I am a normal, red-blooded,
heterosexual American male. You, on the other hand, must be prone to
thinking along those lines, otherwise, you would not have suggested it.

And Kim's callsign *is* demeaning to herself, female hams, and all women in general. The fact that you don't agree doesn't mean it isn't so. Last time I looked, the world didn't revolve around Rick Adams.

>>Again, you are not the one to be making such statements. In case you
>haven't
>>noticed, *you* are the Captain of a burning, sinking ship.
>
> Gee--that sounds like a pretty good description of you and
>Dick Carroll when it comes to code testing to me.

A classic attempt at a "turn back" right out of the W5TIT Handbook of quick-and-easy newsgroup posting! And, like everything that comes from Kim, just about as convincing!

>> If I were you, I'd
>>be looking for a life raft! I'm sure you can find one at the ULS web site!
>
> Yeah, by now she probably needs one--thanks to your posts it
>IS getting pretty deep in here.
>
> Rick (Kuwaiti Emirs Ate Hasidic Heroines)

Are those the phonetics you really want to be associated with your call sign? Sounds pretty horrible to me...

73 de Larry, K3LT

4843. K1MANs Reply to Wile E. Hollywood, Selective Enforcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 03:50:39 UTC
From: Rafman&#65533; <rafman2u@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <jedU7.2945$Cw3.337247@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27840

Found on: http://members.aol.com/jcunham/

From: Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., K1MAN

14 December 2001 2:47 P.M.

W. Riley Hollingsworth, Esq.
Special Counsel, Enforcement Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Gettysburg, Pa. 17325-7245

Mr. Hollingsworth:

This is in reference to your "warning letter" to me dated 11 December 2001. I was accurately advised about your letter to me and its exact contents by both Keith Lamonica, W7DXX, and Dick Leavitt, W2CSQ, on 11 December 2001. This is an ethical violation of FCC ex parte rules of procedure and supports my public allegations that you are a sleazy and cheap politician as well as an unethical (alleged) attorney not fit for employment by the United States Government.

Your letter illegally threatens me with a "license revocation or renewal hearing" because I have (and fully intend to continue) filed sworn affidavits with the U.S. Attorney regarding alleged criminal violations of Sections 333 and 501 of the 1934 Communications Act.

My filing of these sworn affidavits are protected by the First Amendment to the United Stated Constitution protecting free speech as well as the Fourth Amendment regarding my absolute right to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Further, your letter, itself, and you openly encouraging radio amateurs to "talk over" my radio transmissions, is also a criminal violation of Section 501 as well as criminal obstruction of justice, and I am taking legal steps to assure that you are vigorously prosecuted and also removed from your employment at the FCC. I am also taking legally sanctioned steps to assure that you are disbarred as a licensed attorney (if, in fact, you are licensed to practice law in any state.

For your information, K1MAN is fully licensed to transmit information bulletins per a published schedule, and the K1MAN Bulletin Service is specifically recognized to be lawful in a letter from FCC Chief of Special Services, Robert H. Mc Namara, to Kenneth Black, G4WNE, dated 2 November 1989 (reference 7240-F). If you are really an attorney, and we question whether you are, you will understand the legal doctrine of res judicata that applies in this matter.

Finally, you have publicly lied to radio amateurs that you had something to do with putting my station, K1MAN, off the air in 1999 which, of course, is totally false. You have total immunity for this sort of defamation and libel, as you well know, and you take full public relations advantage of this government immunity. You are, however, a public disgrace to the Amateur Radio Service, to the Commission, to the legal profession, and to the United States of America.

We look forward to seeing you in court.

(signed)

Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., K1MAN
Registered Professional Engineer

cc: FCC Chairman Powell
U.S. Attorney, Bangor, Maine
Senator Susan Collins
Senator Olympia Snow
American Bar Association
W5YI
WA6ITF
ARRL
W2CSQ
W7DXX
Distribution

4844. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:16:42 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <KCdU7.3207$Rw4.727674@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 27841
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

```
: > > >Yeah, well someone needs to explain it to the NY State Police.
: > >
: > > But in all honesty, one of the country's experts in combating
: > > cellular phone fraud is Dan Delaney, a detective lieutenant in the
: > > NY State Police in Long Island. We've done several seminars
: > > together in years past.
: > >
: > > >A few years back they were interpreting their scanner laws in such a
: way as to be able to arrest your non-ham wife if she happened to be
driving
: the car with all your mobile gear installed, and BTW impounding the car.
: Even if all your gear was straight ham stuff and no scanner involved.
: > >
: > > That's a prima facie case of ignorance.
: > >
: > > >Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm to
: the point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
: > > >47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides to
: > > >demonstrate diminished capacity.
: > >
: > > Remember what I was ranting and raving about when the legislation
: > > (Finegold Bill) was making its way through The Congress?
: > >
: > > If the "scanner law" (as well as the "radio interception" law) is
: > > properly drafted, it would be specific that it covered equipment
: > > being used in the commission of a crime or in furtherance of some
: > > illegal purpose, as California's law states.
: > >
: > > --
: > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
: >
: > Remember the same thing happens to
: > folks with guns in cars. Even if they are
: > legal.
:
: There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm
: which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed
: to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of
: possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies
: rather than ever offering one justification of probable
: cause to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.
:
Actually it is a crime in my state not have
```

a radio license if you have a scanner in the car. While the cops may not be as hard nosed with a scanner as they are with guns, having either in your vehicle then having your son or wife drive the vehicle might will result in them being arrested in my state (if they do not have either a ham license - for the scanner, or a gun permit for the weapon).

4845. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:19:37 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2168eb$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27844

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011219211404.01104.00000802@mb-cu.aol.com...
> In article <3c1ff26d_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >
> >*Especially* if it could be done by stinking up the air less than our
> >current public transportation buses. :o
> >
>
> Kim:
>
> Each public transit bus has the potential to take hundreds of private
> automobiles off the road every day. The savings in pollution are
> enormous. My company offers free bus rides during days when the
> low-level ozone is high -- typical during the hottest days of the Summer.
> Public transportation is an important factor in maintaining clean air,
> reducing traffic congestion, and providing efficient movement of
> daily commuters to and from work, shopping, and routine errands.
> Perhaps you should encourage more people to use your local
> public transit system, rather than complaining about the relatively
> small amount of pollution coming from a single vehicle which is
> replacing many others!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Paratransit Specialist,
> Delaware Transit Corporation (DART)
> www.dartfirststate.com
> Member, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 842
>

I can't imagine that you (a professed person against liberals) have such a
mamby-pamby, liberal, environmentalist attitude, Larry!

To suggest our public transit system around here is to risk be a laughing
stock for several hours, if not a whole day. No, it's not quite that
bad--but people are not as accepting of public transportation around here as
they are in the north. Heck, I even tried the train for about 3 months, and
tried the bus for nearly a year. N'er again, n'er again. The next time I
have a butt wiped across my face from some person moving to the inside seat
on a bus will be...uh, never.

Kim W5TIT
Domestic Engineer
Hey, if a bus driver can be a Paratransit Specialist, then I can be a

Domestic Engineer!

4846. Re: RADIO LAW vs police procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:20:03 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <SFdU7.3212$Rw4.727088@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 27842
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

```
:
: >Like my Lieutenant used to say, "If you aint catching no beefs, you aint
: >doin your job."
:
: Mine used to say "Do not under any circumstances embarrass the
: department by doing stupid things". Even if the complaint was
: no-merit, you caught hell from him if he felt (as he usually did)
: that you could have handled it so as to avoid the situation.
:
: He wasn't called "Iron-A** Bailey" for nothing.

Phil, you are now an attorney, where formerly
a federal agent. Lenny is a street cop. He does
not have the level of support that you had.

Hell, in Chicago the locals in some neighborhoods
would beat up the fire fighters and EMTs when
they showed up. Then file complaints because
they were not properly served!

And the mayor, that great democrat, of Chicago
has yet to settle with the police so that they can
get a pay raise.
```

4847. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:21:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2168ed_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27843

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:B2cU7.232885$3d2.11132889@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011219211404.01104.00000802@mb-cu.aol.com...
> > In article <3c1ff26d_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >*Especially* if it could be done by stinking up the air less than our
> > > >current public transportation buses. :o
> > >
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > Each public transit bus has the potential to take hundreds of private
> > automobiles off the road every day. The savings in pollution are
> > enormous. My company offers free bus rides during days when the
> > low-level ozone is high -- typical during the hottest days of the
> Summer.
> > Public transportation is an important factor in maintaining clean air,
> > reducing traffic congestion, and providing efficient movement of
> > daily commuters to and from work, shopping, and routine errands.
> > Perhaps you should encourage more people to use your local
> > public transit system, rather than complaining about the relatively
> > small amount of pollution coming from a single vehicle which is
> > replacing many others!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > Paratransit Specialist,
> > Delaware Transit Corporation (DART)
> > www.dartfirststate.com
> > Member, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 842
> >
>
> You also did not mention that when current rules already in place come to
> pass, including making diesel fuel look like Amoco Clear, computer control
> of engines, etc. Dr. Diesel's wonderous invention will be cleaner than
> your car.
>
> Of course it will reduce the number of engine makers to perhaps two: Ford
> is out of diesels choosing to work with International. Cummins is kaput.
> Leaves Cat and GM of which I know zip.

>
> Kim, be glad you live where it is warm; a fuel-efficient diesel will not
> maintain 170 degrees at idle on a 20 degree day in the Marvelous
> Midcontinent. Adds a whole new meaning to freezing your butt off.
>
> Dick, N&#65533;BK part-time diesel driver.
>
>

Wow, Dick M. spoke to me!

Kim W5TIT

4848. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:24:48 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2168ee_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27845

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011219224752.07928.00001230@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article
<420B958A0269BB4F.5E77D600C740311B.FF462350DC33B9C0@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> >>I don't have any idea what you're talking about. My call sign doesn't
> >>spell a damn thing. Kim's does.
> >
> > Actually, since "LT" is taken universally as the abbreviation
> >for "light" (as in reduced in features or capabilities), just as "TIT"
> >is taken as slang for a breast, your call sign has just as much
> >"meaning" as does Kim's.
>
> (The rest of Rick's sexually-obsessive tirade deleted for the purpose
> of reducing the stink in the room)
>

Larry, this isn't one of the chat rooms you haunt on the internet.

>
> My callsign wasn't chosen in order to spell out anything. The letters
> "LT" are abbreviations for things like "left," "Lieutenant," or, as
> you say, "light," but they wern't intended to mean any of those things,
> or anything else you can dream of. No mature, sexually-fulfilled
> woman I've ever known would dream of demeaning herself with such
> a juvenile, immature, and horrendously gauche Vanity call sign. Kim
> obviously has serious negative self-image issues, and feels the need
> to call attention to the only part of her anatomy which she does think
> is "adequate." As I have stated repeatedly, I have no fixation on
> her whatsoever, and, in fact, I am starting to pity her!
>
> >> Whatever stupid phoenitics you make
> >>of it doesn't give my call sign any meaning other than a legal station
> >>identification. Get Mr. Hollingsworth to agree with you, and I'll
certainly
> >>take his comments under advisement, as I've already told Kim.
> >
> > Kim took them under advisement, too, Larry. She simply
> >rejected their premise after having evaluated them. That's what taking
> >something under advisement means--not blindly following the opinion of
> >others.
> >
> > Unlike yourself, she doesn't view Riley as being morally or

> >intellectually superior to her. Sorry that your "light weight" status
> >has obligated you to view him in that manner personally.
>
> The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually" superior
to
> Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have solicited
> his opinion in the first place. The fact that Kim doesn't recognize this
fact
> is merely a typical state of denial common to many people who know all
> too well that they are, always have been, and always will be relegated
> to the lowest common denominator of social acceptance, due to their
> indecorous behavior. This is common of poorly-educated people from
> the southern part of the country. What I'd like to know is.what's YOUR
> excuse?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Riley's no more moral or intellectual than you, Larry. Who is poorly educated from the southern part of the country, Larry? Watch it...don't show your ignorance...

Kim W5TIT

4849. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:26:06 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c21693a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27846

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011219224753.07928.00001231@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article
<EC6AE56176C35C29.DEE6722370582690.849DC8965EF65E70@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> >>I think Kim's callsign is vulgar, demeaning to women, and
> >>inappropriate considering the family-oriented nature of the ARS.
> >>I don't recall ever calling it "obscene."
> >
> > And many of us don't recall ever seeing the ARS legally
> >defined as "family-oriented." That's the FRS (Family Radio Service),
> >Larry, you're getting confused as usual.
> >
> > Now go get yourself an FRS handheld and talk to people you can
> >relate to--the neighborhood kids (if they can stand you in their
> >'hood, of course).
> >
> > Rick (King Edward Ate Horatio Hornblower)
>
> Rick:
>
> I have two FRS radio's --- Icom 4008's. Neat little rigs. Me and a
> friend of mine use them for personal comms at local hamfests, and
> I use them when vacationing with my family in the Adirondacks. I've
> never used them for communicating with anyone I didn't know -- just
> my friends and family. So, you're right about FRS being "family-
> oriented," but you're incorrect about the ARS NOT being "family-
> oriented." Is the "family-oriented" nature of the ARS that was one
> of the prime arguments for reducing and/or eliminating the code
> testing requirements, and largely responsible for the "No-Code test"
> Technician-class license -- the theory being that eliminating the
> 5 WPM code test would allow families to use 2-meters to coordinate
> their activities more effectively than they could on CB. The "family"
> nature of the ARS has been wielded like a sledgehammer all
> throughout the debate leading to our present-day dumbed-down
> licensing requirements. FRS just got there a bit sooner. Once
> the 5-WPM code testing requirement is eliminated, there will be
> very little difference in public perception between the ARS and
> the FRS.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And, Larry's gonna make *everyone* pay for the FCC's decision. *Everyone*

Kim W5TIT

4850. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:27:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c216978$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27847

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011219224753.07928.00001232@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article
<3F7F89779D2A0F35.D28D63EB28211DB6.EAA03272D9273766@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> > Because soap can't clean your mind, Larry, and that's where
> >the "dirt" is, not in her sign.
> >
> > Rick (Kindly Eustice Ate Horrible Humans)
>
> Hmmm -- two sets of phonetics in a row dealing with cannabalism --
> and you say *I* have a dirty mind! Pot --> Kettle --> Black!
>
> (Now Rick will complain about me making a racist comment!)
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

At least you recognize yourself as the kettle.

Kim W5TIT

4851. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:28:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2169c6_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27848

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011219224754.07928.00001233@mb-fi.aol.com...
> In article
<07FCEDD2A7002958.53A48EBF5EC318A6.4A0979901B50C1D6@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> >>Riley cannot change the FCC's policy directly. His statements in his
email
> >were
> >>his personal opinion as a ham.
> >
> > And THAT is precisely the point!
> >
> > It IS his "personal opinion," not a view that either carries
> >any more weight than that of any other ham, or one that has any more
> >probability of being correct than that of Cecil, Dwight, or myself
> >(ANYONE has more probability of being correct than Rolly-Polly Larry).
> >
> > Rick
>
> Rick:
>
> Mr. Hollingsworth is probably the one ham in the United States who
> is most qualified to render an opinion, such as he did, on the matter of
> Kim's ill-conceived Vanity call sign. The fact that Mr. Hollingsworth is
the
> FCC attorney in charge of enforcement of the rules and regulations also
> gives him unique insight into those actions hams take which can can
> be harmful to the overall public image of the ARS. You don't find his
> opinion to be in keeping with your own liberal (or libertarian, if you
prefer
> --
> but they're the same to me) viewpoints, and his position *does* grant
> him a high degree of credibility -- which you find inconvenient. All you
> have going for you is your liberal elitist self-importance. You are in no
> position to judge the "weight" of Mr. Hollingsworth's opinion. There is
> more to life than having everything "our way" each and every time -- and
> K4ZDH stated that very clearly to Kim. I know you don't understand
> this concept, but there are a lot of us out here who do.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Larry has to believe himself, Rick. No one else will... ;)

Kim W5TIT

4852. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:32:38 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c216ac6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27849

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011219224757.07928.00001234@mb-fi.aol.com...
>
> I don't use any voice modes on HF from my station, due to my "low-profile"
> operating conditions. I live in an apartment building, on the top floor,
> with no adequate ground, and using indoor dipoles and a delta loop on my
> balcony. I operate strictly low-power, CW and digital modes (mainly RTTY
> and PSK), no phone due to problems with it getting into the building's
> cable system. I have a better setup at my vacation property in the
> Adirondacks, and occasionally use HF phone from there.
>

WHAT?! Apartment?! Weren't you using the colloquialism "trailer park
trash" some time ago? Wow, and *you* live in an apartment? Man, Larry, you
portend far more intelligence than to pay good money for nothing you will
ever own...

Gosh...

Jeeze, Lar, at least in a trailer park you'd probably find some women
wishing to be overlorded by you--and you'd probably be able to set up a
decent radio station.

(*THAT*'s why Larry's so against lower CW requirements. He fears all CW
operators going away and he not having anyone to contact....)

Kim W5TIT

4853. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 04:59:10 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <u2q22u85asi99rl8i9qi6p0on6ehvjb84c@4ax.com>
Source record: 27850
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com (SD SpecialDelivery Jones)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

do you have the foggiest FREAKING idea what it means to snip?

Jim

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

4854. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 05:02:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220000258.06877.00000586@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 27701

Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583

Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209

As of December 14, 2001:

Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)
Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)
Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)
General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)
Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)
Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)
Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)

Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,860

Total General/Advanced/Extra: 323,006

73 de Jim, N2EY

4855. Re: Jam the bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 05:02:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220000259.06877.00000587@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 27702

In article <B0bU7.232743$3d2.11125812@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>You'd have to ask some old timers who
>were active back in the 60s and before about Mike, W2OY. He was quite a
>work of art. My understanding is, however, that he was just 'breaking
>stones' and he was really a decent guy in person. He used to call CQ with
>something like 'CQ CQ, no lids, kids, space cadets or school bus riders. No
>wet-bottom boys. Only class A operators on this frequency, from W2OY'. He
>was something.

He was ticked because of the Dec. 1952 FCC "privileges giveaway", when
Conditionals and Generals got full HF 'phone privileges. (Prior to that time,
one needed an Advanced or Extra to work 'phone on the ham bands between 3 and
25 MHz).

The classic W2OY call was "CQ 75 meter AM phone, no kids, no lids, no space
cadets, Class A operators only". Class A was the old name for Advanced, "kids"
referred to Novices and newcomers, "lids" referred to Generals and
Conditionals, and "space cadets" referred to SSB ops.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4856. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 05:21:05 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <4zeU7.3273$Rw4.780022@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 27704
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

: > > >Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm to
: the point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
: > > >47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides to
: > > >demonstrate diminished capacity.
: > >
: > > Remember what I was ranting and raving about when the legislation
: > > (Finegold Bill) was making its way through The Congress?
: > >
: > > If the "scanner law" (as well as the "radio interception" law) is
: > > properly drafted, it would be specific that it covered equipment
: > > being used in the commission of a crime or in furtherance of some
: > > illegal purpose, as California's law states.
: > >
: > > --
: > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
: >
: > Remember the same thing happens to
: > folks with guns in cars. Even if they are
: > legal.
:
: There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm
: which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed
: to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of
: possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies
: rather than ever offering one justification of probable
: cause to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.

Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.

His quote:
"Actually, the USSC ruled that police can perform warrantless searches of
vehicles. Permission to search is not a requisite for obtaining a driver's
license. We don't need permission if we have a reasonable suspicion."

4857. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 05:29:14 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vrsmlkkd1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 27703

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C21212C.ECBB69F8@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C20DFCF.870C403@IEEE.org...
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > > Because they are not worth the effort?
> > > >
> > > > What effort?
> > >
> > > The effort of getting out of a warm water bed and driving four hours
> > > round trip in a thunderstorm.
> >
> > Life's a bitch, and then you die. Christmas shopping requires more
effort.

> Exerting effort for something that is worth nothing to one makes one
> a masochist. Are you a masochist?

Asserting inuendo for no reason is something an boor would do. Are you an
boor? You're wrong about amatuer radio. It's a hobby. Do you think people
who build their own radios are masochists? I don't exert effort without a
reason, Cecil.

4858. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 05:45:39 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vsnql$7lj$4@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 27715
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

```
"Big Asshole" <Big_Al@anonynose.edu> wrote in message
news:9vqkd4$dv0$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> news:9vqitu$1gt$1@news.service.uci.edu...
> > KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vq6of$hoe$3@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C1FA9AD.9B3DD642@uci.edu...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Donnie wrote:
> > > > > > Poor confused Wittle Woger Wabbit! He is so afwaid
> > > > > > of the girls. Little Woger breaks out in tears when a real
> > > > > > live girl looks at him. Little Wogey then goes home to play
> > > > > > with his blow up doll.
> > > > >
> > > > > What are you, nine?
> > > >
> > > > You're being to optimistic, Jim. This anonymous coward has spent his
> > > > formative years being shuffled from foster home to foster home and
just
> > > > can't get out of those "special education" classes.
> > >
> > > Your posts are equally disgraceful.
> > >
>
> Roger's posts are not only disgraceful, they are
> sickening, the work of a very sick mind! HO HO that's why
> Roger has a NG in his very own name alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
> HO HO Gimme a call on the big rig when ya get home boy!
> HO HO

I heard your "posts" are being monitored by L.E. Laugh that off, LARDASS...
HO HO
```

4859. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 05:58:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C217DE8.22B61FFC@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27705

>
> A Ph.D. degree is to a BS degree as a tech license is to an extra license.
> Any holder of a BS degree who doesn't have a Ph.D. degree is a hypocrite
> for ragging on a tech+ who doesn't have an extra license.

An extra is equivalent to maybe a 5 credit class in an electrical
engineering curriculum.

4860. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 06:01:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C217EBF.1047814A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27706

krill wrote:

> In article <3c1fef5d_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse@fast.net says...
> >
> >
> > So FSK is not useful in amateur radio? Ever heard of RTTY? Packet?
>
> So you are claiming that the circuitry in my Yaesu and Icom radios are
> made using YOUR PATENTS?? You must be a wealthy man or at least your
> company is/was/maybe

4861. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 06:03:29 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <RafU7.173587$WW.10919654@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27707

N2EY wrote

> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired >
FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

> As of May 14, 2000:

> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792

> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209

Why do you lump them into two groups like that?

> As of December 14, 2001:
> Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)

less than 82% of previous

> Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)

more than 113% of previous

> Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)

less than 67% of previous

> General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)

more than 122% of previous

> Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)

less than 87% of previous

> Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)

more than 124% of previous

> Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)

more than 101% of previous ;-)

On the whole, this seems very normal and predictable.

The total ARS seems slow growth but it is growth..

I'm not sure what you're trying to say with the following...

> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,860
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 323,006

Rich

4862. Re: Morse not anymore needed to use HF-see further

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 06:08:56 UTC
From: googlyelmo@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <3C21805A.A8BFD3EF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27708
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,alt.ham-radio.morse,rec.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.policy

About 2 years ago, a jointly administered department of the NSA and Army hired about 10 civilians, recruiting from among commercial maritime radio officers and the likes, to do morse intercept work. An ad was posted on a number of Fed websites, the NY Times Sunday classified, and copied to several USENET and LISTSERV groups by a ham who came across the original, specifying a proficency of at least 15 WPM. So yes, morse code is still in use by many militaries and intelligence agencies around the world. It should come as no surprise, really. The rapid advances in communications and data processing in the US, Europe, and the more affluent parts of Asia notwithstanding, CW is still a very useful mode where 21st century hardware and technical skills are in short supply. Have you ever wondered why you still hear clandestine "numbers" stations on SW/HF? It would seem like an awfully old, slow way to communicate, but it *is* reliable, and when the data is concise in the extreme, speed and convenience is not nearly as important as accuracy and dependability.

de Will, KD7BFX AR

EZ wrote:

> I'm an active duty military member, been a "ditty bopper" for over 15 years.
> I can tell you, alot of countries are still out there using Morse code for
> tactical
> and strategic purposes. Long live Morse!
>
> Ezee
>
> "Jesus, EA4AQY" <jesus.guardon@navegalia.com> wrote in message
> news:3c1c769a@news.airtel.net...
> > And me too. But don't think about keyers are finished. We still should
> make
> > noise on tha bands...
> > "Web" <WebFx27@hotmail.com> escribiï¿½ en el mensaje
> > news:hCeS7.15523$161.7241951@news02.optonline.net...
> > > I aggree
> > >
> > > Web
> > >
> > >
> > > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> > > news:39IR7.109$YE4.19833@newshog.newsread.com...
> > > >
> > > > "b888" <b888@lcix.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:u1d5tq5dfp5jf2@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > Well said.

> > > > > People still use sailboats, steam engines, propeller aircraft,
> > > > > drive classic cars, and do a million other things that are not
> > > > > "state of the art" but there still useful and fun. I feal sorry for
> > > > > those who have never felt the thrill of that first solid cw copy.
> > > > > Or who have no Idea how to loadup a "hollow state" rig.
> > > > > The easy way out is the booring way out.
> > > > > WB3DSJ
> > > > >
> > > > > You are correct sir! Some may love CW and some may not. Some may
> love
> > > > the
> > > > > digital modes. Some may not. Some may love homebrewing. (and so on
> and
> > > so
> > > > > on) There are many facets of this hobby that are enjoyable to a
> variety
> > > of
> > > > > different people. All a license means is that you are allowed to do
> > > > > whatever is allowed by that license class.
> > > > >
> > > > > Those that chose to (forgive the word) *bitch* about the either the
> > > dropping
> > > > > of the code requirement to a lesser level, or the possibility of it
> > > dropping
> > > > > of it entirely, probably are not the same people who became
> proactively
> > > > > involved in the protest of those conditions. I am sure that at least
> > 80%
> > > of
> > > > > all licensed hams have not bothered to write all the "powers that be"
> > > (i.e.
> > > > > congressmen, senators etc) about ham radio, and in defense of ham
> > radio.
> > > > > We can sit and hope and pray that ARRL *may* work hard to defend us,
> but
> > > can
> > > > > you imagine if our elected officials, from the local level, all the
> way
> > up
> > > > > to the federal level recieved tons of letters in defense of amateur
> > radio?
> > > > > I personally write at least quarterly each year, (as well as fire
> > fighting
> > > > > related mails especially after 9-11-01) and strongly encourage others
> > to
> > > do
> > > > > so too.
> > > > >
> > > > > Another way to win support? Invite your elected officials to your club
> > > > > meetings, ARES/RACES meetings (or similar groups) and share with them

> > the
> > > > experience. This has a two-fold benefit. It allows the ham public to
> > > > actually meet the officials, and of course the officials to actually
> be
> > > able
> > > > to meet the ham public and hear their concerns, and to see what we are
> > > doing
> > > > .
> > > >
> > > > Amateur Radio is a pro-active hobby/service, not a sit back and watch
> > > hobby.
> > > > Get involved!
> > > >
> > > > [first paragrah directed at respondee to my earlier post, other
> > paragraphs
> > > > are to everyone else.]
> > > >
> > > > Ryan KC8PMX
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > KC8PMX wrote in message ...
> > > > > >People who want to use Morse code still will, and those who don't,
> > > won't.
> > > > > >Any changes in the laws short of a law outright banning morse code
> > > > > operation
> > > > > >won't stop those who wish to use the HF frequencies.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Ryan
> > > > > >KC8PMX
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >"Marruk" <mphaannospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > > > >news:4ytO7.18262$Qm6.2451580@zwoll1.home.nl...
> > > > > >> Mose not anymore needed to use HF.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> Hi OMs,
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> In Guatamala it is decided that a morse exam is not anymore
> needed
> > > to
> > > > > use
> > > > > >> the HF bands.
> > > > > >> I guess this is good for the sellers of HF equipment and it will
> > > get
> > > > > the
> > > > > >> band a lot more used for phone dx.
> > > > > >> But I dont think it will be very good for Morsecode as a whole.
> > > > > >> Hope to see you in 2003 on HF when it will be officially released
> > > in

> > > > the
> > > > > >> Netherlands.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> PE1PAE
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >>
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > >

4863. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 06:24:18 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C218412.945F8F3C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27709
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 13:14:21 GMT, VE2VFD Pat wrote:
>
> >Where does it even hint at operating the radio IN a plane? I would
> >assume no ham operator is actually stupid enough to even think about
> >doing that! Geeez.
>
> You'd be surprised at the number of hams in these groups who brag
> that they have done so "and nothing happened".
>

Nothing happened that they knew about. Maybe they interfered
with equipment the pilot didn't need to use at the time (like
during cruise at 30Kfeet). Or the pilot had a backup he
switched to. The pilot may have figured something broke
down and he'll have it fixed/swapped out at the next airport.

I've heard stories of a flight during the Superbowl where passengers
listening to the game on radios caused interference with pilot
equipment. And that is just LO leakage, not intentional emitters.

4864. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 06:47:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C218978.23B91356@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 27710

>
>
> WHAT?! Apartment?! Weren't you using the colloquialism "trailer park
> trash" some time ago? Wow, and *you* live in an apartment? Man, Larry, you
> portend far more intelligence than to pay good money for nothing you will
> ever own...

Some people choose apartments because they know that their career
will have them moving every few years. The electrical engineer field
is like that, especially when companies downsize when they get a tummy
ache. Other points: Upside, no lawn to mow, downside: no visible
antennas, upside: you get the landlord to fix the toilet, downside:
noisy neighbors.

Larry, if you're on the top floor, there may be an access hatch
in a closet you can open to get to an attic crawlspace. I've
used such for crude dipole HF antennas. Did a station
in Antarctica on such once.

4865. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 08:22:14 UTC
From: pproctor@neosoft.com
Message-ID: <336D1D3074E71BF6.7E14ED6979DC6C7D.F2352BD3BE528AB0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27723
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

In article <4zeU7.3273$Rw4.780022@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> writes:
>From: "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net>
>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2001 05:21:05 GMT

>Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
>officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
>by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.

>His quote:
>"Actually, the USSC ruled that police can perform warrantless searches of
>vehicles. Permission to search is not a requisite for obtaining a driver's
>license. We don't need permission if we have a reasonable suspicion."

Not that simple. Having stopped a car under "reasonable suspicion",
LEO's can search the area under control of the driver or a passenger for
weapons. The legal theory is that the safety of the officer allows for a
specific exemption to 4th amendment protections. If, incidental to this
search, they find contraband, this is admissible as evidence.

Admittedly, as a practical matter, this is all a legal fiction that
allows officers to search when and where. But it still means there are
some limitations. E.g., LEO's cannot search a locked container, which gives
an "expectation of privacy". Similarly, a local judge once threw out
contraband found in a metal Bandaid box after a defense attorney pointed out
that it was too small to have held any weapon and thus should not have been
opened.

Dr P

4866. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 10:02:37 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <9vscvt$8jf$5@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 27711
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
> officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
> by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.

Officers have been wrong before - which is why evidence from searches
is sometimes ruled inadmissable.

His statement is too broad to be true all the time.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

4867. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 10:10:32 UTC
From: pproctor@neosoft.com
Message-ID: <4FA4DA80D5E889BD.5FF67A064095F055.2C29C0D5742EDAE4@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27733
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

In article <3C21FE17.1C6ACC0D@gte.net> N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> writes:
>From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.
>Date: Thu, 20 Dec 2001 15:04:04 GMT

>> His statement is too broad to be true all the time.

>He is totally right. The officer has the
>right, confirmed by the courts, to inspect
>anything that is a car. Especially anything
>that is within reach of the driver.

This is not a blanket power. In theory, the exemption to the 4th
amendment is given only to search for only for weapons to protect the officer.
And then only the area under control of the driver or the passengers. There
are specific exemptions for locked containers and (if memory serves) things
like backpacks which give an "expectation of privacy". At least nominally,
the 4th amendment still is in effect.

>While this has been mostly used over issues
>like firearms and drugs, it can apply to cell
>phones and radios if these devices would
>constitute a hazard to safe driving.

Arguando, an LEO might be able to confiscate a cell phone that he
actually sees cause a traffic hazard. Otherwise, not.... In theory,
anything might cause a "hazard to safe driving".

>I do not think that you realize how much authority
>the courts have given the police over the last 10
>years.

Damn-fool War on Drugs again....

Dr P

4868. cq radio clubs - g3zhi club talk

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 10:27:14 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3c21bbd4.3521808@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 27712

if you would like me to give a talk to your radio club then please
email me
the talk is given over the air using the iphone program
the subjct will be iphone internet repeater linking

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi

73 ian

4869. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 11:27:21 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vshrk02u3r@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27713
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Jim Weir" <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:u2q22u85asi99rl8i9qi6p0on6ehvjb84c@4ax.com...

> do you have the foggiest FREAKING idea what it means to snip?

Circumcision?

4870. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 12:32:06 UTC
From: John Kimball <johnkimb@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <9vsllo$5sm$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27714
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 07:46:39 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in
Message id: <9vq6odhoe2@pita.alt.net>:

>No, but I hear you slurp nutsacks behind dumpsters and are too CHICKENSHIT
>to post under your real name, COWARD.

So is 8L0J08 your first name, or last name?

--
"Dr. Seuess is above your reading level."
^^^^^^
Roger Wiseman, Rhodes scholar, blows his cover
in Message-ID: <9u0smepoe0@dosa.alt.net>

4871. Re: K1MANs Reply to Wile E. Hollywood, Selective Enforcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 12:49:05 UTC
From: paul harris <paul@sandwitch.org>
Message-ID: <4A8A59F2BDCDD311BFC800508BA36AC80BB917A5@www.premiersi.com>
Source record: 27719

K1MAN sounds more paranoid and "whacko" everytime a new letter gets published. Those little touches like emphasizing "professional engineer" make it so funny to listen to - as if a PE title somehow adds more credibility to the tales of woe. Is this tale of sorrow an "engineered" effort to get Riley out of the FCC?

... Does anyone (except K1MAN) even care?

"Rafman" <rafman2u@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:jedU7.2945$Cw3.337247@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Found on: http://members.aol.com/jcunham/
>
> From: Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., K1MAN
>
> 14 December 2001 2:47 P.M.
>
> W. Riley Hollingsworth, Esq.
> Special Counsel, Enforcement Bureau
> Federal Communications Commission
> Gettysburg, Pa. 17325-7245
>
> Mr. Hollingsworth:
>
> This is in reference to your "warning letter" to me dated 11 December
> 2001. I was accurately advised about your letter to me and its exact
> contents by both Keith Lamonica, W7DXX, and Dick Leavitt, W2CSQ, on 11
> December 2001. This is an ethical violation of FCC ex parte rules of
> procedure and supports my public allegations that you are a sleazy and
> cheap politician as well as an unethical (alleged) attorney not fit
> for employment by the United States Government.
>
> Your letter illegally threatens me with a "license revocation or
> renewal hearing" because I have (and fully intend to continue) filed
> sworn affidavits with the U.S. Attorney regarding alleged criminal
> violations of Sections 333 and 501 of the 1934 Communications Act.
>
> My filing of these sworn affidavits are protected by the First
> Amendment to the United Stated Constitution protecting free speech as
> well as the Fourth Amendment regarding my absolute right to petition
> the government for a redress of grievances.
>
> Further, your letter, itself, and you openly encouraging radio
> amateurs to "talk over" my radio transmissions, is also a criminal
> violation of Section 501 as well as criminal obstruction of justice,

> and I am taking legal steps to assure that you are vigorously
> prosecuted and also removed from your employment at the FCC. I am
> also taking legally sanctioned steps to assure that you are disbarred
> as a licensed attorney (if, in fact, you are licensed to practice law
> in any state.
>
> For your information, K1MAN is fully licensed to transmit information
> bulletins per a published schedule, and the K1MAN Bulletin Service is
> specifically recognized to be lawful in a letter from FCC Chief of
> Special Services, Robert H. Mc Namara, to Kenneth Black, G4WNE, dated
> 2 November 1989 (reference 7240-F). If you are really an attorney,
> and we question whether you are, you will understand the legal
> doctrine of res judicata that applies in this matter.
>
> Finally, you have publicly lied to radio amateurs that you had
> something to do with putting my station, K1MAN, off the air in 1999
> which, of course, is totally false. You have total immunity for this
> sort of defamation and libel, as you well know, and you take full
> public relations advantage of this government immunity. You are,
> however, a public disgrace to the Amateur Radio Service, to the
> Commission, to the legal profession, and to the United States of
> America.
>
> We look forward to seeing you in court.
>
>
>
> (signed)
>
> Glenn A. Baxter, P.E., K1MAN
> Registered Professional Engineer
>
> cc: FCC Chairman Powell
> U.S. Attorney, Bangor, Maine
> Senator Susan Collins
> Senator Olympia Snow
> American Bar Association
> W5YI
> WA6ITF
> ARRL
> W2CSQ
> W7DXX
> Distribution
>
>

4872. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 13:25:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c21e790_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27716

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011220000258.06877.00000586@mb-mj.aol.com...
> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC
> ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
>
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
>
>
>
> As of December 14, 2001:
>
> Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)
> Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)
> Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)
> General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)
> Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)
> Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)
> Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)
>
> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,860
>
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 323,006
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Seems the upgrade bandwagon is still on. Also, even if we wanted to "just say" that all the Novices that caused a decrease of 8,992 had upgraded to Tech; that still means that there were still 19,268 "unexpired" Tech licenses. I wonder how many of those are new licenses, Jim. Is there a way to easily tell?

Kim W5TIT

4873. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 13:30:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c21e8e2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27717

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
news:4zeU7.3273$Rw4.780022@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
>
> : > > >Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm
to
> : the point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
> : > > >47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides to
> : > > >demonstrate diminished capacity.
> : > >
> : > > Remember what I was ranting and raving about when the legislation
> : > > (Finegold Bill) was making its way through The Congress?
> : > >
> : > > If the "scanner law" (as well as the "radio interception" law) is
> : > > properly drafted, it would be specific that it covered equipment
> : > > being used in the commission of a crime or in furtherance of some
> : > > illegal purpose, as California's law states.
> : > >
> : > > --
> : > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> : >
> : > Remember the same thing happens to
> : > folks with guns in cars. Even if they are
> : > legal.
> :
> : There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm
> : which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed
> : to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of
> : possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies
> : rather than ever offering one justification of probable
> : cause to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.
>
> Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
> officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
> by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.
>
> His quote:
> "Actually, the USSC ruled that police can perform warrantless searches of
> vehicles. Permission to search is not a requisite for obtaining a
driver's
> license. We don't need permission if we have a reasonable suspicion."
>
>

It is my understanding, though I've never researched this, that as of a few (read: unsure how many) years ago there is no more need for "reasonable cause" to search a home, vehicle, possession, etc., of *anyone* by a police officer. The Miranda Act is also either suspended or severely curtailed--no need for a police officer to read you your rights any more. Don't know what else, but that's a couple of things I've heard--I also don't know if this is specific to Texas or not.

Kim W5TIT

4874. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 13:33:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c21e983_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27718

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C217DE8.22B61FFC@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > A Ph.D. degree is to a BS degree as a tech license is to an extra
license.
> > Any holder of a BS degree who doesn't have a Ph.D. degree is a hypocrite
> > for ragging on a tech+ who doesn't have an extra license.
>
> An extra is equivalent to maybe a 5 credit class in an electrical
> engineering curriculum.
>

I heartell some employers regard an MCSE as equal to, I believe, and
Engineering *Degree* (as in, what? four years of college?)

Kim W5TIT

4875. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 13:37:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c21ea86$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27720

Robert:

Just so that you and others will know. I place absolutely no importance on where one lives. I don't care if you live in a ritzy neighborhood, or a cardboard box under a bridge. I've met very interesting people from all walks of life.

My post was a slam, directed specifically at Larry, for his use of the term "trailer park trash" and such.

Kim W5TIT

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3C218978.23B91356@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
>
> >
> >
> > WHAT?! Apartment?! Weren't you using the colloquialism "trailer park
> > trash" some time ago? Wow, and *you* live in an apartment? Man, Larry,
you
> > portend far more intelligence than to pay good money for nothing you
will
> > ever own...
>
> Some people choose apartments because they know that their career
> will have them moving every few years. The electrical engineer field
> is like that, especially when companies downsize when they get a tummy
> ache. Other points: Upside, no lawn to mow, downside: no visible
> antennas, upside: you get the landlord to fix the toilet, downside:
> noisy neighbors.
>
> Larry, if you're on the top floor, there may be an access hatch
> in a closet you can open to get to an attic crawlspace. I've
> used such for crude dipole HF antennas. Did a station
> in Antarctica on such once.
>

4876. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 13:54:47 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c21ee85_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27721

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c21e8e2_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
> news:4zeU7.3273$Rw4.780022@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
> >
> > : > > >Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm
> to
> > : the point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
> > : > > >47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides
to
> > : > > >demonstrate diminished capacity.
> > : > >
> > : > > Remember what I was ranting and raving about when the
legislation
> > : > > (Finegold Bill) was making its way through The Congress?
> > : > >
> > : > > If the "scanner law" (as well as the "radio interception" law)
is
> > : > > properly drafted, it would be specific that it covered
equipment
> > : > > being used in the commission of a crime or in furtherance of
some
> > : > > illegal purpose, as California's law states.
> > : > >
> > : > > --
> > : > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > : >
> > : > Remember the same thing happens to
> > : > folks with guns in cars. Even if they are
> > : > legal.
> > :
> > : There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm
> > : which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed
> > : to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of
> > : possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies
> > : rather than ever offering one justification of probable
> > : cause to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.
> >
> > Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
> > officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
> > by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.
> >
> > His quote:
> > "Actually, the USSC ruled that police can perform warrantless searches

of
> > vehicles. Permission to search is not a requisite for obtaining a
> driver's
> > license. We don't need permission if we have a reasonable suspicion."
> >
> >

CORRECTION:
Sorry, let me correct the statement below, and change "reasonable cause" to search warrant. I think there *is* still a need for reasonable cause...and I apologize for letting my fingers do the walking while I was thinking of a different tangent of this discussion...

>
> It is my understanding, though I've never researched this, that as of a
few
> (read: unsure how many) years ago there is no more need for "reasonable
> cause" to search a home, vehicle, possession, etc., of *anyone* by a
police
> officer. The Miranda Act is also either suspended or severely
curtailed--no
> need for a police officer to read you your rights any more. Don't know
what
> else, but that's a couple of things I've heard--I also don't know if this
is
> specific to Texas or not.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

4877. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 14:17:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220091744.01493.00000294@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27722

In article <RafU7.173587$WW.10919654@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote
>
>> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired >
>FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
>> As of May 14, 2000:
>
>> Novice - 49,329
>> Tech - 205,394
>> Tech Plus - 128,860
>> General - 112,677
>> Advanced - 99,782
>> Extra - 78,750
>> Total - 674,792
>
>> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
>> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
>
>Why do you lump them into two groups like that?

I'm following an idea that came from N0BK.

The first group are, for lack of a better term, "entry level" license classes
with few HF/MF privileges. In the case of Novices, few privileges at all. And
before the restructuring, these were the slow codetest/nocodetest classes.

The second group have all MF/VHF/UHF and lots of HF privileges. In fact the
only operating privilege differences between the second-group classes are a
few bits of 80,40,20 and 15 meters. Before the restructuring, these were the
faster codetest/code waiver classes.

The divide back then was about 57% in the first group and 43% in the second.
>
>> As of December 14, 2001:
>> Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)
>
>less than 82% of previous

Yup - due to expirations and upgrades.
>
>> Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)
>
>more than 113% of previous

Due to new hams, upgrades from Novice and renewals from Tech Plus. Expirations
and upgrades decrease this number, but the increase factors outweigh the
decrease factors.
>
>> Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)

Due to expirations, upgrades and renewals as Techs
>
>less than 67% of previous

Disappearing fastest of all
>
>> General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)
>
>more than 122% of previous

Upgrades and new licenses, etc.
>
>> Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)
>
>less than 87% of previous

Similar situation to Tech Plus but renewals stay Advanced
>
>> Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)
>
>more than 124% of previous

Fastest growing license class of all.
>
>> Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)
>
>more than 101% of previous ;-)
>
>On the whole, this seems very normal and predictable.

Hard to say - it's only been 2 years since the announcement and 20 months since
the actual changes.

One thing is clear - restructuring did NOT bring in lots of new hams. What it
did do was cause lots of upgrades among those already licensed. But the rate of
those upgrades has slowed since the Great Surge of mid 2000. The total number
of US hams is actually down several thousand from the peak, reached earlier
this year. Part of this loss is seasonal, and part is due to the first
post-Feb-14-1991 Technician licenses starting to expire.
>
>The total ARS seems slow growth but it is growth..

True, but what is it compared to the growth in US population over the same time
period?
>
>I'm not sure what you're trying to say with the following...
>
>> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,860

>> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 323,006
>
The mix has changed compared to the above (which see). Was 57%-43%, now it's 53%-47%. More folks with lots of HF/MF.

--

The numbers in my posts on this thread are NOT from the AH0A website. They are from a source which lists Techs and Tech Pluses separately. This source does not show historic data, however. These posts and the archive can serve the purpose of storing the historic data.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4878. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 14:55:34 UTC
From: ve2vfd@remove.rac.this.ca.now
Message-ID: <3c21fb8c.8589072@news.aei.net>
Source record: 27724
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 21:03:09 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
wrote:

> You'd be surprised at the number of hams in these groups who brag
> that they have done so "and nothing happened".

sigh

Well, there goes the impression I had that we hams "knew better" about
these things... :o)

Pat
ve2vfd

4879. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 15:02:31 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <4gu32usu0q9v2f5vrbr1krag7uvkqssjfg@4ax.com>
Source record: 27725
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 22:22:29 -0500, an orbiting mind control laser caused
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> to write in talk.politics.guns :

>There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm
>which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed
>to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of
>possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies
>rather than ever offering one justification of probable
>cause to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.

It's usually called "contempt of cop".

While I've got the opportunity here, I'm in the process of writing up a
petition to the FCC to add verbiage to our wallet license citing
47 USC 302a(f)(2). Something along the lines of:

"This license is issued pursuant to Section 301 of the Communications Act
of 1934. As such, the bearer shall not be subject to action by state or
local government for lawful operations under this license.
47USC302a(f)(2)"

It wouldn't have to be large type or anything. I recall our old tickets
having at least the 'pursuant to Section 301' verbiage, so it would be a
matter of replacing something that was removed and adding a bit to it.

The intent is to make it clear that Feingold only applies to Part 95
operations and not anywhere else. Basically do the job that congress and
the ARRL should have done year before last. It likely won't fly, but at
least it would put the FCC on notice that some of us think there's a
problem here.

Thoughts?

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

4880. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 15:04:04 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C21FE17.1C6ACC0D@gte.net>
Source record: 27726
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

>
> > Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
> > officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
> > by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.
>
> Officers have been wrong before - which is why evidence from searches
> is sometimes ruled inadmissable.
>
> His statement is too broad to be true all the time.

He is totally right. The officer has the
right, confirmed by the courts, to inspect
anything that is a car. Especially anything
that is within reach of the driver.

While this has been mostly used over issues
like firearms and drugs, it can apply to cell
phones and radios if these devices would
constitute a hazard to safe driving.

I do not think that you realize how much authority
the courts have given the police over the last 10
years.

4881. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 15:07:03 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C21FECD.56BCC8FD@gte.net>
Source record: 27728
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

>
> > > > > >The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
> > > > > >Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
> > > > > >out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
> > > > > >of young, inexperienced officers out there.
> > > > >
> > > > > >No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
> > > > > >court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city
> attorney can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.
> > > > >
> > > > > Cops don't tend to care much about the "feel good" laws
> > > > > that some towns enanct. Why should they when the
> > > > > cut and dried basic criminal laws and traffic enforcement
> > > > > easily take their time. As another poster noted here,
> > > > > the CB type law that Tacoma passed won't be enforced
> > > > > except by action initiated by a resident's complaint. The
> > > > > same is true for most nuisance laws. If none of the
> > > > > neighbors care that Mr. Smith's dog barks for hours, then
> > > > > the cops sure aren't going to.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > >These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
> > > > > >officers. They are very professional.
> > > > >
> > > > > If they are professional, then they won't take
> > > > > knee jerk actions just because they are inexperienced.
> > > > > 5 years of service had better be more than enough experience
> > > > > for any cop anywhere to have honed his skills and
> > > > > knowledge.
> > > > >
> > > > > >But if they do not know
> > > > > >what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts
> settle it.
> > > > >
> > > > > You say that and it is absolute rubbish. Maybe it is
> > > > > so in some backwoods towns in your area, but it sure
> > > > > isn't the case in the northeast, nor in many other
> > > > > areas I have either lived or traveled in. Police brass,
> > > > > municipal attornies, judges and elected officials do NOT
> > > > > take lightly to heavy handed police actions that end up in
> > > > > lost court cases and or in civil suits for false arrest.
>
> > > > Look at the lady arrested for having the fake

> > > > grenade:
> > >
> > > I can easily see where a fake grenade can get anyone in trouble.
> > > That is a far cry from a radio that is not at all illegal in any shape
> > > or form.
> >
> > You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
> > who feel that the public does not have a right to own
> > such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
> > CB, scanners as well as things like guns.
>
> That is hogwash. I haven't seen any such "growing
> numbers" opposed to CBs, radios, etc. Indeed, there
> has been NO movement to ban scanners at all...rather
> some states (e.g. NJ) have relaxed old laws which
> did ban scanners in autos.
>
> > There is the feeling that the public can not be trusted,
> > that too many use technology for crime or to try to
> > overthrow the government. Many would prefer that only
> > those who are paid on a professional basis should be allowed
> > to have access to radios or weapons.
>
> More hogwash. Even if there is some such sentiment,
> there hasn't been any support for that attitude in the press,
> the legislatures, etc.
>
> Bill K2UNK

I gather that you do not read that many papers
everyday. The Washington Post, LA Times,
NY Times, Chicago Tribune all go on "crusades"
every so often over gun ownership, cell phones,
scanners. The elite do not like the fact that the
masses understand, and use, technology.

4882. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 15:11:10 UTC
From: OldBiker <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3C21FF8E.7397C0D2@crosslink.net>
Source record: 27727
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:
> ....
> I've heard stories of a flight during the Superbowl where passengers
> listening to the game on radios caused interference with pilot
> equipment. And that is just LO leakage, not intentional emitters.

If those tales are true, the aircraft industry is in deep trouble. I operate a laptop & 50W 2M packet station while my child bride hunts DX on a 100W HF rig beside me with no mutual interference on cheap consumer equipment and I have a tad of knowledge about the immunity of military gear. OTOH I read that airport radars are often down for months waiting for obsolete tubes at the same time the military is scrapping 3D radars only one generation old so I wouldn't key up on an airplane either.
Oy!
KA3DWW

4883. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 15:47:19 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <bKnU7.233649$3d2.11190853@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27729

> >N2EY wrote

> >> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
>
> >FCC ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

> >> As of May 14, 2000:

> >> Novice - 49,329
> >> Tech - 205,394
> >> Tech Plus - 128,860
> >> General - 112,677
> >> Advanced - 99,782
> >> Extra - 78,750
> >> Total - 674,792

> >> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
> >> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209

> Richard Plourde writes

> >Why do you lump them into two groups like that?

N2EY wrote

> I'm following an idea that came from N0BK.

> The first group are, for lack of a better term, "entry level" license
classes
> with few HF/MF privileges. In the case of Novices, few privileges at all.
And
> before the restructuring, these were the slow codetest/nocodetest classes.

My point is AFTER restructuring it's just not meaningful to lump them in
this way.

First, you have one group quantifying two obsolete license classes and one
active class. The other group has one obsolete license and two active
classes. To compare them is fruitless, pointless, and furthermore nothing
can be derived from the data. It's a waste of time to add up those groups
now that we can't say it's the slow/no beepers versus the fast beepers.

Second, to call Technician class entry level is being ingenuous quite a few
hams will do some highly advanced work there without ever 'talking around
the world' on MF/HF. This is NOT entry level to them.

> The second group have all MF/VHF/UHF and lots of HF privileges. In fact
the

> only operating privilege differences between the second-group classes are
a
> few bits of 80,40,20 and 15 meters. Before the restructuring, these were
the
> faster codetest/code waiver classes.

Again, it's AFTER restructuring and the data of this group is not meaningful
when compared to the other group.

> The divide back then was about 57% in the first group and 43% in the
second.

So what, the group has two obsolete classes. I'm still not sure what you
think the data says.

> >> As of December 14, 2001:
> >> Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)

> >less than 82% of previous

> Yup - due to expirations and upgrades.

> >> Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)

> >more than 113% of previous

> Due to new hams, upgrades from Novice and renewals from Tech Plus.
Expirations
> and upgrades decrease this number, but the increase factors outweigh the
> decrease factors.

> >> Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)

> Due to expirations, upgrades and renewals as Techs

> >less than 67% of previous

> Disappearing fastest of all

The most meaningless, useless class of all...

> >> General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)

> >more than 122% of previous

> Upgrades and new licenses, etc.

> >> Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)

> >less than 87% of previous

> Similar situation to Tech Plus but renewals stay Advanced

> >> Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)

> >more than 124% of previous

> Fastest growing license class of all.

> >> Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)

> >more than 101% of previous ;-)

> >On the whole, this seems very normal and predictable.

> Hard to say - it's only been 2 years since the announcement and 20 months since
> the actual changes.

> One thing is clear - restructuring did NOT bring in lots of new hams. What it
> did do was cause lots of upgrades among those already licensed. But the rate of
> those upgrades has slowed since the Great Surge of mid 2000. The total number
> of US hams is actually down several thousand from the peak, reached earlier
> this year. Part of this loss is seasonal, and part is due to the first
> post-Feb-14-1991 Technician licenses starting to expire.

Very true.

> >The total ARS seems slow growth but it is growth..

> True, but what is it compared to the growth in US population over the same time
> period?

Not sure but I would think it's close, also, we need to compare to the population growth for the age groups that would tend to become hams.

> >I'm not sure what you're trying to say with the following...

> >> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,860
> >> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 323,006

> The mix has changed compared to the above (which see). Was 57%-43%, now it's
> 53%-47%. More folks with lots of HF/MF.

So??? we already said two of the classes cannot increase (or even stay the same) in one group and in the other group the license class that can't grow will NOT shrink as fast as the other two because it is a VERY GOOD license class Advanced will tend to stay there for life.

> The numbers in my posts on this thread are NOT from the AH0A website. They are
> from a source which lists Techs and Tech Pluses separately. This source does
> not show historic data, however. These posts and the archive can serve the
> purpose of storing the historic data.

Well Jim, I think that your or N0BK's groupings are of virtually no value... I think to monitor the rate of changes over time will tell a lot more than just presenting the raw totals in wierd disjointed groupings.

Check out my post from the 5th of this month, in dejanews, search on "Rich Technician Plus". I presented quite a bit there about the rates of change in the classes. I'm not sure you'd seen it. (you never responded.

Rich

4884. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 15:48:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C220855.AA77F47D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27730

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually" superior to
> Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have solicited
> his opinion in the first place.

The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected a
reasonable response. She didn't get a reasonable response which tells
us something about Riley's prudish hangups.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4885. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 15:56:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C220A3E.D006520F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27731

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Exerting effort for something that is worth nothing to one makes one
> > a masochist. Are you a masochist?
>
> I don't exert effort without a reason, Cecil.

Well then, you don't exert effort for something that is worth nothing.
So please don't expect others to do something that you refuse to do.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4886. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 15:59:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C220AC9.3A5FC71@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27732

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> >
> > A Ph.D. degree is to a BS degree as a tech license is to an extra license.
> > Any holder of a BS degree who doesn't have a Ph.D. degree is a hypocrite
> > for ragging on a tech+ who doesn't have an extra license.
>
> An extra is equivalent to maybe a 5 credit class in an electrical
> engineering curriculum.

But I am talking about ratios: PhD/BS = extra/tech+
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4887. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 16:18:41 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <9vt3bd0119d@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27737
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"VE2VFD Pat" <ve2vfd@remove.rac.this.ca.now> wrote in message
news:3c21fb8c.8589072@news.aei.net...
> On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 21:03:09 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
> wrote:
>
> > You'd be surprised at the number of hams in these groups who brag
> > that they have done so "and nothing happened".
>
> *sigh*
>
> Well, there goes the impression I had that we hams "knew better" about
> these things... :o)
>

Hi, I'm new to hamming, and taking the test on January 17th for my Tech License. But this strikes me as funny I guess. One would wonder why Ham Radio would be immune to any of the "human" things affecting so many other aspects of our lives. How many people drive 20 miles over the speed limit and claim "nothing bad has happened so far"? Or for that matter, in most every thing inlife there is that faction of folks who believe they are above the "rules".

Isn't the point of Ham Radio supposed to be that it is inhabited by people who have the common sense to police themselves?

Because when it comes right down to it, I'm getting my ham license because I can't stand the snake pit of Citizen Band and I want to be involved in radio where people make a difference to the hobby.

Maybe, when someone claims they have used their rigs on a plane with no ill effects someone should mention to them that, while true they may not have noticed it, by claiming such they are making a mockery of the entire Amateur Radio mission.

--
Jim
No Call Sign, yet.

4888. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 16:22:47 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c221146_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 27735

"tw��,.." <.tw,@nothomeexcite5,yahoomsnATTBI.org.com> wrote in message
news:YNnU7.13583$NM4.3197237@rwcrnsc53...
> X-No-Archive: yes
>
> "Peter H. Proctor" <pproctor@neosoft.com> wrote in message
> news:336D1D3074E71BF6.7E14ED6979DC6C7D.F2352BD3BE528AB0@lp.airnews.net...
> > Not that simple. Having stopped a car under "reasonable
> suspicion",
> > LEO's can search the area under control of the driver or a passenger for
> > weapons. The legal theory is that the safety of the officer allows for
> a
> > specific exemption to 4th amendment protections. If, incidental to
> this
> > search, they find contraband, this is admissible as evidence.
> > Admittedly, as a practical matter, this is all a legal fiction
> that
> > allows officers to search when and where. But it still means there
> are
> > some limitations. E.g., LEO's cannot search a locked container, which
> gives
> > an "expectation of privacy". Similarly, a local judge once threw out
> > contraband found in a metal Bandaid box after a defense attorney pointed
> out
> > that it was too small to have held any weapon and thus should not have
> been
> > opened.
>
>
> Here in Texas, a LEO can not search a car at all unless granted by the
> driver of the vehicle or a search warrant.
>
>

That is *not* the way I understand it at all. In fact, I've got a police dispatcher friend who can probably tell me...I'll send him a note and find out.

Kim W5TIT

4889. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 16:25:06 UTC
From: Robert Frenchu <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com>
Message-ID: <06442u0komo3crlp2m5a86mmm1t0qn4bh2@4ax.com>
Source record: 27734
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote <3C21FECD.56BCC8FD@gte.net> in talk.politics.guns. :

>> > You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
>> > who feel that the public does not have a right to own
>> > such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
>> > CB, scanners as well as things like guns.

Cite.

4890. .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 16:48:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220114848.09658.00001060@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 27736

```
Callsign: N9NWO Class: General Codes: HAI USA
Name: GREGORY A DEAN
Addr1: PO BOX 2121
Addr2: WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47996-2121
Country: USA
Effective: 15 Jul 2000 Expires: 21 Jan 2002 Online Renewals...
License ID: L00090874 FRN: 0003005485 What's this?
Lookups: 163
```

4891. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 17:03:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220120300.05154.00000492@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 27738

In article <3c21e790_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011220000258.06877.00000586@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
>FCC
>> ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>
>> As of May 14, 2000:
>>
>> Novice - 49,329
>> Tech - 205,394
>> Tech Plus - 128,860
>> General - 112,677
>> Advanced - 99,782
>> Extra - 78,750
>> Total - 674,792
>>
>> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
>>
>> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
>>
>>
>>
>> As of December 14, 2001:
>>
>> Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)
>> Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)
>> Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)
>> General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)
>> Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)
>> Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)
>> Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)
>>
>> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,860
>>
>> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 323,006
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Seems the upgrade bandwagon is still on.

Yes, but it's slowing down a bit. But that's to be expected.

>Also, even if we wanted to "just
>say" that all the Novices that caused a decrease of 8,992 had upgraded to
>Tech; that still means that there were still 19,268 "unexpired" Tech
>licenses.

I have no idea what you are trying to say, Kim.

Let's "just say" that 8992 Novices passed "new" Element 2 and got Techs. The other 19,268 Techs in the increase came from new licenses, renewals from Technician plus, and grace-period renewals.

But that oversimplifies the situation. In reality some of the Novice decrease is due to expiration, some to upgrading to Tech, and some to upgrading to General or Extra. End result is a real mixed bag, and the other classes are similarly complex.

>I wonder how many of those are new licenses, Jim. Is there a way
>to easily tell?

http://www.ah0a.org

lists FCC actions per month. Among the data shown are total licenses, new licenses, modified licenses, renewals, expirations, cancellations and renewals-in-the-grace-period. Unfortunately the post restructuring AH0A data combines Tech and Tech Plus into a single number, so I had to go elsewhere for these numbers. Also, FCC and AH0A do not list upgrades separately - they are lumped in with modifications such as address and name changes. I don't know how they categorize vanity call applications (you get a renewal with a vanity call so that they don't have to pro-rate the fee).

Cancellations are partly due to disciplinary action and partly due to the families of silent keys. The recent vanity call changes caused an increase in cancellations because families of dead hams started sending in cancellation letters so that the SK's call could be acquired by someone else. So there's no easy way to tell from cancellation numbers how many offenders are losing their licenses due to FCC enforcement.

As you can see, it's tough to dig out the info you want to know. If you add up the number of new licenses on the AH0A site you get a pretty big number that is pretty close to the number of new hams entering the ARS. Most of them are Technicians because most people get the Tech as their first license.

The per-month numbers wander all over the place for seasonal and batch-process reasons that we have discussed previously. To get a clear picture, one needs to add up, say, a year's worth and look at long-term trends.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4892. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 17:30:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C222032.AF793CED@uci.edu>
Source record: 27739

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Exerting effort for something that is worth nothing to one makes one
> > > a masochist. Are you a masochist?
> >
> > I don't exert effort without a reason, Cecil.
>
> Well then, you don't exert effort for something that is worth nothing.

Ham radio is worth nothing? Great spokesman you are.

4893. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 17:32:28 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C2220AC.BA6CE7F6@uci.edu>
Source record: 27740

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > A Ph.D. degree is to a BS degree as a tech license is to an extra license.
> > > Any holder of a BS degree who doesn't have a Ph.D. degree is a hypocrite
> > > for ragging on a tech+ who doesn't have an extra license.
> >
> > An extra is equivalent to maybe a 5 credit class in an electrical
> > engineering curriculum.
>
> But I am talking about ratios: PhD/BS = extra/tech+

BWAAhaha. 15 units/10 units, maybe.
```

4894. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 17:38:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C22220B.1AF1C860@uci.edu>
Source record: 27741

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 08:57:41 -0800, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >What kind of "sub-atomic particle"?
>
> I couldn't tell you, offhand. I saw a mention of the research
> in the newspaper, and heard a reference to it on a NOVA show Chris was
> watching while I was on the air, but I don't know enough about it (or
> physics, for that matter) to say.

Sounds a little fishy. Was it a photon transporter? ;-)

4895. Re: "no homebrew licenses" (was: UK foundation class)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 17:44:10 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C22236A.D886E324@uci.edu>
Source record: 27743

Richard Plourde wrote:
> Jim Kelley wrote

> > Aren't "homebrew licenses" illegal?
>
> We all have 'homebrew licenses' but not 'homebrew' licenses... ;-)

I clearly meant the latter. ;-)

4896. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 17:54:10 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <uubkA8XiBHA.1900@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27742

The opinion of Steve Robeson K4YZ seems to be......

>Callsign: N9NWO Class: General Codes: HAI USA
>Name: GREGORY A DEAN

Your point?

Hans

4897. Re: Radio fun!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 18:04:57 UTC
From: Nutcase with a Yaesu 1000MP <nforester4@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <dLpU7.4197$Cw3.513706@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 27744
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd Davies" <daviesl@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:XeeU7.309071$AR6.5856396@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...

> http://www.435online.com/

This looks to be a GREAT BUNCH to have somebody sponsor into the ever-growing
14,313 Mess - Part II They also look like they could have some fun
and contribute to 14.275, 3.901 and CLN's Motley's on 3.860 also.
Some Puerto Rico VEC should fix their next test so they can get
it up on HF and join the big boys!

4898. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 18:05:31 UTC
From: Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com>
Message-ID: <3C22286B.956D2B7D@fcc.com>
Source record: 27745
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

Robert Frenchu wrote:
>
> > N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote <3C21FECD.56BCC8FD@gte.net> in talk.politics.guns. :
>
> >> > You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
> >> > who feel that the public does not have a right to own
> >> > such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
> >> > CB, scanners as well as things like guns.
>
> Cite.

DARN!
There's goes another Radio Shack down the tubes!

4899. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 18:11:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2229E4.1E19F8BC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27746

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > I don't exert effort without a reason, Cecil.
> >
> > Well then, you don't exert effort for something that is worth nothing.
>
> Ham radio is worth nothing? Great spokesman you are.

Ham radio is worth nothing to 99+% of the general population.
Only a very small minority of the general population thinks
a ham radio license is worth more than nothing. Please don't
judge the general population by your personal ideas of worth.
Please don't judge techs by your personal ideas of worth.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4900. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 18:23:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C222CB8.4E7EF533@uci.edu>
Source record: 27747

CAM wrote:
> Please don't judge techs by your personal ideas of worth.

I'm in as good a position to "judge techs" as anyone else - having been
one myself, Cecil. When were you ever a tech?

4901. inappropriate Christmas carols

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 19:08:43 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%GqU7.174231$WW.10966907@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27748

Considering that we are about to celebrate an event that actually took
place about September 23, it is appropriate to have a few inappropriate
Christmas carols in the arsenal.

1. From Tom Lehrer for insertion at inappropriate times:

Hark the Herald Tribune sings,
Advertising wonderous things.

God Rest ye Merry, Merchants
May ye make the Yuletide pay

Angels we have heard on high,
telling us to go out and buy.

2. From Pogo of years ago. There are more but not worth the effort.

Deck us all with Boston Charlie,
Walla Walla Wash. and Kalamazoo.
Nora's freezing on the trolley,
Swalller dollar, cauliflower, alleygaroo

Don't we know archaic barrel,
lullaby, lilla boy, Louisville Lou.
Trolley Molly don't love Harold,
Boola, boola, Pensacoola, hullabaloo.

3. From Da Yoopers, Rusty Chevrolet. A yooper is from the Upper
Penninsula of Michigan (UPer). Swampers are waterproof boots. With a
long winter and the salt, the metal moths grow to be huge.

CHORUS:

Rust and Smoke the heater's broke
The Door just blew away
I light a match to see the dash
And then I start to pray, hey.
The Frame is bent, the muffler went
The Radio's it's OK
Oh what fun it is to drive
This Rusty Chevrolet.

1.

Dashing thru the snow
In my rusty Chevrolet
Down the road I go
Sliding all the way.

I need new piston Rings
I need some new snow tires
My car is held together by
A piece of chicken wire.

2.

I went to the IGA
To get some Christmas cheer
I just passed up my left front tire
And it's getting hard to steer.
Skidding down the hiway
Right past the Negaunee cops
I had to drag my swampers
Just to get the car to stop.

3.

Bouncing thru the snowdrifts
In a big blue cloud of smoke
People laugh as I drive by
I wonder what's the joke.
I got to get to Shopko
To pick up a layaway
Cause Santa Claus is coming soon
In his big old rusty sleigh.

Many happy returns from the season to one and all!

Dick N&#65533;BK

4902. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 19:12:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C22381E.75092C56@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27750

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually" superior to
> > Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have solicited
> > his opinion in the first place.
>
> The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected a
> reasonable response. She didn't get a reasonable response which tells
> us something about Riley's prudish hangups.

Funny that I don't see it that way at all. I don't think she liked the reasonable response she got. In typical Kim fashion, she attempts to rationalize her choice in the face of rejection. It tells us something about Kim's "to hell with what anyone thinks of me--I'm doing what I want" attitude.

Dave K8MN

4903. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 19:13:35 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <f1e42u8lnrlk65qjepp0dvd5m15igvc1ol@4ax.com>
Source record: 27749
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 08:22:14 UNDEFINED, an orbiting mind control laser
caused pproctor@neosoft.com (Peter H. Proctor) to write in
talk.politics.guns :

>>His quote:
>>"Actually, the USSC ruled that police can perform warrantless searches of
>>vehicles. Permission to search is not a requisite for obtaining a driver's
>>license. We don't need permission if we have a reasonable suspicion."
>
> Not that simple. Having stopped a car under "reasonable suspicion",
>LEO's can search the area under control of the driver or a passenger for
>weapons. The legal theory is that the safety of the officer allows for a
>specific exemption to 4th amendment protections. If, incidental to this
>search, they find contraband, this is admissible as evidence.

What do you think of this news item?

N.Y. police win more latitude in traffic stops

Rochester Democrat and Chronicle
"In a landmark ruling, New York's top court yesterday gave
police wide latitude to stop vehicles for traffic violations
and then search for evidence of serious crimes. ... The court
said that when police have probable cause to believe the driver
of a vehicle has violated laws, a stop-and-search doesn't
violate New York's constitutional guarantee against illegal
searches." (12/19/01)
http://www.free-market.net/rd/299233041.html

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

4904. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 19:18:13 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <VPqU7.174245$WW.10967792@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27901

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011220000258.06877.00000586@mb-mj.aol.com...
> Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC
> ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
>
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
>
>
>
> As of December 14, 2001:
>
> Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)
> Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)
> Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)
> General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)
> Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)
> Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)
> Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)
>
> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,860
>
> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 323,006
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Not to quibble Jim but you can renew a license within 90 days of
expiration and about 2/3 who will ever renew do so in the first 30 days.
Considering that renewal rates increase with class privleges, if there is
a double-count it will skew things just a tad.

As Jon Bloom told me and with which I came to agree, reading numbers like
this is right up there with reading animal guts. I feel I need a mask and

a feathered costume to pronounce upon them.

Dick N&#65533;BK

4905. Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 19:56:05 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <9vtg5701orp@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27902

I am so interested in finally getting my Technician's License that I have studied and studied for weeks now. I have passed every sample test I can get my hands on, and there is a real test in my area on January 17th, 2002.

But, I'm reading these messages and I'm starting to get the feeling that the priviledges afforded to a Tech No Code gives access to frequencies that are really no better to occupy than a Citizen Band radio would access.

I'm reading about jamming, and this jerk that, that jerk this, kids, lids, space cadets...

I wanted to get into Amateur Radio to get out of the 27Mhz Snake Pit and QSO with some quality contacts.

Am I really making a mistake? Is it too late for Ham Radio now?

4906. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 20:25:10 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3C224910.F60D83AB@icok.net>
Source record: 27903
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

I think the key words are 'probable cause', which is
the 'biggy' in any incidental search...
'Doc

PS - Posting to more than one group at a time is in very
poor taste.

4907. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 20:34:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C224B3B.D0625A51@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27904

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Please don't judge techs by your personal ideas of worth.
>
> I'm in as good a position to "judge techs" as anyone else - having been
> one myself, Cecil. When were you ever a tech?

The tech license completely satisfies many hams. Where do you get
the gall to judge techs as underachievers?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4908. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 20:37:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C224BF0.1A30074B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27905

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected a
> > reasonable response. She didn't get a reasonable response which tells
> > us something about Riley's prudish hangups.
>
> Funny that I don't see it that way at all.

Of course not! You are one of the busybody prudes who want to force
your personal morals, hangups, and value system on everyone else.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4909. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 20:40:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C224CCA.F203B41F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27906

Kamatu wrote:
> I wanted to get into Amateur Radio to get out of the 27Mhz Snake Pit and QSO
> with some quality contacts.
>
> Am I really making a mistake? Is it too late for Ham Radio now?

Only a small percentage of hams are jerks and you can usually avoid
them. You've already expended the effort to learn the material. Get
your license and try it. You might like it.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

4910. PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 20:56:58 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112201256.54a6f516@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27907
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF CBERS.

"Kenneth Vaughan" <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<fGcU7.232938$3d2.11138155@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...

> twas the night before christmas,when all through the house.....
> my radios were silent...silent as a mouse.
> the antenna was hung by the chimney with care,
> in hopes that the "skip",soon would be there.
>
> "gunslinger" was nestled,all snug in his bed.
> while visions of x-force amps,danced in his head.
>
> when on my front door,there arose such a clatter...
> i sprang from my bed, to see what was the matter!
>
> away to the window i flew like a flash,
> thinking"if its uncle charlie,im outta some cash"
> the moon on the breast of the new fallen snow,
> gave the lustre of mid-day,to the assholes below.
>
> when what to my wondering eyes should appear!!
> but an fcc van! and eight voobners in storm trooper gear!!!
>
> with a little old driver,so lively and quick!
> i knew in a moment,its RILEY...the prick!!
>
> more rapid than eagles,his coursers they came,
> and he cussed,and he cursed,and called them by name!
> "now voobner!,now leland! now richard! and jerry!
> "come on you dummies,weve got to hurry!"
>
> to the top of the porch! to the top of the wall!
> now grab his gear! grab his gear! grab it all!!
>
> so out my back door,with my gear i flew!
> with a box full of radios...and my linear ,too!
>
> i spoke not a word,but went straight to my work,
> i hid all my gear,then returned to the "jerk"
> and flashing the "bird" finger,right under his nose!
>
> said "too bad you couldnt find it,you dumb ass holes!!"
>

> and he heard me exclaim,ere he drove out of sight,
> "screw you riley!"...rec radio....good night!!!
>
> elpasogunslinger merry christmas....(all of you)

4911. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 21:03:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220160306.01493.00000300@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27908

In article <3C220855.AA77F47D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually" superior
>to
>> Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have solicited
>> his opinion in the first place.

"Morally and intellectually superior" covers a lot of ground! How about "Mr. H
knows a lot about the subject"?
>
>The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected a
>reasonable response.

And she got a very reasonable response from Mr. H. Note that he did not call
anybody a derogatory name or reflect on their character, intelligence or
morals. He just gave his opinion of the effect of certain choices of callsign.

>She didn't get a reasonable response

What was unreasonable about Mr. H's response?

>which tells
>us something about Riley's prudish hangups.

Actually, it tells us that Cecil's dictionary defines "reasonable response" as
"agrees with Cecil's opinion".

73 de Jim, N2EY

4912. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 21:03:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220160308.01493.00000301@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 27909

In article <bKnU7.233649$3d2.11190853@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>> >> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
>> >> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
>
>> Richard Plourde writes
>
>> >Why do you lump them into two groups like that?
>
>N2EY wrote
>
>> I'm following an idea that came from N0BK.
>
>> The first group are, for lack of a better term, "entry level" license
>classes
>> with few HF/MF privileges. In the case of Novices, few privileges at all.
>And
>> before the restructuring, these were the slow codetest/nocodetest classes.
>
>My point is AFTER restructuring it's just not meaningful to lump them in
>this way.

I kinda disagree, but I see your point.
>
>First, you have one group quantifying two obsolete license classes and one
>active class. The other group has one obsolete license and two active
>classes. To compare them is fruitless, pointless, and furthermore nothing
>can be derived from the data. It's a waste of time to add up those groups
>now that we can't say it's the slow/no beepers versus the fast beepers.

What it really compares is "little HF vs. lotta HF" but the whole issue is so
muddy that it really doesn't tell much.
>
>Second, to call Technician class entry level is being ingenuous quite a few
>hams will do some highly advanced work there without ever 'talking around
>the world' on MF/HF. This is NOT entry level to them.

I disagree. For many years now most newcomers have started out in ham radio
with the Technician class. Some stay there, for a number of reasons, while
others upgrade. This was going on way back before 1991 - most new hams back
then skipped Novice and went right to Tech.
>
>> The second group have all MF/VHF/UHF and lots of HF privileges. In fact
>the

>> only operating privilege differences between the second-group classes are
>a
>> few bits of 80,40,20 and 15 meters. Before the restructuring, these were
>the
>> faster codetest/code waiver classes.
>
>Again, it's AFTER restructuring and the data of this group is not meaningful
>when compared to the other group.

After considering all the issues I think the best comparison is just to look at
each class individually.

>> >> As of December 14, 2001:
>> >> Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)
>
>> >less than 82% of previous
>
>> Yup - due to expirations and upgrades.
>
>> >> Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)
>
>> >more than 113% of previous
>
>> Due to new hams, upgrades from Novice and renewals from Tech Plus.
>Expirations
>> and upgrades decrease this number, but the increase factors outweigh the
>> decrease factors.
>
>> >> Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)
>
>> Due to expirations, upgrades and renewals as Techs
>
>> >less than 67% of previous
>
>> Disappearing fastest of all
>
>The most meaningless, useless class of all...

Not really. "Old" Tech Pluses (from before March 21 1987) just need to visit a
VE session to become Generals and get a whole buncha new HF/MF privs. "New"
Tech Pluses just need new Element 3 to get a General.
>
>> >> General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)
>
>> >more than 122% of previous
>
>> Upgrades and new licenses, etc.
>
>> >> Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)
>
>> >less than 87% of previous

>
>> Similar situation to Tech Plus but renewals stay Advanced
>
>> >> Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)
>
>> >more than 124% of previous
>
>> Fastest growing license class of all.
>
>> >> Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)
>
>> >more than 101% of previous ;-)
>
>> >On the whole, this seems very normal and predictable.
>
>> Hard to say - it's only been 2 years since the announcement and 20 months
>since
>> the actual changes.
>
>> One thing is clear - restructuring did NOT bring in lots of new hams. What
>it
>> did do was cause lots of upgrades among those already licensed. But the
>rate of
>> those upgrades has slowed since the Great Surge of mid 2000. The total
>number
>> of US hams is actually down several thousand from the peak, reached
>earlier
>> this year. Part of this loss is seasonal, and part is due to the first
>> post-Feb-14-1991 Technician licenses starting to expire.
>
>Very true.

The expiration numbers can be deceiving because of
renewals-in-the-grace-period. The percentage of Techs renewing is quite high.
>
>> >The total ARS seems slow growth but it is growth..
>
>> True, but what is it compared to the growth in US population over the same
>time
>> period?
>
>Not sure but I would think it's close, also, we need to compare to the
>population growth for the age groups that would tend to become hams.
>
Very good point. The very young and very old don't usually get many ham new
licenses.

>> >I'm not sure what you're trying to say with the following...
>
>> >> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,860
>> >> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 323,006

>
>> The mix has changed compared to the above (which see). Was 57%-43%, now
>it's
>> 53%-47%. More folks with lots of HF/MF.
>
>So??? we already said two of the classes cannot increase (or even stay the
>same) in one group and in the other group the license class that can't grow
>will NOT shrink as fast as the other two because it is a VERY GOOD license
>class Advanced will tend to stay there for life.

Some will, but many will just take new Element 4 and get Extras.
>
>> The numbers in my posts on this thread are NOT from the AH0A website. They
>are
>> from a source which lists Techs and Tech Pluses separately. This source
>does
>> not show historic data, however. These posts and the archive can serve the
>> purpose of storing the historic data.
>
>Well Jim, I think that your or N0BK's groupings are of virtually no value...
>I think to monitor the rate of changes over time will tell a lot more than
>just presenting the raw totals in wierd disjointed groupings.
>
The main point of this thread is to monitor the numbers over time.

>Check out my post from the 5th of this month, in dejanews, search on "Rich
>Technician Plus". I presented quite a bit there about the rates of change
>in the classes. I'm not sure you'd seen it. (you never responded.
>
I will look - I must have missed it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4913. Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 21:18:09 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112201318.115c1d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27910
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Why? Simple. I am an outlaw CBer. You have spoken out against me one too many times. If life were ideal I could simply shut you up like I do on the freeband by cranking up my big box (just kidding). But this is less than ideal so I have to tolerate you and your hammie pals. I am disgusted by your rule-following, goody-two-shoes holier-than-thou attitude towards radio, Lelnad. Rules are going to be broken and I am going to freeband and that is all there is to it. I will continue to promote illegal CB because I can. Anarchy of the airwaves is where we are headed and you can't come to terms with it, can you? Too bad but 28.085 is just the beginning and it irritates you doesn't it? I am glad, now go back to your kennel with dogie and the rest and lap your wounds"

4914. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 21:19:03 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C2255C7.A7D0DAF9@uci.edu>
Source record: 27912

CAM wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Please don't judge techs by your personal ideas of worth.
> >
> > I'm in as good a position to "judge techs" as anyone else - having been
> > one myself, Cecil. When were you ever a tech?
>
> The tech license completely satisfies many hams. Where do you get
> the gall to judge techs as underachievers?

Where do you get the gall to put words in my mouth? You claimed that
techs don't want the privileges, and I said I don't understand why
someone wouldn't want them.

4915. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 21:20:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C225614.40A33A15@uci.edu>
Source record: 27913

CAM wrote:
> You are one of the busybody prudes who want to force
> your personal morals, hangups, and value system on everyone else.

How's that any worse than being a finger-pointer, name-caller?

4916. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 21:24:32 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3C225710.6EEFC54F@uci.edu>
Source record: 27915

IllegalCBersMustGO wrote:

> FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB.

Next time just leave it there. Thanks.

4917. Re: RADIO SHOULD BE LAWLESS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 21:29:06 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112201329.2240665@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27911
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

Robert Frenchu <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com>
0komo3crlp2m5a86mmm1t0qn40komo3crlp2m5a86mmm1t0qn4
news:<06442u0komo3crlp2m5a86mmm1t0qn4bh2@4ax.com>
take_out-hoo.com
0komo3crlp2m5a86mmm

You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
who feel that the public does not have a right to own
such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
CB, scanners as well as things like guns.

"As I am telling nad and dogie and his lapdog cb-hating cronies
constantly. Radio belongs to the people and we freebanders know this.
Don't get me wrong there are some good hammies like Dick McCollum who
give advice on linears and extra channels but they are few and far
between"

4918. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 21:31:43 UTC
From: Tarzan - Number 1 <Webmaster@loudcrowd.com>
Message-ID: <3NsU7.5451$zX1.7229141@typhoon.ne.mediaone.net>
Source record: 27914
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

well this is not true~~~~!!!! i don't need to say more your blowing out your
ass...
"'Doc" <w5lz@icok.net> wrote in message news:3C224910.F60D83AB@icok.net...
>
>
> I think the key words are 'probable cause', which is
> the 'biggy' in any incidental search...
> 'Doc
>
> PS - Posting to more than one group at a time is in very
> poor taste.

4919. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 21:48:45 UTC
From: John P Vassel <john@vassel.net>
Message-ID: <3c225cbd$0$37104$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net>
Source record: 27916
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

keyclownslappa@hotmail.com (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote in
news:ce9e428e.0112201256.54a6f516@posting.google.com:

> FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF CBERS.
>
>

Oh please tell me this is demented humor on your part, and that you dont
honestly waste time worrying about this type of stuff!
My god, you need help.

John
KC8SKE

4920. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 22:30:01 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <u24ps93bbhume6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 27917
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I was replying based on the 'perception' that someone making the statement the way it was posted was confrontational and just 'sounded' like they felt they had the right to operate aboard an aircraft.

I personally HAVE operated. RX only, and with pilot interaction. He wanted to know when I turned it on, and when I turned it off. But this was many years ago, 1981 to be exact, and now the rules are, I believe, even stricter.

Mike

"VE2VFD Pat" <ve2vfd@remove.rac.this.ca.now> wrote in message news:3c2091f2.2486561@news.aei.net...
> On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 22:42:09 -0500, "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com>
> wrote:
>
> >No way imply at ALL any operation at ANY time, even 'just' receive,
> >aboard a commercial carrier. You do NOT have any right to do that
> >AT ALL under the FAR.
>
> You must be reading something I never wrote into my message...
>
> Where does it even hint at operating the radio IN a plane? I would
> assume no ham operator is actually stupid enough to even think about
> doing that! Geeez.
>
> Pat
> ve2vfd

4921. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 22:32:54 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vtorj0qio@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27918
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
news:06442u0komo3crlp2m5a86mmm1t0qn4bh2@4ax.com...
> > N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote <3C21FECD.56BCC8FD@gte.net> in
talk.politics.guns. :
>
>
> >> > You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
> >> > who feel that the public does not have a right to own
> >> > such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
> >> > CB, scanners as well as things like guns.
>
> Cite.

2600

4922. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 22:35:30 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vtp0f0qot@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27922
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"John Kimball" <johnkimb@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:9vsllo$5sm$0@dosa.alt.net...
> On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 07:46:39 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in
> Message id: <9vq6odhoe2@pita.alt.net>:
>
>
> >No, but I hear you slurp nutsacks behind dumpsters and are too
CHICKENSHIT
> >to post under your real name, COWARD.
>
> So is 8L0J08 your first name, or last name?

Forget it. The guy's too dumb to understand 'L33TI5M5.

4923. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 22:38:44 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vtp6g0r4h@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27921
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ce9e428e.0112201256.54a6f516@posting.google.com...
> FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF >CBERS.

<snip>

I've seen better trolls on pencils.

4924. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 22:41:52 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vtpce0rg2@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27923

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C22381E.75092C56@earthlink.net...

> Funny that I don't see it that way at all. I don't think she liked the
> reasonable response she got. In typical Kim fashion, she attempts to
> rationalize her choice in the face of rejection. It tells us something
> about Kim's "to hell with what anyone thinks of me--I'm doing what I
> want" attitude.

Re-phrase that to read "to hell with what a few people of a minority opinion
might think," and you would be correct.

4925. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 22:47:40 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vtpne0s0o@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27924

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c21e983_2@newsa.ev1.net...

> I heartell some employers regard an MCSE as equal to, I believe, and
> Engineering *Degree* (as in, what? four years of college?)
>
> Kim W5TIT

This is probably true, but the opinion of some people is that Microsoft is
running one helluva scam with the way they teach and administer the tests.

4926. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 22:52:14 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C226BD5.FFD9B3D9@gte.net>
Source record: 27930
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

> Here in Texas, a LEO can not search a car at all unless granted by the
> driver of the vehicle or a search warrant.

Do you have anything that can verify that
statement? It does not fit with what we
are seeing most other states.

4927. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 22:55:08 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <g%tU7.234866$3d2.11219402@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27919

N2EY wrote

> What it really compares is "little HF vs. lotta HF" but the whole
> issue is so muddy that it really doesn't tell much.

Nope.. what you're comparing is the ratio of the total of three arbitrarily chosen classes versus the total of three other arbitrarily chosen classes. ;-)

If you want to compare something...

Compare the ratio of Technician Class totals versus General Class added to Amateur Extra Class Totals. That will tell you where the ARS is going to...

Then... monitor the decay of Novice Class, Technician Class and Advanced Class. That will tell you where they are coming from and going to...

Think about it...

> Richard Plourde writes:

> >Second, to call Technician class entry level is being ingenuous quite a
few
> >hams will do some highly advanced work there without ever 'talking around
> >the world' on MF/HF. This is NOT entry level to them.

> I disagree. For many years now most newcomers have started out in ham
radio
> with the Technician class. Some stay there, for a number of reasons, while
> others upgrade. This was going on way back before 1991 - most new hams
back
> then skipped Novice and went right to Tech.

Listen... for entry... Novice Class and Technician Plus Class is NOT an option. They enter as Technician Class or General Class now. Remember with the right preparation you can complete the tests to General Class in a evening.

> >Again, it's AFTER restructuring and the data of this group is not
meaningful
> >when compared to the other group.

> After considering all the issues I think the best comparison is just to
look at
> each class individually.

There is a couple of other numbers which will be more telling.

> >> >> Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)

> >> >less than 67% of previous

> >> Disappearing fastest of all

> >The most meaningless, useless class of all...

> Not really. "Old" Tech Pluses (from before March 21 1987) just need to visit a
> VE session to become Generals and get a whole buncha new HF/MF privs. "New"
> Tech Pluses just need new Element 3 to get a General.

Jim, that's what makes it so. The return on investment makes element 3 the best test money can buy. ;-)

Remember, I say useless because in HF for someone who is not going to use CW the privleges consists of less modes and less frequency spectrum than CB!!! Now... that is useless. Oh, Yeah, higher frequency so less openings too!!! ;-)

> >> >> Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)

> >> >more than 101% of previous ;-)

> >> >On the whole, this seems very normal and predictable.

> The expiration numbers can be deceiving because of
> renewals-in-the-grace-period.

That's just noise... we can fudge that stuff to oblivion... ;-)

> The percentage of Techs renewing is quite high.

...and the percentage of Technician Plus renewing is VERY low....

> >> >The total ARS seems slow growth but it is growth..

> >Not sure but I would think it's close, also, we need to compare to the
> >population growth for the age groups that would tend to become hams.

> Very good point. The very young and very old don't usually get many ham new
> licenses.

> >> >I'm not sure what you're trying to say with the following...

> >> >> Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 359,860
> >> >> Total General/Advanced/Extra: 323,006

> >So??? we already said two of the classes cannot increase (or even stay the
> >same) in one group and in the other group the license class that can't grow
> >will NOT shrink as fast as the other two because it is a VERY GOOD license
> >class Advanced will tend to stay there for life.

> Some will, but many will just take new Element 4 and get Extras.

There will always be more Advanced Class licenses than Novice Class or Technician Plus Class.

> >Well Jim, I think that your or N0BK's groupings are of virtually no value...
> >I think to monitor the rate of changes over time will tell a lot more than
> >just presenting the raw totals in wierd disjointed groupings.

> The main point of this thread is to monitor the numbers over time.

Absolutely, and I think we can come up with a couple of subtotals (composite scores) and their rate of change over time and be able to monitor the whole thing. The "Obsolete Decay" score and the Technician Class Versus General/Extra ratio. We need names I'll think of something.

Rich

4928. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:03:46 UTC
From: Robert Frenchu <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com>
Message-ID: <fer42u8hbchk012lq430vm5k5lof8ie4m3@4ax.com>
Source record: 27920
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote <9vtorj0qio@enews4.newsguy.com> in
talk.politics.guns. :

>"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
>news:06442u0komo3crlp2m5a86mmm1t0qn4bh2@4ax.com...
>> > N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote <3C21FECD.56BCC8FD@gte.net> in
>talk.politics.guns. :
>>
>>
>> >> > You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
>> >> > who feel that the public does not have a right to own
>> >> > such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
>> >> > CB, scanners as well as things like guns.
>>
>> Cite.
>
>2600

You have failed to provide any documentation whatsoever that

(a) there are police who feel that the public does not have the right
to own radio transceivers and guns
(b) their numbers are growing significantly
(c) there are politicians who feel that the public does not have the
right to own radio transceivers and guns
(d) their numbers are growing significantly

You may make one final attempt.

4929. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:15:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gonqk05.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27925
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 04:16:42 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>Actually it is a crime in my state not have
>a radio license if you have a scanner in the
>car. While the cops may not be as hard
>nosed with a scanner as they are with guns,
>having either in your vehicle then having your
>son or wife drive the vehicle might will result
>in them being arrested in my state (if they do
>not have either a ham license - for the scanner,
>or a gun permit for the weapon).

I didn;t know that you lived in some third-world country where a
radio transmitter is equated to a dangerous weapon.

If that's what your state law says, it's BAD law. What can/will
TOU do to get it fixed - if that's what it actually says.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4930. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:15:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gonqql6.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27927

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 07:30:40 -0600, Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>It is my understanding, though I've never researched this, that as of a few
>(read: unsure how many) years ago there is no more need for "reasonable
>cause" to search a home, vehicle, possession, etc., of *anyone* by a police
>officer. The Miranda Act is also either suspended or severely curtailed--no
>need for a police officer to read you your rights any more. Don't know what
>else, but that's a couple of things I've heard--I also don't know if this is
>specific to Texas or not.

Sounds like "Texan Law" to me, but this LEO-become-lawyer says that
it's not how the law stands in the US of A.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4931. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:15:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gonqwl7.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27928
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 08:22:14 UNDEFINED, Peter H. Proctor wrote:

> Not that simple. Having stopped a car under "reasonable suspicion",
>LEO's can search the area under control of the driver or a passenger for
>weapons. The legal theory is that the safety of the officer allows for a
>specific exemption to 4th amendment protections. If, incidental to this
>search, they find contraband, this is admissible as evidence.

But note that a piece of radio equipment - even if not permissable
to be used on the air - is not contraband and is not seizable as
such. It can be seized as evidence of a non-radio-law crime, such
as a scanner being used by a lookout.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4932. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:15:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gonr448.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27929
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 10:02:31 -0500, Frank Ney wrote:

>The intent is to make it clear that Feingold only applies to Part 95
>operations and not anywhere else. Basically do the job that congress and
>the ARRL should have done year before last. It likely won't fly, but at
>least it would put the FCC on notice that some of us think there's a
>problem here.

You'll be surprised at what the FCC will do with suggestions like
that. Many years ago, a staffer got a cash incentive award for
suggesting that commercial operator, amateur, ship,. and aircraft
license applications be printed on different color papers so that
they could be sorted more easily when they arrive by mail.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4933. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:15:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gonrdra.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27926
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 10:10:32 UNDEFINED, Peter H. Proctor wrote:

>Arguando, an LEO might be able to confiscate a cell phone that he
>actually sees cause a traffic hazard. Otherwise, not.... In theory,
>anything might cause a "hazard to safe driving".

Seize as evidence in a case against the user, not "confiscate"
meaning to permanently deprive the user of same w/o a court order of
forfeiture.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4934. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:18:43 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <nluU7.848$Ya1.498755@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 27931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"'Doc" <w5lz@icok.net> wrote in message news:3C224910.F60D83AB@icok.net...
>
>
> I think the key words are 'probable cause', which is
> the 'biggy' in any incidental search...
> 'Doc

According to the actual text of Public Law 106-521 (the Federal CB Law)
probable cause of criminal radio activity is only required by this law when
searching a commercial vehicle:

SECTION 1. STATE AND LOCAL ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
REGULATIONS ON USE OF CITIZENS BAND RADIO EQUIPMENT.
Section 302 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a) is amended
by adding at the end the following:

(sections 1-6 removed for brevity)

`(7) The enforcement of a statute or ordinance by a State or local
government under paragraph (1) with regard to citizens band radio equipment
on board a `commercial motor vehicle', as defined in section 31101 of title
49, United States Code, shall require probable cause to find that the
commercial motor vehicle or the individual operating the vehicle is in
violation of the regulations described in paragraph (1).'.
---

73 de W6DKN

4935. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:31:49 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C227476.4C030914@spam.me.not>
Source record: 27932
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

And you're a cross posting anal-retentive ass.

de AB8LR

-SSB

IllegalCBersMustGO wrote:
>
> FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF CBERS.
>
> "Kenneth Vaughan" <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<fGcU7.232938$3d2.11138155@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
>
> > twas the night before christmas,when all through the house.....
> > my radios were silent...silent as a mouse.
> > the antenna was hung by the chimney with care,
> > in hopes that the "skip",soon would be there.
> >
> > "gunslinger" was nestled,all snug in his bed.
> > while visions of x-force amps,danced in his head.
> >
> > when on my front door,there arose such a clatter...
> > i sprang from my bed, to see what was the matter!
> >
> > away to the window i flew like a flash,
> > thinking"if its uncle charlie,im outta some cash"
> > the moon on the breast of the new fallen snow,
> > gave the lustre of mid-day,to the assholes below.
> >
> > when what to my wondering eyes should appear!!
> > but an fcc van! and eight voobners in storm trooper gear!!!
> >
> > with a little old driver,so lively and quick!
> > i knew in a moment,its RILEY...the prick!!
> >
> > more rapid than eagles,his coursers they came,
> > and he cussed,and he cursed,and called them by name!
> > "now voobner!,now leland! now richard! and jerry!
> > "come on you dummies,weve got to hurry!"
> >
> > to the top of the porch! to the top of the wall!
> > now grab his gear! grab his gear! grab it all!!
> >
> > so out my back door,with my gear i flew!

> > with a box full of radios...and my linear ,too!
> >
> > i spoke not a word,but went straight to my work,
> > i hid all my gear,then returned to the "jerk"
> > and flashing the "bird" finger,right under his nose!
> >
> > said "too bad you couldnt find it,you dumb ass holes!!"
> >
> > and he heard me exclaim,ere he drove out of sight,
> > "screw you riley!"...rec radio....good night!!!
> >
> > elpasogunslinger merry christmas....(all of you)

4936. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:36:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gont42e.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 27933
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 14:13:35 -0500, Frank Ney wrote:

>What do you think of this news item?
>
>N.Y. police win more latitude in traffic stops
>----------
>Rochester Democrat and Chronicle
> "In a landmark ruling, New York's top court yesterday gave
> police wide latitude to stop vehicles for traffic violations
> and then search for evidence of serious crimes. ... The court
> said that when police have probable cause to believe the driver
> of a vehicle has violated laws, a stop-and-search doesn't
> violate New York's constitutional guarantee against illegal
> searches." (12/19/01)
>http://www.free-market.net/rd/299233041.html

Gotta have probable cause, the same standard as for arrest and
search warrants.

The fear is doing such deeds "at whim" without PC.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4937. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-20 23:51:38 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <eQuU7.321000$5A3.123368207@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27934
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

And So are you SSB, Hey fellas in the amateur NG... Meet the new breed of
Ham his name is SSB, maybe you recognize his numbers on the CB 151.
He went from Illegal CB Keyclown to Extra Class all in about 6 months. He
now takes his freebanding Illegal skills to a HF band near you. Say Hello

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C227476.4C030914@spam.me.not...
> And you're a cross posting anal-retentive ass.
>
> de AB8LR
>
> -SSB
>
> IllegalCBersMustGO wrote:
> >
> > FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF CBERS.
> >
> > "Kenneth Vaughan" <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<fGcU7.232938$3d2.11138155@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> >
> > > twas the night before christmas,when all through the house.....
> > > my radios were silent...silent as a mouse.
> > > the antenna was hung by the chimney with care,
> > > in hopes that the "skip",soon would be there.
> > >
> > > "gunslinger" was nestled,all snug in his bed.
> > > while visions of x-force amps,danced in his head.
> > >
> > > when on my front door,there arose such a clatter...
> > > i sprang from my bed, to see what was the matter!
> > >
> > > away to the window i flew like a flash,
> > > thinking"if its uncle charlie,im outta some cash"
> > > the moon on the breast of the new fallen snow,
> > > gave the lustre of mid-day,to the assholes below.
> > >
> > > when what to my wondering eyes should appear!!
> > > but an fcc van! and eight voobners in storm trooper gear!!!
> > >
> > > with a little old driver,so lively and quick!
> > > i knew in a moment,its RILEY...the prick!!
> > >
> > > more rapid than eagles,his coursers they came,

> > > and he cussed,and he cursed,and called them by name!
> > > "now voobner!,now leland! now richard! and jerry!
> > > "come on you dummies,weve got to hurry!"
> > >
> > > to the top of the porch! to the top of the wall!
> > > now grab his gear! grab his gear! grab it all!!
> > >
> > > so out my back door,with my gear i flew!
> > > with a box full of radios...and my linear ,too!
> > >
> > > i spoke not a word,but went straight to my work,
> > > i hid all my gear,then returned to the "jerk"
> > > and flashing the "bird" finger,right under his nose!
> > >
> > > said "too bad you couldnt find it,you dumb ass holes!!"
> > >
> > > and he heard me exclaim,ere he drove out of sight,
> > > "screw you riley!"...rec radio....good night!!!
> > >
> > > elpasogunslinger merry christmas....(all of you)

4938. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:00:40 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C227B39.F203E090@spam.me.not>
Source record: 27935
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Um.. you're wrong.. I was never an illegal keyclown, but then again, I don't expect you to know the difference. I ran the legal 40 with legal power and with legal gear.

You can call names all you want, but it doesn't change the truth.

But you're right. I did go from CBer (which I ran sideband for a bit over 20 years, and ran professionally) to extra in 6 months, 1 week, and two days. Of course, I worked hard for nine years (I started drilling the code in '92) to overcome my dyslexia so I could pass the code requirement.

What of it?

de AB8LR

-SSB

"middlefiger4@home.comss" wrote:
>
> And So are you SSB, Hey fellas in the amateur NG... Meet the new breed of
> Ham his name is SSB, maybe you recognize his numbers on the CB 151.
> He went from Illegal CB Keyclown to Extra Class all in about 6 months. He
> now takes his freebanding Illegal skills to a HF band near you. Say Hello
>
> "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> news:3C227476.4C030914@spam.me.not...
> > And you're a cross posting anal-retentive ass.
> >
> > de AB8LR
> >
> > -SSB
> >
> > IllegalCBersMustGO wrote:
> > >
> > > FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF CBERS.
> > >
> > > "Kenneth Vaughan" <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:<fGcU7.232938$3d2.11138155@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > >
> > > > twas the night before christmas,when all through the house.....
> > > > my radios were silent...silent as a mouse.
> > > > the antenna was hung by the chimney with care,
> > > > in hopes that the "skip",soon would be there.
> > > >
> > > > "gunslinger" was nestled,all snug in his bed.

> > > > while visions of x-force amps,danced in his head.
> > > >
> > > > when on my front door,there arose such a clatter...
> > > > i sprang from my bed, to see what was the matter!
> > > >
> > > > away to the window i flew like a flash,
> > > > thinking"if its uncle charlie,im outta some cash"
> > > > the moon on the breast of the new fallen snow,
> > > > gave the lustre of mid-day,to the assholes below.
> > > >
> > > > when what to my wondering eyes should appear!!
> > > > but an fcc van! and eight voobners in storm trooper gear!!!
> > > >
> > > > with a little old driver,so lively and quick!
> > > > i knew in a moment,its RILEY...the prick!!
> > > >
> > > > more rapid than eagles,his coursers they came,
> > > > and he cussed,and he cursed,and called them by name!
> > > > "now voobner!,now leland! now richard! and jerry!
> > > > "come on you dummies,weve got to hurry!"
> > > >
> > > > to the top of the porch! to the top of the wall!
> > > > now grab his gear! grab his gear! grab it all!!
> > > >
> > > > so out my back door,with my gear i flew!
> > > > with a box full of radios...and my linear ,too!
> > > >
> > > > i spoke not a word,but went straight to my work,
> > > > i hid all my gear,then returned to the "jerk"
> > > > and flashing the "bird" finger,right under his nose!
> > > >
> > > > said "too bad you couldnt find it,you dumb ass holes!!"
> > > >
> > > > and he heard me exclaim,ere he drove out of sight,
> > > > "screw you riley!"...rec radio....good night!!!
> > > >
> > > > elpasogunslinger merry christmas....(all of you)

4939. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:03:18 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011220190333.229$lm@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 27936
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Sounds Like a story for QRZ or 73 magazine. Perhaps you can get Twisty to
author it, and any money made off the idea I will recieve my normal stipend
of 25%.
I have applied for a copyright so don't think your gonna pull a fast one on
me and sell your story without paying me.

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C227B39.F203E090@spam.me.not...
> Um.. you're wrong.. I was never an illegal keyclown, but then again, I
> don't expect you to know the difference. I ran the legal 40 with legal
> power and with legal gear.
>
> You can call names all you want, but it doesn't change the truth.
>
> But you're right. I did go from CBer (which I ran sideband for a bit over
> 20 years, and ran professionally) to extra in 6 months, 1 week, and two
> days. Of course, I worked hard for nine years (I started drilling the code
> in '92) to overcome my dyslexia so I could pass the code requirement.
>
> What of it?
>
> de AB8LR
>
> -SSB
>
> "middlefiger4@home.comss" wrote:
> >
> > And So are you SSB, Hey fellas in the amateur NG... Meet the new breed
of
> > Ham his name is SSB, maybe you recognize his numbers on the CB 151.
> > He went from Illegal CB Keyclown to Extra Class all in about 6 months.
He
> > now takes his freebanding Illegal skills to a HF band near you. Say
Hello
> >
> > "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> > news:3C227476.4C030914@spam.me.not...
> > > And you're a cross posting anal-retentive ass.
> > >
> > > de AB8LR
> > >
> > > -SSB
> > >

> > > IllegalCBersMustGO wrote:
> > > >
> > > > FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF
CBERS.
> > > >
> > > > "Kenneth Vaughan" <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote in
message
> > news:<fGcU7.232938$3d2.11138155@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > twas the night before christmas,when all through the house.....
> > > > > my radios were silent...silent as a mouse.
> > > > > the antenna was hung by the chimney with care,
> > > > > in hopes that the "skip",soon would be there.
> > > > >
> > > > > "gunslinger" was nestled,all snug in his bed.
> > > > > while visions of x-force amps,danced in his head.
> > > > >
> > > > > when on my front door,there arose such a clatter...
> > > > > i sprang from my bed, to see what was the matter!
> > > > >
> > > > > away to the window i flew like a flash,
> > > > > thinking"if its uncle charlie,im outta some cash"
> > > > > the moon on the breast of the new fallen snow,
> > > > > gave the lustre of mid-day,to the assholes below.
> > > > >
> > > > > when what to my wondering eyes should appear!!
> > > > > but an fcc van! and eight voobners in storm trooper gear!!!
> > > > >
> > > > > with a little old driver,so lively and quick!
> > > > > i knew in a moment,its RILEY...the prick!!
> > > > >
> > > > > more rapid than eagles,his coursers they came,
> > > > > and he cussed,and he cursed,and called them by name!
> > > > > "now voobner!,now leland! now richard! and jerry!
> > > > > "come on you dummies,weve got to hurry!"
> > > > >
> > > > > to the top of the porch! to the top of the wall!
> > > > > now grab his gear! grab his gear! grab it all!!
> > > > >
> > > > > so out my back door,with my gear i flew!
> > > > > with a box full of radios...and my linear ,too!
> > > > >
> > > > > i spoke not a word,but went straight to my work,
> > > > > i hid all my gear,then returned to the "jerk"
> > > > > and flashing the "bird" finger,right under his nose!
> > > > >
> > > > > said "too bad you couldnt find it,you dumb ass holes!!"
> > > > >
> > > > > and he heard me exclaim,ere he drove out of sight,
> > > > > "screw you riley!"...rec radio....good night!!!

> > > > >
> > > > > elpasogunslinger merry christmas....(all of you)

4940. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:04:31 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <9vturn0l20@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27941
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
news:e9de0154.0112201318.115c1d6@posting.google.com...
> "Why? Simple. I am an outlaw CBer. You have spoken out against me one
> too many times. If life were ideal I could simply shut you up like I
> do on the freeband by cranking up my big box (just kidding). But this
> is less than ideal so I have to tolerate you and your hammie pals. I
> am disgusted by your rule-following, goody-two-shoes holier-than-thou
> attitude towards radio, Lelnad. Rules are going to be broken and I am
> going to freeband and that is all there is to it. I will continue to
> promote illegal CB because I can. Anarchy of the airwaves is where we
> are headed and you can't come to terms with it, can you? Too bad but
> 28.085 is just the beginning and it irritates you doesn't it? I am
> glad, now go back to your kennel with dogie and the rest and lap your
> wounds"

Well, there's always going to be some uneducated slug, who has a Messiah Complex, thinking he has every right to be above the law. Charles Manson, Adolph Hitler, Jim Jones, Son of Sam, The Zodiac Killer, the list goes on and on...

I'll assume that anyone who believes radio should be free to the unlicensed public, also can't understand why they keep getting their driver's license revoked for driving under the influence, why they can't yell "fire" in a crowded theater, and they believe the people in handcuffs on COPS are just being harrassed...

LOL!

What sport these losers are.

--
Jim

4941. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:09:20 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112201609.3c5967f3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27937
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:<u2q22u85asi99rl8i9qi6p0on6ehvjb84c@4ax.com>...
> SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com (SD SpecialDelivery Jones)
> shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
> do you have the foggiest FREAKING idea what it means to snip?
>
> Jim
>
>
> Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

veep.....my ,my....i am impressed........really......also on the
letters by your name thing......may i suggest the letters 'DH' be
added....i feel it would be most appropriate.......

4942. FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:12:27 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112201612.4aaccfeb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27938
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

For Sale, toothpick used by Adolph Hitler. It is authentic because there is a letter (signed by me) saying so. Comes with a photo of Hitler with his hand near his face (no one can prove he is NOT using this toothpick) as corroboration. I am asking $1500. Please email me by putting an @ where the _ is in my address and drop subdimension.com. In this way I will avoid the spambots.

If you don't like the price, let's talk.

Thank you,
Twistedhed

4943. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:30:36 UTC
From: Lenny Stover <mppd5107@the-police.com>
Message-ID: <YnvU7.8379$Xs4.1367146@feed.centurytel.net>
Source record: 27939
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"Peter H Proctor" <drp@drproctor.com> wrote

> It has to be articulable and excludes areas where there is a
> "reasonable expectation of privacy", where you need a warrant.. This
> includes locked containers and (if memory serves) things like
> backpacks, etc.

If it is within the person's reach, a warrant is *not* required.

> You can ask any damn thing you want. But you cannot
> search such areas without a warrant, except with the drivers
> permission. And the "drivers reach" business is a specific
> exception for the safety of the officer, so he can search for
> weapons.

You just contridicted yourself. If it is within the driver's reach, locked or not, I can search the damn thing. You may not think so, but the USSC does.

> True, if he just happens to find contraband, he can
> arest for that. BTW, occasionally, this legal fiction
> matters--- e.g., in theory you can't search an unlocked container
> (such as a band-aid box) if it is too small to hold a weapon.

A .22 caliber derringer fits nicely in a bandaid box! I'd be happy to show the court, when justifying my search.

4944. Re: RADIO LAW vs police procedures

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:33:59 UTC
From: Lenny Stover <mppd5107@the-police.com>
Message-ID: <grvU7.8381$Xs4.1367456@feed.centurytel.net>
Source record: 27940
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote

> And the mayor, that great democrat, of Chicago
> has yet to settle with the police so that they can
> get a pay raise.

Yea, but his old man, "Da Boss," ....now *that* was a mayor! ;-)

He passed away 25 years ago today, and Chicago will never be the same.

4945. I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:50:33 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27942
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Hammies and dog-pound refugees (dogie,nad,pipeboy) would do well to read my scintillating prose and learned insights on the fine art of freebanding. A pet peeve of mine is that hammies (certain ones) put down radio hobbyists like myself just because they are CBers and just because they use gear that's advanced. I have logged more DX on the freeband than most 2 meter hams have in a lifetime. Why shouldn't I be treated with respect? All I am asking is that the issue of legality be put aside and my acheivements be recognized for what they are"

http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html

"If you take the time to read this you will see that we on freeband have problems with troublemakers too. They don't abide by our rules. They don't care what others think. They jam and make noises on 27.555. Read about it in my article. They are wrecking my freeband and they should be stopped"

http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html

"I admit I get all upset when hammies tell me I am breaking rules. I don't care about rules. I don't care what others think. If I want to operate freeband it is my responsibility and I don't like to hear anyone putting me down for it. Read about how we have created our own little illegal alternative to ham radio on the freeband. You hammies can be jealous"

http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html

"Hammies try to say that there are goverment users on 27.555 and above. I have never heard any myself so that proves there are none. Because of course what I say is true and everyone else is a liar. Read my wonderful prose and see for yourself"

http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html

"Geniuses like me don't need to obey laws since we are above the masses. Take that, you pussy-footed hams"

4946. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:52:50 UTC
From: ni4l <ni4l@charter.net>
Message-ID: <3C2287E2.7010100@charter.net>
Source record: 27943
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DUMBASS

Twistedhed wrote:

> For Sale, toothpick used by Adolph Hitler. It is authentic because
> there is a letter (signed by me) saying so. Comes with a photo of
> Hitler with his hand near his face (no one can prove he is NOT using
> this toothpick) as corroboration. I am asking $1500. Please email me
> by putting an @ where the _ is in my address and drop
> subdimension.com. In this way I will avoid the spambots.
>
> If you don't like the price, let's talk.
>
> Thank you,
> Twistedhed
>

4947. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:55:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vu1d3nqm1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27944
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
news:KCdU7.3207$Rw4.727674@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
> : > > >Yeah, well someone needs to explain it to the NY State Police.
> : > >
> : >
> : > Remember the same thing happens to
> : > folks with guns in cars. Even if they are
> : > legal.
> :
> : There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm
> : which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed
> : to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of
> : possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies
> : rather than ever offering one justification of probable
> : cause to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.
> :
> Actually it is a crime in my state not have
> a radio license if you have a scanner in the
> car.

That is the case in only about 10 states.

> While the cops may not be as hard
> nosed with a scanner as they are with guns,
> having either in your vehicle then having your
> son or wife drive the vehicle might will result
> in them being arrested in my state (if they do
> not have either a ham license - for the scanner,
> or a gun permit for the weapon).

The issue would be what would the judge rule.
The FCC preempts all local law regarding ham
transcievers which have extended recieve capability.
Few hams have ONLY a scanner in their car that I know.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4948. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 00:58:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vu1otqlp1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27945
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
news:4zeU7.3273$Rw4.780022@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
>
> : > > >Thanks to congress and the current political state of affairs I'm
to
> : the point where next to the ticket in my wallet I've got a card citing
> : > > >47 USC 302a(f)(2), just in case some idiot with a badge decides to
> : > > >demonstrate diminished capacity.
> : > >
> : > > Remember what I was ranting and raving about when the legislation
> : > > (Finegold Bill) was making its way through The Congress?
> : > >
> : > > If the "scanner law" (as well as the "radio interception" law) is
> : > > properly drafted, it would be specific that it covered equipment
> : > > being used in the commission of a crime or in furtherance of some
> : > > illegal purpose, as California's law states.
> : > >
> : > > --
> : > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> : >
> : > Remember the same thing happens to
> : > folks with guns in cars. Even if they are
> : > legal.
> :
> : There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm
> : which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed
> : to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of
> : possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies
> : rather than ever offering one justification of probable
> : cause to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.
>
> Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
> officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
> by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.
>
> His quote:
> "Actually, the USSC ruled that police can perform warrantless searches of
> vehicles. Permission to search is not a requisite for obtaining a
driver's
> license. We don't need permission if we have a reasonable suspicion."

'll rephrase the statement/challenge:
There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm

which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies rather than ever offering one justification of REASONABLE SUSPICION to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4949. Re: inappropriate Christmas carols

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:03:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220200306.02371.00000456@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 27946

In article <%GqU7.174231$WW.10966907@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Angels we have heard on high,
>telling us to go out and buy.

I have seen this in National Lampoon rendered as:

Angels we have heard on high
Tell us to go out and buy
And the merchants in reply
Echo with their greedy cry:

Mooooooooooooooney
O how we do love it
Mooooooooooooooney
We shall make more of it

73 de Jim, N2EY

4950. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:03:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220200309.02371.00000458@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 27947

In article <3C22220B.1AF1C860@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>> >What kind of "sub-atomic particle"?
>>
>> I couldn't tell you, offhand. I saw a mention of the research
>> in the newspaper, and heard a reference to it on a NOVA show Chris was
>> watching while I was on the air, but I don't know enough about it (or
>> physics, for that matter) to say.
>
>Sounds a little fishy. Was it a photon transporter? ;-)
>
HEY! I got one of those!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4951. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:03:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220200309.02371.00000457@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 27948

In article <05CC461F98FB8716.ED6F031291429B65.97EA10CFFB8C5672@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 18 Dec 2001 01:45:59 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>> Hemp oil IS a vegetable oil, remember?
>>
>>If you say so, Rick. Thus it has all the advantages and disadvantages named
>>above.
>
> Essentially, yes, although those vary from one form of oil to
>another as I'm sure you know (for example, it takes a vastly greater
>amount of acreage to produce a given amount of soy bean or peanut oil
>than it does to produce the same quantity of hemp oil, due to the size
>of the hemp plant and the percentage of the plant suitable for oil
>production).

How much is "vastly greater"? Real numbers, not vague generalities.
>
>>"Efficient" in what sense? How many gallons per acre, how many gallons per
>ton
>>of raw harvested crop, how many gallons per dollar spent to grow it?
>
> Efficient in the sense of having very high energy/volume
>potential, of being inexpensive to produce (no pesticides, herbicides,
>or [in most cases] irrigation are needed), and in the sense of
>providing a high per-acre yield.

Still no actual numbers presented, though.
>
> You can get the precise yield figures from some of the sources
>I previously cited, or from such sites on the Inet as the Farm Bureau
>home page, the Hemp Council home page, or HEMP Canada.

I will take a look. But it would sure help you cause to quote some real numbers
and how they are derived.
>
>>For food purposes, soybean oil is pretty bad stuff. Canola oil is better and
>>olive oil is better than canola. Flaxseed oil is tops but is very expensive
>and
>>not as easy to cook with.
>
> According to nutritionists, hemp oil has a very high
>percentage of essential nutriants--more so than any other currently
>used vegetable oil--and appears to be completely non-allergeric as

>well.

Vegetable oils are mostly just fat. Some fats are better than others,
nutritionally, but to describe any vegetable oil as having "essential
nutrients" is a bit of hyperbole.

>Peanut oil isn't too far from it nutritionally, but there are a
>number of people allergic to it, and it isn't as nutritionally
>valuable as hemp oil on a gallon for gallon basis--nor is it as easily
>(or inexpensively) produced.

I note you do not compare it to olive oil or canola oil, which are preferable
to peanut or soy oils.

>>> As far as costs are concerned, assuming the development of
>>>sufficient processing facilities and farms
>>
>>Whoa! Don't Assume that at all!!
>
> Why?

Because you're ignoring the tremendous startup costs. Those facilities do not
just grow on trees.
>
> Can you name a single product which, once in demand, did not
>inspire precisely that type of developments?

Ya missed the point.
>
>>To make any sort of sizable dent in the US consumption of petrofuels, any
>>biofuel must be produced in millions-of-gallons-per-day quantities, at
>least.
>>That means BIG investments in farms and refining facilities. Those facilites
>>don't just grow out of the ground.
>
> Nope. But neither do investment opportunities with the
>potential yield of hemp production and processing. Create a market and
>you'll have plenty of investors willing to put up the money.

IF the price pays those investors an adequate ROI.
>
>>Show your source. I think the raw production cost would be much higher.
>Here's
>>why:
>
> I DID provide my sources--refer to them.

I did - no hard numbers. I'll check the ones you named in the most recent post.
>
>>Take a stroll down any supermarket aisle and price the absolute cheapest
>>vegetable oil you can find. It's a lot more than 49 cents a gallon, and
>there
>>is practically no tax on it because it's a food item. And it cannot be used

>as
>>an engine fuel without additional procesing. Hemp oil is no different.
>
> And how much would the price on that vegetable oil be if it
>were produced in the kind of quantities that hemp oil would be
>produced in?

No way to know for sure unless it's actually done. And the food grade vegetable
oil needs more procesing to be used as motor fuel.
>
> Economies of scale are VERY important in an area such as that.

Up to a point, yes. But you have not shown how the fuel will cost so little.

>And as far as taxation goes, if people are stupid enough to permit
>their congresscritters to pass high taxes on the product, they have no
>one to blame but themselves if they have to pay the price at the
>pumps.

The taxes currently placed on motor fuels in the USA are actually very low.

> At least with hemp oil, there would be enough producers (it
>isn't that expensive to produce) that a monopoly couldn't form--which
>would keep prices reasonable.

You gotta be kidding. What do you think has been happening in agriculture for
the past 20 years?
>
>>Get an actual pilot plant running and see what the actual production costs
>are.
>>Thye biodiesel folks have done so.
>
> Glad to as soon as you get me the necessary permits from the
>government to do so.

That's YOUR job, not mine.

>I'd LOVE to own the first hemp oil production
>facility in the USA--and the patents that went with that as well, of
>course.
>
What patents? You talk about all this as if it's an existing technology, ready
to roll.

>>>Since it can
>>>be produced domestically, no transportation expenses (or oil spill
>>>risks) exist with respect to its use,
>>
>>Wrong. It still must be transported domestically, and that's a major cost
>for
>>any fuel.
>
> Not compared to international shipments with the cost of

>transportation AND tariffs or duties added to it.

Tariffs and duties are not transportation costs. Supertankers are pretty
efficient, too.
>
>>Production and distribution costs of any fuel cannot be dismissed so
>lightly.

>>What is "a reasonable rate" of taxation? US fuel taxes are used mostly for
>road
>>construction and maintenance. Use of biofuel doesn't reduce road
>maintenance.
>
> No, but it reduces AIR pollution, which effects a savings for
>government and industry (as well as for the medical field). In
>addition, while US taxes may be used mostly for road construction and
>maintenance, that doesn't necessarily hold true for STATE taxes on
>fuels--often those go to pet projects of the legislators.

Such as bridges and alternative transportation?
>
>>I think reducing/eliminating petrol imports should be a top priority for a
>>number of reasons. Biofuels is one part of the solution to that problem. But
>>I'm also realistic enough to know that it's not going to be quick, cheap or
>>easy.
>
> I can agree with the "quick" part--but cheap and easy are
>relative. Hemp oil production would take time to get going, but once
>established would be both cheap AND easy.

Yeah right. I remember being told time and again that nuclear plants would make
electricity "too cheap to meter". Uh-huh.
>
>>The cars to use it are available today, and have been for decades. I know -
>I
>>drove the same Rabbit Diesel for 17 years. Wonderful car. 43 mpg over its
>life,
>>which was spent mostly in the worst possible driving conditions. On the
>highway
>>the thing would do well over 50 mpg.
>
> And it will run--unmodified--on vegetable fuel?

I dunno - don't have the car anymore. But read up on biodiesel - the mods are
minimal if any. The FUEL has to be processed, though.

The whole point of biodiesel is that it is a diesel replacement. Can vbe mixed
with petrodiesel in any ratio, too.
>
> Since when?

Several years, at least. Exhaust smells like french fries.
>
>>You're not seeing the real problem, Rick.
>>
>>In an earlier post you wrote that cars could be "converted" to use hemp
>fuel.
>>That implies that the hemp fuel is a gasoline replacement.
>>
>>But in reality what we're talking about biodiesel, which means the
>"conversion"
>>entails replacing the entire engine and much of the fuel system. And the
>result
>>is a diesel car.
>>
>>The real problem is getting Americans to accept diesel cars. They've been
>>around for decades but haven't made much of a dent in market share.
>>
>>If you're talking about some other type of hemp fuel, what is it? Alcohol?
>
> Hemp oil can be converted to a form that will run in standard
>internal combustion engines (with suitable modifications to the fuel
>systems) as easily as it can be converted to a form that will run in
>standard diesel cars with similar modifications.

And just what is that form, and those "modifications"??

>Ford Motors has just
>such engine designs patented (and has demonstrated prototypes of hemp
>run vehicles both in the past [the first was in 1936] and in recent
>years).

Brazil has millions of cars running on alcohol made from bioproducts.

>>> Of all nations, we have the greatest ability to produce
>>>industrial hemp--not only are our agricultural sciences at least as
>>>advanced as those used anywhere on earth, but we have a tremendous
>>>amount of arable land suitable to hemp production--
>>
>>This may or may not be true. What matters is how many gallons per acre can
>be
>>produced, and at what cost.
>
> And according to Farm Bureau studies, the answer to those
>questions is one that makes development of hemp fuel economically
>feasible.

Then it should be done.
>
>>>and could thus
>>>produce fuel at a reasonable price, encouraging the production of hemp
>>>based vehicles (both Ford and GM have patents on engines designed to
>>>use hemp fuel, btw, I don't know about Chrysler or the major foreign
>>>manufacturers, but it's reasonable to assume they have the same--thus

>>>production of autos designed for the fuel wouldn't be a major barrier
>>>to its implementation).
>>
>>Technology companies patent everything they can. Most patents don't make a
>>dime, but they look real good on the inventor's resume.
>
> Perhaps--but the fact that they HAVE developed engines made to
>run on this fuel indicates that it's not a difficult task to do so.

Untrue. Simply proves it can be done. Says nothing about how difficult or
expensive it will be, or how the cars will perform.
>
>>As I have said before - the barrier is getting people to buy the cars.
>
> Make them flashy--American car buyers are rather superficial
>(can you say "SUV?").

Not the problem. TDIs are very flashy.
>
>>> Those answers should be available on the site I cited above.
>>
>>They are not. I looked carefully, and it's just not there. Please post the
>>info, or a link, if you can find it. I couldn't.
>
> I'll try to find some and post them by the weekend if
>possible. Sorry, I thought the sites I listed would have included
>them.
>
Just the numbers, Rick, just the numbers.

>>As I've said many times, I'm a proponent of reducing and eliminating our
>>dependence on imported oil. Biofuels is one part of the solution. But the
>idea
>>that "hemp fuel" is a quick, cheap and easy answer is far from proven.
>
> It never will be proven until trials are permitted, Jim. And
>that requires the government to change its rulings on the production
>of hemp agriculturally.

Also requires that the claims of cheap fuel and low cost be substantiated.
Biodiesel is being done NOW, but the cost is not competitive in most places.
Yet.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4952. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:04:34 UTC
From: smoolb@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011220200434.02371.00000459@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 27949

In article <e2FaJ8PiBHA.1648@cpimsnntpa02>, "K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
writes:

>KE8HH got it wrong again, and said:
>
>> Actually, since "LT" is taken universally as the abbreviation
>> for "light" (as in reduced in features or capabilities),
>
>No, it isn't "taken universally" that way at all. For example,
>many makers of finer automobiles over the years have
>applied "LT" as the marquï¿½ of their "Luxury Touring" editions.

True, Hans.

And some folks think of "Lieutenant" when they see the abbreviation "LT".
Others think "light" as in "illuminating the darkness".
>
>My "LT" model has many features not found on the next lower
>models, such as heated leather seating, enhanced
>entertainment system, built-in telecommunications and
>GPS facilities, "3-zone" climate comfort, improved
>sound-proofing, deep tinted glass, electronic traction
>control, electronic ride control, heated outside mirrors,
>theft deterrent system, automatic day/night rear view
>mirror, tire pressure monitoring, and many other features.

COOL!!!
>
>So rather than "reduced in features and capabilities"
>as you erroneously claim, "LT" often stands for "greatly
>enhanced features and capabilities".
>
And lots of other things.

>In other words, you're just flat-out wrong (again).

Bingo.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4953. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:06:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vu209fbk1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27950
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C21FECD.56BCC8FD@gte.net...
>Bill K2UNK wrote:
> > That is hogwash. I haven't seen any such "growing
> > numbers" opposed to CBs, radios, etc. Indeed, there
> > has been NO movement to ban scanners at all...rather
> > some states (e.g. NJ) have relaxed old laws which
> > did ban scanners in autos.
> >
> > > There is the feeling that the public can not be trusted,
> > > that too many use technology for crime or to try to
> > > overthrow the government. Many would prefer that only
> > > those who are paid on a professional basis should be allowed
> > > to have access to radios or weapons.
> >
> > More hogwash. Even if there is some such sentiment,
> > there hasn't been any support for that attitude in the press,
> > the legislatures, etc.
> >
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> I gather that you do not read that many papers
> everyday. The Washington Post, LA Times,
> NY Times, Chicago Tribune all go on "crusades"
> every so often over gun ownership, cell phones,
> scanners. The elite do not like the fact that the
> masses understand, and use, technology.

I have seen public opposition to gun ownership, mixed
opposition to cellphone use in an auto (no one
seems to want to ban any total use/ownership
of cellphones) ...BUT
not one crusade at all against scanners. There has
been NO demand to ban scanners at all, even for
specific frequencies, since the FCC rules
prohibiting scanners manufactured that can recieve
cellular.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4954. The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:12:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vu2cb$2ne$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27951

Here's the law itself from the Tacoma WEB site:

Chapter 8.38
PROHIBITED USE OF NON-FCC
CERTIFICATED TRANSMITTING
EQUIPMENT IN THE CITIZENS BAND
Sections:

8.38.010 Prohibited use of non-FCC certificated
transmitting equipment in the citizens band.

8.38.020 Violation penalty.

8.38.010 Prohibited use of non-FCC certificated transmitting
equipment in the citizens band. It is unlawful for any person, firm, or
corporation, to
(a) use citizens band radio equipment not authorized
by the Federal Communications Commission;
(b) to allow the unauthorized operation of citizens band
radio equipment on a frequency between 24 MHz
and 35 MHz. Provided, however, as required by
47 U.S.C. 302(a), licensed amateur radio ("Ham")
operators are excluded from the above provisions.
(Ord. 26851 1; passed Sept. 18, 2001)

8.38.020 Violation penalty.
Any person found guilty of a violation of this chapter
shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction
thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding
$500 or by imprisonment in the Pierce County Jail
for a period not exceeding six months or by both
such fine and imprisonment. (Ord. 26851 1; passed
Sept. 18, 2001)
----------end of Tacoma city code cite.----------

The KEY as to any enforcement MUST be PROVING the USE
in the first place...AND proving the radio is not authorized.

Good luck...looks like nothing but feel good legislation to
placate one or more complaining residents.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4955. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:17:21 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C228D8E.896E9CE9@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 27952
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Twistedhed wrote:

<NOTHING>

He wrote nothing because it was a forge.
Twistedhed has a webtv addy.

4956. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:29:17 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C22905A.298B3432@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 27953
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Welcome to the forge zone, where everything is as fake as it seems.

4957. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:29:42 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C229073.951979FD@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 27954
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Welcome to the forge zone, where everything is as fake as it seems.

4958. Re: RADIO SHOULD BE LAWLESS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:32:45 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C22912A.9BB63CB0@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 27955
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

Welcome to the forge zone, where everything is as fake as it seems.

4959. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:33:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011220203308.19213.00001175@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27956

In article <3c216ac6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>WHAT?! Apartment?! Weren't you using the colloquialism "trailer park
>trash" some time ago? Wow, and *you* live in an apartment? Man, Larry, you
>portend far more intelligence than to pay good money for nothing you will
>ever own...

Kim:

If it makes you feel any better, I am now looking for property to buy here in Delaware. I'm trying to decide to buy a house or build one; something will happen along those lines very soon. Living in this apartment has been quite cost-effective for me; due to the fact I've been here for 9 years, my rent is about 75% of what it would be getting if occupied by a new tenant. And, as someone said, I've not had to concern myself with repairs, lawn mowing, etc. which is an important consideration in my life -- and if this place ever went condo I might just write a check for it -- as long as I could make certain upgrades. However, in reality, I need/want a bit more space, so I'll probably get out of here pretty soon.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4960. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:33:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011220203309.19213.00001176@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 27957

In article <3C218978.23B91356@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> WHAT?! Apartment?! Weren't you using the colloquialism "trailer park
>> trash" some time ago? Wow, and *you* live in an apartment? Man, Larry,
>you
>> portend far more intelligence than to pay good money for nothing you will
>> ever own...
>
>Some people choose apartments because they know that their career
>will have them moving every few years. The electrical engineer field
>is like that, especially when companies downsize when they get a tummy
>ache. Other points: Upside, no lawn to mow, downside: no visible
>antennas, upside: you get the landlord to fix the toilet, downside:
>noisy neighbors.
>
>Larry, if you're on the top floor, there may be an access hatch
>in a closet you can open to get to an attic crawlspace. I've
>used such for crude dipole HF antennas. Did a station
>in Antarctica on such once.
>

I use a dual-band (20 & 10 meter) dipole and a monoband 40-meter
dipole inside my apartment, and a 10-meter delta loop on my balcony,
in addition to 2-meter and 440 MHz 1/2-wave Ringos on my balcony.
I live in an apartment because I was brought here by the Air Force,
was never sure I was going to stay in Delaware, and haven't been
sure of my future in this town until just this past year. The real-estate
market here is strictly a "buyer's market" -- any place I would have
bought would have been tough to sell and probably not have
appreciated very much. That has also turned around in the last year
or so, and I'm now very much interested in buying a home -- and may
build one from scratch. There are other deciding factors, but they
may be sorted out soon.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4961. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:33:23 UTC
From: Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com>
Message-ID: <3C229163.30388D94@fcc.com>
Source record: 27958
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> > I gather that you do not read that many papers
> > everyday. The Washington Post, LA Times,
> > NY Times, Chicago Tribune all go on "crusades"
> > every so often over gun ownership, cell phones,
> > scanners. The elite do not like the fact that the
> > masses understand, and use, technology.
>
> I have seen public opposition to gun ownership, mixed
> opposition to cellphone use in an auto (no one
> seems to want to ban any total use/ownership
> of cellphones) ...BUT
> not one crusade at all against scanners. There has
> been NO demand to ban scanners at all, even for
> specific frequencies, since the FCC rules
> prohibiting scanners manufactured that can recieve
> cellular.

When N9NWO sees a 'source' that comes from all the Newspapers he
claims to read and then he nor they themselves do not provide
any source to these allegations regarding opposition to radios in
the hands of the people and the like in this case, well....

4962. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 01:48:25 UTC
From: K0HB with non-approved radios <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <0b020915e4639788e81942d936dd3dd2.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 27959
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C10E771.9B1CFEF9@gte.net...

> And how does that young cop know that you
> are not some type of terrorist? All those radios
> could be used to spy on the police so that you
> can try to overthrow the US government.

The "young cop" could care less if I have a whole 18-wheeler loaded with radios, with or without FCC stickers. It is not against the law, even the Tacoma law, to possess a non-FCC certificated radio (or dozens of them)!

The violation is related to *USE*, not possession.

Sort of the like lady on our lake who decided one day to take her husbands fishing boat out into the middle of the lake, away from the kids, to anchor and read her book in peace. Along comes a conservation officer and asks for her fishing license. She has none (she doesn't fish), so he says he'll have to charge her with "fishing without a license". She replies "But I wasn't fishing".... He responds that she has fishing equipment, so he can probably make the charge stick. To which she replies, "Well, then I charge you with rape." He is aghast ..... how could she do that? "Well, you are in possession of the equipment."

So go stuff your "superior cops can search my car for illegal radios" crap up where the sun doesn't shine.

With all kind regards

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas11poolc239.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.21.239]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4963. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 02:07:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C228C4B.76F87EBE@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27960

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > What radiotelegraphy actually is, instead, is the
> > most basic method of radiocommunications yet devised, or likely ever to be
> > devised. Even tho it is a hundred years old.
> > It wouldn't matter if it was done in Morse or Swahili. It is bottom line
> > radio at its finest..
> "
> "Basic" is not "finest", Dick. If "basic" were "finest"

Well, there goes Mister Twister, full speed ahead at his favorite passtime-obfuscsation by conversion. I said Basic radiocommunications at **ITS* finest. So you try to shoot that statement down by changing the meaning to "the finest".. Of course you know there is a huge difference, you just hope no one else will notice.

Basic is basic. If JPL could have successfully carried off their space probes using simple CW they would have been fools to reject it in favor of anything else. Just as ham radio ops would be fools to reject it just because there exists more efficient methods which demand far more overhead.

4964. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 02:24:10 UTC
From: Dave Holford <holford@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <3C229D4A.B9C82202@sympatico.ca>
Source record: 27961
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Try a simple experiment. Assuming you have a scanner or Ham rig capable
of monitoring the 108-118 portion of the aviation band.

Pick a freq between 108 and 118 - they are used for navigation and
Instrument Landing Systems.

Now slowly tune a portable receiver between 97.3 and 107.3
Somewhere in this range (10.7 below the scanner freq) you will hear the
LO of your portable.

So there you are with a little radio up close to the window transmitting
a very weak signal on the frequency your pilot may be relying on to find
the runway in miserable weather. Depending on where you are seated you
might even be able to see the aircraft antenna.

That's what happened during the Superbowl.
My little Sony portable completely obliterates local navigation signals.

Not sure what military gear you are familiar with but the US military is
in the process of a major upgrade to their ILS receivers to meet
European interference standards. I would assume (makes an ass of 'u' and
'me') that most professional civil avionics meet European standards
since many of the aircraft at one time or another find themselves in
European airspace.

And, of course, avionics uses frequencies throughout most of the
spectrum. Certainly from 100 kHz up through a few GHz depending on the
aircraft.

I too operate a laptop, a desktop, a 50W 2M/70cm rig and a 100W HF rig
with no problems. But I have completely disrupted an ATC radar display
by operating a 2m HT in the room.

Dave

OldBiker wrote:
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
> > ....
> > I've heard stories of a flight during the Superbowl where passengers
> > listening to the game on radios caused interference with pilot
> > equipment. And that is just LO leakage, not intentional emitters.
>
> If those tales are true, the aircraft industry is in deep trouble. I
> operate a laptop & 50W 2M packet station while my child bride hunts DX
> on a 100W HF rig beside me with no mutual interference on cheap consumer

> equipment and I have a tad of knowledge about the immunity of military
> gear. OTOH I read that airport radars are often down for months waiting
> for obsolete tubes at the same time the military is scrapping 3D radars
> only one generation old so I wouldn't key up on an airplane either.
> Oy!
> KA3DWW

4965. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 02:30:49 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <t9xU7.174629$WW.11002069@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 27962
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C227B39.F203E090@spam.me.not...
> Um.. you're wrong.. I was never an illegal keyclown, but then again, I
> don't expect you to know the difference. I ran the legal 40 with legal
> power and with legal gear.
>
> You can call names all you want, but it doesn't change the truth.
>
> But you're right. I did go from CBer (which I ran sideband for a bit
over
> 20 years, and ran professionally) to extra in 6 months, 1 week, and two
> days. Of course, I worked hard for nine years (I started drilling the
code
> in '92) to overcome my dyslexia so I could pass the code requirement.
>
> What of it?
>
> de AB8LR
>
> -SSB
>
> "middlefiger4@home.comss" wrote:
> >
> > And So are you SSB, Hey fellas in the amateur NG... Meet the new breed
of
> > Ham his name is SSB, maybe you recognize his numbers on the CB 151.
> > He went from Illegal CB Keyclown to Extra Class all in about 6
months. He
> > now takes his freebanding Illegal skills to a HF band near you. Say
Hello
> >

Dear Middie:

I've been licensed longer than CB is old. Elmered a batch of freebanders
over the years and all of them were decent amateurs. If his coming out of
CB is supposed to disturb my digestion, sorry. The numbers game alone
assures that most people becoming radioactive do so via CB.
He seems to have handled his problem; can you say the same??

Dick NBK

4966. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 02:36:18 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <b524d53ce8a586dcfa6b47dfac64d0f2.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 27963
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"chris" <k4rch@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vjehm$p4e$1@bob.news.rcn.net...

> You only need permission if you are going to transmit during the flight.
>
> Chris

Horse shit!!!!!

Your little HT becomes a low level transmitter as soon
as it's turned on (because of internal injection frequencies).

It is within a few yards of very sensitive receivers
looking for navigation signals, often feeding "fly by
wire" flight assistance equipment.

Pull the batteries, put it in checked luggage, and pick
it up at baggage claim at your destination. Have a nice
flight.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted from mplsapanas11poolc239.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.21.239]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4967. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 02:37:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C229353.B80A358F@townsqr.com>
Source record: 27964

K0HB wrote:

> N2EY said:
>
> > This can be interpreted to mean "everybody should have to do
> > what I did". But it can also mean "I learned a lot from it, and others
> > will, too".
>
> All sorts of ways to interpret it. Here's one from the Book of Bokonon:
>
> "Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> without having come by their ignorance the hard way."

Your book should be retitled the "Book of BS 'em".
Anyone who learns something and finds himself no wiser than
before either didn't learn anything or has just gotten his Question Pool
Extra.
(same difference)

4968. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 02:40:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C22A13A.36CDAB78@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27965

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected a
> > > reasonable response. She didn't get a reasonable response which tells
> > > us something about Riley's prudish hangups.
> >
> > Funny that I don't see it that way at all.
>
> Of course not! You are one of the busybody prudes who want to force
> your personal morals, hangups, and value system on everyone else.

The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her supporters.
She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views and
promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.

Dave K8MN

4969. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 02:45:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C22A25B.BCB4CB7F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 27966

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C22381E.75092C56@earthlink.net...
>
> > Funny that I don't see it that way at all. I don't think she liked the
> > reasonable response she got. In typical Kim fashion, she attempts to
> > rationalize her choice in the face of rejection. It tells us something
> > about Kim's "to hell with what anyone thinks of me--I'm doing what I
> > want" attitude.
>
> Re-phrase that to read "to hell with what a few people of a minority opinion
> might think," and you would be correct.

Why would I do that? We haven't established what the majority believes
about this situation.

Dave K8MN

4970. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 02:45:46 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C22A247.FB057182@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 27967
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

K0HB with non-approved radios wrote:
>
> Sort of the like lady on our lake who decided one
> day to take her husbands fishing boat out into
> the middle of the lake, away from the kids, to
> anchor and read her book in peace. Along comes
> a conservation officer and asks for her fishing
> license. She has none (she doesn't fish), so he
> says he'll have to charge her with "fishing
> without a license". She replies "But I wasn't
> fishing".... He responds that she has fishing
> equipment, so he can probably make the charge
> stick. To which she replies, "Well, then I
> charge you with rape." He is aghast ..... how
> could she do that? "Well, you are in possession
> of the equipment."

That's a two-thumbs-up reply. LMAO!

4971. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 03:00:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vu8k901mvp@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27970
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
news:fer42u8hbchk012lq430vm5k5lof8ie4m3@4ax.com...

> >2600
>
> You have failed to provide any documentation whatsoever that
>
> (a) there are police who feel that the public does not have the right
> to own radio transceivers and guns
> (b) their numbers are growing significantly
> (c) there are politicians who feel that the public does not have the
> right to own radio transceivers and guns
> (d) their numbers are growing significantly
>
> You may make one final attempt.

You posted a one-word question, I gave you a one-word response. I leave it to you to figure out what it means. Kinda like a puzzle. Once you discover the solution, you'll know where to look for your answer.

4972. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 03:01:00 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3C22A5D9.D40A94D4@icok.net>
Source record: 27968
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Can you give me one good reason why you post this silliness
here? I mean, other than as a 'troll'?

1. posting to more than one group -- 'D'-
2. style -- 'D'-
3. content -- 'D'-

converting to 'troll' numerics -- maybe a '2'.
'Doc

4973. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 03:01:46 UTC
From: Omniscient <KnowsAll@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <9vu8nh$h8i$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 27969
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vtp0f0qot@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "John Kimball" <johnkimb@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:9vsllo$5sm$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 07:46:39 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in
> > Message id: <9vq6odhoe2@pita.alt.net>:
> >
> >
> > >No, but I hear you slurp nutsacks behind dumpsters and are too
> CHICKENSHIT
> > >to post under your real name, COWARD.
> >
> > So is 8L0J08 your first name, or last name?

Roger is the guy that has been slipping three dollar bills into the big ol' kettle and he makes sure that his name, address and phone number are on each bill. Yes, it is rather tacky but he gets better results with this method than he did with the magic marker in the gay bar stalls. No COWARD, he!

4974. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 03:10:15 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27972
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >
> > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> >
>
> The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?

My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.

FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in the 70s. They were those little things with the big eyes and different colored, Don King style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils, or on keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still around, but not as popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence in popularity about ten years ago.

4975. Question for Beer Experts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 03:33:39 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112201933.77397e3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27971
Cross-posted to: alt.beer,rec.food.drink.beer,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"A few months ago I was out on my boat drinking Malt Liquor and not my usual Miller Genuine Draft. After a while I became quite dizzy and hit my head on the gunwale. Not long after that I decided to get on my illegal CB and listen on the "freeband". There I heard a man who identified himself as being from a flying saucer. It sounded very real to me. So real that I am still convinced I had an authentic encounter. My question is, is this kind of thing normal with malt liquor?"

"Please email me your thoughts. I have a very elaborate anti-spam guard so you need to add a @ where the _ is in my addy and put a . after the tv and drop the subdimension.com altogether"

Thank You,

Twistedhed
Oldsmar, FLA

4976. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 03:44:24 UTC
From: Robert Frenchu <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com>
Message-ID: <uvb52u098cv2du8eclpf0kjs7gicfgpdhj@4ax.com>
Source record: 27973
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote <9vu8k901mvp@enews2.newsguy.com> in
talk.politics.guns. :

>
>"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
>news:fer42u8hbchk012lq430vm5k5lof8ie4m3@4ax.com...
>
>> >2600
>>
>> You have failed to provide any documentation whatsoever that
>>
>> (a) there are police who feel that the public does not have the right
>> to own radio transceivers and guns
>> (b) their numbers are growing significantly
>> (c) there are politicians who feel that the public does not have the
>> right to own radio transceivers and guns
>> (d) their numbers are growing significantly
>>
>> You may make one final attempt.
>
>You posted a one-word question, I gave you a one-word response. I leave it
>to you to figure out what it means. Kinda like a puzzle. Once you discover
>the solution, you'll know where to look for your answer.

You have failed. Again. The answer required was obvious. Go to your
room.

4977. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 03:45:12 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <cfyU7.1231$Ya1.689971@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 27974
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

```
: > > That is hogwash. I haven't seen any such "growing
: > > numbers" opposed to CBs, radios, etc. Indeed, there
: > > has been NO movement to ban scanners at all...rather
: > > some states (e.g. NJ) have relaxed old laws which
: > > did ban scanners in autos.
: > >
: > > > There is the feeling that the public can not be trusted,
: > > > that too many use technology for crime or to try to
: > > > overthrow the government. Many would prefer that only
: > > > those who are paid on a professional basis should be allowed
: > > > to have access to radios or weapons.
: > >
: > > More hogwash. Even if there is some such sentiment,
: > > there hasn't been any support for that attitude in the press,
: > > the legislatures, etc.
: > >
: > > Bill K2UNK
: >
: > I gather that you do not read that many papers
: > everyday. The Washington Post, LA Times,
: > NY Times, Chicago Tribune all go on "crusades"
: > every so often over gun ownership, cell phones,
: > scanners. The elite do not like the fact that the
: > masses understand, and use, technology.
:
: I have seen public opposition to gun ownership, mixed
: opposition to cellphone use in an auto (no one
: seems to want to ban any total use/ownership
: of cellphones) ...BUT
: not one crusade at all against scanners. There has
: been NO demand to ban scanners at all, even for
: specific frequencies, since the FCC rules
: prohibiting scanners manufactured that can recieve
: cellular.

I suggest that you become familiar
with the issues over APCO 25
standards for digital trunked radio.
The main purpose is to prevent private
citizens from receiving ANY public
radio transmission. As I am a member
of APCO, I have had conversations with
individuals who run public safety radio
```

systems. Their one big goal is to have
an digitally encrypted system that no one,
not even the media, will be able to receive
without their permission.

Read some of the articles at http://www.strongsignals.net

4978. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 03:59:33 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <FsyU7.321804$5A3.123586339@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 27975
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

```
Dick, I would expect anything different from you hang in rec.radio.CB
lending your expertise to the illegal there.
```

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:t9xU7.174629$WW.11002069@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> news:3C227B39.F203E090@spam.me.not...
> > Um.. you're wrong.. I was never an illegal keyclown, but then again, I
> > don't expect you to know the difference. I ran the legal 40 with legal
> > power and with legal gear.
> >
> > You can call names all you want, but it doesn't change the truth.
> >
> > But you're right. I did go from CBer (which I ran sideband for a bit
> over
> > 20 years, and ran professionally) to extra in 6 months, 1 week, and two
> > days. Of course, I worked hard for nine years (I started drilling the
> code
> > in '92) to overcome my dyslexia so I could pass the code requirement.
> >
> > What of it?
> >
> > de AB8LR
> >
> > -SSB
> >
> > "middlefiger4@home.comss" wrote:
> > >
> > > And So are you SSB, Hey fellas in the amateur NG... Meet the new breed
> of
> > > Ham his name is SSB, maybe you recognize his numbers on the CB 151.
> > > He went from Illegal CB Keyclown to Extra Class all in about 6
> months. He
> > > now takes his freebanding Illegal skills to a HF band near you. Say
> Hello
> > > >
>
> Dear Middie:
>
> I've been licensed longer than CB is old. Elmered a batch of freebanders
> over the years and all of them were decent amateurs. If his coming out of
> CB is supposed to disturb my digestion, sorry. The numbers game alone

> assures that most people becoming radioactive do so via CB.
> He seems to have handled his problem; can you say the same??
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
>

4979. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:12:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C22B6B1.ACC402D3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27977

Dave Heil wrote:
> The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her supporters.
> She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views and
> promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.

Who denied it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4980. Re: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:17:16 UTC
From: marvin moss <mmoss@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9vucpt$h41$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 27976
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It must be a full moon.....

Twistedhed <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
news:e9de0154.0112201612.4aaccfeb@posting.google.com...
> For Sale, toothpick used by Adolph Hitler. It is authentic because
> there is a letter (signed by me) saying so. Comes with a photo of
> Hitler with his hand near his face (no one can prove he is NOT using
> this toothpick) as corroboration. I am asking $1500. Please email me
> by putting an @ where the _ is in my address and drop
> subdimension.com. In this way I will avoid the spambots.
>
> If you don't like the price, let's talk.
>
> Thank you,
> Twistedhed

4981. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:17:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C22B7EA.BDBF2669@IEEE.org>
Source record: 27978

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Where do you get the gall to put words in my mouth? You claimed that
> techs don't want the privileges, and I said I don't understand why
> someone wouldn't want them.

And I said for the same reason that not everyone wants a PhD degree.
What is it about a ham being 100% satisfied with a tech license
that you don't understand?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

4982. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:36:54 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vue5p0274r@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27984

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C22A13A.36CDAB78@earthlink.net...

> The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her supporters.
> She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views and
> promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.
>
> Dave K8MN

Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was legally
issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.

4983. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:38:56 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <O8rmRkdiBHA.1848@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 27979

I said:

>> All sorts of ways to interpret it. Here's one from the Book of Bokonon:
>>
>> "Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
>> learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
>> full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
>> without having come by their ignorance the hard way."

Dick Carroll didn't like that religion, and said:

> Your book should be retitled "The Book of BS em" .....<CLIP>

Ain't my book, Dick (I wish it were!), but the work of Kurt Vonnegut in "Cat's Cradle".

Here are some other truths from the same source.

"Maturity is a bitter disappointment for which no remedy exists, unless laughter can be said to remedy anything."

"Sometimes the shit-storm exceeds the power of humans to comment."

"Midget, midget, midget, how he struts and winks,
For he knows a man's as big as what he hopes
and thinks!"

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4984. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:41:25 UTC
From: Julian Frost <jfrost@eclectic.ss.uci.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.33.0112202039391.6227-100000@eclectic.ss.uci.edu>
Source record: 27980
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 16 Dec 2001, Maurice ON4BAM wrote:

> On Sun, 16 Dec 2001 00:35:50 -0500, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>
> >If asked, tell them it's a cell phone. They won't know.....
>
> Unless one of the guys is a ham.. then try to explain why you lied...
> maybe a concerned passenger may notice and tell the security guy you
> lied..

Simply tell them that it's a ham radio and if questioned further, tell them that you are a Federally licensed ham radio operator. Have a copy of your license available. You won't have any trouble whatsoever.

Julian
--
"Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."

-- Benjamin Franklin
Nov 11 1755, from the Pennsylvania Assembly

4985. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:44:27 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vuejt027kf@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27985

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C22A25B.BCB4CB7F@earthlink.net...

> Why would I do that? We haven't established what the majority believes
> about this situation.
>
> Dave K8MN

No. YOU haven't established that. Leave me out of your "we" scenario.

4986. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:45:31 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vuelt027mt@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 27986
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
news:uvb52u098cv2du8eclpf0kjs7gicfgpdhj@4ax.com...
> >> You have failed to provide any documentation whatsoever that
> >>
> >> (a) there are police who feel that the public does not have the right
> >> to own radio transceivers and guns
> >> (b) their numbers are growing significantly
> >> (c) there are politicians who feel that the public does not have the
> >> right to own radio transceivers and guns
> >> (d) their numbers are growing significantly
> >>
> >> You may make one final attempt.
> >
> >You posted a one-word question, I gave you a one-word response. I leave
it
> >to you to figure out what it means. Kinda like a puzzle. Once you
discover
> >the solution, you'll know where to look for your answer.
>
> You have failed. Again. The answer required was obvious. Go to your
> room.

Byte me! (That's another clue to the puzzle)

4987. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:51:25 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <e63d86f3.0112202051.4ff5c856@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27981
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:<3C227476.4C030914@spam.me.not>...
> And you're a cross posting anal-retentive ass.
>
> de AB8LR
>
And you are a gay sex loving, basement apartment living, 1989 sundance
driving, impoverished, fagboy.

4988. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:52:07 UTC
From: twithedsmaster@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <e63d86f3.0112202052.6678a94f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 27982
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

I saw your gay sex solicitation posts, christine...lol...

Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:<3C227476.4C030914@spam.me.not>...
> And you're a cross posting anal-retentive ass.
>
> de AB8LR
>
> -SSB
>
> IllegalCBersMustGO wrote:
> >
> > FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF CBERS.
> >
> > "Kenneth Vaughan" <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<fGcU7.232938$3d2.11138155@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> >
> > > twas the night before christmas,when all through the house.....
> > > my radios were silent...silent as a mouse.
> > > the antenna was hung by the chimney with care,
> > > in hopes that the "skip",soon would be there.
> > >
> > > "gunslinger" was nestled,all snug in his bed.
> > > while visions of x-force amps,danced in his head.
> > >
> > > when on my front door,there arose such a clatter...
> > > i sprang from my bed, to see what was the matter!
> > >
> > > away to the window i flew like a flash,
> > > thinking"if its uncle charlie,im outta some cash"
> > > the moon on the breast of the new fallen snow,
> > > gave the lustre of mid-day,to the assholes below.
> > >
> > > when what to my wondering eyes should appear!!
> > > but an fcc van! and eight voobners in storm trooper gear!!!
> > >
> > > with a little old driver,so lively and quick!
> > > i knew in a moment,its RILEY...the prick!!
> > >
> > > more rapid than eagles,his coursers they came,
> > > and he cussed,and he cursed,and called them by name!
> > > "now voobner!,now leland! now richard! and jerry!
> > > "come on you dummies,weve got to hurry!"
> > >

> > > to the top of the porch! to the top of the wall!
> > > now grab his gear! grab his gear! grab it all!!
> > >
> > > so out my back door,with my gear i flew!
> > > with a box full of radios...and my linear ,too!
> > >
> > > i spoke not a word,but went straight to my work,
> > > i hid all my gear,then returned to the "jerk"
> > > and flashing the "bird" finger,right under his nose!
> > >
> > > said "too bad you couldnt find it,you dumb ass holes!!"
> > >
> > > and he heard me exclaim,ere he drove out of sight,
> > > "screw you riley!"...rec radio....good night!!!
> > >
> > > elpasogunslinger merry christmas....(all of you)

4989. Re: Question for Beer Experts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 04:54:40 UTC
From: ZOOM <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <sjzU7.34321$x25.3634639@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 27983
Cross-posted to: alt.beer,rec.food.drink.beer,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Do you actually have a job?
Someone told me you make frenchfries and your boss is 18yrs old.
Is this true?
Someday you might get promoted to assembler where you put the hamburgers together.
Way to reach your goals!

Twistedhed <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message news:e9de0154.0112201933.77397e3f@posting.google.com...
> "A few months ago I was out on my boat drinking Malt Liquor and not my
> usual Miller Genuine Draft. After a while I became quite dizzy and hit
> my head on the gunwale. Not long after that I decided to get on my
> illegal CB and listen on the "freeband". There I heard a man who
> identified himself as being from a flying saucer. It sounded very real
> to me. So real that I am still convinced I had an authentic encounter.
> My question is, is this kind of thing normal with malt liquor?"
>
> "Please email me your thoughts. I have a very elaborate anti-spam
> guard so you need to add a @ where the _ is in my addy and put a .
> after the tv and drop the subdimension.com altogether"
>
> Thank You,
>
> Twistedhed
> Oldsmar, FLA

4990. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 05:20:36 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C22C63C.F21B6449@spam.me.not>
Source record: 27987
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Sundance? '89? ROFL! You couldn't be further off...

Oh, and as for the gay sex, just because you're like that doesn't mean the
rest of us are. Please don't push your personal life off on me, I don't
want it.

-SSB

Twithed's Master wrote:
>
> Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message news:<3C227476.4C030914@spam.me.not>...
> > And you're a cross posting anal-retentive ass.
> >
> > de AB8LR
> >
> And you are a gay sex loving, basement apartment living, 1989 sundance
> driving, impoverished, fagboy.

4991. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 05:41:42 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <poi52u4609q2ksgj7irkvpe0e7jr72mqes@4ax.com>
Source record: 27988
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com (SD SpecialDelivery Jones)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->veep.....my ,my....i am impressed........really......also on the
->letters by your name thing......may i suggest the letters 'DH' be
->added....i feel it would be most appropriate.......

I'm presuming that the above circumlocution means "no". I'd suggest some
remedial education is in order.

Learn how to snip, asshole.

Jim

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

4992. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 05:43:11 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B22121006388A994.1F24EAE42AEA77C0.C548E8975C0CAA91@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27989

On 20 Dec 2001 03:47:52 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>No mature, sexually-fulfilled
>woman I've ever known would dream of demeaning herself with such
>a juvenile, immature, and horrendously gauche Vanity call sign.

On the other hand, since no mature, sexually-fulfilled, woman
in her right mind would give you the time of day, let alone give you
any indication about how she feels about things . . .

> Kim
>obviously has serious negative self-image issues, and feels the need
>to call attention to the only part of her anatomy which she does think
>is "adequate."

What ever you say, Larry--NOW will you take your meds and stop
hallucinating?

> As I have stated repeatedly, I have no fixation on
>her whatsoever, and, in fact, I am starting to pity her!

Sure.

That's why you keep focusing on her "TIT" in this newsgroup
and have made it your life's work to make a fool out of yourself
(sounds like a pretty simple alteration to me, but . . .) trying to
convince people that your absurdly old-fashion views should be
listened to concerning her call sign.

>The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually" superior to
>Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have solicited
>his opinion in the first place.

Utter nonsense.

"Morally and intellectually superior?" Larry--the guy is an
FCC cop. Period. He's not a spiritual leader. He's not a scientific
researcher. He's not a saint. He's a COP with a nice paycheck and
that's ALL he is.

His values are neither more nor less valuable than Kim's,
Cecil's, mine, or anyone else's. Get off your kick, Larry--you may
have the hots for Riley (that WOULD explain your attitude toward
women--hmmmmmmmm . . .), but to anyone else, he's just another ham.

> The fact that Kim doesn't recognize this fact
>is merely a typical state of denial common to many people who know all

>too well that they are, always have been, and always will be relegated
>to the lowest common denominator of social acceptance, due to their
>indecorous behavior.

Yeah, right.

According to your egotistical views, anyone who disagrees with
you MUST have something wrong with them.

Larry, you know what they say about people who believe
everyone else is wrong but them, don't you?

> This is common of poorly-educated people from
>the southern part of the country. What I'd like to know isï¿½what's YOUR
>excuse?

Intelligence--what's yours?

I see you're not just bigoted against one group--now it's
southerners as a whole. Who's next, Larry, anyone who isn't related to
you by blood?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4993. Re: Morse not anymore needed to use HF-see further

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 05:43:32 UTC
From: EZ <ezkeyl1@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <8_zU7.132767$OW.40878512@typhoon.hawaii.rr.com>
Source record: 27990
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,alt.ham-radio.morse,rec.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Left the NSA in July 2000 after being stationed there 5 years, had several civilians working for me that were prior military. Never ran into any that were commercial maritime radio officers, but NSA is a big beast, they were probably elsewhere.

EZ

<googlyelmo@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:3C21805A.A8BFD3EF@earthlink.net...
> About 2 years ago, a jointly administered department of the NSA and Army hired
> about 10 civilians, recruiting from among commercial maritime radio officers
> and the likes, to do morse intercept work. An ad was posted on a number of Fed
> websites, the NY Times Sunday classified, and copied to several USENET and
> LISTSERV groups by a ham who came across the original, specifying a proficency
> of at least 15 WPM. So yes, morse code is still in use by many militaries and
> intelligence agencies around the world. It should come as no surprise, really.
> The rapid advances in communications and data processing in the US, Europe, and
> the more affluent parts of Asia notwithstanding, CW is still a very useful mode
> where 21st century hardware and technical skills are in short supply. Have you
> ever wondered why you still hear clandestine "numbers" stations on SW/HF? It
> would seem like an awfully old, slow way to communicate, but it *is* reliable,
> and when the data is concise in the extreme, speed and convenience is not
> nearly as important as accuracy and dependability.
>
> de Will, KD7BFX AR
>
> EZ wrote:
>
> > I'm an active duty military member, been a "ditty bopper" for over 15 years.
> > I can tell you, alot of countries are still out there using Morse code for

> > tactical
> > and strategic purposes. Long live Morse!
> >
> > Ezee
> >
> > "Jesus, EA4AQY" <jesus.guardon@navegalia.com> wrote in message
> > news:3c1c769a@news.airtel.net...
> > > And me too. But don't think about keyers are finished. We still should
> > make
> > > noise on tha bands...
> > > "Web" <WebFx27@hotmail.com> escribi&#65533; en el mensaje
> > > news:hCeS7.15523$161.7241951@news02.optonline.net...
> > > > I aggree
> > > >
> > > > Web
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:39IR7.109$YE4.19833@newshog.newsread.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > "b888" <b888@lcix.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:u1d5tq5dfp5jf2@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > Well said.
> > > > > > People still use sailboats, steam engines, propeller aircraft,
> > > > > > drive classic cars, and do a million other things that are not
> > > > > > "state of the art" but there still useful and fun. I feal sorry
> > for
> > > > > > those who have never felt the thrill of that first solid cw
> > copy.
> > > > > > Or who have no Idea how to loadup a "hollow state" rig.
> > > > > > The easy way out is the booring way out.
> > > > > > WB3DSJ
> > > > > >
> > > > > You are correct sir! Some may love CW and some may not. Some may
> > > love
> > > > the
> > > > > digital modes. Some may not. Some may love homebrewing. (and so
> > on
> > > and
> > > > so
> > > > > on) There are many facets of this hobby that are enjoyable to a
> > > variety
> > > > of
> > > > > different people. All a license means is that you are allowed to
> > do
> > > > whatever is allowed by that license class.
> > > > >
> > > > > Those that chose to (forgive the word) *bitch* about the either
> > the

> > > > dropping
> > > > > of the code requirement to a lesser level, or the possibility of
it
> > > > dropping
> > > > > of it entirely, probably are not the same people who became
> > proactively
> > > > > involved in the protest of those conditions. I am sure that at
least
> > > 80%
> > > > of
> > > > > all licensed hams have not bothered to write all the "powers that
be"
> > > > (i.e.
> > > > > congressmen, senators etc) about ham radio, and in defense of ham
> > > radio.
> > > > > We can sit and hope and pray that ARRL *may* work hard to defend
us,
> > but
> > > > can
> > > > > you imagine if our elected officials, from the local level, all
the
> > way
> > > up
> > > > > to the federal level recieved tons of letters in defense of
amateur
> > > radio?
> > > > > I personally write at least quarterly each year, (as well as fire
> > > fighting
> > > > > related mails especially after 9-11-01) and strongly encourage
others
> > > to
> > > > do
> > > > > so too.
> > > > >
> > > > > Another way to win support? Invite your elected officials to your
club
> > > > > meetings, ARES/RACES meetings (or similar groups) and share with
them
> > > the
> > > > > experience. This has a two-fold benefit. It allows the ham public
to
> > > > > actually meet the officials, and of course the officials to
actually
> > be
> > > > able
> > > > > to meet the ham public and hear their concerns, and to see what we
are
> > > > doing
> > > > > .

> > > > >
> > > > > Amateur Radio is a pro-active hobby/service, not a sit back and
watch
> > > > hobby.
> > > > > Get involved!
> > > > >
> > > > > [first paragrah directed at respondee to my earlier post, other
> > > paragraphs
> > > > > are to everyone else.]
> > > > >
> > > > > Ryan KC8PMX
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > KC8PMX wrote in message ...
> > > > > > >People who want to use Morse code still will, and those who
don't,
> > > > won't.
> > > > > > >Any changes in the laws short of a law outright banning morse
code
> > > > > operation
> > > > > > >won't stop those who wish to use the HF frequencies.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Ryan
> > > > > > >KC8PMX
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >"Marruk" <mphaannospam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > >news:4ytO7.18262$Qm6.2451580@zwoll1.home.nl...
> > > > > > >> Mose not anymore needed to use HF.
> > > > > > >>
> > > > > > >> Hi OMs,
> > > > > > >>
> > > > > > >> In Guatamala it is decided that a morse exam is not anymore
> > needed
> > > > to
> > > > > > use
> > > > > > >> the HF bands.
> > > > > > >> I guess this is good for the sellers of HF equipment and it
will
> > > get
> > > > > the
> > > > > > >> band a lot more used for phone dx.
> > > > > > >> But I dont think it will be very good for Morsecode as a
whole.
> > > > > > >> Hope to see you in 2003 on HF when it will be officially
released
> > > in
> > > > > > the

> > > > > > >> Netherlands.
> > > > > > > >>
> > > > > > > >> PE1PAE
> > > > > > > >>
> > > > > > > >>
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
>

4994. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 05:47:33 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3F9A4F7C0E556E88.60C242A83F304FD8.3BE6D3FB6BE32DA1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27991

On 20 Dec 2001 03:47:53 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I have two FRS radio's --- Icom 4008's. Neat little rigs. Me and a
>friend of mine use them for personal comms at local hamfests, and
>I use them when vacationing with my family in the Adirondacks. I've
>never used them for communicating with anyone I didn't know -- just
>my friends and family. So, you're right about FRS being "family-
>oriented," but you're incorrect about the ARS NOT being "family-
>oriented." Is the "family-oriented" nature of the ARS that was one
>of the prime arguments for reducing and/or eliminating the code
>testing requirements, and largely responsible for the "No-Code test"
>Technician-class license -- the theory being that eliminating the
>5 WPM code test would allow families to use 2-meters to coordinate
>their activities more effectively than they could on CB. The "family"
>nature of the ARS has been wielded like a sledgehammer all
>throughout the debate leading to our present-day dumbed-down
>licensing requirements. FRS just got there a bit sooner. Once
>the 5-WPM code testing requirement is eliminated, there will be
>very little difference in public perception between the ARS and
>the FRS.

So, in other words, when it comes to changes you DON'T approve
of, you don't like the "Family Oriented" label--but when it suits your
purposes (i.e., to put Kim down) you do.

Hey, Larry. When you find "Family oriented" in Part 97 let me
know--or when you find some kind of evidence that the ARS really did
change the rules so that families can use it as "super-cb" (which is
NOT the purpose of amateur radio according to Part 97) be sure to let
us know where THAT appears in the rules as well.

Until then, you'll have to accept the view that you don't have
the vaguest idea what you are talking about.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4995. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 05:49:01 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <0611DA6CD0EB6BB8.0E443225DFE5A090.7BDAAB144E54C60B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 27992

On 20 Dec 2001 03:47:53 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3F7F89779D2A0F35.D28D63EB28211DB6.EAA03272D9273766@lp.airnews.net>,
>Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
>>
>> Because soap can't clean your mind, Larry, and that's where
>>the "dirt" is, not in her sign.
>>
>> Rick (Kindly Eustice Ate Horrible Humans)
>
>Hmmm -- two sets of phonetics in a row dealing with cannabalism --
>and you say *I* have a dirty mind! Pot --> Kettle --> Black!
>
>(Now Rick will complain about me making a racist comment!)

Nope--but I WILL comment that it's interesting you see those
comments as being _cannibalistic_!

Rick
--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

4996. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 06:31:29 UTC
From: Roger Conroy <rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <9vul2fnmu1@ctb-nnrp1.saix.net>
Source record: 27993
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I don't know about the rules in the US, but here is South Africa it's legal
to operate on an airliner with the captain's permission - actually getting
that permission is another matter entirely! I know a few hams who are also
private pilots that have in fact installed quite extensive rigs in their own
planes. Over here the aircraft owner/captain has full authority.

73 Roger ZR1RC

"Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
news:u24ps93bbhume6@corp.supernews.com...
> I was replying based on the 'perception' that someone making the statement
> the way it was posted was confrontational and just 'sounded' like they
felt
> they had the right to operate aboard an aircraft.
>
> I personally HAVE operated. RX only, and with pilot interaction. He
> wanted to know when I turned it on, and when I turned it off. But this
> was many years ago, 1981 to be exact, and now the rules are, I believe,
> even stricter.
>
> Mike
>
> "VE2VFD Pat" <ve2vfd@remove.rac.this.ca.now> wrote in message
> news:3c2091f2.2486561@news.aei.net...
> > On Tue, 18 Dec 2001 22:42:09 -0500, "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >No way imply at ALL any operation at ANY time, even 'just' receive,
> > >aboard a commercial carrier. You do NOT have any right to do that
> > >AT ALL under the FAR.
> >
> > You must be reading something I never wrote into my message...
> >
> > Where does it even hint at operating the radio IN a plane? I would
> > assume no ham operator is actually stupid enough to even think about
> > doing that! Geeez.
> >
> > Pat
> > ve2vfd
>
>

4997. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 11:04:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221060420.14755.00001221@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 27994

In article <20011220114848.09658.00001060@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Subject: .
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 20 Dec 2001 16:48:48 GMT
>
>Callsign: N9NWO Class: General Codes: HAI USA
>Name: GREGORY A DEAN
>Addr1: PO BOX 2121
>Addr2: WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47996-2121
>Country: USA
>Effective: 15 Jul 2000 Expires: 21 Jan 2002 Online Renewals...
>License ID: L00090874 FRN: 0003005485 What's this?
>Lookups: 163

Steve:

OK, so you've demonstrated that you know how to look up a call sign on qrz.com, and copy/paste the results to the newsgroup. Ripping good stuff. Flawless technique.

Point???

73 de Larry, K3LT

Another one of the things that make me go "Hmmm..."

4998. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 11:04:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221060420.14755.00001222@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 27995

In article <3C220855.AA77F47D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually" superior
>to
>> Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have solicited
>> his opinion in the first place.
>
>The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected a
>reasonable response. She didn't get a reasonable response which tells
>us something about Riley's prudish hangups.

Cecil:

I seriously doubt that Riley has any "prudish hangups." He seems like
a very normal, average kind of guy from what I've read about him and
the direct quotations I have read from him. What he does seem to have
is a traditional kind of common decency, one which naturally sees the
potential harm in Kim's call sign, with it's self-serving, in-your-face
defiance of the family-oriented nature of the ARS. I'm sure Kim's call
makes her feel like a strong, independent, defiant-of-male-anything kind
of woman; the stuff of modern-day country songs. However, to everyone
else, it makes her seem to be a simple, common, every day moron.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4999. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 11:04:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221060421.14755.00001223@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 27996

In article <3C22381E.75092C56@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> > The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually" superior
>to
>> > Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have solicited
>> > his opinion in the first place.
>>
>> The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected a
>> reasonable response. She didn't get a reasonable response which tells
>> us something about Riley's prudish hangups.
>
>Funny that I don't see it that way at all. I don't think she liked the
>reasonable response she got. In typical Kim fashion, she attempts to
>rationalize her choice in the face of rejection. It tells us something
>about Kim's "to hell with what anyone thinks of me--I'm doing what I
>want" attitude.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Precisely. Kim is concerned with only one radio amateur -- herself.
The fact that she is deliberately spoiling the image of radio amateurs
to outsiders means absolutely nothing to her. Worse, she's doing it
in the only place that matters -- on the air -- with her self-serving,
sexually-suggestive call sign that demeans female hams and women
in general. As Riley Hollingsworth said, she has a perfect "right" to
do this -- but the fact is that in doing so, she runs the risk of taking
the ARS "...one step closer to extinction." We don't know what kind
of damage she has done -- but the potential is there, and is very
likely to cause some potential ham to be disillusioned. If so, who
knows who we could have lost -- or did lose! One of the real problems
here is we'll never know the extent of the damage Kim has done!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5000. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 11:16:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221061626.14755.00001224@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 27997

In article <3F9A4F7C0E556E88.60C242A83F304FD8.3BE6D3FB6BE32DA1@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> Hey, Larry. When you find "Family oriented" in Part 97 let me
>know--or when you find some kind of evidence that the ARS really did
>change the rules so that families can use it as "super-cb" (which is
>NOT the purpose of amateur radio according to Part 97) be sure to let
>us know where THAT appears in the rules as well.
>
> Until then, you'll have to accept the view that you don't have
>the vaguest idea what you are talking about.
>
> Rick

Rick:

I've got a better idea -- you find me someone at ARRL HQ that will
flatly deny that the ARS is viewed as a "family-oriented" activity --
intended to be passed down from fathers, mothers, uncles, grand-
parents to children, grandchildren, nephews, nieces, etc. etc.
Find someone who will state, from a standpoint of their being an
ARRL official, that the ARS is intended to be a non-"G"-rated,
over 21, adults-only activity for mature audiences only. If you can,
then we'll entertain the notion that I "don't have the vaguest idea"
what I'm talking about. In the meantime, I'm not too sure *you*
do!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5001. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 11:39:25 UTC
From: Robert Frenchu <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com>
Message-ID: <op762u0n99g3enl1onfcag8b0laq0rjllu@4ax.com>
Source record: 27998
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote <9vuelt027mt@enews4.newsguy.com> in
talk.politics.guns. :

>
>"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
>news:uvb52u098cv2du8eclpf0kjs7gicfgpdhj@4ax.com...
>> >> You have failed to provide any documentation whatsoever that
>> >>
>> >> (a) there are police who feel that the public does not have the right
>> >> to own radio transceivers and guns
>> >> (b) their numbers are growing significantly
>> >> (c) there are politicians who feel that the public does not have the
>> >> right to own radio transceivers and guns
>> >> (d) their numbers are growing significantly
>> >>
>> >> You may make one final attempt.
>> >
>> >You posted a one-word question, I gave you a one-word response. I leave
>it
>> >to you to figure out what it means. Kinda like a puzzle. Once you
>discover
>> >the solution, you'll know where to look for your answer.
>>
>> You have failed. Again. The answer required was obvious. Go to your
>> room.
>
>Byte me! (That's another clue to the puzzle)

You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.

5002. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 12:22:18 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <_PFU7.85577$bs2.19566973@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 27999
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Your first clue should be that the thread is crossposted
Train

"ni4l" <ni4l@charter.net> wrote in message
news:3C2287E2.7010100@charter.net...
> DUMBASS
>
> Twistedhed wrote:
>
> > For Sale, toothpick used by Adolph Hitler. It is authentic because
> > there is a letter (signed by me) saying so. Comes with a photo of
> > Hitler with his hand near his face (no one can prove he is NOT using
> > this toothpick) as corroboration. I am asking $1500. Please email me
> > by putting an @ where the _ is in my address and drop
> > subdimension.com. In this way I will avoid the spambots.
> >
> > If you don't like the price, let's talk.
> >
> > Thank you,
> > Twistedhed
> >
>

5003. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 12:36:09 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C232CA6.234D028D@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 28000
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Train wrote:
>
> Your first clue should be that the thread is crossposted

The second is that it came from google.com.

The third clue is the posting IP: It came from AOL.

5004. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 13:02:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2332f9_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 28001

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"krill" <radioisnot4everyone@nowhere.org> wrote in message
news:MPG.168a4eef5c1485c5989717@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <3c1fef5d_1@news7.fast.net>, wa6vse@fast.net says...
> >
> >
> > So FSK is not useful in amateur radio? Ever heard of RTTY?
Packet?
>
> So you are claiming that the circuitry in my Yaesu and Icom radios
are
> made using YOUR PATENTS??

No, I am not claiming that my inventions are used in your radio
(or current production radios) ... just that they COULD be used
in amateur radio with benefits.

> > Never heard of a DDS being used in ham radio? Seems I just tore
an
> > article out of a recent QST on a DDS-based VFO ...
>
> So you are claiming that the circuitry in my Yaesu and Icom radios
are
> made using YOUR PATENTS??

No, I am not claiming that my inventions are used in your radio
(or current production radios) ... just that they COULD be used
in amateur radio with benefits.

> > Improved FEC (that's Forward Error Correction) techniques? Seen
> > articles on that in ham publications, too ...
>
> So you are claiming that the circuitry in my Yaesu and Icom radios
are
> made using YOUR PATENTS??

No, I am not claiming that my inventions are used in your radio
(or current production radios) ... just that they COULD be used
in amateur radio with benefits.

> > Improved image reject techniques for SSB? Since the future is in
> > software-defined radios, DSP, etc., it seems to me that your
assertion
> > that these inventions have no applicability to ham radio is

absurd.
>
> So you are claiming that the circuitry in my Yaesu and Icom radios
are
> made using YOUR PATENTS??

No, I am not claiming that my inventions are used in your radio
(or current production radios) ... just that they COULD be used
in amateur radio with benefits.

> Your insinuation that YOUR patents are part of the current "crop" of

> amateur radio is doubtful ul at best, an outright fabrication at the

> least.

No, I am not claiming that my inventions are used in your radio
(or current production radios) ... just that they COULD be used
in amateur radio with benefits.

> > [snip garbage about phones ... my employer doesn't make
> > phones, we make integrated circuits and wireless LAN devices]
>
> Actually Carl, I know your employer and they DO design cordless
phones
> and them farm out the manufacture to the Asian rim countries because
they
> labor is cheap.

The parent company of my company (now being spun off as an
independent company) USED to have a division which made
cordless phones, but that division was sold to another company
approximately 2 years ago ... my company does NOT do cordless
phones.

> > > Be interesting to see which patents that actually are related to
> > amateur
> > > radio, as in actual use in all those store bought rigs I see in
the
> > > catalogs.
> >
> > Most of the patents Robert listed above (plus some he seems to
> > have inadvertently missed) would be directly applicable to
improving
> > the performance of those rigs you see in the catalogs ...
>
> Not **would be** Carl..which of them ARE?? You made the claim now
chose
> to put the transmission into reverse? Which of your patents ARE
directly
> involved in amateur radio?

You seem to fail to understand the distinction between what is
currently
used in production radios and what could be used in the future to
obtain
benefits, either in terms of improved performance, cost reduction, or
both.
This is symptomatic of being stuck in the past and unable to have a
vision
of new things in the future.

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCMyrZe+N6+q84HiEQJL7QCg6Vr0l9eZqSpwZl4s8esn/s2wRvIAoLrc
kRQmABwk2g9Gyrg9QcDHQW9P
=04Rg
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5005. Re: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 13:04:14 UTC
From: Wazzoo <Here&There@Anytiime.com>
Message-ID: <irGU7.6153$PO5.1119289@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 28002
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

OH YES YES YES!!! WHERE did you find THAT! Oh Good Lord I have been looking for that since my Father came back with tales of the Hitler toothpick from Germany in WWII> He actually SAW Hitler using it! Do you have more? Please PLEASE contact me.
My name is:

Urylee Believethis
1 Housedown St.
Yakingroup, USA

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message news:e9de0154.0112201612.4aaccfeb@posting.google.com...
> For Sale, toothpick used by Adolph Hitler. It is authentic because
> there is a letter (signed by me) saying so. Comes with a photo of
> Hitler with his hand near his face (no one can prove he is NOT using
> this toothpick) as corroboration. I am asking $1500. Please email me
> by putting an @ where the _ is in my address and drop
> subdimension.com. In this way I will avoid the spambots.
>
> If you don't like the price, let's talk.
>
> Thank you,
> Twistedhed
>

5006. Re: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 13:09:36 UTC
From: hog@ev1.net
Message-ID: <3C233490.22DD138@ev1.net>
Source record: 28003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Full moon is next week! Hey! I got one of Fidel's good cuban cigars in
my cache here! Think I will smoke it on new years eve, before I ring in
the new year!...

marvin moss wrote:

> It must be a full moon.....
>
> Twistedhed <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> news:e9de0154.0112201612.4aaccfeb@posting.google.com...
> > For Sale, toothpick used by Adolph Hitler. It is authentic because
> > there is a letter (signed by me) saying so. Comes with a photo of
> > Hitler with his hand near his face (no one can prove he is NOT using
> > this toothpick) as corroboration. I am asking $1500. Please email me
> > by putting an @ where the _ is in my address and drop
> > subdimension.com. In this way I will avoid the spambots.
> >
> > If you don't like the price, let's talk.
> >
> > Thank you,
> > Twistedhed

5007. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 13:17:50 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vvhp3hkd5@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28009
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > >
> >
> > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
>
> My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
>
> FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in the 70s. They
> were those little things with the big eyes and different colored, Don King
> style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils, or on
> keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still around, but not
as
> popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence in
popularity
> about ten years ago.

That anonymous COWARD is ignorant of everything. "Woger Wussman" aka Twatty Campbell(Posts as Scott Campbell) should be familiar with the troll doll, since he was the initial model for them.

5008. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 13:20:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c23371e_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 28004

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011219200316.06877.00000543@mb-mj.aol.com...
>
> Even thought the majority of those who bother to voice an opinion
disagree.

Excuse me ... the fact is that the large majority of those who
"bother(ed) to voice an opinion" (in the "restructuring"
proceeding, supported "the no code position" ... (or at
least a maximum of 5 wpm until the ITU Radio Regs are
changed).

> >
> >> > If you can't
> >> >articulate a clear and compelling reason to retain code
> >> >now except for the treaty requirement, then on what basis
> >> >would you argue for its retention?
> >>
> >> Clear and compelling reasons for code test retention were
presented to the
> >FCC
> >> in the comments associated with 98-143 (the recent
restructuring). FCC
> >decided
> >> to ignore them.
> >
> >The FCC didn't ignore them...the FCC in issuing its ruling clearly
found
> >them to be anything but clear or compelling.

Not to mention that those comments were also a small minority ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCM2+5e+N6+q84HiEQIlNgCfd7fheXgkCGiqKge8Ot/n4eB2jD0AoPKX
c34OXRTnbQaDlOLdEqIngtC0
=Inp9
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5009. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 13:24:51 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vvhpahkd8@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28010
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vtp0f0qot@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "John Kimball" <johnkimb@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:9vsllo$5sm$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 07:46:39 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in
> > Message id: <9vq6odhoe2@pita.alt.net>:
> >
> >
> > >No, but I hear you slurp nutsacks behind dumpsters and are too
> CHICKENSHIT
> > >to post under your real name, COWARD.
> >
> > So is 8L0J08 your first name, or last name?
>
> Forget it. The guy's too dumb to understand 'L33TI5M5.

Script kiddies.

5010. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 13:35:01 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <9vvhpihkdb@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28011
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

"Omniscient" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:9vu8nh$h8i$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> Roger is the guy that has been slipping three dollar bills into the big
ol'
> kettle and he makes sure that his name, address and phone number are on
each
> bill. Yes, it is rather tacky but he gets better results with this method
> than he did with the magic marker in the gay bar stalls. No COWARD, he!

Omniscent is the guy slipping his willing lips over any hard cock. Usually he likes to buttfuck little boys, but his terminal genital herpes prevents him from using that 2 inch midget. Omniscent is one of those convicted felons who has that fry cook job but he put his face in the hot fry oil and his facial features resemble that of a rotting corpse.

5011. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 13:50:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C233E1A.2EF7B7BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28005

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Kim is concerned with only one radio amateur -- herself.

Larry, you are concerned with only one radio amateur -- yourself.
Kim's callsign makes you feel bad. That's why you don't like it.
If it made you feel good, you wouldn't be bitchin' about it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5012. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 13:53:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C233EF6.47E675EC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28006

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I seriously doubt that Riley has any "prudish hangups."

Sorry Larry, Riley has proved he has prudish hangups and I have
lost a lot of respect for him because of that. He offered his
personal opinion while in an FCC position. That is exactly
the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
opinion while in an ARRL position. You are a hypocrite.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5013. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 14:04:34 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C234172.573794D4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28007

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I've got a better idea -- you find me someone at ARRL HQ that will
> flatly deny that the ARS is viewed as a "family-oriented" activity --
> intended to be passed down from fathers, mothers, uncles, grand-
> parents to children, grandchildren, nephews, nieces, etc. etc.

No need for that, Larry. The great majority of "ham homes" contain
only one ham. The great majority of children of hams do NOT become
hams. The ARS is not "family-oriented" in the sense that little-
league is "family-oriented". There is no mandate for the ARS to be
"family-oriented". You've just set up yet another strawman.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5014. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 14:32:08 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <9vvh25$185$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 28016

"Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message news:9vtg5701orp@enews3.newsguy.com...
> I am so interested in finally getting my Technician's License that I have
> studied and studied for weeks now. I have passed every sample test I can get
> my hands on, and there is a real test in my area on January 17th, 2002.
>
> But, I'm reading these messages and I'm starting to get the feeling that the
> priviledges afforded to a Tech No Code gives access to frequencies that are
> really no better to occupy than a Citizen Band radio would access.
>
> I'm reading about jamming, and this jerk that, that jerk this, kids, lids,
> space cadets...
>
> I wanted to get into Amateur Radio to get out of the 27Mhz Snake Pit and QSO
> with some quality contacts.
>
> Am I really making a mistake? Is it too late for Ham Radio now?
>
>

I left the 'Snake Pit' and have never looked back. And I don't regret it either.
Just think about it this way, while the 'jerks' are posting their junk here, they
aren't on the airwaves showing their stupidity there.

This NG here of late is starting to look like rec.radio.amateur.misc.
Did that toilet overflow and start flooding this NG or what?
If so let's call a plumber and get this 'crap' fixed!
--

'73' From KB9TMP

For every action,
there is an equal
and opposite criticism.
-Harrison's Postulate

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com

5015. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 14:42:08 UTC
From: Norm Malick <henmel@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C234A35.45FFAF38@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28008
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

SD SpecialDelivery Jones wrote:
>
> Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:<u2q22u85asi99rl8i9qi6p0on6ehvjb84c@4ax.com>...
> > SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com (SD SpecialDelivery Jones)
> > shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
> >
> > do you have the foggiest FREAKING idea what it means to snip?
> >
> > Jim
> >
> >
> > Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> > A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup
>
> veep.....my ,my....i am impressed........really......also on the
> letters by your name thing......may i suggest the letters 'DH' be
> added....i feel it would be most appropriate.......

SD, give up with this Jim Weir clown. Remember the old adage about not
mudwresting with pigs. You get filthy and the pig likes it.

Norm Melick

5016. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 14:46:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221094627.07219.00001632@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 28012

Why did it take Carl the CBplusser over a year to upgrade, I thought it was the CW that stopped you not the Theory.

5017. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 14:49:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221094916.10722.00001047@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 28013

>Subject: Re: .
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 12/21/2001 5:04 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011221060420.14755.00001221@mb-cg.aol.com>

>Point???

No point. Just an awareness check. You said some nice things but you
seemed to have missed the point, so you only get a 75%.

Sorry.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5018. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 14:50:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221095048.10722.00001048@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 28014

>Subject: Re: .
>From: "K0HB" K0HB@bitbucket73.com
>Date: 12/20/2001 11:54 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <uubkA8XiBHA.1900@cpimsnntpa02>

>Your point?

Unlike Larry, you DIDN'T say anything nice, and completely missed all the points.

50% just for taking the time to answer. Sorry.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5019. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 14:52:04 UTC
From: OldBiker <vito@crosslink.net>
Message-ID: <3C234C94.1BA19D95@crosslink.net>
Source record: 28015
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"middlefiger4@home.comss" wrote:
>
> ... Hey fellas in the amateur NG... Meet the new breed of Ham ...
> ..He went from Illegal CB Keyclown to Extra Class all in about 6 months.

Great! If we could get the rest of them to do the same we'd have mucho
more political power.

I invite anyone with a wide-band receive rig to listen on the freq's
just above CB where the "Hi-banders" congregate. I did, and as far as I
can tell, these are serious CB hobbiests - criminals only because
they're operating in the wrong bands. So fight crime: convert them to
hams!
My $.02
Merry Christmas to all
KA3DWW

5020. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:03:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c23502d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28017

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C22381E.75092C56@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually"
superior to
> > > Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have
solicited
> > > his opinion in the first place.
> >
> > The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected a
> > reasonable response. She didn't get a reasonable response which tells
> > us something about Riley's prudish hangups.
>
> Funny that I don't see it that way at all. I don't think she liked the
> reasonable response she got. In typical Kim fashion, she attempts to
> rationalize her choice in the face of rejection. It tells us something
> about Kim's "to hell with what anyone thinks of me--I'm doing what I
> want" attitude.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave: Would you please answer, for once, a question? I sent a note to Riley Hollingsworth, directly, *mostly* to prove to Larry and a couple of other creeps who were posting at the time, that the FCC would have *nothing* to do with changing my callsign. Riley responded, directly to me, and included his personal opinion of my callsign (at least according to Larry he did...I truly don't remember). At any rate, Riley's response in no way meant anything to me other than that he responded. In contrast to your belief, I *do* appreciate the response I got from Riley--and have absolutely no problem with it at all. I posted his response, in its entirety, here to the newsgroup--it was *not* secret and I obviously hid nothing of his response. His response proved that the FCC would have nothing to do with revoking my callsign, and he added his personal opinion of my callsign. Why are you trying to find magic where there is none?

Now, could you please tell what the HELL I am supposed to be rationalizing? And, in the face of WHAT rejection are you talking about? Your commentary is exasperating. You, and Larry, and anyone else who has this grandiose idea that I should hang my head in shame over my choice of callsigns, are crazy--nothing more and nothing less. I like my callsign. And, I am the only one who has to use it--so what the hell do you care? If I am such a smudge on *your* opinion of yourself as a ham radio operator, because *I* have an objectionable callsign, then let me suggest this: GET OUT OF HAM

RADIO. How's that?

I am not responsible for your idea and values of what is good an true in your life, the hobbies you choose, or the ideas you have. If you believe ham radio is worthy and good, IN SPITE of people like me, then shut the hell up. If you truly believe that *your* reputation is somehow affected by people like me--and it is obvious that I am not going to change (because I am not)--then it becomes *YOUR* responsibility to make personal decisions about it, Dave. And one of those decisions might be to get out if it is so awful. Good grief. You use these red-herring phrases like "liberal", etc., and make the idea of "it takes a village" such a nasty one--yet you choose to decide that this hobby is a little less because of people like me. It either takes a village or it doesn't, Dave. Have I said charlatan lately?

So, the questions are:

What, exactly, is it that I am rationalizing?

and:

What rejection am I facing? (If you are even going to dare answer that it is yours and Larry's, etc., don't even delude yourself, Dave).

Kim W5TIT

5021. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:05:12 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c235096$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28018

If you are going to allow things that you read to formulate your opinion of something before you have personally experienced it, then I would suggest you not bother.

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim

"Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message news:9vtg5701orp@enews3.newsguy.com...
> I am so interested in finally getting my Technician's License that I have
> studied and studied for weeks now. I have passed every sample test I can get
> my hands on, and there is a real test in my area on January 17th, 2002.
>
> But, I'm reading these messages and I'm starting to get the feeling that the
> priviledges afforded to a Tech No Code gives access to frequencies that are
> really no better to occupy than a Citizen Band radio would access.
>
> I'm reading about jamming, and this jerk that, that jerk this, kids, lids,
> space cadets...
>
> I wanted to get into Amateur Radio to get out of the 27Mhz Snake Pit and QSO
> with some quality contacts.
>
> Am I really making a mistake? Is it too late for Ham Radio now?
>
>

5022. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:09:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c235198_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28019

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vtp0f0qot@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "John Kimball" <johnkimb@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:9vsllo$5sm$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > On Wed, 19 Dec 2001 07:46:39 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in
> > Message id: <9vq6odhoe2@pita.alt.net>:
> >
> >
> > >No, but I hear you slurp nutsacks behind dumpsters and are too
> CHICKENSHIT
> > >to post under your real name, COWARD.
> >
> > So is 8L0J08 your first name, or last name?
>
> Forget it. The guy's too dumb to understand 'L33TI5M5.
>
>

Uh, Krell? Is this some kind of one of those Pagan Spells? ~:o

Kim W5TIT

5023. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:10:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2351df_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28020

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vtpne0s0o@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c21e983_2@newsa.ev1.net...
>
> > I heartell some employers regard an MCSE as equal to, I believe, and
> > Engineering *Degree* (as in, what? four years of college?)
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> This is probably true, but the opinion of some people is that Microsoft is
> running one helluva scam with the way they teach and administer the tests.
>
>

heh heh heh. My point exactly. Go to, I think it is, troytech.com, or
maybe troytec.com.

Kim W5TIT

5024. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:15:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c23530b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28021

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C226BD5.FFD9B3D9@gte.net...
> > Here in Texas, a LEO can not search a car at all unless granted by the
> > driver of the vehicle or a search warrant.
>
> Do you have anything that can verify that
> statement? It does not fit with what we
> are seeing most other states.
>
>
>

I sent an email to a Dispatcher friend of mine and here is his response:

"Let me preface my response with this: I am NOT certified any longer and it has been a while since I went through the academy, but for the most part the law should still be about the same.
An officer CAN search your vehicle or purse but only if he has permission to do so. Now, there are extenuating circumstances to every instance (if they see a weapon, drugs, etc.). But for the purposes of your query, without permission they cannot search your vehicle without a search warrant."

End of his response.

This is in the State of Texas.

Kim W5TIT

5025. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:21:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221102141.24724.00000465@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 28022

In article <3c23371e_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011219200316.06877.00000543@mb-mj.aol.com...
>>
>> Even thought the majority of those who bother to voice an opinion
>disagree.
>
>Excuse me ...

For what? Your mistake about what the comments actually were?

>the fact is that the large majority of those who
>"bother(ed) to voice an opinion" (in the "restructuring"
>proceeding, supported "the no code position" ... (or at
>least a maximum of 5 wpm until the ITU Radio Regs are
>changed).
>
Not according to an actual count of the comments. As I recall, only 43% of those who commented and expressed an opinion on code speed wanted 5 wpm or no code - the "nocodetest position". The rest wanted two or more codetest speeds.

The count and classification was done for NCI by Larry Klose and posted here. Are his numbers not reliable? 43% is not a majority, anyway.

I think you are confused, Carl. Or perhaps you want to lump all comments that supported 5 wpm or less into "the nocodetest position" but subdivide the other comments into "5 and 12 wpm", "5, 13 and 20 wpm", "5 and 20 wpm", etc., so that they will appear as minority opinions. You tried this sort of spin doctoring before, calling 5/12/12 "the ARRL proposal" (which got 20%) separating it from those who wanted 5/12/20 or the status quo (37%). You crowed about how "the NCI proposal beat the ARRL proposal 2 to 1" - a classic case of spindoctoring the favorable facts but ignoring the really important ones (57% OPPOSED a single 5 wpm test).

But the fact remains that the MAJORITY of comments that expressed an opinion supported TWO OR MORE code test speeds. Only a MINORITY supported the single code test speed of 5 wpm. FCC went with the minority opinion, though.

FCC also reduced the number and total question count of the WRITTEN tests, despite the fact that there was no clear mandate to do so. I would not be surprised if a US version of the UK "Foundation class" license was enacted here even though the majoritty of comments were against it.

Of course FCC is not mandated to follow majority opinion on anything. 98-143 proves that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5026. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:25:02 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9vvk5201g8i@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28031
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
news:op762u0n99g3enl1onfcag8b0laq0rjllu@4ax.com...
> You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
> the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.

I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled "2600"
that has been writing about the same subject for quite some time - keeping
modern technology in the hands of private corporations and out of the hands
of the public. If you want more, read the DMCA of 1998. It's basically made
it illegal to take something apart to see how it works.

5027. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:26:38 UTC
From: Dave Holford <holford@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <3C2354AE.4B25B332@sympatico.ca>
Source record: 28023
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Julian Frost wrote:
>
> Simply tell them that it's a ham radio and if questioned further, tell
> them that you are a Federally licensed ham radio operator. Have a copy of
> your license available. You won't have any trouble whatsoever.
>
> Julian
> --

That makes as much sense as showing your 'Federal Pilot Licence' and
expecting to ride the flight deck.

Dave

5028. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:28:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C235501.C7F2353D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28024

WW - KB9TMP wrote:
> This NG here of late is starting to look like rec.radio.amateur.misc.
> Did that toilet overflow and start flooding this NG or what?

This NG was created to offload the excrement from r.r.a.m.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5029. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:28:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2355fb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28026

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C22A13A.36CDAB78@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected
a
> > > > reasonable response. She didn't get a reasonable response which
tells
> > > > us something about Riley's prudish hangups.
> > >
> > > Funny that I don't see it that way at all.
> >
> > Of course not! You are one of the busybody prudes who want to force
> > your personal morals, hangups, and value system on everyone else.
>
> The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her supporters.
> She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views and
> promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.
>
> Dave K8MN

Man, Dave. You are every bit as deluded as Larry thinking I was trying to "trick" Riley. ENLIST RILEY AS A SUPPORTER OF THE CALLSIGN W5TIT?????????? Just how stupid do you think I am? *ANYONE* who thinks for one moment that Riley would *support* a callsign like mine is lacking a brain. There is no way that Riley would ever do so, and no way I thought he would. For crying out loud. What I proved by writing to Riley was that the FCC would not take on or desire to take on revoking or changing a callsign.

I don't dismiss at all Riley's opinion. He has every right to it. Do I think it's more important that anyone else's? No. Do I think it carries more validity than anyone else's? No. And, I honestly think that Riley--even disagreeing with my choice of callsigns--is still far more logical than anyone like you. The *BASIS* (basis, Dave, not substance) of Riley's response to me was that the FCC was not "in the business" (paraphrased, I think) of judging callsigns.

It is not hard at all to deny your lie, Dave. Actually, it probably is not a lie--it is your illogical, elitist mind telling you things you want to hear.

Kim W5TIT

5030. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:29:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C23556F.A536A32A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28025

WA8ULX wrote:
> Why did it take Carl the CBplusser over a year to upgrade, I thought it was
> the CW that stopped you not the Theory.

Carl obviously had other higher priorities. Some people have a life
outside of ham radio, Bruce. You should try it sometime.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5031. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:29:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c23565e$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28027

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C22A25B.BCB4CB7F@earthlink.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C22381E.75092C56@earthlink.net...
> >
> > > Funny that I don't see it that way at all. I don't think she liked
the
> > > reasonable response she got. In typical Kim fashion, she attempts to
> > > rationalize her choice in the face of rejection. It tells us
something
> > > about Kim's "to hell with what anyone thinks of me--I'm doing what I
> > > want" attitude.
> >
> > Re-phrase that to read "to hell with what a few people of a minority
opinion
> > might think," and you would be correct.
>
> Why would I do that? We haven't established what the majority believes
> about this situation.
>
> Dave K8MN

What you don't seem to understand, Dave, is that it just plain doesn't
matter to me--*WHATEVER* the majority opinion believes about "this
situation." (It cracks me up that my callsign has now been escalated to a
"situation").

;) Kim W5TIT

5032. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:31:44 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2356d2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28028

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > >
> >
> > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
>
> My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
>
> FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in the 70s. They
> were those little things with the big eyes and different colored, Don King
> style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils, or on
> keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still around, but not
as
> popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence in
popularity
> about ten years ago.
>
>

Yep, I've got a Kilroy troll, sitting looking over the edge of my monitor.
(At Dave). ROFLMAO

Kim W5TIT

5033. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:33:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c235728$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28029

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C22B6B1.ACC402D3@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her supporters.
> > She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views and
> > promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.
>
> Who denied it?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Goodness. In Dave's mind, it's anyone's guess...

Kim W5TIT

5034. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:40:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2358c6_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28030

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011221060420.14755.00001221@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <20011220114848.09658.00001060@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4YZ) writes:
>
> >Subject: .
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
> >Date: 20 Dec 2001 16:48:48 GMT
> >
> >Callsign: N9NWO Class: General Codes: HAI USA
> >Name: GREGORY A DEAN
> >Addr1: PO BOX 2121
> >Addr2: WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47996-2121
> >Country: USA
> >Effective: 15 Jul 2000 Expires: 21 Jan 2002 Online Renewals...
> >License ID: L00090874 FRN: 0003005485 What's this?
> >Lookups: 163
>
> Steve:
>
> OK, so you've demonstrated that you know how to look up a call sign
> on qrz.com, and copy/paste the results to the newsgroup. Ripping good
> stuff. Flawless technique.
>
> Point???
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Another one of the things that make me go "Hmmm..."
>
>
>

Hmmmm, vibrating more microphones, eh?

Kim W5TIT

5035. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:49:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c235afa_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28032

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011221060421.14755.00001223@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <3C22381E.75092C56@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> > The fact is, Mr. Hollingsworth *is* "morally and intellectually"
superior
> >to
> >> > Kim, and, quite obviously, she knows this, or she wouldn't have
solicited
> >> > his opinion in the first place.
> >>
> >> The reason that Kim solicited Riley's opinion was that she expected a
> >> reasonable response. She didn't get a reasonable response which tells
> >> us something about Riley's prudish hangups.
> >
> >Funny that I don't see it that way at all. I don't think she liked the
> >reasonable response she got. In typical Kim fashion, she attempts to
> >rationalize her choice in the face of rejection. It tells us something
> >about Kim's "to hell with what anyone thinks of me--I'm doing what I
> >want" attitude.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> Precisely. Kim is concerned with only one radio amateur -- herself.
>

And whom else should I concern myself with, Larry?

>
> The fact that she is deliberately spoiling the image of radio amateurs
> to outsiders means absolutely nothing to her.
>

Let me suggest the same thing I did to Dave, Larry. If you are so ashamed,
so concerned for your reputation, then leave ham radio. You want me to
concern myself with other radio amateurs, right? Which ones, Larry? You?
Dave? Others who agree with you? Or should it be Cecil? Rick? Others who
don't agree with you. Which ones, Larry?

>
> Worse, she's doing it

> in the only place that matters -- on the air -- with her self-serving,
> sexually-suggestive call sign that demeans female hams and women
> in general.
>

Sorry that you, a male, cannot rise above three letters and get yourself to recognize a whole callsign, Larry. On the air it sounds like W-5-T-I-T. It doesn't sound like TIT unless you really, really stretch your imagination...or have prior experience. In your case, I think it's imagination. [PS--I got "on the air" two mornings in a row in Dallas this week. All of about 15 minutes over the past two months. And, none on HF].

>
> As Riley Hollingsworth said, she has a perfect "right" to
> do this
>

And a perfect right it is.

>
> -- but the fact is that in doing so, she runs the risk of taking
> the ARS "...one step closer to extinction."
>

You know what? I never thought of it before...but, if I have the perfect right to my callsign, I also have the perfect right to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction" don't I? Yeah, I do.

>
> We don't know what kind
> of damage she has done -- but the potential is there, and is very
> likely to cause some potential ham to be disillusioned.
>

Well, that's your opinion. And you have the perfect right to it. My opinion is that if a callsign can "cause some potential ham to be disillusioned" then that person needs to just get off the planet.

>
> If so, who
> knows who we could have lost -- or did lose! One of the real problems
> here is we'll never know the extent of the damage Kim has done!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

None. Not even to you. You've been having fun with this for nearly two years now. My TIT is obviously the only one you've had to think about.

Kim W5TIT

5036. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:58:23 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <9vvmv501kb6@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28035

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c235096$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> If you are going to allow things that you read to formulate your opinion
of
> something before you have personally experienced it, then I would suggest
> you not bother.
>

You're right. Just because the label says "poison", is no reason I shouldn't
taste the contents of the bottle.

--
Jim

5037. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 15:59:11 UTC
From: Robert Frenchu <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com>
Message-ID: <i0n62ucv8ui4p5bb60nvhh6rgrmhcgfs08@4ax.com>
Source record: 28033
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote <9vvk5201g8i@enews2.newsguy.com> in
talk.politics.guns. :

>
>"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
>news:op762u0n99g3enl1onfcag8b0laq0rjllu@4ax.com...
>> You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
>> the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.
>
>I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled "2600"

Posting a periodical name as a cite is not sufficient. You lose. I've
made the call.

5038. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 16:09:33 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <19JU7.24189$Z03.12637630@news1.rdc1.mi.home.com>
Source record: 28034
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

> I invite anyone with a wide-band receive rig to listen on the freq's
> just above CB where the "Hi-banders" congregate. I did, and as far as I
> can tell, these are serious CB hobbiests - criminals only because
> they're operating in the wrong bands. So fight crime: convert them to
> hams!
> My $.02
> Merry Christmas to all
> KA3DWW

I brought one into the flock this year.
He's sold his galaxy rig, and bought an HT :)
I loaned him an HT, and spotted him some 9914 feedline, and a three element quad to get started.
Every year, I try to get three or four people licenced.

--
Dave's Engineering Page: http://www.dvanhorn.org

5039. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 16:46:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c236872$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28036

"Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message
news:9vvmv501kb6@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c235096$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > If you are going to allow things that you read to formulate your opinion
> of
> > something before you have personally experienced it, then I would
suggest
> > you not bother.
> >
>
> You're right. Just because the label says "poison", is no reason I
shouldn't
> taste the contents of the bottle.
>
> --
> Jim
>
>

Hmmm, well, if you are holding the bottle in your hand, I'd say you are personally experiencing it, right? So, you'd know whether to drink from it or not--hopefully. Now, if you were reading about a bottle that said 'poison,' not having seen the bottle personally yourself--that's a whole different story. :)

Kim W5TIT

5040. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 16:48:00 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2368b4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28037

"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
news:i0n62ucv8ui4p5bb60nvhh6rgrmhcgfs08@4ax.com...
> > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote <9vvk5201g8i@enews2.newsguy.com> in
talk.politics.guns. :
>
> >
> >"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:op762u0n99g3enl1onfcag8b0laq0rjllu@4ax.com...
> >> You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
> >> the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.
> >
> >I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled
"2600"
>
> Posting a periodical name as a cite is not sufficient. You lose. I've
> made the call.
>
>

Uh uh. You lose. *I've* made the call. :|

Kim W5TIT

5041. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 17:02:05 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <9vvprb$1gq$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 28038

"Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message news:9vvmv501kb6@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c235096$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > If you are going to allow things that you read to formulate your opinion
> of
> > something before you have personally experienced it, then I would suggest
> > you not bother.
> >
>
> You're right. Just because the label says "poison", is no reason I shouldn't
> taste the contents of the bottle.
>
> --
> Jim

How about reading a movie review for "The Years Worst Picture" and when
you go watch it you find out that it's a GREAT movie. You're just getting
someone else's 'opinion' of it, and not what really matters, which is what
YOUR opinion of it is!

Just remember we're not all 'jerks', just some of us! ;^)
Happy Holidays to one and all!!!!

--

'73' From KB9TMP

The sum of the intelligence on the planet is a constant;
the population is growing. -Cole's Axiom

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com

5042. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 17:37:57 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <9vvsrp021hl@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28044

"WW - KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
news:9vvprb$1gq$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> "Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message
news:9vvmv501kb6@enews2.newsguy.com...
> >
> > "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> > news:3c235096$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > If you are going to allow things that you read to formulate your
opinion
> > of
> > > something before you have personally experienced it, then I would
suggest
> > > you not bother.
> > >
> >
> > You're right. Just because the label says "poison", is no reason I
shouldn't
> > taste the contents of the bottle.
> >
> > --
> > Jim
>
> How about reading a movie review for "The Years Worst Picture" and when
> you go watch it you find out that it's a GREAT movie. You're just getting
> someone else's 'opinion' of it, and not what really matters, which is what
> YOUR opinion of it is!
>
> Just remember we're not all 'jerks', just some of us! ;^)
> Happy Holidays to one and all!!!!
>

Oh, I guess I just missed the part where I said you can all go to hell. LOL!
Of course, I was going to experience the flavor of these newsgroups because
I internet as well as radio. And of course, I'm still going to get my
license and rigs and do what I believe is expected of me (and not be one of
the jerks). But, you can't fault me for asking if what I read is true.

So far, only one person has bothered to tell me not to worry about it. One
person has told me to not bother if I'm gonna have an attitude because of
what I read... sigh...

I'm not really a bad person, I just have bad timing...

I'm just gonna go along and not have a public opinion, maybe that will be
the answer.

;-)

--
Jim

5043. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 17:50:03 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vvsc4jrv1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 28041

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:7C675AACFD8F3A2B.108F330199F6C161.5F67135A2F8866E6@lp.airnews.net...
> I) DEFINITION.
>
> Magick is the Science and Art of causing Change to occur in conformity
> with Will.

There's a Christian group, the Science of Mind, that believes the same
thing.

5044. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 17:51:45 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vvsfa$js5$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 28040

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C22B7EA.BDBF2669@IEEE.org...
> What is it about a ham being 100% satisfied with a tech license
> that you don't understand?

The part about not wanting HF privileges.

5045. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 17:54:41 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112210954.64cbefb7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28042
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:<9vvhp3$hkd$5@pita.alt.net>...
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com...
> >
> > "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > > >
> > >
> > > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
> >
> > My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
> >
> > FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in the 70s. They
> > were those little things with the big eyes and different colored, Don King
> > style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils, or on
> > keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still around, but not
> as
> > popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence in
> popularity
> > about ten years ago.
>
> That anonymous COWARD is ignorant of everything. "Woger Wussman" aka Twatty
> Campbell(Posts as Scott Campbell) should be familiar with the troll doll,
> since he was the initial model for them.

hit the bricks chuckie....you aren't wanted here.......
```

5046. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 17:55:09 UTC
From: Dave Edwards <kd2e@home.com>
Message-ID: <1IKU7.287653$ez.40194908@news1.rdc1.nj.home.com>
Source record: 28043
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

This gotta' be a joke!!

Twistedhed <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
news:e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com...
> "Hammies and dog-pound refugees (dogie,nad,pipeboy) would do well to
> read my scintillating prose and learned insights on the fine art of
> freebanding. A pet peeve of mine is that hammies (certain ones) put
> down radio hobbyists like myself just because they are CBers and just
> because they use gear that's advanced. I have logged more DX on the
> freeband than most 2 meter hams have in a lifetime. Why shouldn't I be
> treated with respect? All I am asking is that the issue of legality be
> put aside and my acheivements be recognized for what they are"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "If you take the time to read this you will see that we on freeband
> have problems with troublemakers too. They don't abide by our rules.
> They don't care what others think. They jam and make noises on 27.555.
> Read about it in my article. They are wrecking my freeband and they
> should be stopped"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "I admit I get all upset when hammies tell me I am breaking rules. I
> don't care about rules. I don't care what others think. If I want to
> operate freeband it is my responsibility and I don't like to hear
> anyone putting me down for it. Read about how we have created our own
> little illegal alternative to ham radio on the freeband. You hammies
> can be jealous"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "Hammies try to say that there are goverment users on 27.555 and
> above. I have never heard any myself so that proves there are none.
> Because of course what I say is true and everyone else is a liar.
> Read my wonderful prose and see for yourself"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "Geniuses like me don't need to obey laws since we are above the
> masses. Take that, you pussy-footed hams"

5047. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 18:15:53 UTC
From: pproctor@neosoft.com
Message-ID: <80B187B7C9672A40.56A9D1D3D271DE05.E8E15E89244104E6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28144
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In article <3C23951D.E1493E12@fcc.com> Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com> writes:
>From: Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com>
>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.
>Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 15:01:33 -0500

> The police are only supporting the laws they were sworn to
>uphold.
> It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
>have your own body armor.

Er, there may be occasional state laws, but there is no federal law.

Dr P

5048. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 18:19:37 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vvu3i$ks0$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 28045

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C22B7EA.BDBF2669@IEEE.org...
> And I said for the same reason that not everyone wants a PhD degree.

For most people, a PhD is unobtainable for various reasons. Is that how you
feel about ham licenses?

5049. Re: Question for Beer Experts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 18:24:59 UTC
From: Ed Cregger <nm2k@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <u26vcg94c9ro9a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 28046
Cross-posted to: alt.beer,rec.food.drink.beer,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Slumming again, Ken? <G>

Ed Cregger
nm2k@arl.net

"Ken Cashion" <kcashion@datasync.com> wrote in message
news:3c2381ac.13174530@news.datasync.com...
> On 20 Dec 2001 19:33:39 -0800,
twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
> (Twistedhed) wrote:
>
> >"A few months ago I was out on my boat drinking Malt
Liquor and not my
> >usual Miller Genuine Draft. After a while I became quite
dizzy and hit
> >my head on the gunwale. Not long after that I decided to
get on my
> >illegal CB and listen on the "freeband". There I heard a
man who
> >identified himself as being from a flying saucer. It
sounded very real
> >to me. So real that I am still convinced I had an
authentic encounter.
> >My question is, is this kind of thing normal with malt
liquor?"
>
> Yes.
>
> >"Please email me your thoughts. I have a very elaborate
anti-spam
> >guard so you need to add a @ where the _ is in my addy
and put a .
> >after the tv and drop the subdimension.com altogether"
>
> No.
>
> Ken Cashion

5050. Re: Question for Beer Experts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 18:39:14 UTC
From: kcashion@datasync.com
Message-ID: <3c2381ac.13174530@news.datasync.com>
Source record: 28039
Cross-posted to: alt.beer,rec.food.drink.beer,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 20 Dec 2001 19:33:39 -0800, twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com (Twistedhed) wrote:

>"A few months ago I was out on my boat drinking Malt Liquor and not my
>usual Miller Genuine Draft. After a while I became quite dizzy and hit
>my head on the gunwale. Not long after that I decided to get on my
>illegal CB and listen on the "freeband". There I heard a man who
>identified himself as being from a flying saucer. It sounded very real
>to me. So real that I am still convinced I had an authentic encounter.
>My question is, is this kind of thing normal with malt liquor?"

Yes.

>"Please email me your thoughts. I have a very elaborate anti-spam
>guard so you need to add a @ where the _ is in my addy and put a .
>after the tv and drop the subdimension.com altogether"

No.

Ken Cashion

5051. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 18:44:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9vvvhdlcu1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 28047

Kamatu <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message
news:9vvsrp021hl@enews2.newsguy.com...
> Oh, I guess I just missed the part where I said you can all go to hell.
LOL!
> Of course, I was going to experience the flavor of these newsgroups
because
> I internet as well as radio. And of course, I'm still going to get my
> license and rigs and do what I believe is expected of me (and not be one
of
> the jerks). But, you can't fault me for asking if what I read is true.
>
> So far, only one person has bothered to tell me not to worry about it. One
> person has told me to not bother if I'm gonna have an attitude because of
> what I read... sigh...
>
> I'm not really a bad person, I just have bad timing...
>
> I'm just gonna go along and not have a public opinion, maybe that will be
> the answer.

Well, you mentioned that you do internet, so I'm sure you've seen how people behave on the newsgroups. The amateur radio newsgroups really aren't any different. Quite often, people are on their worst behavior. But I think you'll find for the most part that on the air, and at club meetings, hams are a great bunch of guys. If you are into radio communications for the love of it, amateur radio is a highly fulfilling kind of activity.

73, Jim AC6XG

5052. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 18:53:43 UTC
From: Big Al <Big_Al@38945BigAl.net>
Message-ID: <a000es$nb2$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28048
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame,alt.2600.warez

> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3C1FA9AD.9B3DD642@uci.edu...

> Your posts are equally disgraceful.
>

Yes, KC8JBO is equally disgraceful! Roger suffers from
grave mental problems. He is employed as a Walmart Fry
Cook, which accounts for his poor attitude on life. The boy
needs to come on 3894.5 so I can slap him around a little and
give him a radio whuppin. HO HO

5053. latest NYC update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 19:24:05 UTC
From: webdoc@mailandnews.com
Message-ID: <de9751ca.0112211124.466d76e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28049
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

For those who are interested, I will be driving home to ohio next week, I will be outproccessing on wed 26th, and either driving out web afternoon or thursday am, heading back to ohio.

Keith Hosman

5054. Re: From a former Trucker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 19:44:24 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112211144.379cfdb1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28101
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

```
Norm Malick <henmel@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<3C234A35.45FFAF38@worldnet.att.net>...
> SD SpecialDelivery Jones wrote:
> >
> > Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:<u2q22u85asi99rl8i9qi6p0on6ehvjb84c@4ax.com>...
> > > SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com (SD SpecialDelivery Jones)
> > > shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
> > >
> > > do you have the foggiest FREAKING idea what it means to snip?
> > >
> > > Jim
> > >
> > >
> > > Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
> > > A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup
> >
> > veep.....my ,my....i am impressed........really......also on the
> > letters by your name thing......may i suggest the letters 'DH' be
> > added....i feel it would be most appropriate.......
>
> SD, give up with this Jim Weir clown. Remember the old adage about not
> mudwresting with pigs. You get filthy and the pig likes it.
>
> Norm Melick

aw geez norm.......i thought hams were cool and took baths everyday
and brushed their teeth too.....well i never......
```

5055. >NO CODE = NO HAM.<

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 19:45:35 UTC
From: CW - never CB <realhams@ncpnet.com>
Message-ID: <3C23915F.E57549F3@ncpnet.com>
Source record: 28050

NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.

CW or CB -- no other choice.

5056. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 19:49:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C239257.44DC590B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28103

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C22A13A.36CDAB78@earthlink.net...
>
> > The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her supporters.
> > She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views and
> > promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was legally
> issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.

That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official. If his support is a moot point, why did Kim feel it necessary to seek it?

Dave K8MN

5057. Wow - A hamfest on the highway!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 19:51:25 UTC
From: CW - never CB <realhams@ncpnet.com>
Message-ID: <3C2392BD.5F11A12A@ncpnet.com>
Source record: 28102

NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.

My. Eight little words... and another 800 car pileup on the Newington Interstate... with rubber duckies all over the highway...

5058. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 19:51:42 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C2392FD.9BADB903@gte.net>
Source record: 28104
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> >> You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
> >> the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.
> >
> >I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled "2600"
>
> Posting a periodical name as a cite is not sufficient. You lose. I've
> made the call.

No, you want someone else to do your research.
Go to Barnes & Nobles and start reading the fucking
magazine. Go over to http://www.strongsignals.net
and read.

I just went out to price body armor at a local police
equipment store. It is not available, from them, to
be sold to private citizens. The police do not want
private citizens having body armor and will stop buying
from any dealer who sells to them if they sell to private
citizens.

And all we wanted was something to wear while hunting
(a buddy just was shot in a hunting accident, it makes good
sense to wear body armor out there).

5059. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 20:01:33 UTC
From: Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com>
Message-ID: <3C23951D.E1493E12@fcc.com>
Source record: 28105
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

N9NWO wrote:
>
> > >> You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
> > >> the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.
> > >
> > >I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled "2600"
> >
> > Posting a periodical name as a cite is not sufficient. You lose. I've
> > made the call.
>
> No, you want someone else to do your research.
> Go to Barnes & Nobles and start reading the fucking
> magazine. Go over to http://www.strongsignals.net
> and read.

Which article? Some are deceased.

>
> I just went out to price body armor at a local police
> equipment store. It is not available, from them, to
> be sold to private citizens.

Did you ask why?

> The police do not want
> private citizens having body armor and will stop buying
> from any dealer who sells to them if they sell to private
> citizens.

The police are only supporting the laws they were sworn to
uphold.
It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
have your own body armor.

>
> And all we wanted was something to wear while hunting
> (a buddy just was shot in a hunting accident, it makes good
> sense to wear body armor out there).

Is it idiot huntin' season where you live?

5060. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 20:12:09 UTC
From: Huckleberry Hoshimoto <huckleberry_hoshimoto@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <tIMU7.113051$RP1.19635466@typhoon.kc.rr.com>
Source record: 28106
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame,alt.2600.warez

Yes. Picture the madness - Some poor $6.00 an hour bell-ringer turns his back for 10 minutes and the local Gay Pride Brigade sneak in and redecorate the bucket!!!

5061. Re: The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 20:15:45 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112212011370.16639-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 28107

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001, Bill Sohl wrote:
>Here's the law itself from the Tacoma WEB site:
>
>Chapter 8.38
>PROHIBITED USE OF NON-FCC
>CERTIFICATED TRANSMITTING
>EQUIPMENT IN THE CITIZENS BAND
>Sections:
>
>8.38.010 Prohibited use of non-FCC certificated
>transmitting equipment in the citizens band.
>
>8.38.020 Violation penalty.
>
>8.38.010 Prohibited use of non-FCC certificated transmitting
>equipment in the citizens band. It is unlawful for any person, firm, or
>corporation, to
>(a) use citizens band radio equipment not authorized
>by the Federal Communications Commission;
>(b) to allow the unauthorized operation of citizens band
>radio equipment on a frequency between 24 MHz
>and 35 MHz. Provided, however, as required by
>47 U.S.C. § 302(a), licensed amateur radio ("Ham")
>operators are excluded from the above provisions.
>(Ord. 26851 § 1; passed Sept. 18, 2001)
>
>8.38.020 Violation penalty.
>Any person found guilty of a violation of this chapter
>shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction
>thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding
>$500 or by imprisonment in the Pierce County Jail
>for a period not exceeding six months or by both
>such fine and imprisonment. (Ord. 26851 § 1; passed
>Sept. 18, 2001)
>----------end of Tacoma city code cite.----------
>
>The KEY as to any enforcement MUST be PROVING the USE
>in the first place...AND proving the radio is not authorized.

But it also looks as if any licensed amateur could operate on the CB band with ANY equipment (even amateur equipment) and not be subject to this law. They wouldn't meet either clause of 8.38.010. Of course, the FCC would have something to say, but that would mean a federal matter, not a local one, so that seems to be what the amateur community wanted too; correct?

>Good luck...looks like nothing but feel good legislation to
>placate one or more complaining residents.

5062. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 20:15:46 UTC
From: gayillegalscott69@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <4303d5a2.0112211215.26f87e63@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28108
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C232CA6.234D028D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> Train wrote:
> >
> > Your first clue should be that the thread is crossposted
>
> The second is that it came from google.com.
>
> The third clue is the posting IP: It came from AOL.

The fourth clue is that it got me running all over Usenet like a sissy
trying to disclaim it!

5063. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 20:18:39 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C23994E.5D72F489@gte.net>
Source record: 28109
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> >
> > > >> You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
> > > >> the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.
> > > > >
> > > > >I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled "2600"
> > > >
> > > > Posting a periodical name as a cite is not sufficient. You lose. I've
> > > > made the call.
> > >
> > > No, you want someone else to do your research.
> > > Go to Barnes & Nobles and start reading the fucking
> > > magazine. Go over to http://www.strongsignals.net
> > > and read.
> >
> > Which article? Some are deceased.
> >

You need to read on a regular basis. This
is an ongoing battle over technology. 2600
is a good place to start, so is strong signals.
Even Monitoring Times has had articles on
this issue.

>
> >
> > I just went out to price body armor at a local police
> > equipment store. It is not available, from them, to
> > be sold to private citizens.
>
> Did you ask why?
>
> > The police do not want
> > private citizens having body armor and will stop buying
> > from any dealer who sells to them if they sell to private
> > citizens.
>
> The police are only supporting the laws they were sworn to
> uphold.
> It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
> have your own body armor.
>

Sorry but you are wrong. Only a few cities
limit body armor to police, no state that I know

of. And it is perfectly legal at the federal level.
I have other sources, but I would have liked a
local source.

>
> >
> > And all we wanted was something to wear while hunting
> > (a buddy just was shot in a hunting accident, it makes good
> > sense to wear body armor out there).
>
> Is it idiot huntin' season where you live?

The individual in question is a former Marine,
one of the best weapons handlers in my Army
unit. It shocked everyone who knows him which
includes those of us in the military (my colonel is
very close friends with him and is a Class III
collector), many of the local police and even the
local gun stores. He is that good.

But life happens and sometimes you can not stop it.
He lost his left lung, two ribs and 4 out of 5 units of
blood. Never passed out, barking orders to a fellow
soldier who treated him for shock, a sucking chest
wound then backpacked him out over a 1/4 mile!

Everyone is thankful that he is such a hard headed
old Marine (well he is younger than me). Had he
passed out, I doubt that he would have lived, going
into shock.

It has been a real wake up call to many of our younger
troops. It pushed the need to learn Common Task Training.

And it has many of us really thinking that body armor
might be a good thing to have, for both hunting and if
we get activated.

5064. Re: >NO CODE = NO HAM.<

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 20:35:28 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <a007be02nl1@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28115

Troll rejected.

Try again.

"CW - never CB" <realhams@ncpnet.com> wrote in message
news:3C23915F.E57549F3@ncpnet.com...
> NO CODE = NO HAM. KNOW CODE = KNOW HAM.
>
> CW or CB -- no other choice.
>

5065. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 20:35:52 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <a007ca02nmr@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28116

Yeah, I do know how the people on newsgroups are.
Thanks Jim

--
Jim

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:9vvvhdlcu1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> Kamatu <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message
> news:9vvsrp021hl@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > Oh, I guess I just missed the part where I said you can all go to hell.
> LOL!
> > Of course, I was going to experience the flavor of these newsgroups
> because
> > I internet as well as radio. And of course, I'm still going to get my
> > license and rigs and do what I believe is expected of me (and not be one
> of
> > the jerks). But, you can't fault me for asking if what I read is true.
> >
> > So far, only one person has bothered to tell me not to worry about it.
One
> > person has told me to not bother if I'm gonna have an attitude because
of
> > what I read... sigh...
> >
> > I'm not really a bad person, I just have bad timing...
> >
> > I'm just gonna go along and not have a public opinion, maybe that will
be
> > the answer.
>
> Well, you mentioned that you do internet, so I'm sure you've seen how
people
> behave on the newsgroups. The amateur radio newsgroups really aren't any
> different. Quite often, people are on their worst behavior. But I think
> you'll find for the most part that on the air, and at club meetings, hams
> are a great bunch of guys. If you are into radio communications for the
> love of it, amateur radio is a highly fulfilling kind of activity.
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG
>
>

5066. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 20:36:06 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C239D62.D73C8F3C@gte.net>
Source record: 28110
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

delta.sxixeleven@gte.net wrote:

> >Here in Texas, a LEO can not search a car at all unless granted by the
> >driver of the vehicle or a search warrant.
> >
> That is not exactly correct, do a search for "The Carroll Doctrine"

You had better explain it. I know
of no state that does not allow the
police to inspect vehicles.

What these guys do not understand
is this just is not about radio equipment.
It is about drugs, guns, scanners, alcohol
or anything else that the officer may think
that you are doing. There are so many
bad guys (perps) out there that the average
LEO has to expect that every traffic stop
might be more than just a normal guy.

After all look at all the drug runners who
are caught during traffic stops. It is the
number one enforcement tool for the
police.

5067. Re: The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 20:59:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a007un$b50$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28111

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.10.10112212011370.16639-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
On Thu, 20 Dec 2001, Bill Sohl wrote:
>Here's the law itself from the Tacoma WEB site:
>
>Chapter 8.38
>PROHIBITED USE OF NON-FCC
>CERTIFICATED TRANSMITTING
>EQUIPMENT IN THE CITIZENS BAND
>Sections:
>
>8.38.010 Prohibited use of non-FCC certificated
>transmitting equipment in the citizens band.
>
>8.38.020 Violation penalty.
>
>8.38.010 Prohibited use of non-FCC certificated transmitting
>equipment in the citizens band. It is unlawful for any person, firm, or
>corporation, to
>(a) use citizens band radio equipment not authorized
>by the Federal Communications Commission;
>(b) to allow the unauthorized operation of citizens band
>radio equipment on a frequency between 24 MHz
>and 35 MHz. Provided, however, as required by
>47 U.S.C. &#65533; 302(a), licensed amateur radio ("Ham")
>operators are excluded from the above provisions.
>(Ord. 26851 &#65533; 1; passed Sept. 18, 2001)
>
>8.38.020 Violation penalty.
>Any person found guilty of a violation of this chapter
>shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction
>thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding
>$500 or by imprisonment in the Pierce County Jail
>for a period not exceeding six months or by both
>such fine and imprisonment. (Ord. 26851 &#65533; 1; passed
>Sept. 18, 2001)
>----------end of Tacoma city code cite.----------
>
>The KEY as to any enforcement MUST be PROVING the USE
>in the first place...AND proving the radio is not authorized.

But it also looks as if any licensed amateur could operate on the CB band
with

ANY equipment (even amateur equipment) and not be subject to this law. They wouldn't meet either clause of 8.38.010. Of course, the FCC would have something to say, but that would mean a federal matter, not a local one, so that seems to be what the amateur community wanted too; correct?

I would say that there's nothing in the law that should cause any grief for amateurs and probably no one else either. The "law" is (IMHO) all bark and no bite because the ability to PROVE any violation is out of the capabilities of almost any police.

5068. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:10:10 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <a0083lpel1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 28112

Big Al <Big_Al@38945BigAl.net> wrote in message
news:a000es$nb2$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3C1FA9AD.9B3DD642@uci.edu...
>
> > Your posts are equally disgraceful.
> >
>
> Yes, KC8JBO is equally disgraceful! Roger suffers from
> grave mental problems. He is employed as a Walmart Fry
> Cook, which accounts for his poor attitude on life. The boy
> needs to come on 3894.5 so I can slap him around a little and
> give him a radio whuppin. HO HO

It appears there's a whole bunch of ya. Sorry I said anything. Merry
Christmas.

5069. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:15:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0093f$r6c$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28113
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C239D62.D73C8F3C@gte.net...
>
>
> delta.sxixeleven@gte.net wrote:
>
> > >Here in Texas, a LEO can not search a car at all unless granted by the
> > >driver of the vehicle or a search warrant.
> > >
> > That is not exactly correct, do a search for "The Carroll Doctrine"
>
> You had better explain it. I know
> of no state that does not allow the
> police to inspect vehicles.

NJ does not allow searches without permission or
a warrant based on reasonable suspicion. The
police can look into the vehicle through windows, etc, but
they can not demand that you open the trunk, etc.

In the event that police have a reasonable suspicion
for some reason, they can get a court issued warrant.
The KEY element is "reasonable suspicion."

> What these guys do not understand
> is this just is not about radio equipment.
> It is about drugs, guns, scanners, alcohol
> or anything else that the officer may think
> that you are doing.

So you claim, but fail to clearly convince anyone
of. There is NOTHING illegal about me having
unopened alcohol containers in a vehicle. The
officer may THINK anything s/he wants, but
without the reasonable suspicion aspect, there is
no absolute right of the police to search the vehicle.
As to scanners and other radios, none of those items
constitute anything against the law in NJ and, therefore,
do not of themselves constitute any reasonable suspicion
to get a search warrant.

> There are so many
> bad guys (perps) out there that the average
> LEO has to expect that every traffic stop
> might be more than just a normal guy.

Other than drugs, guns and open alcohol containers,
nothing else (certainly not a radio except
for a scanner in the handful of states that prohibit
them in cars) you offer suggests any valid
reason to justify a search or the confiscation
(taking as evidence) of any radio equipment.

> After all look at all the drug runners who
> are caught during traffic stops. It is the
> number one enforcement tool for the police.

So what, we are talking about radio equipment, not drugs.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5070. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:17:07 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <FFD82E29E38266F1.F736BC86DC96F54D.41F6654C0E7A2214@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28114

On 21 Dec 2001 11:16:26 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I've got a better idea -- you find me someone at ARRL HQ that will
>flatly deny that the ARS is viewed as a "family-oriented" activity --
>intended to be passed down from fathers, mothers, uncles, grand-
>parents to children, grandchildren, nephews, nieces, etc. etc.
>Find someone who will state, from a standpoint of their being an
>ARRL official, that the ARS is intended to be a non-"G"-rated,
>over 21, adults-only activity for mature audiences only. If you can,
>then we'll entertain the notion that I "don't have the vaguest idea"
>what I'm talking about. In the meantime, I'm not too sure *you*
>do!

I truly hate to burst your bubble, Larry, but to the best of
my knowledge, the ARRL hasn't been named the legal regulatory agency
for the Amateur Radio Service by the government--that responsibility
belongs to the FCC exclusively.

Why should I--or anyone else--care what the ARRL position on
the "family oriented" nature of the ARS is? You and Dick Carroll
certainly didn't credit them with any ability to speak for YOU when it
came to code testing, remember? And how am I supposed to find someone
with the ARRL who will make such a statement--we BOTH know that as
soon as anyone with the ARRL states his or her _opinion_, you start
claiming they don't have the right to do so (can you say "Ed Hare?").

You'll have to do better than that, Larry. The ARRL doesn't
speak for everyone in ham radio--it doesn't even speak for all of its
members. It would be JUST as valid to ask a spokesperson for NCI to do
so as it would to ask one from the ARRL.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5071. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:21:13 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B0998739E8E5FBD2.55FE05509341B310.9C8AA2F135BF89CD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28117

On 21 Dec 2001 01:33:08 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>If it makes you feel any better, I am now looking for property to buy
>here in Delaware. I'm trying to decide to buy a house or build one;
>something will happen along those lines very soon. Living in this
>apartment has been quite cost-effective for me; due to the fact I've
>been here for 9 years, my rent is about 75% of what it would be
>getting if occupied by a new tenant. And, as someone said, I've
>not had to concern myself with repairs, lawn mowing, etc. which is
>an important consideration in my life -- and if this place ever went
>condo I might just write a check for it -- as long as I could make
>certain upgrades. However, in reality, I need/want a bit more space,
>so I'll probably get out of here pretty soon.

You know, Larry, those are almost exactly the same statements
a mobile home resident would make if he or she were moving to a house
instead. And since you (as Kim pointed out) view such individuals as
"trailer trash," I'll just point out that at least THEY own the
property they're in--you have exactly the same complaints about yours,
and you don't even have any equity in it of your own. If property
owners are "trash," I can only guess what renters are in your view.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5072. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:26:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a009ha$18k$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28118
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:9vvk5201g8i@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
> news:op762u0n99g3enl1onfcag8b0laq0rjllu@4ax.com...
> > You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
> > the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.
>
> I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled
"2600"
> that has been writing about the same subject for quite some time - keeping
> modern technology in the hands of private corporations and out of the
hands
> of the public. If you want more, read the DMCA of 1998. It's basically
made
> it illegal to take something apart to see how it works.

That law is targeted specifically at reverse engineering activity of
corporate R&D organizations.

Has anyone been found guilty of that law?

Do you really see that law being used against a ham or anyone
else who decides to take apart their TV, Stereo, CD player,
PC or anything else just to learn more about it?

Bottom line, the DCMA is of NO consequence to individuals
who like to tinker.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5073. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:32:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C23AA71.909C7BC4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28119

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C22B7EA.BDBF2669@IEEE.org...
> > What is it about a ham being 100% satisfied with a tech license
> > that you don't understand?
>
> The part about not wanting HF privileges.

Some hams are perfectly satisfied with a tech license.
You are not required to understand everything. I,
myself, was perfectly satisfied with VHF-only operation
during the 15 years that I lived in CA. I had HF
privileges but I didn't use them.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5074. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:32:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a009sfkpp1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28120
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
news:cfyU7.1231$Ya1.689971@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
> : > > That is hogwash. I haven't seen any such "growing
> : > > numbers" opposed to CBs, radios, etc. Indeed, there
> : > > has been NO movement to ban scanners at all...rather
> : > > some states (e.g. NJ) have relaxed old laws which
> : > > did ban scanners in autos.
> : > >
> : > > > There is the feeling that the public can not be trusted,
> : > > > that too many use technology for crime or to try to
> : > > > overthrow the government. Many would prefer that only
> : > > > those who are paid on a professional basis should be allowed
> : > > > to have access to radios or weapons.
> : > >
> : > > More hogwash. Even if there is some such sentiment,
> : > > there hasn't been any support for that attitude in the press,
> : > > the legislatures, etc.
> : > >
> : > > Bill K2UNK
> : >
> : > I gather that you do not read that many papers
> : > everyday. The Washington Post, LA Times,
> : > NY Times, Chicago Tribune all go on "crusades"
> : > every so often over gun ownership, cell phones,
> : > scanners. The elite do not like the fact that the
> : > masses understand, and use, technology.
> :
> : I have seen public opposition to gun ownership, mixed
> : opposition to cellphone use in an auto (no one
> : seems to want to ban any total use/ownership
> : of cellphones) ...BUT
> : not one crusade at all against scanners. There has
> : been NO demand to ban scanners at all, even for
> : specific frequencies, since the FCC rules
> : prohibiting scanners manufactured that can recieve
> : cellular.
>
> I suggest that you become familiar
> with the issues over APCO 25
> standards for digital trunked radio.
> The main purpose is to prevent private
> citizens from receiving ANY public
> radio transmission.

So what, that doesn't mean there is any public
demand to outlaw scanners.

> As I am a member
> of APCO, I have had conversations with
> individuals who run public safety radio
> systems. Their one big goal is to have
> an digitally encrypted system that no one,
> not even the media, will be able to receive
> without their permission.

That too does NOT constitute any public outcry
to ban scanners either.

> Read some of the articles at http://www.strongsignals.net

There is nothing wrong with police using new technology to
protect their frequencies from eavesdropping...BUT that
is not at all anlogous to banning scanners altogether as
you claim their is public support for.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5075. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:34:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C23AAFD.92800412@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28121

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C22B7EA.BDBF2669@IEEE.org...
> > And I said for the same reason that not everyone wants a PhD degree.
>
> For most people, a PhD is unobtainable for various reasons. Is that how you
> feel about ham licenses?

Yes, for some hams an extra license is unobtainable because they
don't do anything to obtain it.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5076. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:36:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C23AB69.5623605D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28122

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Krell wrote:
> > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was legally
> > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
>
> That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official.

Too bad Riley's official opinion carries such little weight at the FCC.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----
```

5077. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:45:09 UTC
From: Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com>
Message-ID: <3C23AD65.8E6D3BBA@fcc.com>
Source record: 28123
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

N9NWO wrote:
>
> > >
> > > > >> You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
> > > > >> the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled "2600"
> > > > >
> > > > > Posting a periodical name as a cite is not sufficient. You lose. I've
> > > > > made the call.
> > > >
> > > > No, you want someone else to do your research.
> > > > Go to Barnes & Nobles and start reading the fucking
> > > > magazine. Go over to http://www.strongsignals.net
> > > > and read.
> > >
> > > Which article? Some are deceased.
> > >
>
> You need to read on a regular basis.

You ninny.
Half the LINKS are dead.. DECEASED!

Moving on....

> > > I just went out to price body armor at a local police
> > > equipment store. It is not available, from them, to
> > > be sold to private citizens.

> > Did you ask why?

I did.

> > > The police do not want
> > > private citizens having body armor and will stop buying
> > > from any dealer who sells to them if they sell to private
> > > citizens.

That is not entirely true.
The police don't want convicted FELONS that are let loose and
are still dangerous from owning such protective gear.

Why were _you_ turned down?

> > The police are only supporting the laws they were sworn to
> > uphold.
> > It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
> > have your own body armor.
> >
>
> Sorry but you are wrong. Only a few cities
> limit body armor to police,

I didn't say the police, you ninny.
I said THE PEOPLE!

But, I have to admit that I was wrong in thinking it was a crime
for a typical person to have or own.
I was misled by strange, left wing propaganda, as well as my own
local police!
As far as I know now, there are NO laws regarding the wearing or
purchasing of such clothing..yet!
Unless of course one is a convicted felon or use them in the
commission of a crime.

> no state that I know
> of. And it is perfectly legal at the federal level.
> I have other sources, but I would have liked a
> local source.

I talked to my local Police in my state (NJ) and they said it is
a FELONY for a CIVILIAN to wear, let alone HAVE, any bullet proof
vest or Body armor.
He also said that is not just "NJ STATE" wide, but also," It's
"Nationwide."

Apparently, nothing could have been further from the truth.

As having just called to "a" manufacturer, he told me "That cop
is nutz and I want his badge number!"
"While it is perfectly OK to sell to the general public, the
cops will never give you a straight answer, and even we refuse to
sell to criminals or punks." he said in a 'round about way.

This place was VERY informative, and kind and they are in
California.
He also said that the majority of his sales are NOT to LEO's!

http://www.bulletproofme.com/
http://www.bulletproofme.com/Quick_Answers.shtml#12
http://www.bulletproofme.com/What_s_New.shtml

Again, please except my humble apologies for the information I
gave, that for the first time WAS not quite accurate.

Now then.. how's that friend of yours doing that you shot the
last time you went hunting?

5078. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:49:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C23A15A.B95CFBAB@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28124

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I seriously doubt that Riley has any "prudish hangups."
>
> Sorry Larry, Riley has proved he has prudish hangups and I have
> lost a lot of respect for him because of that. He offered his
> personal opinion while in an FCC position.

So since Riley answered an exact question directed to him by the principal seeking his opininion, not Federal law which she aready knew, and he honestly answered it with his personal opinion, you now pronounce him a prude simply because his opinion doesn't match your sleazy opinion. Right, we got it.

> That is exactly
> the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
> opinion while in an ARRL position.

That is NOT what he said to Ed. He and I said we simply didn't believe that the ARRL leadership would allow Ed to post opinions here that were not closely aligned with official ARRL policy. Ed himself stated that very fact when he said that ARRL heirarchy knew he wouldn't say or do anything contrary to those policies. So you are a deliberate liar, not to mention a complete fool.

5079. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 21:58:03 UTC
From: Robert Frenchu <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com>
Message-ID: <n1c72us5rlidsakjianl7jt4p5npi2j497@4ax.com>
Source record: 28126
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote <3C2392FD.9BADB903@gte.net> in talk.politics.guns. :

>> >> You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
>> >> the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.
>> >
>> >I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled "2600"
>>
>> Posting a periodical name as a cite is not sufficient. You lose. I've
>> made the call.
>
>No, you want someone else to do your research.

No, I want you to provide the cite. Can't do it? I'm not surprised,
loser.

5080. Re: Jam the bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:00:35 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7iOU7.235834$3d2.11322047@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28127

Jim, you are right about the AM. He was always using AM. Ummmm ... what about the 'wet-bottom boys'. I assume he was refering to the WB callsigns (I'm not sure when the WA2 calls were finished off. My 1st ticket was WN2CJV, issued in 1962).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20011220000259.06877.00000587@mb-mj.aol.com...
> In article <B0bU7.232743$3d2.11125812@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >You'd have to ask some old timers who
> >were active back in the 60s and before about Mike, W2OY. He was quite a
> >work of art. My understanding is, however, that he was just 'breaking
> >stones' and he was really a decent guy in person. He used to call CQ with
> >something like 'CQ CQ, no lids, kids, space cadets or school bus riders. No
> >wet-bottom boys. Only class A operators on this frequency, from W2OY'. He
> >was something.
>
> He was ticked because of the Dec. 1952 FCC "privileges giveaway", when
> Conditionals and Generals got full HF 'phone privileges. (Prior to that time,
> one needed an Advanced or Extra to work 'phone on the ham bands between 3 and
> 25 MHz).
>
> The classic W2OY call was "CQ 75 meter AM phone, no kids, no lids, no space
> cadets, Class A operators only". Class A was the old name for Advanced, "kids"
> referred to Novices and newcomers, "lids" referred to Generals and
> Conditionals, and "space cadets" referred to SSB ops.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5081. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:02:21 UTC
From: Jim Patrick <jpatrickMAPS-ITNA@shentel.net>
Message-ID: <vvb72u0uarm696a2dul0gcr3fqoegrbhjl@4ax.com>
Source record: 28125
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In talk.politics.guns, Bill Sohl wrote:

>That law is targeted specifically at reverse engineering activity of
>corporate R&D organizations.

And has been applied to one single case.
Not against a corporation or R&D firm.

>Has anyone been found guilty of that law?

The case hasn't made it to trial yet. After some months in the pokey,
the bail donation fund was able to get them out. But the case has yet
to be heard.

>Do you really see that law being used against a ham or anyone
>else who decides to take apart their TV, Stereo, CD player,
>PC or anything else just to learn more about it?

Yeah. Do you think you pay income taxes to fund WWI?
Once in place, the expansion of use is inevitable.

5082. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:02:33 UTC
From: Jim Patterson <jrp32nospam@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <5g872usjmr8ocgfc2iqnb2p59mujefunb9@4ax.com>
Source record: 28128
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 15:01:33 -0500, Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com> in
talk.politics.guns wrote:

> It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
>have your own body armor.
>

I am curious. Do you feel that this is a good law?
I am thinking of someone who is say, transporting jewelry or cash.
So far as I can remember, I grew up in a country with a framework of
laws that were protective without being needlessly restrictive.

Of course there were about 130-150 million in the country then, and that
makes somewhat of a difference in this anecdote about laws:

When quite young though in my memory, I was injured (turned out to be
just a broken collarbone) at a convention that my parents were attending
at a rural town park. Dad got me in his (then new) '55 Olds and had a
Legion buddy holding me down in the back seat. He later told me that we
were going over 100mph to the hospital. We were stopped by a highway
patrolman who in seconds was escorting us to the hospital, same speed,
with sirens going and that was the last heard from the police. To me,
that is non-restrictive law at work.
I wonder what would happen with the same circumstances today?

In the mid-sixties, I had a holiday job at a men's clothing store. After
we closed at night, the owner would take the receipts to a night deposit
at the other end of the mall....with his hand on a revolver. I have no
idea if he had any kind of permit, but I seriously doubt it would have
made any difference to a cop. So far as I know, he never used it.
About that I could only ask, who was hurt.

But what we have now is a country that says one law fits all at all
times and by golly that is how it will be.

Cheers,

jim

>>
>> And all we wanted was something to wear while hunting
>> (a buddy just was shot in a hunting accident, it makes good
>> sense to wear body armor out there).
>
>Is it idiot huntin' season where you live?

5083. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:21:41 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <VBOU7.87696$bs2.20625334@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 28129
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

Worst part of this useless bullshit is that they continue to cross post the
crap.
Train
"Jim Patterson" <jrp32nospam@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:5g872usjmr8ocgfc2iqnb2p59mujefunb9@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 15:01:33 -0500, Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com> in
> talk.politics.guns wrote:
>
> > It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
> >have your own body armor.
> >
>
> I am curious. Do you feel that this is a good law?
> I am thinking of someone who is say, transporting jewelry or cash.
> So far as I can remember, I grew up in a country with a framework of
> laws that were protective without being needlessly restrictive.
>
> Of course there were about 130-150 million in the country then, and that
> makes somewhat of a difference in this anecdote about laws:
>
> When quite young though in my memory, I was injured (turned out to be
> just a broken collarbone) at a convention that my parents were attending
> at a rural town park. Dad got me in his (then new) '55 Olds and had a
> Legion buddy holding me down in the back seat. He later told me that we
> were going over 100mph to the hospital. We were stopped by a highway
> patrolman who in seconds was escorting us to the hospital, same speed,
> with sirens going and that was the last heard from the police. To me,
> that is non-restrictive law at work.
> I wonder what would happen with the same circumstances today?
>
> In the mid-sixties, I had a holiday job at a men's clothing store. After
> we closed at night, the owner would take the receipts to a night deposit
> at the other end of the mall....with his hand on a revolver. I have no
> idea if he had any kind of permit, but I seriously doubt it would have
> made any difference to a cop. So far as I know, he never used it.
> About that I could only ask, who was hurt.
>
> But what we have now is a country that says one law fits all at all
> times and by golly that is how it will be.
>
> Cheers,
>
> jim

>
> >>
> >> And all we wanted was something to wear while hunting
> >> (a buddy just was shot in a hunting accident, it makes good
> >> sense to wear body armor out there).
> >
> >Is it idiot huntin' season where you live?
>

5084. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:24:14 UTC
From: Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com>
Message-ID: <3C23B68E.AE136BBC@fcc.com>
Source record: 28130
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

Jim Patterson wrote:
>
> On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 15:01:33 -0500, Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com> in
> talk.politics.guns wrote:
>
> > It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
> >have your own body armor.
> >
>
> I am curious. Do you feel that this is a good law?

Before we go further, allow me to say that I was (gasp) Wrong!
Citizens most certainly CAN own and wear armor.

And also, I have always been in favor of the people to do such a
thing.

I was misled regarding the "law."

5085. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:26:17 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c23b64e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28131

"Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message
news:9vvsrp021hl@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "WW - KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
> news:9vvprb$1gq$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> > "Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message
> news:9vvmv501kb6@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > >
> > > "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3c235096$1_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > > If you are going to allow things that you read to formulate your
> opinion
> > > of
> > > > something before you have personally experienced it, then I would
> suggest
> > > > you not bother.
> > > >
> > >
> > > You're right. Just because the label says "poison", is no reason I
> shouldn't
> > > taste the contents of the bottle.
> > >
> > > --
> > > Jim
> >
> > How about reading a movie review for "The Years Worst Picture" and when
> > you go watch it you find out that it's a GREAT movie. You're just
getting
> > someone else's 'opinion' of it, and not what really matters, which is
what
> > YOUR opinion of it is!
> >
> > Just remember we're not all 'jerks', just some of us! ;^)
> > Happy Holidays to one and all!!!!
> >
>
>
> Oh, I guess I just missed the part where I said you can all go to hell.
LOL!
> Of course, I was going to experience the flavor of these newsgroups
because
> I internet as well as radio. And of course, I'm still going to get my
> license and rigs and do what I believe is expected of me (and not be one
of

> the jerks). But, you can't fault me for asking if what I read is true.
>
> So far, only one person has bothered to tell me not to worry about it. One
> person has told me to not bother if I'm gonna have an attitude because of
> what I read... sigh...
>

Didn't mean to imply that, and sorry you took it that way. What I *mean* by what I said is: don't get into ham radio if you are going to allow yourself to be affected so much by some of the crap you may hear, and some of the creeps you may meet, etc. They're all there--the good *and* the bad. The idea with ham radio is the same as with life in general. You choose what you wish, and choose the mountains you wish to climb. The stuff you don't like? Shrug your shoulders. It's big enough for everyone.

Kim W5TIT

5086. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:27:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c23b68a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28132

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:9vvsc4jrv1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> news:7C675AACFD8F3A2B.108F330199F6C161.5F67135A2F8866E6@lp.airnews.net...
> > I) DEFINITION.
> >
> > Magick is the Science and Art of causing Change to occur in conformity
> > with Will.
>
> There's a Christian group, the Science of Mind, that believes the same
> thing.
>
>
>

I think that's our point, exactly. Now, the only thing is, in some cases thought really can make a difference. And, in those cases, it truly is magical.

Kim W5TIT

5087. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:29:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c23b700_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28133

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:9vvsfa$js5$1@news.service.uci.edu...
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C22B7EA.BDBF2669@IEEE.org...
> > What is it about a ham being 100% satisfied with a tech license
> > that you don't understand?
>
> The part about not wanting HF privileges.
>
>

Jim, forgive me, and I don't want to be taken as confrontational about this. For some, SSTV may be the only thing they ever really "get" about ham radio. For others, it might be APRS. Still others, CW. And so it goes. I don't like HF for all the noise it makes--it really does to me. I don't like the hissing...don't like the wavering in and out. BUT, I enjoy HF once in a while. Some do not. There's LOTS to do in any spectrum of the hobby that is chosen.

Kim W5TIT

5088. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:36:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c23b89b$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28134

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C239257.44DC590B@earthlink.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C22A13A.36CDAB78@earthlink.net...
> >
> > > The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her
supporters.
> > > She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views and
> > > promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was
legally
> > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
>
> That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official. If his support is a moot
> point, why did Kim feel it necessary to seek it?
>
> Dave K8MN

I'm running out of crayons here, Dave. At the time the solicitation from Riley was sought, there was some nitwit (not Larry) who was telling me he was going to see to it that the FCC would revoke my callsign...blah, blah, blah. At the same time our resident nitwit (Larry) was just getting stoked up. So, for both of them, and to the shut the non-resident nitwit up, I wrote to Riley and asked him about the idea of the FCC revoking a callsign, in fact the FCC being interested in policing callsigns at all. Riley is, as you say, an FCC official. His response shut the non-resident nitwit up. His response lit a fire under the resident nitwit--and now you.

K?

Got it?

Is it sinking in?

Kim W5TIT

5089. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:41:35 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c23b9e4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28135

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:B0998739E8E5FBD2.55FE05509341B310.9C8AA2F135BF89CD@lp.airnews.net...
> On 21 Dec 2001 01:33:08 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >If it makes you feel any better, I am now looking for property to buy
> >here in Delaware. I'm trying to decide to buy a house or build one;
> >something will happen along those lines very soon. Living in this
> >apartment has been quite cost-effective for me; due to the fact I've
> >been here for 9 years, my rent is about 75% of what it would be
> >getting if occupied by a new tenant. And, as someone said, I've
> >not had to concern myself with repairs, lawn mowing, etc. which is
> >an important consideration in my life -- and if this place ever went
> >condo I might just write a check for it -- as long as I could make
> >certain upgrades. However, in reality, I need/want a bit more space,
> >so I'll probably get out of here pretty soon.
>
> You know, Larry, those are almost exactly the same statements
> a mobile home resident would make if he or she were moving to a house
> instead. And since you (as Kim pointed out) view such individuals as
> "trailer trash," I'll just point out that at least THEY own the
> property they're in--you have exactly the same complaints about yours,
> and you don't even have any equity in it of your own. If property
> owners are "trash," I can only guess what renters are in your view.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

<BIG EVIL GRIN> I wasn't gonna go there. Oh yeah, I didn't...you did.
ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

5090. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:42:10 UTC
From: Josey Wales <nothanks@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <yNPU7.4707$_f.114138@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28140
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

That's correct. If you refuse, they can get a warrant and detain you if it takes 12 hours to get it if they want. They will likely then tear your car apart looking for drugs, not reassemble it for you of course, while a drug dog is turned loose inside and outside your car with his claws scratching the shit out of your paint job. Don't be so naive as to think they can't ruin their day in any number of ways. Refuse a search and it's assumed you have something to hide. You do have rights but there are ways too numerous to mention how they can make your day a real bitch.

I witnessed a South Carolina State Patrol Officer chamber a round in a 12 gauge shotgun, ram it (and I mean ram) in the stomach of a fat, greasy looking truck driver because he was mouthing off as he was asked to step down from his cab. Needless to say, the driver shut the fuck up and said more "yes sirs" then he probably ever had previously in his life. Go ahead and tell them your rights, just be prepared for the consequences because they know them better than most motorists do.

tw��,.., <.tw,@nothomeexcite5,yahoomsnATTBI.org.com> wrote in message
news:YNnU7.13583$NM4.3197237@rwcrnsc53...
> X-No-Archive: yes
>
> "Peter H. Proctor" <pproctor@neosoft.com> wrote in message
> news:336D1D3074E71BF6.7E14ED6979DC6C7D.F2352BD3BE528AB0@lp.airnews.net...
> > Not that simple. Having stopped a car under "reasonable
> suspicion",
> > LEO's can search the area under control of the driver or a passenger for
> > weapons. The legal theory is that the safety of the officer allows for
> a
> > specific exemption to 4th amendment protections. If, incidental to
> this
> > search, they find contraband, this is admissible as evidence.
> > Admittedly, as a practical matter, this is all a legal fiction
> that
> > allows officers to search when and where. But it still means there
> are
> > some limitations. E.g., LEO's cannot search a locked container, which
> gives
> > an "expectation of privacy". Similarly, a local judge once threw out
> > contraband found in a metal Bandaid box after a defense attorney pointed
> out
> > that it was too small to have held any weapon and thus should not have
> been
> > opened.

>
>
> Here in Texas, a LEO can not search a car at all unless granted by the
> driver of the vehicle or a search warrant.
>
>

5091. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:49:39 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <70PU7.88150$bs2.20682171@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 28136
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Panhead" <Panmyfinger@fcc.com> wrote in message
news:3C23B68E.AE136BBC@fcc.com...
> Jim Patterson wrote:
> >
> > On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 15:01:33 -0500, Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com> in
> > talk.politics.guns wrote:
> >
> > > It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
> > >have your own body armor.
> > >
> >
> > I am curious. Do you feel that this is a good law?
>
> Before we go further, allow me to say that I was (gasp) Wrong!
> Citizens most certainly CAN own and wear armor.
>
Most states have laws on the books criminalizing the use of body armor while
committing a crime. Owning the body armor in and of itself is not usually
the crime.
Train

5092. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:54:54 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C23BDED.1564320F@gte.net>
Source record: 28137
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> > > > > >> You're obviously unable to provide a cite. I shall now report you to
> > > > > >> the proper authorities for a gross violation of the False Cite Act.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled "2600"
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Posting a periodical name as a cite is not sufficient. You lose. I've
> > > > > > made the call.
> > > > > >
> > > > > No, you want someone else to do your research.
> > > > > Go to Barnes & Nobles and start reading the fucking
> > > > > magazine. Go over to http://www.strongsignals.net
> > > > > and read.
> > > > >
> > > > Which article? Some are deceased.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > You need to read on a regular basis.
> >
> You ninny.
> Half the LINKS are dead.. DECEASED!
>
> Moving on....
>

Well, I assume that you are talking about
Strong Signals. Read it on a regular basis.
New stuff all the time.

And learn about APCO 25 and how the
public safety communications community
is planning to make all government radios
encrypted.

>
> > > > > I just went out to price body armor at a local police
> > > > > equipment store. It is not available, from them, to
> > > > > be sold to private citizens.
> >
> > > > Did you ask why?
> >
> I did.
> >
> > > > > The police do not want
> > > > > private citizens having body armor and will stop buying

> > > > from any dealer who sells to them if they sell to private
> > > > citizens.
>
> That is not entirely true.
> The police don't want convicted FELONS that are let loose and
> are still dangerous from owning such protective gear.
>
> Why were _you_ turned down?
>

They refuse to sell to anyone who is
not a sworn officer. Even though I
am working for government and have
security clearance. Police only.

It does not matter, I have other sources
like Gall's

>
> > > The police are only supporting the laws they were sworn to
> > > uphold.
> > > It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
> > > have your own body armor.
> > >
> >
> > Sorry but you are wrong. Only a few cities
> > limit body armor to police,
>
> I didn't say the police, you ninny.
> I said THE PEOPLE!
>
> But, I have to admit that I was wrong in thinking it was a crime
> for a typical person to have or own.
> I was misled by strange, left wing propaganda, as well as my own
> local police!
> As far as I know now, there are NO laws regarding the wearing or
> purchasing of such clothing..yet!
> Unless of course one is a convicted felon or use them in the
> commission of a crime.
>
> > no state that I know
> > of. And it is perfectly legal at the federal level.
> > I have other sources, but I would have liked a
> > local source.
>
> I talked to my local Police in my state (NJ) and they said it is
> a FELONY for a CIVILIAN to wear, let alone HAVE, any bullet proof
> vest or Body armor.
> He also said that is not just "NJ STATE" wide, but also," It's
> "Nationwide."
>

> Apparently, nothing could have been further from the truth.
>
> As having just called to "a" manufacturer, he told me "That cop
> is nutz and I want his badge number!"
> "While it is perfectly OK to sell to the general public, the
> cops will never give you a straight answer, and even we refuse to
> sell to criminals or punks." he said in a 'round about way.
>
> This place was VERY informative, and kind and they are in
> California.
> He also said that the majority of his sales are NOT to LEO's!
>
> http://www.bulletproofme.com/
> http://www.bulletproofme.com/Quick_Answers.shtml#12
> http://www.bulletproofme.com/What_s_New.shtml
>
> Again, please except my humble apologies for the information I
> gave, that for the first time WAS not quite accurate.
>
> Now then.. how's that friend of yours doing that you shot the
> last time you went hunting?

That was why I was gentle. I thought you
might have had wrong info.

I wasn't with him. Thank god the kid that
he was hunting with was there. He had
the military training plus he is rather big
and strong. The right person to be there.

Unfortunately Kevin shot himself. We have
three deer season: bow, muzzle loader,
and shotgun. Kevin had his blackpowder
rifle plus a blackpowder pistol for backup.
The pistol had worked lose in the holster
and when he went to get up, it slipped out
and discharged when it hit the ground (I
know, it sounds really weird). As I said,
he lost a lung and about 4/5 of his blood.
He is damned lucky to be alive.

Just went thru surgery to close everything
up and should be out of the hospital before
Christmas (they were expecting him to stay
for another week). Again, even the best
have shit happen to them.

Guess that this is another reason to buy body
armor.

5093. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 22:57:38 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C23BE93.B40B0CEE@gte.net>
Source record: 28138
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

>
> > It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
> >have your own body armor.
> >
>
> I am curious. Do you feel that this is a good law?
> I am thinking of someone who is say, transporting jewelry or cash.
> So far as I can remember, I grew up in a country with a framework of
> laws that were protective without being needlessly restrictive.
>
> Of course there were about 130-150 million in the country then, and that
> makes somewhat of a difference in this anecdote about laws:
>
> When quite young though in my memory, I was injured (turned out to be
> just a broken collarbone) at a convention that my parents were attending
> at a rural town park. Dad got me in his (then new) '55 Olds and had a
> Legion buddy holding me down in the back seat. He later told me that we
> were going over 100mph to the hospital. We were stopped by a highway
> patrolman who in seconds was escorting us to the hospital, same speed,
> with sirens going and that was the last heard from the police. To me,
> that is non-restrictive law at work.
> I wonder what would happen with the same circumstances today?
>
> In the mid-sixties, I had a holiday job at a men's clothing store. After
> we closed at night, the owner would take the receipts to a night deposit
> at the other end of the mall....with his hand on a revolver. I have no
> idea if he had any kind of permit, but I seriously doubt it would have
> made any difference to a cop. So far as I know, he never used it.
> About that I could only ask, who was hurt.
>
> But what we have now is a country that says one law fits all at all
> times and by golly that is how it will be.
>

In my state there is one exemption to having a pistol on
you in public (without a license, that is). And that is that
your employer requires to have it. It is allowed for businesses
to have armed staff who deposit money, no carry permit
required.

5094. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 23:03:57 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C23C00D.A9037FA@gte.net>
Source record: 28139
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

> > : > > That is hogwash. I haven't seen any such "growing
> > : > > numbers" opposed to CBs, radios, etc. Indeed, there
> > : > > has been NO movement to ban scanners at all...rather
> > : > > some states (e.g. NJ) have relaxed old laws which
> > : > > did ban scanners in autos.
> > : > >
> > : > > > There is the feeling that the public can not be trusted,
> > : > > > that too many use technology for crime or to try to
> > : > > > overthrow the government. Many would prefer that only
> > : > > > those who are paid on a professional basis should be allowed
> > : > > > to have access to radios or weapons.
> > : > >
> > : > > More hogwash. Even if there is some such sentiment,
> > : > > there hasn't been any support for that attitude in the press,
> > : > > the legislatures, etc.
> > : > >
> > : > > Bill K2UNK
> > : >
> > : I gather that you do not read that many papers
> > : everyday. The Washington Post, LA Times,
> > : NY Times, Chicago Tribune all go on "crusades"
> > : every so often over gun ownership, cell phones,
> > : scanners. The elite do not like the fact that the
> > : masses understand, and use, technology.
> > :
> > : I have seen public opposition to gun ownership, mixed
> > : opposition to cellphone use in an auto (no one
> > : seems to want to ban any total use/ownership
> > : of cellphones) ...BUT
> > : not one crusade at all against scanners. There has
> > : been NO demand to ban scanners at all, even for
> > : specific frequencies, since the FCC rules
> > : prohibiting scanners manufactured that can recieve
> > : cellular.
> >
> > I suggest that you become familiar
> > with the issues over APCO 25
> > standards for digital trunked radio.
> > The main purpose is to prevent private
> > citizens from receiving ANY public
> > radio transmission.
>
> So what, that doesn't mean there is any public

> demand to outlaw scanners.
>

No public demand, just behind the door lobbying
by police organizations. Congress has passed
some rather restrictive laws about scanners in
the last 10 years.

>
> > As I am a member
> > of APCO, I have had conversations with
> > individuals who run public safety radio
> > systems. Their one big goal is to have
> > an digitally encrypted system that no one,
> > not even the media, will be able to receive
> > without their permission.
>
> That too does NOT constitute any public outcry
> to ban scanners either.
>

The public wants scanners, the media wants them.
The cops would rather that you did not have them.

> > Read some of the articles at http://www.strongsignals.net
>
> There is nothing wrong with police using new technology to
> protect their frequencies from eavesdropping...BUT that
> is not at all anlogous to banning scanners altogether as
> you claim their is public support for.

It will cause more problems that it is worth.
Right now most police officers use scanners
to listen to adjacent patrol areas, other departments
and others services. If radios are encrypted, you
will only have those talk groups that are programmed
into your radio. Already we have problems with
various agencies not wanting other agencies on
their talk groups. For example, the ambulance
service does not want the fire fighters on their
talk group. Makes it damned hard to co-ordinate
at an accident scene or talk the ambulance in.

And you know that the media will be the first
to be locked out. They are just now realizing
that the cops might be pulling a fast one.

5095. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 23:28:23 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a00gf901kle@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28141
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Robert Frenchu" <robert_frenchu@ya-take_out-hoo.com> wrote in message
news:i0n62ucv8ui4p5bb60nvhh6rgrmhcgfs08@4ax.com...
> >I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled
"2600"
>
> Posting a periodical name as a cite is not sufficient. You lose. I've
> made the call.

If you're too fucking lazy to read any of them published within the past
year, you're the one who loses

5096. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 23:42:49 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a00haa01lrs@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28142
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a009ha$18k$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net...
> That law is targeted specifically at reverse engineering activity of
> corporate R&D organizations.
>
> Has anyone been found guilty of that law?

As a matter of fact, yes. 2600 magazine was found to be in violation of the law when they published DeCSS code (a DVD ripper program) by a federal judge in California. His decision was based on the fact that someone MIGHT use such code to violate copyrights. The case is currently under appeal. In another case, a software company was threatened with a lawsuit because they wrote a program that would play DVDs on the Linux platform. I don't know the details of this, but the corporate lawyers argued that since DVDs weren't designed to run under Linux by the manufacturers, copyright protection MIGHT be compromised. (or some other crazy argument to that effect)

> Do you really see that law being used against a ham or anyone
> else who decides to take apart their TV, Stereo, CD player,
> PC or anything else just to learn more about it?
>
> Bottom line, the DCMA is of NO consequence to individuals
> who like to tinker.

...and the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

5097. Re: Gays harass Salvation Army during Christmas season

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 23:44:51 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a00he401m0b@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28143

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c235198_2@newsa.ev1.net...
> > > So is 8L0J08 your first name, or last name?
> >
> > Forget it. The guy's too dumb to understand 'L33TI5M5.
> >
> >
>
> Uh, Krell? Is this some kind of one of those Pagan Spells? ~:o
>
> Kim W5TIT

Maybe. ;-)

5098. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-21 23:52:44 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a00hsu01mn7@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28146

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C239257.44DC590B@earthlink.net...
> > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was
legally
> > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
>
> That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official. If his support is a moot

Bullshit! The only thing that needed to be said in the capacity as an FCC
official is whether or not the callsign was legal. Anything additional is
personal opinion.

> point, why did Kim feel it necessary to seek it?

I don't know. Why don't you ask HER?

5099. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 00:19:07 UTC
From: otis brasfield <otis@nts-online.net>
Message-ID: <u27kadnc749761@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 28145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

DEAR SIR
YES, YOU CAN BE A FREEBANDER AND I FOR ONE AM GLAD THAT YOU ARE. BECAUSE THERE MANY PLACES YOU CAN GO AND FREEBAND. I CAN RECOMMEND A FEW. SUCH AS ALL THE PHONY GOD SALESMEN ON THE 40 METER HAM BAND THEY NEED A KICK TO ANOTHER LIFE. THEN THERE ARE ALL THE LIBERAL NEWS AGENCIES FREQS THAT NEED TO BE JAMMED, WHEN THEY SPOUT THEIR TRASH. AND THE LIST GOES ON AND ON. SO DON'T FEEL PERSECUTED, FEEL GOOD YOU AND YOUR MERRY BAND OF EQUAL JAMES ARE DOING A PUBLIC SERVICE. AND NEED TO BE COMMENDED. THE GOVT FREQ. ALSO NEED TO BE JAMMED SUCH AS THE ARMED FORCES BECAUSE THEY ARE LYING ABOUT THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN THE AFGHANI WORLD. ALL THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES SHOULD NOT BE LEFT OUT, THEY TOO NEED JAMMING. SO KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK AND MAYBE YOU WILL BE VISITED BY OUR FRIENDLY FCC WHO WILL REWARD FOR YOUR GOOD WORKS.
MERRY XMAS

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message news:e9de0154.0112201318.115c1d6@posting.google.com...
> "Why? Simple. I am an outlaw CBer. You have spoken out against me one
> too many times. If life were ideal I could simply shut you up like I
> do on the freeband by cranking up my big box (just kidding). But this
> is less than ideal so I have to tolerate you and your hammie pals. I
> am disgusted by your rule-following, goody-two-shoes holier-than-thou
> attitude towards radio, Lelnad. Rules are going to be broken and I am
> going to freeband and that is all there is to it. I will continue to
> promote illegal CB because I can. Anarchy of the airwaves is where we
> are headed and you can't come to terms with it, can you? Too bad but
> 28.085 is just the beginning and it irritates you doesn't it? I am
> glad, now go back to your kennel with dogie and the rest and lap your
> wounds"

5100. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 00:39:57 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <a00lrg0l53@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28149

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c23b64e_1@newsa.ev1.net...

<snippity-do-dah>

> Didn't mean to imply that, and sorry you took it that way. What I *mean*
by
> what I said is: don't get into ham radio if you are going to allow
yourself
> to be affected so much by some of the crap you may hear, and some of the
> creeps you may meet, etc. They're all there--the good *and* the bad. The
> idea with ham radio is the same as with life in general. You choose what
> you wish, and choose the mountains you wish to climb. The stuff you don't
> like? Shrug your shoulders. It's big enough for everyone.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

Gotcha.

5101. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 00:55:40 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C23D9F9.99473DAA@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 28147
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott Unit 69 wrote:
>
> "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C232CA6.234D028D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> > Train wrote:
> > >
> > > Your first clue should be that the thread is crossposted
> >
> > The second is that it came from google.com.
> >
> > The third clue is the posting IP: It came from AOL.
>
> The fourth clue is that it got me running all over Usenet like a sissy
> trying to disclaim it!

That's bullshit and you know it. A simple traceroute will tell
you loads of information. Just because you don't know simple
computer stuff doesn't mean the rest are naive about this.

Even quicker then TRACEROUTE is NSLOOKUP:

Name: spider-ta023.proxy.aol.com
Address: 152.163.205.53

For those of us using real browsers and real internet connections,
the standard four line headers show Google for organization.

5102. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 01:19:27 UTC
From: John P Vassel <john@vassel.net>
Message-ID: <3c23df9f$0$37104$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net>
Source record: 28150
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"otis brasfield" <otis@nts-online.net> wrote in
news:u27kadnc749761@corp.supernews.com:

> DEAR SIR
> YES, YOU CAN BE A FREEBANDER AND I FOR ONE AM GLAD THAT YOU ARE.
> BECAUSE THERE MANY PLACES YOU CAN GO AND FREEBAND. I CAN RECOMMEND A
> FEW. SUCH AS ALL THE PHONY GOD SALESMEN ON THE 40 METER HAM BAND THEY
> NEED A KICK TO ANOTHER LIFE. THEN THERE ARE ALL THE LIBERAL NEWS
> AGENCIES FREQS THAT NEED TO BE JAMMED, WHEN THEY SPOUT THEIR TRASH. AND
> THE LIST GOES ON AND ON. SO DON'T FEEL PERSECUTED, FEEL GOOD YOU AND
> YOUR MERRY BAND OF EQUAL JAMES ARE DOING A PUBLIC SERVICE. AND NEED TO
> BE COMMENDED. THE GOVT FREQ. ALSO NEED TO BE JAMMED SUCH AS THE ARMED
> FORCES BECAUSE THEY ARE LYING ABOUT THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN THE AFGHANI
> WORLD. ALL THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES SHOULD NOT BE LEFT OUT, THEY
> TOO NEED JAMMING. SO KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK AND MAYBE YOU WILL BE
> VISITED BY OUR FRIENDLY FCC WHO WILL REWARD FOR YOUR GOOD WORKS. MERRY
> XMAS
>
>

<Plonk>

5103. Re: Question for Beer Experts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 01:21:44 UTC
From: MrUniverse <bunko70@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <u27ns77qg4ksee@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 28148
Cross-posted to: alt.beer,rec.food.drink.beer,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BOL :-D

"ZOOM" <kandrparker@sympatico.ca> wrote in message
news:sjzU7.34321$x25.3634639@news20.bellglobal.com...
> Do you actually have a job?
> Someone told me you make frenchfries and your boss is 18yrs old.
> Is this true?
> Someday you might get promoted to assembler where you put the hamburgers
> together.
> Way to reach your goals!
>
>
> Twistedhed <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> news:e9de0154.0112201933.77397e3f@posting.google.com...
> > "A few months ago I was out on my boat drinking Malt Liquor and not my
> > usual Miller Genuine Draft. After a while I became quite dizzy and hit
> > my head on the gunwale. Not long after that I decided to get on my
> > illegal CB and listen on the "freeband". There I heard a man who
> > identified himself as being from a flying saucer. It sounded very real
> > to me. So real that I am still convinced I had an authentic encounter.
> > My question is, is this kind of thing normal with malt liquor?"
> >
> > "Please email me your thoughts. I have a very elaborate anti-spam
> > guard so you need to add a @ where the _ is in my addy and put a .
> > after the tv and drop the subdimension.com altogether"
> >
> > Thank You,
> >
> > Twistedhed
> > Oldsmar, FLA
>
>

5104. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 01:27:39 UTC
From: Your Friend Bill <"Remove The NO In The Reply Address"@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <3C23E18B.B971CE51@coqui.net>
Source record: 28051
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Woger Wussman wrote:
>
> On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 22:10:15 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >
> > "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > > >
> > >
> > > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
> >
> > My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
> >
> > FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in the 70s. They
>
> I see. Pop culture, according to you, is something that happened 20 or
> more years ago. The rest of us think of pop culture as something a bit
> more current -- say something going on *now*.
>
> Being in a time warp must be confusing to you.

Does this mean they are still selling those little troll-doll pencils?

-Bill

5105. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 01:45:01 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <yuRU7.10753$BX4.940960@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 28053
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

See below for comments.
Josey Wales <nothanks@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:yNPU7.4707$_f.114138@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> That's correct. If you refuse, they can get a warrant and detain you if
it
> takes 12 hours to get it if they want. They will likely then tear your
car
> apart looking for drugs, not reassemble it for you of course, while a drug
> dog is turned loose inside and outside your car with his claws scratching
> the shit out of your paint job. Don't be so naive as to think they can't
> ruin their day in any number of ways. Refuse a search and it's assumed
you
> have something to hide. You do have rights but there are ways too
numerous
> to mention how they can make your day a real bitch.

I am asking a question here, so don't think I am being smarty, OK? If an
officer
"suspects" you of something and tears up your vehicle, paint, upholstery,
etc., if he
finds nothing, wouldn't there be recourse for the owner of the vehicle for
damage of the vehicle.
That would seem most unfair to be able to rip up someone's car on
"suspicion".

> I witnessed a South Carolina State Patrol Officer chamber a round in a 12
> gauge shotgun, ram it (and I mean ram) in the stomach of a fat, greasy
> looking truck driver because he was mouthing off as he was asked to step
> down from his cab. Needless to say, the driver shut the fuck up and said
> more "yes sirs" then he probably ever had previously in his life. Go
ahead
> and tell them your rights, just be prepared for the consequences because
> they know them better than most motorists do.

I don't muck with SC Highway Patrol troopers. Them 'ere boys invented the
phrase, "Y'all in a heap o' trouble, boy, ya heah me?" I must say that, in
my own
experience, SCHP is the most unprofessional, untrained, uncouth,
smart-mouthed
bunch of pot bellied yahoos I have ever encountered. And the nationally
televised
clip of the SC trooper dragging a frightened woman out of her car while
screaming
obscenities and spitting like a mad dog PROVES it! I try to stay out of SC

if I can.
LMAO!

Jerry
>
>
> tw��,.., <.tw,@nothomeexcite5,yahoomsnATTBI.org.com> wrote in message
> news:YNnU7.13583$NM4.3197237@rwcrnsc53...
> > X-No-Archive: yes
> >
> > "Peter H. Proctor" <pproctor@neosoft.com> wrote in message
> >
news:336D1D3074E71BF6.7E14ED6979DC6C7D.F2352BD3BE528AB0@lp.airnews.net...
> > > Not that simple. Having stopped a car under "reasonable
> > suspicion",
> > > LEO's can search the area under control of the driver or a passenger
for
> > > weapons. The legal theory is that the safety of the officer allows
for
> a
> > > specific exemption to 4th amendment protections. If, incidental to
> this
> > > search, they find contraband, this is admissible as evidence.
> > > Admittedly, as a practical matter, this is all a legal
fiction
> > that
> > > allows officers to search when and where. But it still means
there
> > are
> > > some limitations. E.g., LEO's cannot search a locked container,
which
> > gives
> > > an "expectation of privacy". Similarly, a local judge once threw
out
> > > contraband found in a metal Bandaid box after a defense attorney
pointed
> > out
> > > that it was too small to have held any weapon and thus should not have
> > been
> > > opened.
> >
> >
> > Here in Texas, a LEO can not search a car at all unless granted by the
> > driver of the vehicle or a search warrant.
> >
> >
>
>

5106. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 01:47:09 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <xCRU7.1634$7a5.571922@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28052
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C2392FD.9BADB903@gte.net...

> <<< SNIP >>>
> And all we wanted was something to wear while hunting
> (a buddy just was shot in a hunting accident, it makes good
> sense to wear body armor out there).
>

It makes more sense to choose your hunting partners carefully ... :>)

Besides, short of hard body armor (military hard panel insert stuff) none of the stuff you find in a cop shop will stop any of the typical hunting rifle rounds. Threat Level III soft armor (still pretty bulky) is only rated up to .44 mag pistol and 00 buck.

73 de W6DKN

5107. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 01:58:41 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <INRU7.1673$7a5.578930@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28055
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C23BDED.1564320F@gte.net...

> <<< SNIP >>>
> Unfortunately Kevin shot himself. We have
> three deer season: bow, muzzle loader,
> and shotgun. Kevin had his blackpowder
> rifle plus a blackpowder pistol for backup.
> The pistol had worked lose in the holster
> and when he went to get up, it slipped out
> and discharged when it hit the ground (I
> know, it sounds really weird). As I said,
> he lost a lung and about 4/5 of his blood.
> He is damned lucky to be alive.

Since very few (if any) black powder pistols have any type of hammer block safety, knowledgeable shooters always carry in the field with the hammer resting on an empty cylinder. Percussion caps can self-ignite from static electricity alone... Even in the "cowboy days" with the good old SAA's, it was common practice to carry with the hammer down on an empty cylinder.

73 de W6DKN

5108. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 01:59:02 UTC
From: Patrick Keele <pkg1dra@g1dra.freeserve.co.uk>
Message-ID: <a02hkm$39e$1@news7.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 28191
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

WHY do you use that STUPID word "MINDSET"?What the hell is a MINDSET?Do you mean it's how someone thinks?Can i buy this "mindset" in a store or shop???why don't you speak PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH??????????

I am british and i am SICK of the british using and picking up STUPID americanisms in the uk! WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!

MOST cbers as you call them in the uk who use SSB/AM ARE criminals and often get caught to.Any bad reputation the cb fraternity have is mainly due to their own illegal operations and behaviour.you REAP what you SOW!

PK

5109. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 02:09:11 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c23ec32_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28054

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:yuRU7.10753$BX4.940960@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> See below for comments.
> Josey Wales <nothanks@nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:yNPU7.4707$_f.114138@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > That's correct. If you refuse, they can get a warrant and detain you if
> it
> > takes 12 hours to get it if they want. They will likely then tear your
> car
> > apart looking for drugs, not reassemble it for you of course, while a
drug
> > dog is turned loose inside and outside your car with his claws
scratching
> > the shit out of your paint job. Don't be so naive as to think they
can't
> > ruin their day in any number of ways. Refuse a search and it's assumed
> you
> > have something to hide. You do have rights but there are ways too
> numerous
> > to mention how they can make your day a real bitch.
>
> I am asking a question here, so don't think I am being smarty, OK? If an
> officer
> "suspects" you of something and tears up your vehicle, paint, upholstery,
> etc., if he
> finds nothing, wouldn't there be recourse for the owner of the vehicle for
> damage of the vehicle.
> That would seem most unfair to be able to rip up someone's car on
> "suspicion".
>

I've witnessed two occasions where, in one, an apartment of some friends of
my brother was torn apart in a "drug raid." Every single box of whatever
was turned upside down and dumped in the middle of the kitchen floor,
speaker grills on the stereo were cut, sofa cushions and back were cut, all
furniture was tossed every which way, framed pictures yanked (yes, yanked)
off the walls and paper backing torn off...and on and on. By the time the
cops were done, the apartment looked worse than any vandals could ever have
hoped, the cops were empty-handed (turned out it was tenant wars--the
upstairs tenants had called with "suspicion" that there was drug dealing
going on because they were mad at the volume of the stereo) and not even an
apology was uttered as they went out the door. There were about 7-8 of them
and I guarantee you that every neighbor and visitor around there had their
chins hanging to the ground in literal shock. There was no recoourse for

these people to have anything cleaned, replaced, or repaired.

In another, a car's seats and headliner were cut open for the same thing. Again, nothing found, no apology, no repairs.

"There are ways" bad cops will force compliance with their wishes. "There are ways" you'd wish there *was* something for you to get busted for--the court costs and attorney fees are a lot cheaper than replacing personal property. One of the satirical laughs we used to come up with was "for god's sake, keep some weed around so we can give it to them when they crash in through the front door!"

Kim W5TIT

5110. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 02:25:11 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a00qqp0tet@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28060
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a00kelhmn0@pita.alt.net...
> I see. Pop culture, according to you, is something that happened 20 or
> more years ago. The rest of us think of pop culture as something a bit

Us? You and who else? Did you take a poll to find out what find out what
everyone else thinks?

5111. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 02:37:14 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221213714.05517.00000126@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 28056

>And So are you SSB, Hey fellas in the amateur NG... Meet the new breed of
>Ham his name is SSB, maybe you recognize his numbers on the CB 151.
> He went from Illegal CB Keyclown to Extra Class all in about 6 months. He
>now takes his freebanding Illegal skills to a HF band near you. Say Hello

I think they've already met, George. Glad you could join us. BTW...hello.

Mark

5112. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 02:40:29 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221214029.05517.00000127@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 28057

>Dick, I would expect anything different from you hang in rec.radio.CB
>lending your expertise to the illegal there.

The trick is to use that "expertise" to turn them on to the ham bands...legally! Dick has done this and has thus "made a difference." What've you done lately to make a difference, George?

Mark

5113. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 02:42:22 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221214222.05517.00000128@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 28058

>> ... Hey fellas in the amateur NG... Meet the new breed of Ham ...
>> ..He went from Illegal CB Keyclown to Extra Class all in about 6 months.
>
>Great! If we could get the rest of them to do the same we'd have mucho
>more political power.
>
>I invite anyone with a wide-band receive rig to listen on the freq's
>just above CB where the "Hi-banders" congregate. I did, and as far as I
>can tell, these are serious CB hobbiests - criminals only because
>they're operating in the wrong bands. So fight crime: convert them to
>hams!
>My $.02
>Merry Christmas to all
>KA3DWW

Worth much more than $.02. Thanks and Merry Christmas to you too. Take care and 73.

Mark

5114. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 02:48:18 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221214818.05517.00000131@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 28059

>Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired FCC
>ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
>As of May 14, 2000:
>
>Novice - 49,329
>Tech - 205,394
>Tech Plus - 128,860
>General - 112,677
>Advanced - 99,782
>Extra - 78,750
>Total - 674,792
>
>Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
>
>Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209

I've got a question, Jim. Perhaps you might know the answer. What happens to the Advanced licensees when they renew? Can one retain his/her Advanced ticket indefinitely? Just curious. Take care and 73.

Mark

5115. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 02:51:11 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221215111.05517.00000132@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 28061

>>> Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)
>>
>>less than 87% of previous
>
>Similar situation to Tech Plus but renewals stay Advanced

I think this answers it. Thanks and 73, Jim.

Mark

5116. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 02:57:07 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletelZ.com>
Message-ID: <3C23F682.26F8@mobiletelZ.com>
Source record: 28062

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:yuRU7.10753$BX4.940960@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > See below for comments.
> > Josey Wales <nothanks@nospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:yNPU7.4707$_f.114138@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > That's correct. If you refuse, they can get a warrant and detain you if
> > it
> > > takes 12 hours to get it if they want. They will likely then tear your
> > car
> > > apart looking for drugs, not reassemble it for you of course, while a
> drug
> > > dog is turned loose inside and outside your car with his claws
> scratching
> > > the shit out of your paint job. Don't be so naive as to think they
> can't
> > > ruin their day in any number of ways. Refuse a search and it's assumed
> > you
> > > have something to hide. You do have rights but there are ways too
> > numerous
> > > to mention how they can make your day a real bitch.
> >
> > I am asking a question here, so don't think I am being smarty, OK? If an
> > officer
> > "suspects" you of something and tears up your vehicle, paint, upholstery,
> > etc., if he
> > finds nothing, wouldn't there be recourse for the owner of the vehicle for
> > damage of the vehicle.
> > That would seem most unfair to be able to rip up someone's car on
> > "suspicion".
> >
>
> I've witnessed two occasions where, in one, an apartment of some friends of
> my brother was torn apart in a "drug raid." Every single box of whatever
> was turned upside down and dumped in the middle of the kitchen floor,
> speaker grills on the stereo were cut, sofa cushions and back were cut, all
> furniture was tossed every which way, framed pictures yanked (yes, yanked)
> off the walls and paper backing torn off...and on and on. By the time the
> cops were done, the apartment looked worse than any vandals could ever have
> hoped, the cops were empty-handed (turned out it was tenant wars--the
> upstairs tenants had called with "suspicion" that there was drug dealing
> going on because they were mad at the volume of the stereo) and not even an
> apology was uttered as they went out the door. There were about 7-8 of them

> and I guarantee you that every neighbor and visitor around there had their
> chins hanging to the ground in literal shock. There was no recoourse for
> these people to have anything cleaned, replaced, or repaired.
>
> In another, a car's seats and headliner were cut open for the same thing.
> Again, nothing found, no apology, no repairs.
>
> "There are ways" bad cops will force compliance with their wishes. "There
> are ways" you'd wish there *was* something for you to get busted for--the
> court costs and attorney fees are a lot cheaper than replacing personal
> property. One of the satirical laughs we used to come up with was "for
> god's sake, keep some weed around so we can give it to them when they crash
> in through the front door!"
>
> Kim W5TIT

Did you watch the Dateline story on Louisiana a few years back about
car searches at the border? Several agencies had to repair several
cars and undo a lot of damage. Don't find anything in Louisiana, you
had better be willing to explain to the Judge (the officer requesting
the search) why you had your suspecions about the search. Louisiana
Internal Affairs (State Police Unit) is curious also and doesn't
like being made a fool of, especially on national tv. Usually the
Drug Dog has just wee'd itself before the request is aired, else
a no-show gets hard to explain.

5117. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 02:59:37 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221215937.05517.00000137@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 28063

>On what basis would the FCC have to retain even the 5wpm code
>test if/when the ITU requirement goes away? If you can't
>articulate a clear and compelling reason to retain code
>now except for the treaty requirement, then on what basis
>would you argue for its retention?
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

The same as the Russians, Bill. Because it's a fundamental "discipline" of amateur radio and as such, should be learnt. Even at the most elementary level. Take care and 73.

Mark

5118. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 03:23:05 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011221222305.05517.00000145@mb-de.aol.com>
Source record: 28064

>We're talking about licensing requirements ... that's PURELY a
>regulatory function. "Tradition" has NOTHING to do with *legitimate*
>regulatory goals ... it's not the FCC's job to preserve amateur
>"tradition" ... the FCC's job is to regulate the use of the spectrum
>in the public interest. End of story.

Perhaps, but you can now be licensed without having to show "Morse proficiency." The requirement of demonstrating a very traditional "discipline" in order to "earn" additional privileges seems to be very much in the public interest. Do you really think it's a "regulatory function" we're talking about?

>Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
>three basic motivations 1) "I had to do it, so everyone else should,
>too."; 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
>not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of contacts
>will dry up; and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
>using "their" bands. All 3 of those are pure rubbish.

...and the motivations of those who wish to remove the code requirement entirely are? I guess you said it best..."Standards, shmandards..."

>Yes, the new Extra pool is done and must be used by June 1, 2002.
>My understanding is that the intent of the QPC was to make it more
>modern and comprehensive.

I just hope they'll keep the code requirement at 5 w.p.m., it's the "least" they can do.

Mark

5119. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 03:36:35 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <7dTU7.355$2B.161836@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28065
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

```
: > <<< SNIP >>>
: > Unfortunately Kevin shot himself. We have
: > three deer season: bow, muzzle loader,
: > and shotgun. Kevin had his blackpowder
: > rifle plus a blackpowder pistol for backup.
: > The pistol had worked lose in the holster
: > and when he went to get up, it slipped out
: > and discharged when it hit the ground (I
: > know, it sounds really weird). As I said,
: > he lost a lung and about 4/5 of his blood.
: > He is damned lucky to be alive.
:
: Since very few (if any) black powder pistols have any type of hammer block
: safety, knowledgeable shooters always carry in the field with the hammer
: resting on an empty cylinder. Percussion caps can self-ignite from static
: electricity alone... Even in the "cowboy days" with the good old SAA's, it
: was common practice to carry with the hammer down on an empty cylinder.
:
: 73 de W6DKN

It was a single shot black powder pistol,
not a revolver. Had he had a revolver,
it might have been better. This was a
hunting gun which he used to get a second
shot if needed.
```

5120. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 03:39:44 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <4gTU7.357$2B.162422@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28068
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

: > <<< SNIP >>>
: > And all we wanted was something to wear while hunting
: > (a buddy just was shot in a hunting accident, it makes good
: > sense to wear body armor out there).
: >
:
: It makes more sense to choose your hunting partners carefully ... :>)
:
: Besides, short of hard body armor (military hard panel insert stuff) none
: of the stuff you find in a cop shop will stop any of the typical hunting
: rifle rounds. Threat Level III soft armor (still pretty bulky) is only
: rated up to .44 mag pistol and 00 buck.

My state does not allow center fire rifles.
We only have a bow, black powder and
shotgun/pistol seasons. Therefore a 3A
vest might do. For high power rifle, yes
you would need a Class 4 vest.

5121. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 03:42:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C24013E.AC871766@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28066

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So since Riley answered an exact question directed to him by the
> principal seeking his opininion, not Federal law which she aready knew,
> and he honestly answered it with his personal opinion, you now pronounce
> him a prude simply because his opinion doesn't match your sleazy
> opinion. Right, we got it.

Yep, you got it all right. I have a lot less respect for him now
than I did before.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5122. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 03:44:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2401B6.E38FD6DD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28067

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > That is exactly
> > the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
> > opinion while in an ARRL position.
>
> That is NOT what he said to Ed.

He said Ed's opinion could not be taken seriously because he worked
for the ARRL. Using the identical logic, Riley's opinion cannot be
taken seriously because he works for the FCC.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5123. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 03:56:30 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net>
Message-ID: <OvTU7.7059$x72.2277881967@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 28069
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Not really any that matter Scott. It's the same BS
that our little buddy was doing a few months back
To all that's concerned, for a year or more now
we have had a few resident trolls on rec.radio.cb.
They were using MIBX until after months of
complaints he was terminated. It seems as though
he is back from prep school, for Christmas vacation
stirring the pot.

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011221204335.191$hs@newsreader.com...
> gayillegalscott69@hotmail.com (Scott Unit 69) wrote:
> > "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:<3C232CA6.234D028D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> > > Train wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Your first clue should be that the thread is crossposted
> > >
> > > The second is that it came from google.com.
> > >
> > > The third clue is the posting IP: It came from AOL.
> >
> > The fourth clue is that it got me running all over Usenet like a sissy
> > trying to disclaim it!
> >
> That's it,Im gonna try to killfile the entire google domain now,new 'puter
> and reader, and it need to be done. Apologies to a few google posters(not
> very many)...
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

5124. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 03:56:31 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net>
Message-ID: <PvTU7.7060$G72.2277891258@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 28070
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Another alias for the kill filed, for my little
friend at AOL.

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

"Scott Unit 69" <gayillegalscott69@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:4303d5a2.0112211215.26f87e63@posting.google.com...
> "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C232CA6.234D028D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> > Train wrote:
> > >
> > > Your first clue should be that the thread is crossposted
> >
> > The second is that it came from google.com.
> >
> > The third clue is the posting IP: It came from AOL.
>
> The fourth clue is that it got me running all over Usenet like a sissy
> trying to disclaim it!

5125. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:16:40 UTC
From: Patrick Keele <pkg1dra@g1dra.freeserve.co.uk>
Message-ID: <a02pmn$7c7$1@news5.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 28207
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Richard Clark <kb7qhc@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:e0p92uce6r4lfje4ea241av3t6pg0t9m4g@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 17:59:02 -0800, "Patrick Keele"
> <pkg1dra@g1dra.freeserve.co.uk> wrote:
>
> >WHY do you use that STUPID word "MINDSET"?What the hell is a MINDSET?Do
you
> >mean it's how someone thinks?Can i buy this "mindset" in a store or
> >shop???why don't you speak PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH??????????
> >
> >I am british and i am SICK of the british using and picking up STUPID
> >americanisms in the uk! WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
> >
> >MOST cbers as you call them in the uk who use SSB/AM ARE criminals and
often
> >get caught to.Any bad reputation the cb fraternity have is mainly due to
> >their own illegal operations and behaviour.you REAP what you SOW!
> >
> >PK
> >
>
> Hi All,
>
> The origins of English are found in the both the nordic and romance
> languages. That is, English borrows heavily from German and French.
> There is, of course, a considerable amount of Latin (whose roots are
> found in India's sanskrit).
>
> >PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH
>
> From the Oxford English Dictionary we find:
> Plain - Old French, plaign, or from French plein, or Latin planum;
> Ordinary - early Old French ordinaire or Latin ordinarious;
> Commonsense - Greek, or Latin sensus communis
> English - Old Teutonic anglisko
>
> >WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
>
> Indeed....
> What - Old teutonic hwat (English juggles spelling too)

> Other - Dutch and German ander
> Society - Old French societe
> In - Old High German, Teutonic
> The - Sanskrit tat
> World - Teutonic weorold
> Imports - Latin importare
> Another - see Other, above (English also compounds like german)
> Country's (misspelled above) - Old French contr�e
> Language - French langage and Latin lingua
> To - Old Teutonic ta or Lithuanian da
> Replace - Bingo! No derivation shown.
> its (misspelled above) - Bingo! however original English was hit
> Own - Old Teutonic aigano
> How - Old Norse haug
> Pathetic - Late Latin patheticus
>
> Even the puffery of being Anglo-Saxon relates to the German tribes of
> Angles, Saxons and Jutes. Hence our correspondent above barely
> qualifies as English literate (at 10% for original English content
> with points lost for spelling throughout).
>
> If you want correspondence in original English, from "C�dmon's Hymn"
> Nu sculon herigean heofonrices Weard
> Meotodes meahte and his modge�anc
> weore Wuldor-F�der swa he wundra gehw�
> ece Drihten or onstealede
> He �rest sceop ielda nearnum
> heofon to hrofe halig Scyppend
> Da middangeard moncynnes Weard
> ece Drihten �fter teode
> firum foldan Frea aelmihtig
>
> The split in the stanzas is known as a C�sura, a pacing device, or
> pause during recitation.
>
> Perhaps this little piece offers a compelling answer to that pining
> >WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
> because the word "modge�anc" means mindset. :-O
>
> 73's
> Richard Clark, KB7QHC

Well,well.Congratulations to an excellent reply to my topic.
Some of my text was composed in haste.10 out of 10 for oginality,or was it composed by cutting and pasting from various dictionaries or one or more thesaurus?:)

PK

5126. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:41:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gopxm82.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28071
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 10:02:37 +0000 (UTC), Bill Nelson wrote:

>In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>
>> Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
>> officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
>> by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.
>
>Officers have been wrong before - which is why evidence from searches
>is sometimes ruled inadmissable.

And why many jurisdictions (used to) have Deputy DAs ride around
with patrol officers to make those calls. My kid brother (KE7DX)
did that (as a DA) for several years in Phoenix. Made his "day"
job easier, too.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5127. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:41:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gopxpv4.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28074
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 04:20:03 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>:
>: >Like my Lieutenant used to say, "If you aint catching no beefs, you aint
>: >doin your job."
>:
>: Mine used to say "Do not under any circumstances embarrass the
>: department by doing stupid things". Even if the complaint was
>: no-merit, you caught hell from him if he felt (as he usually did)
>: that you could have handled it so as to avoid the situation.
>:
>: He wasn't called "Iron-A** Bailey" for nothing.
>
>Phil, you are now an attorney, where formerly
>a federal agent. Lenny is a street cop. He does
>not have the level of support that you had.

The above took place while I was a street cop - Los Angeles
Sheriff's Office, in a minority-ghetto area - a good 10 years before
I joined the Feds.

>Hell, in Chicago the locals in some neighborhoods
>would beat up the fire fighters and EMTs when
>they showed up. Then file complaints because
>they were not properly served!
>
>And the mayor, that great democrat, of Chicago
>has yet to settle with the police so that they can
>get a pay raise.

Chi-town lives up to its reputation.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5128. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:41:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gopxz45.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28072
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 03:45:12 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>I suggest that you become familiar with the issues over APCO 25
>standards for digital trunked radio. The main purpose is to prevent
>private citizens from receiving ANY public radio transmission. As I
>am a member of APCO, I have had conversations with individuals who run
>public safety radio systems. Their one big goal is to have an
>digitally encrypted system that no one, not even the media, will be
>able to receive without their permission.

Sheeeesh....none of my (Northern California) APCO colleagues
have expressed that concern. Their major concerns are over
reliability and coverage of communications in difficult
terrain and inter-system operability and they don't look to
APCO 25 as the final answer. Several have tried and were
underwhelmed by The Big Em's product.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5129. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:41:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gopy6x6.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28075
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 10:25:02 -0500, Krell wrote:

>I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled "2600"
>that has been writing about the same subject for quite some time - keeping
>modern technology in the hands of private corporations and out of the hands
>of the public.

The credibility of "2600" is expressed by the last two digits in its
name.

If you want more, read the DMCA of 1998. It's basically made
>it illegal to take something apart to see how it works.

A good friend of mine who is a high-up lawyer with the Motion
Picture Association of America has convinced me that the techno
pirates brought such draconian laws upon themselves.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5130. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:42:09 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <#$MIxKqiBHA.1524@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 28073

K4YZ says:

> All a police officer has to do is see what s/he perceives to be
> a two-way radio antenna and then find some other legitimate
> excuse to stop you and "poof"...They have you.

Poof, they have me for *what*? I can have a whole car full of
radios, 37 antennas on the roof, no license, and not an
FCC "acceptance" sticker in sight, and I haven't broken
a single law, even in Tacoma.

The violation is for *use*, not for possession. What a bunch
of wannabe Deputy Phyfes!

Search away, Sarge.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

5131. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:44:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C240FAD.C73ADB5D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28076

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> > > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was legally
> > > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
> >
> > That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> > opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official.
>
> Too bad Riley's official opinion carries such little weight at the FCC.

Glad we've found some common ground. I think so too.

Dave K8MN
```

5132. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:47:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221234741.13039.00001422@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28078

In article <3c2358c6_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>> Another one of the things that make me go "Hmmm..."
>>
>>
>>
>
>Hmmmm, vibrating more microphones, eh?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I have a bad code in my dose, thad's aboud the only sound
I can make!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5133. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:47:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221234741.13039.00001421@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28080

In article <20011220114848.09658.00001060@mb-fm.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>Callsign: N9NWO Class: General Codes: HAI USA
>Name: GREGORY A DEAN
>Addr1: PO BOX 2121
>Addr2: WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47996-2121
>Country: USA
>Effective: 15 Jul 2000 Expires: 21 Jan 2002 Online Renewals...
>License ID: L00090874 FRN: 0003005485 What's this?
>Lookups: 163

Steve:

I see now. OM Greg is getting ripped off by having a ham radio license that is good for a mere 17 months and six days. Normal expiration date should have been 14 Jul 2010. Perhaps this was an administrative change of address or something that wouldn't cause an automatic renewal to take place. If he had just chosen a Vanity Call Sign, they would have renewed his ticket and it would have been good for ten years.

Am I warm?

73 de Larry, K3LT

5134. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:47:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221234742.13039.00001423@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28079

In article <3C233E1A.2EF7B7BB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Kim is concerned with only one radio amateur -- herself.
>
>Larry, you are concerned with only one radio amateur -- yourself.
>Kim's callsign makes you feel bad. That's why you don't like it.
>If it made you feel good, you wouldn't be bitchin' about it.

Cecil:

Kim's call sign doesn't make me feel bad, but it sure does
make her, and all other hams, *look* bad! That's what I don't
like about it. Call signs don't make me feel good or bad. Kim
obviously thought her call sign would make her feel good, and
this self-serving idea is probably what motivated her to choose
it. She wansn't thinking of anyone but herself.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5135. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:47:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221234742.13039.00001424@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28082

In article <3C233EF6.47E675EC@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I seriously doubt that Riley has any "prudish hangups."
>
>Sorry Larry, Riley has proved he has prudish hangups and I have
>lost a lot of respect for him because of that. He offered his
>personal opinion while in an FCC position. That is exactly
>the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
>opinion while in an ARRL position. You are a hypocrite.

Cecil:

Don't look now, but I didn't say that. I said that Ed's opinions were, out of the professional necessity of his position as an ARRL HQ employee, to be taken as reflective of official ARRL policy. Therefore, he did not have total freedom to state a position that was substantially out of step with ARRL policy. The fact that he never (that I recall) included any disclaimer stating that his opinions were his and his alone, led me to believe that he was, in fact, acting as an official ARRL spokesperson in this newsgroup. The only thing hypocritical here is your assertion that *I* am a hypocrite!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5136. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:47:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221234743.13039.00001425@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28083

In article <3c2355fb_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>I don't dismiss at all Riley's opinion. He has every right to it. Do I
>think it's more important that anyone else's? No. Do I think it carries
>more validity than anyone else's? No. And, I honestly think that
>Riley--even disagreeing with my choice of callsigns--is still far more
>logical than anyone like you. The *BASIS* (basis, Dave, not substance) of
>Riley's response to me was that the FCC was not "in the business"
>(paraphrased, I think) of judging callsigns.

Kim:

That is correct -- the FCC is not in the business of judging call signs. The reason is because, under the Vanity Call Sign program, they trust radio amateurs to have the maturity, good taste, and judgment necessary to select a call sign which is not offensive, demeaning, or insulting to others. If and when a person such as yourself shows up, and requests a call sign with the potential to take the ARS "…one step closer to extinction," they will still issue it, leaving the fallout to land on *your* head!

>It is not hard at all to deny your lie, Dave. Actually, it probably is not
>a lie--it is your illogical, elitist mind telling you things you want to
>hear.

Where did Dave lie, Kim? I must have missed that!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5137. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:47:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221234745.13039.00001426@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28085

In article <3c235afa_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> Dave:
>>
>> Precisely. Kim is concerned with only one radio amateur -- herself.
>>
>
>And whom else should I concern myself with, Larry?

Kim:

If you have to ask that question, you couldn't possibly understand
the answer.

>> The fact that she is deliberately spoiling the image of radio amateurs
>> to outsiders means absolutely nothing to her.
>>
>
>Let me suggest the same thing I did to Dave, Larry. If you are so ashamed,
>so concerned for your reputation, then leave ham radio.

See -- proof positive that you are incapable of "getting it."

>You want me to
>concern myself with other radio amateurs, right? Which ones, Larry? You?
>Dave? Others who agree with you? Or should it be Cecil? Rick? Others who
>don't agree with you. Which ones, Larry?

All of us, Kim -- and each and every other radio amateur who could
see or hear your call sign, be offended by it, and consequently decide
that they can't be bothered to pursue this hobby -- if you are representative
of the type of mentality that exists among radio amateurs.

>> Worse, she's doing it
>> in the only place that matters -- on the air -- with her self-serving,
>> sexually-suggestive call sign that demeans female hams and women
>> in general.
>>
>
>Sorry that you, a male, cannot rise above three letters and get yourself to
>recognize a whole callsign, Larry. On the air it sounds like W-5-T-I-T. It
>doesn't sound like TIT unless you really, really stretch your
>imagination...or have prior experience. In your case, I think it's
>imagination. [PS--I got "on the air" two mornings in a row in Dallas this
>week. All of about 15 minutes over the past two months. And, none on HF].

Kim, that kind of lame excuse only demonstrates your consistent lack
of integrity. When you first appeared on this newsgroup, you were
giggling about having chosen your callsign in order to attract attention
to your breasts, as a means of expressing your desire to assert your
"womanhood" as a ham radio operator, or some such drivel. The suffix
of your call sign spells "TIT" because you want other (male) hams to
think of you and your breasts -- and, hopefully, be attracted to you
physically because of it. You did this to gain power among your fellow
hams by having a callsign that gave you instant notoriety, whether or
not you were worthy of it.

>> As Riley Hollingsworth said, she has a perfect "right" to
>> do this

>And a perfect right it is.

And that "right" is not now, and never has been, at issue.

>> -- but the fact is that in doing so, she runs the risk of taking
>> the ARS "...one step closer to extinction."
>
>You know what? I never thought of it before...but, if I have the perfect
>right to my callsign, I also have the perfect right to take the ARS "...one
>step closer to extinction" don't I? Yeah, I do.

In your own way of thinking, perhaps so. In my way of thinking,
you have as much right to take the ARS "…one step closer to
extinction" as Al Quieda had in flying those airplanes into the
WTC and the Pentagon on 9/11.

>> We don't know what kind
>> of damage she has done -- but the potential is there, and is very
>> likely to cause some potential ham to be disillusioned.

>Well, that's your opinion. And you have the perfect right to it. My
>opinion is that if a callsign can "cause some potential ham to be
>disillusioned" then that person needs to just get off the planet.

I see -- sooooo --- if a prospective ham is disillusioned by your
call sign, then they can should commit suicide? Wow -- now
THAT's kind of severe! I'd bet you'd make a good consort for a
member of the Taliban -- but I doubt that they make Burkas in
your size!

>> If so, who
>> knows who we could have lost -- or did lose! One of the real problems
>> here is we'll never know the extent of the damage Kim has done!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>None. Not even to you. You've been having fun with this for nearly two
>years now. My TIT is obviously the only one you've had to think about.

I have a very intelligent and attractive lady friend, Kim -- but when I think of her, I'm not just thinking about her breasts. If you had it your way, that's all anyone would think about then they thought of you. I think *you* are the one with the weird obsession.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5138. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:47:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221234746.13039.00001427@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28084

In article <FFD82E29E38266F1.F736BC86DC96F54D.41F6654C0E7A2214@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>>I've got a better idea -- you find me someone at ARRL HQ that will
>>flatly deny that the ARS is viewed as a "family-oriented" activity --
>>intended to be passed down from fathers, mothers, uncles, grand-
>>parents to children, grandchildren, nephews, nieces, etc. etc.
>>Find someone who will state, from a standpoint of their being an
>>ARRL official, that the ARS is intended to be a non-"G"-rated,
>>over 21, adults-only activity for mature audiences only. If you can,
>>then we'll entertain the notion that I "don't have the vaguest idea"
>>what I'm talking about. In the meantime, I'm not too sure *you*
>>do!
>
> I truly hate to burst your bubble, Larry, but to the best of
>my knowledge, the ARRL hasn't been named the legal regulatory agency
>for the Amateur Radio Service by the government--that responsibility
>belongs to the FCC exclusively.

Rick:

Notwithstanding the state of my "bubble," it was/is the ARRL that has
made the statements regarding the "family-oriented" nature of the ARS
to which I am now responding. It was a prime argument made by ARRL
officials who, in spite of the current policy of the ARRL, gave support
to the notion of reducing and/or eliminating the code testing requirements
in any future proceedings to alter the amateur licensing system. I didn't
mention the FCC because the FCC is strictly a regulatory agency of the
federal government -- not "The National Organization for Amateur Radio."

> Why should I--or anyone else--care what the ARRL position on
>the "family oriented" nature of the ARS is? You and Dick Carroll
>certainly didn't credit them with any ability to speak for YOU when it
>came to code testing, remember?

I can't speak for Dick, but I, as an ARRL member, consider the policies
of that organization to reflect on me, personally, as a U.S. licensed
radio amateur. Therefore, the ARRL does indirectly "speak" for me.
I may not agree with what they are saying, but that doesn't stop them
from saying it!

>And how am I supposed to find someone
>with the ARRL who will make such a statement--we BOTH know that as
>soon as anyone with the ARRL states his or her _opinion_, you start
>claiming they don't have the right to do so (can you say "Ed Hare?").

They have a perfect right to state their opinions here, as long as they are clearly identified as being the official position of the ARRL -- and that is done simply by identifying themselves as such. Ed Hare never made it any secret that he was the director of the ARRL Lab -- and so he, therefore, speaks as an ARRL official. Ed never even took the simple step of including a disclaimer on his signature line, stating that his opinions were strictly his own, and not those of his employer. Therefore, I had to infer that he was, indeed, speaking in the capacity of an ARRL official.

> You'll have to do better than that, Larry. The ARRL doesn't
>speak for everyone in ham radio--it doesn't even speak for all of its
>members. It would be JUST as valid to ask a spokesperson for NCI to do
>so as it would to ask one from the ARRL.
>
> Rick

Rick, it would have been a lot easier for you to say, "Larry, I'm not going to do that, because *you're* right!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

5139. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:47:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221234747.13039.00001429@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28077

In article <3c23b68a_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>
>I think that's our point, exactly. Now, the only thing is, in some cases
>thought really can make a difference. And, in those cases, it truly is
>magical.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

If you were to come up with a clear, logical, intelligent thought -- that
would be magic, indeed!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5140. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:47:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011221234747.13039.00001428@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28081

In article <B0998739E8E5FBD2.55FE05509341B310.9C8AA2F135BF89CD@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> You know, Larry, those are almost exactly the same statements
>a mobile home resident would make if he or she were moving to a house
>instead. And since you (as Kim pointed out) view such individuals as
>"trailer trash," I'll just point out that at least THEY own the
>property they're in--you have exactly the same complaints about yours,
>and you don't even have any equity in it of your own. If property
>owners are "trash," I can only guess what renters are in your view.
>
> Rick

Rick:

If it makes you feel any better, I own a significant interest in several
tracts of commercial property in New York. I simply choose not to
live in that state, and I hadn't decided to stay in Delaware permanently
until just this past year, when I got my present job. What I don't
understand is what this matters to others. My business is my
business -- and as long as my business doesn't bring the ARS
"...one step closer to extinction," like Kim's call sign, then get your
nose out of it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5141. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:49:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2410B6.8D1A8D40@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28086

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C239257.44DC590B@earthlink.net...
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C22A13A.36CDAB78@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > > The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her
> supporters.
> > > > She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views and
> > > > promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was
> legally
> > > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
> >
> > That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> > opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official. If his support is a moot
> > point, why did Kim feel it necessary to seek it?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I'm running out of crayons here, Dave. At the time the solicitation from
> Riley was sought, there was some nitwit (not Larry) who was telling me he
> was going to see to it that the FCC would revoke my callsign...blah, blah,
> blah. At the same time our resident nitwit (Larry) was just getting stoked
> up. So, for both of them, and to the shut the non-resident nitwit up, I
> wrote to Riley and asked him about the idea of the FCC revoking a callsign,
> in fact the FCC being interested in policing callsigns at all. Riley is, as
> you say, an FCC official. His response shut the non-resident nitwit up.
> His response lit a fire under the resident nitwit--and now you.
>
> K?
>
> Got it?
>
> Is it sinking in?
>
> Kim W5TIT
```

We know what was asked. We know what the response was. We know what you did about it. We know that you chose to ignore Riley's advice. That has sunk in. So has the idea that you take anyone who thinks that your choice of a vanity call is in poor taste as a nitwit.

Dave K8MN

5142. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 04:56:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a013v1nei1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28087

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011221214818.05517.00000131@mb-de.aol.com...
> >Here are some numbers to think about. These are the number of unexpired
FCC
> >ARS licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >
> >As of May 14, 2000:
> >
> >Novice - 49,329
> >Tech - 205,394
> >Tech Plus - 128,860
> >General - 112,677
> >Advanced - 99,782
> >Extra - 78,750
> >Total - 674,792
> >
> >Total Novice/Tech/Tech Plus: 383,583
> >
> >Total General/Advanced/Extra: 291,209
>
> I've got a question, Jim. Perhaps you might know the answer. What happens
to
> the Advanced licensees when they renew? Can one retain his/her Advanced
ticket
> indefinitely? Just curious. Take care and 73.
> Mark

At this time, with the current rules, an Advanced can renew as an Advanced
indefinitely. The FCC could change that in the future, but that's
the way it is now.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5143. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:01:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0144n$4ji$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28090

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011221222305.05517.00000145@mb-de.aol.com...
> >We're talking about licensing requirements ... that's PURELY a
> >regulatory function. "Tradition" has NOTHING to do with *legitimate*
> >regulatory goals ... it's not the FCC's job to preserve amateur
> >"tradition" ... the FCC's job is to regulate the use of the spectrum
> >in the public interest. End of story.
>
> Perhaps, but you can now be licensed without having to show "Morse
> proficiency." The requirement of demonstrating a very traditional
"discipline"
> in order to "earn" additional privileges seems to be very much in the
public
> interest.

What is that "public interest?" If you can articulate it, you'll
be the first to do so.

> Do you really think it's a "regulatory function" we're talking about?

If it isn't a regulatory function, it doesn't belong in the rules.

> >Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
> >three basic motivations 1) "I had to do it, so everyone else should,
> >too."; 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
> >not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of contacts
> >will dry up; and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
> >using "their" bands. All 3 of those are pure rubbish.
>
> ...and the motivations of those who wish to remove the code requirement
> entirely are? I guess you said it best..."Standards, shmandards..."

Very simply...there is NO valid, rational or compelling reason anymore
to test for code knowledge. The FCC stated the ONLY reason they even
retained 5 wpm testing is to stay compliant with the ITU treaty.

> >Yes, the new Extra pool is done and must be used by June 1, 2002.
> >My understanding is that the intent of the QPC was to make it more
> >modern and comprehensive.
>
> I just hope they'll keep the code requirement at 5 w.p.m., it's the
"least"
> they can do.

WHY? Give the reason you expect will be sufficient to convince
the FCC it should be retained.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5144. SHSC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:01:38 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <#5A6pVqiBHA.1380@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 28088

The Radio Telegraphy Super High Speed Club was founded on the 20th of march 1982 in association with the HSC and VHSC and was created for every amateur who enjoys high speed telegraphy to provide a stimulating challenge to achieve their highest operating speeds.Active members strive for an optimum discipline in radio telegraphy traffic and also encourage and help other amateurs to use high speed telegraphy to increase their speed.

The club consists of honorary members, active members and shortwave listeners who have all the same rights. The club is open to membership from all countries and language groups.

How to join the SHSC

To become an active member of the SHSC three recommendations must be obtained from other active members. An active member may give a recommendation after a "sponsor QSO" under the following conditions:A recommendation can be made after having a 2-way CW contact with a SHSC member for at least 30 minutes using a telegraphy speed of 250 letters per minute or higher (Paris-base, 50 WPM). Solid copy must be made by the applicant together with excellent keying. Computers, keyboards or decoders are NOT allowed during these contacts. Reception must be done by ear and only a basic electronic keyer may be used to assist with sending. After having 3 recommendations in your possession you can send your application together with 10 IRC's (or equivalent) and a written and signed statement that the applicant did not used any computers, keyboards or decoders during the sponsor QSO's. There is no further payment for life membership. Applications should be addressed to the president of the SHSC:

ON5ME Oscar Verbanck
Pijlijzerlaan 109C
B-8670 OOSTDUINKERKE
BELGIUM

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

5145. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:02:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2413DD.76E2B63F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28089

Krell wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C239257.44DC590B@earthlink.net...
> > > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was
> legally
> > > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
> >
> > That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> > opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official. If his support is a moot
>
> Bullshit! The only thing that needed to be said in the capacity as an FCC
> official is whether or not the callsign was legal. Anything additional is
> personal opinion.

Bullshit? Is that sort of like, "I beg to disagree"? Riley spoke in
his official capacity. He isn't the neighbor, telling Kim over the
backyard fence, "I think you're doing a stupid thing here, Kim".

> > point, why did Kim feel it necessary to seek it?
>
> I don't know. Why don't you ask HER?

Because I'm responding to the comments of an anonymous Pittsburgh area
type. Kim was hoping for a solid positive response. She didn't get it.

Dave K8MN

5146. Re: The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:03:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222000315.05154.00000526@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 28091

In article <9vu2cb$2ne$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>The KEY as to any enforcement MUST be PROVING the USE
>in the first place...AND proving the radio is not authorized.

Yup - but in a serious-enough case, it could be done. Proving use is the harder part because I'm sure the FCC could easily and quickly tell Tacoma law enforcement whether a particular piece of equipment is certified for cb use or not.
>
>Good luck...looks like nothing but feel good legislation to
>placate one or more complaining residents.
>
It will be interesting to see if any actual enforcement is done by Tacoma.

One has to wonder what sparked the passage of such a law. Were residents experiencing TVI or other problems? Somebody had to have a reaosn to push this through.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5147. Re: Jam the bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:03:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222000317.05154.00000527@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 28092

In article <7iOU7.235834$3d2.11322047@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Jim, you are right about the AM. He was always using AM. Ummmm ... what >about the 'wet-bottom boys'. I assume he was refering to the WB callsigns >(I'm not sure when the WA2 calls were finished off. My 1st ticket was >WN2CJV, issued in 1962).

Hello again Jim,

I don't think "wet-bottom boys" refers to the WB-prefix hams at all, but that IS a possibility, because 2 land was one of the first to issue those prefixes.

I think he was referring to inexperienced hams. Before the "Great Giveaway" of December 1952, getting on amateur 'phone on the bands between 3 and 25 MHz required an Advanced (formerly called Class A) or Extra class license. Advanced required at least a year's experience as General or Conditional before you could even take the test, and Extra took two years experience. The General and Conditional had no such requirement.

What ol' W2OY was so sore about was the sudden changes that had hit ham radio in the 1950s.

Before those changes, all hams started with the equivalent of a General license. 13 wpm code, sending and receiving, and a pretty tough written that required drawing schematics and maybe even some essay answers. Getting on the really good HF 'phone bands required the Class A ticket, with an even tougher written, experience, etc. And the Class A could not be taken by mail - you had to journey to an exam point to take that test. Exam elements taken by mail did not count for Class A credit - holders of Conditional (old Class C) licenses had to retake and pass the code and written for the General/Class B before they could try the Class A!

Then in '51 came the Novice and Tech licenses, with 5 wpm code. Then the opening of all HF phone to Generals and Conditionals - and the retesting requirement disappeared. Lots of unfamiliar voices began to crowd the 'phone bands.

The Novice license in particular caused the average age of new hams to drop dramatically. Although teenagers and children had gotten licenses before, their numbers radically increased after 1951. The total number of hams grew from about 100,000 in 1950 to about a quarter million in 1963, too. .

Before 1948 or so, "phone" to most hams meant "AM". Although AM is simple in theory, putting a high power AM rig on the air in those days was a complex and expensive proposition. There were very few manufactured rigs on the market that could do AM beyond the 100 watt level, and none that could do 500 watts, let

alone the legal limit. The manufactured stuff was so expensive that most 'phone ops homebrewed their transmitters. A kilowatt AM rig usually took up a pair of six foot relay racks and involved some serious investment of time and money. End result was that the big signals on the 'phone bands almost always belonged to hams who had been in the game quite a while.

All that began to change in the '50s. Although hams had been using SSB as far back as the early 1930s, their numbers increased dramatically after 1948 or so. New rigs, many of them kits, dramatically reduced the size and cost of a transmitter, and the time it took to set up a station. It also reduced the resale value and market for AM parts, too. By the early 1960s, legal limit SSB rigs were affordable desktop affairs and the "wet bottom boys" were tearing up the bands with their "Donald Duck" signals.

And ol' Mike wasn't too happy about any of it.

The codetest squabbles of today are nothing compared to the AM vs. SSB battles of that era, or the incentive licensing wars of the 1960s.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim
>
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011220000259.06877.00000587@mb-mj.aol.com...
>> In article <B0bU7.232743$3d2.11125812@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
>> "JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>>
>> >You'd have to ask some old timers who
>> >were active back in the 60s and before about Mike, W2OY. He was quite a
>> >work of art. My understanding is, however, that he was just 'breaking
>> >stones' and he was really a decent guy in person. He used to call CQ
>with
>> >something like 'CQ CQ, no lids, kids, space cadets or school bus riders.
>No
>> >wet-bottom boys. Only class A operators on this frequency, from W2OY'.
>He
>> >was something.
>>
>> He was ticked because of the Dec. 1952 FCC "privileges giveaway", when
>> Conditionals and Generals got full HF 'phone privileges. (Prior to that
>time,
>> one needed an Advanced or Extra to work 'phone on the ham bands between 3
>and
>> 25 MHz).
>>
>> The classic W2OY call was "CQ 75 meter AM phone, no kids, no lids, no
>space
>> cadets, Class A operators only". Class A was the old name for Advanced,
>"kids"

>> referred to Novices and newcomers, "lids" referred to Generals and
>> Conditionals, and "space cadets" referred to SSB ops.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

5148. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:04:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a014bv$ou0$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28095

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011221215937.05517.00000137@mb-de.aol.com...
> >On what basis would the FCC have to retain even the 5wpm code
> >test if/when the ITU requirement goes away? If you can't
> >articulate a clear and compelling reason to retain code
> >now except for the treaty requirement, then on what basis
> >would you argue for its retention?
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> The same as the Russians, Bill. Because it's a fundamental "discipline" of
> amateur radio and as such, should be learnt. Even at the most elementary
level.

Sorry Mark, it is neither a building block nor is it fundamental
in order to understand or do anything further up the technical
ladder. If it was, it would be taught to would be engineering
students. If it was a fundamental discipline, that would
imply one needed that expertise in order to be a good communicator
or operator. Thousands of people are excellent operator/communicators
and they have zero knowledge of morse code.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5149. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:06:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2414CA.1022734D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28094

CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > That is exactly
> > > the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
> > > opinion while in an ARRL position.
> >
> > That is NOT what he said to Ed.
>
> He said Ed's opinion could not be taken seriously because he worked
> for the ARRL. Using the identical logic, Riley's opinion cannot be
> taken seriously because he works for the FCC.

...and yours cannot be taken seriously because you told us so.

Dave K8MN

5150. Freebanders, 1910

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:08:57 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
Message-ID: <#tSLwZqiBHA.1848@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 28093

The Outlook, January 15, 1910, page 131:

THE AMATEUR WIRELESS OPERATOR
BY ROBERT A. MORTON

PRACTICALLY every passenger-carrying steam vessel of any size in American waters, and many freight boats and even tugs, are equipped with wireless telegraphy. Every ship in the American navy, including colliers and revenue cutters, carries wireless operators, and for the purpose of keeping in touch with naval vessels at sea the Navy Department has constructed a line of shore stations reaching from Maine to Alaska.

In the last two years another wireless system has been gradually developing, a system that has far outstripped all others in size and popularity. It is estimated that throughout the United States over four thousand amateur wireless telegraph stations are in active operation. Hundreds of school-boys in every part of the country have taken to this most popular scientific fad, and, by copying the instruments used at the regular stations and constructing apparatus out of all kinds of electrical junk, have built wireless equipments that in some cases approach the naval stations in efficiency. These amateur operators have learned the commercial and naval telegraph codes and are able to receive the Government wireless despatches as accurately and promptly as the naval operators for whom they are intended. Official despatches sent out to naval vessels at sea from the shore stations of the navy become the common property of any amateur who takes the trouble to copy them on paper. Moreover, in some localities, amateur stations have interfered with the reception of Government messages, and have been responsible for long delays in the forwarding of official business. The efficiency of a number of the coastal stations of the navy has been cut in half because of the presence of dozens of small amateur stations.

Boston is the headquarters of some five hundred amateur operators, a number of whom can put the Charlestown Navy-Yard completely out of commission as regards the receiving of messages. A single amateur station of low power can absolutely prevent the reception of wireless messages at this as well as at other naval stations. New York, Washington, and Baltimore have several hundred amateurs each, and a similar line of amateur stations extends along the Pacific coast from California to Alaska. In the interior the amateur forces reach into the thousands. A town of nine hundred inhabitants in upper New York State is the proud possessor of twenty-eight amateur wireless stations. Three electrical

publications cater almost exclusively to these operators, and several manufacturers of electrical apparatus advertise wireless instruments for amateurs guaranteed to work up to several hundred miles.

The result of this interest in wireless is the creation of the problem of the so-called amateur interference, a problem which, especially for the Navy Department, has reached threatening proportions.

In a remarkably short interval of time wireless telegraphy has come to exercise an important function in the marine service. By means of the shore stations of the commercial companies, press despatches, storm warnings, weather reports, etc., are regularly transmitted to ships at sea. Captains of vessels keep in touch with each other and with the home office, and reports of wrecks, derelicts, threatening weather, or orders from the company's headquarters are sent over the land telegraph lines to and from the most convenient coastal stations. Every ship operator sends in regular reports, giving the approximate position of the vessel at a certain time, together with any other important information at hand. Thus the position and distance of a ship at sea may be determined at short notice, and, in case of emergency, every vessel within a certain radius may be ordered to hurry to the assistance of the ship in distress.

In addition to the naval stations on board ship, a large number of naval shore stations are in operation at the principal navy-yards, forts, and lighthouses on both sides of the continent. These stations are supposed to keep in touch with naval vessels in the vicinity, to send out weather reports, receive official messages from all ships, handle the routine business of the department, and to be ready for any cases of emergency. The naval wireless system is thus a distinct part of the National defense, and no efforts should be spared to keep the equipment thoroughly modern and efficient.

Every consideration, therefore, points to the conclusion that any needless interference with, or interruption of, wireless communication is directed against public safety and National organization.

During the anxious hours that followed the collision between the Republic and the Florida, last January, the naval stations at Portsmouth, Charlestown, and Newport were often incapacitated through the working of amateur stations. Later, when the revenue cutters were standing by the Republic, communication with the land was at times entirely cut off for the same reason. Again and again the naval operators explained the situation and requested the amateurs not to use their instruments. Regardless of the warning, the interference continued, a number of the amateurs carrying on private conversations for hours.

The sinking of the steamship Horatio Hall was attended by similar circumstances. No sooner had the emergency call been sent out from that vessel than dozens of amateur operators started up their apparatus. Requests from the naval stations were treated with indifference, some of the amateurs even arguing with the navy men over the ownership of the ether. That the thoughtless and even malicious interference of the amateurs did not have serious results was a fortunate accident.

In order to appreciate fully the amateur question, it will be necessary to get a clear idea of the scientific meaning of the term "interference." Wireless messages are radiated through space in the form of electric waves or vibrations in the ether. Each dot and dash, representing a character in the telegraph code, is made up of thousands of electromagnetic waves that originate at the transmitting apparatus and fly off in every direction with the velocity of light, or 186,000 miles per second. The sending station contains instruments for the artificial production of these waves, while the receiving station must have apparatus sensitive enough to detect the presence of the waves, and to convert the energy received into intelligible signals. The familiar analogy of the motion of a wave in water may serve to illustrate the propagation of a vibratory disturbance in the ether. When a stone is thrown into the water, a series of ripples gradually spread outward in the form of circles. As the ripples leave the center of the original disturbance farther and farther behind, their strength diminishes until finally they fade away completely. It is clear that a chip of wood placed close to the center of the circle will be more violently agitated than a similar chip placed at a greater distance where the waves are correspondingly weaker.

In much the same way, the electro-magnetic waves spread out in all directions from the aerial of a wireless telegraph station, gradually becoming weaker as the distance increases. If the chips of wood are now replaced by wireless receiving stations, it may be seen that the receiving instruments nearer the transmitting station will be more strongly affected by the electric waves than those situated at a greater distance. Thus a wireless message is received at all stations within the circumference of a circle that depends upon the strength of the sending apparatus and the sensitiveness of the receiving instruments, and the nearer the station the clearer will be the signal.

Suppose, now, a coastal station is receiving a wireless message from a ship at sea, perhaps one hundred miles distant. Because of the distance the signals must travel, the dots and dashes are rather faint. Suddenly an amateur station within a few miles of the coastal station begins to transmit a message. Although the power of the amateur station may be small compared with that of the ship, it is much nearer to the coastal station, and its signals at that station will sound considerably louder than the signals from the distant ship. In other words, two separate series of waves reach the shore

station together, and those produced by the amateur station, being the stronger, drown out the incoming signals from the sea. The shore operator finds it impossible to receive distant messages while the amateur station is working. Roughly speaking, this is what is meant by "amateur interference."

It may now be readily understood why many of the naval stations are completely at the mercy of the neighboring amateurs. From early in the afternoon until late at night the amateur operators take possession of the ether, experimenting and testing with their apparatus, calling up their friends, carrying on long conversations on every conceivable topic, and occasionally varying the monotony by sounding the call letters of the nearest naval operator and inquiring about his health. This last seldom fails to call forth the wrath of the navy representative, and the heated wireless conversation that often follows is eagerly listened to by the rest of the amateurs, who sometimes join in the discussion. A Boston amateur, when recently told by a naval operator to "butt out," made the following classic remark: "Say, you navy people think you own the ether. Who ever heard of the navy, anyway? Beat it, you, beat it."

An interesting record of amateur gossip as it is carried on over the ether has been compiled by one of the naval operators. The following selection is typical of the aerial chat that goes on for hours:
"How do you get me to-day? I am using my new transformer and my helix is hitched up different. How are your batteries holding out? Say, old man, I get you fine as silk. You have the navy skun a mile. My aerial came down last night, but I fixed it up again. Did you go to that show last night you spoke about? I have been too busy to go to town this week. Have you got any number thirty-two copper wire? Thought you would drop over last week. Say, old man, I met your lady friend yesterday. Ha, ha ! Quit your kidding. Say, do you know the fellow who is putting up a new station out your way? I think he is a ham. Will call you up in ten minutes. Say, old man, must go to supper now, but will be on the rest of the night. O.K., O.K., will see you later."

During this time the naval stations are cut off from communication except for short distances. At times, when important messages are expected, the amateurs are told to "break," and a few stop their instruments until the official despatches are received. Others continue, regardless of the warning, and hold up all departmental business in the vicinity unless the naval operator is able to copy a few words of the message between breaks in the amateur conversation. This results in long delays, which in a case of emergency might have serious consequences. It has been said that during certain hours of the day and night when the amateurs are out in full force a dozen ships might send out the emergency call without being heard at the shore stations. Only a very few of the

amateurs have apparatus powerful enough to cause interference any great distance off the coast, and the trouble is therefore confined mainly to the coastal stations. Except when close to land, or when entering port, the ship operators experience little or no difficulty from this cause. The owners of high-power private stations capable of long-distance work have heretofore used their apparatus for scientific purposes only, and have been careful to avoid interfering with the regular operation of the naval and commercial stations. But in recent months a number of high-power stations have been erected by less responsible amateurs, and a single station of this description with a sending radius of a hundred miles or more can seriously reduce the efficiency of ship as well as of shore stations.

Amateur interference can be eliminated only by one or both of two means: either the building of amateur stations must be prohibited or at least regulated by law, or the Navy Department and the commercial companies must adopt improved apparatus designed to prevent certain forms of interference, and so regulate the operation of their stations as to be immune from the accidental or malicious interfering of amateur operators. Although at first glance the former method would appear the simpler and more effective remedy, a careful consideration of the entire question of interference leads at once to the conclusion that, unless accompanied by scientific measures, legal action cannot bring about a satisfactory and efficient adjustment of the situation. The fundamental issue lies deeper than the amateur operator, and is plainly a matter for scientific as well as for legal solution. It is obvious that the agitation of the various wireless interests for the suppression of the amateur is only the first sign of a movement that must eventually result in a universal adjustment of the relations between the rival wireless telegraph companies and the naval systems, an adjustment that will require the services of both the scientist and the lawyer. Because of its nature, the ether, as a medium of international communication, will require safeguards in the form of wise restrictions and regulations, much as a city thoroughfare or other institution involving public safety and convenience demands efficient organization for the public good.

Up to recent times the naval and commercial wireless stations have not been seriously inconvenienced by mutual interference. Although in many cases several stations are located in the same vicinity, and each would, under present means and methods of operation, interfere with the others unless care were taken to avoid conflict, but little trouble of this nature has been experienced. Each operator respects the rights of his neighbor and is careful not to "butt in" when messages are received. Thus in New York City, probably the busiest wireless spot in the world, a dozen naval and commercial stations have worked side by side with comparatively slight friction. But it should be noted that these harmonious conditions are the result of experience that has proven such

co-operation absolutely necessary under present operating methods. For any programme that compels five stations to suspend all business while the sixth is working is obviously a waste that seriously reduces the efficiency of all stations involved. The construction of new coastal stations and the increasing number of ship outfits have brought matters to a point that demonstrates the total inability of means now in use to relieve interference difficulties without a systematic revision. It would thus seem that, leaving the amateur out of consideration, the naval and commercial interests are already involved in serious troubles due to interference.

The first few years of wireless development in the commercial field witnessed the growth of a number of large companies, each working in its chosen territory with comparatively little competition. Under these circumstances wireless interference, except for a few specific cases, was not a cause for great complaint. More recently the rapid spreading and overlapping of the different commercial systems, the growth of the naval systems, the building of long-distance stations, and the consequent increase in the number of messages transmitted, have brought about what might be termed a congestion of aerial traffic. In 1906 the governments of the world, recognizing the need for a systematic regulation of wireless service, called together at Berlin the International Wireless Telegraph Conference. The plan finally drawn up by that body was signed by the representatives of twenty-seven countries, including the United States. Later, however, Congress refused to ratify the convention, the adoption of which would have given the Government control over all wireless systems in this country. Without discussing the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the instrument as a whole, it is enough to note that in failing to indorse the Berlin Convention the Government gave up an opportunity to settle once and for all the case of the amateur operator. At present the Navy Department has no authority to deal with the amateur situation. Just how such authority is to be obtained is an interesting question, more especially in view of the fact that, in the general opinion of experts, at least eighty per cent of all wireless interference now experienced could be eliminated by the use of improved apparatus, together with the adoption of a special system of wave-lengths for the different wireless systems.

Every wireless telegraph station may be constructed in such a manner as to send out electro-magnetic waves of a given length or period. In order to respond to these waves, the instruments at the receiving station must be adjusted to correspond to the wave-length, or period of oscillation of the transmitting apparatus. The adjustment of the receiving instruments to the incoming wave is called "tuning." If the wave-length of a station is fixed at, say, four hundred meters, messages from this station can be received at a distant station only in case the receiving instruments are tuned to approximately four hundred meters. With the latest improved apparatus for selective tuning, the wave must closely approach the

tune of the instrument to be detected, and of a number of conflicting waves of slightly different lengths, any one may be received and the rest excluded. On the other hand, two or more waves of the same or nearly the same length cannot be separated and tuned out as desired, and will interfere one with the other. Without going into technical details, it should be seen that, even with the most selective apparatus, a number of wireless stations of about the same wave-length in the immediate vicinity must of necessity cause interference when more than one station is in operation at a time. Also, that the more selective the receiving instruments are, the greater is the number of stations that may work without mutual interference. The fact that practically all government, commercial, and amateur wireless stations are built for the same or approximately the same wave-length, and that not one in twenty is equipped with selective instruments, at once accounts for the greater part of interference difficulties, and also suggests two obvious remedies--the use of improved apparatus and of a system of varied wave-lengths.

Suppose, for example, that the naval stations increase the length of their official wave to eight hundred meters and that the commercial companies adopt a series of wave-lengths varying by perhaps ten or twenty per cent. The use of selective instruments would then permit the simultaneous operation of the different groups of stations. Thus the naval stations might transmit their official despatches regardless of the operation of the hundreds of commercial establishments, or of the thousands of amateurs, who of course could be allowed to play with a non-interfering wave of limited range. By improved apparatus is meant both sending and receiving instruments, the former capable of sending out waves which for reception require the close adjustment of the latter. Such apparatus has long been known to the laboratory, and is the property of no one scientist or manufacturer. A number of new stations are employing this method with entire success, and it is obvious that all stations that suffer from interference must finally be protected by a means advocated by experts as offering the only permanent solution now available for the problem of interference.

Objection has been made that a system of special wave-lengths would hinder communication between stations in cases of emergency. This difficulty may readily be avoided by the use of a standard wave for calling purposes in connection with the regular wave of the particular station. An operator wishing to communicate with any given station may sound the call signal of the station by means of the standard or universal wave. The receiving instruments of stations awaiting a call would be tuned to the universal wave, and when the desired station responds and communication is thus established, both operators, by a simple adjustment, may change over to the special wave and proceed with their business undisturbed. As the continued growth of wireless systems will doubtless further complicate the conditions of interference, it may be necessary to

arrange for a more elaborate system of wave-lengths than here suggested. At present, however, the plan as outlined will easily meet the needs of the occasion.

Clearly, therefore, the cure for wireless interference does not hinge alone on the extermination of the amateur operator. That the naval and commercial systems are suffering severely from amateur interference is an undeniable fact. Equally is it true that the amateur must be checked to some extent through legal procedure. He is, however, by no means the most important factor in the interference situation. Although his carelessness and ignorance have often been a source of just complaint, and his presence under present conditions inevitably adds much to the increasing difficulties of efficient wireless operation, there seems little necessity for the militia or a special session of Congress to dispose of his case. A slight amount of regulation will easily suffice to prevent the abuse by the irresponsible school-boy of his latest scientific toy. What is a more important need by far is the intelligent co-operation of the several wireless interests for the purpose of utilizing the latest products of the laboratory in a systematic effort to eliminate defects in methods of operation due, in part, to the rapid and unstandardized development of the science.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

5151. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:12:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222001257.14343.00000014@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 28096

>Subject: Re: .
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 12/21/2001 10:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011221234741.13039.00001421@mb-ch.aol.com>

>Expires: 21 Jan 2002

>OM Greg is getting ripped off by having a ham radio
>license that is good for a mere 17 months and six days.

Check the math, Larry. Today is December 21, 2001.

Steve

5152. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:14:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C241688.4530DD48@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28097

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3c2355fb_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >I don't dismiss at all Riley's opinion. He has every right to it. Do I
> >think it's more important that anyone else's? No. Do I think it carries
> >more validity than anyone else's? No. And, I honestly think that
> >Riley--even disagreeing with my choice of callsigns--is still far more
> >logical than anyone like you. The *BASIS* (basis, Dave, not substance) of
> >Riley's response to me was that the FCC was not "in the business"
> >(paraphrased, I think) of judging callsigns.
>
> Kim:
>
> That is correct -- the FCC is not in the business of judging call signs.
> The reason is because, under the Vanity Call Sign program, they
> trust radio amateurs to have the maturity, good taste, and judgment
> necessary to select a call sign which is not offensive, demeaning,
> or insulting to others. If and when a person such as yourself shows
> up, and requests a call sign with the potential to take the ARS "â□¦one
> step closer to extinction," they will still issue it, leaving the fallout
> to land on *your* head!
>
> >It is not hard at all to deny your lie, Dave. Actually, it probably is not
> >a lie--it is your illogical, elitist mind telling you things you want to
> >hear.
>
> Where did Dave lie, Kim? I must have missed that!

She must mean the portion where I stated that she dismissed Riley's view. That isn't a lie though. That is precisely what took place. She retained her call despite Riley's words. That certainly shows that she dismissed what he wrote.

She also perceives someone as an "elitist" when that person recognizes tacky as tacky.

Dave K8MN

5153. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:23:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a015dt$s98$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28098
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C23C00D.A9037FA@gte.net...
> > > : > > More hogwash. Even if there is some such sentiment,
> > > : > > there hasn't been any support for that attitude in the press,
> > > : > > the legislatures, etc.
> > > : > >
> > > : > > Bill K2UNK
> > > : >
> > > : > I gather that you do not read that many papers
> > > : > everyday. The Washington Post, LA Times,
> > > : > NY Times, Chicago Tribune all go on "crusades"
> > > : > every so often over gun ownership, cell phones,
> > > : > scanners. The elite do not like the fact that the
> > > : > masses understand, and use, technology.
> > > :
> > > : I have seen public opposition to gun ownership, mixed
> > > : opposition to cellphone use in an auto (no one
> > > : seems to want to ban any total use/ownership
> > > : of cellphones) ...BUT
> > > : not one crusade at all against scanners. There has
> > > : been NO demand to ban scanners at all, even for
> > > : specific frequencies, since the FCC rules
> > > : prohibiting scanners manufactured that can recieve
> > > : cellular.
> > >
> > > I suggest that you become familiar
> > > with the issues over APCO 25
> > > standards for digital trunked radio.
> > > The main purpose is to prevent private
> > > citizens from receiving ANY public
> > > radio transmission.
> >
> > So what, that doesn't mean there is any public
> > demand to outlaw scanners.
> >
>
> No public demand, just behind the door lobbying
> by police organizations. Congress has passed
> some rather restrictive laws about scanners in
> the last 10 years.

Other than the ban on cellular recieving capability for newly manufactured
scanners. Just what other restrictive laws about scanners are you
thinking of.

> > > As I am a member
> > > of APCO, I have had conversations with
> > > individuals who run public safety radio
> > > systems. Their one big goal is to have
> > > an digitally encrypted system that no one,
> > > not even the media, will be able to receive
> > > without their permission.
> >
> > That too does NOT constitute any public outcry
> > to ban scanners either.
> >
>
> The public wants scanners, the media wants them.
> The cops would rather that you did not have them.

So what! There is NO groundswell of support to outlaw
scanners at all. The police will end up encrypting their
channels and that'll be the end of any police concerns too.

> > > Read some of the articles at http://www.strongsignals.net
> >
> > There is nothing wrong with police using new technology to
> > protect their frequencies from eavesdropping...BUT that
> > is not at all anlogous to banning scanners altogether as
> > you claim their is public support for.
>
> It will cause more problems that it is worth.
> Right now most police officers use scanners
> to listen to adjacent patrol areas, other departments
> and others services. If radios are encrypted, you
> will only have those talk groups that are programmed
> into your radio. Already we have problems with
> various agencies not wanting other agencies on
> their talk groups. For example, the ambulance
> service does not want the fire fighters on their
> talk group. Makes it damned hard to co-ordinate
> at an accident scene or talk the ambulance in.

Sounds like a police problem then. Are you suggesting
a total ban on scanners for public purchase?

> And you know that the media will be the first
> to be locked out. They are just now realizing
> that the cops might be pulling a fast one.

If encryption is a "fast one" it sure is taking a long
time. The ability to encrypt has been around for
years...nothing new on that technology.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5154. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:25:47 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <vPUU7.136396$bs2.21702260@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 28159
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The ONLY reason MIBX dropped his sorry ass was that UUNet got involved. That
is one internet player you DON'T want on your bad side!
Train

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote in message
news:OvTU7.7059$x72.2277881967@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> Not really any that matter Scott. It's the same BS
> that our little buddy was doing a few months back
> To all that's concerned, for a year or more now
> we have had a few resident trolls on rec.radio.cb.
> They were using MIBX until after months of
> complaints he was terminated. It seems as though
> he is back from prep school, for Christmas vacation
> stirring the pot.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All
>
>
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20011221204335.191$hs@newsreader.com...
> > gayillegalscott69@hotmail.com (Scott Unit 69) wrote:
> > > "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:<3C232CA6.234D028D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> > > > Train wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Your first clue should be that the thread is crossposted
> > > >
> > > > The second is that it came from google.com.
> > > >
> > > > The third clue is the posting IP: It came from AOL.
> > >
> > > The fourth clue is that it got me running all over Usenet like a sissy
> > > trying to disclaim it!
> > >
> > That's it,Im gonna try to killfile the entire google domain now,new
'puter
> > and reader, and it need to be done. Apologies to a few google
posters(not
> > very many)...

> >
> > --
> > ~Moparholic~
>
>

5155. Re: Freebanders, 1910

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:26:27 UTC
From: rimjobs <codesucksbig5@aol.com>
Message-ID: <7QUU7.8094$PO5.1406373@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 28099

"K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote in message news:#tSLwZqiBHA.1848@cpimsnntpa02...

> The Outlook, January 15, 1910, page 131:

(snip)

You mean this was like the 14.313 mHz of the last Century...?

5156. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 05:28:15 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <PRUU7.136444$bs2.21708176@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 28160
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

Just the thought of drinking it should be a felony!
Get a Sam Adams!
Train

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011221202220.495$ws@newsreader.com...
> "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote:
> > "Panhead" <Panmyfinger@fcc.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C23B68E.AE136BBC@fcc.com...
> > > Jim Patterson wrote:
> > > >
> > > > On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 15:01:33 -0500, Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com> in
> > > > talk.politics.guns wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
> > > > >have your own body armor.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > I am curious. Do you feel that this is a good law?
> > >
> > > Before we go further, allow me to say that I was (gasp) Wrong!
> > > Citizens most certainly CAN own and wear armor.
> > >
> > Most states have laws on the books criminalizing the use of body armor
> > while committing a crime. Owning the body armor in and of itself is not
> > usually the crime.
> > Train
> >
> What about Iron City beer cans,Train?
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

5157. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 06:07:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2415F7.A372C26@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28100

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So since Riley answered an exact question directed to him by the
> > principal seeking his opininion, not Federal law which she aready knew,
> > and he honestly answered it with his personal opinion, you now pronounce
> > him a prude simply because his opinion doesn't match your sleazy
> > opinion. Right, we got it.
>
> Yep, you got it all right. I have a lot less respect for him now
> than I did before.

About every time you post you lose even more respect. I couldn't say that
you have any left.

5158. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 06:09:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C24168E.EA3751FB@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28151

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > That is exactly
> > > the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
> > > opinion while in an ARRL position.
> >
> > That is NOT what he said to Ed.
>
> He said Ed's opinion could not be taken seriously because he worked
> for the ARRL. Using the identical logic, Riley's opinion cannot be
> taken seriously because he works for the FCC.

Don't you ever get tired of lying and making up shit? He and I said
that Ed's opinions couldn't be taken as his independent beliefs since he
works at ARRL and he said that his bosses knew that he wouldn't say
anything contrary to official policy.

5159. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 06:16:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C241814.5A21F87D@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28152
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 10:02:37 +0000 (UTC), Bill Nelson wrote:
>
> >In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
> >
> >> Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
> >> officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
> >> by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.
> >

I believe he's wrong. The Supreme Court ruling said that officers may check the passenger area for any weapons that might be readily accessible and thus present a danger. Complete searches require either permission of the driver/owner or a search warrant issued by a court based on valid information and stipulating exactly what is being sought in the search. Contraband found during the search is admissible. Drug dog scans do not require a search warrant.

Of course this does not apply to national border crossing searches which are indeed are legal.

5160. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 07:47:27 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112212347.3868de48@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28153
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net>
news:<9vturn0l20@enews1.newsguy.com>
Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Well, there's always going to be some uneducated slug, who has a
Messiah
Complex, thinking he has every right to be above the law. Charles
Manson,
Adolph Hitler, Jim Jones, Son of Sam, The Zodiac Killer, the list goes
on
and on...

I'll assume that anyone who believes radio should be free to the
unlicensed
public, also can't understand why they keep getting their driver's
license
revoked for driving under the influence, why they can't yell "fire" in
a
crowded theater, and they believe the people in handcuffs on COPS are
just
being harrassed...

"Listen Jim or whatever monicker of Lelnads kennel club you are using
today, I am quite surpassing in educational acheivement more to the
likes of you can see for eons of time. If any of your so-called
epithets could harm me you would be dangerous and lack the sentence
structre to dialogue with me. I observe that you are a no-code
CB-hater so go back to the dog pound and lap your paw some more"

5161. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 07:51:20 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112212351.4ab47671@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28154
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"I cannot believe the derisive comments and unbelieving attitudes of my fellow usenetters and cb room friends. ATTENTION PLEASE anyone reading this: this is an authentic item and the terms of sale still stand. Ignore the petty howling of jealous no-coders. The first to mail me a check for $1500 will get said toothpick gift wrapped in time for the holidays"

5162. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 08:49:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C243C0A.1362664@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28155
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote:

> > >
> > > > The way you were going at it was that you
> > > > were making it out that you were some big
> > > > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
> > > > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
> > > > that cop were to get off.
> > >
> > > An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
> > > into such a situation in the first place.
> >
> > The police he describes are a bunch of untrained, juvenile loose
> > cannons. The many I knew would not begin to enforce a new law without
> > learning the law in detail, and many minor narrowly- focused laws such
> > as this one would prety well be ignored without a formal complaint
> > having been signed by a victim. Then there might be an investigation
> > which might lead to an arrest if it proved to be warrented.
> >
> > Most cops are not fools. Fools don't normally enjoy long tenure as
> > police officers.
>
> The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
> Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
> out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
> of young, inexperienced officers out there.
>
> No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
> court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city attorney
> can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.
>
> These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
> officers. They are very professional. But if they do not know
> what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts settle
> it.

Speaking from the perspective of thirty years direct working experience with law enforcement officers, the officers you describe are poorly trained and even more poorly supervised. Any supervisor who allows a junior officer to send any questionable case to the prosecutor is derelict. And he will shortly hear so from that prosecutor, who has no time for that sort of nonsense.Without exception he will have real work to do. And in the unlikely event the presecutor is just as green and sends it on the the court, the judge himself will set the whole bunch on the straight and narrow. He's the

busiest of all.
It sounds like you've been talking with a bunch of rank recruits straight
out of the academy who have yet to even meet their field training officers,
who surely WILL set them straight.

5163. Who in the pluperfect is George?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 09:12:10 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <K7YU7.306566$W8.11065674@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28156

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011221214029.05517.00000127@mb-de.aol.com...
> >Dick, I would expect anything different from you hang in rec.radio.CB
> >lending your expertise to the illegal there.
>
> The trick is to use that "expertise" to turn them on to the ham
> bands...legally! Dick has done this and has thus "made a difference."
What've
> you done lately to make a difference, George?
>
> Mark

As pure recreation is my one and only motive, I will take your word for it. These days, if it don't get me paid, laid, or fed it is difficult to stay interested.

I run a beta of a mail manager developed for a well-known local biz guy being set up to be given away or sold, named pro tem Bozo*Flush. As I do not hide behind screen names etc. Mad Boris the programmer figured - correctly - that I would be a great blocking dummy and so it has proven. As a result, most dross is shitcanned before I ever see it. Were it not for sane people reprinting the rants I could go blissfully about spreading joy and happiness from flower to flower forever.

George or whoever has a case of the tights with anyone who does not subscribe to his Old Yankee view of the world. When a few of the groupies passed the code test and ultimately became Extras, it seemed that he expected me to piss on their shoes and tell them it was raining. Whatever I may believe about licensing or births out of wedlock one does not take it out on the children. Sorry George. Certainly a lot of CB (and amateur) practices will cause a goat to gag but most of it is merely pointless. George or Aaron or whoever seems to view it as some sort of moral crusade but in the long run of things you are not the only one to discover it is pointless so offering alternatives rather than a sermon generally works better. You vil march in schrait lines und learn to luf it ain't much of a morale booster.

Whoever he may be he is well on the way to becoming the resident Frau Blucher.

So who in hell is George???

Dick N&#65533;BK

5164. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 09:12:17 UTC
From: Patrick Keele <pkg1dra@g1dra.freeserve.co.uk>
Message-ID: <a03b12$i9o$1@news5.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 28246
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Suffice to say on my part.Point taken.
Thanks
PK

5165. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 09:15:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C24422C.4CA59E74@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28157
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

N9NWO wrote:

> And what makes you think that you are
> safe from the police over reaching in the
> current setting of paranoia over terrorism.

No question, things are a bit different due to Sept 11. As an example, not long ago I drove across Hoover Dam, on the Arizona/Nevada border. There were plenty of warning signs that no commercial trucks nor RV's were allowed to cross, and must turn around long before approaching. Signs also warned of roadblocks, and of course I had read in the news media that the dam was being protected, so I expected all that, and expected to be checked. We were driving a full size pickup with a tenneau cover on the bed, with luggage and a few other articles inside, and my wife was driving when we arrived at the roadblock. They didn't ask to see any ID nor even drivers license, they just wanted to know where we were going, if we had any weapons, and they wanted to see inside the closed bed beneath the tenneau cover, which was locked. They told us to pull over to the side and open the cover, which we did. One glance inside was all they needed, and we were sent on our way. But technically that should require a search warrant, to search anything but the driver/passenger compartment. And there was one small pickup with a shell cover which was stuffed full of things that the driver was being made to unload so they could get a good look. He wasn't too happy, but he was doing it. I saw nothing there so unreasonable that I couldn't support it under the circumstances. If you don't like it, take another route.
We could say that the laxness of of immigration policies of liberal administrations and bureaucracies in the past has led to the current situation but that won't solve anything now...

5166. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 09:25:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C244463.A9673EEC@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28158
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

N9NWO wrote:

> You have a growing number of police, and politicians,
> who feel that the public does not have a right to own
> such technology. That includes things like ham radio,
> CB, scanners as well as things like guns.
>

That wasn't my experience. Most of the cops I knew were ok with gun ownership by citizens, and there were a few who had been helped outof a bad spot by armed citizens. It was not that unusual for a citizen who had heard a police dispatch on a scanner to contribute useful information on a case. Of course that was in an earlier era, though not many years ago. But trunked digital comm systems are a double edged sword. They are like the cell phone system - fine when working, useless when not. Earlier base to mobile analog distpatch systems were and are more reliable. And much less expensive, always a factor, especially in a time of fading economic conditions..

>
> There is the feeling that the public can not be trusted,
> that too many use technology for crime or to try to
> overthrow the government. Many would prefer that only
> those who are paid on a professional basis should be allowed
> to have access to radios or weapons.

5167. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 09:30:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2445B6.39172FAB@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28161
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Peter H. Proctor" wrote:

> In article <3C23951D.E1493E12@fcc.com> Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com> writes:
> >From: Panhead <Panmyfinger@fcc.com>
> >Subject: Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.
> >Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 15:01:33 -0500
>
> > The police are only supporting the laws they were sworn to
> >uphold.
> > It's against FEDERAL law in many, if not most or all states, to
> >have your own body armor.
>
> Er, there may be occasional state laws, but there is no federal law.
>

Yeah, that would be the first Federal law I ever heard of that didn't apply to
all states.

5168. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 09:36:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C24470B.8833D654@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote:

How can a cop take a car for a traffic stop

> if he only suspects drugs? Yet it is done all
> the time. If he can justify it, that is all that matters.

If they are allowed to get away with it that is the fault of the people who are having their cars confiscated - if they don't actually have drugs aboard.

5169. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 09:44:16 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <QBYU7.306588$W8.11067053@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28163
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C243C0A.1362664@townsqr.com...
>
> Speaking from the perspective of thirty years direct working
experience
> with law enforcement officers, the officers you describe are poorly
trained
> and even more poorly supervised. Any supervisor who allows a junior
officer
> to send any questionable case to the prosecutor is derelict. And he
will
> shortly hear so from that prosecutor, who has no time for that sort of
> nonsense.Without exception he will have real work to do. And in the
unlikely
> event the presecutor is just as green and sends it on the the court, the
> judge himself will set the whole bunch on the straight and narrow. He's
the
> busiest of all.
> It sounds like you've been talking with a bunch of rank recruits
straight
> out of the academy who have yet to even meet their field training
officers,
> who surely WILL set them straight.
>

Dick, without disagreeing with you, the police forces are fighting - and I think losing - being ground down by the burden of a lot of things including really stupid drug enforcement. This plagues the system from the cop thru the courts and the penal institutions. The NHP has become the I-80 drug patrol and as a result does most of its recruiting thru the truck inspectors; the OPD leads the planet in pot busts, BFD. When the MHP, KHP etc. are lining up to recruit at NebrOma's law enforcement program to compete for the decent you know that some warm bodies are being given badges and guns; the out of state patrolmen probably accomplish more traffic enforcement than the NHP during their body-snatching visits. We had a minor dust-up in the complex involving the Douglas County Sheriff's office and I thought the place was being invaded by Sea Scouts.

When you can't interest the Federal DAs office in anything that can't raise 10 grand or confiscate something, similar down at the local Prosecutor, it is no small wonder radio enforcement goes to hell. So we get bandaids like Tacoma in hopes the local gendarmes can cure TVI thru sheer force of personality. As a practical matter, an undermanned group takes up acting like the Marines and it is welcome time to the LAPD.

At the same time, as you point out, the radio-owning public has little to fear barring a complaint. The poor cop is out looking for drug mules to add one more rusty 82 Chevy to the impound lot.

Dick N&#65533;BK

5170. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 09:57:05 UTC
From: Robert <KnowsAll@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <a01lg9$9hl$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C243C0A.1362664@townsqr.com...
>
>
> N9NWO wrote:
>
> > > > >
> > > > > The way you were going at it was that you
> > > > > were making it out that you were some big
> > > > > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
> > > > > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
> > > > > that cop were to get off.
> > > > >
> > > > An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
> > > > into such a situation in the first place.
> > > >
> > > The police he describes are a bunch of untrained, juvenile loose
> > > cannons. The many I knew would not begin to enforce a new law without
> > > learning the law in detail, and many minor narrowly- focused laws such
> > > as this one would prety well be ignored without a formal complaint
> > > having been signed by a victim. Then there might be an investigation
> > > which might lead to an arrest if it proved to be warrented.
> > >
> > > Most cops are not fools. Fools don't normally enjoy long tenure as
> > > police officers.
> >
> > The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
> > Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
> > out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
> > of young, inexperienced officers out there.
> >
> > No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
> > court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city attorney
> > can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.
> >
> > These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
> > officers. They are very professional. But if they do not know
> > what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts settle
> > it.
>
> Speaking from the perspective of thirty years direct working experience
> with law enforcement officers, the officers you describe are poorly
trained

> and even more poorly supervised. Any supervisor who allows a junior
officer
> to send any questionable case to the prosecutor is derelict. And he will
> shortly hear so from that prosecutor, who has no time for that sort of
> nonsense.Without exception he will have real work to do. And in the
unlikely
> event the presecutor is just as green and sends it on the the court, the
> judge himself will set the whole bunch on the straight and narrow. He's
the
> busiest of all.
> It sounds like you've been talking with a bunch of rank recruits
straight
> out of the academy who have yet to even meet their field training
officers,
> who surely WILL set them straight.

Amazing, is it not? Amazing that so many would weigh in on so little.
LEO's, whether a one year or twenty year veteran, can only enforce the laws they are given, and even then Officer Discretion almost always comes into being and then only with PC (Probable Cause).
From what I have seen of this string, too much is being made of too little.
For the most part if you mind your own business and act accordingly, you have little reason to worry over seing the red and blue lights light up behind you.
Yes, some gung-ho newbie officers may carry things to extremes but they rarely operate outside of the laws they have at hand. Give the new guys and gals a year or two and they will usually calm down and most will get over the Wyatt Earp syndrome.
Be honest. Did not you first year officers feel just a bit full of youselves after you were sworn in? Did you not like wearing that badge on your belt while sporting the Dept. issue handgun...even when off duty? Be honest...you LIKED being recognized as the latest cop in town and many of you really didn't take great pains to hide the dept. issue weapon. Other newbies even go so far as to wear a handcuff case on their belt everywhere they go....that , too will soon wear off as you gain experience.
Many departments require that their officers go armed both on duty and off, and the new rookies often tend to shove a large handgun in their belts...or if they are at a singles bar, they like shoulder holsters. Makes them macho.
I have been there, guys. After the newness wears off (three or four years) you will find that the Job can be a real pain. You will no longer want to carry that large, crappy duty weapon on your off hours...after all, you carried it for nine hours on your shift and when you get home all you want to do is ditch it and that damn Sam Browne belt it rides on. As you spend more time on the job you may even find that you do not wish to carry an off-duty weapon despite department policies. After all, it is a pain to go visiting, swimming, or even to church while carrying a handgun. (I opt for an ankle holster, but the choice is yours)

The statement, " Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates out of law enforcement by 5 years" is not quite true. Most of this half will quit within the first three years and move on to other jobs. Yes, there is a

turnover in Law Enforcement. Good people apply and pass the stringent requirements. Unfortunately these same good people find that a career in Law Enforcement pays little, has great risks, and affords no weekends or holidays off. As a result they move on to more stable positions within the private sector.
My outlook is that you have to want to be a cop above all else. Money is secondary.

5171. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 11:54:44 UTC
From: pproctor@neosoft.com
Message-ID: <A711CE7C1FC84235.7AD7F8CFEBD91A21.CC08E927557F6EE0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28190
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.gopy6x6.pminews@or.news.verio.net> "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@no.spam> writes:
>From: "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
>Subject: Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.
>Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2001 04:41:13 GMT

>If you want more, read the DMCA of 1998. It's basically made
>>it illegal to take something apart to see how it works.

> A good friend of mine who is a high-up lawyer with the Motion
> Picture Association of America has convinced me that the techno
> pirates brought such draconian laws upon themselves.

But if a company cannot take something apart, they cannot do the "
reasonable examination " that is required to file a patent suit under
established case law..

Dr P

5172. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 12:33:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 28165

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011221222305.05517.00000145@mb-de.aol.com...
> >We're talking about licensing requirements ... that's PURELY a
> >regulatory function. "Tradition" has NOTHING to do with
legitimate
> >regulatory goals ... it's not the FCC's job to preserve amateur
> >"tradition" ... the FCC's job is to regulate the use of the
spectrum
> >in the public interest. End of story.
>
> Perhaps, but you can now be licensed without having to show "Morse
> proficiency." The requirement of demonstrating a very traditional
"discipline"
> in order to "earn" additional privileges seems to be very much in
the public
> interest. Do you really think it's a "regulatory function" we're
talking about?

The key word here is "traditional" ... the idea of Morse proficiency
as a "ham tradition" has no place in regulation. If those who like
Morse want to promote it, without government "arm-twisting," fine.
I have no problem with that ... but it is NOT within the FCC's charter
to enforce "amateur tradition."

Another concept to consider is that "discipline" is a bit misused in
this application, IMHO. Are you talking about the concept that some
have voiced that "It's (jumping through the Morse proficiency hoop)
necessary to show 'committment'." ???

Showing"committment" also has no place in regulation. All that's
legitimate is a demonstration of understanding of the rules and regs
and sufficient technical competence to operate safely and without
violating the rules or causing interference problems.

> >Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
> >three basic motivations 1) "I had to do it, so everyone else
should,
> >too."; 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
> >not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of
contacts
> >will dry up; and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
> >using "their" bands. All 3 of those are pure rubbish.
>

> ...and the motivations of those who wish to remove the code
requirement
> entirely are? I guess you said it best..."Standards, shmandards..."

You're missing the distinction that, in the paragraph above, I was
disparaging the numbered motives above as not being legitimate
standards ... I was NOT disparaging the validity of legitimate
standards, which I support whole-heartedly.

73,
- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCR9r5e+N6+q84HiEQKJ2QCdHwiZNuMYX9T8eKOBvoooUMgs3QwAoLh7
AA5HHguxXcoISXR9Gn6WOgBH
=scBy
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5173. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 13:03:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011222080340.13985.00001628@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 28166

In article <20011222001257.14343.00000014@mb-fy.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>
>>OM Greg is getting ripped off by having a ham radio
>>license that is good for a mere 17 months and six days.
>
> Check the math, Larry. Today is December 21, 2001.
>
>Steve

Steve:

I was perfectly aware that Greg's ticket expires next month. I was referring to the total length of his license term, from issuance to expiration. That is 17 months, 6 days. I reckon he was somehow gypped out of just short of 8 1/2 years of his license term -- assuming that the date of issue was, in fact, a renewal action, as opposed to an administrative change.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5174. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 13:37:57 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <V00V7.306655$W8.11077136@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28167

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net...

** el snippo applied **

> You're missing the distinction that, in the paragraph above, I was
> disparaging the numbered motives above as not being legitimate
> standards ... I was NOT disparaging the validity of legitimate
> standards, which I support whole-heartedly.
>
> 73,
> - --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> <mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
> <http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

Without disagreeing or disparaging, just what might those legitimate standards be?? I have looked for them since 1955 and haven't found them yet. Even safety might be questioned on the theory that a man has the right to kill himself or gaze down microwave horns.

The crux of this discussion is who to bar more than who to accept. There is a secondary issue that results from allowing every kid with two propellors on his beanie (Cecil, Jim, me) to get on and klutz around: how to keep the newbie from becoming a real pain in the butt to your 20 meter net, etc. So we developed the Class A, B, C structure before the war that required a year before one could get off 40 meter CW or 160 and 10 meter phone. Time becomes the standard legitimate or not. So the real issue is how to blend newbies into the scenery with a minimum of fuss and feathers.

With all due respect, legitimate standards are not going to come from the world of electronics. It is nice to know Ohm's and Joule's Laws in their permutations and even better if some of the implications dawn on the young and inexperienced. But then they didn't dawn on the writer and publisher of the infamous DDRR bent down at your local muffler shop that was featured in the Handbook for several years. Much like my days coaching middle school football, you had better expect some mistakes, some colossal, when you set a bunch of sixth and seventh-graders loose on a field; self-education can get real ugly.

Even lowering the code thing to 5wpm has not had a major effect of any kind simply because it serves the purpose of a small 'cooling off' period between decision and actuality. If I want to be the Channel Master of 14.313 at least I have a week or two to come to my senses before hauling out my credit card and ending up with a Frankensteen. To some extent the Brits with their theory of gathering similar people (personifying the

enemy so to speak) in a room for eight hours in a spate of Morse Appreciation ending in an open book, take all day code test may actually have the problem right; I have been in corporate meetings less of a purpose for much the same reason: keeping the landmines and barbed wire down to a gentle, ladylike belch.

Given the problem, translating a typical QSO into conversational Swahili probably is as legitimate as anything so long as no one knows that making the attempt is qualification enough. Course someone would immediately form No Swahili International.

So what do you view as legitimate standards???

Dick N&#65533;BK

5175. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 13:47:08 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <w90V7.271$UO1.110693@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28168
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

: >> Look for the post by Lenny Stover. He is a police
: >> officer and pointed out that he has the right, backed
: >> by the USSC, to inspect everything that is in car.
: >
: >Officers have been wrong before - which is why evidence from searches
: >is sometimes ruled inadmissable.
:
: And why many jurisdictions (used to) have Deputy DAs ride around
: with patrol officers to make those calls. My kid brother (KE7DX)
: did that (as a DA) for several years in Phoenix. Made his "day"
: job easier, too.

Actually that is a good idea. The French merged
the prosecutors office with the commissioner of
police for that very reason.

Even the military is placing JAG officers down as
low as Battalion so that the commanders can get
rulings on the law of war.

With the US graduating 35,000 lawyers a year,
lawyers are cheap. And a law degree for a cop
is a fast track to LT.

5176. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 13:54:28 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <og0V7.275$UO1.114713@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28169
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

```
: > > > : > > More hogwash. Even if there is some such sentiment,
: > > > : > > there hasn't been any support for that attitude in the press,
: > > > : > > the legislatures, etc.
: > > > : > >
: > > > : > > Bill K2UNK
: > > > : >
: > > > : > I gather that you do not read that many papers
: > > > : > everyday. The Washington Post, LA Times,
: > > > : > NY Times, Chicago Tribune all go on "crusades"
: > > > : > every so often over gun ownership, cell phones,
: > > > : > scanners. The elite do not like the fact that the
: > > > : > masses understand, and use, technology.
: > > > :
: > > > : I have seen public opposition to gun ownership, mixed
: > > > : opposition to cellphone use in an auto (no one
: > > > : seems to want to ban any total use/ownership
: > > > : of cellphones) ...BUT
: > > > : not one crusade at all against scanners. There has
: > > > : been NO demand to ban scanners at all, even for
: > > > : specific frequencies, since the FCC rules
: > > > : prohibiting scanners manufactured that can recieve
: > > > : cellular.
: > > >
: > > > I suggest that you become familiar
: > > > with the issues over APCO 25
: > > > standards for digital trunked radio.
: > > > The main purpose is to prevent private
: > > > citizens from receiving ANY public
: > > > radio transmission.
: > >
: > > So what, that doesn't mean there is any public
: > > demand to outlaw scanners.
: > >
: >
: > No public demand, just behind the door lobbying
: > by police organizations. Congress has passed
: > some rather restrictive laws about scanners in
: > the last 10 years.
:
: Other than the ban on cellular recieving capability for newly manufactured
: scanners. Just what other restrictive laws about scanners are you
: thinking of.
```

Well part of that law made it illegal to
reverse engineer any coding scheme
such as Motorola's trunking format.
Or their MDT coding. Mind you now,
these are not encryption, just a computer
code. It also restricted listening to pagers.

And remember, this only applies to civilians,
the police are exempt.

: > > > As I am a member
: > > > of APCO, I have had conversations with
: > > > individuals who run public safety radio
: > > > systems. Their one big goal is to have
: > > > an digitally encrypted system that no one,
: > > > not even the media, will be able to receive
: > > > without their permission.
: > >
: > > That too does NOT constitute any public outcry
: > > to ban scanners either.
: > >
: >
: > The public wants scanners, the media wants them.
: > The cops would rather that you did not have them.
:
: So what! There is NO groundswell of support to outlaw
: scanners at all. The police will end up encrypting their
: channels and that'll be the end of any police concerns too.

If the average police chief had his way, there would
be no scanners, body armor, or guns in the hands of
private citizens. Hell, too many chiefs would be happy
if everyone was forced to take public transportation.
All except their wives and kids, of course.

: > > > Read some of the articles at http://www.strongsignals.net
: > >
: > > There is nothing wrong with police using new technology to
: > > protect their frequencies from eavesdropping...BUT that
: > > is not at all anlogous to banning scanners altogether as
: > > you claim their is public support for.
: >
: > It will cause more problems that it is worth.
: > Right now most police officers use scanners
: > to listen to adjacent patrol areas, other departments
: > and others services. If radios are encrypted, you
: > will only have those talk groups that are programmed
: > into your radio. Already we have problems with
: > various agencies not wanting other agencies on
: > their talk groups. For example, the ambulance
: > service does not want the fire fighters on their
: > talk group. Makes it damned hard to co-ordinate

: > at an accident scene or talk the ambulance in.
:
: Sounds like a police problem then. Are you suggesting
: a total ban on scanners for public purchase?

No, but many in law enforcement would love
a total ban, especially for the newspapers.

And someone is going to sue once it is learned
that different agencies can not co-ordinate. It
is going to cost someone there life.

: > And you know that the media will be the first
: > to be locked out. They are just now realizing
: > that the cops might be pulling a fast one.
:
: If encryption is a "fast one" it sure is taking a long
: time. The ability to encrypt has been around for
: years...nothing new on that technology.

Not cheaply and easily. Digital trunked radio
has made it very easily. Except that digital trunking
has not worked out as well as they had hoped.

5177. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 14:01:55 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <nn0V7.282$UO1.119372@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28170
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

: >I suggest that you become familiar with the issues over APCO 25
: >standards for digital trunked radio. The main purpose is to prevent
: >private citizens from receiving ANY public radio transmission. As I
: >am a member of APCO, I have had conversations with individuals who run
: >public safety radio systems. Their one big goal is to have an
: >digitally encrypted system that no one, not even the media, will be
: >able to receive without their permission.
:
: Sheeeesh....none of my (Northern California) APCO colleagues
: have expressed that concern. Their major concerns are over
: reliability and coverage of communications in difficult
: terrain and inter-system operability and they don't look to
: APCO 25 as the final answer. Several have tried and were
: underwhelmed by The Big Em's product.

Within my agency, and many of the local and state
agencies I co-ordinate with, there have been comments
that they really do not want private citizens listening, especially
the press. Often someone overhears on site comments
and makes it into a major political issue. The decision
makers are wanting a bit of room to maneuver without
lawyers, the press and the common citizen doing arm
chair quarter backing. They want to be able to cuss
"in the heat of battle" without having to answer to every
anti cop and anti government group out there.

The problem is that without citizens and the press listening,
news becomes filtered and controlled. The political elements
can spin things easier. Plus the average street cop will go
back to treating the radio as a CB where they all tell their
off colored stories about women and minorities. Or co-ordinate
the stories so that the last incident that went bad will look good
on paper.

5178. Re: RADIO LAW and the average cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 14:20:58 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <eF0V7.287$UO1.130866@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28171
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

```
Robert <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:a01lg9$9hl$0@dosa.alt.net...:
:
:
: "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote ...
: >
: >: > > > > > The way you were going at it was that you
: > > > > > were making it out that you were some big
: > > > > > shot ham radio operator with all sorts of
: > > > > > fucking rights and you were going to TELL
: > > > > > that cop were to get off.
: > > > > >
: > > > > An intelligent and reasonable police officer would not get himself
: > > > > into such a situation in the first place.
: > > > >
: > > > The police he describes are a bunch of untrained, juvenile loose
: > > > cannons. The many I knew would not begin to enforce a new law
without learning the law in detail, and many minor narrowly- focused laws
such
: > > > as this one would prety well be ignored without a formal complaint
: > > > having been signed by a victim. Then there might be an investigation
: > > > which might lead to an arrest if it proved to be warrented.
: > > >
: > > > Most cops are not fools. Fools don't normally enjoy long tenure as
: > > > police officers.
: > >
: > > The average cop has less than 5 years on the force.
: > > Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
: > > out of law enforcement by 5 years. It is mostly a bunch
: > > of young, inexperienced officers out there.
: > >
: > > No law really has merit until it has been in front of an appeals
: > > court. No one really knows the limits until then. The city attorney
: > > can give an opinion, but it has no merit as a ruling.
: > >
: > > These are not loose cannons rather they are just inexperienced
: > > officers. They are very professional. But if they do not know
: > > what to do, they will cite into the courts and let the courts settle
: > > it.
: >
: > Speaking from the perspective of thirty years direct working
experience
: > with law enforcement officers, the officers you describe are poorly
```

: trained and even more poorly supervised. Any supervisor who allows a
junior
: officer to send any questionable case to the prosecutor is derelict. And
he will
: > shortly hear so from that prosecutor, who has no time for that sort of
: > nonsense.Without exception he will have real work to do. And in the
: unlikely event the presecutor is just as green and sends it on the the
court, the
: > judge himself will set the whole bunch on the straight and narrow. He's
: the busiest of all.
: > It sounds like you've been talking with a bunch of rank recruits
: straight out of the academy who have yet to even meet their field training
: officers, who surely WILL set them straight.
:
: Amazing, is it not? Amazing that so many would weigh in on so little.
: LEO's, whether a one year or twenty year veteran, can only enforce the
laws
: they are given, and even then Officer Discretion almost always comes into
: being and then only with PC (Probable Cause).
: From what I have seen of this string, too much is being made of too
little.
: For the most part if you mind your own business and act accordingly, you
: have little reason to worry over seing the red and blue lights light up
: behind you.
: Yes, some gung-ho newbie officers may carry things to extremes but they
: rarely operate outside of the laws they have at hand. Give the new guys
and
: gals a year or two and they will usually calm down and most will get over
: the Wyatt Earp syndrome.
: Be honest. Did not you first year officers feel just a bit full of
youselves
: after you were sworn in? Did you not like wearing that badge on your belt
: while sporting the Dept. issue handgun...even when off duty? Be
honest...you
: LIKED being recognized as the latest cop in town and many of you really
: didn't take great pains to hide the dept. issue weapon. Other newbies even
: go so far as to wear a handcuff case on their belt everywhere they
: go....that , too will soon wear off as you gain experience.
: Many departments require that their officers go armed both on duty and
off,
: and the new rookies often tend to shove a large handgun in their
belts...or
: if they are at a singles bar, they like shoulder holsters. Makes them
macho.
: I have been there, guys. After the newness wears off (three or four years)
: you will find that the Job can be a real pain. You will no longer want to
: carry that large, crappy duty weapon on your off hours...after all, you
: carried it for nine hours on your shift and when you get home all you want
: to do is ditch it and that damn Sam Browne belt it rides on. As you spend
: more time on the job you may even find that you do not wish to carry an

: off-duty weapon despite department policies. After all, it is a pain to go
: visiting, swimming, or even to church while carrying a handgun. (I opt for
: an ankle holster, but the choice is yours)
:
: The statement, " Most academy classes will see over half of the graduates
: out of law enforcement by 5 years" is not quite true. Most of this half
will
: quit within the first three years and move on to other jobs. Yes, there is
a
: turnover in Law Enforcement. Good people apply and pass the stringent
: requirements. Unfortunately these same good people find that a career in
Law
: Enforcement pays little, has great risks, and affords no weekends or
: holidays off. As a result they move on to more stable positions within the
: private sector.
: My outlook is that you have to want to be a cop above all else. Money is
: secondary.

Well said!!!

5179. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 14:24:46 UTC
From: wf3h@ptd.net
Message-ID: <3c24970a.39814589@news.ptdprolog.net>
Source record: 28173
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 19:28:59 -0800, senecal@mapson.cs.ucdavis.edu
(Joshua Senecal) wrote:

>Hi all,
>
>I'm going to be flying soon, and I'd like to take my HT with me in my
>carryon (no, I won't be using it on the plane! :) I'm concerned that
>having this may cause a problem at airport security, what with the current
>situation and all. Has anyone flown recently and carried their rig with
>them? If so, what was your experience at the airport?
>
>Thanks!
>
>-Josh Senecal, KG6IBF
>

just got back from round trip to SF. what a nightmare. the security
line stretched the entire length of the terminal into the next
terminal.

carrying an HT won't really make a difference. they're randomly
selecting folks for full baggage search (i got flagged 3/4 times going
to airports...that's enough reason for me to want OBL greased)....

just be prepared to turn the rig on.

and if you're going to a big airport (EWR, SFO, SJC, ORD, etc), be
prepared to wait for hours...

5180. Re: RADIO LAW and the newbie cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 14:25:38 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <CJ0V7.289$UO1.134860@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28172
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote...
:
: "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote ...
: >
: > Speaking from the perspective of thirty years direct working
: experience with law enforcement officers, the officers you describe are
poorly
: trained and even more poorly supervised. Any supervisor who allows a
junior
: officer to send any questionable case to the prosecutor is derelict. And
he
: will shortly hear so from that prosecutor, who has no time for that sort
of
: > nonsense.Without exception he will have real work to do. And in the
: unlikely event the presecutor is just as green and sends it on the the
court, the
: > judge himself will set the whole bunch on the straight and narrow. He's
: thebusiest of all.
: > It sounds like you've been talking with a bunch of rank recruits
: straight out of the academy who have yet to even meet their field training
: officers, who surely WILL set them straight.
: >
:
: Dick, without disagreeing with you, the police forces are fighting - and I
: think losing - being ground down by the burden of a lot of things
: including really stupid drug enforcement. This plagues the system from
: the cop thru the courts and the penal institutions. The NHP has become
: the I-80 drug patrol and as a result does most of its recruiting thru the
: truck inspectors; the OPD leads the planet in pot busts, BFD. When the
: MHP, KHP etc. are lining up to recruit at NebrOma's law enforcement
: program to compete for the decent you know that some warm bodies are being
given badges and guns; the out of state patrolmen probably accomplish more
traffic enforcement than the NHP during their body-snatching visits. We
: had a minor dust-up in the complex involving the Douglas County Sheriff's
: office and I thought the place was being invaded by Sea Scouts.
:
: When you can't interest the Federal DAs office in anything that can't
: raise 10 grand or confiscate something, similar down at the local
: Prosecutor, it is no small wonder radio enforcement goes to hell. So we
: get bandaids like Tacoma in hopes the local gendarmes can cure TVI thru
: sheer force of personality. As a practical matter, an undermanned group
: takes up acting like the Marines and it is welcome time to the LAPD.

:
: At the same time, as you point out, the radio-owning public has little to
: fear barring a complaint. The poor cop is out looking for drug mules to
: add one more rusty 82 Chevy to the impound lot.
:
: Dick N&#65533;BK

Good points.

I, however, think that many out there
just do not have an idea what the average
LEO goes thru. Too many have an image
of "Dragnet". Law enforcement has changed.

The average department is made up of younger
(they just do not stay around like they used to),
more fit and a bit more hard nosed individuals
these days.

BTW, did you guys know that Buddy Hatchett
had been a cop? (I think I spelled his name right,
you know the fat little comedy guy).

5181. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 14:38:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222093844.06229.00000813@mb-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 28174

>All that's
>legitimate is a demonstration of understanding of the rules and regs
>and sufficient technical competence to operate safely and without
>violating the rules or causing interference problems.

Boy, Carl most have had a hard time with the above, it took him over a Year to upgrade. What was the hardest for you to Memorize Carl, or did you just use little notes written on your hand?

5182. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 14:43:18 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a02dhn$1i6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28187
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
message news:d9f7b76c.0112210954.64cbefb7@posting.google.com...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:<9vvhp3hkd5@pita.alt.net>...
> > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > >
> > > "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
> > >
> > > My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
> > >
> > > FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in the 70s.
They
> > > were those little things with the big eyes and different colored, Don
King
> > > style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils, or on
> > > keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still around, but
not
> > as
> > > popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence in
> > popularity
> > > about ten years ago.
> >
> > That anonymous COWARD is ignorant of everything. "Woger Wussman" aka
Twatty
> > Campbell(Posts as Scott Campbell) should be familiar with the troll
doll,
> > since he was the initial model for them.
>
> hit the bricks chuckie....you aren't wanted here.....

Fuck off, Dickhead, as the Stones sing "You can't always get what you want."

5183. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 15:12:43 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112220712.6673674@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28175
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com (Twistedhed) wrote in message
news:<e9de0154.0112212347.3868de48@posting.google.com>...
> "Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net>
> news:<9vturn0l20@enews1.newsguy.com>
> Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU
>
> Well, there's always going to be some uneducated slug, who has a
> Messiah
> Complex, thinking he has every right to be above the law. Charles
> Manson,
> Adolph Hitler, Jim Jones, Son of Sam, The Zodiac Killer, the list goes
> on
> and on...
>
> I'll assume that anyone who believes radio should be free to the
> unlicensed
> public, also can't understand why they keep getting their driver's
> license
> revoked for driving under the influence, why they can't yell "fire" in
> a
> crowded theater, and they believe the people in handcuffs on COPS are
> just
> being harrassed...
>
> "Listen Jim or whatever monicker of Lelnads kennel club you are using
> today, I am quite surpassing in educational acheivement more to the
> likes of you can see for eons of time. If any of your so-called
> epithets could harm me you would be dangerous and lack the sentence
> structre to dialogue with me. I observe that you are a no-code
> CB-hater so go back to the dog pound and lap your paw some more"

you know twist.....the problem with you is this. you write articles in
magazines pertaining to radio related subjects, you operate on the
freeband and talk all over the world and of course finally.....you
don't have any numbers and letters after your name......now that my
friend is what puts the burr in their collective saddles,.....no
doubt about it.............

5184. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 15:32:28 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net>
Message-ID: <gI1V7.7112$Li3.2380900517@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 28176
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

You know SD, You surprise me
by responding to the forge. I know you
know better, check the headers.

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
message news:d9f7b76c.0112220712.6673674@posting.google.com...
> twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com (Twistedhed) wrote in message
news:<e9de0154.0112212347.3868de48@posting.google.com>...
> > "Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net>
> > news:<9vturn0l20@enews1.newsguy.com>
> > Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU
> >
> > Well, there's always going to be some uneducated slug, who has a
> > Messiah
> > Complex, thinking he has every right to be above the law. Charles
> > Manson,
> > Adolph Hitler, Jim Jones, Son of Sam, The Zodiac Killer, the list goes
> > on
> > and on...
> >
> > I'll assume that anyone who believes radio should be free to the
> > unlicensed
> > public, also can't understand why they keep getting their driver's
> > license
> > revoked for driving under the influence, why they can't yell "fire" in
> > a
> > crowded theater, and they believe the people in handcuffs on COPS are
> > just
> > being harrassed...
> >
> > "Listen Jim or whatever monicker of Lelnads kennel club you are using
> > today, I am quite surpassing in educational acheivement more to the
> > likes of you can see for eons of time. If any of your so-called
> > epithets could harm me you would be dangerous and lack the sentence
> > structre to dialogue with me. I observe that you are a no-code
> > CB-hater so go back to the dog pound and lap your paw some more"
>
> you know twist.....the problem with you is this. you write articles in
> magazines pertaining to radio related subjects, you operate on the

> freeband and talk all over the world and of course finally.....you
> don't have any numbers and letters after your name......now that my
> friend is what puts the burr in their collective saddles,......no
> doubt about it.............

5185. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 15:55:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24ade2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28177

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2401B6.E38FD6DD@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > That is exactly
> > > the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
> > > opinion while in an ARRL position.
> >
> > That is NOT what he said to Ed.
>
> He said Ed's opinion could not be taken seriously because he worked
> for the ARRL. Using the identical logic, Riley's opinion cannot be
> taken seriously because he works for the FCC.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

BUT, Dick, Larry, Dave, et al, like to shape things to their way of
thinking...

Kim W5TIT

5186. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 15:58:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24aeb5$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28178

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011221234743.13039.00001425@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3c2355fb_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >I don't dismiss at all Riley's opinion. He has every right to it. Do I
> >think it's more important that anyone else's? No. Do I think it carries
> >more validity than anyone else's? No. And, I honestly think that
> >Riley--even disagreeing with my choice of callsigns--is still far more
> >logical than anyone like you. The *BASIS* (basis, Dave, not substance)
of
> >Riley's response to me was that the FCC was not "in the business"
> >(paraphrased, I think) of judging callsigns.
>
> Kim:
>
> That is correct -- the FCC is not in the business of judging call signs.
> The reason is because, under the Vanity Call Sign program, they
> trust radio amateurs to have the maturity, good taste, and judgment
> necessary to select a call sign which is not offensive, demeaning,
> or insulting to others. If and when a person such as yourself shows
> up, and requests a call sign with the potential to take the ARS ".one
> step closer to extinction," they will still issue it, leaving the fallout
> to land on *your* head!
>

And, when will this landing on my head, happen, Larry? Haven't felt a thing
yet.

Kim W5TIT

5187. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:08:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24b11c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28180

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011221234745.13039.00001426@mb-ch.aol.com...
> In article <3c235afa_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >> Dave:
> >>
> >> Precisely. Kim is concerned with only one radio amateur -- herself.
> >>
> >
> >And whom else should I concern myself with, Larry?
>
> Kim:
>
> If you have to ask that question, you couldn't possibly understand
> the answer.
>

Oh, no. Not at all. I understand perfectly that you don't have one.

> >> The fact that she is deliberately spoiling the image of radio amateurs
> >> to outsiders means absolutely nothing to her.
> >>
> >
> >Let me suggest the same thing I did to Dave, Larry. If you are so
ashamed,
> >so concerned for your reputation, then leave ham radio.
>
> See -- proof positive that you are incapable of "getting it."
>

No. I think my statement proves that I quite understand. You think that my
callsign is a shameful mess for *all* hams and that it is detrimental to the
entire ARS. What don't I get. So, if you think that, and if you think
that it ruins any of what's left of your reputation, then I suggest you get
out---QUICK.

> >You want me to
> >concern myself with other radio amateurs, right? Which ones, Larry?
You?
> >Dave? Others who agree with you? Or should it be Cecil? Rick? Others
who
> >don't agree with you. Which ones, Larry?
>
> *All* of us, Kim -- and each and every other radio amateur who could

> see or hear your call sign, be offended by it, and consequently decide
> that they can't be bothered to pursue this hobby -- if you are
representative
> of the type of mentality that exists among radio amateurs.
>

Well, sorry. I choose to concern myself with just being a ham. If there
are people falling over behind my trail because they can't handle a
callsign, or chumming it up because they like it, that's *their* business,
not mine. And, the mentality that exists among radio amateurs is many a
varied and wonderful thing, Larry.

> >> Worse, she's doing it
> >> in the only place that matters -- on the air -- with her self-serving,
> >> sexually-suggestive call sign that demeans female hams and women
> >> in general.
> >>
> >
> >Sorry that you, a male, cannot rise above three letters and get yourself
to
> >recognize a whole callsign, Larry. On the air it sounds like W-5-T-I-T.
It
> >doesn't sound like TIT unless you really, really stretch your
> >imagination...or have prior experience. In your case, I think it's
> >imagination. [PS--I got "on the air" two mornings in a row in Dallas
this
> >week. All of about 15 minutes over the past two months. And, none on
HF].
>
> Kim, that kind of lame excuse only demonstrates your consistent lack
> of integrity. When you first appeared on this newsgroup, you were
> giggling about having chosen your callsign in order to attract attention
> to your breasts, as a means of expressing your desire to assert your
> "womanhood" as a ham radio operator, or some such drivel.

Yeah. Uh huh. *Cough* NEVER did I say any such drivel, or anything near
it. You lie.

> The suffix
> of your call sign spells "TIT" because you want other (male) hams to
> think of you and your breasts -- and, hopefully, be attracted to you
> physically because of it. You did this to gain power among your fellow
> hams by having a callsign that gave you instant notoriety, whether or
> not you were worthy of it.
>

Eeeegads you don't know me at all (I am actually quite thankful for that).
No, Larry, I couldn't care any less about whether a male (or female) ham (or
anyone else) is attracted to my tits. What the hell shall I do with this
imagined power you think I am seeking, Larry? God, your so paranoid. You
really do need to find a woman...maybe a blow up doll would even help.
Yeah, let me know what I am supposed to do with this power, K?

> >> As Riley Hollingsworth said, she has a perfect "right" to
> >> do this
>
> >And a perfect right it is.
>
> And that "right" is not now, and never has been, at issue.
>
> >> -- but the fact is that in doing so, she runs the risk of taking
> >> the ARS "...one step closer to extinction."
> >
> >You know what? I never thought of it before...but, if I have the perfect
> >right to my callsign, I also have the perfect right to take the ARS
"...one
> >step closer to extinction" don't I? Yeah, I do.
>
> In your own way of thinking, perhaps so. In my way of thinking,
> you have as much right to take the ARS ".one step closer to
> extinction" as Al Quieda had in flying those airplanes into the
> WTC and the Pentagon on 9/11.
>

OH, NICE ANALOGY! I love it. At least you didn't utter the other red
herring...you know, the Hitler one.

> >> We don't know what kind
> >> of damage she has done -- but the potential is there, and is very
> >> likely to cause some potential ham to be disillusioned.
>
> >Well, that's your opinion. And you have the perfect right to it. My
> >opinion is that if a callsign can "cause some potential ham to be
> >disillusioned" then that person needs to just get off the planet.
>
> I see -- sooooo --- if a prospective ham is disillusioned by your
> call sign, then they can should commit suicide?

Your ability to articulate needs work, Larry.

> Wow -- now
> THAT's kind of severe! I'd bet you'd make a good consort for a
> member of the Taliban -- but I doubt that they make Burkas in
> your size!
>

OH, ANOTHER GOOD ANALOGY. LOL

> >> If so, who
> >> knows who we could have lost -- or did lose! One of the real problems
> >> here is we'll never know the extent of the damage Kim has done!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >None. Not even to you. You've been having fun with this for nearly two

> >years now. My TIT is obviously the only one you've had to think about.
>
> I have a very intelligent and attractive lady friend, Kim -- but when
> I think of her, I'm not just thinking about her breasts. If you had it
> your way, that's all anyone would think about then they thought
> of you. I think *you* are the one with the weird obsession.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

I think *you* are the one who mentioned my tits while you speak of some imagined good looking and intellgent "lady" friend. Hint: sitting behind your driver's seat on the bus doesn't mean, necessarily, that she's your friend, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

5188. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:10:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222111038.10711.00000284@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 28179

>Subject: Re: .
>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>Date: 12/22/2001 7:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011222080340.13985.00001628@mb-md.aol.com>

>
>I was perfectly aware that Greg's ticket expires next month.

Then you got the whole message.

>I was referring to the total length of his license term,...(SNIP)

You were trying to read too much into it, Larry.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5189. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:14:16 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net>
Message-ID: <sj2V7.7116$9A4.2386145330@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 28181
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well Train, a lot of the BS posts are
still coming from UUNet.

Landshark

"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:vPUU7.136396$bs2.21702260@news02.optonline.net...
> The ONLY reason MIBX dropped his sorry ass was that UUNet got involved.
That
> is one internet player you DON'T want on your bad side!
> Train
>
> "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote in message
> news:OvTU7.7059$x72.2277881967@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> > Not really any that matter Scott. It's the same BS
> > that our little buddy was doing a few months back
> > To all that's concerned, for a year or more now
> > we have had a few resident trolls on rec.radio.cb.
> > They were using MIBX until after months of
> > complaints he was terminated. It seems as though
> > he is back from prep school, for Christmas vacation
> > stirring the pot.
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> >
> > --
> > Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All
> >
> >
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011221204335.191$hs@newsreader.com...
> > > gayillegalscott69@hotmail.com (Scott Unit 69) wrote:
> > > > "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:<3C232CA6.234D028D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> > > > > Train wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Your first clue should be that the thread is crossposted
> > > > >
> > > > > The second is that it came from google.com.
> > > > >
> > > > > The third clue is the posting IP: It came from AOL.
> > > >
> > > > The fourth clue is that it got me running all over Usenet like a

sissy
> > > > trying to disclaim it!
> > > >
> > > That's it,Im gonna try to killfile the entire google domain now,new
> 'puter
> > > and reader, and it need to be done. Apologies to a few google
> posters(not
> > > very many)...
> > >
> > > --
> > > ~Moparholic~
> >
> >
>
>

5190. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:14:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24b275_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28182

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2410B6.8D1A8D40@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C239257.44DC590B@earthlink.net...
> > > Krell wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C22A13A.36CDAB78@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > > The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her
> > supporters.
> > > > > She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views
and
> > > > > promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was
> > legally
> > > > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
> > >
> > > That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> > > opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official. If his support is a
moot
> > > point, why did Kim feel it necessary to seek it?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I'm running out of crayons here, Dave. At the time the solicitation
from
> > Riley was sought, there was some nitwit (not Larry) who was telling me
he
> > was going to see to it that the FCC would revoke my callsign...blah,
blah,
> > blah. At the same time our resident nitwit (Larry) was just getting
stoked
> > up. So, for both of them, and to the shut the non-resident nitwit up, I
> > wrote to Riley and asked him about the idea of the FCC revoking a
callsign,
> > in fact the FCC being interested in policing callsigns at all. Riley
is, as
> > you say, an FCC official. His response shut the non-resident nitwit up.

> > His response lit a fire under the resident nitwit--and now you.
> >
> > K?
> >
> > Got it?
> >
> > Is it sinking in?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> We know what was asked. We know what the response was. We know what
> you did about it. We know that you chose to ignore Riley's advice.
>

Oh? Really? OK, Dave. *WHAT* advice did Riley give? Hmmmmmmm?????

> That has sunk in.

Like I said in another post. In your jello of a mind, *WHAT* advice did Riley give? Remember that, while I wrote Riley for his personal opinion as an official of the FCC, he would still have been regarded as speaking on behalf of that official nature. So, what "advice" do you think Mr. Riley Hollingsworth would offer a citizen of the United States who could possibly take that as being official? Hmmm???? Just wondering what your little feeble mind is trying to contrive this time.

> So has the idea that you take anyone who thinks that
> your choice of a vanity call is in poor taste as a nitwit.
>
> Dave K8MN

Well. Exactly. Just as you think that I, and anyone who thinks it is OK, is a jerk.

Kim W5TIT

5191. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:19:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24b383_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28183

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2413DD.76E2B63F@earthlink.net...
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C239257.44DC590B@earthlink.net...
> > > > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was
> > legally
> > > > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
> > >
> > > That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> > > opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official. If his support is a
moot
> >
> > Bullshit! The only thing that needed to be said in the capacity as an
FCC
> > official is whether or not the callsign was legal. Anything additional
is
> > personal opinion.
>
> Bullshit? Is that sort of like, "I beg to disagree"? Riley spoke in
> his official capacity. He isn't the neighbor, telling Kim over the
> backyard fence, "I think you're doing a stupid thing here, Kim".
>

Riley was not speaking officially, Dave. At most, Riley was speaking his personal opinion as an FCC official. Kind of like Phil Kane offering his personal "read" on amateur radio R&R as a former FCC official. Or, kind of like asking a meteorologist his personal opinion of what he thinks the weather will do--which may contrast considerably from what is offered the public, *officially.* GADS I thought you were more intelligent than that. Riley was *not* speaking as an official of the FCC.

> > > point, why did Kim feel it necessary to seek it?
> >
> > I don't know. Why don't you ask HER?
>
> Because I'm responding to the comments of an anonymous Pittsburgh area
> type. Kim was hoping for a solid positive response. She didn't get it.
>
> Dave K8MN

You're so full of crap, Dave. You can't see past that silver spoon dangling off the end of your nose.

Kim W5TIT

5192. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:20:20 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24b3ca_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28184

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2414CA.1022734D@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > That is exactly
> > > > the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
> > > > opinion while in an ARRL position.
> > >
> > > That is NOT what he said to Ed.
> >
> > He said Ed's opinion could not be taken seriously because he worked
> > for the ARRL. Using the identical logic, Riley's opinion cannot be
> > taken seriously because he works for the FCC.
>
> ...and yours cannot be taken seriously because you told us so.
>
> Dave K8MN

I love it. Reduced to the antics of a 3-year old. Nyah nyah nyah...LOL

Kim W5TIT

5193. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:22:35 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24b451_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28185

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C241688.4530DD48@earthlink.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <3c2355fb_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
> >
> > >I don't dismiss at all Riley's opinion. He has every right to it. Do
I
> > >think it's more important that anyone else's? No. Do I think it
carries
> > >more validity than anyone else's? No. And, I honestly think that
> > >Riley--even disagreeing with my choice of callsigns--is still far more
> > >logical than anyone like you. The *BASIS* (basis, Dave, not substance)
of
> > >Riley's response to me was that the FCC was not "in the business"
> > >(paraphrased, I think) of judging callsigns.
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > That is correct -- the FCC is not in the business of judging call signs.
> > The reason is because, under the Vanity Call Sign program, they
> > trust radio amateurs to have the maturity, good taste, and judgment
> > necessary to select a call sign which is not offensive, demeaning,
> > or insulting to others. If and when a person such as yourself shows
> > up, and requests a call sign with the potential to take the ARS "�?�one
> > step closer to extinction," they will still issue it, leaving the
fallout
> > to land on *your* head!
> >
> > >It is not hard at all to deny your lie, Dave. Actually, it probably is
not
> > >a lie--it is your illogical, elitist mind telling you things you want
to
> > >hear.
> >
> > Where did Dave lie, Kim? I must have missed that!
>
> She must mean the portion where I stated that she dismissed Riley's
> view. That isn't a lie though. That is precisely what took place.
> She retained her call despite Riley's words. That certainly shows that
> she dismissed what he wrote.
>

ho ho ho....ya found a silver lining in your train of thinking, did ya?
You're hilarious. WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?

> She also perceives someone as an "elitist" when that person recognizes
> tacky as tacky.
>
> Dave K8MN

You are an elitist, Dave. A highly crappy one, but one nevertheless.

Kim W5TIT

5194. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:23:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24b476_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28186

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2415F7.A372C26@townsqr.com...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > So since Riley answered an exact question directed to him by the
> > > principal seeking his opininion, not Federal law which she aready
knew,
> > > and he honestly answered it with his personal opinion, you now
pronounce
> > > him a prude simply because his opinion doesn't match your sleazy
> > > opinion. Right, we got it.
> >
> > Yep, you got it all right. I have a lot less respect for him now
> > than I did before.
>
> About every time you post you lose even more respect. I couldn't say
that
> you have any left.
>

OH, GOD, Dick. Like you had any to begin with?????????????

LOL, Kim W5TIT

5195. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:28:32 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <a02ce202lp3@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28188
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
message news:d9f7b76c.0112220712.6673674@posting.google.com...
> twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com (Twistedhed) wrote in message
news:<e9de0154.0112212347.3868de48@posting.google.com>...
> > "Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net>
> > news:<9vturn0l20@enews1.newsguy.com>
> > Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU
> >
> > Well, there's always going to be some uneducated slug, who has a
> > Messiah
> > Complex, thinking he has every right to be above the law. Charles
> > Manson,
> > Adolph Hitler, Jim Jones, Son of Sam, The Zodiac Killer, the list goes
> > on
> > and on...
> >
> > I'll assume that anyone who believes radio should be free to the
> > unlicensed
> > public, also can't understand why they keep getting their driver's
> > license
> > revoked for driving under the influence, why they can't yell "fire" in
> > a
> > crowded theater, and they believe the people in handcuffs on COPS are
> > just
> > being harrassed...
> >
> > "Listen Jim or whatever monicker of Lelnads kennel club you are using
> > today, I am quite surpassing in educational acheivement more to the
> > likes of you can see for eons of time. If any of your so-called
> > epithets could harm me you would be dangerous and lack the sentence
> > structre to dialogue with me. I observe that you are a no-code
> > CB-hater so go back to the dog pound and lap your paw some more"
>
> you know twist.....the problem with you is this. you write articles in
> magazines pertaining to radio related subjects, you operate on the
> freeband and talk all over the world and of course finally.....you
> don't have any numbers and letters after your name......now that my
> friend is what puts the burr in their collective saddles,.....no
> doubt about it.............

nah, what irks me is he's an asshole.

5196. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 16:34:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24ba07_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28189

"Martin" <mdwade@mobiletelZ.com> wrote in message
news:3C23F682.26F8@mobiletelZ.com...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:yuRU7.10753$BX4.940960@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > > See below for comments.
> > > Josey Wales <nothanks@nospam.com> wrote in message
> > > news:yNPU7.4707$_f.114138@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > That's correct. If you refuse, they can get a warrant and detain
you if
> > > it
> > > > takes 12 hours to get it if they want. They will likely then tear
your
> > > car
> > > > apart looking for drugs, not reassemble it for you of course, while
a
> > drug
> > > > dog is turned loose inside and outside your car with his claws
> > scratching
> > > > the shit out of your paint job. Don't be so naive as to think they
> > can't
> > > > ruin their day in any number of ways. Refuse a search and it's
assumed
> > > you
> > > > have something to hide. You do have rights but there are ways too
> > > numerous
> > > > to mention how they can make your day a real bitch.
> > >
> > > I am asking a question here, so don't think I am being smarty, OK? If
an
> > > officer
> > > "suspects" you of something and tears up your vehicle, paint,
upholstery,
> > > etc., if he
> > > finds nothing, wouldn't there be recourse for the owner of the vehicle
for
> > > damage of the vehicle.
> > > That would seem most unfair to be able to rip up someone's car on
> > > "suspicion".
> > >
> >
> > I've witnessed two occasions where, in one, an apartment of some friends
of

> > my brother was torn apart in a "drug raid." Every single box of
whatever
> > was turned upside down and dumped in the middle of the kitchen floor,
> > speaker grills on the stereo were cut, sofa cushions and back were cut,
all
> > furniture was tossed every which way, framed pictures yanked (yes,
yanked)
> > off the walls and paper backing torn off...and on and on. By the time
the
> > cops were done, the apartment looked worse than any vandals could ever
have
> > hoped, the cops were empty-handed (turned out it was tenant wars--the
> > upstairs tenants had called with "suspicion" that there was drug dealing
> > going on because they were mad at the volume of the stereo) and not even
an
> > apology was uttered as they went out the door. There were about 7-8 of
them
> > and I guarantee you that every neighbor and visitor around there had
their
> > chins hanging to the ground in literal shock. There was no recoourse
for
> > these people to have anything cleaned, replaced, or repaired.
> >
> > In another, a car's seats and headliner were cut open for the same
thing.
> > Again, nothing found, no apology, no repairs.
> >
> > "There are ways" bad cops will force compliance with their wishes.
"There
> > are ways" you'd wish there *was* something for you to get busted
for--the
> > court costs and attorney fees are a lot cheaper than replacing personal
> > property. One of the satirical laughs we used to come up with was "for
> > god's sake, keep some weed around so we can give it to them when they
crash
> > in through the front door!"
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Did you watch the Dateline story on Louisiana a few years back about
> car searches at the border? Several agencies had to repair several
> cars and undo a lot of damage. Don't find anything in Louisiana, you
> had better be willing to explain to the Judge (the officer requesting
> the search) why you had your suspecions about the search. Louisiana
> Internal Affairs (State Police Unit) is curious also and doesn't
> like being made a fool of, especially on national tv. Usually the
> Drug Dog has just wee'd itself before the request is aired, else
> a no-show gets hard to explain.

heh heh. And, I've always heard that Louisiana is the most crooked state in the United States in terms of laws...

Kim W5TIT

5197. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 18:23:10 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a02iv401pqb@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28192
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gopy6x6.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 10:25:02 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >I posted a cite in my original response. There is a magazine entitled
"2600"
> >that has been writing about the same subject for quite some time -
keeping
> >modern technology in the hands of private corporations and out of the
hands
> >of the public.
>
> The credibility of "2600" is expressed by the last two digits in its
> name.
>
> If you want more, read the DMCA of 1998. It's basically made
> >it illegal to take something apart to see how it works.
>
> A good friend of mine who is a high-up lawyer with the Motion
> Picture Association of America has convinced me that the techno
> pirates brought such draconian laws upon themselves.

Yeah. Right. The same way that law-abiding gun owners bring on draconian
gun laws.

Judging from your "credibility" statement about 2600, I doubt that your
lawyer friend had to try very hard to convince you. If you want to find out
how quickly this law was rushed through congress without any challenge as to
its constitutionality, look up the congressional record to see how your
represenative and senators voted.

5198. Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:06:06 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a02lo5$ci6$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28194

http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/6/23494.html

"In a five-page order released Friday, the US Federal Communications Commission (FCC) claims that 38-year old convicted hacker Kevin Mitnick is not morally fit to be a ham radio operator. "

Mitnick isn't an A-rab name, is it?

This is bordering on unhealthy obsession. The government apparently sees him as some sort of M3G4 - 3V1L 5UP3RG3N1U5. To my knowledge, only one of THOSE exists: http://users.mfi.net//~jfwallace/spurrier.html

73 Corry K4DOH
--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

I have sold more books about physics than Madonna has about sex.
- Stephen Hawking

5199. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:21:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C24DD53.5595CDC7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28195

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Kim's call sign doesn't make me feel bad, ...

If Kim's call sign doesn't make you feel bad then why the
heck have you spent weeks complaining about it. You sure
don't understand yourself or human nature very well, Larry.

Kim's callsign makes you feel bad - that's why you waste
so much time ragging on her about it. Ask yourself this
question: If you felt neutral or good about Kim's callsign,
would you be complaining so much about it? Obviously not.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5200. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:26:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C24DE51.EF1AB2D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28196

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> If you have to ask that question, you couldn't possibly understand
> the answer.

Aha! The old argumentum ad ignorantiam. You sure are full of diversions.

> *All* of us, Kim -- and each and every other radio amateur who could
> see or hear your call sign, be offended by it, and consequently decide
> that they can't be bothered to pursue this hobby -- if you are representative
> of the type of mentality that exists among radio amateurs.

I find you to be offensive, Larry. Exactly what are you going to do
about it?

> And that "right" is not now, and never has been, at issue.

The issue is: Does Kim have the right to live her life as she pleases
or should she be your slave. The Constitution answers that question
very well.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5201. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:28:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C24DED0.D536F667@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28197

Dick Carroll wrote:
> About every time you post you lose even more respect. I couldn't say that
> you have any left.

Dick, if you respected me, that would make me a slimeball - no thanks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5202. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:29:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C24DF14.9B8A2628@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28198

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > He said Ed's opinion could not be taken seriously because he worked
> > for the ARRL. Using the identical logic, Riley's opinion cannot be
> > taken seriously because he works for the FCC.
>
> ...and yours cannot be taken seriously because you told us so.

IMHO, nothing posted on this newsgroup can be taken seriously.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5203. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:31:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C24DF8D.E29D5940@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28199

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > That is exactly
> > > > the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
> > > > opinion while in an ARRL position.
> > >
> > > That is NOT what he said to Ed.
> >
> > He said Ed's opinion could not be taken seriously because he worked
> > for the ARRL. Using the identical logic, Riley's opinion cannot be
> > taken seriously because he works for the FCC.
>
> Don't you ever get tired of lying and making up shit? He and I said
> that Ed's opinions couldn't be taken as his independent beliefs since he
> works at ARRL and he said that his bosses knew that he wouldn't say
> anything contrary to official policy.

The same conclusion still applies. If Ed cannot be taken seriously because
he works for the ARRL then Riley cannot be taken seriously because he
works for the FCC. You cannot have your cake and eat it too.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5204. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:33:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C24E006.31FB7868@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28200

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Sorry Larry, Riley has proved he has prudish hangups and I have
> >lost a lot of respect for him because of that. He offered his
> >personal opinion while in an FCC position. That is exactly
> >the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
> >opinion while in an ARRL position. You are a hypocrite.
>
> Don't look now, but I didn't say that.

Of course you did, Larry. The entire newsgroup read it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5205. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:34:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c24e116_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28201

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C24DD53.5595CDC7@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > Kim's call sign doesn't make me feel bad, ...
>
> If Kim's call sign doesn't make you feel bad then why the
> heck have you spent weeks complaining about it. You sure
> don't understand yourself or human nature very well, Larry.
>
> Kim's callsign makes you feel bad - that's why you waste
> so much time ragging on her about it. Ask yourself this
> question: If you felt neutral or good about Kim's callsign,
> would you be complaining so much about it? Obviously not.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

;p I actually think Larry *does* feel good about my callsign! He just doesn't realize what pleasure he takes in thinking he is 'being superior' by constant nagging and complaining about me. Larry's one of those folks who finds dark rain in even the shiniest of silver clouds. I've got a sister-in-law like that. She'll invent something evil and dark and ferociously unhappy even if the whole world around her is perfect. Larry can't stand happiness. I mean, for goodness sake, look at all the posts by him that the whole rest of the world is all wrong and he is the only thing that is right about it. Eh? See what I mean?

Kim W5TIT

5206. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:38:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C24E131.97A70EE4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28202

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Second, I'm an Extra .
>
> Well look A$$ Wipe, maybe you ought to inform QRZ, they still have you as a
> Tech

Say Bruce, still don't know about CSCEs?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5207. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:47:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C24E340.AF8A2675@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28203

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> ;p I actually think Larry *does* feel good about my callsign! He just
> doesn't realize what pleasure he takes in thinking he is 'being superior' by
> constant nagging and complaining about me. Larry's one of those folks who
> finds dark rain in even the shiniest of silver clouds. I've got a
> sister-in-law like that. She'll invent something evil and dark and
> ferociously unhappy even if the whole world around her is perfect. Larry
> can't stand happiness. I mean, for goodness sake, look at all the posts by
> him that the whole rest of the world is all wrong and he is the only thing
> that is right about it. Eh? See what I mean?

Yes, I get it now. Larry is sorta like the masochist who enjoys pain. He
enjoyed ragging on Ed but since Ed is scarce nowadays, he *enjoys*
ragging on you. Your callsign is bringing joy to an otherwise boring
life. I *do* understand. This is how Larry has fun. So keep spreading
the joy, Kim.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5208. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 19:50:13 UTC
From: Richard Clark <kb7qhc@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <e0p92uce6r4lfje4ea241av3t6pg0t9m4g@4ax.com>
Source record: 28204
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 17:59:02 -0800, "Patrick Keele"
<pkg1dra@g1dra.freeserve.co.uk> wrote:

>WHY do you use that STUPID word "MINDSET"?What the hell is a MINDSET?Do you
>mean it's how someone thinks?Can i buy this "mindset" in a store or
>shop???why don't you speak PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH??????????
>
>I am british and i am SICK of the british using and picking up STUPID
>americanisms in the uk! WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
>countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
>
>MOST cbers as you call them in the uk who use SSB/AM ARE criminals and often
>get caught to.Any bad reputation the cb fraternity have is mainly due to
>their own illegal operations and behaviour.you REAP what you SOW!
>
>PK
>

Hi All,

The origins of English are found in the both the nordic and romance
languages. That is, English borrows heavily from German and French.
There is, of course, a considerable amount of Latin (whose roots are
found in India's sanskrit).

>PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH

From the Oxford English Dictionary we find:
Plain - Old French, plaign, or from French plein, or Latin planum;
Ordinary - early Old French ordinaire or Latin ordinarious;
Commonsense - Greek, or Latin sensus communis
English - Old Teutonic anglisko

>WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
>countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!

Indeed....
What - Old teutonic hwat (English juggles spelling too)
Other - Dutch and German ander
Society - Old French societe
In - Old High German, Teutonic
The - Sanskrit tat
World - Teutonic weorold
Imports - Latin importare
Another - see Other, above (English also compounds like german)

Country's (misspelled above) - Old French contrï¿½e
Language - French langage and Latin lingua
To - Old Teutonic ta or Lithuanian da
Replace - Bingo! No derivation shown.
its (misspelled above) - Bingo! however original English was hit
Own - Old Teutonic aigano
How - Old Norse haug
Pathetic - Late Latin patheticus

Even the puffery of being Anglo-Saxon relates to the German tribes of Angles, Saxons and Jutes. Hence our correspondent above barely qualifies as English literate (at 10% for original English content with points lost for spelling throughout).

If you want correspondence in original English, from "Cï¿½dmon's Hymn"
Nu sculon herigean heofonrices Weard
Meotodes meahte and his modgeï¿½anc
weore Wuldor-Fï¿½der swa he wundra gehwï¿½
ece Drihten or onstealede
He ï¿½rest sceop ielda nearnum
heofon to hrofe halig Scyppend
Da middangeard moncynnes Weard
ece Drihten ï¿½fter teode
firum foldan Frea aelmihtig

The split in the stanzas is known as a Cï¿½sura, a pacing device, or pause during recitation.

Perhaps this little piece offers a compelling answer to that pining
>WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
>countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
because the word "modgeï¿½anc" means mindset. :-O

73's
Richard Clark, KB7QHC

5209. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 20:01:47 UTC
From: gayillegalscott69@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <4303d5a2.0112221201.1fb1e436@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28205
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote in message
news:<gI1V7.7112$Li3.2380900517@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> You know SD, You surprise me
> by responding to the forge. I know you
> know better, check the headers.
>
> Landshark
>

Again Landshark we do not understand your sudden transformation from "free spirit" to "NET COP". Your sig file is "BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN" but now you are getting down on people for breaking rules on Usenet. What's the deal? Are you screwed up in the head? Or are you some kind of h y p o c r i t e?

5210. Re: Question for Beer Experts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 20:03:43 UTC
From: kcashion@datasync.com
Message-ID: <3c24e6ee.14180426@news.datasync.com>
Source record: 28193
Cross-posted to: alt.beer,rec.food.drink.beer,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 13:24:59 -0500, "Ed Cregger" <nm2k@arrl.net>
wrote:

>Slumming again, Ken? <G>

Ed, I do get around a little...and I try to enjoy myself while
learning. :o)

Ken Cashion

5211. Re: FS: Hitler's Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 20:11:43 UTC
From: gayillegalscott69@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <4303d5a2.0112221211.5f53fae8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28206
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote in message
news:<OvTU7.7059$x72.2277881967@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> Not really any that matter Scott. It's the same BS
> that our little buddy was doing a few months back
> To all that's concerned, for a year or more now
> we have had a few resident trolls on rec.radio.cb.
> They were using MIBX until after months of
> complaints he was terminated. It seems as though
> he is back from prep school, for Christmas vacation
> stirring the pot.
>
> Landshark
>
>

Yeah just one thing Landshark. How come you have become a NET COP? You are going around like a small town sherrif enforcing Usenet rules. It's sickening. I mean, YOU were the one that taught me 'BAD CITIZENS HAVE MORE FUN" and snitches are assholes. What the hell is going on? You are making us all confused.

5212. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 20:49:00 UTC
From: Richard Clark <kb7qhc@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <oar92u8tssiansirqbo36akht9aq9pjul0@4ax.com>
Source record: 28208
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 20:16:40 -0800, "Patrick Keele"
<pkg1dra@g1dra.freeserve.co.uk> wrote:

>
>Richard Clark <kb7qhc@attbi.com> wrote in message
>news:e0p92uce6r4lfje4ea241av3t6pg0t9m4g@4ax.com...
>> On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 17:59:02 -0800, "Patrick Keele"
>> <pkg1dra@g1dra.freeserve.co.uk> wrote:
>>
>> >WHY do you use that STUPID word "MINDSET"?What the hell is a MINDSET?Do
>you
>> >mean it's how someone thinks?Can i buy this "mindset" in a store or
>> >shop???why don't you speak PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH??????????
>> >
>> >I am british and i am SICK of the british using and picking up STUPID
>> >americanisms in the uk! WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
>> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
>> >
>> >MOST cbers as you call them in the uk who use SSB/AM ARE criminals and
>often
>> >get caught to.Any bad reputation the cb fraternity have is mainly due to
>> >their own illegal operations and behaviour.you REAP what you SOW!
>> >
>> >PK
>> >
>>
>> Hi All,
>>
>> The origins of English are found in the both the nordic and romance
>> languages. That is, English borrows heavily from German and French.
>> There is, of course, a considerable amount of Latin (whose roots are
>> found in India's sanskrit).
>>
>> >PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH
>>
>> From the Oxford English Dictionary we find:
>> Plain - Old French, plaign, or from French plein, or Latin planum;
>> Ordinary - early Old French ordinaire or Latin ordinarious;
>> Commonsense - Greek, or Latin sensus communis
>> English - Old Teutonic anglisko
>>
>> >WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
>> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!

>>
>> Indeed....
>> What - Old teutonic hwat (English juggles spelling too)
>> Other - Dutch and German ander
>> Society - Old French societe
>> In - Old High German, Teutonic
>> The - Sanskrit tat
>> World - Teutonic weorold
>> Imports - Latin importare
>> Another - see Other, above (English also compounds like german)
>> Country's (misspelled above) - Old French contrï¿½e
>> Language - French langage and Latin lingua
>> To - Old Teutonic ta or Lithuanian da
>> Replace - Bingo! No derivation shown.
>> its (misspelled above) - Bingo! however original English was hit
>> Own - Old Teutonic aigano
>> How - Old Norse haug
>> Pathetic - Late Latin patheticus
>>
>> Even the puffery of being Anglo-Saxon relates to the German tribes of
>> Angles, Saxons and Jutes. Hence our correspondent above barely
>> qualifies as English literate (at 10% for original English content
>> with points lost for spelling throughout).
>>
>> If you want correspondence in original English, from "Cï¿½dmon's Hymn"
>> Nu sculon herigean heofonrices Weard
>> Meotodes meahte and his modgeï¿½anc
>> weore Wuldor-Fï¿½der swa he wundra gehwï¿½
>> ece Drihten or onstealede
>> He ï¿½rest sceop ielda nearnum
>> heofon to hrofe halig Scyppend
>> Da middangeard moncynnes Weard
>> ece Drihten ï¿½fter teode
>> firum foldan Frea aelmihtig
>>
>> The split in the stanzas is known as a Cï¿½sura, a pacing device, or
>> pause during recitation.
>>
>> Perhaps this little piece offers a compelling answer to that pining
>> >WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
>> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
>> because the word "modgeï¿½anc" means mindset. :-O
>>
>> 73's
>> Richard Clark, KB7QHC
>
>Well,well.Congratulations to an excellent reply to my topic.
>Some of my text was composed in haste.10 out of 10 for oginality,or was it
>composed by cutting and pasting from various dictionaries or one or more
>thesaurus?:)

>
>PK
>

Hi OM,

The olde fashion way, reading and typing. All references are within 6 feet of me. "Cï¿½dmon's Hymn" was courtesy of "The Norton Anthology of English Literature."

One of the pleasures of English found before Shaksper is that so much of it written seems like gibberish - until you hear it. With Shaksper's work, the language grew enormously (but his work was actually written in an old dialect that was not spoken during his time). Where the educated citizen has a vocabulary of say 10,000 words, his works reveal nearly three times that.

The conceit of Shaksper is a product of having just seen "The Beard Of Avon" two nights ago. [No that wasn't a typo, it is a comic stage play of the "authorship problem."]

73's
Richard Clark, KB7QHC, B.A. English

5213. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 21:02:14 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222160214.05233.00000400@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 28209

>> >WHY do you use that STUPID word "MINDSET"?What the hell is a MINDSET?Do
>you
>> >mean it's how someone thinks?Can i buy this "mindset" in a store or
>> >shop???why don't you speak PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH??????????
>> >
>> >I am british and i am SICK of the british using and picking up STUPID
>> >americanisms in the uk! WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
>> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
>> >
>> >MOST cbers as you call them in the uk who use SSB/AM ARE criminals and
>often
>> >get caught to.Any bad reputation the cb fraternity have is mainly due to
>> >their own illegal operations and behaviour.you REAP what you SOW!
>> >
>> >PK
>> >
>>
>> Hi All,
>>
>> The origins of English are found in the both the nordic and romance
>> languages. That is, English borrows heavily from German and French.
>> There is, of course, a considerable amount of Latin (whose roots are
>> found in India's sanskrit).
>>
>> >PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH
>>
>> From the Oxford English Dictionary we find:
>> Plain - Old French, plaign, or from French plein, or Latin planum;
>> Ordinary - early Old French ordinaire or Latin ordinarious;
>> Commonsense - Greek, or Latin sensus communis
>> English - Old Teutonic anglisko
>>
>> >WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
>> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
>>
>> Indeed....
>> What - Old teutonic hwat (English juggles spelling too)
>> Other - Dutch and German ander
>> Society - Old French societe
>> In - Old High German, Teutonic
>> The - Sanskrit tat
>> World - Teutonic weorold
>> Imports - Latin importare
>> Another - see Other, above (English also compounds like german)

>> Country's (misspelled above) - Old French contrï¿½e
>> Language - French langage and Latin lingua
>> To - Old Teutonic ta or Lithuanian da
>> Replace - Bingo! No derivation shown.
>> its (misspelled above) - Bingo! however original English was hit
>> Own - Old Teutonic aigano
>> How - Old Norse haug
>> Pathetic - Late Latin patheticus
>>
>> Even the puffery of being Anglo-Saxon relates to the German tribes of
>> Angles, Saxons and Jutes. Hence our correspondent above barely
>> qualifies as English literate (at 10% for original English content
>> with points lost for spelling throughout).
>>
>> If you want correspondence in original English, from "Cï¿½dmon's Hymn"
>> Nu sculon herigean heofonrices Weard
>> Meotodes meahte and his modgeï¿½anc
>> weore Wuldor-Fï¿½der swa he wundra gehwï¿½
>> ece Drihten or onstealede
>> He ï¿½rest sceop ielda nearnum
>> heofon to hrofe halig Scyppend
>> Da middangeard moncynnes Weard
>> ece Drihten ï¿½fter teode
>> firum foldan Frea aelmihtig
>>
>> The split in the stanzas is known as a Cï¿½sura, a pacing device, or
>> pause during recitation.
>>
>> Perhaps this little piece offers a compelling answer to that pining
>> >WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
>> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
>> because the word "modgeï¿½anc" means mindset. :-O
>>
>> 73's
>> Richard Clark, KB7QHC
>
>Well,well.Congratulations to an excellent reply to my topic.
>Some of my text was composed in haste.10 out of 10 for oginality,or was it
>composed by cutting and pasting from various dictionaries or one or more
>thesaurus?:)
>
>PK

Ok Patrick. You're a wanker. Better? It's dufus' with a "mind-set" like yours that makes me glad my parents emigrated from the UK...aw heck let's just call it England...before I was conceived.

No so nice when someone responds in a mean fashion, hmm? Think about that next time you feel an attack of pomposity coming on. My folks have had so many people from "back home" come over and act like they're better than the "yankees." (Perhaps that's why they're my favorite baseball team...word

association.) Take care and 73.

Mark

5214. Re: Who in the pluperfect is George?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 21:10:11 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222161011.05233.00000401@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 28210

>So who in hell is George???

Sorry about that, Dick. Our friend...Old man in PA, middlefinger4, etc. posted his first name and call, George. Take care and 73.

Mark

5215. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 21:12:15 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222161215.05233.00000402@mb-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 28211

>What happens
>to
>> the Advanced licensees when they renew? Can one retain his/her Advanced
>ticket
>> indefinitely? Just curious. Take care and 73.
>> Mark
>
>At this time, with the current rules, an Advanced can renew as an Advanced
>indefinitely. The FCC could change that in the future, but that's
>the way it is now.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Thanks Bill. Take care and 73.

Mark

5216. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 21:12:57 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <ACAA129EBB074F0E.97CC7AD30D38B62C.680DA1D2E8CA22E9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28212

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 21:44:54 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>He said Ed's opinion could not be taken seriously because he worked
>for the ARRL. Using the identical logic, Riley's opinion cannot be
>taken seriously because he works for the FCC.

I guess his views on the arrl are situational--if you
remember, the other day he told me that if I doubted that the ARS was
defined as "family oriented" I should check with the arrl. Presumably,
they are a legitimate source of definitions so long as he agrees with
them--but when he disagrees, they aren't to be taken seriously.

How very convenient.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5217. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 21:32:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8CD927DECEB9ED59.AF3C7F3C059F815B.C682CC1D864B079A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28213

On 22 Dec 2001 04:47:46 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Notwithstanding the state of my "bubble," it was/is the ARRL that has
>made the statements regarding the "family-oriented" nature of the ARS
>to which I am now responding. It was a prime argument made by ARRL
>officials who, in spite of the current policy of the ARRL, gave support
>to the notion of reducing and/or eliminating the code testing requirements
>in any future proceedings to alter the amateur licensing system. I didn't
>mention the FCC because the FCC is strictly a regulatory agency of the
>federal government -- not "The National Organization for Amateur Radio."

Do I understand correctly that Larry Roll is using arguments
raised in support of the elimination of any code requirements to make
a point about the nature of amateur radio?

Larry, either those views have no value, and can thus be
discounted completely, or they DO have value, in which case your
direct opposition to the elimination of the code requirements marks
you as FAR more harmful to the ARS than Kim's call sign could possibly
be! You can't have it both ways--if the statements are from a credible
and qualified source YOU are violating your own standards; if they are
not from a credible and qualified source they have no bearing on Kim
or anyone else what-so-ever.

>I can't speak for Dick, but I, as an ARRL member, consider the policies
>of that organization to reflect on me, personally, as a U.S. licensed
>radio amateur. Therefore, the ARRL does indirectly "speak" for me.
>I may not agree with what they are saying, but that doesn't stop them
>from saying it!

Guess what?

If it's ok for YOU (an arrl member) to disagree with what they
are saying, it's certainly just as reasonable for Kim to do so as
well! Even if the arrl DID view her call sign as offensive (and, so
far as I've seen, there has been NO "official" pronouncement from the
arrl about her call sign at all) it would have no more direct bearing
on her decision than their support for no-code licensure has on your
own decision to oppose that policy.

If you want the arrl view, since you claim that Ed Hare "toes
the line" to arrl policy when he posts, why not ask HIS opinion?

>They have a perfect right to state their opinions here, as long as they are
>clearly identified as being the official position of the ARRL -- and that
>is done simply by identifying themselves as such.

Can we take it, then, that your views concerning what is
offensive and what is not represent the official position of the bus
company you drive for? After all, you DO make it clear that you work
for them--certainly as clear as Ed made it that he works for the
ARRL--and "offensiveness" is as much a legitimate concern of transit
companies as it is of amateur radio organizations.

You aren't speaking for your firm? Then why on earth would it
be a given that any one else is, either?

>Ed Hare never made
>it any secret that he was the director of the ARRL Lab -- and so he,
>therefore, speaks as an ARRL official.

No, he speaks as an expert in one area of amateur radio
technology. And in that area it's pretty safe to say that most readers
would accept his views as being accurate, wouldn't you?

> Ed never even took the simple
>step of including a disclaimer on his signature line, stating that his
>opinions were strictly his own, and not those of his employer. Therefore,
>I had to infer that he was, indeed, speaking in the capacity of an ARRL
>official.

Fair enough.

From now on, based on your OWN statement above, we'll just
assume that your statements are made speaking in your official
capacity as a bus driver.

That should be "fare."

>Rick, it would have been a lot easier for you to say, "Larry, I'm not
>going to do that, because *you're* right!"

Of course it would.

It wouldn't have been true.

But it would have been easier.

Is that why YOU make so many inaccurate statements--or are
those "professional" pronouncements from the "driver's seat?"

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5218. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 21:37:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E1422B87ED28BEF9.E7298A00386C35B4.FCA005A88FA1112B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28214

On 22 Dec 2001 04:47:47 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>If it makes you feel any better, I own a significant interest in several
>tracts of commercial property in New York.

Slumlord, huh?

>I simply choose not to
>live in that state, and I hadn't decided to stay in Delaware permanently
>until just this past year, when I got my present job. What I don't
>understand is what this matters to others. My business is my
>business -- and as long as my business doesn't bring the ARS
>"...one step closer to extinction," like Kim's call sign, then get your
>nose out of it!

Er, Driver . . . Driver . . . You missed your stop!

YOU are the one who started using the term "trailer trash,"
remember? Since you attacked others on their choice of homes, it's
only reasonable to open the subject of your OWN choice of residences
to discussion as well.

Now we know that you not only live in an apartment, but
wouldn't consider living on the property you DO own. That's GOT to be
pretty bad, Larry, if even "renter wreckage" won't live there!

Rick <--homeowner

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5219. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 21:47:06 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@icok.net>
Message-ID: <3C24FF42.AF13518E@icok.net>
Source record: 28215
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Patrick,
As an 'aside', all other societies 'import' and use words and
phrases from other countries or societies. Take English for
example,
it's an amalgam of several other languages, with very few
'unmodified'
words from the original Saxon, Gaelic, Goth, German, Latin, and
Engl
remaining.
'Doc

5220. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 22:06:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C250386.413BAF74@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28216

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2410B6.8D1A8D40@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C239257.44DC590B@earthlink.net...
> > > > Krell wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C22A13A.36CDAB78@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > > The fact remains, Kim set out to enlist Riley as one of her
> > > supporters.
> > > > > > She didn't like his response, which was 180 degrees from her views
> and
> > > > > > promptly dismissed it. That is pretty hard to deny.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was
> > > legally
> > > > > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
> > > > >
> > > > That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> > > > opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official. If his support is a
> moot
> > > > point, why did Kim feel it necessary to seek it?
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > I'm running out of crayons here, Dave. At the time the solicitation
> from
> > > Riley was sought, there was some nitwit (not Larry) who was telling me
> he
> > > was going to see to it that the FCC would revoke my callsign...blah,
> blah,
> > > blah. At the same time our resident nitwit (Larry) was just getting
> stoked
> > > up. So, for both of them, and to the shut the non-resident nitwit up, I
> > > wrote to Riley and asked him about the idea of the FCC revoking a
> callsign,
> > > in fact the FCC being interested in policing callsigns at all. Riley
```

> is, as
> > > you say, an FCC official. His response shut the non-resident nitwit up.
> > > His response lit a fire under the resident nitwit--and now you.
> > >
> > > K?
> > >
> > > Got it?
> > >
> > > Is it sinking in?
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > We know what was asked. We know what the response was. We know what
> > you did about it. We know that you chose to ignore Riley's advice.
> >
>
> Oh? Really? OK, Dave. *WHAT* advice did Riley give? Hmmmmmmm?????
>
> > That has sunk in.
>
> Like I said in another post. In your jello of a mind, *WHAT* advice did
> Riley give? Remember that, while I wrote Riley for his personal opinion as
> an official of the FCC, he would still have been regarded as speaking on
> behalf of that official nature. So, what "advice" do you think Mr. Riley
> Hollingsworth would offer a citizen of the United States who could possibly
> take that as being official? Hmmm???? Just wondering what your little
> feeble mind is trying to contrive this time.

One step closer to extinction...

Further, Riley did NOT say, "I think you've made a fine decision, Kim"
or "Anyone who would take offense at your call must be made, Kim".

> > So has the idea that you take anyone who thinks that
> > your choice of a vanity call is in poor taste as a nitwit.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Well. Exactly. Just as you think that I, and anyone who thinks it is OK,
> is a jerk.

Not really, Kim. I don't believe that you have any concept of what is
appropriate. I don't know how many think it is "OK". You've received a
few statements of support here. You've also heard from a number who
believe that you've shown a lack of class.

Dave K8MN

5221. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 22:10:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C25044C.4766B089@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28217

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2413DD.76E2B63F@earthlink.net...
> > Krell wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C239257.44DC590B@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Riley's personal opinion has nothing to do with a callsign that was
> > > legally
> > > > > issued. His support, or non-support, is a moot point.
> > > >
> > > > That simply is not the case. Riley wasn't speaking from his personal
> > > > opinion. He was speaking as an FCC official. If his support is a
> moot
> > >
> > > Bullshit! The only thing that needed to be said in the capacity as an
> FCC
> > > official is whether or not the callsign was legal. Anything additional
> is
> > > personal opinion.
> >
> > Bullshit? Is that sort of like, "I beg to disagree"? Riley spoke in
> > his official capacity. He isn't the neighbor, telling Kim over the
> > backyard fence, "I think you're doing a stupid thing here, Kim".
> >
>
> Riley was not speaking officially, Dave. At most, Riley was speaking his
> personal opinion as an FCC official. Kind of like Phil Kane offering his
> personal "read" on amateur radio R&R as a former FCC official. Or, kind of
> like asking a meteorologist his personal opinion of what he thinks the
> weather will do--which may contrast considerably from what is offered the
> public, *officially.* GADS I thought you were more intelligent than that.
> Riley was *not* speaking as an official of the FCC.

So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?

> > > > point, why did Kim feel it necessary to seek it?
> > >
> > > I don't know. Why don't you ask HER?
> >
> > Because I'm responding to the comments of an anonymous Pittsburgh area
> > type. Kim was hoping for a solid positive response. She didn't get it.
> >

> > Dave K8MN
>
> You're so full of crap, Dave. You can't see past that silver spoon dangling
> off the end of your nose.

What's with this "silver spoon" stuff, Kim? This is perhaps the third
or fourth time you've used it with me? What has it to do with my
comment? Did you or did you not receive the positive response you
sought from Riley?

Dave K8MN

5222. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 22:13:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C250511.92F4443@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28218

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C241688.4530DD48@earthlink.net...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3c2355fb_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> writes:
> > >
> > > >I don't dismiss at all Riley's opinion. He has every right to it. Do
> I
> > > >think it's more important that anyone else's? No. Do I think it
> carries
> > > >more validity than anyone else's? No. And, I honestly think that
> > > >Riley--even disagreeing with my choice of callsigns--is still far more
> > > >logical than anyone like you. The *BASIS* (basis, Dave, not substance)
> of
> > > >Riley's response to me was that the FCC was not "in the business"
> > > >(paraphrased, I think) of judging callsigns.
> > >
> > > Kim:
> > >
> > > That is correct -- the FCC is not in the business of judging call signs.
> > > The reason is because, under the Vanity Call Sign program, they
> > > trust radio amateurs to have the maturity, good taste, and judgment
> > > necessary to select a call sign which is not offensive, demeaning,
> > > or insulting to others. If and when a person such as yourself shows
> > > up, and requests a call sign with the potential to take the ARS "ï¿½?ï¿½one
> > > step closer to extinction," they will still issue it, leaving the
> fallout
> > > to land on *your* head!
> > >
> > > >It is not hard at all to deny your lie, Dave. Actually, it probably is
> not
> > > >a lie--it is your illogical, elitist mind telling you things you want
> to
> > > >hear.
> > >
> > > Where did Dave lie, Kim? I must have missed that!
> >
> > She must mean the portion where I stated that she dismissed Riley's
> > view. That isn't a lie though. That is precisely what took place.
> > She retained her call despite Riley's words. That certainly shows that
> > she dismissed what he wrote.

> >
>
> ho ho ho....ya found a silver lining in your train of thinking, did ya?
> You're hilarious. WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?

Because it is the right thing to do.

> > She also perceives someone as an "elitist" when that person recognizes
> > tacky as tacky.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You are an elitist, Dave. A highly crappy one, but one nevertheless.

Why would that be the case? Is it because I didn't choose a tacky
callsign? Is it because I've stated that I find your choice of calls is
tacky and lacking in judgement?

I've always wondered: Is Kim short for Kimodo?

Dave K8MN

5223. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 22:23:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C25074D.9742EA0B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28219

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > If you have to ask that question, you couldn't possibly understand
> > the answer.
>
> Aha! The old argumentum ad ignorantiam. You sure are full of diversions.
>
> > *All* of us, Kim -- and each and every other radio amateur who could
> > see or hear your call sign, be offended by it, and consequently decide
> > that they can't be bothered to pursue this hobby -- if you are representative
> > of the type of mentality that exists among radio amateurs.
>
> I find you to be offensive, Larry. Exactly what are you going to do
> about it?
>
> > And that "right" is not now, and never has been, at issue.
>
> The issue is: Does Kim have the right to live her life as she pleases
> or should she be your slave. The Constitution answers that question
> very well.

Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the events
which have unfolded over the past several months.

Kim's "rights" are not without limits.

Dave K8MN

5224. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 22:24:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C250790.6A39D430@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28220

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > He said Ed's opinion could not be taken seriously because he worked
> > > for the ARRL. Using the identical logic, Riley's opinion cannot be
> > > taken seriously because he works for the FCC.
> >
> > ...and yours cannot be taken seriously because you told us so.
>
> IMHO, nothing posted on this newsgroup can be taken seriously.

See--we can't believe that is your view since you can't be taken
seriously.

Dave K8MN

5225. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:02:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222180255.01493.00000323@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 28221

In article <3C24E131.97A70EE4@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>WA8ULX wrote:
>>
>> >Second, I'm an Extra .
>>
>> Well look A$$ Wipe, maybe you ought to inform QRZ, they still have you as a
>> Tech
>
>Say Bruce, still don't know about CSCEs?

Obviously not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5226. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:08:09 UTC
From: Martin <mdwade@mobiletelZ.com>
Message-ID: <3C251259.4F59@mobiletelZ.com>
Source record: 28222

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Martin" <mdwade@mobiletelZ.com> wrote in message
> news:3C23F682.26F8@mobiletelZ.com...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > > news:yuRU7.10753$BX4.940960@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> > > > See below for comments.
> > > > Josey Wales <nothanks@nospam.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:yNPU7.4707$_f.114138@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > That's correct. If you refuse, they can get a warrant and detain
> you if
> > > > it
> > > > > takes 12 hours to get it if they want. They will likely then tear
> your
> > > > car
> > > > > apart looking for drugs, not reassemble it for you of course, while
> a
> > > drug
> > > > > dog is turned loose inside and outside your car with his claws
> > > scratching
> > > > > the shit out of your paint job. Don't be so naive as to think they
> > > can't
> > > > > ruin their day in any number of ways. Refuse a search and it's
> assumed
> > > > you
> > > > > have something to hide. You do have rights but there are ways too
> > > > numerous
> > > > > to mention how they can make your day a real bitch.
> > > >
> > > > I am asking a question here, so don't think I am being smarty, OK? If
> an
> > > officer
> > > > "suspects" you of something and tears up your vehicle, paint,
> upholstery,
> > > etc., if he
> > > > finds nothing, wouldn't there be recourse for the owner of the vehicle
> for
> > > damage of the vehicle.
> > > > That would seem most unfair to be able to rip up someone's car on
> > > > "suspicion".
> > > >
> > >

> > > I've witnessed two occasions where, in one, an apartment of some friends
> of
> > > my brother was torn apart in a "drug raid." Every single box of
> whatever
> > > was turned upside down and dumped in the middle of the kitchen floor,
> > > speaker grills on the stereo were cut, sofa cushions and back were cut,
> all
> > > furniture was tossed every which way, framed pictures yanked (yes,
> yanked)
> > > off the walls and paper backing torn off...and on and on. By the time
> the
> > > cops were done, the apartment looked worse than any vandals could ever
> have
> > > hoped, the cops were empty-handed (turned out it was tenant wars--the
> > > upstairs tenants had called with "suspicion" that there was drug dealing
> > > going on because they were mad at the volume of the stereo) and not even
> an
> > > apology was uttered as they went out the door. There were about 7-8 of
> them
> > > and I guarantee you that every neighbor and visitor around there had
> their
> > > chins hanging to the ground in literal shock. There was no recoourse
> for
> > > these people to have anything cleaned, replaced, or repaired.
> > >
> > > In another, a car's seats and headliner were cut open for the same
> thing.
> > > Again, nothing found, no apology, no repairs.
> > >
> > > "There are ways" bad cops will force compliance with their wishes.
> "There
> > > are ways" you'd wish there *was* something for you to get busted
> for--the
> > > court costs and attorney fees are a lot cheaper than replacing personal
> > > property. One of the satirical laughs we used to come up with was "for
> > > god's sake, keep some weed around so we can give it to them when they
> crash
> > > in through the front door!"
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Did you watch the Dateline story on Louisiana a few years back about
> > car searches at the border? Several agencies had to repair several
> > cars and undo a lot of damage. Don't find anything in Louisiana, you
> > had better be willing to explain to the Judge (the officer requesting
> > the search) why you had your suspecions about the search. Louisiana
> > Internal Affairs (State Police Unit) is curious also and doesn't
> > like being made a fool of, especially on national tv. Usually the
> > Drug Dog has just wee'd itself before the request is aired, else
> > a no-show gets hard to explain.

>
> heh heh. And, I've always heard that Louisiana is the most crooked state in
> the United States in terms of laws...
>
> Kim W5TIT
Every locale has its pluses and minuses and I guess Louisiana took the
winners
circle for crooks but then it takes one to know one HEH HEH! But
seriously,
judges don't like their warrants being questioned when it is shown
flimsy
excuses for making a determination for a warrant. If a cop looks like
an
dolt too many times, the Judge could have questions about his
integrity.
Be right or be ready to explain.

Martin N5PZJ

5227. CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:12:24 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28223
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....

http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/

5228. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:17:06 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011222181706.05085.00000530@mb-ma.news.cs.com>
Source record: 28224

>DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
>
>http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/

Troll, troll, troll your post gently down the thread...

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

5229. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:18:09 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 28225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

I like it!

IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
>
> http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/

5230. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:30:35 UTC
From: john <w9jcm@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <vl8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net>
Source record: 28227
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
> I like it!
>
>
> IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> >
> > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
>
>

5231. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:38:01 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112222337350.18576-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 28226

His name has nothing to do with it. His conviction for cellular phone phreaking is the reason behind why he was found morally unfit.

On Sat, 22 Dec 2001, Unclaimed Mysteries wrote:
>http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/6/23494.html
>
>"In a five-page order released Friday, the US Federal Communications
>Commission (FCC) claims that 38-year old convicted hacker Kevin Mitnick is
>not morally fit to be a ham radio operator. "
>
>Mitnick isn't an A-rab name, is it?
>
>This is bordering on unhealthy obsession. The government apparently sees him
>as some sort of M3G4 - 3V1L 5UP3RG3N1U5. To my knowledge, only one of THOSE
>exists: http://users.mfi.net//~jfwallace/spurrier.html
>
>73 Corry K4DOH
>--
>It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
>http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

5232. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:50:14 UTC
From: Frank Todd <k3eko@nospam.nidhog.net>
Message-ID: <W_8V7.2101$6p.19157@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 28228

You don't say????

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.10.10112222337350.18576-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org...
> His name has nothing to do with it. His conviction for cellular phone
> phreaking is the reason behind why he was found morally unfit.
>
> On Sat, 22 Dec 2001, Unclaimed Mysteries wrote:
> >http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/6/23494.html
> >
> >"In a five-page order released Friday, the US Federal Communications
> >Commission (FCC) claims that 38-year old convicted hacker Kevin Mitnick
is
> >not morally fit to be a ham radio operator. "
> >
> >Mitnick isn't an A-rab name, is it?
> >
> >This is bordering on unhealthy obsession. The government apparently sees
him
> >as some sort of M3G4 - 3V1L 5UP3RG3N1U5. To my knowledge, only one of
THOSE
> >exists: http://users.mfi.net//~jfwallace/spurrier.html
> >
> >73 Corry K4DOH
> >--
> >It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
> >http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net
>

5233. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:56:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C251DBF.687C2C9F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28229

Dave Heil wrote:
> Since Dr. "No" has no need for HF
> access, what is his beef? If he has none, why do you keep trotting him
> out?

As an example of a nocode tech who is perfectly satisfied with
his present ham license and is technically head and shoulders
above the vast majority of all coded hams.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5234. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-22 23:59:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C251E5E.41E3536B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28230

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > He has no beef. Mine is the idea presented by the PCTA folk that all
> > nocode techs are technical dumb $hits. One would think a PhD in EE
> > would be good enough proof to the contrary.
>
> I don't recall any idea presented by "PCTA folk" which is as
> you claim. Are you basing your claim in the statements of one or two
> individuals?

I'm basing my claim on the statements of some members of the PCTA
crowd, e.g. Larry and Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5235. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:03:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C251F43.1458C5DD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28232

```
Dave Heil wrote:
> So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?

How can a private email be official?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5236. Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:04:33 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112221604.26efbb6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28231
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote in message
news:<gI1V7.7112$Li3.2380900517@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> You know SD, You surprise me
> by responding to the forge. I know you
> know better, check the headers.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All
>
> "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
> message news:d9f7b76c.0112220712.6673674@posting.google.com...
> > twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com (Twistedhed) wrote in message
> news:<e9de0154.0112212347.3868de48@posting.google.com>...
> > > "Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net>
> > > news:<9vturn0l20@enews1.newsguy.com>
> > > Re: Lelnad I Am Obsessed With YOU
> > >
> > > Well, there's always going to be some uneducated slug, who has a
> > > Messiah
> > > Complex, thinking he has every right to be above the law. Charles
> > > Manson,
> > > Adolph Hitler, Jim Jones, Son of Sam, The Zodiac Killer, the list goes
> > > on
> > > and on...
> > >
> > > I'll assume that anyone who believes radio should be free to the
> > > unlicensed
> > > public, also can't understand why they keep getting their driver's
> > > license
> > > revoked for driving under the influence, why they can't yell "fire" in
> > > a
> > > crowded theater, and they believe the people in handcuffs on COPS are
> > > just
> > > being harrassed...
> > >
> > > "Listen Jim or whatever monicker of Lelnads kennel club you are using
> > > today, I am quite surpassing in educational acheivement more to the
> > > likes of you can see for eons of time. If any of your so-called
> > > epithets could harm me you would be dangerous and lack the sentence
> > > structre to dialogue with me. I observe that you are a no-code

> > > CB-hater so go back to the dog pound and lap your paw some more"
> >
> > you know twist.....the problem with you is this. you write articles in
> > magazines pertaining to radio related subjects, you operate on the
> > freeband and talk all over the world and of course finally.....you
> > don't have any numbers and letters after your name......now that my
> > friend is what puts the burr in their collective saddles,......no
> > doubt about it.............

oops you are right shark.....didn't read the post close enough....to
tell you the truth , i haven't been paying much attention to this
twist/leland fued.....however, do you agree with my post as it relates
to twist? because that was who i wanted to talk to.......the twist,
the whole twist, and nothing but the twist.....so help me, radio
god.....

5237. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:07:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C252031.BDE6AC6A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28233

Dave Heil wrote:
> > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
>
> Because it is the right thing to do.

The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
First Amendment rights without badgering her.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5238. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:09:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2520C2.E6E16225@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28234

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > The issue is: Does Kim have the right to live her life as she pleases
> > or should she be your slave. The Constitution answers that question
> > very well.
>
> Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
> determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
> Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
> freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the events
> which have unfolded over the past several months.
>
> Kim's "rights" are not without limits.

So Dave, are you going to bring that lawsuit against Kim or just try
to kill her with the jawbone of an ass?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5239. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:17:25 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <po9V7.307152$W8.11127825@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28235

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message

> My folks have had so many
> people from "back home" come over and act like they're better than the
> "yankees." (Perhaps that's why they're my favorite baseball team...word
> association.) Take care and 73.

Strike TWO!!!...

Rich

5240. Re: Who in the pluperfect is George?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:18:18 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112221618.6137e73c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28236

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<K7YU7.306566$W8.11065674@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> George or whoever has a case of the tights with anyone who does not
> subscribe to his Old Yankee view of the world.

OBEYING LAWS IS AN OLD YANKEE VIEW OF THE WORLD? ABIDING BY PART 95 IS
AN OLD YANKEE VIEW OF THE WORLD?

IF YOU SAY SO DICK.

5241. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:23:17 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <Vt9V7.307160$W8.11127020@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28237

Dave Heil wrote

> Not really, Kim. I don't believe that you have any concept of what is
> appropriate. I don't know how many think it is "OK". You've received a
> few statements of support here.

I didn't say it was "OK", I said it was fine...

Consice and to the point...

Rich

5242. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:25:18 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <Ov9V7.144346$bs2.23874540@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 28238
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

No..........It's just the way I am. I really DO think FCC regs SUCK OUT
LOUD!
I've been on both sides of the fence and decided i liked the view better
from the trees!
I'm also not the TROLL who started the cross posted thread.
Train
"john" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:vI8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net...
> Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
> "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
> news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
> > I like it!
> >
> >
> > IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> > >
> > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
> >
> >
>
>

5243. Re: RADIO LAW and the newbie cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:29:50 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <2A9V7.144454$bs2.23887464@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 28239
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:CJ0V7.289$UO1.134860@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
>
> Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote...
> :
> : "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote ...
> : >
> : > Speaking from the perspective of thirty years direct working
> : experience with law enforcement officers, the officers you describe are
> poorly
> : trained and even more poorly supervised. Any supervisor who allows a
> junior
> : officer to send any questionable case to the prosecutor is derelict. And
> he
> : will shortly hear so from that prosecutor, who has no time for that sort
> of
> : > nonsense.Without exception he will have real work to do. And in the
> : unlikely event the presecutor is just as green and sends it on the the
> court, the
> : > judge himself will set the whole bunch on the straight and narrow.
He's
> : thebusiest of all.
> : > It sounds like you've been talking with a bunch of rank recruits
> : straight out of the academy who have yet to even meet their field
training
> : officers, who surely WILL set them straight.
> : >
> :
> : Dick, without disagreeing with you, the police forces are fighting - and
I
> : think losing - being ground down by the burden of a lot of things
> : including really stupid drug enforcement. This plagues the system from
> : the cop thru the courts and the penal institutions. The NHP has become
> : the I-80 drug patrol and as a result does most of its recruiting thru
the
> : truck inspectors; the OPD leads the planet in pot busts, BFD. When the
> : MHP, KHP etc. are lining up to recruit at NebrOma's law enforcement
> : program to compete for the decent you know that some warm bodies are
being
> given badges and guns; the out of state patrolmen probably accomplish more
> traffic enforcement than the NHP during their body-snatching visits. We
> : had a minor dust-up in the complex involving the Douglas County

Sheriff's
> : office and I thought the place was being invaded by Sea Scouts.
> :
> : When you can't interest the Federal DAs office in anything that can't
> : raise 10 grand or confiscate something, similar down at the local
> : Prosecutor, it is no small wonder radio enforcement goes to hell. So we
> : get bandaids like Tacoma in hopes the local gendarmes can cure TVI thru
> : sheer force of personality. As a practical matter, an undermanned group
> : takes up acting like the Marines and it is welcome time to the LAPD.
> :
> : At the same time, as you point out, the radio-owning public has little
to
> : fear barring a complaint. The poor cop is out looking for drug mules to
> : add one more rusty 82 Chevy to the impound lot.
> :
> : Dick N&#65533;BK
>
> Good points.
>
> I, however, think that many out there
> just do not have an idea what the average
> LEO goes thru. Too many have an image
> of "Dragnet". Law enforcement has changed.
>
> The average department is made up of younger
> (they just do not stay around like they used to),
> more fit and a bit more hard nosed individuals
> these days.
>
> BTW, did you guys know that Buddy Hatchett
> had been a cop? (I think I spelled his name right,

No........You didn't,
Buddy Hackett

Train

> you know the fat little comedy guy).
>
>
>
>

5244. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:35:59 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C252677.CE91748D@spam.me.not>
Source record: 28240
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Interesting you should say that, Patrick, considering English is nothing
but a hodgepodge of Norse, Gaelic, High German, Latin, and French...

Or doesn't that count?

-SSB

Patrick Keele wrote:
>
> WHY do you use that STUPID word "MINDSET"?What the hell is a MINDSET?Do you
> mean it's how someone thinks?Can i buy this "mindset" in a store or
> shop???why don't you speak PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense ENGLISH??????????
>
> I am british and i am SICK of the british using and picking up STUPID
> americanisms in the uk! WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS another
> countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!
>
> MOST cbers as you call them in the uk who use SSB/AM ARE criminals and often
> get caught to.Any bad reputation the cb fraternity have is mainly due to
> their own illegal operations and behaviour.you REAP what you SOW!
>
> PK

5245. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:50:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <QT9V7.178578$WW.11206430@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28241
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C252677.CE91748D@spam.me.not...
> Interesting you should say that, Patrick, considering English is nothing
> but a hodgepodge of Norse, Gaelic, High German, Latin, and French...
>
> Or doesn't that count?
>
> -SSB
>

or Arabic (sugar), Hindi (bungalow, thug), Spanish (particularly in
American idiom - ranch, buckaroo, a corruption of vaquero).

5246. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:53:43 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <rW9V7.178580$WW.11206394@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28242

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C252031.BDE6AC6A@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> >
> > Because it is the right thing to do.
>
> The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> First Amendment rights without badgering her.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

No one suggests otherwise, Cecil. The whole rationale for the First
Amendment is that dumbshit ideas are better off exposed to the air rather
than being allowed to ferment in the walls.

5247. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:55:30 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C252B09.AF6DAF76@spam.me.not>
Source record: 28243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Thanks for expounding upon my point Dick.

73's

-SSB

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> news:3C252677.CE91748D@spam.me.not...
> > Interesting you should say that, Patrick, considering English is nothing
> > but a hodgepodge of Norse, Gaelic, High German, Latin, and French...
> >
> > Or doesn't that count?
> >
> > -SSB
> >
>
> or Arabic (sugar), Hindi (bungalow, thug), Spanish (particularly in
> American idiom - ranch, buckaroo, a corruption of vaquero).

5248. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 00:59:46 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <60aV7.178583$WW.11206978@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28244
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C252B09.AF6DAF76@spam.me.not...
> Thanks for expounding upon my point Dick.
>
> 73's
>
> -SSB

Oh it gets worse. Pretty soon we will hear from the Latin scholar
objecting to ending sentences with prepositions. This resulted in I
believe Shaw and possibly used by Churchill replying to a critic with,
"That's the sort of nonsense up with which I will not put."

Beer Keg

>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "Sideband" <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> > news:3C252677.CE91748D@spam.me.not...
> > > Interesting you should say that, Patrick, considering English is
nothing
> > > but a hodgepodge of Norse, Gaelic, High German, Latin, and French...
> > >
> > > Or doesn't that count?
> > >
> > > -SSB
> > >
> >
> > or Arabic (sugar), Hindi (bungalow, thug), Spanish (particularly in
> > American idiom - ranch, buckaroo, a corruption of vaquero).

5249. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 01:08:59 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A2E190FAE796A0DF.4FEFBB9AF182142E.D2693F8941B9036D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28245

On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 18:09:38 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>So Dave, are you going to bring that lawsuit against Kim or just try
>to kill her with the jawbone of an ass?

Has he been dismembering Larry Roll again?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5250. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 01:10:09 UTC
From: Kamatu <admin@ahww.net>
Message-ID: <a03b2s06a6@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Looks to me that someone with just enough brains to use Geoshitties, has now bought himself a President Ham Radio and just can't figure out why they put all those little push buttons on a CB.

Hehehe, if it weren't so obviously pathetic, it might warrant an argument.

"john" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:vI8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net...
> Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
> "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
> news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
> > I like it!
> >
> >
> > IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> > >
> > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
> >
> >
>
>

5251. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 01:26:18 UTC
From: "James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <9lca2u4lqrb3lck2jlnq1cuc6q7o1ksm7q@4ax.com>
Source record: 28247

>CAM wrote:
>>
>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> > If you have to ask that question, you couldn't possibly understand
>> > the answer.
>>
>> Aha! The old argumentum ad ignorantiam. You sure are full of diversions.
>>
>> > *All* of us, Kim -- and each and every other radio amateur who could
>> > see or hear your call sign, be offended by it, and consequently decide
>> > that they can't be bothered to pursue this hobby -- if you are representative
>> > of the type of mentality that exists among radio amateurs.
>>
>> I find you to be offensive, Larry. Exactly what are you going to do
>> about it?
>>
>> > And that "right" is not now, and never has been, at issue.
>>
>> The issue is: Does Kim have the right to live her life as she pleases
>> or should she be your slave. The Constitution answers that question
>> very well.
>
>Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
>determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
>Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
>freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the events
>which have unfolded over the past several months.
>
>Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
>
>Dave K8MN
What's wrong with her callsign? I see nothing obscene about it.
It should be up to her and her alone to keep it or change it since
the FCC issued it. Whether you or I like it should have nothing
to do with her keeping or changing it.

5252. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 01:58:08 UTC
From: ZOOM <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <9TaV7.49651$x25.4981036@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 28249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Of course you like it there because you don't have 20 stations competing for the same frequency. That's why it's a ham band and not a CB band cause if it was a CB band it would be like all the other channels cramped and hard to make a contact.
Just another reason why you as a CBer should request more frequency coverage so we don't keep going around in circles with good guy bad guy BS.
Hams don't want you on the frequencies because it gets real unruly quickly. Those who think they are rebels cause they go on frequencies that they have no right to be on soon find out that no one wants to talk to them. A ham will not talk to an unlicensed station not because they are being arrogant it's because it's the law!
You want to break the law and call yourself a rebel or the funniest thing i heard was patriot then go ahead. You soon find that you'll be talking to yourself.
The CB hobby is full of wantabees cause your all in it for yourself and can't organize to improve your hobby.

If you could get organized and talk with the FCC, you could have your frequencies clear and free with people who are polite and actually know something about radio and how to actually operate a radio. 95% of you don't have a clue. Your only concern is lots of power so you can walk over the other guy.

If that's your thing then stay on your side of the Chicken Band but if you want to improve things and work within the system, then you will get respect from others including hams. You need more frequency allocation then change your operating habits, learn something and show you deserve it and it will happen.

The reason CB is still the same as it was in the 70's is because you have no organization, no respect for rules or others.

Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:Ov9V7.144346$bs2.23874540@news02.optonline.net...
> No..........It's just the way I am. I really DO think FCC regs SUCK OUT
> LOUD!
> I've been on both sides of the fence and decided i liked the view better
> from the trees!
> I'm also not the TROLL who started the cross posted thread.
> Train
> "john" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:vI8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net...
> > Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
> > "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message

> > news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
> > > I like it!
> > >
> > >
> > > IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> > > >
> > > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

5253. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 02:07:33 UTC
From: ZOOM <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <Z%aV7.49673$x25.4987615@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 28351
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

As with the amateur bands, CB frequencies are a privilege and not a right.
The FCC could take away that privilege any time they want. You don't own
the frequencies but are given the privilege to use them. You don't like the
rules then complain to the FCC.

Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
news:Ov9V7.144346$bs2.23874540@news02.optonline.net...
> No..........It's just the way I am. I really DO think FCC regs SUCK OUT
> LOUD!
> I've been on both sides of the fence and decided i liked the view better
> from the trees!
> I'm also not the TROLL who started the cross posted thread.
> Train
> "john" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:vI8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net...
> > Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
> > "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
> > news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
> > > I like it!
> > >
> > >
> > > IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> > > >
> > > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

5254. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 02:08:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222210823.24447.00000907@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 28250

>Say Bruce, still don't know about CSCEs?
>
>Obviously not.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yes I am aware of CSCEs, but why does it take over a Year to get 1, must be that tough written Test, yea right

5255. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 02:16:47 UTC
From: John P Vassel <john@vassel.net>
Message-ID: <3c253e8f$0$37100$2c3e98f8@news.voyager.net>
Source record: 28352
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

keyclownslappa@hotmail.com (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote in
news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com:

> DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
>
> http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/

<Gasp> The sky is falling!! The sky is falling!!!

John
KC8SKE

5256. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 02:31:35 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222213135.20315.00000871@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 28353

>> My folks have had so many
>> people from "back home" come over and act like they're better than the
>> "yankees." (Perhaps that's why they're my favorite baseball team...word
>> association.) Take care and 73.
>
>Strike TWO!!!...
>
>Rich

Good one, Rich. LOL! :-)

Mark

5257. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 02:41:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C253757.F9056C46@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28354

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >> I'm guessing that when the 5 WPM code testing requirement
> > >> is dropped, 'ole Doc Williamson will suddenly develop a "need"
> > >> for HF privileges!
> > >
> > >You're on, Larry. Are you willing to put your money where your
> > >mouth is? say $100?
> >
> > That was a guess, not a wager.
>
> As usual, you guessed wrong. I would bet that Dr. Williamson's
> HT nicads are dead and gone at this very moment.

Really not much of a ham, is he?

5258. Re: PROOF that we are all BARKING MAD! CBERS.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 02:44:56 UTC
From: Patrick Keele <pkg1dra@g1dra.freeserve.co.uk>
Message-ID: <a058mq$6p3$1@newsg1.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 28285
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote
calling me a wanker or such like......blah blah.....

What you REALLY mean is "why don't i get a life"(am i alive so i have a life) or be "focussed"(concentrate) or "touch"(mention) upon the "issue"(subject) if it is "appropriate"(no right or wrong now)or maybe i should "address the issue"(an address is something of a location or writing on a letter)or do i need to be "dumbed down"(treated like a bloody fool)by a CRETIN like you?
you see the thing is SUNSHINE MOTOR MOUTH is that this new founded language is designed for CRETINS like you(what are you anyway) because it's people like YOU who can't not speak PROPLY CAUSE I AIN'T GOT A BRAIN(he left it in America)!
by using "simplified" shortened phrases like i've mentioned it makes it so much easier for you to say such gibberish!of course " i now where your coming from"(I know what he means or is talking about)or is this all "garbage"(rubbish) and should i "trash" (dump) your messages in future,IF you want to talk like an American,FOOL, and THINK you are an American then be prepared to live with consequences of being an American.Have i now "connected"(plugged into his single brain cell)?

shall we now pass this "text"(message) onto the "chairperson"(what the hell is that supposed to be?Or is it the "chair"(shall i sit on the pratt)!
while we are at it lets not forget the other "politically correct" rubbish to don't upset a politician he MIGHT come around your house and lock you up)

Asians(pakistanis,bangladeshis etc)now why the hell do we call them "asians"?
do we call chinese "mongolians",or swedes "scandinavians",or Americans "north americans",BUT wait a minute,we DO call "britains" BRITONS don't we,BUT we DON'T call americans AMERICONS!!Why is this?No.in my opinion a spade is a spade,and i ain't going to call it a fork or an "asian"!!

and now i will "text" this message to another scribe for comments after "touching" the subject,as i have "adddressed the issue".

Patrick

5259. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:03:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222220317.04115.00000525@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 28355

In article <3C252031.BDE6AC6A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
>> > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
>>
>> Because it is the right thing to do.
>
>The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
>First Amendment rights without badgering her.

Why do Kim's alleged First Amendment rights take precedence over other folks rights? IOW, why is it right for her to pick and use an inappropriate callsign but not right for others talk about it?

Looks like Cecil is only a libertarian if people agree with him.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5260. Re: RADIO LAW vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:12:04 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <8YbV7.1233$UO1.611739@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28357
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote ..
:
:
: K0HB wrote:
:
: >
: > > And are you a police officer? Are you
: > > an attorney? NO. You are a Private
: > > Fucking Civilian (PFC) with little contact
: > > with the current system.
: > >
: > > Understand this. The police and the
: > > military are your superiors. Their lives
: > > are far more valuable than yours.
: >
: > If this is your true opinion, then you are indeed a dangerous
: > person and I earnestly pray that you are not in _ANY_
: > position, even a part-time school crossing guard, which
: > allows you to assert your "authority". If you are in such a
: > position, then the citizens of your community should consider
: > the risk they have placed themselves in by your continued
: > service in any capacity of authority.
: >
: > The police and military have my respect and gratitude (and
: > I spent 21 years bearing arms to protect America), but they
: > are not superior to any other citizen. Period.
: >
:
: The outfit I worked for had as its motto "Service and Protection".
: Most all who worked there stayed pretty close to that theme, at least in
: the absence of unusally adverse circmstances. Of course the guard has
: changed there, too, but I'd like to believe that most public servants
: still think they really are just that.

They serve the politicians and protect the system.

5261. Re: RADIO LAW vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:15:59 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <P%bV7.1242$UO1.614693@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28356
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote...
:
:
: > The police and military are your superiors.
:
: Horse-shit.
:
: Pure extra fine Grade-A Horse-Shit.
:
: The police and military are my hired help. They work for me,
: which makes _me_ their superior.
:
: Do you live in the old USSR or Iraq or some such dictatorship?
:
: 73, de Hans, K0HB

Sorry but you are no more than a taxpayer
with no choice in paying your taxes or they
will be forcible taken from you. The mayor
or the governor is who the police work for.
It is they who hire them.

Now if you are very rich or powerful, you
might be able to dictate who the mayor is.
But most people, there is little recourse unless
you band together in enough numbers to
force the political establishment to listen.
And the police do know this.

5262. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:21:50 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <h5cV7.1259$UO1.617492@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28358
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> wrote...
: "Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote ...
: > > There is a pecking order. Governors and mayors are
: > > the most valuable then powerful men then professionals
: > > like doctors and lawyers. The Police are just under mayors.
: >
: > If I were injured, I would feel that a doctor was far more important
: > than some political hack who happened to get elected to office.
: >
: > > Look there are so many elite who see the police and
: > > the military as a bunch of losers who are there to die
: > > for them. People like you who make huge amounts
: > > of money and live in big fancy houses. I have them
: > > in my community. The military is not allowed to recruit
: > > in the local high school as their kids are going to college
: > > and the military is for those who can't really make it.
: >
: > > People like you see themselves as too valuable to get
: > > their hands dirty. Sorry but your life is not worth that
: > > of a police officer, a fire fighter or a soldier.
: >
: > How do you know what we do for our livings?
: >
: > In my opinion, it is elitist attitudes like yours that are part of
: > the problems we face in this country.
: >
: > --
: > Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
: >
:
: ABSOLUTELY! And, most cops don't think they are better than anyone else.
: It's the ones that do that make it so rough for the industry (and while I
: used the word "most" in my last sentence, there are still lots who do
think
: they are more important).
:
: Each and every one of us is nearly, if not exactly, as important as the
: next. We all have our "things" to do, work to do, families to raise,
: neighborhoods to live in, communities to vote and pay taxes in, etc. Not
: one of us is doing something more important than the next.
:
: And, please don't use the excuse that cops or firefighters put themselves
in

: harm's way more than anyone else. When I get in my vehicle every day to
go
: to work, statistics say that I am more likely to be injured or die than
any
: other industry-related statistic! Add rain, snow or ice to that scenario
: and it's pretty darned dangerous just getting to work.
:
: Kim W5TIT
:

But it is not in your job description that you
MUST risk your life as part of your job.

5263. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:24:16 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <A7cV7.1268$UO1.618842@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28359

Jim Bromley, K7JEB <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> wrote ...
:
:
: > And are you a police officer? Are you
: > an attorney? NO. You are a Private
: > Fucking Civilian (PFC) with little contact
: > with the current system.
: >
: > Understand this. The police and the
: > military are your superiors. Their lives
: > are far more valuable than yours. And
: > they are the only thing that is keeping this
: > country together. There lives are living
: > sacrifices, their deaths atone for your
: > screw ups.
:
: and:
:
: > And your service to "king and country"?
: > I do have 30 years of political service.
: > I have put judges on the bench, congressmen
: > in office, have worked on political campaigns
: > from the local to federal level.
: >
: > Plus 20 years of military service, to include
: > a year in the Gulf War and another year
: > with the Bosnian mess.
: >
: > What have you done with your miserable
: > two bit life?
:
:
: You know, it was a while ago, but didn't we fight
: a revolutionary war against a bunch of military/
: political/religious elitists who thought they were
: inherently better than the common man, knew what
: was best for him and saw themselves as society's
: bulwark against chaos and anarchy.
:
: Oh, and by the way, this is the United States of
: America. We don't have a king to serve.

Yes we do, in a way. When one takes the oath
of office as police officer, a soldier, as politicians

then the constitution becomes your king to whom
you are subject to.

5264. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:34:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C254FF4.B073BB7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28360

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Since Dr. "No" has no need for HF
> > access, what is his beef? If he has none, why do you keep trotting him
> > out?
>
> As an example of a nocode tech who is perfectly satisfied with
> his present ham license...

Bully for him. Why not let him speak for himself sometime rather than having it appear that he is your marionette? I'm perfectly satisfied with my present ham license too.

>... and is technically head and shoulders
> above the vast majority of all coded hams.

We have only your statement to that effect. I suppose only his operating skills are lacking.

Dave K8MN

5265. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:36:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C255084.877BFD7D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28361

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > He has no beef. Mine is the idea presented by the PCTA folk that all
> > > nocode techs are technical dumb $hits. One would think a PhD in EE
> > > would be good enough proof to the contrary.
> >
> > I don't recall any idea presented by "PCTA folk" which is as
> > you claim. Are you basing your claim in the statements of one or two
> > individuals?
>
> I'm basing my claim on the statements of some members of the PCTA
> crowd, e.g. Larry and Dick.

So let us make it clear right now then that you are basing your claim on the statements of two individuals and not any "agenda" at all. Now that you have changed your story, let us hope that you attempt to keep it straight.

Dave K8MN

5266. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:38:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2550C7.ECAFF3C1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28362

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> > callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?
>
> How can a private email be official?

Riley e-mailed Kim from his home on his own time? Keep massaging things until you set the scenario you'd like, Cecil.

Dave K8MN

5267. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:39:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C25512D.C82D2861@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28363

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> >
> > Because it is the right thing to do.
>
> The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> First Amendment rights without badgering her.

That isn't correct. That stifles MY First Amendment rights!
There is no clause which demands that I agree to her view.

Dave K8MN

5268. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:40:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C25515D.50134CBB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28364

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > The issue is: Does Kim have the right to live her life as she pleases
> > > or should she be your slave. The Constitution answers that question
> > > very well.
> > >
> > Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
> > determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
> > Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
> > freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the events
> > which have unfolded over the past several months.
> >
> > Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
>
> So Dave, are you going to bring that lawsuit against Kim or just try
> to kill her with the jawbone of an ass?

After you're through yapping, perhaps you'll allow me to borrow it.

Dave K8MN
```

5269. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:41:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2551AD.B3109E66@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28365

```
Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote
>
> > Not really, Kim. I don't believe that you have any concept of what is
> > appropriate. I don't know how many think it is "OK". You've received a
> > few statements of support here.
>
> I didn't say it was "OK", I said it was fine...
>
> Consice and to the point...

It sounded pretty "consice" to me too.

Dave K8MN
```

5270. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:43:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C25521A.E164347D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28366

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 18:09:38 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >So Dave, are you going to bring that lawsuit against Kim or just try
> >to kill her with the jawbone of an ass?
>
> Has he been dismembering Larry Roll again?
>
> Rick

If Cecil is still using his, perhaps you'd loan yours.

Dave K8MN

5271. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:47:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2552E0.E8BE7182@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28367

James R. DeLoach wrote:
>
>
> >CAM wrote:
> >>
> >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> > If you have to ask that question, you couldn't possibly understand
> >> > the answer.
> >>
> >> Aha! The old argumentum ad ignorantiam. You sure are full of diversions.
> >>
> >> > *All* of us, Kim -- and each and every other radio amateur who could
> >> > see or hear your call sign, be offended by it, and consequently decide
> >> > that they can't be bothered to pursue this hobby -- if you are representative
> >> > of the type of mentality that exists among radio amateurs.
> >>
> >> I find you to be offensive, Larry. Exactly what are you going to do
> >> about it?
> >>
> >> > And that "right" is not now, and never has been, at issue.
> >>
> >> The issue is: Does Kim have the right to live her life as she pleases
> >> or should she be your slave. The Constitution answers that question
> >> very well.
> >
> >Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
> >determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
> >Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
> >freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the events
> >which have unfolded over the past several months.
> >
> >Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
> What's wrong with her callsign? I see nothing obscene about it.
> It should be up to her and her alone to keep it or change it since
> the FCC issued it. Whether you or I like it should have nothing
> to do with her keeping or changing it.

I'll put you down in column B headed "Also Lacking Good Taste".
Always glad to hear from another who believes that there is no right and
wrong.

Dave K8MN

5272. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 03:54:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2554A9.4CB2E346@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28368

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C252031.BDE6AC6A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >> > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> >> > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> >>
> >> Because it is the right thing to do.
> >
> >The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> >First Amendment rights without badgering her.
>
> Why do Kim's alleged First Amendment rights take precedence over other folks
> rights? IOW, why is it right for her to pick and use an inappropriate callsign
> but not right for others talk about it?
>
> Looks like Cecil is only a libertarian if people agree with him.

The secret is that Cecil isn't really a libertarian or Libertarian.
He is quick to attempt the stifling of opposing views. Of course there
is always the chance that his statements aren't serious.

I also amused at Kim's idea that Larry and I should leave amateur radio
because she chooses to be vulgar and a part of ham radio.

Dave K8MN

5273. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:06:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25583D.436AF622@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28369

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Since Dr. "No" has no need for HF
> > > access, what is his beef? If he has none, why do you keep trotting him
> > > out?
> >
> > As an example of a nocode tech who is perfectly satisfied with
> > his present ham license...
>
> Bully for him. Why not let him speak for himself ...

This newsgroup is not his cup of tea.

> >... and is technically head and shoulders
> > above the vast majority of all coded hams.
>
> We have only your statement to that effect. I suppose only his
> operating skills are lacking.

He doesn't operate so he needs no operating skills. The only reason
he has a ham license is to talk to his camping buddies.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5274. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:09:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2558F5.E77D0BD9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28371

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > He has no beef. Mine is the idea presented by the PCTA folk that all
> > > > nocode techs are technical dumb $hits. One would think a PhD in EE
> > > > would be good enough proof to the contrary.
> > >
> > > I don't recall any idea presented by "PCTA folk" which is as
> > > you claim. Are you basing your claim in the statements of one or two
> > > individuals?
> > >
> > I'm basing my claim on the statements of some members of the PCTA
> > crowd, e.g. Larry and Dick.
>
> So let us make it clear right now then that you are basing your claim on
> the statements of two individuals and not any "agenda" at all. Now that
> you have changed your story, let us hope that you attempt to keep it
> straight.

I haven't changed my story. Do you know what "e.g." means?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5275. ARNewsline 1271 - Dec 2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:09:52 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222230952.24476.00001105@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 28370

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1271 - DEC 21, 2001

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1271 with a release date of Friday, December 21st, 2001 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A national ham radio society is asked to train new hams for government service. This story is first on this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1271 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE EDUCATION SCENE: HAM TRAINING LEADS TO SA GOVERNMENT JOBS

A government agency has asked a national ham radio society to help train new hams. The reason. careers with that agency. Its happened in South Africa as we hear from Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB:

--

In South Africa, their Department of Communications contacted the SARL with the request to train seventeen post graduate students as amateur radio operators. These students had already qualified in different fields, some technical and some in the Information Technology fields. There were nine ladies and eight men. From next year they will be employed by the Department of Communications, and the idea was to give them some experience in the field of radio communications.

Training was done by Henry Chamberlain, ZS1AAZ, over a period of one full month. In addition to lectures, the students could see practical demonstrations of amateur radio and they spent one period building and testing a Morse Code practice oscillator. They also visited ZS1AAZ's home shack. The seventeen students had already proved their ability by passing their previous studies successfully. It was therefore no surprise that they ALL passed the amateur examination.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Graham Kemp. VK4BB, of Q-News.

--

The seventeen will be assigned specific jobs with the South African Department of Communications in early 2002. (SARL, Q-News)

**

SPECTRUM SHARING: FCC SAYS YES TO HIGHER POWER UNLICENSED TRANSMITTERS AT 2.4 GHZ

The FCC has approved issued new rules permitting certain unlicensed Part 15 devices operating between 2405 and 2450 MHz to use higher power, but under significant restrictions. The band is allocated to amateurs on a co-secondary basis. Amateur Radio Newsline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, takes a look at the FCC action:

--
According to the C-Q Magazine website, the decision was adopted on December 11Th. In it, the FCC approved a petition by Sierra Digital Communications, Inc. to permit unlicensed fixed point-to-point transmitters in the band to operate at field strengths of up to 2500 millivolts per meter. This is a tenfold increase over past power limitations.

Sierra Digital Communications manufactures and sells equipment for wireless data communications, including high-speed wireless computer networks and Internet links. The ARRL had opposed Sierra's petition on the basis of increased risk of interference to amateur and amateur satellite operations. This is because the downlink from the AO-40 satellite is in the 24 GHz band.

But the FCC said it believed the restrictions it is imposing on the higher-power transmitters will provide sufficient protection to other users. This includes industrial/scientific/medical equipment, radar and Earth exploration satellites, in addition to amateur radio. The new rules require highly directional antennas and high frequency stability of transmitters.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

In its decision, the FCC singled out an ARRL comment where the League clamed that Part 15 devices are permitted by the Communications Act of 1934 only where they have no interference potential to licensed services. The Commission called the League's interpretation of the law overly conservative. It said that its rulings to date appropriately provide a means for allowing unlicensed devices to share spectrum with licensed services with little risk of interference and adequate protection to licensed service. (CQ)

**

HAM RADIO AND THE WAR: MARS ON THE AIR FROM THE WAR ON TERROR

Ham radio is making it possible for those fighting the war against terrorism to phone home. This as the ARRL Letter announces that Army Special Forces on duty in Islamabad, Pakistan, and in other undisclosed locations have begun keeping in touch with home via MARS -- the Military Affiliate Radio System.

Phone patches provided by the Military Affiliate Radio System make it possible for troops to call their families in the US from areas where commercial communications channels are not available. Amateur Radio operators enrolled in MARS provide the connection between the Military Affiliate Radio System stations deployed overseas and the telephone system back home.

During the Vietnam War, phone patches were a major source of comfort to families and service members alike. MARS also responded during Operation Desert Storm. (ARRL)

**

BREAK 1

Wishing you a Happy Holiday from the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world, including the Great South Bay Amateur Radio Club repeater, W2GSB, serving West Babylon New York.

(5 Sec Pause Here)

**

HAM RADIO AND THE WAR: GODDARD ARC FEELS THE PINCH

The Goddard Amateur Radio Club says that it has been having serious problems with manpower lately and the war on terrorism is partly to blame. This is because new security restrictions imposed after September 11th require all visitors to Goddard to be escorted by a badged employee at all times.

According to Dan Schultz, N8FGV writing to the Amsat Bulletin Board, the clubs WA3NAN ham shack is located on government property we are bound by the new restrictions. This says Schultz makes it much harder to bring in control operators who are not Goddard employees. As a result, WA3NAN which for years has been the primary rebroadcaster of shuttle communications on the ham bands is not there as often as it would like to be.

Schultz also notes that the Goddard Amateur Radio Club currently has no president because no one has stepped forward to accept the job. The position of Shuttle Retransmission Director is also vacant, this is the person who makes the phone calls to get operators lined up to pull shifts at the retransmission facility.

Schultz says that the long term technical solution will be to automate the station with remote controls and telemetry for the transmitters so that the retransmission operator can operate from his home. But adds N8FGV, but that is still a little ways off in the future. As a result, WA3NAN is not there as much as it used to be. (AMSAT-BB)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: NEW HOMELAND TERRORIST ALERT SYSTEM PROPOSED

Homeland security chief Tom Ridge is considering a multistage system for terrorism alerts. Ridge is also weighing how to reimburse states for the costs of increased security since the terror attacks.

Since the September 11th terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, Ridge has issued three general warnings. None of the alerts identified specific targets.

Now, according to news reports, Ridge will propose a four-stage Threat Alert Network similar to the military's DEFCON'' system. DEFCON alerts military personnel to the seriousness of a threat. A private sector version would be aimed at helping state and local law enforcement personnel determine the level to react to a Federal government issued terror warning.

The proposal came to light after California Governor Gray Davis met with Ridge about a week and a half ago. Davis told Ridge he had proposed such a similar system for California, and said Ridge had asked him to wait pending a national model. Ridge told Davis that he hopes to unveil the national system by January 15th of 2002. Whether or not ham radio will play any part in such an alert system is not known as we go to air. (Published news reports)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: CONFERENCE HELD ON ALERTING THE PUBLIC

Still in there area of alerting the public, more than 120 leaders from the emergency warning community met November 30th and unanimously called for the creation of a public-private partnership. This, aimed at improving the delivery of timely and accurate emergency information to people at risk. Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA reports:

--

The group came together at a special conference arranged by the National Warning Organizing Committee. This is a group of emergency warning advocates representing the public and private sectors.

Those attending included federal, state and local government officials, not-for-profit organizations, and representatives from the private sector. And in the end the group has tasked itself to improve the delivery of warnings and emergency information to the public. This, through better education, research, standards creation and policy recommendations.

The Committee Chairman is David Liebersbach, Director of the Alaska Division of Emergency Services. He has appointed Peter Ward, formerly of the U.S. Geological Survey and chair of a White House-appointed working group on natural disaster information systems, to head up a committee to determine the new organization's structure and governance. Ward also serves as the new organization's spokesman. More news on the work of this committee as information is released.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA, in New Orleans.

--

The conference was hosted by The MITRE Corporation in McLean, Va. MITRE is a not-for-profit national technology resource that provides systems engineering, research and development, and information technology support to the government. (MITRE)

**

HAM RADIO AND EDUCATION: HAM RADIO MASS BALLOON LAUNCH

The Timberlane Regional High School, in Plaistow New Hampshire will be taking part in a high altitude experiment next spring. This with an announcement that the Coordinated Algebra II and Physics classes taught by Lorainne Mascioli, N1VYQ, and Lou Broad, N1RCA, are planning thier third year of ham radio and high altitude balloons in May of 2002.

Six student teams will attempt to launch their balloons at the Hosstraders Ham Fest at the Hopkington Fair Grounds in New Hampshire. Each team is responsible for design, construction, and operation of their system. Each balloon will carry a GPS receiver, a packet reporting system and several experimental payloads. This could include cameras, video, amateur television and cross band repeaters. At maximum altitude such systems will have a range of 300 miles and should easily cover all of New England and more.

The class has grown to 34 students and they are planning to launch six balloons in a two day period! This could make it a record breaking event in both ham radio and high altitude ballooning. For more information check out the CAPSAT Website located in cyberspace at
http://www.mv.com/ipusers/llb/capsat.html (Via Internet)

**

HAM RADIO SPOTLIGHTED IN POUGHKEEPSIE JOURNAL

New York’s Poughkeepsie Journal has highlighted ham radio in a December 6th front page article. The piece focused on the public service aspects ham radio with quotes and pictures.

According to Andrew Schmidt, N2FTR, who is an ARRL Assistant Director in the League’s Hudson Division, many Poughkeepsie area local hams spent time at Ground Zero or at the Red Cross centers in the greater NYC area following the September 12th terrorist attacks. Andrew says that their work is well highlighted in the article. The link is:
http://www.poughkeepsiejournal.com/thursday/community/stories/co120601s12.
shtml. (Via Internet)

**

A SPECIAL AM EVENT: THE HEAVY METAL RALLYE

This is Paul Courson WA3VJB with news of an operating event Saturday night, December 22nd. It's the Heavy Metal Rally, featuring big iron, vacuum tubes, and the warm and inviting sound of AM on the shortwave ham bands.

Starting around local sunset listen for rigs in the 250 watt or 250 pound category to populate AM gathering points on 160, 75 and 40 meters.

Jim, W8MAQ was testing HIS 1947 Collins 300-G a few days ahead of the Heavy Metal Rally. The retired broadcast transmitter re-tuned to 75 meters sounded like this:

In-Q: it's been great to get on... 300-G..
Out-Q: forward to that

--

Prizes include a trophy, pictured as a posting on QRZ.com, for the best sounding station.

Last year more than a hundred stations took part -- and the winner was Mike, WN3B, on a Gates 250-C. He gave Jim an audio report the other night:

--
In-Q: It's got more highs....
Out-Q: Shure 55
--

The Heavy Metal Rally is sponsored by Electric Radio, a magazine featuring vintage ham radio, and published by Barry N6CSW. The event was pioneered by Bill, KD0HG of Colorado, a broadcast engineer with a knack for big homebrew rigs that sound great.

Frequencies and a website are listed on the news page of QRZ.com.
Paul Courson, WA3VJB, Annapolis Maryland.

**

HAM RADIO HISTORY: COLLINS RADIO CENTER NOW OPEN

The new Collins Radio Center which is the headquarters for the Collins Radio Association is now officially open for guests and visitors. Located near Johnstown, Pennsylvania, the Collins Radio Center includes a representative collection of Collins radio equipment, from the 1930's to the present. There are other classic and antique radios on display as well. More information is on the web at www.collinsra.com. (Collins RA Press release)

**

HAM RADIO BUSINESS: CITY ELECTRONICS - RIP

Alex Stalinsky, WA5UHT, who owns City Electronics, a small parts outlet in Houston for almost 50 years, has decided to call it quits. According to Chris Boone, WB5ITT, this place was one of the main sources of parts, components in Houston long before the likes of Mouser and Digikey took off in mail order sales.

Chris tell Amateur Radio Newsline that he bought many parts from City Electronics in his early days of repeater building. In fact, Chris says his mother claimed that he owned half of the local Radio Shack but she was wrong. It was really like he was a part of City Electronics as were many other young Houston area hams and Chris tells Amateur Radio Newsline, it will be missed. (WB5ITT)

**

BREAK 2

By telephone, satellite and the World Wide Web, we are the amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world at our only official website - www.arnewsline.org.

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: INTELS NEW WARP SPEED CHIP

In another step toward faster computers, Intel Corp. has developed two new technologies that will help the tiny transistors inside microprocessors run cooler, use less power and operate more efficiently. The new designs

complement several recent breakthroughs in building minuscule transistors that form the basis of all modern computing as they switch on and off billions of times a second. Earlier this year, Intel unveiled transistors just 20 nanometers wide. Today's Pentium 4 has 42 million transistors, each about 180 nanometers. For reference, a manometer is about 10,000 times narrower than a human hair. (Intel)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: DTV ROLLOUT UPDATE

Roughly two-thirds of commercial television stations plan to broadcast a digital signal by a federal government deadline of May 1, 2002. This, according to the National Association of Broadcasters.

In a report to the Federal Communications Commission, the industry group said that many of those that won't make the deadline are waiting for equipment to be delivered and expect to have digital broadcasts on the air in the months afterward. But some stations in smaller markets are having a hard time paying for the upgrade, the association says.

Right now, most home television sets in use receive only analog signals. But congress has mandated that broadcasters must give up their analog channels to the government by 2006. As a result, there are concerns that consumers won't have made the costly upgrade to televisions that can receive digital signals by that date. (Broadcasting Daily)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: EXPEDITION 4 CREW NOW ON THE ISS

An all ham crew is now in charge of the International Space Station and will be for the next six months.

Three astronauts and cosmonauts now running the ISS. They are Russian Commander Yuri Onufrienko, RK3DUO, along with American Flight Engineers Dan Bursch, KD5PNU, and Carl Walz, KC5TIE. They make up what is called the Expedition 4 crew and all three are expected to be on the air regularly for school contacts and possible open QSO times made available to talk with hams worldwide, as time permits.

The Expedition 3 crew comprised of United States Commander Frank Culbertson, KD5OPQ, along with Russian Flight Specialists Mikhal Tyurin and Vladimir Dezhurov is now back on good old Mother Earth. They returned on Monday, December the 17th aboard the space shuttle Endeavour. (AMSAT-NA, ARISS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FROM VK5ZAI

Attention educators. If you are thinking about teaching the International Space Station, here is a bit of assistance.

Tony Hutchison, VK5ZAI has updated his web pages with links to help schools in obtaining educational programs associated with the I-S-S and space science in

general. Hutchison says that this should be of interest students and teachers alike especially if they are contemplating applying for a ham radio contact with the astronauts on the station.

Hutchison is the Australian ARISS Coordinator. His website in cyberspace at www.electric-web.org (VK5ZAI)

**

SPACE AND SCIENCE: CHINA ON THE BRINK

Space Daily reports that China is getting ready to launch its third unmanned spaceship. This, to pave the way for sending that nations first astronaut into space sometime next year. China is reportedly also in final testing and preparation to launch a new satellite dedicated to study ocean colors and related phenomena. (Space Dailey)

**

DX

In DX, 9V1YC reports that he and eleven other hams will be activating South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands in January and February of 2002. The operation will be strictly on the high frequency bands. Exact dates, call signs and QSL managers are not being made public until the group is actually on the air. The New Zealand registered vessel "Braveheart" of ZL9CI fame will be supporting this team for the entire 30 day trip. (RSGB)

A bit higher in frequency, Jeff Klein, K1TEO reports that December 6th was another great D-X day on the 6 meter band. Jeff who lives in Connecticut says over the VHFReflector that the band was open for a solid two hours beginning at 7:30 am local. And talk about D-X. On his very first C-Q he landed HB9QQ who was operating portable HB0. Even better, Jeff says that the fifth caller was 4X1RF. (VHF Reflector)

Over in Great Britain hams are actually D-Xing for charity. Jeramy Boot G4NJH, reports from Nottingham in the U-K.

--

Every year in September, the British Wireless Fund for the Blind -- a registered charity - organises a fund-raising event in which amateur radio clubs and individuals are sponsored for the number and distance of the contacts that they make. As of the 11th of December, the British Wireless for the Blind Fund reported that 'Transmission 2001' had raised £6681.48, with more coming in every day. They say that they hope the final total will reach £7000. The charity offers prizes to the club and individual raising the greatest amounts.

This year the Cray Valley Radio Society operating as GB2FB and taking part for the first time, won the prizes for the club raising the most money and for making the most contacts. Robert Guscott, M5GUS, operating as GB0WB, won the prize for the leading individual.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH.

--

The bottom line. This is another way that hams can not only enjoy their hobby, but can help others at the same time. (G4NJH)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: A HAM RADIO CHRISTMAS STORY

And finally this week, the story that we wait all year to tell you. Its the ongoing story of hams who care about hospitalized children and what they do to bring a bit of holiday cheer to those kids who cannot make it to the mall to spend a few moments with old Saint Nick. Here’s Amateur Radio Newsline’s Joe Moell, K0OV:

--

As most hams know, propagation is very good this time of year. It's so good that it's easy to make contact with the North Pole. Many clubs around the country are taking advantage of these propagation conditions to set up QSOs with a very special North Pole station. They're making these contacts from hospitals and rehabilitation centers, and they sound like this:

--
Santa and Kids Audio Here
--

That's what the North Pole Network sounds like in southern California, where it's celebrating its 25th anniversary at Childrens Hospital of Orange County. In the past few days, I've heard from other clubs in the North Pole Network, including the AkSarBen ARC in Omaha and the Southwest Missouri ARC in Springfield. And YOUR club could bring holiday joy to hospital patients. There's a how-to article on the subject, with a dozen suggestions for your best North Pole Network ever, currently running on ARRL's Web site. That's arrl.org, of course. And there's even more about North Pole Network in southern California, plus lots of photos showing a quarter century of holiday fun, at the Hospital Disaster Support Communications System Web site, www.hdscs.org. Check it out, and start planning for your own North Pole Network joy.

--
Santa And Kids Audio Here
--

Joe Moell K-zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

From us here at Amateur Radio Newsline: A Merry Christmas to those very special kids and a Merry Christmas to all of you.

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, some get well wishes to our longtime friend Ron Broadbent, G3AAJ. Ron is the former Secretary of AMSAT-UK. He is in the hospital in the U-K and will be undergoing surgery. AMSAT says that he hopes to be home by Christmas. Get well wishes can be sent by e-mail to g3aaj@amsat.org.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jeff Clark, K8JAC and I’m Jim Damron, N8TMW, saying Happy Holidays, God Bless America, 73, and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2001. All rights reserved.

**
End Newscast
**

RAIN PROMO HERE

5276. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:11:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C255975.EE40BF4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28372

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > As usual, you guessed wrong. I would bet that Dr. Williamson's
> > HT nicads are dead and gone at this very moment.
>
> Really not much of a ham, is he?

Legally, as much as you are since he is licensed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5277. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:13:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2559E0.37772146@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28373

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> > > callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?
> >
> > How can a private email be official?
>
> Riley e-mailed Kim from his home on his own time?

Emails don't represent official policy. Where, exactly, is this
official policy written down? I don't see it in Part 97.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5278. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:15:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C255A5A.FB4C75D0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28374

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C252031.BDE6AC6A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >> > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> >> > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> >>
> >> Because it is the right thing to do.
> >
> >The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> >First Amendment rights without badgering her.
>
> Why do Kim's alleged First Amendment rights take precedence over other folks
> rights? IOW, why is it right for her to pick and use an inappropriate callsign
> but not right for others talk about it?

Please produce something official from the FCC that says that Kim's callsign
is inappropriate. Riley's prudish email is not official enough for me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5279. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:18:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C255B02.C98E7467@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28375

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C252031.BDE6AC6A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > >Dave Heil wrote:
> > >> > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > >> > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> > >>
> > >> Because it is the right thing to do.
> > >
> > >The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> > >First Amendment rights without badgering her.
> >
> > Why do Kim's alleged First Amendment rights take precedence over other folks
> > rights? IOW, why is it right for her to pick and use an inappropriate callsign
> > but not right for others talk about it?
> >
> > Looks like Cecil is only a libertarian if people agree with him.
>
> The secret is that Cecil isn't really a libertarian or Libertarian.
> He is quick to attempt the stifling of opposing views.

Just trying to get you to mind your own business. What is wrong with
live and let live?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5280. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:19:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C255B5D.15BFD6F2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28376

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > > > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> > > >
> > > Because it is the right thing to do.
> > >
> > The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> > First Amendment rights without badgering her.
>
> That isn't correct. That stifles MY First Amendment rights!
> There is no clause which demands that I agree to her view.

But why don't you mind your own business and stop stalking Kim?
What is wrong with live and let live?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5281. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:21:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C255BB6.62C9C0DB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28377

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > So Dave, are you going to bring that lawsuit against Kim or just try
> > to kill her with the jawbone of an ass?
>
> After you're through yapping, perhaps you'll allow me to borrow it.

I'm serious, Dave. When are you going to stop electronically stalking
Kim and bring that lawsuit?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5282. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:23:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C255C29.8338AA2B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28379

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'll put you down in column B headed "Also Lacking Good Taste".
> Always glad to hear from another who believes that there is no right and
> wrong.

There's nothing wrong with Kim's callsign. What is wrong is your
electronic assault and battery of her on this newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5283. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:23:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011222232352.01734.00000923@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28378

>Legally, as much as you are since he is licensed.
>--
>cheers, CAM

Are you in Love with this Dr??.

5284. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:26:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C255D0F.F58A7341@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28381

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Legally, as much as you are since he is licensed.
>
> Are you in Love with this Dr??.

Nope, he's just the only nocode tech I know with a PhD in EE.
Do you have a PhD in EE, Bruce? If not, are you too stupid
to get one?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5285. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:28:39 UTC
From: Phil's TALL Tales <BULLSHIT@PureBULLSHIT.edu>
Message-ID: <a03mgg$6r4$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28380
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message:
> The above took place while I was a street cop - Los Angeles
> Sheriff's Office, in a minority-ghetto area - a good 10 years before
> I joined the Feds.
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Sure Phil sure. Spin us yet another one of your tall tales.
LOL LOL LOL

5286. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:35:40 UTC
From: ZOOM <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <UadV7.50178$x25.5077319@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 28382
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

This guy is a troll. He has posted this same message in many NG. Don't waste your time responding to it.

IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
>
> http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/

5287. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:44:48 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112222044.50ba0dc5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28383
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"john" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<vI8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net>...
> Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
> "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
> news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
> > I like it!
> >
> >
> > IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> > >
> > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
> >
> >

oh cool ....move over hammies.......its called corporate
expansion.....i told you...we are in the appropriation business....if
you don't use it you loose it.......remember????

5288. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 04:46:09 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112222046.5c2c6625@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28384
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:<a02dhn$1i6$0@pita.alt.net>...
> "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
> message news:d9f7b76c.0112210954.64cbefb7@posting.google.com...
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:<9vvhp3hkd5@pita.alt.net>...
> > > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > news:9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
> > > >
> > > > My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
> > > >
> > > > FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in the 70s.
> They
> > > > were those little things with the big eyes and different colored, Don
> King
> > > > style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils, or on
> > > > keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still around, but
> not
> as
> > > > popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence in
> popularity
> > > > about ten years ago.
> > >
> > > That anonymous COWARD is ignorant of everything. "Woger Wussman" aka
> Twatty
> > > Campbell(Posts as Scott Campbell) should be familiar with the troll
> doll,
> > > since he was the initial model for them.
> >
> > hit the bricks chuckie....you aren't wanted here.......
>
> Fuck off, Dickhead, as the Stones sing "You can't always get what you want."

oh geez...what happened chuckie.....get kicked off the ham reflector
because you pissed in measure's corn flakes one too many times????

5289. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 05:16:47 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a03p9q027l7@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28386

"Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a02lo5$ci6$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/6/23494.html
>
> "In a five-page order released Friday, the US Federal Communications
> Commission (FCC) claims that 38-year old convicted hacker Kevin Mitnick is
> not morally fit to be a ham radio operator. "

Maybe this is how the FCC plans on dismantling the amateur radio service.
They'll declare all current licensees morally unfit in some way, not renew
the license, and when the numbers have dwindled low enough, sell off the
spectrum to the highest commercial bidder.

5290. Re: PROOF that we are all BARKING MAD! CBERS.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 05:22:30 UTC
From: Patrick Keele <pkg1dra@g1dra.freeserve.co.uk>
Message-ID: <a05hu8bk1@news6.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 28409
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

>
> > What you REALLY mean is..... CAUSE I AIN'T GOT A BRAIN.....i
have
> > "adddressed the issue".
Not quite gov'nor

I was merely re- iterating the level of intelligence by paraphrasing(if you know what the word means) which i think the CRETIN who insulted me possesses.
I was demonstrating how i think the CRETIN speaks,judging by the level of illiteracy which he exudes.You and he both clearly miss the point of my message.

You don't impress me at all by misquoting what i originally said,which is out of context to the original message.ANY fool(you as an example)can cut and paste.You are not clever.

Better luck next time "pal".

Patrick

5291. Re: Airline travel with a rig?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 05:25:42 UTC
From: Julian Frost <jfrost@eclectic.ss.uci.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.33.0112222124130.8305-100000@eclectic.ss.uci.edu>
Source record: 28385
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001, Dave Holford wrote:

> Julian Frost wrote:
> >
> > Simply tell them that it's a ham radio and if questioned further, tell
> > them that you are a Federally licensed ham radio operator. Have a copy of
> > your license available. You won't have any trouble whatsoever.
>
>
> That makes as much sense as showing your 'Federal Pilot Licence' and
> expecting to ride the flight deck.

I think you're making more of my comment than I said. Simply explaining
that you have a ham radio and a federally issued license to operate it is
nothing at all like showing your Federal Pilot's License and expecting to
ride in the flight deck.

Julian

5292. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 05:25:56 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a03pps028ec@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28387
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
>
> http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/

The guy running this page has an e-mail in the Netherlands. How about
posting something that's based on U.S. communications laws?

5293. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 05:35:46 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a03qcc029l4@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28388
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Richard Clark" <kb7qhc@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:oar92u8tssiansirqbo36akht9aq9pjul0@4ax.com...
> >> >WHY do you use that STUPID word "MINDSET"?What the hell is a
MINDSET?Do
> >you
> >> >mean it's how someone thinks?Can i buy this "mindset" in a store or
> >> >shop???why don't you speak PLAIN ORDINARY commonsense
ENGLISH??????????
> >> >
> >> >I am british and i am SICK of the british using and picking up STUPID
> >> >americanisms in the uk! WHAt other society in the world IMPORTS
another
> >> >countries language to replace it's OWN???????HOW pathetic!

Languages evolve. Meanings of words change while new words emerge. (Remember when "gay" didn't mean homosexual?) And don't give me shit about our language not being English. The French spoken in Canada is different from that in France, but it's still called French. Same goes for Mexico and Spain with the Spanish Language. As long as people communicate their thoughts and understand each other, why should you or anyone else criticize? Get a clue, you stupid-arse wanker!

5294. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 05:40:40 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a03qlg02a0d@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28389

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C251F43.1458C5DD@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> > callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?
>
> How can a private email be official?

Dave thinks that anything Riley says with regards to ham radio is in an official capacity, even if such statements are contrary to what the regulations permit and what the FCC has done.

5295. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 05:45:16 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a03qu502afm@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28390

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011222220317.04115.00000525@mb-fy.aol.com...
> >The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> >First Amendment rights without badgering her.
>
> Why do Kim's alleged First Amendment rights take precedence over other
folks
> rights? IOW, why is it right for her to pick and use an inappropriate
callsign
> but not right for others talk about it?

Who said you weren't allowed to talk about it? All Cecil said was what he felt was the right thing to do. You are completely free to do the wrong thing. No one is stopping you.

5296. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 06:08:05 UTC
From: N7MFR <n7mfr@teleport.com>
Message-ID: <9xeV7.10921$Cw3.1288316@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 28391
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

And we needed to see this because.....its for sale?

"IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ce9e428e.0112201256.54a6f516@posting.google.com...
> FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF CBERS.
>
> "Kenneth Vaughan" <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<fGcU7.232938$3d2.11138155@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
>
> > twas the night before christmas,when all through the house.....
> > my radios were silent...silent as a mouse.
> > the antenna was hung by the chimney with care,
> > in hopes that the "skip",soon would be there.
> >
> > "gunslinger" was nestled,all snug in his bed.
> > while visions of x-force amps,danced in his head.
> >
> > when on my front door,there arose such a clatter...
> > i sprang from my bed, to see what was the matter!
> >
> > away to the window i flew like a flash,
> > thinking"if its uncle charlie,im outta some cash"
> > the moon on the breast of the new fallen snow,
> > gave the lustre of mid-day,to the assholes below.
> >
> > when what to my wondering eyes should appear!!
> > but an fcc van! and eight voobners in storm trooper gear!!!
> >
> > with a little old driver,so lively and quick!
> > i knew in a moment,its RILEY...the prick!!
> >
> > more rapid than eagles,his coursers they came,
> > and he cussed,and he cursed,and called them by name!
> > "now voobner!,now leland! now richard! and jerry!
> > "come on you dummies,weve got to hurry!"
> >
> > to the top of the porch! to the top of the wall!
> > now grab his gear! grab his gear! grab it all!!
> >
> > so out my back door,with my gear i flew!
> > with a box full of radios...and my linear ,too!
> >
> > i spoke not a word,but went straight to my work,

> > i hid all my gear,then returned to the "jerk"
> > and flashing the "bird" finger,right under his nose!
> >
> > said "too bad you couldnt find it,you dumb ass holes!!"
> >
> > and he heard me exclaim,ere he drove out of sight,
> > "screw you riley!"...rec radio....good night!!!
> >
> > elpasogunslinger merry christmas....(all of you)
>

5297. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 06:32:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011223013218.03420.00001037@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 28392

>Do you have a PhD in EE, Bruce? If not, are you too stupid
>to get one?
>--
>cheers, CAM

For your info yes I do, but what does that have to do with anything?

5298. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 06:43:43 UTC
From: "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
Message-ID: <a03uek02fsj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28301
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> released a brain fart when he wrote in
message news:Ov9V7.144346$bs2.23874540@news02.optonline.net...
> No..........It's just the way I am. I really DO think FCC regs SUCK OUT
> LOUD!

I think the laws that do not permit discharging firearms in populated areas
SUCK OUT LOUD. How about sending me your address so I can come fire a few
dozen 9-mm rounds through your front door? Screw laws and regs -- every man
for himself and let the one with the biggest caliber handgun win. Makes
sense to me.

Were you born stupid or did you just get that way through practice?

--
- - -

Regards,
Joe S.

> I've been on both sides of the fence and decided i liked the view better
> from the trees!
> I'm also not the TROLL who started the cross posted thread.
> Train
> "john" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:vI8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net...
> > Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
> > "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
> > news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
> > > I like it!
> > >
> > >
> > > IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> > > >
> > > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

5299. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 06:50:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C257ECF.BC4A1D29@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28393

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Since Dr. "No" has no need for HF
> > > > access, what is his beef? If he has none, why do you keep trotting him
> > > > out?
> > >
> > > As an example of a nocode tech who is perfectly satisfied with
> > > his present ham license...
> >
> > Bully for him. Why not let him speak for himself ...
>
> This newsgroup is not his cup of tea.

The poor guy.

> > >... and is technically head and shoulders
> > > above the vast majority of all coded hams.
> >
> > We have only your statement to that effect. I suppose only his
> > operating skills are lacking.
>
> He doesn't operate so he needs no operating skills. The only reason
> he has a ham license is to talk to his camping buddies.

Glad to hear that it has worked out well for him. He doesn't need HF
and doesn't have it. He doesn't need operating skills since he works
only other people whom I'd have to assume don't know much about
operating either. I'm frankly surprised he bothered to obtain any kind
of license. Sounds like FRS wouldn't have been perfect for him.

Dave K8MN

5300. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 06:52:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C257F2E.F828AC2A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28394

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > He has no beef. Mine is the idea presented by the PCTA folk that all
> > > > > nocode techs are technical dumb $hits. One would think a PhD in EE
> > > > > would be good enough proof to the contrary.
> > > >
> > > > I don't recall any idea presented by "PCTA folk" which is as
> > > > you claim. Are you basing your claim in the statements of one or two
> > > > individuals?
> > >
> > > I'm basing my claim on the statements of some members of the PCTA
> > > crowd, e.g. Larry and Dick.
> >
> > So let us make it clear right now then that you are basing your claim on
> > the statements of two individuals and not any "agenda" at all. Now that
> > you have changed your story, let us hope that you attempt to keep it
> > straight.
>
> I haven't changed my story. Do you know what "e.g." means?

Yeah and you've given two "e.g"'s. Sure you've changed your story. In
fact, you change your stories so often that even YOU can't keep up with
'em.

Dave K8MN

5301. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 06:53:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C257F69.8766A107@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28395

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> > > > callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?
> > >
> > > How can a private email be official?
> >
> > Riley e-mailed Kim from his home on his own time?
>
> Emails don't represent official policy. Where, exactly, is this
> official policy written down? I don't see it in Part 97.

What a simp.

Dave K8MN
```

5302. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 06:55:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C257FD3.8EAC7B58@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28396

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C252031.BDE6AC6A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > >Dave Heil wrote:
> > >> > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > >> > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> > >>
> > >> Because it is the right thing to do.
> > >
> > >The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> > >First Amendment rights without badgering her.
> >
> > Why do Kim's alleged First Amendment rights take precedence over other folks
> > rights? IOW, why is it right for her to pick and use an inappropriate callsign
> > but not right for others talk about it?
>
> Please produce something official from the FCC that says that Kim's callsign
> is inappropriate. Riley's prudish email is not official enough for me.

Man, that's tough. I'll bet the guy is happy that he doesn't report to
you.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

5303. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 06:56:24 UTC
From: Omniscient <KnowsAll@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <a03vae$47g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28397
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"N7MFR" <n7mfr@teleport.com> wrote in message
news:9xeV7.10921$Cw3.1288316@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> And we needed to see this because.....its for sale?
>
>
> "IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:ce9e428e.0112201256.54a6f516@posting.google.com...
> > FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF CBERS.
> >
> > "Kenneth Vaughan" <kenneth.vaughan@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:<fGcU7.232938$3d2.11138155@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> >
> > > twas the night before christmas,when all through the house.....
> > > my radios were silent...silent as a mouse.
> > > the antenna was hung by the chimney with care,
> > > in hopes that the "skip",soon would be there.
> > >
> > > "gunslinger" was nestled,all snug in his bed.
> > > while visions of x-force amps,danced in his head.
> > >
> > > when on my front door,there arose such a clatter...
> > > i sprang from my bed, to see what was the matter!
> > >
> > > away to the window i flew like a flash,
> > > thinking"if its uncle charlie,im outta some cash"
> > > the moon on the breast of the new fallen snow,
> > > gave the lustre of mid-day,to the assholes below.
> > >
> > > when what to my wondering eyes should appear!!
> > > but an fcc van! and eight voobners in storm trooper gear!!!
> > >
> > > with a little old driver,so lively and quick!
> > > i knew in a moment,its RILEY...the prick!!
> > >
> > > more rapid than eagles,his coursers they came,
> > > and he cussed,and he cursed,and called them by name!
> > > "now voobner!,now leland! now richard! and jerry!
> > > "come on you dummies,weve got to hurry!"
> > >
> > > to the top of the porch! to the top of the wall!
> > > now grab his gear! grab his gear! grab it all!!
> > >
> > > so out my back door,with my gear i flew!

> > > with a box full of radios...and my linear ,too!
> > >
> > > i spoke not a word,but went straight to my work,
> > > i hid all my gear,then returned to the "jerk"
> > > and flashing the "bird" finger,right under his nose!
> > >
> > > said "too bad you couldnt find it,you dumb ass holes!!"
> > >
> > > and he heard me exclaim,ere he drove out of sight,
> > > "screw you riley!"...rec radio....good night!!!
> > >
> > > elpasogunslinger merry christmas....(all of you)
> >
And your point is?
>

5304. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 06:59:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2580D6.5793C1C5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28398

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3C252031.BDE6AC6A@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> > >
> > > >Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >> > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > > >> > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> > > >>
> > > >> Because it is the right thing to do.
> > > >
> > > >The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> > > >First Amendment rights without badgering her.
> > >
> > > Why do Kim's alleged First Amendment rights take precedence over other folks
> > > rights? IOW, why is it right for her to pick and use an inappropriate callsign
> > > but not right for others talk about it?
> > >
> > > Looks like Cecil is only a libertarian if people agree with him.
> >
> > The secret is that Cecil isn't really a libertarian or Libertarian.
> > He is quick to attempt the stifling of opposing views.
>
> Just trying to get you to mind your own business. What is wrong with
> live and let live?

Vulgar callsigns and offensive speech in amateur radio are my business.
Let Kim try the "live and let live" for a change. Let Kim do her part
to avoid hosing up the amateur service. Let Kim think first of how her
choice might effect the sensibilities of others. Yeah, live and let
live.

Dave K8MN

5305. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 07:01:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C25813E.F6574435@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28399

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > > > > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> > > > >
> > > > > Because it is the right thing to do.
> > > >
> > > > The right thing to do would be to allow Kim to exercise her
> > > > First Amendment rights without badgering her.
> > >
> > > That isn't correct. That stifles MY First Amendment rights!
> > > There is no clause which demands that I agree to her view.
> >
> > But why don't you mind your own business and stop stalking Kim?
> > What is wrong with live and let live?

Why don't YOU mind YOUR own business? Stating my opinion about Kim's choice cannot be construed as "stalking" under any circumstances. Why are you attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights, Cecil?

Dave K8MN

5306. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 07:03:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2581DE.DDA7AB3F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28400

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > So Dave, are you going to bring that lawsuit against Kim or just try
> > > to kill her with the jawbone of an ass?
> >
> > After you're through yapping, perhaps you'll allow me to borrow it.
>
> I'm serious, Dave. When are you going to stop electronically stalking
> Kim and bring that lawsuit?

Ahhh, but you CAN'T be taken seriously here. I'm serious when I tell you that your "stalking" stuff is nonsense. This is a newsgroup. I post here. Kim posts here. You post here. This is a public bulletin board of opinion. I don't send Kim any e-mail or letters. I don't stand outside her home with a placard.

Why are attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights you old, false libertarian you?

Dave K8MN

5307. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 07:06:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C258285.AFA0528A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28302

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'll put you down in column B headed "Also Lacking Good Taste".
> > Always glad to hear from another who believes that there is no right and
> > wrong.
>
> There's nothing wrong with Kim's callsign. What is wrong is your
> electronic assault and battery of her on this newsgroup.

There's plenty wrong with Kim's lack of class in choosing a deliberately vulgar call. Your silly attempts to stifle my First Amendment rights by painting them as something other than what they are is absurd.

I find many of premises absurd--like the one where you claim to be a libertarian.

Dave K8MN

5308. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 07:14:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C25843D.C75BAE14@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28303

Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C251F43.1458C5DD@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> > > callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?
> >
> > How can a private email be official?
>
> Dave thinks that anything Riley says with regards to ham radio is in an
> official capacity, even if such statements are contrary to what the
> regulations permit and what the FCC has done.

Dave thinks Krell is guessing at what Dave thinks. Just a few posts earlier you made a statement in response to an FCC statement concerning the morality of a licensee. It would appear that the Commission does take such actions and I seem to recall similar language used in denying renewals in earlier years. Obtaining and holding an amateur radio license is by no means a right.

I wonder if Phil would care to comment.

Dave K8MN

5309. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 08:47:44 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a045nf$6fh$2@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28304
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> I suggest that you become familiar
> with the issues over APCO 25
> standards for digital trunked radio.
> The main purpose is to prevent private
> citizens from receiving ANY public
> radio transmission. As I am a member
> of APCO, I have had conversations with
> individuals who run public safety radio
> systems. Their one big goal is to have
> an digitally encrypted system that no one,
> not even the media, will be able to receive
> without their permission.

That is not the primary purpose. The primary purpose is so
that all radios have one communications standard, so that they
will be interoperable between systems. Understandably, the
manufacturers are not overly happy about this - as it eliminates
their propriatory functionality that generates their real money
maker - the sale of radios.

Digital encoding all by itself stops most people from receiving
the communications. There already exists the capability to encode
analog communications so that the public cannot monitor traffic,
if desired.

Some police forces might wish to keep the public ignorant. But
with the use of MDTs becoming more and more common, there isn't
much spoken over the radios that would be of concern - except
for special ops communications, which are already scrambled.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5310. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 08:55:24 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a0465r$6fh$3@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28305
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:

> It will cause more problems that it is worth.
> Right now most police officers use scanners
> to listen to adjacent patrol areas, other departments
> and others services. If radios are encrypted, you
> will only have those talk groups that are programmed
> into your radio. Already we have problems with
> various agencies not wanting other agencies on
> their talk groups. For example, the ambulance
> service does not want the fire fighters on their
> talk group. Makes it damned hard to co-ordinate
> at an accident scene or talk the ambulance in.

With a trunking system, you only have the talk groups that
are programmed into your radio - the same is true for systems.
This is no different than for conventional repeater setups.

With a trunking system - there is no need for different agencies
to be on the same talk groups - except for the designed interagency
groups. Those interagency groups are meant for use when such
coordinated operation is desired.

I speak from practical experience here. I have performed the design
and implementation of various trunking systems.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5311. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 08:58:20 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a046bc$6fh$4@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28306
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

> If encryption is a "fast one" it sure is taking a long
> time. The ability to encrypt has been around for
> years...nothing new on that technology.

Even conventional systems have had encryption for many years.
The delay is over the cost of replacing the current systems
with new equipment. The repeaters/controllers are relatively
inexpensive - it is replacing all the handhelds and mobils
that is most expensive.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5312. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 09:05:20 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a046of$6fh$5@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28307
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote:
> :
> : Other than the ban on cellular recieving capability for newly manufactured
> : scanners. Just what other restrictive laws about scanners are you
> : thinking of.

> Well part of that law made it illegal to
> reverse engineer any coding scheme
> such as Motorola's trunking format.
> Or their MDT coding. Mind you now,
> these are not encryption, just a computer
> code. It also restricted listening to pagers.

Funny. I wonder how Radio Shack can sell their trunking scanners then?
They were designed and built after the law was passed.

Further, there is (as far as I know) no law against analyzing the
over the air signals and producing a receiver that works based on
that information. As it is digital, it is really not very difficult.

> And remember, this only applies to civilians,
> the police are exempt.

From what? Hacking trunking schemes? Monitoring cellular communications?
The police cannot monitor cellular calls without a warrant - at least,
not legally.

> If the average police chief had his way, there would
> be no scanners, body armor, or guns in the hands of
> private citizens. Hell, too many chiefs would be happy
> if everyone was forced to take public transportation.
> All except their wives and kids, of course.

Police chiefs are politicians. They often have never had any experience
on the street.

> And someone is going to sue once it is learned
> that different agencies can not co-ordinate. It
> is going to cost someone there life.

Ah, but different agencies can coordinate - as long as the radios
are all in the same band. Such system interoperability is trivial
to set up.

> : > And you know that the media will be the first
> : > to be locked out. They are just now realizing

> : > that the cops might be pulling a fast one.
> :
> : If encryption is a "fast one" it sure is taking a long
> : time. The ability to encrypt has been around for
> : years...nothing new on that technology.

> Not cheaply and easily. Digital trunked radio
> has made it very easily. Except that digital trunking
> has not worked out as well as they had hoped.

What is wrong with digital trunking? From my experience, it has worked out quite well. A much larger number of communications are carried out on the same number of repeaters, and you don't have to listen on a channel before transmitting to make sure it is clear.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5313. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 09:08:21 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0473c$j0j$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28308

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a03p9q027l7@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:a02lo5$ci6$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> > http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/6/23494.html
> >
> > "In a five-page order released Friday, the US Federal Communications
> > Commission (FCC) claims that 38-year old convicted hacker Kevin Mitnick
is
> > not morally fit to be a ham radio operator. "
>
> Maybe this is how the FCC plans on dismantling the amateur radio service.
> They'll declare all current licensees morally unfit in some way, not renew
> the license, and when the numbers have dwindled low enough, sell off the
> spectrum to the highest commercial bidder.
>

N6NHG just rooted my Alinco DX-70TH! Now it's trying to make random PSK31
contacts with other 1337 hax0rs! ARRGH!!! ALL CAPS TOO. WHAT A L4M3R. Wait,
what was that? I didn't have anything in my toaster...what in the wide, wide
world of sports is a-goin' on here?

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

WARNING! This message has not been cleared by the Office Of Homeland
Security. Read at your own risk.

5314. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 09:09:26 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a04705$6fh$6@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28309
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> an earlier era, though not many years ago. But trunked digital comm systems are
> a double edged sword. They are like the cell phone system - fine when working,
> useless when not. Earlier base to mobile analog distpatch systems were and are
> more reliable. And much less expensive, always a factor, especially in a time of
> fading economic conditions..

All trunking systems have a fallback mode. If the controller fails, you now
have a standard conventional system.

Digital does have a somewhat shorter range than analog, but not much.

You are correct that the conventional systems were/are less expensive.
But they have their own shortcomings.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5315. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 09:27:35 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a04826$6fh$7@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28310
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>>
>> Officers have been wrong before - which is why evidence from searches
>> is sometimes ruled inadmissable.
>>
>> His statement is too broad to be true all the time.

> He is totally right. The officer has the
> right, confirmed by the courts, to inspect
> anything that is a car. Especially anything
> that is within reach of the driver.

That is not true, as others have pointed out. For example, say I
have a locked briefcase in the trunk of my car. The officer does
not have the right to even look in the trunk, much less the
briefcase. That is a long way from "anything that is (in) a car".
He did not qualify the statement by "within reach of the driver".
For that matter, a locked briefcase that is within the reach of
the driver is also probably not searchable without a warrant or
probable cause.

> While this has been mostly used over issues
> like firearms and drugs, it can apply to cell
> phones and radios if these devices would
> constitute a hazard to safe driving.

> I do not think that you realize how much authority
> the courts have given the police over the last 10
> years.

Oh yes I do. And some of the things they have been doing under
the pretext of the so-called "war on drugs" are frightening.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5316. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 11:44:12 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <gsjV7.307737$W8.11171087@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28311

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C255D0F.F58A7341@IEEE.org...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > >Legally, as much as you are since he is licensed.
> >
> > Are you in Love with this Dr??.
>
> Nope, he's just the only nocode tech I know with a PhD in EE.
> Do you have a PhD in EE, Bruce? If not, are you too stupid
> to get one?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Out of curiousity, is this a real two-language with all the frosting Piled
Hip Deep? Or might it be a Dummkopf Second Class? Almost makes one want
to go to Yale for a BA in EE. That'll humanize the technofreaks.

Dick, Beer Keg

5317. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 12:47:42 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a04p67$l7u$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28330
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
message news:d9f7b76c.0112222046.5c2c6625@posting.google.com...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:<a02dhn$1i6$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote
in
> > message news:d9f7b76c.0112210954.64cbefb7@posting.google.com...
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:<9vvhp3hkd5@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> > wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in the
70s.
> > They
> > > > > > were those little things with the big eyes and different colored,
Don
> > King
> > > > > > style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils, or
on
> > > > > > keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still around,
but
> > not
> > as
> > > > > > popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence in
> > popularity
> > > > > > about ten years ago.
> > > > >
> > > > > That anonymous COWARD is ignorant of everything. "Woger Wussman" aka
> > Twatty

> > > > Campbell(Posts as Scott Campbell) should be familiar with the troll
> > doll,
> > > > since he was the initial model for them.
> > >
> > > hit the bricks chuckie....you aren't wanted here.......
> >
> > Fuck off, Dickhead, as the Stones sing "You can't always get what you
want."
>
>
> oh geez...what happened chuckie.....get kicked off the ham reflector
> because you pissed in measure's corn flakes one too many times????

Reflector, anonymous coward? So you're a ham radio newbie as well as an internet newbie. Oh, too bad, gay SD. Haven't been "kicked" anywhere, you ignorant dolt.

5318. Re: Roger Goes (Humming) Caroling

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:31:01 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a04p6u$l7u$g@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28331
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.2600

```
"Robert" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:a02ndg$mih$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a02dik$1i6$m@pita.alt.net...
> >
> --
> > "Impotent" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > news:a00o9k$pb4$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:9vvhos$hkd$3@pita.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > "ghost" <ghost_dj_no_spam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:zfyU7.5432$Cw3.657624@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > "Omniscient" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:9vuapu$nrs$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > > > > > Roger and some of his "dear" friends at the Pink Triangle Sweet
> Meat
> > > > Bar
> > > > > and
> > > > > > > Grill have gotten together and formed a group called The Hummers
> to
> > > go
> > > > > > > Christmas caroling. They have but one song on their list but
they
> do
> > > it
> > > > > > > well, often, and usually to "stand up" crowds.
> > > > > > > That one song is their most favorite, and they can hum "Come All
> Ye
> > > > > > > Faithful" in three different octaves. They usually hum this
little
> > > ditty
> > > > > > > while on their knees and Roger is typically the leading
supplicant
> > and
> > > > > > > greatest crowd pleaser.
> > > > > > > There is no shortage of protein in Roger's diet and his twinky
> > little
> > > > > Pinky
> > > > > > > butties have fondly dubbed Roger with the nickname "Chipmunk
```

> > Cheeks".
> > > > > > Roger still holds the humming record for no spillage, but his
> > butties
> > > > are
> > > > > > quickly bringing up the rear.
> > > > > > Roger, ever undaunted, unabashedly informs his admirers that the
> > > secret
> > > > to
> > > > > > his sucksess is, "If at first you don't suck seed, suck, suck
> > again."
> > > > > > Go, Roger! Go!
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > LMFAO
> > > > >
> > > > > ghost
> > > >
> > > > Translation: "Slllllluuuuurrrrrpppp!"
> > > >
> > > > "Ghjost" is familiar with licking rectums, since that's how he got
the
> > > > herpes on his tongue.
> > >
> >
> > Poor Impotent, he was so upset at his ineffectiveness, he spammed with
> > identical responses on two posts. Run along and beat your wife up some
> more,
> > wife beater.
>
> One Who Knows the feel of a sheep's anus [flush!]

Poor babbling cocoaine addict Booby.

5319. Re: Roger Goes (Humming) Caroling

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:32:24 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a04p6v$l7u$h@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28332
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Robert" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:a02nj6$msm$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a02dil$1i6$n@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Omniscient" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > news:a00o7r$p7l$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:9vvhor$hkd$2@pita.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Impotent" <KnowsAssholeswell@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:9vuapu$nrs$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > > > > Roger and some of his "dear" friends at the Pink Triangle Sweet
Meat
> > Bar
> > > > > and
> > > > > > Grill have gotten together and formed a group called The Hummers
to
> go
> > > > > > Christmas caroling. They have but one song on their list but they
do
> > it
> > > > > > well, often, and usually to "stand up" crowds.
> > > > > > That one song is their most favorite, and they can hum "Come All
Ye
> > > > > > Faithful" in three different octaves. They usually hum this little
> > ditty
> > > > > > while on their knees and Roger is typically the leading supplicant
> and
> > > > > > greatest crowd pleaser.
> > > > > > There is no shortage of protein in Roger's diet and his twinky
> little
> > > > Pinky
> > > > > > butties have fondly dubbed Roger with the nickname "Chipmunk
> Cheeks".
> > > > > > Roger still holds the humming record for no spillage, but his
> butties
> > > are
> > > > > > quickly bringing up the rear.
> > > > > > Roger, ever undaunted, unabashedly informs his admirers that the
> > secret
```

> > > to
> > > > > his sucksess is, "If at first you don't suck seed, suck, suck
> again."
> > > > > Go, Roger! Go!
> > > >
> > > > Poor anonymous COWARD all he's got is a pathetic IKYABWAI.
> > > > Too bad he's been charged with molesting his two daughters.
> >
> > [flush]
> >
> > Poor Impotent the anonymous COWARD.
>
> Still [STOMP!]

Still hiding behind that anonimity, taliban-supporting COWARD?

> --
> One Who Knows the feel of a sheep's anus

5320. Re: Roger Goes (Humming) Caroling

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:35:06 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a04p70$l7u$i@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28333
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Pedophile
"Robert" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:a02nae$mch$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a02dii$1i6$1@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Impotent" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > news:a00o54$ovv$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "ghost" <ghost_dj_no_spam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:cuIU7.6197$Cw3.725258@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > > <snip>
> > > >
> > > > "Slllllluuuuurrrrrpppp!"
> > > > >
> > > > > "Ghjost" is familiar with licking rectums, since that's how he got
> the
> > > > > herpes on his tongue.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > That was lame, perhaps you would care to try again? Let's play a
game,
> I
> > > > hold my hand up, and you pick a finger. It's an easy game, as I will
> let
> > > you
> > > > keep guessing till you get it right.
> > > >
> > > ghost
> > > >
> > >
> > > --
> > >
> --
> One Who Knows the touch of a sheep's anus said:
> "The hallmark of an outed coward is my hiding behind aliases. Get the best
sheep
> you can find. Then the cum you swallow won't get that stale taste to it.

Poor anonymous COWARD.
```

> > Impotent and Gasp are familiar with stale tates, since they regularly
suck
> > off their grandfathers.

Impotent's admission he sucks off his grandfather, noted.
> >
>
>

5321. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:35:19 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <r4lV7.17$Qs3.66489@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net>
Source record: 28312
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

: > : Other than the ban on cellular recieving capability for newly
manufactured
: > : scanners. Just what other restrictive laws about scanners are you
: > : thinking of.
:
: > Well part of that law made it illegal to
: > reverse engineer any coding scheme
: > such as Motorola's trunking format.
: > Or their MDT coding. Mind you now,
: > these are not encryption, just a computer
: > code. It also restricted listening to pagers.
:
: Funny. I wonder how Radio Shack can sell their trunking scanners then?
: They were designed and built after the law was passed.
:
: Further, there is (as far as I know) no law against analyzing the
: over the air signals and producing a receiver that works based on
: that information. As it is digital, it is really not very difficult.

I do not think that law was passed. There
was a good deal of opposition from within
the ham community. I believe that it was in
committee last year and was quietly dropped.

But the idea is still on the backburner, so to
speak.

: > And remember, this only applies to civilians,
: > the police are exempt.
:
: From what? Hacking trunking schemes? Monitoring cellular communications?
: The police cannot monitor cellular calls without a warrant - at least,
: not legally.

The police can not use information gathered in
court if it has not be subject to a warrant. But
the law exempts the police. They can buy scanners,
or even modified cellular equipment, and listen to
whatever they want. There is no restrictions on
them, or us, about listening. It is that they can not
official gather "intelligence" without a warrant.

: > If the average police chief had his way, there would
: > be no scanners, body armor, or guns in the hands of
: > private citizens. Hell, too many chiefs would be happy

: > if everyone was forced to take public transportation.
: > All except their wives and kids, of course.
:
: Police chiefs are politicians. They often have never had any experience
: on the street.
:
: > And someone is going to sue once it is learned
: > that different agencies can not co-ordinate. It
: > is going to cost someone there life.
:
: Ah, but different agencies can coordinate - as long as the radios
: are all in the same band. Such system interoperability is trivial
: to set up.

In the "heat of battle", it is too late. What happens
now is that each patrol area or agency vehicles can
monitor each other via scanners. If things are encrypted,
it would mean that dispatch would have to move everyone
to a common talk group which would take time.

Give you an example. I was talking over lunch with a
sheriff's deputy who transfers prisoners from the jail to
the court house. He has the sheriff's talk groups but does
not have the baliff's nor the downtown police talk groups.
If he were to have a prisoner escape, he would have to
co-ordinate everything via dispatch. It may take several
minutes to inform everyone. Some may be totally out of
the loop and even have the escaped prisoner go right by
them. Scanners help in such cases to keep everyone informed.

: > : > And you know that the media will be the first
: > : > to be locked out. They are just now realizing
: > : > that the cops might be pulling a fast one.
: > :
: > : If encryption is a "fast one" it sure is taking a long
: > : time. The ability to encrypt has been around for
: > : years...nothing new on that technology.
:
: > Not cheaply and easily. Digital trunked radio
: > has made it very easily. Except that digital trunking
: > has not worked out as well as they had hoped.
:
: What is wrong with digital trunking? From my experience, it has
: worked out quite well. A much larger number of communications are
: carried out on the same number of repeaters, and you don't have
: to listen on a channel before transmitting to make sure it is
: clear.

Read http://www.strongsignals.net on a regular
basis. Much of the digital systems are not working
well. Now they think that the NYC FD digital

radios may not have worked thus not informing
the fire fighters to leave the WTC in time.

5322. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:36:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25D0CC.66AF4F6D@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28313

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Yeah, Congratulations on the downgraded "upgrade", Carl. I guess you do
> >it however and whenever you can
>
> Those who can't build things up tear things down. It has been the modus
> operandi of our lowest common denominator for years. Is THAT what learning
> code teaches people to become?

Nosir, Edard, that's what NOT learning code teaches people.

5323. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:37:12 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <c6lV7.18$Qs3.67090@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net>
Source record: 28317
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

```
: > It will cause more problems that it is worth.
: > Right now most police officers use scanners
: > to listen to adjacent patrol areas, other departments
: > and others services. If radios are encrypted, you
: > will only have those talk groups that are programmed
: > into your radio. Already we have problems with
: > various agencies not wanting other agencies on
: > their talk groups. For example, the ambulance
: > service does not want the fire fighters on their
: > talk group. Makes it damned hard to co-ordinate
: > at an accident scene or talk the ambulance in.
:
: With a trunking system, you only have the talk groups that
: are programmed into your radio - the same is true for systems.
: This is no different than for conventional repeater setups.
:
: With a trunking system - there is no need for different agencies
: to be on the same talk groups - except for the designed interagency
: groups. Those interagency groups are meant for use when such
: coordinated operation is desired.
:
: I speak from practical experience here. I have performed the design
: and implementation of various trunking systems.

And if everything is encrypted then one can not
monitor other agencies. Many LEOs have scanners
in their vehicles.
```

5324. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:38:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25D150.69216283@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28314

Bill Sohl wrote:

> On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 17:45:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
> >A professional engineer should have aced the Extra test.
>
> Why? 1/4 or more of the questions involve totally
> non-technical subjects (VE credentials, amateur space
> operations rules, etc.)

I aced the Extra test over 30 years ago, long before VE credential etc
questions, and I'm, not a degreed engineer. All that means what?

5325. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:39:19 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <b8lV7.19$Qs3.67667@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net>
Source record: 28315
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

```
: > I suggest that you become familiar
: > with the issues over APCO 25
: > standards for digital trunked radio.
: > The main purpose is to prevent private
: > citizens from receiving ANY public
: > radio transmission. As I am a member
: > of APCO, I have had conversations with
: > individuals who run public safety radio
: > systems. Their one big goal is to have
: > an digitally encrypted system that no one,
: > not even the media, will be able to receive
: > without their permission.
:
: That is not the primary purpose. The primary purpose is so
: that all radios have one communications standard, so that they
: will be interoperable between systems. Understandably, the
: manufacturers are not overly happy about this - as it eliminates
: their propriatory functionality that generates their real money
: maker - the sale of radios.
:
: Digital encoding all by itself stops most people from receiving
: the communications. There already exists the capability to encode
: analog communications so that the public cannot monitor traffic,
: if desired.
:
: Some police forces might wish to keep the public ignorant. But
: with the use of MDTs becoming more and more common, there isn't
: much spoken over the radios that would be of concern - except
: for special ops communications, which are already scrambled.

And look at how pissed everyone got when
Bill Cheek broke the Motorola encoding for
their MDT's! Just because the NYC PD
department had a bunch of cops using the
MDT's to pass their off color jokes about
women and minorities.
```

5326. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:41:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25D1E5.D1C0B74A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28316

Krell wrote:

> . (We now
> have Kim, W5TIT, being a boil on his behind and taking pleasure in it, but
> that's another topic)

Wrong, she's a pimple on the nose of the ARS and evidently sees that as her
main goal in life.

5327. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:46:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25D311.555196F7@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28318

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3C1E45C3.B98A3784@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> After all, Carl's the professional engineer -- not me!
> >
> >So when are you going to get off your lazy ass and get an
> >engineering degree, Larry?
>
> Cecil:
>
> Never -- that's not what I aspire to be!
>
> >While Carl has been doing
> >professional engineering, you have wasted your time
> >doing what?
>
> Serving my country -- sacrificing the best and most productive years
> of my adult life to support the effort necessary to defeat the Evil
> Empire of the Soviet Union, bring the threat of Soviet Communist
> hegemony to an end, and make the world much safer from nuclear
> holocaust. All of my fellow Cold War Era veterans did the same thing,
> and I don't consider that to have been a waste of our time.

And all the while Cecil & col were busy pursuing another spot of that "One-hit
$hit" he loves.

5328. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:48:21 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <FgIV7.307794$W8.11176598@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28319

> > Dave Heil wrote

> > > Not really, Kim. I don't believe that you have any concept of what is
> > > appropriate. I don't know how many think it is "OK". You've received
a
> > > few statements of support here.

> Richard Plourde wrote:

> > I didn't say it was "OK", I said it was fine...

> > Consice and to the point...

Dave Heil wrote

> It sounded pretty "consice" to me too.

I knew it... as soon as I posted it...

I'd, mistakenly, spelled concise wrong; since I've aggravated the
'anal-retentives'... sorry, Dave, I didn't intend for it to be a troll.

Rich

And... of course they'd miss the humor. ;-)

Rich

5329. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:49:42 UTC
From: Scout <scout@monumental.com>
Message-ID: <kglV7.3967$0g.106631@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28320
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:h5cV7.1259$UO1.617492@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
>
> Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> wrote...
> : "Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote ...
> : > > There is a pecking order. Governors and mayors are
> : > > the most valuable then powerful men then professionals
> : > > like doctors and lawyers. The Police are just under mayors.
> : >
> : > If I were injured, I would feel that a doctor was far more important
> : > than some political hack who happened to get elected to office.
> : >
> : > > Look there are so many elite who see the police and
> : > > the military as a bunch of losers who are there to die
> : > > for them. People like you who make huge amounts
> : > > of money and live in big fancy houses. I have them
> : > > in my community. The military is not allowed to recruit
> : > > in the local high school as their kids are going to college
> : > > and the military is for those who can't really make it.
> : >
> : > > People like you see themselves as too valuable to get
> : > > their hands dirty. Sorry but your life is not worth that
> : > > of a police officer, a fire fighter or a soldier.
> : >
> : > How do you know what we do for our livings?
> : >
> : > In my opinion, it is elitist attitudes like yours that are part of
> : > the problems we face in this country.
> : >
> : > --
> : > Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
> : >
> :
> : ABSOLUTELY! And, most cops don't think they are better than anyone
else.
> : It's the ones that do that make it so rough for the industry (and while
I
> : used the word "most" in my last sentence, there are still lots who do
> think
> : they are more important).
> :
> : Each and every one of us is nearly, if not exactly, as important as the
> : next. We all have our "things" to do, work to do, families to raise,

> : neighborhoods to live in, communities to vote and pay taxes in, etc.
Not
> : one of us is doing something more important than the next.
> :
> : And, please don't use the excuse that cops or firefighters put
themselves
> in
> : harm's way more than anyone else. When I get in my vehicle every day to
> go
> : to work, statistics say that I am more likely to be injured or die than
> any
> : other industry-related statistic! Add rain, snow or ice to that
scenario
> : and it's pretty darned dangerous just getting to work.
> :
> : Kim W5TIT
> :
>
> But it is not in your job description that you
> MUST risk your life as part of your job.

Life is risk, and ALL jobs require a certain level of risk acceptance to perform. Miners must risk their lives to perform their jobs.....they know the hazards and the rate of death in their industry, yet they accept that and continue to work.

You're just pissed, again, because people aren't buying into your "I'm superior to you because I'm military" crap.

What I find really interesting is how on one hand you claim you have to risk your life as part of your job, then on the other gripe because "the yuppies" send you out on missions that risk your life.

If risk is in your job description (and I would like to see you document that), then quit bitching when you are asked to risk your life in the performance of your job.

5330. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:54:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E219.80BB8338@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28321

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm frankly surprised he bothered to obtain any kind of license.

He got tired of all us hams being able to communicate on
camping trips while he drove around lost in the desert.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5331. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:55:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E257.93706B4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28322

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I haven't changed my story. Do you know what "e.g." means?
>
> Yeah and you've given two "e.g"'s.

Yep, two examples - there are many more.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5332. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:56:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E299.4AB9B5B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28323

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >Do you have a PhD in EE, Bruce? If not, are you too stupid
> >to get one?
>
> For your info yes I do, but what does that have to do with anything?

I'm assuming your PhD is not in English.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5333. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 13:57:00 UTC
From: Bradley Stone <nb9mNOSPAM@reliable-net.net>
Message-ID: <u2d3h0b84gh49a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 28459
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Loose it to what? The imbecilic, pathetic, moral-less banter amid the squeals and howls of mis-tuned transmitters, roger-beeps and echoes characteristic of CB now? Why do you think that abuse is better than no use at all? Jeez-0-Pete; I can't even tune into 11 meters with the kids around.

Corporate expansion? What's that supposed to mean????

Do you think law-abiding, cooperative, knowledegable hams are going to happily loose 10 meters like they did the 11 meter band all those years ago?

Take a deep breath and consider this: there are other people in this world but you - and they DON'T exist solely to provide you pleasure and comfort, or support you when you don't get your sophomoric way. The law IS the law. Just because you don't like it doesn't make it less so.

Alternatively, study and get your ticket. Try it - it can build character!

-Brad, NB9M

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in message news:d9f7b76c.0112222044.50ba0dc5@posting.google.com...
> "john" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message news:<vI8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net>...
> > Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
> > "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
> > news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
> > > I like it!
> > >
> > >
> > > IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> > > >
> > > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
> > >
> > >
>
> oh cool ....move over hammies.......its called corporate
> expansion.....i told you...we are in the appropriation business....if
> you don't use it you loose it.......remember????

5334. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:00:01 UTC
From: Bradley Stone <nb9mNOSPAM@reliable-net.net>
Message-ID: <u2d3mp4u7st5e0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 28460
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

The poor spelling and incorrect use of apostrophes are SO characteristic...

"IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
>
> http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/

5335. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:03:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E417.47048036@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28324

Krell wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C251F43.1458C5DD@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> > > callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?
> >
> > How can a private email be official?
>
> Dave thinks that anything Riley says with regards to ham radio is in an
> official capacity, even if such statements are contrary to what the
> regulations permit and what the FCC has done.

One would think that official United States of America Federal Communications Commission policy would appear somewhere besides private emails. Aren't they required by law under the Freedom of Information Act to publish their official policy somewhere besides private email?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5336. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:03:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E449.1010740E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28325

Dave Heil wrote:
> Vulgar callsigns and offensive speech in amateur radio are my business.

How many of them do you sell each year?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5337. Re: Big Al sucks and swallows Omniscient

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:04:55 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a04p74$l7u$l@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28334
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.2600,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Impotent" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:a02nua$nl7$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a02ebd$2rk$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Big Al" <Big_Al@38945BigAl.net> wrote in message
> > news:a026p3nsv0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > Roger [Slurp slurp slurp]
> >
> > Poor "Big Al" slurping "Impotent's" syphlitic ass in public. Too bad he
> only
> > has a G.E.D. and no degree or even a "certificate" from any
post-secondary
> > educational institution.
> > Now, he's stuck in those service jobs is the only types of jobs he's
> > qualified for.
>
> And this [Whiny, sniveling excuses]

Impotent regularly fucks his underaged daughters....because to them he's a
"big man" but his wife considers him an "itsy bitsy man."

5338. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:07:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E518.9E3CCBAA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28326

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Please produce something official from the FCC that says that Kim's callsign
> > is inappropriate. Riley's prudish email is not official enough for me.
>
> Man, that's tough. I'll bet the guy is happy that he doesn't report to
> you.

I believe it is illegal to publish United States of America Federal
Communications Commission official policy only in private email.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5339. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:08:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E55B.CAB1609F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28327

Dave Heil wrote:
> Why don't YOU mind YOUR own business? Stating my opinion about Kim's
> choice cannot be construed as "stalking" under any circumstances. Why
> are you attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights, Cecil?

You've had your say ten times over, Dave. What you are doing now is
electronic stalking.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5340. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:11:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E60B.605D8A47@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28328

Dave Heil wrote:
> Why are attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights you old, false
> libertarian you?

You've had your say ten times over. If the FCC found anything wrong
with Kim's callsign, they would recall it. What you are doing now is
badgering and harassing, the equivalent of electronic stalking.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5341. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:14:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E6C9.BC90E5FC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28329

Dave Heil wrote:
> There's plenty wrong with Kim's lack of class in choosing a deliberately
> vulgar call.

That's your personal delusional opinion, Dave, and you are sticking to
it. If the FCC thought there was anything wrong with Kim's callsign,
they shouldn't have issued it. Thus, you have sided with Queen Victoria,
a sad throwback to days long passed.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5342. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:21:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25E872.3799835A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28335

Dave Heil wrote:
> Why are you attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights, Cecil?

Please explain exactly what magical power I am using to attempt to
stifle your First Amendment rights, Dave. Am I putting tape over
the mouth of your voodoo doll or what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5343. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:42:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011223094250.13039.00001539@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28336

In article <3C220AC9.3A5FC71@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>But I am talking about ratios: PhD/BS = extra/tech+

Cecil:

These days, an Extra is to a Tech Plus what a 9th grader with an
'A' average is to a 9th grader with a 'B' average. There's just not
that much difference in overall effort required anymore, just an
inflation in the operating privileges bestowed for such a small effort.
You can't use the Ph. D-to-B.S. comparison, because either one
is way off the scale compared to acquiring an Extra-class license
these days -- or at any time, for that matter.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5344. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:42:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011223094250.13039.00001540@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28337

In article <3C217DE8.22B61FFC@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> A Ph.D. degree is to a BS degree as a tech license is to an extra license.
>> Any holder of a BS degree who doesn't have a Ph.D. degree is a hypocrite
>> for ragging on a tech+ who doesn't have an extra license.
>
>An extra is equivalent to maybe a 5 credit class in an electrical
>engineering curriculum.

Bob:

Not even that. It's probably the equivalent of a couple of seminars --
MAYBE. Anyone who has even a passing interest in electronics
from a consumer standpoint can probably take the Extra test stone
cold and score over 50%. Add a couple of hours of boning up on
sample exams, and you've got it knocked. Any ham who doesn't
have his Extra these days obviously has some serious fear of
failure issues, or is simply a moron looking for his well-deserved
recognition as such. A Tech with a Ph. D in E. E. has no excuse
whatsoever, considering the fact that the 5 WPM code test can
be passed with as little as one evening's worth of preparation.

I know several hams with Ph. D's in technical fields, and each and
every one of them is a CW-proficient, Pre-Restructuring, Pro-Code
Testing, Amateur Extra class licensee.

73 de Larry, K3LT
The Amateur Radio Superior of all No-Code Techs with Ph. D's in E.E.

5345. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:42:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011223094251.13039.00001541@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28339

In article <3C251E5E.41E3536B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> CAM wrote:
>> > He has no beef. Mine is the idea presented by the PCTA folk that all
>> > nocode techs are technical dumb $hits. One would think a PhD in EE
>> > would be good enough proof to the contrary.
>>
>> I don't recall any idea presented by "PCTA folk" which is as
>> you claim. Are you basing your claim in the statements of one or two
>> individuals?
>
>I'm basing my claim on the statements of some members of the PCTA
>crowd, e.g. Larry and Dick.

Cecil:

Please provide a quote where I said *all* no-code Techs are
"technical dumb-shits," or words to that effect. The quotation must
use the term "all no-code Techs" i.e. not having excluded even
one single no-code Tech from the statement. Provide that
quote, or perhaps you and your lying will have to be the topic
of another long-running thread!

5346. Re: .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:42:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011223094252.13039.00001542@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28338

In article <20011222111038.10711.00000284@mb-cc.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>>I was perfectly aware that Greg's ticket expires next month.
>
> Then you got the whole message.
>
>>I was referring to the total length of his license term,...(SNIP)
>
> You were trying to read too much into it, Larry.
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Steve:

OIC. Well, then, if the whole message is that this guy Greg's ticket expires next month, then please, let us in on it -- WHAT IS THE POINT??? Who is N9NWO to us -- the regular participants in this newsgroup?

I'm sure that there are hundreds of hams whose tickets expire next month, but you only posted N9NWO'S here. What is it all about? I'm more interested in why his ticket was good for less than 1 1/2 years.

Am I going to get the same attention from you in March of 2007, one month before *my* ticket expires?

73 de Larry, K3LT

5347. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:42:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011223094252.13039.00001543@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28340

In article <3C24E006.31FB7868@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Sorry Larry, Riley has proved he has prudish hangups and I have
>> >lost a lot of respect for him because of that. He offered his
>> >personal opinion while in an FCC position. That is exactly
>> >the thing that you condemned Ed Hare for - offering his personal
>> >opinion while in an ARRL position. You are a hypocrite.
>>
>> Don't look now, but I didn't say that.
>
>Of course you did, Larry. The entire newsgroup read it.

Cecil:

OK, maybe you'd better look now, because I *did not* say that!

Your homework for tonight is to find and post a direct quote from
me where I said I was "condemning" Ed for offering his personal
opinion while in an ARRL position. Make sure the attributions are
correct when you cut/paste it to a new posting. And if you can't,
won't, or simply don't want to do your "homework" then your
very *next* posting should be an apology to me for lying about me --
again!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5348. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:46:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011223094648.20186.00000788@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 28341

>I'm assuming your PhD is not in English.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.n

What does that have to do with the Subject? As a matter of fact why do you keep bringing up this phoney Dr. His he a God or something that we are suppose to be proud to know, does he sell T-Shirts with his Picture on it. If he does sell T-Shirts, maybe we can all buy 1 or 2, then before we push are Mic Buttons we can put are T-Shirts on face toward Texas, and pray to the Dr that we work some Rare DX.

5349. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 14:48:56 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <s9mV7.31$Qs3.99910@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net>
Source record: 28342
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

```
: > : > > There is a pecking order. Governors and mayors are
: > : > > the most valuable then powerful men then professionals
: > : > > like doctors and lawyers. The Police are just under mayors.
: > : >
: > : > If I were injured, I would feel that a doctor was far more important
: > : > than some political hack who happened to get elected to office.
: > : >
: > : > > Look there are so many elite who see the police and
: > : > > the military as a bunch of losers who are there to die
: > : > > for them. People like you who make huge amounts
: > : > > of money and live in big fancy houses. I have them
: > : > > in my community. The military is not allowed to recruit
: > : > > in the local high school as their kids are going to college
: > : > > and the military is for those who can't really make it.
: > : >
: > : > > People like you see themselves as too valuable to get
: > : > > their hands dirty. Sorry but your life is not worth that
: > : > > of a police officer, a fire fighter or a soldier.
: > : >
: > : > How do you know what we do for our livings?
: > : >
: > : > In my opinion, it is elitist attitudes like yours that are part of
: > : > the problems we face in this country.
: > : >
: > :
: > : ABSOLUTELY! And, most cops don't think they are better than anyone
: else. It's the ones that do that make it so rough for the industry (and
while
: I used the word "most" in my last sentence, there are still lots who do
: > think they are more important).
: > :
: > : Each and every one of us is nearly, if not exactly, as important as
the
: > : next. We all have our "things" to do, work to do, families to raise,
: > : neighborhoods to live in, communities to vote and pay taxes in, etc.
: Not one of us is doing something more important than the next.
: > :
: > : And, please don't use the excuse that cops or firefighters put
: themselves in harm's way more than anyone else. When I get in my vehicle
every day to go to work, statistics say that I am more likely to be injured
or die than any other industry-related statistic! Add rain, snow or ice
to that
: scenario and it's pretty darned dangerous just getting to work.
```

: > :
: > : Kim W5TIT
: > :
: >
: > But it is not in your job description that you
: > MUST risk your life as part of your job.
:
: Life is risk, and ALL jobs require a certain level of risk acceptance to
: perform. Miners must risk their lives to perform their jobs.....they know
: the hazards and the rate of death in their industry, yet they accept that
: and continue to work.
:
: You're just pissed, again, because people aren't buying into your "I'm
: superior to you because I'm military" crap.
:
: What I find really interesting is how on one hand you claim you have to
risk
: your life as part of your job, then on the other gripe because "the
yuppies"
: send you out on missions that risk your life.
:
: If risk is in your job description (and I would like to see you document
: that), then quit bitching when you are asked to risk your life in the
: performance of your job.

Then recognize our superiority by paying 75% of
your income to support us in the style that you live.

5350. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:01:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011223100146.13039.00001546@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28343

In article <3C255BB6.62C9C0DB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>I'm serious, Dave. When are you going to stop electronically stalking
>Kim and bring that lawsuit?

Cecil:

Nobody in this newsgroup is "stalking" anyone else, electronically
or otherwise. You are obviously *not* serious!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5351. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:01:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011223100146.13039.00001545@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28344

In article <3C255C29.8338AA2B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>There's nothing wrong with Kim's callsign. What is wrong is your
>electronic assault and battery of her on this newsgroup.

Cecil:

Nobody is committing "assault and battery" on anyone else in this
newsgroup, electronically or otherwise. The only thing wrong here
is your very Cecil-like tendency to make bizarre statements about
other people's behavior when it is yours which is in question.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5352. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:01:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011223100147.13039.00001547@mb-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 28345

In article <3C255A5A.FB4C75D0@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Please produce something official from the FCC that says that Kim's callsign
>is inappropriate. Riley's prudish email is not official enough for me.

Cecil:

You are years behind on "producing" documentary proof of statements
you've made here. If I were you, I'd get caught up, and restore some
semblence of credibility before I asked anyone else for "something
official" to back up what they say.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5353. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:04:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25E552.2FE7C823@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28346

Dave Heil wrote:

> > > > Where did Dave lie, Kim? I must have missed that!
> > >
> > > She must mean the portion where I stated that she dismissed Riley's
> > > view. That isn't a lie though. That is precisely what took place.
> > > She retained her call despite Riley's words. That certainly shows that
> > > she dismissed what he wrote.
> > >
> >
> > ho ho ho....ya found a silver lining in your train of thinking, did ya?
> > You're hilarious. WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
>
> Because it is the right thing to do.
>
> > > She also perceives someone as an "elitist" when that person recognizes
> > > tacky as tacky.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > You are an elitist, Dave. A highly crappy one, but one nevertheless.
>
> Why would that be the case? Is it because I didn't choose a tacky
> callsign? Is it because I've stated that I find your choice of calls is
> tacky and lacking in judgement?

So there it all is -'W5TIT' is Kim's ultimate claim to fame within ham radio.
The best she will ever do, the top accomplisment. Pitiful.

5354. Re: SOCK PUPPET CONFESSES!! (was: Hal Turder and others)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:12:06 UTC
From: Firebottle <Firebottle@EdNortonNet.org>
Message-ID: <a04s73$3h4$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28347
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a04rco$v1h$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 08:08:51 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> >
> > "radiosigs" <radiosigs@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:a02jqp$du4$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > AF2Y
> >
> > Hi, me!
>
> Stagger Lee is right! You _are_ a radiosigs sock puppet!!!

Can you imagine? KC8JBO gets up this morning, tells Big
Marie to shut up, then gets on Usenet. Poor Wogey, too
chicken shit to show up at Dalton, too chicken shit to talk
in person with N8WGM, too chicken shit to talk on 3901,
too chicken shit to talk in person to Oris. Wogey, lets face it,
you are just a plagiarizing Chicken Shit with no friends
anywhere. Usenet is your life, HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR

5355. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:24:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25F749.FA191C94@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28348

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Please provide a quote where I said *all* no-code Techs are
> "technical dumb-shits," or words to that effect.

Larry, when you say nocode techs are dumb-shits, the English
language implication is "all". If you meant "some", you should
have said "some". Would you like to correct your statement?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5356. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:26:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25F7B8.8F233EA8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28349

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >I'm assuming your PhD is not in English.
>
> What does that have to do with the Subject?

If you cannot figure out what the UK has to do with English,
I feel sorry for you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5357. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:28:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25F800.91576D8B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28350

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C255A5A.FB4C75D0@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >Please produce something official from the FCC that says that Kim's callsign
> > >is inappropriate. Riley's prudish email is not official enough for me.
>
> You are years behind on "producing" documentary proof of statements
> you've made here. If I were you, I'd get caught up, and restore some
> semblence of credibility before I asked anyone else for "something
> official" to back up what they say.

Translation: I, Larry, cannot provide the requested official statement
so I will mount an ad hominem attack, as usual.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5358. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:32:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25F902.BF4BE4F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28252

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3C255BB6.62C9C0DB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > >
> > >I'm serious, Dave. When are you going to stop electronically stalking
> > >Kim and bring that lawsuit?
>
> Nobody in this newsgroup is "stalking" anyone else, electronically
> or otherwise. You are obviously *not* serious!

Larry, you electronically stalked Ed until he gave up on this newsgroup.
Now you are electronically stalking Kim. Why do you get so much pleasure
from sadistically verbally assaulting your fellow hams?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5359. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:32:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25EC0B.6123875D@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28251

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Krell wrote:
>
> > . (We now
> > have Kim, W5TIT, being a boil on his behind and taking pleasure in it, but
> > that's another topic)
>
> Wrong, she's a pimple on the nose of the ARS and evidently sees that as her
> main goal in life.

What Kim *really* has done is that she has willingly - nay, *eagerly* - joined up with the tribe of morons that inhabit 3950, 14.313, and whatever those other obscenity-laden spots on HF are.
The neat part of it all is that she didn't need to ever place a signal on the air nor utter a word in direct parfticipation. Her callsign says it all!

5360. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:33:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25F946.49F399ED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28253

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Nobody is committing "assault and battery" on anyone else in this
> newsgroup, electronically or otherwise.

Larry, your sadistic postings are there for all to see. How you can
deny your verbal assaults is beyond comprehension.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5361. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:36:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25ECF7.8D8BE330@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28254

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm frankly surprised he bothered to obtain any kind of license.
>
> He got tired of all us hams being able to communicate on
> camping trips while he drove around lost in the desert.

Really? A PHd EE who isn't bright enough to be able to monitor the
others to keep track? Just what ham radio needs.

5362. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:37:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25FA22.7019572B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28256

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Your homework for tonight is to find and post a direct quote from
> me where I said I was "condemning" Ed for offering his personal
> opinion while in an ARRL position.

"Condemning" is my word for what you did to Ed, Larry. Everyone
who was reading this newsgroup at the time witnessed your
sadistic attack upon Ed. I'm not going to waste my time digging
it up again because it would add nothing new to the situation.
You have already proven yourself to be a sadistic jerk time
and again.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5363. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:38:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25ED7A.3DF7D0ED@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28255

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Why don't YOU mind YOUR own business? Stating my opinion about Kim's
> > choice cannot be construed as "stalking" under any circumstances. Why
> > are you attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights, Cecil?
>
> You've had your say ten times over, Dave. What you are doing now is
> electronic stalking.

Then you're far more guilty of that sort of thing than Dave ever could be.
You're also an idiot.

5364. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:39:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C25FAB4.E4B5E4F4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28258

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> You can't use the Ph. D-to-B.S. comparison, because either one
> is way off the scale compared to acquiring an Extra-class license
> these days -- or at any time, for that matter.

Are you also so ignorant that you don't understand ratios, Larry?
Do you comprehend 1/2 = 1000000/2000000?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5365. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:42:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25EE3F.2ADACBE3@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28257

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > There's plenty wrong with Kim's lack of class in choosing a deliberately
> > vulgar call.
>
> That's your personal delusional opinion, Dave, and you are sticking to
> it. If the FCC thought there was anything wrong with Kim's callsign,
> they shouldn't have issued it. Thus, you have sided with Queen Victoria,
> a sad throwback to days long passed.

What a maroon. What Kim has done is to eagerly join the mass of *other*
morons on 3950, 14313 etc without ever placing a signal on the air or uttering
a syllable. Her callsign has already said it all.

5366. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:47:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C25EF92.4ABB2E71@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28259

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3C255C29.8338AA2B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >
> >There's nothing wrong with Kim's callsign. What is wrong is your
> >electronic assault and battery of her on this newsgroup.
>
> Cecil:
>
> Nobody is committing "assault and battery" on anyone else in this
> newsgroup, electronically or otherwise. The only thing wrong here
> is your very Cecil-like tendency to make bizarre statements about
> other people's behavior when it is yours which is in question.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

This is the usual off-the-deep-end crap that Cecil always comes on with when his usual bullshit train is finally derailed.

5367. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 15:59:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011223105925.24455.00001059@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 28260

>If you cannot figure out what the UK has to do with English,
>I feel sorry for you.
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net

No reason to feel sorry for me, but I really feel you need to talk to someone about your fetish with your so called Dr freind. Do you also see objects on your Monitor and Black Helicopters that scare you????

5368. Re: SOCK PUPPET CONFESSES!! (was: Hal Turder and others)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 16:02:28 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a04vro$g76$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28261
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Fuckwittle" <Firebottle@EdNortonNet.org> wrote in message
news:a04s73$3h4$0@dosa.alt.net...

Poor Joanie the mangled faced pedophile.

> > On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 08:08:51 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> >
>> > "radiosigs" <radiosigs@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:a02jqp$du4$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>> > > AF2Y
>> >
>> > Hi, me!
>
> > Stagger Lee is right! You _are_ a radiosigs sock puppet!!!

Sarcasm impaired idiot.

> Can you imagine{Joanie's bullshit]

Can you imagine, This anonymous COWARD Joanie KShitballis too chickenshit
to post under his own name. Nadless 8 White Gay Male was too chickenshit to
get out of his extension of his undersized penis, LARDASSSS LLLLLLLOYD ran
his mouth in
the newsgroups that he was going to kick Orassss' ass and didn't show up at
dalton, and George girl Arslicks is too chickenshit to give the FCC his
correct address.
Georgie Girl still pimps his fat hog of a mother and still jams while drunk.
Nick the drunken sot slater still is pining for his dead gay lover Sgt. Fred
Eichorn.

5369. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 16:46:35 UTC
From: porky <porky@cfl.rr.com>
Message-ID: <LTnV7.160210$oj3.27634268@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>
Source record: 28262
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Not only that, but he clearly states that the color green(
which("witch" hihi) represents ham freqs.) are starting from 28.005. Duh,
the initial post was an incorrect statement in which the poster was saying
that cber's consider 28mhz as cb land.

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a03pps028ec@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> "IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> >
> > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
>
> The guy running this page has an e-mail in the Netherlands. How about
> posting something that's based on U.S. communications laws?
>
>
>

5370. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:06:18 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <eaoV7.327008$5A3.125551950@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 28263
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Porky just listen on 28.035 you too will see many consider 28 megs as the CB band

"porky" <porky@cfl.rr.com> wrote in message
news:LTnV7.160210$oj3.27634268@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com...
> Not only that, but he clearly states that the color green(
> which("witch" hihi) represents ham freqs.) are starting from 28.005. Duh,
> the initial post was an incorrect statement in which the poster was saying
> that cber's consider 28mhz as cb land.
>
>
> "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:a03pps028ec@enews4.newsguy.com...
> >
> > "IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
> > >
> > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
> >
> > The guy running this page has an e-mail in the Netherlands. How about
> > posting something that's based on U.S. communications laws?
> >
> >
> >
>
>

5371. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:10:41 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0533c02khp@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28271

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C25843D.C75BAE14@earthlink.net...
> Dave thinks Krell is guessing at what Dave thinks. Just a few posts

No guess at all. One just has to read your posts to see what you think.

> earlier you made a statement in response to an FCC statement concerning
> the morality of a licensee. It would appear that the Commission does
> take such actions and I seem to recall similar language used in denying
> renewals in earlier years. Obtaining and holding an amateur radio
> license is by no means a right.

It doesn't appear that the FCC considers a naughty callsign to be of the
same caliber as that of a convicted felon - yet. If they do start, then
we're all in trouble.

5372. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:19:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C261225.AC4794B1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28264

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm frankly surprised he bothered to obtain any kind of license.
>
> He got tired of all us hams being able to communicate on
> camping trips while he drove around lost in the desert.

So his technical superiority only applies to electronics. He sounds like the kind of guy who can't find his way to the bathroom on a foggy night.

Dave K8MN

5373. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:21:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2612A8.10F48AD8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28265

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Krell wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C251F43.1458C5DD@IEEE.org...
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> > > > callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?
> > >
> > > How can a private email be official?
> > >
> > Dave thinks that anything Riley says with regards to ham radio is in an
> > official capacity, even if such statements are contrary to what the
> > regulations permit and what the FCC has done.
>
> One would think that official United States of America Federal Communications
> Commission policy would appear somewhere besides private emails. Aren't they
> required by law under the Freedom of Information Act to publish their official
> policy somewhere besides private email?

Perhaps you have a new mission, Don Quixote. Call or write the
Commission and find out if this is "must have" information for you.

Dave K8MN
```

5374. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:23:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C261316.AC600672@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28266

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Vulgar callsigns and offensive speech in amateur radio are my business.
>
> How many of them do you sell each year?

This would be more interesting if you could be taken seriously.
What, then is Kim's business--obtaining and flaunting vulgar callsigns?

Dave K8MN

5375. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:24:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C26134A.ADCD6E13@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28267

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Please produce something official from the FCC that says that Kim's callsign
> > > is inappropriate. Riley's prudish email is not official enough for me.
> > >
> > > Man, that's tough. I'll bet the guy is happy that he doesn't report to
> > > you.
>
> I believe it is illegal to publish United States of America Federal
> Communications Commission official policy only in private email.

On with the quest, Don Q. Let us know what you find out.

Dave K8MN

5376. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:27:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C261405.90EF7D29@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28268

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Why don't YOU mind YOUR own business? Stating my opinion about Kim's
> > choice cannot be construed as "stalking" under any circumstances. Why
> > are you attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights, Cecil?
>
> You've had your say ten times over, Dave. What you are doing now is
> electronic stalking.

That is simply and utterly preposterous. Kim is still warbling about her "rights". You are still braying about her "rights". Rick Adams is singing Buddhist hymns about her "rights". There is neither a time limit nor a quantity limit on my excercise of First Amendment rights.

So much for your libertarian values.

Dave K8MN

5377. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:29:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C261489.D79E42B7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28269

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > There's plenty wrong with Kim's lack of class in choosing a deliberately
> > vulgar call.
>
> That's your personal delusional opinion, Dave, and you are sticking to
> it. If the FCC thought there was anything wrong with Kim's callsign,
> they shouldn't have issued it. Thus, you have sided with Queen Victoria,
> a sad throwback to days long passed.

Naw, I've sided with decency, good judgement and good taste. My views
are personal but not delusional at all.

You are right about one thing. The FCC shouldn't have issued Kim's
call.

Dave K8MN

5378. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:33:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C26156C.F8D4A600@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28270

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Why are you attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights, Cecil?
>
> Please explain exactly what magical power I am using to attempt to
> stifle your First Amendment rights, Dave. Am I putting tape over
> the mouth of your voodoo doll or what?

In your latest propaganda barrage, you've accused me of stalking--not once or twice but multiple times. You've done it even after I pointed out that I have not telephoned Kim, visited her home, accosted her on the street nor sent her e-mail on the issue of her poor judgement in selecting a vanity call. What I have done is draw attention to the issue on this electronic bulletin board. Your accusations are an enormous falsehood.

Dave K8MN

5379. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:39:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2616BF.6499CE78@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28272

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > In article <3C255BB6.62C9C0DB@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >
> > > >
> > > >I'm serious, Dave. When are you going to stop electronically stalking
> > > >Kim and bring that lawsuit?
> >
> > Nobody in this newsgroup is "stalking" anyone else, electronically
> > or otherwise. You are obviously *not* serious!
>
> Larry, you electronically stalked Ed until he gave up on this newsgroup.
> Now you are electronically stalking Kim. Why do you get so much pleasure
> from sadistically verbally assaulting your fellow hams?

Do us a favor and remind us again of your particular function here.

Dave K8MN

5380. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:41:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C26172C.B43FB491@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28273

CAM wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Your homework for tonight is to find and post a direct quote from
> > me where I said I was "condemning" Ed for offering his personal
> > opinion while in an ARRL position.
>
> "Condemning" is my word for what you did to Ed, Larry. Everyone
> who was reading this newsgroup at the time witnessed your
> sadistic attack upon Ed. I'm not going to waste my time digging
> it up again because it would add nothing new to the situation.
> You have already proven yourself to be a sadistic jerk time
> and again.

Do us a favor and remind us once again what your particular function
here is?

Dave K8MN

5381. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 17:50:32 UTC
From: "James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <l36c2u8drsun9ntanbqrvojkkatab5q2p1@4ax.com>
Source record: 28274

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 17:23:47 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>CAM wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>> > Vulgar callsigns and offensive speech in amateur radio are my business.
>>
>> How many of them do you sell each year?
>
>This would be more interesting if you could be taken seriously.
>What, then is Kim's business--obtaining and flaunting vulgar callsigns?

Calling her callsign vulgar?? What is vulgar about it, wake up, we
are not in the dark ages? I hear worse language on the news at
night and on the TV shows than what I think you're referring to.

Regards,

James

Note: To reply by email, remove the "X" in the reply to address.

5382. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:00:50 UTC
From: "James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <nd6c2uouk8bf7qp55oonm0np03aquvsqqo@4ax.com>
Source record: 28275

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 06:59:33 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Vulgar callsigns and offensive speech in amateur radio are my business.

If the above is you're business, then you are NOT doing your job. All
anyone has to do is listen to the HF bands nowdays. The four letter
words are more common than they are national TV now days. Try
cleaning up that language before you start worrying about someone's
choice of callsign. Who do you think you are, the amateur radio cop?

I think you just an old FART that thinks women have no place in
amateur radio, that it's just a male only hobby. It's people like you
that are killing amateur radio, making it another dying hobby.
Get your head of out the sand and get the chip off your shoulder.

5383. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:13:19 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <#BaUS09iBHA.1932@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 28276

> I think you just an old FART that thinks women have
> no place in amateur radio, that it's just a male only hobby.
> It's people like you that are killing amateur radio, making
> it another dying hobby.

Nope, not me! My wife is a ham, my Mom was a ham way
back in the 30's before I was born, and Kim has every right
to be a ham.

She also has a right to pick the trashiest vanity call sign
she can imagine, which she has done.

And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans K0HB

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

5384. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:21:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26209D.9100A5BF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28277

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What Kim *really* has done is that she has willingly - nay, *eagerly* - joined
> up with the tribe of morons that inhabit 3950, 14.313, and whatever those other
> obscenity-laden spots on HF are.

But, but, but Dick. What about all the obscenities that you have uttered
on this very newsgroup? Seems that you belong to that crowd more than
Kim does.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5385. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:23:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26213A.895E91F9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28278

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I'm frankly surprised he bothered to obtain any kind of license.
> > >
> > He got tired of all us hams being able to communicate on
> > camping trips while he drove around lost in the desert.
>
> Really? A PHd EE who isn't bright enough to be able to monitor the
> others to keep track? Just what ham radio needs.

What gift of ESP allows you to know *exactly* where a mobile station
is without asking. Maybe you should volunteer your ESP locating
abilities to the FCC. They could do away with their DF equipment.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5386. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:26:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2621D7.ECEA372E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28279

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I'm frankly surprised he bothered to obtain any kind of license.
> >
> > He got tired of all us hams being able to communicate on
> > camping trips while he drove around lost in the desert.
>
> So his technical superiority only applies to electronics. He sounds
> like the kind of guy who can't find his way to the bathroom on a foggy
> night.

Dave, have you any idea how big the Valley of the Sun is? I'd
sure like to see you locate a specific vehicle when you have
no idea where it is. Oh yeah, I forgot, you are omniscient
and therefore know everything. Say, if you are so omniscient
why don't you help the US locate Osama bin Laden?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5387. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:28:19 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C262243.85151B07@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28280

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >If you cannot figure out what the UK has to do with English,
> >I feel sorry for you. cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net
>
> No reason to feel sorry for me, but I really feel you need to talk to someone
> about your fetish with your so called Dr freind.
^^^^^^
I rest my case.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5388. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:32:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26232B.33343F42@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28281

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > One would think that official United States of America Federal Communications
> > Commission policy would appear somewhere besides private emails. Aren't they
> > required by law under the Freedom of Information Act to publish their official
> > policy somewhere besides private email?
>
> Perhaps you have a new mission, Don Quixote. Call or write the
> Commission and find out if this is "must have" information for you.

Oh, I'm already aware that most of your postings come from the
North end of a Southbound jackass. No need to bother the FCC.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5389. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:34:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2623CE.21CE6005@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28282

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I believe it is illegal to publish United States of America Federal
> > Communications Commission official policy only in private email.
>
> On with the quest, Don Q. Let us know what you find out.

No quest necessary, Dave. I've already found you out.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5390. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:35:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C262409.C55F3125@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28283

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You're also an idiot.

You're sounding more like the Liberty Net crowd every day, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5391. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:41:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C262546.19A9210D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28284

Dave Heil wrote:
> In your latest propaganda barrage, you've accused me of stalking--not
> once or twice but multiple times.

Yep, that's exactly how I would describe what you have been doing.
It is of the electronic variety, of course. Kim is the prey and
you and others have pursued your quarry incessantly. How will
it all end?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5392. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:42:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2625A1.DECDE958@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28286

Dave Heil wrote:
> Do us a favor and remind us again of your particular function here.

To criticize the sadists in the amateur radio ranks.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5393. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:44:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2625FD.DC2A11C5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28287

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What a maroon. What Kim has done is to eagerly join the mass of *other*
> morons on 3950, 14313 etc without ever placing a signal on the air or uttering
> a syllable. Her callsign has already said it all.

Considering the profanity that you have used on this newsgroup, Dick, you must be
a charter member of the Liberty Net.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5394. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:46:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C262682.37A7CC91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28288

Dave Heil wrote:
> You are right about one thing. The FCC shouldn't have issued Kim's
> call.

Well then Dave, it seems logical for you to stop bitchin' and get
the FCC to do something about it. Too bad The Constitution will
slap you up aside the head with a 2x4 in the process.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5395. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:51:18 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2627A6.D9C2A14C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28290

Dave Heil wrote:
> Do us a favor and remind us once again what your particular function
> here is?

To prevent the destruction of amateur radio by a few jerks who
have buried their heads in the sands of time.

"Sink the ARS, Master Gunner, Sink 'er, blow 'er to heck.
Fall into the hands of God, And not in the hands of the techs."
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5396. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:52:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2627EF.E508C4C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28291

K0HB wrote:
> And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.

How many times?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5397. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:54:33 UTC
From: Scout <scout@monumental.com>
Message-ID: <6KpV7.3987$0g.107197@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28289
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:s9mV7.31$Qs3.99910@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
> : > : > > There is a pecking order. Governors and mayors are
> : > : > > the most valuable then powerful men then professionals
> : > : > > like doctors and lawyers. The Police are just under mayors.
> : > : >
> : > : > If I were injured, I would feel that a doctor was far more
important
> : > : > than some political hack who happened to get elected to office.
> : > : >
> : > : > > Look there are so many elite who see the police and
> : > : > > the military as a bunch of losers who are there to die
> : > : > > for them. People like you who make huge amounts
> : > : > > of money and live in big fancy houses. I have them
> : > : > > in my community. The military is not allowed to recruit
> : > : > > in the local high school as their kids are going to college
> : > : > > and the military is for those who can't really make it.
> : > : >
> : > : > > People like you see themselves as too valuable to get
> : > : > > their hands dirty. Sorry but your life is not worth that
> : > : > > of a police officer, a fire fighter or a soldier.
> : > : >
> : > : > How do you know what we do for our livings?
> : > : >
> : > : > In my opinion, it is elitist attitudes like yours that are part of
> : > : > the problems we face in this country.
> : > : >
> : > :
> : > : ABSOLUTELY! And, most cops don't think they are better than anyone
> : else. It's the ones that do that make it so rough for the industry
(and
> while
> : I used the word "most" in my last sentence, there are still lots who do
> : > think they are more important).
> : > :
> : > : Each and every one of us is nearly, if not exactly, as important as
> the
> : > : next. We all have our "things" to do, work to do, families to
raise,
> : > : neighborhoods to live in, communities to vote and pay taxes in, etc.
> : Not one of us is doing something more important than the next.
> : > :
> : > : And, please don't use the excuse that cops or firefighters put

> : themselves in harm's way more than anyone else. When I get in my
vehicle
> every day to go to work, statistics say that I am more likely to be
injured
> or die than any other industry-related statistic! Add rain, snow or ice
> to that
> : scenario and it's pretty darned dangerous just getting to work.
> : > :
> : > : Kim W5TIT
> : > :
> : >
> : > But it is not in your job description that you
> : > MUST risk your life as part of your job.
> :
> : Life is risk, and ALL jobs require a certain level of risk acceptance to
> : perform. Miners must risk their lives to perform their jobs.....they
know
> : the hazards and the rate of death in their industry, yet they accept
that
> : and continue to work.
> :
> : You're just pissed, again, because people aren't buying into your "I'm
> : superior to you because I'm military" crap.
> :
> : What I find really interesting is how on one hand you claim you have to
> risk
> : your life as part of your job, then on the other gripe because "the
> yuppies"
> : send you out on missions that risk your life.
> :
> : If risk is in your job description (and I would like to see you document
> : that), then quit bitching when you are asked to risk your life in the
> : performance of your job.
>
> Then recognize our superiority by paying 75% of
> your income to support us in the style that you live.

Ah, but that's just it. I do NOT recognize your claim to superiority because of your occupation. Nor does risking your life within your occupation automatically confer some form of superiority upon the members of that occupation. If you don't like the pay, then you better find another career.

Of course you'd probably take a cut in pay since it's apparent that your skills couldn't compete on the open market with those inferior civilians...

5398. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 18:55:37 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112231055.b2c4366@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28292
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:<a04p67$l7u$0@dosa.alt.net>...
> "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
> message news:d9f7b76c.0112222046.5c2c6625@posting.google.com...
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:<a02dhn$1i6$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote
> in
> > > message news:d9f7b76c.0112210954.64cbefb7@posting.google.com...
> > > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:<9vvhp3hkd5@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in the
> 70s.
> They
> > > > > were those little things with the big eyes and different colored,
> Don
> King
> > > > > style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils, or
> on
> > > > > keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still around,
> but
> > > not
> > > as
> > > > > popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence in
> popularity
> > > > > about ten years ago.
> > > > >
> > > > That anonymous COWARD is ignorant of everything. "Woger Wussman" aka

> Twatty
> > > > > Campbell(Posts as Scott Campbell) should be familiar with the troll
> doll,
> > > > > since he was the initial model for them.
> > > > >
> > > > hit the bricks chuckie....you aren't wanted here.......
> > > >
> > > Fuck off, Dickhead, as the Stones sing "You can't always get what you
> want."
> >
> >
> > oh geez...what happened chuckie.....get kicked off the ham reflector
> > because you pissed in measure's corn flakes one too many times????
>
> Reflector, anonymous coward? So you're a ham radio newbie as well as an
> internet newbie. Oh, too bad, gay SD. Haven't been "kicked" anywhere, you
> ignorant dolt.

me thinks i struck a raw nerve chuckie....have you entered any beauty
contest lately you bad boy.....?????

5399. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 19:07:03 UTC
From: Pipedream <pipedreams@hotmail.comp>
Message-ID: <20011223140708.227$gg@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 28293
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

sd that is not Chuckie perhaps you need to take your medicine again.

"SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
message news:d9f7b76c.0112231055.b2c4366@posting.google.com...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:<a04p67$l7u$0@dosa.alt.net>...
> > "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote
in
> > message news:d9f7b76c.0112222046.5c2c6625@posting.google.com...
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:<a02dhn$1i6$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com>
wrote
> > in
> > > > message news:d9f7b76c.0112210954.64cbefb7@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:<9vvhp3hkd5@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > > > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell
<krell1215@yahoo.com>
> > wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in
the
> > 70s.
> > They
> > > > > > > > were those little things with the big eyes and different
colored,
> > Don
> > King
> > > > > > > > style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils,

or
> > on
> > > > > > > keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still
around,
> > but
> > > > not
> > > > as
> > > > > > > popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence
in
> > popularity
> > > > > > > about ten years ago.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That anonymous COWARD is ignorant of everything. "Woger Wussman"
aka
> > Twatty
> > > > > > Campbell(Posts as Scott Campbell) should be familiar with the
troll
> > doll,
> > > > > > since he was the initial model for them.
> > > > > >
> > > > > hit the bricks chuckie....you aren't wanted here.......
> > > > >
> > > > Fuck off, Dickhead, as the Stones sing "You can't always get what
you
> > want."
> > >
> > >
> > > oh geez...what happened chuckie.....get kicked off the ham reflector
> > > because you pissed in measure's corn flakes one too many times????
> >
> > Reflector, anonymous coward? So you're a ham radio newbie as well as an
> > internet newbie. Oh, too bad, gay SD. Haven't been "kicked" anywhere,
you
> > ignorant dolt.
>
>
> me thinks i struck a raw nerve chuckie....have you entered any beauty
> contest lately you bad boy.....?????

5400. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 19:14:37 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1f4vbjg.160bp3lxepsi2N%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 28294

Kamatu <admin@ahww.net> wrote:

> I am so interested in finally getting my Technician's License that I have
> studied and studied for weeks now. I have passed every sample test I can get
> my hands on, and there is a real test in my area on January 17th, 2002.
>
> But, I'm reading these messages and I'm starting to get the feeling that the
> priviledges afforded to a Tech No Code gives access to frequencies that are
> really no better to occupy than a Citizen Band radio would access.
>
> I'm reading about jamming, and this jerk that, that jerk this, kids, lids,
> space cadets...
>
> I wanted to get into Amateur Radio to get out of the 27Mhz Snake Pit and QSO
> with some quality contacts.
>
> Am I really making a mistake? Is it too late for Ham Radio now?

You're NOT making a mistake so go for it. It's a LOT different than CB,
MUCH more civilized. Good luck on your test and welcome to ham radio.
--
Do infants enjoy infancy as much as
adults enjoy adultery?□ - George Carlin□□□□□□□□□□□□

5401. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 19:59:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011223145946.20186.00000845@mb-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 28295

>I rest my case.
>--
>cheers, CAM

You need to rest your case, it is very apparent you need help

5402. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 20:02:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <QLqV7.194737$WW.11280960@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28296

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2627A6.D9C2A14C@IEEE.org...

> "Sink the ARS, Master Gunner, Sink 'er, blow 'er to heck.
> Fall into the hands of God, And not in the hands of the techs."
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Constipation, Constipation the heavenly hosts proclaim,
'til man's remotest entrail shall know its Maker's name.

Throw that in the next time the choir master suggests Stand Up, Stand up
for Jesus.
Mark Twain BTW

Bionic Klutz

5403. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 20:10:11 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <DSqV7.520$YL5.315803@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28297
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

<delta.sixxeleven@gte.net> wrote ...
:
: >That is not true, as others have pointed out. For example, say I
: >have a locked briefcase in the trunk of my car. The officer does
: >not have the right to even look in the trunk, much less the
: >briefcase. That is a long way from "anything that is (in) a car".
: >He did not qualify the statement by "within reach of the driver".
: >For that matter, a locked briefcase that is within the reach of
: >the driver is also probably not searchable without a warrant or
: >probable cause.
:
: >Oh yes I do. And some of the things they have been doing under
: >the pretext of the so-called "war on drugs" are frightening.
:
:
: I am a ham AND a Narcotics Agent..You Need Probable Cause to search
: a vehicle with or without a warrant. The whole purpose of the Carroll
: Doctrine is there is no time to obtain a search warrant on a stopped
: car as it will flee. (and yes, the very laws you say are now
: frightening, an officer could only keep the vehicle stopped as long as
: necessary to write a ticket, you cant keep a car stopped while writing
: a warrant. The SC has ruled over thirty minutes is unreasonable) So
: you can search without one.(Including the TRUNK, LOCKED ANYTHING !!)
:
: You must articulate the same fact in a Suppression hearing as you
: would have in a search warrant..This has nothing to with the "War on
: Drugs" but the "War on Booze" from the late 20's or whatever.
:
: What the person is referring to above is search incident to
: arrest..You then can search ANYTHING the driver or passenger has
: access to..ANY Locked container within the passenger space, no warrant
: for the trunk, but no locked containers in trunk without a warrant.

I gather that D611 is a callsign?

Thanks. Too many these days
have so little contact with either
the police or the military. Not
like it was 50 years ago.

5404. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 20:14:00 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <bWqV7.548$YL5.318014@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28298
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

: Life is risk, and ALL jobs require a certain level of risk acceptance to
: perform. Miners must risk their lives to perform their jobs.....they know
: the hazards and the rate of death in their industry, yet they accept that
: and continue to work.
:
: You're just pissed, again, because people aren't buying into your "I'm
: superior to you because I'm military" crap.
:
: What I find really interesting is how on one hand you claim you have to
risk
: your life as part of your job, then on the other gripe because "the
yuppies"
: send you out on missions that risk your life.
:
: If risk is in your job description (and I would like to see you document
: that), then quit bitching when you are asked to risk your life in the
: performance of your job.

Give you a little choice in this matter.

We can continue down the path we are going.
We now have a mercenary military, police and
fire force in this country that is divorced from the
people. They see themselves as more superior,
a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
(Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
A bunch of sheeple.

The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
and gang bangers too, they cry.

Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
men. We will do as we do with the military and
allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private

army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
to cell phones). And you do not think people with
this type of training will not see themselves as superior
to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
the gang bangers?

You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
amendment but is having 75% of your income
taken any different? Because that is what it is
going to take to support such an elite cadre.

The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
that the police, the military and fire protection be a
community effort with ALL able bodied (those who
are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
that the public be involved, not in service but in the
decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.

What do we have today? An American people who
have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
the government to make their decisions, others to be
their protectors. But the draft is still the law, re-authorized
by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
word (and the money) from congress.

So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?

5405. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 20:39:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c264421_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 28401

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C24E131.97A70EE4@IEEE.org...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > >Second, I'm an Extra .
> >
> > Well look A$$ Wipe, maybe you ought to inform QRZ, they still have you
as a
> > Tech
>
> Say Bruce, still don't know about CSCEs?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Cecil,

He must have also lost the link to QRZ ... the upgrade made
it into the FCC database (and the callbook servers) on Dec. 20.
Not too bad a turn-around on the paperwork.

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

5406. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 20:45:20 UTC
From: Brainbuster <brain@buster.com>
Message-ID: <a068itcpu7@news5.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 28467
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
news:3C227B39.F203E090@spam.me.not...
>
> <snipped>
> But you're right. I did go from CBer (which I ran sideband for a bit over
> 20 years, and ran professionally) to extra in 6 months, 1 week, and two
> days. Of course, I worked hard for nine years (I started drilling the code
> in '92) to overcome my dyslexia so I could pass the code requirement.
===

Damn fine achievement for anyone.
Very good of Mr. Middlefinger to explain to everyone what an intelligent
person you are. Has he become your friend, or is it just the "Christmas
spirit".

Have a great Christmas.

Brainbuster.

5407. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 20:45:29 UTC
From: Brainbuster <brain@buster.com>
Message-ID: <a068iucpu8@news5.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 28468
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Omniscient <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:a03vae$47g$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "N7MFR" <n7mfr@teleport.com> wrote in message
> news:9xeV7.10921$Cw3.1288316@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > And we needed to see this because.....its for sale?
> >
> > "IllegalCBersMustGO" <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:ce9e428e.0112201256.54a6f516@posting.google.com...
> > > FOUND IN REC.RADIO.CB. THIS IS THE TYPICAL CRIMINAL MINDSET OF CBERS.
> > >
> > >
> And your point is?
====

Well, I see the point...

The original message was to "rec.radio.cb", yet "IllegalCBersMustGO" decided
to cross post his whining to every ng that he could think of.

Why, when it was of no interest to all the other groups?

As this is cross posted, I will take this opportunity to wish all radio and
electronics enthusiasts a very merry christmas.

Brainbuster.

5408. Re: PROOF that we are all BARKING MAD! CBERS.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 20:46:33 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <WA7AA@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3C26423B.CC8A87AC@attbi.com>
Source record: 28299
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Patrick Keele wrote:

> What you REALLY mean is.......... CAUSE I AIN'T GOT A BRAIN.........i have
> "adddressed the issue".

Too much bourbon, not enough soda, eh, governor?

5409. BARF Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 20:51:26 UTC
From: BARF HQ <BARFHQ@KV4FZourHERO.org>
Message-ID: <a05g37$q33$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28300
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

****IMPORTANT BARF News Release****

BARF HQ proudly announces Herb, KV4FZ, will give
his annual BARF Christmas message of good will to all
hams. MOST Important, Herb will be announcing the
glorious date he will be returning to ham radio. Looks like
the Goodfellows will be very upset, so watch for frequencies
and times to be announced. HAIL HERB!

5410. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:01:57 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <9DrV7.194782$WW.11285611@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28402

Dick Carroll wrote

> What a maroon.

Ah, Carroll, That is a racist statement. Do you know what a maroon is????

Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a moron is someone who doesn't know what a maroon is. Steve the LPN called me that once. So, I have to think it is a trait of self-rightious pro-coders. ;-)

> What Kim has done is to eagerly join the mass of *other*
> morons on 3950, 14313 etc without ever placing a signal on the air or uttering
> a syllable. Her callsign has already said it all.

Wrong, Carol, her call sign has absolutely nothing to do with the idiots on 3950 and 14313. Try to come up with an argument that's, at least, plausable.

Rich

5411. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:03:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011223160343.06877.00000703@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 28403

In article <20011223094251.13039.00001541@mb-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3C251E5E.41E3536B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
>>> CAM wrote:
>>> > He has no beef. Mine is the idea presented by the PCTA folk that all
>>> > nocode techs are technical dumb $hits. One would think a PhD in EE
>>> > would be good enough proof to the contrary.

Cecil, when you say "the idea presented by the PCTA folk", the English language implication is "all".

>>> I don't recall any idea presented by "PCTA folk" which is as
>>> you claim. Are you basing your claim in the statements of one or two
>>> individuals?
>>
>>I'm basing my claim on the statements of some members of the PCTA
>>crowd, e.g. Larry and Dick.

Ahh - first you said "the PCTA folks" (implying "all the PCTA folk") and now you are limiting it to "some". And in fact you name only two individuals.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5412. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:09:49 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7399C4E05872CB7D.1CE297FB2422FE01.32C52B1D30333976@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28404

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 17:27:48 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>That is simply and utterly preposterous. Kim is still warbling about
>her "rights". You are still braying about her "rights". Rick Adams is
>singing Buddhist hymns about her "rights". There is neither a time
>limit nor a quantity limit on my excercise of First Amendment rights.

You're absolutely right, Dave. You have every right to say
what you wish.

What neither you, nor anyone else, have the right to do,
however, is to harass someone for having _exercised_ that freedom
herself. Your rights end--as ANY libertarian (or Libertarian) would
agree--at the point that you do specific and identifiable harm to a
non-consenting person. Unless Kim _consents_ to being badgered,
defamed, and attacked by you over her choice of call sign, you can't
claim that you are "exercising your freedom" because you are doing so
at the expense of the freedom of someone else--which is NOT a
reasonable action. If you could clearly demonstrate someone who WAS
harmed directly by her choice of call signs you would have a case for
arguing that she doesn't have the right to exercise that freedom
either. As it happens, however, the only "victim" you can find is an
unidentifiable "potential ham" who is supposedly offended by her call.
Until you produce that ham--and if her call offends the person it is
reasonable to insist that the person you DO produce does not, him or
her self, EVER use such terms as "tit" personally, nor do they view
"R" rated movies (where they are visually presented instead of in
words), read modern novels (Harry Potter books excepted), or do other
things that voluntarily expose them to such terms--you have no grounds
for making a similar claim about her freedom.

>So much for your libertarian values.

Mine are quite consistent--and so are Cecil's for that matter.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5413. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:12:32 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F62B0B1BC3EBA223.2563A824751D0CBE.9C8F9912AC8B32E9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28405

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 03:43:49 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 18:09:38 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >So Dave, are you going to bring that lawsuit against Kim or just try
>> >to kill her with the jawbone of an ass?
>>
>> Has he been dismembering Larry Roll again?
>>
>> Rick
>
>If Cecil is still using his, perhaps you'd loan yours.

Sorry Dave, I can't help you.

I don't _have_ a Larry Roll to lend you.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5414. Re: BARF Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:13:35 UTC
From: The Better Amateur Radio Federation <lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm>
Message-ID: <f26f938778abdebcfb56c578e4caaacf@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 28406
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

We will post this on our webpage.

http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61

"BARF HQ" <BARFHQ@KV4FZourHERO.org> wrote in message
news:a05g37$q33$0@dosa.alt.net...
> ****IMPORTANT BARF News Release****
>
> BARF HQ proudly announces Herb, KV4FZ, will give
> his annual BARF Christmas message of good will to all
> hams. MOST Important, Herb will be announcing the
> glorious date he will be returning to ham radio. Looks like
> the Goodfellows will be very upset, so watch for frequencies
> and times to be announced. HAIL HERB!
>
>

5415. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:15:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C26495B.A57EFABC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28407

James R. DeLoach wrote:
>
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 17:23:47 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >CAM wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil wrote:
> >> > Vulgar callsigns and offensive speech in amateur radio are my business.
> >>
> >> How many of them do you sell each year?
> >
> >This would be more interesting if you could be taken seriously.
> >What, then is Kim's business--obtaining and flaunting vulgar callsigns?
>
> Calling her callsign vulgar?? What is vulgar about it, wake up, we
> are not in the dark ages? I hear worse language on the news at
> night and on the TV shows than what I think you're referring to.

James,

Stop sending your postings to my e-mail address as well as to the
newsgroup.

Yes, Kim's callsign is vulgar. Yes, I think we are in the dark ages.
Yes, there is worse on TV and I don't think we should put up with that
either. I have not heard Tom Brokaw use vulgarity nor have I heard it
on CNN.

Dave K8MN

5416. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:20:53 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <470BD3FDC0B51852.1C48673A079379E3.1016853312015960@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28408

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 07:03:56 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Ahhh, but you CAN'T be taken seriously here. I'm serious when I tell
>you that your "stalking" stuff is nonsense. This is a newsgroup. I
>post here. Kim posts here. You post here. This is a public bulletin
>board of opinion. I don't send Kim any e-mail or letters. I don't
>stand outside her home with a placard.
>
>Why are attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights you old, false
>libertarian you?

Put it in perspective, Dave.

Your First Amendment rights don't APPLY to online
postings--the COU/TOS of your isp do! The Internet isn't a government
entity that must observe Constitutional limitations--it's a computer
network that you access through a commercial service after agreeing to
adhere to the rules imposed by that service--and those rules DO
address content issues in ways that the US government could not do.

What you and Larry Roll have been doing is, technically,
harassment. In Larry's case in particular, he has made the public
statement that he will NOT allow the subject of Kim's call sign to
drop until she decides to change it. That, Dave, is a clear violation
of the COU of any isp in the USA and could, if Kim chose to complain
to his isp, cost him his account and Internet access.

Don't confuse Kim's freedom of speech, as exercised by
applying for and receiving a call sign from the US Government (which
IS bound to adhere to the terms of the Constitution) with your freedom
of speech to attack her over her choice, which is regulated not by the
Constitution but by your own legal agreements with a private firm.

There's no conflict in Cecil's statements. You DO have the
right to voice your opinion. You do NOT have the right, however (based
on YOUR agreement to your COU/TOS agreement when you obtained your
account) to continue to repost that opinion and thus harass Kim with
your messages.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5417. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:29:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3E832F4B49721019.61A9FC192BC734FB.5A2A07BAE7B05EF8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28410

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 15:42:03 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
wrote:

> What a maroon.

Left you behind on a desert island of confusion, huh?

>What Kim has done is to eagerly join the mass of *other*
>morons on 3950, 14313 etc without ever placing a signal on the air or uttering
>a syllable. Her callsign has already said it all.

Dick, the only thing that separates you from the 3950 crowd is
that you do your hate mongering on the Internet instead of on the
air--thus fouling someone ELSE'S hobby space instead of your own. What
you post here is just as offensive--and as insensitive--as what the
Liberty Net crowd discuss on the air.

Get off your "holier-than-thou" stance, Dickie, the offensive
and classless people in this newsgroup aren't Kim and her
supporters--they are you, Larry Roll, and Dave Heil who insist that
YOUR values are more important than those of others and that YOU are
the final arbitrars of morality.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5418. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:33:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C264D8E.5E2F1067@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28411

James R. DeLoach wrote:
>
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 06:59:33 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Vulgar callsigns and offensive speech in amateur radio are my business.
>
> If the above is you're business, then you are NOT doing your job. All
> anyone has to do is listen to the HF bands nowdays. The four letter
> words are more common than they are national TV now days. Try
> cleaning up that language before you start worrying about someone's
> choice of callsign. Who do you think you are, the amateur radio cop?

It isn't my job alone, James. What are you doing about it? What are
you doing to help clean up the ham bands? Let's do both.

Yes, I'm an amateur radio cop. Amateur radio is self-policing. You too
can be an amateur radio cop. Make a tape of those you hear breaking the
regs. Telephone the operator of a station using foul language.

> I think you just an old FART that thinks women have no place in
> amateur radio, that it's just a male only hobby. It's people like you
> that are killing amateur radio, making it another dying hobby.
> Get your head of out the sand and get the chip off your shoulder.

At 52 I hardly qualify for rocking chair status. I just celebrated the
completion of my 38th year in amateur radio. I have no problem with
women in amateur radio. I have a problem with someone who deliberately
chooses a tacky vanity call which paints her as a trashy bimbette. I
think that is no better for hamming than the crud we hear on 75m.
There is a bucket of sand in the corner with a chip in it. Does it
belong to you?

Oh, kindly stop sending me your comments at my e-mail address. Just
post them here.

Dave K8MN

5419. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:37:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C264E9A.4B2A9339@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28412

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I'm frankly surprised he bothered to obtain any kind of license.
> > >
> > > He got tired of all us hams being able to communicate on
> > > camping trips while he drove around lost in the desert.
> >
> > So his technical superiority only applies to electronics. He sounds
> > like the kind of guy who can't find his way to the bathroom on a foggy
> > night.
>
> Dave, have you any idea how big the Valley of the Sun is? I'd
> sure like to see you locate a specific vehicle when you have
> no idea where it is. Oh yeah, I forgot, you are omniscient
> and therefore know everything. Say, if you are so omniscient
> why don't you help the US locate Osama bin Laden?

You are the who pointed out that the guy gets lost. Maybe it'd be
easier for him to ride in or follow the other vehicle....unless the
other guys make him bring up the rear.

You forget a couple of things. I didn't get into amateur radio to keep
in touch with camping buddies. I have not and am not lost.

As far as Osama: It is someone else's watch now. I'm retired.
What is Osama's call?

Dave K8MN

5420. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:39:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C264F13.607CD583@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28413

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > One would think that official United States of America Federal Communications
> > > Commission policy would appear somewhere besides private emails. Aren't they
> > > required by law under the Freedom of Information Act to publish their official
> > > policy somewhere besides private email?
> >
> > Perhaps you have a new mission, Don Quixote. Call or write the
> > Commission and find out if this is "must have" information for you.
>
> Oh, I'm already aware that most of your postings come from the
> North end of a Southbound jackass. No need to bother the FCC.

Well, Mr. Quixote--or can I just call you Don?--you asked a question
which can best be answered by someone from the FCC. If you are curious,
you have a new mission. I'm sure the Commission won't think it an undue
burden to provide you the information.

Dave K8MN

5421. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:40:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C264F49.4A156012@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28414

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I believe it is illegal to publish United States of America Federal
> > > Communications Commission official policy only in private email.
> > >
> > On with the quest, Don Q. Let us know what you find out.
> >
> No quest necessary, Dave. I've already found you out.

The information you seek is available. Why not go to the source, Don?

Dave K8MN
```

5422. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:42:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C264FB2.D0C610CF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28415

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > In your latest propaganda barrage, you've accused me of stalking--not
> > once or twice but multiple times.
>
> Yep, that's exactly how I would describe what you have been doing.
> It is of the electronic variety, of course. Kim is the prey and
> you and others have pursued your quarry incessantly. How will
> it all end?

I know it is how you'd describe it. That's how you DID describe it.
The only difficulty I have with it is that it simply isn't true.
How will it end? That can be part of your next quest.

Dave K8MN

5423. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:43:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C264FF4.7A7AE2EF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28416

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Do us a favor and remind us again of your particular function here.
>
> To criticize the sadists in the amateur radio ranks.

Let us know when you get to that spiffy self-flagellation part.

Dave K8MN

5424. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:45:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C265061.E649A293@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28417

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You are right about one thing. The FCC shouldn't have issued Kim's
> > call.
>
> Well then Dave, it seems logical for you to stop bitchin' and get
> the FCC to do something about it. Too bad The Constitution will
> slap you up aside the head with a 2x4 in the process.

The Constitution doesn't slap anyone up side the head with anything.
I'm content to draw attention to the FCC's about face. In the past, the
Commission would not and did not issue such calls.

Dave K8MN

5425. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:47:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2650B9.306714E2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28418

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Do us a favor and remind us once again what your particular function
> > here is?
>
> To prevent the destruction of amateur radio by a few jerks who
> have buried their heads in the sands of time.
>
> "Sink the ARS, Master Gunner, Sink 'er, blow 'er to heck.
> Fall into the hands of God, And not in the hands of the techs."

So we have yet another change of story with a touch of creative (well,
not very creative) writing. Sure wish I could take your stuff
seriously.

Dave K8MN

5426. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:47:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2650F1.B22D718@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28419

CAM wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
>
> How many times?

There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.

Dave K8MN

5427. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:50:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C265194.5E37FA07@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28420

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote
>
> > What a maroon.
>
> Ah, Carroll, That is a racist statement. Do you know what a maroon is????
>
> Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a moron is
> someone who doesn't know what a maroon is. Steve the LPN called me that
> once. So, I have to think it is a trait of self-rightious pro-coders. ;-)

Blow a couple of bucks at Blockbuster and rent a couple of Bugs Bunny
cartoons.

Dave K8MN

5428. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:56:16 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <4qsV7.194822$WW.11289029@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28421

Dave Heil wrote

> Richard Plourde wrote:

> > Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a moron is
> > someone who doesn't know what a maroon is.

> Blow a couple of bucks at Blockbuster and rent a couple of Bugs Bunny
> cartoons.

Maybe you do have a sense of humor...

Rich

maroon is still racist...

5429. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:57:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C26533C.65A2CD79@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28422

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 17:27:48 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >That is simply and utterly preposterous. Kim is still warbling about
> >her "rights". You are still braying about her "rights". Rick Adams is
> >singing Buddhist hymns about her "rights". There is neither a time
> >limit nor a quantity limit on my excercise of First Amendment rights.
>
> You're absolutely right, Dave. You have every right to say
> what you wish.
>
> What neither you, nor anyone else, have the right to do,
> however, is to harass someone for having _exercised_ that freedom
> herself. Your rights end--as ANY libertarian (or Libertarian) would
> agree--at the point that you do specific and identifiable harm to a
> non-consenting person/ Unless Kim _consents_ to being badgered,
> defamed, and attacked by you over her choice of call sign, you can't
> claim that you are "exercising your freedom" because you are doing so
> at the expense of the freedom of someone else--which is NOT a
> reasonable action.

Naw Rick, that simply doesn't wash. Kim's own comments directed at
those who object to her choice show her to be giving at least as much as
she gets. There isn't a time limit on quantity limit on First Amendment
rights. This is a plain old electonic bulletin board. I'm free to post
here numerous times daily.

> If you could clearly demonstrate someone who WAS
> harmed directly by her choice of call signs you would have a case for
> arguing that she doesn't have the right to exercise that freedom
> either. As it happens, however, the only "victim" you can find is an
> unidentifiable "potential ham" who is supposedly offended by her call.
> Until you produce that ham--and if her call offends the person it is
> reasonable to insist that the person you DO produce does not, him or
> her self, EVER use such terms as "tit" personally, nor do they view
> "R" rated movies (where they are visually presented instead of in
> words), read modern novels (Harry Potter books excepted), or do other
> things that voluntarily expose them to such terms--you have no grounds
> for making a similar claim about her freedom.

I'm offended by her call. I don't need to produce a potential ham.
We have several others here who are offended.

> >So much for your libertarian values.
>
> Mine are quite consistent--and so are Cecil's for that matter.

At last reading, you guys couldn't even agree on what makes a libertarian.

Dave K8MN

5430. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 21:59:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C26538E.3EB73DDE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28423

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 03:43:49 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >>
> >> On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 18:09:38 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >So Dave, are you going to bring that lawsuit against Kim or just try
> >> >to kill her with the jawbone of an ass?
> >>
> >> Has he been dismembering Larry Roll again?
> >>
> >> Rick
> >
> >If Cecil is still using his, perhaps you'd loan yours.
>
> Sorry Dave, I can't help you.
>
> I don't _have_ a Larry Roll to lend you.

Just pass the jawbone, Samson.

Dave K8MN

5431. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:09:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2655E5.3A36C7E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28424

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 07:03:56 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Ahhh, but you CAN'T be taken seriously here. I'm serious when I tell
> >you that your "stalking" stuff is nonsense. This is a newsgroup. I
> >post here. Kim posts here. You post here. This is a public bulletin
> >board of opinion. I don't send Kim any e-mail or letters. I don't
> >stand outside her home with a placard.
> >
> >Why are attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights you old, false
> >libertarian you?
>
> Put it in perspective, Dave.
>
> Your First Amendment rights don't APPLY to online
> postings--the COU/TOS of your isp do! The Internet isn't a government
> entity that must observe Constitutional limitations--it's a computer
> network that you access through a commercial service after agreeing to
> adhere to the rules imposed by that service--and those rules DO
> address content issues in ways that the US government could not do.

Then I suggest you make a test case of it. See if you can get Earthlink
to drop me as a customer based on my statements here regarding Kim's
trashy callsign.

> What you and Larry Roll have been doing is, technically,
> harassment. In Larry's case in particular, he has made the public
> statement that he will NOT allow the subject of Kim's call sign to
> drop until she decides to change it. That, Dave, is a clear violation
> of the COU of any isp in the USA and could, if Kim chose to complain
> to his isp, cost him his account and Internet access.

I disagree with you regarding your silly talk of harrassment. Make an
issue of it with Earthlink if you like.

> Don't confuse Kim's freedom of speech, as exercised by
> applying for and receiving a call sign from the US Government (which
> IS bound to adhere to the terms of the Constitution) with your freedom
> of speech to attack her over her choice, which is regulated not by the
> Constitution but by your own legal agreements with a private firm.

You are quite wrong again. Firstly, I have serious doubts as to whether
Earthlink will drop me as a paying customer because of my expression of
my views. Secondly, I can stand on the street corner expressing those

views if I can interest anyone in the topic. Thirdly, I can write letters to magazines regarding my views. Fourthly, I can make those views known on the air.

> There's no conflict in Cecil's statements. You DO have the
> right to voice your opinion. You do NOT have the right, however (based
> on YOUR agreement to your COU/TOS agreement when you obtained your
> account) to continue to repost that opinion and thus harass Kim with
> your messages.

Prove it, Rick! I've uttered no vile rants. I've expressed my opinion. That you don't like it is too bad.

Dave K8MN

5432. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:11:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C265675.8C4B3C2A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28425

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote
>
> > Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > > Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a moron is
> > > someone who doesn't know what a maroon is.
>
> > Blow a couple of bucks at Blockbuster and rent a couple of Bugs Bunny
> > cartoons.
>
> Maybe you do have a sense of humor...
>
> Rich
>
> maroon is still racist...

That would certainly depend entirely upon context. That racist Mel
Blanc!

Dave K8MN

5433. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:15:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26577F.DBD75DA7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28427

Dave Heil wrote:
> You are the who pointed out that the guy gets lost. Maybe it'd be
> easier for him to ride in or follow the other vehicle....unless the
> other guys make him bring up the rear.

The beauty of ham radio is that there needs be no meeting place or
meeting time or even a campsite picked out. Everyone gets on a
mountaintop repeater and decides where to camp out. Some of the
Phoenix area mountaintop repeaters cover 1000 square miles.

> You forget a couple of things. I didn't get into amateur radio to keep
> in touch with camping buddies.

Did you get into amateur radio for the purpose of harassing Kim?

> As far as Osama: It is someone else's watch now. I'm retired.

If you are omniscient, it is a capital offense for you to retire.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5434. Re: Roger Goes (Humming) Caroling

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:16:30 UTC
From: Omniscient <KnowsAll@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <a05l3reec0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28426
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.2600,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a04p6u$l7u$g@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Robert" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> news:a02ndg$mih$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a02dik$1i6$m@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > --
> > > "Impotent" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a00o9k$pb4$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > news:9vvhos$hkd$3@pita.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "ghost" <ghost_dj_no_spam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:zfyU7.5432$Cw3.657624@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Omniscient" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:9vuapu$nrs$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > > > > > Roger and some of his "dear" friends at the Pink Triangle
Sweet
> > Meat
> > > > Bar
> > > > > and
> > > > > > Grill have gotten together and formed a group called The
Hummers
> > to
> > > go
> > > > > > Christmas caroling. They have but one song on their list but
> they
> > do
> > > > it
> > > > > > well, often, and usually to "stand up" crowds.
> > > > > > That one song is their most favorite, and they can hum "Come
All
> > Ye
> > > > > > Faithful" in three different octaves. They usually hum this
> little
> > > > ditty
> > > > > > while on their knees and Roger is typically the leading
> supplicant
```

> > > and
> > > > > > > greatest crowd pleaser.
> > > > > > > There is no shortage of protein in Roger's diet and his twinky
> > > little
> > > > > > Pinky
> > > > > > > butties have fondly dubbed Roger with the nickname "Chipmunk
> > > Cheeks".
> > > > > > > Roger still holds the humming record for no spillage, but his
> > > butties
> > > > > are
> > > > > > > quickly bringing up the rear.
> > > > > > > Roger, ever undaunted, unabashedly informs his admirers that
the
> > > > secret
> > > > > to
> > > > > > > his sucksess is, "If at first you don't suck seed, suck, suck
> > > again."
> > > > > > > Go, Roger! Go!
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > LMFAO
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ghost
> > > > >
> > > > > Translation: "Slllllluuuuurrrrrpppp!"
> > > > >
> > > > > "Ghjost" is familiar with licking rectums, since that's how he got
> the
> > > > > herpes on his tongue.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Poor Impotent, he was so upset at his ineffectiveness, he spammed with
> > > identical responses on two posts. Run along and beat your wife up some
> > more,
> > > wife beater.
> >
> > One Who Knows the feel of a sheep's anus [flush!]
>
> Poor babbling cocoaine addict Booby.

--
One Who Knows Roger said about Roger's responses:
"The hallmark of an outed coward. Then your (f)lame quality
began to get a stale taste to it. The same repetitive crap, re-arranged
ad nauseum, ad infinitum."

5435. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:16:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2657D5.8042C776@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28429

N2EY wrote:
> Cecil, when you say "the idea presented by the PCTA folk", the English
> language implication is "all".

You're right. I should have said some of the PCTA folk. Please forgive me.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5436. Re: Roger Goes (Humming) Caroling

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:19:00 UTC
From: Omniscient <KnowsAll@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <a05l8geme0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28428
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a04p6v$l7u$h@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Robert" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> news:a02nj6$msm$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a02dil$1i6$n@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "Omniscient" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a00o7r$p7l$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > news:9vvhor$hkd$2@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > "Impotent" <KnowsAssholeswell@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:9vuapu$nrs$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > > > > Roger and some of his "dear" friends at the Pink Triangle Sweet
> Meat
> > > Bar
> > > > > and
> > > > > > Grill have gotten together and formed a group called The Hummers
> to
> > go
> > > > > > Christmas caroling. They have but one song on their list but
they
> do
> > > it
> > > > > > well, often, and usually to "stand up" crowds.
> > > > > > That one song is their most favorite, and they can hum "Come All
> Ye
> > > > > > Faithful" in three different octaves. They usually hum this
little
> > > ditty
> > > > > > while on their knees and Roger is typically the leading
supplicant
> > and
> > > > > > greatest crowd pleaser.
> > > > > > There is no shortage of protein in Roger's diet and his twinky
> > little
> > > > > Pinky
> > > > > > butties have fondly dubbed Roger with the nickname "Chipmunk
> > Cheeks".
```

> > > > > > Roger still holds the humming record for no spillage, but his
> > butties
> > > > are
> > > > > > quickly bringing up the rear.
> > > > > > Roger, ever undaunted, unabashedly informs his admirers that the
> > > secret
> > > > to
> > > > > > his sucksess is, "If at first you don't suck seed, suck, suck
> > again."
> > > > > > Go, Roger! Go!
> > > > >
> > > > > Poor anonymous COWARD all he's got is a pathetic IKYABWAI.
> > > > > Too bad he's been charged with molesting his two daughters.
> > >
> > > [flush]
> > >
> > > Poor Impotent the anonymous COWARD.
> >
> > Still [STOMP!]
>
> Still hiding behind that anonimity, taliban-supporting COWARD?

Still peeking from behind your mommy's curtain, Wogie?

--
One Who Knows Roger said about Roger's responses:
"The hallmark of an outed coward. Then your (f)lame quality
began to get a stale taste to it. The same repetitive crap, re-arranged
ad nauseum, ad infinitum."

5437. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:19:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C265863.33224047@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28431

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >I rest my case. cheers, CAM
>
> You need to rest your case, it is very apparent you need help

I rest my case. Can't you post even a single sentence in proper English?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5438. Re: Roger Goes (Humming) Caroling

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:19:51 UTC
From: Omniscient <KnowsAll@Anon.com>
Message-ID: <a05la4$eq4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28430
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a04p70$l7u$i@dosa.alt.net...
> Pedophile
> "Robert" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> news:a02naemch0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a02dii$1i6$l@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "Impotent" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
> > > news:a00o54ovv0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > "ghost" <ghost_dj_no_spam@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:cuIU7.6197$Cw3.725258@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > > > > <snip>
> > > > > >
> > > > > "Slllllluuuuurrrrrpppp!"
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > "Ghjost" is familiar with licking rectums, since that's how he
got
> > the
> > > > > > herpes on his tongue.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > That was lame, perhaps you would care to try again? Let's play a
> game,
> > I
> > > > > > hold my hand up, and you pick a finger. It's an easy game, as I
will
> > let
> > > > > you
> > > > > > keep guessing till you get it right.
> > > > > >
> > > > > ghost
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > --
> > > >
> > --
> > One Who Knows the touch of a sheep's anus said:
> > "The hallmark of an outed coward is my hiding behind aliases. Get the
best

> sheep
> > you can find. Then the cum you swallow won't get that stale taste to it.
>
> Poor anonymous COWARD.
>
>
> > > Impotent and Gasp are familiar with stale tates, since they regularly
> suck
> > > off their grandfathers.
>
> Impotent's admission he sucks off his grandfather, noted.

--
One Who Knows Roger said about Roger's responses:
"The hallmark of an outed coward. Then your (f)lame quality
began to get a stale taste to it. The same repetitive crap, re-arranged
ad nauseum, ad infinitum."

5439. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:20:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a05ll9$87e$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28432

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C25D150.69216283@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 17:45:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> > >A professional engineer should have aced the Extra test.
> >
> > Why? 1/4 or more of the questions involve totally
> > non-technical subjects (VE credentials, amateur space
> > operations rules, etc.)
>
> I aced the Extra test over 30 years ago, long before VE credential etc
> questions, and I'm, not a degreed engineer. All that means what?

It means nothing. My comment was directed at the notion
that any person who is a PE should be able to just ACE the
exam because of the inherent knowledhge the individual has because
the person is a PE. Since a fair amount of the Extra test includes
subject matter that is totally unrelated to technical info that a PE
might know, I was commenting that the PE wouldn't just ACE
the test and, more likly could not do so without at least studying
the non-tech stuff first (i.e. VE credentials, certain FCC regs, etc.)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5440. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:20:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2658C4.8535D40E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28433

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> He must have also lost the link to QRZ ... the upgrade made
> it into the FCC database (and the callbook servers) on Dec. 20.

Merry Christmas
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5441. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:22:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26593F.27532459@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28434

Dave Heil wrote:
> Well, Mr. Quixote--or can I just call you Don?--you asked a question
> which can best be answered by someone from the FCC.

It was a rhetorical question, Dave, but of course you knew that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5442. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:24:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2659A7.E5E17B6D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28435

Dave Heil wrote:
> Yes, Kim's callsign is vulgar.

How many times must a doorbell be rung before it is harassment?
How many times must you make the above statement before it is
harassment?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5443. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:26:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C265A06.52189B36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28436

Dave Heil wrote:
> The information you seek is available. Why not go to the source, Don?

It was a rhetorical question, Dave, but of course you knew that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5444. Re: RADIO LAW vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:27:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a05lrl$6i2$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28437
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:P%bV7.1242$UO1.614693@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
>
> K0HB <K0HB@bitbucket73.com> wrote...
> :
> :
> : > The police and military are your superiors.
> :
> : Horse-shit.
> :
> : Pure extra fine Grade-A Horse-Shit.
> :
> : The police and military are my hired help. They work for me,
> : which makes _me_ their superior.
> :
> : Do you live in the old USSR or Iraq or some such dictatorship?
> :
> : 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Sorry but you are no more than a taxpayer
> with no choice in paying your taxes or they
> will be forcible taken from you. The mayor
> or the governor is who the police work for.
> It is they who hire them.

And good mayors, governors, etc. will demand that their
police force personnel and anyone else that is
employed by government understands and respects the fact
that they ARE public servants. Unfortunately, there still
are jurisdictions that operate on the "Dukes of Hazard
School of Local Government." Thankfully, with the media
coverage today, that is becoming far more difficult to
do and the bad attitude employees will find it more
difficult to thumb their noses at the public that employs the,.

> Now if you are very rich or powerful, you
> might be able to dictate who the mayor is.
> But most people, there is little recourse unless
> you band together in enough numbers to
> force the political establishment to listen.
> And the police do know this.

It's called democracy...and it does work.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5445. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:29:49 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C265ADD.6D59ED14@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28439

Dave Heil wrote:
> I know it is how you'd describe it. That's how you DID describe it.
> The only difficulty I have with it is that it simply isn't true.

What you are doing is harassment, pure and simple. How many times
can you ring a doorbell before someone calls the cops?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5446. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:31:06 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <KWsV7.238389$3d2.11521443@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28438

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:4qsV7.194822$WW.11289029@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> Dave Heil wrote
>
> > Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > > Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a
moron is
> > > someone who doesn't know what a maroon is.
>
> > Blow a couple of bucks at Blockbuster and rent a couple of Bugs Bunny
> > cartoons.
>
> Maybe you do have a sense of humor...
>
> Rich
>
> maroon is still racist...

The University of Chicago football teams were racist?

5447. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:37:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C265C9D.5C9EC91F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28440

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm content to draw attention to the FCC's about face. In the past, the
> Commission would not and did not issue such calls.

Aha, so the FCC is to blame. That's what I have been saying all along.
It is the FCC's responsibility to recall Kim's callsign if necessary.
Otherwise, the FCC has given its tacit approval and sided with Kim
against you and your United Uppity Prudes of the ARS.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5448. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:39:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C265D10.66498310@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28442

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> > >
> > How many times?
>
> There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.

The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws. How
many times can you ring someone's doorbell before being arrested?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5449. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:39:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a05mhnotk1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:c6lV7.18$Qs3.67090@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
> : > It will cause more problems that it is worth.
> : > Right now most police officers use scanners
> : > to listen to adjacent patrol areas, other departments
> : > and others services. If radios are encrypted, you
> : > will only have those talk groups that are programmed
> : > into your radio. Already we have problems with
> : > various agencies not wanting other agencies on
> : > their talk groups. For example, the ambulance
> : > service does not want the fire fighters on their
> : > talk group. Makes it damned hard to co-ordinate
> : > at an accident scene or talk the ambulance in.
> :
> : With a trunking system, you only have the talk groups that
> : are programmed into your radio - the same is true for systems.
> : This is no different than for conventional repeater setups.
> :
> : With a trunking system - there is no need for different agencies
> : to be on the same talk groups - except for the designed interagency
> : groups. Those interagency groups are meant for use when such
> : coordinated operation is desired.
> :
> : I speak from practical experience here. I have performed the design
> : and implementation of various trunking systems.
>
> And if everything is encrypted then one can not
> monitor other agencies. Many LEOs have scanners
> in their vehicles.

Translation...you can't have it both ways. If you don't want it
encrypted (or trunked) to keep most scanner owners from
listening...then you have to live with the fact that they can
listen. There are far too many receivers already in existence
to ever consider any ban on people owning/listening to
police frequencies. Indeed, most any radio can do so with
a simple converter in front of it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5450. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:44:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C265E34.24996CC3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28444

Richard McCollum wrote:
> The University of Chicago football teams were racist?

I guess Texas A&M teams are maroons and whites. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5451. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 22:44:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a05mtp$i8p$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28443
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C1E72FD.3AC2EEC4@gte.net...
> > >> >
> > >> >Think again. First the cops would just the
> > >> >car and the radios. Then when the CID
> > >> >folks show up, they will explain how you
> > >> >lipped off to the cops that you were some
> > >> >type of hot shot Air Force type. At that
> > >> >point, the investigation might be about your
> > >> >fitness to serve.
> > >>
> > >> Which is why I strongly endorse and support that
> > >> all police cars be equipped with both audio and video
> > >> recording equipment to document exactly what
> > >> happened. I have seen the absolute value in
> > >> these in both protecting the public against rogue
> > >> cops and protecting police against false accusations of
> > >> police brutality.
> > >
> > >Bill, I am not talking about rogue cops or
> > >even police brutality. Rather it is the cop
> > >who is a professional, who keeps his cool,
> > >but is not going to let some ham tell him that
> > >the cop has no right to inspect his radios
> > >and plays the hot shot.
> >
> > INSPECT for WHAT reason. The radio in
> > the car is NOT illegal. The cop as NO need
> > to ask. If asked, I'd tell him what my radio is
> > and that's the end of it. What else would he
> > need or want to do?
> >
> > >No cop will put up with that.
> >
> > After telling the cop the radio is a ham rig (or CB,
> > or FRS, or private mobile, or whatever, just what
> > more could the cop ask?
> >
> > >The average cop is trained to suspect everyone.
> > >Even other cops. They are trained that they
> > >are superior, the "force" of government, the
> > >thin blue line that keeps us a civilized society.
> > >And it is almost universal that the biggest goal
> > >that a cop will have is to make it home alive

> > >every night.
> >
> > That is not the training I am aware of. Cops may have
> > the powerm but their application of that power must
> > be tempered with restraint and rational reasoning...or
> > they will end up off the force in many cases.
> >
> > >If there is a question about a radio,
> >
> > WHAT could be questioned?
> >
> > >it is just easier
> > >to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
> > >courts settle. I have said this over and over.
> >
> > Yes you have and you fail to see that any cop
> > that developes a histry of bad arrests, court
> > losses, etc won't go far as a cop.
> >
> > > This
> > >includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
> > >a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
> > >chief's problem, and not theirs.
> >
> > Believe it or not, cops can end up being criminally
> > prosecuted for departures from proper enforcement.
> >
> > >This does not mean that they will keep the radios forever,
> > >as the AF CAP chap suggested. When the AF types come,
> > >it will go in front of a judge. And remember, this is only if
> > >there is question that the street officer can not settle quickly.
> >
> > I repeat...what could be in question that the local cop
> > would have any role in or knowledge of?
> >
> > >Too many Americans are jerks, assholes.
> >
> > If they aren't breaking the law then so what?
> >
> > >They believe that
> > >they have a right to do anything, and everything.
> >
> > Again, unless they are breaking a law, so what...it
> > isn't a police matter.
> >
> > >That they
> > >have NO responsibility to society or their fellow man.
> >
> > Yet again, unless they are breaking a law, so what...it
> > isn't a police matter.

> > >
> > > And the cops want that attitude to end.
> >
> > So do many others, but it ain't a police matter UNLESS
> > laws are being broken.
>
> You just do not get it, do you?
>
> It is more about your attitude than anything.
> Get an attitude with a cop, he will find things
> to write tickets for.

I know far better than to "get an attitude"...but that doesn't
mean I checked my rights at the door when I get
in my car.

> Some cops do not care about ham equipment.
> Some cops do. It depends whether the state
> has a law over radio usage like we are now
> seeing with Cell Phones.

There are NO such laws against ham equipment.
If you know of any, please cite.

> The real point is that if the officer does decide
> to take the radio, he will be damned use that
> he can justify doing so.

I'd not stop any cop from taking the radio...BUT that cop
better have a valid reason when I follow-up with
the authorities to get it back and to learn just what/why
it was taken in the first place.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5452. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 23:01:02 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <OmtV7.194874$WW.11294656@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28445

> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
> news:4qsV7.194822$WW.11289029@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote
> >
> > > Richard Plourde wrote:
> >
> > > > Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a
> moron is
> > > > someone who doesn't know what a maroon is.
> >
> > > Blow a couple of bucks at Blockbuster and rent a couple of Bugs Bunny
> > > cartoons.
> >
> > Maybe you do have a sense of humor...
> >
> > Rich
> >
> > maroon is still racist...

Richard McCollum wrote

> The University of Chicago football teams were racist?

No, Richard, the team members were not neccessarily racists. Whoever started calling the team members maroons may very have been the racists.

maroon - a fugitive Negro slave of the West Indies and Guiana in the 17th and 18th centuries; also: a descendant of such a slave.

There're a many details in our heritage which lose their luster in the light of day.

Rich

5453. Re: PROOF that we are all BARKING MAD! CBERS.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 23:07:05 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <WA7AA@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <3C26630D.B1034855@attbi.com>
Source record: 28446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Patrick Keele wrote:

> > > What you REALLY mean is..... CAUSE I AIN'T GOT A BRAIN.....i
> have
> > > "adddressed the issue".
> Not quite gov'nor
>
> I was merely re- iterating the level of intelligence by paraphrasing(if you
> know what the word means)

No, you're the only scholar here, it seems.

> which i think the CRETIN who insulted me
> possesses.
> I was demonstrating how i think the CRETIN speaks,judging by the level of
> illiteracy which he exudes.

??? So in order to prove your point, you dish out a totally unintelligible and illiterate post? Not to mention the drunken mumbling about "asians", "scandinavians", etc.

> You and he both clearly miss the point of my
> message.

That you dislike americanisms in the English language, yet are unable to write a coherent sentence in the language you're "protecting"?

> You don't impress me at all by misquoting what i originally said,which is
> out of context to the original message.ANY fool(you as an example)can cut
> and paste.You are not clever.

Any fool *may* be able to cut and paste, but that's one skill you apparently lack. Let me give you a few pointers: sentences begin with a capital letter. There is always a space between a word and parentheses (with the exception of whatever the parentheses contain) as well as between the period at the end of the sentence and the next word. Ditto for commas, exclamation marks and question marks. Writing whole words in upper case is considered tacky and in poor taste (also yelling in ng's), especially if it's done randomly. "Reiterate" is not spelled with a hyphen (let alone with a space after it). Nationalities and other words describing belonging to a geographical group are always capitalized. A sentence cannot begin with either "or" or "but". Abbreviations for countries are always capitalized (i.e. UK instead of uk). Learn the difference between "its" and "it's", as well between "countries" and "country's". Ditto for "too" and "to".
Also, you seem to be perplexed about certain nationalities, so let me enlighten you: we call Pakistanis and Bangladeshis Asians because they are from Asia.

Simple, isn't it? Likewise, it is perfectly normal to call Swedes Scandinavians and Americans - North Americans. The reason we don't call Britons "Britains" is because it is a word made up by you and no one else uses it.

And finally, language is a live, complex and fluid concept. To reject new words and phrases simply on the basis of their origin is to show an extreme close-mindedness that borders on stupidity. Most repressive governments usually take it upon themselves to regulate the language instead of allowing it to develop naturally. Therefore, your mindset is clearly similar to the one of a linguistic fascist. Notice that even though "mindset" can be described as "how someone thinks", there are few synonims for the word - ergo, there is nothing wrong with the word and the fact that it hasn't been around in the time of Shakespeare does not invalidate it in any way. As long as I'm mentioning Shakespeare, I wonder what you would have called dozens of his made up words which are today standard English. At least you have to agree that it is more natural to say "mindset" than "how someone thinks" in a sentence.

73 .... Zoran WA7AA

5454. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 23:20:10 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <KEtV7.26419$Z03.14414496@news1.rdc1.mi.home.com>
Source record: 28447
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

I thought 20M was abnormally quiet lately..

--
--
Dave's Engineering Page: http://www.dvanhorn.org

Got a need to read Bar codes? http://www.barcodechip.com
Bi-directional read of UPC-A, UPC-E, EAN-8, EAN-13, JAN, and Bookland, with
two or five digit supplemental codes, in an 8 pin chip, with NO external
parts.

5455. Re: BARF Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 23:37:59 UTC
From: SLee@houston-hunks.com
Message-ID: <pile.it.on.baby@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 28448
Cross-posted to: alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.sex.sheep.chubby,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 15:13:35 -0600, The Better Amateur Radio Federation
<lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm> wrote:
: We will post this on our webpage.
:
: http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61

That's a very large picture of Woger Wiseman that you have posted near the bottom of your page. How did you get him sit still long enough to pose for it? I hear that his piles are very inflamed during the holiday season.

5456. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 23:45:49 UTC
From: keyclownslappa@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ce9e428e.0112231545.7f1e04db@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"porky" <porky@cfl.rr.com> wrote in message
news:<LTnV7.160210$oj3.27634268@typhoon.tampabay.rr.com>...
> Not only that, but he clearly states that the color green(
> which("witch" hihi) represents ham freqs.) are starting from 28.005. Duh,
> the initial post was an incorrect statement in which the poster was saying
> that cber's consider 28mhz as cb land.

PORKY WHERE DO YOU SEE ON HIS CHART ANYTHING THAT SAYS 'HAM' OR 'AMATEUR'?

AND THE HAM BAND STARTS AT 28.000 NOT 28.005, YOU DIPWAD.

5457. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-23 23:51:01 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <9dade74e4bc566e31591c70eb4dd72ba.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 28450

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C265D10.66498310@IEEE.org...

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> > >
> > > How many times?
> >
> > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
>
> The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws.

If you think I've exceeded the limit of time I'm allowed to say
"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign.", take me to court.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

"Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign."

(wanna borrow my <CTRL-V> keys?)

--
Posted from mplsapanas12poolb20.mpls.uswest.net [65.103.22.20]
via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

5458. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 00:07:47 UTC
From: daver40us@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c71973b3.0112231607.618fc039@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28451

"Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net> wrote in message news:<9vtg5701orp@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> I am so interested in finally getting my Technician's License that I have
> studied and studied for weeks now. I have passed every sample test I can get
> my hands on, and there is a real test in my area on January 17th, 2002.
>
> But, I'm reading these messages and I'm starting to get the feeling that the
> priviledges afforded to a Tech No Code gives access to frequencies that are
> really no better to occupy than a Citizen Band radio would access.
>
> I'm reading about jamming, and this jerk that, that jerk this, kids, lids,
> space cadets...
>
> I wanted to get into Amateur Radio to get out of the 27Mhz Snake Pit and QSO
> with some quality contacts.
>
> Am I really making a mistake? Is it too late for Ham Radio now?
You're not making a mistake.

My experience has been nothing but positive. 2 meters is much
different, and IMO, far better than CB.

Take your test in January. In the mean time, plug some local repeater
frequencies in a scanner and listen to the QSO's to form your own
opinion.

Welcome and Good Luck
Dave KB2TTT

5459. Re: BARF Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 00:09:10 UTC
From: Big Al <Big_Al@hohoho.com>
Message-ID: <a05rlv$o27$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28452
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation"
<lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:f26f938778abdebcfb56c578e4caaacf@spamfreenews.com...
> We will post this on our webpage.
>
> http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61
>

Hey, that is some full size picture you have of
Big Marie's ugly little boy Wogey on you web page!
Good Job! Wogey don't like peoples to see how ugly he is!

5460. Re: Big Al sucks and swallows Omniscient

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 00:15:22 UTC
From: Big Al <Big_Al@hohoho.com>
Message-ID: <a05s1ioqd0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28453
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.2600,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Poor KC8JBO. Meals-on-Wheels will come in Christmas
day to feed Big Marie. Woger will smell the great food, want
to eat, but no one will cook for poor Woger. No one loves
poor Woger, save maybe the lavendar lads gang at O'Leary's
Hourly Motel in Glendale. Woger will get vewy vewy angwy
and spew tons of filth on Usenet, but alas, poor Wogey will
still be unable to find anyone to cook for him or love him.
Poor little Wogey!

5461. On "Vacation"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 00:15:24 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112231615.25450bec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28454
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.pirate.radio,rec.radio.swap

"Thanks to you to Scott, Landshark and Sideband for policing the NG and exposing the cowardly no-code forgers for what they are. The AKC dog pound is filled with excrement this time of year and the hounds become overwrought with desire. Much as I would like to take them out for exercise, I will be absent from the group for a short time. The reason is that I am undergoing elective surgery. I will have certain male organs removed and reconstructed to better suit my lifestyle. When I return I will appear with a new addy that is more appropriate such as "Ms.Twist" or "MissyTwistedhed". I will also be posting pics on WWW.TIMNEBO.COM to show off my new persona and these galleries will be available to those with ADULT CHECK GOLD. Gender-changing has been a lifelong dream of mine and those of you who are not tolerant are not welcome to comment. (Dogie, AA, Sparky this means you) Suffice to say "if you ain't tried it don't knock it". Please keep your opinions to yourself. I will also continue to freeband and make friends on 27.555 and above despite the wishes of certain hammies who have comprehension problems (Lelnad being chief among them). I look forward to seeing you all in a new light upon my return"

5462. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 01:35:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011223203516.24795.00001259@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 28455

>He must have also lost the link to QRZ ... the upgrade made
>it into the FCC database (and the callbook servers) on Dec. 20.
>Not too bad a turn-around on the paperwork.
>
>73,
>
>--
>Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

Yea thats right only took you a Year to upgrade, must have been that real hard Memory Test. I thought it was the Code??

5463. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 01:37:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011223203713.24795.00001260@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 28456

>I rest my case. Can't you post even a single sentence in proper English?
>--
>cheers, CAM

NO, wouldnt be any fun in that there

5464. Re: On "Vacation"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 01:57:37 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <IYvV7.308654$W8.11228948@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28457
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.pirate.radio,rec.radio.swap

Assuming, of course, that this is not itself a forgery, best of luck to you.

You will pardon a bad play on words but it takes balls to do something about a problem few, including this writer, have a clue about let alone understand.

Dick N&#65533;BK

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message news:e9de0154.0112231615.25450bec@posting.google.com...
> "Thanks to you to Scott, Landshark and Sideband for policing the NG
> and exposing the cowardly no-code forgers for what they are. The AKC
> dog pound is filled with excrement this time of year and the hounds
> become overwrought with desire. Much as I would like to take them out
> for exercise, I will be absent from the group for a short time. The
> reason is that I am undergoing elective surgery. I will have certain
> male organs removed and reconstructed to better suit my lifestyle.
> When I return I will appear with a new addy that is more appropriate
> such as "Ms.Twist" or "MissyTwistedhed". I will also be posting pics
> on WWW.TIMNEBO.COM to show off my new persona and these galleries will
> be available to those with ADULT CHECK GOLD. Gender-changing has been
> a lifelong dream of mine and those of you who are not tolerant are not
> welcome to comment. (Dogie, AA, Sparky this means you) Suffice to say
> "if you ain't tried it don't knock it". Please keep your opinions to
> yourself. I will also continue to freeband and make friends on 27.555
> and above despite the wishes of certain hammies who have comprehension
> problems (Lelnad being chief among them). I look forward to seeing you
> all in a new light upon my return"

5465. aye 14.313 Xmas (burrrp....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 02:08:16 UTC
From: "Old St. Prick" <14313loons@biteme.net>
Message-ID: <k6wV7.12466$PO5.1961219@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 28458
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Found this on the 14.313 news page. I nearly peed myself laughing.
The author deserves a case of Samuel Addams beer fer-sure !

For the boys on 313:

'Twas the night before Christmas, and boy was it neat.
The kids were both gone, and I, Caracus Mike was in heat.
The doors were all bolted, the mike off the hook,
It was time for some nooky, by hook or by crook.
Momma in her teddy and I in the nude,
Had just hit the bedroom and reached for the mobil lube.
When out on the lawn there arose such a cry,
That I lost my boner, and momma went dry.
Up to the window I sprang like an elf,
Tore back the shade while she played with herself.
The moon on the crest of the snowman we'd built,
Showed a broom up his ass, clean up to the hilt.
When what to my wondering eyes should appear,
But a rusty old sleigh and eight mangy reindeer.
With a gay little driver, half out of the sled,
A sock in his ear and a bra on his head.
Sure as I'm speaking, Summers EVE was high as a kite,
Whoa Shithead, whoa Asshole, whoa Stupid, whoa Putz,
Either slow down this rig or I'll cut off your nuts.
Look out for the lamp post, and don't hit the tree,
Quit shaking the sleigh, 'cause I gotta go pee.
They cleared the old lamp post, the tree got a rub,
Just as Santa leaned out and threw up on my shrub.
And then from the roof we heard such a clatter,
As each little reindeer now emptied his bladder.
I was donning my jockeys, to cover my ass,
When down the chimney Dave came with a crash.
His suit was all smelly with perfume galore,
He looked like a bum and smelled like a whore.
"That was some gay hotel," he said with a smile,
"The reindeer are pooped, and I'll just stay awhile"
He walked to the kitchen for himself poured a drink,
Then whipped out his pecker and pissed in the sink.
I started to laugh, my wife smiled with glee,
The old boy was hung nearly down to his knee.
Back in the den, Old Dave reached in his sack,
But his toys were all gone, and some new things were packed.
The first thing he found was a pair of false tits,
The next was a handgun with a penis that spits.

A box filled with condoms was Dave's next find,
And six pair of panties, the edible kind.
A bra without nipples, a penis extension,
And several more things I shouldn't even mention.
A recording of NTI, a photo of OTK, and all types of oil,
And a dildo so long that it lay in a coil.
"This stuff ain't for kids, Mrs. Santa will shit,
So I'll leave 'em here, and then I'll just split."
He filled every stocking and then took his leave,
With one tiny butt plug stuck under his sleeve.
He sprang to his sleigh, but his feet were like lead,
Thus he fell on his ass and broke wind instead.
In time he was seated, took reigns of his hitch,
Saying,"Take me home, Rudolf. This night's been a bitch!"
The sleigh was near gone when we heard Davey shout,
"Thank God the K1MAN bulletin service is on the way out!!!"

M E R R Y C H R I S T M A S

http://members.aol.com/jcunham/

5466. Re: On "Vacation"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 02:37:35 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net>
Message-ID: <PxwV7.12176$s%1.2733405281@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 28461
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.pirate.radio,rec.radio.swap

Forge. If it doesn't have the webtv signature
in the properties, it's a forge.

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:lYvV7.308654$W8.11228948@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Assuming, of course, that this is not itself a forgery, best of luck to
> you.
>
> You will pardon a bad play on words but it takes balls to do something
> about a problem few, including this writer, have a clue about let alone
> understand.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> news:e9de0154.0112231615.25450bec@posting.google.com...
> > "Thanks to you to Scott, Landshark and Sideband for policing the NG
> > and exposing the cowardly no-code forgers for what they are. The AKC
> > dog pound is filled with excrement this time of year and the hounds
> > become overwrought with desire. Much as I would like to take them out
> > for exercise, I will be absent from the group for a short time. The
> > reason is that I am undergoing elective surgery. I will have certain
> > male organs removed and reconstructed to better suit my lifestyle.
> > When I return I will appear with a new addy that is more appropriate
> > such as "Ms.Twist" or "MissyTwistedhed". I will also be posting pics
> > on WWW.TIMNEBO.COM to show off my new persona and these galleries will
> > be available to those with ADULT CHECK GOLD. Gender-changing has been
> > a lifelong dream of mine and those of you who are not tolerant are not
> > welcome to comment. (Dogie, AA, Sparky this means you) Suffice to say
> > "if you ain't tried it don't knock it". Please keep your opinions to
> > yourself. I will also continue to freeband and make friends on 27.555
> > and above despite the wishes of certain hammies who have comprehension
> > problems (Lelnad being chief among them). I look forward to seeing you
> > all in a new light upon my return"
>
>

5467. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 02:57:03 UTC
From: "Keith R. Williams" <krw@attglobal.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1690638c86a46750989871@enews.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28465
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In article <3C23BE93.B40B0CEE@gte.net>, 2121d@gte.net says...

> In my state there is one exemption to having a pistol on
> you in public (without a license, that is). And that is that
> your employer requires to have it. It is allowed for businesses
> to have armed staff who deposit money, no carry permit
> required.

As long as we're talking about state's laws, The differ wildly.

Here, there aren't any carry laws for law-abiding citizens.
There aren't any licences either, which is a double-edged sword.
I can carry anywhere in the state (other than the obvious places
- schools, courthouses...) no license required. OTOH, I can't
get any benefit from reciprocal agreements either, since I have
no permit. ..concealed or not.

Keith

5468. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 03:10:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C269C8C.EEEB054@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28462

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You are the who pointed out that the guy gets lost. Maybe it'd be
> > easier for him to ride in or follow the other vehicle....unless the
> > other guys make him bring up the rear.
>
> The beauty of ham radio is that there needs be no meeting place or
> meeting time or even a campsite picked out. Everyone gets on a
> mountaintop repeater and decides where to camp out. Some of the
> Phoenix area mountaintop repeaters cover 1000 square miles.
>
> > You forget a couple of things. I didn't get into amateur radio to keep
> > in touch with camping buddies.
>
> Did you get into amateur radio for the purpose of harassing Kim?

You're more dense than usual. a) I don't even talk with Kim on the air.
b) My opinion of her callsign does not take the form of harrassment.
c) I was a radio amateur for over 30 years before Kim arrived on the
scene. She's a mere bimbette-come-lately.

> > As far as Osama: It is someone else's watch now. I'm retired.
>
> If you are omniscient, it is a capital offense for you to retire.
If I am omniscient, you'll understand if I tell you that you are again
wrong.

Dave K8MN

5469. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 03:17:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C269E17.FDDB83AA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28463

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'm content to draw attention to the FCC's about face. In the past, the
> > Commission would not and did not issue such calls.
>
> Aha, so the FCC is to blame. That's what I have been saying all along.
> It is the FCC's responsibility to recall Kim's callsign if necessary.
> Otherwise, the FCC has given its tacit approval and sided with Kim
> against you and your United Uppity Prudes of the ARS.

The FCC did not choose Kim's callsign. Kim did that and she did it deliberately to get the *nudge*, *wink* reaction.

Is it your opinion that anyone with a sense of propriety is an uppity prude?

Dave K8MN

5470. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 03:18:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C269E58.3B516BFF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28464

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> > >
> > > How many times?
> >
> > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
>
> The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws. How
> many times can you ring someone's doorbell before being arrested?

Another irrelevant quest, Don Q. Give it a shot and get back to us.
Since I'm not ringing doorbells but stating my views, stow the doorbell
jazz.

Dave K8MN

5471. Re: On "Vacation"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 03:34:31 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <bnxV7.308689$W8.11236295@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28466
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.pirate.radio,rec.radio.swap

Did not notice the source. Sorry 'bout that Chief.

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011223221330.865$IT@newsreader.com...
> "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote:
> > Forge. If it doesn't have the webtv signature
> > in the properties, it's a forge.
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> > --
> > Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All
> >
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:lYvV7.308654$W8.11228948@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Assuming, of course, that this is not itself a forgery, best of luck
to
> > > you.
> > >
> > > You will pardon a bad play on words but it takes balls to do
something
> > > about a problem few, including this writer, have a clue about let
alone
> > > understand.
> > >
> > > Dick N[illegible]BK
> > >
> >
> Any jackass who responds to these google forges,won't except advice.
> I've killfiled it,by domain.
>
> Of course you'll never see this,you've killfiled me..lol>
> Carry on soldier.
> >
> > > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> > > news:e9de0154.0112231615.25450bec@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Thanks to you to Scott, Landshark and Sideband for policing the
NG
> > > > and exposing the cowardly no-code forgers for what they are. The
AKC
> > > > dog pound is filled with excrement this time of year and the
hounds
> > > > become overwrought with desire. Much as I would like to take them

out
> > > > for exercise, I will be absent from the group for a short time.
The
> > > > reason is that I am undergoing elective surgery. I will have
certain
> > > > male organs removed and reconstructed to better suit my lifestyle.
> > > > When I return I will appear with a new addy that is more
appropriate
> > > > such as "Ms.Twist" or "MissyTwistedhed". I will also be posting
pics
> > > > on WWW.TIMNEBO.COM to show off my new persona and these galleries
> > > > will be available to those with ADULT CHECK GOLD. Gender-changing
has
> > > > been a lifelong dream of mine and those of you who are not
tolerant
> > > > are not welcome to comment. (Dogie, AA, Sparky this means you)
> > > > Suffice to say "if you ain't tried it don't knock it". Please keep
> > > > your opinions to yourself. I will also continue to freeband and
make
> > > > friends on 27.555 and above despite the wishes of certain hammies
who
> > > > have comprehension problems (Lelnad being chief among them). I
look
> > > > forward to seeing you all in a new light upon my return"
> > >
> > >
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

5472. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 03:51:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C269932.EDC9FF8C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28469

CAM wrote:

> K0HB wrote:
> > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
>
> How many times?

As many times as it takes to convince her and you.

5473. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 03:52:54 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BF9A4B9886B5806C.A8505456F572616C.8D597DE35B7791BE@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28470

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 21:57:47 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Naw Rick, that simply doesn't wash. Kim's own comments directed at
>those who object to her choice show her to be giving at least as much as
>she gets. There isn't a time limit on quantity limit on First Amendment
>rights. This is a plain old electonic bulletin board. I'm free to post
>here numerous times daily.

Only if your ISP agreement states that. The First Amendment
(or any OTHER Constitutional protection) does NOT apply to the private
sector (which your access to the Inet is), only to those areas
governed by the federal government.

>I'm offended by her call. I don't need to produce a potential ham.
>We have several others here who are offended.

You have stated your perspective. That's reasonable. But
continuing to do so isn't a question of voicing opinion, it's one of
harassing someone.

>> Mine are quite consistent--and so are Cecil's for that matter.
>
>At last reading, you guys couldn't even agree on what makes a
>libertarian.

No--we disagree on Libertarian party philosophy. We agree on
what a "libertarian" is--we simply don't agree on what a party which
identifies itself as "Libertarian" should have as a platform. That's
no more the same thing than stating you believe in democratic
principles means you have to agree with the Democratic Party platform.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5474. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 03:54:26 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1BD715196E60722E.6AF5952A7B043A51.70DA01405A34B8D2@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28471

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 21:59:07 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> >> Has he been dismembering Larry Roll again?
>> >>
>> >> Rick
>> >
>> >If Cecil is still using his, perhaps you'd loan yours.
>>
>> Sorry Dave, I can't help you.
>>
>> I don't _have_ a Larry Roll to lend you.
>
>Just pass the jawbone, Samson.

Sorry Dave--but I have no intention of touching Larry Roll's
Jawbone. I haven't had all my shots and I don't want to catch
anything.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5475. Re: On "Vacation"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 04:01:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <tMxV7.308716$W8.11236176@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.pirate.radio,rec.radio.swap

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011223225848.154$el@newsreader.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> > Did not notice the source. Sorry 'bout that Chief.
> >
> Nothing to be sorry about,glad to see I'm not in the Bozo flush...
>
> This is only a test... j/k
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

You were for a while because I flushed Hotmail but relented. Now as for
google, that will be seen to more or less immediately.

5476. Re: On "Vacation"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 04:05:00 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net>
Message-ID: <MPxV7.12842$y55.2746261601@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 28473
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.pirate.radio,rec.radio.swap

No problem Dick, no sorry needed, just
pointing it out.

Landshark

--
Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:bnxV7.308689$W8.11236295@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Did not notice the source. Sorry 'bout that Chief.
>
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20011223221330.865$IT@newsreader.com...
> > "Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote:
> > > Forge. If it doesn't have the webtv signature
> > > in the properties, it's a forge.
> > >
> > > Landshark
> > >
> > > --
> > > Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All
> > >
> > > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:IYvV7.308654$W8.11228948@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > > Assuming, of course, that this is not itself a forgery, best of luck
> to
> > > > you.
> > > >
> > > > You will pardon a bad play on words but it takes balls to do
> something
> > > > about a problem few, including this writer, have a clue about let
> alone
> > > > understand.
> > > >
> > > > Dick NBK
> > > >
> > >
> > > Any jackass who responds to these google forges,won't except advice.
> > > I've killfiled it,by domain.
> > >
> > > Of course you'll never see this,you've killfiled me..lol>
> > > Carry on soldier.

> > >
> > > > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:e9de0154.0112231615.25450bec@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Thanks to you to Scott, Landshark and Sideband for policing the
> NG
> > > > > and exposing the cowardly no-code forgers for what they are. The
> AKC
> > > > > dog pound is filled with excrement this time of year and the
> hounds
> > > > > become overwrought with desire. Much as I would like to take them
> out
> > > > > for exercise, I will be absent from the group for a short time.
> The
> > > > > reason is that I am undergoing elective surgery. I will have
> certain
> > > > > male organs removed and reconstructed to better suit my lifestyle.
> > > > > When I return I will appear with a new addy that is more
> appropriate
> > > > > such as "Ms.Twist" or "MissyTwistedhed". I will also be posting
> pics
> > > > > on WWW.TIMNEBO.COM to show off my new persona and these galleries
> > > > > will be available to those with ADULT CHECK GOLD. Gender-changing
> has
> > > > > been a lifelong dream of mine and those of you who are not
> tolerant
> > > > > are not welcome to comment. (Dogie, AA, Sparky this means you)
> > > > > Suffice to say "if you ain't tried it don't knock it". Please keep
> > > > > your opinions to yourself. I will also continue to freeband and
> make
> > > > > friends on 27.555 and above despite the wishes of certain hammies
> who
> > > > > have comprehension problems (Lelnad being chief among them). I
> look
> > > > > forward to seeing you all in a new light upon my return"
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > --
> > ~Moparholic~
>
>

5477. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 04:09:19 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1B35FEF7C45D7689.D1AA7460DBF360A7.8459FEAF5758DF49@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28474

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 22:09:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Then I suggest you make a test case of it. See if you can get Earthlink
>to drop me as a customer based on my statements here regarding Kim's
>trashy callsign.

>I disagree with you regarding your silly talk of harrassment. Make an
>issue of it with Earthlink if you like.

>You are quite wrong again. Firstly, I have serious doubts as to whether
>Earthlink will drop me as a paying customer because of my expression of
>my views.

From the Earthlink Acceptable Use Policy:

Your violation of this AUP may result in the suspension or termination
of either your access to the Services and/or your EarthLink account or
other actions as detailed in Section 3. This AUP should be read in
conjunction with our Internet Service Agreement and other policies.

. . .

d. Harassment. Using the Services to transmit any material (by email,
uploading, posting, or otherwise) that harasses another.

. . .

m. News. EarthLink Members should use their best judgment when posting
to any newsgroup. Many groups have charters, published guidelines,
FAQs, or "community standards" describing what is and is not
considered appropriate. Usenet can be a valuable resource if used
properly. The continued posting of off-topic articles is prohibited.
... Please familiarize yourself with basic Usenet netiquette before
posting to a newsgroup.

Because the discussion of Kim's call sign is clearly NOT
within the scope of the charter for this group (it has nothing to do
with Amateur Radio Policy at all) and because it CLEARLY harasses
another member of the news group (Kim), it is in violation of at least
TWO of the TOS of your isp. Obviously, you don't consider it
appropriate to live up to your contractual obligations to Earthlink,
which tells us a lot about your REAL morality.

> Secondly, I can stand on the street corner expressing those
>views if I can interest anyone in the topic. Thirdly, I can write
>letters to magazines regarding my views. Fourthly, I can make those
>views known on the air.

All true. NONE of those locations are private in nature, and
therefore are subject to the protections of the First Amendment. On
the other hand, if you choose to stand on a street corner stating that
someone is immoral and has no self-respect (as you have done with
Kim), then by necessity you leave yourself open to defamation of
character suits--the "protection" against abuse of your First
Amendment rights.

>Prove it, Rick! I've uttered no vile rants. I've expressed my opinion.
>That you don't like it is too bad.

No, you have harassed and insulted another user of this
newsgroup because you disagree with her choices. That goes WELL beyond
"expressing an opinion" and becomes pure harassment to any intelligent
person.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5478. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 04:18:58 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <S0yV7.308732$W8.11240246@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28475

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:1B35FEF7C45D7689.D1AA7460DBF360A7.8459FEAF5758DF49@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 22:09:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Then I suggest you make a test case of it. See if you can get
Earthlink
> >to drop me as a customer based on my statements here regarding Kim's
> >trashy callsign.
>
> >I disagree with you regarding your silly talk of harrassment. Make an
> >issue of it with Earthlink if you like.
>
> >You are quite wrong again. Firstly, I have serious doubts as to
whether
> >Earthlink will drop me as a paying customer because of my expression of
> >my views.
>
> From the Earthlink Acceptable Use Policy:
>
> Your violation of this AUP may result in the suspension or termination
> of either your access to the Services and/or your EarthLink account or
> other actions as detailed in Section 3. This AUP should be read in
> conjunction with our Internet Service Agreement and other policies.
>
> . . .
>
> d. Harassment. Using the Services to transmit any material (by email,
> uploading, posting, or otherwise) that harasses another.
>
> . . .
>
> m. News. EarthLink Members should use their best judgment when posting
> to any newsgroup. Many groups have charters, published guidelines,
> FAQs, or "community standards" describing what is and is not
> considered appropriate. Usenet can be a valuable resource if used
> properly. The continued posting of off-topic articles is prohibited.
> ... Please familiarize yourself with basic Usenet netiquette before
> posting to a newsgroup.
>
> Because the discussion of Kim's call sign is clearly NOT
> within the scope of the charter for this group (it has nothing to do
> with Amateur Radio Policy at all) and because it CLEARLY harasses
> another member of the news group (Kim), it is in violation of at least

> TWO of the TOS of your isp. Obviously, you don't consider it
> appropriate to live up to your contractual obligations to Earthlink,
> which tells us a lot about your REAL morality.
>
> > Secondly, I can stand on the street corner expressing those
> >views if I can interest anyone in the topic. Thirdly, I can write
> >letters to magazines regarding my views. Fourthly, I can make those
> >views known on the air.
>
> All true. NONE of those locations are private in nature, and
> therefore are subject to the protections of the First Amendment. On
> the other hand, if you choose to stand on a street corner stating that
> someone is immoral and has no self-respect (as you have done with
> Kim), then by necessity you leave yourself open to defamation of
> character suits--the "protection" against abuse of your First
> Amendment rights.
>
> >Prove it, Rick! I've uttered no vile rants. I've expressed my
opinion.
> >That you don't like it is too bad.
>
> No, you have harassed and insulted another user of this
> newsgroup because you disagree with her choices. That goes WELL beyond
> "expressing an opinion" and becomes pure harassment to any intelligent
> person.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>

With all due respect Rick this is why killfiles were invented. If
harassment it be as opposed to two people making prime fools of themselves
it is easily cured.

If my experience is indicative, getting kicked off Earthlink would be a
favor -- kind of like throwing Brer Rabbit into the briar patch.

Dick NBK

5479. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 04:25:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C26A12A.4CAD2772@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28476
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

N9NWO wrote:

> : Life is risk, and ALL jobs require a certain level of risk acceptance to
> : perform. Miners must risk their lives to perform their jobs.....they know
> : the hazards and the rate of death in their industry, yet they accept that
> : and continue to work.
> :
> : You're just pissed, again, because people aren't buying into your "I'm
> : superior to you because I'm military" crap.
> :
> : What I find really interesting is how on one hand you claim you have to
> risk
> : your life as part of your job, then on the other gripe because "the
> yuppies"
> : send you out on missions that risk your life.
> :
> : If risk is in your job description (and I would like to see you document
> : that), then quit bitching when you are asked to risk your life in the
> : performance of your job.
>
> Give you a little choice in this matter.
>
> We can continue down the path we are going.
> We now have a mercenary military, police and
> fire force in this country that is divorced from the
> people. They see themselves as more superior,
> a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
> (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
> academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
> Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
> time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
> A bunch of sheeple.
>
> The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
> fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
> sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
> and gang bangers too, they cry.
>
> Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
> larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
> men. We will do as we do with the military and
> allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
> recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.

> Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
> in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
> recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
> army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
> are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
> Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
> community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
> to cell phones). And you do not think people with
> this type of training will not see themselves as superior
> to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
> the gang bangers?
>
> You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
> amendment but is having 75% of your income
> taken any different? Because that is what it is
> going to take to support such an elite cadre.
>
> The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
> that the police, the military and fire protection be a
> community effort with ALL able bodied (those who
> are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
> that the public be involved, not in service but in the
> decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
>
> What do we have today? An American people who
> have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
> the government to make their decisions, others to be
> their protectors. But the draft is still the law, re-authorized
> by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
> in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
> word (and the money) from congress.
>
> So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
> by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?

I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying. Contacts in the military are saying that units have been training for domestic operations for some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge mistake, but one that could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as big a mistake as Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few dollars. If it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated and will be given away without the givers even knowing what they give.

5480. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 04:39:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C26A490.37024A6C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28477

Richard Plourde wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote
>
> > What a maroon.
>
> Ah, Carroll, That is a racist statement. Do you know what a maroon is????

Yep, I know what a maroon is. I used the word so according to Cecil I get to define it. A maroon is a moron, as defined in spelling bucthery by Buddy Masa, another very green young fella who used to post here.

The rest of your diatribe is not in any way applicible but is certainly characteistic of you.

5481. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 04:43:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C26A557.9426AC06@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28478

Richard Plourde wrote:

>
> Wrong, Carol, her call sign has absolutely nothing to do with the idiots on
> 3950 and 14313. Try to come up with an argument that's, at least, plausable.

As it happens, Riley Hollingsworth believes it, and I take his opinion over yours anytime. (No, he didn't specifically state that but if you would pay a little attention you'd know that he made almost identical statements concerning her choice of callsign and the noted idiot activity on the air). Close enough.

5482. Re: BARF Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 04:53:24 UTC
From: fisherville1@excite.com
Message-ID: <688a8779.0112232053.75dae387@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28479
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I am overjoyed at the tidings of great joy.
The worlds greatest Amateur radio personality, station operator and electronic genius, KV4FZ is giving his annual Christmas message of good will , and peace on earth.. Please send later information about frequencies..

And to all my good friends in the Better Amateur Radio Federation (BARF). Have a very Merry Christmas, and a Happy New Year, Enjoy the season , You have earned it !!!!

Seasons Greetings

LORO

"BARF HQ" <BARFHQ@KV4FZourHERO.org> wrote in message news:<a05g37$q33$0@dosa.alt.net>...
> ****IMPORTANT BARF News Release****
>
> BARF HQ proudly announces Herb, KV4FZ, will give
> his annual BARF Christmas message of good will to all
> hams. MOST Important, Herb will be announcing the
> glorious date he will be returning to ham radio. Looks like
> the Goodfellows will be very upset, so watch for frequencies
> and times to be announced. HAIL HERB!

5483. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 04:59:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26B617.C97628AA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28480

Dave Heil wrote:
> b) My opinion of her callsign does not take the form of harrassment.

It does when it is repeated incessantly. If I were Kim, I would
complain about your harassment to your ISP.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5484. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:03:42 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <OGyV7.26489$Z03.14653686@news1.rdc1.mi.home.com>
Source record: 28481
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011223230136.279$Gl@newsreader.com...
> "Dave VanHorn" <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote:
> > I thought 20M was abnormally quiet lately..
> >
> Dave,if you're gonna talk about 20,please snip the cross post to
> rec.radio.cb .
>
> Thank You.

I wasn't aware that they considered anything out of band.

--
Dave's Engineering Page: http://www.dvanhorn.org

Got a need to read Bar codes? http://www.barcodechip.com
Bi-directional read of UPC-A, UPC-E, EAN-8, EAN-13, JAN, and Bookland, with
two or five digit supplemental codes, in an 8 pin chip, with NO external
parts.

5485. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:04:11 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <fHyV7.238816$3d2.11554105@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28482

> Richard Plourde wrote:

> > Wrong, Carol, her call sign has absolutely nothing to do with the idiots
on
> > 3950 and 14313. Try to come up with an argument that's, at least,
plausable.

Dick Carroll wrote

> As it happens, Riley Hollingsworth believes it, and I take his opinion
over
> yours anytime. (No, he didn't specifically state that but if you would
pay a
> little attention you'd know that he made almost identical statements
concerning
> her choice of callsign and the noted idiot activity on the air). Close
enough.

Of course he didn't specifically state that...

I've never seen his statements, but if they're almost identical then he
lacks imagination and a sense of awareness.

Close enough for what??? Government work??? You should know about that...

Last thing you should do, Dick, is hang your reputation on a bureaucrat.

Rich

5486. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:05:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26B792.2704F139@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28484

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Richard Plourde wrote:
> > Ah, Carroll, That is a racist statement. Do you know what a maroon is????
>
> Yep, I know what a maroon is. I used the word so according to Cecil I get to
> define it. A maroon is a moron, ...

Dick, you get to choose a definition from the dictionary. That definition
is not in the dictionary. You lose.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5487. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:05:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C26AAA2.50020AA@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28483

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Yes, Kim's callsign is vulgar.
>
> How many times must a doorbell be rung before it is harassment?
> How many times must you make the above statement before it is
> harassment?

You might as well get used to the fact that it is vulgar. Your denying it doesn't make any difference whatever. Riley says it places the ARS one step closer to extinction, which is what he also said about the vulgar idiots on 3050 etc. And of course he's right
If you don't like it, hey, that's life. I don't like her chosen callsign.

5488. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:08:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C26AB29.6C42DD94@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28485

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I know it is how you'd describe it. That's how you DID describe it.
> > The only difficulty I have with it is that it simply isn't true.
>
> What you are doing is harassment, pure and simple. How many times
> can you ring a doorbell before someone calls the cops?

I hate to keep repeating myself, but you really ARE an idiot. No one
forces her to read anything posted here.

5489. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:08:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C26AB5D.958352EF@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28486

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
> news:4qsV7.194822$WW.11289029@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote
> >
> > > Richard Plourde wrote:
> >
> > > > Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a
> moron is
> > > > someone who doesn't know what a maroon is.
> >
> > > > Blow a couple of bucks at Blockbuster and rent a couple of Bugs Bunny
> > > > cartoons.
> >
> > Maybe you do have a sense of humor...
> >
> > Rich
> >
> > maroon is still racist...
>
> The University of Chicago football teams were racist?

Dippy Dick Plourde hasn't a hint of a clue.

5490. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:13:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26B97A.BD9182F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28487

Dave Heil wrote:
> Is it your opinion that anyone with a sense of propriety is an uppity
> prude?

From Webster's: "uppity - haughty, snobbish" "prude - a person who is excessively proper" So, according to Webster's, you have a snobbish excessive sense of propriety. That describes your attitude very well. Here's another word to describe what you are doing: "harass - to trouble by repeated attacks"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5491. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:16:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26BA12.FEF07EC0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28488

K0HB wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
> >
> > The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws.
>
> If you think I've exceeded the limit of time I'm allowed to say
> "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign.", take me to court.

> "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign." ...

"harass - to trouble by repeated attacks"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5492. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:20:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26BB30.B953CFE3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28489

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > K0HB wrote:
> > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> > >
> > How many times?
>
> As many times as it takes to convince her and you.

I will never be convinced. Kim will probably never be convinced. W5TIT is a valid callsign issued by the FCC. Would the FCC issue a trashy callsign? If so, it's the FCC's fault. Webster's even proves that W5TIT is not trashy. "trashy - inferior in quality; useless or worthless" Kim's callsign is worth as much as any other callsign.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5493. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:24:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26BC0A.4C4D6C18@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28490

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Yes, Kim's callsign is vulgar.
> >
> > How many times must a doorbell be rung before it is harassment?
> > How many times must you make the above statement before it is
> > harassment?
>
> You might as well get used to the fact that it is vulgar.

Vulgar or not, what you guys are doing meets the definition
of harassment. Harassment is worse than vulgar.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5494. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:25:01 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a06e6i01p0m@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28493

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:OmtV7.194874$WW.11294656@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > The University of Chicago football teams were racist?
>
> No, Richard, the team members were not neccessarily racists. Whoever
started
> calling the team members maroons may very have been the racists.

That depends on if they intended the term to be racist when they started
using it.

> maroon - a fugitive Negro slave of the West Indies and Guiana in the 17th
> and 18th centuries; also: a descendant of such a slave.
>
> There're a many details in our heritage which lose their luster in the
light
> of day.

Only if you let it get to you.

5495. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:26:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C26BC95.7474AEEB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28491

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I know it is how you'd describe it. That's how you DID describe it.
> > > The only difficulty I have with it is that it simply isn't true.
> >
> > What you are doing is harassment, pure and simple. How many times
> > can you ring a doorbell before someone calls the cops?
>
> I hate to keep repeating myself, but you really ARE an idiot. No one
> forces her to read anything posted here.

Be that as it may, what you guys are doing meets the definition of
harassment and no doubt violates the rules and standards of your ISPs.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5496. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 05:31:51 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <b5zV7.26492$Z03.14676736@news1.rdc1.mi.home.com>
Source record: 28492
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

> > > >
> > > Dave,if you're gonna talk about 20,please snip the cross post to
> > > rec.radio.cb .
> > >
> > > Thank You.
> >
> > I wasn't aware that they considered anything out of band.
> >
> Was this a lame attempt at humor,or are you stupid?
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, Than are dreamt of in
your philosophy.

--
Dave's Engineering Page: http://www.dvanhorn.org

Got a need to read Bar codes? http://www.barcodechip.com
Bi-directional read of UPC-A, UPC-E, EAN-8, EAN-13, JAN, and Bookland, with
two or five digit supplemental codes, in an 8 pin chip, with NO external
parts.

5497. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 06:29:26 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a06i05$ka5$4@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28494
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <2121d@gte.net> wrote:
>>
>> In my opinion, it is elitist attitudes like yours that are part of
>> the problems we face in this country.

> Sorry, I am only showing what the attitudes
> are among the educated elite in this country.

No, you are only showing how you and your acquaintances
feel.

I would qualify as one of the "educated elite". Yes, I am active
in politics and with the local police/fire departments. I am also
fairly well educated. It is funny that none of the people I know
ever display the attitude you exhibit. Either they hide it well
or you are an aberation.

> Politicians see themselves as extremely valuable
> to society. And they have the authority and power
> to enforce that belief. They use the police as
> their muscle to enforce their will on the public.

Many politicians enjoy the power, I agree about that. Most of them
actually believe that they are doing the ordinary citizen a favor
by passing more and more restrictive laws.

They have no "authority and power" to enforce the laws. All they
can do is provide the funds and hope the appropriate agencies use
it as they intend.

> Doctors see themselves as more valuable than
> most working class (blue collar) individuals. So
> do many college professors.

Yes, some doctors feel that way. But that is slowly changing as
more and more people realize that doctors are not infallable. It
has been a pleasure for me to see people starting to demand that
they be allowed an active role in deciding what will be done to
solve a medical problem. A doctor IS more valuable, when it comes
to medical matters - but not so when it comes to areas outside
the medical profession.

I don't know a lot of college professors, but have never felt that
they have treated me as inferior in what associations I have had
with them. Again, if it comes to knowledge about their area of
specialization, then they are certainly more valuable as sources

of information. But put a physical education professor in with a group of physicists, and the physical ed professor is going to feel inadequate and out of place.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5498. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 06:37:21 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a06if0$ka5$5@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28495
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote:

> : Ah, but different agencies can coordinate - as long as the radios
> : are all in the same band. Such system interoperability is trivial
> : to set up.

> In the "heat of battle", it is too late. What happens
> now is that each patrol area or agency vehicles can
> monitor each other via scanners. If things are encrypted,
> it would mean that dispatch would have to move everyone
> to a common talk group which would take time.

It is obvious that you don't know much about trunking systems. All
that is required is that the people switch to the interagency channel.
That is a simple turn of a knob or flipping of a switch.

On some systems, the dispatcher CAN move everyone - which takes a
few seconds. But it is unnecessary on a properly set up trunking
system.

> Give you an example. I was talking over lunch with a
> sheriff's deputy who transfers prisoners from the jail to
> the court house. He has the sheriff's talk groups but does
> not have the baliff's nor the downtown police talk groups.
> If he were to have a prisoner escape, he would have to
> co-ordinate everything via dispatch. It may take several
> minutes to inform everyone. Some may be totally out of
> the loop and even have the escaped prisoner go right by
> them. Scanners help in such cases to keep everyone informed.

All that shows is an inadequately designed talkgroup design.
It is not a fault of the system - it is the fault of whomever
assigned the talk groups.

> : What is wrong with digital trunking? From my experience, it has
> : worked out quite well. A much larger number of communications are
> : carried out on the same number of repeaters, and you don't have
> : to listen on a channel before transmitting to make sure it is
> : clear.

> Read http://www.strongsignals.net on a regular
> basis. Much of the digital systems are not working
> well. Now they think that the NYC FD digital
> radios may not have worked thus not informing
> the fire fighters to leave the WTC in time.

The WTC firefighters would not have received any warning. No one expected such a catastrophic collapse, or for it to happen so quickly. Even if they had, many of the firefighters would have gone in anyway - to get as many out as possible.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5499. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 06:40:02 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a06ik1$ka5$6@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28496
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote:
> :
> : With a trunking system - there is no need for different agencies
> : to be on the same talk groups - except for the designed interagency
> : groups. Those interagency groups are meant for use when such
> : coordinated operation is desired.

> And if everything is encrypted then one can not
> monitor other agencies. Many LEOs have scanners
> in their vehicles.

The LEOs would not need the scanners, if their trunking system were
set up correctly.

The only people who would not be able to listen would be anyone outside
the police/fire etc departments that were not programmed with the proper
decryption codes.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5500. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 06:42:55 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a06ipf$ka5$7@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28497
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote:
> :
> : Digital encoding all by itself stops most people from receiving
> : the communications. There already exists the capability to encode
> : analog communications so that the public cannot monitor traffic,
> : if desired.
> :
> : Some police forces might wish to keep the public ignorant. But
> : with the use of MDTs becoming more and more common, there isn't
> : much spoken over the radios that would be of concern - except
> : for special ops communications, which are already scrambled.

> And look at how pissed everyone got when
> Bill Cheek broke the Motorola encoding for
> their MDT's! Just because the NYC PD
> department had a bunch of cops using the
> MDT's to pass their off color jokes about
> women and minorities.

Which is one of the reasons why police etc should not be allowed to
encrypt routine traffic. Whether they should be allowed to do so with
MDTs is another matter.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5501. Merry Christmas from the B.A.R.F. !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 06:50:54 UTC
From: The Better Amateur Radio Federation <lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm>
Message-ID: <acd51342bd2a1cfb722e90c906c5b88c@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 28498
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

As Chief of Communications, I would like to wish everyone here a Happy
Holidays!

--
Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
Chief of Communications
The Better Amateur Radio Federation
Ham radio for Straight, White, Americans!
http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61

5502. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 11:23:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C270FD0.11D285BE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28499

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 21:57:47 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Naw Rick, that simply doesn't wash. Kim's own comments directed at
> >those who object to her choice show her to be giving at least as much as
> >she gets. There isn't a time limit on quantity limit on First Amendment
> >rights. This is a plain old electonic bulletin board. I'm free to post
> >here numerous times daily.
>
> Only if your ISP agreement states that. The First Amendment
> (or any OTHER Constitutional protection) does NOT apply to the private
> sector (which your access to the Inet is), only to those areas
> governed by the federal government.

Feel free to attempt to make an issue with it to Earthlink. See if they
share your views.

> >I'm offended by her call. I don't need to produce a potential ham.
> >We have several others here who are offended.
>
> You have stated your perspective. That's reasonable. But
> continuing to do so isn't a question of voicing opinion, it's one of
> harassing someone.

That's simply not true. If your statement was correct, your continued
posting of information to the effect that I am harrassing Kim would have
to be viewed as harrassment. After all, you've already stated your
perspective.

> >> Mine are quite consistent--and so are Cecil's for that matter.
> >
> >At last reading, you guys couldn't even agree on what makes a
> >libertarian.
>
> No--we disagree on Libertarian party philosophy. We agree on
> what a "libertarian" is--we simply don't agree on what a party which
> identifies itself as "Libertarian" should have as a platform. That's
> no more the same thing than stating you believe in democratic
> principles means you have to agree with the Democratic Party platform.

You started out disagreeing on Libertarian Party philosophy. Things
went down hill from there.

Dave K8MN

5503. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 11:30:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2711A9.1B0925EA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28500

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 22:09:09 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Then I suggest you make a test case of it. See if you can get Earthlink
> >to drop me as a customer based on my statements here regarding Kim's
> >trashy callsign.
>
> >I disagree with you regarding your silly talk of harrassment. Make an
> >issue of it with Earthlink if you like.
>
> >You are quite wrong again. Firstly, I have serious doubts as to whether
> >Earthlink will drop me as a paying customer because of my expression of
> >my views.
>
> From the Earthlink Acceptable Use Policy:
>
> Your violation of this AUP may result in the suspension or termination
> of either your access to the Services and/or your EarthLink account or
> other actions as detailed in Section 3. This AUP should be read in
> conjunction with our Internet Service Agreement and other policies.
>
> . . .
>
> d. Harassment. Using the Services to transmit any material (by email,
> uploading, posting, or otherwise) that harasses another.
>
> . . .
>
> m. News. EarthLink Members should use their best judgment when posting
> to any newsgroup. Many groups have charters, published guidelines,
> FAQs, or "community standards" describing what is and is not
> considered appropriate. Usenet can be a valuable resource if used
> properly. The continued posting of off-topic articles is prohibited.
> ... Please familiarize yourself with basic Usenet netiquette before
> posting to a newsgroup.

That is simply your interpretation. If you feel strongly, make an issue
of it with Earthlink.

> Because the discussion of Kim's call sign is clearly NOT
> within the scope of the charter for this group (it has nothing to do
> with Amateur Radio Policy at all) and because it CLEARLY harasses
> another member of the news group (Kim), it is in violation of at least

> TWO of the TOS of your isp. Obviously, you don't consider it
> appropriate to live up to your contractual obligations to Earthlink,
> which tells us a lot about your REAL morality.

Your idiotic claim (as if capital letters make something true) that it
is "CLEARLY" harrassment is absurd on its face. That you would attempt
to stifle another's First Amendment rights shows us that your
committment to libertarianism is only thin veneer.

> > Secondly, I can stand on the street corner expressing those
> >views if I can interest anyone in the topic. Thirdly, I can write
> >letters to magazines regarding my views. Fourthly, I can make those
> >views known on the air.
>
> All true. NONE of those locations are private in nature, and
> therefore are subject to the protections of the First Amendment. On
> the other hand, if you choose to stand on a street corner stating that
> someone is immoral and has no self-respect (as you have done with
> Kim), then by necessity you leave yourself open to defamation of
> character suits--the "protection" against abuse of your First
> Amendment rights.

Excuse me? At which point did I state that Kim is immoral. Lacking
taste in obtaining a trashy callsign is not the same as accusing one of
being immoral. Get a life, Rick.

> >Prove it, Rick! I've uttered no vile rants. I've expressed my opinion.
> >That you don't like it is too bad.
>
> No, you have harassed and insulted another user of this
> newsgroup because you disagree with her choices. That goes WELL beyond
> "expressing an opinion" and becomes pure harassment to any intelligent
> person.

No one receives immunity from insults, Rick. You yourself have often
handed out insults which go well beyond expressing an opinion. You are
stuck with a few empty claims.

Dave K8MN

5504. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 11:34:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C271281.4D8F695A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28601

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > b) My opinion of her callsign does not take the form of harrassment.
>
> It does when it is repeated incessantly. If I were Kim, I would
> complain about your harassment to your ISP.

That is an empty statement. Then there are the facts that you aren't Kim and that, if you were Kim, Earthlink would ignore your complaint because of its invalidity. Other than that, feel free to continue with your rant.

Dave K8MN

5505. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 11:37:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C27133C.F81B893F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28602

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Is it your opinion that anyone with a sense of propriety is an uppity
> > prude?
>
> From Webster's: "uppity - haughty, snobbish" "prude - a person who is
> excessively proper" So, according to Webster's, you have a snobbish
> excessive sense of propriety. That describes your attitude very well.
> Here's another word to describe what you are doing: "harass - to
> trouble by repeated attacks"

You are pretty good at looking up words. Perhaps at some point during
the new year, you'll be able to properly apply the meanings of some of
the words you've looked up.

Dave K8MN

5506. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 11:38:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C27136B.268A9B19@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28603

CAM wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
> > >
> > > The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws.
> >
> > If you think I've exceeded the limit of time I'm allowed to say
> > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign.", take me to court.
>
> > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign." ...
>
> "harass - to trouble by repeated attacks"

Work on being able to apply those definitions.

Dave K8MN

5507. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 11:39:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2713BB.457C4DEF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28604

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I know it is how you'd describe it. That's how you DID describe it.
> > > > The only difficulty I have with it is that it simply isn't true.
> > >
> > > What you are doing is harassment, pure and simple. How many times
> > > can you ring a doorbell before someone calls the cops?
> >
> > I hate to keep repeating myself, but you really ARE an idiot. No one
> > forces her to read anything posted here.
>
> Be that as it may, what you guys are doing meets the definition of
> harassment and no doubt violates the rules and standards of your ISPs.

No much more so than what you do on this group each and every day.

Dave K8MN
```

5508. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 11:45:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2715b2_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 28605

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2658C4.8535D40E@IEEE.org...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > He must have also lost the link to QRZ ... the upgrade made
> > it into the FCC database (and the callbook servers) on Dec. 20.
>
> Merry Christmas
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Merry Christmas (or happy whatever holiday you observe)
to all.

73,
- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCcVY5e+N6+q84HiEQJ+kQCfXOSJXyYUWgoXvMzcZPbKz0XzraYAoKvF
kn8FCHJpd8E2551vX9YAWHIN
=0Vzq
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

5509. Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 11:51:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c271712_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 28606

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

Dear r.r.a.p.'ers,

In the spirit of the holiday season (whatever your
religious persuasion), I'd like to take this opportunity
to sincerely convey wishes for a happy holiday
season and a prosperous new year to you, on behalf
of both myself and the entire Board of Directors and
membership of No Code International.

73,
- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- -----------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- -----------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCcWvpe+N6+q84HiEQKnVQCgjzqeBK1y00Cp7fId7/aLoBtzd1MAoNWU
9672hEYUS1DRg+UymIfAEQ4R
=poWe
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

5510. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 12:39:51 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <rmFV7.239124$3d2.11578204@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28607

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C26AB5D.958352EF@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:4qsV7.194822$WW.11289029@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote
> > >
> > > > Richard Plourde wrote:
> > >
> > > > > Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a
> > moron is
> > > > > someone who doesn't know what a maroon is.
> > >
> > > > Blow a couple of bucks at Blockbuster and rent a couple of Bugs
Bunny
> > > > cartoons.
> > >
> > > Maybe you do have a sense of humor...
> > >
> > > Rich
> > >
> > > maroon is still racist...
> >
> > The University of Chicago football teams were racist?
>
> Dippy Dick Plourde hasn't a hint of a clue.
>

Next time you are marooned in a 'sports bar' or other cheap dive ask the resident dipstick to name the 12 members of the Big Ten. Give him a hint, three are in Illinois. The University of Chicago is a founding and still active member of the Western Conference although they haven't fielded an intercollegiate sports team since, I believe, 1937. Go Maroons!

The real purpose of the Big 10 can be illustrated by the active ingredient in De-Con or the blood thinner called something like cumanin. Warfarin is Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation etc. The object of the exercise is to roll up some centavos on research. Guess who has a good batch of stem cells ready for sale and one hell of a lobbyist given the ex-Governor is Tommy Thompson now HHS secretary replacing the ex-chancellor of the UW system. TT is an easy man to underestimate; don't!

So it is no accident that the first nuclear reactor was assembled in Amos Alonzo Stagg Stadium at the U of C. God, can you imagine doing that today??

I suspect that Bugs Bunny's 'What a Maroon' came right out of Mel Blanc for no better reason than it fit the occasion, kind of like Cucamonga on the Jack Benny show.

Dick N&#65533;BK

5511. Re: BARF Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 12:54:55 UTC
From: Big Al <Big_Al@hohohoho.com>
Message-ID: <a078i4dde0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28608
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

Look who has posted here. Stumpjumper nr 1 himself,
W4FQF, King of the QRMers. Polly, you are still
obsessed with Doc, Dan, & Porkbutt. Funny thing is,
the three of them hardly ever give you a thought. And
Riley knows you and Al still jam 3901. You can bet on it!

"loro1313" <fisherville1@excite.com> wrote in message
news:688a8779.0112232053.75dae387@posting.google.com...
> I am overjoyed at the tidings of great joy.
> The worlds greatest Amateur radio personality, station operator and
> electronic genius, KV4FZ is giving his annual Christmas message of
> good will , and peace on earth.. Please send later information about
> frequencies..
>
> And to all my good friends in the Better Amateur Radio Federation
> (BARF). Have a very Merry Christmas, and a Happy New Year, Enjoy the
> season , You have earned it !!!!
>
>
> Seasons Greetings
>
> LORO

5512. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:13:21 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a07dn3$oh4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28619
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"SuckingDick SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com>
wrote in message news:d9f7b76c.0112231055.b2c4366@posting.google.com...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:<a04p67$l7u$0@dosa.alt.net>...
> > "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote
in
> > message news:d9f7b76c.0112222046.5c2c6625@posting.google.com...
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:<a02dhn$1i6$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > "SD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com>
wrote
> > in
> > > > message news:d9f7b76c.0112210954.64cbefb7@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:<9vvhp3hkd5@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > > > "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:9vu93o01oba@enews2.newsguy.com...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Woger Wussman" <W0GER@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:9vts89$f8j$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > On Thu, 20 Dec 2001 17:38:44 -0500, Krell
<krell1215@yahoo.com>
> > wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I've seen better trolls on pencils.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > The Jack Daniels was that effective, eh?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > My, my. Aren't we ignorant of pop culture.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > FYI, I was referring to the troll dolls that were popular in
the
> > 70s.
> > They
> > > > > > > > were those little things with the big eyes and different
colored,
> > Don
> > King
> > > > > > > > style of hair. Smaller ones were often on the ends of pencils,
or
> > on

> > > > > > > keychains, or hanging from rearview mirors. They're still
around,
> > but
> > > > not
> > > > as
> > > > > > > popular as they once were. Although they did have a resurgence
in
> > popularity
> > > > > > > about ten years ago.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That anonymous COWARD is ignorant of everything. "Woger Wussman"
aka
> > Twatty
> > > > > > Campbell(Posts as Scott Campbell) should be familiar with the
troll
> > doll,
> > > > > > since he was the initial model for them.
> > > > > >
> > > > > hit the bricks chuckie....you aren't wanted here.......
> > > >
> > > Fuck off, Dickhead, as the Stones sing "You can't always get what
you
> > want."
> > >
> > >
> > > oh geez...what happened chuckie.....get kicked off the ham reflector
> > > because you pissed in measure's corn flakes one too many times????
> >
> > Reflector, anonymous coward? So you're a ham radio newbie as well as an
> > internet newbie. Oh, too bad, gay SD. Haven't been "kicked" anywhere,
you
> > ignorant dolt.
>
>
> me thinks

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
How droll.....you and the concept of thinking....ROFLMAO!

5513. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:18:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011224081800.24460.00001395@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 28609

>In the spirit of the holiday season (whatever your
>religious persuasion), I'd like to take this opportunity
>to sincerely convey wishes for a happy holiday
>season and a prosperous new year to you, on behalf
>of both myself and the entire Board of Directors and
>membership of No Code International.
>
>73,
>- --
>Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

TAKE YOUR USELESS GREETINGS AND STICK IT!!!!!!!!!!

5514. Re: Big Al sucks and swallows Omniscient

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:22:07 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a07dn5$oh4$2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28620
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.2600,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Big Al" <Big_Al@hohoho.com> wrote in message
news:a05s1ioqd0@dosa.alt.net...

>[IKYABWAI]

Poor Big Al, he'll suck off his reatrded son John again this year as part of the Xmas eve family tradition. Then he'll get drunk and jam up and down the band again until Riley kicks him off the air for good this time. Then he can concentrate all his energies on manufacturing and distribution of kiddie porn. Big Al will prepare his Xmas dinner of a TV dinner and Abernathy supremes. Unlike Big Al, Woger can cook for himself, or can go out to eat because he has money and doesn't spend it on drugs and booze like Big Al.

I wonder if Steve Turdeater will snort cocaine and babble on the air this year again?

5515. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:23:54 UTC
From: Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not>
Message-ID: <3C272C5D.5B8E58A0@spam.me.not>
Source record: 28610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Dunno, Brain, but I do appreciate the compliment.

Happy Holidays to you, too.

73 de SSB

Brainbuster wrote:
>
> Sideband <sideband@spam.me.not> wrote in message
> news:3C227B39.F203E090@spam.me.not...
> >
> > <snipped>
> > But you're right. I did go from CBer (which I ran sideband for a bit over
> > 20 years, and ran professionally) to extra in 6 months, 1 week, and two
> > days. Of course, I worked hard for nine years (I started drilling the code
> > in '92) to overcome my dyslexia so I could pass the code requirement.
> ===
>
> Damn fine achievement for anyone.
> Very good of Mr. Middlefinger to explain to everyone what an intelligent
> person you are. Has he become your friend, or is it just the "Christmas
> spirit".
>
> Have a great Christmas.
>
> Brainbuster.
> ---

5516. Re: BARF Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:28:20 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a07dn8$oh4$4@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28621
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris

"Big Al" <Big_Al@hohohoho.com> wrote in message
news:a078i4dde0@pita.alt.net...
> Look who has posted here. Stumpjumper nr 1 himself,
> W4FQF, King of the QRMers. Polly, you are still
> obsessed with Doc, Dan, & Porkbutt. Funny thing is,
> the three of them hardly ever give you a thought. And
> Riley knows you and Al still jam 3901. You can bet on it!

Not to mention how you help jam unidentified, huh, fuckhead?

> "loro1313" <fisherville1@excite.com> wrote in message
> news:688a8779.0112232053.75dae387@posting.google.com...
> > I am overjoyed at the tidings of great joy.
> > The worlds greatest Amateur radio personality, station operator and
> > electronic genius, KV4FZ is giving his annual Christmas message of
> > good will , and peace on earth.. Please send later information about
> > frequencies..
> >
> > And to all my good friends in the Better Amateur Radio Federation
> > (BARF). Have a very Merry Christmas, and a Happy New Year, Enjoy the
> > season , You have earned it !!!!
> >
> >
> > Seasons Greetings
> >
> > LORO

5517. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:40:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C27305E.4E796F03@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28612

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > b) My opinion of her callsign does not take the form of harrassment.
> >
> > It does when it is repeated incessantly. If I were Kim, I would
> > complain about your harassment to your ISP.
>
> That is an empty statement. Then there are the facts that you aren't
> Kim and that, if you were Kim, Earthlink would ignore your complaint
> because of its invalidity. Other than that, feel free to continue with
> your rant.

It's obvious that you don't consider harassment to be a serious problem.
However, you are violating the agreement that you made with your ISP.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5518. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:42:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011224084205.08595.00001292@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 28611

>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 12/22/2001 5:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112222337350.18576-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>

>His name has nothing to do with it. His conviction for cellular phone
>phreaking is the reason behind why he was found morally unfit.

The FCC has no business deciding who is "morally fit" to do ANYTHING. He
did his time in the legal system.

The prosecutor himself has stated that he just doesn't like his "attitude"
and is doing what he can to further prevent Mitnik from retruning to society.

It's reasons like this that many people who might otherwise fit back in
to society wind up dropping back into less-than-desireable conduct. They can't
get past the past, not because they want to, but becuase idiots like the
prosecutor don't want to let it go and let him get on with his life.

He screwed up, he know's it, he paid the price the courts put on him.

Time to tell the FCC and the courts to act like men, not sandlot whiners.

Steve, K4YZ

5519. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:46:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2731B5.1A3618D4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28613

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > K0HB wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
> > > >
> > > > The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws.
> > >
> > > If you think I've exceeded the limit of time I'm allowed to say
> > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign.", take me to court.
> >
> > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign." ...
> >
> > "harass - to trouble by repeated attacks"
>
> Work on being able to apply those definitions.

OK, Kim is being repeatedly attacked on this newsgroup for her choice
of a callsign legally issued by the FCC. That's harassment and you
are violating the contract you signed with your ISP.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5520. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:54:32 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ssGV7.239151$3d2.11582707@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28614

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C27305E.4E796F03@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > b) My opinion of her callsign does not take the form of
harrassment.
> > >
> > > It does when it is repeated incessantly. If I were Kim, I would
> > > complain about your harassment to your ISP.
> >
> > That is an empty statement. Then there are the facts that you aren't
> > Kim and that, if you were Kim, Earthlink would ignore your complaint
> > because of its invalidity. Other than that, feel free to continue
with
> > your rant.
>
> It's obvious that you don't consider harassment to be a serious problem.
> However, you are violating the agreement that you made with your ISP.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

As noted to Rick, so long as killfiles exist and are really easy to do harassment has to be taken as voluntary so long as Dave does not go into phony mode to bypass the filters. This is pretty implicit in hanging out on Usenet. I have personally killfiled Kim and a few others as a total waste of my time but that is my decision; I have the alternative. Hell, I have killfiled entire domains like the public urinals where crud originates. Did wonders for my blood pressure.

Sounds like you are in Seabag Lawyer mode today, Cec.

Dick NBK

5521. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 13:59:47 UTC
From: "James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <gsce2ukpsvamtl7vq32rttmgpmktkk47j4@4ax.com>
Source record: 28615

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 23:20:48 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> CAM wrote:
>>
>> > K0HB wrote:
>> > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
>> >
>> > How many times?
>>
>> As many times as it takes to convince her and you.
>
>I will never be convinced. Kim will probably never be
>convinced. W5TIT is a valid callsign issued by the FCC.
>Would the FCC issue a trashy callsign? If so, it's the
>FCC's fault. Webster's even proves that W5TIT is not
>trashy. "trashy - inferior in quality; useless or
>worthless" Kim's callsign is worth as much as any
>other callsign.
If you all are going to continue to pick on Kim for picking
W5TIT, why don't you pick on Larry Bowling, W4TIT?
You do realize that there are other people out here that
have callsigns with the letters "TIT" in them, but I guess
you already know that, right.

Regards,

James

Note: To reply by email, remove the "X" in the reply to address.

5522. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 14:03:06 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <uAGV7.239157$3d2.11582568@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28616

> Richard Plourde wrote

> > No, Richard, the team members were not neccessarily racists.
> > Whoever started calling the team members maroons may very
> > have been the racists.

"Krell" wrote

> That depends on if they intended the term to be racist when they started
> using it.

That's why I said "may"... but yep... you're right...
but... now that Cecil mentioned Texas A&M it makes me wonder.

> > maroon - a fugitive Negro slave of the West Indies and Guiana
> > in the 17th and 18th centuries; also: a descendant of such a slave.

> > There're a many details in our heritage which lose their luster in the
> > light of day.

> Only if you let it get to you.

What do you mean by that? Racism is only in the eye of the beholder?

Rich

5523. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 14:08:13 UTC
From: "James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <r9de2u0fm5iqaemed4qa4fnjeslitb88lh@4ax.com>
Source record: 28617

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 03:17:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>CAM wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>> > I'm content to draw attention to the FCC's about face. In the past, the
>> > Commission would not and did not issue such calls.
>>
>> Aha, so the FCC is to blame. That's what I have been saying all along.
>> It is the FCC's responsibility to recall Kim's callsign if necessary.
>> Otherwise, the FCC has given its tacit approval and sided with Kim
>> against you and your United Uppity Prudes of the ARS.
>
>The FCC did not choose Kim's callsign. Kim did that and she did it
>deliberately to get the *nudge*, *wink* reaction.
>
>Is it your opinion that anyone with a sense of propriety is an uppity
>prude?
>
>Dave K8MN
Why do you continue to badger Kim for her callsign, W5TIT?
If you dislike that callsign so much, why don't you pick on all the
other hams that have callsigns with the letters, "TIT". With very
little effort on your part you could locate them. Why not pick on
Larry Bowling, W4TIT or is it because he is a man and Kim is a
woman?

Hopefully this message will not be emailed to you, Dave. I need to
find out how to change the default on Agent so that it does not email
messages posted on usenet.
Regards,

James

Note: To reply by email, remove the "X" in the reply to address.

5524. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 14:14:16 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <YKGV7.239168$3d2.11583917@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28618

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> I suspect that Bugs Bunny's 'What a Maroon' came right out of Mel Blanc
> for no better reason than it fit the occasion,

Probably true... but he's dead so we'll never know...
The only good racist is a ....well... ...never mind... ;-)

> kind of like Cucamonga on
> the Jack Benny show.

Or... Beach Boys Kokomo... which seems to have derived from Cucamonga...
hmmm....

Rich

5525. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 14:26:59 UTC
From: Graham Broadbridge <grahamb@peachy.org>
Message-ID: <3c273b33$0$16782$afc38c87@news.optusnet.com.au>
Source record: 28622
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message
news:cfyU7.1231$Ya1.689971@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...

> I suggest that you become familiar
> with the issues over APCO 25
> standards for digital trunked radio.
> The main purpose is to prevent private
> citizens from receiving ANY public
> radio transmission. As I am a member
> of APCO, I have had conversations with
> individuals who run public safety radio
> systems. Their one big goal is to have
> an digitally encrypted system that no one,
> not even the media, will be able to receive
> without their permission.

Indeed, this is how the police service in Sydney, Australia now operate.
It's (I believe) 512 bit
encrypted with the key built into a smartcard assigned to each officer).
The officer must insert
the key before being able to decode, and hear the transmissions. This was
all put in place
as part of the Sydney 2000 Olympic games to protect police service
transmissions from
being eavesdropped by potential terrorist groups.

It's only a small step from production use in Australia, to test usage in
the United States.

Graham VK2YUI

>
> Read some of the articles at http://www.strongsignals.net
>
>
>

5526. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 14:37:12 UTC
From: Scout <scout@monumental.com>
Message-ID: <S2HV7.4042$0g.109298@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28623
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C26A12A.4CAD2772@townsqr.com...
>
>
> N9NWO wrote:
>
> > : Life is risk, and ALL jobs require a certain level of risk acceptance
to
> > : perform. Miners must risk their lives to perform their jobs.....they
know
> > : the hazards and the rate of death in their industry, yet they accept
that
> > : and continue to work.
> > :
> > : You're just pissed, again, because people aren't buying into your "I'm
> > : superior to you because I'm military" crap.
> > :
> > : What I find really interesting is how on one hand you claim you have
to
> > risk
> > : your life as part of your job, then on the other gripe because "the
> > yuppies"
> > : send you out on missions that risk your life.
> > :
> > : If risk is in your job description (and I would like to see you
document
> > : that), then quit bitching when you are asked to risk your life in the
> > : performance of your job.
> >
> > Give you a little choice in this matter.
> >
> > We can continue down the path we are going.
> > We now have a mercenary military, police and
> > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
> > people. They see themselves as more superior,
> > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
> > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
> > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
> > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
> > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
> > A bunch of sheeple.
> >
> > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more

> > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
> > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
> > and gang bangers too, they cry.
> >
> > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
> > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
> > men. We will do as we do with the military and
> > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
> > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
> > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
> > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
> > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
> > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
> > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
> > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
> > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
> > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
> > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
> > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
> > the gang bangers?
> >
> > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
> > amendment but is having 75% of your income
> > taken any different? Because that is what it is
> > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
> >
> > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
> > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
> > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who
> > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
> > that the public be involved, not in service but in the
> > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
> >
> > What do we have today? An American people who
> > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
> > the government to make their decisions, others to be
> > their protectors. But the draft is still the law, re-authorized
> > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
> > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
> > word (and the money) from congress.
> >
> > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
> > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
>
> I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying. Contacts in
the
> military are saying that units have been training for domestic operations
for
> some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge mistake, but one
that

> could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as big a mistake
as
> Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
> A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few dollars.
If
> it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated and will be
> given away without the givers even knowing what they give.

Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that choice. To force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's good for them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If fewer people want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we need to determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve, and fix it.

5527. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:03:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011224100325.27168.00000587@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 28624

In article <rmFV7.239124$3d2.11578204@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>I suspect that Bugs Bunny's 'What a Maroon' came right out of Mel Blanc
>for no better reason than it fit the occasion, kind of like Cucamonga on
>the Jack Benny show.
>
Si.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5528. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:03:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011224100325.27168.00000588@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 28625

In article <3C2657D5.8042C776@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Cecil, when you say "the idea presented by the PCTA folk", the English
>> language implication is "all".
>
>You're right.

I know.

>I should have said some of the PCTA folk.

But you didn't. Coulda woulda shoulda.

>Please forgive me.

It is not my forgiveness that you need to seek.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5529. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:03:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011224100327.27168.00000589@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 28627

In article <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

>"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011221222305.05517.00000145@mb-de.aol.com...
>> >We're talking about licensing requirements ... that's PURELY a
>> >regulatory function. "Tradition" has NOTHING to do with
>*legitimate*
>> >regulatory goals ... it's not the FCC's job to preserve amateur
>> >"tradition" ... the FCC's job is to regulate the use of the
>spectrum
>> >in the public interest. End of story.
>>
>> Perhaps, but you can now be licensed without having to show "Morse
>> proficiency." The requirement of demonstrating a very traditional
>"discipline"
>> in order to "earn" additional privileges seems to be very much in
>the public
>> interest. Do you really think it's a "regulatory function" we're
>talking about?
>
>The key word here is "traditional" ... the idea of Morse proficiency
>as a "ham tradition" has no place in regulation.

Many of us think it does. From your previous posts of long ago, I know that you
would also eliminate things like subbands for various modes.

> If those who like
>Morse want to promote it, without government "arm-twisting," fine.
>I have no problem with that ... but it is NOT within the FCC's charter
>to enforce "amateur tradition."

The government frequently supports traditions and historic places and
practices. Community standards are one source of legal standards. Zoning,
building codes, and historic districts are some examples. Much of what the
various park services do is presrvation of wilderness and historic/traditional
sites.

What is the difference between an FCC rule that says Morse skill is required to
use a particular part of the radio spectrum and a Park Service rule that says
motor vehicles cannot be used in certain parks and wilderness areas?
>
>Another concept to consider is that "discipline" is a bit misused in
>this application, IMHO. Are you talking about the concept that some
>have voiced that "It's (jumping through the Morse proficiency hoop)
>necessary to show 'committment'." ???

Experience has shown what happens without such commitment.
>
>Showing"committment" also has no place in regulation.

I would call it "responsibility".

>All that's
>legitimate is a demonstration of understanding of the rules and regs
>and sufficient technical competence to operate safely and without
>violating the rules or causing interference problems.

Using that as a your standard, almost everything in the current written tests must be eliminated. This is particularly true of the General and Extra class written tests. If a Technician class licensee who has passed the current 35 question multiple-choice test is deemed by the FCC to be qualified to use all authorized amateur modes and frequencies above 30 MHz, why is additional written testing needed for that amateur to have full access below 30 MHz? Why should full access to amateur HF/MF require more than three times the written testing required to access all of amateur VHF/UHF?

>> >Standards, shmandards ... the "keep Morse forever" crowd has
>> >three basic motivations 1) "I had to do it, so everyone else
>should,
>> >too."; 2) fear that, if everyone else is not forced to learn Morse,
>> >not enough will choose to learn and use it and their source of
>contacts
>> >will dry up; and 3) the misguided goal of keeping "outsiders" from
>> >using "their" bands. All 3 of those are pure rubbish.
>>
>> ...and the motivations of those who wish to remove the code
>requirement
>> entirely are? I guess you said it best..."Standards, shmandards..."
>
>You're missing the distinction that, in the paragraph above, I was
>disparaging the numbered motives above as not being legitimate
>standards

Apply that logic to the written tests, then. They force people to "jump through technical proficiency hoops".

>... I was NOT disparaging the validity of legitimate
>standards, which I support whole-heartedly.

What are those "legitimate standards", then? Who gets to determine them?

--

It is very probable that after WRC 2003 the code test treaty requirement will simply disappear. I can imagine the entire action at WRC 2003 will consist of something like "Eliminate S25.5? The ayes have it" and that will be the end of it. FCC and many other agencies will simply drop the code test. FCC could simply say that Element 1 was "waived" until the treaty was formally ratified and the appropriate US regs changed.

What should be discussed NOW is what the US license structure will become if/when S25.5 goes away. Some folks want just one class of license, while others want two classes at most. Some say "just drop Element 1 and leave the rest alone". Lots of ideas and possibilities, but I don't see much real discussion about the subject.

General question to all: What are YOUR ideas?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5530. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:03:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011224100328.27168.00000590@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 28626

In article <3C265061.E649A293@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>CAM wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>> > You are right about one thing. The FCC shouldn't have issued Kim's
>> > call.
>>
>> Well then Dave, it seems logical for you to stop bitchin' and get
>> the FCC to do something about it. Too bad The Constitution will
>> slap you up aside the head with a 2x4 in the process.
>
>The Constitution doesn't slap anyone up side the head with anything.
>I'm content to draw attention to the FCC's about face. In the past, the
>Commission would not and did not issue such calls.
>
Some facts to remember:

- What you get with an amateur radio license are privileges, not rights

- The privilege of choosing a vanity callsign has come and gone over the
history of the FCC, for various reasons.

- The FCC does not issue certain callsigns in routine sequence.

- The FCC could abolish the vanity callsign program at any time, for a variety
of reasons.

- Intentional choice of inappropriate callsigns by a few hams is one possible
reason for the FCC to discontinue the program.

- What is transmitted on the public airwaves (which includes amateur radio) is
not protected by the First Amendment in the same way as other media.
"Community standards" is one metric that can be applied.

- The mere fact that the FCC does something, or allows something, is no proof
that the specific something is good for the ARS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

- The choice of a callsi

5531. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:04:05 UTC
From: Graham Broadbridge <grahamb@peachy.org>
Message-ID: <3c2743e5$0$16784$afc38c87@news.optusnet.com.au>
Source record: 28628
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C24422C.4CA59E74@townsqr.com...

> They told us to pull over to the side and open the cover, which we did.
One
> glance inside was all they needed, and we were sent on our way. But
> technically that should require a search warrant, to search anything but
the
> driver/passenger compartment. And there was one small pickup with a shell
> cover which was stuffed full of things that the driver was being made to
> unload so they could get a good look. He wasn't too happy, but he was
doing
> it. I saw nothing there so unreasonable that I couldn't support it under
the
> circumstances. If you don't like it, take another route.

Quite likely, if you had refused the search you would have been arrested,
and
then searched.

If you attempted to refuse the search and turn around, you would have been
arrested
and then searched.

More often then not, state cops look at the way people react and make
decisions
based on gut feel. Most often they're right.

Graham

5532. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:16:46 UTC
From: Graham Broadbridge <grahamb@peachy.org>
Message-ID: <3c2746de$0$16781$afc38c87@news.optusnet.com.au>
Source record: 28629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Robert" <KnowsAll@Anon.com> wrote in message
news:a01lg9$9hl$0@dosa.alt.net...

> My outlook is that you have to want to be a cop above all else. Money is
> secondary.

You have be a cop first. All the money and graft comes after a few years.

Then you earn lots. :-)

5533. RE: Funny Hams Site has found new home!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:20:35 UTC
From: Funnyham <funnyham@juno.com>
Message-ID: <7JHV7.168447$bs2.28540959@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 28630

http://www.geocities.com/talkRadio58/funnyhams.html

5534. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:21:49 UTC
From: Graham Broadbridge <grahamb@peachy.org>
Message-ID: <3c27480e$0$16780$afc38c87@news.optusnet.com.au>
Source record: 28631
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C1E2CAB.A3BAF551@gte.net...

> The drug trade has changed law enforcement.

Law enforcement has changed the drug trade.

You can get discounted dope at the local bar from a cop
instead of having to be worried about being busted buying
from a dealer.

5535. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:37:15 UTC
From: Silver Bullet <silverbullet325@aol.comspam>
Message-ID: <LYHV7.3977$Tm1.2458@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 28632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20011224004254.744$yV@newsreader.com...

> > Talking out your ass again

> Hope Santa is good to you...doubt it.
>
> --
> ~Moparholic~

Talking out ones ass is normal for the rec.radio.cb crowd. Your a seasoned
pro Mopar.

5536. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:37:53 UTC
From: Graham Broadbridge <grahamb@peachy.org>
Message-ID: <3c274bd1$0$16784$afc38c87@news.optusnet.com.au>
Source record: 28633
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

I wish you'd learn how to trim posts.

Quoting a 122 line post followed by a one line reply is not going to earn
you any
sympathy.

"N9NWO" <2121d@gte.net> wrote in message news:3C14E40F.51A14E01@gte.net...

> Given the events of Sept 11th, yes.

5537. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:42:07 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a07i9g04cl@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28642

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C26BC0A.4C4D6C18@IEEE.org...

> Vulgar or not, what you guys are doing meets the definition
> of harassment. Harassment is worse than vulgar.

By definition, yes, but it would be very difficult to prove to an ISP. Now if they were e-mailing Kim, bypassing kill filters, etc., that would be harassment. There's also a part in the definition about "disturbing one or destroying one's peace of mind." Repeated posting of an opinion on usenet could hardly be called that, unless it was taken to the extremes mentioned.

5538. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:46:05 UTC
From: Graham Broadbridge <grahamb@peachy.org>
Message-ID: <3c274dbd$0$16782$afc38c87@news.optusnet.com.au>
Source record: 28634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote in message
news:Si5T7.9296$AQ5.1655880836@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Hi Bill,
> Here you go:
>
> http://www.cityoftacoma.org/54council/Agendas/2001/ca010918.pdf
>
> Ordinance # 26851
>
> If the link doesn't work go to the Agenda page and bring
> it up for Sept. 18th.

That applies to Citizens Band Radio, no Amateur Radio.

5539. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:47:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c274d64_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28635

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C24E340.AF8A2675@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > ;p I actually think Larry *does* feel good about my callsign! He just
> > doesn't realize what pleasure he takes in thinking he is 'being
superior' by
> > constant nagging and complaining about me. Larry's one of those folks
who
> > finds dark rain in even the shiniest of silver clouds. I've got a
> > sister-in-law like that. She'll invent something evil and dark and
> > ferociously unhappy even if the whole world around her is perfect.
Larry
> > can't stand happiness. I mean, for goodness sake, look at all the posts
by
> > him that the whole rest of the world is all wrong and he is the only
thing
> > that is right about it. Eh? See what I mean?
>
> Yes, I get it now. Larry is sorta like the masochist who enjoys pain. He
> *enjoyed* ragging on Ed but since Ed is scarce nowadays, he *enjoys*
> ragging on you. Your callsign is bringing joy to an otherwise boring
> life. I *do* understand. This is how Larry has fun. So keep spreading
> the joy, Kim.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

;o Merry Christmas, Cecil!

Kim W5TIT

5540. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:51:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c274e5f_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28636

ROFLMAO....

Merry Holidays, Rick.

W5TIT

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:E1422B87ED28BEF9.E7298A00386C35B4.FCA005A88FA1112B@lp.airnews.net...
> On 22 Dec 2001 04:47:47 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >If it makes you feel any better, I own a significant interest in several
> >tracts of commercial property in New York.
>
> Slumlord, huh?
>
> >I simply choose not to
> >live in that state, and I hadn't decided to stay in Delaware permanently
> >until just this past year, when I got my present job. What I don't
> >understand is what this matters to others. My business is my
> >business -- and as long as my business doesn't bring the ARS
> >"...one step closer to extinction," like Kim's call sign, then get your
> >nose out of it!
>
> Er, Driver . . . Driver . . . You missed your stop!
>
> YOU are the one who started using the term "trailer trash,"
> remember? Since you attacked others on their choice of homes, it's
> only reasonable to open the subject of your OWN choice of residences
> to discussion as well.
>
> Now we know that you not only live in an apartment, but
> wouldn't consider living on the property you DO own. That's GOT to be
> pretty bad, Larry, if even "renter wreckage" won't live there!
>
> Rick <--homeowner
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>

> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5541. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:52:09 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a07is9056m@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28646

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:uAGV7.239157$3d2.11582568@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Only if you let it get to you.
>
> What do you mean by that? Racism is only in the eye of the beholder?
>
> Rich

Damn right! That's what Clevelend Indians fans have been saying for years when these politically correct types want to ban the Chief Wahoo logo, yet persons of Irish ancestry don't seem to have a problem with the "Fighting Irish" logo of Notre Dame.

5542. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:55:14 UTC
From: Graham Broadbridge <grahamb@peachy.org>
Message-ID: <3c274fe3$0$16784$afc38c87@news.optusnet.com.au>
Source record: 28637
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:9vrljs$b1q$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...

> There is STILL a major difference between having a firearm
> which requires a license or permit in most states as opposed
> to a radio which requires NOTHING as justification of
> possession. N9NWO continues to dreg up poor anologies
> rather than ever offering one justification of probable
> cause to inspect and/or confiscate a radio.

I really wish that the comparisons between guns and radios would stop.

They have no common basis at all, apart from legal argument over
constitutional right.

Graham.

5543. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:55:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c274f55_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28638

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C250386.413BAF74@earthlink.net...
>
> Not really, Kim. I don't believe that you have any concept of what is
> appropriate. I don't know how many think it is "OK". You've received a
> few statements of support here. You've also heard from a number who
> believe that you've shown a lack of class.
>
> Dave K8MN

Uh, Dave. I would refrain from joining your class. So to lack any of it is quite an achievement for me. You represent many of things I dislike in people. I represent many of the things you dislike in people. You have to *look* for support in far corners for your "argument" while I pretty much have no argument at all. My callsign is great. No one else *has* to like it, approve of it, or bless it. That's what's so great about the world.

Kim W5TIT

5544. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 15:59:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c275066_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28643

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C25044C.4766B089@earthlink.net...
>
> What's with this "silver spoon" stuff, Kim? This is perhaps the third
> or fourth time you've used it with me? What has it to do with my
> comment? Did you or did you not receive the positive response you
> sought from Riley?
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, to have received any response at all from Riley was positive. But *you* refuse to understand that. I cannot beat you over the head with the statements that a) I appreciate that Riley responded to my query, b) I wholeheartedly accept everything Riley had to say but *do not* agree with him that my callsign brings the ARS one step closer to extinction, c) I don't believe Riley was speaking official FCC line--there is no way he could have, d) I *do* believe (because I know me so well) that the reason I sent the note to Riley was to ask him a question as an official of the FCC on what he *believed* the policy should be coming from a government organization.

Now, for you to insist that I think anything else about or from Riley, is just your ignorant silver spoon flaring at you in your face. Get a life, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

5545. Re: RADIO LAW vs. law enforcement procedures.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:01:53 UTC
From: Graham Broadbridge <grahamb@peachy.org>
Message-ID: <3c275172$0$16782$afc38c87@news.optusnet.com.au>
Source record: 28641
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.law-enforcement,talk.politics.guns

"Bill Nelson" <billn@spock.peak.org> wrote in message
news:a04826$6fh$7@quark.scn.rain.com...

> Oh yes I do. And some of the things they have been doing under
> the pretext of the so-called "war on drugs" are frightening.

Some of the things being done under pretext of the 'War on Terrorism' are
even more frightening.

5546. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:03:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2751CB.1A7E9EE3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28639

Richard McCollum wrote:
> As noted to Rick, so long as killfiles exist and are really easy to do
> harassment has to be taken as voluntary so long as Dave does not go into
> phony mode to bypass the filters.

But killfiles do not get rid of the harassment. A reply to a harassing
posting by someone not killfiled displays the harassing posting thus
repeating the mental anguish of the original harassing posting.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5547. Re: PROOF that we are all BARKING MAD! CBERS.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:04:29 UTC
From: radiosam@wongfaye.com
Message-ID: <823e3267.0112240804.49c6c1f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28640
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Zoran Brlecic <WA7AA@attbi.com> wrote in message news:<3C26630D.B1034855@attbi.com>...
> Patrick Keele wrote:
>
> > > > What you REALLY mean is..... CAUSE I AIN'T GOT A BRAIN.....i
> have
> > > > "adddressed the issue".
> > Not quite gov'nor
> >
> > I was merely re- iterating the level of intelligence by paraphrasing(if you
> > know what the word means)
>
> No, you're the only scholar here, it seems.
>
> > which i think the CRETIN who insulted me
> > possesses.
> > I was demonstrating how i think the CRETIN speaks,judging by the level of
> > illiteracy which he exudes.
>
> ??? So in order to prove your point, you dish out a totally unintelligible and
> illiterate post? Not to mention the drunken mumbling about "asians",
> "scandinavians", etc.
>
> > You and he both clearly miss the point of my
> > message.
>
> That you dislike americanisms in the English language, yet are unable to write a
> coherent sentence in the language you're "protecting"?
>
> > You don't impress me at all by misquoting what i originally said,which is
> > out of context to the original message.ANY fool(you as an example)can cut
> > and paste.You are not clever.
>
> Any fool *may* be able to cut and paste, but that's one skill you apparently
> lack. Let me give you a few pointers: sentences begin with a capital letter.
> There is always a space between a word and parentheses (with the exception of
> whatever the parentheses contain) as well as between the period at the end of
> the sentence and the next word. Ditto for commas, exclamation marks and question
> marks. Writing whole words in upper case is considered tacky and in poor taste
> (also yelling in ng's), especially if it's done randomly. "Reiterate" is not
> spelled with a hyphen (let alone with a space after it). Nationalities and other
> words describing belonging to a geographical group are always capitalized. A
> sentence cannot begin with either "or" or "but". Abbreviations for countries are
> always capitalized (i.e. UK instead of uk). Learn the difference between "its"

> and "it's", as well between "countries" and "country's". Ditto for "too" and
> "to".
> Also, you seem to be perplexed about certain nationalities, so let me enlighten
> you: we call Pakistanis and Bangladeshis Asians because they are from Asia.
> Simple, isn't it? Likewise, it is perfectly normal to call Swedes Scandinavians
> and Americans - North Americans. The reason we don't call Britons "Britains" is
> because it is a word made up by you and no one else uses it.
>
> And finally, language is a live, complex and fluid concept. To reject new words
> and phrases simply on the basis of their origin is to show an extreme
> close-mindedness that borders on stupidity. Most repressive governments usually
> take it upon themselves to regulate the language instead of allowing it to
> develop naturally. Therefore, your mindset is clearly similar to the one of a
> linguistic fascist. Notice that even though "mindset" can be described as "how
> someone thinks", there are few synonims for the word - ergo, there is nothing
> wrong with the word and the fact that it hasn't been around in the time of
> Shakespeare does not invalidate it in any way. As long as I'm mentioning
> Shakespeare, I wonder what you would have called dozens of his made up words
> which are today standard English. At least you have to agree that it is more
> natural to say "mindset" than "how someone thinks" in a sentence.
>
>
>
> 73 .... Zoran WA7AA

Damn! He's good. I havn't read a better dressing down in quite some time.

5548. Re: RADIO LAW vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:06:48 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <solV7.118$T6.183447@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net>
Source record: 28644
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

: > : > The police and military are your superiors.
: > :
: > : Horse-shit.
: > :
: > : Pure extra fine Grade-A Horse-Shit.
: > :
: > : The police and military are my hired help. They work for me,
: > : which makes _me_ their superior.
: > :
: > : Do you live in the old USSR or Iraq or some such dictatorship?
: > :
: > : 73, de Hans, K0HB
: >
: > Sorry but you are no more than a taxpayer
: > with no choice in paying your taxes or they
: > will be forcible taken from you. The mayor
: > or the governor is who the police work for.
: > It is they who hire them.
:
: And good mayors, governors, etc. will demand that their
: police force personnel and anyone else that is
: employed by government understands and respects the fact
: that they ARE public servants. Unfortunately, there still
: are jurisdictions that operate on the "Dukes of Hazard
: School of Local Government." Thankfully, with the media
: coverage today, that is becoming far more difficult to
: do and the bad attitude employees will find it more
: difficult to thumb their noses at the public that employs the,.

Then go to Chicago or LA? Are they
dukes of hazard? Ever hear of the Ramparts
Divison? Oh, and BTW, the LAPD is not
under the mayor. They have a special structure
that is not under any political control.

: > Now if you are very rich or powerful, you
: > might be able to dictate who the mayor is.
: > But most people, there is little recourse unless
: > you band together in enough numbers to
: > force the political establishment to listen.
: > And the police do know this.
:
: It's called democracy...and it does work.

Democracy is a lynch mob, majority rules.
We are a republic and the liberals have
made damned sure that it has problems.

5549. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:12:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2753D5.7CDB445C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28645

Krell wrote:
> By definition, yes, but it would be very difficult to prove to an ISP. Now
> if they were e-mailing Kim, bypassing kill filters, etc., that would be
> harassment. There's also a part in the definition about "disturbing one or
> destroying one's peace of mind." Repeated posting of an opinion on usenet
> could hardly be called that, unless it was taken to the extremes mentioned.

Seems the sheer number of harassing postings would be prima facie proof
of taking it to the extremes.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5550. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:21:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C27556B.59E46BAE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28647

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > b) My opinion of her callsign does not take the form of harrassment.
> > >
> > > It does when it is repeated incessantly. If I were Kim, I would
> > > complain about your harassment to your ISP.
> >
> > That is an empty statement. Then there are the facts that you aren't
> > Kim and that, if you were Kim, Earthlink would ignore your complaint
> > because of its invalidity. Other than that, feel free to continue with
> > your rant.
>
> It's obvious that you don't consider harassment to be a serious problem.
> However, you are violating the agreement that you made with your ISP.

No, what is obvious is that I am not harassing Kim and thus am not in
violation of my agreement with Earthlink. Feel free to make your case
to my provider, Don Q. This will provide you with yet another new
quest.

Dave K8MN

5551. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:25:25 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <VFIV7.147$T6.199957@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net>
Source record: 28648
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

: > > Give you a little choice in this matter.
: > >
: > > We can continue down the path we are going.
: > > We now have a mercenary military, police and
: > > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
: > > people. They see themselves as more superior,
: > > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
: > > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
: > > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
: > > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
: > > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
: > > A bunch of sheeple.
: > >
: > > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
: > > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
: > > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
: > > and gang bangers too, they cry.
: > >
: > > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
: > > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
: > > men. We will do as we do with the military and
: > > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
: > > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
: > > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
: > > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
: > > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
: > > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
: > > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
: > > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
: > > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
: > > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
: > > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
: > > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
: > > the gang bangers?
: > >
: > > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
: > > amendment but is having 75% of your income
: > > taken any different? Because that is what it is
: > > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
: > >
: > > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
: > > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
: > > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who

: > > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
: > > that the public be involved, not in service but in the
: > > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
: > >
: > > What do we have today? An American people who
: > > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
: > > the government to make their decisions, others to be
: > > their protectors. But the draft is still the law, re-authorized
: > > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
: > > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
: > > word (and the money) from congress.
: > >
: > > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
: > > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
: >
: > I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying. Contacts in
: the military are saying that units have been training for domestic
operations
: for some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge mistake, but
one
: that could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as big a
mistake
: as Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
: > A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few dollars.
: If it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated and will
be
: > given away without the givers even knowing what they give.
:
: Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that choice. To
: force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's good for
: them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If fewer people
: want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we need to
: determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve, and fix it.

Then why do you allow yourself to be forced
to pay taxes? That takes your labor from you
as much as the draft would.

And the problems within the American population
not easy to fix. Look at how vast the idea of pacifism
has become among the yuppies (professional class,
moderates) as well as the neo-Liberals. Or how we
now have neo-Victorianism that is trying to train out
any form of male behavior.

We are now a nation of cowards, of wimps. We no
longer have the farm boys who knew how to fix things
and were taught to be self reliant. Instead we have a
lot of little rich kids in the suburbs who are spoiled rotten
and mostly play video games. Over weight, lazy, no
major life styles (first aid, shooting skills, knowledge of

how things work or mechanical skills) who go on to college
and become our leaders. IT IS THAT BAD!!!

There is talk in Congress of reactivating the draft.
As you know, congress did reauthorize it in 1994.
We have National Guard officers who man the
draft board in each state capital, just waiting for
the word (and the money). If you feel strongly
against the draft then you MUST be willing to file
a lawsuit against the US, based on your views of
the 13th amendment, to force the courts to declare
the draft unconstitutional. It is your right to do so.

5552. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:25:53 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <IGIV7.239252$3d2.11593385@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28649

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011224100327.27168.00000589@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse@fast.net>
> writes:
>
>
> What should be discussed NOW is what the US license structure will
become
> if/when S25.5 goes away. Some folks want just one class of license,
while
> others want two classes at most. Some say "just drop Element 1 and leave
the
> rest alone". Lots of ideas and possibilities, but I don't see much real
> discussion about the subject.
>
> General question to all: What are YOUR ideas?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

The trick is and always has been bringing in the newbies and letting them soak in the sauce until they can go on to 20 meters without stirring up the OTs or develop a skin thick enough to withstand a W2OY. It is not so much keeping them off as keeping them from being roasted before their time. So we have seen over the years time gaps between classes which to my mind is more an act of mercy to the newbie than a barrier. You can test til your butt sucks wind but no one is prepared for the rough-and-tumble of a good pile up, encountering some net that thinks it is sanctioned, or the crochety old fart. And there is and continues to be the need to show a good face to the rest of the world.

So in principle at least I would favor a three class system: a bread-and-milk Tech much like we have now but give them 28.1-28.5, cut the power limit to 50 max. and keep them out of non-channelized VHF/UHF/SHF, an entry-level ticket resembling the present General with 200 watts max, and a senior ticket much like the Extra but with a one-year waiting period. The present structure is not really half bad except that it is unkind to those passing the Extra more or less out of the box. The junior ticket has to include regs both U. S. and International and the usual safety and regulatory stuff so I doubt if Element 3 would change a whole lot. The trick is Element 4.

Just how technical is technical? Damfino. The real thing with Element 4 is a proper ceremony for pontification so one should probably deal with impedence matching, Ohm's or Joule's laws in various permutations, a bit on angle modulation, non-linearity and how to detect and prevent it, and the inevitable VE questions.

The issue is not whom to keep out although we all have our candidates but how to blend the newbie into a hobby with traditions that predate the Titanic partially to keep him from being a major pain in the butt but mostly to give him time to orient himself for the long haul; marching people thru the hobby and out looks good on paper but does not in the long run accomplish a hell of a lot. I suspect that the aging vat effect is one reason that the 5wpm restructuring was largely a wet firecracker. It is known among marketers and has been for 30 years that the average CBer buys five rigs before the last one goes into the garage and to a large extent we have seen that when the Tech is touted as entry-level which it presently is not but is rather a dirty trick played by the FCC and ARRL.

Sum and substance: does the hobby need protection from the newbie or the newbie need a bit of protection from a hobby that can eat one up?

Dick NBK

5553. Re: On "Vacation"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:26:06 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0112240826.38613515@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.pirate.radio,rec.radio.swap

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.Net> wrote in message
news:<MPxV7.12842$y55.2746261601@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> No problem Dick, no sorry needed, just
> pointing it out.
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Merry Christmas & Happy New Year to All

Good job Shark. I'm jealous.

5554. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:27:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2756DB.32A0F26A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28551

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > K0HB wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
> > > > >
> > > > > The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws.
> > > > >
> > > > If you think I've exceeded the limit of time I'm allowed to say
> > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign.", take me to court.
> > > >
> > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign." ...
> > > >
> > > "harass - to trouble by repeated attacks"
> > >
> > Work on being able to apply those definitions.
>
> OK, Kim is being repeatedly attacked on this newsgroup for her choice
> of a callsign legally issued by the FCC. That's harassment and you
> are violating the contract you signed with your ISP.

You are a silly old man, Cecil.

Kim is being chided, occasionally insulted and often undergoes derision
for her *choice* of callsign.

Feel free to spend some of the enormous amount of free time available to
you to pursue it with Earthlink (with whom I've "signed" nothing). If
you're successful, we'll apply the same logic to what you do here on a
regular basis. Yeah, I think I'm beginning to feel harassed by you.
That means I'm a victim and you are in violation of your agreement with
your ISP.

Dave K8MN

5555. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:29:08 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <oJIV7.239259$3d2.11593004@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28552

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2751CB.1A7E9EE3@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > As noted to Rick, so long as killfiles exist and are really easy to do
> > harassment has to be taken as voluntary so long as Dave does not go
into
> > phony mode to bypass the filters.
>
> But killfiles do not get rid of the harassment. A reply to a harassing
> posting by someone not killfiled displays the harassing posting thus
> repeating the mental anguish of the original harassing posting.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>

Yup, so killfile the donkey carts as well as the donkeys.

5556. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:33:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C27585F.8304BD74@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28553

James R. DeLoach wrote:
>
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 23:20:48 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM wrote:
> >>
> >> > K0HB wrote:
> >> > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> >> >
> >> > How many times?
> >>
> >> As many times as it takes to convince her and you.
> >
> >I will never be convinced. Kim will probably never be
> >convinced. W5TIT is a valid callsign issued by the FCC.
> >Would the FCC issue a trashy callsign? If so, it's the
> >FCC's fault. Webster's even proves that W5TIT is not
> >trashy. "trashy - inferior in quality; useless or
> >worthless" Kim's callsign is worth as much as any
> >other callsign.
> If you all are going to continue to pick on Kim for picking
> W5TIT, why don't you pick on Larry Bowling, W4TIT?
> You do realize that there are other people out here that
> have callsigns with the letters "TIT" in them, but I guess
> you already know that, right.

For one thing, Larry hasn't shown up here. I believe in equal
opportunity. Larry chose his vanity call as well.

Dave K8MN

5557. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:34:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2758d7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28556

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C250511.92F4443@earthlink.net...
> >
> > ho ho ho....ya found a silver lining in your train of thinking, did ya?
> > You're hilarious. WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
>
> Because it is the right thing to do.
>

That would be *your* definition of right, Dave. Not mine. What makes your kind of people think they have the final say over my kind of people?

> > > She also perceives someone as an "elitist" when that person recognizes
> > > tacky as tacky.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > You are an elitist, Dave. A highly crappy one, but one nevertheless.
>
> Why would that be the case? Is it because I didn't choose a tacky
> callsign? Is it because I've stated that I find your choice of calls is
> tacky and lacking in judgement?
>

I consider you an elitist for the reason stated above. You think I should change my callsign because *you* think it is the right thing to do. I don't request that you get a callsign that complies with *my* idea of callsigns, do I? Never would. I am quite comfortable with however you want to think, *until* you believe the rest of the world (meaning all people) should comply with how *you* think the world should be. That's either a communist or an elitist. Take your pick.

> I've always wondered: Is Kim short for Kimodo?
>
> Dave K8MN

If the callsign W5TIT stands for sex in your mind, then Kim can be anything you want it to be, Dave. There is no miracle in what you are going to think.

Kim W5TIT

5558. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:35:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2758CE.4A64F701@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28554

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> > Richard Plourde wrote
>
> > > No, Richard, the team members were not neccessarily racists.
> > > Whoever started calling the team members maroons may very
> > > have been the racists.
>
> "Krell" wrote
>
> > That depends on if they intended the term to be racist when they started
> > using it.
>
> That's why I said "may"... but yep... you're right...
> but... now that Cecil mentioned Texas A&M it makes me wonder.
>
> > > maroon - a fugitive Negro slave of the West Indies and Guiana
> > > in the 17th and 18th centuries; also: a descendant of such a slave.
>
> > > There're a many details in our heritage which lose their luster in the
> > > light of day.
>
> > Only if you let it get to you.
>
> What do you mean by that? Racism is only in the eye of the beholder?

Only finding racism where none is intended is in the eye of the
beholder. You obviously managed to find racism where none was intended.

Dave K8MN

5559. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:35:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2758dd$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28557

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C25074D.9742EA0B@earthlink.net...
>
> Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
> determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
> Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
> freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the events
> which have unfolded over the past several months.
>
> Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
>
> Dave K8MN

No, and neither are yours, Dave. The government, by virtue of allowing my callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in a manner directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You, not me, have exceeded the limits of your rights.

Kim W5TIT

5560. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:38:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c27596a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28559

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C251F43.1458C5DD@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> > callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?
>
> How can a private email be official?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

heh heh. I'm not so sure it was all that private, either. I can't remember for sure, but I *think* I had told Riley that I was asking his opinion to post back to the newsgroup if he would allow me to. That he granted would even further negate that *his* opinion was/is not official FCC.

Kim W5TIT

5561. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:39:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2759CB.48DB8F4C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28555

James R. DeLoach wrote:
>
> On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 03:17:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >CAM wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil wrote:
> >> > I'm content to draw attention to the FCC's about face. In the past, the
> >> > Commission would not and did not issue such calls.
> >>
> >> Aha, so the FCC is to blame. That's what I have been saying all along.
> >> It is the FCC's responsibility to recall Kim's callsign if necessary.
> >> Otherwise, the FCC has given its tacit approval and sided with Kim
> >> against you and your United Uppity Prudes of the ARS.
> >>
> >The FCC did not choose Kim's callsign. Kim did that and she did it
> >deliberately to get the *nudge*, *wink* reaction.
> >
> >Is it your opinion that anyone with a sense of propriety is an uppity
> >prude?
> >
> >Dave K8MN
> Why do you continue to badger Kim for her callsign, W5TIT?
> If you dislike that callsign so much, why don't you pick on all the
> other hams that have callsigns with the letters, "TIT". With very
> little effort on your part you could locate them. Why not pick on
> Larry Bowling, W4TIT or is it because he is a man and Kim is a
> woman?

This is your second attempt to introduce sexism into the mix, James.
Larry W4TIT does not post here. Perhaps you can convince him to show
up. He would certainly be the recipient of my feelings toward his
choice of calls. The fact is that Kim does post here and has explained
why *nudge* *wink* she chose her particular call. She also e-mailed
Riley Hollingsworth expecting a blanket endorsement of her choice.
She did not receive it, hence the title of this thread.

> Hopefully this message will not be emailed to you, Dave. I need to
> find out how to change the default on Agent so that it does not email
> messages posted on usenet.

You were apparently successful.

Dave K8MN

5562. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:42:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c275a36_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28560

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2550C7.ECAFF3C1@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > So you received TWO communications from Riley regarding your choice of
> > > callsigns--one official and one pal-to-pal?
> >
> > How can a private email be official?
>
> Riley e-mailed Kim from his home on his own time? Keep massaging things
> until you set the scenario you'd like, Cecil.
>
> Dave K8MN

More like that you should keep clinging, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

5563. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:44:00 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c275abb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28561

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2552E0.E8BE7182@earthlink.net...
> James R. DeLoach wrote:
> >
> >
> > >CAM wrote:
> > >>
> > >> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >> > If you have to ask that question, you couldn't possibly understand
> > >> > the answer.
> > >>
> > >> Aha! The old argumentum ad ignorantiam. You sure are full of
diversions.
> > >>
> > >> > *All* of us, Kim -- and each and every other radio amateur who
could
> > >> > see or hear your call sign, be offended by it, and consequently
decide
> > >> > that they can't be bothered to pursue this hobby -- if you are
representative
> > >> > of the type of mentality that exists among radio amateurs.
> > >>
> > >> I find you to be offensive, Larry. Exactly what are you going to do
> > >> about it?
> > >>
> > >> > And that "right" is not now, and never has been, at issue.
> > >>
> > >> The issue is: Does Kim have the right to live her life as she pleases
> > >> or should she be your slave. The Constitution answers that question
> > >> very well.
> > >
> > >Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
> > >determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
> > >Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
> > >freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the events
> > >which have unfolded over the past several months.
> > >
> > >Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
> > >
> > >Dave K8MN
> > What's wrong with her callsign? I see nothing obscene about it.
> > It should be up to her and her alone to keep it or change it since
> > the FCC issued it. Whether you or I like it should have nothing
> > to do with her keeping or changing it.

>
> I'll put you down in column B headed "Also Lacking Good Taste".
> Always glad to hear from another who believes that there is no right and
> wrong.
>
> Dave K8MN

And, let's not forget that what elitist Dave believes is what the whole rest of the world has to believe.

Kim W5TIT

5564. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:44:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C275AF6.7DB720E5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28558

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C250386.413BAF74@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Not really, Kim. I don't believe that you have any concept of what is
> > appropriate. I don't know how many think it is "OK". You've received a
> > few statements of support here. You've also heard from a number who
> > believe that you've shown a lack of class.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Uh, Dave. I would refrain from joining your class. So to lack any of it is
> quite an achievement for me. You represent many of things I dislike in
> people. I represent many of the things you dislike in people. You have to
> *look* for support in far corners for your "argument" while I pretty much
> have no argument at all. My callsign is great. No one else *has* to like
> it, approve of it, or bless it. That's what's so great about the world.

What is? Your lack of decorum?

Dave K8MN

5565. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:45:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c275b02_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28562

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2554A9.4CB2E346@earthlink.net...
>
> I also amused at Kim's idea that Larry and I should leave amateur radio
> because she chooses to be vulgar and a part of ham radio.
>
> Dave K8MN

I bet you're not as amused as I am over the fact that you and Larry, et al,
think my callsign is vulgar.

Kim W5TIT

5566. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:54:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C275D4A.BB14655B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28563

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C25044C.4766B089@earthlink.net...
> >
> > What's with this "silver spoon" stuff, Kim? This is perhaps the third
> > or fourth time you've used it with me? What has it to do with my
> > comment? Did you or did you not receive the positive response you
> > sought from Riley?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, to have received any response at all from Riley was positive. But
> *you* refuse to understand that. I cannot beat you over the head with the
> statements that a) I appreciate that Riley responded to my query, b) I
> wholeheartedly accept everything Riley had to say but *do not* agree with
> him that my callsign brings the ARS one step closer to extinction, c) I
> don't believe Riley was speaking official FCC line--there is no way he could
> have, d) I *do* believe (because I know me so well) that the reason I sent
> the note to Riley was to ask him a question as an official of the FCC on
> what he *believed* the policy should be coming from a government
> organization.
>
> Now, for you to insist that I think anything else about or from Riley, is
> just your ignorant silver spoon flaring at you in your face. Get a life,
> Dave.

Again, you fail to explain the silver spoon stuff, Kim. You use it but
don't attempt to explain what it is that you mean by it. It begins to
sound even more peculiar when you write something like "ignorant silver
spoon".

Your response from Riley was no better than 50/50. The fact that you
disagree with him (and thus reject the portion of the response)
regarding his statement about your helping to bring the amateur service
"one step closer to extinction" shows that you lack any understanding of
the sensitivities of others who might be offended by your choice.

James deLoach has brought up Larry W4TIT, another vanity call holder who
made a poor choice. Larry doesn't post here but I'd be happy to make
the same statements to him which I have made to you.

Dave K8MN

5567. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:55:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C275118.B3034263@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28564

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I know it is how you'd describe it. That's how you DID describe it.
> > > > The only difficulty I have with it is that it simply isn't true.
> > >
> > > What you are doing is harassment, pure and simple. How many times
> > > can you ring a doorbell before someone calls the cops?
> >
> > I hate to keep repeating myself, but you really ARE an idiot. No one
> > forces her to read anything posted here.
>
> Be that as it may, what you guys are doing meets the definition of
> harassment and no doubt violates the rules and standards of your ISPs.

>

As asways you make rules on the fly to suit your Agenda du jour.

5568. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 16:58:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c275e15_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28565

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C261489.D79E42B7@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > There's plenty wrong with Kim's lack of class in choosing a
deliberately
> > > vulgar call.
> >
> > That's your personal delusional opinion, Dave, and you are sticking to
> > it. If the FCC thought there was anything wrong with Kim's callsign,
> > they shouldn't have issued it. Thus, you have sided with Queen Victoria,
> > a sad throwback to days long passed.
>
> Naw, I've sided with decency, good judgement and good taste. My views
> are personal but not delusional at all.
>
> You are right about one thing. The FCC shouldn't have issued Kim's
> call.
>
> Dave K8MN

Then, take your argument to the FCC, Dave. Get them to make an official
policy more in line with your views.

Kim W5TIT

5569. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:09:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C275434.3EA5DCE1@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28566

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > b) My opinion of her callsign does not take the form of harrassment.
> > >
> > > It does when it is repeated incessantly. If I were Kim, I would
> > > complain about your harassment to your ISP.
> >
> > That is an empty statement. Then there are the facts that you aren't
> > Kim and that, if you were Kim, Earthlink would ignore your complaint
> > because of its invalidity. Other than that, feel free to continue with
> > your rant.
>
> It's obvious that you don't consider harassment to be a serious problem.
> However, you are violating the agreement that you made with your ISP.

That's your story, and since you invented it we know you're stickin' to it.
But that doesn't make it true. You're a real piece of work.

5570. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:11:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C276135.E977741B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28567

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C250511.92F4443@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > ho ho ho....ya found a silver lining in your train of thinking, did ya?
> > > You're hilarious. WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> >
> > Because it is the right thing to do.
> >
>
> That would be *your* definition of right, Dave. Not mine. What makes your
> kind of people think they have the final say over my kind of people?

"My" kind of people don't choose callsigns which could be construed to
be anything other than callsigns. "Your" kind of people choose
callsigns which can offend others and which are deliberately chosen for
maximum effect. "My" kind of people would admit it if they'd done
something stupid and would take steps to rectify it. "Your" kind of
people bray about their "rights" to the world. They are, in some
manner, pleased to thumb their noses at the world.

> > > > She also perceives someone as an "elitist" when that person recognizes
> > > > tacky as tacky.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > You are an elitist, Dave. A highly crappy one, but one nevertheless.
> >
> > Why would that be the case? Is it because I didn't choose a tacky
> > callsign? Is it because I've stated that I find your choice of calls is
> > tacky and lacking in judgement?
> >
>
> I consider you an elitist for the reason stated above. You think I should
> change my callsign because *you* think it is the right thing to do. I don't
> request that you get a callsign that complies with *my* idea of callsigns,
> do I? Never would.

What part of the makeup of my callsign offends the sensibilities of
anyone, Kim?

> I am quite comfortable with however you want to think,
> *until* you believe the rest of the world (meaning all people) should comply

> with how *you* think the world should be. That's either a communist or an
> elitist. Take your pick.

It is? You mean that anyone who tells you that they believe your call,
deliberately chosen for maximum effect, takes the amateur radio service
a step closer to extinction is either a communist or an elitist?
That doesn't sound rational.

> > I've always wondered: Is Kim short for Kimodo?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> If the callsign W5TIT stands for sex in your mind, then Kim can be anything
> you want it to be, Dave. There is no miracle in what you are going to
> think.

Your call doesn't stand for sex, Kim. It stands for tacky. It stands
for the lowest common denominator. It stands for thumbing your nose at
what society generally finds acceptable. It stands for lounge lizard
humor.

Dave K8MN

5571. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:13:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2761A1.9C3109F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28568

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C25074D.9742EA0B@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
> > determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
> > Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
> > freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the events
> > which have unfolded over the past several months.
> >
> > Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> No, and neither are yours, Dave. The government, by virtue of allowing my
> callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in a manner
> directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You, not me, have
> exceeded the limits of your rights.

Please tell me what the limit is on stating my belief that your call is
tacky.

Dave K8MN

5572. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:17:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2762A0.8F7704D2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28569

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2554A9.4CB2E346@earthlink.net...
> >
> > I also amused at Kim's idea that Larry and I should leave amateur radio
> > because she chooses to be vulgar and a part of ham radio.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I bet you're not as amused as I am over the fact that you and Larry, et al,
> think my callsign is vulgar.

I think more than your callsign is vulgar, Kim. Your piece about what
you'd like to say to some woman at a social function was especially
enlightening. Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.

Dave K8MN

5573. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:18:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C275647.432D525E@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28570
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

Scout wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C26A12A.4CAD2772@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > N9NWO wrote:
> >
> > > : Life is risk, and ALL jobs require a certain level of risk acceptance
> to
> > > : perform. Miners must risk their lives to perform their jobs.....they
> know
> > > : the hazards and the rate of death in their industry, yet they accept
> that
> > > : and continue to work.
> > > :
> > > : You're just pissed, again, because people aren't buying into your "I'm
> > > : superior to you because I'm military" crap.
> > > :
> > > : What I find really interesting is how on one hand you claim you have
> to
> > > risk
> > > : your life as part of your job, then on the other gripe because "the
> > > yuppies"
> > > : send you out on missions that risk your life.
> > > :
> > > : If risk is in your job description (and I would like to see you
> document
> > > : that), then quit bitching when you are asked to risk your life in the
> > > : performance of your job.
> > >
> > > Give you a little choice in this matter.
> > >
> > > We can continue down the path we are going.
> > > We now have a mercenary military, police and
> > > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
> > > people. They see themselves as more superior,
> > > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
> > > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
> > > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
> > > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
> > > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
> > > A bunch of sheeple.

> > >
> > > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
> > > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
> > > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
> > > and gang bangers too, they cry.
> > >
> > > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
> > > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
> > > men. We will do as we do with the military and
> > > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
> > > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
> > > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
> > > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
> > > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
> > > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
> > > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
> > > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
> > > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
> > > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
> > > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
> > > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
> > > the gang bangers?
> > >
> > > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
> > > amendment but is having 75% of your income
> > > taken any different? Because that is what it is
> > > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
> > >
> > > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
> > > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
> > > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who
> > > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
> > > that the public be involved, not in service but in the
> > > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
> > >
> > > What do we have today? An American people who
> > > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
> > > the government to make their decisions, others to be
> > > their protectors. But the draft is still the law, re-authorized
> > > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
> > > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
> > > word (and the money) from congress.
> > >
> > > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
> > > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
> >
> > I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying. Contacts in
> the
> > military are saying that units have been training for domestic operations
> for

> > some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge mistake, but one
> that
> > could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as big a mistake
> as
> > Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
> > A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few dollars.
> If
> > it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated and will be
> > given away without the givers even knowing what they give.
>
> Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that choice. To
> force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's good for
> them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If fewer people
> want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we need to
> determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve, and fix it.

You serve as proof that today few realize that freedom really isn't free.

5574. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:19:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C276321.642AB693@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28571

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C261489.D79E42B7@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > There's plenty wrong with Kim's lack of class in choosing a
> deliberately
> > > > vulgar call.
> > >
> > > That's your personal delusional opinion, Dave, and you are sticking to
> > > it. If the FCC thought there was anything wrong with Kim's callsign,
> > > they shouldn't have issued it. Thus, you have sided with Queen Victoria,
> > > a sad throwback to days long passed.
> >
> > Naw, I've sided with decency, good judgement and good taste. My views
> > are personal but not delusional at all.
> >
> > You are right about one thing. The FCC shouldn't have issued Kim's
> > call.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Then, take your argument to the FCC, Dave. Get them to make an official
> policy more in line with your views.

You know, that's not really such a bad idea, Kim, though I think the
Commission dances better when congressmen and senators whistle a tune.

Dave K8MN

5575. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:19:48 UTC
From: The Better Amateur Radio Federation <lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm>
Message-ID: <bc32031f9c5f9eeb4d702daed61826f4@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 28572

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
news:3c271712_2@news7.fast.net...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> Dear r.r.a.p.'ers,
>
> In the spirit of the holiday season (whatever your
> religious persuasion), I'd like to take this opportunity
> to sincerely convey wishes for a happy holiday
> season and a prosperous new year to you, on behalf
> of both myself and the entire Board of Directors and
> membership of No Code International.
>
> 73,
> - --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> <mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
> <http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
> - --
> NCI-1052
> Executive Director, No Code International
> Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> Senior Member, IEEE
> Member, TAPR
> Member, ARRL
> - --
> Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> <http://www.nocode.org>
>

Same to you, Carl. Happy Holidays!

--
Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
Chief of Communications
The Better Amateur Radio Federation
Ham radio for Straight, White, Americans!
http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61

5576. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:22:23 UTC
From: The Better Amateur Radio Federation <lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm>
Message-ID: <e73f046bb195317ee26ef69ec31b5378@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 28573

"Steve Robeson K4YZ" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011224084205.08595.00001292@mb-fz.aol.com...
>>
> Time to tell the FCC and the courts to act like men, not sandlot
whiners.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

That's right, Steve. Join the B.A.R.F. and together we can make a show of force to remind these folks that they are servents and not masters!

--
Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
Chief of Communications
The Better Amateur Radio Federation
Ham radio for Straight, White, Americans!
http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61

5577. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:50:46 UTC
From: Middlefinger <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <WVJV7.328417$5A3.126340968@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 28574
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Brainbuster" <brain@buster.com> wrote in message
> Damn fine achievement for anyone.
> Very good of Mr. Middlefinger to explain to everyone what an intelligent
> person you are.

Sorry Terdbuster, I was explaining how pretty much anyone with a pulse these days can pass the Amateur radio exams. You have guys whoare illegal 11 metr ops and now they hold a fcc license.

5578. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:52:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C275E62.67901DF7@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28575

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C250511.92F4443@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > ho ho ho....ya found a silver lining in your train of thinking, did ya?
> > > You're hilarious. WHY would I change my callsign just because someone
> > > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> > >
> > Because it is the right thing to do.
> > >
> >
> That would be *your* definition of right, Dave. Not mine. What makes your
> kind of people think they have the final say over my kind of people?
>
> > > > She also perceives someone as an "elitist" when that person recognizes
> > > > tacky as tacky.
> > > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > You are an elitist, Dave. A highly crappy one, but one nevertheless.
> > >
> > Why would that be the case? Is it because I didn't choose a tacky
> > callsign? Is it because I've stated that I find your choice of calls is
> > tacky and lacking in judgement?
> > >
> >
> I consider you an elitist for the reason stated above. You think I should
> change my callsign because *you* think it is the right thing to do. I don't
> request that you get a callsign that complies with *my* idea of callsigns,
> do I? Never would. I am quite comfortable with however you want to think,
> *until* you believe the rest of the world (meaning all people) should comply
> with how *you* think the world should be. That's either a communist or an
> elitist. Take your pick.
>
> > I've always wondered: Is Kim short for Kimodo?
> > >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
> If the callsign W5TIT stands for sex in your mind, then Kim can be anything
> you want it to be, Dave. There is no miracle in what you are going to
> think.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Isn't she fairly mahvellous?? Such a pacifist she'd stand silent and lose her life rather than defend it, but out comes tooth and clawl when it comes to defending her awful callsign choice.

5579. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 17:59:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C276012.3DA14352@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28576

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>. The government, by virtue of allowing my

> callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in a manner
> directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You, not me, have
> exceeded the limits of your rights.

So where is it stated that the government has a responsibility to protect you from your ignorance? If you do sonething dumb you can't expect the government to protect you from the consequences, to include ridicule from others.

>
> Kim W5TIT

5580. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 18:03:33 UTC
From: Scout <scout@monumental.com>
Message-ID: <i4KV7.4057$0g.109904@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28577
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

"Graham Broadbridge" <grahamb@peachy.org> wrote in message
news:3c2743e5$0$16784$afc38c87@news.optusnet.com.au...
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C24422C.4CA59E74@townsqr.com...
>
> > They told us to pull over to the side and open the cover, which we did.
> One
> > glance inside was all they needed, and we were sent on our way. But
> > technically that should require a search warrant, to search anything but
> the
> > driver/passenger compartment. And there was one small pickup with a
shell
> > cover which was stuffed full of things that the driver was being made to
> > unload so they could get a good look. He wasn't too happy, but he was
> doing
> > it. I saw nothing there so unreasonable that I couldn't support it under
> the
> > circumstances. If you don't like it, take another route.
>
> Quite likely, if you had refused the search you would have been arrested,
> and
> then searched.
>
> If you attempted to refuse the search and turn around, you would have been
> arrested
> and then searched.
>
> More often then not, state cops look at the way people react and make
> decisions
> based on gut feel. Most often they're right.

I've never had any problems refusing a "consent search". However, I usually ask why first, and when they can't establish cause, it's to late to make something up. Sorry, but I'm not going to waste my time, energy plus having to pack and unpack my car just because some cop is on a fishing expedition. Either he has cause at which point he does NOT need to ask me, or he's going to need a warrant. I will NOT volunteer for such a search. I would also tend to claim that by asking for a search the cop is admitting that he lacks probable cause to search as otherwise he wouldn't bother asking your permission. I think I could make the judge see things my way, particularly when the cop doesn't find anything.

5581. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 18:05:20 UTC
From: Scout <scout@monumental.com>
Message-ID: <Z5KV7.4059$0g.109811@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28578
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:VFIV7.147$T6.199957@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
> : > > Give you a little choice in this matter.
> : > >
> : > > We can continue down the path we are going.
> : > > We now have a mercenary military, police and
> : > > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
> : > > people. They see themselves as more superior,
> : > > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
> : > > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
> : > > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
> : > > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
> : > > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
> : > > A bunch of sheeple.
> : > >
> : > > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
> : > > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
> : > > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
> : > > and gang bangers too, they cry.
> : > >
> : > > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
> : > > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
> : > > men. We will do as we do with the military and
> : > > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
> : > > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
> : > > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
> : > > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
> : > > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
> : > > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
> : > > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
> : > > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
> : > > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
> : > > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
> : > > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
> : > > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
> : > > the gang bangers?
> : > >
> : > > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
> : > > amendment but is having 75% of your income
> : > > taken any different? Because that is what it is
> : > > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
> : > >
> : > > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:

> : > > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
> : > > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who
> : > > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
> : > > that the public be involved, not in service but in the
> : > > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
> : > >
> : > > What do we have today? An American people who
> : > > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
> : > > the government to make their decisions, others to be
> : > > their protectors. But the draft is still the law, re-authorized
> : > > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
> : > > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
> : > > word (and the money) from congress.
> : > >
> : > > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
> : > > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
> : >
> : > I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying. Contacts
in
> : the military are saying that units have been training for domestic
> operations
> : for some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge mistake,
but
> one
> : that could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as big a
> mistake
> : as Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
> : > A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few
dollars.
> : If it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated and
will
> be
> : > given away without the givers even knowing what they give.
> :
> : Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that choice. To
> : force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's good
for
> : them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If fewer
people
> : want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we need to
> : determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve, and fix
it.
>
> Then why do you allow yourself to be forced
> to pay taxes? That takes your labor from you
> as much as the draft would.

Congress has been given the power to tax, the 13th prohibits the draft.

Next question.

5582. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 18:30:33 UTC
From: Scout <scout@monumental.com>
Message-ID: <EtKV7.4066$0g.109842@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28579
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C275647.432D525E@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Scout wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C26A12A.4CAD2772@townsqr.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > N9NWO wrote:
> > >
> > > > : Life is risk, and ALL jobs require a certain level of risk
acceptance
> > to
> > > > : perform. Miners must risk their lives to perform their
jobs.....they
> > know
> > > > : the hazards and the rate of death in their industry, yet they
accept
> > that
> > > > : and continue to work.
> > > > :
> > > > : You're just pissed, again, because people aren't buying into your
"I'm
> > > > : superior to you because I'm military" crap.
> > > > :
> > > > : What I find really interesting is how on one hand you claim you
have
> > to
> > > > risk
> > > > : your life as part of your job, then on the other gripe because
"the
> > > > yuppies"
> > > > : send you out on missions that risk your life.
> > > > :
> > > > : If risk is in your job description (and I would like to see you
> > document
> > > > : that), then quit bitching when you are asked to risk your life in
the
> > > > : performance of your job.
> > > >
> > > > Give you a little choice in this matter.
```

> > > >
> > > > We can continue down the path we are going.
> > > > We now have a mercenary military, police and
> > > > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
> > > > people. They see themselves as more superior,
> > > > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
> > > > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
> > > > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
> > > > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
> > > > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
> > > > A bunch of sheeple.
> > > >
> > > > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
> > > > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
> > > > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
> > > > and gang bangers too, they cry.
> > > >
> > > > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
> > > > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
> > > > men. We will do as we do with the military and
> > > > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
> > > > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
> > > > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
> > > > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
> > > > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
> > > > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
> > > > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
> > > > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
> > > > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
> > > > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
> > > > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
> > > > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
> > > > the gang bangers?
> > > >
> > > > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
> > > > amendment but is having 75% of your income
> > > > taken any different? Because that is what it is
> > > > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
> > > >
> > > > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
> > > > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
> > > > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who
> > > > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
> > > > that the public be involved, not in service but in the
> > > > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
> > > >
> > > > What do we have today? An American people who
> > > > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
> > > > the government to make their decisions, others to be
> > > > their protectors. But the draft is still the law, re-authorized

> > > > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
> > > > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
> > > > word (and the money) from congress.
> > > >
> > > > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
> > > > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
> > >
> > > I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying. Contacts
in
> > the
> > > > military are saying that units have been training for domestic
operations
> > for
> > > > some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge mistake, but
one
> > that
> > > > could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as big a
mistake
> > as
> > > > Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
> > > > A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few
dollars.
> > If
> > > > it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated and
will be
> > > > given away without the givers even knowing what they give.
> > >
> > Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that choice. To
> > force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's good
for
> > them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If fewer
people
> > want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we need to
> > determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve, and fix
it.
>
> You serve as proof that today few realize that freedom really isn't free.

Enslave me so I shall be free?

Freedom means BEING ABLE TO CHOSE. You deny choice, you deny freedom. People SHOULD serve, but they and they alone should make that choice for themselves. If fewer people chose to serve, then that should be taken as a warning sign that something is wrong in the system.

And before you get on your high horse claim I am proof that freedom isn't free, let's see you post a scan of your DD-214. That is assuming you even know what that is......

5583. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 18:34:11 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <CyKV7.1273$to2.253352@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28580
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

: > : > > We can continue down the path we are going.
: > : > > We now have a mercenary military, police and
: > : > > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
: > : > > people. They see themselves as more superior,
: > : > > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
: > : > > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
: > : > > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
: > : > > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
: > : > > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
: > : > > A bunch of sheeple.
: > : > >
: > : > > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
: > : > > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
: > : > > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
: > : > > and gang bangers too, they cry.
: > : > >
: > : > > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
: > : > > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
: > : > > men. We will do as we do with the military and
: > : > > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
: > : > > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
: > : > > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
: > : > > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
: > : > > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
: > : > > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
: > : > > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
: > : > > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
: > : > > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
: > : > > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
: > : > > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
: > : > > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
: > : > > the gang bangers?
: > : > >
: > : > > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
: > : > > amendment but is having 75% of your income
: > : > > taken any different? Because that is what it is
: > : > > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
: > : > >
: > : > > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
: > : > > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
: > : > > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who
: > : > > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
: > : > > that the public be involved, not in service but in the

: > : > > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
: > : > >
: > : > > What do we have today? An American people who
: > : > > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
: > : > > the government to make their decisions, others to be
: > : > > their protectors. But the draft is still the law, re-authorized
: > : > > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
: > : > > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
: > : > > word (and the money) from congress.
: > : > >
: > : > > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
: > : > > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
: > : >
: > : > I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying.
Contacts
: in
: > : the military are saying that units have been training for domestic
: > operations
: > : for some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge mistake,
: but
: > one
: > : that could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as big a
: > mistake
: > : as Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
: > : > A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few
: dollars.
: > : If it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated and
: will
: > be
: > : > given away without the givers even knowing what they give.
: > :
: > : Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that choice.
To
: > : force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's good
: for
: > : them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If fewer
: people
: > : want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we need to
: > : determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve, and fix
: it.
: >
: > Then why do you allow yourself to be forced
: > to pay taxes? That takes your labor from you
: > as much as the draft would.
:
: Congress has been given the power to tax, the 13th prohibits the draft.
:
: Next question.

Where in the 13th amendment does it is
say that the draft is covered by that amendment.
If you look, the 13th exempts the government.

What legal scholars support your wild ass
views? What court ruling support your off
the wall hype libertarianism?

5584. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:02:22 UTC
From: Scout <scout@monumental.com>
Message-ID: <rXKV7.4076$0g.109996@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28581
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:CyKV7.1273$to2.253352@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
> : > : > > We can continue down the path we are going.
> : > : > > We now have a mercenary military, police and
> : > : > > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
> : > : > > people. They see themselves as more superior,
> : > : > > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
> : > : > > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
> : > : > > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
> : > : > > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
> : > : > > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
> : > : > > A bunch of sheeple.
> : > : > >
> : > : > > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
> : > : > > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
> : > : > > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
> : > : > > and gang bangers too, they cry.
> : > : > >
> : > : > > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
> : > : > > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
> : > : > > men. We will do as we do with the military and
> : > : > > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
> : > : > > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
> : > : > > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
> : > : > > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
> : > : > > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
> : > : > > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
> : > : > > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
> : > : > > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
> : > : > > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
> : > : > > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
> : > : > > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
> : > : > > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
> : > : > > the gang bangers?
> : > : > >
> : > : > > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
> : > : > > amendment but is having 75% of your income
> : > : > > taken any different? Because that is what it is
> : > : > > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
> : > : > >
> : > : > > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
> : > : > > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
> : > : > > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who

> : > : > > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
> : > : > > that the public be involved, not in service but in the
> : > : > > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
> : > : > >
> : > : > > What do we have today? An American people who
> : > : > > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
> : > : > > the government to make their decisions, others to be
> : > : > > their protectors. But the draft is still the law, re-authorized
> : > : > > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
> : > : > > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
> : > : > > word (and the money) from congress.
> : > : > >
> : > : > > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
> : > : > > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
> : > : >
> : > : > I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying.
> Contacts
> : in
> : > : the military are saying that units have been training for domestic
> : > operations
> : > : for some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge
mistake,
> : but
> : > one
> : > : that could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as big
a
> : > mistake
> : > : as Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
> : > : > A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few
> : dollars.
> : > : If it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated
and
> : will
> : > be
> : > : > given away without the givers even knowing what they give.
> : > :
> : > : Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that choice.
> To
> : > : force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's
good
> : for
> : > : them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If fewer
> : people
> : > : want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we need to
> : > : determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve, and
fix
> : it.
> : >
> : > Then why do you allow yourself to be forced
> : > to pay taxes? That takes your labor from you

> : > as much as the draft would.
> :
> : Congress has been given the power to tax, the 13th prohibits the draft.
> :
> : Next question.
>
> Where in the 13th amendment does it is
> say that the draft is covered by that amendment.

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

> If you look, the 13th exempts the government.

Where please?

Section 1 is posted above, section 2 states

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

There are no other sections. No exemptions for the government.

> What legal scholars support your wild ass
> views?

Oh, it's something called the Constitution of the United States of America as Amended.

I don't need to appeal to authority. The facts themselves support me.

> What court ruling support your off
> the wall hype libertarianism?

I see, so unless an authority supports you, then you can' t be right. No wonder Galileo was locked up, all the authorities said he was wrong.....but damn the facts supported him. Now who is see to have been right, the one supported by the fact, or the "authority"?

Appeal to authority is a useless undertaking, either the facts support you at which point it doesn't matter what authority states, or you are wrong and agreement with authority isn't going to make you right.

>
>
>

5585. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:08:53 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <93LV7.195929$WW.11368044@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28582

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

> Only finding racism where none is intended is in the eye of the
> beholder.

ONLY???? This sentence doesn't make sense. You normally have a logical outlook but you've failed on this one.

> You obviously managed to find racism where none was intended.

I merely pointed out to Carroll that his slur (joke) could be miscontrued as a racial one.

He has a habit of name-calling; I think he could do better than that.

Rich

5586. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:17:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C277F47.360E2FF1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28583

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > It's obvious that you don't consider harassment to be a serious problem.
> > However, you are violating the agreement that you made with your ISP.
>
> No, what is obvious is that I am not harassing Kim and thus am not in
> violation of my agreement with Earthlink. Feel free to make your case
> to my provider, Don Q.

Since I am not the injured party, that is not a logical action. But your postings indeed do meet the dictionary definition of harassing.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5587. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:21:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C278045.766E997D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28584

Dave Heil wrote:
> Kim is being chided, occasionally insulted and often undergoes derision
> for her *choice* of callsign.

That's very close to the dictionary definition of harassing, Dave.

> Feel free to spend some of the enormous amount of free time available to
> you to pursue it with Earthlink (with whom I've "signed" nothing).

I am not the injured party so it is not logical for me to complain.
OTOH, when you signed on with Earthlink you gave tacit acceptance
to their terms and conditions which you have violated by harassing
Kim.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5588. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:22:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C278088.87A8C9D6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28585

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Yup, so killfile the donkey carts as well as the donkeys.

That would mean killfiling everyone on the newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5589. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:26:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C27816D.51991201@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28586

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> If the callsign W5TIT stands for sex in your mind, then Kim can be anything
> you want it to be, Dave. There is no miracle in what you are going to
> think.

Do you think Dave goes down the telephone book harassing everyone whose
initials are TIT? :-)
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5590. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:29:00 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <0mLV7.1397$to2.286679@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28587
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

: > > >> >Think again. First the cops would just the
: > > >> >car and the radios. Then when the CID
: > > >> >folks show up, they will explain how you
: > > >> >lipped off to the cops that you were some
: > > >> >type of hot shot Air Force type. At that
: > > >> >point, the investigation might be about your
: > > >> >fitness to serve.
: > > >>
: > > >> Which is why I strongly endorse and support that
: > > >> all police cars be equipped with both audio and video
: > > >> recording equipment to document exactly what
: > > >> happened. I have seen the absolute value in
: > > >> these in both protecting the public against rogue
: > > >> cops and protecting police against false accusations of
: > > >> police brutality.
: > > >
: > > >Bill, I am not talking about rogue cops or
: > > >even police brutality. Rather it is the cop
: > > >who is a professional, who keeps his cool,
: > > >but is not going to let some ham tell him that
: > > >the cop has no right to inspect his radios
: > > >and plays the hot shot.
: > >
: > > INSPECT for WHAT reason. The radio in
: > > the car is NOT illegal. The cop as NO need
: > > to ask. If asked, I'd tell him what my radio is
: > > and that's the end of it. What else would he
: > > need or want to do?
: > >
: > > >No cop will put up with that.
: > >
: > > After telling the cop the radio is a ham rig (or CB,
: > > or FRS, or private mobile, or whatever, just what
: > > more could the cop ask?
: > >
: > > >The average cop is trained to suspect everyone.
: > > >Even other cops. They are trained that they
: > > >are superior, the "force" of government, the
: > > >thin blue line that keeps us a civilized society.
: > > >And it is almost universal that the biggest goal
: > > >that a cop will have is to make it home alive
: > > >every night.
: > >

: > > That is not the training I am aware of. Cops may have
: > > the powerm but their application of that power must
: > > be tempered with restraint and rational reasoning...or
: > > they will end up off the force in many cases.
: > >
: > > >If there is a question about a radio,
: > >
: > > WHAT could be questioned?
: > >
: > > >it is just easier
: > > >to take the radios, even the car as well, and let the
: > > >courts settle. I have said this over and over.
: > >
: > > Yes you have and you fail to see that any cop
: > > that developes a histry of bad arrests, court
: > > losses, etc won't go far as a cop.
: > >
: > > > This
: > > >includes lawsuits, which most cops do not really give
: > > >a rats ass about. That is the courts' problem, the
: > > >chief's problem, and not theirs.
: > >
: > > Believe it or not, cops can end up being criminally
: > > prosecuted for departures from proper enforcement.
: > >
: > > >This does not mean that they will keep the radios forever,
: > > >as the AF CAP chap suggested. When the AF types come,
: > > >it will go in front of a judge. And remember, this is only if
: > > >there is question that the street officer can not settle quickly.
: > >
: > > I repeat...what could be in question that the local cop
: > > would have any role in or knowledge of?
: > >
: > > >Too many Americans are jerks, assholes.
: > >
: > > If they aren't breaking the law then so what?
: > >
: > > >They believe that
: > > >they have a right to do anything, and everything.
: > >
: > > Again, unless they are breaking a law, so what...it
: > > isn't a police matter.
: > >
: > > >That they
: > > >have NO responsibility to society or their fellow man.
: > >
: > > Yet again, unless they are breaking a law, so what...it
: > > isn't a police matter.
: > > >
: > > > And the cops want that attitude to end.

: > >
: > > So do many others, but it ain't a police matter UNLESS
: > > laws are being broken.
: >
: > You just do not get it, do you?
: >
: > It is more about your attitude than anything.
: > Get an attitude with a cop, he will find things
: > to write tickets for.
:
: I know far better than to "get an attitude"...but that doesn't
: mean I checked my rights at the door when I get
: in my car.
:
: > Some cops do not care about ham equipment.
: > Some cops do. It depends whether the state
: > has a law over radio usage like we are now
: > seeing with Cell Phones.
:
: There are NO such laws against ham equipment.
: If you know of any, please cite.
:
: > The real point is that if the officer does decide
: > to take the radio, he will be damned use that
: > he can justify doing so.
:
: I'd not stop any cop from taking the radio...BUT that cop
: better have a valid reason when I follow-up with
: the authorities to get it back and to learn just what/why
: it was taken in the first place.

Just ask the millions of blacks who each year
have their vehicles searched, everything taken
out of their vehicles and so forth. They file complaints,
lawsuits and still little changes. The cops can
do it, and will do it. Maybe a nice yuppie
like yourself might be overlooked but some
bearded, fat redneck will get it in spades.

5591. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:33:27 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <bqLV7.1407$to2.291089@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28588
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

: >> In my opinion, it is elitist attitudes like yours that are part of
: >> the problems we face in this country.
:
: > Sorry, I am only showing what the attitudes
: > are among the educated elite in this country.
:
: No, you are only showing how you and your acquaintances
: feel.
:
: I would qualify as one of the "educated elite". Yes, I am active
: in politics and with the local police/fire departments. I am also
: fairly well educated. It is funny that none of the people I know
: ever display the attitude you exhibit. Either they hide it well
: or you are an aberation.
:
: > Politicians see themselves as extremely valuable
: > to society. And they have the authority and power
: > to enforce that belief. They use the police as
: > their muscle to enforce their will on the public.
:
: Many politicians enjoy the power, I agree about that. Most of them
: actually believe that they are doing the ordinary citizen a favor
: by passing more and more restrictive laws.
:
: They have no "authority and power" to enforce the laws. All they
: can do is provide the funds and hope the appropriate agencies use
: it as they intend.
:
: > Doctors see themselves as more valuable than
: > most working class (blue collar) individuals. So
: > do many college professors.
:
: Yes, some doctors feel that way. But that is slowly changing as
: more and more people realize that doctors are not infallable. It
: has been a pleasure for me to see people starting to demand that
: they be allowed an active role in deciding what will be done to
: solve a medical problem. A doctor IS more valuable, when it comes
: to medical matters - but not so when it comes to areas outside
: the medical profession.
:
: I don't know a lot of college professors, but have never felt that
: they have treated me as inferior in what associations I have had
: with them. Again, if it comes to knowledge about their area of

: specialization, then they are certainly more valuable as sources
: of information. But put a physical education professor in with a
: group of physicists, and the physical ed professor is going to
: feel inadequate and out of place.

What kind of sheltered life do you live?

Have you been on an modern university in
the last 20 years? It is not just their specialization,
it is that they see themselves as the elite of
society.

Same with doctors. Ask nurses how doctors
act like tin gods.

There are a good deal of elitism out there.
For whatever reason. The Marines teach
it. So do the police academies.

5592. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:34:25 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C278341.455B791D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28589

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > It's obvious that you don't consider harassment to be a serious problem.
> > However, you are violating the agreement that you made with your ISP.
>
> That's your story, and since you invented it we know you're stickin' to it.
> But that doesn't make it true. You're a real piece of work.

If Kim wanted to, I'll bet she could cause y'all some ISP trouble.
What y'all have done certainly meets the dictionary definition
of harassment.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5593. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:34:57 UTC
From: Gary - KJ6Q <davison7@gte.net>
Message-ID: <BrLV7.180$SX6.73233@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28590
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.com> wrote in message
news:WVJV7.328417$5A3.126340968@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
>
> "Brainbuster" <brain@buster.com> wrote in message
> > Damn fine achievement for anyone.
> > Very good of Mr. Middlefinger to explain to everyone what an intelligent
> > person you are.
>
> Sorry Terdbuster,

He didn't SEEM to bust you up all THAT bad...

I was explaining how pretty much anyone with a pulse these
> days can pass the Amateur radio exams.

So yer saying YOUR pulse is pretty weak these days?

>You have guys whoare illegal 11 metr
> ops and now they hold a fcc license.

AHHhh - "a rose by any other name is STILL a rose"

OR, to break it down into language even a CBer can comprehend - obtaining a Ham License does NOT
automatically, or instantly, transform a raving crude IDIOT into a useful, considerate and law
abiding operator. BUT, CBers entering the Ham ranks soon find that their former operating habits
loom as objectional on the Ham bands as does a fart in church - and they quickly either modify their
habits, or LEAVE...

Ignorance is curable - but rank, dedicated STUPIDITY is FOREVER!

But YOU already know that from long-time personal experience, don't you...

--
Gary - KJ6Q
****
Two things we'll never see:
1. Perpetual motion...
2. A liberal Democrat complaining
about "Too much government"

5594. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:37:15 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <LtLV7.1420$to2.293612@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28591
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

: > : > : > > We can continue down the path we are going.
: > : > : > > We now have a mercenary military, police and
: > : > : > > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
: > : > : > > people. They see themselves as more superior,
: > : > : > > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
: > : > : > > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
: > : > : > > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
: > : > : > > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
: > : > : > > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
: > : > : > > A bunch of sheeple.
: > : > : > >
: > : > : > > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
: > : > : > > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
: > : > : > > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
: > : > : > > and gang bangers too, they cry.
: > : > : > >
: > : > : > > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
: > : > : > > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
: > : > : > > men. We will do as we do with the military and
: > : > : > > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
: > : > : > > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
: > : > : > > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
: > : > : > > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
: > : > : > > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
: > : > : > > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
: > : > : > > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
: > : > : > > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
: > : > : > > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
: > : > : > > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
: > : > : > > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
: > : > : > > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
: > : > : > > the gang bangers?
: > : > : > >
: > : > : > > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
: > : > : > > amendment but is having 75% of your income
: > : > : > > taken any different? Because that is what it is
: > : > : > > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
: > : > : > >
: > : > : > > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
: > : > : > > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
: > : > : > > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who
: > : > : > > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
: > : > : > > that the public be involved, not in service but in the

: > : > : > > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
: > : > : > >
: > : > : > > What do we have today? An American people who
: > : > : > > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
: > : > : > > the government to make their decisions, others to be
: > : > : > > their protectors. But the draft is still the law,
re-authorized
: > : > : > > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
: > : > : > > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
: > : > : > > word (and the money) from congress.
: > : > : > >
: > : > : > > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
: > : > : > > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
: > : > : >
: > : > : > I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying.
: > Contacts
: > : in
: > : > : the military are saying that units have been training for domestic
: > : > operations
: > : > : for some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge
: mistake,
: > : but
: > : > one
: > : > : that could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as
big
: a
: > : > mistake
: > : > : as Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
: > : > : > A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few
: > : dollars.
: > : > : If it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated
: and
: > : will
: > : > be
: > : > : > given away without the givers even knowing what they give.
: > : > :
: > : > : Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that
choice.
: > To
: > : > : force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's
: good
: > : for
: > : > : them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If fewer
: > : people
: > : > : want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we need
to
: > : > : determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve, and
: fix
: > : it.
: > : >

: > : > Then why do you allow yourself to be forced
: > : > to pay taxes? That takes your labor from you
: > : > as much as the draft would.
: > :
: > : Congress has been given the power to tax, the 13th prohibits the
draft.
: > :
: > : Next question.
: >
: > Where in the 13th amendment does it is
: > say that the draft is covered by that amendment.
:
: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for
crime
: whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the
: United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."
:
: > If you look, the 13th exempts the government.
:
: Where please?
:
: Section 1 is posted above, section 2 states
:
: "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate
: legislation."
:
: There are no other sections. No exemptions for the government.
:
:
:
: > What legal scholars support your wild ass
: > views?
:
: Oh, it's something called the Constitution of the United States of America
: as Amended.
:
: I don't need to appeal to authority. The facts themselves support me.
:
: > What court ruling support your off
: > the wall hype libertarianism?
:
: I see, so unless an authority supports you, then you can' t be right. No
: wonder Galileo was locked up, all the authorities said he was
wrong.....but
: damn the facts supported him. Now who is see to have been right, the one
: supported by the fact, or the "authority"?
:
: Appeal to authority is a useless undertaking, either the facts support you
: at which point it doesn't matter what authority states, or you are wrong
and

: agreement with authority isn't going to make you right.

What we have are your OPINIONS. They have
no meaning in constitutional law. Say whatever you
fucking want, it is empty words. Without the force
of the courts behind you, it is just bullshit.

That is the way it works in America. Even the best
an attorney can tell you is his learned opinion. It is
the rulings of the courts that tells us whether something
fits within the guidance of the constitution.

What you are is a hyper libertarian. Not even the
Libertarian Party agrees with you.

What I suggest is that your family commits you
to a mental health facility for treatment.

5595. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:38:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C278422.D3C1AFBB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28592

Dave Heil wrote:
> It stands for lounge lizard humor.

It stands for cuteness, Dave. Halitosis is better than no breath
at all. If I send you ten bucks, will you buy a sense of humor?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5596. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:39:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C27847C.37121546@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28593

Dave Heil wrote:
> Please tell me what the limit is on stating my belief that your call is
> tacky.

Harassment is the limit and you are way over the limit.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5597. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 19:42:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C27852D.2B6D0DAA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28594

Dave Heil wrote:
> Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.

It is you who is thumbing your nose at the world, Dave.
Come down from your ivory tower, join the world, and
enjoy life instead of being such an elitist grinch.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5598. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 20:43:50 UTC
From: Middlefinger <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <asMV7.328523$5A3.126444567@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 28595
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Gary - KJ6Q" <davison7@gte.net> wrote in message
news:BrLV7.180$SX6.73233@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net...
> I was explaining how pretty much anyone with a pulse these
> > days can pass the Amateur radio exams.
>
> So yer saying YOUR pulse is pretty weak these days?

I did not say anything Gary thats your ASSumption so why would you say that
any basis for your comment or do you just like to look like a fool.

>
> >You have guys whoare illegal 11 metr
> > ops and now they hold a fcc license.
>
> AHHhh - "a rose by any other name is STILL a rose"

So what you are saying is now they are illegal Ham ops?

> OR, to break it down into language even a CBer can comprehend -

Gary, you whining jackass I am not a CBer are you?

> obtaining a Ham License does NOT
> automatically, or instantly, transform a raving crude >IDIOT into a
useful, considerate and law
> abiding operator.

As noted by your actions.

BUT, CBers entering the Ham ranks soon find that their former operating
habits
> loom as objectional on the Ham bands as does a fart in church - and they
quickly either modify their
> habits, or LEAVE...

Says Who?

> Ignorance is curable - but rank, dedicated >STUPIDITY is FOREVER!

So is being a jackass and butting into a post when you have no idea what
your talking about ... a 66 yr old mental midget are ya.

5599. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:01:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C279718.322D8A1F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28596

Richard Plourde wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> > Only finding racism where none is intended is in the eye of the
> > beholder.
>
> ONLY???? This sentence doesn't make sense. You normally have a logical
> outlook but you've failed on this one.
>
> > You obviously managed to find racism where none was intended.
>
> I merely pointed out to Carroll that his slur (joke) could be miscontrued as
> a racial one.
>
> He has a habit of name-calling; I think he could do better than that.

Perhaps he should start calling Elmer, er Cecil a nimrod.

Dave K8MN

5600. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:03:37 UTC
From: Scout <scout@monumental.com>
Message-ID: <7JMV7.4092$0g.110122@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28597
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:LtLV7.1420$to2.293612@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
> : > : > : > > We can continue down the path we are going.
> : > : > : > > We now have a mercenary military, police and
> : > : > : > > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
> : > : > : > > people. They see themselves as more superior,
> : > : > : > > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
> : > : > : > > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
> : > : > : > > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
> : > : > : > > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
> : > : > : > > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
> : > : > : > > A bunch of sheeple.
> : > : > : > > >
> : > : > : > > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
> : > : > : > > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
> : > : > : > > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
> : > : > : > > and gang bangers too, they cry.
> : > : > : > > >
> : > : > : > > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
> : > : > : > > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
> : > : > : > > men. We will do as we do with the military and
> : > : > : > > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
> : > : > : > > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
> : > : > : > > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
> : > : > : > > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
> : > : > : > > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
> : > : > : > > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
> : > : > : > > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
> : > : > : > > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
> : > : > : > > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
> : > : > : > > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
> : > : > : > > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
> : > : > : > > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
> : > : > : > > the gang bangers?
> : > : > : > > >
> : > : > : > > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
> : > : > : > > amendment but is having 75% of your income
> : > : > : > > taken any different? Because that is what it is
> : > : > : > > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
> : > : > : > > >
> : > : > : > > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
> : > : > : > > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
> : > : > : > > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who

> : > : > : > > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
> : > : > : > > that the public be involved, not in service but in the
> : > : > : > > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
> : > : > : > >
> : > : > : > > What do we have today? An American people who
> : > : > : > > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
> : > : > : > > the government to make their decisions, others to be
> : > : > : > > their protectors. But the draft is still the law,
> re-authorized
> : > : > : > > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
> : > : > : > > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
> : > : > : > > word (and the money) from congress.
> : > : > : > >
> : > : > : > > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
> : > : > : > > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
> : > : > : > >
> : > : > : > I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying.
> : > Contacts
> : > : in
> : > : > : the military are saying that units have been training for
domestic
> : > : > operations
> : > : > : for some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge
> : mistake,
> : > : but
> : > : > one
> : > : > : that could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as
> big
> : a
> : > : > mistake
> : > : > : as Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
> : > : > : > A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a
few
> : > : dollars.
> : > : > : If it's not worth personal participation it cannot be
appreciated
> : and
> : > : will
> : > : > be
> : > : > : > given away without the givers even knowing what they give.
> : > : > :
> : > : > : Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that
> choice.
> : > To
> : > : > : force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's
> : good
> : > : for
> : > : > : them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If
fewer
> : > : people

> : > : > : want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we
need
> to
> : > : > : determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve,
and
> : fix
> : > : it.
> : > : >
> : > : > Then why do you allow yourself to be forced
> : > : > to pay taxes? That takes your labor from you
> : > : > as much as the draft would.
> : > :
> : > : Congress has been given the power to tax, the 13th prohibits the
> draft.
> : > :
> : > : Next question.
> : >
> : > Where in the 13th amendment does it is
> : > say that the draft is covered by that amendment.
> :
> : "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for
> crime
> : whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the
> : United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."
> :
> : > If you look, the 13th exempts the government.
> :
> : Where please?
> :
> : Section 1 is posted above, section 2 states
> :
> : "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate
> : legislation."
> :
> : There are no other sections. No exemptions for the government.
> :
> :
> :
> : > What legal scholars support your wild ass
> : > views?
> :
> : Oh, it's something called the Constitution of the United States of
America
> : as Amended.
> :
> : I don't need to appeal to authority. The facts themselves support me.
> :
> : > What court ruling support your off
> : > the wall hype libertarianism?
> :

> : I see, so unless an authority supports you, then you can' t be right. No
> : wonder Galileo was locked up, all the authorities said he was
> wrong.....but
> : damn the facts supported him. Now who is see to have been right, the one
> : supported by the fact, or the "authority"?
> :
> : Appeal to authority is a useless undertaking, either the facts support
you
> : at which point it doesn't matter what authority states, or you are wrong
> and
> : agreement with authority isn't going to make you right.
>
> What we have are your OPINIONS.

What we have is the language of the 13th Amendment. What we do not have is any language that would support YOUR opinion that the government is excluded from the provisions of the 13th Amendment.

> They have
> no meaning in constitutional law.

Yep, but the language of the 13th Amendment sure as hell does, and it doesn't say anything about excluding the government.

> Say whatever you
> fucking want, it is empty words. Without the force
> of the courts behind you, it is just bullshit.

Yep, now we see it people. The Constitution is just bullshit.

Nice to have your finally confirm your position on the Constitution.

So much for your oath.

> That is the way it works in America

You mean as in the language of the Constitution is actually the law?

> Even the best
> an attorney can tell you is his learned opinion. It is
> the rulings of the courts that tells us whether something
> fits within the guidance of the constitution.

I see. So according to you, racial discrimination is legitimate because Courts ruled it was Constitutional?

Sorry, but the Court is nothing more than another opinion...heck they even CALL their decisions opinions... What about that?

> What you are is a hyper libertarian. Not even the
> Libertarian Party agrees with you.

Cite please. Present something from the Libertarian Party which states they do not agree with
scout@monumental.com

I think you are pulling authority out of your ass again, and that they have said no such thing.

> What I suggest is that your family commits you
> to a mental health facility for treatment.

Sorry, but my family doesn't listen to demented people such as yourself.

Nor would I listen to you, except that pointing out the errors in your position is so much fun.

5601. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:05:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2797DF.D3140584@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28598

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > It's obvious that you don't consider harassment to be a serious problem.
> > > However, you are violating the agreement that you made with your ISP.
> > >
> > No, what is obvious is that I am not harassing Kim and thus am not in
> > violation of my agreement with Earthlink. Feel free to make your case
> > to my provider, Don Q.
>
> Since I am not the injured party, that is not a logical action. But your
> postings indeed do meet the dictionary definition of harassing.

Actually, they don't all. You've attempted to stretch my actions to fit
the mold you have ready but you've failed pretty spectacularly.

Since you aren't the alleged injured party or a member of this new class
of victim you've invented, perhaps you'd agree to counsel the holder of
the tacky callsign as to how she should proceed.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

5602. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:07:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C27986B.C40607A7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28599

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Kim is being chided, occasionally insulted and often undergoes derision
> > for her *choice* of callsign.
>
> That's very close to the dictionary definition of harassing, Dave.
>
> > Feel free to spend some of the enormous amount of free time available to
> > you to pursue it with Earthlink (with whom I've "signed" nothing).
>
> I am not the injured party so it is not logical for me to complain.
> OTOH, when you signed on with Earthlink you gave tacit acceptance
> to their terms and conditions which you have violated by harassing
> Kim.

Even the alleged injured party is not an injured party in this new
fantasy world of yours, Spock.

Earthlink has not contacted me about my alleged violations--probably
because Kim is not a victim of harrassment.

Dave K8MN

5603. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:10:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C279937.5CE26F45@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28600

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > It stands for lounge lizard humor.
>
> It stands for cuteness, Dave. Halitosis is better than no breath
> at all. If I send you ten bucks, will you buy a sense of humor?

A comedian is only funny if the audience laughs. Kim falls short. You, on the other hand, may have a future in standup whether your humor is intentional or not.

Send the ten spot and I promise I'll buy something.

Dave K8MN

5604. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:12:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C27997D.6788EC45@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28501

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Please tell me what the limit is on stating my belief that your call is
> > tacky.
>
> Harassment is the limit and you are way over the limit.

Get serious, Cecil. You're just attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights. You are badgering me and harassing me. You may find yourself in trouble with your ISP for such behavior.

Dave K8MN

5605. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:12:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2799B8.D7A9D265@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28502

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.
>
> It is you who is thumbing your nose at the world, Dave.
> Come down from your ivory tower, join the world, and
> enjoy life instead of being such an elitist grinch.

That, you silly old man, is simply a load of....fiction.

Dave K8MN

5606. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:15:16 UTC
From: xxxxxxxx <carpediem@netrover.com>
Message-ID: <nWMV7.80380$Z2.1170032@nnrp1.uunet.ca>
Source record: 28503
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

Scout <scout@monumental.com> wrote in message
news:rXKV7.4076$0g.109996@iad-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
> news:CyKV7.1273$to2.253352@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
> > : > : > > We can continue down the path we are going.
> > : > : > > We now have a mercenary military, police and
> > : > : > > fire force in this country that is divorced from the
> > : > : > > people. They see themselves as more superior,
> > : > : > > a warrior class. It is taught to them in Basic Training
> > : > : > > (Marines are the best at such attitudes), in their
> > : > : > > academies. And the public reinforces that belief.
> > : > : > > Just look at the panic among the yuppies every
> > : > : > > time there is a shooting in a workplace or school.
> > : > : > > A bunch of sheeple.
> > : > : > >
> > : > : > > The yuppie ruling class wants more police, more
> > : > : > > fire fighters, more military. But do not take their
> > : > : > > sons. Oh, and please disarm all those rednecks
> > : > : > > and gang bangers too, they cry.
> > : > : > >
> > : > : > > Watch as our police force becomes bigger, much
> > : > : > > larger than the military, reaching 5 to 10 million
> > : > : > > men. We will do as we do with the military and
> > : > : > > allow foreigners to serve. And we are already
> > : > : > > recruiting special ops folks to be police officers.
> > : > : > > Just talked to a guy yesterday who spent 11 years
> > : > : > > in the Rangers and is now a local cop. Heavily
> > : > : > > recruited. Why? Maybe the mayor wants a private
> > : > : > > army? And that is happening everywhere, cities
> > : > : > > are looking for former Marines, Rangers, Special
> > : > : > > Forces, SEALS and members of the military intelligence
> > : > : > > community (especially Signal Intel so they can listen
> > : > : > > to cell phones). And you do not think people with
> > : > : > > this type of training will not see themselves as superior
> > : > : > > to the average yuppie sheeple or the white trash or
> > : > : > > the gang bangers?
> > : > : > >
> > : > : > > You may see the draft as a violation of the 13th
> > : > : > > amendment but is having 75% of your income
> > : > : > > taken any different? Because that is what it is
> > : > : > > going to take to support such an elite cadre.
> > : > : > >

> > : > : > > The other choice is to do what the Founders wanted:
> > : > : > > that the police, the military and fire protection be a
> > : > : > > community effort with ALL able bodied (those who
> > : > : > > are fit to serve) men serving part time. The intent was
> > : > : > > that the public be involved, not in service but in the
> > : > : > > decisions to go to war. Everything was to be shared.
> > : > : > >
> > : > : > > What do we have today? An American people who
> > : > : > > have abdicated their responsibilities, willing to allow
> > : > : > > the government to make their decisions, others to be
> > : > : > > their protectors. But the draft is still the law,
re-authorized
> > : > : > > by congress in 1994. There are National Guard officers
> > : > : > > in every state who man the draft boards, waiting for the
> > : > : > > word (and the money) from congress.
> > : > : > >
> > : > : > > So what is the choice? An elite government, protected
> > : > : > > by mercenaries? Or a nation where everyone is involved?
> > : > : >
> > : > : > I'm afraid there is a lot of truth in what you are saying.
> > Contacts
> > : in
> > : > : the military are saying that units have been training for domestic
> > : > operations
> > : > : for some time now. Dropping the draft in the 70's was a huge
> mistake,
> > : but
> > : > one
> > : > : that could not be avoided politically. But it was not nearly as
big
> a
> > : > mistake
> > : > : as Carter forgiving all the draft dodgers>
> > : > : > A free people cannot forever secure their freedoms with a few
> > : dollars.
> > : > : If it's not worth personal participation it cannot be appreciated
> and
> > : will
> > : > be
> > : > : > given away without the givers even knowing what they give.
> > : > :
> > : > : Perhaps, but under the idea of freedom they should have that
choice.
> > To
> > : > : force people to do something they don't want to do "because it's
> good
> > : for
> > : > : them", is usually the hallmark of oppression and tyranny. If fewer
> > : people
> > : > : want to serve, and we would like to have more serve, then we need

to
> > : > : determine what and why they no longer have a desire to serve, and
> fix
> > : it.
> > : >
> > : > Then why do you allow yourself to be forced
> > : > to pay taxes? That takes your labor from you
> > : > as much as the draft would.
> > :
> > : Congress has been given the power to tax, the 13th prohibits the
draft.
> > :
> > : Next question.
> >
> > Where in the 13th amendment does it is
> > say that the draft is covered by that amendment.
>
> "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for
crime
> whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the
> United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."
>
> > If you look, the 13th exempts the government.
>
> Where please?
>
> Section 1 is posted above, section 2 states
>
> "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate
> legislation."
>
> There are no other sections. No exemptions for the government.
>
>
>
> > What legal scholars support your wild ass
> > views?
>
> Oh, it's something called the Constitution of the United States of America
> as Amended.
>
> I don't need to appeal to authority. The facts themselves support me.
>
> > What court ruling support your off
> > the wall hype libertarianism?
>
> I see, so unless an authority supports you, then you can' t be right. No
> wonder Galileo was locked up, all the authorities said he was
wrong.....but
> damn the facts supported him. Now who is see to have been right, the one

> supported by the fact, or the "authority"?
>
> Appeal to authority is a useless undertaking, either the facts support you
> at which point it doesn't matter what authority states, or you are wrong
and
> agreement with authority isn't going to make you right.
>
>
>
> >
> >
> >
>
>

5607. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:32:07 UTC
From: WW - KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a086q5hcp1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 28505

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011224081800.24460.00001395@mb-fc.aol.com...
> >In the spirit of the holiday season (whatever your
> >religious persuasion), I'd like to take this opportunity
> >to sincerely convey wishes for a happy holiday
> >season and a prosperous new year to you, on behalf
> >of both myself and the entire Board of Directors and
> >membership of No Code International.
> >
> >73,
> >- --
> >Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
>
>
> TAKE YOUR USELESS GREETINGS AND STICK IT!!!!!!!!!!

You forgot the part about being boiled in their own pudding and Bah Humbug!
I'll bet you cheer for the Grinch, Darth Vader, and Adolf Hitler also!

--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI - 2385

Harrison's Postulate;

For every action,
there is an equal
and opposite criticism.

Sent via the LATE Deja.com
A.K.A. Google Groups
http://groups.google.com

5608. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 21:43:42 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112242140370.1871-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 28504

On 24 Dec 2001, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Date: 12/22/2001 5:38 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112222337350.18576-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
>>His name has nothing to do with it. His conviction for cellular phone
>>phreaking is the reason behind why he was found morally unfit.
>
> The FCC has no business deciding who is "morally fit" to do ANYTHING. He
>did his time in the legal system.
>
> The prosecutor himself has stated that he just doesn't like his "attitude"
>and is doing what he can to further prevent Mitnik from retruning to society.
>
> It's reasons like this that many people who might otherwise fit back in
>to society wind up dropping back into less-than-desireable conduct. They can't
>get past the past, not because they want to, but becuase idiots like the
>prosecutor don't want to let it go and let him get on with his life.
>
> He screwed up, he know's it, he paid the price the courts put on him.
>
> Time to tell the FCC and the courts to act like men, not sandlot whiners.

So a criminal conviction for violation of the Communications Act is not
sufficient reason? He has already proven that he cannot follow the rules. An
amateur radio license is a privilege, not a right. As a convicted felon, there
are even some rights he doesn't have now (such as to vote or to own firearms).

[If his conviction were for some other, non-communication action, then I would
agree that the FCC doesn't have a basis for denying renewal.]

5609. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 22:00:23 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D66B62B5E3CF6FE0.51E9E0D530AFFB31.FCFDC1DD0007148B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28506

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 05:05:50 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
wrote:

>You might as well get used to the fact that it is vulgar. Your denying
>it doesn't make any difference whatever. Riley says it places the ARS
>one step closer to extinction, which is what he also said about the
>vulgar idiots on 3050 etc.

How do shortwave stations place the ARS one step closer to
extinction?

> And of course he's right

Just as he was about the need to eliminate the code testing
requirement, right Dickie?

> If you don't like it, hey, that's life. I don't like her chosen
>callsign.

So don't communicate with her on the air--sounds pretty simple
to me.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5610. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 22:09:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <37C6941A53928EA9.0CA262FF0AA47C15.1AE35D5BFB7197E6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28507

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 10:42:07 -0500, "Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>
>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3C26BC0A.4C4D6C18@IEEE.org...
>
>> Vulgar or not, what you guys are doing meets the definition
>> of harassment. Harassment is worse than vulgar.
>
>By definition, yes, but it would be very difficult to prove to an ISP. Now
>if they were e-mailing Kim, bypassing kill filters, etc., that would be
>harassment. There's also a part in the definition about "disturbing one or
>destroying one's peace of mind." Repeated posting of an opinion on usenet
>could hardly be called that, unless it was taken to the extremes mentioned.
>

Actually, it's pretty easy to prove it to an isp. Anyone who
collected Larry or Dave's posts about Kim and her call sign over the
last few months (particularly Larry's statements that he intends to
keep this thread alive until she changes it--which, of course, is
direct evidence that he is attempting to intimidate her into an act
she doesn't choose to perform) would have more than enough evidence
for an isp to act--at a minimum they would pull the offender's posting
privileges on their news server (and I doubt very many of the people
in this thread pay for a separate commercial news server as I do, thus
they are limited to the one provided by their isp) and warn them that
further harassment will result in loss of their account under the
COU/TOS.

I don't advocate reporting anyone to an isp for something of
this nature (threats and spam yes, but not something like this). On
the other hand, the holier-than-thou group certainly feel that Kim has
no business doing something "inappropriate" and thus have an
obligation of their own to keep their word (as customers of an isp
everyone here agreed to adhere to the TOS/COU of the isp) and not
violate the terms of their contracts. If they do so knowingly, it
simply proves to anyone reading it that they are unwilling to
demonstrate honest, moral, and ethical behavior, and thus have no
legitimacy in judging the "moral" choices of others.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5611. A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 22:15:40 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011224171540.14772.00001392@mb-bj.news.cs.com>
Source record: 28508

Hi everybody,

I just wanted to take a moment to thank a few of the folks on r.r.a.p. for all the help they gave me with my license upgrade. Ed Hare for never even allowing me to entertain the thought that I wouldn't lick the code test like a postage stamp. Jerry Oxendine and Jim Hampton for encouraging me to "enjoy" the code and giving me pointers in 'Conversational CW 101' so I wouldn't sound like a horses you-know-what upon my first true AR CW QSO. Dick McCollum gets BIG TIME kudos for answering a multitude of questions with the patience of Job. Especially for telling me to "calm down," when, for reasons unknown to this day, all my "Fast Farnsworth" practice flew out the window and I couldn't copy 5-wpm to save my life...on the day before the test.

I'm forced to put Dick Carroll and Larry Roll in a separate paragraph because they helped me with something other than the code...an attitude adjustment. Their self-made reputations as r.r.a.p. "toughies" are forever shattered in this ham's eyes as they demonstrated that they would've gladly given me their "lucky" shirts off their backs if it'd help me pass. Needless to say both were very happy to hear that I passed. BTW, if you study with the ARRL 'Fast Farnsworth' CD's, the actual exam characters will feel like they're "floating in."

I originally did not want to write this because I thought it might be construed as a "congratulate me" post. I did so because I want to let anybody who might be "put off" by what they perceive as an attitude know that these folks WANT to help you...so stick around.

I'd be remiss if I didn't mention one other guy, a non-ham. My college certification professor, Mr. Cronk. He fixed it so that we could NOT earn our sheepskins by just memorizing exam pool questions, hence the birth of the infamous "Cronk screenings." The General was easy but the Extra required the dusting off of some pretty deeply buried electronics theory. Thanks Professor C.!

If I failed to mention any of you who encouraged me along the way, forgive me. I just wanted to acknowledge the folks I leaned on the most. Thanks again. I promise to pass it on to others. :-)

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

5612. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 22:20:03 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <42AB8850EDF3DA99.FCF12E24880B10E7.4105D373E4E10813@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28509

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 11:23:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Feel free to attempt to make an issue with it to Earthlink. See if they
>share your views.

I don't need to ask them, Dave, the answer is very clearly
defined in the TOU/COS you agreed to (which is available to you on the
Earthlink home site). I no more need to "prove" that to you than I
need to "prove" that it is illegal for you to transmit LSB on
10.125MHz--in both cases the rule is clearly spelled out in a readily
available location.

>> You have stated your perspective. That's reasonable. But
>> continuing to do so isn't a question of voicing opinion, it's one of
>> harassing someone.
>
>That's simply not true. If your statement was correct, your continued
>posting of information to the effect that I am harrassing Kim would have
>to be viewed as harrassment. After all, you've already stated your
>perspective.

No problem at all, Dave. While I might argue that defending
against harassment is unlikely to be _viewed_ as harassment, it isn't
really relevant since I don't obtain my news feed from an isp. My news
feed comes from Airnews (Internet America) and my postings are subject
to THEIR rules, not the TOU/COS in force at voyager.net where I
receive some of my email (I also run my own servers on the three
registered domains I maintain). According to Airnews own TOU/COS I am
NOT in violation of my agreements, and thus unlike yourself, I'm not
breaking my word by my posts here.

>> No--we disagree on Libertarian party philosophy. We agree on
>> what a "libertarian" is--we simply don't agree on what a party which
>> identifies itself as "Libertarian" should have as a platform. That's
>> no more the same thing than stating you believe in democratic
>> principles means you have to agree with the Democratic Party platform.
>
>You started out disagreeing on Libertarian Party philosophy. Things
>went down hill from there.

We ended up debating an area of Libertarian Party policy that
we have very different views on--that of social support for the sick
and poor. That, however, has nothing to do with libertarian
philosophy, which limits itself to directly addressing the issues of
rights and freedoms--and in that area, Cecil and I agree on most

points and can agree to disagree on the few where we differ.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5613. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 22:40:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C27AEF9.4CCEA458@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28510

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > It's obvious that you don't consider harassment to be a serious problem.
> > > > However, you are violating the agreement that you made with your ISP.
> > >
> > > No, what is obvious is that I am not harassing Kim and thus am not in
> > > violation of my agreement with Earthlink. Feel free to make your case
> > > to my provider, Don Q.
> > >
> > Since I am not the injured party, that is not a logical action. But your
> > postings indeed do meet the dictionary definition of harassing.
>
> Actually, they don't all.

Just some of them, eh? I'm glad to see you admit it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5614. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 22:50:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C27B122.66BF6E94@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28511

Dave Heil wrote:
> A comedian is only funny if the audience laughs. Kim falls short.

Given the choice between your brand of misery and Kim's brand of
humor, guess who gets my vote?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5615. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 22:51:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C27B188.18C3D7B0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28512

Richard Plourde wrote:
> That's why I said "may"... but yep... you're right...
> but... now that Cecil mentioned Texas A&M it makes me wonder.

Maroon is an old military color.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5616. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 22:57:59 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C27B2F7.7C3681FB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28513

Dave Heil wrote:
> You're just attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights.

Pray tell, how would I go about doing that? Unlike you, I
am not omnipotent.

> You are badgering me and harassing me. You may find yourself
> in trouble with your ISP for such behavior.

Badgering a harasser is self defense, not harassing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5617. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:00:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C27B37D.388B6C06@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28514

Dave Heil wrote:
> Earthlink has not contacted me about my alleged violations--probably
> because Kim is not a victim of harrassment.

Probably because Kim is a nice person and doesn't want to get
you into trouble.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5618. Re: RADIO LAW vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:00:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a08cab$4ej$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28515
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:soIV7.118$T6.183447@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
> : > : > The police and military are your superiors.
> : > :
> : > : Horse-shit.
> : > :
> : > : Pure extra fine Grade-A Horse-Shit.
> : > :
> : > : The police and military are my hired help. They work for me,
> : > : which makes _me_ their superior.
> : > :
> : > : Do you live in the old USSR or Iraq or some such dictatorship?
> : > :
> : > : 73, de Hans, K0HB
> : >
> : > Sorry but you are no more than a taxpayer
> : > with no choice in paying your taxes or they
> : > will be forcible taken from you. The mayor
> : > or the governor is who the police work for.
> : > It is they who hire them.
> :
> : And good mayors, governors, etc. will demand that their
> : police force personnel and anyone else that is
> : employed by government understands and respects the fact
> : that they ARE public servants. Unfortunately, there still
> : are jurisdictions that operate on the "Dukes of Hazard
> : School of Local Government." Thankfully, with the media
> : coverage today, that is becoming far more difficult to
> : do and the bad attitude employees will find it more
> : difficult to thumb their noses at the public that employs the,.
>
> Then go to Chicago or LA? Are they
> dukes of hazard? Ever hear of the Ramparts
> Divison? Oh, and BTW, the LAPD is not
> under the mayor. They have a special structure
> that is not under any political control.
>
> : > Now if you are very rich or powerful, you
> : > might be able to dictate who the mayor is.
> : > But most people, there is little recourse unless
> : > you band together in enough numbers to
> : > force the political establishment to listen.
> : > And the police do know this.

> :
> : It's called democracy...and it does work.
>
> Democracy is a lynch mob, majority rules.
> We are a republic and the liberals have
> made damned sure that it has problems.

What a sorry attitude. Thankfully here in
NJ the mayor is in charge and the press, the
courts and the public do not take kindly to rogue
policing. We support good police...but we
don't support a police state.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5619. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:18:22 UTC
From: Hiram HappyHam <natradger@aol.com>
Message-ID: <2JOV7.14161$PO5.2206092@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 28516

BLOW ME in Macy's window
then 5 min later, take a nigger's (..with pink
curlers in his hair) fat 13" mandingo cockmeat
tool up the ole poop-chute, while you eat out
a 400 pound samoa woman's drippy stinkin
snatch simultaneously for all the post-xmas shopping bargan hunters on the street outside
to
enjoy.

Thanks and have a happy day!

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation" <lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm> wrote
in
message news:bc32031f9c5f9eeb4d702daed61826f4@spamfreenews.com...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
> news:3c271712_2@news7.fast.net...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > Dear r.r.a.p.'ers,
> >
> > In the spirit of the holiday season (whatever your
> > religious persuasion), I'd like to take this opportunity
> > to sincerely convey wishes for a happy holiday
> > season and a prosperous new year to you, on behalf
> > of both myself and the entire Board of Directors and
> > membership of No Code International.
> >
> > 73,
> > - --
> > Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
> > <mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
> > <http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
> > - --
> > NCI-1052
> > Executive Director, No Code International
> > Fellow, The Radio Club of America
> > Senior Member, IEEE
> > Member, TAPR
> > Member, ARRL
> > - --
> > Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> > Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> > <http://www.nocode.org>

> >
>
> Same to you, Carl. Happy Holidays!
>
>
> --
> Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> Chief of Communications
> The Better Amateur Radio Federation
> Ham radio for Straight, White, Americans!
> http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61
>
>
>

5620. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:24:13 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2CC69775D3688C11.485EF57EE353824C.021260550CA5B8C0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28517

To "lighten things up" a bit for the holiday (back to our scheduled flame-fest Wednesday), here's a version of an old favorite that was obviously adapted for some of the participants here:

=====

On the 12th day of the Eurocentrically imposed midwinter festival, my Significant Other in a consenting adult, monogamous relationship gave to me:

TWELVE males reclaiming their inner warrior through ritual drumming,

ELEVEN pipers piping (plus the 18-member pit orchestra made up of members in good standing of the Musicians Equity Union as called for in their union contract even though they will not be asked to play a note),

TEN melanin deprived testosterone-poisoned scions of the patriarchal ruling class system leaping,

NINE persons engaged in rhythmic self-expression,

EIGHT economically disadvantaged female persons stealing milk-products from enslaved Bovine-Americans,

SEVEN endangered swans swimming on federally protected wetlands,

SIX enslaved Fowl-Americans producing stolen non-human animal products,

FIVE golden symbols of culturally sanctioned enforced domestic incarceration,

(NOTE: after members of the Animal Liberation Front threatened to throw red paint at my computer, the calling birds, French hens and partridge have been reintroduced to their native habitat. To avoid further Animal-American enslavement, the remaining gift package has been revised.)

FOUR hours of recorded whale songs

THREE deconstructionist poets

TWO Sierra Club calendars printed on recycled processed tree carcasses and...

ONE Spotted Owl activist chained to an old-growth pear tree.

Merry Christmas Happy Chanukah. Good Kwanzaa. Blessed Yule. Oh,
heck! Happy Holidays!!!! (unless otherwise prohibited by law) *

*Unless, of course, you are suffering from Seasonal Affective Disorder
(SAD). If this be the case, please substitute this gratuitous call for
celebration with suggestion that you have a thoroughly adequate day.

(copyright ï¿½ 2001 About.com, Inc.)

=====

Happy (or adequate) holidays,

73 de KE8HH, Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5621. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:24:20 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <303866F887C70E66.4BAA1DCC39D0DB29.E084D98A420123CC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28518

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 04:18:58 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>With all due respect Rick this is why killfiles were invented. If
>harassment it be as opposed to two people making prime fools of themselves
>it is easily cured.

In most cases I would agree. While I don't use kill files,
neither am I bothered by people flaming me--I'm only offended when
they aren't good enough at the task to make the flame war fun.

On the other hand, this thread was specifically created--and
Larry Roll has stated more than once that it will CONTINUE to
exist--for the sole purpose of attempting to intimidate Kim into
changing her call sign. In that case, a kill file isn't an acceptable
solution since she would have to kill file people who may otherwise
have something of relevance to amateur radio, and who she would no
longer be able to read. More, the thread about HER would continue
without her even having the chance to respond to new insults or lies
about her. Clearly, that's not an acceptable resolution in this case
as it would be if, for example, the argument were over code testing or
some other non-personal issue.

>If my experience is indicative, getting kicked off Earthlink would be a
>favor -- kind of like throwing Brer Rabbit into the briar patch.

Now THERE we agree! Earthlink is like aol for the learning
disabled (sort of like msn, but better email access). On the other
hand, it isn't the loss of the account that would be relevant--it's
the fact that people who are adamant about "ethics" and "morality" are
willing to deliberately break their words to their isps by violating
the terms of their agreements. To me, that tells everyone a great deal
about their so-called morality and makes their claim that they have
the "moral high ground" when it comes to Kim's choice of her call sign
just a bit ludicrous.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5622. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:24:23 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <35BA1432C1D192BE.3426F9BC6AF8F3CC.B28FEE7C5BE84791@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28519

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 11:30:58 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>That is simply your interpretation. If you feel strongly, make an issue
>of it with Earthlink.

I'm not interested in making it into an issue, Dave. Only in
pointing out your own lack of morality and ethics in deliberately
violating the agreement you made when you signed up for Earthlink
services. If you profess to be credible in claiming Kim's call sign is
inappropriate, then it follows that the readers have a right to know
what your OWN ethics and morality are like, so they can decide whether
you are worth listening to or not.

Clearly you are not.

>Your idiotic claim (as if capital letters make something true) that it
>is "CLEARLY" harrassment is absurd on its face. That you would attempt
>to stifle another's First Amendment rights shows us that your
>committment to libertarianism is only thin veneer.

I really wish that at least a FEW of the people who toss out
"First Amendment" or "Constitution" in support of their actions would
READ them first!

The Constitution of the United States applies ONLY to actions
governed by the federal government. It does NOT limit restrictions
that may be place by the private sector. For example, if you choose to
stand on a soapbox (in a place where gatherings are legally permitted,
and on public land, of course) and preach hatred for Islamic people,
you may be regarded as a fool but unless you are actually calling for
violence or riot (legally: hate speech), you are totally legal doing
so and will suffer no sanctions as a result. On the other hand, if you
do precisely the same thing in the employee lounge at your place of
work, your employer is well within his or her rights to terminate you
on the spot.

By choosing Earthlink as your isp, you agreed to be bound to
their conditions of service and terms of usage--and your behavior in
this newsgroup is a direct violation of that agreement. It's
irrelevant if you could legally be prosecuted for harassment or not,
the fact remains that you gave your word NOT to violate those terms
and are now doing so.

By the way, before you accuse me of doing the same thing,
Dave, take a look at the TOU/COS on airnews and on altopia (the two
news services I use) and you will discover that the agreements are NOT

the same as that for your isp--and I am NOT in violation of either
one. Unlike you, I keep my word.

>> All true. NONE of those locations are private in nature, and
>> therefore are subject to the protections of the First Amendment. On
>> the other hand, if you choose to stand on a street corner stating that
>> someone is immoral and has no self-respect (as you have done with
>> Kim), then by necessity you leave yourself open to defamation of
>> character suits--the "protection" against abuse of your First
>> Amendment rights.
>
>Excuse me? At which point did I state that Kim is immoral. Lacking
>taste in obtaining a trashy callsign is not the same as accusing one of
>being immoral. Get a life, Rick.

The concept of "trashy" is synonymous with lacking in morals
and we both know it. If you're going to debate words at least use them
correctly.

>No one receives immunity from insults, Rick. You yourself have often
>handed out insults which go well beyond expressing an opinion. You are
>stuck with a few empty claims.

I never claimed I _didn't_ insult anyone here--although if
you'll look at my posts, I've never been the first to use a direct
insult with someone. Once I'm told I'm an idiot, a fool, or any of the
other accusations that have greeted some of my posts I feel perfectly
comfortable responding in kind.

On the other hand, my actions aren't the ones at issue here.
Nothing I've posted to this group is in any way in violation of my
agreements with my service providers, and none of it is in any way
harassing (I respond to other's posts, I don't originate them--and
unlike Larry Roll, I have NOT stated that the thread won't be allowed
to die until someone changes their behavior to conform to my desires).
The issue here is the discussion of Kim's call sign (not the call sign
itself, the discussion of it). And the relevant concerns are the
veracity and legitimacy of those who feel that call sign is
inappropriate. Clearly, if the people who are arguing against it can
be shown to be dishonest themselves (as is the case with your
violation of the agreements you made with Earthlink) then their
statements have to be viewed as originating with known liars and
evaluated on that basis alone.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5623. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:24:25 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C8349AB7FDFD00A7.0A256E7F75097C5F.0AF2142F34E9F65C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28520

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 14:08:13 GMT, James R. DeLoach
<jasd-49X@attbi.com> wrote:

>Hopefully this message will not be emailed to you, Dave. I need to
>find out how to change the default on Agent so that it does not email
>messages posted on usenet.

Go to Group/Properties/Post and uncheck the box marked "Copy
follow-up messages to author via email." You can either do that on a
group by group basis (if you want email to go to the authors in other
groups) or just use the "Default Properties" menu selection if you
prefer not to copy your reply by email at all.

Hope it helps,

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5624. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:32:10 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <_VOV7.196162$WW.11384217@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28521

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011224171540.14772.00001392@mb-bj.news.cs.com...
> Hi everybody,
>
> I just wanted to take a moment to thank a few of the folks on r.r.a.p.
for all
> the help they gave me with my license upgrade. Ed Hare for never even
allowing
> me to entertain the thought that I wouldn't lick the code test like a
postage
> stamp. Jerry Oxendine and Jim Hampton for encouraging me to "enjoy" the
code
> and giving me pointers in 'Conversational CW 101' so I wouldn't sound
like a
> horses you-know-what upon my first true AR CW QSO. Dick McCollum gets
BIG TIME
> kudos for answering a multitude of questions with the patience of Job.
> Especially for telling me to "calm down," when, for reasons unknown to
this
> day, all my "Fast Farnsworth" practice flew out the window and I
couldn't copy
> 5-wpm to save my life...on the day before the test.
>
> I'm forced to put Dick Carroll and Larry Roll in a separate paragraph
because
> they helped me with something other than the code...an attitude
adjustment.
> Their self-made reputations as r.r.a.p. "toughies" are forever shattered
in
> this ham's eyes as they demonstrated that they would've gladly given me
their
> "lucky" shirts off their backs if it'd help me pass. Needless to say
both were
> very happy to hear that I passed. BTW, if you study with the ARRL 'Fast
> Farnsworth' CD's, the actual exam characters will feel like they're
"floating
> in."
>
> I originally did not want to write this because I thought it might be
construed
> as a "congratulate me" post. I did so because I want to let anybody who
might
> be "put off" by what they perceive as an attitude know that these folks
WANT to

> help you...so stick around.
>
> I'd be remiss if I didn't mention one other guy, a non-ham. My college
> certification professor, Mr. Cronk. He fixed it so that we could NOT
earn our
> sheepskins by just memorizing exam pool questions, hence the birth of
the
> infamous "Cronk screenings." The General was easy but the Extra required
the
> dusting off of some pretty deeply buried electronics theory. Thanks
Professor
> C.!
>
> If I failed to mention any of you who encouraged me along the way,
forgive me.
> I just wanted to acknowledge the folks I leaned on the most. Thanks
again. I
> promise to pass it on to others. :-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

More than that cannot be asked. We've all been there, Bert.

Dick N�BK

5625. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:38:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <s%OV7.196167$WW.11384424@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28522

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:303866F887C70E66.4BAA1DCC39D0DB29.E084D98A420123CC@lp.airnews.net...
> On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 04:18:58 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >With all due respect Rick this is why killfiles were invented. If
> >harassment it be as opposed to two people making prime fools of
themselves
> >it is easily cured.
>
> In most cases I would agree. While I don't use kill files,
> neither am I bothered by people flaming me--I'm only offended when
> they aren't good enough at the task to make the flame war fun.
>
> On the other hand, this thread was specifically created--and
> Larry Roll has stated more than once that it will CONTINUE to
> exist--for the sole purpose of attempting to intimidate Kim into
> changing her call sign. In that case, a kill file isn't an acceptable
> solution since she would have to kill file people who may otherwise
> have something of relevance to amateur radio, and who she would no
> longer be able to read. More, the thread about HER would continue
> without her even having the chance to respond to new insults or lies
> about her. Clearly, that's not an acceptable resolution in this case
> as it would be if, for example, the argument were over code testing or
> some other non-personal issue.
>
> >If my experience is indicative, getting kicked off Earthlink would be a
> >favor -- kind of like throwing Brer Rabbit into the briar patch.
>
> Now THERE we agree! Earthlink is like aol for the learning
> disabled (sort of like msn, but better email access). On the other
> hand, it isn't the loss of the account that would be relevant--it's
> the fact that people who are adamant about "ethics" and "morality" are
> willing to deliberately break their words to their isps by violating
> the terms of their agreements. To me, that tells everyone a great deal
> about their so-called morality and makes their claim that they have
> the "moral high ground" when it comes to Kim's choice of her call sign
> just a bit ludicrous.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH

> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>

Many years ago, a roommate at Wash U in St. Louis had, in hieroglyphics no less, a sign on our door. The gung-ho shall inherit the earth -- they deserve it. It is threads like this one that add new meaning to his sentiments.

5626. Re: RADIO LAW vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-24 23:43:38 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <K4PV7.178611$bs2.29764512@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 28523
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

"N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
news:soIV7.118$T6.183447@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
>
> Democracy is a lynch mob, majority rules.
> We are a republic and the liberals have
> made damned sure that it has problems.
>
>
This is by far the only good thing in a post from you yet!
Train

5627. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 00:28:55 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a08h87$9fi$4@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote:
> : they have treated me as inferior in what associations I have had
> : with them. Again, if it comes to knowledge about their area of
> : specialization, then they are certainly more valuable as sources
> : of information. But put a physical education professor in with a
> : group of physicists, and the physical ed professor is going to
> : feel inadequate and out of place.

> What kind of sheltered life do you live?

As far as I know, it is a rather normal life. But I don't live in
a crowded megacity either.

> Have you been on an modern university in
> the last 20 years? It is not just their specialization,
> it is that they see themselves as the elite of
> society.

Yes, as a matter of fact, I have. I occasionally take continuing
ed classes.

> Same with doctors. Ask nurses how doctors
> act like tin gods.

I guess it depends on where you live. You have your perceptions
and I have mine. I would not tolerate a doctor who was a "tin god".

> There are a good deal of elitism out there.
> For whatever reason. The Marines teach
> it. So do the police academies.

The police/Marines/doctors/professors etc ARE the elite, when it
comes to their areas of expertise. Outside that, they are no better
or worse than anyone else.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5628. Re: Merry Christmas from the B.A.R.F. !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 00:29:53 UTC
From: 91bxuc2hvc8e001@sneakemail.com
Message-ID: <Xns9181C612C577DJimnospamcom@24.253.156.38>
Source record: 28525
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation"
<lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm> wrote in
news:acd51342bd2a1cfb722e90c906c5b88c@spamfreenews.com:

> As Chief of Communications, I would like to wish everyone here a Happy
> Holidays!
>
>
> --
> Lloyd Davies, N0VFP
> Chief of Communications
> The Better Amateur Radio Federation
> Ham radio for Straight, White, Americans!
> http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61
>
>
>

Fuck you Davies, I hope you choke on your possum!

5629. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 00:31:03 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <a08hc7$9fi$5@quark.scn.rain.com>
Source record: 28526
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

In rec.radio.cb Graham Broadbridge <grahamb@peachy.org> wrote:

> Quite likely, if you had refused the search you would have been arrested,
> and
> then searched.

They would have no cause to do so. Most likely, they would tell you to
find another route - which is rather long in the instance mentioned.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

5630. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 01:25:42 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <qAQV7.196255$WW.11390036@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28527

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> It is very probable that after WRC 2003 the code test treaty requirement will
> simply disappear. I can imagine the entire action at WRC 2003 will consist of
> something like "Eliminate S25.5? The ayes have it" and that will be the end of
> it. FCC and many other agencies will simply drop the code test. FCC could
> simply say that Element 1 was "waived" until the treaty was formally ratified
> and the appropriate US regs changed.

> What should be discussed NOW is what the US license structure will become
> if/when S25.5 goes away. Some folks want just one class of license, while
> others want two classes at most. Some say "just drop Element 1 and leave the
> rest alone". Lots of ideas and possibilities, but I don't see much real
> discussion about the subject.

> General question to all: What are YOUR ideas?

Ok Jim... herre's my ideas.

First, consider this, we have two 'kinds' of licenses. Those which can be granted and those which can't. I believe this must be solved before or during whatever else is done.

So, when the morse requirements are gone we have six licenses most with a different count for written elements completed.

Technician and Technician Plus have passed the same written elements. If the Novice is promoted to this class by simply waiving element 2 then the situation becomes much clearer. Call this Technician class.

The General Class remains as is.

The difference between Advanced and Amateur Extra is element 4(B) so waive it. Call this Amateur Extra Class.

Now, we have only three license classes all available for growth.

This simplifies the existing band plans. I've listed the changes resulting from the above action.

1) The entire bands above 30 MHz are open to all licensees.
2) Novice subbands on 1.25 meters and 23 centimeters disappear.
3) Technicians get 200W 28.100 to 28.300 on 10 meters.

4) Technicians get 200W CW and SSB only 28.300 to 28.500 on 10 meters.
5) Technicians get 200W CW only subbands on 15, 40, and 80 meters.
6) Advanced Class subbands on 80, 40, 20, and 15 meters disappear.

All this is accomplished by waiving Element 2 for Novices and waiving Element 4(B) for Advanced. I think this is a very tiny price to pay in order to have a structure which can have some basic adjustments applied for better transitioning of everyone throughout the ARS experience.

I now add my thoughts on the 'adjustments'... ;-)

One, give the Technicians 10 meters because in light of the infringement of freebanders it's better to have plenty of licenced operators squatting there trying to maintain control of the band. There is no sense in being exclusionary to your fellow hams. I say get the freeband candidates licensed and accountable. This would eliminate the subband on 10 meters which I view a good thing. As far as I'm concerned limit everyone on the band to 200 watts and go after the jerks.

Two, give the Technicians 200 W CW only operation on the General subands. If you want them to learn CW then put the horse before cart and the carrot in front of the horse. This would eliminate the CW only subbands on 15, 40, and 80 meters.

As Red Green would say... "We're all in this together"... ;-)

Rich

5631. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 02:29:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011224212958.24476.00001390@mb-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 28528

>
>If I failed to mention any of you who encouraged me along the way, forgive
>me.
>I just wanted to acknowledge the folks I leaned on the most. Thanks again. I
>promise to pass it on to others. :-)
>
>73 de Bert
>KC2HMN

Bert:

You did it and YOU deserve all the credit. I can not take any of the credit for your accomplishment just because I told you something about yourself that you obviously already knew. However, perhaps by posting here in the future, and explaining to people that they can pass a code test like a Ferrari passing a Yugo in second gear, then you can take ham radio one step further from extinction.

Good luck and enjoy your new privileges comforted in the knowledge that you are, indeed, a Real Ham!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Posting from my ancestral home in Alden, NY, and wishing everyone a very Merry Christmas!

5632. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 03:58:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c27fa6e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28529

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:9DrV7.194782$WW.11285611@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Dick Carroll wrote
>
> > What a maroon.
>
> Ah, Carroll, That is a racist statement. Do you know what a maroon is????
>
> Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a moron is
> someone who doesn't know what a maroon is. Steve the LPN called me that
> once. So, I have to think it is a trait of self-rightious pro-coders. ;-)
>
> > What Kim has done is to eagerly join the mass of *other*
> > morons on 3950, 14313 etc without ever placing a signal on the air or
> uttering
> > a syllable. Her callsign has already said it all.
>
> Wrong, Carol, her call sign has absolutely nothing to do with the idiots
on
> 3950 and 14313. Try to come up with an argument that's, at least,
plausable.
>
> Rich
>

Thing is...no one's been able to do that yet (give a plausible argument). ;)

Merry Christmas, W5TIT

5633. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:08:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c27fc9c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28531

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C269932.EDC9FF8C@townsqr.com...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > K0HB wrote:
> > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> >
> > How many times?
>
> As many times as it takes to convince her and you.
>

Ever hear the phrase "falling on deaf ears"?

Kim W5TIT

5634. Re: PROOF that we are all BARKING MAD! CBERS.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:10:41 UTC
From: Reg Edwards <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <a08u81$9nk$1@helle.btinternet.com>
Source record: 28530
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Dear Radiosam,

An amendment :

Place a full stop after "Mad" and delete "Cb-ers".

Merry Xmas.

Reg.

5635. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:11:13 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c27fd56_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28532

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:BF9A4B9886B5806C.A8505456F572616C.8D597DE35B7791BE@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 21:57:47 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Naw Rick, that simply doesn't wash. Kim's own comments directed at
> >those who object to her choice show her to be giving at least as much as
> >she gets. There isn't a time limit on quantity limit on First Amendment
> >rights. This is a plain old electonic bulletin board. I'm free to post
> >here numerous times daily.
>
> Only if your ISP agreement states that. The First Amendment
> (or any OTHER Constitutional protection) does NOT apply to the private
> sector (which your access to the Inet is), only to those areas
> governed by the federal government.
>
> >I'm offended by her call. I don't need to produce a potential ham.
> >We have several others here who are offended.
>
> You have stated your perspective. That's reasonable. But
> continuing to do so isn't a question of voicing opinion, it's one of
> harassing someone.
>
> >> Mine are quite consistent--and so are Cecil's for that matter.
> >
> >At last reading, you guys couldn't even agree on what makes a
> >libertarian.
>
> No--we disagree on Libertarian party philosophy. We agree on
> what a "libertarian" is--we simply don't agree on what a party which
> identifies itself as "Libertarian" should have as a platform. That's
> no more the same thing than stating you believe in democratic
> principles means you have to agree with the Democratic Party platform.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>

> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Aw, that's OK, Rick. Dave H., Larry R., Dick C., etc., all are nothing more than armchair nitwits. They get to run their own personal little crusade on a newsgroup. I don't think I've ever heard of one protest by any of them on the air with any of the other "distasteful" sets they've each spoken of at one time or another. I'm an easy target for them...and they enjoy it.

At least I have them off the back of someone else. It's cute how they feel so connected to the ARS. Or, should I say, use the ARS as such an excuse?

Kim W5TIT

5636. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:19:21 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c27ff3e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28533

"James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:gsce2ukpsvamtl7vq32rttmgpmktkk47j4@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 23:20:48 -0600, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> wrote:
>
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM wrote:
> >>
> >> > K0HB wrote:
> >> > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> >> >
> >> > How many times?
> >>
> >> As many times as it takes to convince her and you.
> >
> >I will never be convinced. Kim will probably never be
> >convinced. W5TIT is a valid callsign issued by the FCC.
> >Would the FCC issue a trashy callsign? If so, it's the
> >FCC's fault. Webster's even proves that W5TIT is not
> >trashy. "trashy - inferior in quality; useless or
> >worthless" Kim's callsign is worth as much as any
> >other callsign.
> If you all are going to continue to pick on Kim for picking
> W5TIT, why don't you pick on Larry Bowling, W4TIT?
> You do realize that there are other people out here that
> have callsigns with the letters "TIT" in them, but I guess
> you already know that, right.
>
> Regards,
>
> James
>
> Note: To reply by email, remove the "X" in the reply to address.

Wow! Maybe someday we could have the TIT club. Ooops, never mind...LOL

Kim W5TIT

5637. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:24:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c280087_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28534

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2756DB.32A0F26A@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws.
> > > > >
> > > > > If you think I've exceeded the limit of time I'm allowed to say
> > > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign.", take me to court.
> > > >
> > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign." ...
> > > >
> > > "harass - to trouble by repeated attacks"
> > >
> > > Work on being able to apply those definitions.
> >
> > OK, Kim is being repeatedly attacked on this newsgroup for her choice
> > of a callsign legally issued by the FCC. That's harassment and you
> > are violating the contract you signed with your ISP.
>
> You are a silly old man, Cecil.
>
> Kim is being chided, occasionally insulted and often undergoes derision
> for her *choice* of callsign.
>

I have? Doesn't one need to "feel" these things in order for them to be
assessed in such a manner? I have never felt chided, have never felt
insulted. And, I surely feel no derision whatsoever. On the other hand,
Dave, I believe you are beginning to become as deluded as Larry. He also
believes I am somehow affected as such by his opinion of my callsign.

Maybe the two of you could pat each other on the back.

Kim W5TIT

5638. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:28:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c280177_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28535

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2759CB.48DB8F4C@earthlink.net...
> James R. DeLoach wrote:
> >
> > On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 03:17:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >CAM wrote:
> > >>
> > >> Dave Heil wrote:
> > >> > I'm content to draw attention to the FCC's about face. In the
past, the
> > >> > Commission would not and did not issue such calls.
> > >>
> > >> Aha, so the FCC is to blame. That's what I have been saying all
along.
> > >> It is the FCC's responsibility to recall Kim's callsign if necessary.
> > >> Otherwise, the FCC has given its tacit approval and sided with Kim
> > >> against you and your United Uppity Prudes of the ARS.
> > >
> > >The FCC did not choose Kim's callsign. Kim did that and she did it
> > >deliberately to get the *nudge*, *wink* reaction.
> > >
> > >Is it your opinion that anyone with a sense of propriety is an uppity
> > >prude?
> > >
> > >Dave K8MN
> > Why do you continue to badger Kim for her callsign, W5TIT?
> > If you dislike that callsign so much, why don't you pick on all the
> > other hams that have callsigns with the letters, "TIT". With very
> > little effort on your part you could locate them. Why not pick on
> > Larry Bowling, W4TIT or is it because he is a man and Kim is a
> > woman?
>
> This is your second attempt to introduce sexism into the mix, James.
> Larry W4TIT does not post here. Perhaps you can convince him to show
> up. He would certainly be the recipient of my feelings toward his
> choice of calls. The fact is that Kim does post here and has explained
> why *nudge* *wink* she chose her particular call. She also e-mailed
> Riley Hollingsworth expecting a blanket endorsement of her choice.
> She did not receive it, hence the title of this thread.
>

Dave, you really need to change your story--as it is your flawed story. If you are stupid enough to think that anyone such as Riley Hollingsworth would, for one minute, endorse a racey callsign, then your more stupid than I thought. I have more intelligence than to think Riley would ever *endorse* something such as my callsign. I don't think there's a person around of any official nature, out of the FCC or even the ARRL who *would* endorse a callsign like mine. Get real, would you?

Kim W5TIT

5639. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:29:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28019d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28536

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C275AF6.7DB720E5@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C250386.413BAF74@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Not really, Kim. I don't believe that you have any concept of what is
> > > appropriate. I don't know how many think it is "OK". You've received
a
> > > few statements of support here. You've also heard from a number who
> > > believe that you've shown a lack of class.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Uh, Dave. I would refrain from joining your class. So to lack any of
it is
> > quite an achievement for me. You represent many of things I dislike in
> > people. I represent many of the things you dislike in people. You have
to
> > *look* for support in far corners for your "argument" while I pretty
much
> > have no argument at all. My callsign is great. No one else *has* to
like
> > it, approve of it, or bless it. That's what's so great about the world.
>
> What is? Your lack of decorum?
>
> Dave K8MN

That, and your overindulgence.

Kim W5TIT

5640. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:34:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2802cb$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28537

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C275D4A.BB14655B@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C25044C.4766B089@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > What's with this "silver spoon" stuff, Kim? This is perhaps the third
> > > or fourth time you've used it with me? What has it to do with my
> > > comment? Did you or did you not receive the positive response you
> > > sought from Riley?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave, to have received any response at all from Riley was positive. But
> > *you* refuse to understand that. I cannot beat you over the head with
the
> > statements that a) I appreciate that Riley responded to my query, b) I
> > wholeheartedly accept everything Riley had to say but *do not* agree
with
> > him that my callsign brings the ARS one step closer to extinction, c) I
> > don't believe Riley was speaking official FCC line--there is no way he
could
> > have, d) I *do* believe (because I know me so well) that the reason I
sent
> > the note to Riley was to ask him a question as an official of the FCC on
> > what he *believed* the policy should be coming from a government
> > organization.
> >
> > Now, for you to insist that I think anything else about or from Riley,
is
> > just your ignorant silver spoon flaring at you in your face. Get a
life,
> > Dave.
>
> Again, you fail to explain the silver spoon stuff, Kim. You use it but
> don't attempt to explain what it is that you mean by it. It begins to
> sound even more peculiar when you write something like "ignorant silver
> spoon".
>
> Your response from Riley was no better than 50/50. The fact that you
> disagree with him (and thus reject the portion of the response)
> regarding his statement about your helping to bring the amateur service
> "one step closer to extinction" shows that you lack any understanding of
```

> the sensitivities of others who might be offended by your choice.
>

And, I'll ask you again, Dave, the question that you nor others like you ever seem to quite answer. In fact, you all avoid it like the plague. *WHY* should one such as me change *my* ways for one such as you? *WHAT* makes your desire for me to change more important that my desire not to? *WHO* made it your world to force (or even request) that others change the way they are for you? *WHEN* did the laws of human nature change such that you've become more superior to me and therefore have more rights than me? *WHERE* do you get off pushing such crap on others?

Not that I ever would, but how 'bout if I request that you come out and get a little nasty for me?

Kim W5TIT

5641. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:35:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2802fb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28538

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C275118.B3034263@townsqr.com...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > I know it is how you'd describe it. That's how you DID describe
it.
> > > > > The only difficulty I have with it is that it simply isn't true.
> > > >
> > > > What you are doing is harassment, pure and simple. How many times
> > > > can you ring a doorbell before someone calls the cops?
> > >
> > > I hate to keep repeating myself, but you really ARE an idiot. No one
> > > forces her to read anything posted here.
> >
> > Be that as it may, what you guys are doing meets the definition of
> > harassment and no doubt violates the rules and standards of your ISPs.
>
> >
>
> As asways you make rules on the fly to suit your Agenda du jour.
>

Yeah, Dave does have a tendency toward that du jour stuff.

Kim W5TIT

5642. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:42:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2804a5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28540

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C276135.E977741B@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C250511.92F4443@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > ho ho ho....ya found a silver lining in your train of thinking, did
ya?
> > > > You're hilarious. WHY would I change my callsign just because
someone
> > > > doesn't like it, or thinks it's baaaaaaaaddddddd for the ARS?
> > >
> > > Because it is the right thing to do.
> > >
> >
> > That would be *your* definition of right, Dave. Not mine. What makes
your
> > kind of people think they have the final say over my kind of people?
>
> "My" kind of people don't choose callsigns which could be construed to
> be anything other than callsigns. "Your" kind of people choose
> callsigns which can offend others and which are deliberately chosen for
> maximum effect.
>

OK, Dave. *You* are offensive to me. Now, what the Hell are you going to
do about it? :o

>
> "My" kind of people would admit it if they'd done
> something stupid and would take steps to rectify it.
>

And, I would too.

>
> "Your" kind of
> people bray about their "rights" to the world. They are, in some
> manner, pleased to thumb their noses at the world.
>

And, so what? How many people have successfully thumb their noses at the
world and made our lives better for it? Do you live by some kind of book,
never ever reaching for the stars, or stepping outside the box, Dave?

>
> > > > > She also perceives someone as an "elitist" when that person
recognizes
> > > > > tacky as tacky.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > You are an elitist, Dave. A highly crappy one, but one
nevertheless.
> > >
> > > Why would that be the case? Is it because I didn't choose a tacky
> > > callsign? Is it because I've stated that I find your choice of calls
is
> > > tacky and lacking in judgement?
> > >
> >
> > I consider you an elitist for the reason stated above. You think I
should
> > change my callsign because *you* think it is the right thing to do. I
don't
> > request that you get a callsign that complies with *my* idea of
callsigns,
> > do I? Never would.
>
>
> What part of the makeup of my callsign offends the sensibilities of
> anyone, Kim?
>

I am an anyone, Dave. And your bland, lifeless, simpleton callsign offends
me to no end.

>
> > I am quite comfortable with however you want to think,
> > *until* you believe the rest of the world (meaning all people) should
comply
> > with how *you* think the world should be. That's either a communist or
an
> > elitist. Take your pick.
>
> It is? You mean that anyone who tells you that they believe your call,
> deliberately chosen for maximum effect, takes the amateur radio service
> a step closer to extinction is either a communist or an elitist?
> That doesn't sound rational.
>

It's about as rational as your beliefs, Dave.

>
> > > I've always wondered: Is Kim short for Kimodo?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN

> >
> > If the callsign W5TIT stands for sex in your mind, then Kim can be
anything
> > you want it to be, Dave. There is no miracle in what you are going to
> > think.
>
> Your call doesn't stand for sex, Kim. It stands for tacky. It stands
> for the lowest common denominator. It stands for thumbing your nose at
> what society generally finds acceptable. It stands for lounge lizard
> humor.
>
> Dave K8MN

My callsign means to you, Dave, whatever *you* want it to mean to you. I am not responsible for making you see the fun and humor in my callsign, the beauty and usefulness of tits, nor for any of the negativity you make it. You are responsible for your own actions, Dave, and can't blame me for your apparently filthy mind.

I wonder how much it's going to cost you to cover all the beautiful nude art in the world. You think *any* of those artists ever grinned just a little?

Kim W5TIT

5643. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:43:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2804d1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28541

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2761A1.9C3109F7@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C25074D.9742EA0B@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
> > > determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
> > > Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
> > > freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the
events
> > > which have unfolded over the past several months.
> > >
> > > Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > No, and neither are yours, Dave. The government, by virtue of allowing
my
> > callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in a manner
> > directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You, not me,
have
> > exceeded the limits of your rights.
>
> Please tell me what the limit is on stating my belief that your call is
> tacky.
>
> Dave K8MN

You can say it all you want. To demand change of me, for you, exceeds the
limits.

Kim W5TIT

5644. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:43:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c280503$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28542

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2762A0.8F7704D2@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2554A9.4CB2E346@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > I also amused at Kim's idea that Larry and I should leave amateur
radio
> > > because she chooses to be vulgar and a part of ham radio.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I bet you're not as amused as I am over the fact that you and Larry, et
al,
> > think my callsign is vulgar.
>
> I think more than your callsign is vulgar, Kim. Your piece about what
> you'd like to say to some woman at a social function was especially
> enlightening. Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.
>
> Dave K8MN

Oh? I now need and have your blessing for my actions? You *are* becoming
as delusional as Larry.

Kim W5TIT

5645. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:44:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c280532$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28543

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C276321.642AB693@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C261489.D79E42B7@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > There's plenty wrong with Kim's lack of class in choosing a
> > deliberately
> > > > > vulgar call.
> > > >
> > > > That's your personal delusional opinion, Dave, and you are sticking
to
> > > > it. If the FCC thought there was anything wrong with Kim's callsign,
> > > > they shouldn't have issued it. Thus, you have sided with Queen
Victoria,
> > > > a sad throwback to days long passed.
> > >
> > > Naw, I've sided with decency, good judgement and good taste. My views
> > > are personal but not delusional at all.
> > >
> > > You are right about one thing. The FCC shouldn't have issued Kim's
> > > call.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Then, take your argument to the FCC, Dave. Get them to make an official
> > policy more in line with your views.
>
> You know, that's not really such a bad idea, Kim, though I think the
> Commission dances better when congressmen and senators whistle a tune.
>
> Dave K8MN

You want me to look your reps names up? Maybe you can run for office
yourself.

Kim W5TIT

5646. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:46:17 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28058e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28544

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C276012.3DA14352@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
>
> >. The government, by virtue of allowing my
>
> > callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in a manner
> > directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You, not me,
have
> > exceeded the limits of your rights.
>
> So where is it stated that the government has a responsibility to
protect you
> from your ignorance? If you do sonething dumb you can't expect the
government
> to protect you from the consequences, to include ridicule from others.
>
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>

Where do I need protection, Dick? And, I have never been ridiculed for my
callsign. Sorry to burst your bubble.

Kim W5TIT

5647. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:47:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2805d4$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28545

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C27816D.51991201@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > If the callsign W5TIT stands for sex in your mind, then Kim can be
anything
> > you want it to be, Dave. There is no miracle in what you are going to
> > think.
>
> Do you think Dave goes down the telephone book harassing everyone whose
> initials are TIT? :-)
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>

You might have just given Dave another idea, Cecil :o

Kim W5TIT

5648. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:48:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C27F804.3B18C985@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28539

Dave Heil wrote:

> Since you aren't the alleged injured party or a member of this new class
> of victim you've invented, perhaps you'd agree to counsel the holder of
> the tacky callsign as to how she should proceed.

I'd bet he already has. He can't keep away from making things up. It's compulsive with him.

5649. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:48:32 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c280614$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28546

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C27852D.2B6D0DAA@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.
>
> It is you who is thumbing your nose at the world, Dave.
> Come down from your ivory tower, join the world, and
> enjoy life instead of being such an elitist grinch.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>

He'd need to pull the silver spoon out of his...er...well, you get the idea.

Kim W5TIT

5650. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 04:58:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C27FA6D.82318E0D@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28547

Bert Craig wrote:

> Hi everybody,
>
> I just wanted to take a moment to thank a few of the folks on r.r.a.p. for all
> the help they gave me with my license upgrade. >snip<

Way to go, Bert! You're the sort of guy who would do it in any era. Again,
contrats.

Dick

5651. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 05:01:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C27FB0C.21E37B52@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28548

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You're just attempting to stifle my First Amendment rights.
>
> Pray tell, how would I go about doing that? Unlike you, I
> am not omnipotent.
>
> > You are badgering me and harassing me. You may find yourself
> > in trouble with your ISP for such behavior.
>
> Badgering a harasser is self defense, not harassing.

So you arbritrarily declare Dave to be a harrasser so that you can get a pass at harrassing him. We got it.

5652. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 05:11:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C280A88.B3FD8193@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28550

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> However, perhaps by posting here in the future,
> and explaining to people that they can pass a code test like a Ferrari passing
> a Yugo in second gear, then you can take ham radio one step further from
> extinction.

Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed the
5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what response?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5653. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 05:14:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C27FE15.15FF1732@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28549

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
> news:9DrV7.194782$WW.11285611@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Dick Carroll wrote
> >
> > > What a maroon.
> >
> > Ah, Carroll, That is a racist statement. Do you know what a maroon is????
> >
> > Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a moron is
> > someone who doesn't know what a maroon is. Steve the LPN called me that
> > once. So, I have to think it is a trait of self-rightious pro-coders. ;-)
> >
> > > What Kim has done is to eagerly join the mass of *other*
> > > morons on 3950, 14313 etc without ever placing a signal on the air or
> > uttering
> > > a syllable. Her callsign has already said it all.
> >
> > Wrong, Carol, her call sign has absolutely nothing to do with the idiots
> on
> > 3950 and 14313. Try to come up with an argument that's, at least,
> plausable.
> >
> > Rich
> >
>
> Thing is...no one's been able to do that yet (give a plausible argument). ;)

So why don't you send Riley Hollingsworth another email and ask him how he considers your callsign choice as compared to the other vulgarity used on the air. Let us know what his answer is this time, too.

5654. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 13:33:07 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ne%V7.197048$WW.11421177@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28651

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C280A88.B3FD8193@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > However, perhaps by posting here in the future,
> > and explaining to people that they can pass a code test like a Ferrari
passing
> > a Yugo in second gear, then you can take ham radio one step further
from
> > extinction.
>
> Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed
the
> 5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what
response?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

As the old C&W song, complete with a fiddle in the band for Texans, puts
it:

If you don't know I ain't a gonna tell you

5655. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 13:34:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28806A.FB97F97E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28652

Rick Adams wrote:

> I don't advocate reporting anyone to an isp for something of
> this nature (threats and spam yes, but not something like this). On
> the other hand, the holier-than-thou group certainly feel that Kim has
> no business doing something "inappropriate" and thus have an
> obligation of their own to keep their word (as customers of an isp
> everyone here agreed to adhere to the TOS/COU of the isp) and not
> violate the terms of their contracts. If they do so knowingly, it
> simply proves to anyone reading it that they are unwilling to
> demonstrate honest, moral, and ethical behavior, and thus have no
> legitimacy in judging the "moral" choices of others.

You are perhaps the ultimate hypocrite, Rick. You set yourself up as judge of what constitutes harassment and as definer of TOS/COU violations based only upon YOUR interpretations. You decry those who would judge another's actions based on morality yet set yourself up to decide who is honest, moral and ethical. Pretty pathetic stuff.

I'll let you know when Earthlink advises me that I've violated our agreement.

Dave K8MN

5656. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 13:44:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2882B9.61DAB8BF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28653

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 11:23:03 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Feel free to attempt to make an issue with it to Earthlink. See if they
> >share your views.
>
> I don't need to ask them, Dave, the answer is very clearly
> defined in the TOU/COS you agreed to (which is available to you on the
> Earthlink home site). I no more need to "prove" that to you than I
> need to "prove" that it is illegal for you to transmit LSB on
> 10.125MHz--in both cases the rule is clearly spelled out in a readily
> available location.

There is only a violation based upon your own interpretation of what
Earthlink says so your argument holds no water. You don't need to prove
that I post in violation of Earthlink's policies. You aren't a factor
at all. Earthlink will let me know if they believe my posts violate
their policies. So far they've not done so. There is no indication
that they think my commenting Kim's lack of class in choosing a tacky
callsign is a problem.

> >> You have stated your perspective. That's reasonable. But
> >> continuing to do so isn't a question of voicing opinion, it's one of
> >> harassing someone.
> >
> >That's simply not true. If your statement was correct, your continued
> >posting of information to the effect that I am harrassing Kim would have
> >to be viewed as harrassment. After all, you've already stated your
> >perspective.
>
> No problem at all, Dave. While I might argue that defending
> against harassment is unlikely to be _viewed_ as harassment, it isn't
> really relevant since I don't obtain my news feed from an isp. My news
> feed comes from Airnews (Internet America) and my postings are subject
> to THEIR rules, not the TOU/COS in force at voyager.net where I
> receive some of my email (I also run my own servers on the three
> registered domains I maintain). According to Airnews own TOU/COS I am
> NOT in violation of my agreements, and thus unlike yourself, I'm not
> breaking my word by my posts here.

That wouldn't matter, Rick. You'd still be harassing me whether you
violated TOU/COS with anyone you deal with. As to your "defending
against harassment"--Phhhhfffffffftttttttt! What a load of blarney!

> >> No--we disagree on Libertarian party philosophy. We agree on
> >> what a "libertarian" is--we simply don't agree on what a party which
> >> identifies itself as "Libertarian" should have as a platform. That's
> >> no more the same thing than stating you believe in democratic
> >> principles means you have to agree with the Democratic Party platform.
> >
> >You started out disagreeing on Libertarian Party philosophy. Things
> >went down hill from there.
>
> We ended up debating an area of Libertarian Party policy that
> we have very different views on--that of social support for the sick
> and poor. That, however, has nothing to do with libertarian
> philosophy, which limits itself to directly addressing the issues of
> rights and freedoms--and in that area, Cecil and I agree on most
> points and can agree to disagree on the few where we differ.

Forgive me, Rick. I didn't know that you and Cecil had come to such an agreement. It must have been done privately as it was not evident in posts to the newsgroup.

Dave K8MN

5657. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 13:45:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C288304.2F63B5B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28654

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > A comedian is only funny if the audience laughs. Kim falls short.
>
> Given the choice between your brand of misery and Kim's brand of
> humor, guess who gets my vote?

Who said you get a vote on what I find funny?

Dave K8MN

5658. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 13:51:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28845C.7EFC91B9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28655

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Earthlink has not contacted me about my alleged violations--probably
> > because Kim is not a victim of harrassment.
>
> Probably because Kim is a nice person and doesn't want to get
> you into trouble.

Silly me! Of course that is it. It couldn't be that the folks at Earthlink think guys like you and Rick cling to absurd ideas. They mustn't care much that I believe Kim's choice of vanity call is lacking in decorum.

Dave K8MN

5659. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 13:59:41 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <hD%V7.372$Tk6.107307@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

: > : they have treated me as inferior in what associations I have had
: > : with them. Again, if it comes to knowledge about their area of
: > : specialization, then they are certainly more valuable as sources
: > : of information. But put a physical education professor in with a
: > : group of physicists, and the physical ed professor is going to
: > : feel inadequate and out of place.
:
: > What kind of sheltered life do you live?
:
: As far as I know, it is a rather normal life. But I don't live in
: a crowded megacity either.
:
: > Have you been on an modern university in
: > the last 20 years? It is not just their specialization,
: > it is that they see themselves as the elite of
: > society.
:
: Yes, as a matter of fact, I have. I occasionally take continuing
: ed classes.
:
: > Same with doctors. Ask nurses how doctors
: > act like tin gods.
:
: I guess it depends on where you live. You have your perceptions
: and I have mine. I would not tolerate a doctor who was a "tin god".
:
: > There are a good deal of elitism out there.
: > For whatever reason. The Marines teach
: > it. So do the police academies.
:
: The police/Marines/doctors/professors etc ARE the elite, when it
: comes to their areas of expertise. Outside that, they are no better
: or worse than anyone else.

There is the problem. Because they are elite
in their fields, they do transfer that attitude to
every other aspect of society. Because they
are competent, they tend that no one else is.
And if they do not know how to do it, then
no one else should be able to do so either.
(Thus the desire to ban technology such as
guns or radios).

5660. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 14:03:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225090336.10613.00000798@mb-cc.aol.com>
Source record: 28656

>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 12/24/2001 3:43 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112242140370.1871-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>

>So a criminal conviction for violation of the Communications Act is not
>sufficient reason?

The purpose and intent of our criminal justice system is to punish a person
for non-compliance, allegedly rehabilitate them, then return them to society...

NOT keep on punishing them again and again and again.

>He has already proven that he cannot follow the rules. An
>amateur radio license is a privilege, not a right.

You are absolutely right...he did not follow some rules (laws)...However
NONE of the rules he violated were in Part 97.

Why is the FCC violating the Constitutional guarantees against punishment
without due process?

P et V

Steve, K4YZ

5661. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 14:23:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C288BE3.82B1D724@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28658

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 04:18:58 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >With all due respect Rick this is why killfiles were invented. If
> >harassment it be as opposed to two people making prime fools of themselves
> >it is easily cured.
>
> In most cases I would agree. While I don't use kill files,
> neither am I bothered by people flaming me--I'm only offended when
> they aren't good enough at the task to make the flame war fun.
>
> On the other hand, this thread was specifically created--and
> Larry Roll has stated more than once that it will CONTINUE to
> exist--for the sole purpose of attempting to intimidate Kim into
> changing her call sign. In that case, a kill file isn't an acceptable
> solution since she would have to kill file people who may otherwise
> have something of relevance to amateur radio, and who she would no
> longer be able to read. More, the thread about HER would continue
> without her even having the chance to respond to new insults or lies
> about her. Clearly, that's not an acceptable resolution in this case
> as it would be if, for example, the argument were over code testing or
> some other non-personal issue.
>
> >If my experience is indicative, getting kicked off Earthlink would be a
> >favor -- kind of like throwing Brer Rabbit into the briar patch.
>
> Now THERE we agree! Earthlink is like aol for the learning
> disabled (sort of like msn, but better email access). On the other
> hand, it isn't the loss of the account that would be relevant--it's
> the fact that people who are adamant about "ethics" and "morality" are
> willing to deliberately break their words to their isps by violating
> the terms of their agreements. To me, that tells everyone a great deal
> about their so-called morality and makes their claim that they have
> the "moral high ground" when it comes to Kim's choice of her call sign
> just a bit ludicrous.

Earthlink is like internet access since that is what it is. Some use
Earthlink's software, others don't. Your condesending attitude duly
noted.

What is a bit ludicrous--no, make that extremely ludicrous is your claim
that one stating his opinion in a non-threatening manner is guilty of
harassment of another based upon your personal (and obviously skewed)

interpretation of an ISPs terms of service.

Dave K8MN

5662. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 14:43:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C289053.64B8946B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28659

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 11:30:58 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >That is simply your interpretation. If you feel strongly, make an issue
> >of it with Earthlink.
>
> I'm not interested in making it into an issue, Dave. Only in
> pointing out your own lack of morality and ethics in deliberately
> violating the agreement you made when you signed up for Earthlink
> services. If you profess to be credible in claiming Kim's call sign is
> inappropriate, then it follows that the readers have a right to know
> what your OWN ethics and morality are like, so they can decide whether
> you are worth listening to or not.
>
> Clearly you are not.

Clearly, you aren't in command of your faculties if you are basing your absurd claims in your own interpretation of actions. Your skew to the left is evident.

> >Your idiotic claim (as if capital letters make something true) that it
> >is "CLEARLY" harrassment is absurd on its face. That you would attempt
> >to stifle another's First Amendment rights shows us that your
> >committment to libertarianism is only thin veneer.
>
> I really wish that at least a FEW of the people who toss out
> "First Amendment" or "Constitution" in support of their actions would
> READ them first!
>
> The Constitution of the United States applies ONLY to actions
> governed by the federal government. It does NOT limit restrictions
> that may be place by the private sector. For example, if you choose to
> stand on a soapbox (in a place where gatherings are legally permitted,
> and on public land, of course) and preach hatred for Islamic people,
> you may be regarded as a fool but unless you are actually calling for
> violence or riot (legally: hate speech), you are totally legal doing
> so and will suffer no sanctions as a result. On the other hand, if you
> do precisely the same thing in the employee lounge at your place of
> work, your employer is well within his or her rights to terminate you
> on the spot.

Do your research, Rick. You haven't proven anything at all by your speculative claims. Kim isn't a victim of anything other than her own

poor judgement. Your efforts to paint her a victim make you look silly
and Kim look even more silly than she already looks.

> By choosing Earthlink as your isp, you agreed to be bound to
> their conditions of service and terms of usage--and your behavior in
> this newsgroup is a direct violation of that agreement. It's
> irrelevant if you could legally be prosecuted for harassment or not,
> the fact remains that you gave your word NOT to violate those terms
> and are now doing so.

When you become Mr. Earthlink and decide that I've violated my TOS, get
back with me. Until that time, your silliness is simply a
misinterpretation by an individual not involved in any agreement between
me and my ISP.

> By the way, before you accuse me of doing the same thing,
> Dave, take a look at the TOU/COS on airnews and on altopia (the two
> news services I use) and you will discover that the agreements are NOT
> the same as that for your isp--and I am NOT in violation of either
> one. Unlike you, I keep my word.

I haven't accused you nor do I intend to. I don't want to look like the
fool you've made of yourself.

> >> All true. NONE of those locations are private in nature, and
> >> therefore are subject to the protections of the First Amendment. On
> >> the other hand, if you choose to stand on a street corner stating that
> >> someone is immoral and has no self-respect (as you have done with
> >> Kim), then by necessity you leave yourself open to defamation of
> >> character suits--the "protection" against abuse of your First
> >> Amendment rights.
> >
> >Excuse me? At which point did I state that Kim is immoral. Lacking
> >taste in obtaining a trashy callsign is not the same as accusing one of
> >being immoral. Get a life, Rick.
>
> The concept of "trashy" is synonymous with lacking in morals
> and we both know it. If you're going to debate words at least use them
> correctly.

Am I getting this message on word useage from a guy who can't even
interpret TOS with an ISP without inserting his skewed social bias?
You're on the road to replacing Cecil as a guy who can't be taken
seriously.

> >No one receives immunity from insults, Rick. You yourself have often
> >handed out insults which go well beyond expressing an opinion. You are
> >stuck with a few empty claims.
>
> I never claimed I _didn't_ insult anyone here--although if
> you'll look at my posts, I've never been the first to use a direct
> insult with someone. Once I'm told I'm an idiot, a fool, or any of the

> other accusations that have greeted some of my posts I feel perfectly
> comfortable responding in kind.

I'll have to check out your claim. I could swear that you've been first any number of times, not that it really matter. We're not really discussing whether you've insulted folks but that no person is granted immunity from being insulted.

> On the other hand, my actions aren't the ones at issue here.
> Nothing I've posted to this group is in any way in violation of my
> agreements with my service providers, and none of it is in any way
> harassing (I respond to other's posts, I don't originate them--and
> unlike Larry Roll, I have NOT stated that the thread won't be allowed
> to die until someone changes their behavior to conform to my desires).

Gee, if that's how your logic works, then I'm not guilty of anything. With only a couple of exceptions, I've not begun threads, I've simply responded to the posts of others. You have yet to prove that anyone is in violation of ISP terms of service. You're simply babbling based on your own silly interpretations of what makes up harassment. Your actions here as a claimant to the throne of "newsgroup morality monitor" are certainly at issue. Why should anyone accept your interpretations of terms of service violations at face value?

> The issue here is the discussion of Kim's call sign (not the call sign
> itself, the discussion of it). And the relevant concerns are the
> veracity and legitimacy of those who feel that call sign is
> inappropriate. Clearly, if the people who are arguing against it can
> be shown to be dishonest themselves (as is the case with your
> violation of the agreements you made with Earthlink) then their
> statements have to be viewed as originating with known liars and
> evaluated on that basis alone.

It would be so simple if we'd just agree to your views of what constitutes harassment and what constitutes violations of terms of service with various ISPs. Since I don't agree with you, that makes your litany just so much background buzz. You'd like to make an issue of my honesty and morality but you have no ammunition. What is a body to do?

Dave K8MN

5663. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 14:49:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C289206.D0CE47C6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28660

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C269932.EDC9FF8C@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> > >
> > > How many times?
> >
> > As many times as it takes to convince her and you.
> >
>
> Ever hear the phrase "falling on deaf ears"?

While I've long suspected that you are incapable of telling the
difference between right and wrong, good taste and poor taste and poetry
compared to Rod McKuen, I've always had hope that you could be persuaded
that you've done something rather stupid.

I maintain that hope.

Dave K8MN

5664. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 15:04:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28958B.5F6B0750@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28661

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> Aw, that's OK, Rick. Dave H., Larry R., Dick C., etc., all are
> nothing more than armchair nitwits.
> They get to run their own personal little crusade on
> a newsgroup. I don't think I've ever heard of one protest by any of them on
> the air with any of the other "distasteful" sets they've each spoken of at
> one time or another. I'm an easy target for them...and they enjoy it.

You'd have a hard time listening for an on-air discussion by any of us
if you are only listening to a couple of 2m FM repeaters in Texas. You
probably have only to listen the folks you've honked off down there as a
result of the clashes you've previously revealed with hams down your
way.

> At least I have them off the back of someone else. It's cute how they > feel so connected to the ARS. Or, should I say, use the ARS as such an excuse?

You should say that if it is what you really meant. Maybe it is your
own masochistic desire to be used as a newsgroup punching bag which
brought you to begin posting your material about your clashes with
League officials in your area, your reasoning in choosing a tacky vanity
call, your "what I'd like to say to some woman at a social function" and
the like.

Dave K8MN

5665. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 15:09:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2896C8.159D318@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28662

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2756DB.32A0F26A@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > > > > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > If you think I've exceeded the limit of time I'm allowed to say
> > > > > > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign.", take me to court.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign." ...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "harass - to trouble by repeated attacks"
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Work on being able to apply those definitions.
> > > > >
> > > > > OK, Kim is being repeatedly attacked on this newsgroup for her choice
> > > > > of a callsign legally issued by the FCC. That's harassment and you
> > > > > are violating the contract you signed with your ISP.
> > >
> > > You are a silly old man, Cecil.
> > >
> > > Kim is being chided, occasionally insulted and often undergoes derision
> > > for her *choice* of callsign.
> > >
>
> I have? Doesn't one need to "feel" these things in order for them to be
> assessed in such a manner? I have never felt chided, have never felt
> insulted. And, I surely feel no derision whatsoever. On the other hand,
> Dave, I believe you are beginning to become as deluded as Larry. He also
> believes I am somehow affected as such by his opinion of my callsign.
>
```

> Maybe the two of you could pat each other on the back.

Wow--quite an admission, Kim! There goes the great Cecil and Rick harassment theory. I don't hold with the notion that you'd have to feel chided, insulted or derided. I'd think you'd have to be able to tell the difference between what is right and wrong, what is proper and improper, what is socially acceptable and socially unacceptable for those feelings to take effect. Yet you are somehow "affected" since you'd likely not respond to posts concerning the issue unless some emotion bubbled to the surface.

Dave K8MN

5666. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 15:14:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2897CD.E53C98D2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28663

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2759CB.48DB8F4C@earthlink.net...
> > James R. DeLoach wrote:
> > >
> > > On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 03:17:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >CAM wrote:
> > > >>
> > > >> Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >> > I'm content to draw attention to the FCC's about face. In the
> past, the
> > > >> > Commission would not and did not issue such calls.
> > > >>
> > > >> Aha, so the FCC is to blame. That's what I have been saying all
> along.
> > > >> It is the FCC's responsibility to recall Kim's callsign if necessary.
> > > >> Otherwise, the FCC has given its tacit approval and sided with Kim
> > > >> against you and your United Uppity Prudes of the ARS.
> > > >
> > > >The FCC did not choose Kim's callsign. Kim did that and she did it
> > > >deliberately to get the *nudge*, *wink* reaction.
> > > >
> > > >Is it your opinion that anyone with a sense of propriety is an uppity
> > > >prude?
> > > >
> > > >Dave K8MN
> > > Why do you continue to badger Kim for her callsign, W5TIT?
> > > If you dislike that callsign so much, why don't you pick on all the
> > > other hams that have callsigns with the letters, "TIT". With very
> > > little effort on your part you could locate them. Why not pick on
> > > Larry Bowling, W4TIT or is it because he is a man and Kim is a
> > > woman?
> >
> > This is your second attempt to introduce sexism into the mix, James.
> > Larry W4TIT does not post here. Perhaps you can convince him to show
> > up. He would certainly be the recipient of my feelings toward his
> > choice of calls. The fact is that Kim does post here and has explained
> > why *nudge* *wink* she chose her particular call. She also e-mailed
> > Riley Hollingsworth expecting a blanket endorsement of her choice.
> > She did not receive it, hence the title of this thread.
> >

>
> Dave, you really need to change your story--as it is your flawed story. If
> you are stupid enough to think that anyone such as Riley Hollingsworth
> would, for one minute, endorse a racey callsign, then your more stupid than
> I thought. I have more intelligence than to think Riley would ever
> *endorse* something such as my callsign. I don't think there's a person
> around of any official nature, out of the FCC or even the ARRL who *would*
> endorse a callsign like mine. Get real, would you?

I'm fine with reality, Kim. I already knew that no one at the FCC or
the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls. So you've come to
think of your call as "racey", have you?

Dave K8MN

5667. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 15:24:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C289A48.3E39B90C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28664

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C275D4A.BB14655B@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C25044C.4766B089@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > What's with this "silver spoon" stuff, Kim? This is perhaps the third
> > > > or fourth time you've used it with me? What has it to do with my
> > > > comment? Did you or did you not receive the positive response you
> > > > sought from Riley?
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Dave, to have received any response at all from Riley was positive. But
> > > *you* refuse to understand that. I cannot beat you over the head with
> the
> > > statements that a) I appreciate that Riley responded to my query, b) I
> > > wholeheartedly accept everything Riley had to say but *do not* agree
> with
> > > him that my callsign brings the ARS one step closer to extinction, c) I
> > > don't believe Riley was speaking official FCC line--there is no way he
> could
> > > have, d) I *do* believe (because I know me so well) that the reason I
> sent
> > > the note to Riley was to ask him a question as an official of the FCC on
> > > what he *believed* the policy should be coming from a government
> > > organization.
> > >
> > > Now, for you to insist that I think anything else about or from Riley,
> is
> > > just your ignorant silver spoon flaring at you in your face. Get a
> life,
> > > Dave.
> >
> > Again, you fail to explain the silver spoon stuff, Kim. You use it but
> > don't attempt to explain what it is that you mean by it. It begins to
> > sound even more peculiar when you write something like "ignorant silver
> > spoon".
> >
> > Your response from Riley was no better than 50/50. The fact that you
> > disagree with him (and thus reject the portion of the response)
```

> > regarding his statement about your helping to bring the amateur service
> > "one step closer to extinction" shows that you lack any understanding of
> > the sensitivities of others who might be offended by your choice.
> >
>
> And, I'll ask you again, Dave, the question that you nor others like you
> ever seem to quite answer. In fact, you all avoid it like the plague.
> *WHY* should one such as me change *my* ways for one such as you? *WHAT*
> makes your desire for me to change more important that my desire not to?
> *WHO* made it your world to force (or even request) that others change the
> way they are for you? *WHEN* did the laws of human nature change such that
> you've become more superior to me and therefore have more rights than me?
> *WHERE* do you get off pushing such crap on others?
>
> Not that I ever would, but how 'bout if I request that you come out and get
> a little nasty for me?

Is that your standard? Should the world stoop to the lowest possible standard? Should we totally do away with any concept of accomodating the sensibilities and values of others or do we all simply do what we want regardless of who we offend? I don't want to live in a world like that, Kim, nor do I know many folks who do. I see what you've done in the way I view the Howard Sterns of the world. You'd appear to do anything for shock value. I already gave you my answer to your "WHY?" question: Because it is the right thing to do. I think you already know that deep inside.

Dave K8MN

5668. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 15:29:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C289B72.93CC660A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28665

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2761A1.9C3109F7@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C25074D.9742EA0B@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must be
> > > > determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's rights.
> > > > Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to every
> > > > freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the
> events
> > > > which have unfolded over the past several months.
> > > >
> > > > Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > No, and neither are yours, Dave. The government, by virtue of allowing
> my
> > > callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in a manner
> > > directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You, not me,
> have
> > > exceeded the limits of your rights.
> >
> > Please tell me what the limit is on stating my belief that your call is
> > tacky.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You can say it all you want. To demand change of me, for you, exceeds the
> limits.

I've demanded nothing of you, Kim. I've tried to explain to you why you
should change your call, not for me alone but for any who would be
offended by it and for the amateur radio service. As I pointed out to
James deLoach, I'd ask anyone with a similar call do the same. They
aren't all here. You are.

Dave K8MN

5669. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 15:36:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C289D13.11372591@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28666

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2762A0.8F7704D2@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C2554A9.4CB2E346@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > I also amused at Kim's idea that Larry and I should leave amateur
> radio
> > > > because she chooses to be vulgar and a part of ham radio.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > I bet you're not as amused as I am over the fact that you and Larry, et
> al,
> > > think my callsign is vulgar.
> >
> > I think more than your callsign is vulgar, Kim. Your piece about what
> > you'd like to say to some woman at a social function was especially
> > enlightening. Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Oh? I now need and have your blessing for my actions? You *are* becoming
> as delusional as Larry.

You don't need my blessing, Kim. It should be pretty apparent that you wouldn't receive it and that you'd reject it if given. I see you as one who pretty much rejects society and civility. I see you as someone who has been snubbed at some point (and maybe on numerous occasions) and who has been so hurt by it that she has decided to make folks pay in some manner. I'm not sure if your call is a way to get even or just a way to draw attention to yourself.

Dave K8MN

5670. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 15:38:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C289D80.8B9C8193@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28667

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C276321.642AB693@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C261489.D79E42B7@earthlink.net...
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > There's plenty wrong with Kim's lack of class in choosing a
> > > deliberately
> > > > > > vulgar call.
> > > > > >
> > > > > That's your personal delusional opinion, Dave, and you are sticking
> to
> > > > > it. If the FCC thought there was anything wrong with Kim's callsign,
> > > > > they shouldn't have issued it. Thus, you have sided with Queen
> Victoria,
> > > > > a sad throwback to days long passed.
> > > > >
> > > > Naw, I've sided with decency, good judgement and good taste. My views
> > > > are personal but not delusional at all.
> > > > >
> > > > You are right about one thing. The FCC shouldn't have issued Kim's
> > > > call.
> > > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > Then, take your argument to the FCC, Dave. Get them to make an official
> > > policy more in line with your views.
> > >
> > You know, that's not really such a bad idea, Kim, though I think the
> > Commission dances better when congressmen and senators whistle a tune.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You want me to look your reps names up? Maybe you can run for office
> yourself.

Alan Mollohan, Robert Byrd and Jay Rockefeller. It's too early for me
to think about national office. I'll probably start with the Marshall
County Commission.
```

Dave K8MN

5671. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 15:40:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C289DE0.9CCDE8AB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28668

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C276012.3DA14352@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> >
> > >. The government, by virtue of allowing my
> >
> > > callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in a manner
> > > directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You, not me,
> have
> > > exceeded the limits of your rights.
> >
> > So where is it stated that the government has a responsibility to
> protect you
> > from your ignorance? If you do sonething dumb you can't expect the
> government
> > to protect you from the consequences, to include ridicule from others.
> >
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> Where do I need protection, Dick? And, I have never been ridiculed for my
> callsign. Sorry to burst your bubble.

You've been ridiculed for your callsign any number of times here alone.

Dave K8MN

5672. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 15:41:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C289E2D.D0DA3058@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28669

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C27852D.2B6D0DAA@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.
> >
> > It is you who is thumbing your nose at the world, Dave.
> > Come down from your ivory tower, join the world, and
> > enjoy life instead of being such an elitist grinch.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> >
> >
>
> He'd need to pull the silver spoon out of his...er...well, you get the idea.

I've asked several times, Kim. What's with the silver spoon stuff?

Dave K8MN

5673. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:09:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C28A4AD.700A3AF7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28670

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > A comedian is only funny if the audience laughs. Kim falls short.
> >
> > Given the choice between your brand of misery and Kim's brand of
> > humor, guess who gets my vote?
>
> Who said you get a vote on what I find funny?

Uhhhhh, earth to Dave - it's my vote on what *I* find funny. Your
malevolent view of reality is downright depressing. I have never
even smiled at any of your postings.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5674. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:09:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28a5b4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28671

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C27FE15.15FF1732@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:9DrV7.194782$WW.11285611@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Dick Carroll wrote
> > >
> > > > What a maroon.
> > >
> > > Ah, Carroll, That is a racist statement. Do you know what a maroon
is????
> > >
> > > Or... the difference between a moron and a maroon? In my book a moron
is
> > > someone who doesn't know what a maroon is. Steve the LPN called me
that
> > > once. So, I have to think it is a trait of self-rightious pro-coders.
;-)
> > >
> > > > What Kim has done is to eagerly join the mass of *other*
> > > > morons on 3950, 14313 etc without ever placing a signal on the air
or
> > > uttering
> > > > a syllable. Her callsign has already said it all.
> > >
> > > Wrong, Carol, her call sign has absolutely nothing to do with the
idiots
> > on
> > > 3950 and 14313. Try to come up with an argument that's, at least,
> > plausable.
> > >
> > > Rich
> > >
> >
> > Thing is...no one's been able to do that yet (give a plausible
argument). ;)
>
> So why don't you send Riley Hollingsworth another email and ask him how
he
> considers your callsign choice as compared to the other vulgarity used on
the
```

> air. Let us know what his answer is this time, too.
>

Dick, you oaf, you know as well as I do what his answer would be. At least I think you have at least that small amount of intelligence. But, just in case *you* are wondering what his response would be, you are more than welcome to send him a note and ask. His *opinion* is no more plausible than anyone else's. It simply is not true that my callsign has the magnitude of impact to the ARS as to bring it anywhere but where people like you bring it.

Kim W5TIT

5675. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:11:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28a62f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28672

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C288304.2F63B5B@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > A comedian is only funny if the audience laughs. Kim falls short.
> > >
> > > Given the choice between your brand of misery and Kim's brand of
> > > humor, guess who gets my vote?
> >
> > Who said you get a vote on what I find funny?
> >
> > Dave K8MN

And, conversely Dave, who said *you* get a vote on what Cecil finds funny?
For God's sake, why, why, why is it only you who you think should count?

Kim W5TIT

5676. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:12:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28a666$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28674

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28845C.7EFC91B9@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Earthlink has not contacted me about my alleged violations--probably
> > > because Kim is not a victim of harrassment.
> >
> > Probably because Kim is a nice person and doesn't want to get
> > you into trouble.
>
> Silly me! Of course that is it. It couldn't be that the folks at
> Earthlink think guys like you and Rick cling to absurd ideas. They
> mustn't care much that I believe Kim's choice of vanity call is lacking
> in decorum.
>
> Dave K8MN

Ya finally get close to something that is probably right. I doubt there are
many at all who care what you believe, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

5677. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:14:33 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C28A5E9.B168E85@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28673

Dave Heil wrote:
> I already knew that no one at the FCC or
> the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls.

From Webster's: "endorse - to inscribe with a title"

The FCC endorsed Kim's callsign when they issued it.
Kim's official ARS title, endorsed by the FCC, is
clearly printed on her amateur radio license.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5678. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:15:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28a732_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28677

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C289053.64B8946B@earthlink.net...
>
> Do your research, Rick. You haven't proven anything at all by your
> speculative claims. Kim isn't a victim of anything other than her own
> poor judgement.
>

What poor judgement, Dave? Who died and made you the judge? You are really getting ridiculously desperate to be right.

Kim W5TIT

5679. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:16:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C28A650.69A61229@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28675

Dave Heil wrote:
> I've demanded nothing of you, Kim. I've tried to explain to you why you
> should change your call, not for me alone but for any who would be
> offended by it and for the amateur radio service.

And some of us have described how you are being offensive to us.
Yet you choose to do absolutely nothing about it. Your double
standard is showing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5680. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:19:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28a7f2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28680

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C289206.D0CE47C6@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C269932.EDC9FF8C@townsqr.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> > > >
> > > > How many times?
> > >
> > > As many times as it takes to convince her and you.
> > >
> >
> > Ever hear the phrase "falling on deaf ears"?
>
> While I've long suspected that you are incapable of telling the
> difference between right and wrong, good taste and poor taste and poetry
> compared to Rod McKuen, I've always had hope that you could be persuaded
> that you've done something rather stupid.
>
> I maintain that hope.
>
> Dave K8MN

OK, Larry. OH, it's Dave who echoes Larry's thoughts now. Isn't that just so cute? Now you wish to determine what someone's idea of poetry is. Do you advocate judging how everyone shall live, what art they shall also believe is beautiful, what political thoughts are correct?

You are quite the follower, Davey. Here's a Christmas present for you: get some gristle to your personality--step out of the cramped, deplorable box you live in and dare, just dare, to take life on.

Kim W5TIT

5681. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:19:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C28A70C.A2B29B18@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28676

Dave Heil wrote:
> Silly me! Of course that is it. It couldn't be that the folks at
> Earthlink think guys like you and Rick cling to absurd ideas. They
> mustn't care much that I believe Kim's choice of vanity call is lacking
> in decorum.

What you think is not the problem, Dave. The volume of postings telling
us what you think is extreme overkill and meets the definition of harassment.
Any rational person would realize that. Methinks thou protesteth too much.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5682. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:21:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C28A777.63849FAD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28678

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'd think you'd have to be able to tell
> the difference between what is right and wrong, what is proper and
> improper, what is socially acceptable and socially unacceptable for
> those feelings to take effect.

Since you are unable to tell the difference between right and wrong,
you are trying to hold Kim to a double standard. Your harassment
is wrong, Dave, and I hope you are rational enough to realize that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5683. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:22:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C28A7B9.D6C23467@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28679

Dave Heil wrote:
> While I've long suspected that you are incapable of telling the
> difference between right and wrong, good taste and poor taste and poetry
> compared to Rod McKuen, I've always had hope that you could be persuaded
> that you've done something rather stupid.

The most stupid thing on this newsgroup is your harassment of Kim for
possessing a callsign endorsed by the FCC.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5684. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:22:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28a8b9_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28681

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28958B.5F6B0750@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Aw, that's OK, Rick. Dave H., Larry R., Dick C., etc., all are
> > nothing more than armchair nitwits.
> > They get to run their own personal little crusade on
> > a newsgroup. I don't think I've ever heard of one protest by any of
them on
> > the air with any of the other "distasteful" sets they've each spoken of
at
> > one time or another. I'm an easy target for them...and they enjoy it.
>
> You'd have a hard time listening for an on-air discussion by any of us
> if you are only listening to a couple of 2m FM repeaters in Texas. You
> probably have only to listen the folks you've honked off down there as a
> result of the clashes you've previously revealed with hams down your
> way.
>

Oh, Hell no. I assure you they are in the minority, Dave.

> > At least I have them off the back of someone else. It's cute how they >
feel so connected to the ARS. Or, should I say, use the ARS as such an
excuse?
>
> You should say that if it is what you really meant. Maybe it is your
> own masochistic desire to be used as a newsgroup punching bag which
> brought you to begin posting your material about your clashes with
> League officials in your area, your reasoning in choosing a tacky vanity
> call, your "what I'd like to say to some woman at a social function" and
> the like.
>
> Dave K8MN

You are getting desperate, Dave. Desperate. You want so bad to be so
right. Go open the Christmas present I gave to you. Liberate yourself,
please! You'll have so much more to be happy about.

It cracks me up hysterically that you are so stuck on the word fuck. George
Carlin is also one of my heroes.

Kim W5TIT

5685. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:28:23 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28aa1f_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28682

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2896C8.159D318@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2756DB.32A0F26A@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > > > > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > If you think I've exceeded the limit of time I'm allowed to
say
> > > > > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign.", take me to court.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign." ...
> > > > > >
> > > > > "harass - to trouble by repeated attacks"
> > > > >
> > > > Work on being able to apply those definitions.
> > > >
> > > OK, Kim is being repeatedly attacked on this newsgroup for her
choice
> > > of a callsign legally issued by the FCC. That's harassment and you
> > > are violating the contract you signed with your ISP.
> > >
> > You are a silly old man, Cecil.
> >
> > Kim is being chided, occasionally insulted and often undergoes
derision
> > for her *choice* of callsign.
> >
> >
> I have? Doesn't one need to "feel" these things in order for them to be
```

> > assessed in such a manner? I have never felt chided, have never felt
> > insulted. And, I surely feel no derision whatsoever. On the other
hand,
> > Dave, I believe you are beginning to become as deluded as Larry. He
also
> > believes I am somehow affected as such by his opinion of my callsign.
> >
> > Maybe the two of you could pat each other on the back.
>
> Wow--quite an admission, Kim! There goes the great Cecil and Rick
> harassment theory.
>

Is it my responsibility to hold that up for you?

>
> I don't hold with the notion that you'd have to feel
> chided, insulted or derided. I'd think you'd have to be able to tell
> the difference between what is right and wrong, what is proper and
> improper, what is socially acceptable and socially unacceptable for
> those feelings to take effect.
>

You live in such a tight box, and have been so directed your entire life, Dave, that you just don't know anything about living. That is my opinion of you. And, I think you lead a dreadfully, dreadfully boring life. But, do I lose sleep or care about how you choose to live? Hell no. I just feel really sorry for people like you.

>
> Yet you are somehow "affected" since
> you'd likely not respond to posts concerning the issue unless some
> emotion bubbled to the surface.
>
> Dave K8MN

I have a blast with these types of posts, Dave. It always amazes me that there are people like you, and Larry, and Dick C., and a couple of others that I can think of. It really does amaze me that you sit there, pontificating about someone's choice of a callsign and the only retort that I've ever offered was in response to your judgementalism--yet there are the many claims of how *I* am the one who is being selfish, *I* am the one who is dictating to the world how the world must be, *I* am the one who must yield to the desires of others with whom I disagree, ad nauseum.

It simply amazes me.

Kim W5TIT

5686. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:30:57 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28aab8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28683

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2897CD.E53C98D2@earthlink.net...
>
> I'm fine with reality, Kim. I already knew that no one at the FCC or
> the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls. So you've come to
> think of your call as "racey", have you?
>
> Dave K8MN

What kind of dark closet *do* you live in?! Of course I think it's racey, different, fun, daring, non-conformist, dignified, respectable and naughty all at the same time. It's *my* callsign, Dave. It is to me what I wish it to be. It is to you whatever you wish it to be. And, I accept every single bit of it.

Kim W5TIT

5687. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:41:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28AC48.B330BCEF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28684

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > A comedian is only funny if the audience laughs. Kim falls short.
> > >
> > > Given the choice between your brand of misery and Kim's brand of
> > > humor, guess who gets my vote?
> >
> > Who said you get a vote on what I find funny?
>
> Uhhhhh, earth to Dave - it's my vote on what *I* find funny. Your
> malevolent view of reality is downright depressing. I have never
> even smiled at any of your postings.

My best indicator of my stuff is whether others get a grin at any of my responses to you. You'll never know whether there is a huge humor conspiracy or not.

Dave K8MN

5688. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:45:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28AD31.3E38404A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28685

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C288304.2F63B5B@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > A comedian is only funny if the audience laughs. Kim falls short.
> > >
> > > Given the choice between your brand of misery and Kim's brand of
> > > humor, guess who gets my vote?
> >
> > Who said you get a vote on what I find funny?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> And, conversely Dave, who said *you* get a vote on what Cecil finds funny?
> For God's sake, why, why, why is it only you who you think should count?

My point was that I don't find you to be intentionally funny.

Dave K8MN

5689. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:47:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28ADBB.8BC1CF7B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28686

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C28845C.7EFC91B9@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Earthlink has not contacted me about my alleged violations--probably
> > > > because Kim is not a victim of harrassment.
> > >
> > > Probably because Kim is a nice person and doesn't want to get
> > > you into trouble.
> >
> > Silly me! Of course that is it. It couldn't be that the folks at
> > Earthlink think guys like you and Rick cling to absurd ideas. They
> > mustn't care much that I believe Kim's choice of vanity call is lacking
> > in decorum.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Ya finally get close to something that is probably right. I doubt there are
> many at all who care what you believe, Dave.

Certainly not folks at Earthlink. You, on the other hand, certainly
care. Otherwise you'd not bother to continue your replies to my
responses to the posts of others.

Dave K8MN

5690. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:50:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28AE5C.74F9C167@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28687

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I already knew that no one at the FCC or
> > the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls.
>
> From Webster's: "endorse - to inscribe with a title"
>
> The FCC endorsed Kim's callsign when they issued it.
> Kim's official ARS title, endorsed by the FCC, is
> clearly printed on her amateur radio license.

There is about thee a certain aura. 'tis the manner in which thou art able to perform the dictionary equivalent of adding one and one and arriving at an incorrect result. Thou silly, old man.

Dave K8MN

5691. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:53:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28affa_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28691

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C289A48.3E39B90C@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C275D4A.BB14655B@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C25044C.4766B089@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > What's with this "silver spoon" stuff, Kim? This is perhaps the
third
> > > > > or fourth time you've used it with me? What has it to do with my
> > > > > comment? Did you or did you not receive the positive response you
> > > > > sought from Riley?
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Dave, to have received any response at all from Riley was positive.
But
> > > > *you* refuse to understand that. I cannot beat you over the head
with
> > the
> > > > statements that a) I appreciate that Riley responded to my query, b)
I
> > > > wholeheartedly accept everything Riley had to say but *do not* agree
> > with
> > > > him that my callsign brings the ARS one step closer to extinction,
c) I
> > > > don't believe Riley was speaking official FCC line--there is no way
he
> > could
> > > > have, d) I *do* believe (because I know me so well) that the reason
I
> > sent
> > > > the note to Riley was to ask him a question as an official of the
FCC on
> > > > what he *believed* the policy should be coming from a government
> > > > organization.
> > > >
> > > > Now, for you to insist that I think anything else about or from
Riley,
> > is

> > > > just your ignorant silver spoon flaring at you in your face. Get a
> > life,
> > > > > Dave.
> > > >
> > > Again, you fail to explain the silver spoon stuff, Kim. You use it
but
> > > don't attempt to explain what it is that you mean by it. It begins to
> > > sound even more peculiar when you write something like "ignorant
silver
> > > spoon".
> > > >
> > > Your response from Riley was no better than 50/50. The fact that you
> > > disagree with him (and thus reject the portion of the response)
> > > regarding his statement about your helping to bring the amateur
service
> > > "one step closer to extinction" shows that you lack any understanding
of
> > > the sensitivities of others who might be offended by your choice.
> > > >
> >
> > And, I'll ask you again, Dave, the question that you nor others like you
> > ever seem to quite answer. In fact, you all avoid it like the plague.
> > *WHY* should one such as me change *my* ways for one such as you?
WHAT
> > makes your desire for me to change more important that my desire not to?
> > *WHO* made it your world to force (or even request) that others change
the
> > way they are for you? *WHEN* did the laws of human nature change such
that
> > you've become more superior to me and therefore have more rights than
me?
> > *WHERE* do you get off pushing such crap on others?
> >
> > Not that I ever would, but how 'bout if I request that you come out and
get
> > a little nasty for me?
>
> Is that your standard? Should the world stoop to the lowest possible
> standard?
>

I didn't ask the world to, Dave, only you. And, no, you do not have to meet
my standard. Nor do I have to meet yours. *WHY* do you insist that I must
meet yours? Huh?

>
> Should we totally do away with any concept of accomodating
> the sensibilities and values of others or do we all simply do what we
> want regardless of who we offend?
>

Like I said to you. We all (those of us who live the way I do, anyway) have our limitations. I will conform where I believe it is utmost for me to do so. I don't think places like the ARS is one of those situations. If you believe it is, and if I am so damned insulting to you, then cease and desist with recognition of me, Dave. Go on with your life and let me have and live mine. Of course, I'm going to do that anyway, and it simply amazes me that you--one who would have the world believe you are so dignified and intelligent--spend your time arguing such innane things as are here in this newsgroup. Good grief, you're no more grand than any of us here--it's Christmas Day and you are posting to a fucking newsgroup, Dave. What's *YOUR* excuse?

>
> I don't want to live in a world like
> that, Kim, nor do I know many folks who do.
>

And, for God's sake would you finally get this....*NO ONE* (most of all me) says you have to. BUT, why do you wish me, demand nearly of me, that I must abide by your lifestyle? WHY? The grand scale of the ARS, in my humblest of opinions, is not one of the places where I believe accommodation is necessary. You may disagree with that, but it's too bad. I also don't believe "accommodation" is mine to give at places like sports arenas, bars, concerts, parades, and lots of other places. I do believe that accommodation is allowable--for *me*--at times such as emergency nets in the ARS, meetings, and lots of other places. But, if you think that a hobby is the place for everyone to yield to each other, I am sorry. I will not comply with your desire. I don't think it is. It is known as an impasse, Dave. And, we either agree to disagree, or shut the Hell up about it. But neither of us is going to yield on our thoughts about our position. And, what is totally wrong--in my eyes--about you is that you nearly demand of someone how they must behave. AND, added to that you almost make it sound as though you'd think better of them if they do, maybe be their friend, maybe respect them. How much more idealistic can that be, Dave? For you to "make deals" so that people will have you like them? I couldn't care less if you like me.

>
> I see what you've done in
> the way I view the Howard Sterns of the world.
>

I happen to enjoy *some* of Howard Stern. I think he goes way overboard on *some* things. I've never written him a letter telling him that I'll listen more if he *behaves*. I simply don't listen to him when he's, to me, boring. AND, I don't think in any circumstance that he should be off the air.

>
> You'd appear to do
> anything for shock value.
>

If that's what you believe, then you have fun believing it. Just don't expect me to live up to all your expectations. I can meet all of them, but am only willing to meet some of them.

> I already gave you my answer to your "WHY?"
> question: Because it is the right thing to do. I think you already
> know that deep inside.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Well, you're deluding yourself then. Because I don't believe it's the right thing to do. I know you think it is, but I know that I do not. Again, you have your right to your opinion. You even have your right to express it to me. But, you don't have the right to demand that I be any different than what I am. No one has that right. Well, let's put it this way...yes, I suppose they do have that right. And I have the right to completely, literally, and happily dismiss their opinion and desire--and I do.

Kim W5TIT

5692. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:53:22 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0aaql01n4a@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28706

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C280A88.B3FD8193@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > However, perhaps by posting here in the future,
> > and explaining to people that they can pass a code test like a Ferrari
passing
> > a Yugo in second gear, then you can take ham radio one step further from
> > extinction.
>
> Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed the
> 5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what
response?

Maybe it's a back-handed complement.

5693. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:54:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b055_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28693

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C289B72.93CC660A@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2761A1.9C3109F7@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C25074D.9742EA0B@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must
be
> > > > > determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's
rights.
> > > > > Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to
every
> > > > > freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the
> > events
> > > > > which have unfolded over the past several months.
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > No, and neither are yours, Dave. The government, by virtue of
allowing
> > my
> > > > > callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in a
manner
> > > > directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You, not
me,
> > have
> > > > exceeded the limits of your rights.
> > >
> > > Please tell me what the limit is on stating my belief that your call
is
> > > tacky.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > You can say it all you want. To demand change of me, for you, exceeds
the
> > limits.

>
> I've demanded nothing of you, Kim. I've tried to explain to you why you
> should change your call, not for me alone but for any who would be
> offended by it and for the amateur radio service. As I pointed out to
> James deLoach, I'd ask anyone with a similar call do the same. They
> aren't all here. You are.
>
> Dave K8MN

I think it's been more of a demand, Dave. You are incessant about your desire to have me change my call, you say that it is for you and people like you. What about me, what about people like me? What about that, Dave? Why do I have to change for you?

Kim W5TIT

5694. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:55:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225115509.04546.00000458@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 28688

>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ)
>Date: 12/25/2001 8:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20011225090336.10613.00000798@mb-cc.aol.com>
>
>>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Date: 12/24/2001 3:43 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112242140370.1871-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
>
>>So a criminal conviction for violation of the Communications Act is not
>>sufficient reason?
>
> The purpose and intent of our criminal justice system is to punish a
>person
>for non-compliance, allegedly rehabilitate them, then return them to
>society...
>
> NOT keep on punishing them again and again and again.

Case in point...We allow DUI's back on the road, assuming they are not
HABITUAL offenders.

So where does the FCC get the right to determine that since he got busted
on OTHER laws, he's now ineligible for ANY license at all? Espeically the ONE
that he HAS shown respect and care for?

73

Steve, K4YZ

5695. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:56:07 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Hc2W7.310259$W8.11361729@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28689

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28AE5C.74F9C167@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I already knew that no one at the FCC or
> > > the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls.
> >
> > From Webster's: "endorse - to inscribe with a title"
> >
> > The FCC endorsed Kim's callsign when they issued it.
> > Kim's official ARS title, endorsed by the FCC, is
> > clearly printed on her amateur radio license.
>
> There is about thee a certain aura. 'tis the manner in which thou art
> able to perform the dictionary equivalent of adding one and one and
> arriving at an incorrect result. Thou silly, old man.
>
> Dave K8MN

You two are very close to being fed to Bozo*Flush

5696. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 16:57:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28AFF0.4C011B60@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28690

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C289053.64B8946B@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Do your research, Rick. You haven't proven anything at all by your
> > speculative claims. Kim isn't a victim of anything other than her own
> > poor judgement.
> >
>
> What poor judgement, Dave? Who died and made you the judge? You are really
> getting ridiculously desperate to be right.

Gosh Kim, your actions are judged in comparison with what society generally agrees is appropriate behavior. Nobody has to die in order for me to make a judgement. I have to make judgements and to decide whether something is right or wrong each and every day of my life.

Y'know, I think you've been writing to Riley when you really needed to pen a note to "Dear Abbey" or to phone "Dr. Laura".

Dave K8MN

5697. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:00:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28B0D0.7119FA71@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28692

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I've demanded nothing of you, Kim. I've tried to explain to you why you
> > should change your call, not for me alone but for any who would be
> > offended by it and for the amateur radio service.
>
> And some of us have described how you are being offensive to us.
> Yet you choose to do absolutely nothing about it. Your double
> standard is showing.

I wish I could take your seriously, you silly, old man. You are the same fellow who tried to elevate Kim to victimhood and the same fellow who accused me of harassment. Interesting that both you and Kim choose to continue to respond. The thread itself would likely die on the vine if not for those who assist in keeping it alive.

Dave K8MN

5698. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:04:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b27c_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28696

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C289D13.11372591@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2762A0.8F7704D2@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C2554A9.4CB2E346@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > I also amused at Kim's idea that Larry and I should leave amateur
> > radio
> > > > > because she chooses to be vulgar and a part of ham radio.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > I bet you're not as amused as I am over the fact that you and Larry,
et
> > al,
> > > > think my callsign is vulgar.
> > >
> > > I think more than your callsign is vulgar, Kim. Your piece about what
> > > you'd like to say to some woman at a social function was especially
> > > enlightening. Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Oh? I now need and have your blessing for my actions? You *are*
becoming
> > as delusional as Larry.
>
> You don't need my blessing, Kim. It should be pretty apparent that you
> wouldn't receive it and that you'd reject it if given. I see you as one
> who pretty much rejects society and civility. I see you as someone who
> has been snubbed at some point (and maybe on numerous occasions) and who
> has been so hurt by it that she has decided to make folks pay in some
> manner. I'm not sure if your call is a way to get even or just a way to
> draw attention to yourself.
>
> Dave K8MN
>
```

Oh, good grief, Dave. You are absolutely astounding. To have a callsign such as mine is as grand as to "reject society and civility." I think you are also the one who started with the idea that my callsign has become a "situation." I also think I've seen you attempt to chide others for being "armchair psychiatrists." But, you are allowed, right? Dave, we've all (even you) been snubbed at one time or another in our lives...probably many as you say. If you deny it, you deny only yourself--because I think challenges such as that happen. More in childhood than adulthood, I think. I also think for some people it can be dramatic. It was when I was young and I thought everyone had to like me.

It used to really bother me that I could be friends with the cheerleaders only when I was with them, and friends with the "bad girls" only when I was with them. And, neither group would have anything to do with me if I wanted both entities together--you know, for things like birthday parties and such. Isn't that strange? Let's weigh that: one group is your friend only when you're with them. The other group is your friend only when your with them. Doesn't that make both groups pretty much the idiot? Yeah, I'd say. But maybe you think things like that are so dramatic as to have some kind of detrimental impact on one's life. My answer to it is simply to tell people that if they're acting like that, they're idiots and I don't need to be a part of it. That when they have figured out what life is *really* all about, get back to me. In the meantime, call it being so hurt if you want, but I am living truthfully, without the pandering of idiots, and am quite happy. In sum: life is way, way too short to play games like that. At least for me, it is. Now, if you want to get in the trenches with me no matter where I am, then I'm tickled--for you, not for me.

Kim W5TIT

5699. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:04:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28B191.2192D6B0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28694

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C289206.D0CE47C6@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3C269932.EDC9FF8C@townsqr.com...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > > > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > How many times?
> > > > >
> > > > > As many times as it takes to convince her and you.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Ever hear the phrase "falling on deaf ears"?
> > >
> > > While I've long suspected that you are incapable of telling the
> > > difference between right and wrong, good taste and poor taste and poetry
> > > compared to Rod McKuen, I've always had hope that you could be persuaded
> > > that you've done something rather stupid.
> > >
> > > I maintain that hope.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > OK, Larry. OH, it's Dave who echoes Larry's thoughts now. Isn't that just
> > so cute? Now you wish to determine what someone's idea of poetry is. Do
> > you advocate judging how everyone shall live, what art they shall also
> > believe is beautiful, what political thoughts are correct?
> >
> > You are quite the follower, Davey. Here's a Christmas present for you: get
> > some gristle to your personality--step out of the cramped, deplorable box
> > you live in and dare, just dare, to take life on.

Strive for the best in life, Kim instead of going for the lowest cheap
restroom wall yuk you can get. "Tacky" is not a virtue.

Dave K8MN

5700. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:05:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b2c7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28697

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C289DE0.9CCDE8AB@earthlink.net...
> >
> > Where do I need protection, Dick? And, I have never been ridiculed for
my
> > callsign. Sorry to burst your bubble.
>
> You've been ridiculed for your callsign any number of times here alone.
>
> Dave K8MN

I don't know when, Dave. I've never felt ridiculed. I think you're
allowing yourself far more power than you have.

Kim W5TIT

5701. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:05:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b2ea_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28698

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C289E2D.D0DA3058@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C27852D.2B6D0DAA@IEEE.org...
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.
> > >
> > > It is you who is thumbing your nose at the world, Dave.
> > > Come down from your ivory tower, join the world, and
> > > enjoy life instead of being such an elitist grinch.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> > >
> > >
> >
> > He'd need to pull the silver spoon out of his...er...well, you get the
idea.
>
> I've asked several times, Kim. What's with the silver spoon stuff?
>
> Dave K8MN

It's my little secret, Dave. All mine. ;)

Kim W5TIT

5702. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:06:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b322$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28700

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C280A88.B3FD8193@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > However, perhaps by posting here in the future,
> > and explaining to people that they can pass a code test like a Ferrari
passing
> > a Yugo in second gear, then you can take ham radio one step further from
> > extinction.
>
> Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed the
> 5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what
response?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

It's maddening, isn't it? LOL

Kim W5TIT

5703. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:08:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28B284.6D7585C4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28695

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Silly me! Of course that is it. It couldn't be that the folks at
> > Earthlink think guys like you and Rick cling to absurd ideas. They
> > mustn't care much that I believe Kim's choice of vanity call is lacking
> > in decorum.
>
> What you think is not the problem, Dave. The volume of postings telling
> us what you think is extreme overkill and meets the definition of harassment.
> Any rational person would realize that. Methinks thou protesteth too much.

Youthinks wrong. Now you'd set a limit on how much I can protest?
It'd be interesting to compare my total volume of posts in this
newsgroup to your total volume--your expression of opinion on any number
of subjects. How many times can you post your opinion on morse testing?
How many times can you attempt to equate morse testing with racism?
My postings only represent YOUR definition of harassment. Yours is a
silly old man's attempt at creating a new victim. It fails.

Dave K8MN

5704. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:08:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b398$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28702

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C28A650.69A61229@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I've demanded nothing of you, Kim. I've tried to explain to you why you
> > should change your call, not for me alone but for any who would be
> > offended by it and for the amateur radio service.
>
> And some of us have described how you are being offensive to us.
> Yet you choose to do absolutely nothing about it. Your double
> standard is showing.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

And, a big huge double it is...

Kim W5TIT

5705. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:10:48 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b410_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28703

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28AD31.3E38404A@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C288304.2F63B5B@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > A comedian is only funny if the audience laughs. Kim falls short.
> > > > >
> > > > > Given the choice between your brand of misery and Kim's brand of
> > > > > humor, guess who gets my vote?
> > > >
> > > > Who said you get a vote on what I find funny?
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > And, conversely Dave, who said *you* get a vote on what Cecil finds
> funny?
> > > For God's sake, why, why, why is it only you who you think should count?
> >
> > My point was that I don't find you to be intentionally funny.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

I would worry if you did, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

5706. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:11:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b440_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28705

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28ADBB.8BC1CF7B@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C28845C.7EFC91B9@earthlink.net...
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > Earthlink has not contacted me about my alleged
violations--probably
> > > > > because Kim is not a victim of harrassment.
> > > >
> > > > Probably because Kim is a nice person and doesn't want to get
> > > > you into trouble.
> > >
> > > Silly me! Of course that is it. It couldn't be that the folks at
> > > Earthlink think guys like you and Rick cling to absurd ideas. They
> > > mustn't care much that I believe Kim's choice of vanity call is
lacking
> > > in decorum.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Ya finally get close to something that is probably right. I doubt there
are
> > many at all who care what you believe, Dave.
>
> Certainly not folks at Earthlink. You, on the other hand, certainly
> care. Otherwise you'd not bother to continue your replies to my
> responses to the posts of others.
>
> Dave K8MN

It is no wonder you seem to live life in such a confused state.

Kim W5TIT
```

5707. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:12:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28B37A.AE7A62C1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28699

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I'd think you'd have to be able to tell
> > the difference between what is right and wrong, what is proper and
> > improper, what is socially acceptable and socially unacceptable for
> > those feelings to take effect.
>
> Since you are unable to tell the difference between right and wrong,
> you are trying to hold Kim to a double standard. Your harassment
> is wrong, Dave, and I hope you are rational enough to realize that.

That's funny. I'd think you'd be able to tell the difference in manufactured victimhood and reality, Cecil. I think you are part of the problem. Rather than extending any effort to let the thread die a death of its own, you help to prolong it. Your silly attempts to paint Kim the "victim" of harassment prolong it. Your attempts to defend Kim's thumbing her nose at the world prolong it. Are you rational enough to realize it?

Dave K8MN

5708. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:13:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28B3A8.F976904D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28701

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > While I've long suspected that you are incapable of telling the
> > difference between right and wrong, good taste and poor taste and poetry
> > compared to Rod McKuen, I've always had hope that you could be persuaded
> > that you've done something rather stupid.
>
> The most stupid thing on this newsgroup is your harassment of Kim for
> possessing a callsign endorsed by the FCC.

Allow me to hold this mirror so that you might better see yourself, you
silly old man.

Dave K8MN

5709. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:16:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b550_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28707

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28AFF0.4C011B60@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C289053.64B8946B@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Do your research, Rick. You haven't proven anything at all by your
> > > speculative claims. Kim isn't a victim of anything other than her own
> > > poor judgement.
> > >
> >
> > What poor judgement, Dave? Who died and made you the judge? You are
really
> > getting ridiculously desperate to be right.
>
> Gosh Kim, your actions are judged in comparison with what society
> generally agrees is appropriate behavior.
>

You are judging the callsign of a radio amateur--in a grouping of some
measley slight percentage of the entire population of the world--as being
somehow related to an entire society?! Look at television shows, comedic
acts, workplaces, billboards, media, songs, art, theater, and then get back
to me about the "standards" of society, Dave. You'll have to get
electricity first, so you can turn all those things on.

>
> Nobody has to die in order for
> me to make a judgement.
>

That's almost too scarey to respond to. In fact, it is too scarey to
respond to.

>
> I have to make judgements and to decide whether
> something is right or wrong each and every day of my life.
>

Wow, me too. And I think we do it individually, Dave.

>
> Y'know, I think you've been writing to Riley when you really needed to
> pen a note to "Dear Abbey" or to phone "Dr. Laura".
>

> Dave K8MN
>

Dear Abbey is as good as reading Dagwood and Dr. Laura needs to have good sex.

Kim W5TIT

5710. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:17:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28B49C.BF3225F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28704

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C28958B.5F6B0750@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > Aw, that's OK, Rick. Dave H., Larry R., Dick C., etc., all are
> > > nothing more than armchair nitwits.
> > > They get to run their own personal little crusade on
> > > a newsgroup. I don't think I've ever heard of one protest by any of
> them on
> > > the air with any of the other "distasteful" sets they've each spoken of
> at
> > > one time or another. I'm an easy target for them...and they enjoy it.
> >
> > You'd have a hard time listening for an on-air discussion by any of us
> > if you are only listening to a couple of 2m FM repeaters in Texas. You
> > probably have only to listen the folks you've honked off down there as a
> > result of the clashes you've previously revealed with hams down your
> > way.
> >
>
> Oh, Hell no. I assure you they are in the minority, Dave.
>
> > > At least I have them off the back of someone else. It's cute how they >
> feel so connected to the ARS. Or, should I say, use the ARS as such an
> excuse?
> >
> > You should say that if it is what you really meant. Maybe it is your
> > own masochistic desire to be used as a newsgroup punching bag which
> > brought you to begin posting your material about your clashes with
> > League officials in your area, your reasoning in choosing a tacky vanity
> > call, your "what I'd like to say to some woman at a social function" and
> > the like.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You are getting desperate, Dave. Desperate. You want so bad to be so
> right. Go open the Christmas present I gave to you. Liberate yourself,
> please! You'll have so much more to be happy about.
>
> It cracks me up hysterically that you are so stuck on the word fuck. George
> Carlin is also one of my heroes.

Some folks believe that professional baseball players who sell autographs to kids are heroes. My heroes are genuine heroes.

You seem to have some peculiar idea in your head that I'm not happy. I'm happy as a clam, Kim. Right now I'm happy that the FCC doesn't yet issue four letter suffixes.

Dave K8MN

5711. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:17:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b5b7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28708

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28B0D0.7119FA71@earthlink.net...
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I've demanded nothing of you, Kim. I've tried to explain to you why
you
> > > should change your call, not for me alone but for any who would be
> > > offended by it and for the amateur radio service.
> >
> > And some of us have described how you are being offensive to us.
> > Yet you choose to do absolutely nothing about it. Your double
> > standard is showing.
>
> I wish I could take your seriously, you silly, old man. You are the
> same fellow who tried to elevate Kim to victimhood and the same fellow
> who accused me of harassment. Interesting that both you and Kim choose
> to continue to respond. The thread itself would likely die on the vine
> if not for those who assist in keeping it alive.
>
> Dave K8MN

I should probably remind you that you're right in there with us, Dave.
Being as defensive, as offensive, as ridiculous, as inane. It may be as
close as you ever really get to real life. Pity.

Kim W5TIT

5712. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:18:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b5e2_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28709

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28B191.2192D6B0@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C289206.D0CE47C6@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C269932.EDC9FF8C@townsqr.com...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > > > > And we have the right to tell her it is trashy.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > How many times?
> > > > >
> > > > > As many times as it takes to convince her and you.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Ever hear the phrase "falling on deaf ears"?
> > >
> > > While I've long suspected that you are incapable of telling the
> > > difference between right and wrong, good taste and poor taste and
poetry
> > > compared to Rod McKuen, I've always had hope that you could be
persuaded
> > > that you've done something rather stupid.
> >
> > I maintain that hope.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
> > OK, Larry. OH, it's Dave who echoes Larry's thoughts now. Isn't that
just
> > so cute? Now you wish to determine what someone's idea of poetry is.
Do
> > you advocate judging how everyone shall live, what art they shall also
> > believe is beautiful, what political thoughts are correct?
> >
> > You are quite the follower, Davey. Here's a Christmas present for you:
get
```

> > some gristle to your personality--step out of the cramped, deplorable
box
> > you live in and dare, just dare, to take life on.
>
> Strive for the best in life, Kim instead of going for the lowest cheap
> restroom wall yuk you can get. "Tacky" is not a virtue.
>
> Dave K8MN

Nope. Patience is a virtue.

Kim W5TIT

5713. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:21:35 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c28b696_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28710

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28B49C.BF3225F@earthlink.net...
>
> You seem to have some peculiar idea in your head that I'm not happy.
> I'm happy as a clam, Kim. Right now I'm happy that the FCC doesn't yet
> issue four letter suffixes.
>
> Dave K8MN

Well, then I suppose I can delight in that you find some happiness through
people like me after all.

Kim W5TIT

5714. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:27:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28B715.1498F3EB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28711

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2896C8.159D318@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C2756DB.32A0F26A@earthlink.net...
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > K0HB wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > There is no quantity specified in the First Amendment.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > The quantity is probably specified in the harassment laws.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > If you think I've exceeded the limit of time I'm allowed to
> say
> > > > > > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign.", take me to court.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Kim picked a trashy vanity callsign." ...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "harass - to trouble by repeated attacks"
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Work on being able to apply those definitions.
> > > > > >
> > > > > OK, Kim is being repeatedly attacked on this newsgroup for her
> choice
> > > > > of a callsign legally issued by the FCC. That's harassment and you
> > > > > are violating the contract you signed with your ISP.
> > > >
> > > > You are a silly old man, Cecil.
> > > >
> > > Kim is being chided, occasionally insulted and often undergoes
> derision
> > > for her *choice* of callsign.
> > >
```

> > >
> > > I have? Doesn't one need to "feel" these things in order for them to be
> > > assessed in such a manner? I have never felt chided, have never felt
> > > insulted. And, I surely feel no derision whatsoever. On the other
> hand,
> > > Dave, I believe you are beginning to become as deluded as Larry. He
> also
> > > believes I am somehow affected as such by his opinion of my callsign.
> > >
> > > Maybe the two of you could pat each other on the back.
> >
> > Wow--quite an admission, Kim! There goes the great Cecil and Rick
> > harassment theory.
> >
>
> Is it my responsibility to hold that up for you?

Not at all. I never for a minute subscribed to it.

> >
> > I don't hold with the notion that you'd have to feel
> > chided, insulted or derided. I'd think you'd have to be able to tell
> > the difference between what is right and wrong, what is proper and
> > improper, what is socially acceptable and socially unacceptable for
> > those feelings to take effect.
> >
>
> You live in such a tight box, and have been so directed your entire life,
> Dave, that you just don't know anything about living. That is my opinion of
> you. And, I think you lead a dreadfully, dreadfully boring life. But, do I
> lose sleep or care about how you choose to live? Hell no. I just feel
> really sorry for people like you.

Your guesses could not be more incorrect. Maybe your mental picture
somehow comforts you. You made a choice to obtain a tacky callsign for
the effect it would generate. Your choice has offended some folks. You
certainly had to guess that this would be the case when you made your
choice. You indicate that you don't care what others think and that you
can live with negative reaction. Now you are being forced to do just
that--live with it. I don't see much you can do about folks letting you
know that they find your choice of vanity call tasteless.

> >
> > Yet you are somehow "affected" since
> > you'd likely not respond to posts concerning the issue unless some
> > emotion bubbled to the surface.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I have a blast with these types of posts, Dave. It always amazes me that
> there are people like you, and Larry, and Dick C., and a couple of others

> that I can think of. It really does amaze me that you sit there,
> pontificating about someone's choice of a callsign and the only retort that
> I've ever offered was in response to your judgementalism--yet there are the
> many claims of how *I* am the one who is being selfish, *I* am the one who
> is dictating to the world how the world must be, *I* am the one who must
> yield to the desires of others with whom I disagree, ad nauseum.
>
> It simply amazes me.

That's largely because you don't seem to have understood how your choices might offend people. We now know about your amazement. I'm waiting for the part where you reach enlightenment.

Dave K8MN

5715. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:30:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28B7BD.9BEE9175@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28712

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2897CD.E53C98D2@earthlink.net...
> >
> > I'm fine with reality, Kim. I already knew that no one at the FCC or
> > the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls. So you've come to
> > think of your call as "racey", have you?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> What kind of dark closet *do* you live in?! Of course I think it's racey,
> different, fun, daring, non-conformist, dignified, respectable and naughty
> all at the same time. It's *my* callsign, Dave. It is to me what I wish it
> to be. It is to you whatever you wish it to be. And, I accept every single
> bit of it.

Then I'd assume that you're getting used to the cat calls you've
garnered that you're likely becoming accustomed to your newly found
notoriety.

Dave K8MN

5716. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 17:58:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28BE16.9B5CD14E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28713

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C289A48.3E39B90C@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C275D4A.BB14655B@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C25044C.4766B089@earthlink.net...

> > >
> > > Not that I ever would, but how 'bout if I request that you come out and
> get
> > > a little nasty for me?
> >
> > Is that your standard? Should the world stoop to the lowest possible
> > standard?
> >
>
> I didn't ask the world to, Dave, only you. And, no, you do not have to meet
> my standard. Nor do I have to meet yours. *WHY* do you insist that I must
> meet yours? Huh?

I don't believe in the lowest possible standard, Kim. I believe in the
highest possible standard.

> >
> > Should we totally do away with any concept of accomodating
> > the sensibilities and values of others or do we all simply do what we
> > want regardless of who we offend?
> >
>
> Like I said to you. We all (those of us who live the way I do, anyway) have
> our limitations. I will conform where I believe it is utmost for me to do
> so.

Be honest with us and with yourself, Kim. I don't believe that you
conform unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. You wear your
non-conformity like a badge and feel it necessary to shock people.

> I don't think places like the ARS is one of those situations. If you
> believe it is, and if I am so damned insulting to you, then cease and > desist with
recognition of me, Dave.

I do believe that amateur radio does not need offensive folks whether
they take the form of shock-value callsigns, on air obscenity or racism
or argument of religious or political views.

> Go on with your life and let me have and live
> mine. Of course, I'm going to do that anyway, and it simply amazes me that
> you--one who would have the world believe you are so dignified and
> intelligent--spend your time arguing such innane things as are here in this
> newsgroup. Good grief, you're no more grand than any of us here--it's
> Christmas Day and you are posting to a fucking newsgroup, Dave. What's
> *YOUR* excuse?

I don't know what kind of newsgroup you're posting to, Kim but your
stuff is appearing in an amateur radio newsgroup. Right now I'm posting
here as I wait for dinner. I posted earlier in the day after
participating in a 6m opening to Europe and the Caribbean.

> >
> > I don't want to live in a world like
> > that, Kim, nor do I know many folks who do.
> >
>
> And, for God's sake would you finally get this....*NO ONE* (most of all me)
> says you have to. BUT, why do you wish me, demand nearly of me, that I must
> abide by your lifestyle? WHY? The grand scale of the ARS, in my humblest
> of opinions, is not one of the places where I believe accommodation is
> necessary.

You are, of course, absolutely correct that the amateur radio service is
one place where accommodation is necessary. Your callsign does not meet
that accommodation. Oh--did you mean that amateur radio must tolerate
those who choose a call based on sexual innuendo and that we must all
put up with it because you've found a new "right"? What you do in
private with your life is indeed your business. What you do on the air
in amateur radio and what you post here is most certainly not private.

> You may disagree with that, but it's too bad. I also don't
> believe "accommodation" is mine to give at places like sports arenas, bars,
> concerts, parades, and lots of other places. I do believe that
> accommodation is allowable--for *me*--at times such as emergency nets in the
> ARS, meetings, and lots of other places. But, if you think that a hobby is
> the place for everyone to yield to each other, I am sorry. I will not
> comply with your desire. I don't think it is. It is known as an impasse,
> Dave. And, we either agree to disagree, or shut the Hell up about it. But
> neither of us is going to yield on our thoughts about our position. And,
> what is totally wrong--in my eyes--about you is that you nearly demand of
> someone how they must behave. AND, added to that you almost make it sound
> as though you'd think better of them if they do, maybe be their friend,
> maybe respect them. How much more idealistic can that be, Dave? For you to
> "make deals" so that people will have you like them? I couldn't care less
> if you like me.

Liking you or disliking you isn't part of the issue, Kim. I might not
like you even if you had a normal callsign. It is just that you
wouldn't be offending me and others with a non-suggestive call.

I think you are confusing the words "accommodation" and "civility".
You believe that you should be pretty much able to shout an oath just
about anywhere you choose. You can do that but you'll have to steel
yourself against being treated like the bastard child at the family
reunion. You've chosen a *wink, nudge* callsign and defend your choice
as a "right". If others take offense, they have a "right" to snub you,
tell you off or laugh at you.

> >
> > I see what you've done in
> > the way I view the Howard Sterns of the world.
> >
>
> I happen to enjoy *some* of Howard Stern. I think he goes way overboard on
> *some* things. I've never written him a letter telling him that I'll listen
> more if he *behaves*. I simply don't listen to him when he's, to me,
> boring. AND, I don't think in any circumstance that he should be off the
> air.

Stern has been yanked from more stations than most hosts ever have the
opportunity to work for. He may his right to an opinion but station
management and ultimately the listeners have a right to pull the plug on
him.

> >
> > You'd appear to do
> > anything for shock value.
> >
>
> If that's what you believe, then you have fun believing it. Just don't
> expect me to live up to all your expectations. I can meet all of them, but
> am only willing to meet some of them.

Kim, you've not met any of my positive expectations. You have more than
met some of my negative expectations.

> >
> > I already gave you my answer to your "WHY?"
> > question: Because it is the right thing to do. I think you already
> > know that deep inside.
>
>
> Well, you're deluding yourself then. Because I don't believe it's the right
> thing to do. I know you think it is, but I know that I do not. Again, you
> have your right to your opinion. You even have your right to express it to
> me. But, you don't have the right to demand that I be any different than
> what I am. No one has that right. Well, let's put it this way...yes, I
> suppose they do have that right. And I have the right to completely,
> literally, and happily dismiss their opinion and desire--and I do.

I've made no demands at all upon you, Kim.

Dave K8MN

5717. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 18:07:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28C057.E538CE19@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28714

```
Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C289B72.93CC660A@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C2761A1.9C3109F7@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C25074D.9742EA0B@earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it must
> be
> > > > > > determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's
> rights.
> > > > > > Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits to
> every
> > > > > > freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by the
> > > events
> > > > > > which have unfolded over the past several months.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > No, and neither are yours, Dave. The government, by virtue of
> allowing
> > > my
> > > > > callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in a
> manner
> > > > > directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You, not
> me,
> > > have
> > > > > exceeded the limits of your rights.
> > > >
> > > > Please tell me what the limit is on stating my belief that your call
> is
> > > > tacky.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > You can say it all you want. To demand change of me, for you, exceeds
```

> the
> > > limits.
> >
> > I've demanded nothing of you, Kim. I've tried to explain to you why you
> > should change your call, not for me alone but for any who would be
> > offended by it and for the amateur radio service. As I pointed out to
> > James deLoach, I'd ask anyone with a similar call do the same. They
> > aren't all here. You are.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I think it's been more of a demand, Dave. You are incessant about your
> desire to have me change my call, you say that it is for you and people like
> you. What about me, what about people like me? What about that, Dave? Why
> do I have to change for you?

You have not changed for me or for anyone. I believe that the right
thing to do would be to obtain a call that isn't offensive to anyone.
I'd would like to think that you aren't one to go out of your way to
offend anyone and that you care about the sensitivities of others.
There is no demand to that, Kim. At this point, the only person who can
take any corrective step would be you.

Let's examine the scenario again. You have:

Kim - Who doesn't give a damn what anybody thinks of her or her call
and who deliberately chose a call which was suggestive in
order to achieve a desired effect.

Dave - Who has not chosen a call which would offend the
sensitivities of anyone. His call was chosen as the "K"
counterpart of a
ham he greatly admired.

Dave K8MN

5718. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 18:08:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28C092.768275D5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28715

```
Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C28AE5C.74F9C167@earthlink.net...
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > I already knew that no one at the FCC or
> > > > the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls.
> > >
> > > From Webster's: "endorse - to inscribe with a title"
> > >
> > > The FCC endorsed Kim's callsign when they issued it.
> > > Kim's official ARS title, endorsed by the FCC, is
> > > clearly printed on her amateur radio license.
> >
> > There is about thee a certain aura. 'tis the manner in which thou art
> > able to perform the dictionary equivalent of adding one and one and
> > arriving at an incorrect result. Thou silly, old man.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You two are very close to being fed to Bozo*Flush

Heh, maybe it is time to lighten up.

Dave K8MN
```

5719. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 18:12:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28C188.31B21058@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28716

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C289DE0.9CCDE8AB@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Where do I need protection, Dick? And, I have never been ridiculed for
> my
> > > callsign. Sorry to burst your bubble.
> >
> > You've been ridiculed for your callsign any number of times here alone.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I don't know when, Dave. I've never felt ridiculed. I think you're
> allowing yourself far more power than you have.

If a Kim falls victim to ridicule in the forest and there is no one to
to alert her, is she still ridiculed?

Dave K8MN

5720. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 18:13:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C28C1C9.76613834@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28717

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C289E2D.D0DA3058@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3C27852D.2B6D0DAA@IEEE.org...
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.
> > > > >
> > > > It is you who is thumbing your nose at the world, Dave.
> > > > Come down from your ivory tower, join the world, and
> > > > enjoy life instead of being such an elitist grinch.
> > > > --
> > > > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > He'd need to pull the silver spoon out of his...er...well, you get the
> idea.
> >
> > I've asked several times, Kim. What's with the silver spoon stuff?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> It's my little secret, Dave. All mine. ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT

It'd probably have more effect in the newsgroup if folks could make
sense of it.

Dave K8MN

5721. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 18:34:13 UTC
From: Gary - KJ6Q <davison7@gte.net>
Message-ID: <FE3W7.275$8b4.40748@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 28718
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

'Tis said that if ya toss a brick into a pigpen, you can tell how many you hit by counting the
squeals...

YOUR loud squeal is duly noted, tallied and acknowledged...

--
Gary - KJ6Q
****
Two things we'll never see:
1. Perpetual motion...
2. A liberal Democrat complaining
about "Too much government"
"Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.com> wrote in message
news:asMV7.328523$5A3.126444567@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
>
> "Gary - KJ6Q" <davison7@gte.net> wrote in message
> news:BrLV7.180$SX6.73233@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net...
> > I was explaining how pretty much anyone with a pulse these
> > > days can pass the Amateur radio exams.
> >
> > So yer saying YOUR pulse is pretty weak these days?
>
> I did not say anything Gary thats your ASSumption so why would you say that
> any basis for your comment or do you just like to look like a fool.
>
>
> >
> > >You have guys whoare illegal 11 metr
> > > ops and now they hold a fcc license.
> >
> > AHHhh - "a rose by any other name is STILL a rose"
>
> So what you are saying is now they are illegal Ham ops?
>
> > OR, to break it down into language even a CBer can comprehend -
>
> Gary, you whining jackass I am not a CBer are you?
>
>
>
> > obtaining a Ham License does NOT
> > automatically, or instantly, transform a raving crude >IDIOT into a
> useful, considerate and law

> > abiding operator.
>
> As noted by your actions.
>
>
> BUT, CBers entering the Ham ranks soon find that their former operating
> habits
> > loom as objectional on the Ham bands as does a fart in church - and they
> quickly either modify their
> > habits, or LEAVE...
>
> Says Who?
>
>
>
> > Ignorance is curable - but rank, dedicated >STUPIDITY is FOREVER!
>
> So is being a jackass and butting into a post when you have no idea what
> your talking about ... a 66 yr old mental midget are ya.
>
>

5722. Re: PROOF THAT ILLEGAL CBERS ARE CRIMINALS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 20:03:08 UTC
From: Middlefinger <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <0Y4W7.329822$5A3.127018529@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 28719
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

Strawman reply!

"Gary - KJ6Q" <davison7@gte.net> wrote in message
news:FE3W7.275$8b4.40748@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net...
> 'Tis said that if ya toss a brick into a pigpen, you can tell how many you
hit by counting the
> squeals...
>
> YOUR loud squeal is duly noted, tallied and acknowledged...
>
> --
> Gary - KJ6Q
> **********
> Two things we'll never see:
> 1. Perpetual motion...
> 2. A liberal Democrat complaining
> about "Too much government"
> "Middlefinger" <middlefinger4@home.com> wrote in message
> news:asMV7.328523$5A3.126444567@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> >
> > "Gary - KJ6Q" <davison7@gte.net> wrote in message
> > news:BrLV7.180$SX6.73233@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net...
> > > I was explaining how pretty much anyone with a pulse these
> > > > days can pass the Amateur radio exams.
> > >
> > > So yer saying YOUR pulse is pretty weak these days?
> >
> > I did not say anything Gary thats your ASSumption so why would you say
that
> > any basis for your comment or do you just like to look like a fool.
> >
> >
> > >
> > > >You have guys whoare illegal 11 metr
> > > > ops and now they hold a fcc license.
> > >
> > > AHHhh - "a rose by any other name is STILL a rose"
> >
> > So what you are saying is now they are illegal Ham ops?
> >
> > > OR, to break it down into language even a CBer can comprehend -
> >
> > Gary, you whining jackass I am not a CBer are you?

> >
> >
> >
> > > obtaining a Ham License does NOT
> > > automatically, or instantly, transform a raving crude >IDIOT into a
> > useful, considerate and law
> > > abiding operator.
> >
> > As noted by your actions.
> >
> >
> > BUT, CBers entering the Ham ranks soon find that their former operating
> > habits
> > > loom as objectional on the Ham bands as does a fart in church - and
they
> > quickly either modify their
> > > habits, or LEAVE...
> >
> > Says Who?
> >
> >
> >
> > > Ignorance is curable - but rank, dedicated >STUPIDITY is FOREVER!
> >
> > So is being a jackass and butting into a post when you have no idea what
> > your talking about ... a 66 yr old mental midget are ya.
> >
> >
>

5723. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 20:06:09 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112252005210.3479-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 28720

On 25 Dec 2001, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>>Date: 12/24/2001 3:43 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112242140370.1871-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
>
>>So a criminal conviction for violation of the Communications Act is not
>>sufficient reason?
>
> The purpose and intent of our criminal justice system is to punish a person
>for non-compliance, allegedly rehabilitate them, then return them to society...
>
> NOT keep on punishing them again and again and again.
>
>>He has already proven that he cannot follow the rules. An
>>amateur radio license is a privilege, not a right.
>
> You are absolutely right...he did not follow some rules (laws)...However
>NONE of the rules he violated were in Part 97.
>
> Why is the FCC violating the Constitutional guarantees against punishment
>without due process?

He had due process. He was convicted by a court (presumedly a trial by jury).

5724. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 21:53:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E9F262C0810A7565.CDAF9564C124251D.4EC4168890D1A0A6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28721

On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:58:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Be honest with us and with yourself, Kim. I don't believe that you
>conform unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. You wear your
>non-conformity like a badge and feel it necessary to shock people.

Sometimes people NEED shocking, Dave. Non-conformity is the
basis for change, conformity the basis for inertia. Off hand, I don't
know of ANY system that can't profit from looking at itself from a
different perspective and at least _considering_ change, can you?

>I do believe that amateur radio does not need offensive folks whether
>they take the form of shock-value callsigns, on air obscenity or racism
>or argument of religious or political views.

Dave, I can agree about obscenity and racism. But not
discussing religion or politics on the air? What do you want, an ARS
filled with people discussing their recent operations, their
equipment, and each other's signal strength only? A great benefit of
being a ham is the ability to talk with people in different cultures
and to discuss the issues important to them--and, Dave, those issues
are often religion and politics. Sorry, but if I--and, I suspect, many
other hams--couldn't feel free to discuss meaningful topics on the
air, there would be no reason to bother with amateur radio at all--the
Usenet would be FAR more interesting--and despite the bigots, racists,
homophobes, and self-righteous guardians of morality that infest the
Internet, would inspire far more intelligent conversations as well.

Don't you ever get tired of exchanging signal reports or
discussing such "vital" topics as your station, the weather, your
family, and your job? Ham radio is about communications, Dave, not
just technology--and communications _includes_ those topics that are
controversial just as much as it does those that are far more mundane.

>I don't know what kind of newsgroup you're posting to, Kim but your
>stuff is appearing in an amateur radio newsgroup. Right now I'm posting
>here as I wait for dinner. I posted earlier in the day after
>participating in a 6m opening to Europe and the Caribbean.

Funny how this becomes "an amateur radio newsgroup" when it
comes to criticizing Kim, but when I (or someone else) point out that
people here are demonstrating pretty poor behavior to potential hams,
I'm always told that "this is the Internet--not ham radio."

>You are, of course, absolutely correct that the amateur radio service is
>one place where accommodation is necessary. Your callsign does not meet

>that accommodation. Oh--did you mean that amateur radio must tolerate
>those who choose a call based on sexual innuendo and that we must all
>put up with it because you've found a new "right"? What you do in
>private with your life is indeed your business. What you do on the air
>in amateur radio and what you post here is most certainly not private.

Then, since you agree that what is posted here is as relevant
as what is said on the air, I wonder how you can justify the harsh
posts by you, Larry, Dick, and others about Kim's call sign. She
merely USES the sign, the group of you pick it apart, insult her (and
others), demonstrate a total lack of respect for other hams in the
group, and in general make it clear that hams are NOT respectful,
polite, courteous, and friendly people--but are biased, opinionated,
self-righteous, and as capable of viciousness as any pit bull. How can
you POSSIBLY claim that you believe in accommodation when it comes to
public behavior, yet act as you do in this news group? YOU may not
view yourself as a computer hobbiest--but many of us do, and your
behavior here is no less offensive than the behavior of the
freebanders in the lower end of 10m!

>Liking you or disliking you isn't part of the issue, Kim. I might not
>like you even if you had a normal callsign. It is just that you
>wouldn't be offending me and others with a non-suggestive call.
>
>I think you are confusing the words "accommodation" and "civility".
>You believe that you should be pretty much able to shout an oath just
>about anywhere you choose. You can do that but you'll have to steel
>yourself against being treated like the bastard child at the family
>reunion. You've chosen a *wink, nudge* callsign and defend your choice
>as a "right". If others take offense, they have a "right" to snub you,
>tell you off or laugh at you.

But NOT to harass, insult, or attempt to intimidate her, Dave.
When something offends you, you make it clear that it IS offensive
and, if nothing is done to change it you either ignore it or stop
associating with the person giving the offense. In the case of a news
group, that would mean just kill filing Kim so you wouldn't have to be
exposed to her call sign at all.

What you are doing has nothing to do with expressing offense
or making your position clear--it has everything to do with power. You
insist that you have the right to determine what is best for Kim and
for the ARS based on your personal values. Obviously, Kim and many
others of us disagree with you. Rather than treating it as a case
where you have to "agree to disagree" however, you seem fixated on
asserting your "power" by pressuring Kim to change her sign. I hate to
burst your bubble, Dave, but you don't have any power over anyone at
all.

>Stern has been yanked from more stations than most hosts ever have the
>opportunity to work for. He may his right to an opinion but station
>management and ultimately the listeners have a right to pull the plug on

>him.

Typical.

Did you know, btw, that among the 100 most banned books in the
United States are Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn, The Age of Reason,
Black Beauty, and The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin? Apparently,
Kim's call sign isn't the only thing people like yourself find obscene
and work to remove from society.

When will people like you learn that simply because something
is personally offensive to you, it does NOT give you the right to
demand that OTHERS who don't share your view be deprived of it?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5725. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 21:58:57 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <62A83595BCC82783.19615073450F0AB4.AEE9A5A033D1B8EF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28722

On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 13:34:29 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>You are perhaps the ultimate hypocrite, Rick. You set yourself up as
>judge of what constitutes harassment and as definer of TOS/COU
>violations based only upon YOUR interpretations. You decry those who
>would judge another's actions based on morality yet set yourself up to
>decide who is honest, moral and ethical. Pretty pathetic stuff.

Funny--YOU'RE the one who is demanding that people live up to
YOUR ethical and moral values. But when it comes to living up to your
own commitments--something that nearly EVERYONE believes in doing--you
feel it's no one else's business. Perhaps not--but then, CLEARLY,
Kim's call sign is none of your own!

>I'll let you know when Earthlink advises me that I've violated our
>agreement.

And Kim will let you know when the FCC advises her that she's
violated her agreement with them.

Kim had the courage to write to the FCC and ASK about her call
sign choice--and to post the response here, Dave. Do YOU have the
courage to write to Earthlink, forward a few dozen of your posts from
this thread so they can see what you have to say (and not just the
ones where you talk to other moralists--the ones where you ridicule
and insult Kim directly) and to post THEIR reply to this group? I
doubt it--that takes courage not just a big mouth.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5726. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 22:07:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7193848D9B462F9F.21125963735E771B.BF74FCFE19553061@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28723

On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 13:44:21 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>There is only a violation based upon your own interpretation of what
>Earthlink says so your argument holds no water. You don't need to prove
>that I post in violation of Earthlink's policies. You aren't a factor
>at all. Earthlink will let me know if they believe my posts violate
>their policies. So far they've not done so. There is no indication
>that they think my commenting Kim's lack of class in choosing a tacky
>callsign is a problem.

Dave, even YOU aren't that stupid, are you?

You know perfectly well that unless someone specifically
forwards your posts to Earthlink with a complaint they don't have the
slightest idea WHAT you are posting at all!

What a completely absurd straw dog. That's like arguing that
if you break into an empty house and steal the jewelry, you haven't
broken the law since, if you had, the police would have arrested you!

>> No problem at all, Dave. While I might argue that defending
>> against harassment is unlikely to be _viewed_ as harassment, it isn't
>> really relevant since I don't obtain my news feed from an isp. My news
>> feed comes from Airnews (Internet America) and my postings are subject
>> to THEIR rules, not the TOU/COS in force at voyager.net where I
>> receive some of my email (I also run my own servers on the three
>> registered domains I maintain). According to Airnews own TOU/COS I am
>> NOT in violation of my agreements, and thus unlike yourself, I'm not
>> breaking my word by my posts here.
>
>That wouldn't matter, Rick. You'd still be harassing me whether you
>violated TOU/COS with anyone you deal with. As to your "defending
>against harassment"--Phhhhfffffffftttttttt! What a load of blarney!

Matters quite a bit, Dave. You're accusing me of doing what
you are doing. Wrong. I'M not violating my contract with an isp or a
news server. You are. One of us is dishonest in his dealings with a
commercial firm, the other is not. Sorry you don't like being viewed
as dishonest, but that's your decision not mine.

>> We ended up debating an area of Libertarian Party policy that
>> we have very different views on--that of social support for the sick
>> and poor. That, however, has nothing to do with libertarian
>> philosophy, which limits itself to directly addressing the issues of
>> rights and freedoms--and in that area, Cecil and I agree on most

>> points and can agree to disagree on the few where we differ.
>
>Forgive me, Rick. I didn't know that you and Cecil had come to such an
>agreement. It must have been done privately as it was not evident in
>posts to the newsgroup.

I'll ask him.

Hey, Cecil--do you feel that with respect to our views on the
Libertarian Party platform we have to "agree to disagree?" I'll be
glad to do so if you feel it's appropriate.

Ok, I asked. Now how about making the same offer to Kim about
her call sign?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5727. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 22:49:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29027C.D8064171@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28724

Dave Heil wrote:
> I don't believe in the lowest possible standard, Kim. I believe in the
> highest possible standard.

Maybe for everyone else - obviously not for yourself.

> I do believe that amateur radio does not need offensive folks ...

Then why are you so offensive? The FCC has endorsed your callsign,
my callsign, and Kim's callsign. That's all that matters.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5728. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 22:56:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29040D.FB400473@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28725

Rick Adams wrote:
> Hey, Cecil--do you feel that with respect to our views on the
> Libertarian Party platform we have to "agree to disagree?" I'll be
> glad to do so if you feel it's appropriate.

Any two people can find something upon which to disagree. I'll bet that you, Kim, Dave, and I agree on 95% of all subjects, e.g. smallpox is bad. No two people agree 100% on everything. Think how boring the world would be if everyone agreed on everything. This newsgroup would not exist.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5729. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:02:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C290582.83F0C0D7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28726

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Uhhhhh, earth to Dave - it's my vote on what *I* find funny. Your
> > malevolent view of reality is downright depressing. I have never
> > even smiled at any of your postings.
>
> My best indicator of my stuff is whether others get a grin at any of my
> responses to you.

You must be copying Nero who allegedly grined while Rome burned.
IMO, you are a sad example of humanity.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5730. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:07:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2906AE.5CF7406E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28727

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> For God's sake, why, why, why is it only you who you think should count?

Because Dave has an over exaggerated idea of his own importance and nobody
else's opinion matters a tinker's damn to him.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5731. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:11:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29079F.73704568@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28728

Dave Heil wrote:
> Gosh Kim, your actions are judged in comparison with what society
> generally agrees is appropriate behavior.

Have you polled society on Kim's callsign, Dave? I'll bet you elitists
are in the very small minority. The origin of the word "vulgar" means
that it comes from the common folk who outnumber your uppity kind by a
large percentage.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5732. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:17:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2908ED.3751A909@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28729

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > From Webster's: "endorse - to inscribe with a title"
> >
> > The FCC endorsed Kim's callsign when they issued it.
> > Kim's official ARS title, endorsed by the FCC, is
> > clearly printed on her amateur radio license.
>
> There is about thee a certain aura. 'tis the manner in which thou art
> able to perform the dictionary equivalent of adding one and one and
> arriving at an incorrect result.

Too bad you don't realize that one plus one can have an infinite
number of results depending on the phase angle between the ones.

I haven't seen Kim's amateur radio license but I'll bet it's
printed on the same form as yours and mine and fully *endorced* by
the "United States of America Federal Communications Commission".
Kim, is that what your license says?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5733. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:20:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2909D3.73B3CEE7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28730

Dave Heil wrote:
> You are the
> same fellow who tried to elevate Kim to victimhood and the same fellow
> who accused me of harassment. Interesting that both you and Kim choose
> to continue to respond.

Is it your advice that someone being harassed should do nothing about it?
Sorry, that lets the evil people win.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5734. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:24:45 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C290ABC.FB06EC82@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28731

Dave Heil wrote:
> Dave - Who has not chosen a call which would offend the
> sensitivities of anyone. His call was chosen as the "K"
> counterpart of a
> ham he greatly admired.

Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
you going to do about it?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5735. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:28:31 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C290B9F.EB77E377@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28732

Dave Heil wrote:
> Now you'd set a limit on how much I can protest?

Not me, the government has set limits on how much you can protest.
You have stepped over that limit with your harassment.

> It'd be interesting to compare my total volume of posts in this
> newsgroup to your total volume--

Not a fair comparison at all. There is a big difference between
attacking a concept and viscously attacking a person as you
have done.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5736. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:30:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C290C2C.D1F01252@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28733

Dave Heil wrote:
> Rather than extending any effort to let the thread die a death
> of its own, you help to prolong it. Your silly attempts to paint Kim
> the "victim" of harassment prolong it. Your attempts to defend Kim's
> thumbing her nose at the world prolong it. Are you rational enough to
> realize it?

If the conflict is not prolonged by the good guys, evil wins. What you are doing is evil, Dave, and I have faith that you will burn in hell for it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5737. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:34:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C290CFD.4250B884@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28734

Dave Heil wrote:
> That's largely because you don't seem to have understood how your
> choices might offend people. We now know about your amazement. I'm
> waiting for the part where you reach enlightenment.

Dave, you must be the reincarnation of one of the priests who
condemned Galileo to house arrest for asserting the earth was
not the center of the universe. Enlightenment indeed. How can
you know anything about enlightenment with your head buried
in the sands of time?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5738. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:45:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C290F86.2F23E933@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28735

Dave Heil wrote:
> Allow me to hold this mirror so that you might better see yourself, you
> silly old man.

Only 11 years older than you, Dave. That's not much. I just realized what your and my problem is. I'm an Aquarian, a clear-eyed seeker of wisdom and truth on the verge of the emerging Golden Age of Aquarius and you are a Pices left over from the decaying but lingering warlike Age of Pices which is, at this very moment, heaving its last ugly breath.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5739. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-25 23:56:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <fn8W7.240951$3d2.11696183@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28736

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2906AE.5CF7406E@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > For God's sake, why, why, why is it only you who you think should
count?
>
> Because Dave has an over exaggerated idea of his own importance and
nobody
> else's opinion matters a tinker's damn to him.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

It's tinkers dam, without the 'n', Cecil. Look that up in your Funk and
Wagnalls

5740. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 00:27:26 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225192726.26499.00001606@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 28737

>Hi everybody,
>
>I just wanted to take a moment to thank a few of the folks on r.r.a.p. for
>all
>the help they gave me with my license upgrade. Ed Hare for never even
>allowing
>me to entertain the thought that I wouldn't lick the code test like a postage
>stamp. Jerry Oxendine and Jim Hampton for encouraging me to "enjoy" the code
>and giving me pointers in 'Conversational CW 101' so I wouldn't sound like a
>horses you-know-what upon my first true AR CW QSO. Dick McCollum gets BIG
>TIME
>kudos for answering a multitude of questions with the patience of Job.
>Especially for telling me to "calm down," when, for reasons unknown to this
>day, all my "Fast Farnsworth" practice flew out the window and I couldn't
>copy
>5-wpm to save my life...on the day before the test.
>
>I'm forced to put Dick Carroll and Larry Roll in a separate paragraph because
>they helped me with something other than the code...an attitude adjustment.
>Their self-made reputations as r.r.a.p. "toughies" are forever shattered in
>this ham's eyes as they demonstrated that they would've gladly given me their
>"lucky" shirts off their backs if it'd help me pass. Needless to say both
>were
>very happy to hear that I passed. BTW, if you study with the ARRL 'Fast
>Farnsworth' CD's, the actual exam characters will feel like they're "floating
>in."
>
>I originally did not want to write this because I thought it might be
>construed
>as a "congratulate me" post. I did so because I want to let anybody who might
>be "put off" by what they perceive as an attitude know that these folks WANT
>to
>help you...so stick around.
>
>I'd be remiss if I didn't mention one other guy, a non-ham. My college
>certification professor, Mr. Cronk. He fixed it so that we could NOT earn our
>sheepskins by just memorizing exam pool questions, hence the birth of the
>infamous "Cronk screenings." The General was easy but the Extra required the
>dusting off of some pretty deeply buried electronics theory. Thanks Professor
>C.!
>
>If I failed to mention any of you who encouraged me along the way, forgive
>me.
>I just wanted to acknowledge the folks I leaned on the most. Thanks again. I

>promise to pass it on to others. :-)
>
>73 de Bert
>KC2HMN

Congratulations, my friend. I always saw the invisible /AE behind your call.
Now you've made it official. Take care and 73.

Mark

5741. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 00:33:32 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225193332.26499.00001614@mb-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 28738

>> However, perhaps by posting here in the future,
>> and explaining to people that they can pass a code test like a Ferrari
>passing
>> a Yugo in second gear, then you can take ham radio one step further from
>> extinction.
>
>Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed the
>5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what response?
>--
>cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Attitude perhaps? Some pass the code begrudgingly while for others it is merely a "speed bump" on the road to bigger and better things. I think it's safe to say Bert belongs to the latter group. Take care and 73.

Mark

5742. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 01:56:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c292f17_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 28739

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011224100327.27168.00000589@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse@fast.net>
> writes:
>
[snip]
>
> What is the difference between an FCC rule that says Morse skill is
required to
> use a particular part of the radio spectrum and a Park Service rule
that says
> motor vehicles cannot be used in certain parks and wilderness areas?

The sort of Park Service rules that you refer to are intended to
protect and preserve the environment. The FCC (and other
rational entities) have recognized the fact that Morse proficiency
doesn't "preserve the environment" (it doesn't, as some claim,
serve as a "lid filter" ... see various FCC Report and Order
documents for such findings.)

> >Another concept to consider is that "discipline" is a bit misused
in
> >this application, IMHO. Are you talking about the concept that
some
> >have voiced that "It's (jumping through the Morse proficiency hoop)
> >necessary to show 'committment'." ???
>
> Experience has shown what happens without such commitment.

And that is WHAT? Most of the no-code techs I've met are
polite and concientious operators. MANY are far more
technically competent than many fast-beepers ... and I view
technical competence as FAR more valuable to the future
of amateur radio than being able to beep fast.

> >Showing"committment" also has no place in regulation.
>
> I would call it "responsibility".

One can operate and behave responsibly with no knowledge
of Morse whatsoever ...

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCkuRpe+N6+q84HiEQJ2JACfaX+7JSoayhAKcwuUx3K9vzJI1gIAn297
mIbDL9/MtsfIKBb8ZxTiyBOm
=0q9T
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5743. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 02:32:14 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <OEaW7.198235$WW.11459138@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28740

"Mark Pearsal" <radiohead11m@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011225193332.26499.00001614@mb-fo.aol.com...
> >> However, perhaps by posting here in the future,
> >> and explaining to people that they can pass a code test like a
Ferrari
> >passing
> >> a Yugo in second gear, then you can take ham radio one step further
from
> >> extinction.
> >
> >Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed
the
> >5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what
response?
> >--
> >cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Attitude perhaps? Some pass the code begrudgingly while for others it is
merely
> a "speed bump" on the road to bigger and better things. I think it's
safe to
> say Bert belongs to the latter group. Take care and 73.
>
> Mark

Give that man a ceegar, a kim-sized kewpie doll, and a 3-lb wedge of
Fatchamatta's Macaroni Cheese.

Bug Killer

5744. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 02:52:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C293B5C.84B12937@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28741

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:58:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Be honest with us and with yourself, Kim. I don't believe that you
> >conform unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. You wear your
> >non-conformity like a badge and feel it necessary to shock people.
>
> Sometimes people NEED shocking, Dave. Non-conformity is the
> basis for change, conformity the basis for inertia. Off hand, I don't
> know of ANY system that can't profit from looking at itself from a
> different perspective and at least _considering_ change, can you?

You are talking about two very different things. Are you attempting to get me to agree that the key to re-examination is shock via vulgarity? That's not likely to happen. Your idea that people "NEED" shocking is self-advanced.

> >I do believe that amateur radio does not need offensive folks whether
> >they take the form of shock-value callsigns, on air obscenity or racism
> >or argument of religious or political views.
>
> Dave, I can agree about obscenity and racism. But not
> discussing religion or politics on the air? What do you want, an ARS
> filled with people discussing their recent operations, their
> equipment, and each other's signal strength only? A great benefit of
> being a ham is the ability to talk with people in different cultures
> and to discuss the issues important to them--and, Dave, those issues
> are often religion and politics.

You are probably as aware as I am where such discussions lead--to an argument which no one wins and no one changes his mind.

> Sorry, but if I--and, I suspect, many
> other hams--couldn't feel free to discuss meaningful topics on the
> air, there would be no reason to bother with amateur radio at all--the
> Usenet would be FAR more interesting--and despite the bigots, racists,
> homophobes, and self-righteous guardians of morality that infest the
> Internet, would inspire far more intelligent conversations as well.

I'm not suggesting that hams not have meaningful conversations, Rick. Funny that you'd read that into my statements. You are partially correct about the time-shifted "conversations" (or monologues placed end to end) of Usenet. They might be better than amateur radio for those who feel called upon to discuss offbeat topics for which the air waves

are ill-suited.

> Don't you ever get tired of exchanging signal reports or
> discussing such "vital" topics as your station, the weather, your
> family, and your job? Ham radio is about communications, Dave, not
> just technology--and communications _includes_ those topics that are
> controversial just as much as it does those that are far more mundane.

How long have you been a ham, Rick? Do you think I need your advice about what ham radio is about? The word "communications" is a generic term with many meanings. Amateur radio may consist of the exchange of signal reports or the tale of a trip up the Orinoco River. It can include the discussion of the weather in Phoenix or may include formal message traffic. Avoiding controversial topics is plain old common sense. If you believe that it should include the controversial then perhaps you support the Liberty Net, K1MAN's broadcasts and the regular brawls which take place on 75m or on 14.313.

> >I don't know what kind of newsgroup you're posting to, Kim but your
> >stuff is appearing in an amateur radio newsgroup. Right now I'm posting
> >here as I wait for dinner. I posted earlier in the day after
> >participating in a 6m opening to Europe and the Caribbean.
>
> Funny how this becomes "an amateur radio newsgroup" when it
> comes to criticizing Kim, but when I (or someone else) point out that
> people here are demonstrating pretty poor behavior to potential hams,
> I'm always told that "this is the Internet--not ham radio."

Go back and read what Kim stated (including her colorful and unneccessary adjective). Now read my response. You might want to attempt to tie the two together before clambering up on that soapbox. Otherwise you end up looking kind of silly.

> >You are, of course, absolutely correct that the amateur radio service is
> >one place where accommodation is necessary. Your callsign does not meet
> >that accommodation. Oh--did you mean that amateur radio must tolerate
> >those who choose a call based on sexual innuendo and that we must all
> >put up with it because you've found a new "right"? What you do in
> >private with your life is indeed your business. What you do on the air
> >in amateur radio and what you post here is most certainly not private.
>
> Then, since you agree that what is posted here is as relevant
> as what is said on the air, I wonder how you can justify the harsh
> posts by you, Larry, Dick, and others about Kim's call sign. She
> merely USES the sign, the group of you pick it apart, insult her (and
> others), demonstrate a total lack of respect for other hams in the
> group, and in general make it clear that hams are NOT respectful,
> polite, courteous, and friendly people--but are biased, opinionated,
> self-righteous, and as capable of viciousness as any pit bull. How can
> you POSSIBLY claim that you believe in accommodation when it comes to
> public behavior, yet act as you do in this news group? YOU may not
> view yourself as a computer hobbiest--but many of us do, and your

> behavior here is no less offensive than the behavior of the
> freebanders in the lower end of 10m!

"Hobbyist", Rick. No, I'm not a computer hobbyist. I'm a computer user. I don't post in computer hobbyist newsgroups. I post in amateur radio newsgroups. I just uses computers as a tool. I didn't agree with you about anything. I stated my belief that vulgarity is vulgarity here or on the air. Your statement attempting to compare my actions to those of freebanders are laughable.

> >Liking you or disliking you isn't part of the issue, Kim. I might not
> >like you even if you had a normal callsign. It is just that you
> >wouldn't be offending me and others with a non-suggestive call.
> >
> >I think you are confusing the words "accommodation" and "civility".
> >You believe that you should be pretty much able to shout an oath just
> >about anywhere you choose. You can do that but you'll have to steel
> >yourself against being treated like the bastard child at the family
> >reunion. You've chosen a *wink, nudge* callsign and defend your choice
> >as a "right". If others take offense, they have a "right" to snub you,
> >tell you off or laugh at you.
>
> But NOT to harass, insult, or attempt to intimidate her, Dave.
> When something offends you, you make it clear that it IS offensive
> and, if nothing is done to change it you either ignore it or stop
> associating with the person giving the offense. In the case of a news
> group, that would mean just kill filing Kim so you wouldn't have to be
> exposed to her call sign at all.

Insult, Rick? Sure I have that right. I don't harass and I don't intimidate. As long as Kim sees fit to argue the issue, I am free to respond. Don't like it? Killfile my stuff.

> What you are doing has nothing to do with expressing offense
> or making your position clear--it has everything to do with power. You
> insist that you have the right to determine what is best for Kim and
> for the ARS based on your personal values. Obviously, Kim and many
> others of us disagree with you. Rather than treating it as a case
> where you have to "agree to disagree" however, you seem fixated on
> asserting your "power" by pressuring Kim to change her sign. I hate to
> burst your bubble, Dave, but you don't have any power over anyone at
> all.

Get off your high horse, Rick. You can attempt to paint it as whatever your leftist heart desires. The only thing is, *you can't prove it*. I don't see the "many" standing behind you. Where did they go?

> >Stern has been yanked from more stations than most hosts ever have the
> >opportunity to work for. He may his right to an opinion but station
> >management and ultimately the listeners have a right to pull the plug on
> >him.
>

> Typical.

Your "typical" is typical.

> Did you know, btw, that among the 100 most banned books in the
> United States are Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn, The Age of Reason,
> Black Beauty, and The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin? Apparently,
> Kim's call sign isn't the only thing people like yourself find obscene
> and work to remove from society.

I don't have any interest at all in banning books, Rick. For a book to enter my home, I have to bring it here. There is no tie to that and a call like Kim's on the public airwaves.

> When will people like you learn that simply because something
> is personally offensive to you, it does NOT give you the right to
> demand that OTHERS who don't share your view be deprived of it?

Probably about the time that "people like you" learn that the public airwaves are not a sewer and that the people are not obligated to submit to your idea of radio nirvana. "People like you" can do what they want in private. They can't force it upon those who find their actions offensive.

Dave K8MN

5745. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:01:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxap1p.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28742

On 24 Dec 2001 13:42:05 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>>His name has nothing to do with it. His conviction for cellular phone
>>phreaking is the reason behind why he was found morally unfit.
>
>The FCC has no business deciding who is "morally fit" to do ANYTHING. He
>did his time in the legal system.

Section 308(b) of the Communications Avt specifically charges the
Commission to make a detrmination of wherher any applicant or
licensee possesses the moral character to become or remain a
licensee.

>The prosecutor himself has stated that he just doesn't like his "attitude"
>and is doing what he can to further prevent Mitnik from retruning to society.

Did you read the entire jistory of this case? This wasn't the first
time.....and may not be his last, either.

>He screwed up, he know's it, he paid the price the courts put on him.

He is totally unrepentent.

>Time to tell the FCC and the courts to act like men, not sandlot whiners.

The FCC is doing what the law requires to yank this guy's privileges
to operate a radio.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5746. Re: "...one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:02:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225220255.24724.00000530@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 28743

In article <OtqVjwphBHA.1752@cpimsnntpa02>, "K0HB" <K0HB@bitbucket73.com>
writes:

>KE8HH says:
>
>> The ONLY reason for taking that position is because they are paying some
>people
>> more to do a given job than they are paying others for the same work. If
>their pay
>> scale was based on equal pay for equal work they wouldn't CARE if people
>told
>> others what they earned.

That's a nice concept but it rarely works out nice and clean. Who gets to gauge
what is "equal work" when a job is not easily quantifiable? Engineering design
is not like making widgets.

>Hogwash! People get paid what they get paid because of their value to their
>employer.

In part, yes.

They also get paid what they get paid because of the employer's value to the
employee. Money is not the only way an employer "pays" an employee. For many
people, non-cash factors can have a bigger influence than the paycheck.

There's also the effect of an employee's negotiating skills. Some people can
wheel and deal better than others.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5747. Re: latest NYC update

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:02:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225220256.24724.00000532@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 28745

In article <de9751ca.0112211124.466d76e1@posting.google.com>,
webdoc@mailandnews.com (Keith Hosman Red Cross Disaster Services) writes:

>For those who are interested, I will be driving home to ohio next
>week, I will be outproccessing on wed 26th, and either driving out web
>afternoon or thursday am, heading back to ohio.
>
>Keith Hosman

Keith,

Good to hear it! Stay safe and Godspeed on your trip home.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5748. Re: Could it be?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:02:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225220256.24724.00000531@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 28747

In article <9vtg5701orp@enews3.newsguy.com>, "Kamatu" <admin@ahww.net> writes:

>I am so interested in finally getting my Technician's License that I have
>studied and studied for weeks now. I have passed every sample test I can get
>my hands on, and there is a real test in my area on January 17th, 2002.

GREAT!! Go for it! Try the other tests while you're there, too.
>
>But, I'm reading these messages and I'm starting to get the feeling that the
>priviledges afforded to a Tech No Code gives access to frequencies that are
>really no better to occupy than a Citizen Band radio would access.

I'm not sure what you mean. The Technician class license gives you all amateur
radio privileges above 30 MHz - that's a lot of spectrum, lots of modes, lots
of power.
>
>I'm reading about jamming, and this jerk that, that jerk this, kids, lids,
>space cadets...

This stuff exists, but it's the exception, not the rule. At least in the places
I've lived.

The character of Usenet groups varies all over the place, and amateur radio NGs
are no exception. What you see is rarely a representative sample. I have found
that the character of most amateur radio email reflectors is more to my liking.

>
>I wanted to get into Amateur Radio to get out of the 27Mhz Snake Pit and QSO
>with some quality contacts.
>
>Am I really making a mistake? Is it too late for Ham Radio now?

A resounding "NO" to both questions!!
>
73 & good luck

Jim, N2EY

5749. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:02:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225220257.24724.00000534@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 28744

Bert,

Congrats! Now be sure to USE the new license. It's what happens after it's earned that matters.

73 es seasons greetings,

Jim N2EY

5750. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:02:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225220257.24724.00000533@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 28746

In article <20011224084205.08595.00001292@mb-fz.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4YZ) writes:

>The FCC has no business deciding who is "morally fit" to do ANYTHING.

Actually, they do. A radio license is a special privilege to use the public airwaves, which are public property. For ham licenses, the FCC assumes that applicants are trustworthy unless proven otherwise. Communications-related criminal convictions are "proof otherwise".

>He did his time in the legal system.

Has he? Did he serve his entire sentence, or is he out on parole?
>
> The prosecutor himself has stated that he just doesn't like his
>"attitude"
>and is doing what he can to further prevent Mitnik from retruning to society.

"Attitude" has everything to do with being granted a privilege.
>
> It's reasons like this that many people who might otherwise fit back in
>to society wind up dropping back into less-than-desireable conduct. They
>can't
>get past the past, not because they want to, but becuase idiots like the
>prosecutor don't want to let it go and let him get on with his life.

There's an old saying:

"Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me."

If this guy has seriously violated communications law and been convicted of same, it's up to HIM to convince the govt. that he has changed his ways and has become trustworthy of the privilege of a license.
>
> He screwed up, he know's it, he paid the price the courts put on him.

One can say the same thing about Bill Clinton.

Does he admit he screwed up? Does he say "I've changed, it'll never happen again"?

> Time to tell the FCC and the courts to act like men, not sandlot
>whiners.

What would "men" do?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5751. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:11:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2940dd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28750

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28B7BD.9BEE9175@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2897CD.E53C98D2@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > I'm fine with reality, Kim. I already knew that no one at the FCC or
> > > the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls. So you've come to
> > > think of your call as "racey", have you?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > What kind of dark closet *do* you live in?! Of course I think it's
racey,
> > different, fun, daring, non-conformist, dignified, respectable and
naughty
> > all at the same time. It's *my* callsign, Dave. It is to me what I
wish it
> > to be. It is to you whatever you wish it to be. And, I accept every
single
> > bit of it.
>
> Then I'd assume that you're getting used to the cat calls you've
> garnered that you're likely becoming accustomed to your newly found
> notoriety.
>
> Dave K8MN

I haven't heard any. I can get way past the negative responses, Dave, and
get on with the fun about it. I didn't realize I'd reached any status of
notoriety.

Kim W5TIT

5752. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:11:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C293FE4.82EFDCE4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28748

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 13:34:29 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >You are perhaps the ultimate hypocrite, Rick. You set yourself up as
> >judge of what constitutes harassment and as definer of TOS/COU
> >violations based only upon YOUR interpretations. You decry those who
> >would judge another's actions based on morality yet set yourself up to
> >decide who is honest, moral and ethical. Pretty pathetic stuff.
>
> Funny--YOU'RE the one who is demanding that people live up to
> YOUR ethical and moral values. But when it comes to living up to your
> own commitments--something that nearly EVERYONE believes in doing--you
> feel it's no one else's business. Perhaps not--but then, CLEARLY,
> Kim's call sign is none of your own!

It's tough that I don't choose to accept your interpretation of an agreement I don't have with you. It's tough that I don't choose to base my actions on your definition of what constitutes harassment. My ISP has not contacted me or threatened me with closing my account. I have only the accusations of a couple of guys on the fringes of society. Your continued attempts to paint Kim as a victim are really a grin.

> >I'll let you know when Earthlink advises me that I've violated our
> >agreement.
>
> And Kim will let you know when the FCC advises her that she's
> violated her agreement with them.
>
> Kim had the courage to write to the FCC and ASK about her call
> sign choice--and to post the response here, Dave. Do YOU have the
> courage to write to Earthlink, forward a few dozen of your posts from
> this thread so they can see what you have to say (and not just the
> ones where you talk to other moralists--the ones where you ridicule
> and insult Kim directly) and to post THEIR reply to this group? I
> doubt it--that takes courage not just a big mouth.

You're starting to sound as silly as Cecil. Why would I find it necessary to do that? If you have the courage of your convictions, make your case to Earthlink. After all, I'm not accusing myself of harassment. Be sure to include some of Kim's greatest hits when you send those samples of material posted here. A few of your own would surely do wonders for your case.

You write of courage but I've seen nothing courageous of you. You write of freedoms but you champion only the excesses in the expression of freedom. In your posts I've found that you'd suppress the freedoms of those who are offended by the extremes. You even tried to play the Vietnam card with me in an effort to bully me with your "I've earned the right to..." stuff as if your service somehow gave you greater rights than the average citizen. That, of course, stopped when I identified myself as a Viet vet. What do you have other than a "big mouth"?

Dave K8MN

5753. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:13:39 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <DfbW7.241088$3d2.11707577@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28749

> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote

> > Because Dave has an over exaggerated idea of his own importance and
> > nobody else's opinion matters a tinker's damn to him.

Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> It's tinkers dam, without the 'n', Cecil. Look that up in your Funk and
> Wagnalls

Sorry... Richard... it tinker's damn OR tinker's dam but NEVER tinkers dam.

Rich

5754. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:20:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C294213.DDF3140B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28851

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 13:44:21 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >There is only a violation based upon your own interpretation of what
> >Earthlink says so your argument holds no water. You don't need to prove
> >that I post in violation of Earthlink's policies. You aren't a factor
> >at all. Earthlink will let me know if they believe my posts violate
> >their policies. So far they've not done so. There is no indication
> >that they think my commenting Kim's lack of class in choosing a tacky
> >callsign is a problem.
>
> Dave, even YOU aren't that stupid, are you?
>
> You know perfectly well that unless someone specifically
> forwards your posts to Earthlink with a complaint they don't have the
> slightest idea WHAT you are posting at all!

Rick, I don't think that even YOU are stupid enough to believe that Earthlink is going to terminate my service even if you DO attempt to make an issue of it. You are right that Earthlink has the slightest idea what I'm posting. Further, I don't think anyone at Earthlink cares a whit.

> What a completely absurd straw dog. That's like arguing that
> if you break into an empty house and steal the jewelry, you haven't
> broken the law since, if you had, the police would have arrested you!

Then, if you believe that I am in violation of my terms of service with Earthlink, feel free to make an issue. Earthlink will then decide if that is indeed the case. They won't and I won't take your word for it, Rick. Until that happens, you and Cecil are simply blowing smoke.

> >> No problem at all, Dave. While I might argue that defending
> >> against harassment is unlikely to be _viewed_ as harassment, it isn't
> >> really relevant since I don't obtain my news feed from an isp. My news
> >> feed comes from Airnews (Internet America) and my postings are subject
> >> to THEIR rules, not the TOU/COS in force at voyager.net where I
> >> receive some of my email (I also run my own servers on the three
> >> registered domains I maintain). According to Airnews own TOU/COS I am
> >> NOT in violation of my agreements, and thus unlike yourself, I'm not
> >> breaking my word by my posts here.
> >
> >That wouldn't matter, Rick. You'd still be harassing me whether you

> >violated TOU/COS with anyone you deal with. As to your "defending
> >against harassment"--Phhhhfffffffftttttttt! What a load of blarney!
>
> Matters quite a bit, Dave. You're accusing me of doing what
> you are doing. Wrong. I'M not violating my contract with an isp or a
> news server. You are. One of us is dishonest in his dealings with a
> commercial firm, the other is not. Sorry you don't like being viewed
> as dishonest, but that's your decision not mine.

...only by your definition, Rick. One of us is being dishonest in his claims of TOS violations. I'm likewise sorry that you don't like being viewed as a loon but don't you have some sunset calls to make down by the lake?

> >> We ended up debating an area of Libertarian Party policy that
> >> we have very different views on--that of social support for the sick
> >> and poor. That, however, has nothing to do with libertarian
> >> philosophy, which limits itself to directly addressing the issues of
> >> rights and freedoms--and in that area, Cecil and I agree on most
> >> points and can agree to disagree on the few where we differ.
> >
> >Forgive me, Rick. I didn't know that you and Cecil had come to such an
> >agreement. It must have been done privately as it was not evident in
> >posts to the newsgroup.
>
> I'll ask him.
>
> Hey, Cecil--do you feel that with respect to our views on the
> Libertarian Party platform we have to "agree to disagree?" I'll be
> glad to do so if you feel it's appropriate.
>
> Ok, I asked. Now how about making the same offer to Kim about
> her call sign?

Uh, I didn't make the claim that Kim and I had "agreed to disagree". You did make that claim regarding you and Cecil. No cigar.

Dave K8MN

5755. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:22:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29427B.C2F06B2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28852

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Uhhhhh, earth to Dave - it's my vote on what *I* find funny. Your
> > > malevolent view of reality is downright depressing. I have never
> > > even smiled at any of your postings.
> >
> > My best indicator of my stuff is whether others get a grin at any of my
> > responses to you.
>
> You must be copying Nero who allegedly grined while Rome burned.
> IMO, you are a sad example of humanity.

Then again, you can't be taken seriously.

Dave K8MN

5756. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:23:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29429D.59270CDA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28853

CAM wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Hey, Cecil--do you feel that with respect to our views on the
> > Libertarian Party platform we have to "agree to disagree?" I'll be
> > glad to do so if you feel it's appropriate.
>
> Any two people can find something upon which to disagree. I'll bet that
> you, Kim, Dave, and I agree on 95% of all subjects, e.g. smallpox is
> bad. No two people agree 100% on everything. Think how boring the
> world would be if everyone agreed on everything. This newsgroup would
> not exist.

Yet he provides no response to the query.

Dave K8MN

5757. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:26:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c294471_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28857

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28BE16.9B5CD14E@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C289A48.3E39B90C@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C275D4A.BB14655B@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:3C25044C.4766B089@earthlink.net...
>
> > > > >
> > > > > Not that I ever would, but how 'bout if I request that you come out
and
> > get
> > > > > a little nasty for me?
> > > >
> > > > Is that your standard? Should the world stoop to the lowest possible
> > > standard?
> > > >
> > >
> > > I didn't ask the world to, Dave, only you. And, no, you do not have to
meet
> > my standard. Nor do I have to meet yours. *WHY* do you insist that I
must
> > meet yours? Huh?
>
> I don't believe in the lowest possible standard, Kim. I believe in the
> highest possible standard.
>

And, where have I noted that you should do otherwise? I am asking you why
*I* must meet your standard(s), Dave. I am not saying that you need to
believe any which way.

> > >
> > > Should we totally do away with any concept of accomodating
> > > the sensibilities and values of others or do we all simply do what we
> > > want regardless of who we offend?
> > >
> >
```

> > Like I said to you. We all (those of us who live the way I do, anyway)
have
> > our limitations. I will conform where I believe it is utmost for me to
do
> > so.
>
> Be honest with us and with yourself, Kim. I don't believe that you
> conform unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. You wear your
> non-conformity like a badge and feel it necessary to shock people.
>

I do not strive for anything other than living life to its fullest, Dave.
What do you not understand about that there are places I conform and those
where I relax and let my hair down?

> >
> > I don't think places like the ARS is one of those situations. If you
> > believe it is, and if I am so damned insulting to you, then cease and >
desist with recognition of me, Dave.
>
> I do believe that amateur radio does not need offensive folks whether
> they take the form of shock-value callsigns, on air obscenity or racism
> or argument of religious or political views.
>

And, I don't believe I am offensive. I believe you think I am. But I don't
believe I am. And some of the best darned conversations I've had on HF (and
even on 2M) have been those of religious and political views. You see, some
people can actually have conversastions, disagree totally, and still conduct
themselves with respect for others and in a diginified manner. That
includes me, by the way.

> >
> > Go on with your life and let me have and live
> > mine. Of course, I'm going to do that anyway, and it simply amazes me
that
> > you--one who would have the world believe you are so dignified and
> > intelligent--spend your time arguing such innane things as are here in
this
> > newsgroup. Good grief, you're no more grand than any of us here--it's
> > Christmas Day and you are posting to a fucking newsgroup, Dave. What's
> > *YOUR* excuse?
>
> I don't know what kind of newsgroup you're posting to, Kim but your
> stuff is appearing in an amateur radio newsgroup. Right now I'm posting
> here as I wait for dinner. I posted earlier in the day after
> participating in a 6m opening to Europe and the Caribbean.
>
> > >
> > > I don't want to live in a world like
> > > that, Kim, nor do I know many folks who do.

> > >
> >
> > And, for God's sake would you finally get this....*NO ONE* (most of all
me)
> > says you have to. BUT, why do you wish me, demand nearly of me, that I
must
> > abide by your lifestyle? WHY? The grand scale of the ARS, in my
humblest
> > of opinions, is not one of the places where I believe accommodation is
> > necessary.
>
> You are, of course, absolutely correct that the amateur radio service is
> one place where accommodation is necessary.
>

You apparently misread what I wrote. I said "the grand scale of the ARS, in
my humblest of opinions, is *NOT* one the places where I believe
accommodation is necessary.

>
> Your callsign does not meet
> that accommodation.
>

And, I'll remind you that I don't think the ARS is one of the places where
accommodation need be conducted.

>
> Oh--did you mean that amateur radio must tolerate
> those who choose a call based on sexual innuendo and that we must all
> put up with it because you've found a new "right"? What you do in
> private with your life is indeed your business. What you do on the air
> in amateur radio and what you post here is most certainly not private.
>

No, it is not. It is not meant to be. What I wear in public is not
private, what I do in public is not private, and I hope you know where I am
going with this. It used to be, Dave, that women in anything but dresses to
their ankles and some kind of horridly uncomfortable attire for swimming
were considered vulgar. It used to be that women weren't supposed to vote.
It used to be that women did not accompany a man in a bar or pub. What I
now do in public is far more acceptable than it was several years ago and
will be nothing but ho hum in another 30-40.

> >
> > You may disagree with that, but it's too bad. I also don't
> > believe "accommodation" is mine to give at places like sports arenas,
bars,
> > concerts, parades, and lots of other places. I do believe that
> > accommodation is allowable--for *me*--at times such as emergency nets in
the
> > ARS, meetings, and lots of other places. But, if you think that a hobby

is
> > the place for everyone to yield to each other, I am sorry. I will not
> > comply with your desire. I don't think it is. It is known as an
impasse,
> > Dave. And, we either agree to disagree, or shut the Hell up about it.
But
> > neither of us is going to yield on our thoughts about our position.
And,
> > what is totally wrong--in my eyes--about you is that you nearly demand
of
> > someone how they must behave. AND, added to that you almost make it
sound
> > as though you'd think better of them if they do, maybe be their friend,
> > maybe respect them. How much more idealistic can that be, Dave? For
you to
> > "make deals" so that people will have you like them? I couldn't care
less
> > if you like me.
>
> Liking you or disliking you isn't part of the issue, Kim. I might not
> like you even if you had a normal callsign. It is just that you
> wouldn't be offending me and others with a non-suggestive call.
>

Well, I am offended that you are offended.

>
> I think you are confusing the words "accommodation" and "civility".
> You believe that you should be pretty much able to shout an oath just
> about anywhere you choose. You can do that but you'll have to steel
> yourself against being treated like the bastard child at the family
> reunion. You've chosen a *wink, nudge* callsign and defend your choice
> as a "right". If others take offense, they have a "right" to snub you,
> tell you off or laugh at you.
>

And, they're more than welcome to do it, Dave. Have I given you some kind
of impression that I feel like a bastard child? Have I given you the idea
that I feel wrongly snubbed, told off, or laughed at? Have you ever heard
of the saying "with friends like you who would need enemies?" If you are
that offended by a callsign, or even by my entire personality, it is not
your approval that I would wish upon myself.

> > >
> > > I see what you've done in
> > > the way I view the Howard Sterns of the world.
> > >
> >
> > I happen to enjoy *some* of Howard Stern. I think he goes way overboard
on
> > *some* things. I've never written him a letter telling him that I'll

listen
> > more if he *behaves*. I simply don't listen to him when he's, to me,
> > boring. AND, I don't think in any circumstance that he should be off
the
> > air.
>
> Stern has been yanked from more stations than most hosts ever have the
> opportunity to work for. He may his right to an opinion but station
> management and ultimately the listeners have a right to pull the plug on
> him.
>

What's that got to do with anything?

> > >
> > > You'd appear to do
> > > anything for shock value.
> > >
> >
> > If that's what you believe, then you have fun believing it. Just don't
> > expect me to live up to all your expectations. I can meet all of them,
but
> > am only willing to meet some of them.
>
> Kim, you've not met any of my positive expectations. You have more than
> met some of my negative expectations.
>
> > >
> > > I already gave you my answer to your "WHY?"
> > > question: Because it is the right thing to do. I think you already
> > > know that deep inside.
> >
> >
> > Well, you're deluding yourself then. Because I don't believe it's the
right
> > thing to do. I know you think it is, but I know that I do not. Again,
you
> > have your right to your opinion. You even have your right to express it
to
> > me. But, you don't have the right to demand that I be any different
than
> > what I am. No one has that right. Well, let's put it this way...yes, I
> > suppose they do have that right. And I have the right to completely,
> > literally, and happily dismiss their opinion and desire--and I do.
>
> I've made no demands at all upon you, Kim.
>
> Dave K8MN

Call it what you wish, Dave. You see it one way, I see it another. As I
said before, that is what makes life, diversity, and the world so fantastic.

Kim W5TIT

5758. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:26:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C294345.22DCB2BA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28854

CAM wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > For God's sake, why, why, why is it only you who you think should count?
>
> Because Dave has an over exaggerated idea of his own importance and nobody
> else's opinion matters a tinker's damn to him.

Here Cecil, wait while I drag this mirror over again. Can you see
yourself in it? Has it dawned upon you that the same words could be
used to describe you? Do you suppose that it has dawned upon Kim that
the same words could be used to describe her? Should I take the mirror
to where she can take a gander?

Dave K8MN

5759. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:27:28 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2944a7_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28858

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28C057.E538CE19@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C289B72.93CC660A@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C2761A1.9C3109F7@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:3C25074D.9742EA0B@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Actually, it does not. The courts are full of cases where it
must
> > be
> > > > > > > determined whether one person's choices intrude upon another's
> > rights.
> > > > > > > Slavery does not enter the equation at all. There are limits
to
> > every
> > > > > > > freedom we enjoy. You see some of the limits illustrated by
the
> > > > events
> > > > > > > which have unfolded over the past several months.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Kim's "rights" are not without limits.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No, and neither are yours, Dave. The government, by virtue of
> > allowing
> > > > > my
> > > > > > > callsign, has given me the right to have it. You are acting in
a
> > manner
> > > > > > > directly contrary to what my government allows me to do. You,
not
> > me,
> > > > > have
> > > > > > > exceeded the limits of your rights.
> > > > > >
```

> > > > > Please tell me what the limit is on stating my belief that your
call
> > is
> > > > > > tacky.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > You can say it all you want. To demand change of me, for you,
exceeds
> > the
> > > > > limits.
> > > >
> > > I've demanded nothing of you, Kim. I've tried to explain to you why
you
> > > should change your call, not for me alone but for any who would be
> > > offended by it and for the amateur radio service. As I pointed out to
> > > James deLoach, I'd ask anyone with a similar call do the same. They
> > > aren't all here. You are.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I think it's been more of a demand, Dave. You are incessant about your
> > desire to have me change my call, you say that it is for you and people
like
> > you. What about me, what about people like me? What about that, Dave?
Why
> > do I have to change for you?
>
> You have not changed for me or for anyone. I believe that the right
> thing to do would be to obtain a call that isn't offensive to anyone.
> I'd would like to think that you aren't one to go out of your way to
> offend anyone and that you care about the sensitivities of others.
> There is no demand to that, Kim. At this point, the only person who can
> take any corrective step would be you.
>
> Let's examine the scenario again. You have:
>
> Kim - Who doesn't give a damn what anybody thinks of her or her call
> and who deliberately chose a call which was suggestive in
> order to achieve a desired effect.
>
> Dave - Who has not chosen a call which would offend the
> sensitivities of anyone. His call was chosen as the "K"
> counterpart of a
> ham he greatly admired.
>
>
> Dave K8MN

And contrary to your way of thinking, Dave, both are wonderful calls.

Kim W5TIT

5760. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:27:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2943A6.275A38ED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28855

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Gosh Kim, your actions are judged in comparison with what society
> > generally agrees is appropriate behavior.
>
> Have you polled society on Kim's callsign, Dave? I'll bet you elitists
> are in the very small minority. The origin of the word "vulgar" means
> that it comes from the common folk who outnumber your uppity kind by a
> large percentage.

No, but it sounds like another quest for you. We weren't playing a game of word origins. Perhaps you'd like to provide us a commonly used and current definition of the term.

Dave K8MN

5761. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:29:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c294527_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28861

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28C188.31B21058@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C289DE0.9CCDE8AB@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > Where do I need protection, Dick? And, I have never been ridiculed
for
> > my
> > > > callsign. Sorry to burst your bubble.
> > >
> > > You've been ridiculed for your callsign any number of times here
alone.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I don't know when, Dave. I've never felt ridiculed. I think you're
> > allowing yourself far more power than you have.
>
> If a Kim falls victim to ridicule in the forest and there is no one to
> to alert her, is she still ridiculed?
>
> Dave K8MN

What a weak paradox, Dave. But, no, on either count. There is no sound if
a tree falls in the woods and no one is around to hear it, either. And, it
is a philosophical question, with no right or wrong answer.

Kim W5TIT

5762. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:29:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29441F.1400AF27@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28856

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You are the
> > same fellow who tried to elevate Kim to victimhood and the same fellow
> > who accused me of harassment. Interesting that both you and Kim choose
> > to continue to respond.
>
> Is it your advice that someone being harassed should do nothing about it?
> Sorry, that lets the evil people win.

Piffle.

Dave K8MN

5763. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:30:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c294570_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28863

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C28C1C9.76613834@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C289E2D.D0DA3058@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C27852D.2B6D0DAA@IEEE.org...
> > > > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > > > Just go on thumbing your nose at the world.
> > > > >
> > > > > It is you who is thumbing your nose at the world, Dave.
> > > > > Come down from your ivory tower, join the world, and
> > > > > enjoy life instead of being such an elitist grinch.
> > > > > --
> > > > > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > He'd need to pull the silver spoon out of his...er...well, you get
the
> > idea.
> > >
> > > I've asked several times, Kim. What's with the silver spoon stuff?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > It's my little secret, Dave. All mine. ;)
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> It'd probably have more effect in the newsgroup if folks could make
> sense of it.
>
> Dave K8MN

I'm not looking for effect in the newsgroup, Dave. It is *you* who believes
that our lives should be made up of things that have effects.

Kim W5TIT
```

5764. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:33:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29450C.4FCDCE26@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28859

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Dave - Who has not chosen a call which would offend the
> > sensitivities of anyone. His call was chosen as the "K"
> > counterpart of a
> > ham he greatly admired.
>
> Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
> you going to do about it?

You have no class, Cecil. My call was not chosen for suggestive impact nor does it spell anything, unless you find the abbreviation for Minnesota disturbing.

Dave K8MN

5765. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:36:06 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <GAbW7.310887$W8.11394890@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28860

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:DfbW7.241088$3d2.11707577@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote
>
> > > Because Dave has an over exaggerated idea of his own importance and
> > > nobody else's opinion matters a tinker's damn to him.
>
> Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
> > It's tinkers dam, without the 'n', Cecil. Look that up in your Funk
and
> > Wagnalls
>
> Sorry... Richard... it tinker's damn OR tinker's dam but NEVER tinkers
dam.
>
> Rich
>

Sorry, I don't own a Funk and Wagnalls

5766. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:36:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2945AF.FC782341@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28862

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Now you'd set a limit on how much I can protest?
>
> Not me, the government has set limits on how much you can protest.
> You have stepped over that limit with your harassment.

Let me know when the government places you in charge of Homeland
Harassment and provides you some authority.

> > It'd be interesting to compare my total volume of posts in this
> > newsgroup to your total volume--
>
> Not a fair comparison at all. There is a big difference between
> attacking a concept and viscously attacking a person as you
> have done.

You don't really want me to start dredging up some of the things you've
said to Dick Carroll and Larry have them come back to prove you a liar,
do you?

Dave K8MN

5767. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:37:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2945EA.72C17A6D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28864

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Rather than extending any effort to let the thread die a death
> > of its own, you help to prolong it. Your silly attempts to paint Kim
> > the "victim" of harassment prolong it. Your attempts to defend Kim's
> > thumbing her nose at the world prolong it. Are you rational enough to
> > realize it?
>
> If the conflict is not prolonged by the good guys, evil wins. What you are
> doing is evil, Dave, and I have faith that you will burn in hell for it.

Only if there is a choice between hell and Texas.

Dave K8MN

5768. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:37:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c29471e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28867

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2908ED.3751A909@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > From Webster's: "endorse - to inscribe with a title"
> > >
> > > The FCC endorsed Kim's callsign when they issued it.
> > > Kim's official ARS title, endorsed by the FCC, is
> > > clearly printed on her amateur radio license.
> >
> > There is about thee a certain aura. 'tis the manner in which thou art
> > able to perform the dictionary equivalent of adding one and one and
> > arriving at an incorrect result.
>
> Too bad you don't realize that one plus one can have an infinite
> number of results depending on the phase angle between the ones.
>
> I haven't seen Kim's amateur radio license but I'll bet it's
> printed on the same form as yours and mine and fully *endorced* by
> the "United States of America Federal Communications Commission".
> Kim, is that what your license says?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Uh, <giggle> I'd have to find, Cecil. But I bet you're right...LOL

Kim W5TIT

5769. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:40:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C294695.5D6E52D9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28865

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > That's largely because you don't seem to have understood how your
> > choices might offend people. We now know about your amazement. I'm
> > waiting for the part where you reach enlightenment.
>
> Dave, you must be the reincarnation of one of the priests who
> condemned Galileo to house arrest for asserting the earth was
> not the center of the universe. Enlightenment indeed. How can
> you know anything about enlightenment with your head buried
> in the sands of time?

How can you know anything about my head with your head buried
in the sands of Texas? It couldn't have been me. I know the great
circle paths from here backward and forward. What was Galileo's tacky
callsign?

Dave K8MN

5770. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:44:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29478E.D5E72FF8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28866

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Allow me to hold this mirror so that you might better see yourself, you
> > silly old man.
>
> Only 11 years older than you, Dave. That's not much. I just realized what
> your and my problem is. I'm an Aquarian, a clear-eyed seeker of wisdom
> and truth on the verge of the emerging Golden Age of Aquarius and you
> are a Pices left over from the decaying but lingering warlike Age of
> Pices which is, at this very moment, heaving its last ugly breath.

Eleven years is a long time, especially if you've wasted much of it.
Good thing for me that I'm a Pisces and not a subsciber to the beliefs
of astrologers. I don't know what that "Pices" thing is. Once could be
a typo but twice...

Dave K8MN

5771. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:48:42 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <uMbW7.241116$3d2.11709897@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28868

Congratulations, Bert! You had a doubt? One thing I am very happy about - you didn't simply memorize the Q&A pool. You have no idea how much you have helped yourself. You'll find you will be able to do a lot more about the problems which do crop up now and then when running on HF (or any other band, for that matter). You have the theory to deal with them. Again, congrats!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Bert Craig" <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011224171540.14772.00001392@mb-bj.news.cs.com...
> Hi everybody,
>
> I just wanted to take a moment to thank a few of the folks on r.r.a.p. for
all
> the help they gave me with my license upgrade. Ed Hare for never even
allowing
> me to entertain the thought that I wouldn't lick the code test like a
postage
> stamp. Jerry Oxendine and Jim Hampton for encouraging me to "enjoy" the
code
> and giving me pointers in 'Conversational CW 101' so I wouldn't sound like
a
> horses you-know-what upon my first true AR CW QSO. Dick McCollum gets BIG
TIME
> kudos for answering a multitude of questions with the patience of Job.
> Especially for telling me to "calm down," when, for reasons unknown to
this
> day, all my "Fast Farnsworth" practice flew out the window and I couldn't
copy
> 5-wpm to save my life...on the day before the test.
>
> I'm forced to put Dick Carroll and Larry Roll in a separate paragraph
because
> they helped me with something other than the code...an attitude
adjustment.
> Their self-made reputations as r.r.a.p. "toughies" are forever shattered
in
> this ham's eyes as they demonstrated that they would've gladly given me
their
> "lucky" shirts off their backs if it'd help me pass. Needless to say both
were
> very happy to hear that I passed. BTW, if you study with the ARRL 'Fast
> Farnsworth' CD's, the actual exam characters will feel like they're

"floating
> in."
>
> I originally did not want to write this because I thought it might be
construed
> as a "congratulate me" post. I did so because I want to let anybody who
might
> be "put off" by what they perceive as an attitude know that these folks
WANT to
> help you...so stick around.
>
> I'd be remiss if I didn't mention one other guy, a non-ham. My college
> certification professor, Mr. Cronk. He fixed it so that we could NOT earn
our
> sheepskins by just memorizing exam pool questions, hence the birth of the
> infamous "Cronk screenings." The General was easy but the Extra required
the
> dusting off of some pretty deeply buried electronics theory. Thanks
Professor
> C.!
>
> If I failed to mention any of you who encouraged me along the way, forgive
me.
> I just wanted to acknowledge the folks I leaned on the most. Thanks again.
I
> promise to pass it on to others. :-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

5772. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:49:22 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C2948C2.6052A62F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 28869

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

>
>
> Wow! Maybe someday we could have the TIT club. Ooops, never mind...LOL

Would it be a bird watcher club? :-)

5773. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:50:16 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c294a47_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28875

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C293B5C.84B12937@earthlink.net...
> Rick Adams wrote:
> >
> > On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:58:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >Be honest with us and with yourself, Kim. I don't believe that you
> > >conform unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. You wear your
> > >non-conformity like a badge and feel it necessary to shock people.
> >
> > Sometimes people NEED shocking, Dave. Non-conformity is the
> > basis for change, conformity the basis for inertia. Off hand, I don't
> > know of ANY system that can't profit from looking at itself from a
> > different perspective and at least _considering_ change, can you?
>
> You are talking about two very different things. Are you attempting to
> get me to agree that the key to re-examination is shock via vulgarity?
> That's not likely to happen. Your idea that people "NEED" shocking is
> self-advanced.
>
> > >I do believe that amateur radio does not need offensive folks whether
> > >they take the form of shock-value callsigns, on air obscenity or racism
> > >or argument of religious or political views.
> >
> > Dave, I can agree about obscenity and racism. But not
> > discussing religion or politics on the air? What do you want, an ARS
> > filled with people discussing their recent operations, their
> > equipment, and each other's signal strength only? A great benefit of
> > being a ham is the ability to talk with people in different cultures
> > and to discuss the issues important to them--and, Dave, those issues
> > are often religion and politics.
>
> You are probably as aware as I am where such discussions lead--to an
> argument which no one wins and no one changes his mind.
>

If there are people immature enough that they cannot discuss topics such as
culture, religion, politics, etc., with each other without civility and
respect, then there are those who would refrain from going any farther with
the discussion. I hear folks on the air all the time talking about military
strategies, governmental policies, religion, etc., and the conversations are
exchanges of ideas, little argued. I join in on those. I hear other
conversations that become as inflamed as they do here, and I refrain from

those. It takes a few moments to figure out the good and bad, Dave, but I have faith you can do it.

> >
> > Sorry, but if I--and, I suspect, many
> > other hams--couldn't feel free to discuss meaningful topics on the
> > air, there would be no reason to bother with amateur radio at all--the
> > Usenet would be FAR more interesting--and despite the bigots, racists,
> > homophobes, and self-righteous guardians of morality that infest the
> > Internet, would inspire far more intelligent conversations as well.
>
> I'm not suggesting that hams not have meaningful conversations, Rick.
> Funny that you'd read that into my statements. You are partially
> correct about the time-shifted "conversations" (or monologues placed end
> to end) of Usenet. They might be better than amateur radio for those
> who feel called upon to discuss offbeat topics for which the air waves
> are ill-suited.
>
> > Don't you ever get tired of exchanging signal reports or
> > discussing such "vital" topics as your station, the weather, your
> > family, and your job? Ham radio is about communications, Dave, not
> > just technology--and communications _includes_ those topics that are
> > controversial just as much as it does those that are far more mundane.
>
> How long have you been a ham, Rick? Do you think I need your advice
> about what ham radio is about? The word "communications" is a generic
> term with many meanings. Amateur radio may consist of the exchange of
> signal reports or the tale of a trip up the Orinoco River. It can
> include the discussion of the weather in Phoenix or may include formal
> message traffic. Avoiding controversial topics is plain old common
> sense. If you believe that it should include the controversial then
> perhaps you support the Liberty Net, K1MAN's broadcasts and the regular
> brawls which take place on 75m or on 14.313.
>

I support the idea that they have those discussions. I don't support that they would curse and swear, etc., because I don't think that is for ham radio. But to tell one group that their conversation is OK, while telling another that theirs is not is just so contrary to what I believe ham radio should be. I don't care if they're brawling. In fact, I listen sometimes and laugh hysterically.

> > >
> > >I don't know what kind of newsgroup you're posting to, Kim but your
> > >stuff is appearing in an amateur radio newsgroup. Right now I'm
posting
> > >here as I wait for dinner. I posted earlier in the day after
> > >participating in a 6m opening to Europe and the Caribbean.
> >
> > Funny how this becomes "an amateur radio newsgroup" when it
> > comes to criticizing Kim, but when I (or someone else) point out that

> > people here are demonstrating pretty poor behavior to potential hams,
> > I'm always told that "this is the Internet--not ham radio."
>
> Go back and read what Kim stated (including her colorful and
> unneccessary adjective). Now read my response. You might want to
> attempt to tie the two together before clambering up on that soapbox.
> Otherwise you end up looking kind of silly.
>
> > >You are, of course, absolutely correct that the amateur radio service
is
> > >one place where accommodation is necessary. Your callsign does not
meet
> > >that accommodation. Oh--did you mean that amateur radio must tolerate
> > >those who choose a call based on sexual innuendo and that we must all
> > >put up with it because you've found a new "right"? What you do in
> > >private with your life is indeed your business. What you do on the air
> > >in amateur radio and what you post here is most certainly not private.
> >
> > Then, since you agree that what is posted here is as relevant
> > as what is said on the air, I wonder how you can justify the harsh
> > posts by you, Larry, Dick, and others about Kim's call sign. She
> > merely USES the sign, the group of you pick it apart, insult her (and
> > others), demonstrate a total lack of respect for other hams in the
> > group, and in general make it clear that hams are NOT respectful,
> > polite, courteous, and friendly people--but are biased, opinionated,
> > self-righteous, and as capable of viciousness as any pit bull. How can
> > you POSSIBLY claim that you believe in accommodation when it comes to
> > public behavior, yet act as you do in this news group? YOU may not
> > view yourself as a computer hobbiest--but many of us do, and your
> > behavior here is no less offensive than the behavior of the
> > freebanders in the lower end of 10m!
>
>
> "Hobbyist", Rick. No, I'm not a computer hobbyist. I'm a computer
> user. I don't post in computer hobbyist newsgroups. I post in amateur
> radio newsgroups. I just uses computers as a tool. I didn't agree with
> you about anything. I stated my belief that vulgarity is vulgarity here
> or on the air. Your statement attempting to compare my actions to those
> of freebanders are laughable.
>
> > >Liking you or disliking you isn't part of the issue, Kim. I might not
> > >like you even if you had a normal callsign. It is just that you
> > >wouldn't be offending me and others with a non-suggestive call.
> > >
> > >I think you are confusing the words "accommodation" and "civility".
> > >You believe that you should be pretty much able to shout an oath just
> > >about anywhere you choose. You can do that but you'll have to steel
> > >yourself against being treated like the bastard child at the family
> > >reunion. You've chosen a *wink, nudge* callsign and defend your choice
> > >as a "right". If others take offense, they have a "right" to snub you,

> > >tell you off or laugh at you.
> >
> > But NOT to harass, insult, or attempt to intimidate her, Dave.
> > When something offends you, you make it clear that it IS offensive
> > and, if nothing is done to change it you either ignore it or stop
> > associating with the person giving the offense. In the case of a news
> > group, that would mean just kill filing Kim so you wouldn't have to be
> > exposed to her call sign at all.
>
> Insult, Rick? Sure I have that right. I don't harass and I don't
> intimidate. As long as Kim sees fit to argue the issue, I am free to
> respond. Don't like it? Killfile my stuff.
>
> > What you are doing has nothing to do with expressing offense
> > or making your position clear--it has everything to do with power. You
> > insist that you have the right to determine what is best for Kim and
> > for the ARS based on your personal values. Obviously, Kim and many
> > others of us disagree with you. Rather than treating it as a case
> > where you have to "agree to disagree" however, you seem fixated on
> > asserting your "power" by pressuring Kim to change her sign. I hate to
> > burst your bubble, Dave, but you don't have any power over anyone at
> > all.
>
> Get off your high horse, Rick. You can attempt to paint it as whatever
> your leftist heart desires. The only thing is, *you can't prove it*.
> I don't see the "many" standing behind you. Where did they go?
>
> > >Stern has been yanked from more stations than most hosts ever have the
> > >opportunity to work for. He may his right to an opinion but station
> > >management and ultimately the listeners have a right to pull the plug
on
> > >him.
> >
> > Typical.
>
> Your "typical" is typical.
>
> > Did you know, btw, that among the 100 most banned books in the
> > United States are Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn, The Age of Reason,
> > Black Beauty, and The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin? Apparently,
> > Kim's call sign isn't the only thing people like yourself find obscene
> > and work to remove from society.
>
> I don't have any interest at all in banning books, Rick. For a book to
> enter my home, I have to bring it here. There is no tie to that and a
> call like Kim's on the public airwaves.
>
> > When will people like you learn that simply because something
> > is personally offensive to you, it does NOT give you the right to
> > demand that OTHERS who don't share your view be deprived of it?

>
> Probably about the time that "people like you" learn that the public
> airwaves are not a sewer and that the people are not obligated to submit
> to your idea of radio nirvana. "People like you" can do what they want
> in private. They can't force it upon those who find their actions
> offensive.
>
> Dave K8MN

It's easy in the newsgroup. Have you taken on the television, movie, and
media industries also? Oh, they don't post here...pppphhhhhhfffttttttttt

Kim W5TIT

5774. RADIO LAW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:51:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxe9vq.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28870

On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 11:54:44 UNDEFINED, Peter H. Proctor wrote:

>But if a company cannot take something apart, they cannot do the "
>reasonable examination " that is required to file a patent suit under
>established case law..

Ah, you see the man behind the curtain....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5775. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:53:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C2949BA.9D7066A1@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 28871

Dave Heil wrote:

> What was Galileo's tacky
> callsign?

I5TIT? :-)

5776. RADIO LAW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:57:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxejhr.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28872

On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 13:23:10 -0500, Krell wrote:

>Judging from your "credibility" statement about 2600,

I've been dealing with "communication crooks" for decades. I "made
my bones" in the "Captain Crunch" era.

>I doubt that your lawyer friend had to try very hard to convince you.

Not at all.

>If you want to find out
>how quickly this law was rushed through congress without any challenge as to
>its constitutionality, look up the congressional record to see how your
>represenative and senators voted.

If it's so bad how come it sailed right through with no challenge?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5777. RADIO LAW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:57:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxekas.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28874

On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 13:54:28 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>: If encryption is a "fast one" it sure is taking a long
>: time. The ability to encrypt has been around for
>: years...nothing new on that technology.
>
>Not cheaply and easily. Digital trunked radio
>has made it very easily. Except that digital trunking
>has not worked out as well as they had hoped.

You noticed. One client of mine - a major LE agency - actually
forced The Big Em to take their 800 system back and provide a
WORKING 150 system in its place.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5778. RADIO LAW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 03:57:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxel1t.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28873

On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 14:01:55 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>Often someone overhears on site comments
>and makes it into a major political issue.

>They want to be able to cuss
>"in the heat of battle" without having to answer to every
>anti cop and anti government group out there.
>
>Plus the average street cop will go
>back to treating the radio as a CB where they all tell their
>off colored stories about women and minorities. Or co-ordinate
>the stories so that the last incident that went bad will look good
>on paper.

After 50 years of being a ham, I've learned that one should NEVER
say anything into a mivrophone (or a cell phone) that one would not
want to see on Page One of the New Yorl Times the next day.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5779. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:03:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c294dd0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28877

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3C2948C2.6052A62F@ix.netcom.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Wow! Maybe someday we could have the TIT club. Ooops, never mind...LOL
>
> Would it be a bird watcher club? :-)
>

It could be that among many things, I suppose. Have you ever seen flitting tits? That would be tits flitting all about.

Kim W5TIT

5780. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:09:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C294D79.51CFE330@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 28876

>

Congrads. Get on HF, it's fun to DX to other continents and
such. All you need is a used HF rig and an antenna as big as
you can get up. I've used crude dipoles strung in attic crawl spaces
and strung between trees. A rig with a good antenna tuner
will take care of most SWR issues. Just ignore the idiots
on 75 and 20. Plenty of reasonable hams out there.
I also do contests, but I don't compete. That is, I
see contests as a steady supply of contacts to see
how my rig and antenna are working. I can usually
hear further than I can be heard.

5781. Re: PROOF that we are all BARKING MAD! CBERS.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:15:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112252015.25eedf94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28878
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.swap

"Reg Edwards" <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com> wrote in message
news:<a08u81$9nk$1@helle.btinternet.com>...
> Dear Radiosam,
>
> An amendment :
>
> Place a full stop after "Mad" and delete "Cb-ers".
>
> Merry Xmas.
>
> Reg.
>
>
Good Lord Reg are things so boring over in .antannas these days that
it's gotten down to surfing this toxic waste site to find some
jollies?
>
>
w3rv

5782. The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:18:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxflk0.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28879

On 22 Dec 2001 05:03:15 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>One has to wonder what sparked the passage of such a law. Were
>residents experiencing TVI or other problems? Somebody had to have a
>reaosn to push this through.

That was the reason that Sen. Feingold pushed the bill through
The Congress giving away the FCC's jurisdiction to local entities.

The local worthies of Beloit whined that the FCC wouldn't do
anything - most probably because it was audio rectification and/or
fundamental overload which the FCC told them - rightfully - was
curable only at the affected equipment.

Supposedly that's what happened in Tacoma. We'd be interested in
hearing how this was applied to the "culprit" in question and what
the results were.

"You can't make chicken stew out of chicken feathers."

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5783. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:21:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C295058.A3011D6B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28881

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Rick Adams wrote:
> > > Hey, Cecil--do you feel that with respect to our views on the
> > > Libertarian Party platform we have to "agree to disagree?" I'll be
> > > glad to do so if you feel it's appropriate.
> >
> > Any two people can find something upon which to disagree. I'll bet that
> > you, Kim, Dave, and I agree on 95% of all subjects, e.g. smallpox is
> > bad. No two people agree 100% on everything. Think how boring the
> > world would be if everyone agreed on everything. This newsgroup would
> > not exist.
>
> Yet he provides no response to the query.

The answer is there, Dave, for any rational person.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5784. RADIO LAW - TACOMA BANS NON FCC....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:23:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxftz1.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28880

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 06:29:26 +0000 (UTC), Bill Nelson wrote:

>But put a physical education professor in with a
>group of physicists, and the physical ed professor is going to
>feel inadequate and out of place.

My ex-wife was a phys ed professor when I met her and she never felt inadequate and out of place with anyone.....nor did she permit anyone to regard her as such. (She earned a Master's Degree in Nursing and is now a nursing instructor at a major medical center.)

And on Mon, 24 Dec 2001 19:33:27 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>Same with doctors. Ask nurses how doctors act like tin gods.

Anyone who tries that with my ex gets it back in spades. The docs actually ask her opinion in her specialty (respiratory problems of newborn babies).

Not bad for a lady who started out as a phys ed instructor for blind kids.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5785. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:25:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C294430.BD749740@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28882

CAM wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > However, perhaps by posting here in the future,
> > and explaining to people that they can pass a code test like a Ferrari passing
> > a Yugo in second gear, then you can take ham radio one step further from
> > extinction.
>
> Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed the
> 5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what response?

Notg a single NCTA will know. Every PCTA will.

5786. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:25:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C295150.25B1E690@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28885

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Because Dave has an over exaggerated idea of his own importance and
> > nobody else's opinion matters a tinker's damn to him.
>
> It's tinkers dam, without the 'n', Cecil. Look that up in your Funk and
> Wagnalls

I did look it up in my Webster's Unabridged. Here's what it said:
"tinker's dam - see tinker's damn"
"tinker's damn - the least value"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5787. Mistuh Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:28:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxfzu2.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28883

On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 13:06:06 -0600, Unclaimed Mysteries wrote:

>"In a five-page order released Friday, the US Federal Communications
>Commission (FCC) claims that 38-year old convicted hacker Kevin Mitnick is
>not morally fit to be a ham radio operator. "
>
>Mitnick isn't an A-rab name, is it?

Not at all. Kevin is a convicted felon who served time for computer
and communications law crimes, and the Commish' is just following
the procedure to yank his license.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5788. Mistuh Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:28:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxg183.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28884

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 00:16:47 -0500, Krell wrote:

>> "In a five-page order released Friday, the US Federal Communications
>> Commission (FCC) claims that 38-year old convicted hacker Kevin Mitnick is
>> not morally fit to be a ham radio operator. "
>
>Maybe this is how the FCC plans on dismantling the amateur radio service.
>They'll declare all current licensees morally unfit in some way, not renew
>the license, and when the numbers have dwindled low enough, sell off the
>spectrum to the highest commercial bidder.

Only if they are convicted felons.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5789. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:28:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2951E8.5F44B72D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28886

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > For God's sake, why, why, why is it only you who you think should count?
> >
> > Because Dave has an over exaggerated idea of his own importance and nobody
> > else's opinion matters a tinker's damn to him.
>
> Here Cecil, wait while I drag this mirror over again. Can you see
> yourself in it? Has it dawned upon you that the same words could be
> used to describe you?

Has it dawned upon you that I present people with a mirror image of
themselves so they can learn something from the exercise? I become
you and respond to you as you would. Everything you say about me
applies to you.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5790. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:30:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29524A.807E241A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28887

Dave Heil wrote:
> Perhaps you'd like to provide us a commonly used and
> current definition of the term.

"term - a point in time assigned to something"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5791. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:33:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C295336.E8BFFAED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28889

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
> > you going to do about it?
>
> You have no class, Cecil. My call was not chosen for suggestive impact
> nor does it spell anything, unless you find the abbreviation for
> Minnesota disturbing.

Kim's call is one of 17K+ possible combinations of three letters and
you find it offensive. Why don't I have exactly the same right to
find your callsign offensive? And exactly what are you going to
do about that offensive callsign of yours?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5792. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:35:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F0035CA49B07E6B7.A2C1FE2D6EE4AE3C.AC1457A12A541813@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28888

On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:17:10 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Some folks believe that professional baseball players who sell
>autographs to kids are heroes. My heroes are genuine heroes.

Who?

>You seem to have some peculiar idea in your head that I'm not happy.
>I'm happy as a clam, Kim. Right now I'm happy that the FCC doesn't yet
>issue four letter suffixes.

Are you afraid that the urge to apply for k8dumb would be
overpowering?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5793. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:37:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C295404.DB50EBF7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28890

Dave Heil wrote:
> You don't really want me to start dredging up some of the things you've
> said to Dick Carroll and Larry have them come back to prove you a liar,
> do you?

They started it, Dave. I merely defended myself.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5794. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:40:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2954AE.34992319@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28892

Dave Heil wrote:
> How can you know anything about my head with your head buried
> in the sands of Texas? It couldn't have been me. I know the great
> circle paths from here backward and forward. What was Galileo's tacky
> callsign?

In Galileo's case, it was a theory that the priests found tacky, just
like you find Kim's callsign to be tacky. Come out of the closet, Dave.
If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5795. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:41:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2947E5.A74082F4@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote:

> : > There are a good deal of elitism out there.
> : > For whatever reason. The Marines teach
> : > it. So do the police academies.
> :
> : The police/Marines/doctors/professors etc ARE the elite, when it
> : comes to their areas of expertise. Outside that, they are no better
> : or worse than anyone else.
>
> There is the problem. Because they are elite
> in their fields, they do transfer that attitude to
> every other aspect of society. Because they
> are competent, they tend that no one else is.
> And if they do not know how to do it, then
> no one else should be able to do so either.
> (Thus the desire to ban technology such as
> guns or radios).

I don't buy it, N9MWO. There is and always has been elitgeism amongst the elite in any human endeavor, and that elitism has served for far more good than evil in free societies. I've known a lot of elite police officers in the past 40 years and darn few of them showed any tendency to transfer that to the sort constitutional violations you describe. Things change, and sometimes pretty fast, but if we're headed down that slippery slope, I haven't seen a lot of evidence of it. Of course I have seen some. One of he most gregarious cases was in New York Cit. In 1962 I watched a NYPD street cop give a guy an awful cussing in public while he stood with his hand on the butt of his revolver as if he dared the guy to respond in any way. The fellow' soffense was cuttting across one extra traffic lane to get to a (rare) parking spot. There was no safety reason for him not to do that, except the LEO noted his out of state license plate, and after all, some jerk behind who wanted the spot himself honked.....

5796. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 04:43:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011225234315.00833.00000842@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 28893

>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 12/25/2001 2:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112252005210.3479-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>

>He had due process. He was convicted by a court (presumedly a trial by
>jury).

Granted. Now, please tell me WHERE in American law it is written that we keep ON punishing someone AFTER the sentence meted out by the court has been fulfilled?

This action to cancel his license has absolutely NOTHING to do with any misconduct as an Amateur licensee, and as far as I can remember, he never used his Amateur license in any of his previous misdeeds.

Steve

5797. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 05:02:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011226000258.01493.00000420@mb-mw.aol.com>
Source record: 28896

In article <V00V7.306655$W8.11077136@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>The crux of this discussion is who to bar more than who to accept. There
>is a secondary issue that results from allowing every kid with two
>propellors on his beanie (Cecil, Jim, me) to get on and klutz around: how
>to keep the newbie from becoming a real pain in the butt to your 20 meter
>net, etc. So we developed the Class A, B, C structure before the war that
>required a year before one could get off 40 meter CW or 160 and 10 meter
>phone. Time becomes the standard legitimate or not. So the real issue is
>how to blend newbies into the scenery with a minimum of fuss and feathers.

I agree 100% so far. And the old systems didn't depend just on time - they
required more tests.
>
>With all due respect, legitimate standards are not going to come from the
>world of electronics. It is nice to know Ohm's and Joule's Laws in their
>permutations and even better if some of the implications dawn on the young
>and inexperienced. But then they didn't dawn on the writer and publisher
>of the infamous DDRR bent down at your local muffler shop that was
>featured in the Handbook for several years. Much like my days coaching
>middle school football, you had better expect some mistakes, some
>colossal, when you set a bunch of sixth and seventh-graders loose on a
>field; self-education can get real ugly.

"Experience varies directly with equipment ruined". Yeah, verily.

In fact the whole concept of LBMA (learning by messing around) is one of the
prime reasons for the ARS to exist. One can study electrical engineering and
radio propagaion till one is very schooled but the real education comes from
doing.
>
>Even lowering the code thing to 5wpm has not had a major effect of any
>kind simply because it serves the purpose of a small 'cooling off' period
>between decision and actuality. If I want to be the Channel Master of
>14.313 at least I have a week or two to come to my senses before hauling
>out my credit card and ending up with a Frankensteen.

Would that it worked so well. One of the problems today is that some newcomers
think they are experts in amateur radio because of experiences elsewhere.
Sometimes they are right and sometimes not. Arrogant disregard for the
community standards of amateur radio is not a good thing, and one of the
purposes of entry standards is to expose the newbies.

>To some extent the
>Brits with their theory of gathering similar people (personifying the

>enemy so to speak) in a room for eight hours in a spate of Morse
>Appreciation ending in an open book, take all day code test may actually
>have the problem right; I have been in corporate meetings less of a
>purpose for much the same reason: keeping the landmines and barbed wire
>down to a gentle, ladylike belch.

Maybe. The Brits are a different society, and their licensing has long been very different from ours. The Brits didn't have a Charlie Stewart back in 1910 so they even license receivers.

And all is not warm beer and skittles across the pond. Surf over to your favorite search engine and look up "UKRS" (United Kingdom Radio Society) Interesting stuff on their site about how the whole codetest thingie is being handled.
>
>Given the problem, translating a typical QSO into conversational Swahili
>probably is as legitimate as anything so long as no one knows that making
>the attempt is qualification enough.

Listen to the amateur bands in the USA and you don't hear much Swahili. But you do hear lots of Morse code.

>Course someone would immediately
>form No Swahili International.

Shall I dig out my Smith Chart rant again?

>So what do you view as legitimate standards???

One thing I note is that many people will give you "Zen" answers to that question - they'll tell you what is not a legitimate standard, but not what one is. Not much help.

I can give you a long discourse on the subject but it's late and you've seen it before.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5798. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 05:03:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011226000315.00833.00000845@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 28895

>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
>Date: 12/25/2001 9:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxap1p.pminews@or.news.verio.net>

> Section 308(b) of the Communications Avt specifically charges the
> Commission to make a detrmination of wherher any applicant or
> licensee possesses the moral character to become or remain a
> licensee.

(1) Why wasn't this done at the time he was first convicted? If it had occured then, no one would have thought twice about it...But NOW it's just vengence. Vengence and justice are not necessarily synonymous.

(2) WHO in the FCC has ANY qualifications to make a determination on morality? The bureaucrats and lawyers...?!?! HA!!

>Did you read the entire jistory of this case? This wasn't the first
> time.....and may not be his last, either.

Yes, I know about his "jistory". I also know that there has never been any allegation of misdeed as far as his Amateur license is concerned.

>>He screwed up, he know's it, he paid the price the courts put on him.
>
> He is totally unrepentent.

So...Mr FCC Lawyer...Unless they drop to thier knees, wallowing in tears, begging you to forgive them and "pretty pretty please don't take my license". they are unworthy of submitting to your (or your successors) whims?

A bit Napoleonic, aren't you?

>The FCC is doing what the law requires to yank this guy's privileges
> to operate a radio.

Was the FCC REQUESTED to revoke his license? If so, WHY? Has he perpetrated a NEW act against the law?

Is the action in response to a violation of the regulations underwhich he is licensed?

Phil, I guess you can't see the forest for the trees, here, but your bureaucratic arrogance is showing here. Like a bonfire at midnight.

You may not like the guy's attitude, Phil, but he submitted to the courts, and he fulfilled the sentence imposed upon him. The FCC's present action has NOTHING to do with any violation of FCC regulations as it pertains to his

Amatuer license, unless you have some sort of "super secret double probation" information you'd care to share?

Funnny...The FCC of your era just threw it's arms up and quit...Now they are taking every opportunity they can to be arrogant, abusive and totalitarian.

Seems your colleagues need to be reminded who they work for....Not vice versa.

5799. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 05:03:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxgpt8.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 28894

On 25 Dec 2001 14:03:36 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>Why is the FCC violating the Constitutional guarantees against punishment
>without due process?

He most certainly is getting due process. He was served with a
statement of charges and has been given the opportunity to respond
to them. He has been informed what he has to do if he wants a
hearing to contest the PROPOSED action, and what will happen if he
does not request or appear at that hearing.

What more do you consider "due process" ??

Does it bother you that the FCC is taking away his licemse? The
reason that the court did not do that is that only the FCC has that
jurisdiction.

Such "two step" actions are common in regulatory law. If a
physician is convicted of a felony the state medical board can and
usually does revoke his license to practice.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5800. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 05:51:19 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <rzdW7.198422$WW.11474840@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28897

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011226000258.01493.00000420@mb-mw.aol.com...
> In article
<V00V7.306655$W8.11077136@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> >The crux of this discussion is who to bar more than who to accept.
There
> >is a secondary issue that results from allowing every kid with two
> >propellors on his beanie (Cecil, Jim, me) to get on and klutz around:
how
> >to keep the newbie from becoming a real pain in the butt to your 20
meter
> >net, etc. So we developed the Class A, B, C structure before the war
that
> >required a year before one could get off 40 meter CW or 160 and 10
meter
> >phone. Time becomes the standard legitimate or not. So the real issue
is
> >how to blend newbies into the scenery with a minimum of fuss and
feathers.
>
> I agree 100% so far. And the old systems didn't depend just on time -
they
> required more tests.
> >
> >With all due respect, legitimate standards are not going to come from
the
> >world of electronics. It is nice to know Ohm's and Joule's Laws in
their
> >permutations and even better if some of the implications dawn on the
young
> >and inexperienced. But then they didn't dawn on the writer and
publisher
> >of the infamous DDRR bent down at your local muffler shop that was
> >featured in the Handbook for several years. Much like my days coaching
> >middle school football, you had better expect some mistakes, some
> >colossal, when you set a bunch of sixth and seventh-graders loose on a
> >field; self-education can get real ugly.
>
> "Experience varies directly with equipment ruined". Yeah, verily.
>
> In fact the whole concept of LBMA (learning by messing around) is one of
the

> prime reasons for the ARS to exist. One can study electrical engineering
and
> radio propagaion till one is very schooled but the real education comes
from
> doing.
> >
> >Even lowering the code thing to 5wpm has not had a major effect of any
> >kind simply because it serves the purpose of a small 'cooling off'
period
> >between decision and actuality. If I want to be the Channel Master of
> >14.313 at least I have a week or two to come to my senses before
hauling
> >out my credit card and ending up with a Frankensteen.
>
> Would that it worked so well. One of the problems today is that some
newcomers
> think they are experts in amateur radio because of experiences
elsewhere.
> Sometimes they are right and sometimes not. Arrogant disregard for the
> community standards of amateur radio is not a good thing, and one of the
> purposes of entry standards is to expose the newbies.
>
> >To some extent the
> >Brits with their theory of gathering similar people (personifying the
> >enemy so to speak) in a room for eight hours in a spate of Morse
> >Appreciation ending in an open book, take all day code test may
actually
> >have the problem right; I have been in corporate meetings less of a
> >purpose for much the same reason: keeping the landmines and barbed wire
> >down to a gentle, ladylike belch.
>
> Maybe. The Brits are a different society, and their licensing has long
been
> very different from ours. The Brits didn't have a Charlie Stewart back
in 1910
> so they even license receivers.
>
> And all is not warm beer and skittles across the pond. Surf over to your
> favorite search engine and look up "UKRS" (United Kingdom Radio Society)
> Interesting stuff on their site about how the whole codetest thingie is
being
> handled.
> >
> >Given the problem, translating a typical QSO into conversational
Swahili
> >probably is as legitimate as anything so long as no one knows that
making
> >the attempt is qualification enough.
>
> Listen to the amateur bands in the USA and you don't hear much Swahili.

But you
> do hear lots of Morse code.
>
> >Course someone would immediately
> >form No Swahili International.
>
> Shall I dig out my Smith Chart rant again?
>
> >So what do you view as legitimate standards???
>
> One thing I note is that many people will give you "Zen" answers to that
> question - they'll tell you what is not a legitimate standard, but not
what one
> is. Not much help.
>
> I can give you a long discourse on the subject but it's late and you've
seen it
> before.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

This particular rant was in answer to Carl; I answered your question more directly in another post. But the theme is the same: when you have a hobby with 945 facets and traditions predating the Titanic not to mention international implications it is not something you throw at someone off the street or Channel 37 and expect either the newbie or the veteran to survive. There has to be some sort of 'aging' before the wine is drunk for the benefit of the hobby to be sure but also to the tyro himself or we will simply go thru recruits who don't re-up.

In my Novice days I lacked the real estate for an 80 meter dipole so I fired up on 7175 to find that Radio Moscow liked that freq as well. My mother probably still wonders where her nice plate glass mirror went; I used it and some Babo to get the crystal up to 7178 or so. For lack of anything better to do, I put in the plug-in coils for 15 and plugged in one of my dad's 40 cw rocks and fired up on 15 and worked a raft of DX in a very short time. To this day I like 15 far more than 20 for a far nicer group of derelicts. Then as antennas are prone to do in storms, I got to install it right this time. OK, learning by klutzing around.

The hobby does not need a steel gate but it sure as hell could use an airlock.

Dick NBK

5801. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 07:58:35 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3CC96B2F008A864E.1BA7F5924A45FA74.2BA56C4C37F4932D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28898

On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 22:49:22 -0500, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>> Wow! Maybe someday we could have the TIT club. Ooops, never mind...LOL
>
>Would it be a bird watcher club? :-)

Only if you're British.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5802. Re: The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 11:40:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011226064022.28248.00000648@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 28899

From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam

> The local worthies of Beloit whined that the FCC wouldn't do
> anything - most probably because it was audio rectification and/or
> fundamental overload which the FCC told them - rightfully - was
> curable only at the affected equipment.

Although that is technically quite correct, there is still plenty the FCC could have done if the source of the RF energy were not following its power rules. However, the real crux of the matter is that 95% of the time where a "CB" station is involved with an interference problem. there is some other rules violation involved (power, frequency) that could be enforced to eliminate the problem.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5803. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 11:42:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011226064243.28248.00000649@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 28900

>Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed
>the 5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what
>response?

It appears quite simple. Those that sing Larry's praises on rrap are told they deserve congratulations for passing the 5 wpm test. Those that do not praise Larry receive the badmouth treatment.

It appears to me that in Larry's view, it really IS all about Larry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5804. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 11:45:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011226064502.28248.00000650@mb-cq.aol.com>
Source record: 28801

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Notg a single NCTA will know. Every PCTA will.

Another way of saying that he doesn't know, either. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5805. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 12:24:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C29B465.56D1FFF@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28802

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C289A48.3E39B90C@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C275D4A.BB14655B@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:3C25044C.4766B089@earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > What's with this "silver spoon" stuff, Kim? This is perhaps the
> third
> > > > > > or fourth time you've used it with me? What has it to do with my
> > > > > > comment? Did you or did you not receive the positive response you
> > > > > > sought from Riley?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > Dave, to have received any response at all from Riley was positive.
> But
> > > > > *you* refuse to understand that. I cannot beat you over the head
> with
> > > the
> > > > > statements that a) I appreciate that Riley responded to my query, b)
> I
> > > > > wholeheartedly accept everything Riley had to say but *do not* agree
> > > with
> > > > > him that my callsign brings the ARS one step closer to extinction,
> c) I
> > > > > don't believe Riley was speaking official FCC line--there is no way
> he
> > > could
> > > > > have, d) I *do* believe (because I know me so well) that the reason
> I
> > > sent
> > > > > the note to Riley was to ask him a question as an official of the
> FCC on
> > > > > what he *believed* the policy should be coming from a government
> > > > > organization.
> > > > >
> > > > Now, for you to insist that I think anything else about or from

> Riley,
> > > is
> > > > > just your ignorant silver spoon flaring at you in your face. Get a
> > > life,
> > > > > Dave.
> > > >
> > > > Again, you fail to explain the silver spoon stuff, Kim. You use it
> but
> > > > don't attempt to explain what it is that you mean by it. It begins to
> > > > sound even more peculiar when you write something like "ignorant
> silver
> > > > spoon".
> > > >
> > > > Your response from Riley was no better than 50/50. The fact that you
> > > > disagree with him (and thus reject the portion of the response)
> > > > regarding his statement about your helping to bring the amateur
> service
> > > > "one step closer to extinction" shows that you lack any understanding
> of
> > > > the sensitivities of others who might be offended by your choice.
> > > >
> > >
> > > And, I'll ask you again, Dave, the question that you nor others like you
> > > ever seem to quite answer. In fact, you all avoid it like the plague.
> > > *WHY* should one such as me change *my* ways for one such as you?
> *WHAT*
> > > makes your desire for me to change more important that my desire not to?
> > > *WHO* made it your world to force (or even request) that others change
> the
> > > way they are for you? *WHEN* did the laws of human nature change such
> that
> > > you've become more superior to me and therefore have more rights than
> me?
> > > *WHERE* do you get off pushing such crap on others?
> > >
> > > Not that I ever would, but how 'bout if I request that you come out and
> get
> > > a little nasty for me?
> >
> > Is that your standard? Should the world stoop to the lowest possible
> > standard?
> >
>
> I didn't ask the world to, Dave, only you. And, no, you do not have to meet
> my standard. Nor do I have to meet yours. *WHY* do you insist that I must
> meet yours? Huh?
>
> >
> > Should we totally do away with any concept of accomodating
> > the sensibilities and values of others or do we all simply do what we

> > want regardless of who we offend?
> >
>
> Like I said to you. We all (those of us who live the way I do, anyway) have
> our limitations. I will conform where I believe it is utmost for me to do
> so. I don't think places like the ARS is one of those situations. If you
> believe it is, and if I am so damned insulting to you, then cease and desist
> with recognition of me, Dave. Go on with your life and let me have and live
> mine. Of course, I'm going to do that anyway, and it simply amazes me that
> you--one who would have the world believe you are so dignified and
> intelligent--spend your time arguing such innane things as are here in this
> newsgroup. Good grief, you're no more grand than any of us here--it's
> Christmas Day and you are posting to a fucking newsgroup, Dave. What's
> *YOUR* excuse?
>
> >
> > I don't want to live in a world like
> > that, Kim, nor do I know many folks who do.
> >
>
> And, for God's sake would you finally get this....*NO ONE* (most of all me)
> says you have to. BUT, why do you wish me, demand nearly of me, that I must
> abide by your lifestyle? WHY? The grand scale of the ARS, in my humblest
> of opinions, is not one of the places where I believe accommodation is
> necessary. You may disagree with that, but it's too bad. I also don't
> believe "accommodation" is mine to give at places like sports arenas, bars,
> concerts, parades, and lots of other places. I do believe that
> accommodation is allowable--for *me*--at times such as emergency nets in the
> ARS, meetings, and lots of other places. But, if you think that a hobby is
> the place for everyone to yield to each other, I am sorry. I will not
> comply with your desire. I don't think it is. It is known as an impasse,
> Dave. And, we either agree to disagree, or shut the Hell up about it. But
> neither of us is going to yield on our thoughts about our position. And,
> what is totally wrong--in my eyes--about you is that you nearly demand of
> someone how they must behave. AND, added to that you almost make it sound
> as though you'd think better of them if they do, maybe be their friend,
> maybe respect them. How much more idealistic can that be, Dave? For you to
> "make deals" so that people will have you like them? I couldn't care less
> if you like me.
>
> >
> > I see what you've done in
> > the way I view the Howard Sterns of the world.
> >
>
> I happen to enjoy *some* of Howard Stern. I think he goes way overboard on
> *some* things. I've never written him a letter telling him that I'll listen
> more if he *behaves*. I simply don't listen to him when he's, to me,
> boring. AND, I don't think in any circumstance that he should be off the
> air.

>
> >
> > You'd appear to do
> > anything for shock value.
> >
>
> If that's what you believe, then you have fun believing it. Just don't
> expect me to live up to all your expectations. I can meet all of them, but
> am only willing to meet some of them.
>
> >
> > I already gave you my answer to your "WHY?"
> > question: Because it is the right thing to do. I think you already
> > know that deep inside.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Well, you're deluding yourself then. Because I don't believe it's the right
> thing to do. I know you think it is, but I know that I do not. Again, you
> have your right to your opinion. You even have your right to express it to
> me. But, you don't have the right to demand that I be any different than
> what I am. No one has that right. Well, let's put it this way...yes, I
> suppose they do have that right. And I have the right to completely,
> literally, and happily dismiss their opinion and desire--and I do.

I bet she calls her little granddaughter in to listen to her George Carlin and
Howard Stern tapes with her.....

5806. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 12:50:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C29BAA5.36F47983@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28803

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Dave - Who has not chosen a call which would offend the
> > sensitivities of anyone. His call was chosen as the "K"
> > counterpart of a
> > ham he greatly admired.
>
> Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
> you going to do about it?

I'd imagine he'll make the futile suggestion that you work on cleaning up your thought process. Ya gott reach really way down there to come up with that crap.

5807. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 13:05:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C29BE05.3D9FA679@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28804

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C28B7BD.9BEE9175@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C2897CD.E53C98D2@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > I'm fine with reality, Kim. I already knew that no one at the FCC or
> > > > the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls. So you've come to
> > > > think of your call as "racey", have you?
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > What kind of dark closet *do* you live in?! Of course I think it's
> racey,
> > > different, fun, daring, non-conformist, dignified, respectable and
> naughty
> > > all at the same time. It's *my* callsign, Dave. It is to me what I
> wish it
> > > to be. It is to you whatever you wish it to be. And, I accept every
> single
> > > bit of it.
> >
> > Then I'd assume that you're getting used to the cat calls you've
> > garnered that you're likely becoming accustomed to your newly found
> > notoriety.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I haven't heard any. I can get way past the negative responses, Dave, and
> get on with the fun about it. I didn't realize I'd reached any status of
> notoriety.

Yep. Topless. Nothin' above the neck

5808. Re: RADIO LAW - TACOMA BANS NON FCC....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 13:10:02 UTC
From: Steve Yodel <BAQ_Enterprises@arqwxz.com>
Message-ID: <a0ci6r$9ih$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 28805

My ex-wife started out as dance instructor in the inner
city. While teaching dance to pregnant teens, she earned
24 Doctorate degrees, ranging from exotic dance to nuclear
physics. When testifying before Congress, she would put
down sexist Congressman in a heart beat. I met her while we
were special advisors to the President. In fact, the President
so admired here that he would seek her advice before he made
any major decision. Later, we got bored being on the President's
national security team, so we both joined the Army Airborne
Rangers. She earned 13 more Doctorate degrees, one while
bailing out of a C-17 aircraft over hostile territory. The male
troops would try to put her down, but that never stopped her.
In fact she went on to become a Navy Seal. Then we resigned
from the armed forces, opened our own business selling rare
comic books. Yes, quite a lady! She finally divorced me for
spending too much time on Usenet and ran off with Bill Clinton,
but their affair remains a secret, as the one thing my ex-wife does
fear is Hillary Clinton. Ahhh, those were the years! Now all I have
left in life is sitting here on Usenet trying to top the postings of
other people and act superior to everyone else. Geronimo!
Up Up and away, to infinity!

Steve-The-Wonderful, a ham since 1926.

5809. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 13:35:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112260535.4c902b85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28806

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<3C25D150.69216283@townsqr.com>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 17:45:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > wrote:
> > >A professional engineer should have aced the Extra test.
> >
> > Why? 1/4 or more of the questions involve totally
> > non-technical subjects (VE credentials, amateur space
> > operations rules, etc.)
>
> I aced the Extra test over 30 years ago, long before VE credential etc
> questions, and I'm, not a degreed engineer. All that means what?
>
>
Precisely nothing as you well know.
>
>
If the life of ham radio depended on EEs our game woulda been long
gone. If the life of ham radio depended on the the even more scarce
EEs who are also PEs the game woulda been over even quicker. There is
no correlation whatsoever among flavors of degrees and/or a lack
thereof and/or the FCC passing out radio operator licenses and/or
passing scores on the writtens and/or the individual's contributions
to anything in ham radio.
>
>
Unless of course there is some perceived merit in gloming an Extra
just for the bragging rights instead of actually putting it on the air
in the Extra setasides.
>
>
If bragging rights is the name of the game then what the hell, thee me
and gazillions of others around here did the 20wpm thing at our
neigborhood FCC offices which the lightweights around here will never
do.
>
>
w3rv

5810. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 13:37:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c29d3ae_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28808

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C29B465.56D1FFF@townsqr.com...
>
> I bet she calls her little granddaughter in to listen to her George Carlin
and
> Howard Stern tapes with her.....
>

No I don't, Dick. She's not old enough to understand the humor yet. As you
aren't.

Kim W5TIT

5811. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 13:37:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c29d3cc$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28809

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C29BAA5.36F47983@townsqr.com...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Dave - Who has not chosen a call which would offend the
> > > sensitivities of anyone. His call was chosen as the "K"
> > > counterpart of a
> > > ham he greatly admired.
> >
> > Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
> > you going to do about it?
>
> I'd imagine he'll make the futile suggestion that you work on cleaning
> up your thought process. Ya gott reach really way down there to come up
> with that crap.
>

Just as you do, right?

Kim W5TIT

5812. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 13:38:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C29C5E6.C461E500@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28807

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You don't really want me to start dredging up some of the things you've
> > said to Dick Carroll and Larry have them come back to prove you a liar,
> > do you?
>
> They started it, Dave. I merely defended myself.

With lies, of course, which we see you're still doing.

5813. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 13:39:14 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c29d41d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28810

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C29BE05.3D9FA679@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C28B7BD.9BEE9175@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C2897CD.E53C98D2@earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm fine with reality, Kim. I already knew that no one at the FCC
or
> > > > > the ARRL would endorse your poor choice of calls. So you've come
to
> > > > > think of your call as "racey", have you?
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > What kind of dark closet *do* you live in?! Of course I think it's
> > racey,
> > > > different, fun, daring, non-conformist, dignified, respectable and
> > naughty
> > > > all at the same time. It's *my* callsign, Dave. It is to me what I
> > wish it
> > > > to be. It is to you whatever you wish it to be. And, I accept
every
> > single
> > > > bit of it.
> > >
> > > Then I'd assume that you're getting used to the cat calls you've
> > > garnered that you're likely becoming accustomed to your newly found
> > > notoriety.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I haven't heard any. I can get way past the negative responses, Dave,
and
> > get on with the fun about it. I didn't realize I'd reached any status
of
> > notoriety.
>
```

> Yep. Topless. Nothin' above the neck
>
>

At least I've got something below my waist.

Kim W5TIT

5814. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 13:52:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C29C931.4E75F75@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28811

W1RFI wrote:

> >Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed
> >the 5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what
> >response?
>
> It appears quite simple. Those that sing Larry's praises on rrap are told they
> deserve congratulations for passing the 5 wpm test. Those that do not praise
> Larry receive the badmouth treatment.
>
> It appears to me that in Larry's view, it really IS all about Larry.

Ed I would have expected a more intelligent analysis than that, given that you do work CW. But then again, you also work at ARRL HQ.....

5815. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 13:53:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C29C977.DC532D89@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28812

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Not a single NCTA will know. Every PCTA will.
>
> Another way of saying that he doesn't know, either. :-)

Well, we now know where that puts you.....

5816. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:05:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C29CC26.18A681D1@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28813

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<3C25D150.69216283@townsqr.com>...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 17:45:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > wrote:
> > > >A professional engineer should have aced the Extra test.
> > >
> > > Why? 1/4 or more of the questions involve totally
> > > non-technical subjects (VE credentials, amateur space
> > > operations rules, etc.)
> >
> > I aced the Extra test over 30 years ago, long before VE credential etc
> > questions, and I'm, not a degreed engineer. All that means what?
> >
> >
> Precisely nothing as you well know.
> >
> >
> If the life of ham radio depended on EEs our game woulda been long
> gone. If the life of ham radio depended on the the even more scarce
> EEs who are also PEs the game woulda been over even quicker. There is
> no correlation whatsoever among flavors of degrees and/or a lack
> thereof and/or the FCC passing out radio operator licenses and/or
> passing scores on the writtens and/or the individual's contributions
> to anything in ham radio.
> >
> >
> Unless of course there is some perceived merit in gloming an Extra
> just for the bragging rights instead of actually putting it on the air
> in the Extra setasides.
> >
> >
> If bragging rights is the name of the game then what the hell, thee me
> and gazillions of others around here did the 20wpm thing at our
> neigborhood FCC offices which the lightweights around here will never
> do.

BINGO!

5817. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:05:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112260605.2ea72102@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28814

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message news:<3c292f17_2@news7.fast.net>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011224100327.27168.00000589@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > In article <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse@fast.net>
> > writes:
> >
> [snip]
> >
> > What is the difference between an FCC rule that says Morse skill is
> required to
> > use a particular part of the radio spectrum and a Park Service rule
> that says
> > motor vehicles cannot be used in certain parks and wilderness areas?
>
> The sort of Park Service rules that you refer to are intended to
> protect and preserve the environment.

Which means the govt. does have an interest in protecting the historic
and traditional nature of some things, even if they are public
property.

The end result is a "setaside" for "legacy modes of transportation"
like walking and horseback riding.

> The FCC (and other
> rational entities) have recognized the fact that Morse proficiency
> doesn't "preserve the environment" (it doesn't, as some claim,
> serve as a "lid filter" ... see various FCC Report and Order
> documents for such findings.)

You're missing the point, Carl. The issue was about traditions and
their preservation as a matter of law.

No test can serve perfectly as a "lid filter". That doesn't mean the
tests have no effect on behavior.

The FCC decided long ago (1975) to push for code test elimination.
They have gradually but steadily eroded code testing over time, and
are merely keeping 5 wpm because of S25.5. Doesn't mean the FCC is
"right" or "rational", just that they decided on a course of action
and are pursuing it.

FCC also decided that the written tests were to be reduced in size and number, too. The process has been going on for a long time and there's no end in sight. Does that make those of us who support better written testing irrational? Nope.
>
> > >Another concept to consider is that "discipline" is a bit misused
> in
> > >this application, IMHO. Are you talking about the concept that
> some
> > >have voiced that "It's (jumping through the Morse proficiency hoop)
> > >necessary to show 'committment'." ???
> >
> > Experience has shown what happens without such commitment.
>
> And that is WHAT?

A service that is a complete mess.

> Most of the no-code techs I've met are
> polite and concientious operators.

Most of the hams I know, of all license classes, are polite, conscientious, skilled and technically-knowledgeable operators.

What I was referring to was what happened to the cb radio service, which has never required any sort of "commitment" other than getting a radio set and putting it on the air.

> MANY are far more
> technically competent than many fast-beepers ...

The reverse is also true. All depends who you hang out with and how you define "technical competence". Technical competence is also not a "lid filter", btw. Just check the FCC enforcement letters.

"Technical competence" is of no consequence unless an amateur actually does something with it. I've got BSEE and MSEE degrees - does that make me "FAR more valuable" to the ARS' future?

> and I view
> technical competence as FAR more valuable to the future
> of amateur radio than being able to beep fast.

Your opinion only. That's not a reason to force new modes and technologies down the throats of people who are not interested, nor to force new hams to jump through technical proficiency hoops to get a license.

All hams are free to develop their technical skills in whatever area they so desire, to whatever level they choose. No degree or specific class of license required. But in the decade since the dropping of the code test for the Technician, no revolution in amateur radio technology has occurred because of the code test changes.
>

> > >Showing"committment" also has no place in regulation.
> >
> > I would call it "responsibility".
>
> One can operate and behave responsibly with no knowledge
> of Morse whatsoever ...

No doubt. That's not the point. One cannot operate and behave responsibly with no sense of responsibility, or commitment to the ARS.

--

Which still begs the questions: what do YOU consider "legitimate standards"? If/when the code test completely disappears, what should the US amateur radio license structure and requirements look like?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5818. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:23:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29DD7B.EFF001B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28815

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
> > you going to do about it?
>
> I'd imagine he'll make the futile suggestion that you work on cleaning
> up your thought process.

EXACTLY the point, Dick. You guys need to work on cleaning up
your thought processes. Vulgarity is not in the call sign - it
is in your and Larry's and Dave's minds. I'm glad you finally
get it. Hey Kim, Dick finally gets it!
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5819. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:29:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c29dfd7_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28817

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C29DD7B.EFF001B3@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
> > > you going to do about it?
> >
> > I'd imagine he'll make the futile suggestion that you work on cleaning
> > up your thought process.
>
> EXACTLY the point, Dick. You guys need to work on cleaning up
> your thought processes. Vulgarity is not in the call sign - it
> is in your and Larry's and Dave's minds. I'm glad you finally
> get it. Hey Kim, Dick finally gets it!
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

It won't last, Cecil. It won't last. He never does. ;)

Kim W5TIT

5820. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:29:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29DEC4.AB7B30A2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28816

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You don't really want me to start dredging up some of the things you've
> > > said to Dick Carroll and Larry have them come back to prove you a liar,
> > > do you?
> > >
> > They started it, Dave. I merely defended myself.
>
> With lies, of course, which we see you're still doing.

Dick, most people can disagree without being disagreeable.
You are an exception. You are congenitally disagreeable.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5821. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:30:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c29e046_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28818

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C29C977.DC532D89@townsqr.com...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >Not a single NCTA will know. Every PCTA will.
> >
> > Another way of saying that he doesn't know, either. :-)
>
> Well, we now know where that puts you.....
>

Yep. In the know...

Kim W5TIT

5822. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:51:44 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <ftoj2uscc3uckro3ptsick2p5urmepa9hm@4ax.com>
Source record: 28819
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 17:02:33 -0500, an orbiting mind control laser caused
Jim Patterson <jrp32nospam@bellsouth.net> to write in talk.politics.guns :

>When quite young though in my memory, I was injured (turned out to be
>just a broken collarbone) at a convention that my parents were attending
>at a rural town park. Dad got me in his (then new) '55 Olds and had a
>Legion buddy holding me down in the back seat. He later told me that we
>were going over 100mph to the hospital. We were stopped by a highway
>patrolman who in seconds was escorting us to the hospital, same speed,
>with sirens going and that was the last heard from the police. To me,
>that is non-restrictive law at work.
>I wonder what would happen with the same circumstances today?

You would have a five-to-thirty minute delay while an ambulance was called,
then you'd be on your way to the hospital and your father would be on his
way to jail for reckless endangerment.

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

5823. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:52:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112260652.5b0604bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28821

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2954AE.34992319@IEEE.org>...

> If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?

Nope. Nor to anyone else. Nor would I issue similar inappropriate callsigns.

Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5824. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:53:13 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <e2pj2uog3911df0f82akhpljvmn1hi4uhe@4ax.com>
Source record: 28820
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

On 24 Dec 2001 03:34:32 GMT, an orbiting mind control laser caused
Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com to write in talk.politics.guns :

>> Here, there aren't any carry laws for law-abiding citizens.
>> There aren't any licences either, which is a double-edged sword.
>> I can carry anywhere in the state (other than the obvious places
>> - schools, courthouses...) no license required. OTOH, I can't
>> get any benefit from reciprocal agreements either, since I have
>> no permit. ..concealed or not.
>>
>> ----
>> Keith
>>
>You in Texas,Keith?

I was guessing Vermont.

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

5825. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 14:57:28 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <aapj2ugu78p240em937rp5dehc9phmkl61@4ax.com>
Source record: 28822
Cross-posted to: alt.military,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 04:41:09 GMT, an orbiting mind control laser caused
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> to write in talk.politics.guns :

>>Hell, in Chicago the locals in some neighborhoods
>>would beat up the fire fighters and EMTs when
>>they showed up. Then file complaints because
>>they were not properly served!
>>
>>And the mayor, that great democrat, of Chicago
>>has yet to settle with the police so that they can
>>get a pay raise.
>
> Chi-town lives up to its reputation.....

Wrong direction.

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

5826. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:11:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29E8A5.8AA1D59B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28823

```
CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > For God's sake, why, why, why is it only you who you think should count?
> > >
> > > Because Dave has an over exaggerated idea of his own importance and nobody
> > > else's opinion matters a tinker's damn to him.
> >
> > Here Cecil, wait while I drag this mirror over again. Can you see
> > yourself in it? Has it dawned upon you that the same words could be
> > used to describe you?
>
> Has it dawned upon you that I present people with a mirror image of
> themselves so they can learn something from the exercise? I become
> you and respond to you as you would. Everything you say about me
> applies to you.

What has dawned on me is that you use my stuff as if you originated it.

Dave K8MN
```

5827. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:13:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29E926.AB353375@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28824

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
> > > you going to do about it?
> >
> > You have no class, Cecil. My call was not chosen for suggestive impact
> > nor does it spell anything, unless you find the abbreviation for
> > Minnesota disturbing.
>
> Kim's call is one of 17K+ possible combinations of three letters and
> you find it offensive. Why don't I have exactly the same right to
> find your callsign offensive? And exactly what are you going to
> do about that offensive callsign of yours?

Your new quest, Don. Q., is to advise us on how many of the 17k+ spell
something which could be viewed by others as vulgar.

Dave K8MN

5828. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:15:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29E982.49F34632@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28825

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:17:10 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Some folks believe that professional baseball players who sell
> >autographs to kids are heroes. My heroes are genuine heroes.
>
> Who?

Folks other than professional baseball players who sell autographs to
kids.

> >You seem to have some peculiar idea in your head that I'm not happy.
> >I'm happy as a clam, Kim. Right now I'm happy that the FCC doesn't yet
> >issue four letter suffixes.
>
> Are you afraid that the urge to apply for k8dumb would be
> overpowering?

You thought of it. It's yours by right.

Dave K8MN

5829. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:16:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29E9EB.D916263F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28826

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You don't really want me to start dredging up some of the things you've
> > said to Dick Carroll and Larry have them come back to prove you a liar,
> > do you?
>
> They started it, Dave. I merely defended myself.

Awwww, Cecil. Maybe the other kids will quit pushing you down out in
the playground.

Dave K8MN

5830. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:18:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C29EA4D.68E36264@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28827

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > How can you know anything about my head with your head buried
> > in the sands of Texas? It couldn't have been me. I know the great
> > circle paths from here backward and forward. What was Galileo's tacky
> > callsign?
>
> In Galileo's case, it was a theory that the priests found tacky, just
> like you find Kim's callsign to be tacky. Come out of the closet, > Dave.

Just what scientific theory has Kim come up with, Cecil?

> If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?

Isn't the answer apparent?

Dave K8MN

5831. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:18:32 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <cTlW7.241581$3d2.11746845@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28828

Just a quick comment, Dick; years before I obtained my first ticket (1962, WN2CJV), I built my first one tube regenerative receiver (didn't we all?). I got the tickler coil backwards, yet Radio Moscow came in just fine! Of course, I corrected the problem, but the strength of their signal always amazed me. I recall reading that they actually could adjust the take off angle of their signal, thereby maximizing their signal at the desired audience. My feelings about 15 meters are exactly the same as yours vs 'killowatt alley'. Thanks for the memories!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:rzdW7.198422$WW.11474840@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011226000258.01493.00000420@mb-mw.aol.com...
> > In article
> <V00V7.306655$W8.11077136@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:
> >
> > >The crux of this discussion is who to bar more than who to accept.
> There
> > > >is a secondary issue that results from allowing every kid with two
> > > >propellors on his beanie (Cecil, Jim, me) to get on and klutz around:
> how
> > > >to keep the newbie from becoming a real pain in the butt to your 20
> meter
> > > >net, etc. So we developed the Class A, B, C structure before the war
> that
> > > >required a year before one could get off 40 meter CW or 160 and 10
> meter
> > > >phone. Time becomes the standard legitimate or not. So the real issue
> is
> > > >how to blend newbies into the scenery with a minimum of fuss and
> feathers.
> >
> > I agree 100% so far. And the old systems didn't depend just on time -
> they
> > required more tests.
> > >
> > > >With all due respect, legitimate standards are not going to come from
> the
> > > >world of electronics. It is nice to know Ohm's and Joule's Laws in

> their
> > >permutations and even better if some of the implications dawn on the
> young
> > >and inexperienced. But then they didn't dawn on the writer and
> publisher
> > >of the infamous DDRR bent down at your local muffler shop that was
> > >featured in the Handbook for several years. Much like my days coaching
> > >middle school football, you had better expect some mistakes, some
> > >colossal, when you set a bunch of sixth and seventh-graders loose on a
> > >field; self-education can get real ugly.
> >
> > "Experience varies directly with equipment ruined". Yeah, verily.
> >
> > In fact the whole concept of LBMA (learning by messing around) is one of
> the
> > prime reasons for the ARS to exist. One can study electrical engineering
> and
> > radio propagaion till one is very schooled but the real education comes
> from
> > doing.
> > >
> > >Even lowering the code thing to 5wpm has not had a major effect of any
> > >kind simply because it serves the purpose of a small 'cooling off'
> period
> > >between decision and actuality. If I want to be the Channel Master of
> > >14.313 at least I have a week or two to come to my senses before
> hauling
> > >out my credit card and ending up with a Frankensteen.
> >
> > Would that it worked so well. One of the problems today is that some
> newcomers
> > think they are experts in amateur radio because of experiences
> elsewhere.
> > Sometimes they are right and sometimes not. Arrogant disregard for the
> > community standards of amateur radio is not a good thing, and one of the
> > purposes of entry standards is to expose the newbies.
> >
> > >To some extent the
> > >Brits with their theory of gathering similar people (personifying the
> > >enemy so to speak) in a room for eight hours in a spate of Morse
> > >Appreciation ending in an open book, take all day code test may
> actually
> > >have the problem right; I have been in corporate meetings less of a
> > >purpose for much the same reason: keeping the landmines and barbed wire
> > >down to a gentle, ladylike belch.
> >
> > Maybe. The Brits are a different society, and their licensing has long
> been
> > very different from ours. The Brits didn't have a Charlie Stewart back

> in 1910
> > so they even license receivers.
> >
> > And all is not warm beer and skittles across the pond. Surf over to your
> > favorite search engine and look up "UKRS" (United Kingdom Radio Society)
> > Interesting stuff on their site about how the whole codetest thingie is
> being
> > handled.
> > >
> > >Given the problem, translating a typical QSO into conversational
> Swahili
> > >probably is as legitimate as anything so long as no one knows that
> making
> > >the attempt is qualification enough.
> >
> > Listen to the amateur bands in the USA and you don't hear much Swahili.
> But you
> > do hear lots of Morse code.
> >
> > >Course someone would immediately
> > >form No Swahili International.
> >
> > Shall I dig out my Smith Chart rant again?
> >
> > >So what do you view as legitimate standards???
> >
> > One thing I note is that many people will give you "Zen" answers to that
> > question - they'll tell you what is not a legitimate standard, but not
> what one
> > is. Not much help.
> >
> > I can give you a long discourse on the subject but it's late and you've
> seen it
> > before.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> This particular rant was in answer to Carl; I answered your question more
> directly in another post. But the theme is the same: when you have a
> hobby with 945 facets and traditions predating the Titanic not to mention
> international implications it is not something you throw at someone off
> the street or Channel 37 and expect either the newbie or the veteran to
> survive. There has to be some sort of 'aging' before the wine is drunk
> for the benefit of the hobby to be sure but also to the tyro himself or we
> will simply go thru recruits who don't re-up.
>
> In my Novice days I lacked the real estate for an 80 meter dipole so I
> fired up on 7175 to find that Radio Moscow liked that freq as well. My
> mother probably still wonders where her nice plate glass mirror went; I

> used it and some Babo to get the crystal up to 7178 or so. For lack of
> anything better to do, I put in the plug-in coils for 15 and plugged in
> one of my dad's 40 cw rocks and fired up on 15 and worked a raft of DX in
> a very short time. To this day I like 15 far more than 20 for a far nicer
> group of derelicts. Then as antennas are prone to do in storms, I got to
> install it right this time. OK, learning by klutzing around.
>
> The hobby does not need a steel gate but it sure as hell could use an
> airlock.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
>

5832. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:20:34 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <6VlW7.241586$3d2.11747941@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28829

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011226064243.28248.00000649@mb-cq.aol.com...
> >Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed
> >the 5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what
> >response?
>
> It appears quite simple. Those that sing Larry's praises on rrap are
told they
> deserve congratulations for passing the 5 wpm test. Those that do not
praise
> Larry receive the badmouth treatment.
>
> It appears to me that in Larry's view, it really IS all about Larry.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Oh come now, Ed. You, me, Larry, and a host of others did what we could; there had to be a common characteristic somewhere. And the whole bloody gang has been in the Elmer seat before, I suspect many times. And if you have been there you know that you will meet a lot of the 'I am perfect already, don't try to change me' brigade. For these guys you do a quick Pontius Pilate act so you will have the time for the Berts of the world.

Reading Larry is akin to reading the mind of God, granted, and it is equally stupid to try in either case but grant for a moment that Larry might just be a sane if opinionated human being (as are we all). There is no basic conflict in welcoming those who pass the rules currently in effect while not having a lot of use for the rules currently in effect; gentlemen do not waste their spleen on underlings, children, and newbies who did not write the rules. It is far more likely that Larry is a gentleman rewarding the attitude and achievement than he is some petty tyrant.

I did 20 but believing that anything over 12 was stupid in 1972. When I had passed the 20 I felt that I could say it, before that you shut up. I, for one, am quite ready to go to the ends of the earth for someone who confronts reality, develops a plan for doing it, and executes the plan. And not just with respect to Amateur Radio.

In my middle school football coaching days I had occasion to check in with a shrink of my aquaintance (as a bridge player) and ask about how to at least 'do no damage' to 12-13 year-olds. He told me that a 13 year-old lacked three things of being a functioning adult male: experience, an

identity separate from the pack, and the ability to handle situations where long term goals required short term sacrifices - the latter being required to be a father. He basically told me to let the game do the teaching and don't be afraid to challenge the troops. Good advice.

So I read Larry as simply preferring to deal with adult men and not oversize boys.

Pretty well sums up my attitude as well.

Dick N&#65533;BK

5833. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:33:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28830

N2EY wrote:
> Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.

Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.

Do you refuse to use words, parts of which spell a vulgar
word? e.g. assume, harass? If you use words, parts of which
spell a vulgar word, why bar callsigns, parts of which spell
vulgar words? It's exactly the same concept.

What message are we sending to our youth when we tell them
to avoid any word that starts or ends with "ass"? The
same thing applies to callsigns. A vulgar callsign is an
opportunity to teach youngsters about random groupings
of alpha-numeric characters.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5834. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:35:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29EE5C.87AF75AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28831

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Has it dawned upon you that I present people with a mirror image of
> > themselves so they can learn something from the exercise? I become
> > you and respond to you as you would. Everything you say about me
> > applies to you.
>
> What has dawned on me is that you use my stuff as if you originated it.

You originate the crap, Dave, and I mirror it back at you. I've
been doing that to crappy people since I learned it as a teaching
technique in 1962.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5835. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:40:43 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <%bmW7.241611$3d2.11749934@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28832

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C29EE5C.87AF75AC@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Has it dawned upon you that I present people with a mirror image of
> > > themselves so they can learn something from the exercise? I become
> > > you and respond to you as you would. Everything you say about me
> > > applies to you.
> >
> > What has dawned on me is that you use my stuff as if you originated
it.
>
> You originate the crap, Dave, and I mirror it back at you. I've
> been doing that to crappy people since I learned it as a teaching
> technique in 1962.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

And an awful lot of wives become ex-wives that way.

5836. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:48:16 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29F140.4262FB8D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28833

Dave Heil wrote:
> Your new quest, Don. Q., is to advise us on how many of the 17k+ spell
> something which could be viewed by others as vulgar.

That's easy, Dave. Everyone is perfectly free to view each and
every callsign as being vulgar. Vulgarity is in the mind of
the reader. Vulgarity doesn't exist independently in any
callsign.

Non-English speaking people would have to have it explained
to them before they could possibly find it vulgar. Seems that
proves the word is not objectively vulgar. All you have to do to
solve the problem is, instead of morbidly looking for vulgarity
everywhere 24 hours a day, try looking for goodness, kindness,
love, and mercy. Most of your vulgar thoughts would disappear.

Dave, you are like the unfortunate soul who sees vulgar pictures
in ink blots. It is all in your mind. Try switching from vulgar
thoughts to beautiful thoughts and thus make the world a better
place instead of the cesspool in which you live.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5837. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:52:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29F237.8CA9DA36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28835

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?
>
> Isn't the answer apparent?

Yes it is, Dave, and that's why we have a Bill of Rights to
protect us from statists like you who would deny us our
inalienable rights.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5838. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:53:25 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <gbsj2uk4nhkv4t8bqd02vis6a75uo37quf@4ax.com>
Source record: 28834
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 09:25:16 GMT, an orbiting mind control laser caused
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> to write in talk.politics.guns :

> That wasn't my experience. Most of the cops I knew were ok with gun ownership
>by citizens, and there were a few who had been helped outof a bad spot by armed
>citizens. It was not that unusual for a citizen who had heard a police dispatch
>on a scanner to contribute useful information on a case.

I got to help get a drunk driver off the road that way once on I-95. I had
heard the report on the MDSP frequency, and not 30 seconds later there he
was in front of me. Got on Channel 9, which was the only "interagency"
radio I had and reported the guy. Three minutes later, I had two trooper
cars pulling him over. Blew a .23 -- I'm surprised he was staying on the
road, never mind between the lines.

But it was a darn good thing I had a ham ticket to go with the scanner.

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

5839. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 15:57:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C29F36A.2B0A7A03@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28836

Richard McCollum wrote:
> There is
> no basic conflict in welcoming those who pass the rules currently in
> effect while not having a lot of use for the rules currently in effect;

Unfortunately, Larry is not that way. He has bitched loud and long
about post-restructuring extras not deserving their privileges.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5840. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 16:24:29 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <1RmW7.198773$WW.11506255@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28837

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote

> If bragging rights is the name of the game then what the hell, thee me
> and gazillions of others around here did the 20wpm thing at our
> neigborhood FCC offices which the lightweights around here will never
> do.

Gazillions??? Stick to the facts. All of you people who did do the 20 wpm thing at your neighborhood FCC offices had the proclivity and predilection to accomplish morse code at a reasonably rapid rate and you should be commended for that. Although, just as you or your buddy will only attain a certain speed and will never approach the speed operators who break records of > 60 wpm. There are plenty of people who because of their own proclivity and predilection will never be able to approach 12 wpm.

The ARS is full of operators selected from society who could, in fact, attain those speeds. This was a good thing in the past when CW operators were needed throughout the services but these days it's just flat out not needed. The skills sets needed has shifted. Deal with it.

When you call people lightweights are you REALLY in the belief that you are superior? You are when it comes to beeping fast... granted... but that's as far as it goes.

5841. Re: Mistuh Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 16:39:11 UTC
From: bob.weiss@verizon.net
Message-ID: <cd11d464.0112260839.2156736e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28838

General Electric has been convicted of defrauding the US government on
several defense contracts. They are also the largest producer of EPA
superfund sites, IIRC. So when is the FCC going to cancel all of the
broadcast licenses held by GE (owner of NBC)?

Or are computer hackers subject to a different set of laws than
corporate
criminals?

Bob Weiss N2IXK

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.goxg183.pminews@or.news.verio.net>...
> On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 00:16:47 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >> "In a five-page order released Friday, the US Federal Communications
> >> Commission (FCC) claims that 38-year old convicted hacker Kevin Mitnick is
> >> not morally fit to be a ham radio operator. "
> >
> >Maybe this is how the FCC plans on dismantling the amateur radio service.
> >They'll declare all current licensees morally unfit in some way, not renew
> >the license, and when the numbers have dwindled low enough, sell off the
> >spectrum to the highest commercial bidder.
>
> Only if they are convicted felons.

5842. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 16:45:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112260845.55b40b1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28839

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:<qAQV7.196255$WW.11390036@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > What should be discussed NOW is what the US license structure will become
> > if/when S25.5 goes away. Some folks want just one class of license, while
> > others want two classes at most. Some say "just drop Element 1 and leave
> the
> > rest alone". Lots of ideas and possibilities, but I don't see much real
> > discussion about the subject.
>
> > General question to all: What are YOUR ideas?
>
> Ok Jim... herre's my ideas.
>
> First, consider this, we have two 'kinds' of licenses. Those which can be
> granted and those which can't.

"Current" vs. "heritage", as it were. Novices, Tech Pluses and
Advanceds are in the latter category.

> I believe this must be solved before or
> during whatever else is done.

Not to be argumentative, but - why "must" it be solved? If the license
structure is radically changed, a solution should be incorporated.
If/when Element 1 disappears, there will be no reason to distinguish
Techs from Tech Pluses, and all of them should get Tech Plus privs,
such as they are.

From Jan 1952 to Nov 1967 (approximately) the FCC issued zero new
Advanced licenses, but allowed the ~40K hams who held Advanceds to
renew and modify them. When the changes of Nov 1968 came, those folks
were mighty happy they'd not been mixed in with the Generals.
>
> So, when the morse requirements are gone we have six licenses most with a
> different count for written elements completed.

Yup. We even have some folks with the same license (Tech Plus) but
with different written credits (pre Mar 21, 1987 vs. post that date).
Watta mess!
>
> Technician and Technician Plus have passed the same written elements.

Most of them have, but pre Mar 21 Techs have General class written
credit.

> If the
> Novice is promoted to this class by simply waiving element 2 then the
> situation becomes much clearer.

Yup - but is it right to give away upgrades like that?

ARRL proposed simply upgrading Novices and Tech Pluses to General, and
the FCC said no way.

>Call this Technician class.

Alrighty.
>
> The General Class remains as is.

I presume holders of "old" Tech Pluses could get instant upgrades to
General, same as today. Just present the documentation, a 605 and the
fee.
>
> The difference between Advanced and Amateur Extra is element 4(B) so waive
> it.

I understand it's Christmas, but that's a lot of giveaway.

>Call this Amateur Extra Class.
>
> Now, we have only three license classes all available for growth.

Yup. But will the FCC and the amateur radio community accept it? FCC
has already rejected all forms of upgrade giveaways. Why should they
accept them now?
>
> This simplifies the existing band plans. I've listed the changes resulting
> from the above action.
>
> 1) The entire bands above 30 MHz are open to all licensees.

Full power and all modes, I presume.

> 2) Novice subbands on 1.25 meters and 23 centimeters disappear.
> 3) Technicians get 200W 28.100 to 28.300 on 10 meters.
> 4) Technicians get 200W CW and SSB only 28.300 to 28.500 on 10 meters.
> 5) Technicians get 200W CW only subbands on 15, 40, and 80 meters.
> 6) Advanced Class subbands on 80, 40, 20, and 15 meters disappear.

All logical consequences from the combinations suggested.
>
> All this is accomplished by waiving Element 2 for Novices and waiving
> Element 4(B) for Advanced. I think this is a very tiny price to pay in order
> to have a structure which can have some basic adjustments applied for better
> transitioning of everyone throughout the ARS experience.

I see your point, but others may be outraged and the FCC may nix the
whole free upgrade idea. Without those giveaways, we're back to all
those subbands.

>
> I now add my thoughts on the 'adjustments'... ;-)
>
> One, give the Technicians 10 meters because in light of the infringement of
> freebanders it's better to have plenty of licenced operators squatting there
> trying to maintain control of the band. There is no sense in being
> exclusionary to your fellow hams. I say get the freeband candidates licensed
> and accountable. This would eliminate the subband on 10 meters which I view
> a good thing. As far as I'm concerned limit everyone on the band to 200
> watts and go after the jerks.

I agree in part. Give everyone all of 10 meters - just limit Techs to
200W. (To do otherwise takes away privileges from higher class
licenses).
>
> Two, give the Technicians 200 W CW only operation on the General subands.

I agree 100%. But this was proposed formally to the FCC and they shot
it down. An ARRL committee is proposing virtually the same thing,
(good) plus widening the 'phone slots on those bands (bad). But why
should the FCC reverse itself from its previous refusal of AH0A's very
reasonable idea? FCC's answer was essentially "let them take Element 3
and get Generals".

> you want them to learn CW then put the horse before cart and the carrot in
> front of the horse. This would eliminate the CW only subbands on 15, 40, and
> 80 meters.

I think you mean "Novice/TechPlus subbands".
>
> As Red Green would say... "We're all in this together"... ;-)

Yup!

The main problems I see are:

1) the FCC has already shot down many of your ideas
2) free upgrades may not get much support from other hams
3) the big opportunities of the post-2003 era are not being addressed
adequately.

How about this:

Right now:

1) Give all Novices and Tech Pluses 200 W CW only on all nonphone
General HF/MF bands, 160-10. (FCC will probably balk at this)

2) Allow all "old" Tech Pluses to get Generals by a simple mail or
online procedure, instead of forcing them to attend VE sessions. (FCC
will hate this one, too).

3) Resolve the 40 meter mess at WRC 2003 to get a worldwide exclusive
amateur allocation, even if it gives away spectrum. 7000-7200

worldwide exclusive amateur is better for everyone than 7000-7300 in Region 2 and 7000-7100 everywhere else.

4) Develop bandplans for all HF/MF that separate CW, digital and analog voice/image modes.

After S25.5 is gone:

1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the names if you don't like them)

2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license class. (Some bands, like 10 and the WARC bands, may be split by mode only).

3) Basic license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs, procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff, main purpose is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150 watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (determined by RF exposure limits). Modes are CW, SSB, FM, PSK31 and maybe some of the other common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or be club trustees. Basics get all VHF/UHF and about half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the entry level.

4) Intermediate license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical and RF exposure stuff, with some regs to cover expanded privs. Intermediates get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires at least one year experience as a Basic.

5) Full license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands, etc. except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see below). Full license requires ar least one year (preferably two years) as an Intermediate.

6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.

7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character calls.

8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs.

9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses, Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras become Fulls. Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to upgrade.

End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges.

Of course this probably has even less chance than your ideas, Rich.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5843. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 17:11:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112260911.3c2a6908@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28840

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.
>
> Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.

There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
>
> Do you refuse to use words, parts of which spell a vulgar
> word? e.g. assume, harass? If you use words, parts of which
> spell a vulgar word, why bar callsigns, parts of which spell
> vulgar words? It's exactly the same concept.

Not at all. A callsign is not a word. Some callsigns are chosen to
resemble words, (K1MMY, W1NDY, K0OL) but the callsign in question is
not one of them.
>
> What message are we sending to our youth when we tell them
> to avoid any word that starts or ends with

[expletive deleted]

>?

A callsign is not a word. See above

>The
> same thing applies to callsigns.

Nope.

>A vulgar callsign is an
> opportunity to teach youngsters about random groupings
> of alpha-numeric characters.

Nonsense.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5844. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 18:13:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A1342.1587B4EF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28841

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
>
> There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.

It doesn't matter unless you are trying to mimic "1984"'s thought
police. W5TIT is a valid callsign. It doesn't matter objectively
if it was chosen or issued at random. W5TIT is NOT a word!!!
If you are going to prohibit callsigns where a part of the
callsign spells something, then you need to prohibit words
where a part of the word spells something.

What is wrong with issuing the callsign and then allowing
everyone to choose to think what they choose to think about it?
Choosing to think dirty thoughts is a choice freely made by
the thinker. Nobody's forcing you to think those dirty thoughts.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5845. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 18:16:10 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6D854230DC4FCB47.9018BEE47C3D4B85.A58090EAD5AF6427@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28842

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 15:15:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:17:10 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Some folks believe that professional baseball players who sell
>> >autographs to kids are heroes. My heroes are genuine heroes.
>>
>> Who?
>
>Folks other than professional baseball players who sell autographs to
>kids.

That means Ted Bundy, Charles Manson, Adolph Hitler, Saddam
Hussein, and Osama bin Laden are among your heros.

And you pretend to have enough taste to appraise Kim's call
sign?

Sheesh!

>> >You seem to have some peculiar idea in your head that I'm not happy.
>> >I'm happy as a clam, Kim. Right now I'm happy that the FCC doesn't yet
>> >issue four letter suffixes.
>>
>> Are you afraid that the urge to apply for k8dumb would be
>> overpowering?
>
>You thought of it. It's yours by right.

I'll forfeit it for you Dave--you deserve it so much more than
I ever will.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5846. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 18:23:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <D7963D64694DFC99.EAED21104D6F9632.B6F403C4270D682D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28843

On 26 Dec 2001 06:52:18 -0800, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2954AE.34992319@IEEE.org>...
>
>> If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?
>
>Nope. Nor to anyone else. Nor would I issue similar inappropriate callsigns.
>
>Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.

In other words, simply because the law would require you to do
something, you would refuse anyway because it "isn't right" in your
mind?

And you wonder why many of us think you aren't playing with a
full deck!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5847. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 18:42:20 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <WNoW7.62569$BX4.4334364@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 28845
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Hi Dick,

When I got my driver's license in 1964, there was an NCHP trooper in that county that did
everything he could to make certain teen drivers got tickets. He would check DMV records to
see who was newly licensed and deliberately stalk and follow them--sometimes so closely that
one could not even see his headlights. He absolutely HATED anyone under 21 years old--even
though he wasn't very old himself. He was arrogant, self-centered, egotistical, and a real SOB.
Not long after I was licensed at 16, sure enough, he appeared at a local store lot, and when I
turned onto the main highway, he immediately got right on my bumper and held his handset up
to his ear as tho he was calling in my tag #. I had been warned by the other kids about this, so
I wasn't concerned except for his dangerous tailgating. He did this to me several times. My Dad reported him to the Sergeant to no avail. Another day, I started to town on an errand assigned by my Mom, and he began tailing me. I found a wide shoulder, signaled and pulled off
the road. I got out and pretended to be looking at the car as if something were wrong. Finding nothing, I got back in and continued. Corporal C had stopped just a few yards behind, making no effort to hide his harassment. I drove a couple more miles and pulled off, again pretending to inspect the car for a problem totally ignoring Coporal C who, again, had stopped as well. I
continued to do this every few miles until finally, when I signalled to pull off again, he turned on his light and stopped right behind me. He gruffly asked me what was wrong. I calmly said the car was making a "squeaking noise" like there was a bad bearing or something. He looked at the car and, finding nothing (of course!) he, pointed his finger at me and said, "You BETTER be
having trouble, boy, or I'll run you in!" Huh? He then left quickly. I was pretty sure there was
nothing he could do to me because there was no law against "suspecting" there is something wrong with one's car. I think maybe he caught onto what I was really doing, and it made him mad that a kid was making a fool out of him.

I heard that he pulled over a football player (senior, 6' 5" and 260lbs) and started cussing him
out for swerving to dodge a pothole. The kid didn't hesitate and knocked

Corporal C down into a ditch (full of water) and out cold. Richie (not his real name) drove away and left the muddy, sopping trooper to wake up alone. The odd thing was, Richie never heard anything from it...even though he expected a yard full of NCHP cars at any moment for the next couple weeks! Did ole "C" KNOW he was out of line, but just enjoyed hassling teenagers? Maybe this story was a bit enhanced--I don't know----, BUT there WAS another witness that said he
saw trooper C climbing out of the ditch with mud from head to toe, and he didn't know why
because there was nobody around except the now VERY wet trooper and a lonely Ford patrol
car with blue lights blinking. He didn't stop because, "I HATE that sonuvabitch"!

Trooper C, I heard after I moved away, got into deep doo doo when he began to harass a young girl. I'm told she was quite the looker, JV Queen, Cheerleader, etc. His interest became
MORE than giving her tickets--he became obsessed with this one girl. He followed her, both
in and out of his patrol car, he harassed and threatened her steady boyfriend, and finally tried to force her to do "things" with him in exchange for dropping "charges" that were bogus to begin
with. Her Dad's brother was a State Representative. He pulled a few strings and they had her wear a wire (bug). They got what they needed, and Trooper C found himself facing charges--
to the laughter and delight of all--especially the high school kids he had been such grief to.
It couldn't have happened to a 'more deserving' fellow! LOL!

73

Jerry
K4KWH

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2947E5.A74082F4@townsqr.com...
>
>
> N9NWO wrote:
>
> > : > There are a good deal of elitism out there.
> > : > For whatever reason. The Marines teach
> > : > it. So do the police academies.
> > :
> > : The police/Marines/doctors/professors etc ARE the elite, when it
> > : comes to their areas of expertise. Outside that, they are no better
> > : or worse than anyone else.
> >
> > There is the problem. Because they are elite
> > in their fields, they do transfer that attitude to
> > every other aspect of society. Because they

> > are competent, they tend that no one else is.
> > And if they do not know how to do it, then
> > no one else should be able to do so either.
> > (Thus the desire to ban technology such as
> > guns or radios).
>
> I don't buy it, N9MWO. There is and always has been elitgeism amongst
> the elite in any human endeavor, and that elitism has served for far more
> good than evil in free societies. I've known a lot of elite police
> officers in the past 40 years and darn few of them showed any tendency to
> transfer that to the sort constitutional violations you describe.
> Things change, and sometimes pretty fast, but if we're headed down that
> slippery slope, I haven't seen a lot of evidence of it. Of course I have
> seen some. One of he most gregarious cases was in New York Cit. In 1962 I
> watched a NYPD street cop give a guy an awful cussing in public while he
> stood with his hand on the butt of his revolver as if he dared the guy to
> respond in any way. The fellow' soffense was cuttting across one extra
> traffic lane to get to a (rare) parking spot. There was no safety reason
> for him not to do that, except the LEO noted his out of state license
> plate, and after all, some jerk behind who wanted the spot himself
> honked.....
>

5848. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 18:43:50 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <GToW7.311496$W8.11444280@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28844

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112260911.3c2a6908@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.
> >
> > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
>
> There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
> >
> > Do you refuse to use words, parts of which spell a vulgar
> > word? e.g. assume, harass? If you use words, parts of which
> > spell a vulgar word, why bar callsigns, parts of which spell
> > vulgar words? It's exactly the same concept.
>
> Not at all. A callsign is not a word. Some callsigns are chosen to
> resemble words, (K1MMY, W1NDY, K0OL) but the callsign in question is
> not one of them.
> >
> > What message are we sending to our youth when we tell them
> > to avoid any word that starts or ends with
>
> [expletive deleted]
>
> >?
>
> A callsign is not a word. See above
>
> >The
> > same thing applies to callsigns.
>
> Nope.
>
> >A vulgar callsign is an
> > opportunity to teach youngsters about random groupings
> > of alpha-numeric characters.
>
> Nonsense.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I don't know, Jim. Because the FCC lady turned the 610s around I got BK rather than BJ. All things considered, Butt Kiss is one hell of an improvement over what it could have been. The late Norm Fowler was welcome to it.

5849. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 18:49:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112261049.70af3e32@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28846

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<lGIV7.239252$3d2.11593385@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011224100327.27168.00000589@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > In article <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wa6vse@fast.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > What should be discussed NOW is what the US license structure will
> become
> > if/when S25.5 goes away. Some folks want just one class of license,
> while
> > others want two classes at most. Some say "just drop Element 1 and leave
> the
> > rest alone". Lots of ideas and possibilities, but I don't see much real
> > discussion about the subject.
> >
> > General question to all: What are YOUR ideas?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

This is the post I shoulda answered first....
> >
>
> The trick is and always has been bringing in the newbies and letting them
> soak in the sauce until they can go on to 20 meters without stirring up
> the OTs or develop a skin thick enough to withstand a W2OY.

20 meters or 2 meters...

> It is not so
> much keeping them off as keeping them from being roasted before their
> time. So we have seen over the years time gaps between classes which to
> my mind is more an act of mercy to the newbie than a barrier. You can
> test til your butt sucks wind but no one is prepared for the
> rough-and-tumble of a good pile up, encountering some net that thinks it
> is sanctioned, or the crochety old fart.

Plus all the reverse.

> And there is and continues to be
> the need to show a good face to the rest of the world.

That most of all. One thing to keep in mind at all times when on the
air is "what if an enemy of ham radio is taping this to play as an
example of why hams should lose their allocations?"

>
> So in principle at least I would favor a three class system: a
> bread-and-milk Tech much like we have now but give them 28.1-28.5, cut the
> power limit to 50 max. and keep them out of non-channelized VHF/UHF/SHF,

See other posts by me this date this thread.

> an entry-level ticket resembling the present General with 200 watts max,
> and a senior ticket much like the Extra but with a one-year waiting
> period.

Three levels, yeah, but more differentiation.

> The present structure is not really half bad except that it is
> unkind to those passing the Extra more or less out of the box. The junior
> ticket has to include regs both U. S. and International and the usual
> safety and regulatory stuff so I doubt if Element 3 would change a whole
> lot. The trick is Element 4.

Yup.
>
> Just how technical is technical? Damfino. The real thing with Element 4
> is a proper ceremony for pontification so one should probably deal with
> impedence matching, Ohm's or Joule's laws in various permutations, a bit
> on angle modulation, non-linearity and how to detect and prevent it, and
> the inevitable VE questions.

Maybe. What happens when No Charts International gets going?
>
> The issue is not whom to keep out although we all have our candidates but
> how to blend the newbie into a hobby with traditions that predate the
> Titanic partially to keep him from being a major pain in the butt but
> mostly to give him time to orient himself for the long haul; marching
> people thru the hobby and out looks good on paper but does not in the long
> run accomplish a hell of a lot.

I agree 100%.

> I suspect that the aging vat effect is
> one reason that the 5wpm restructuring was largely a wet firecracker.

Nah. Lots of other stuff going on.

The bread-and-milk ("honeydo") attraction of amateur VHF/UHF that
drove much of the '80s growth is all but gone with cellphones. Yes,
there are areas where cellphones don't work and they do cost money but
most people nowadays have one anyway so they get a familytalk plan and
done. FRS and GMRS suck up a lot of that sorta stuff, too.

Those who simply want cheap longdistance electronic communication have
email and newsgroups and websites. The odea that some sort of amateur
wireless internet will compete with AOL or Earthlink is simply
misguided.

What's left are those who want RADIO, for whatever reason. Medium is
the message and all that.

> It
> is known among marketers and has been for 30 years that the average CBer
> buys five rigs before the last one goes into the garage and to a large
> extent we have seen that when the Tech is touted as entry-level which it
> presently is not but is rather a dirty trick played by the FCC and ARRL.

Actually the FCC did an end-around on the League back in 1990 anyway.
The trend towards entry-by-VHF was in place by then anyway.

One real problem nobody talks about much is the addytoods of those who
come to ham radio with "experience" in other services.
>
> Sum and substance: does the hobby need protection from the newbie or the
> newbie need a bit of protection from a hobby that can eat one up?

Both.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5850. Re: RADIO LAW vs law enforcement practices.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 18:56:08 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <45pW7.283555$er5.5432979@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 28847
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,alt.military,talk.politics.guns

This happened to me when I was 17. A neighbor with conjestive heart failure had an attack and was near death. I had a 1961 Chevrolet with a pretty "peppy" engine. We got Mr. Parham in the car and started out to the hospital. I was driving at around 85 MPH with flashers and lights on. NCHP caught up alongside and I pointed at my passenger whose head was lolling back on the seat and made the "cutthroat" sign. The trooper nailed that Plymouth and led us to the hospital at 85-95 MPH. He made certain that we DID have an emergency, and that done, there were no ramifications. We lived at that time a full 12 miles from town-- out in the boonies. To wait for an ambulance would've meant certain death for our neighbor because there just weren't any rescue squads out there. It was the one time I got to drive at a high rate of speed (I am not thrilled by that anymore) without being ticketed. I do remember the sound of that Quadra-jet moaning as we raced to the hospital.

73
Jerry
Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com> wrote in message
news:ftoj2uscc3uckro3ptsick2p5urmepa9hm@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 21 Dec 2001 17:02:33 -0500, an orbiting mind control laser caused
> Jim Patterson <jrp32nospam@bellsouth.net> to write in talk.politics.guns :
>
> >When quite young though in my memory, I was injured (turned out to be
> >just a broken collarbone) at a convention that my parents were attending
> >at a rural town park. Dad got me in his (then new) '55 Olds and had a
> >Legion buddy holding me down in the back seat. He later told me that we
> >were going over 100mph to the hospital. We were stopped by a highway
> >patrolman who in seconds was escorting us to the hospital, same speed,
> >with sirens going and that was the last heard from the police. To me,
> >that is non-restrictive law at work.
> >I wonder what would happen with the same circumstances today?
>
> You would have a five-to-thirty minute delay while an ambulance was called,
> then you'd be on your way to the hospital and your father would be on his
> way to jail for reckless endangerment.
>
>
> Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO

> --
> "I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
> more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
> -- Ted Nugent
> Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
> Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

5851. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 19:18:44 UTC
From: no.email@available.com
Message-ID: <3c2a21b5.103550406@news.iaxs.net>
Source record: 28848
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

On 22 Dec 2001 20:44:48 -0800, SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com (SD SpecialDelivery Jones) wrote:

>"john" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<vI8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net>...
>> Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
>> "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
>> news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
>> > I like it!
>> >
>> >
>> > IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
>> > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
>> > >
>> > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
>> >
>> >
>
>oh cool ....move over hammies.......its called corporate
>expansion.....i told you...we are in the appropriation business....if
>you don't use it you loose it.......remember????

Excuse me? The old 11M band was swiped from us HAMS back in the 1950s
and was VERY well used and liked by hams across the globe. Would you
like a history lession?
The FCC has no intention of giving CBers anymore bandwidth in the USA,
get a clue and 42

Running above 27.405 is aganst the law and considered a federal crime.
Next issue

5852. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 19:40:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a2737_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28849

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org...
>
> A vulgar callsign is an
> opportunity to teach youngsters about random groupings
> of alpha-numeric characters.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>

I don't think my callsign is vulgar, as I believe there is nothing vulgar about parts of the body, nothing vulgar about the physical expression of love between two people, nothing vulgar about language or its expression in general. (I know you knew that, Cecil, but had to say it anyway).

I think that if a kid recognizes anything in my callsign (and I think kids' and young adults' minds are much cleaner than those of the supposed "gentlemen" on this newsgroup) that is "dirty" or "vulgar" or "nasty" then it is probably an extension of what they have learned from adults closest to them. When my brother and I used to giggle at pictures in the National Geographic magazine, it was our mom or dad that would ask us what did we find so amusing about the human body? My brother would usually laugh and point at a picture of some nude woman and state, "that is nasty." At which point my mother would explain to him all the reasons why it wasn't nasty at all. It gave us something to think about.

Dave, Larry, Dick C., and people like them would probably see nothing but "nasty" in a person walking on a beach in the nude, or nothing but "nasty" in a woman who nurses her child in public, or nothing but "nasty" at the idea of a man and woman making love together. They miss opportunities to see beauty when it is all around them. My callsign is intended for fun--and that does not have to include nasty. Nasty is in their minds, not mine. And, it is also not in the minds of many, many people I have talked to on the air.

To believe that my callsign is vulgar, does not belong in the ARS, and should not have been requested by me and/or issued by the FCC is to focus on "nasty" or "vulgar" ideas of what my callsign is. I choose to ignore the "nasty" or "vulgar" minded, because my callsign isn't.

Kim W5TIT

5853. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 19:46:47 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a2894_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28850

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C29F36A.2B0A7A03@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > There is
> > no basic conflict in welcoming those who pass the rules currently in
> > effect while not having a lot of use for the rules currently in effect;
>
> Unfortunately, Larry is not that way. He has bitched loud and long
> about post-restructuring extras not deserving their privileges.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>

I think Dick has missed most of those posts...

Kim W5TIT

5854. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 19:49:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a295a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28751

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112260911.3c2a6908@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.
> >
> > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
>
> There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
> >

Giggle value. Not shock.

> >
> > Do you refuse to use words, parts of which spell a vulgar
> > word? e.g. assume, harass? If you use words, parts of which
> > spell a vulgar word, why bar callsigns, parts of which spell
> > vulgar words? It's exactly the same concept.
>
> Not at all. A callsign is not a word. Some callsigns are chosen to
> resemble words, (K1MMY, W1NDY, K0OL) but the callsign in question is
> not one of them.
> >

That is correct. When I say "W5TIT" on the air, it either takes some
thinking or writing it down before it is even recognized as having a twist
to it. There are many folks I've talked to on the air who never even say a
word or indicate in any way that they take for anything but a callsign.

> >
> > What message are we sending to our youth when we tell them
> > to avoid any word that starts or ends with
>
> [expletive deleted]
>
> >?
>
> A callsign is not a word. See above
>
> >The
> > same thing applies to callsigns.
>

> Nope.
>
> >A vulgar callsign is an
> > opportunity to teach youngsters about random groupings
> > of alpha-numeric characters.
>
> Nonsense.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I don't think so, but that's our difference.

Kim W5TIT

5855. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 19:51:40 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a29be_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28752

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2A1342.1587B4EF@IEEE.org...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> > > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
> >
> > There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> > They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
>
> It doesn't matter unless you are trying to mimic "1984"'s thought
> police. W5TIT is a valid callsign. It doesn't matter objectively
> if it was chosen or issued at random. W5TIT is NOT a word!!!
> If you are going to prohibit callsigns where a part of the
> callsign spells something, then you need to prohibit words
> where a part of the word spells something.
>
> What is wrong with issuing the callsign and then allowing
> everyone to choose to think what they choose to think about it?
> Choosing to think dirty thoughts is a choice freely made by
> the thinker. Nobody's forcing you to think those dirty thoughts.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>

Precisely.

Kim W5TIT

5856. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 19:58:47 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <XZpW7.242101$3d2.11769921@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28753

> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> > > if/when S25.5 goes away.

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote

> > First, consider this, we have two 'kinds' of licenses. Those which can
be
> > granted and those which can't.

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> "Current" vs. "heritage", as it were. Novices, Tech Pluses and
> Advanceds are in the latter category.

> > I believe this must be solved before or
> > during whatever else is done.

> Not to be argumentative, but - why "must" it be solved?

Because, simply said, the ARS is in need of cleaning up. There is no good
reason why there needs to be 6 license classes.

My thought is that when the S25.5 foes away the only distinguishing marks on
a particular license is... "Which written elements have been passed and
when?"

I know that's cruel to say but that's the fact. Very few people including
the FCC want 6 license classes and 4 or 5 license classes have very little
support either. So, Jim, my proposal is not very much concerned with what
the FCC has done in the past. or what the ARRL has done in the past. They
both have indicated lately that feelings have shifted dramatically.

> If the license
> structure is radically changed, a solution should be incorporated.
> If/when Element 1 disappears, there will be no reason to distinguish
> Techs from Tech Pluses, and all of them should get Tech Plus privs,
> such as they are.

True...

> From Jan 1952 to Nov 1967 (approximately) the FCC issued zero new
> Advanced licenses, but allowed the ~40K hams who held Advanceds to
> renew and modify them. When the changes of Nov 1968 came, those folks
> were mighty happy they'd not been mixed in with the Generals.

You and anyone else who has a heartbeat knows that no matter what happens,
no one will lose privileges. If the FCC doesn't see a significant number of
people request/condone something then the FCC will not do it.

> > So, when the morse requirements are gone we have six licenses most with
a
> > different count for written elements completed.

> Yup. We even have some folks with the same license (Tech Plus) but
> with different written credits (pre Mar 21, 1987 vs. post that date).
> Watta mess!

> > Technician and Technician Plus have passed the same written elements.

> Most of them have, but pre Mar 21 Techs have General class written
> credit.

Oh... have they passed 3(B)? If so then they are General class.

> > If the
> > Novice is promoted to this class by simply waiving element 2 then the
> > situation becomes much clearer.

> Yup - but is it right to give away upgrades like that?

Well, yes, it is because they have been law abiding hams for years, possibly
decades and granting them Element 2 is not going to ire anyone.

> ARRL proposed simply upgrading Novices and Tech Pluses to General, and
> the FCC said no way.

This was back when things were clouded by the morse requirements. In 2003
morse requirements and morse accomplishments are null and void.

> >Call this Technician class.

> Alrighty.

> > The General Class remains as is.

> I presume holders of "old" Tech Pluses could get instant upgrades to
> General, same as today. Just present the documentation, a 605 and the
> fee.

No... I think it should be automatic... they should have that now. They ARE
Generals.

At any rate, the FCC should be reclassifying everyone automatically if the
FCC is killing the license classes.

> > The difference between Advanced and Amateur Extra is element 4(B) so
waive
> > it.

> I understand it's Christmas, but that's a lot of giveaway.

What are you giving away? Yes, you are waiving 4(B) but the code thingy is
gone. Do Advanced have the same level of VE status as Amateur Extra?

> >Call this Amateur Extra Class.

> > Now, we have only three license classes all available for growth.

> Yup. But will the FCC and the amateur radio community accept it? FCC
> has already rejected all forms of upgrade giveaways. Why should they
> accept them now?

Not quite... the FCC has waived things in the past. OK, Jim, think about it, do you believe that newbies can pass a bunch of writtens to attain the same class as you but that there is no way an Advanced class ham could 'clep' a written? That's what I'm talking about.

> > This simplifies the existing band plans. I've listed the changes
resulting
> > from the above action.
> >
> > 1) The entire bands above 30 MHz are open to all licensees.
>
> Full power and all modes, I presume.

I really think that, yes, there is no reason to hold the power down for the ex-Novices when the new person off the street gets full power.

If you want to somehow limit power up there then what should be done is that a limit should be the norm and an additional endorsement should be given to ONLY those people who actually need/want to use excessive power. This endorsement is separate from license classes and that way you aren't handing out excessive power endorsements by rote. But this is another discussion. ;-)

> > 2) Novice subbands on 1.25 meters and 23 centimeters disappear.
> > 3) Technicians get 200W 28.100 to 28.300 on 10 meters.
> > 4) Technicians get 200W CW and SSB only 28.300 to 28.500 on 10 meters.
> > 5) Technicians get 200W CW only subbands on 15, 40, and 80 meters.
> > 6) Advanced Class subbands on 80, 40, 20, and 15 meters disappear.

> All logical consequences from the combinations suggested.

> > All this is accomplished by waiving Element 2 for Novices and waiving
> > Element 4(B) for Advanced. I think this is a very tiny price to pay in
order
> > to have a structure which can have some basic adjustments applied for
better
> > transitioning of everyone throughout the ARS experience.

> I see your point, but others may be outraged and the FCC may nix the
> whole free upgrade idea.

Frankly, my dear... I don't give a damn... ;-)

No, really, if people are outraged fine. They can 'lobby' for they're own 'vision' of what the ARS of the future should be. The FCC will do whatever they perceive the shift to be.

> Without those giveaways, we're back to all those subbands.

The FCC should also take a look at any other nation to find out that SIX CLASSES ARE ABSOLUTELY NOT WANTED OR NEEDED if the FCC had to write a proposal on organizing an ARS from scratch they (or anyone else) could not justify starting out with six classes.

> > I now add my thoughts on the 'adjustments'... ;-)
> >
> > One, give the Technicians 10 meters because in light of the infringement of
> > freebanders it's better to have plenty of licenced operators squatting there
> > trying to maintain control of the band. There is no sense in being
> > exclusionary to your fellow hams. I say get the freeband candidates licensed
> > and accountable. This would eliminate the subband on 10 meters which I view
> > a good thing. As far as I'm concerned limit everyone on the band to 200
> > watts and go after the jerks.
>
> I agree in part. Give everyone all of 10 meters - just limit Techs to
> 200W. (To do otherwise takes away privileges from higher class
> licenses).

That's seems fair but I think that what you have to do is think about the HIGH POWER endorsement. and limit EVERYONE to 200 watts on 10 meters. I am treating 10 meters as a completely different animal here because of the state of affairs there and I'm worried about where it will be in 10 years.

> > Two, give the Technicians 200 W CW only operation on the General subands.

> I agree 100%. But this was proposed formally to the FCC and they shot
> it down.

In a post code testing era they won't shoot it down, they will look for consensus on how to allow it.

> An ARRL committee is proposing virtually the same thing,
> (good) plus widening the 'phone slots on those bands (bad).

I agree with you here, also.

> But why
> should the FCC reverse itself from its previous refusal of AH0A's very
> reasonable idea? FCC's answer was essentially "let them take Element 3
> and get Generals".

Don't do it... personally, I couldn't care less. ;-)
(this is NOT my fight) just a suggestion.

> > you want them to learn CW then put the horse before cart and the carrot in
> > front of the horse. This would eliminate the CW only subbands on 15, 40, and

> > 80 meters.

> I think you mean "Novice/TechPlus subbands".

They are CW only subbands on my chart. I was avoiding using the words Novice and Technician Plus in my post S25.5 world. Besides, you know what I meant.

> The main problems I see are:

> 1) the FCC has already shot down many of your ideas

Tough, they'll have to have good reasons to shoot them down, again. As a package the whole thing is pure and simple. If they can't handle that and they insist on helter skelter then they can save their cab fare... they're already there.

> 2) free upgrades may not get much support from other hams

I think other hams see what's happening... the new ones come in and get to general and extra very quickly and the elders are being 'corraled' out in their pastures.

> 3) the big opportunities of the post-2003 era are not being addressed
> adequately.

I didn't meant to imply my adjustments where all that is needed. ;-)

> How about this:

> Right now:

> 1) Give all Novices and Tech Pluses 200 W CW only on all nonphone
> General HF/MF bands, 160-10. (FCC will probably balk at this)

FCC will go with the consensus... build a consensus... what does the ARRL say what does NCI and the Quarter Century folks and the VE orgs say???? This would happen if the pressure comes from everywhere.

> 2) Allow all "old" Tech Pluses to get Generals by a simple mail or
> online procedure, instead of forcing them to attend VE sessions. (FCC
> will hate this one, too).

This should be automatic. The FCC should realize they ARE GENERALS!!!! The FCC should issue the licenses. Much cleaner and simpler if they run the computers to cough up the licenses and issue them. Oh and don't bring up their budget. It'd be much cheaper also.

> 3) Resolve the 40 meter mess at WRC 2003 to get a worldwide exclusive
> amateur allocation, even if it gives away spectrum. 7000-7200
> worldwide exclusive amateur is better for everyone than 7000-7300 in
> Region 2 and 7000-7100 everywhere else.

No question about this one!!!!

> 4) Develop bandplans for all HF/MF that separate CW, digital and
> analog voice/image modes.

Jim, I'm confused, the sentence doesn't make sense. Do you mean separate digital from analog... voice from image...

> After S25.5 is gone:

> 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
> names if you don't like them)

I would think about a high power endorsement in ALL three classes. Maybe the endorsement is awarded to all existing licensees and all future would have to earn them. I believe, going foward, the handing out willy nilly high power should be avoided.

> 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license
> class. (Some bands, like 10 and the WARC bands, may be split by mode
> only).

> 3) Basic license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
> procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff,
> main purpose is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150
> watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (determined by RF
> exposure limits). Modes are CW, SSB, FM, PSK31 and maybe some of the
> other common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control ops
> for repeaters, or be club trustees. Basics get all VHF/UHF and about
> half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the entry level.

Perhaps, the bands could be 10, 12, 17, and 30 meters. What do you think?

The power limit should be high enough that using the normal HF rigs that do approximately 100 watts or so are totally legal for the newbies not have to worry. Same in the UHF normal rigs as built now should be allowed.

What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???

By SSB do you mean the same as I have on 10 meter now...
J3E single-sideband supressed carrier
R3E single sideband reduced carrier
but excluding the other 25 phone modes, including AM (which CB'ers have), single sideband full carrier, and MCW "for providing telegraphy practice interspersed with speech" as excluded in Part 97 now for no good reason???

Oh... I see you arbitrarily included FM.

I don't think you could subdivide 'data' the modes aren't even invented; yet, you want to exclude them... now THAT'S arbitrary... ;-)

> 4) Intermediate license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on
> regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical and RF
> exposure stuff, with some regs to cover expanded privs. Intermediates
> get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs
> after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club
> trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or
> more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires at least one year
> experience as a Basic.

Incrementing the power is a good way to not just grant the high power willy nilly.

> 5) Full license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs,
> procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some
> regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands,
> etc. except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see
> below). Full license requires ar least one year (preferably two years)
> as an Intermediate.

Sounds reasonable to me.

> 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.
> 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
> six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character
> calls.
> 8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open
> to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs.
> 9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses,
> Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras
> become Fulls. Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams
> to upgrade.

> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned
> as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but
> meaningful steps to reach full privileges.

> Of course this probably has even less chance than your ideas, Rich.

There is a problem with telling Advanced and Generals that you're reducing their power limits arbitrarily across the board. but that's your sell, not mine... ;-)

I'll take one more stab at it later. I'll take my ideas and your class names and quite a few of your ideas. Now, be more specific on which MF/HF bands Basic gets and which modes should be kept away from the basics, and why... ;-)

Another go-round and we should have something solid. Then a look around to see if it aligns with some other groups/advocates to see if it couldn't be presented to the powers that be with some backing. Hey, who knows....

Rich

5857. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 20:02:47 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <H1qW7.198934$WW.11520820@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28754

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112261049.70af3e32@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<lGIV7.239252$3d2.11593385@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011224100327.27168.00000589@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wa6vse@fast.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > What should be discussed NOW is what the US license structure will
> > become
> > > if/when S25.5 goes away. Some folks want just one class of license,
> > while
> > > others want two classes at most. Some say "just drop Element 1 and
leave
> > the
> > > rest alone". Lots of ideas and possibilities, but I don't see much
real
> > > discussion about the subject.
> > >
> > > General question to all: What are YOUR ideas?
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> This is the post I shoulda answered first....
> > >
> >
> > The trick is and always has been bringing in the newbies and letting
them
> > soak in the sauce until they can go on to 20 meters without stirring
up
> > the OTs or develop a skin thick enough to withstand a W2OY.
>
> 20 meters or 2 meters...
>
> > It is not so
> > much keeping them off as keeping them from being roasted before their
> > time. So we have seen over the years time gaps between classes which
to
> > my mind is more an act of mercy to the newbie than a barrier. You can
> > test til your butt sucks wind but no one is prepared for the
> > rough-and-tumble of a good pile up, encountering some net that thinks
it

> > is sanctioned, or the crochety old fart.
>
> Plus all the reverse.
>
> > And there is and continues to be
> > the need to show a good face to the rest of the world.
>
> That most of all. One thing to keep in mind at all times when on the
> air is "what if an enemy of ham radio is taping this to play as an
> example of why hams should lose their allocations?"
> >
> > So in principle at least I would favor a three class system: a
> > bread-and-milk Tech much like we have now but give them 28.1-28.5, cut
the
> > power limit to 50 max. and keep them out of non-channelized
VHF/UHF/SHF,
>
> See other posts by me this date this thread.
>
> > an entry-level ticket resembling the present General with 200 watts
max,
> > and a senior ticket much like the Extra but with a one-year waiting
> > period.
>
> Three levels, yeah, but more differentiation.
>
> > The present structure is not really half bad except that it is
> > unkind to those passing the Extra more or less out of the box. The
junior
> > ticket has to include regs both U. S. and International and the usual
> > safety and regulatory stuff so I doubt if Element 3 would change a
whole
> > lot. The trick is Element 4.
>
> Yup.
> >
> > Just how technical is technical? Damfino. The real thing with Element
4
> > is a proper ceremony for pontification so one should probably deal
with
> > impedence matching, Ohm's or Joule's laws in various permutations, a
bit
> > on angle modulation, non-linearity and how to detect and prevent it,
and
> > the inevitable VE questions.
>
> Maybe. What happens when No Charts International gets going?
> >
> > The issue is not whom to keep out although we all have our candidates
but

> > how to blend the newbie into a hobby with traditions that predate the
> > Titanic partially to keep him from being a major pain in the butt but
> > mostly to give him time to orient himself for the long haul; marching
> > people thru the hobby and out looks good on paper but does not in the
long
> > run accomplish a hell of a lot.
>
> I agree 100%.
>
> > I suspect that the aging vat effect is
> > one reason that the 5wpm restructuring was largely a wet firecracker.
>
> Nah. Lots of other stuff going on.
>
> The bread-and-milk ("honeydo") attraction of amateur VHF/UHF that
> drove much of the '80s growth is all but gone with cellphones. Yes,
> there are areas where cellphones don't work and they do cost money but
> most people nowadays have one anyway so they get a familytalk plan and
> done. FRS and GMRS suck up a lot of that sorta stuff, too.
>
> Those who simply want cheap longdistance electronic communication have
> email and newsgroups and websites. The odea that some sort of amateur
> wireless internet will compete with AOL or Earthlink is simply
> misguided.
>
> What's left are those who want RADIO, for whatever reason. Medium is
> the message and all that.
>
> > It
> > is known among marketers and has been for 30 years that the average
CBer
> > buys five rigs before the last one goes into the garage and to a large
> > extent we have seen that when the Tech is touted as entry-level which
it
> > presently is not but is rather a dirty trick played by the FCC and
ARRL.
>
> Actually the FCC did an end-around on the League back in 1990 anyway.
> The trend towards entry-by-VHF was in place by then anyway.
>
> One real problem nobody talks about much is the addytoods of those who
> come to ham radio with "experience" in other services.
> >
> > Sum and substance: does the hobby need protection from the newbie or
the
> > newbie need a bit of protection from a hobby that can eat one up?
>
> Both.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

That attitude is precisely why we really do need to establish a time-in-grade standard for VEing if nothing else. As it sits, Unit 437 could gun up and pass the Extra bringing the Velvet Jockstrap and Dingleberry 42 into the fold and have all the buds on the air in six months. When they run a test session at the BARF convention and CB keydowns we are doomed.

The bread-and-milk ticket is mostly for the convenience of a ham's family given that the gear usually exists anyway. I remember well being asked why a guy with an Extra, a First Phone, etc could not be contacted for a gallon of milk. The alternative is some sort of sponsored use where N&#65533;BK/Spouse calls N&#65533;BK on the repeater to report that N&#65533;BK/Kid1 needs a ride home after the police investigation. Good family usage also means a better gear budget.

I have been jacked up by the lifer-Tech repeater trolls myself but generally do not take them too seriously but 46 years licensed does tend to develop a non-serious approach. Seabag lawyering is an ancient tradition going back to about the time bitching became the right of the enlisted man. They can usually be bafflegabbed into submission.

So the object of testing is an attitude adjustment period whatever it might be called and for whatever reason it might be necessary. A year is probably about right. Band privleges as they are currently constituted between General and Extra are pretty close to right. I am of several minds at the moment re the old Novice bands. One might drop the phone band to 21.15 and the ten meter to 28.2 but there is something to be said for providing room to do a new mode or engage in some QRP or code practice without conflicting with the big boys and, of course, giving the rest of the world a place to hide from Americans. Some of the NCI jocks would have it wall-to-wall SSB without ever having a clue about how and why the allocations got that way; amazing how CW hatred permeates every thought, isn't it. Bad things happen when institutional memory is lost.

So we return to element 4. Antenna theory is fruitful including such items as Cecil's how-to-tap open feeders for a 50 ohm match but coax length, contrary to CB legend, means zilch. It might be useful to calculate the voltage at the end of a dipole with 200 watts to keep the fires to a ladylike belch and not give dogs whizzing on your downspout the thrill of a lifetime. Proper use of GDOs and noise bridges might be fruitful. If one is now going to get to run a linear it might be nice if a non-linearity detection circuit could be recognized and the very existence of such things noted. Some passing familiarity with FSK and PSK techniques could be noted and the inevitable what deviation allows one to operate in a 10, 12.5, or 15 kHz channel without being a pain in the drain. Personally, orientation toward how not to be a major nincompoop seems more useful than how to be the big winner.

The unanswered question is how much idiocy to allow and how long to allow it. Self-education is not pretty but some of the frequency wars need to be sat upon by a major elephant. Even middle school football teams need the zebras.

In general however, I am far more interested in protecting the newbie who knows he is a newbie than I am in protecting the terminal know-it-all from finding that he doesn't. It is just the coach in my soul.

Dick, Bug Killer.

As if Cornhusker isn't fruitloop enough, the team was originally called Bug Eaters.

5858. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 20:11:52 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A2F08.8436E4D0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28755
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Atomic Punk wrote:
> Running above 27.405 is aganst the law and considered a federal crime.

Oh No! I was on 28.4 on Christmas Day. Am I in trouble?

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5859. Re: RADIO LAW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 20:14:32 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <IcqW7.242113$3d2.11769870@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28756

Or page one of a NAL! :-)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.goxel1t.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sat, 22 Dec 2001 14:01:55 GMT, N9NWO wrote:
>
> >Often someone overhears on site comments
> >and makes it into a major political issue.
>
> >They want to be able to cuss
> >"in the heat of battle" without having to answer to every
> >anti cop and anti government group out there.
> >
> >Plus the average street cop will go
> >back to treating the radio as a CB where they all tell their
> >off colored stories about women and minorities. Or co-ordinate
> >the stories so that the last incident that went bad will look good
> >on paper.
>
> After 50 years of being a ham, I've learned that one should NEVER
> say anything into a mivrophone (or a cell phone) that one would not
> want to see on Page One of the New Yorl Times the next day.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>
>

5860. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 20:14:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A2FC1.1A3A7D47@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28757

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> I don't think my callsign is vulgar, as I believe there is nothing vulgar
> about parts of the body, nothing vulgar about the physical expression of
> love between two people, nothing vulgar about language or its expression in
> general. (I know you knew that, Cecil, but had to say it anyway).

I'm using the dictionary definition of "vulgar", Kim, as being of the
common folk. Vulgar Latin is what the commoners spoke during the
Roman Empire.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5861. Re: Mistuh Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 20:17:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112262014590.5233-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 28758

On 26 Dec 2001, Bob Weiss wrote:
>General Electric has been convicted of defrauding the US government on
>several defense contracts. They are also the largest producer of EPA
>superfund sites, IIRC. So when is the FCC going to cancel all of the
>broadcast licenses held by GE (owner of NBC)?
>
>Or are computer hackers subject to a different set of laws than
>corporate
>criminals?

Natural persons and corporations are treated differently under criminal statute.

Secondly, the "yanking of his license" (by denying renewal, since that is how this has come about) is not a punishment because the license does not represent [expression of] a right.

Thirdly, licensing matters are civil in nature, not criminal, and thus take a separate track through the law. The government is not barred from taking the action simply because it hadn't taken it concurrent with the criminal matter.

5862. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 20:18:57 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <RgqW7.198949$WW.11519992@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28759
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Atomic Punk" <no.email@available.com> wrote in message
news:3c2a21b5.103550406@news.iaxs.net...
> On 22 Dec 2001 20:44:48 -0800, SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com (SD
> SpecialDelivery Jones) wrote:
>
> >"john" <w9jcm@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<vI8V7.5825$6t1.11077@newsfeed.intelenet.net>...
> >> Just another attempt to start up a big argument on here.
> >> "Train" <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com> wrote in message
> >> news:Rw8V7.142409$bs2.23713117@news02.optonline.net...
> >> > I like it!
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > IllegalCBersMustGO <keyclownslappa@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:ce9e428e.0112221512.73aac040@posting.google.com...
> >> > > DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB
PAGE.....
> >> > >
> >> > > http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
> >> >
> >> >
> >
> >oh cool ....move over hammies.......its called corporate
> >expansion.....i told you...we are in the appropriation business....if
> >you don't use it you loose it.......remember????
>
>
> Excuse me? The old 11M band was swiped from us HAMS back in the 1950s
> and was VERY well used and liked by hams across the globe. Would you
> like a history lession?
> The FCC has no intention of giving CBers anymore bandwidth in the USA,
> get a clue and 42
>

Excuse me all to hell but 11 meters was given to the Amateur Service in
Region 2 after the 1947 WARC cut 20 meters; it was never a treaty band and
was never available in Region 1 (Europe and Africa). When 15 meters, a
treaty band out of the same WARC, was cleared of its Marine occupants in
the early 50s, 11 became a wasteland and was returned to Land Mobile in
the late 50s. I was on 11 in 1957-58 fiddling with A4 when 11 was the
only legal place to do it and believe me it was e-m-p-t-y. As the good
Baron put it, I vas dere Sharlie. We did not lose a thing anyone cared
about.

You might also note that being a treaty band, the FCC lacks the authority to redesignate ten meters in any case.

Dick N&#65533;BK, Omaha

5863. Re: RADIO LAW - TACOMA BANS NON FCC....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 20:21:26 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ajqW7.242118$3d2.11771533@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28760

Yep, and I have 98 degrees myself. Sometimes, however, if I am sick, I have
103 degrees; then I see a doctorate.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

ps - Phil, do I detect a bit of jelousy in the post I am responding to?

"Steve Yodel" <BAQ_Enterprises@arqwxz.com> wrote in message
news:a0ci6r$9ih$0@pita.alt.net...
> My ex-wife started out as dance instructor in the inner
> city. While teaching dance to pregnant teens, she earned
> 24 Doctorate degrees, ranging from exotic dance to nuclear
> physics. When testifying before Congress, she would put
> down sexist Congressman in a heart beat. I met her while we
> were special advisors to the President. In fact, the President
> so admired here that he would seek her advice before he made
> any major decision. Later, we got bored being on the President's
> national security team, so we both joined the Army Airborne
> Rangers. She earned 13 more Doctorate degrees, one while
> bailing out of a C-17 aircraft over hostile territory. The male
> troops would try to put her down, but that never stopped her.
> In fact she went on to become a Navy Seal. Then we resigned
> from the armed forces, opened our own business selling rare
> comic books. Yes, quite a lady! She finally divorced me for
> spending too much time on Usenet and ran off with Bill Clinton,
> but their affair remains a secret, as the one thing my ex-wife does
> fear is Hillary Clinton. Ahhh, those were the years! Now all I have
> left in life is sitting here on Usenet trying to top the postings of
> other people and act superior to everyone else. Geronimo!
> Up Up and away, to infinity!
>
> Steve-The-Wonderful, a ham since 1926.
>
>
>
>

5864. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 20:22:12 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a30e5_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28761

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2A2FC1.1A3A7D47@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > I don't think my callsign is vulgar, as I believe there is nothing
vulgar
> > about parts of the body, nothing vulgar about the physical expression of
> > love between two people, nothing vulgar about language or its expression
in
> > general. (I know you knew that, Cecil, but had to say it anyway).
>
> I'm using the dictionary definition of "vulgar", Kim, as being of the
> common folk. Vulgar Latin is what the commoners spoke during the
> Roman Empire.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
>

Ah. I speak pretty vulgar Latin, also. :)

Kim W5TIT

5865. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 20:30:41 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <RrqW7.198971$WW.11523205@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28762

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:XZpW7.242101$3d2.11769921@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > > > if/when S25.5 goes away.
>
> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote
>
> > > First, consider this, we have two 'kinds' of licenses. Those which
can
> be
> > > granted and those which can't.
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > "Current" vs. "heritage", as it were. Novices, Tech Pluses and
> > Advanceds are in the latter category.
>
> > > I believe this must be solved before or
> > > during whatever else is done.
>
> > Not to be argumentative, but - why "must" it be solved?
>
> Because, simply said, the ARS is in need of cleaning up. There is no
good
> reason why there needs to be 6 license classes.
>
> My thought is that when the S25.5 foes away the only distinguishing
marks on
> a particular license is... "Which written elements have been passed and
> when?"
>
> I know that's cruel to say but that's the fact. Very few people
including
> the FCC want 6 license classes and 4 or 5 license classes have very
little
> support either. So, Jim, my proposal is not very much concerned with
what
> the FCC has done in the past. or what the ARRL has done in the past.
They
> both have indicated lately that feelings have shifted dramatically.
>
> > If the license
> > structure is radically changed, a solution should be incorporated.

> > If/when Element 1 disappears, there will be no reason to distinguish
> > Techs from Tech Pluses, and all of them should get Tech Plus privs,
> > such as they are.
>
> True...
>
> > From Jan 1952 to Nov 1967 (approximately) the FCC issued zero new
> > Advanced licenses, but allowed the ~40K hams who held Advanceds to
> > renew and modify them. When the changes of Nov 1968 came, those folks
> > were mighty happy they'd not been mixed in with the Generals.
>
> You and anyone else who has a heartbeat knows that no matter what
happens,
> no one will lose privileges. If the FCC doesn't see a significant number
of
> people request/condone something then the FCC will not do it.
>
> > > So, when the morse requirements are gone we have six licenses most
with
> a
> > > different count for written elements completed.
>
> > Yup. We even have some folks with the same license (Tech Plus) but
> > with different written credits (pre Mar 21, 1987 vs. post that date).
> > Watta mess!
>
> > > Technician and Technician Plus have passed the same written
elements.
>
> > Most of them have, but pre Mar 21 Techs have General class written
> > credit.
>
> Oh... have they passed 3(B)? If so then they are General class.
>
> > > If the
> > > Novice is promoted to this class by simply waiving element 2 then
the
> > > situation becomes much clearer.
>
> > Yup - but is it right to give away upgrades like that?
>
> Well, yes, it is because they have been law abiding hams for years,
possibly
> decades and granting them Element 2 is not going to ire anyone.
>
> > ARRL proposed simply upgrading Novices and Tech Pluses to General, and
> > the FCC said no way.
>
> This was back when things were clouded by the morse requirements. In
2003

> morse requirements and morse accomplishments are null and void.
>
> > >Call this Technician class.
>
> > Alrighty.
>
> > > The General Class remains as is.
>
> > I presume holders of "old" Tech Pluses could get instant upgrades to
> > General, same as today. Just present the documentation, a 605 and the
> > fee.
>
> No... I think it should be automatic... they should have that now. They
ARE
> Generals.
>
> At any rate, the FCC should be reclassifying everyone automatically if
the
> FCC is killing the license classes.
>
> > > The difference between Advanced and Amateur Extra is element 4(B) so
> waive
> > > it.
>
> > I understand it's Christmas, but that's a lot of giveaway.
>
> What are you giving away? Yes, you are waiving 4(B) but the code thingy
is
> gone. Do Advanced have the same level of VE status as Amateur Extra?
>
> > >Call this Amateur Extra Class.
>
> > > Now, we have only three license classes all available for growth.
>
> > Yup. But will the FCC and the amateur radio community accept it? FCC
> > has already rejected all forms of upgrade giveaways. Why should they
> > accept them now?
>
> Not quite... the FCC has waived things in the past. OK, Jim, think about
it,
> do you believe that newbies can pass a bunch of writtens to attain the
same
> class as you but that there is no way an Advanced class ham could 'clep'
a
> written? That's what I'm talking about.
>
> > > This simplifies the existing band plans. I've listed the changes
> resulting
> > > from the above action.
> > >

> > > 1) The entire bands above 30 MHz are open to all licensees.
> >
> > Full power and all modes, I presume.
>
> I really think that, yes, there is no reason to hold the power down for
the
> ex-Novices when the new person off the street gets full power.
>
> If you want to somehow limit power up there then what should be done is
that
> a limit should be the norm and an additional endorsement should be given
to
> ONLY those people who actually need/want to use excessive power. This
> endorsement is separate from license classes and that way you aren't
handing
> out excessive power endorsements by rote. But this is another
discussion.
> ;-)
>
> > > 2) Novice subbands on 1.25 meters and 23 centimeters disappear.
> > > 3) Technicians get 200W 28.100 to 28.300 on 10 meters.
> > > 4) Technicians get 200W CW and SSB only 28.300 to 28.500 on 10
meters.
> > > 5) Technicians get 200W CW only subbands on 15, 40, and 80 meters.
> > > 6) Advanced Class subbands on 80, 40, 20, and 15 meters disappear.
>
> > All logical consequences from the combinations suggested.
>
> > > All this is accomplished by waiving Element 2 for Novices and
waiving
> > > Element 4(B) for Advanced. I think this is a very tiny price to pay
in
> order
> > > to have a structure which can have some basic adjustments applied
for
> better
> > > transitioning of everyone throughout the ARS experience.
>
> > I see your point, but others may be outraged and the FCC may nix the
> > whole free upgrade idea.
>
> Frankly, my dear... I don't give a damn... ;-)
>
> No, really, if people are outraged fine. They can 'lobby' for they're
own
> 'vision' of what the ARS of the future should be. The FCC will do
whatever
> they perceive the shift to be.
>
> > Without those giveaways, we're back to all those subbands.

>
> The FCC should also take a look at any other nation to find out that SIX
> CLASSES ARE ABSOLUTELY NOT WANTED OR NEEDED if the FCC had to write a
> proposal on organizing an ARS from scratch they (or anyone else) could
not
> justify starting out with six classes.
>
> > > I now add my thoughts on the 'adjustments'... ;-)
> > >
> > > One, give the Technicians 10 meters because in light of the
infringement
> of
> > > freebanders it's better to have plenty of licenced operators
squatting
> there
> > > trying to maintain control of the band. There is no sense in being
> > > exclusionary to your fellow hams. I say get the freeband candidates
> licensed
> > > and accountable. This would eliminate the subband on 10 meters which
I
> view
> > > a good thing. As far as I'm concerned limit everyone on the band to
200
> > > watts and go after the jerks.
> >
> > I agree in part. Give everyone all of 10 meters - just limit Techs to
> > 200W. (To do otherwise takes away privileges from higher class
> > licenses).
>
> That's seems fair but I think that what you have to do is think about
the
> HIGH POWER endorsement. and limit EVERYONE to 200 watts on 10 meters. I
am
> treating 10 meters as a completely different animal here because of the
> state of affairs there and I'm worried about where it will be in 10
years.
>
> > > Two, give the Technicians 200 W CW only operation on the General
> subands.
>
> > I agree 100%. But this was proposed formally to the FCC and they shot
> > it down.
>
> In a post code testing era they won't shoot it down, they will look for
> consensus on how to allow it.
>
> > An ARRL committee is proposing virtually the same thing,
> > (good) plus widening the 'phone slots on those bands (bad).
>
> I agree with you here, also.

>
> > But why
> > should the FCC reverse itself from its previous refusal of AH0A's very
> > reasonable idea? FCC's answer was essentially "let them take Element 3
> > and get Generals".
>
> Don't do it... personally, I couldn't care less. ;-)
> (this is NOT my fight) just a suggestion.
>
> > > you want them to learn CW then put the horse before cart and the
carrot
> in
> > > front of the horse. This would eliminate the CW only subbands on 15,
40,
> and
> > > 80 meters.
>
> > I think you mean "Novice/TechPlus subbands".
>
> They are CW only subbands on my chart. I was avoiding using the words
Novice
> and Technician Plus in my post S25.5 world. Besides, you know what I
meant.
>
> > The main problems I see are:
>
> > 1) the FCC has already shot down many of your ideas
>
> Tough, they'll have to have good reasons to shoot them down, again. As a
> package the whole thing is pure and simple. If they can't handle that
and
> they insist on helter skelter then they can save their cab fare...
they're
> already there.
>
> > 2) free upgrades may not get much support from other hams
>
> I think other hams see what's happening... the new ones come in and get
to
> general and extra very quickly and the elders are being 'corraled' out
in
> their pastures.
>
> > 3) the big opportunities of the post-2003 era are not being addressed
> > adequately.
>
> I didn't meant to imply my adjustments where all that is needed. ;-)
>
> > How about this:
>

> > Right now:
>
> > 1) Give all Novices and Tech Pluses 200 W CW only on all nonphone
> > General HF/MF bands, 160-10. (FCC will probably balk at this)
>
> FCC will go with the consensus... build a consensus... what does the
ARRL
> say what does NCI and the Quarter Century folks and the VE orgs say????
This
> would happen if the pressure comes from everywhere.
>
> > 2) Allow all "old" Tech Pluses to get Generals by a simple mail or
> > online procedure, instead of forcing them to attend VE sessions. (FCC
> > will hate this one, too).
>
> This should be automatic. The FCC should realize they ARE GENERALS!!!!
The
> FCC should issue the licenses. Much cleaner and simpler if they run the
> computers to cough up the licenses and issue them. Oh and don't bring up
> their budget. It'd be much cheaper also.
>
> > 3) Resolve the 40 meter mess at WRC 2003 to get a worldwide exclusive
> > amateur allocation, even if it gives away spectrum. 7000-7200
> > worldwide exclusive amateur is better for everyone than 7000-7300 in
> > Region 2 and 7000-7100 everywhere else.
>
> No question about this one!!!!
>
> > 4) Develop bandplans for all HF/MF that separate CW, digital and
> > analog voice/image modes.
>
> Jim, I'm confused, the sentence doesn't make sense. Do you mean separate
> digital from analog... voice from image...
>
> > After S25.5 is gone:
>
> > 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
> > names if you don't like them)
>
> I would think about a high power endorsement in ALL three classes. Maybe
the
> endorsement is awarded to all existing licensees and all future would
have
> to earn them. I believe, going foward, the handing out willy nilly high
> power should be avoided.
>
> > 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license
> > class. (Some bands, like 10 and the WARC bands, may be split by mode
> > only).
>

> > 3) Basic license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
> > procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff,
> > main purpose is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150
> > watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (determined by RF
> > exposure limits). Modes are CW, SSB, FM, PSK31 and maybe some of the
> > other common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control ops
> > for repeaters, or be club trustees. Basics get all VHF/UHF and about
> > half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the entry level.
>
> Perhaps, the bands could be 10, 12, 17, and 30 meters. What do you
think?
>
> The power limit should be high enough that using the normal HF rigs that
do
> approximately 100 watts or so are totally legal for the newbies not have
to
> worry. Same in the UHF normal rigs as built now should be allowed.
>
> What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???
>
> By SSB do you mean the same as I have on 10 meter now...
> J3E single-sideband supressed carrier
> R3E single sideband reduced carrier
> but excluding the other 25 phone modes, including AM (which CB'ers
have),
> single sideband full carrier, and MCW "for providing telegraphy
practice
> interspersed with speech" as excluded in Part 97 now for no good
reason???
>
> Oh... I see you arbitrarily included FM.
>
> I don't think you could subdivide 'data' the modes aren't even invented;
> yet, you want to exclude them... now THAT'S arbitrary... ;-)
>
> > 4) Intermediate license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on
> > regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical and RF
> > exposure stuff, with some regs to cover expanded privs. Intermediates
> > get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs
> > after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club
> > trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or
> > more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires at least one year
> > experience as a Basic.
>
> Incrementing the power is a good way to not just grant the high power
willy
> nilly.
>
> > 5) Full license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs,
> > procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some

> > regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands,
> > etc. except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see
> > below). Full license requires ar least one year (preferably two years)
> > as an Intermediate.
>
> Sounds reasonable to me.
>
> > 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.
> > 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
> > six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character
> > calls.
> > 8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open
> > to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs.
> > 9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses,
> > Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras
> > become Fulls. Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams
> > to upgrade.
>
> > End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned
> > as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but
> > meaningful steps to reach full privileges.
>
> > Of course this probably has even less chance than your ideas, Rich.
>
> There is a problem with telling Advanced and Generals that you're
reducing
> their power limits arbitrarily across the board. but that's your sell,
not
> mine... ;-)
>
> I'll take one more stab at it later. I'll take my ideas and your class
names
> and quite a few of your ideas. Now, be more specific on which MF/HF
bands
> Basic gets and which modes should be kept away from the basics, and
why...
> ;-)
>
> Another go-round and we should have something solid. Then a look around
to
> see if it aligns with some other groups/advocates to see if it couldn't
be
> presented to the powers that be with some backing. Hey, who knows....
>
> Rich
>
>
>

I have a better idea. On the day, freeze all the Classes and start with AB and C. And issue distinguished callsigns. So a brand new instant Extra could be KA42BK. Existing Techs and Plusses without the moxie to upgrade would be given punctuation as well. There is something to be said for " Hi, this is Rich N41 Interrobang Quebec Juliet Xray.

Serves you right for the cleanliness fetish.

Dick N&#65533;BK

5866. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 21:16:35 UTC
From: "James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <7ldk2uklq7qh0pn8vmi718luvi3nv7ha89@4ax.com>
Source record: 28763

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 13:40:46 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org...
>>
>> A vulgar callsign is an
>> opportunity to teach youngsters about random groupings
>> of alpha-numeric characters.
>> --
>> cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>>
>>
>
>I don't think my callsign is vulgar, as I believe there is nothing vulgar
>about parts of the body, nothing vulgar about the physical expression of
>love between two people, nothing vulgar about language or its expression in
>general. (I know you knew that, Cecil, but had to say it anyway).
>
>I think that if a kid recognizes anything in my callsign (and I think kids'
>and young adults' minds are much cleaner than those of the supposed
>"gentlemen" on this newsgroup) that is "dirty" or "vulgar" or "nasty" then
>it is probably an extension of what they have learned from adults closest to
>them. When my brother and I used to giggle at pictures in the National
>Geographic magazine, it was our mom or dad that would ask us what did we
>find so amusing about the human body? My brother would usually laugh and
>point at a picture of some nude woman and state, "that is nasty." At which
>point my mother would explain to him all the reasons why it wasn't nasty at
>all. It gave us something to think about.
>
>Dave, Larry, Dick C., and people like them would probably see nothing but
>"nasty" in a person walking on a beach in the nude, or nothing but "nasty"
>in a woman who nurses her child in public, or nothing but "nasty" at the
>idea of a man and woman making love together. They miss opportunities to
>see beauty when it is all around them. My callsign is intended for fun--and
>that does not have to include nasty. Nasty is in their minds, not mine.
>And, it is also not in the minds of many, many people I have talked to on
>the air.
>
>To believe that my callsign is vulgar, does not belong in the ARS, and
>should not have been requested by me and/or issued by the FCC is to focus on
>"nasty" or "vulgar" ideas of what my callsign is. I choose to ignore the
>"nasty" or "vulgar" minded, because my callsign isn't.
>

>Kim W5TIT
>
Kim, there is nothing wrong with your callsign. I can't believe these dirty old men are making such a fuss over it. Enjoy your callsign. There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose. I think it's great if you like it and that's all that really matters. Only in America are we FREE to choose what we like or dislike about things, people, etc. etc.
As I saw in another message that someone posted, your callsign is made up of letters, not words. In your case it just happens to spell a slang word for a part of the human body (breast), that both men and women have. The attitude of these people is part of what is wrong with this country now days. The best way to handle these people is to just ignore them like we do the "dead keyers" on the repeaters. When they realize that they are not antagonizing anyone, they will go away and find something else to complain about.

You and I don't live that far from each other. Your on the east side of Dallas and I live just to the north of Dallas in Richardson.

James N5SKU
Regards,

James

Note: To reply by email, remove the "X" in the reply to address.

5867. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 21:25:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A4049.1E3F11FA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28764

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Your new quest, Don. Q., is to advise us on how many of the 17k+ spell
> > something which could be viewed by others as vulgar.
>
> That's easy, Dave. Everyone is perfectly free to view each and
> every callsign as being vulgar. Vulgarity is in the mind of
> the reader. Vulgarity doesn't exist independently in any
> callsign.

So where I see a few vulgar calls, you see only an opportunity for 17k+ vulgar calls. That is certainly an interesting concept.

> Non-English speaking people would have to have it explained
> to them before they could possibly find it vulgar. Seems that
> proves the word is not objectively vulgar. All you have to do to
> solve the problem is, instead of morbidly looking for vulgarity
> everywhere 24 hours a day, try looking for goodness, kindness,
> love, and mercy. Most of your vulgar thoughts would disappear.

Just how many non-English speaking hams have licenses issued by the FCC, Cecil?

> Dave, you are like the unfortunate soul who sees vulgar pictures
> in ink blots. It is all in your mind. Try switching from vulgar
> thoughts to beautiful thoughts and thus make the world a better
> place instead of the cesspool in which you live.

Cecil, this newsgroup is about as close as I get to a cesspool. You haven't even guessed right in your comparison of me to a fellow who sees vulgar pictures in ink blot tests. I'm more likely to see a buffalo hide drying on a tepee wall.

Dave K8MN

5868. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 21:26:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A409E.59FF6E67@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28765

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?
> >
> > Isn't the answer apparent?
>
> Yes it is, Dave, and that's why we have a Bill of Rights to
> protect us from statists like you who would deny us our
> inalienable rights.

Well, my foggy friend, you don't even have an inalienable right to an amateur radio license so I don't know how you'd have one for a call of choice. Darn! Another perfectly good rant ruined.

Dave K8MN

5869. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 21:35:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A429A.F705F990@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28766

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On 26 Dec 2001 06:52:18 -0800, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2954AE.34992319@IEEE.org>...
> >
> >> If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?
> >
> >Nope. Nor to anyone else. Nor would I issue similar inappropriate callsigns.
> >
> >Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.
>
> In other words, simply because the law would require you to do
> something, you would refuse anyway because it "isn't right" in your
> mind?
>
> And you wonder why many of us think you aren't playing with a
> full deck!

You'll note, Jim, that this is the kindly prof who only responds in kind. He never throws the first stone and he is as supportive of your right to express an opinion as he is supportive of Kim's ideas. How do we know these things? Because he told us so.

Dave K8MN

5870. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 21:37:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A4322.1600E2F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28767

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 15:15:08 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >>
> >> On Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:17:10 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Some folks believe that professional baseball players who sell
> >> >autographs to kids are heroes. My heroes are genuine heroes.
> >>
> >> Who?
> >
> >Folks other than professional baseball players who sell autographs to
> >kids.
>
> That means Ted Bundy, Charles Manson, Adolph Hitler, Saddam
> Hussein, and Osama bin Laden are among your heros.

It does? What a perfectly peculiar and illogical thing to say!

> And you pretend to have enough taste to appraise Kim's call
> sign?
>
> Sheesh!

You're babbling again.

> >> >You seem to have some peculiar idea in your head that I'm not happy.
> >> >I'm happy as a clam, Kim. Right now I'm happy that the FCC doesn't yet
> >> >issue four letter suffixes.
> >>
> >> Are you afraid that the urge to apply for k8dumb would be
> >> overpowering?
> >
> >You thought of it. It's yours by right.
>
> I'll forfeit it for you Dave--you deserve it so much more than
> I ever will.

I've not indicated any desire to change my call. You had previously
mentioned on several occasions that you might change yours. Go for it
and don't be too sure of yourself on whether or not you deserve the
call.

Dave K8MN

5871. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 21:40:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A43C9.5B613C6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28768

N2EY wrote:
>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<lGIV7.239252$3d2.11593385@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011224100327.27168.00000589@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wa6vse@fast.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > What should be discussed NOW is what the US license structure will
> > become
> > > if/when S25.5 goes away. Some folks want just one class of license,
> > while
> > > others want two classes at most. Some say "just drop Element 1 and leave
> > the
> > > rest alone". Lots of ideas and possibilities, but I don't see much real
> > > discussion about the subject.
> > >
> > > General question to all: What are YOUR ideas?
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> This is the post I shoulda answered first....
> > >
> >
> > The trick is and always has been bringing in the newbies and letting them
> > soak in the sauce until they can go on to 20 meters without stirring up
> > the OTs or develop a skin thick enough to withstand a W2OY.
>
> 20 meters or 2 meters...
>
> > It is not so
> > much keeping them off as keeping them from being roasted before their
> > time. So we have seen over the years time gaps between classes which to
> > my mind is more an act of mercy to the newbie than a barrier. You can
> > test til your butt sucks wind but no one is prepared for the
> > rough-and-tumble of a good pile up, encountering some net that thinks it
> > is sanctioned, or the crochety old fart.
>
> Plus all the reverse.
>
> > And there is and continues to be
> > the need to show a good face to the rest of the world.

>
> That most of all. One thing to keep in mind at all times when on the
> air is "what if an enemy of ham radio is taping this to play as an
> example of why hams should lose their allocations?"
> >
> > So in principle at least I would favor a three class system: a
> > bread-and-milk Tech much like we have now but give them 28.1-28.5, cut the
> > power limit to 50 max. and keep them out of non-channelized VHF/UHF/SHF,
>
> See other posts by me this date this thread.
>
> > an entry-level ticket resembling the present General with 200 watts max,
> > and a senior ticket much like the Extra but with a one-year waiting
> > period.
>
> Three levels, yeah, but more differentiation.
>
> > The present structure is not really half bad except that it is
> > unkind to those passing the Extra more or less out of the box. The junior
> > ticket has to include regs both U. S. and International and the usual
> > safety and regulatory stuff so I doubt if Element 3 would change a whole
> > lot. The trick is Element 4.
>
> Yup.
> >
> > Just how technical is technical? Damfino. The real thing with Element 4
> > is a proper ceremony for pontification so one should probably deal with
> > impedence matching, Ohm's or Joule's laws in various permutations, a bit
> > on angle modulation, non-linearity and how to detect and prevent it, and
> > the inevitable VE questions.
>
> Maybe. What happens when No Charts International gets going?
> >
> > The issue is not whom to keep out although we all have our candidates but
> > how to blend the newbie into a hobby with traditions that predate the
> > Titanic partially to keep him from being a major pain in the butt but
> > mostly to give him time to orient himself for the long haul; marching
> > people thru the hobby and out looks good on paper but does not in the long
> > run accomplish a hell of a lot.
>
> I agree 100%.
>
> > I suspect that the aging vat effect is
> > one reason that the 5wpm restructuring was largely a wet firecracker.
>
> Nah. Lots of other stuff going on.
>
> The bread-and-milk ("honeydo") attraction of amateur VHF/UHF that
> drove much of the '80s growth is all but gone with cellphones. Yes,
> there are areas where cellphones don't work and they do cost money but

> most people nowadays have one anyway so they get a familytalk plan and
> done. FRS and GMRS suck up a lot of that sorta stuff, too.
>
> Those who simply want cheap longdistance electronic communication have
> email and newsgroups and websites. The odea that some sort of amateur
> wireless internet will compete with AOL or Earthlink is simply
> misguided.
>
> What's left are those who want RADIO, for whatever reason. Medium is
> the message and all that.
>
> > It
> > is known among marketers and has been for 30 years that the average CBer
> > buys five rigs before the last one goes into the garage and to a large
> > extent we have seen that when the Tech is touted as entry-level which it
> > presently is not but is rather a dirty trick played by the FCC and ARRL.
>
> Actually the FCC did an end-around on the League back in 1990 anyway.
> The trend towards entry-by-VHF was in place by then anyway.
>
> One real problem nobody talks about much is the addytoods of those who
> come to ham radio with "experience" in other services.
> >
> > Sum and substance: does the hobby need protection from the newbie or the
> > newbie need a bit of protection from a hobby that can eat one up?
>
> Both.

McCollum sometimes has a way with a phrase, doesn't he? I like it.

Dave K8MN

5872. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 21:42:02 UTC
From: N2EY@aol.com
Message-ID: <975b4ea9.0112261342.5c545886@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28769

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2A1342.1587B4EF@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> > > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
> >
> > There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> > They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
>
> It doesn't matter unless you are trying to mimic "1984"'s thought
> police.

Yes, it does matter. If there is no choice, the licensee bears no
repsonsibility. But Kim specifically chose that call for reasons that
have nothing to do with the good of the ARS.

[Kim's call]

>is a valid callsign.

Only because the FCC has made a mistake in issuing it. Do you believe
the FCC is infallible, Cecil?

> It doesn't matter objectively
> if it was chosen or issued at random.

Yes, it does. The person who makes a choice has to take some
responsibility for the choice.

The FCC does NOT issue that particular suffix (and others) in sequence
or at random. It must be specifically requested through the vanity
call program.

[Kim's call]

>is NOT a word!!!

Exactly. So your rant about "parts of words" doesn't apply. QED.

> If you are going to prohibit callsigns where a part of the
> callsign spells something, then you need to prohibit words
> where a part of the word spells something.

Nope. Since Kim's call is not a word (you say so yourself) your claim
is baseless. Illogical. Does not apply.
>
> What is wrong with issuing the callsign and then allowing

> everyone to choose to think what they choose to think about it?

The image of the ARS is damaged. It's an inappropriate callsign.

> Choosing to think dirty thoughts is a choice freely made by
> the thinker.

Who said anyhting about "dirty" thoughts? Not me.

Look through my posts, and you will see that I have not referred to Kim's callsign as dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy. Nor have I described Kim or anyone else in those terms. The term I use for the callsign is "inappropriate".

What's wrong with choosing a callsign that is appropriate to the community standards of the amateur radio service and reflects positively upon that service?

> Nobody's forcing you to think those dirty thoughts.

What "dirty thoughts"? I challenge you to produce a post where I say that I have "dirty thoughts" because of any callsign. (maybe KD1RT would have that effect....)

73 de Jim, N2EY

5873. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 21:50:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A4617.1B81193A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28770

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org...
> >
> > A vulgar callsign is an
> > opportunity to teach youngsters about random groupings
> > of alpha-numeric characters.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> >
> >
>
> I don't think my callsign is vulgar, as I believe there is nothing vulgar
> about parts of the body, nothing vulgar about the physical expression of
> love between two people, nothing vulgar about language or its expression in
> general. (I know you knew that, Cecil, but had to say it anyway).
>
> I think that if a kid recognizes anything in my callsign (and I think kids'
> and young adults' minds are much cleaner than those of the supposed
> "gentlemen" on this newsgroup) that is "dirty" or "vulgar" or "nasty" then
> it is probably an extension of what they have learned from adults closest to
> them. When my brother and I used to giggle at pictures in the National
> Geographic magazine, it was our mom or dad that would ask us what did we
> find so amusing about the human body? My brother would usually laugh and
> point at a picture of some nude woman and state, "that is nasty." At which
> point my mother would explain to him all the reasons why it wasn't nasty at
> all. It gave us something to think about.
>
> Dave, Larry, Dick C., and people like them would probably see nothing but
> "nasty" in a person walking on a beach in the nude,

Kim, about the only thing nastier than ME walking nude on a beach would
be the thought of YOU walking nude on a beach. We're both past our
expiration date. There would likely be folks willing to pay us just to
avoid seeing us nude on a beach. Keep talking about it and I'm sure
someone will take up a collection beginning right about now.

> or nothing but "nasty"
> in a woman who nurses her child in public, or nothing but "nasty" at
> the idea of a man and woman making love together.

Oh, horse hockey, Kim. I don't believe that any of us any problem with
an idea of people making love. I don't won't it broadcast via ATV and
don't think we need an audio book version on 20m.

> They miss opportunities to
> see beauty when it is all around them. My callsign is intended for > fun--and
> that does not have to include nasty. Nasty is in their minds, not > mine.

Sure, Kim. That's why you chose your call over W5FAT, K5LID or N5DOH.
It wasn't for the shock value, it was purely for the "fun".

> And, it is also not in the minds of many, many people I have talked to on
> the air.

How do you know? Do you e-mail all of them or just ask them at the
beginning or end of each QSO?

> To believe that my callsign is vulgar, does not belong in the ARS, and
> should not have been requested by me and/or issued by the FCC is to focus on
> "nasty" or "vulgar" ideas of what my callsign is. I choose to ignore the
> "nasty" or "vulgar" minded, because my callsign isn't.

Right. You're all about butterflies and sunrises. That's not why you
chose your call according to your own admission.

Dave K8MN

5874. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 21:56:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A4793.B99A5AAA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28771

CAM wrote:
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > I don't think my callsign is vulgar, as I believe there is nothing vulgar
> > about parts of the body, nothing vulgar about the physical expression of
> > love between two people, nothing vulgar about language or its expression in
> > general. (I know you knew that, Cecil, but had to say it anyway).
>
> I'm using the dictionary definition of "vulgar", Kim, as being of the
> common folk. Vulgar Latin is what the commoners spoke during the
> Roman Empire.

Naw, you're not. You are using a word origin and not the common, modern
definition of the word. It was fairly evident that when anyone here
referred to Kim's call as vulgar, he was not making a statement to the
effect that it was common or that is was intoned in Latin.

You can do better.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

5875. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:00:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A486C.2AF12EBE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28773

Dave Heil wrote:
> You haven't even guessed right in your comparison of me to a fellow who
> sees vulgar pictures in ink blot tests. I'm more likely to see a
> buffalo hide drying on a tepee wall.

Too bad you cannot extend that lack of vulgarity to this newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5876. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:00:35 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7MrW7.242256$3d2.11779071@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28772

Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> wrote:

> It could be that among many things, I suppose. Have you ever seen flitting
> tits? That would be tits flitting all about.

That reminds me of a story I heard about Earl Stanley Gardner,
creator of "Perry Mason".

It seems he was traveling around the world and found himself
in a large African city for a few days. News of the presence
of this well-known author spread rapidly and he was invited
to attend a dramatization of the climatic courtroom scene
from one of his books by the director of the local theatrical
troupe.

The play followed the book closely for about 15 or 20 minutes.
But right in the middle of an exchange between the Perry Mason
character and District Attorney Burger, a bare-breasted woman
ran through the "courtroom" screaming incoherently and waving
her arms. The play then proceeded normally, but this
interruption happened several more times during the course of
the presentation.

Gardner mentioned these occurrences to the director and commented
about remaining true to his work. The director assured him
that they had been assiduously faithful in their adaptation.
He opened the book and pointed to a sentence that said:

"Upon Mason's asking the question, a nervous titter ran through
the courtroom".

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

5877. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:02:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A48DA.C573077@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28774

Dave Heil wrote:
> Well, my foggy friend, you don't even have an inalienable right to an
> amateur radio license so I don't know how you'd have one for a call of
> choice.

I'm sure vanity callsigns are covered by the First Amendment. Why
else would the FCC issue callsigns that they consider vulgar?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5878. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:03:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A4948.B0257262@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28775

James R. DeLoach wrote:

> Kim, there is nothing wrong with your callsign. I can't believe these
> dirty old men are making such a fuss over it. Enjoy your callsign.
> There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
> have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose.

But she didn't choose one of 'em. Oh--you must've meant THAT kind of
call!

> I think it's great if you like it and that's all that really matters.
> Only in America are we FREE to choose what we like or dislike about
> things, people, etc. etc.
> As I saw in another message that someone posted, your callsign is
> made up of letters, not words. In your case it just happens to spell
> a slang word for a part of the human body (breast), that both men and
> women have. The attitude of these people is part of what is wrong
> with this country now days. The best way to handle these people
> is to just ignore them like we do the "dead keyers" on the repeaters.
> When they realize that they are not antagonizing anyone, they will
> go away and find something else to complain about.

Repeaters? We don't need no steenking repeaters! Actually, the best
way for Kim to handle it would have been not to begin braying about her
nudge wink reasons for obtaining her call and to clam up about it.
Kim doesn't clam up for anyone or anything.

Dave K8MN

5879. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:04:06 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <57315826F822BCE4.7ADDC31F767911FD.5F14774AD700FDEB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28776

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:37:30 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> >> >Some folks believe that professional baseball players who sell
>> >> >autographs to kids are heroes. My heroes are genuine heroes.
>> >>
>> >> Who?
>> >
>> >Folks other than professional baseball players who sell autographs to
>> >kids.
>>
>> That means Ted Bundy, Charles Manson, Adolph Hitler, Saddam
>> Hussein, and Osama bin Laden are among your heros.
>
>It does? What a perfectly peculiar and illogical thing to say!

On the contrary--it's COMPLETELY logical. Here:

Let P represent the set of all professional baseball players.

Let N represent the set of all people who are NOT professional
baseball players.

Let K represent the subset of N who are serial killers.

Then it follows that NOT P=N.

Given (above) you find NOT P to be your heros, it follows that
you find N to be your heros. And since K is a subset of N, it also
follows that you find K to be your heros.

Therefore, because all the individuals named above are members
of the subset K, it follows that all of them are your heros and the
argument is proven.

I agree that it's peculiar--most of us don't wish to emulate
Ted Bundy (although you may personally wish to when it comes to Cecil,
Kim, and myself, but . . .) or view him as our "hero" but while it's
peculiar (come to think of it, so are most of your statements) it
certainly isn't illogical.

>> And you pretend to have enough taste to appraise Kim's call
>> sign?
>>
>> Sheesh!
>
>You're babbling again.

Really?

Where?

>I've not indicated any desire to change my call. You had previously
>mentioned on several occasions that you might change yours.

Yup!

And if you'll recall ALL my choices were 1x3s--which happens
to be my preferred format for a new call sign (I have no desire for a
1x2, a 2x1, or another 2x2). Sorry, but a 1x4 would be as ackward as
my wife's 2x3 to use.

Besides, keeping that sign from you would be cruel. What sign
could _possibly_ fit you better (well, maybe W8ASS, but you don't like
expressive call signs).

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5880. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:05:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A49A3.AE2E5363@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28777

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You haven't even guessed right in your comparison of me to a fellow who
> > sees vulgar pictures in ink blot tests. I'm more likely to see a
> > buffalo hide drying on a tepee wall.
>
> Too bad you cannot extend that lack of vulgarity to this newsgroup.

I can't stop you from posting so there is little I can do about it.

Dave K8MN

5881. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:06:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A49EA.329BF0B5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28778

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Well, my foggy friend, you don't even have an inalienable right to an
> > amateur radio license so I don't know how you'd have one for a call of
> > choice.
>
> I'm sure vanity callsigns are covered by the First Amendment. Why
> else would the FCC issue callsigns that they consider vulgar?

Dodge ball. No one has a inalienable right to a call or a license.

Dave K8MN

5882. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:06:39 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2E98927437F3EEA0.65CC15F63BAA64F9.0F69929B54EF7593@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28779

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:25:21 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Cecil, this newsgroup is about as close as I get to a cesspool.

Really?

Is that why you like it here so much--seems "homey?"

>You haven't even guessed right in your comparison of me to a fellow who
>sees vulgar pictures in ink blot tests. I'm more likely to see a
>buffalo hide drying on a tepee wall.

Depending on the Rorschach blot you saw it in, you could be
revealing quite a bit about your inner feelings there, Dave. Are you
sure you mean that?

Rick<--who DOESN'T see buffalo hides on card 07a

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5883. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:11:09 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A4AFD.CDA3172E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28781

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >is a valid callsign.
>
> Only because the FCC has made a mistake in issuing it. Do you believe
> the FCC is infallible, Cecil?

Well, maybe you should be ragging on the FCC instead of Kim.

> The FCC does NOT issue that particular suffix (and others) in sequence
> or at random. It must be specifically requested through the vanity
> call program.

But in the process of issuing any amateur radio callsign, the FCC
endorses that callsign as suitable and appropriate for identification
on the ham bands.

> The image of the ARS is damaged. It's an inappropriate callsign.

Pure unadulterated BS. Your dirty mind is the problem, not Kim's call.

> Who said anyhting about "dirty" thoughts? Not me.

You are the one choosing to think dirty thoughts when you see Kim's
callsign.

> What's wrong with choosing a callsign that is appropriate to the
> community standards of the amateur radio service and reflects
> positively upon that service?

Kim's callsign is definitely appropriate to the community standards
here in Texas. Texas women have beautiful tits.

> > Nobody's forcing you to think those dirty thoughts.
>
> What "dirty thoughts"?

The thought that Kim's callsign is dirty. The reason that you think
it is inappropriate is that you think it is dirty. You don't think
my callsign is dirty - therefore you are not complaining about mine.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

5884. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:11:35 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <74B09328A5F1AE72.C0D56E19E0A29FB0.2848A208328290AC@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28780

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 13:49:54 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>That is correct. When I say "W5TIT" on the air, it either takes some
>thinking or writing it down before it is even recognized as having a twist
>to it. There are many folks I've talked to on the air who never even say a
>word or indicate in any way that they take for anything but a callsign.

Perhaps that's the problem here, Kim.

Nearly everyone who is riding you about your call sign is also
a cw buff (or at least I _believe_ that to be the case). Perhaps they
tend to think in abbreviations and letter combinations where the rest
of us think in terms of spoken words.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5885. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:12:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A4B51.95EB76AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28782

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:37:30 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> >> >Some folks believe that professional baseball players who sell
> >> >> >autographs to kids are heroes. My heroes are genuine heroes.
> >> >>
> >> >> Who?
> >> >
> >> >Folks other than professional baseball players who sell autographs to
> >> >kids.
> >>
> >> That means Ted Bundy, Charles Manson, Adolph Hitler, Saddam
> >> Hussein, and Osama bin Laden are among your heros.
> >
> >It does? What a perfectly peculiar and illogical thing to say!
>
> On the contrary--it's COMPLETELY logical. Here:
>
> Let P represent the set of all professional baseball players.
>
> Let N represent the set of all people who are NOT professional
> baseball players.
>
> Let K represent the subset of N who are serial killers.
>
> Then it follows that NOT P=N.
>
> Given (above) you find NOT P to be your heros, it follows that
> you find N to be your heros. And since K is a subset of N, it also
> follows that you find K to be your heros.
>
> Therefore, because all the individuals named above are members
> of the subset K, it follows that all of them are your heros and the
> argument is proven.
>
> I agree that it's peculiar--most of us don't wish to emulate
> Ted Bundy (although you may personally wish to when it comes to Cecil,
> Kim, and myself, but . . .) or view him as our "hero" but while it's
> peculiar (come to think of it, so are most of your statements) it
> certainly isn't illogical.

I guess you failed logic in school as you've failed it here. Look at my statement. Do you see the word "all" in front of the word "folks"? You're right, I don't see it either. You must feel like a complete fool.

> >> And you pretend to have enough taste to appraise Kim's call
> >> sign?
> >>
> >> Sheesh!
> >
> >You're babbling again.
>
> Really?
>
> Where?

Right here--same place as usual.

> >I've not indicated any desire to change my call. You had previously
> >mentioned on several occasions that you might change yours.
>
> Yup!
>
> And if you'll recall ALL my choices were 1x3s--which happens
> to be my preferred format for a new call sign (I have no desire for a
> 1x2, a 2x1, or another 2x2). Sorry, but a 1x4 would be as ackward as
> my wife's 2x3 to use.
>
> Besides, keeping that sign from you would be cruel. What sign
> could _possibly_ fit you better (well, maybe W8ASS, but you don't like
> expressive call signs).

You must have missed it. I've indicated no desire to change my call.

> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

I'm pondering this one.

Dave K8MN

5886. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:16:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2A4C29.7B58B263@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28783

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:25:21 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Cecil, this newsgroup is about as close as I get to a cesspool.
>
> Really?
>
> Is that why you like it here so much--seems "homey?"

What is your particular reason for being here? You seem to enjoy it.

> >You haven't even guessed right in your comparison of me to a fellow who
> >sees vulgar pictures in ink blot tests. I'm more likely to see a
> >buffalo hide drying on a tepee wall.
>
> Depending on the Rorschach blot you saw it in, you could be
> revealing quite a bit about your inner feelings there, Dave. Are you
> sure you mean that?

Just on a few, Rick. On some, I see pancakes drizzled with maple syrup
and melted butter. On others I can see rain puddling on the floor below
an old yellow rain slicker. Then there is the one with Oprah.

> Rick<--who DOESN'T see buffalo hides on card 07a

That's Oprah.

Dave K8MN

5887. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:36:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011226173645.00794.00000989@mb-cv.aol.com>
Source record: 28784

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> It appears quite simple. Those that sing Larry's praises on rrap are told
>>they deserve congratulations for passing the 5 wpm test. Those that do not
>>praise Larry receive the badmouth treatment.

>> It appears to me that in Larry's view, it really IS all about Larry.

>Ed I would have expected a more intelligent analysis than that, given that
>you do
>work CW. But then again, you also work at ARRL HQ.....

You know, it does appear that you are not capable of offering much of meaning
past "I know but I am not going to tell" and "he only says that because he
works at ARRL HQ." Didn't we have this same non-conversation a few months ago?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

5888. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:41:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a5376_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28785

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2A4617.1B81193A@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org...
> > >
> > > A vulgar callsign is an
> > > opportunity to teach youngsters about random groupings
> > > of alpha-numeric characters.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> > >
> > >
> >
> > I don't think my callsign is vulgar, as I believe there is nothing
vulgar
> > about parts of the body, nothing vulgar about the physical expression of
> > love between two people, nothing vulgar about language or its expression
in
> > general. (I know you knew that, Cecil, but had to say it anyway).
> >
> > I think that if a kid recognizes anything in my callsign (and I think
kids'
> > and young adults' minds are much cleaner than those of the supposed
> > "gentlemen" on this newsgroup) that is "dirty" or "vulgar" or "nasty"
then
> > it is probably an extension of what they have learned from adults
closest to
> > them. When my brother and I used to giggle at pictures in the National
> > Geographic magazine, it was our mom or dad that would ask us what did we
> > find so amusing about the human body? My brother would usually laugh
and
> > point at a picture of some nude woman and state, "that is nasty." At
which
> > point my mother would explain to him all the reasons why it wasn't nasty
at
> > all. It gave us something to think about.
> >
> > Dave, Larry, Dick C., and people like them would probably see nothing
but
> > "nasty" in a person walking on a beach in the nude,
>
> Kim, about the only thing nastier than ME walking nude on a beach would
```

> be the thought of YOU walking nude on a beach. We're both past our
> expiration date. There would likely be folks willing to pay us just to
> avoid seeing us nude on a beach. Keep talking about it and I'm sure
> someone will take up a collection beginning right about now.
>

Well at least you show some humor, above. But, I don't think anyone who is
the kind of human being I'd admire would be running from either of us.

> >
> > or nothing but "nasty"
> > in a woman who nurses her child in public, or nothing but "nasty" at
> > the idea of a man and woman making love together.
>
> Oh, horse hockey, Kim. I don't believe that any of us any problem with
> an idea of people making love. I don't won't it broadcast via ATV and
> don't think we need an audio book version on 20m.
>

So, don't broadcast it. We have movies for the satisfaction of voyeurism.

> >
> > They miss opportunities to
> > see beauty when it is all around them. My callsign is intended for >
fun--and
> > that does not have to include nasty. Nasty is in their minds, not >
mine.
>
> Sure, Kim. That's why you chose your call over W5FAT, K5LID or N5DOH.
> It wasn't for the shock value, it was purely for the "fun".
>

I like the N5DOH.

> >
> > And, it is also not in the minds of many, many people I have talked to
on
> > the air.
>
> How do you know? Do you e-mail all of them or just ask them at the
> beginning or end of each QSO?
>

Their non-asking is enough for me. Do you spend a lot of time emailing,
Dave, to see if people thought you were offensive on the air? Can't you
just take it for granted that if they don't say you were offensive, you
probably weren't?

> >
> > To believe that my callsign is vulgar, does not belong in the ARS, and
> > should not have been requested by me and/or issued by the FCC is to
focus on
> > "nasty" or "vulgar" ideas of what my callsign is. I choose to ignore

the
> > "nasty" or "vulgar" minded, because my callsign isn't.
>
>
> Right. You're all about butterflies and sunrises. That's not why you
> chose your call according to your own admission.
>
> Dave K8MN

You mean butterflies and sunrises can't be fun? Gosh.

Kim W5TIT

5889. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:45:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a545a_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28786

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2A4948.B0257262@earthlink.net...
> James R. DeLoach wrote:
>
> > Kim, there is nothing wrong with your callsign. I can't believe these
> > dirty old men are making such a fuss over it. Enjoy your callsign.
> > There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
> > have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose.
>
> But she didn't choose one of 'em. Oh--you must've meant THAT kind of
> call!
>
> > I think it's great if you like it and that's all that really matters.
> > Only in America are we FREE to choose what we like or dislike about
> > things, people, etc. etc.
> > As I saw in another message that someone posted, your callsign is
> > made up of letters, not words. In your case it just happens to spell
> > a slang word for a part of the human body (breast), that both men and
> > women have. The attitude of these people is part of what is wrong
> > with this country now days. The best way to handle these people
> > is to just ignore them like we do the "dead keyers" on the repeaters.
> > When they realize that they are not antagonizing anyone, they will
> > go away and find something else to complain about.
>
> Repeaters? We don't need no steenking repeaters! Actually, the best
> way for Kim to handle it would have been not to begin braying about her
> *nudge wink* reasons for obtaining her call and to clam up about it.
> Kim doesn't clam up for anyone or anything.
>
> Dave K8MN

Check the timelines, Dave. I am not the one who brings my callsign up in
conversations on this newsgroup. It is usually brought up when one of you
gets stung over something I say--Larry being the most common responder of
same.

I also don't argue my callsign--if you'll read between the lines...and you
don't and haven't so far. I argue that the reactions to my callsign are
less than admirable.

Kim W5TIT

5890. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:52:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a55f9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28787

"James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:7ldk2uklq7qh0pn8vmi718luvi3nv7ha89@4ax.com...
> >
> Kim, there is nothing wrong with your callsign.
>

I don't think so either, James.

>
> I can't believe these
> dirty old men are making such a fuss over it.

'Cuz they're dirty old men? ;p

>
> Enjoy your callsign.
> There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
> have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose.
>

Yeah. How 'bout _5BAL, _5WOM, _5BAB, _5SEX, _5CNT (that idea was actually
given to me by this little old lady ham that giggled all night at a
Christmas party when she thought of it. I told her to go for it and she
said she probably would if her husband wouldn't yell...LOL), and so on.

>
> I think it's great if you like it and that's all that really matters.
> Only in America are we FREE to choose what we like or dislike about
> things, people, etc. etc.
>

Absolutely.

>
> As I saw in another message that someone posted, your callsign is
> made up of letters, not words. In your case it just happens to spell
> a slang word for a part of the human body (breast), that both men and
> women have.
>

Thank goodness. Imagine if it was only us women that had them.

>
> The attitude of these people is part of what is wrong
> with this country now days. The best way to handle these people
> is to just ignore them like we do the "dead keyers" on the repeaters.
> When they realize that they are not antagonizing anyone, they will

> go away and find something else to complain about.
>

True. But they are so much fun.

>
> You and I don't live that far from each other. Your on the east side
> of Dallas and I live just to the north of Dallas in Richardson.
>
>
> James N5SKU
> Regards,
>
> James
>

I bet we've met.?

Kim W5TIT

5891. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 22:54:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a565e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28788

"Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:7MrW7.242256$3d2.11779071@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> wrote:
>
> > It could be that among many things, I suppose. Have you ever seen
flitting
> > tits? That would be tits flitting all about.
>
>
> That reminds me of a story I heard about Earl Stanley Gardner,
> creator of "Perry Mason".
>
> It seems he was traveling around the world and found himself
> in a large African city for a few days. News of the presence
> of this well-known author spread rapidly and he was invited
> to attend a dramatization of the climatic courtroom scene
> from one of his books by the director of the local theatrical
> troupe.
>
> The play followed the book closely for about 15 or 20 minutes.
> But right in the middle of an exchange between the Perry Mason
> character and District Attorney Burger, a bare-breasted woman
> ran through the "courtroom" screaming incoherently and waving
> her arms. The play then proceeded normally, but this
> interruption happened several more times during the course of
> the presentation.
>
> Gardner mentioned these occurrences to the director and commented
> about remaining true to his work. The director assured him
> that they had been assiduously faithful in their adaptation.
> He opened the book and pointed to a sentence that said:
>
> "Upon Mason's asking the question, a nervous titter ran through
> the courtroom".
>
>
> --
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
> Glendale, Arizona
>

ROFLMAO...NO way!!! Is that really a true story?! Great!

Kim W5TIT

5892. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 23:02:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a5869_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28789

"N2EY" <N2EY@aol.com> wrote in message
news:975b4ea9.0112261342.5c545886@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2A1342.1587B4EF@IEEE.org>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> > > > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
> > >
> > > There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> > > They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
> >
> > It doesn't matter unless you are trying to mimic "1984"'s thought
> > police.
>
> Yes, it does matter. If there is no choice, the licensee bears no
> repsonsibility. But Kim specifically chose that call for reasons that
> have nothing to do with the good of the ARS.
>

I beg to differ. This callsign has been immediately recognizable in many
situations, emergency and otherwise. I think this callsign would also be
highly illadvised to used by a LID, since it carries some reputation with
it. Most times, when I key up on any local repeater, it is known who I am,
and it is known that despite the un-seriousness of my callsign, I am a quite
capable and serious ham. You guys don't know that, but it's known around
here. Even people who don't like me--if they are telling the truth and most
do--will say that I am a serious ham. I encourage youngsters, love the
hobby, am fairly dedicated to public service (that has been falling off
lately), will help in any way I can and am able to--even people and clubs I
don't like because I can see the greater good. Now, the callsign, true, has
nothing to do with that--but the callsign of Kim Walker is instantly
recognized and there's no doubt who is on the other end of it. There's lots
more reasons to do with the good of the ARS.

>
> [Kim's call]
>
> >is a valid callsign.
>
> Only because the FCC has made a mistake in issuing it. Do you believe
> the FCC is infallible, Cecil?
>

We'd better tell them they made a mistake.

> >
> > It doesn't matter objectively
> > if it was chosen or issued at random.
>
> Yes, it does. The person who makes a choice has to take some
> responsibility for the choice.
>

And, I do.

>
> The FCC does NOT issue that particular suffix (and others) in sequence
> or at random. It must be specifically requested through the vanity
> call program.
>
> [Kim's call]
>
> >is NOT a word!!!
>
> Exactly. So your rant about "parts of words" doesn't apply. QED.
>
> > If you are going to prohibit callsigns where a part of the
> > callsign spells something, then you need to prohibit words
> > where a part of the word spells something.
>
> Nope. Since Kim's call is not a word (you say so yourself) your claim
> is baseless. Illogical. Does not apply.
> >
> > What is wrong with issuing the callsign and then allowing
> > everyone to choose to think what they choose to think about it?
>
> The image of the ARS is damaged. It's an inappropriate callsign.
>

It's an interesting contrast. Most people believe as you. But, for the
reasons I mention above, my callsign is immediately rejected, then warmed up
to most of the time.

> >
> > Choosing to think dirty thoughts is a choice freely made by
> > the thinker.
>
> Who said anyhting about "dirty" thoughts? Not me.
>

Then, what's the problem?

>
> Look through my posts, and you will see that I have not referred to
> Kim's callsign as dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy. Nor have
> I described Kim or anyone else in those terms. The term I use for the

> callsign is "inappropriate".
>

A rose by any other name is still a rose...at least it goes something like
that. Why is the callsign inappropriate, then, Jim?

>
> What's wrong with choosing a callsign that is appropriate to the
> community standards of the amateur radio service and reflects
> positively upon that service?
>
> > Nobody's forcing you to think those dirty thoughts.
>
> What "dirty thoughts"? I challenge you to produce a post where I say
> that I have "dirty thoughts" because of any callsign. (maybe KD1RT
> would have that effect....)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Ew, like it. I like that.

Kim W5TIT

5893. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 23:04:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a6648_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28791

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:74B09328A5F1AE72.C0D56E19E0A29FB0.2848A208328290AC@lp.airnews.net...
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 13:49:54 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >That is correct. When I say "W5TIT" on the air, it either takes some
> >thinking or writing it down before it is even recognized as having a
twist
> >to it. There are many folks I've talked to on the air who never even say
a
> >word or indicate in any way that they take for anything but a callsign.
>
> Perhaps that's the problem here, Kim.
>
> Nearly everyone who is riding you about your call sign is also
> a cw buff (or at least I _believe_ that to be the case). Perhaps they
> tend to think in abbreviations and letter combinations where the rest
> of us think in terms of spoken words.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

It's a thought...

Kim W5TIT

5894. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-26 23:25:20 UTC
From: "James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <0emk2uc50ugubos831vh9o56l8fko9e9e2@4ax.com>
Source record: 28790

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 16:52:49 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>> There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
>> have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose.
>>
>
>Yeah. How 'bout _5BAL, _5WOM, _5BAB, _5SEX, _5CNT (that idea was actually
>given to me by this little old lady ham that giggled all night at a
>Christmas party when she thought of it. I told her to go for it and she
>said she probably would if her husband wouldn't yell...LOL), and so on.
>
The callsigns that I was thinking of were _?SEX. Looks like most of
the W_SEX callsigns have been taken. I noticed that in the ARRL
Repeater directory that there are some repeaters in the mid-west and
on the east coast that have _?SEX callsigns.

I bet Dave thinks these callsigns are dirty as well.

>I bet we've met.?

We may have. I'll have to keep you in mind the next time I head out
east of Dallas and give you a shout on the repeater.
>

James N5SKU

5895. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 00:14:14 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a6764_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28792

"James R. DeLoach" <jasd-49X@attbi.com> wrote in message
news:0emk2uc50ugubos831vh9o56l8fko9e9e2@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 16:52:49 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
>
> >> There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
> >> have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose.
> >>
> >
> >Yeah. How 'bout _5BAL, _5WOM, _5BAB, _5SEX, _5CNT (that idea was
actually
> >given to me by this little old lady ham that giggled all night at a
> >Christmas party when she thought of it. I told her to go for it and she
> >said she probably would if her husband wouldn't yell...LOL), and so on.
> >
> The callsigns that I was thinking of were _?SEX. Looks like most of
> the W_SEX callsigns have been taken. I noticed that in the ARRL
> Repeater directory that there are some repeaters in the mid-west and
> on the east coast that have _?SEX callsigns.
>
> I bet Dave thinks these callsigns are dirty as well.
>

Hey, I hear tell of a Red River club (not Red River up at the border--I
think this was Red River over in South Carolina or something like that),
where the callsign was K0TEX. WHEW....!!

> >
> >I bet we've met.?
>
> We may have. I'll have to keep you in mind the next time I head out
> east of Dallas and give you a shout on the repeater.
> >
>
> James N5SKU

Check out Billy's Big Machine in Big D, 145.190. We are a great bunch, but
hard to define. There are a couple of guys who are neat guys, but hanker
around a lot early morning. If I am on, it would be between about
6:30a-7:15a and I was on a couple of mornings last week. I've got a new
truck with nice sound system...so I've been listening to lots of music and
NPR.

Kim W5TIT

5896. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 00:16:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a67dc_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28793

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011226173645.00794.00000989@mb-cv.aol.com...
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> It appears quite simple. Those that sing Larry's praises on rrap are
told
> >>they deserve congratulations for passing the 5 wpm test. Those that do
not
> >>praise Larry receive the badmouth treatment.
>
> >> It appears to me that in Larry's view, it really IS all about Larry.
>
> >Ed I would have expected a more intelligent analysis than that, given
that
> >you do
> >work CW. But then again, you also work at ARRL HQ.....
>
> You know, it does appear that you are not capable of offering much of
meaning
> past "I know but I am not going to tell" and "he only says that because he
> works at ARRL HQ." Didn't we have this same non-conversation a few months
ago?
>
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Dick (and a few others) have been having quite a few non-conversations for
over a year now...wait 'til you backread his stuff on Islam, if you do...LOL

Kim W5TIT

5897. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 00:22:37 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A69CD.C0F068A2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28794

Rick Adams wrote:
> Nearly everyone who is riding you about your call sign is also
> a cw buff (or at least I _believe_ that to be the case).

To illustrate just how ridiculous their objections are, consider the
difference between 'tit' and 'x' in CW. Would you believe that a
couple of dead spaces can change an 'x' into something vulgar?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5898. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 00:25:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A6A8F.C1DE563@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28795

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > I'm using the dictionary definition of "vulgar", Kim, as being of the
> > common folk. Vulgar Latin is what the commoners spoke during the
> > Roman Empire.
>
> Naw, you're not. You are using a word origin and not the common, modern
> definition of the word.

Seems you would crack open a dictionary before embarrassing yourself, Dave.
From Webster's: "vulgar - of or relating to the common people"
It doesn't say a thing about that definition not being common and modern.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5899. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 00:29:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A6B78.F5CD46C1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28796

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> You mean butterflies and sunrises can't be fun? Gosh.

Fun is what Dave commands fun to be. Any other kind of fun is evil.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5900. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 00:34:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2A6C9B.C594AF34@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28797

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Well, my foggy friend, you don't even have an inalienable right to an
> > > amateur radio license so I don't know how you'd have one for a call of
> > > choice.
> >
> > I'm sure vanity callsigns are covered by the First Amendment. Why
> > else would the FCC issue callsigns that they consider vulgar?
>
> No one has a inalienable right to a call or a license.

Everyone who qualifies for a call or a license has a right to it/them.
It is against the law for the FCC to refuse a license or a call to
individuals who have met all the qualifications. What would it take
for you to comprehend that this is a nation of laws, not a nation of
arbitrary royal whims. Your Royal Hinee will likely get spanked for that.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5901. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 02:08:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011226210826.27103.00000569@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 28798

>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
>Date: 12/25/2001 11:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxgpt8.pminews@or.news.verio.net>

> He most certainly is getting due process. He was served with a
> statement of charges and has been given the opportunity to respond
> to them. He has been informed what he has to do if he wants a
> hearing to contest the PROPOSED action, and what will happen if he
> does not request or appear at that hearing.

Years after the initial conviction, and in the absence of any other
validating excuse, it's nothing but bitter vengence.

I consider it harrassment. Pure and simple.

>What more do you consider "due process" ??

Not dragging him back into court years after the original hearings.
Again, it's harassment.

Answer me THIS, Phil...WHERE was the FCC when the convictions occured?
Are you telling me the FCC had no interest in this at all? Did they not have
the opportunity to address this years ago?

>Does it bother you that the FCC is taking away his licemse? The
> reason that the court did not do that is that only the FCC has that
> jurisdiction.

It bothers me that it's happening years after the fact, and that NO
violation of RELEVENT regulations has occured vis-a-vis Part 97.

They could have done this when he was found guilty of the other charges.
Now, it's harrassment.

Period.

>Such "two step" actions are common in regulatory law. If a
> physician is convicted of a felony the state medical board can and
> usually does revoke his license to practice.

Not always, Phil, and you know it. Many Physicians have been found guilty
of crimes NOT RELATED to the practice of medicine, and have suffered little if
any sanction of their medical license.

Steve, K4YZ

5902. Re: Mistuh Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 02:11:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011226211125.27103.00000571@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 28799

>Subject: Mistuh Mitnick...
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
>Date: 12/25/2001 10:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxfzu2.pminews@or.news.verio.net>

>Not at all. Kevin is a convicted felon who served time for computer
> and communications law crimes, and the Commish' is just following
> the procedure to yank his license

At the time it happened, it was due process....Years after the fact and in matters NOT related to the offenses he was convicted of, it is harrassment.

More assinine bureaucrats looking for ways to justify their parasitic employment.

5903. really dumb SW radio pirate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 02:44:18 UTC
From: "Kaa B." <erielacaw400@aol.com>
Message-ID: <6WvW7.17814$PO5.2724976@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 28800
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Found in alt.radio.pirate:

A radio pirate in the Barnes Road area of St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada has had his equipment confiscated by Industry Canada. The pirate, who, they describe as 'not too bright' and dressed in woman's clothing was awakened from his sleep by a squad of agents, who searched the house and seized thousands of dollars of radio transmitting equipment. The pirate was caught when while under the influence of alcohol, mistakenly broadcast his address on the air, while soliciting free beer from listeners. Charges are pending.

Wonder if he also operated on 14.313 and fancied an "erotic exotic relationship" with a certain ham in Vermont? ;)

5904. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 03:03:43 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <54D07669EC922BFA.142CD3270585C5B1.7654CCDCA5A74FFF@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28902

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:26:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Well, my foggy friend, you don't even have an inalienable right to an
>amateur radio license so I don't know how you'd have one for a call of
>choice. Darn! Another perfectly good rant ruined.

On the contrary, Dave, he _does_ have an inalienable right to
one--so long as amateur radio licenses are administered by the federal
government (they are, obviously), so long as Cecil or anyone else
meets the legal requirements for licensure it is illegal for the FCC
to _refuse_ to issue such a license. Were he not to have that right it
would mean that the FCC could "pick and choose" whoever they wished to
issue a license to and could refuse to license anyone they wished on
any grounds including race, creed, nation of origin, sex or sexual
orientation--something the clearly canNOT do.

Darn!

Another perfectly good inaccuracy revealed!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5905. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 03:03:46 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <5258EFEA73020D34.5DBFF5A4130EAE85.A21CF0D706D8A164@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28901

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:35:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Rick Adams wrote:
>>
>> On 26 Dec 2001 06:52:18 -0800, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2954AE.34992319@IEEE.org>...
>> >
>> >> If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?
>> >
>> >Nope. Nor to anyone else. Nor would I issue similar inappropriate callsigns.
>> >
>> >Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.
>>
>> In other words, simply because the law would require you to do
>> something, you would refuse anyway because it "isn't right" in your
>> mind?
>>
>> And you wonder why many of us think you aren't playing with a
>> full deck!
>
>You'll note, Jim, that this is the kindly prof who only responds in
>kind. He never throws the first stone and he is as supportive of your
>right to express an opinion as he is supportive of Kim's ideas. How do
>we know these things? Because he told us so.

Actually, that was an error, Dave. I thought I was responding
to one of your own tirades. In Jim's case, he can delete the last line
of my response (about playing with a full deck)--that was meant to
apply to you, not to more normal people.

My apologies, Jim, I would hate to accidently put anyone in
Dave's class--that would be far more insulting than you deserve.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5906. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 03:09:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2A8403.59FABAFB@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28903

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
> > > you going to do about it?
> >
> > I'd imagine he'll make the futile suggestion that you work on cleaning
> > up your thought process.
>
> EXACTLY the point, Dick. You guys need to work on cleaning up
> your thought processes. Vulgarity is not in the call sign - it
> is in your and Larry's and Dave's minds. I'm glad you finally
> get it. Hey Kim, Dick finally gets it!

Oh, I've had it all along. You're a lying, scheming, conniving dipschit who wouldn't recognize truth if it jumped up and bit your butt.

5907. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 03:16:54 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <AB2B95A72AF373C0.EC8796E96C52EBAA.5836D96CE6B77A73@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28904

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 22:12:27 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>> >> >Folks other than professional baseball players who sell autographs to
>> >> >kids.
>> >>
>> >> That means Ted Bundy, Charles Manson, Adolph Hitler, Saddam
>> >> Hussein, and Osama bin Laden are among your heros.
>> >
>> >It does? What a perfectly peculiar and illogical thing to say!
>I guess you failed logic in school as you've failed it here. Look at my
>statement. Do you see the word "all" in front of the word "folks"?
>You're right, I don't see it either. You must feel like a complete
>fool.

Let's see:

Let F stand for Folks other than professional baseball players
who sell autographs to kids.

Let P stand for professional baseball players who sell
autographs to kids.

Then F=NOT P

Because you make no provision for subsets in your statement
above it is inclusive and thus your set of heros DOES include serial
killers (unless they are also professional baseball players who sell
autographs to kids).

Had you wished to exclude subsets, you would have modified
your "Folks other than . . ." to read "Certain folks other than . . ."
or "My heros do NOT include professional baseball . . ." either of
which could be taken to exclude unnamed subsets.

Sorry, Dave, I not only passed logic, I got a 4.0 in it!

And as usual you were wrong in more than one way. I don't feel
like a fool, either. But you should, if you have been making so-called
logical statements that are clearly so poorly constructed.

>> >You're babbling again.
>>
>> Really?
>>
>> Where?
>

>Right here--same place as usual.

But, Dave.

I'm not there--I'm here. YOU'RE there. If babbling is
occurring there (you DO state it is occurring "Right here...") it must
be your own, as usual.

>> Besides, keeping that sign from you would be cruel. What sign
>> could _possibly_ fit you better (well, maybe W8ASS, but you don't like
>> expressive call signs).
>
>You must have missed it. I've indicated no desire to change my call.

Perhaps you should. By now, people are bound to be starting to
recognize your current one--and it would be a shame to have a large
investment in radio equipment if no one will communicate with you.

>> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
>> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
>I'm pondering this one.

I was hoping you would. Perhaps it will help.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5908. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 03:25:07 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <nwwW7.29$8M.494921@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net>
Source record: 28905
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

: > : > There are a good deal of elitism out there.
: > : > For whatever reason. The Marines teach
: > : > it. So do the police academies.
: > :
: > : The police/Marines/doctors/professors etc ARE the elite, when it
: > : comes to their areas of expertise. Outside that, they are no better
: > : or worse than anyone else.
: >
: > There is the problem. Because they are elite
: > in their fields, they do transfer that attitude to
: > every other aspect of society. Because they
: > are competent, they tend that no one else is.
: > And if they do not know how to do it, then
: > no one else should be able to do so either.
: > (Thus the desire to ban technology such as
: > guns or radios).
:
: I don't buy it, N9MWO. There is and always has been elitgeism amongst
: the elite in any human endeavor, and that elitism has served for far more
: good than evil in free societies. I've known a lot of elite police
: officers in the past 40 years and darn few of them showed any tendency to
: transfer that to the sort constitutional violations you describe.
: Things change, and sometimes pretty fast, but if we're headed down that
: slippery slope, I haven't seen a lot of evidence of it. Of course I have
: seen some. One of he most gregarious cases was in New York Cit. In 1962 I
: watched a NYPD street cop give a guy an awful cussing in public while he
: stood with his hand on the butt of his revolver as if he dared the guy to
: respond in any way. The fellow' soffense was cuttting across one extra
: traffic lane to get to a (rare) parking spot. There was no safety reason
: for him not to do that, except the LEO noted his out of state license
: plate, and after all, some jerk behind who wanted the spot himself
: honked.....

While I do agree with you that elitism has
been more good than bad as our country
was founded on elitism (our Founders were
men of learning and property, to even vote
required that one had to own land). And also
the French ideal of equality has created more
suffering than good (the French revolution was
at the root of a good deal of the wars since then).
However, what I have a problem with is that
so many in the US just can not accept that someone

might be better than they.

And elitism can be carried too far. One of my
friends is Purdue cop. He had been a Lafayette
officer. He told me of how one of the Lieuteants
on the LPD and he were coming out of city hall.
the LT spotted a local bum (drunk), called him
over and asked to look at something. When the
bum looked over to see, the LT just beat the hell
out of him then turned to my friend and ordered
him to write it up and charge the bum with something.
My friend refused, because there was not way
for them to force him to. But from that time
on he was labeled a troublemaker.

And remember this is a college town.

Oh, the west side cops have a little technique
where they get a mouthy college student on the
ground, bring his arms up behind him then twist
(it is an old wrestling move). They call it "imprinting"
as it tears the muscles and the kid will always
have pain. Hard to prove in court.

5909. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 03:37:55 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <CE1185DDA6C99715.7617DAF3DD82CDB7.F157B5CC131CC9A7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28906

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 22:16:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>What is your particular reason for being here? You seem to enjoy it.

I do.

This is recreation from more serious intellectual exercises
such as teaching and writing. Here I can kid with friends, annoy the
narrow minded, and enrage the intolerant.

In my classes, I have to demonstrate respect for the views of
my students, even if some of them are diametrically opposed to my own
(the only areas I can legitimately oppose in a class room are those
which contradict science and those which represent racism or sexism,
both of which are prohibited by the school honor code), and even then
I have to do so in a way that won't offend the student, since I'm in a
power position with respect to them.

Here, on the other hand, I have no such restraints--I'm
perfectly free to call an idiot an idiot and a bigot a bigot without
abusing my position. I have no authority here at all, which means I
don't have to worry about power differentials (unless you include
intellectual ones--it's amazing how few bigots and moralists are even
the intellectual equals of the average public High School student) and
can respond however I wish with no concern for the effect of my words
on the person I'm communicating with. And since I take what people say
to (or about) me here about as seriously as I take Dan Quayle's
assurances that there was intelligent life on Mars or President
Wimpus' assurances that he believes in freedom, responses like yours
are at best amusing and at worst frustrating to read since they so
often are written in a self-righteous, confused, manner rather than
precisely and clearly--and even that isn't a major problem, I have
first year students who write almost as poorly so I'm used to it.

Now that I've answered your question, why are YOU here (Simple
masochism? A sincere need to be viewed as a prig? Not allowed to post
in adult news groups? Lost your access to www.hate.com?)?

>> Depending on the Rorschach blot you saw it in, you could be
>> revealing quite a bit about your inner feelings there, Dave. Are you
>> sure you mean that?
>
>Just on a few, Rick. On some, I see pancakes drizzled with maple syrup
>and melted butter. On others I can see rain puddling on the floor below
>an old yellow rain slicker. Then there is the one with Oprah.

If you're serious about that (which I doubt--you usually don't mean what you say) you really need to talk to a therapist. NOT seeing sexual images in a Rorschach test is as diagnostic as an over-emphasis on them--perhaps even more so as it indicates a serious repression of sexual desire. Of course, you may just be a homosexual in denial but you could also have far more serious sexual problems that could lead to major identity and relationship problems in the future (serious enough ones that even your Viagra won't help you conquer any more).

It DOES explain why you are so offended by Kim's call however--you've fixated on the "TIT" part and are sickened by the thought of sex that your fixation engenders in you.

>> Rick<--who DOESN'T see buffalo hides on card 07a
>
>That's Oprah.

Amazing.

There IS no card 07a--the "a" was a typo.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5910. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 03:41:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2a9897_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 28936

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112260605.2ea72102@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c292f17_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011224100327.27168.00000589@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wa6vse@fast.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > [snip]
> > >
> > > What is the difference between an FCC rule that says Morse skill
is
> > required to
> > > use a particular part of the radio spectrum and a Park Service
rule
> > that says
> > > motor vehicles cannot be used in certain parks and wilderness
areas?
> >
> > The sort of Park Service rules that you refer to are intended to
> > protect and preserve the environment.
>
> Which means the govt. does have an interest in protecting the
historic
> and traditional nature of some things, even if they are public
> property.

That's not the point at all ... the prohibition on motor vehicles
is to protect the environment ... that doesn't correlate to
the spectrum, which is more resiliant, in the sense that when
lids stop acting up, there is no permanent, residual damage
to the spectrum.

> The end result is a "setaside" for "legacy modes of transportation"
> like walking and horseback riding.

That is an incidental side effect of prohibiting uses which
could cause long-term damage to the environment.

> > The FCC (and other
> > rational entities) have recognized the fact that Morse proficiency
```

> > doesn't "preserve the environment" (it doesn't, as some claim,
> > serve as a "lid filter" ... see various FCC Report and Order
> > documents for such findings.)
>
> You're missing the point, Carl. The issue was about traditions and
> their preservation as a matter of law.

And preserving traditions is NOT a legitimate purpose of
regulation.

> No test can serve perfectly as a "lid filter". That doesn't mean the
> tests have no effect on behavior.

The FCC has explicitly determined and stated that Morse
proficency (as demonstrated through testing requirements)
demonstrates NOTHING about how an applicant will behave.

> The FCC decided long ago (1975) to push for code test elimination.
> They have gradually but steadily eroded code testing over time, and
> are merely keeping 5 wpm because of S25.5. Doesn't mean the FCC is
> "right" or "rational", just that they decided on a course of action
> and are pursuing it.

I've had detailed conversations with numerous FCC officials.
I find them quite rational about the purpose of their rules.
(and some of them are long-term 20 wpm extras who operate
CW almost exclusively ... but they still recognize that Morse
testing has no place in FCC rules ...)

> FCC also decided that the written tests were to be reduced in size
and
> number, too.

Give me a break ... the number of questions and the breadth of
material has increased over the years ... ask Ed about how he
passed his General many years ago after studying a FOUR PAGE
ARRL study guide ... now they have to send you a book of about
200 pages to cover it all ...

This entire assertion that the written tests have been "dumbed
down" is JUST PLAIN INACCURATE.

> The process has been going on for a long time and there's
> no end in sight. Does that make those of us who support better
written
> testing irrational? Nope.

I'll agree with you that the written tests could be improved.
I've found a number of question/answer sets that could be
better written (or outright corrected) ... I intend to spend some
time reviewing the new pools as they are released and
sending suggested improvements and corrections to the QPC.

> > > >Another concept to consider is that "discipline" is a bit
misused
> > in
> > > >this application, IMHO. Are you talking about the concept that
> > some
> > > >have voiced that "It's (jumping through the Morse proficiency
hoop)
> > > >necessary to show 'committment'." ???
> > >
> > > Experience has shown what happens without such commitment.
> >
> > And that is WHAT?
>
> A service that is a complete mess.

Excuse me, but that's a pile ... many of the worst offenders
are 20 wpm long-term extras, or crotchety old generals who
think "real radios glow in the dark" and couldn't pass a test
on modern technology if their lives depended on it ...

Bad behavior has been the result of two factors:
1) lack of enforcement (until Riley, at least, thank God
for Riley ...)
2) too damned many hams think they're God's gift to
the spectrum because they've been licensed
a long time and can beep real fast and have as their
major goal to put down (and try to keep/drive out) newbies
"who shouldn't be crowding 'their' bands" ... those are
the types of lids who jam, use bad language on the air,
make rude, insulting comments to "lesser hams," etc.

[snip]

> What I was referring to was what happened to the cb radio service,
> which has never required any sort of "commitment" other than getting
a
> radio set and putting it on the air.

If you were to study the history, CB was pretty well-behaved
until the "Smokey and the Bandit" and "Convoy" era ... then
things got out of hand and the FCC threw up its hands and
made it a completely unlicensed service because they couldn't
enforce against tens of millions of people who chose not to
behave ...

But "committment" (of work to jump through stupid hoops)
has never been a factor in promoting good behavior on
the ham bands ...

[snip]

> Which still begs the questions: what do YOU consider "legitimate
> standards"? If/when the code test completely disappears, what should
> the US amateur radio license structure and requirements look like?

With some improvements in the written tests (more in terms
of modernization, editorial/technical correctness, etc., NOT
in terms of "making them harder to pass"), I'm pretty happy
with the standards we have today.

The one exception would be that I don't think that the "tech"
written exam is technically adequate to convey 1.5 kW power
privileges with unlimited antenna gain at frequencies that
cook meat ...

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCqYZpe+N6+q84HiEQKLPQCg4VfUZ32RTluPiXVcDVEPlGcwTrwAoJEi
KmlKcG4KcHaQLWMnUFStebAE
=VYYs
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5911. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 03:55:08 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3C727E9BE6E1611B.232A23DC372EC3D1.B44A3FCD334935B9@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28907

On 26 Dec 2001 13:42:02 -0800, N2EY@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Yes, it does matter. If there is no choice, the licensee bears no
>repsonsibility. But Kim specifically chose that call for reasons that
>have nothing to do with the good of the ARS.

Would you care to try to identify any hams who DID
specifically choose their vanity calls for "the good of the ARS?"

To the best of my knowledge, every ham who has a vanity call
has it either because the call commemorates a PERSON they respected
(not the ARS--an individual ham) or (far more common) because they
like the sound of the call or it contains their initials or nickname
(i.e., W8RIC, W8RAA, etc. for myself). I doubt very many--if any--hams
stop to consider whether the vanity call they are applying for is for
"the good of the ARS."

>[Kim's call]
>
>>is a valid callsign.
>
>Only because the FCC has made a mistake in issuing it. Do you believe
>the FCC is infallible, Cecil?

Do you believe YOU are?

Or Dave Heil, Larry Roll, or Dick Carroll?

If so, justify that absurd belief. If not, then why do you
feel that the four of you have any more legitimacy in determining
whether a call should be issued or not than does Kim herself?

>> It doesn't matter objectively
>> if it was chosen or issued at random.
>
>Yes, it does. The person who makes a choice has to take some
>responsibility for the choice.

Kim DOES take responsibility for her choice. The trouble is,
several people here don't feel she had a right to MAKE that choice,
and want to make a new one FOR her.

>The FCC does NOT issue that particular suffix (and others) in sequence
>or at random. It must be specifically requested through the vanity
>call program.

I see.

Because a suffix is not issued sequentially or randomly by the
FCC it is vulgar, tasteless, or immoral and it's use will contribute
to taking the ARS "one step closer to extinction" right?

I guess that "GOD" is vulgar, tasteless, or immoral then--it
isn't issued sequentially or randomly, either.

Hmmmmm mm . . .

>>is NOT a word!!!
>
>Exactly. So your rant about "parts of words" doesn't apply. QED.

Nor do your claims that it's vulgar or tasteless!

>> If you are going to prohibit callsigns where a part of the
>> callsign spells something, then you need to prohibit words
>> where a part of the word spells something.
>
>Nope. Since Kim's call is not a word (you say so yourself) your claim
>is baseless. Illogical. Does not apply.

And thus, by your own statement, Kim's call is nothing but a
collection of letters grouped in a manner specified by regulation. So
is yours, Dave's, Larry's, Dick's, or mine.

But if that's the case, you have absolutely no reason to
oppose her call at all since it has no meaning and is just as
acceptable as your own.

>> What is wrong with issuing the callsign and then allowing
>> everyone to choose to think what they choose to think about it?
>
>The image of the ARS is damaged. It's an inappropriate callsign.

But you just stated it isn't a word. How can a grouping of
letters that are not a word be inappropriate so long as they meet the
criteria for a legal call sign (i.e., 1x3, 1x2, 2x2, 2x1, 2x3,
appropriate prefix, etc.)--which Kim's clearly does?

You can't have it both ways, Jim. Either it's a word or it
isn't. If it is, you admit to Cecil's claim above. If not you admit to
mine.

>Who said anyhting about "dirty" thoughts? Not me.
>
>Look through my posts, and you will see that I have not referred to
>Kim's callsign as dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy. Nor have
>I described Kim or anyone else in those terms. The term I use for the
>callsign is "inappropriate".
>
>What's wrong with choosing a callsign that is appropriate to the
>community standards of the amateur radio service and reflects
>positively upon that service?

But who is DEFINING those "community standards?" On any rational basis, "Community standards" are set by members of the community as a whole, not by a few individuals or by a government agency. And, despite the convictions of a few people here, I doubt seriously that if you took a survey of a representative sample of hams (which this news group is NOT) you would find any consensus that Kim's call sign is inappropriate. I suspect quite strongly that the reverse would be true--most hams would find it either amusing or irrelevant and very few would find it in any way detrimental to the ARS.

When you--or someone else in this news group--has actually conducted such a study--and documented it so we can verify your results--if that survey demonstrates that "most hams" find the sign inappropriate you will have proven your point--otherwise it represents only one opinion and there is absolutely no reason for Kim or anyone else to believe that it represents the opinion of a significant number of hams.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5912. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 04:05:55 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A17D53CE133D6D39.5F6E437A9BAFA70A.F74698D962F766B7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28908

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 22:03:44 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Repeaters? We don't need no steenking repeaters! Actually, the best
>way for Kim to handle it would have been not to begin braying about her
>*nudge wink* reasons for obtaining her call and to clam up about it.
>Kim doesn't clam up for anyone or anything.

Maybe that's the entire problem, Dave.

You, Dick, and Larry all feel that a woman should behave
differently than a man in public (and probably in private as well) and
that she has an obligation to appear demure, innocent, and moral. When
a woman demonstrates that she is as much a whole person as a man is
and isn't willing to defer to your "superior" male values, you go ape
and can't allow her decisions to go unchallenged.

It isn't a question of Kim's call sign bothering you--it's
just that you don't think she knows her place!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5913. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 04:17:01 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2aa1eb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28910

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:A17D53CE133D6D39.5F6E437A9BAFA70A.F74698D962F766B7@lp.airnews.net...
>
> It isn't a question of Kim's call sign bothering you--it's
> just that you don't think she knows her place!
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH
> adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
> Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Now the crosshairs are on the target. That's what I think about their protests to my callsign. It is more that they "just don't like me" and couldn't, originally, come up with something that honest. ;)

Kim W5TIT

5914. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 04:19:12 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <71035F948257A84E.6161DB3A11624B25.BFCB3BD5CFEA81E8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28909

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:50:07 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Kim, about the only thing nastier than ME walking nude on a beach would
>be the thought of YOU walking nude on a beach. We're both past our
>expiration date. There would likely be folks willing to pay us just to
>avoid seeing us nude on a beach. Keep talking about it and I'm sure
>someone will take up a collection beginning right about now.

Actually, Dave, quite a number of the people at nude beaches
and nudist/naturist resorts are between 45 and 65 with a good number
much older than that. Unlike "textile" beaches, people at nude beaches
don't go to "ogle" the bodies of others--only to enjoy the beach.

Sorry that you judge people on their physical appearance--most
adults have matured past that point--or at least the ones who go to
nude recreational sites have done so.

BTW, the amateur "Nude Net" meets on HF on Saturdays as I
recall. You might want to tune it in sometime and note the age of some
of the participants.

>> or nothing but "nasty"
>> in a woman who nurses her child in public, or nothing but "nasty" at
>> the idea of a man and woman making love together.

>Oh, horse hockey, Kim. I don't believe that any of us any problem with
>an idea of people making love. I don't won't it broadcast via ATV and
>don't think we need an audio book version on 20m.

Given the lack of knowledge of human sexuality among American
youths, I wish they WOULD provide them an audio book version--it might
prevent a lot of unwanted pregnancies and STD infections.

>Sure, Kim. That's why you chose your call over W5FAT, K5LID or N5DOH.
>It wasn't for the shock value, it was purely for the "fun".

Kim (correctly, btw) doesn't see herself as "Fat," a "LID," or
representative of the kind of person for whom "DOH" is appropriate.
She sees herself as a woman and chose a different defining
characteristic to use in her sign. Too bad that you find a "TIT" any
more inappropriate than a "LEG" or an "ARM." That isn't her
fault--it's yours!

>How do you know? Do you e-mail all of them or just ask them at the
>beginning or end of each QSO?

How many have YOU surveyed to determine that they find Kim's
call offensive or inappropriate? From what I've seen here, there are
more hams supporting her decision than opposing it.

>Right. You're all about butterflies and sunrises. That's not why you
>chose your call according to your own admission.

She feels positive about butterflies and sunrises. She also
feels positive about her tits. W5BUTTERFLY and W5SUNRISE aren't valid
call signs. W5TIT is.

You really SHOULD consider applying for K8DUM!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5915. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 04:19:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2aa19b_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 28937

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112260845.55b40b1d@posting.google.com...
> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:<qAQV7.196255$WW.11390036@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> How about this:
>
> Right now:
>
> 1) Give all Novices and Tech Pluses 200 W CW only on all nonphone
> General HF/MF bands, 160-10. (FCC will probably balk at this)

Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
digital modes as well?

This is a "no-reward reward" ... if they aren't interested
in using CW now, they won't be under your proposal
either ... you can't force it down their throats because
they don't like the taste.

Again ... Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to
use modern digital modes as well?

> 2) Allow all "old" Tech Pluses to get Generals by a simple mail or
> online procedure, instead of forcing them to attend VE sessions.
(FCC
> will hate this one, too).

This would seem reasonable ... since it's just an administrative
update ... however, since the FCC is set up now to take all
input from the VECs, you're probably right that they wouldn't
like this idea (it would probably require changes to their
system and more work for already under-budgeted FCC staff).

> 3) Resolve the 40 meter mess at WRC 2003 to get a worldwide
exclusive
> amateur allocation, even if it gives away spectrum. 7000-7200
> worldwide exclusive amateur is better for everyone than 7000-7300 in
> Region 2 and 7000-7100 everywhere else.

- From reports I've heard in WRC-03 preparatory meetings,
things may actually be looking better for 7000-7300 worldwide,
but even if it's agreed at WRC-03 it could be 5-10 years
before it becomes reality ... all the broadcasters in R1 and R3

won't move overnight.

> 4) Develop bandplans for all HF/MF that separate CW, digital and
> analog voice/image modes.

If you're talking about FCC-rules-mandated separation of that
type, I wouldn't hold my breath ... it takes too long to change
FCC rules ... such rules would be too limiting in terms of us
being able to flexibly take advantage of new modes in the
future (something the FCC really WANTS to see us do ...)

(Read Dale Hatfield's comments and Bill Cross's comments
... links to on-line versions can be found on the NCI website
on the "Articles" page ...)

> After S25.5 is gone:
>
> 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
> names if you don't like them)

We have that now ... tech, general, extra ... the main problem
is that techs get screwed on HF.

> 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by
license
> class. (Some bands, like 10 and the WARC bands, may be split by mode
> only).

GAG!!!!!!!!! Such "balkanization" is a VERY BAD IDEA ... people
need to mix and intermingle ... isolating newbies into "ghettos"
is NOT the way to educate and socialize them ... all it does is breed
ill will (and to the extent that some "better hams" are contemptuous
of the newbies, it breeds contempt for the higher class licensees
who have the knowedge and experience to educate and socialize
the newbies)... making such efforts by the (majority?) of higher class
licensees who DON'T have an attitude problem more difficult.

It also, again will be too limiting of our ability to respond to
changes
in technology, promoting the technological stagnation that the ARS
has suffered from more or less since SSB and FM came into common
use.

> 3) Basic license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
> procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure
stuff,
> main purpose is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150
> watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (determined by RF
> exposure limits). Modes are CW, SSB, FM, PSK31 and maybe some of the
> other common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control
ops
> for repeaters, or be club trustees. Basics get all VHF/UHF and about
> half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the entry level.

A little TOO basic for my taste ... and there's that balkanization
by class again ...

> 4) Intermediate license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on
> regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical and
RF
> exposure stuff, with some regs to cover expanded privs.
Intermediates
> get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs
> after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club
> trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or
> more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires at least one year
> experience as a Basic.

While I personally think that power limits based on tecnical level
are entirely appropriate (and make FAR more sense than sub-band
balkinization by license the generals, paraticularly many of the
older
ones, will skin you alive if you try to take their "California
kilowats"
away from them ... so many seem to think that the "minimum
power rule" was intended for everyone but them and their cronies
and that it's their God-given right to run full legal limit (or more)
to
talk across town and compliment each other on being 40-60 over
S9.

Also, there's that balkanization by class again ... bad idea ...

And the "time in grade" idea REALLY SUCKS!!! If someone
can pass the test, they're qualified and deserve their license,
period.

> 5) Full license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs,
> procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some
> regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes,
bands,
> etc. except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see
> below). Full license requires ar least one year (preferably two
years)
> as an Intermediate.

You want 100-120 questions ... fine by me ... but many others
will bitch that it's too much.

Also, there's that balkanization by class again ... bad idea ...

And the "time in grade" idea REALLY SUCKS!!! If someone
can pass the test, they're qualified and deserve their license,
period.

> 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.

That's what we have now ...

> 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
> six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character
> calls.

The "vanity call" system is too entrenched ... trying to take away
"prefered" calls from those who have them will also get you
tarred and feathered (or worse ...)

> 8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification,
open
> to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs.

I have no problem with the idea of a separate VE test ...

> 9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses,
> Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras
> become Fulls. Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams
> to upgrade.

This gives too much to tech/tech plus without a sufficent technical
exam ... as you pointed out in a previous post, the FCC rejected
the ARRL's idea of "grandfather" tech+ to general ... and so did
the NCVECs and NCI and many others ...

And the "time in grade" idea REALLY SUCKS!!! If someone
can pass the test, they're qualified and deserve their license,
period.

> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned
> as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but
> meaningful steps to reach full privileges.

I don't see how this is really any different than a "codeless"
version of what we have now ... except that the basic sounds
even more basic than the current tech, you want to take amps
away from generals, you want to screw around with everyone's
callsigns, and you want that stupid "time in grade" thing ...

> Of course this probably has even less chance than your ideas, Rich.

I think it's DOA for the reasons I've outlined above ...

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL

- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCqg85e+N6+q84HiEQJHVQCff7Sxt014nfpTa8grgel+fCXfTU4AnROM
pAUjOtyysBhV/fmAb7MglaQY
=of3d
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5916. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 04:28:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E5996A57FDF305B8.3263D2BADB80AAC2.EE5B85E6A7868876@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28911

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 03:09:45 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
wrote:

>
>
>CAM wrote:
>
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM wrote:
>> > > Your "Kevin Ate Mary's Nookie" call offends me, Dave. What are
>> > > you going to do about it?
>> >
>> > I'd imagine he'll make the futile suggestion that you work on cleaning
>> > up your thought process.
>>
>> EXACTLY the point, Dick. You guys need to work on cleaning up
>> your thought processes. Vulgarity is not in the call sign - it
>> is in your and Larry's and Dave's minds. I'm glad you finally
>> get it. Hey Kim, Dick finally gets it!
>
> Oh, I've had it all along. You're a lying, scheming, conniving dipschit who
>wouldn't recognize truth if it jumped up and bit your butt.

Sorry, Cecil--he obviously doesn't get it after all.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5917. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:03:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011227000313.05154.00000644@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 28913

In article <3C2A48DA.C573077@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>I'm sure vanity callsigns are covered by the First Amendment.

They're not. The vanity callsign program is an option offered by the FCC, not a right. For most of the history of ham radio, the vanity callsign program either did not exist or was extremely limited. I remember when the only vanity call program was that hams who'd been Extras for 20 years could get a sequentially-isued 1X2.

>Why else would the FCC issue callsigns that they consider vulgar?

Several reasons (assuming that the FCC actually considers them vulgar):

1) The FCC is mistaken in issuing them
2) The FCC doesn't have the resources, or doesn't want to spend them, arguing with hams who want the callsigns.
3) The FCC doesn't care if some hams damage the image of the ARS
4) The FCC wants to end the vanity callsign program, and every inappropriate call requested is another bit of evidence they can use to say "See what some hams do when allowed to choose their calls?"
5) The FCC doesn't want to get involved in a long debate over dictionary definitons of "vulgar", "profane", etc.

Note that I'm not saying here that any callsign is vulgar.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5918. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:03:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011227000314.05154.00000645@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 28912

In article <3C2A4C29.7B58B263@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>On some, I see pancakes drizzled with maple syrup
>and melted butter.

yummmm.....

>On others I can see rain puddling on the floor below
>an old yellow rain slicker.

rainy day in spring.....ahhhhhhhhh

> Then there is the one with Oprah.

AHHHHHHH!!!! MY EYES!!!!!!!

73 de (whew! that was close) Jim, N2EY

5919. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:05:28 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0ea4f022p3@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28917

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C29F36A.2B0A7A03@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > There is
> > no basic conflict in welcoming those who pass the rules currently in
> > effect while not having a lot of use for the rules currently in effect;
>
> Unfortunately, Larry is not that way. He has bitched loud and long
> about post-restructuring extras not deserving their privileges.
> --
> cheers, CAM, W5DXP

I'm surprised that he didn't reply that the new licensee should raise his code speed to 40 WPM so that he could be considered a real ham despite the new regs.

5920. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:24:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2AA396.4CB9C7B2@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28914

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C29EE5C.87AF75AC@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > Has it dawned upon you that I present people with a mirror image of
> > > > themselves so they can learn something from the exercise? I become
> > > > you and respond to you as you would. Everything you say about me
> > > > applies to you.
> > >
> > > What has dawned on me is that you use my stuff as if you originated
> it.
> > >
> > > You originate the crap, Dave, and I mirror it back at you. I've
> > > been doing that to crappy people since I learned it as a teaching
> > > technique in 1962.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> >
> And an awful lot of wives become ex-wives that way.

Could it be that Cecil may be familiar with the concept on a personal level?

5921. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:26:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2AA424.A8BDDBA3@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28915

CAM wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Your new quest, Don. Q., is to advise us on how many of the 17k+ spell
> > something which could be viewed by others as vulgar.
>
> That's easy, Dave. Everyone is perfectly free to view each and
> every callsign as being vulgar. Vulgarity is in the mind of
> the reader. Vulgarity doesn't exist independently in any
> callsign.
>
> Non-English speaking people would have to have it explained
> to them before they could possibly find it vulgar. Seems that
> proves the word is not objectively vulgar. All you have to do to
> solve the problem is, instead of morbidly looking for vulgarity
> everywhere 24 hours a day, try looking for goodness, kindness,
> love, and mercy. Most of your vulgar thoughts would disappear.
>
> Dave, you are like the unfortunate soul who sees vulgar pictures
> in ink blots. It is all in your mind. Try switching from vulgar
> thoughts to beautiful thoughts and thus make the world a better
> place instead of the cesspool in which you live.

Wow! You go deeper into lunacy with each post!

5922. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:33:22 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <rdhalste@tm.net>
Message-ID: <CoyW7.1399$DI1.693885@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 28916
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

One more troll!

Roger (K8RI)

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
news:e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com...

5923. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:42:20 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ONz0$ipjBHA.1236@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 28944

N9NWO had the grapes to say:

> However, what I have a problem with is that
> so many in the US just can not accept that someone
> might be better than they.

Well sweetheart, you have a *huge* problem with me
then.

I do not accept that anyone is "better" than I, and I
especially do not accept that a uniform, badge,
or election results makes them better.

Our founding fathers, whom you are so proud to
cite, seemed to feel a lot like me when they
said.... "We hold these truths to be self-evident...
...that all men are created equal...."

Take your superiority drivel over to alt.skinheads
or some similarly deluded crowd of losers. Sounds
to me like you've been "imprinted" by some really
insecure personalities!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

5924. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:42:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2AA7D9.35A6A66A@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28918

CAM wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> > > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
> >
> > There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> > They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
>
> It doesn't matter unless you are trying to mimic "1984"'s thought
> police

OM you're running just ahead of the idiot police.

5925. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:42:53 UTC
From: ROCK <rock1@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <xxyW7.12069$uM.141230@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 28919
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Okay lets all just take it 1 Jan 2002 19:00hrs (est) everybody just meet on 28.500 and we will all have one big key down LoL, just take it over and everybody will be happy.

5926. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 05:49:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2AA97B.D6291637@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28920

N2EY wrote:

>One real problem nobody talks about much is the addytoods of those who

> come to ham radio with "experience" in other services.
> >

Well, I sure did and you saw what happened. Cecil and his pals the jackels at NCI tried to eat me alive.

5927. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:00:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2AABED.497C6FC2@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28921

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C2A1342.1587B4EF@IEEE.org...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> > > > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
> > >
> > > There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> > > They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
> >
> > It doesn't matter unless you are trying to mimic "1984"'s thought
> > police. W5TIT is a valid callsign. It doesn't matter objectively
> > if it was chosen or issued at random. W5TIT is NOT a word!!!
> > If you are going to prohibit callsigns where a part of the
> > callsign spells something, then you need to prohibit words
> > where a part of the word spells something.
> >
> > What is wrong with issuing the callsign and then allowing
> > everyone to choose to think what they choose to think about it?
> > Choosing to think dirty thoughts is a choice freely made by
> > the thinker. Nobody's forcing you to think those dirty thoughts.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> >
> >
>
> Precisely.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C2A1342.1587B4EF@IEEE.org...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> > > > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
> > >
> > > There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> > > They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.

> >
> > It doesn't matter unless you are trying to mimic "1984"'s thought
> > police. W5TIT is a valid callsign. It doesn't matter objectively
> > if it was chosen or issued at random. W5TIT is NOT a word!!!
> > If you are going to prohibit callsigns where a part of the
> > callsign spells something, then you need to prohibit words
> > where a part of the word spells something.
> >
> > What is wrong with issuing the callsign and then allowing
> > everyone to choose to think what they choose to think about it?
> > Choosing to think dirty thoughts is a choice freely made by
> > the thinker. Nobody's forcing you to think those dirty thoughts.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
> >
> >
>
> Precisely.
>
> Kim W5TIT

What a bunch of loons. Society decides what is considered vulgar and what is most every other category. Delude yourselves as you wish.

If you want to go around fourishing your tits in private no on will care a damn. Do it publically, as in choosing, using and displaying it on your han radio callsign and you may as well expect to get a very negative reaction from the majority. You have no choice but to live with it.

5928. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:07:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2AADA7.33136270@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28922

Richard McCollum wrote:

> > > Sum and substance: does the hobby need protection from the newbie or
> the
> > > newbie need a bit of protection from a hobby that can eat one up?
> >
> > Both.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> That attitude is precisely why we really do need to establish a
> time-in-grade standard for VEing if nothing else. As it sits, Unit 437
> could gun up and pass the Extra bringing the Velvet Jockstrap and
> Dingleberry 42 into the fold and have all the buds on the air in six
> months. When they run a test session at the BARF convention and CB
> keydowns we are doomed.

And from all indications FCC couldn't care less.
It's very, very easy to view it all as a totally lost cause.

5929. Re: I made it home alive

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:25:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7C4CAFBD8958B318.3FFFD9E662580877.0065D9629641CB69@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 28924

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 01:34:11 -0500, "WebDoc REACT Unit #602"
<arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:

>Well all I am back home, I left Brooklyn at 1:30 PM and arrived in my
>driveway at 11:30 PM, and wouldn't you know..... I can't sleep. So I am
>practicing copying code, I missed the test date in NYC by about 20
>minutes..... I got lost at the 59th st / Columbus Circle transfer from the
>A train to the 1 train..... Oh well, there is an exam coming up in
>Toledo OH.

Keith, where on earth do you live that your choice of testing
sites is NYC and Toledo--or that you have to travel 10 hours each way
for testing?

Nearly ever middle sized city in the US has regular testing.
If you are between NYC and Toledo, what about Cleveland, Pittsburgh,
Philly, Syracuse, or Albany? Or any of the dozens of smaller cities in
Pennsylvania, New York, or Ohio for that matter?

Unless you have a reason to prefer testing in a major city it
would seem a LOT more relaxing (and far less stressful--which can lead
to better test results, of course) to take your test locally instead
of traveling as far as you have. At one time you had to go to a major
center for testing--my first license and my upgrade to Advanced were
taken at FCC regional offices [Las Vegas and San Francisco,
respectively] but my Extra came from a testing site only 50 miles from
my home in the rural midwest--you should be able to do the same in
your own area.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

5930. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:33:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AC0D6.F4D8BF9D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28925

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2A4617.1B81193A@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> > > Dave, Larry, Dick C., and people like them would probably see nothing
> but
> > > "nasty" in a person walking on a beach in the nude,
> >
> > Kim, about the only thing nastier than ME walking nude on a beach would
> > be the thought of YOU walking nude on a beach. We're both past our
> > expiration date. There would likely be folks willing to pay us just to
> > avoid seeing us nude on a beach. Keep talking about it and I'm sure
> > someone will take up a collection beginning right about now.
> >
>
> Well at least you show some humor, above. But, I don't think anyone who is
> the kind of human being I'd admire would be running from either of us.

No, not the kind of person you'd admire--just the kind with plain old
common sense.

> > >
> > > or nothing but "nasty"
> > > in a woman who nurses her child in public, or nothing but "nasty" at
> > > the idea of a man and woman making love together.
> >
> > Oh, horse hockey, Kim. I don't believe that any of us any problem with
> > an idea of people making love. I don't won't it broadcast via ATV and
> > don't think we need an audio book version on 20m.
> >
>
> So, don't broadcast it. We have movies for the satisfaction of voyeurism.

I don't broadcast it. You, if you'll remember, brought up that the
"idea" of two people making love would seem nasty to several of us.
I pointed out that the idea isn't nasty to me.

> > >
> > > They miss opportunities to
> > > see beauty when it is all around them. My callsign is intended for >
> fun--and
> > > that does not have to include nasty. Nasty is in their minds, not >
> mine.
> >

> > Sure, Kim. That's why you chose your call over W5FAT, K5LID or N5DOH.
> > It wasn't for the shock value, it was purely for the "fun".
> >
>
> I like the N5DOH.
>
> > >
> > > And, it is also not in the minds of many, many people I have talked to
> on
> > > the air.
> >
> > How do you know? Do you e-mail all of them or just ask them at the
> > beginning or end of each QSO?
> >
>
> Their non-asking is enough for me. Do you spend a lot of time emailing,
> Dave, to see if people thought you were offensive on the air? Can't you
> just take it for granted that if they don't say you were offensive, you
> probably weren't?

I'm not the one with the suggestive call, Kim.

> > >
> > > To believe that my callsign is vulgar, does not belong in the ARS, and
> > > should not have been requested by me and/or issued by the FCC is to
> focus on
> > > "nasty" or "vulgar" ideas of what my callsign is. I choose to ignore
> the
> > > "nasty" or "vulgar" minded, because my callsign isn't.
> >
> >
> > Right. You're all about butterflies and sunrises. That's not why you
> > chose your call according to your own admission.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You mean butterflies and sunrises can't be fun? Gosh.

Sure they can. That's not the kind of fun you sought when choosing your
call though.

Dave K8MN

5931. I made it home alive

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:34:11 UTC
From: WebDoc REACT Unit #602 <arcweb@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <DXyW7.12814$_K.1636006@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 28923

Well all I am back home, I left Brooklyn at 1:30 PM and arrived in my driveway at 11:30 PM, and wouldn't you know..... I can't sleep. So I am practicing copying code, I missed the test date in NYC by about 20 minutes..... I got lost at the 59th st / Columbus Circle transfer from the A train to the 1 train..... Oh well, there is an exam coming up in Toledo OH.

Hope everyone had a good holiday.

73's
Keith Hosman

5932. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:37:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AC193.4B63C856@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28926

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2A4948.B0257262@earthlink.net...
> > James R. DeLoach wrote:
> >
> > > Kim, there is nothing wrong with your callsign. I can't believe these
> > > dirty old men are making such a fuss over it. Enjoy your callsign.
> > > There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
> > > have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose.
> >
> > But she didn't choose one of 'em. Oh--you must've meant THAT kind of
> > call!
> >
> > > I think it's great if you like it and that's all that really matters.
> > > Only in America are we FREE to choose what we like or dislike about
> > > things, people, etc. etc.
> > > As I saw in another message that someone posted, your callsign is
> > > made up of letters, not words. In your case it just happens to spell
> > > a slang word for a part of the human body (breast), that both men and
> > > women have. The attitude of these people is part of what is wrong
> > > with this country now days. The best way to handle these people
> > > is to just ignore them like we do the "dead keyers" on the repeaters.
> > > When they realize that they are not antagonizing anyone, they will
> > > go away and find something else to complain about.
> >
> > Repeaters? We don't need no steenking repeaters! Actually, the best
> > way for Kim to handle it would have been not to begin braying about her
> > *nudge wink* reasons for obtaining her call and to clam up about it.
> > Kim doesn't clam up for anyone or anything.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Check the timelines, Dave. I am not the one who brings my callsign up in
> conversations on this newsgroup. It is usually brought up when one of you
> gets stung over something I say--Larry being the most common responder of
> same.
>
> I also don't argue my callsign--if you'll read between the lines...and you
> don't and haven't so far. I argue that the reactions to my callsign are
> less than admirable.

Less than admirable in this case means you aren't having the "fun" you
thought you'd have with it. You can say you argue reactions if it helps

you to rationalize your responses. In either case, you simply fan the flames.

Dave K8MN

5933. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:38:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2AB50D.6DE58CD4@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28927

W1RFI wrote:

> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> It appears quite simple. Those that sing Larry's praises on rrap are told
> >>they deserve congratulations for passing the 5 wpm test. Those that do not
> >>praise Larry receive the badmouth treatment.
>
> >> It appears to me that in Larry's view, it really IS all about Larry.
>
> >Ed I would have expected a more intelligent analysis than that, given that
> >you do
> >work CW. But then again, you also work at ARRL HQ.....
>
> You know, it does appear that you are not capable of offering much of meaning
> past "I know but I am not going to tell" and "he only says that because he
> works at ARRL HQ." Didn't we have this same non-conversation a few months ago?

You really should learn to drop the selective reading and try to get at what's
there.
I said "I knew all along you (Bert) could and would do it" and that was because of
what Mark said- it's all in the attitude one brings to the project. Guess you
missed all you didn't want to see.

Henry Ford gets credit for saying "Think you can, think you can't, either way
you're right". When a young fellow shows up expressing the attitude that he WILL do
whatever it takes, that seemingly difficult tasks are just another job to be done,
one that WILL be done, then I for one take notice. No PC necessary.
I remember being that way in 1956.

5934. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:42:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AC2BF.7632A0ED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28928

James R. DeLoach wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 16:52:49 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
> >> have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose.
> >>
> >
> >Yeah. How 'bout _5BAL, _5WOM, _5BAB, _5SEX, _5CNT (that idea was actually
> >given to me by this little old lady ham that giggled all night at a
> >Christmas party when she thought of it. I told her to go for it and she
> >said she probably would if her husband wouldn't yell...LOL), and so on.
> >
> The callsigns that I was thinking of were _?SEX. Looks like most of
> the W_SEX callsigns have been taken. I noticed that in the ARRL
> Repeater directory that there are some repeaters in the mid-west and
> on the east coast that have _?SEX callsigns.
>
> I bet Dave thinks these callsigns are dirty as well.

Do your homework before engaging the keyboard, James. I've never stated
that Kim's call is "dirty". It is tacky. It is tasteless. It
demonstrates a lack of good judgement.

Dave K8MN

5935. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:43:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AC325.7AC43F65@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28929

CAM wrote:
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > Nearly everyone who is riding you about your call sign is also
> > a cw buff (or at least I _believe_ that to be the case).
>
> To illustrate just how ridiculous their objections are, consider the
> difference between 'tit' and 'x' in CW. Would you believe that a
> couple of dead spaces can change an 'x' into something vulgar?

Not if the dead spaces are, as in your case, between the cans.

Dave K8MN

5936. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:45:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AC379.6B1A598B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28930

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > I'm using the dictionary definition of "vulgar", Kim, as being of the
> > > common folk. Vulgar Latin is what the commoners spoke during the
> > > Roman Empire.
> > >
> > > Naw, you're not. You are using a word origin and not the common, modern
> > > definition of the word.
>
> Seems you would crack open a dictionary before embarrassing yourself, Dave.
> From Webster's: "vulgar - of or relating to the common people"
> It doesn't say a thing about that definition not being common and modern.

Get back to me when you finally figure out how a dictionary is arranged.
If you keep this up, you'll look as dim as you did over the difference
between "church" and "Church".

Dave K8MN

5937. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:48:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AC43E.679C49B5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28931

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Well, my foggy friend, you don't even have an inalienable right to an
> > > > amateur radio license so I don't know how you'd have one for a call of
> > > > choice.
> > >
> > > I'm sure vanity callsigns are covered by the First Amendment. Why
> > > else would the FCC issue callsigns that they consider vulgar?
> >
> > No one has a inalienable right to a call or a license.
>
> Everyone who qualifies for a call or a license has a right to it/them.
> It is against the law for the FCC to refuse a license or a call to
> individuals who have met all the qualifications. What would it take
> for you to comprehend that this is a nation of laws, not a nation of
> arbitrary royal whims. Your Royal Hinee will likely get spanked for that.

Perhaps you'd like to argue my statement, Don Q.:

Nobody has an inalienable right to an amateur radio license or a
callsign--especially a *particular* callsign. Chew that over for a
spell.

Good luck with this latest quest.

Dave K8MN

5938. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:48:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2AB75B.567A9391@townsqr.com>
Source record: 28932
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote:

> : > : > There are a good deal of elitism out there.
> : > : > For whatever reason. The Marines teach
> : > : > it. So do the police academies.
> : > :
> : > : The police/Marines/doctors/professors etc ARE the elite, when it
> : > : comes to their areas of expertise. Outside that, they are no better
> : > : or worse than anyone else.
> : >
> : > There is the problem. Because they are elite
> : > in their fields, they do transfer that attitude to
> : > every other aspect of society. Because they
> : > are competent, they tend that no one else is.
> : > And if they do not know how to do it, then
> : > no one else should be able to do so either.
> : > (Thus the desire to ban technology such as
> : > guns or radios).
> :
> : I don't buy it, N9MWO. There is and always has been elitgeism amongst
> : the elite in any human endeavor, and that elitism has served for far more
> : good than evil in free societies. I've known a lot of elite police
> : officers in the past 40 years and darn few of them showed any tendency to
> : transfer that to the sort constitutional violations you describe.
> : Things change, and sometimes pretty fast, but if we're headed down that
> : slippery slope, I haven't seen a lot of evidence of it. Of course I have
> : seen some. One of he most gregarious cases was in New York Cit. In 1962 I
> : watched a NYPD street cop give a guy an awful cussing in public while he
> : stood with his hand on the butt of his revolver as if he dared the guy to
> : respond in any way. The fellow' soffense was cuttting across one extra
> : traffic lane to get to a (rare) parking spot. There was no safety reason
> : for him not to do that, except the LEO noted his out of state license
> : plate, and after all, some jerk behind who wanted the spot himself
> : honked.....
>
> While I do agree with you that elitism has
> been more good than bad as our country
> was founded on elitism (our Founders were
> men of learning and property, to even vote
> required that one had to own land). And also
> the French ideal of equality has created more
> suffering than good (the French revolution was
> at the root of a good deal of the wars since then).

> However, what I have a problem with is that
> so many in the US just can not accept that someone
> might be better than they.
>
> And elitism can be carried too far. One of my
> friends is Purdue cop. He had been a Lafayette
> officer. He told me of how one of the Lieuteants
> on the LPD and he were coming out of city hall.
> the LT spotted a local bum (drunk), called him
> over and asked to look at something. When the
> bum looked over to see, the LT just beat the hell
> out of him then turned to my friend and ordered
> him to write it up and charge the bum with something.
> My friend refused, because there was not way
> for them to force him to. But from that time
> on he was labeled a troublemaker.
>
> And remember this is a college town.
>
> Oh, the west side cops have a little technique
> where they get a mouthy college student on the
> ground, bring his arms up behind him then twist
> (it is an old wrestling move). They call it "imprinting"
> as it tears the muscles and the kid will always
> have pain. Hard to prove in court.

Usually impossible to prove. And cops who do that stuff will be protected from
the discipline (and removal from the force) that they deserve by the "code".
That should not be, and sometimes it blows up on them, big time. Seen it happen.

5939. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:52:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AC52A.6CEAA947@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28933

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:26:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Well, my foggy friend, you don't even have an inalienable right to an
> >amateur radio license so I don't know how you'd have one for a call of
> >choice. Darn! Another perfectly good rant ruined.
>
> On the contrary, Dave, he _does_ have an inalienable right to
> one--so long as amateur radio licenses are administered by the federal
> government (they are, obviously), so long as Cecil or anyone else
> meets the legal requirements for licensure it is illegal for the FCC
> to _refuse_ to issue such a license. Were he not to have that right it
> would mean that the FCC could "pick and choose" whoever they wished to
> issue a license to and could refuse to license anyone they wished on
> any grounds including race, creed, nation of origin, sex or sexual
> orientation--something the clearly canNOT do.
>
> Darn!
>
> Another perfectly good inaccuracy revealed!
>
> Rick

Yeah, on your part. Been reading the Kevin Mitnick thread? There is no constitutional guarantee of a radio license or of a particular callsign. So you mean folks would have to actually meet the qualifications for a license in order to obtain an amateur radio license. Man, who knew????

Dave K8MN

5940. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 06:53:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AC57C.94E91244@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28934

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:35:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Rick Adams wrote:
> >>
> >> On 26 Dec 2001 06:52:18 -0800, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >>
> >> >CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2954AE.34992319@IEEE.org>...
> >> >
> >> >> If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?
> >> >
> >> >Nope. Nor to anyone else. Nor would I issue similar inappropriate callsigns.
> >> >
> >> >Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.
> >>
> >> In other words, simply because the law would require you to do
> >> something, you would refuse anyway because it "isn't right" in your
> >> mind?
> >>
> >> And you wonder why many of us think you aren't playing with a
> >> full deck!
> >>
> >You'll note, Jim, that this is the kindly prof who only responds in
> >kind. He never throws the first stone and he is as supportive of your
> >right to express an opinion as he is supportive of Kim's ideas. How do
> >we know these things? Because he told us so.
>
> Actually, that was an error, Dave. I thought I was responding
> to one of your own tirades. In Jim's case, he can delete the last line
> of my response (about playing with a full deck)--that was meant to
> apply to you, not to more normal people.
>
> My apologies, Jim, I would hate to accidently put anyone in
> Dave's class--that would be far more insulting than you deserve.

A tad too late. That particular horse already departed the area of the
barn.

Dave K8MN

5941. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 07:10:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AC933.265EB9B3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28935

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 22:12:27 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >> >> >Folks other than professional baseball players who sell autographs to
> >> >> >kids.
> >> >>
> >> >> That means Ted Bundy, Charles Manson, Adolph Hitler, Saddam
> >> >> Hussein, and Osama bin Laden are among your heros.
> >> >
> >> >It does? What a perfectly peculiar and illogical thing to say!
> >I guess you failed logic in school as you've failed it here. Look at my
> >statement. Do you see the word "all" in front of the word "folks"?
> >You're right, I don't see it either. You must feel like a complete
> >fool.
>
> Let's see:
>
> Let F stand for Folks other than professional baseball players
> who sell autographs to kids.
>
> Let P stand for professional baseball players who sell
> autographs to kids.
>
> Then F=NOT P
>
> Because you make no provision for subsets in your statement
> above it is inclusive and thus your set of heros DOES include serial
> killers (unless they are also professional baseball players who sell
> autographs to kids).
>
> Had you wished to exclude subsets, you would have modified
> your "Folks other than . . ." to read "Certain folks other than . . ."
> or "My heros do NOT include professional baseball . . ." either of
> which could be taken to exclude unnamed subsets.
>
> Sorry, Dave, I not only passed logic, I got a 4.0 in it!
>
> And as usual you were wrong in more than one way. I don't feel
> like a fool, either. But you should, if you have been making so-called
> logical statements that are clearly so poorly constructed.

No logical mind could read the statement I made and come to the
conclusion to which you've arrived. Only a fool or a dishonest person
would make such an accusation. Which are you?
> >> >You're babbling again.

> >>
> >> Really?
> >>
> >> Where?
> >
> >Right here--same place as usual.
>
> But, Dave.
>
> I'm not there--I'm here. YOU'RE there. If babbling is
> occurring there (you DO state it is occurring "Right here...") it must
> be your own, as usual.

Nope. I'm over there. And I couldn't be here by the time you read this
unless the laws of physics are repealed.

> >> Besides, keeping that sign from you would be cruel. What sign
> >> could _possibly_ fit you better (well, maybe W8ASS, but you don't like
> >> expressive call signs).
> >
> >You must have missed it. I've indicated no desire to change my call.
>
> Perhaps you should. By now, people are bound to be starting to
> recognize your current one--and it would be a shame to have a large
> investment in radio equipment if no one will communicate with you.

I'll let this third time be the final. I h a v e e x p r e s s e d
n o i n t e r e s t i n c h a n g i n g m y c a l l. As
far as the rest of your drivel, I don't recall ever hearing you or
working you on the air. To be certain, I checked my logs. My K8MN log
contains about 35,000 QSOs. My J52US log runs to about 75,000. There
are more than 60,000 QSOs in my 9L1US log. My A22MN log contains
roughly 55,000 QSOs. My OH0 and OH2 logs run to about 15,000 QSOs.
You aren't in any of 'em on any band using any mode. By the way, when
do suppose all this shunning of me is going to take place?

> >> "... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
> >> will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
> >
> >I'm pondering this one.
>
> I was hoping you would. Perhaps it will help.

It is a pretty poignant bit of fluff coming from a guy who comes off
pretty much as a smart mouth.

Dave K8MN

5942. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 07:31:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2ACE4E.5D4A3308@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28938

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 22:16:01 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >What is your particular reason for being here? You seem to enjoy it.
>
> I do.
>
> This is recreation from more serious intellectual exercises
> such as teaching and writing. Here I can kid with friends, annoy the
> narrow minded, and enrage the intolerant.
>
> In my classes, I have to demonstrate respect for the views of
> my students, even if some of them are diametrically opposed to my own
> (the only areas I can legitimately oppose in a class room are those
> which contradict science and those which represent racism or sexism,
> both of which are prohibited by the school honor code), and even then
> I have to do so in a way that won't offend the student, since I'm in a
> power position with respect to them.
>
> Here, on the other hand, I have no such restraints--I'm
> perfectly free to call an idiot an idiot and a bigot a bigot without
> abusing my position. I have no authority here at all, which means I
> don't have to worry about power differentials (unless you include
> intellectual ones--it's amazing how few bigots and moralists are even
> the intellectual equals of the average public High School student) and
> can respond however I wish with no concern for the effect of my words
> on the person I'm communicating with. And since I take what people say
> to (or about) me here about as seriously as I take Dan Quayle's
> assurances that there was intelligent life on Mars or President
> Wimpus' assurances that he believes in freedom, responses like yours
> are at best amusing and at worst frustrating to read since they so
> often are written in a self-righteous, confused, manner rather than
> precisely and clearly--and even that isn't a major problem, I have
> first year students who write almost as poorly so I'm used to it.

It'd seem that you have a rough time getting a hat on that noggin of
yours. Your ego knows no bounds. If you have trouble understanding my
stuff, I'll be happy to write in such a manner that even y o u c a n
u n d e r s t a n d i t.

> Now that I've answered your question, why are YOU here (Simple
> masochism? A sincere need to be viewed as a prig? Not allowed to post
> in adult news groups? Lost your access to www.hate.com?)?

Probably because I don't want to see amateur radio sink any deeper into bedlam and chaos than it already has. Kim's call is only one issue which interests me.

> >> Depending on the Rorschach blot you saw it in, you could be
> >> revealing quite a bit about your inner feelings there, Dave. Are you
> >> sure you mean that?
> >
> >Just on a few, Rick. On some, I see pancakes drizzled with maple syrup
> >and melted butter. On others I can see rain puddling on the floor below
> >an old yellow rain slicker. Then there is the one with Oprah.
>
> If you're serious about that (which I doubt--you usually don't
> mean what you say) you really need to talk to a therapist. NOT seeing
> sexual images in a Rorschach test is as diagnostic as an over-emphasis
> on them--perhaps even more so as it indicates a serious repression of
> sexual desire. Of course, you may just be a homosexual in denial but
> you could also have far more serious sexual problems that could lead
> to major identity and relationship problems in the future (serious
> enough ones that even your Viagra won't help you conquer any more).

Really, you thought I was kidding? Are you serious about the homosexuality? Maybe you and I could do some winter camping and discuss the issue. Maybe you could spin some of your Vietnam tales for me and go over your spiffy theories about sexual repression. Do you use Viagra? Were you under the impression that most men over 50 need it?

> It DOES explain why you are so offended by Kim's call
> however--you've fixated on the "TIT" part and are sickened by the
> thought of sex that your fixation engenders in you.

I have to admit, your supply of absurd statements is seemingly endless. Kim's call is in poor taste. I'm "fixated" on that. On second thought, the camping trip is off! You'll have to find another guy to play "Let's analyze the ink blots".

> >> Rick<--who DOESN'T see buffalo hides on card 07a
> >
> >That's Oprah.
>
> Amazing.
>
> There IS no card 07a--the "a" was a typo.

Too bad, I still see Oprah.

Rick, I know even less about Rorshach tests than you do about ACP-127 format, Niact cables, playing the guitar, maintaining a classified local area network or about any number of ham radio operating activities. I do know a great line of self-important manure when I read it. You da man!

Dave K8MN

5943. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 07:37:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2ACFAA.BB5CA091@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28939

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 22:03:44 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Repeaters? We don't need no steenking repeaters! Actually, the best
> >way for Kim to handle it would have been not to begin braying about her
> >*nudge wink* reasons for obtaining her call and to clam up about it.
> >Kim doesn't clam up for anyone or anything.
>
> Maybe that's the entire problem, Dave.
>
> You, Dick, and Larry all feel that a woman should behave
> differently than a man in public (and probably in private as well) and
> that she has an obligation to appear demure, innocent, and moral. When
> a woman demonstrates that she is as much a whole person as a man is
> and isn't willing to defer to your "superior" male values, you go ape
> and can't allow her decisions to go unchallenged.
>
> It isn't a question of Kim's call sign bothering you--it's
> just that you don't think she knows her place!
>
No, Rick. Those are ideas and words which you came up with. They don't
express my thoughts at all. Thusly, *poof* they are dismissed. I
identified a trait in Kim. I stated my belief that she is a contributor
to the continuation of the thread. Even you are a contributor to the
continuation of the thread. You'd like to argue the issue. She wants
to argue the issue.

Dave K8MN

5944. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 07:38:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2ACFF6.446731CD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28940

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> news:A17D53CE133D6D39.5F6E437A9BAFA70A.F74698D962F766B7@lp.airnews.net...
> >
> > It isn't a question of Kim's call sign bothering you--it's
> > just that you don't think she knows her place!
> >

>
> *Now* the crosshairs are on the target. That's what I think about their
> protests to my callsign. It is more that they "just don't like me" and
> couldn't, originally, come up with something that honest. ;)

Kim, in my book you are a real man.

Dave K8MN

5945. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 07:46:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AD1CC.53A6385D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28941

Rick Adams wrote:
>
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 21:50:07 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Kim, about the only thing nastier than ME walking nude on a beach would
> >be the thought of YOU walking nude on a beach. We're both past our
> >expiration date. There would likely be folks willing to pay us just to
> >avoid seeing us nude on a beach. Keep talking about it and I'm sure
> >someone will take up a collection beginning right about now.
>
> Actually, Dave, quite a number of the people at nude beaches
> and nudist/naturist resorts are between 45 and 65 with a good number
> much older than that. Unlike "textile" beaches, people at nude beaches
> don't go to "ogle" the bodies of others--only to enjoy the beach.

Then I'd rather go to a beach where I'm unable to avoid seeing all of
that flesh. It would dramatically increase my enjoyment of the beach.

> Sorry that you judge people on their physical appearance--most
> adults have matured past that point--or at least the ones who go to
> nude recreational sites have done so.

Don't be sorry, Rick. All normal folks make some judgements about
others based upon appearance. Most adults who claim otherwise could
benefit from seeing a good therapist.

> BTW, the amateur "Nude Net" meets on HF on Saturdays as I
> recall. You might want to tune it in sometime and note the age of some
> of the participants.

Yeah, I'm certain I'd have a rollicking good time.

> >> or nothing but "nasty"
> >> in a woman who nurses her child in public, or nothing but "nasty" at
> >> the idea of a man and woman making love together.
>
> >Oh, horse hockey, Kim. I don't believe that any of us any problem with
> >an idea of people making love. I don't won't it broadcast via ATV and
> >don't think we need an audio book version on 20m.
>
> Given the lack of knowledge of human sexuality among American
> youths, I wish they WOULD provide them an audio book version--it might
> prevent a lot of unwanted pregnancies and STD infections.

Great idea, Rick. Let's have it replace the K1MAN broadcasts or perhaps
you could talk Glenn into carrying it.

> >Sure, Kim. That's why you chose your call over W5FAT, K5LID or N5DOH.
> >It wasn't for the shock value, it was purely for the "fun".
>
> Kim (correctly, btw) doesn't see herself as "Fat," a "LID," or
> representative of the kind of person for whom "DOH" is appropriate.
> She sees herself as a woman and chose a different defining
> characteristic to use in her sign. Too bad that you find a "TIT" any
> more inappropriate than a "LEG" or an "ARM." That isn't her
> fault--it's yours!

C'mon, Rick. It's all for FUN according to Kim. Let's have some FUN!

> >How do you know? Do you e-mail all of them or just ask them at the
> >beginning or end of each QSO?
>
> How many have YOU surveyed to determine that they find Kim's
> call offensive or inappropriate? From what I've seen here, there are
> more hams supporting her decision than opposing it.

I don't believe you.

> >Right. You're all about butterflies and sunrises. That's not why you
> >chose your call according to your own admission.
>
> She feels positive about butterflies and sunrises. She also
> feels positive about her tits. W5BUTTERFLY and W5SUNRISE aren't valid
> call signs. W5TIT is.

W5TIT is a tacky callsign.

> You really SHOULD consider applying for K8DUM!

See my earlier post.

Dave K8MN

5946. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 07:48:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2AD24F.651C30D4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28942

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C2A4C29.7B58B263@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >On some, I see pancakes drizzled with maple syrup
> >and melted butter.
>
> yummmm.....
>
> >On others I can see rain puddling on the floor below
> >an old yellow rain slicker.
>
> rainy day in spring.....ahhhhhhhhh
>
> > Then there is the one with Oprah.
>
> AHHHHHHH!!!! MY EYES!!!!!!!
>
> 73 de (whew! that was close) Jim, N2EY

Be very, very careful what you say, Jim. You could need therapy.

Dave K8MN

5947. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 08:50:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <phBW7.242731$3d2.11838369@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 28943

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2AABED.497C6FC2@townsqr.com...
>
>
> What a bunch of loons. Society decides what is considered vulgar and
> what is most every other category. Delude yourselves as you wish.
>
> If you want to go around fourishing your tits in private no on will
care
> a damn. Do it publically, as in choosing, using and displaying it on
your
> han radio callsign and you may as well expect to get a very negative
> reaction from the majority. You have no choice but to live with it.
>

Dick, the very concept of actions having consequences has never dawned on Kim, is considered debatable by Rick, will be firmly driven into the ground by Dave, and semantically parsed by Cecil. A juvenile act will be defended by juveniles in a juvenile manner; you have no choice but to live with it -- or become a juvenile.

Dick, Bug Killer

5948. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 12:49:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011227074914.11823.00001933@mb-fx.aol.com>
Source record: 28945

From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> You know, it does appear that you are not capable of offering much of
>meaning
>> past "I know but I am not going to tell" and "he only says that because he
>> works at ARRL HQ." Didn't we have this same non-conversation a few months
>ago?

> You really should learn to drop the selective reading and try to get at
>what's there.

>I said "I knew all along you (Bert) could and would do it" and that was
>because of what Mark said- it's all in the attitude one brings to the project.

>Guess you missed all you didn't want to see.

I read that, Dick. I was responding to what you had said just prior to the post I responded to, not several posts ago. I am pretty good about quoting what post I am responding to, but if you get confused again, I will be glad to set you straight.

To help you keep track of what is going on, just prior to the post I responded to, you had said something to the effect that every PCTA would know why Larry was cruel to some who pass the code test and offered praise to others. That is what I summarized as "I know, but I am not going to tell." You then followed up by something that said that I was stupid because I worked for ARRL HQ, or words to that effect.

Have it all straight in your mind now, Dick? I will be glad to help explain the threads any time you lose them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

> Henry Ford gets credit for saying "Think you can, think you can't, either
>way
>you're right". When a young fellow shows up expressing the attitude that he
>WILL do
>whatever it takes, that seemingly difficult tasks are just another job to be
>done,
>one that WILL be done, then I for one take notice. No PC necessary.
> I remember being that way in 1956.
>
>
>
>
>

>
>

5949. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 13:40:58 UTC
From: Ed Cregger <nm2k@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <u2m8vs8ka1b06e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 28946
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

They can have it. Ten meters was trashed years ago.

Ed Cregger
nm2k@adoublerl.net

"ROCK" <rock1@antisocial.com> wrote in message
news:xxyW7.12069$uM.141230@rwcrnsc54...
> Okay lets all just take it 1 Jan 2002 19:00hrs (est)
everybody just meet on
> 28.500 and we will all have one big key down LoL, just
take it over and
> everybody will be happy.
>
>

5950. Re: Roger DOES have a social life!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 13:43:21 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0fche$q4t$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 28957
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Big Al" <Big_Al@38945BossHog.com> wrote in message
news:a0f5ab$4u7$0@pita.alt.net...
> Things are not going well for [Cocaine-induced babble]

Oraasssss, you been pimping those retarded daughters of yours?

5951. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 13:47:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b25fd_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28947

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2AC0D6.F4D8BF9D@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2A4617.1B81193A@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > > > Dave, Larry, Dick C., and people like them would probably see
nothing
> > but
> > > > > "nasty" in a person walking on a beach in the nude,
> > >
> > > Kim, about the only thing nastier than ME walking nude on a beach
would
> > > be the thought of YOU walking nude on a beach. We're both past our
> > > expiration date. There would likely be folks willing to pay us just
to
> > > avoid seeing us nude on a beach. Keep talking about it and I'm sure
> > > someone will take up a collection beginning right about now.
> > >
> >
> > Well at least you show some humor, above. But, I don't think anyone who
is
> > the kind of human being I'd admire would be running from either of us.
>
> No, not the kind of person you'd admire--just the kind with plain old
> common sense.
>

You mean you feel it is common sense to truly judge someone by the way they
look? And, you mean your wife or a woman near your age is no longer
attractive to you? Goodness...my darlin' reminds me all the time of how
beautiful I look to him--even as we grow older together.

> > > >
> > > > or nothing but "nasty"
> > > > in a woman who nurses her child in public, or nothing but "nasty" at
> > > > the idea of a man and woman making love together.
> > >
> > > Oh, horse hockey, Kim. I don't believe that any of us any problem
with
> > > an idea of people making love. I don't won't it broadcast via ATV and
> > > don't think we need an audio book version on 20m.
> > >
```

> >
> > So, don't broadcast it. We have movies for the satisfaction of
voyeurism.
>
> I don't broadcast it. You, if you'll remember, brought up that the
> "idea" of two people making love would seem nasty to several of us.
> I pointed out that the idea isn't nasty to me.
>

Yes, yes I did. And you are the one who made some comment about how you
don't intend or like to broadcast it. I pointed out that you then
shouldn't.

> > > >
> > > > They miss opportunities to
> > > > see beauty when it is all around them. My callsign is intended for
>
> > fun--and
> > > > that does not have to include nasty. Nasty is in their minds, not >
> > mine.
> > >
> > > Sure, Kim. That's why you chose your call over W5FAT, K5LID or N5DOH.
> > > It wasn't for the shock value, it was purely for the "fun".
> > >
> >
> > I like the N5DOH.
> >
> > > > >
> > > > And, it is also not in the minds of many, many people I have talked
to
> > on
> > > > the air.
> > >
> > > How do you know? Do you e-mail all of them or just ask them at the
> > > beginning or end of each QSO?
> > >
> >
> > Their non-asking is enough for me. Do you spend a lot of time emailing,
> > Dave, to see if people thought you were offensive on the air? Can't you
> > just take it for granted that if they don't say you were offensive, you
> > probably weren't?
>
> I'm not the one with the suggestive call, Kim.
>

And, the callsign certainly isn't "suggestive" at all, Dave. *You* like to
think it is. I don't think it is.

> > > >
> > > > To believe that my callsign is vulgar, does not belong in the ARS,
and

> > > > should not have been requested by me and/or issued by the FCC is to
> > focus on
> > > > "nasty" or "vulgar" ideas of what my callsign is. I choose to
ignore
> > the
> > > > "nasty" or "vulgar" minded, because my callsign isn't.
> > >
> > >
> > > Right. You're all about butterflies and sunrises. That's not why you
> > > chose your call according to your own admission.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > You mean butterflies and sunrises can't be fun? Gosh.
>
> Sure they can. That's not the kind of fun you sought when choosing your
> call though.
>
> Dave K8MN

How do you know? Now you read my mind?

Kim W5TIT

5952. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 13:48:43 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b2632$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28948

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2AC193.4B63C856@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2A4948.B0257262@earthlink.net...
> > > James R. DeLoach wrote:
> > >
> > > > Kim, there is nothing wrong with your callsign. I can't believe
these
> > > > dirty old men are making such a fuss over it. Enjoy your callsign.
> > > > There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
> > > > have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you
chose.
> > >
> > > But she didn't choose one of 'em. Oh--you must've meant THAT kind of
> > > call!
> > >
> > > > I think it's great if you like it and that's all that really
matters.
> > > > Only in America are we FREE to choose what we like or dislike about
> > > > things, people, etc. etc.
> > > > As I saw in another message that someone posted, your callsign is
> > > > made up of letters, not words. In your case it just happens to
spell
> > > > a slang word for a part of the human body (breast), that both men
and
> > > > women have. The attitude of these people is part of what is wrong
> > > > with this country now days. The best way to handle these people
> > > > is to just ignore them like we do the "dead keyers" on the
repeaters.
> > > > When they realize that they are not antagonizing anyone, they will
> > > > go away and find something else to complain about.
> > >
> > > Repeaters? We don't need no steenking repeaters! Actually, the best
> > > way for Kim to handle it would have been not to begin braying about
her
> > > *nudge wink* reasons for obtaining her call and to clam up about it.
> > > Kim doesn't clam up for anyone or anything.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Check the timelines, Dave. I am not the one who brings my callsign up
in

> > conversations on this newsgroup. It is usually brought up when one of
you
> > gets stung over something I say--Larry being the most common responder
of
> > same.
> >
> > I also don't argue my callsign--if you'll read between the lines...and
you
> > don't and haven't so far. I argue that the reactions to my callsign are
> > less than admirable.
>
>
> Less than admirable in this case means you aren't having the "fun" you
> thought you'd have with it. You can say you argue reactions if it helps
> you to rationalize your responses. In either case, you simply fan the
> flames.
>
> Dave K8MN

And, I suppose now you'd tell me that you don't?

Kim W5TIT

5953. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 13:49:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b265b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28949

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2AC2BF.7632A0ED@earthlink.net...
> James R. DeLoach wrote:
> >
> > On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 16:52:49 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >> There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
> > >> have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose.
> > >>
> > >
> > >Yeah. How 'bout _5BAL, _5WOM, _5BAB, _5SEX, _5CNT (that idea was
actually
> > >given to me by this little old lady ham that giggled all night at a
> > >Christmas party when she thought of it. I told her to go for it and
she
> > >said she probably would if her husband wouldn't yell...LOL), and so on.
> > >
> > The callsigns that I was thinking of were _?SEX. Looks like most of
> > the W_SEX callsigns have been taken. I noticed that in the ARRL
> > Repeater directory that there are some repeaters in the mid-west and
> > on the east coast that have _?SEX callsigns.
> >
> > I bet Dave thinks these callsigns are dirty as well.
>
> Do your homework before engaging the keyboard, James. I've never stated
> that Kim's call is "dirty". It is tacky. It is tasteless. It
> demonstrates a lack of good judgement.
>
> Dave K8MN

Yep. And Dave has none of the above.

Kim W5TIT

5954. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 13:52:37 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b2721_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28950

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2AC933.265EB9B3@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > >You must have missed it. I've indicated no desire to change my call.
> >
> > Perhaps you should. By now, people are bound to be starting to
> > recognize your current one--and it would be a shame to have a large
> > investment in radio equipment if no one will communicate with you.
>
> I'll let this third time be the final. I h a v e e x p r e s s e d
> n o i n t e r e s t i n c h a n g i n g m y c a l l. As
> far as the rest of your drivel, I don't recall ever hearing you or
> working you on the air. To be certain, I checked my logs. My K8MN log
> contains about 35,000 QSOs. My J52US log runs to about 75,000. There
> are more than 60,000 QSOs in my 9L1US log. My A22MN log contains
> roughly 55,000 QSOs. My OH0 and OH2 logs run to about 15,000 QSOs.
> You aren't in any of 'em on any band using any mode. By the way, when
> do suppose all this shunning of me is going to take place?
>

And you know what that means to a DXer. ;)

Kim W5TIT

5955. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 13:57:00 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b2823_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28951

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2ACFAA.BB5CA091@earthlink.net...
>
> Rick Adams wrote:
> > It isn't a question of Kim's call sign bothering you--it's
> > just that you don't think she knows her place!
> >
> No, Rick. Those are ideas and words which you came up with. They don't
> express my thoughts at all. Thusly, *poof* they are dismissed. I
> identified a trait in Kim. I stated my belief that she is a contributor
> to the continuation of the thread. Even you are a contributor to the
> continuation of the thread. You'd like to argue the issue. She wants
> to argue the issue.
>
> Dave K8MN

I do? I'll let you know right now, that I don't want to argue that at all.
I am pretty sure I can get this thread to last until around March. I've
said that. It's pretty much the only thread I'm really paying any attention
to. I don't know what I am supposed to be arguing...but it sounds to me
like you are trying to be a visionary again.

Kim W5TIT

5956. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 13:57:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b2858_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28952

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2ACFF6.446731CD@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> >
news:A17D53CE133D6D39.5F6E437A9BAFA70A.F74698D962F766B7@lp.airnews.net...
> > >
> > > It isn't a question of Kim's call sign bothering you--it's
> > > just that you don't think she knows her place!
> > >
> >
> > > *Now* the crosshairs are on the target. That's what I think about their
> > > protests to my callsign. It is more that they "just don't like me" and
> > > couldn't, originally, come up with something that honest. ;)
> >
> > Kim, in my book you are a real man.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

Thanks!

Kim W5TIT

5957. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 14:00:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b28fb$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28953

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2AD1CC.53A6385D@earthlink.net...
>
> W5TIT is a tacky callsign.
>

It must not be as tacky as f_ _ _. You typed my callsign all the way. I think that is probably a Freudian slip that you actually don't see as much in my callsign as you think you do. :o

Kim W5TIT

5958. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 14:05:51 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b2a36_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28954

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2AABED.497C6FC2@townsqr.com...
>
> What a bunch of loons. Society decides what is considered vulgar and
> what is most every other category. Delude yourselves as you wish.
>

Are *you* the only member of society, Dick? Let me suggest to you that you take a look around you at some of the most popular music, comedic acts, movies, books, discussions on the internet, etc., today. You'll find, I think, that your idea of society is quite different from what is really out there.

>
> If you want to go around fourishing your tits in private no on will care
> a damn.
>

Gotta hand it to you, you definitely are imaginative.

>
> Do it publically, as in choosing, using and displaying it on your
> han radio callsign and you may as well expect to get a very negative
> reaction from the majority. You have no choice but to live with it.
>

I didn't expect a negative reaction from the majority, and I haven't gotten a negative reaction from the majority. I'll clue you in...most people, even hams, are far above even getting involved with something this petty, Dick. I wonder if you were directing your "you have no choice but to live with it" comment to me. If so, I am living with it, nicely thank you.

Kim W5TIT

5959. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 14:10:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b2b64_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28955

"Krell" <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a0ea4f022p3@enews2.newsguy.com...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C29F36A.2B0A7A03@IEEE.org...
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > > There is
> > > no basic conflict in welcoming those who pass the rules currently in
> > > effect while not having a lot of use for the rules currently in
effect;
> >
> > Unfortunately, Larry is not that way. He has bitched loud and long
> > about post-restructuring extras not deserving their privileges.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM, W5DXP
>
> I'm surprised that he didn't reply that the new licensee should raise his
> code speed to 40 WPM so that he could be considered a real ham despite the
> new regs.
>
>

He can't. He can't do that fast...LOL

Kim W5TIT

5960. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 14:18:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112270618.1febab84@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28956

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message news:<3c2a9897_2@news7.fast.net>...

(N2EY wrote):
> > > > What is the difference between an FCC rule that says Morse skill
> is
> required to
> > > > > use a particular part of the radio spectrum and a Park Service
> rule
> that says
> > > > > motor vehicles cannot be used in certain parks and wilderness
> areas?
> > > >
> > > > The sort of Park Service rules that you refer to are intended to
> > > > protect and preserve the environment.
> > >
> > Which means the govt. does have an interest in protecting the
> historic
> > > and traditional nature of some things, even if they are public
> > > property.
> >
> That's not the point at all ...

Yes, it is.

> the prohibition on motor vehicles
> is to protect the environment ...

Part of "protect the environment" is to preserve the character of the
place. Ever been to Colonial Williamsburg? No motor vehicles are
allowed because they would detract from the character of the place.
The same is true in many parks and wilderness areas.

> that doesn't correlate to
> the spectrum, which is more resiliant, in the sense that when
> lids stop acting up, there is no permanent, residual damage
> to the spectrum.

Actually, it does correlate. When "lids act up" they leave a negative
impression on at least some of those listening. While the EM spectrum
may not be "damaged", the image of the service to whom that spectrum
is allocated sure can be.

I've seen this effect in real life. Coupla new hams with bad addytoods
and habits showed up on a local repeater, carried on in all sorts of
inappropriate ways. Control ops shut down the repeater whenever they
would act up, and eventually they were sent letters by certified mail

telling them they were not welcome - which only made things worse.
Only after they discovered that the repeater would shut down whenever
they tried to use it did they go elsewhere.

Trouble is, all of this was being monitored by some scanner
enthusiasts in the area. They were turned off to ham radio by the
whole mess. I recall in particular one family that were all very
interested in getting licenses until those guys showed up. We lost at
least a half dozen potential hams in that one family alone.

Guess what license class the hams with bad addytoods had.
>
> > The end result is a "setaside" for "legacy modes of transportation"
> > like walking and horseback riding.
>
> That is an incidental side effect of prohibiting uses which
> could cause long-term damage to the environment.

AND an attempt to contorl the character of the place.
>
> > > The FCC (and other
> > > rational entities) have recognized the fact that Morse proficiency
> > > doesn't "preserve the environment" (it doesn't, as some claim,
> > > serve as a "lid filter" ... see various FCC Report and Order
> > > documents for such findings.)
> >
> > You're missing the point, Carl. The issue was about traditions and
> > their preservation as a matter of law.
>
> And preserving traditions is NOT a legitimate purpose of
> regulation.

Yes, it is. That's one of the reasons we have a park system and
historical place designations.
>
> > No test can serve perfectly as a "lid filter". That doesn't mean the
> > tests have no effect on behavior.
>
> The FCC has explicitly determined and stated that Morse
> proficency (as demonstrated through testing requirements)
> demonstrates NOTHING about how an applicant will behave.

So? that simply means the FCC doesn't accept the "lid filter" argument
for code testing. Did they publish a report on how they made their
determination? I don't think so.

Besides, the test is a dead issue. FCC and other agencies want it
gone, and it's all but gone now.

The important point is that the NALs are practically all issued to
hams using 'phone modes.
>

> > The FCC decided long ago (1975) to push for code test elimination.
> > They have gradually but steadily eroded code testing over time, and
> > are merely keeping 5 wpm because of S25.5. Doesn't mean the FCC is
> > "right" or "rational", just that they decided on a course of action
> > and are pursuing it.
>
> I've had detailed conversations with numerous FCC officials.

That's nice.

> I find them quite rational about the purpose of their rules.

Because they agree with you.

> (and some of them are long-term 20 wpm extras who operate
> CW almost exclusively ... but they still recognize that Morse
> testing has no place in FCC rules ...)

Just their opinions.
>
> > FCC also decided that the written tests were to be reduced in size
> and
> > number, too.
>
> Give me a break ... the number of questions and the breadth of
> material has increased over the years ...

The breadth of material has increased but the depth has decreased. The number of questions has decreased and the nature of the test has changed.

Here's proof:

Written test requirements before April 15, 2000:

Novice: 1 test, 30 questions
Tech/Tech Plus: 2 tests, 30/35 questions (65 total)
General: 3 tests, 30/35/35 questions (100 total)
Advanced: 4 tests, 30/35/35/50 questions (150 total)
Extra: 5 tests, 30/35/35/50/40 questions (190 total)

Written test requirements after April 15, 2000:

Tech: 1 test, 35 questions
General: 2 tests, 35/35 questions (70 total)
Extra: 3 tests, 35/35/50 questions (120 total)

I did this from memory so the number of questions may not be perfect, but the trend is very clear. Fewer tests and fewer questions across the board.

Back when I took the exams (1967-1970) the Novice was about 20 questions, and all of the other classes about 50 questions each. About 170 total questions. The exact number of questions on the test was not

known in advance back then, nor were the exact Q&A.

The number of questions HAS NOT increased - the trend is exactly the other way.

> ask Ed about how he
> passed his General many years ago after studying a FOUR PAGE
> ARRL study guide ... now they have to send you a book of about
> 200 pages to cover it all ...

You are mistaken again, Carl.

The "four page study guide" story refers to the Novice exam, not the General. It refers to the pages of the License Manual devoted to the Novice license, as if that were all a prospective ham had to study. The "200 page book" refers to the Tech Q&A book of the pre-2000-restructuring era.

The trouble with the story is that it's an apples-and-oranges comparison. The old LM "study guides" were simply the FCC sample essay questions reprinted. The exact Q&A were NOT given. The answers were not detailed explanations of theory or rules, either. The rest of the LM was instructions on exam procedure and a complete reprint of the regs, which had to be studied in addition to the guide.

The "200 page book" is a complete manual, listing all of the exact Q&A, with explanations. And lots of other stuff.

On top of this, the 1963 Novice was a very limited license that was good for one year and then gone forever. 75 watts of xtal-controlled CW on tiny slices of 80, 40 and 15, plus the same power/xtal on 145-147 CW and AM. The Tech is a completely different animal. ALL amateur privileges above 30 MHz for just a 35 question multiple choice written - and the EXACT Q&A pool is easily available as a book or a free download.
>
> This entire assertion that the written tests have been "dumbed
> down" is JUST PLAIN INACCURATE.

Do the math, Carl. Is 190 questions in 5 tests more than 120 questions in 3 tests? Has the testing for any of the license classes been increased? Have the nature of the questions or the method of testing changed? A big "NO" on all counts.
>
> > The process has been going on for a long time and there's
> > no end in sight. Does that make those of us who support better
> written
> > testing irrational? Nope.
>
> I'll agree with you that the written tests could be improved.
> I've found a number of question/answer sets that could be
> better written (or outright corrected) ... I intend to spend some
> time reviewing the new pools as they are released and

> sending suggested improvements and corrections to the QPC.

Three questions on the new Extra pool have already been tossed because of mistakes - even though they'd been reviewed by the QPC and APPROVED by the FCC.

> > > > Experience has shown what happens without such commitment.
> > >
> > > And that is WHAT?
> >
> > A service that is a complete mess.
>
> Excuse me, but that's a pile

cb is not a mess? Why do you ASSUME I'm talking about the ARS?

>... many of the worst offenders
> are 20 wpm long-term extras, or crotchety old generals

Name some. Look at the enforcement letters and tell us what the offenses are and who are doing them.

They are spread out over license class, but they concentrate on two things: the offenders tend to be of a certain age and they mostly use 'phone modes.

> who
> think "real radios glow in the dark" and couldn't pass a test
> on modern technology if their lives depended on it ...

HOW do you know any of that?
>
> Bad behavior has been the result of two factors:
> 1) lack of enforcement (until Riley, at least, thank God
> for Riley ...)

Riley is the direct result of constant requests for more enforcement by the ARRL and "old fashioned" hams who saw the service going downhill.

> 2) too

[expletive deleted]

> many hams think they're God's gift to
> the spectrum because they've been licensed
> a long time and can beep real fast and have as their
> major goal to put down (and try to keep/drive out) newbies
> "who shouldn't be crowding 'their' bands" ... those are
> the types of lids who jam, use bad language on the air,
> make rude, insulting comments to "lesser hams," etc.

Where in the world do you get that stuff? Look at the enforcement letters and tell us where any of that comes from. You're saying that

new hams and those who have not passed "real fast" code tests don't do
any of these things.
>
> > What I was referring to was what happened to the cb radio service,
> > which has never required any sort of "commitment" other than getting
> a
> > radio set and putting it on the air.
>
> If you were to study the history, CB was pretty well-behaved
> until the "Smokey and the Bandit" and "Convoy" era

I know the history. 27 MHz CB started in 1958, and was pretty
civilized until the mid-60s. I knew plenty of cbers in the mid-60s,
and listen to them sometimes. It was a mess then, and has only gotten
worse.

>... then
> things got out of hand and the FCC threw up its hands and
> made it a completely unlicensed service because they couldn't
> enforce against tens of millions of people who chose not to
> behave ...

The important question is WHY they chose not to behave. They were not
committed to an orderly service or following the rules.
>
> But "committment" (of work to jump through stupid hoops)
> has never been a factor in promoting good behavior on
> the ham bands ...

The commitment and responsibility of hams to an orderly service and
following the rules is THE major factor in keeping the ARS from being
just like cb. How that commitment and sense of responsibility comes
about is a major concern in preserving and improving the ARS.
>
> > Which still begs the questions: what do YOU consider "legitimate
> > standards"? If/when the code test completely disappears, what should
> > the US amateur radio license structure and requirements look like?
>
> With some improvements in the written tests (more in terms
> of modernization, editorial/technical correctness, etc., NOT
> in terms of "making them harder to pass"), I'm pretty happy
> with the standards we have today.

So the written test reductions of April 2000 are OK with you.
>
> The one exception would be that I don't think that the "tech"
> written exam is technically adequate to convey 1.5 kW power
> privileges with unlimited antenna gain at frequencies that
> cook meat ...

But the FCC sure does! In fact, they recently CUT the testing
requirements for the Tech license almost in HALF. You say they are

quite rational in the reasons for their rules, so they must rationally think that the current single 35 question multiple choice written test from a published pool is perfectly adequate to license someone for full 1.5 kW output power on all amateur frequencies and modes above 30 MHz. Even though a person could get all of the questions on RF safety wrong and still pass. Who are you and I to question them on this?

On the other hand, operating a 1.5 kW transmitter on amateur frequencies below 30 MHz requires additional written testing. And full privileges requires still more written testing.

Why is it OK with you to make hams "jump through stupid hoops" of additional written tests to get HF/MF privileges that match their VHF/UHF privileges? You say you are "pretty happy with the standards we have today", which means the current system, sans code test and with some tweaking of the Tech, is OK with you.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5961. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 14:53:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0fct1$h05$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28958

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0112260535.4c902b85@posting.google.com...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<3C25D150.69216283@townsqr.com>...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > On Sat, 15 Dec 2001 17:45:34 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > wrote:
> > > >A professional engineer should have aced the Extra test.
> > >
> > > Why? 1/4 or more of the questions involve totally
> > > non-technical subjects (VE credentials, amateur space
> > > operations rules, etc.)
> >
> > I aced the Extra test over 30 years ago, long before VE credential etc
> > questions, and I'm, not a degreed engineer. All that means what?
> >
> Precisely nothing as you well know.
> >
> If the life of ham radio depended on EEs our game woulda been long
> gone. If the life of ham radio depended on the the even more scarce
> EEs who are also PEs the game woulda been over even quicker. There is
> no correlation whatsoever among flavors of degrees and/or a lack
> thereof and/or the FCC passing out radio operator licenses and/or
> passing scores on the writtens and/or the individual's contributions
> to anything in ham radio.
> >
> >
> Unless of course there is some perceived merit in gloming an Extra
> just for the bragging rights instead of actually putting it on the air
> in the Extra setasides.

Brian,
I passed the Extra so I have the "option" of operating anywhere
in the ham bands/modes authorized for a USA ham. I almost
never operate in Extra subbands....BUT I always have the
option if I want to. Additionally, Extra allows me to be a
VE for any level testing.

> If bragging rights is the name of the game then what the hell, thee me
> and gazillions of others around here did the 20wpm thing at our
> neigborhood FCC offices which the lightweights around here will never
> do.

If it makes you feel good, feel free to brag all you want.

Cheers and Happy Holidays
Bill K2UNK

5962. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 15:16:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0fe7k$fh4$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 28959

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:9f4bfe89.0112260605.2ea72102@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message
news:<3c292f17_2@news7.fast.net>...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20011224100327.27168.00000589@mb-cb.aol.com...
> > > In article <3c247df9_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > > writes:
> > >
> > [snip]
> > >
> > > What is the difference between an FCC rule that says Morse skill is
> > required to
> > > use a particular part of the radio spectrum and a Park Service rule
> > that says
> > > motor vehicles cannot be used in certain parks and wilderness areas?
> >
> > The sort of Park Service rules that you refer to are intended to
> > protect and preserve the environment.
>
> Which means the govt. does have an interest in protecting the historic
> and traditional nature of some things, even if they are public
> property.

Not at all...the protection is not for the "mode" but
rather the avoidance of the PERMANENT damage to
the environment IF motor vehicles were allowed. NO
such damage can happen where other radio modes
coexist with CW.

> The end result is a "setaside" for "legacy modes of transportation"
> like walking and horseback riding.

Again, it isn't for "tradition", but rather
to avoid changing the landscape.

> > The FCC (and other
> > rational entities) have recognized the fact that Morse proficiency
> > doesn't "preserve the environment" (it doesn't, as some claim,
> > serve as a "lid filter" ... see various FCC Report and Order
> > documents for such findings.)
>
> You're missing the point, Carl. The issue was about traditions and

> their preservation as a matter of law.

And the ONLY thing that you are arguing here now IS
tradition.

> No test can serve perfectly as a "lid filter". That doesn't mean the
> tests have no effect on behavior.

The intent of any LID filter can be accomplished with almost
any effort based exam. The intent, however, of FCC amateur
test requirements is not now, nor has it ever been, to serve
as a LID filter or determination of effort/commitment by
the applicant.

> The FCC decided long ago (1975) to push for code test elimination.
> They have gradually but steadily eroded code testing over time, and
> are merely keeping 5 wpm because of S25.5. Doesn't mean the FCC is
> "right" or "rational", just that they decided on a course of action
> and are pursuing it.

However, not ONE rational argument has been raised that
can counter the FCC position. If it did, there'd at least be
some legal basis to claim the FCC was acting "wrong" or
"irrationally."

> FCC also decided that the written tests were to be reduced in size and
> number, too. The process has been going on for a long time and there's
> no end in sight. Does that make those of us who support better written
> testing irrational? Nope.
>
> > > >Another concept to consider is that "discipline" is a bit misused
> > in
> > > > >this application, IMHO. Are you talking about the concept that
> > some
> > > > >have voiced that "It's (jumping through the Morse proficiency hoop)
> > > > >necessary to show 'committment'." ???
> > > >
> > > > Experience has shown what happens without such commitment.
> > >
> > > And that is WHAT?
> >
> A service that is a complete mess.

Yet that is not the case at all. All the
doom and gloom predictions are nothing but
bull.

> > Most of the no-code techs I've met are
> > polite and concientious operators.
> >
> Most of the hams I know, of all license classes, are polite,
> conscientious, skilled and technically-knowledgeable operators.

EXACTLY!

> What I was referring to was what happened to the cb radio service,
> which has never required any sort of "commitment" other than getting a
> radio set and putting it on the air.

And how does that compare to ham radio. Last I checked
we DO have licensing and testing. Indeed, as a comparison,
CB NEVER had testing of ANY sort and only minimal
licensing that was abondoned as useless effort.

> > MANY are far more
> > technically competent than many fast-beepers ...
>
> The reverse is also true. All depends who you hang out with and how
> you define "technical competence". Technical competence is also not a
> "lid filter", btw. Just check the FCC enforcement letters.

True...so what? The point is that morse DOSE NOT equal
technical competency anymore than many other things.

> "Technical competence" is of no consequence unless an amateur actually
> does something with it. I've got BSEE and MSEE degrees - does that
> make me "FAR more valuable" to the ARS' future?

Depends on how you consider use of such competency.
I'd say anyione that serves as a mentor, teacher and/or
lends their competency to others does just that. You don't
have to "invent" or write tech articles for QST to apply your
technical competency to amateur radio.

> > and I view
> > technical competence as FAR more valuable to the future
> > of amateur radio than being able to beep fast.
>
> Your opinion only. That's not a reason to force new modes and
> technologies down the throats of people who are not interested, nor to
> force new hams to jump through technical proficiency hoops to get a
> license.

And neither of those has happened to any degree that the
morse test requirement has done for decades.
All hams are free to use or not use any modes
authorized by the rules.

> All hams are free to develop their technical skills in whatever area
> they so desire, to whatever level they choose. No degree or specific
> class of license required. But in the decade since the dropping of the
> code test for the Technician, no revolution in amateur radio
> technology has occurred because of the code test changes.

Your point?

> > > >Showing"committment" also has no place in regulation.
> > >

> > > I would call it "responsibility".
> >
> > One can operate and behave responsibly with no knowledge
> > of Morse whatsoever ...
>
> No doubt. That's not the point. One cannot operate and behave
> responsibly with no sense of responsibility, or commitment to the ARS.
>
> --
> Which still begs the questions: what do YOU consider "legitimate
> standards"? If/when the code test completely disappears, what should
> the US amateur radio license structure and requirements look like?

The same as it does now (IMHO) except with no code test at all.
I see no reason for any radical chnage due to an end of all
code testing... nor do I expect the FCC to embark on any
such path. The FCC was pretty clear that the 5wpm test is
just a treaty element and is an appendage that can easily be
dropped with no real need to alter any other aspect of the
licensing structure or exams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5963. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 15:22:59 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0fe970aje@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28963

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:phBW7.242731$3d2.11838369@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Dick, the very concept of actions having consequences has never dawned on
> Kim, is considered debatable by Rick, will be firmly driven into the
> ground by Dave, and semantically parsed by Cecil. A juvenile act will be
> defended by juveniles in a juvenile manner; you have no choice but to live
> with it -- or become a juvenile.
>
> Dick, Bug Killer

So who decides what is juvenile?

5964. Re: really dumb SW radio pirate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 15:23:27 UTC
From: Dave Holford <holford@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <3C2B3CEF.C9BEA96@sympatico.ca>
Source record: 28960
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Industry Canada actually has a "squad of agents" in Newfoundland?

Dave

"Kaa B." wrote:
>
> Found in alt.radio.pirate:
>
> A radio pirate in the Barnes Road area of St. John's, Newfoundland,
> Canada has had his equipment confiscated by Industry Canada. The
> pirate, who, they describe as 'not too bright' and dressed in woman's
> clothing was awakened from his sleep by a squad of agents, who
> searched the house and seized thousands of dollars of radio
> transmitting equipment. The pirate was caught when while under the
> influence of alcohol, mistakenly broadcast his address on the air,
> while soliciting free beer from listeners. Charges are pending.
>
> Wonder if he also operated on 14.313 and fancied an "erotic exotic
> relationship" with a certain ham in Vermont? ;)

5965. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 15:32:05 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0feq90bat@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 28967

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011227000313.05154.00000644@mb-fm.aol.com...

> Note that I'm not saying here that any callsign is vulgar.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Here's one that could go with Kim's, although it's missing a "p" - N1PLE,
held by Kevin Culverhouse. We should tell him that his callsign is vulgar.

5966. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 15:44:03 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B41C3.BB8EC1FF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28961

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Dave, you are like the unfortunate soul who sees vulgar pictures
> > in ink blots. It is all in your mind. Try switching from vulgar
> > thoughts to beautiful thoughts and thus make the world a better
> > place instead of the cesspool in which you live.
>
> Wow! You go deeper into lunacy with each post!

I'm not surprised that you have never had a beautiful thought in
your entire life, Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5967. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 15:45:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B4231.C6B6A9F2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28962

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > EXACTLY the point, Dick. You guys need to work on cleaning up
> > your thought processes. Vulgarity is not in the call sign - it
> > is in your and Larry's and Dave's minds. I'm glad you finally
> > get it. Hey Kim, Dick finally gets it!
>
> Oh, I've had it all along. You're a lying, scheming, conniving dipschit who
> wouldn't recognize truth if it jumped up and bit your butt.

Don't you just love it when Dick waxes intellectual.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5968. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 15:48:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B42BE.400CBDD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28964

Rick Adams wrote:
> Sorry, Cecil--he obviously doesn't get it after all.

Oh, he got it all right - but he lost it. Dick wakes up in a new
world every morning, thinking dirty thoughts and looking for
someone to bully.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5969. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 15:54:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B441E.7CA76819@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28965

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >One real problem nobody talks about much is the addytoods of those who
> > come to ham radio with "experience" in other services.
>
> Well, I sure did and you saw what happened. Cecil and his pals the jackels at NCI tried to eat me alive.

Well Dick, your false statements and gross ignorance could not be left unchallenged. Look at the bright side. You learned about Shannon's Theorem.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5970. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 15:55:57 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28966

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> digital modes as well?

Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
learn Morse code?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5971. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 16:05:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B46D6.75888B66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28968

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What a bunch of loons. Society decides what is considered vulgar and
> what is most every other category. Delude yourselves as you wish.

I do not believe that society finds the word "tit" to be obscene,
Dick. In fact, folks around here think "breast" is risque' and
everyone in my family prefers "titty" to "breast". Do you have
any proof of your assertion? Please don't come back with your
"everyone knows" argumentum ad populum.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5972. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 16:11:41 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B483D.D00B4537@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28969

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> I didn't expect a negative reaction from the majority, and I haven't gotten
> a negative reaction from the majority.

Maybe "tit" means something different to Yankees, Kim. When referring
to the human breast, most folks around Madison County, TX say "titty"
which is considered to be "baby talk" and is certainly not obscene.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5973. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 16:13:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B4899.3AF4B355@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28970

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > It doesn't matter unless you are trying to mimic "1984"'s thought
> > police
>
> OM you're running just ahead of the idiot police.

Dick, when are you going to take responsibility for *YOUR*
dirty thoughts that originate in *YOUR* dirty mind?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5974. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 16:15:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B4928.F14375F9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28972

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > CAM wrote:
> > > > I'm using the dictionary definition of "vulgar", Kim, as being of the
> > > > common folk. Vulgar Latin is what the commoners spoke during the
> > > > Roman Empire.
> > >
> > > Naw, you're not. You are using a word origin and not the common, modern
> > > definition of the word.
> >
> > Seems you would crack open a dictionary before embarrassing yourself, Dave.
> > From Webster's: "vulgar - of or relating to the common people"
> > It doesn't say a thing about that definition not being common and modern.
>
> Get back to me when you finally figure out how a dictionary is arranged.
> If you keep this up, you'll look as dim as you did over the difference
> between "church" and "Church".

Dave, I used the word so I get to pick the definition. When are you
going to realize that you are NOT omnipotent and don't have control
over the words I choose to use even though you are deluded enough to
think you do.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5975. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 16:17:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B49A0.2874B1D4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28971

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > In either case, you simply fan the flames.

> And, I suppose now you'd tell me that you don't?

Dave wouldn't do that. He just pours gasoline on it.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5976. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 16:22:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B4AE0.EFF43B89@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28973

Dave Heil wrote:
> Do your homework before engaging the keyboard, James. I've never stated
> that Kim's call is "dirty". It is tacky. It is tasteless. It
> demonstrates a lack of good judgement.

All definitions of "dirty" when used in that context. From Webster's:
"dirty - undesirable or unpleasant, very unfortunate or regrettable"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5977. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 16:27:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B4BE0.F87C6315@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28975

Dave Heil wrote:
> Nobody has an inalienable right to an amateur radio license or a
> callsign--especially a *particular* callsign. Chew that over for a
> spell.

Kim has just as much of a right to her callsign as you do to yours,
Dave. The FCC has endorsed both as legal and proper for identification
on the ham bands. I know that chaps your ass, but that's reality.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5978. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 16:29:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112270829.5e0259df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28974

Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:<D7963D64694DFC99.EAED21104D6F9632.B6F403C4270D682D@lp.airnews.net>...
> On 26 Dec 2001 06:52:18 -0800, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2954AE.34992319@IEEE.org>...
> >
> >> If you were running the FCC, would you issue W5TIT to Kim?
> >
> >Nope. Nor to anyone else. Nor would I issue similar inappropriate callsigns.
> >
> >Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.
>
> In other words, simply because the law would require you to do
> something, you would refuse anyway because it "isn't right" in your
> mind?

I don't understand your question.

The question asks what I would do if I were "running the FCC".
Actually, as I understand the situation no single person "runs the
FCC", so we're dealing with a completely hypothetical situation where
one person (me) DID "run the FCC".

In that case, I would not issue certain calls to amateurs because they
are inappropriate. It would not be against the law because there is no
law that says the FCC MUST issue anyone a particular callsign. In
fact, no law says that the FCC must have a vanity call sign program at
all.

Related story:

Way back in 1977 I traded in WA3IYC for N2EY when I moved to Wayne
County, New York. Back then an Extra could get a 1X2 or 2X1 upon
request - but NO CHOICE as to what call you got. I'd had an Extra for
seven years at that point and since I thought the move to NY was
permanent I got one of the first "N" calls.

Two years later I moved back to 3-land but the regs had changed. FCC
had decided that they were not going to issue any more 1X2 calls but
those who had them could keep them. Instead, they would issue 2X1s to
Extras who asked, but again no choice. The reason they decided to stop
issuing the 1X2s was that it generated a lot of admin work for them.
Although N3EY was available, neither I nor anyone else could have it.
If I gave up N2EY, nobody else would get it. The supply of 1X2 and 2X1
calls in any call district is very limited, and if I got a new 3 land
2X1 I'd be depriving some other ham from having a short callsign. End

result was that I kept N2EY, and by the time the vanity program changed it was such an old friend there was no reason to change it. Somebody else finally got N3EY. More power to him.

> And you wonder why many of us think you aren't playing with a
> full deck!

All I did was answer Cecil's question. I know you meant the above remark for my friend Dave, K8MN, but that changes nothing. I think Dave would answer the question about the same way I did.

Sounds like you think anyone with an electro-politically incorrect opinion "isn't playing with a full deck". Interesting.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5979. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 16:30:44 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B4CB4.6ED714@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28976

N2EY wrote:
> The vanity callsign program is an option offered by the FCC, not a
> right.

As long as they are offered by the FCC, Kim has the same *RIGHT*
to her callsign as you do to yours, i.e. Kim is not a second-class
citizen compared to you, i.e. you are not Ham Radio Royalty.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5980. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 17:40:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B5CF8.FD602FC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28977

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2AC0D6.F4D8BF9D@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C2A4617.1B81193A@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > > > Dave, Larry, Dick C., and people like them would probably see
> nothing
> > > but
> > > > > "nasty" in a person walking on a beach in the nude,
> > > >
> > > > Kim, about the only thing nastier than ME walking nude on a beach
> would
> > > > be the thought of YOU walking nude on a beach. We're both past our
> > > > expiration date. There would likely be folks willing to pay us just
> to
> > > > avoid seeing us nude on a beach. Keep talking about it and I'm sure
> > > > someone will take up a collection beginning right about now.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Well at least you show some humor, above. But, I don't think anyone who
> is
> > > the kind of human being I'd admire would be running from either of us.
> >
> > No, not the kind of person you'd admire--just the kind with plain old
> > common sense.
> >
>
> You mean you feel it is common sense to truly judge someone by the way they
> look? And, you mean your wife or a woman near your age is no longer
> attractive to you? Goodness...my darlin' reminds me all the time of how
> beautiful I look to him--even as we grow older together.

I mean that it is common sense to choose not to view something which is
past its prime and which would generall detract from what would
otherwise be a lovely setting. My wife isn't near my age. Her view
isn't as good as mine. She receives extra credit. There are women my
age who look attractive. There are women my age who do not look
attractive. I make those *judgements*. I do not see any of those
women, attractive or unattractive nude.

> > > > >
> > > > > or nothing but "nasty"
> > > > > in a woman who nurses her child in public, or nothing but "nasty" at
> > > > > the idea of a man and woman making love together.
> > > > >
> > > > Oh, horse hockey, Kim. I don't believe that any of us any problem
> with
> > > > an idea of people making love. I don't won't it broadcast via ATV and
> > > > don't think we need an audio book version on 20m.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > So, don't broadcast it. We have movies for the satisfaction of
> voyeurism.
> >
> > I don't broadcast it. You, if you'll remember, brought up that the
> > "idea" of two people making love would seem nasty to several of us.
> > I pointed out that the idea isn't nasty to me.
> >
>
> Yes, yes I did. And you are the one who made some comment about how you
> don't intend or like to broadcast it. I pointed out that you then
> shouldn't.

I said nothing at all about my having any intention of broadcasting it,
only that I didn't think it should be something on the airwaves. so your
point was superfluous.

> > > > >
> > > > > They miss opportunities to
> > > > > see beauty when it is all around them. My callsign is intended for
> >
> > > fun--and
> > > > > that does not have to include nasty. Nasty is in their minds, not >
> > > mine.
> > > > >
> > > > Sure, Kim. That's why you chose your call over W5FAT, K5LID or N5DOH.
> > > > It wasn't for the shock value, it was purely for the "fun".
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > I like the N5DOH.
> > >
> > > > > > And, it is also not in the minds of many, many people I have talked
> to
> > > on
> > > > > > the air.
> > > > >
> > > > How do you know? Do you e-mail all of them or just ask them at the
> > > > beginning or end of each QSO?
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > Their non-asking is enough for me. Do you spend a lot of time emailing,

> > > Dave, to see if people thought you were offensive on the air? Can't you
> > > just take it for granted that if they don't say you were offensive, you
> > > probably weren't?
> >
> > I'm not the one with the suggestive call, Kim.
> >
>
> And, the callsign certainly isn't "suggestive" at all, Dave. *You* like to
> think it is. I don't think it is.

Sure it is, Kim. You told us so in your explanation of the "fun" you
could have with it. If it didn't suggest something, you couldn't
achieve *nudge wink* reaction to it.

> > > > >
> > > > > To believe that my callsign is vulgar, does not belong in the ARS,
> and
> > > > > should not have been requested by me and/or issued by the FCC is to
> > > focus on
> > > > > "nasty" or "vulgar" ideas of what my callsign is. I choose to
> ignore
> > > the
> > > > > "nasty" or "vulgar" minded, because my callsign isn't.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Right. You're all about butterflies and sunrises. That's not why you
> > > > chose your call according to your own admission.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > You mean butterflies and sunrises can't be fun? Gosh.
> >
> > Sure they can. That's not the kind of fun you sought when choosing your
> > call though.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> How do you know? Now you read my mind?

It isn't even that complicated. I read your posts here.

Dave K8MN

5981. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 17:42:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B5D74.A72B0030@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28978

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2AC193.4B63C856@earthlink.net...

> > Less than admirable in this case means you aren't having the "fun" you
> > thought you'd have with it. You can say you argue reactions if it helps
> > you to rationalize your responses. In either case, you simply fan the
> > flames.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> And, I suppose now you'd tell me that you don't?

No, I'm not going to tell you any such thing. I'm going to tell you
that it is my intent to fan the flames. You're assisting me.

Dave K8MN

5982. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 17:43:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B5DCE.C331581D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28979

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2AC2BF.7632A0ED@earthlink.net...
> > James R. DeLoach wrote:
> > >
> > > On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 16:52:49 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >> There are other callsigns that you could have chosen that would
> > > >> have been just as funny/different for a woman than the one you chose.
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >Yeah. How 'bout _5BAL, _5WOM, _5BAB, _5SEX, _5CNT (that idea was
> actually
> > > >given to me by this little old lady ham that giggled all night at a
> > > >Christmas party when she thought of it. I told her to go for it and
> she
> > > >said she probably would if her husband wouldn't yell...LOL), and so on.
> > > >
> > > The callsigns that I was thinking of were _?SEX. Looks like most of
> > > the W_SEX callsigns have been taken. I noticed that in the ARRL
> > > Repeater directory that there are some repeaters in the mid-west and
> > > on the east coast that have _?SEX callsigns.
> > >
> > > I bet Dave thinks these callsigns are dirty as well.
> >
> > Do your homework before engaging the keyboard, James. I've never stated
> > that Kim's call is "dirty". It is tacky. It is tasteless. It
> > demonstrates a lack of good judgement.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Yep. And Dave has none of the above.

You may win this round, Kim. I have no tacky. I have no tasteless and I
have no demonstrates.

Dave K8MN

5983. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 17:44:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B5E0C.35DE5F59@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28980

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2AC933.265EB9B3@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > >You must have missed it. I've indicated no desire to change my call.
> > >
> > > Perhaps you should. By now, people are bound to be starting to
> > > recognize your current one--and it would be a shame to have a large
> > > investment in radio equipment if no one will communicate with you.
> >
> > I'll let this third time be the final. I h a v e e x p r e s s e d
> > n o i n t e r e s t i n c h a n g i n g m y c a l l. As
> > far as the rest of your drivel, I don't recall ever hearing you or
> > working you on the air. To be certain, I checked my logs. My K8MN log
> > contains about 35,000 QSOs. My J52US log runs to about 75,000. There
> > are more than 60,000 QSOs in my 9L1US log. My A22MN log contains
> > roughly 55,000 QSOs. My OH0 and OH2 logs run to about 15,000 QSOs.
> > You aren't in any of 'em on any band using any mode. By the way, when
> > do suppose all this shunning of me is going to take place?
> >
>
> And you know what that means to a DXer. ;)

No, I don't. What is your big secret to DX enlightenment?

Dave K8MN

5984. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 17:55:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B60A0.699E767E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28981

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > CAM wrote:
> > > > > I'm using the dictionary definition of "vulgar", Kim, as being of the
> > > > > common folk. Vulgar Latin is what the commoners spoke during the
> > > > > Roman Empire.
> > > >
> > > > Naw, you're not. You are using a word origin and not the common, modern
> > > > definition of the word.
> > >
> > > Seems you would crack open a dictionary before embarrassing yourself, Dave.
> > > From Webster's: "vulgar - of or relating to the common people"
> > > It doesn't say a thing about that definition not being common and modern.
> >
> > Get back to me when you finally figure out how a dictionary is arranged.
> > If you keep this up, you'll look as dim as you did over the difference
> > between "church" and "Church".
>
> Dave, I used the word so I get to pick the definition. When are you
> going to realize that you are NOT omnipotent and don't have control
> over the words I choose to use even though you are deluded enough to
> think you do.

Actually, Cecil, I don't believe you were the first to use that word.
Even if you were, your ignorance of how a dictionary's multiple
definitions for a single word are arranged is a definite handicap for
you. That has to be true unless you are the kind of individual who
attempts to find a definition which better supports his rather weak
hand.

Dave K8MN

5985. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 17:58:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B6149.599A318F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28982

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Do your homework before engaging the keyboard, James. I've never stated
> > that Kim's call is "dirty". It is tacky. It is tasteless. It
> > demonstrates a lack of good judgement.
>
> All definitions of "dirty" when used in that context. From Webster's:
> "dirty - undesirable or unpleasant, very unfortunate or regrettable"

Wow--you're something like Oh-for-three in this latest string of
dictionary diggings. I didn't see "tacky", "tasteless" or anything
about demonstrating a lack of good judgement in your latest quote from
Webster's under the word "dirty".

Dave K8MN

5986. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 17:59:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B618C.8F946704@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28983

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Nobody has an inalienable right to an amateur radio license or a
> > callsign--especially a *particular* callsign. Chew that over for a
> > spell.
>
> Kim has just as much of a right to her callsign as you do to yours,
> Dave. The FCC has endorsed both as legal and proper for identification
> on the ham bands. I know that chaps your ass, but that's reality.

You still haven't been able to deny my statement, have you Cecil?

Dave K8MN

5987. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:03:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B626B.817F3A2E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28984

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > The vanity callsign program is an option offered by the FCC, not a
> > right.
>
> As long as they are offered by the FCC, Kim has the same *RIGHT*
> to her callsign as you do to yours, i.e. Kim is not a second-class
> citizen compared to you, i.e. you are not Ham Radio Royalty.

Just what is "Ham Radio Royalty", Cecil? How do you know that Jim isn't
a part of it?

Dave K8MN

5988. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:09:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9f4bfe89.0112271009.1d79eede@posting.google.com>
Source record: 28985

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net> wrote in message news:<3c2aa19b_1@news7.fast.net>...

> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > How about this:
> >
> > Right now:
> >
> > 1) Give all Novices and Tech Pluses 200 W CW only on all nonphone
> > General HF/MF bands, 160-10. (FCC will probably balk at this)
>
> Why limit them to CW?

Because of the written testing they have passed. The idea of the above
change is to eliminate the Novice/Tech Plus subbands on HF.

> Why not allow them to use modern digital modes as well?

What digital modes qualify as "modern"?

Why do you suggest digital modes but not voice modes?

Any current Novice or Tech Plus can get full General privileges by
simply passing the required writtens. For Novices it's two 35 question
writtens and for post-March-21-1987 Tech Pluses it's one 35 question
written.

> This is a "no-reward reward" .

Who is talking about a "reward"? Reward for what?

>.. if they aren't interested
> in using CW now, they won't be under your proposal
> either ...

How do you know? One of the problems with the current Novice and Tech
Plus HF privs is that they are on a few slivers of a few bands. Let's
take a look:

80 meters: Many hams can't put up a decent 80 meter antenna
40 meters: 7100-7150 is full of high powered SWBC during the evening.
15 meters: Great when it's open, useless when it's not.

By opening up parts of ALL HF/MF bands to Novices and Tech Pluses,
they will have more opportunities that match their resources.

> you can't force it down their throats because
> they don't like the taste.

Same goes for "modern digital modes". btw, giving hams more spectrum
isn't forcing anything on them.
>
> Again ... Why limit them to CW?

Again - Written testing.

> Why not allow them to
> use modern digital modes as well?
>
See above. Why not just give 'em all modes, then?

> > 2) Allow all "old" Tech Pluses to get Generals by a simple mail or
> > online procedure, instead of forcing them to attend VE sessions.
> (FCC
> > will hate this one, too).
>
> This would seem reasonable ... since it's just an administrative
> update ... however, since the FCC is set up now to take all
> input from the VECs, you're probably right that they wouldn't
> like this idea (it would probably require changes to their
> system and more work for already under-budgeted FCC staff).

Probably true. Plus most of the "old" Tech Pluses that have any
interest have probably already upgraded this way. In another thread I
have documented the changes in license numbers, and Tech Plus is
dropping fastest of all.
>
> > 3) Resolve the 40 meter mess at WRC 2003 to get a worldwide
> exclusive
> > amateur allocation, even if it gives away spectrum. 7000-7200
> > worldwide exclusive amateur is better for everyone than 7000-7300 in
> > Region 2 and 7000-7100 everywhere else.
>
> - From reports I've heard in WRC-03 preparatory meetings,
> things may actually be looking better for 7000-7300 worldwide,
> but even if it's agreed at WRC-03 it could be 5-10 years
> before it becomes reality ... all the broadcasters in R1 and R3
> won't move overnight.

The point is that it's better to have a smaller exclusive-amateur band
there than a bigger shared one - 'specially when the other folks have
tens and hundreds of kW and huge arrays.
>
> > 4) Develop bandplans for all HF/MF that separate CW, digital and
> > analog voice/image modes.
>
> If you're talking about FCC-rules-mandated separation of that
> type, I wouldn't hold my breath ... it takes too long to change
> FCC rules ...

I'm talking about having part of each band for CW, part for digital
and part for analog voice/image. If it takes a while for FCC action,

fine, that simply means we should act now.

> such rules would be too limiting in terms of us
> being able to flexibly take advantage of new modes in the
> future

How would it be "too limiting"? "New modes" would have a place in
their respective subbands.

Of course if somebody wants to run DSSS on HF and raise the noise
floor of every other amatuer on the band for miles around by tens of
dB, those rules would be kinda limiting.

> > After S25.5 is gone:
> >
> > 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
> > names if you don't like them)
>
> We have that now ... tech, general, extra ...

Names were chosen to avoid confusion between current classes of
license and new ones.

> the main problem
> is that techs get

[expletive deleted]

> on HF.

Which is why the proposed changes.

The current system tends to "force VHF/UHF down newbies
throats".....;-)
>
> > 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by
> license
> > class. (Some bands, like 10 and the WARC bands, may be split by mode
> > only).
>
> GAG!!!!!!!!! Such "balkanization" is a VERY BAD IDEA ... people
> need to mix and intermingle ... isolating newbies into "ghettos"
> is NOT the way to educate and socialize them ... all it does is breed
> ill will (and to the extent that some "better hams" are contemptuous
> of the newbies, it breeds contempt for the higher class licensees
> who have the knowedge and experience to educate and socialize
> the newbies)... making such efforts by the (majority?) of higher class
> licensees who DON'T have an attitude problem more difficult.

What ARE you talking about, Carl?

Would you simply give all frequencies and modes to all classes of
license? If so, you eliminate two of the most important reasons to
upgrade.

>
> It also, again will be too limiting of our ability to respond to
> changes
> in technology, promoting the technological stagnation that the ARS
> has suffered from more or less since SSB and FM came into common
> use.

How will it be limiting? Each mode would have its bandspace.

As for "technological stagnation", nobody is stopping anyone from
developing new modes and technologies. PSK31, Pactor 1 and 2, MFSK,
APRS, to name just a few...new modes all over the place. New
technology, too - you ever use an FT-1000 or even a K2? They "glow in
the dark", btw...
>
> > 3) Basic license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
> > procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure
> stuff,
> > main purpose is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150
> > watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (determined by RF
> > exposure limits). Modes are CW, SSB, FM, PSK31 and maybe some of the
> > other common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control
> ops
> > for repeaters, or be club trustees. Basics get all VHF/UHF and about
> > half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the entry level.
>
> A little TOO basic for my taste ...

Why? The idea is to have a license that's easy for anyone to get and
gives a good assortment of privileges. But the power level is kept low
enough that lots of RF exposure questions aren't needed. The test is
simple enough that people with non-technical backgrounds don't "need
to learn a 200 page book to use an HT".

N0MHS and W5YI want something like this. The UK already has a version
of it in their "Foundation" license. Note that there would be NO
restrictions on homebrewing for Basics, unlike the UK's "Foundation".

> and there's that balkanization by class again ...

Not at all. Basics would have HALF of HF and ALL of VHF/UHF. What
would YOU do - give them all frequencies?

> > 4) Intermediate license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on
> > regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical and
> RF
> > exposure stuff, with some regs to cover expanded privs.
> Intermediates
> > get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs
> > after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club
> > trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or
> > more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires at least one year

> > experience as a Basic.

> While I personally think that power limits based on tecnical level
> are entirely appropriate (and make FAR more sense than sub-band
> balkinization by license the generals, paraticularly many of the
> older
> ones, will skin you alive if you try to take their "California
> kilowats"
> away from them ... so many seem to think that the "minimum
> power rule" was intended for everyone but them and their cronies
> and that it's their God-given right to run full legal limit (or more)
> to
> talk across town and compliment each other on being 40-60 over
> S9.

Gee, what a rant.

Seems to me that the only thing you want to limit is power output.
>
> Also, there's that balkanization by class again ... bad idea ...

What would you offer as an incentive to upgrade? More power? If so,
those who are satisfied with 100 W can stay Basics forever.

> And the "time in grade" idea REALLY SUCKS!!!

FCC didn't think so for many years. Useta be 1 year for Advanced and 2
for Extra.

But that was before your time, so it MUST be "bad". ;-)

> If someone
> can pass the test, they're qualified and deserve their license,
> period.

I disagree. Book learning is one thing, experience is another.
>
> > 5) Full license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs,
> > procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some
> > regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes,
> bands,
> > etc. except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see
> > below). Full license requires ar least one year (preferably two
> years)
> > as an Intermediate.
>
> You want 100-120 questions ... fine by me ... but many others
> will bitch that it's too much.

It is about the same written testing than was required for full
privileges before April 2000.
>
> Also, there's that balkanization by class again ... bad idea ...

So what's your alternative?
>
> And the "time in grade" idea REALLY SUCKS!!! If someone
> can pass the test, they're qualified and deserve their license,
> period.

Experience, my boy, experience.
>
> > 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.
>
> That's what we have now ...

No reason to change it.
>
> > 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
> > six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character
> > calls.
>
> The "vanity call" system is too entrenched ... trying to take away
> "prefered" calls from those who have them will also get you
> tarred and feathered (or worse ...)

You obviously don't understand the callsign system, Carl.

The only people affected by the above proposed change would be a few
non-Extras with 1X2 callsigns. They could be allowed to keep them.
>
> > 8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification,
> open
> > to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs.
>
> I have no problem with the idea of a separate VE test ...

The idea is to free up space in the tests for non-VE questions.
>
> > 9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses,
> > Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras
> > become Fulls. Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams
> > to upgrade.
>
> This gives too much to tech/tech plus without a sufficent technical
> exam ...

How so? Earlier on you wanted to give them "modern digital modes" on
HF right now. Why are they qualified to run those modes now but not
voice modes in the future?

Seems like you want to force "modern digital modes" down their throats
but not allow them analog voice or a power beyond a few hundred watts.

> as you pointed out in a previous post, the FCC rejected
> the ARRL's idea of "grandfather" tech+ to general ... and so did
> the NCVECs and NCI and many others ...

Doesn't mean it was a bad idea, just that a few folks didn't like it.
NCI represents how many hams - 2000?

> > End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned
> > as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but
> > meaningful steps to reach full privileges.
>
> I don't see how this is really any different than a "codeless"
> version of what we have now ...

A codeless version of what we have now has the following problems:

1)Three classes of license that are no longer available to new applicants but are kept on the regs and in the database for some unexplained reason.

2)Subbands and mode/power restrictions that match the above. For example, on 80 meters alone there's the Extra cw/data subband, the General cw/data subband, the Novice/Tech Plus CW subband (with its power restriction), the Extra phone subband, the Advanced phone subband and the General phone subband. Talk about "balkanization"!! SIX subbands, at least two of which are for licenses no longer issued.

3)The "entry level" class of license allows full privs above 30 MHz but almost nothing below 30 MHz. Its test is inadequate for the privs given and at the same time too much to expect all newcomers to understand in a single step.

4)The only incentive to upgrade is more spectrum.

> except that the basic sounds
> even more basic than the current tech,

Is that bad?

> you want to take amps
> away from generals,

Not at all. The power levels are set about an S unit apart. A "small" amp will still be OK.

Or perhaps existing hams could keep their calls AND their amplifiers.

> you want to screw around with everyone's
> callsigns,

Nope. Tell me which hams would be forced to give up their curent callsigns.

>and you want that stupid "time in grade" thing ...

Experience, my boy, experience. There are some things ya don't learn from study guides. Calling my ideas "stupid" doesn't make you look any smarter.
>
> > Of course this probably has even less chance than your ideas, Rich.

>
> I think it's DOA for the reasons I've outlined above ...

So what's YOUR alternative? Simply limp along with six license classes and the patched-up remnants of a system originally designed 50 years ago? Sell that to my friend Mr. Plourde! Or perhaps W5YI will carry the day, and we'll have a "Foundation" class here in the USA. Or would you rather just have a single class of license for all?

Criticizing is easy. Creating isn't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5989. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:18:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B65E9.E54C277F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28986

N2EY wrote:
> Or perhaps W5YI will carry
> the day, and we'll have a "Foundation" class here in the USA. Or would
> you rather just have a single class of license for all?

IMO, a "Foundation" class and a "General" class license is all we need.
It was almost like that when I first got into ham radio in the early 50's
when there were only three levels of privileges. 50's techs now qualify
for general privileges.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5990. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:32:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B6948.E5EB7688@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28987

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Dave, I used the word so I get to pick the definition. When are you
> > going to realize that you are NOT omnipotent and don't have control
> > over the words I choose to use even though you are deluded enough to
> > think you do.
>
> Actually, Cecil, I don't believe you were the first to use that word.

I didn't say I was the first to use the word. But I have posted the
definition of "vulgar" that I am using multiple times on this newsgroup.
Here it is again: "vulgar - of or relating to the common people". That's
what educated people mean when they use the word "vulgar". Your definition
of "vulgar" is, well, vulgar, by definition.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5991. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:36:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B6A2D.7997C67C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28988

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > From Webster's:
> > "dirty - undesirable or unpleasant, very unfortunate or regrettable"
>
> Wow--you're something like Oh-for-three in this latest string of
> dictionary diggings. I didn't see "tacky", "tasteless" or anything
> about demonstrating a lack of good judgement in your latest quote from
> Webster's under the word "dirty".

Are you denying that you find Kim's callsign "undesirable or unpleasant,
very unfortunate or regrettable"? If so, why are you continuing to act
as if you find Kim's callsign "undesirable or unpleasant, very
unfortunate and regrettable"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5992. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:41:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B6B56.625B19EC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28989

Dave Heil wrote:
> You still haven't been able to deny my statement, have you Cecil?

And you haven't been able to deny my statement that smallpox is bad.
So what?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

5993. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:43:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B6BD1.99A82341@IEEE.org>
Source record: 28990

```
Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > The vanity callsign program is an option offered by the FCC, not a
> > > right.
> >
> > As long as they are offered by the FCC, Kim has the same *RIGHT*
> > to her callsign as you do to yours, i.e. Kim is not a second-class
> > citizen compared to you, i.e. you are not Ham Radio Royalty.
>
> Just what is "Ham Radio Royalty", Cecil?

Ham Radio Royalty is the collection of hams, including you, who
think they should be able to violate the rights of other hams
and completely dominate the hobby.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

5994. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:46:17 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b6bf1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28991

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2B483D.D00B4537@IEEE.org...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > I didn't expect a negative reaction from the majority, and I haven't
gotten
> > a negative reaction from the majority.
>
> Maybe "tit" means something different to Yankees, Kim. When referring
> to the human breast, most folks around Madison County, TX say "titty"
> which is considered to be "baby talk" and is certainly not obscene.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

It may be that the word means something different to them, or the only thing they think of when they hear or see the word, is something dirty or filthy. I got the call for fun...but really never expected that someone would think it was an XXX-rated call...for goodness sake. I guess one person's XXX is another's G.

Kim W5TIT

5995. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:48:11 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b6c63_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28992

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2B4BE0.F87C6315@IEEE.org...
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Nobody has an inalienable right to an amateur radio license or a
> > callsign--especially a *particular* callsign. Chew that over for a
> > spell.
>
> Kim has just as much of a right to her callsign as you do to yours,
> Dave. The FCC has endorsed both as legal and proper for identification
> on the ham bands. I know that chaps your ass, but that's reality.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I've got more right :o I paid for mine...LOL

Kim W5TIT

5996. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:56:19 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b6e51_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28993

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2B5CF8.FD602FC@earthlink.net...
> >
> > You mean you feel it is common sense to truly judge someone by the way
they
> > look? And, you mean your wife or a woman near your age is no longer
> > attractive to you? Goodness...my darlin' reminds me all the time of how
> > beautiful I look to him--even as we grow older together.
>
> I mean that it is common sense to choose not to view something which is
> past its prime and which would generall detract from what would
> otherwise be a lovely setting.
>

OHMYGAWD...you just will never know beauty, Dave. Some people, granted, are scarey at the thought of being in the nude. But we are discussing the normal, every day process of getting older...and there is nothing ugly about that. Well, at least not to me. I can't believe you'd comfortably say to your wife, "Dear, please be sure you are clothed when in front of me; I prefer to remember you when you *were* lovely.

>
> My wife isn't near my age. Her view
> isn't as good as mine. She receives extra credit. There are women my
> age who look attractive. There are women my age who do not look
> attractive. I make those *judgements*.
>

And you are, as I've said before and you've denied, a very judgemental person. It's no wonder you're so dry and lifeless.

>
> I do not see any of those
> women, attractive or unattractive nude.
>

That would be their blessing.

[SNIP]

> >
> > And, the callsign certainly isn't "suggestive" at all, Dave. *You* like
to
> > think it is. I don't think it is.
>
> Sure it is, Kim. You told us so in your explanation of the "fun" you

> could have with it. If it didn't suggest something, you couldn't
> achieve *nudge wink* reaction to it.
>

Dave, the *nudge* *wink* part is where disbelief that such a call can be had becomes self-evident. I hate drawing pictures. I'll remind you, again, that it is *your* mind that took the *nudge* *wink* idea to be "dirty" or, how do you put it: tacky?

[SNIP]

>
> It isn't even that complicated. I read your posts here.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

No, you don't Dave. You judge them here. You don't read and comprehend at all.

Kim W5TIT

5997. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 18:58:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b6ecb_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28994

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2B5DCE.C331581D@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > Do your homework before engaging the keyboard, James. I've never
stated
> > > that Kim's call is "dirty". It is tacky. It is tasteless. It
> > > demonstrates a lack of good judgement.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Yep. And Dave has none of the above.
>
> You may win this round, Kim. I have no tacky. I have no tasteless and I
> have no demonstrates.
>
> Dave K8MN

I had actually included judgement in my thoughts originally. But, now that I see you would judge a woman's beauty by how young and shapely she is, I did miss the target. You do have judgement. Lots of it.

Kim W5TIT

5998. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:00:36 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b6f4d_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 28995

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2B5E0C.35DE5F59@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2AC933.265EB9B3@earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >You must have missed it. I've indicated no desire to change my
call.
> > > > >
> > > > > Perhaps you should. By now, people are bound to be starting
to
> > > > > recognize your current one--and it would be a shame to have a large
> > > > > investment in radio equipment if no one will communicate with you.
> > > >
> > > > I'll let this third time be the final. I h a v e e x p r e s s e
d
> > > > n o i n t e r e s t i n c h a n g i n g m y c a l l. As
> > > > far as the rest of your drivel, I don't recall ever hearing you or
> > > > working you on the air. To be certain, I checked my logs. My K8MN
log
> > > > contains about 35,000 QSOs. My J52US log runs to about 75,000. There
> > > > are more than 60,000 QSOs in my 9L1US log. My A22MN log contains
> > > > roughly 55,000 QSOs. My OH0 and OH2 logs run to about 15,000 QSOs.
> > > > You aren't in any of 'em on any band using any mode. By the way, when
> > > > do suppose all this shunning of me is going to take place?
> > > >
> > >
> > > And you know what that means to a DXer. ;)
> >
> > No, I don't. What is your big secret to DX enlightenment?
> >
> > Dave K8MN

Those of us who know, don't need explanation, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

5999. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:13:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B72D9.257878BA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28997

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > Dave, I used the word so I get to pick the definition. When are you
> > > going to realize that you are NOT omnipotent and don't have control
> > > over the words I choose to use even though you are deluded enough to
> > > think you do.
> >
> > Actually, Cecil, I don't believe you were the first to use that word.
>
> I didn't say I was the first to use the word. But I have posted the
> definition of "vulgar" that I am using multiple times on this newsgroup.
> Here it is again: "vulgar - of or relating to the common people". That's
> what educated people mean when they use the word "vulgar". Your definition
> of "vulgar" is, well, vulgar, by definition.

Naw Cecil, your latest just shows that it doesn't matter how good the
dictionary is if you've not learned how to use it. Wish I could take
your stuff seriously.

Dave K8MN

6000. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:13:43 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <i5rm2ug3juk9ud51hca2tv30m1vps427cr@4ax.com>
Source record: 28996
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Sun, 23 Dec 2001 08:49:42 -0500, an orbiting mind control laser caused
"Scout" <scout@monumental.com> to write in talk.politics.guns :

>> But it is not in your job description that you
>> MUST risk your life as part of your job.
>
>Life is risk, and ALL jobs require a certain level of risk acceptance to
>perform. Miners must risk their lives to perform their jobs.....they know
>the hazards and the rate of death in their industry, yet they accept that
>and continue to work.

True, but the main difference is that coal miners' risks are pretty much
physical force-of-nature types that can be alleviated but not completely
controlled. A police officer's risks are primarily ones of social
interaction, and they've got that big hunk of iron on their hips to control
it. This leads to "shoot first, shoot second, shoot until the clip is
empty" mentalities that result in a black man with no rap sheet dying on
his own porch for handing over his wallet to (what he probably thought)
were a bunch of muggers.

In the big city, a cop's first duty is to make it to the end of the shift
alive. "Protect and Serve" is nothing but a big PR gag -- no citizen can
legally expect either as a matter of law and precedent.

And it doesn't get any better when it is well known that people who score
too high on intelligence tests will be washed out of the hiring process,
quite legitimately and legally (actual court case in CT about two years
ago).

Long gone, in this nation at least, are Sir Robert Peel's 9 Principles:

The basic mission for which the police exist is to prevent crime and
disorder.

The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public
approval of police actions.

Police must secure the willing co-operation of the public in voluntary
observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain the respect of the
public.

The degree of co-operation of the public that can be secured diminishes
proportionately to the necessity of the use of physical force.

Police seek and preserve public favour not by catering to public opinion
but by constantly demonstrating absolute impartial service to the law.

Police use physical force to the extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient.

Police, at all times, should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence.

Police should always direct their action strictly towards their functions and never appear to usurp the powers of the judiciary.

The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with it.

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is
more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

6001. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:15:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B7366.58ADD93B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28998

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > > From Webster's:
> > > "dirty - undesirable or unpleasant, very unfortunate or regrettable"
> >
> > Wow--you're something like Oh-for-three in this latest string of
> > dictionary diggings. I didn't see "tacky", "tasteless" or anything
> > about demonstrating a lack of good judgement in your latest quote from
> > Webster's under the word "dirty".
>
> Are you denying that you find Kim's callsign "undesirable or unpleasant,
> very unfortunate or regrettable"? If so, why are you continuing to act
> as if you find Kim's callsign "undesirable or unpleasant, very
> unfortunate and regrettable"?

We both know very well that you are attempting to attribute to me
something that I've not said. If you'd like to make such a statement,
then by all means, you make it. What you can't do is pretend that I've
said it. Your dictionary definition can't be made to say something it
doesn't say.

Dave K8MN

6002. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:19:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B745F.7BCB4D27@earthlink.net>
Source record: 28999

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You still haven't been able to deny my statement, have you Cecil?
>
> And you haven't been able to deny my statement that smallpox is bad.
> So what?

I've neither tried to deny your statement or to acknowledge that it has anything to do with the discussion of Kim's tacky call. To my knowledge, you don't have Smallpox, Kim doesn't have smallpox nor does any other individual posting here have Smallpox.

Me: "Kim's choice of call shows a lack of good judgement."

You: "Smallpox is bad".

If you'd like to be a Crazy Eight Ball, be my guest.

Dave K8MN
Dave K8MN

6003. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:21:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B74D0.94E7E819@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29000

CAM wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > > > The vanity callsign program is an option offered by the FCC, not a
> > > > right.
> > >
> > > As long as they are offered by the FCC, Kim has the same *RIGHT*
> > > to her callsign as you do to yours, i.e. Kim is not a second-class
> > > citizen compared to you, i.e. you are not Ham Radio Royalty.
> >
> > Just what is "Ham Radio Royalty", Cecil?
>
> Ham Radio Royalty is the collection of hams, including you, who
> think they should be able to violate the rights of other hams
> and completely dominate the hobby.

Do we sit in the back of the bus or the front? Are we all capable of
having babies? What dimension do we live in? How about basketball
dunking--can we do that too? Phhhhhhfffffffft!

Dave K8MN

6004. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:23:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B752A.B38B6426@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29051

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C2B483D.D00B4537@IEEE.org...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > I didn't expect a negative reaction from the majority, and I haven't
> gotten
> > > a negative reaction from the majority.
> >
> > Maybe "tit" means something different to Yankees, Kim. When referring
> > to the human breast, most folks around Madison County, TX say "titty"
> > which is considered to be "baby talk" and is certainly not obscene.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> It may be that the word means something different to them, or the only thing
> they think of when they hear or see the word, is something dirty or filthy.
> I got the call for fun...but really never expected that someone would think
> it was an XXX-rated call...for goodness sake. I guess one person's XXX is
> another's G.

It isn't dirty or filty, Kim. It is tasteless. It isn't necessary for
it to be dirty or filthy to be tacky.

Dave K8MN

6005. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:24:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B755D.254E2C1A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29052

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C2B4BE0.F87C6315@IEEE.org...
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Nobody has an inalienable right to an amateur radio license or a
> > > callsign--especially a *particular* callsign. Chew that over for a
> > > spell.
> >
> > Kim has just as much of a right to her callsign as you do to yours,
> > Dave. The FCC has endorsed both as legal and proper for identification
> > on the ham bands. I know that chaps your ass, but that's reality.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> I've got more right :o I paid for mine...LOL

You RENTED it. See what happens if you don't keep up the payments.

Dave K8MN

6006. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:33:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B779E.B615C61D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29053

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2B5CF8.FD602FC@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > You mean you feel it is common sense to truly judge someone by the way
> they
> > > look? And, you mean your wife or a woman near your age is no longer
> > > attractive to you? Goodness...my darlin' reminds me all the time of how
> > > beautiful I look to him--even as we grow older together.
> >
> > I mean that it is common sense to choose not to view something which is
> > past its prime and which would generall detract from what would
> > otherwise be a lovely setting.
> >
>
> OHMYGAWD...you just will never know beauty, Dave. Some people, granted, are
> scarey at the thought of being in the nude. But we are discussing the
> normal, every day process of getting older...and there is nothing ugly about
> that. Well, at least not to me. I can't believe you'd comfortably say to
> your wife, "Dear, please be sure you are clothed when in front of me; I
> prefer to remember you when you *were* lovely.

Naw, we weren't discussing anything of the kind. I brought up nude
older folks in a humorous way. You acknowledged my humor but went on to
attempt making the issue into something else. I'm not "scarey" or even
scared to be nude, Kim. I built a sauna here after living in Finland.
Sauna is traditionally enjoyed in the nude. I don't invite the
neighbors for a gawk nor do we have mixed gender sauna with visitors.
Sauna isn't tacky or tasteless. Your call is tacky and tasteless.

> >
> > My wife isn't near my age. Her view
> > isn't as good as mine. She receives extra credit. There are women my
> > age who look attractive. There are women my age who do not look
> > attractive. I make those *judgements*.
> >
>
> And you are, as I've said before and you've denied, a very judgemental
> person. It's no wonder you're so dry and lifeless.

Pshaw! Every human on the planet makes judgements each and every day.
There are people I like and people I don't like. There are things I
believe in and things I don't believe in. I believe your call, for
example, is tacky.

> >
> > I do not see any of those
> > women, attractive or unattractive nude.
> >
>
> That would be their blessing.

...and mine.

> [SNIP]
>
> > >
> > > And, the callsign certainly isn't "suggestive" at all, Dave. *You* like
> to
> > > think it is. I don't think it is.
> >
> > Sure it is, Kim. You told us so in your explanation of the "fun" you
> > could have with it. If it didn't suggest something, you couldn't
> > achieve *nudge wink* reaction to it.
> >
>
> Dave, the *nudge* *wink* part is where disbelief that such a call can be had
> becomes self-evident. I hate drawing pictures. I'll remind you, again,
> that it is *your* mind that took the *nudge* *wink* idea to be "dirty" or,
> how do you put it: tacky?

Not dirty, Kim--tacky, tasteless, showing a lack of good judgement.

> [SNIP]
>
> >
> > It isn't even that complicated. I read your posts here.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> No, you don't Dave. You judge them here. You don't read and comprehend at
> all.

If your posts are somehow being misinterpreted, perhaps you want to take
a crack at making clear what you mean to convey. I can only make
judgements based on what is presented.

Dave K8MN

6007. Two for Bozo*Flush

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:34:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <sJKW7.312555$W8.11550065@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29054

Effective about two minutes ago, Cecil and Dave have been fed to Bozo*Flush. It is faster than playing pick and choose and marking the thread as read.

Enough already!

Dick N&#65533;BK

6008. Re: Mistuh Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:39:19 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112271932420.6903-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 29055

On 27 Dec 2001, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:
>>Subject: Mistuh Mitnick...
>>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
>>Date: 12/25/2001 10:28 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.goxfzu2.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
>
>>Not at all. Kevin is a convicted felon who served time for computer
>> and communications law crimes, and the Commish' is just following
>> the procedure to yank his license
>
> At the time it happened, it was due process....Years after the fact and in
>matters NOT related to the offenses he was convicted of, it is harrassment.
>
> More assinine bureaucrats looking for ways to justify their parasitic
>employment.

Actually, you will find that the "civil closing" of a case often occurs after the sentence has been served from the criminal conviction.

I don't go to court vs. the FCC, but I do and have gone to court vs. the IRS. Although I have not had the pleasure of having to defend a taxpayer in any criminal matter, here's what's allowable there (and often happens) for the more serious violations:

- The taxpayer gets convicted of Tax Fraud (filing a false return) or Tax Evasion. He gets sentenced, etc.....

Nothing there bars the IRS from ALSO asserting the CIVIL tax fraud penalty of 75% of the tax due to fraud, and there has been case law exactly on this point (the petitioners/convicts calling it "double jeopardy" or punishment without due process - LOSING every time).

This situation is highly similar (replace "civil penalty" with "loss of license"). THat's what our current legal system allows, plain and simple.

If you don't think this is right, then petition your Congresscritter to get the law changed so that all civil actions as a result of a criminal action must also be raised in the indictment.

6009. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:39:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B78FD.C5ED440C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29056

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2B5DCE.C331581D@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Do your homework before engaging the keyboard, James. I've never
> stated
> > > > that Kim's call is "dirty". It is tacky. It is tasteless. It
> > > > demonstrates a lack of good judgement.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Yep. And Dave has none of the above.
> >
> > You may win this round, Kim. I have no tacky. I have no tasteless and I
> > have no demonstrates.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I had actually included judgement in my thoughts originally. But, now that
> I see you would judge a woman's beauty by how young and shapely she is, I
> did miss the target. You do have judgement. Lots of it.

A women's outer appearance is what we all see. Young and shapely gets
my vote over old and lumpy every time. I have met young and shapely
women who are cold and calculating so I certainly wouldn't want to spend
time with them. I've met women who could never have been described as
great beauties but who are pleasant, kind and cheerful. I've also met
hags who have the demeanor of Attila The Hun. I make judgements about
all of them. What does it all mean, Kim? Further, what has any of it to
do with your tacky call?

Dave K8MN

6010. Re: Two for Bozo*Flush

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:45:22 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mTKW7.312570$W8.11550658@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29057

Incidentally, the message count dropped by over 800 from the 2145. This also includes idiot crossposts so I would guess this issue has been about half of the traffic. Is this hooferaw really necessary over a tee-hee giggle action by a flaming airhead?? The village idiot has this figured out in about three milliseconds.

Bionic Klutz

6011. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:47:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C2B7AE3.80F645AF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29058

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2B5E0C.35DE5F59@earthlink.net...
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3C2AC933.265EB9B3@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > >You must have missed it. I've indicated no desire to change my
> call.
> > > > > > Perhaps you should. By now, people are bound to be starting
> to
> > > > > recognize your current one--and it would be a shame to have a large
> > > > > investment in radio equipment if no one will communicate with you.
> > > > >
> > > > I'll let this third time be the final. I h a v e e x p r e s s e
> d
> > > > n o i n t e r e s t i n c h a n g i n g m y c a l l. As
> > > > far as the rest of your drivel, I don't recall ever hearing you or
> > > > working you on the air. To be certain, I checked my logs. My K8MN
> log
> > > > contains about 35,000 QSOs. My J52US log runs to about 75,000. There
> > > > are more than 60,000 QSOs in my 9L1US log. My A22MN log contains
> > > > roughly 55,000 QSOs. My OH0 and OH2 logs run to about 15,000 QSOs.
> > > > You aren't in any of 'em on any band using any mode. By the way, when
> > > > do suppose all this shunning of me is going to take place?
> > > >
> > >
> > > And you know what that means to a DXer. ;)
> >
> > No, I don't. What is your big secret to DX enlightenment?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Those of us who know, don't need explanation, Dave.

Maybe you can give me some hints on drive-time repeater DXing, Kim? You
know, let us in on handling the pileups and the like.

Rick made a goofy statement about people recognizing my call. I should
hope so. It's been all over the map beginning in 1977 when I obtained
it. Rick seemed to indicate that I'll have nobody to talk to on air.
Do my figures refute his silliness? I haven't contacted Rick in his

current incarnation as KE8HH. There are 975 QSOs in my log for this month alone. They represent QSOs on bands 160m-6m, SSB and CW. What does it all mean, Kim?

Dave K8MN

6012. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 19:57:27 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2001.12.27.14.57.27.636690.8661@arrl.org>
Source record: 29059

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 16:42:02 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> Look through my posts, and you will see that I have not referred to
> Kim's callsign as dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy. Nor have I
> described Kim or anyone else in those terms. The term I use for the
> callsign is "inappropriate".

Wait a minute, Jim... are you saying you DON'T find Kim's call sign dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy? Then what is the salient characteristic of her call sign that makes it "inappropriate" in your view? Please, be specific.

> What's wrong with choosing a callsign that is appropriate to the
> community standards of the amateur radio service

What makes you think, Jim, that your standards are the community's? The only complaints I've heard about Kim's call sign (or similar ones) are from a few bluenoses here on rrap. Hardy an outpouring of community outrage!

> and reflects positively
> upon that service?

How does the call sign N2EY "reflect positively" on the service? How does *any* call sign? To those outside ham radio, it's just a jumble of letters and numbers, no more. Same with W5TIT.

Do you remember an SNL skit where Lisa and Todd (Gilda Radner and Bill Murray), the gawky adolescents, meet Princess Leia and leeringly say "Princess LAY-a [snort, snort]." I can't help but think of that when I see you guys getting all het up by Kim's call sign suffix.

Jon

6013. Re: Two for Bozo*Flush

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 20:07:14 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <SbLW7.312586$W8.11552943@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29060

Yep, and again I must thank you for helping me weed out some of the garbage. I did make the mistake one time of responding to a post without noticing it was cross-posted to about six other groups. Now I check for that and delete all but one if I respond. It's bad enough that some tired threads keep reappearing (coax length, boy scouts, Kim's choice of callsign) - a lot of which is no one's business except the individual or individuals directly involved. Some of the other posts, however, are extremely inflammatory and use words best reserved for outhouse walls. It may be part of the newgroup game, but the Bozo-flush or 'block sender' capability of Internet Explorer can make life easier and blood pressure lower.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:mTKW7.312570$W8.11550658@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Incidentally, the message count dropped by over 800 from the 2145. This
> also includes idiot crossposts so I would guess this issue has been about
> half of the traffic. Is this hooferaw really necessary over a tee-hee
> giggle action by a flaming airhead?? The village idiot has this figured
> out in about three milliseconds.
>
> Bionic Klutz
>
>

6014. Re: I made it home alive

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 20:12:11 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <vgLW7.312590$W8.11551719@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29061

Be thankful your test sight wasn't Buffalo. The Thruway is closed from Batavia west. As of a couple hours ago they had received 42 inches already in this storm and it won't be over until sometime tomorrow! Here in Rochester, we had a green Christmas, a green day before, green before - green today; heck, we've only received 4 inches total this whole fall and winter and that melted the next day! Oh, Buffalo has stated 'no unnecessary travel', the airport has been shut down, folks diverted to Rochester can't get back to Buffalo since the roads are closed ... you get the idea.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote in message news:DXyW7.12814$_K.1636006@cletus.bright.net...
> Well all I am back home, I left Brooklyn at 1:30 PM and arrived in my
> driveway at 11:30 PM, and wouldn't you know..... I can't sleep. So I am
> practicing copying code, I missed the test date in NYC by about 20
> minutes..... I got lost at the 59th st / Columbus Circle transfer from
the
> A train to the 1 train..... Oh well, there is an exam coming up in
> Toledo OH.
>
> Hope everyone had a good holiday.
>
> 73's
> Keith Hosman
>
>

6015. New PHOTOS at www.ab7sl.com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 20:34:20 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b85db$1@news.bnb-lp.com>
Source record: 29062
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

See my new Ham Radio "toys" as well as new photos
of self and kitties too! Happy New Year to All!!!

At web site listed below.....

--

73 / DX

Charles T Johnston
Prescott, Arizona - U.S.A.
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
Official W9INN Antennas Page
www.ab7sl.com

6016. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 21:19:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0112271319.7c0f37eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29063

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2B65E9.E54C277F@IEEE.org>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Or perhaps W5YI will carry
> > the day, and we'll have a "Foundation" class here in the USA. Or would
> > you rather just have a single class of license for all?
>
> IMO, a "Foundation" class and a "General" class license is all we need.

Didja know that the UK Foundation class allows only slightly more than
QRP power levels and no homebrewing or modifying of equipment?

> It was almost like that when I first got into ham radio in the early 50's
> when there were only three levels of privileges.

Back then there was the Novice, which was a one-shot good-for-a-year
upgrade-or-out license. The Tech was VHF/UHF and the
General/Conditional was all privileges.

There were also the Advanced and Extra licenses, but FCC stopped
giving out Advanceds at the end of '52 and the only reason to get an
Extra was for a fancy callsign two decades later.

There were also a lot of ticked off Advanceds back then, too.

> 50's techs now qualify for general privileges.

Yeah - the few thousand who are still around. Maybe 1% of today's US
hams.

The system I propose is pretty similar to that 3 level system. Just
updated to today.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6017. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 21:24:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29064

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > digital modes as well?
>
> Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> learn Morse code?

Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code test, and so they already know the code.

Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes, which are far more popular?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6018. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 21:25:18 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <B27D4889D5384524.D933E2C126812686.FCFA97868A2D8E2D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29065

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 07:10:19 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>No logical mind could read the statement I made and come to the
>conclusion to which you've arrived. Only a fool or a dishonest person
>would make such an accusation. Which are you?

Dave, I can't help it if you don't know how to construct a
sentence in a manner that is logically consistent. If you didn't want
to indicate that you viewed ANYONE except for professional baseball
players who sell autographs to kids as being your hero, it was your
responsibility to make that clear in your post, not mine.

You originally stated that my logic was faulty. Now that I've
demonstrated that it was not you claim that "no logical mind could
read ..." your statement and reach my conclusions.

I'm sorry you don't know how to write a logically consistent
statement that conveys the information you want to convey accurately,
but that's really no one's fault but your own.

>Nope. I'm over there. And I couldn't be here by the time you read this
>unless the laws of physics are repealed.

And YOU just accused ME of making a statement that only a fool
would make?

You have now informed the members of this newsgroup that you
are not where you are but are somewhere else altogether and can never
be where you are.

Right.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6019. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 21:31:29 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <F7BE425325C196EB.77CFF5D85C551CDB.DCB43B90E2284D2F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29066

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 19:47:46 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Maybe you can give me some hints on drive-time repeater DXing, Kim? You
>know, let us in on handling the pileups and the like.

Allow me to help.

Use the Boston or Dallas 10m repeater for your DXing, Dave. On
the Dallas/Ft. Worth machine you can easily work Mexico and, if
conciliations are right, parts of Central and South America. On the
Boston machine you can usually work Eastern Canada, Nova Scotia,
Newfoundland and, if conditions are ideal, Greenland and parts of
Northwestern Europe.

I've racked up about 18 countries that way using a Radio Shack
10m mobile in my car (with a Radio Shack 10/11m mag mount) and there
are about 10 more that I've heard but never worked.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6020. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 21:47:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B96E3.FA437146@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29068

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
> > Are you denying that you find Kim's callsign "undesirable or unpleasant,
> > very unfortunate or regrettable"? If so, why are you continuing to act
> > as if you find Kim's callsign "undesirable or unpleasant, very
> > unfortunate and regrettable"?
>
> We both know very well that you are attempting to attribute to me
> something that I've not said. If you'd like to make such a statement,
> then by all means, you make it. What you can't do is pretend that I've
> said it. Your dictionary definition can't be made to say something it
> doesn't say.

If I have read you wrong, Dave, I apologize. You can alleviate my
potential confusion by answering a couple of yes/no type questions.
Do you think Kim's callsign is "undesirable or unpleasant"? _____
Do you think Kim's callsign is "unfortunate or regrettable"? _____

If you answer no to both questions, I have read you wrong. If you
answer yes to either question then you have met the dictionary
definition of "dirty". If you refuse to answer, I'll know your
answer was yes.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6021. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 21:47:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0112271347.6fda6e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29067

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:<pan.2001.12.27.14.57.27.636690.8661@arrl.org>...
> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 16:42:02 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> > Look through my posts, and you will see that I have not referred to
> > Kim's callsign as dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy. Nor have I
> > described Kim or anyone else in those terms. The term I use for the
> > callsign is "inappropriate".
>
> Wait a minute, Jim... are you saying you DON'T find Kim's call sign dirty,
> vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy?

All I'm saying is that it's not appropriate for the amateur radio
service.

>Then what is the salient
> characteristic of her call sign that makes it "inappropriate" in your
> view? Please, be specific.

The suffix. As if you didn't know ;-)

> > What's wrong with choosing a callsign that is appropriate to the
> > community standards of the amateur radio service
>
> What makes you think, Jim, that your standards are the community's?

What makes you think, Jon, that they are not?

> The
> only complaints I've heard about Kim's call sign (or similar ones) are
> from a few bluenoses here on rrap.

What's a "bluenose", Jon? Please, be specific.

>Hardy an outpouring of community outrage!

Most hams outside of rrap don't know calls like that even exist.
>
> > and reflects positively
> > upon that service?
>
> How does the call sign N2EY "reflect positively" on the service?

It is appropriate in any situation.

> How does
> *any* call sign?

Same way.

>To those outside ham radio, it's just a jumble of
> letters and numbers, no more.

You are mistaken. If that were so, broadcast stations would not care what their callsigns were.

> Same with

[Kim's call]

Lemme ask ya this, Jon:

Suppose a major network was going to do a special, and then a series, on ham radio. Tons of priceless publicity for the ARS. They want a family show, not a late-night series to replace the Howard Stern TV show.

Suppose they wanted to have a real live amateur radio callsign in the title - like the classic "WKRP in Cincinnati" show had a BC callsign.

Suppose they asked YOU to recommend an unassigned amateur callsign (nobody has WKRP, either). Would YOU recommend a callsign like Kim's, or something else? Why or why not? Please, be specific.

73 de Jim, N2EY

...still a fan of Jan Smithers.....

6022. Re: Two for Bozo*Flush

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 21:49:43 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0112271349.1014fbee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29069

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<sJKW7.312555$W8.11550065@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> Effective about two minutes ago, Cecil and Dave have been fed to
> Bozo*Flush.

Not a bad idea.

Maybe we're all Bozos on this bus.....

73 de Jim "still waiting for the electrician" N2EY

6023. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 21:52:05 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B9805.E1FCC44E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29070

Dave Heil wrote:
> It isn't dirty or filty, Kim.

Then, by definition, it is not "undesirable or unpleasant",
also not "very unfortunate or regrettable". Thanks for
admitting that, Dave. I had previously misunderstood you.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6024. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 21:58:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B999F.7BBBFE9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29071

Dave Heil wrote:
> Pshaw! Every human on the planet makes judgements each and every day.
> There are people I like and people I don't like. There are things I
> believe in and things I don't believe in. I believe your call, for
> example, is tacky.

That and a buck fifty will get you a good cup of coffee. Why are
your tastes so overly important, Dave. Why should Kim care about
your tastes?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6025. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 22:05:03 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b9c33_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29073

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2B752A.B38B6426@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3C2B483D.D00B4537@IEEE.org...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > I didn't expect a negative reaction from the majority, and I haven't
> > gotten
> > > > a negative reaction from the majority.
> > >
> > > Maybe "tit" means something different to Yankees, Kim. When referring
> > > to the human breast, most folks around Madison County, TX say "titty"
> > > which is considered to be "baby talk" and is certainly not obscene.
> > > --
> > > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
> >
> > It may be that the word means something different to them, or the only
> thing
> > they think of when they hear or see the word, is something dirty or
> filthy.
> > I got the call for fun...but really never expected that someone would
> think
> > it was an XXX-rated call...for goodness sake. I guess one person's XXX
> is
> > another's G.
>
> It isn't dirty or filty, Kim. It is tasteless. It isn't necessary for
> it to be dirty or filthy to be tacky.
>
> Dave K8MN

Tacky just feels very insignificant to me, Dave. What *is* tacky?

Kim W5TIT

6026. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 22:06:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2B9B52.A14FA8AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29072

N2EY wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> > Wait a minute, Jim... are you saying you DON'T find Kim's call sign dirty,
> > vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy?
>
> All I'm saying is that it's not appropriate for the amateur radio
> service.

But exactly why is it not appropriate? What is wrong with it?
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6027. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 22:18:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2b9f57_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29074

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2B779E.B615C61D@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2B5CF8.FD602FC@earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > You mean you feel it is common sense to truly judge someone by the
way
> > they
> > > > look? And, you mean your wife or a woman near your age is no longer
> > > > attractive to you? Goodness...my darlin' reminds me all the time of
how
> > > > beautiful I look to him--even as we grow older together.
> > >
> > > I mean that it is common sense to choose not to view something which
is
> > > past its prime and which would generall detract from what would
> > > otherwise be a lovely setting.
> > >
> >
> > OHMYGAWD...you just will never know beauty, Dave. Some people, granted,
are
> > scarey at the thought of being in the nude. But we are discussing the
> > normal, every day process of getting older...and there is nothing ugly
about
> > that. Well, at least not to me. I can't believe you'd comfortably say
to
> > your wife, "Dear, please be sure you are clothed when in front of me; I
> > prefer to remember you when you *were* lovely.
>
> Naw, we weren't discussing anything of the kind. I brought up nude
> older folks in a humorous way. You acknowledged my humor but went on to
> attempt making the issue into something else.
>

OK, another dodge by you. WHAT am I trying to make it, Dave? You said: "it
is common sense to choose not to view something which is past its prime and
which would generally detract from what would otherwise be a lovely
setting." Right? You were talking about the human body, right? My
response was shock to that, especially since "we are discussing the normal,
every day process of getting older...and there is nothing ugly about that."
Now you say we weren't discussing anything of the kind (but we were), and
then you say I am trying to make the issue into something else. You mean

you were kidding about the "past its prime" comment? I'll offer an apology if you were, and I'd personally feel a lot better for whomever has to live around you if you were.

> I'm not "scarey" or even
> scared to be nude, Kim. I built a sauna here after living in Finland.
> Sauna is traditionally enjoyed in the nude. I don't invite the
> neighbors for a gawk nor do we have mixed gender sauna with visitors.
> Sauna isn't tacky or tasteless. Your call is tacky and tasteless.

There are times for winking and nodding and "being naughty" about being nude. If a group of responsible adults is going to have a sauna together, that is not the time--and wouldn't be tacky or tasteless to do so. My callsign is not tacky or tasteless. Sounds redundant, if "tasteless" is your choice of definition for tacky. I'd also add that I didn't realize our ham radio callsigns are supposed to have "taste."

> > > My wife isn't near my age. Her view
> > > isn't as good as mine. She receives extra credit. There are women my
> > > age who look attractive. There are women my age who do not look
> > > attractive. I make those *judgements*.
> > > And you are, as I've said before and you've denied, a very judgemental
> > person. It's no wonder you're so dry and lifeless.
> Pshaw! Every human on the planet makes judgements each and every day.
> There are people I like and people I don't like. There are things I
> believe in and things I don't believe in. I believe your call, for
> example, is tacky.

You're right. We make judgements every day. BUT, it sounds overly judgemental (to me) for you to be so critical of the human body, or that one would need only be young and shapely to be of satisfaction to you. I'll need to write a book for you, "Having Fun With Flab." (That's a joke. I've neither the time nor inclination to write such a book--but it sure would be fun.)

[SNIP]

> > Dave, the *nudge* *wink* part is where disbelief that such a call can be had
> > becomes self-evident. I hate drawing pictures. I'll remind you, again,
> > that it is *your* mind that took the *nudge* *wink* idea to be "dirty" or,
> > how do you put it: tacky?

> Not dirty, Kim--tacky, tasteless, showing a lack of good judgement.
>

And, I don't think it does. It doesn't place anyone in physical danger, it doesn't present itself blatantly, but only through prior knowledge of a subject, it isn't allowed (by me) to be discussed in a derogatory way on the air, and lots more. Where's the bad judgement?

> > [SNIP]
> >
> > >
> > > It isn't even that complicated. I read your posts here.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > No, you don't Dave. You judge them here. You don't read and comprehend
at
> > all.
>
> If your posts are somehow being misinterpreted, perhaps you want to take
> a crack at making clear what you mean to convey. I can only make
> judgements based on what is presented.
>
> Dave K8MN

And, like I said, you don't read my posts here, you judge them here. I don't think you try at all to understand them. You can't get past what you believe. You confirm what I said in the last sentence you wrote. What is it I need to make clear?

Kim W5TIT

6028. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 22:24:17 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2ba0b0_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29075

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2B78FD.C5ED440C@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2B5DCE.C331581D@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Do your homework before engaging the keyboard, James. I've never
> > stated
> > > > > that Kim's call is "dirty". It is tacky. It is tasteless. It
> > > > > demonstrates a lack of good judgement.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Yep. And Dave has none of the above.
> > >
> > > You may win this round, Kim. I have no tacky. I have no tasteless and
I
> > > have no demonstrates.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I had actually included judgement in my thoughts originally. But, now
that
> > I see you would judge a woman's beauty by how young and shapely she is,
I
> > did miss the target. You do have judgement. Lots of it.
>
> A women's outer appearance is what we all see. Young and shapely gets
> my vote over old and lumpy every time.
>

I remember when I used to think that about older people. Down here, in the
south, I would see some of the most at first offensive skin I could imagine.
But, then I started thinking about the life that person led, saw all the
smile lines, the thought lines, the leathery appearance because of hard work
in the sun, and so on. To me, older skin now looks quite beautiful. So
does a baby's skin, just waiting to be roadmapped, and the skin of
teen-agers and young adults, before the realities of life have actually
begun to "set in." It's all quite beautiful.

>
> I have met young and shapely
> women who are cold and calculating so I certainly wouldn't want to spend

> time with them. I've met women who could never have been described as
> great beauties but who are pleasant, kind and cheerful. I've also met
> hags who have the demeanor of Attila The Hun. I make judgements about
> all of them.
>

I wonder, though, if your judgements are made quickly, based on what a person looks like. I am not without that, myself. But, I don't think I do it very often.

>
> What does it all mean, Kim? Further, what has any of it to
> do with your tacky call?
>
> Dave K8MN

I think we're just off on another tangent of discussion, Dave. I don't that growing old and looking beautiful or ugly has anything to do with my beautiful callsign.

Kim W5TIT

6029. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 22:31:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2ba278_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29076

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C2B7AE3.80F645AF@earthlink.net...
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2B5E0C.35DE5F59@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3C2AC933.265EB9B3@earthlink.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >You must have missed it. I've indicated no desire to change my
> > call.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Perhaps you should. By now, people are bound to be
starting
> > to
> > > > > > > recognize your current one--and it would be a shame to have a
large
> > > > > > > investment in radio equipment if no one will communicate with
you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'll let this third time be the final. I h a v e e x p r e s
s e
> > d
> > > > > > n o i n t e r e s t i n c h a n g i n g m y c a l l.
As
> > > > > far as the rest of your drivel, I don't recall ever hearing you or
> > > > > working you on the air. To be certain, I checked my logs. My
K8MN
> > log
> > > > > contains about 35,000 QSOs. My J52US log runs to about 75,000.
There
> > > > > are more than 60,000 QSOs in my 9L1US log. My A22MN log contains
> > > > > roughly 55,000 QSOs. My OH0 and OH2 logs run to about 15,000
QSOs.
> > > > > You aren't in any of 'em on any band using any mode. By the way,
when
> > > > > do suppose all this shunning of me is going to take place?
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > And you know what that means to a DXer. ;)
> > >
> > > No, I don't. What is your big secret to DX enlightenment?

> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Those of us who know, don't need explanation, Dave.
>
> Maybe you can give me some hints on drive-time repeater DXing, Kim? You
> know, let us in on handling the pileups and the like.
>

You sound very defensive there, Dave. Have some prior experiences with folks and their opinions of DXers? I don't hold those opinions, by the way. I believe that ham radio is everything it needs to be for each person. Apparently you don't, with your disparaging comments about having discussions on a repeater.

>
> Rick made a goofy statement about people recognizing my call. I should
> hope so. It's been all over the map beginning in 1977 when I obtained
> it.
>

I've never heard of you. Never heard your call. I might add that about a year before I ever got my license, and about six months after, I was listening on HF nearly every waking moment. I don't know if your pronouncement of your call being "all over the map" was for the benefit of making yourself way up high; but let me tell you that it means nothing to people who don't know you or haven't heard you or of you.

>
> Rick seemed to indicate that I'll have nobody to talk to on air.
>

Well, now I'll make fun. Those aren't discussions, Dave. They are contacts. DXing is your thing and that is OK. The reason it isn't mine, and the reason HF turns me off for the most part, is there are very little discussions.

>
> Do my figures refute his silliness?
>

I don't know that he was being silly, Dave. He doesn't know you. Were you being silly when you said, "Maybe you can give me some hints on drive-time repeater DXing, Kim?" If you were, then maybe that's what you mean by being silly.

>
> I haven't contacted Rick in his
> current incarnation as KE8HH. There are 975 QSOs in my log for this
> month alone. They represent QSOs on bands 160m-6m, SSB and CW. What
> does it all mean, Kim?
>
> Dave K8MN

I guess it means that you are pretty stuck on radio and the internet.
Right? What answer do you want, Dave?

Kim W5TIT

6030. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 22:49:15 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <FD67F9C605914285.519282938313629F.DC6607C24333ACF5@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29077

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 07:31:50 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>It'd seem that you have a rough time getting a hat on that noggin of
>yours. Your ego knows no bounds. If you have trouble understanding my
>stuff, I'll be happy to write in such a manner that even y o u c a n
>u n d e r s t a n d i t.

You mean you'll use sophisticated terms and properly
constructed sentences that are logically consistent?

I'll believe it when I see it.

>Probably because I don't want to see amateur radio sink any deeper into
>bedlam and chaos than it already has. Kim's call is only one issue
>which interests me.

Dave, if you sincerely believe that rrap is going to have the
slightest influence on behavior on the amateur radio bands you really
need to get a grip on reality.

This newsgroup has no influence on ham radio at all--or at
least no positive one. I have no doubt at all that many potential hams
read the messages here and decide that ham radio is NOT for them--it's
filled with crotchety old men, fascists, people with no morals, and
flaming liberals (the usual accusations--and behavioral
demonstrations) and their conversations invariably end up in flame
wars, accusations, and insults. No one in his or her right mind would
want to spend money on a ham rig to listen to people communicate as we
do here--and this is the only example they have OF our communications.

You attack Kim for her call sign--but you are just as quick to
model inappropriate behavior to new and potential hams here as you are
to condemn others for the models THEY display. And unlike others in
this thread who don't believe this news group could have any effect at
all on the ARS, you clearly feel that it can. Thus it is YOU and your
constant put downs of Kim and her call sign that are likely to move
the ARS "...one step closer to extinction," not her sign itself.

>Really, you thought I was kidding?

My mistake.

> Are you serious about the
>homosexuality?

In what aspect?

I'm heterosexual personally, so if you're asking if I am
serious about homosexual relationships, the answer is obviously no.
If, on the other hand, you are asking if I believe homosexuals have
the same rights, morality, and legitimacy as heterosexuals in our
society, then yes I am serious about homosexuality. You'll have to
clarify your question more completely.

> Maybe you and I could do some winter camping and discuss
>the issue.

Thanks, but cold weather is NOT my thing (can't breathe well
in cold air with only one functioning lung)--I much prefer camping in
the summer when it's comfortable outside. You'll have to settle for
drinks or a cup of coffee in a heated restaurant.

> Maybe you could spin some of your Vietnam tales for me

You've never seen me discuss specifics of what happened while
I was serving in Southeast Asia, and you never will.

> and
>go over your spiffy theories about sexual repression.

Off hand, I don't have any theories about sexual repression
whatever. However quite a number of well founded ones already exist
and I happen to accept a number of them as quite valid (I draw the
line at the New Age theories that pop up in transpersonal and
humanistic psychology and the absurdities present in traditional
Freudian psychoanalysis).

>Do you use Viagra?

Not regularly--but I _have_ used it before when I was
undergoing chemo, and once or twice since then when particularly tired
or just in the mood to do so. Why, did you want a personal evaluation
of the drug before taking it?

>Were you under the impression that most men over 50 need it?

Nope. Although, believe it or not, most SWINGERS over 45 do
(although seldom with their spouses)!

For the most part, those with high blood pressure (and under
medication for it), those with blocked arteries, heart problems, or
prostate problems often need it, as do diabetics and others with
disorders that affect the hormonal system. I know a number of people
who DO use the substance and it's made a tremendous difference in
their lives.

>I have to admit, your supply of absurd statements is seemingly endless.

Thank you--I work hard to build up a good supply!

>Kim's call is in poor taste. I'm "fixated" on that. On second thought,
>the camping trip is off! You'll have to find another guy to play "Let's
>analyze the ink blots".

No offense, Dave, but as I mentioned above, I'm straight.
While I have a lot of gay friends and colleagues, it just isn't my
lifestyle. I'm afraid you'll just have to find another date for
camping anyway. Don't let it worry you, though, I'm sure you and Larry
would be perfectly suited to each other.

BTW, Kim's call is in poor taste only to those who insist that
we return to the Victorian era. To someone comfortable with living in
the 21st Century, it's not even slightly inappropriate.

>Too bad, I still see Oprah.

Perhaps with the necessary surgery, you could BE Oprah!

>Rick, I know even less about Rorshach tests than you do about ACP-127
>format, Niact cables, playing the guitar, maintaining a classified local
>area network or about any number of ham radio operating activities. I
>do know a great line of self-important manure when I read it. You da
>man!

Let's look at the list:

ACP-127: Since that's a military message format, there's
really no reason why I would have any need to know it's details. I
could probably write acceptable headers, and anyone could recognize
the security warning levels, but that's about it. We'll give you this
one.

Niact cables: Again, since this is an information agency
message format, why would I have any need to know anything about it?
I'll take a few points for knowing what it is and how it's used, but
we'll have to give you this one, too.

Playing the guitar: I don't play professionally, but I _do_
play fairly decent folk and blues guitar (I have a particularly nice
Dobro I use for blues and a decent--although not expensive--Yamaha I
use for folk and oldies). My wife, on the other hand, is an
accomplished Flamenco guitarist and has a very nice Martin D-45. I
_do_ play Sitar quite well, however, and I'm very good at creating
digital music with a computer & midi keyboard if that counts. We'll
give you partial credit on this one, assuming you play at the
professional level.

Maintaining a classified LAN: Sorry, Dave, but you DON'T get
points here. My Master's is in Computer Information Systems and before
I went into the social sciences I did computer security work for major
institutions including the BofA, Wells Fargo, and Crocker Bank in San
Francisco. I'm a well trained IMS/CICS analyst and programmer, have a
good background in low level programming, and I've done work for law
enforcement agencies which requires the same levels of security as do
most military networks (those handling Top Secret and above
communications excepted--but those use dedicated, and protected,
cables for communication anyway so the problems are less severe). I
won't claim to know MORE about it than you, but I WILL claim to know

at least as much. I'm running a small LAN at home right now using DES level security to protect against intrusions. Feel free to try and hack into it if you like, I doubt you'll have much success cracking the security barriers.

Ham radio activities: Dave, I've been a ham since the early seventies (original call: N7AVF) and I've participated in a rather wide range of activities including both digital and analog modes. You may have more experience in some areas than I have, but I undoubtedly have more experience than you in others. No score here either.

Speaking of "self-important manure," Dave, I notice that with the exception of ham radio and guitar playing everything you list to "prove" you have a wider range of knowledge than I have (you don't!) has to do with military applications. Apparently, from your perspective, to play on a level field with you a person has to have sound military knowledge. Ok, fair enough. My turn. How do you do a field amputation of a leg safely? What is the effect of inhaling exhaust fumes from a solid fuel rocket? How do you execute a medevac operation under battle conditions with SAM batteries known to be in the area? What altitudes are involved in a HALO? In a HILO? What does Hell Week consist of at Recon School?

Your turn to play.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6031. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:00:50 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <561009B25B417346.4BC18A06F59D7591.679223C653AA096B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29078

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 08:50:29 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>Dick, the very concept of actions having consequences has never dawned on
>Kim, is considered debatable by Rick, will be firmly driven into the
>ground by Dave, and semantically parsed by Cecil. A juvenile act will be
>defended by juveniles in a juvenile manner; you have no choice but to live
>with it -- or become a juvenile.

No one is claiming that actions don't have consequences. What
I DO claim is that the only negative consequence of Kim's call sign is
the treatment she is receiving here in this newsgroup. Her call sign
has no consequences for the ARS at all (unless this thread discourages
others from becoming hams, of course, and then it isn't her call sign
but the response to it that is at fault), which should be the ONLY
concern of the people who are attacking her choice.

It isn't juvenile to feel that her simple decision to select a
call sign she regards (correctly, in my--and other people's--opinion)
as humorous, "fun," and innocuous. That's a simple question of
personal opinion. What IS juvenile is to continue to attack that
choice, to harass or insult her about it, and to feel that something
as unimportant as a call sign choice can possibly have an effect on
the ARS--or that the act of attacking her sign will result in her
changing it. THAT, Richard, is juvenile thinking.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6032. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:04:54 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <4DD809835AE5BFEA.8125FF41251B13A2.A30B683E1CABC655@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29079

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 19:23:21 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>It isn't dirty or filty, Kim. It is tasteless. It isn't necessary for
>it to be dirty or filthy to be tacky.

Even if her call WERE tasteless, Dave (which many of us don't
believe is the case) would that justify the harassment and attacks on
her choice that are being made in this news group by you, Larry, Dick,
and a couple others? Are you actually so filled with self-importance
that you truly believe you, or anyone else, have the right to harass
someone because their taste is different than your own?

You really ARE a smug, self-righteous, ass, aren't you?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6033. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:21:47 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <83281005275E2715.570E9D25AA02BE8E.53917334EB794DC0@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29080

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 19:13:27 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>CAM wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>> >
>> > CAM wrote:
>> > > Dave, I used the word so I get to pick the definition. When are you
>> > > going to realize that you are NOT omnipotent and don't have control
>> > > over the words I choose to use even though you are deluded enough to
>> > > think you do.
>> >
>> > Actually, Cecil, I don't believe you were the first to use that word.
>>
>> I didn't say I was the first to use the word. But I have posted the
>> definition of "vulgar" that I am using multiple times on this newsgroup.
>> Here it is again: "vulgar - of or relating to the common people". That's
>> what educated people mean when they use the word "vulgar". Your definition
>> of "vulgar" is, well, vulgar, by definition.
>
>Naw Cecil, your latest just shows that it doesn't matter how good the
>dictionary is if you've not learned how to use it. Wish I could take
>your stuff seriously.

From the Merriam-Webster Dictionary:

vuli¿½gar \"vel-ger\ adj [ME, fr. L vulgaris of the mob, vulgar, fr.
vulgus mob, common people] 1 : vernacular <the ~ tongue> 2 : of or
relating to the common people : general, common 3 : lacking
cultivation or refinement : boorish; also : offensive to good taste or
refined feelings syn gross, obscene, ribald, dirty, indecent, profane
ï¿½ vuli¿½gari¿½ly adv

(c)2000 Zane Publishing, Inc. and Merriam-Webster, Incorporated. All
rights reserved

You'll notice that the MOST COMMON definition (listed first)
is the one Cecil uses and only a later (less common) definition
includes the form you claim is accurate. As you SHOULD know, the first
definition is the normal one to assume if you are using a dictionary.
The same primary definition is present in the Oxford English
Dictionary, btw, so it isn't just Websters. In fact the ONLY source
I've found that didn't list it in that order is Encarta Online--hardly
the ultimate source of knowledge of the English language.

Sorry, Dave, but it appears that YOU, not Cecil, are the one
who needs to learn how to use a dictionary.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6034. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:23:40 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <286DB362F898AC67.3ED6E1892738909D.4D567B70B15648BB@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29081

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 07:38:24 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>>
>> "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
>> news:A17D53CE133D6D39.5F6E437A9BAFA70A.F74698D962F766B7@lp.airnews.net...
>> >
>> > It isn't a question of Kim's call sign bothering you--it's
>> > just that you don't think she knows her place!
>> >
>
>>
>> *Now* the crosshairs are on the target. That's what I think about their
>> protests to my callsign. It is more that they "just don't like me" and
>> couldn't, originally, come up with something that honest. ;)
>
>Kim, in my book you are a real man.

Maybe, but considering that YOU'RE the one who asked me to go
camping with him, you might not be the best person to determine that.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6035. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:25:28 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <68C851D98AD69666.A8631DAED041C160.E6B21606E2E51513@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29082

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 06:42:00 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Do your homework before engaging the keyboard, James. I've never stated
>that Kim's call is "dirty". It is tacky. It is tasteless. It
>demonstrates a lack of good judgement.

She has the call sign W5HEIL?

How did she get a 1x4?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6036. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:25:50 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <26OW7.243179$3d2.11893887@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29083

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:561009B25B417346.4BC18A06F59D7591.679223C653AA096B@lp.airnews.net...
> On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 08:50:29 GMT, "Richard McCollum"
> <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> >Dick, the very concept of actions having consequences has never dawned
on
> >Kim, is considered debatable by Rick, will be firmly driven into the
> >ground by Dave, and semantically parsed by Cecil. A juvenile act will
be
> >defended by juveniles in a juvenile manner; you have no choice but to
live
> >with it -- or become a juvenile.
>
> No one is claiming that actions don't have consequences. What
> I DO claim is that the only negative consequence of Kim's call sign is
> the treatment she is receiving here in this newsgroup. Her call sign
> has no consequences for the ARS at all (unless this thread discourages
> others from becoming hams, of course, and then it isn't her call sign
> but the response to it that is at fault), which should be the ONLY
> concern of the people who are attacking her choice.
>
> It isn't juvenile to feel that her simple decision to select a
> call sign she regards (correctly, in my--and other people's--opinion)
> as humorous, "fun," and innocuous. That's a simple question of
> personal opinion. What IS juvenile is to continue to attack that
> choice, to harass or insult her about it, and to feel that something
> as unimportant as a call sign choice can possibly have an effect on
> the ARS--or that the act of attacking her sign will result in her
> changing it. THAT, Richard, is juvenile thinking.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH

There can be no doubt that it was selected with the consequences in mind;
a princess used to being the center of all things sucks in a bunch of old
farts to argue over her. Sorry, don't play the game and didn't when I was
14.

Said old farts have predicted the end of the world, dragged in feminism
(that's you isn't it?), invoked the First Amendment which applies only to
governments to begin with, and worn the covers off of a perfectly good

Funk and Wagnells. Over what is fundamentally no different from a cutesy-poo personal plate. The all-time cutesy-poo callsign is the U.N.s 4U prefix so Kim don't even come close.

So you do what you do when caught behind some moronic personal plate: note, and write off the holder as a moron or child or both. As noted before, that is why killfiles were invented. If I met her on a repeater, I would either fail to note the call for the duration of the QSO or carefully give it Whiskey Five Tango India Tango. I would refrain from Terminally Idiotic Twit.

But I have better things to do: the Seattle Bowl is on.

Dick NBK

6037. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:29:49 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0gapq028lh@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29089

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c2b9c33_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> Tacky just feels very insignificant to me, Dave. What *is* tacky?

Salt water taffy? Peanut Brittle?

6038. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:35:03 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DB310A5B12C650D2.3E0D310773671D75.F2664F9AB11CD192@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29084

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 17:40:04 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I mean that it is common sense to choose not to view something which is
>past its prime and which would generall detract from what would
>otherwise be a lovely setting. My wife isn't near my age. Her view
>isn't as good as mine. She receives extra credit. There are women my
>age who look attractive. There are women my age who do not look
>attractive. I make those *judgements*. I do not see any of those
>women, attractive or unattractive nude.

For someone who claims to be offended by tasteless, Dave, you
excel at it personally!

Don't ever visit a nude beach, Dave, you'll be very
disappointed. People there have too much class to judge each other on
the basis of physical appearance. Go to your textile beaches
instead--that way you can ogle the women (or the men in your case)
just like the other immature sex-crazed losers who hang out there do.

I truly feel sorry for your wife, Dave. Not only must she feel
concern that if she loses her looks you will dump her like yesterday's
garbage (which, of course, might be the best thing that ever happened
to her), but you try to arrange dates with men here in the news group
as well--and I doubt seriously she knows about your "camping trips" at
all.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6039. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:40:45 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <2B9F83FE951F5B2B.9D91137245AAAB38.AB7AAEF1C86FBAA8@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29085

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 19:33:49 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I'm not "scarey" or even
>scared to be nude, Kim. I built a sauna here after living in Finland.
>Sauna is traditionally enjoyed in the nude. I don't invite the
>neighbors for a gawk nor do we have mixed gender sauna with visitors.

Translation: You aren't scared to be nude if you are alone or
with your spouse. Otherwise you are.

It doesn't sound like you learned very much about saunas in
Finland--didn't they view your fetish with modesty to be a bit
extreme?

>Sauna isn't tacky or tasteless. Your call is tacky and tasteless.

No, Dave, your MIND is tacky and tasteless. Kim's call is
light hearted and non-harmful.

>> And you are, as I've said before and you've denied, a very judgemental
>> person. It's no wonder you're so dry and lifeless.
>
>Pshaw! Every human on the planet makes judgements each and every day.
>There are people I like and people I don't like. There are things I
>believe in and things I don't believe in. I believe your call, for
>example, is tacky.

Just as many of us believe you are a stogey old buffoon who
pretends to be far more sophisticated than he actually demonstrates
himself to be.

>If your posts are somehow being misinterpreted, perhaps you want to take
>a crack at making clear what you mean to convey. I can only make
>judgements based on what is presented.

This from someone who can't even identify his location
accurately?

Her posts ARE clear, Dave. It's your mind that is foggy.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6040. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:46:22 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <BDCC347460DE68DD.DFC3B77A8CFA12DD.222EF37AD4629B02@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29086

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 07:46:14 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Then I'd rather go to a beach where I'm unable to avoid seeing all of
>that flesh. It would dramatically increase my enjoyment of the beach.

That's ok. It would dramatically increase the enjoyment of the
beach by the people there, too.

>> Sorry that you judge people on their physical appearance--most
>> adults have matured past that point--or at least the ones who go to
>> nude recreational sites have done so.
>
>Don't be sorry, Rick. All normal folks make some judgements about
>others based upon appearance. Most adults who claim otherwise could
>benefit from seeing a good therapist.

I AM a "good therapist," Dave.

You're wrong.

That isn't personal opinion--it's the statement of the precise
type of professional you state SHOULD be consulted.

>> BTW, the amateur "Nude Net" meets on HF on Saturdays as I
>> recall. You might want to tune it in sometime and note the age of some
>> of the participants.
>
>Yeah, I'm certain I'd have a rollicking good time.

What? Imagining them to all be young, sexy, hard-bodies?

What an image: Dave Heil using an amateur net as masturbatory
material!

Yuck!

>> >Sure, Kim. That's why you chose your call over W5FAT, K5LID or N5DOH.
>> >It wasn't for the shock value, it was purely for the "fun".
>>
>> Kim (correctly, btw) doesn't see herself as "Fat," a "LID," or
>> representative of the kind of person for whom "DOH" is appropriate.
>> She sees herself as a woman and chose a different defining
>> characteristic to use in her sign. Too bad that you find a "TIT" any
>> more inappropriate than a "LEG" or an "ARM." That isn't her
>> fault--it's yours!
>
>C'mon, Rick. It's all for FUN according to Kim. Let's have some FUN!

Sorry, Dave. I've told you before and I'll tell you again, I'm
straight and I'm NOT going camping with you.

Try asking Larry or Dick.

>> How many have YOU surveyed to determine that they find Kim's
>> call offensive or inappropriate? From what I've seen here, there are
>> more hams supporting her decision than opposing it.
>
>I don't believe you.

Then conduct a survey and prove me wrong.

>> She feels positive about butterflies and sunrises. She also
>> feels positive about her tits. W5BUTTERFLY and W5SUNRISE aren't valid
>> call signs. W5TIT is.
>
>W5TIT is a tacky callsign.

No, it's an amateur radio call sign, Dave. Don't you know how
to recognize one?

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6041. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:50:26 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DA8C54FB3040F08D.974877FB31925A1E.3CC13BBDB8F90389@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29087

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 19:19:57 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>CAM wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>> > You still haven't been able to deny my statement, have you Cecil?
>>
>> And you haven't been able to deny my statement that smallpox is bad.
>> So what?
>
>I've neither tried to deny your statement or to acknowledge that it has
>anything to do with the discussion of Kim's tacky call. To my
>knowledge, you don't have Smallpox, Kim doesn't have smallpox nor does
>any other individual posting here have Smallpox.
>
>Me: "Kim's choice of call shows a lack of good judgement."
>
>You: "Smallpox is bad".

A slight difference, Dave.

Whether a call sign shows "a lack of good judgement" is a
matter of opinion only. Whether smallpox is "bad" is scientifically
demonstrable.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6042. Re: really dumb SW radio pirate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-27 23:50:56 UTC
From: Den6N <djmr26@bestweb.net>
Message-ID: <u2ncvihsefom62@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 29088
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

I saw a bumper sticker just the other day that read " Don't drink and
transmit."
I wondered what it meant...

==========
Den6N
Putnam Co NY
==========

"Kaa B." <erielacaw400@aol.com> wrote in message
news:6WvW7.17814$PO5.2724976@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Found in alt.radio.pirate:
>
> A radio pirate in the Barnes Road area of St. John's, Newfoundland,
> Canada has had his equipment confiscated by Industry Canada. The
> pirate, who, they describe as 'not too bright' and dressed in woman's
> clothing was awakened from his sleep by a squad of agents, who
> searched the house and seized thousands of dollars of radio
> transmitting equipment. The pirate was caught when while under the
> influence of alcohol, mistakenly broadcast his address on the air,
> while soliciting free beer from listeners. Charges are pending.
>
> Wonder if he also operated on 14.313 and fancied an "erotic exotic
> relationship" with a certain ham in Vermont? ;)
>
>
>
>

6043. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 00:44:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goz3o0e.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29090
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 04:41:08 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> Things change, and sometimes pretty fast, but if we're headed down that
>slippery slope, I haven't seen a lot of evidence of it. Of course I have
>seen some. One of he most gregarious cases was in New York Cit. In 1962 I
>watched a NYPD street cop give a guy an awful cussing in public while he
>stood with his hand on the butt of his revolver as if he dared the guy to
>respond in any way. The fellow' soffense was cuttting across one extra
>traffic lane to get to a (rare) parking spot. There was no safety reason
>for him not to do that, except the LEO noted his out of state license
>plate, and after all, some jerk behind who wanted the spot himself
>honked.....

That was standard NYPD practice in those days. I too saw it done
and was appalled, even though I grew up in NYC, because I had been
exposed to four years of the California Highway Patrol's extra
courteous manners in the interim.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6044. Re: Mistuh Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 00:45:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.goz42df.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29091

On 26 Dec 2001 08:39:11 -0800, Bob Weiss wrote:

>General Electric has been convicted of defrauding the US government on
>several defense contracts. They are also the largest producer of EPA
>superfund sites, IIRC. So when is the FCC going to cancel all of the
>broadcast licenses held by GE (owner of NBC)?
>
>Or are computer hackers subject to a different set of laws than
>corporate criminals?

Do ypu remember what happened to RKO General, a division of
General Tire, about 30 years ago? WOR, KHJ, and a few other
radio and TV stations went "bye bye".

And yes, computer hackers are subject to a different set of
laws. Violate communications law and communications privileges go
away. It's that simple.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6045. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 01:11:54 UTC
From: Frank Ney <n4zhg@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <6ghn2uo728httplqnrjbn4am8j9dlrujpd@4ax.com>
Source record: 29092
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001 14:02:22 -0500, an orbiting mind control laser caused
"Scout" <scout@monumental.com> to write in talk.politics.guns :

>> If you look, the 13th exempts the government.
>
>Where please?
>
>Section 1 is posted above, section 2 states
>
>"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate
>legislation."
>
>There are no other sections. No exemptions for the government.
>
>
>
>> What legal scholars support your wild ass
>> views?
>
>Oh, it's something called the Constitution of the United States of America
>as Amended.
>
>I don't need to appeal to authority. The facts themselves support me.
>
>> What court ruling support your off
>> the wall hype libertarianism?
>
>I see, so unless an authority supports you, then you can' t be right. No
>wonder Galileo was locked up, all the authorities said he was wrong.....but
>damn the facts supported him. Now who is see to have been right, the one
>supported by the fact, or the "authority"?
>
>Appeal to authority is a useless undertaking, either the facts support you
>at which point it doesn't matter what authority states, or you are wrong and
>agreement with authority isn't going to make you right.

Who needs facts when you control large numbers of armed legbreakers? A
group tried this back during WW1, and Oliver Wendell Holmes sent them to
jail to rot with his "shout 'fire' in a crowded theater" screed, may his
soul be roasting in hell.

Frank Ney N4ZHG WV/EMT-B LPWV NRA(L) ProvNRA GOA CCRKBA JPFO
--
"I believe a self-righteous liberal Democrat with a cause is

more dangerous than a Hell's Angel with an attitude."
-- Ted Nugent
Just Say No to Gestapo Tactics http://reduce.to/justsayno/
Abuses by the BATF http://www.hamnet.net/~n4zhg/batfabus.html

6046. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 02:12:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2bd594_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29103

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > digital modes as well?
>
> Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> learn Morse code?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I'm sure that's EXACTLY the goal of such proposals, Cecil.
That's why I asked the question ... to make that point.

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCvVE5e+N6+q84HiEQIXdACgjChbp9sid1PzvY+y6uCh+QW+dFMAoPbH
n177KLH3v48CXnlQ3HbrIzS6
=kCA9
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6047. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 03:03:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011227220325.01870.00000569@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 29093

In article <XZpW7.242101$3d2.11769921@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:

>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Not to be argumentative, but - why "must" it be solved?
>
>Because, simply said, the ARS is in need of cleaning up. There is no good
>reason why there needs to be 6 license classes.

I'm not gonna argue that one, 'specially since 3 of the 6 are no longer issued
to new applicants. I remember now that we had this discussion before, and
agreed that the Novice/Tech/Tech plus confusion badly needed straightening out.

>My thought is that when the S25.5 foes away the only distinguishing marks on
>a particular license is... "Which written elements have been passed and
>when?"

Yup.
>
>I know that's cruel to say but that's the fact.

Not cruel at all, just a simple fact.

>Very few people including
>the FCC want 6 license classes and 4 or 5 license classes have very little
>support either. So, Jim, my proposal is not very much concerned with what
>the FCC has done in the past. or what the ARRL has done in the past. They
>both have indicated lately that feelings have shifted dramatically.

We have to keep the past in mind as an indicator. From what I see, FCC is in no
hurry to clean up the mess of 6 license classes.

But the important point of this discussion is to look at long-term future
plans, not patching up the 1951 system one more time, as has been done all
along.
>
>> If the license
>> structure is radically changed, a solution should be incorporated.
>> If/when Element 1 disappears, there will be no reason to distinguish
>> Techs from Tech Pluses, and all of them should get Tech Plus privs,
>> such as they are.
>
>True...
>
>> From Jan 1952 to Nov 1967 (approximately) the FCC issued zero new
>> Advanced licenses, but allowed the ~40K hams who held Advanceds to

>> renew and modify them. When the changes of Nov 1968 came, those folks
>> were mighty happy they'd not been mixed in with the Generals.
>
>You and anyone else who has a heartbeat knows that no matter what happens,
>no one will lose privileges.

I dunno about that. But it's probably a good bet.

> If the FCC doesn't see a significant number of
>people request/condone something then the FCC will not do it.

So we gotta build a consensus, more or less.
>
>> > So, when the morse requirements are gone we have six licenses most with
>a
>> > different count for written elements completed.
>
>> Yup. We even have some folks with the same license (Tech Plus) but
>> with different written credits (pre Mar 21, 1987 vs. post that date).
>> Watta mess!

'zactly. More important, the mess doesn't really benefit anybody much.
>
>> > Technician and Technician Plus have passed the same written elements.
>
>> Most of them have, but pre Mar 21 Techs have General class written
>> credit.
>
>Oh... have they passed 3(B)?

Yep. Actually, before Mar 21 1987, the Tech and General used exactly the same written - old Element 3. In 1987 that element was split into 3A for Techs and 3B for Generals (who also needed 3A, of course). The idea was that 3A contained the stuff needed by both classes, but 3B contained "HF only" questions that Techs had no need to be examined for. What this did was to make the old Tech easier to get than before, but also meant upgrading to General required both a written and a code test.

>If so then they are General class.

Except that FCC requires them to jump through the VE hoop to get the upgrade. This is because the VE system is the input machine for all upgrades. FCC doesn't want the additional admin work of handling "paper upgrades" (no test) directly. Same thing happens if a ham collects CSCEs and then wants a license or upgrade - he/she has to go to a VE session.

Let's face it - it's easier and cheaper for the FCC to let unpaid volunteer VEs do much of the work.
>
>> > If the
>> > Novice is promoted to this class by simply waiving element 2 then the
>> > situation becomes much clearer.
>

>> Yup - but is it right to give away upgrades like that?
>
>Well, yes, it is because they have been law abiding hams for years, possibly
>decades and granting them Element 2 is not going to ire anyone.

It might upset those who recently took a test to upgrade. Didja know that both the NCVEC and NCI OPPOSED the ARRL BoD idea to give a "free" upgrade of Novices and Tech Pluses to General?
>
>> ARRL proposed simply upgrading Novices and Tech Pluses to General, and
>> the FCC said no way.
>
>This was back when things were clouded by the morse requirements. In 2003
>morse requirements and morse accomplishments are null and void.

Not true! ARRL proposed 5 wpm for General, so all Novices and Tech Pluses already had the code test for General. 5 wpm General was widely supported, btw - at least 75% of comments wanted 5 wpm General. Only the writtens were different.
>
>> >Call this Technician class.
>
>> Alrighty.
>
>> > The General Class remains as is.
>
>> I presume holders of "old" Tech Pluses could get instant upgrades to
>> General, same as today. Just present the documentation, a 605 and the
>> fee.
>
>No... I think it should be automatic... they should have that now. They ARE
>Generals.
>
I agree!! But the FCC doesn't.

>At any rate, the FCC should be reclassifying everyone automatically if the
>FCC is killing the license classes.

They don't want the admin work. That's a given.
>
>> > The difference between Advanced and Amateur Extra is element 4(B) so
>waive
>> > it.
>
>> I understand it's Christmas, but that's a lot of giveaway.
>
>What are you giving away?

The whole Extra written test! Today, a current Advanced has to take a 50 question written to get the Extra - same as a General. Auto-upgrade would not go over big with some folks.

>Yes, you are waiving 4(B) but the code thingy is
>gone.

Been gone almost two years, too.

> Do Advanced have the same level of VE status as Amateur Extra?

Nope.
>
>> >Call this Amateur Extra Class.
>
>> > Now, we have only three license classes all available for growth.
>
>> Yup. But will the FCC and the amateur radio community accept it? FCC
>> has already rejected all forms of upgrade giveaways. Why should they
>> accept them now?
>
>Not quite... the FCC has waived things in the past.

Yup - only when it suited them. Betcha that if/when S25.5 goes, FCC will up and
"waive" Element 1 ASAP. Won;t even have ta ask them.

> OK, Jim, think about it,
>do you believe that newbies can pass a bunch of writtens to attain the same
>class as you but that there is no way an Advanced class ham could 'clep' a
>written? That's what I'm talking about.

I dunno. Heck, I been a law-abiding ham for 34+years, 30 of them as an Extra.
Can I get in on the giveaway? ;-)
>
>> > This simplifies the existing band plans. I've listed the changes
>resulting
>> > from the above action.
>> >
>> > 1) The entire bands above 30 MHz are open to all licensees.
>>
>> Full power and all modes, I presume.
>
>I really think that, yes, there is no reason to hold the power down for the
>ex-Novices when the new person off the street gets full power.

The whole RF exposure thingie puts a new light on high power, particularly at
VHF/UHF. And one of the problems with the current structure is that for a lot
of nontechnical folks the Tech test is rather daunting (see W1RFI's
oft-repeated "200 page book" story).
>
>If you want to somehow limit power up there then what should be done is that
>a limit should be the norm and an additional endorsement should be given to
>ONLY those people who actually need/want to use excessive power. This
>endorsement is separate from license classes and that way you aren't handing
>out excessive power endorsements by rote. But this is another discussion.
>;-)
>

Might not be a bad idea at all. Set up a new license structure with power limits, and hand out power endorsements to existing hams so nobody loses existing privileges.

>> > 2) Novice subbands on 1.25 meters and 23 centimeters disappear.
>> > 3) Technicians get 200W 28.100 to 28.300 on 10 meters.
>> > 4) Technicians get 200W CW and SSB only 28.300 to 28.500 on 10 meters.
>> > 5) Technicians get 200W CW only subbands on 15, 40, and 80 meters.
>> > 6) Advanced Class subbands on 80, 40, 20, and 15 meters disappear.
>
>> All logical consequences from the combinations suggested.
>
>> > All this is accomplished by waiving Element 2 for Novices and waiving
>> > Element 4(B) for Advanced. I think this is a very tiny price to pay in
>order
>> > to have a structure which can have some basic adjustments applied for
>better
>> > transitioning of everyone throughout the ARS experience.
>
>> I see your point, but others may be outraged and the FCC may nix the
>> whole free upgrade idea.
>
>Frankly, my dear... I don't give a damn... ;-)

HAW - that's a good one!
>
>No, really, if people are outraged fine. They can 'lobby' for they're own
>'vision' of what the ARS of the future should be. The FCC will do whatever
>they perceive the shift to be.

Consensus, man, consensus.
>
>> Without those giveaways, we're back to all those subbands.
>
>The FCC should also take a look at any other nation to find out that SIX
>CLASSES ARE ABSOLUTELY NOT WANTED OR NEEDED if the FCC had to write a
>proposal on organizing an ARS from scratch they (or anyone else) could not
>justify starting out with six classes.

Admin work, my friend, that's the key. No way they want the admin work of more than 4 classes - and 4 is pushing it.
>
>> > I now add my thoughts on the 'adjustments'... ;-)
>> >
>> > One, give the Technicians 10 meters because in light of the infringement
>of
>> > freebanders it's better to have plenty of licenced operators squatting
>there
>> > trying to maintain control of the band. There is no sense in being
>> > exclusionary to your fellow hams. I say get the freeband candidates
>licensed

>> > and accountable. This would eliminate the subband on 10 meters which I
>view
>> > a good thing. As far as I'm concerned limit everyone on the band to 200
>> > watts and go after the jerks.
>>
>> I agree in part. Give everyone all of 10 meters - just limit Techs to
>> 200W. (To do otherwise takes away privileges from higher class
>> licenses).
>
>That's seems fair but I think that what you have to do is think about the
>HIGH POWER endorsement. and limit EVERYONE to 200 watts on 10 meters. I am
>treating 10 meters as a completely different animal here because of the
>state of affairs there and I'm worried about where it will be in 10 years.

The 10 meter situation argues for more hams running high power, not less. The
bad guys sure aren't limiting themselves to 200 watts!!
>
>> > Two, give the Technicians 200 W CW only operation on the General
>subands.
>
>> I agree 100%. But this was proposed formally to the FCC and they shot
>> it down.
>
>In a post code testing era they won't shoot it down, they will look for
>consensus on how to allow it.
>
Maybe. Worth a look, anyway.

>> An ARRL committee is proposing virtually the same thing,
>> (good) plus widening the 'phone slots on those bands (bad).
>
>I agree with you here, also.
>
>> But why
>> should the FCC reverse itself from its previous refusal of AH0A's very
>> reasonable idea? FCC's answer was essentially "let them take Element 3
>> and get Generals".
>
>Don't do it... personally, I couldn't care less. ;-)
>(this is NOT my fight) just a suggestion.

Understood.
>
>> > you want them to learn CW then put the horse before cart and the carrot
>in
>> > front of the horse. This would eliminate the CW only subbands on 15, 40,
>and
>> > 80 meters.
>
>> I think you mean "Novice/TechPlus subbands".
>

>They are CW only subbands on my chart. I was avoiding using the words Novice
>and Technician Plus in my post S25.5 world. Besides, you know what I meant.

Just making sure. It's clear now.
>
>> The main problems I see are:
>
>> 1) the FCC has already shot down many of your ideas
>
>Tough, they'll have to have good reasons to shoot them down, again. As a
>package the whole thing is pure and simple. If they can't handle that and
>they insist on helter skelter then they can save their cab fare... they're
>already there.

We gotta look for a system that has a chance of passing AND will get widespread
support.
>
>> 2) free upgrades may not get much support from other hams
>
>I think other hams see what's happening... the new ones come in and get to
>general and extra very quickly and the elders are being 'corraled' out in
>their pastures.

Hmm - interesting. Could even result in a situation where the newbies say to
the oldsters "I did it, so you have to, as well!"
>
>> 3) the big opportunities of the post-2003 era are not being addressed
>> adequately.
>
>I didn't meant to imply my adjustments where all that is needed. ;-)
>
OK
>> How about this:
>
>> Right now:
>
>> 1) Give all Novices and Tech Pluses 200 W CW only on all nonphone
>> General HF/MF bands, 160-10. (FCC will probably balk at this)
>
>FCC will go with the consensus... build a consensus... what does the ARRL
>say what does NCI and the Quarter Century folks and the VE orgs say???? This
>would happen if the pressure comes from everywhere.

Consensus will help, but FCC went against majority opinion on the code test
thingie. But if everyone was on board for giving more spectrum to Novices and
Tech Pluses, we'd have a leg up.
>
>> 2) Allow all "old" Tech Pluses to get Generals by a simple mail or
>> online procedure, instead of forcing them to attend VE sessions. (FCC
>> will hate this one, too).
>

>This should be automatic. The FCC should realize they ARE GENERALS!!!! The
>FCC should issue the licenses. Much cleaner and simpler if they run the
>computers to cough up the licenses and issue them. Oh and don't bring up
>their budget. It'd be much cheaper also.

I dunno about that. Their system may not know who is an "old" Tech Plus and who
isn't.
>
>> 3) Resolve the 40 meter mess at WRC 2003 to get a worldwide exclusive
>> amateur allocation, even if it gives away spectrum. 7000-7200
>> worldwide exclusive amateur is better for everyone than 7000-7300 in
>> Region 2 and 7000-7100 everywhere else.
>
>No question about this one!!!!
>
Megadittoes.

>> 4) Develop bandplans for all HF/MF that separate CW, digital and
>> analog voice/image modes.
>
>Jim, I'm confused, the sentence doesn't make sense. Do you mean separate
>digital from analog... voice from image...

I mean three slots by mode type: CW, digital, analog voice or image. For
example, 40 meters might be 7000-7075 CW, 7075-7150 digital, 7150-7300 analog
voice or image.
>
>> After S25.5 is gone:
>
>> 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
>> names if you don't like them)
>
>I would think about a high power endorsement in ALL three classes. Maybe the
>endorsement is awarded to all existing licensees and all future would have
>to earn them. I believe, going foward, the handing out willy nilly high
>power should be avoided.

Agreed. See above.
>
>> 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license
>> class. (Some bands, like 10 and the WARC bands, may be split by mode
>> only).
>
>> 3) Basic license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
>> procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff,
>> main purpose is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150
>> watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (determined by RF
>> exposure limits). Modes are CW, SSB, FM, PSK31 and maybe some of the
>> other common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control ops
>> for repeaters, or be club trustees. Basics get all VHF/UHF and about
>> half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the entry level.

>
>Perhaps, the bands could be 10, 12, 17, and 30 meters. What do you think?

I think one of the BIG problems of the Novice and Tech Plus licenses has been
that they offer too few bands. In a few years the sunspots will be down and the
bands above 15 MHz will be dead during darkness. At the bottom of the cycle
even 40 gets raggedy at night. Then there's the issues of rigs and antennas.
Best deal is to give everyone at least a slice of every band, and let 'em use
what they like best.
>
>The power limit should be high enough that using the normal HF rigs that do
>approximately 100 watts or so are totally legal for the newbies not have to
>worry. Same in the UHF normal rigs as built now should be allowed.

That's what I'm trying to suggest with the 100-150 watts on HF and 25 watts on
VHF/UHF. Has to be low enough to avoid the need for lots of RFI questions on
the exam, though.
>
>What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???

Offer an upgrade incentive.
>
>By SSB do you mean the same as I have on 10 meter now...
>J3E single-sideband supressed carrier
>R3E single sideband reduced carrier
>but excluding the other 25 phone modes, including AM (which CB'ers have),
>single sideband full carrier, and MCW "for providing telegraphy practice
>interspersed with speech" as excluded in Part 97 now for no good reason???
>
>Oh... I see you arbitrarily included FM.
>
Not arbitrary - it's probably the most common amateur mode of all.

>I don't think you could subdivide 'data' the modes aren't even invented;
>yet, you want to exclude them... now THAT'S arbitrary... ;-)

Point is that everything allowed has to be tested for. The Basic test needs to
be kept simple. The choice of modes is to offer a sample, not the whole menu.
>
>> 4) Intermediate license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on
>> regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical and RF
>> exposure stuff, with some regs to cover expanded privs. Intermediates
>> get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs
>> after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club
>> trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or
>> more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires at least one year
>> experience as a Basic.
>
>Incrementing the power is a good way to not just grant the high power willy
>nilly.

Also gives an incentive to upgrade. The power levels are set about one S unit
apart, btw.
>
>> 5) Full license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs,
>> procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some
>> regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands,
>> etc. except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see
>> below). Full license requires ar least one year (preferably two years)
>> as an Intermediate.
>
>Sounds reasonable to me.
>
>> 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.
>> 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
>> six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character
>> calls.
>> 8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open
>> to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs.
>> 9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses,
>> Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras
>> become Fulls. Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams
>> to upgrade.
>
>> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned
>> as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but
>> meaningful steps to reach full privileges.
>
>> Of course this probably has even less chance than your ideas, Rich.
>
>There is a problem with telling Advanced and Generals that you're reducing
>their power limits arbitrarily across the board. but that's your sell, not
>mine... ;-)

If they get high power endorsements as suggested, that goes away.
>
>I'll take one more stab at it later. I'll take my ideas and your class names
>and quite a few of your ideas. Now, be more specific on which MF/HF bands
>Basic gets and which modes should be kept away from the basics, and why...
>;-)

Basics would get slices of ALL HF/MF bands. Mode limitation is to simplify the
test - if you allow lots of analog voice modes, for example, the test has to
cover them.
>
>Another go-round and we should have something solid. Then a look around to
>see if it aligns with some other groups/advocates to see if it couldn't be
>presented to the powers that be with some backing. Hey, who knows....

Agreed!! The point is to come up with something that isn't just another patch
slapped on the old system.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6048. Re: What not to say to a cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 03:52:45 UTC
From: LloydVFP <LloydVFP@KV4FZmyHero.net>
Message-ID: <a0gq8q$f9r$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29094
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a0fchi$q4t$2@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
> news:I9yW7.125$8M.574732@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
> >
> > Swift Rider <c_howard_in@disguise.com> wrote in Alt.Law-Enforcement...
> >
> > : The WORST Things to Say to a Police Officer:
> > :
> > :
> > : 1. I can't reach my license unless you hold my beer.
> > :
> > : 2. Sorry, Officer, I didn't realize my radar detector wasn't plugged
in.
> > :
> > : 3. Aren't you the guy from the Village People?
> > :
> > : 4. Hey, you must've been doin' about 125 mph to keep up with me! Good
> job!
> > :
> > : 5. Excuse me. Is "stick up" hyphenated?
> > :
> > : 6. I though you had to be in relatively good physical condition to be
a
> > : police officer.
> > :
> > : 7. I was going to be a cop, but I decided to finish high school
instead.
> > :
> > : 8. Bad cop! No donut!
> > :
> > : 9. You're not gonna check the trunk, are you?
> > :
> > : 10. Gee, that gut sure doesn't inspire confidence.
> > :
> > : 11. Didn't I see you get your butt kicked on "Cops"?
> > :
> > : 12. Wow, you look just like the guy in the picture on my girlfriend's
> > : nightstand!
> > :
> > : 13. Is it true that people become cops because they are too dumb to
work
> > at

> > : McDonald's?
> > :
> > : 14. I pay your salary!
> > :
> > : 15. So, uh, you on the take, or what?
> > :
> > : 16. Gee, Officer! That's terrific. The last officer only gave me a
> > warning,
> > : too!
> > :
> > : 17. Do you know why you pulled me over? OK, just so one of us does.
> > :
> > : 18. I was trying to keep up with traffic. Yes, I know there is no
other
> > car
> > : around me&emdash;that's how far ahead of me they are.
> > :
> > : 19. What do you mean. "Have I been drinking?" You're the trained
> > specialist.
> > :
> > : 20. Well, when I reached down to pick up my bag of crack, my gun fell
> off
> > my
> > : lap and got lodged between the brake pedal and the gas pedal, forcing
me
> > to
> > : speed out of control.
> > :
> > : 21. Hey, is that a 9 mm? That's nothing compared to this .44 magnum.
> > :
> > 22. It's not my car, BUT..... (care of Nightcrawler)
> >
> > 23. I know my rights!!!!

24. KC8JBO, Wogie Wiseman, would say to the cop: Will you
be my boyfriend? LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL

6049. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 04:18:16 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <coSW7.200472$WW.11659969@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29095

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011227220325.01870.00000569@mb-fz.aol.com...
> Agreed!! The point is to come up with something that isn't just another
patch
> slapped on the old system.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Jim, what some view as a patch others might view differently. Especially the FCC. It is not difficult to maintain records on Novice and Advanced tickets until they make it to shady rest nursing home and beyond, particularly when someone else is doing the grunt work. On the other hand, adding new ones would be a major pain in the drain. So you can fairly bet that what you are going to see is Extra, General, Technician. Not a software change in the bundle.

Not being entirely certain just what wonderous opportunities dropping the code test offers and being generally one to let mode wars settle the issue, I am also not entirely sure what is to be gained.

Go ahead and plan out the "Ultimate System"; it is certainly worth the effort but I would suggest that after doing so, one has Plan B and Plan C in the pocket. Certainly the power endorsement is an idea I would not have come up with for sure. Given the CB thing, we might be better to outlaw Antique Modulation entirely and go with a 3kHz max bandwidth below 29 but that doesn't flow from this discussion.

Plans B & C should try to stuff what seems to be a unanimous 3 class approach into both the FCCs problems and attitudes and clearly identify where these attitudes cause problems to the FCC down the road. And it is apparent that Rich is not familiar with the band plans used outside the US. The U.S. phone bands are designed to give the world a place to hide from us. Whether this is good, bad, obsolete or whatever it is reality. Splitting narrow modes without fitting the rest of the planet is not bright. Too much is made over CW; Novices and no one else are limited to CW in their bands.

A related question to what to do with remaining Novice and Advanced is to ask if they are likely to be used enough to be worth changing them. Yes I realize that about 100 Novice tickets are being renewed every month; the question is why? In the absence of a code test, extending power-limited SSB privleges in the 28.3-5 segment or even down to 28.1 to Techs would in effect make the Tech Plus irrelevant anyway. To someone who passed the Advanced in recent memory the new Element 4 is no big deal -- all the advanced I know are ancient Class As. If the ticket is not going to be

used, who cares? Leave them to rot on the vine. I like cleanliness too but why make an issue of it if you have bigger fish to fry?

Making the VE separate from the Extra, and I still think it needs 1-2 years time in grade, is a fine idea.

Dick N&#65533;BK

6050. Re: The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 04:39:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp1575m.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29097

On 26 Dec 2001 11:40:22 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>Although that is technically quite correct, there is still plenty the FCC could
>have done if the source of the RF energy were not following its power rules.
>However, the real crux of the matter is that 95% of the time where a "CB"
>station is involved with an interference problem. there is some other rules
>violation involved (power, frequency) that could be enforced to eliminate the
>problem.

Are you forgetting the extensive field study that the FCC made in
the mid-80s which proved that those problems still existed even when
the transmitter power was lowered to 4 watts?

That was the impetus for Washington to decide to take the "consumer
service" approach with telephone diagnosis and sending out the
(in)famous TVI Handbook on first complaints. We field folks also
realized that even after the enforcement action, the bozo could -
theoretically - get a ham license and then the technical problem
would come back just as badly with no "enforcement" solution.

In truth the field forces did not like being so hobbled, but in
reality I didn't have anyone to send out on all the CB complaints we
were receiving and The Congress wasn't giving me any more bodies to
do the job.

Some folks here call that "throwing up the hands" but I call it
doing what we can with what we (don't) have.

Ya' can't make chicken stew from chicken feathers."

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6051. Re: RADIO LAW - TACOMA BANS NON FCC....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 04:39:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp15gbn.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29096

On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 20:21:26 GMT, JAMES HAMPTON wrote:

>Yep, and I have 98 degrees myself. Sometimes, however, if I am sick, I have
>103 degrees; then I see a doctorate.
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA
>
>ps - Phil, do I detect a bit of jelousy in the post I am responding to?

Anyone who is jealous of my ex better learn to waltz with a
buzz-saw.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6052. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 05:02:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228000247.24724.00000561@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 29098

In article <3C2B4CB4.6ED714@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> The vanity callsign program is an option offered by the FCC, not a
>> right.
>
>As long as they are offered by the FCC, Kim has the same *RIGHT*
>to her callsign as you do to yours

Which is to say - none at all. A callsign is a privilege, not a right. The choice of any particular one is a privilege, not a right. FCC can end the vanity callsign any time they want.

>, i.e. Kim is not a second-class citizen compared to you,

Did I ever say anyone was a second class citizen compared to me? Nope.

> i.e. you are not Ham Radio Royalty.

Thanks! I never claimed to be. Considering your definition of the trm, not being that kind of royalty is a compliment.

Her call is still inappropriate, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6053. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 05:06:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2BF104.4EB91CEB@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29099

Krell wrote:

> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:phBW7.242731$3d2.11838369@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > Dick, the very concept of actions having consequences has never dawned on
> > Kim, is considered debatable by Rick, will be firmly driven into the
> > ground by Dave, and semantically parsed by Cecil. A juvenile act will be
> > defended by juveniles in a juvenile manner; you have no choice but to live
> > with it -- or become a juvenile.
> >
> > Dick, Bug Killer
>
> So who decides what is juvenile?

Surprise! SOCIETY!!

6054. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 05:42:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp17rwo.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29100

On 27 Dec 2001 02:08:26 GMT, Steve Robeson K4YZ wrote:

>Answer me THIS, Phil...WHERE was the FCC when the convictions occured?

Waiting while he was serving his time to see if he was contrite
for what he did. He was not, and that enters BIG into "character
qualification".

>Are you telling me the FCC had no interest in this at all? Did they
>not have the opportunity to address this years ago?

Waiting, waiting....the wheels grind slowly but grind they
do. Remember that Kevin was in the graybar. The Commission has
time to wait it out.

>>Does it bother you that the FCC is taking away his licemse? The
>> reason that the court did not do that is that only the FCC has that
>> jurisdiction.
>
>It bothers me that it's happening years after the fact, and that NO
>violation of RELEVENT regulations has occured vis-a-vis Part 97.

There is no time limit on such a proceeding as long as the
Commission does not renew the license before starting such
proceedings. Therefore, the crucial time ("point of no
return") to make a decision to revoke/suspend is at renewal
time.

Remember that this is administrative law, not criminal law. The
playing field has different stripes.

There is ample precednt for taking action against any and all
licenses held by the respondent in situations like this.

On the case of John Draper, "Captain Crunch", who was convicted
of telephone fraud ("blue boxing") and served time in the
Federal lockup for same, he lost his commercial and amateur
licenses on character qualification grounds in the 1970s.

Springs to mind the case in the late 1970s of Arthur W.W. Brothers,
who lost his Amateur, Aircraft, Ship, Land Mobile. Mobile Telephone,
and assorted Common Carrier Radio station licenses, as well as
his commercial operator and amateur operator licenses because
he set up two (legal) brothels in Nevada as "ship" stations and
gave them telephone service through his Lake Powell Marine
Operator station, thereby lying to the Commission, causing others
to lie to the Commission, and using his Public Coast (Marine

Operator) in a knowing manner in violation of the Commission's rules.

The only connection with Part 97 in Art Brothers' case - and a back door connection at that - was that he had set up his Marine Operator (vhf) repeater on Navajo Mountain on what the Navajo Nation claims as holy ground without permission, and the Tribal Police Chief, who was a ham, confiscated - actually doing what the FCC cannot - the radio and recrystalled it as a 2-meter repeater under his own call. They set their own rules on tribal lands, you know..

The issue isn't whether he violated Part 97 or not -- the issue is whether in doing whatever violation he was found responsible for - and in Kevin's case they were particularly heinous in computer and communicatons law terms - it exhibited sufficient lack of character to become or remain a Commission licensee in ANY service.

The Enforcement Bureau (probably Riley) will have to prove to the ALJ that Kevin Mitnick lacks that character qualification. If they cannot so prove, Kevin gets to renew his license. It's that simple.

>They could have done this when he was found guilty of the other charges.
>Now, it's harrassment.

Not quite. It's justice. Ask his victims. He led them on a merry chase for years, even assuming the identity of one of them on line for a while.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6055. Re: RADIO LAW: vs police practices

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 05:49:38 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <SJTW7.1949$dW6.914209@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 29101
Cross-posted to: alt.law-enforcement,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,talk.politics.guns

```
: >> If you look, the 13th exempts the government.
: >
: >Where please?
: >
: >Section 1 is posted above, section 2 states
: >
: >"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate
: >legislation."
: >
: >There are no other sections. No exemptions for the government.
: >
: >
: >
: >> What legal scholars support your wild ass
: >> views?
: >
: >Oh, it's something called the Constitution of the United States of
America
: >as Amended.
: >
: >I don't need to appeal to authority. The facts themselves support me.
: >
: >> What court ruling support your off
: >> the wall hype libertarianism?
: >
: >I see, so unless an authority supports you, then you can' t be right. No
: >wonder Galileo was locked up, all the authorities said he was
wrong.....but
: >damn the facts supported him. Now who is see to have been right, the one
: >supported by the fact, or the "authority"?
: >
: >Appeal to authority is a useless undertaking, either the facts support
you
: >at which point it doesn't matter what authority states, or you are wrong
and
: >agreement with authority isn't going to make you right.
:
: Who needs facts when you control large numbers of armed legbreakers? A
: group tried this back during WW1, and Oliver Wendell Holmes sent them to
: jail to rot with his "shout 'fire' in a crowded theater" screed, may his
: soul be roasting in hell.
```

Please refresh our memories with who was the
large army of "legbreakers", what WW1 group
and what issue was Holmes debating?

6056. Re: really dumb SW radio pirate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 07:05:05 UTC
From: mike II <ohmwork@spots.ab.ca>
Message-ID: <3C2C19A1.844F98C3@spots.ab.ca>
Source record: 29102
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Den6N wrote:
>
> I saw a bumper sticker just the other day that read " Don't drink and
> transmit."
> I wondered what it meant...

And here I thought it related to the various STDs <g>

mike (the chaste) II
--

__ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
/ /\ / /\ / /\ / /\ / /\ / /\ / /\ / /
/ /\ \/ /\ \/ohmwork@spots.ab.ca/\ \/ /\ \/ /
/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/ \/_/

6057. Re: Two for Bozo*Flush

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 08:29:18 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0hafllfp1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29104

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271349.1014fbee@posting.google.com...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<sJKW7.312555$W8.11550065@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > Effective about two minutes ago, Cecil and Dave have been fed to
> > Bozo*Flush.
>
> Not a bad idea.
>
> Maybe we're all Bozos on this bus.....
>
> 73 de Jim "still waiting for the electrician" N2EY

It is mandatory that you see this:

http://www.firesigntheatre.com/fstads/fstads_jp.html (scroll about half way down) Jack Poet Volkswagen TV commercials from 1969. Now you can see Ralph Spoilsport back when he was Coco Lewis, Christian Cyborg, and others too numerous to mention.

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/

Sean Ormond wrote in atl.general: "Do this for me Corry...Next time you conveniently get from point A to point B using a gas-powered vehicle (I'm guessing this will happen in less than 24 hrs), go ahead and drop to your knees and give a little prayer to Gaia, the Fairy Queen, or whatever it is you nut-jobs worship. You can thank her for schools like Georgia Tech, where students learn how to do something other than hug trees and hate America for a living."

6058. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 10:14:33 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2001.12.28.05.14.32.940745.17079@arrl.org>
Source record: 29105

On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 16:47:34 -0500, N2EY wrote:

> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
>> Wait a minute, Jim... are you saying you DON'T find Kim's call sign
>> dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy?
>
> All I'm saying is that it's not appropriate for the amateur radio
> service.

But you are unwilling or unable to say why. Not exactly a compelling
argument!

>>Then what is the salient
>> characteristic of her call sign that makes it "inappropriate" in your
>> view? Please, be specific.
>
> The suffix. As if you didn't know ;-)

The suffix is not the kind of characteristic I'm referring to. As if you
didn't know.

>> > What's wrong with choosing a callsign that is appropriate to the
>> > community standards of the amateur radio service
>>
>> What makes you think, Jim, that your standards are the community's?
>
s> What makes you think, Jon, that they are not?

The lack of substantial negative commentary, outside of a handful on rrap.
(And there clearly are plenty of hams even on rrap who do not find it
inappropriate.) So I'll repeat the question you ducked: What makes you
think that your standards are the community's?

>> The
>> only complaints I've heard about Kim's call sign (or similar ones) are
>> from a few bluenoses here on rrap.
>
> What's a "bluenose", Jon? Please, be specific.

http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?va=bluenose

>>Hardy an outpouring of community outrage!
>
> Most hams outside of rrap don't know calls like that even exist.

There are a number of calls with the suffix TIT. And there are other
suffixes in use that I suspect you would also find "inappropriate." (I can

only "suspect" since you are unwilling to make any specific complaint against Kim's suffix.) Lots of hams come in contact with those call signs yet make no noise about it. Whether most hams know they exist is irrelevant; most hams who DO know haven't raised objections.

>> How does the call sign N2EY "reflect positively" on the service?
>
> It is appropriate in any situation.

It is irrelevant in any situation other than station identification since it has no meaning. Just like any other call sign.

>>To those outside ham radio, it's just a jumble of
>> letters and numbers, no more.
>
> You are mistaken. If that were so, broadcast stations would not care
> what their callsigns were.

We're talking about HAM RADIO call signs, Jim, not broadcast call signs. (BTW, in case you haven't listened to broadcast radio lately, most stations de-emphasize the call sign as a marketing identification. They prefer to use catchy phrases with the frequency in them, like "Big D 103.")

> Suppose a major network was going to do a special, and then a series, on
> ham radio. Tons of priceless publicity for the ARS. They want a family
> show, not a late-night series to replace the Howard Stern TV show.
>
> Suppose they wanted to have a real live amateur radio callsign in the
> title - like the classic "WKRP in Cincinnati" show had a BC callsign.
>
> Suppose they asked YOU to recommend an unassigned amateur callsign
> (nobody has WKRP, either). Would YOU recommend a callsign like Kim's, or
> something else? Why or why not? Please, be specific.

I wouldn't recommend putting a call sign in the title in the first place; it would be poor marketing. But if they were adamant, sure, they could use a call sign like Kim's. (Heck, they could use Kim's call sign. As long as it's okay with her.) I don't think it would result generally in the smirking, nudging and winking present from a few here on rrap.

I find it interesting that you are unwilling or unable to say specifically what's inappropriate about Kim's call sign and unwilling or unable to explain why you think the community also considers it inappropriate. Pretty weak, Jim.

Jon

6059. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 12:45:06 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c6a8e_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29110

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2BF104.4EB91CEB@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:phBW7.242731$3d2.11838369@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Dick, the very concept of actions having consequences has never dawned
on
> > > Kim, is considered debatable by Rick, will be firmly driven into the
> > > ground by Dave, and semantically parsed by Cecil. A juvenile act will
be
> > > defended by juveniles in a juvenile manner; you have no choice but to
live
> > > with it -- or become a juvenile.
> > >
> > > Dick, Bug Killer
> >
> > So who decides what is juvenile?
>
> Surprise! SOCIETY!!
>

No surprise at all. And, it should come as no surprise to you, Dick, if
you've been a part of society, that there's all kinds in society. In fact,
if you'd like to give society the weight for decisions, take a look at
current music, television shows, books, concerts, comedic acts, radio shows,
radio talk-shows (heck even the sacred Dr. Laura), advertising. I suppose
all those market driven (thus, society driven) acts are being ignored by the
"better" society, right?

Kim W5TIT

6060. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:02:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228080245.09102.00000780@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29108

In article <pan.2001.12.28.05.14.32.940745.17079@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
<jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 16:47:34 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>
>> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
>>> Wait a minute, Jim... are you saying you DON'T find Kim's call sign
>>> dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy?
>>
>> All I'm saying is that it's not appropriate for the amateur radio
>> service.
>
>But you are unwilling or unable to say why.

You called me a "bluenose" but haven't said what a bluenose is.

>
>The lack of substantial negative commentary, outside of a handful on rrap.
>(And there clearly are plenty of hams even on rrap who do not find it
>inappropriate.)

"Nobody complained" is not a compelling argument. Weak, very weak.

>So I'll repeat the question you ducked: What makes you
>think that your standards are the community's?

The reactions of those who DO comment. Like Riley. Is HE a "bluenose"?
>
>>> The
>>> only complaints I've heard about Kim's call sign (or similar ones) are
>>> from a few bluenoses here on rrap.
>>
>> What's a "bluenose", Jon? Please, be specific.
>
>http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?va=bluenose

Ya can't even bother to cut-and-paste.
>
>>>Hardy an outpouring of community outrage!
>>
>> Most hams outside of rrap don't know calls like that even exist.
>
>There are a number of calls with

[that suffix]

>And there are other
>suffixes in use that I suspect you would also find "inappropriate." (I can
>only "suspect" since you are unwilling to make any specific complaint
>against Kim's suffix.)

"Inappropriate" is quite specific.

You work in an office/lab environment up there in CT, Jon. Would it be appropriate to come to work on a regular workday in midsummer wearing a swimsuit and sandals? How about wearing old faded jeans and a T-shirt to a formal dinner party or wedding? Those clothes are perfectly appropriate for other situations. You're the same person. Why not wear the same clothes?

> Lots of hams come in contact with those call signs
>yet make no noise about it.

How do you know? I've never heard any of them on the air. And please note that the FCC does NOT issue them sequentially.

> Whether most hams know they exist is
>irrelevant; most hams who DO know haven't raised objections.

How do you know that? The objectors here on rrap are a sizable group, but you dismiss us and our opinions as irrelevant.
>
>>> How does the call sign N2EY "reflect positively" on the service?
>>
>> It is appropriate in any situation.
>
>It is irrelevant in any situation other than station identification since
>it has no meaning.

It has a lot of meaning to those hams who know me.

>Just like any other call sign.

Then there's no reason Kim can't change hers to "W5KIM" or "W5MKW".
>
>>>To those outside ham radio, it's just a jumble of
>>> letters and numbers, no more.
>>
>> You are mistaken. If that were so, broadcast stations would not care
>> what their callsigns were.
>
>We're talking about HAM RADIO call signs, Jim, not broadcast call signs.

Same principle. To get a reaction and promote an image. The callsign KISS was fought over in court.

>(BTW, in case you haven't listened to broadcast radio lately, most
>stations de-emphasize the call sign as a marketing identification. They
>prefer to use catchy phrases with the frequency in them, like "Big D
>103.")

Only those stations that can't get a catchy one. The point is still the same:
It's NOT just a random, meaningless collection.
>
>> Suppose a major network was going to do a special, and then a series, on
>> ham radio. Tons of priceless publicity for the ARS. They want a family
>> show, not a late-night series to replace the Howard Stern TV show.
>>
>> Suppose they wanted to have a real live amateur radio callsign in the
>> title - like the classic "WKRP in Cincinnati" show had a BC callsign.
>>
>> Suppose they asked YOU to recommend an unassigned amateur callsign
>> (nobody has WKRP, either). Would YOU recommend a callsign like Kim's, or
>> something else? Why or why not? Please, be specific.
>
>I wouldn't recommend putting a call sign in the title in the first place;
>it would be poor marketing.

WHY? "WKRP in Cincinnati" was a very highly rated show. The callsign made it
easy to remember. In fact most people abbreviate the title to just "WKRP".

>But if they were adamant, sure, they could use
>a call sign like Kim's. (Heck, they could use Kim's call sign. As long as
>it's okay with her.) I don't think it would result generally in the
>smirking, nudging and winking present from a few here on rrap.

If that's Hq's idea of good marketing, it's no wonder so few people know about
ham radio.
>
>I find it interesting that you are unwilling or unable to say specifically
>what's inappropriate about Kim's call sign and unwilling or unable to
>explain why you think the community also considers it inappropriate.

See above.

>Pretty weak, Jim.

I find it interesting that you would think it suitable as a marketing tool for
Amateur Radio, Jon.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6061. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:02:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228080246.09102.00000781@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29106

In article <3C2A4AFD.CDA3172E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> >is a valid callsign.
>>
>> Only because the FCC has made a mistake in issuing it. Do you believe
>> the FCC is infallible, Cecil?
>
>Well, maybe you should be ragging on the FCC instead of Kim.

Who is "ragging on" Kim? Not me.

>
>> The FCC does NOT issue that particular suffix (and others) in sequence
>> or at random. It must be specifically requested through the vanity
>> call program.
>
>But in the process of issuing any amateur radio callsign, the FCC
>endorses that callsign as suitable and appropriate for identification
>on the ham bands.

Nope. They simply say it's legal, thus avoiding a lot of headaches.

By the logic of "Govt. issued it, therefore it's OK" you're saying that if the govt. says something is legal, then nobody should say anything against it.

>> What's wrong with choosing a callsign that is appropriate to the
>> community standards of the amateur radio service and reflects
>> positively upon that service?
>
>Kim's callsign is definitely appropriate to the community standards
>here in Texas.

I doubt it. But if that's true, then keep it contained there.

>
>> > Nobody's forcing you to think those dirty thoughts.
>>
>> What "dirty thoughts"?
>
>The thought that Kim's callsign is dirty.

Who said that? Not me. I said inappropriate.

> The reason that you think
>it is inappropriate is that you think it is dirty.

Who said that? Not me. I said inappropriate.

> You don't think
>my callsign is dirty - therefore you are not complaining about mine.

I said inappropriate.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6062. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:02:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228080247.09102.00000782@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29107

In article <3c2a295a_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:9f4bfe89.0112260911.3c2a6908@posting.google.com...
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>news:<3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org>...
>> > N2EY wrote:
>> > > Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.
>> >
>> > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
>> > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
>>
>> There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
>> They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
>
>Giggle value. Not shock.

So the selection is NOT just a random collection of letters. It was
specifically chosen to elicit a reaction.

>> > Do you refuse to use words, parts of which spell a vulgar
>> > word? e.g. assume, harass? If you use words, parts of which
>> > spell a vulgar word, why bar callsigns, parts of which spell
>> > vulgar words? It's exactly the same concept.
>>
>> Not at all. A callsign is not a word. Some callsigns are chosen to
>> resemble words, (K1MMY, W1NDY, K0OL) but the callsign in question is
>> not one of them.
>
>That is correct. When I say

[Kim's call]

>on the air, it either takes some
>thinking or writing it down before it is even recognized as having a twist
>to it. There are many folks I've talked to on the air who never even say a
>word or indicate in any way that they take for anything but a callsign.

So? Doesn't mean they think it's appropriate. They simply don't comment because
all that does is draw more attention to it. Attention is obviously what you
want.

The "nobody complains" argument doesn't hold any water.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6063. Re: I made it home alive

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:12:44 UTC
From: WebDoc REACT Unit #602 <arcweb@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <fTZW7.13456$_K.1663727@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 29109

Rick Adams wrote in message
<7C4CAFBD8958B318.3FFFD9E662580877.0065D9629641CB69@lp.airnews.net>...
>On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 01:34:11 -0500, "WebDoc REACT Unit #602"
><arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
>
>>Well all I am back home, I left Brooklyn at 1:30 PM and arrived in my
>>driveway at 11:30 PM, and wouldn't you know..... I can't sleep. So I am
>>practicing copying code, I missed the test date in NYC by about 20
>>minutes..... I got lost at the 59th st / Columbus Circle transfer from
the
>>A train to the 1 train..... Oh well, there is an exam coming up in
>>Toledo OH.
>
> Keith, where on earth do you live that your choice of testing
>sites is NYC and Toledo--or that you have to travel 10 hours each way
>for testing?
>
> Nearly ever middle sized city in the US has regular testing.
>If you are between NYC and Toledo, what about Cleveland, Pittsburgh,
>Philly, Syracuse, or Albany? Or any of the dozens of smaller cities in
>Pennsylvania, New York, or Ohio for that matter?
>
> Unless you have a reason to prefer testing in a major city it
>would seem a LOT more relaxing (and far less stressful--which can lead
>to better test results, of course) to take your test locally instead
>of traveling as far as you have. At one time you had to go to a major
>center for testing--my first license and my upgrade to Advanced were
>taken at FCC regional offices [Las Vegas and San Francisco,
>respectively] but my Extra came from a testing site only 50 miles from
>my home in the rural midwest--you should be able to do the same in
>your own area.
>
> Rick
>
>--
>
>Rick Adams--KE8HH
>adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
>"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
>will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
>Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

Well Rick, I was working in NYC as a volunteer with the Red Cross, I has been there since October 3rd. I had planned to take my test there so I could enjoy the hobby on my time off. I live in the N.W. Ohio area, like 40 minutes from Toledo, so now that I am home I can take the test there. Understand better now? heheheh.

Keith Hosman

6064. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:33:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c749a_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29118

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > > digital modes as well?
> >
> > Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> > learn Morse code?
>
> Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as
> "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code
> test, and so they already know the code.
>
> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> which are far more popular?

Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
voice privileges as well ... but I had to ask the question
to ferret out your response ... which seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
privileges to that mode ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCx0kJe+N6+q84HiEQIcqACeN6/r2SJezgL35SQKRO5aNffcHJoAn0QA
SC0bFWN27PfaMM2mQHCctD/Z
=YOmu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6065. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:33:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c782c_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29119

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > > digital modes as well?
> >
> > Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> > learn Morse code?
>
> Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as
> "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code
> test, and so they already know the code.
>
> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> which are far more popular?

Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
voice privileges as well ... but I had to ask the question
to ferret out your response ... which seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
privileges to that mode ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>
```

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCx0kJe+N6+q84HiEQIcqACeN6/r2SJezgL35SQKRO5aNffcHJoAn0QA
SC0bFWN27PfaMM2mQHCctD/Z
=YOmu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6066. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:33:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c7bbd_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29120

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > > digital modes as well?
> >
> > Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> > learn Morse code?
>
> Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as
> "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code
> test, and so they already know the code.
>
> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> which are far more popular?

Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
voice privileges as well ... but I had to ask the question
to ferret out your response ... which seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
privileges to that mode ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>
```

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCx0kJe+N6+q84HiEQIcqACeN6/r2SJezgL35SQKRO5aNffcHJoAn0QA
SC0bFWN27PfaMM2mQHCctD/Z
=YOmu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6067. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:33:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c7f4e_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29121

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > > digital modes as well?
> >
> > Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> > learn Morse code?
>
> Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as
> "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code
> test, and so they already know the code.
>
> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> which are far more popular?

Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
voice privileges as well ... but I had to ask the question
to ferret out your response ... which seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
privileges to that mode ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>
```

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCx0kJe+N6+q84HiEQIcqACeN6/r2SJezgL35SQKRO5aNffcHJoAn0QA
SC0bFWN27PfaMM2mQHCctD/Z
=YOmu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6068. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:33:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c82e6_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29122

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > > digital modes as well?
> >
> > Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> > learn Morse code?
>
> Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as
> "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code
> test, and so they already know the code.
>
> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> which are far more popular?

Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
voice privileges as well ... but I had to ask the question
to ferret out your response ... which seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
privileges to that mode ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>
```

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCx0kJe+N6+q84HiEQIcqACeN6/r2SJezgL35SQKRO5aNffcHJoAn0QA
SC0bFWN27PfaMM2mQHCctD/Z
=YOmu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6069. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:33:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c8642_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29124

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > > digital modes as well?
> >
> > Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> > learn Morse code?
>
> Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as
> "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code
> test, and so they already know the code.
>
> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> which are far more popular?

Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
voice privileges as well ... but I had to ask the question
to ferret out your response ... which seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
privileges to that mode ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCx0kJe+N6+q84HiEQIcqACeN6/r2SJezgL35SQKRO5aNffcHJoAn0QA
SC0bFWN27PfaMM2mQHCctD/Z
=YOmu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6070. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:33:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c89da_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29125

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > > digital modes as well?
> >
> > Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> > learn Morse code?
>
> Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as
> "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code
> test, and so they already know the code.
>
> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> which are far more popular?

Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
voice privileges as well ... but I had to ask the question
to ferret out your response ... which seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
privileges to that mode ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>
```

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCx0kJe+N6+q84HiEQIcqACeN6/r2SJezgL35SQKRO5aNffcHJoAn0QA
SC0bFWN27PfaMM2mQHCctD/Z
=YOmu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6071. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:33:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c8c28_2@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29127

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > > digital modes as well?
> >
> > Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> > learn Morse code?
>
> Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as
> "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code
> test, and so they already know the code.
>
> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> which are far more popular?

Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
voice privileges as well ... but I had to ask the question
to ferret out your response ... which seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
privileges to that mode ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCx0kJe+N6+q84HiEQIcqACeN6/r2SJezgL35SQKRO5aNffcHJoAn0QA
SC0bFWN27PfaMM2mQHCctD/Z
=YOmu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6072. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:33:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c8ca0_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29128

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0112271324.2af15ae9@posting.google.com...
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:<3C2B448D.518F68B1@IEEE.org>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > > Why limit them to CW? Why not allow them to use modern
> > > digital modes as well?
> >
> > Because if they allow digital modes, those guys never will
> > learn Morse code?
>
> Illogical. All Novices and Tech Pluses (the folks referred to as
> "those guys" in the above) have already passed at least a 5 wpm code
> test, and so they already know the code.
>
> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
> which are far more popular?

Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
voice privileges as well ... but I had to ask the question
to ferret out your response ... which seems aimed at
"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
privileges to that mode ...

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>
```

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCx0kJe+N6+q84HiEQIcqACeN6/r2SJezgL35SQKRO5aNffcHJoAn0QA
SC0bFWN27PfaMM2mQHCctD/Z
=YOmu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6073. Re: What not to say to a cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 13:49:07 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0i5np$mn1$5@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29134
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"LloydVFP" <LloydVFP@KV4FZmyHero.net> wrote in message
news:a0gq8q$f9r$0@pita.alt.net...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a0fchi$q4t$2@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > "N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
> > news:I9yW7.125$8M.574732@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
> > >
> > > Swift Rider <c_howard_in@disguise.com> wrote in Alt.Law-Enforcement...
> > >
> > > : The WORST Things to Say to a Police Officer:
> > > :
> > > :
> > > : 1. I can't reach my license unless you hold my beer.
> > > :
> > > : 2. Sorry, Officer, I didn't realize my radar detector wasn't plugged
> in.
> > > :
> > > : 3. Aren't you the guy from the Village People?
> > > :
> > > : 4. Hey, you must've been doin' about 125 mph to keep up with me!
Good
> > job!
> > > :
> > > : 5. Excuse me. Is "stick up" hyphenated?
> > > :
> > > : 6. I though you had to be in relatively good physical condition to
be
> a
> > > : police officer.
> > > :
> > > : 7. I was going to be a cop, but I decided to finish high school
> instead.
> > > :
> > > : 8. Bad cop! No donut!
> > > :
> > > : 9. You're not gonna check the trunk, are you?
> > > :
> > > : 10. Gee, that gut sure doesn't inspire confidence.
> > > :
> > > : 11. Didn't I see you get your butt kicked on "Cops"?
> > > :
> > > : 12. Wow, you look just like the guy in the picture on my

girlfriend's
> > > : nightstand!
> > > :
> > > : 13. Is it true that people become cops because they are too dumb to
> work
> > > at
> > > : McDonald's?
> > > :
> > > : 14. I pay your salary!
> > > :
> > > : 15. So, uh, you on the take, or what?
> > > :
> > > : 16. Gee, Officer! That's terrific. The last officer only gave me a
> > > warning,
> > > : too!
> > > :
> > > : 17. Do you know why you pulled me over? OK, just so one of us does.
> > > :
> > > : 18. I was trying to keep up with traffic. Yes, I know there is no
> other
> > > car
> > > : around me&emdash;that's how far ahead of me they are.
> > > :
> > > : 19. What do you mean. "Have I been drinking?" You're the trained
> > > specialist.
> > > :
> > > : 20. Well, when I reached down to pick up my bag of crack, my gun
fell
> > off
> > > my
> > > : lap and got lodged between the brake pedal and the gas pedal,
forcing
> me
> > > to
> > > : speed out of control.
> > > :
> > > : 21. Hey, is that a 9 mm? That's nothing compared to this .44 magnum.
> > > :
> > > 22. It's not my car, BUT..... (care of Nightcrawler)
> > >
> > > 23. I know my rights!!!!
>
> 24. KC8JBO, Wogie Wiseman, would say to the cop: Will you
> be my boyfriend? LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL

N0VFP, Llllardasssss lllllloyd has said to a cop, "Can I slurp your nutsacks to let me off these felonies?" See, Lllardasssss lllloyd has quite a criminal record, for buggering boys , cows, and pumpkins in and around Athens, AL.

This was just faxed from the Birminham Field office:

The Great Pumpkin
Birmingham Post-Herald
October 14, 2000

Police arrested Lloyd A. Davies, a 27 year old white male, resident of Athens, Alabama in the Anderson Pumpkin patch at 11:38pm Friday. Davies will be charged with lewd and lascivious behavior, public indecency, and public intoxication at the Athens Municipal Courthouse Monday. The suspect allegedly stated that as he was passing a pumpkin patch, he decided to stop. "You know, a pumpkin is soft and squishy inside, and there was no one around here for miles. At least I thought there wasn't." he stated in a phone interview from the Athens Municipal Courthouse Jail.
Davies went on to state that he pulled over to the side of the road, picked out a pumpkin that he felt was appropriate to his purposes, cut a hole in it, and proceeded to satisfy his alleged "need". "I guess I was just really into it, you know?" he commented with evident embarrassment. In the process, Torrance apparently failed to notice the Athens Municipal police car approaching and was unaware of his audience until officer Brenda Taylor approached him. "It was an unusual situation, sure." said officer Taylor. "I walked up to (Davies) and he's... just working away at this pumpkin."
Taylor went on to describe what happened when she approached Davies. "I just went up and said, 'Excuse me sir, but do you realize that you are screwing a pumpkin?' He got real surprised as you'd expect, and then looked me straight in the face and said,
'A pumpkin? Damn... is it midnight already?"

6074. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 14:21:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2C7FF0.8921979@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29111

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Krell wrote:
> > So who decides what is juvenile?
>
> Surprise! SOCIETY!!

Exactly where does this body of society meet to sit down and
write out what is juvenile? Saying "society" is just another
argumentum ad populum. Society is an ill-defined nebulous
blob with no enforcement power outside of government.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6075. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 14:23:27 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2C805F.3C3DDC79@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29112

N2EY wrote:
> I said inappropriate.

What definition of "inappropriate" are you using?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6076. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 14:30:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2C8204.29BEFC1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29115

N2EY wrote:
> A callsign is a privilege, not a right. The
> choice of any particular one is a privilege, not a right. FCC can end the
> vanity callsign any time they want.

So talk the FCC into ending the vanity callsign. Until then, Kim has just
as much right to her callsign as I have to mine.

> > i.e. you are not Ham Radio Royalty.
>
> Thanks! I never claimed to be.

You are trying to use the weight of your Royal Do-Gooder standing to
get Kim, a commoner, to change her callsign. You are essentially
saying that you somehow possess something (Royalty) that allows you
to be a better judge of callsigns than she is.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6077. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 14:31:50 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <qn%W7.1525$Dl1.756893@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 29113
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

And of course we seem to find them everywhere we go. Good to see you in this group too there Roger! Hope your Christmas went well.

Ryan KC8PMX

"Roger Halstead" <rdhalste@tm.net> wrote in message news:CoyW7.1399$Dl1.693885@monger.newsread.com...
> One more troll!
>
> Roger (K8RI)
>
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> news:e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com...
>
>

6078. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 14:31:51 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <rn%W7.1526$DI1.757130@monger.newsread.com>
Source record: 29114

> > BTW, the amateur "Nude Net" meets on HF on Saturdays as I
> > recall. You might want to tune it in sometime and note the age of some
> > of the participants.
>

JEEEEEESHHHHHHHHHHHH!!!! This scares me more than Kim's callsign does to some select few in this group. Considering the majority of hams are at or over the age of "middle age", to even know they may be naked while operating I believe will make me need counseling!!! LOL

Is this net "for the good of the ARS??"

Ryan

6079. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 14:48:25 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c8a9d_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29126

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011227220325.01870.00000569@mb-fz.aol.com...
> In article
<XZpW7.242101$3d2.11769921@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:
>
> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > >
> >> > If the
> >> > Novice is promoted to this class by simply waiving element 2
then the
> >> > situation becomes much clearer.
> > >
> >> Yup - but is it right to give away upgrades like that?

Nope ...

> >
> >Well, yes, it is because they have been law abiding hams for years,
possibly
> >decades and granting them Element 2 is not going to ire anyone.

No ... they haven't demonstrated the qualifications tested by the
other
test element. REMEMBER, the purpose of the test is to measure
qualifications ... nothing else ... NOT to measure (or reward)
behavior(s).

> It might upset those who recently took a test to upgrade. Didja know
that both
> the NCVEC and NCI OPPOSED the ARRL BoD idea to give a "free" upgrade
of Novices
> and Tech Pluses to General?

That's true ... as NCI has stated all along, we are "No Code
International,"
not "No Qualifications International."

> The whole Extra written test! Today, a current Advanced has to take
a 50
> question written to get the Extra - same as a General. Auto-upgrade
would not
> go over big with some folks.
```

And the more technical content (not that it's THAT hard, but it's
reasonable for granting a license to operate and experiment)
is virtually all in the Extra test now ... the written elements for
General are quite elementary ...

Now who's proposing to "dumb down" amateur radio???

[snip]

> >> > All this is accomplished by waiving Element 2 for Novices and
waiving
> >> > Element 4(B) for Advanced. I think this is a very tiny price to
pay in
> >order
> >> > to have a structure which can have some basic adjustments
applied for
> >better
> >> > transitioning of everyone throughout the ARS experience.
> >
> >> I see your point, but others may be outraged and the FCC may nix
the
> >> whole free upgrade idea.

NO "freebie" no-test upgrades for novices or advanced ... the material
in those elements is necesssary to assure reasonable qualifications.

If someone has been an advanced for a while, the liklihood is that
they weren't interested in code and have been unwilling to put forth
the effort to get to 20 wpm. With the 20 wpm gone, I have little
sympathy for someone who isn't willing to take a relatively easy
50 question written test to upgrade from adanced to extra.

[snip]

> >> An ARRL committee is proposing virtually the same thing,
> >> (good) plus widening the 'phone slots on those bands (bad).
> >
> >I agree with you here, also.

So do I (surprised) ... I personally oppose widening the phone
bands (at least at this time) because I don't think we should
allow the lower parts of the bands to be over-run with SSB,
which could discourage the development of more modern
digital modes.

[snip]

> >> > you want them to learn CW then put the horse before cart and
the carrot
> >in
> >> > front of the horse. This would eliminate the CW only subbands
on 15, 40,
> >and 80 meters.
> >

> >> I think you mean "Novice/TechPlus subbands".
> >
> >They are CW only subbands on my chart. I was avoiding using the
words Novice
> >and Technician Plus in my post S25.5 world. Besides, you know what
I meant.

He's corrrect ... they are NOT "CW only" sub-bands (except if you
hold a novice/tech+ license) ... others are technically free to use
PSK31, Clover, PacTor, or other digital modes there, as long as
they meet the (stupid) occupied bandwidth restrictions ...

The ONLY "CW only" slots in all of the ham bands are 50.0-50.1 MHz
and 144.0-144.1 MHz ...

> Just making sure. It's clear now.
> >
> >> The main problems I see are:
> >
> >> 1) the FCC has already shot down many of your ideas
> >
> >Tough, they'll have to have good reasons to shoot them down, again.

Why piss off the FCC by going back incesantly asking them to
do things that they have already determined they're not going
to do because they don't serve the public interest?

So there are approx. 40k novice licenses still valid and approx.
87k advanced licenses still valid (source "Year End Census of
Amateur Radio Operators," The W5YI Report. What's the big
deal? And there are some tech+ who will end up getting renewed
as techs (but still keep their limited HF privs) if they don't
upgrade.
What does that hurt?

It took me from the time the rules changed until recently to find
time to get around to going to a VE session to take the extra
written and upgrade ... I didn't bitch ... I didn't ask to have the
test waived ... why should anyone get a total freebie??? If they
don't want to, or don't have the time to, upgrade, they should
remain satisfied with what they have. There is no reason to
change the system ... nobody should get privileges they aren't
qualified for, nor should anyone lose privileges they've already
earned.
[snip]

> >I think other hams see what's happening... the new ones come in and
get to
> >general and extra very quickly and the elders are being 'corraled'
out in
> >their pastures.

How are "the elders being 'corraled' out in their pastures" ???
(serious question ... I don't get what you're infering here ...)

> Hmm - interesting. Could even result in a situation where the
newbies say to
> the oldsters "I did it, so you have to, as well!"

Turnabout is fair play, they say :-) As one who has followed the
rules and taken and passed the extra written, I *could* take that
view with respect to "waiving" the extra written and giving
advanceds a free upgrade ... but that is NOT my motivation for
opposing such a freebie ... the motivation is PURELY that there
is legitimate material in the extra written test that should be tested
and advanceds should have to demonstrate that they know that
material before being granted the additional privileges of the
extra class (and I am NOT refering to the few small "extra only"
sub-band slots ... I'm refering to the other things that are reserved
for extras ...)

> >> 3) the big opportunities of the post-2003 era are not being
addressed
> >> adequately.

I agree with that ... there is still not a good vision in the majority
of the amateur community about what we need to do and where
we need to go, in terms of technology and using our spectrum
more fully and efficiently.

More space for 50 year old SSB technology is NOT the answer,
IMNSHO ... again I refer the interested to public comments by
Dale Hatfield and other FCC officials on the future of amateur
radio (available for reading on "Articles" page of NCI 's website,
URL listed in my sig file below).

[snip]

> I dunno about that. Their system may not know who is an "old" Tech
Plus and who
> isn't.

The FCC's system "knows" who is an "old" Tech Plus and who is not,
but as was pointed out, the system is programmed such that the VECs
are the "engine" for input to the system and it would cost the FCC a
LOT
in manpower and reprogramming to do such upgrades directly themselves.

I don't see taking one's paperwork to a VE session to get the upgrade
as being such an onerous thing ... call it a "demonstration of
committment"
if you like :-) (just joking ... my views on "demonstrations of
committment"
as regulatory goals have NOT changed)

[snip]

> I mean three slots by mode type: CW, digital, analog voice or image.
For
> example, 40 meters might be 7000-7075 CW, 7075-7150 digital,
7150-7300 analog
> voice or image.

More "balkanization" as I pointed out before ... a BAD idea as RULES.
I have no problem with flexible, voluntary bandplans and "gentleman's
agrements" ... they can be changed far more easily than FCC rules
as needs change ... casting sub-band usage by mode into the relative
concrete of Part 97 will ultimately hurt our ability to adapt to
modernizing
changes in technology and usage patterns ... a bad thing.

[snip]

> >What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???
>
> Offer an upgrade incentive.

"Incentive Licensing" was a dismal failure ... philosophically,
I agree with prior comments that power limitations make more
sense than mode limitations, since they are more solidly based
on some reasonable relation to one's technical knowledge,
as demonstrated by passing the more difficult tests.
(however, I also realize the unfortunate political reality that
taking amps away from those who currently are allowed
to use them will raise hell that will make the code/no-code
debate look pale by comparison ... therefore, I would, be
reluctant to propose such a thing, even though I think it's a
good idea ... too many folks just don't realize that there is
far more "bang for the buck" to be had with better antennas
and better modulation and coding schemes than with brute
force power)

[snip]

>The point is to come up with something that isn't just another
> patch slapped on the old system.

As I see it, given that Morse testing will go away completely
after WRC-03, the system isn't so bad ... current novices
are declining by at least 5k/year, either through upgrades,
going SK, or simply not renewing ... adanceds have declined
about 20k since "restructuring," through the same mechanisms
... tech+'s have declined about 45k, presumably mostly through
upgrades to general, and those who don't upgrade will be
renewed as techs, but retain their (limited) HF privs ...

What's the problem with this? Over time, through upgrades
and attrition, we will have only 3 license classes ... some
might argue that 2 is sufficient (that's the norm in much of
the world and it doesn't seem to cause any problem), but
I'm OK with 3 ... particularly if the "power vs. technical

knowledge" thing were enacted, though *I'm* certainly not
planning to propose it ...

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- --
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- --
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCyF5pe+N6+q84HiEQL0QwCgguJUDjijuojtV/wIpN8aHL4fUacAoOlJ
dGfgFlGk29fw9cqikFKQy3nu
=IkcF
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

6080. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 15:08:12 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0i1pe0med@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29116

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2BF104.4EB91CEB@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Krell wrote:
>
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:phBW7.242731$3d2.11838369@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Dick, the very concept of actions having consequences has never dawned
on
> > > Kim, is considered debatable by Rick, will be firmly driven into the
> > > ground by Dave, and semantically parsed by Cecil. A juvenile act will
be
> > > defended by juveniles in a juvenile manner; you have no choice but to
live
> > > with it -- or become a juvenile.
> > >
> > > Dick, Bug Killer
> >
> > So who decides what is juvenile?
>
> Surprise! SOCIETY!!

Really? Larry King blasted Howard Stern for juvenile behavior on his radio
and TV show, yet King is called juvenile by Stern for getting a new wife
every couple of years that's always younger than the one before. How does
society, in this case, decide what's juvenile?

6081. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 15:36:37 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <9k0X7.200751$WW.11698052@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29117

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> > Agreed!! The point is to come up with something that isn't just another
> patch slapped on the old system.

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> Jim, what some view as a patch others might view differently. Especially
> the FCC. It is not difficult to maintain records on Novice and Advanced
> tickets until they make it to shady rest nursing home and beyond,
> particularly when someone else is doing the grunt work. On the other
> hand, adding new ones would be a major pain in the drain. So you can
> fairly bet that what you are going to see is Extra, General, Technician.
> Not a software change in the bundle.

So... what does that mean? Don't do the right thing because some people
might not like it??? Fine, then you can all wallow in the mire.

> Not being entirely certain just what wonderous opportunities dropping the
> code test offers and being generally one to let mode wars settle the
> issue, I am also not entirely sure what is to be gained.

> Go ahead and plan out the "Ultimate System"; it is certainly worth the
> effort but I would suggest that after doing so, one has Plan B and Plan C
> in the pocket.

Nope. Plans B and C are the reasons it got like this to start with. Being
all things to all people.

> Certainly the power endorsement is an idea I would not
> have come up with for sure. Given the CB thing, we might be better to
> outlaw Antique Modulation entirely and go with a 3kHz max bandwidth below
> 29 but that doesn't flow from this discussion.

Right, CB'ers are out of control so take away AM from the General, Advanced
and Extra classes. NOT!!!

3kHz max... only on 10 meters??? on all HF/MF??? What do you mean, exactly?

> Plans B & C should try to stuff what seems to be a unanimous 3 class
> approach into both the FCCs problems and attitudes and clearly identify
> where these attitudes cause problems to the FCC down the road. And it is
> apparent that Rich is not familiar with the band plans used outside the
> US. The U.S. phone bands are designed to give the world a place to hide
> from us. Whether this is good, bad, obsolete or whatever it is reality.
> Splitting narrow modes without fitting the rest of the planet is not
> bright.

WRONG McCollum... How did any of my proposals imply any of that???

> Too much is made over CW; Novices and no one else are limited to
> CW in their bands.

WRONG McCollum... Technician Plus is limited to CW in the same bands. This
may eventually include all the Technician class also.

> A related question to what to do with remaining Novice and Advanced is to
> ask if they are likely to be used enough to be worth changing them.

Of course it's worth changing them. What happens if you change them is...
the whole ARS becomes much cleaner and focused so that future proposals
don't have to have all these 'ifs' 'ands' AND 'buts'.

> Yes I
> realize that about 100 Novice tickets are being renewed every month; the
> question is why? In the absence of a code test, extending power-limited
> SSB privleges in the 28.3-5 segment or even down to 28.1 to Techs would in
> effect make the Tech Plus irrelevant anyway.

Irrelevant??? A Technician Plus is a Novice AND a Technician. Maybe the
other two classes are irrelevent. :^

We already have 'power-limited SSB privileges in the 28.3-5 segment' and
NO...
don't take it down to 28.1!!! That's our ONLY... cw, RTTY and data area in
all of MF/HF. It's obvious you don't know, what and where our privileges
are, do you?

> To someone who passed the
> Advanced in recent memory the new Element 4 is no big deal -- all the
> advanced I know are ancient Class As. If the ticket is not going to be
> used, who cares? Leave them to rot on the vine. I like cleanliness too
> but why make an issue of it if you have bigger fish to fry?

I the ticket is not gonna be used then dump the subband.

> Making the VE separate from the Extra, and I still think it needs 1-2
> years time in grade, is a fine idea.

6082. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 15:41:45 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c93eb_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29123

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011228080245.09102.00000780@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <pan.2001.12.28.05.14.32.940745.17079@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >So I'll repeat the question you ducked: What makes you
> >think that your standards are the community's?
>
> The reactions of those who DO comment. Like Riley. Is HE a "bluenose"?
> >

C'mon. Riley is just another ham. His opinion on whether the FCC should be in the business of judging callsigns or not, was sought because I knew that, as a person from the FCC, his opinion would be listened to. If I'd said to Larry R., or anyone else, "Hey, ask Cecil if the FCC should take my callsign away," that would have garnered nothing but the usual cat meows from a bunch of grown men.

> >>> The
> >>> only complaints I've heard about Kim's call sign (or similar ones) are
> >>> from a few bluenoses here on rrap.
> >>
> >> What's a "bluenose", Jon? Please, be specific.
> >
> >http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?va=bluenose
>
> Ya can't even bother to cut-and-paste.

Main Entry: bluenose
Pronunciation: 'bl-"nOz
Function: noun
Date: 1903
: a person who advocates a rigorous moral code

How's that? Sounds appropriate.

> >
> >>>Hardy an outpouring of community outrage!
> >>
> >> Most hams outside of rrap don't know calls like that even exist.
> >
> >There are a number of calls with
>
> [that suffix]

Which one? TIT?

>
> >And there are other
> >suffixes in use that I suspect you would also find "inappropriate." (I
can
> >only "suspect" since you are unwilling to make any specific complaint
> >against Kim's suffix.)
>
> "Inappropriate" is quite specific.
>
> You work in an office/lab environment up there in CT, Jon. Would it be
> appropriate to come to work on a regular workday in midsummer wearing a
> swimsuit and sandals? How about wearing old faded jeans and a T-shirt to a
> formal dinner party or wedding? Those clothes are perfectly appropriate
for
> other situations. You're the same person. Why not wear the same clothes?
>

I think that's an excellent analogy. Since the ARS is neither professional
in nature, nor is it formal, then a fun callsign is quite appropriate for
the venue. We come into contact with emergency responders, indeed even
provide free service for those organizations. I've recently resigned my
position as Hunt County EC, but my callsign has *never* been brought into
question by *anyone* I wish to serve. In fact, my callsign has been
commented on, negatively, only once by a local ham, the Section Manager now.
He was not the Section Manager then. In usual and customary manner, I would
say that making no comment can be translated to: yes, it's tacky/vulgar/etc.
but not worth getting that upset about; or, "shrug shoulders no big deal."

> > Lots of hams come in contact with those call signs
> >yet make no noise about it.
>
> How do you know? I've never heard any of them on the air. And please note
that
> the FCC does NOT issue them sequentially.
>

Who cares if the FCC issues them sequentially or not? Doesn't matter. What
if I'd gotten W5TIT as a callsign issued sequentially and, for reasons of
tradition or attachment, had decided that I just couldn't do without my
original callsign? I am pretty sure there are some people who've gotten
calls that may be risque to them, but choose to keep them for that reason.
Are they "inappropriate" for the ARS?

> >
> > Whether most hams know they exist is
> >irrelevant; most hams who DO know haven't raised objections.
>
> How do you know that? The objectors here on rrap are a sizable group, but
you
> dismiss us and our opinions as irrelevant.
> >

I don't know that Jon dismisses them as irrelevant. I know that I do not.
I dismiss them because I don't agree with your opinion of the callsign.

> >>> How does the call sign N2EY "reflect positively" on the service?
> >>
> >> It is appropriate in any situation.
> >

So is W5TIT. It has been used during EmComm, Traffic Nets, conversation,
contesting, packet, APRS, emails, as my nametag for hamfests, etc. In fact,
I think it was Jon Bloom that I met at Arlington Hamfest a couple of years
ago with my W5TIT T-shirt on.

> >
> >It is irrelevant in any situation other than station identification since
> >it has no meaning.
>
> It has a lot of meaning to those hams who know me.
>

As I said in a post before, so does my callsign. Even for those hams who
don't like me either as a person or just because of the callsign (weird,
huh), they immediately recognize who is behind my callsign and that I am
quite serious about what I am doing. I will not engage in inappropriate
conversations on the air...well, most of the time; I take public service and
emergency communication very seriously; I am a fairly good storm spotter
(out of practice here in Texas with no significant weather in my area the
past few years); and my callsign is nearly immediately recognizable during
the worst of conditions. Lots of meaning, to many hams.

> >
> >Just like any other call sign.
>
> Then there's no reason Kim can't change hers to "W5KIM" or "W5MKW".
> >

Of course there's no reason. Except that I chided all the guys for getting
their initials. Heck, where's the creativity in that? A vanity callsign
should be a vanity callsign. Initials, smitials, be creative and have fun.
The other part of the whole thing is that, yes, the FCC will issue such
calls. (I wasn't sure they would when I applied...LOL).

> >>>To those outside ham radio, it's just a jumble of
> >>> letters and numbers, no more.
> >>
> >> You are mistaken. If that were so, broadcast stations would not care
> >> what their callsigns were.
> >
> >We're talking about HAM RADIO call signs, Jim, not broadcast call signs.
>

Exactly.

> Same principle. To get a reaction and promote an image. The callsign KISS
was
> fought over in court.
>
> >(BTW, in case you haven't listened to broadcast radio lately, most
> >stations de-emphasize the call sign as a marketing identification. They
> >prefer to use catchy phrases with the frequency in them, like "Big D
> >103.")
>

Hey, Jon, it's even being done on ham radio. Our 145.190 machine here in
Dallas says, "Welcome to the Big Machine in Big D..." It's really neat.
(It is the best machine and the most coverage--ooops, except for maybe one
other repeater--in Dallas). And, the "owner" is so controversial that even
though it's the best machine, it isn't the emergency communications
machine...now, ain't politics a hoot?

> Only those stations that can't get a catchy one. The point is still the
same:
> It's NOT just a random, meaningless collection.
> >
> >> Suppose a major network was going to do a special, and then a series,
on
> >> ham radio. Tons of priceless publicity for the ARS. They want a family
> >> show, not a late-night series to replace the Howard Stern TV show.
> >>
> >> Suppose they wanted to have a real live amateur radio callsign in the
> >> title - like the classic "WKRP in Cincinnati" show had a BC callsign.
> >>
> >> Suppose they asked YOU to recommend an unassigned amateur callsign
> >> (nobody has WKRP, either). Would YOU recommend a callsign like Kim's,
or
> >> something else? Why or why not? Please, be specific.
> >

Why not? Tell ya one thing, if you want attention to the hobby, "an
interview with a female ham, W5TIT" would get people watching and listening.
They may come with evil, misguided intentions, but I'd be so perfectly
representative of the ARS on TV that any of those people would soon change
their minds or recede into nothingness. The callsign is fun, the person is
fun, the callsign is not vulgar, the person is not vulgar. One of the
things I think would be great to point out in an interview would be the very
nature of the politics of my callsign. For anyone thinking that ham radio
is a stuck-up's hobby, they'd have to change their mind.

> >
> >I wouldn't recommend putting a call sign in the title in the first place;
> >it would be poor marketing.
>

I think so, too. A good title for a ham radio show would be something like,
"Getting to Know Your Neighbor...A Few Countries Away." Something like
that. If we were ever lucky enough (yeah, let's really dream here), and we

warranted a weekly show, I'd be more embarrassed to associate myself with RRAP than I would with any one ham or any one ham's callsign. Truthfully.

> WHY? "WKRP in Cincinnati" was a very highly rated show. The callsign made it
> easy to remember. In fact most people abbreviate the title to just "WKRP".
> >But if they were adamant, sure, they could use
> >a call sign like Kim's. (Heck, they could use Kim's call sign. As long as
> >it's okay with her.) I don't think it would result generally in the
> >smirking, nudging and winking present from a few here on rrap.

Nope, I don't think it would, either. In fact, I think to the common person (a non-ham) it would have to be pointed out that my callsign is unusual.

> If that's Hq's idea of good marketing, it's no wonder so few people know about
> ham radio.
> >

Oh no, Jim. I am really, really disappointed in *you* having that mentality. Good grief.

> >I find it interesting that you are unwilling or unable to say specifically
> >what's inappropriate about Kim's call sign and unwilling or unable to
> >explain why you think the community also considers it inappropriate.
> See above.
> >Pretty weak, Jim.
> I find it interesting that you would think it suitable as a marketing tool for
> Amateur Radio, Jon.
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I find it interesting that you are of the opinion that Jon brought up the idea of marketing ham radio through my callsign. Wasn't it *YOU* who presented the scenario, requesting a *specific* response from Jon? I think nearly any respect I had for you is precarious at this point, Jim. I never would have believed for you to use that kind of debating style.

My callsign, no one's callsign, should be used as a marketing tool for ham radio. I don't think Jon is advocating the idea. He was responding to the silly notion you presented.

Kim W5TIT

6083. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 15:47:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c952b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29129

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011228080246.09102.00000781@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3C2A4AFD.CDA3172E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> >is a valid callsign.
> >>
> >> Only because the FCC has made a mistake in issuing it. Do you believe
> >> the FCC is infallible, Cecil?
> >>
> >Well, maybe you should be ragging on the FCC instead of Kim.
>
> Who is "ragging on" Kim? Not me.
> >
> >> The FCC does NOT issue that particular suffix (and others) in sequence
> >> or at random. It must be specifically requested through the vanity
> >> call program.
> >>
> >But in the process of issuing any amateur radio callsign, the FCC
> >endorses that callsign as suitable and appropriate for identification
> >on the ham bands.
>
> Nope. They simply say it's legal, thus avoiding a lot of headaches.
>
> By the logic of "Govt. issued it, therefore it's OK" you're saying that if
the
> govt. says something is legal, then nobody should say anything against it.
>

Stand by. Are you aware of the mood across this country toward anyone who dares to publicly say anything criticising the government right now? I'll daresay that I would never in a million years agree (as has been said by some real idiots) that our government had anything to do with the tragic events of 9-11. But, it sure has provided them with a convenient venue to rapidly implement some pretty harsh measures; feed the frenzy of patriotism; cause those who don't fly a flag to come under suspicion from fellow citizens; and so on. Watch what happens in response to this post.

Kim W5TIT

6084. sorry for any dupes ... (was Re: Radio Policy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 15:55:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c9601_1@news7.fast.net>
Source record: 29130

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

Sorry to anyone who got multiple copies of
a post or two under "Re: Radio Policy" ...
my news server was sending them out, but
telling me it wasn't ... I believe I've resolved
the problem and apologize for any inconvenince
caused by dupes which got out before I fixed
the problem and cancelled dupes.

73,

- --
Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse
<mailto:wa6vse@fast/net>
<http://www.users.fast.net/~wa6vse>
- ------------------------------------------------------
NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, TAPR
Member, ARRL
- ------------------------------------------------------
Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGP for Personal Privacy 5.5.3

iQA/AwUBPCyV+Je+N6+q84HiEQIRfgCgzj7fG4f/BVHlKN6VH72RqrvO6ugAoN7S
Qszhtp7mThbyQvhqFpMh41C1
=JMu9
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

6085. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 15:57:41 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <vD0X7.35$jk5.3836@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 29131

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 08:02:45 -0500, N2EY wrote:

> In article <pan.2001.12.28.05.14.32.940745.17079@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>On Thu, 27 Dec 2001 16:47:34 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>>
>>> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
>>>> Wait a minute, Jim... are you saying you DON'T find Kim's call sign
>>>> dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy?
>>>
>>> All I'm saying is that it's not appropriate for the amateur radio
>>> service.
>>
>>But you are unwilling or unable to say why.
>
> You called me a "bluenose" but haven't said what a bluenose is.

I pointed you toward the online dictionary. Teach a man to fish....

So, you are apparently still unwilling to say that Kim's call sign is
dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy, or lacking that, describe what
it is about her call sign that makes it inappropriate. (Or did you think I
wouldn't notice that you ducked the question AGAIN?)

> "Nobody complained" is not a compelling argument. Weak, very weak.

It's not weak when the issue is one of community standards. When something
is both legal and noncontroversial -- based on there being few complaints
-- the burden of showing that it should not be allowed is, IMO, on those
who would disallow it. I don't think you come close to meeting that burden
by simply repeating the opinion that Kim's call sign is inappropriate
without further justifying that opinion.

>>So I'll repeat the question you ducked: What makes you think that your
>>standards are the community's?
>
> The reactions of those who DO comment. Like Riley. Is HE a "bluenose"?

Let's see, if a few people complain we should conclude that most people
don't like it, ignoring the many more people who don't complain? I'm glad
you're not in the demographics business!

>>> What's a "bluenose", Jon? Please, be specific.
>>
>>http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?va=bluenose
>

> Ya can't even bother to cut-and-paste.

Ya can't even bother to follow the link?

> "Inappropriate" is quite specific.

No, it's not. If you can't explain WHY it's inappropriate, it has little meaning.

> You work in an office/lab environment up there in CT, Jon. Would it be
> appropriate to come to work on a regular workday in midsummer wearing a
> swimsuit and sandals? How about wearing old faded jeans and a T-shirt to
> a formal dinner party or wedding? Those clothes are perfectly
> appropriate for other situations. You're the same person. Why not wear
> the same clothes?

That's a strawman, Jim. Clothes have a long history of societal implications. Call signs do not, especially to nonhams.

>> Lots of hams come in contact with those call signs
>>yet make no noise about it.
>
> How do you know?

Around here one tends to hear about things that make hams unhappy.

> I've never heard any of them on the air.

Do you have a point?

> And please
> note that the FCC does NOT issue them sequentially.

So what?

>> Whether most hams know they exist is
>>irrelevant; most hams who DO know haven't raised objections.
>
> How do you know that? The objectors here on rrap are a sizable group,
> but you dismiss us and our opinions as irrelevant.

Not irrelevant, just wrong. :-) I've seen only a few rrap-ers complain, with plenty of others taking issue with the complaints and yet others saying nothing on the subject at all. In short, even on rrap there is scant evidence of widespread unhappiness with Kim's choice of call sign.

> Then there's no reason Kim can't change hers to "W5KIM" or "W5MKW".

But she doesn't choose to, and you have yet to elucidate why she should other than that you consider her call sign "inappropriate." That's just your opinion, and in the absence of any more compelling argument, why should she conform to your opinion rather than her own?

> If that's Hq's idea of good marketing,

Ah, the old "you must be speaking for ARRL" ploy. You know better, Jim.

> it's no wonder so few people know
> about ham radio.

You're mistaken. Again.

>>I find it interesting that you are unwilling or unable to say
>>specifically what's inappropriate about Kim's call sign and unwilling or
>>unable to explain why you think the community also considers it
>>inappropriate.
>
> See above.

You still haven't explained what, specifically, is objectionable about Kim's call sign. Is it or is it not "dirty, vulgar, obscene, profane, or trashy"? If it is, just say so. If it's not, what IS it that makes it objectionable?

>>Pretty weak, Jim.
>
> I find it interesting that you would think it suitable as a marketing
> tool for Amateur Radio, Jon.

But I don't, Jim. As I clearly said, I don't think amateur call signs make a useful marketing tool at all.

Jon

6086. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 15:58:34 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c97da_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29132

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011228080247.09102.00000782@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3c2a295a_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:9f4bfe89.0112260911.3c2a6908@posting.google.com...
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >news:<3C29EDB2.D4C013F0@IEEE.org>...
> >> > N2EY wrote:
> >> > > Just because it's legal doesn't make it right.
> >> >
> >> > Just because part of a callsign might accidentally spell
> >> > something in some language, doesn't make it wrong.
> >>
> >> There was no accident in Kim's choice of letters for that callsign.
> >> They were specifically chosen for their shock and giggle value.
> >
> >Giggle value. Not shock.
>
> So the selection is NOT just a random collection of letters. It was
> specifically chosen to elicit a reaction.
>

It was specifically chosen on a dare, Jim. You have seen the story many
times. To me, a positive result of its having been issued is the giggles.
My callsign has brought smiles and laughter to old, cantankerous(sp),
churchgoing men *and* women, and has lightened up the load of many who are
usually very stern. It is either because they know me already--and I am a
very giving person; or, as we debate it for the first time, our conversation
ends with smiles and hugs.

> >> > Do you refuse to use words, parts of which spell a vulgar
> >> > word? e.g. assume, harass? If you use words, parts of which
> >> > spell a vulgar word, why bar callsigns, parts of which spell
> >> > vulgar words? It's exactly the same concept.
> >>
> >> Not at all. A callsign is not a word. Some callsigns are chosen to
> >> resemble words, (K1MMY, W1NDY, K0OL) but the callsign in question is
> >> not one of them.
> >
> >That is correct. When I say
>
> [Kim's call]
>
> >on the air, it either takes some

> >thinking or writing it down before it is even recognized as having a
twist
> >to it. There are many folks I've talked to on the air who never even say
a
> >word or indicate in any way that they take for anything but a callsign.
>
> So? Doesn't mean they think it's appropriate. They simply don't comment
because
> all that does is draw more attention to it. Attention is obviously what
you
> want.
>

No, Jim. Is Robin Williams a comdeian because he wants attention? Does an artist paint only because they wish attention? I don't care about attention. I have two arms that will hug me just as tightly and with a whole lot more meaning than most people. I like, in fact love, myself. I don't need anyone's attention. I feel that to smile, to say something funny, to nudge someone with my elbow, to tickle a child or an adult, to share things beautiful, is to give another person something positive. One smile, one giggle, one tinge of "something nicely naughty" given to an older person who hasn't had feelings like that in years is worth more punishment than could be heaped upon me by anyone else. That's all it's about. You are sad, but you'll get over it. How long do you think it's been since some of my friends (my older friends) have felt like they couldn't smile or have "those" kinds of thoughts about their wife, or themselves?

Off topic a little, but for Christmas I gave a man a laser pointer. The darned thing cost me $5. This guy is just a little older than me, but he's a preacher and he thinks life is all about being stern, being adult, speaking only of adult topics, with giggles that are illicited only from childhood memories. I didn't get to see him open his present. But he called me. He was in sheer laughter. Know what he said to me? He said, "You know what, Kim? I think God thinks it's OK if we adult men are little boys again, once in a while." Wonder what his sermon will be this Sunday.

> The "nobody complains" argument doesn't hold any water.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I can't carry aquariums around, Jim. They're cumbersome and sloshy.

Kim W5TIT

6087. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 16:00:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2c986a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29133

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:rn%W7.1526$Dl1.757130@monger.newsread.com...
> > > BTW, the amateur "Nude Net" meets on HF on Saturdays as I
> > > recall. You might want to tune it in sometime and note the age of some
> > > of the participants.
> >
>
> JEEEEEESHHHHHHHHHHH!!!! This scares me more than Kim's callsign does to
> some select few in this group. Considering the majority of hams are at or
> over the age of "middle age", to even know they may be naked while
> operating I believe will make me need counseling!!! LOL
>
>
> Is this net "for the good of the ARS??"
>
> Ryan
>

ROFLMAO...grab your mic and run, Ryan!

Kim W5TIT

6088. Re: Mistah Mitnick...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 16:18:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228111830.28576.00001083@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 29135

>Subject: Re: Mistah Mitnick...
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@no.spam
>Date: 12/27/2001 11:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp17rwo.pminews@or.news.verio.net>

>Waiting while he was serving his time to see if he was contrite
> for what he did. He was not, and that enters BIG into "character
> qualification"

And again...what you are telling me is that since he did not drop to his knees, wallowing and begging for forgiveness, he is "of poor moral character".

You need and your comrades in Washington need a serious dose of humility, Phil. YOU have a problem.

> Waiting, waiting....the wheels grind slowly but grind they
> do. Remember that Kevin was in the graybar. The Commission has
> time to wait it out.

No, what the Commission did was WASTE time and back-burnered this issue until it could bring it out and shake it off to make it look like it was REALLY doing "something" important.

Now that the FCC is coming under great scrutiny in the media for it's years of failed stewardship over enforcement matters, it's taking a decades old problem, CREATING a new probelm, and saying "Loookie what we did! Loookie what we did!"

Mitnick deserved the time served for what he did. But coming back YEARS after the fact and trying to cancel is Amateur Radio license for violation that did not even involve radios is cowardly.

>There is no time limit on such a proceeding as long as the
> Commission does not renew the license before starting such
> proceedings. Therefore, the crucial time ("point of no
> return") to make a decision to revoke/suspend is at renewal
> time.

And in that time, has Mitnick had so much as a warning letter for failing to identify? Has his on-air conduct warranted the scruitiny of Riley?

No.

Ergo, other than it has now been MADE an issue by the former prosecutor who has had his feelings hurt because he never got the emotional response wh thought he deserved, the FCC now tries to further punish Mitnick.

The RIGHT thing to do is renew his license, and then say "See...If you behave, even after breaking a law, we will let you have a license to operate."

> Remember that this is administrative law, not criminal law. The
> playing field has different stripes.

The only stripes I see here are yellow one's running down the back of FCC lawyers and Commissioners.

>There is ample precednt for taking action against any and all
> licenses held by the respondent in situations like this.

There was ample precedent (and evidence) to put Bill Clinton AND his wife in jail for a long time.

You see what happened there. And what Bill Clinton did to America far outstripped any damage that Mitnick ever did to it.

Your other examples (including the illegal "brothel" radio station noted....In that example radio WAS used illegally and the punishment was correct.

>Not quite. It's justice. Ask his victims. He led them on a merry
> chase for years, even assuming the identity of one of them on
> line for a while.

Oh yeah...THAT'S big news....How come the FCC isn't active in RRAP chasing down the dozens of spammes and forgers in here, Phil?

It still comes down to what we, as Americans SAY...And then what we DO...We are SUPPOSED to presume someone innnocent until proven guilty. Mitnick is having to defend his Amateur license against charges totally unrelated to his conduct as a licensee in PArt 97.

Furthermore, our justice system is supposed to be able to return a person to society so that they may function as a PART of that society.

YOU and your Commission comrades seem to think that that system is unjust, and that you have some moral imperative to punish, then continuing punishing at every opportunity.

That's sick.

Steve, K4YZ

6089. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 16:45:17 UTC
From: Richard Plourde <rplourde@att.net>
Message-ID: <xk1X7.313294$W8.11638202@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29136

> N2EY wrote:
> > I said inappropriate.

"CAM" wrote

> What definition of "inappropriate" are you using?

Hey... my dictionary says inappropriate means not appropriate...

not helpful so..

appropriate - especially suitable or compatible

so... inappropiate is not especially suitable or compatible.

This doesn't sound like much of an indictment of her callsign. It sounds
like it's only one step removed from my word for her callsign... fine. ;-)

Rich

6090. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 16:57:33 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ujLzYA8jBHA.1704@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 29137

Jon Bloom says:

> I don't think it would result generally in the
> smirking, nudging and winking present
> from a few here on rrap.

Jon, I'm not winking, nudging, or smirking. I've simply stated that I feel (as in "it is my opinion") that the vanity call choice Kim made is trashy.

If I saw an automobile with the vanity plates "TITS" I would also be of the opinion that the owner (whether female or male) made a trashy choice. So would most folks.

If a brassiere store opened in the mall with the name "Tit-Slings", I would consider their choice trashy. So would most folks.

If a urologist opened a medical office with the name "Pecker-Checker" I would consider that choice trashy. So would most folks.

Kim's vanity call was not sequentially assigned by a computer, but was deliberately selected as her personal preference by which to be identified on the air. I consider her choice trashy. So would most folks.

This isn't an attack on Kim -- she's probably a very nice middle aged lady, keeps her lawn mowed, doesn't fart in public places, looks out for children crossing the street, respects old people, gives generously to deserving charities, is great fun at a party, and a nice neighbor to chat with on a quiet summer evening. Kind of like your and my next door neighbors, who we'd also chide if they made such a silly choice of vanity call.

--
(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

6091. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 17:02:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228120254.24724.00000562@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 29138

In article <3c2c952b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011228080246.09102.00000781@mb-ct.aol.com...
>> In article <3C2A4AFD.CDA3172E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >>
>> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> >> >is a valid callsign.
>> >>
>> >> Only because the FCC has made a mistake in issuing it. Do you believe
>> >> the FCC is infallible, Cecil?
>> >
>> >Well, maybe you should be ragging on the FCC instead of Kim.
>>
>> Who is "ragging on" Kim? Not me.
>> >
>> >> The FCC does NOT issue that particular suffix (and others) in sequence
>> >> or at random. It must be specifically requested through the vanity
>> >> call program.
>> >
>> >But in the process of issuing any amateur radio callsign, the FCC
>> >endorses that callsign as suitable and appropriate for identification
>> >on the ham bands.
>>
>> Nope. They simply say it's legal, thus avoiding a lot of headaches.
>>
>> By the logic of "Govt. issued it, therefore it's OK" you're saying that if
>the
>> govt. says something is legal, then nobody should say anything against it.
>>
>
>Stand by.

For what?

>Are you aware of the mood across this country toward anyone who
>dares to publicly say anything criticising the government right now?

Yup. Do you see the parallel to this situation?

>I'll
>daresay that I would never in a million years agree (as has been said by
>some real idiots) that our government had anything to do with the tragic

>events of 9-11. But, it sure has provided them with a convenient venue to
>rapidly implement some pretty harsh measures; feed the frenzy of patriotism;
>cause those who don't fly a flag to come under suspicion from fellow
>citizens; and so on.

Just like the frenzy of electropolitical correctness when someone dares to suggest that certain callsigns may be inappropriate for the amateur service.

>Watch what happens in response to this post.

Similar to what happens to those who don't jump on the "anything goes with callsigns" bandwagon. Folks are called "bluenoses" and accused of "harrassment" for the terrible crime of disagreeing with a callsign choice.

Do you see the parallel? Do you begin to understand why I bothered to post in these threads?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6092. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 17:10:47 UTC
From: Joanie <alt.flame@flameawayroger.com>
Message-ID: <a0i90u$4kn$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29139
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flamenet,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> >
> >> Why were you kicked out of the Air Force Roger?
> >>
> >> See photo of KC8JBO and his pointed circus boy
> >>head here: www.angelfire.com/al/sj61 courtesy of the
> >>BARF chief of communications.
> >>
> >
> > Man, that's one ugly fucking redneck. I almost feel sorry for 8L0J08.
> > Almost. I bet that mustache is the pubic hair from his mothers twat.
>
>
>
>
> Damn, I was beaten to the punch. I wanted to be the first to come up
> with a photo of Woger. Oh well. I'll have one of his mommie's house in a
> few days. By all reports it's a beat up shack.
>
The photo is about 20 years old. Roger tried to pass himself
off as looking younger. Truth is Roger is fat now, very fat, with
gray hair and looks beyond his years from smoking dope.
Marshall county property tax records are on line and show the
house Roger lives in is owned by his mother and only his mother,
despite Roger's lies otherwise. Property evaluation is $35,000, so
it must be a typical WV hovel.

Roger Wiseman, the troll-on-demand. Boss Hog at the auto
parts store is calling you Wogie. Get off the computer and Usenet,
and go take care of some customers. Boss Hog is getting close to
booting your ass and you know you don't want to got back to
working at Walmart as a fry cook now, do you Wogie? LOL

Love to see Stagger Lee fire up Wogie the troll, LOL LOL LOL

6093. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 17:35:18 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <q32X7.313336$W8.11642973@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29140

I posted:
>> "Upon Mason's asking the question, a nervous titter ran through
>> the courtroom".

Kim-W5TIT reacted:

> ROFLMAO...NO way!!! Is that really a true story?! Great!
>
> Kim W5TIT

Well, it was told to me quite a while back in Texas by
a Texan when we were out on the plains turning cows
around so they wouldn't get shorter on one side by
always leaning into the wind. So you'll have to judge
for yourself.

Jim, K7JEB (ex-W5GYJ, El Paso, Texas)

6094. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 17:37:55 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <t52X7.37$jk5.3907@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 29141

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 11:57:33 -0500, K0HB wrote:

> Jon Bloom says:
>
>> I don't think it would result generally in the smirking, nudging and
>> winking present from a few here on rrap.
>
> Jon, I'm not winking, nudging, or smirking. I've simply stated that I
> feel (as in "it is my opinion") that the vanity call choice Kim made is
> trashy.

I know, and I consider publicly chastizing someone for their choice of call sign to be trashy. Each to his own opinion, right? (Jim, on the other hand, wants to treat her choice as trashy while fastidiously avoiding calling it that. At least you're up-front about it.)

> If I saw an automobile with the vanity plates "TITS" I would also be of
> the opinion that the owner (whether female or male) made a trashy
> choice. So would most folks.

Including me. But I wouldn't feel compelled to tell the driver my opinion.

> If a brassiere store opened in the mall with the name "Tit-Slings", I
> would consider their choice trashy. So would most folks.

Including me. But I wouldn't feel compelled to tell the merchant my opinion.

> If a urologist opened a medical office with the name "Pecker-Checker" I
> would consider that choice trashy. So would most folks.

Including me. But I wouldn't feel compelled to tell the doctor my opinion.

> Kim's vanity call was not sequentially assigned by a computer, but was
> deliberately selected as her personal preference by which to be
> identified on the air. I consider her choice trashy. So would most
> folks.

I don't think so. W5TIT is not the same thing as TIT. Most people recognize that.

If her name were Teresa Isabel Thompson, would her choice of W5TIT as a call sign still be trashy in your opinion?

> Kind of like your and my next door
> neighbors, who we'd also chide if they made such a silly choice of
> vanity call.

My neighbors make all kinds of silly choices, but I don't chide them for a silly choice if it doesn't affect me personally. I don't expect them to chide me when I make a silly choice that doesn't affect them personally, either. Where I was brought up, that's called being a good neighbor.

Jon

6095. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 17:53:53 UTC
From: Allah Muhammad Slut Fucker <pparis7@NOFUCKINGSPAMhome.com>
Message-ID: <3C2CB052.5050706@NOFUCKINGSPAMhome.com>
Source record: 29142
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flamenet,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Joanie wrote:

>>>> Why were you kicked out of the Air Force Roger?
>>>>
>>>> See photo of KC8JBO and his pointed circus boy
>>>>head here: www.angelfire.com/al/sj61 courtesy of the
>>>>BARF chief of communications.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Man, that's one ugly fucking redneck. I almost feel sorry for 8L0J08.
>>>Almost. I bet that mustache is the pubic hair from his mothers twat.
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Damn, I was beaten to the punch. I wanted to be the first to come up
>>with a photo of Woger. Oh well. I'll have one of his mommie's house in a
>>few days. By all reports it's a beat up shack.
>>
>>
> The photo is about 20 years old. Roger tried to pass himself
> off as looking younger. Truth is Roger is fat now, very fat, with
> gray hair and looks beyond his years from smoking dope.
> Marshall county property tax records are on line and show the
> house Roger lives in is owned by his mother and only his mother,
> despite Roger's lies otherwise. Property evaluation is $35,000, so
> it must be a typical WV hovel.
>
> Roger Wiseman, the troll-on-demand. Boss Hog at the auto
> parts store is calling you Wogie. Get off the computer and Usenet,
> and go take care of some customers. Boss Hog is getting close to
> booting your ass and you know you don't want to got back to
> working at Walmart as a fry cook now, do you Wogie? LOL
>
> Love to see Stagger Lee fire up Wogie the troll, LOL LOL LOL

<snicker> Check this one out. One wonder who that is in the picture that
Woger is sucking off.

Woger Wiseman's Profile:

http://profiles.gay.com/scripts/viewprofile?for=8L0J08

Any idea what the name of Woger's work place might be? His fans on Gay.com would surely want his work phone. ROFL!

-Allah

6096. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 18:43:23 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C2CBD7D.90C71ECC@gte.net>
Source record: 29143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > Things change, and sometimes pretty fast, but if we're headed down that
> >slippery slope, I haven't seen a lot of evidence of it. Of course I have
> >seen some. One of he most gregarious cases was in New York Cit. In 1962 I
> >watched a NYPD street cop give a guy an awful cussing in public while he
> >stood with his hand on the butt of his revolver as if he dared the guy to
> >respond in any way. The fellow' soffense was cuttting across one extra
> >traffic lane to get to a (rare) parking spot. There was no safety reason
> >for him not to do that, except the LEO noted his out of state license
> >plate, and after all, some jerk behind who wanted the spot himself
> >honked.....
>
> That was standard NYPD practice in those days. I too saw it done
> and was appalled, even though I grew up in NYC, because I had been
> exposed to four years of the California Highway Patrol's extra
> courteous manners in the interim.

Had a former platoon sergeant who had been a
Los Vegas motorcycle cop in the late 1970s. (He
got out of the Army, became a cop then went back
in). In those days, the jails were mostly for the
tourists and the locals received "street justice".

He had arrested a street prostitute for not have her
"Green Card", the monthly card from the health department
(which you can only get if you were working in a
house, which she was not). Her pimp got pissed,
and decided to get even. So one day my sergeant
was getting back on his cycle after lunch and just
putting on his helmet. The pimp shoots him with
a sawed off shotgun. Thanks to the leather coat
and helmet (and the fact that the pimp was standing
so far away that the shot from sawed off gun just
lost its force) he was unhurt. He turned, drew his
.44 Mag (big thing back in the days of revolvers,
especially out west) and knee caps the jerk. Then
called for an ambulance. End of Story.

Such was it back in simpler times.

6097. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 18:44:12 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2cbcfe_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29144

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011228120254.24724.00000562@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <3c2c952b_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20011228080246.09102.00000781@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >> In article <3C2A4AFD.CDA3172E@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> >writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> >> >is a valid callsign.
> >> >>
> >> >> Only because the FCC has made a mistake in issuing it. Do you
believe
> >> >> the FCC is infallible, Cecil?
> >> >
> >> >Well, maybe you should be ragging on the FCC instead of Kim.
> >>
> >> Who is "ragging on" Kim? Not me.
> >> >
> >> >> The FCC does NOT issue that particular suffix (and others) in
sequence
> >> >> or at random. It must be specifically requested through the vanity
> >> >> call program.
> >> >
> >> >But in the process of issuing any amateur radio callsign, the FCC
> >> >endorses that callsign as suitable and appropriate for identification
> >> >on the ham bands.
> >>
> >> Nope. They simply say it's legal, thus avoiding a lot of headaches.
> >>
> >> By the logic of "Govt. issued it, therefore it's OK" you're saying that
if
> >the
> >> govt. says something is legal, then nobody should say anything against
it.
> >>
> >
> >Stand by.
>
> For what?
>

> >Are you aware of the mood across this country toward anyone who
> >dares to publicly say anything criticising the government right now?
>
> Yup. Do you see the parallel to this situation?
>

Yes. Certainly do. Because I don't agree with people who think my callsign is tacky or vulgar/whatever, it is their expectation that I am still to live "up" (as they put it) to their standards. If I don't wave their flag, I am public enemy number one.

> >
> >I'll
> >daresay that I would never in a million years agree (as has been said by
> >some real idiots) that our government had anything to do with the tragic
> >events of 9-11. But, it sure has provided them with a convenient venue
to
> >rapidly implement some pretty harsh measures; feed the frenzy of
patriotism;
> >cause those who don't fly a flag to come under suspicion from fellow
> >citizens; and so on.
>
> Just like the frenzy of electropolitical correctness when someone dares to
> suggest that certain callsigns may be inappropriate for the amateur
service.
>

Yep, same thing. The same frenzy of electropolitical correctness when someone dares to suggest that certain callsigns are quite OK for the ARS.

> >
> >Watch what happens in response to this post.
>
> Similar to what happens to those who don't jump on the "anything goes with
> callsigns" bandwagon. Folks are called "bluenoses" and accused of
"harrassment"
> for the terrible crime of disagreeing with a callsign choice.
>

I think that we are all the same people, just with different points of view. I think bluenose, though, seems appropriately lain. Did you see the definition? While you have not done it, I have been labeled tacky. I have been labeled even worse. And, I have retorted back. We are all the same people, just with different points of view.

>
> Do you see the parallel? Do you begin to understand why I bothered to post
in
> these threads?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Well, actually no. I don't see why at all. Hell, I wonder half the time what in the world brings me to download these stupid-ass things. I think it's pretty damned stupid to be debating a callsign. Don't you?

Kim W5TIT

6098. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 18:46:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2cbd82_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29145

"Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:q32X7.313336$W8.11642973@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> I posted:
> >> "Upon Mason's asking the question, a nervous titter ran through
> >> the courtroom".
>
> Kim-W5TIT reacted:
>
> > ROFLMAO...NO way!!! Is that really a true story?! Great!
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Well, it was told to me quite a while back in Texas by
> a Texan when we were out on the plains turning cows
> around so they wouldn't get shorter on one side by
> always leaning into the wind. So you'll have to judge
> for yourself.
>
> Jim, K7JEB (ex-W5GYJ, El Paso, Texas)
>

HEH. I think I'll have to take your word for it! Hey, my husband--oh, OM
as I suppose I should call him for hamdom (even though I think YL and OM are
pretty tacky)--has a Worked All El Paso certificate! Were you in on that?
It took him about, hmmmmm, maybe a year to do it?

Kim W5TIT (husband is W5CAW)

6099. ARNewsline 1272 - Dec 28 2001

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 18:54:50 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228135450.07199.00003315@mb-dh.aol.com>
Source record: 29146

AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm) REPORT #1272 - DECEMBER 28 2001

==========

A NOTE TO THOSE WHO ONLY “READ” AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm)

For those of you who only know of the Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) as a text newsletter we would like to invite you to listen to the audio version. This Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) script is actually written for the “spoken word.” It is recorded each by professional broadcasters and is available for private listening or rebroadcast over your repeater. Three methods of delivery are available: Streaming audio using RealAudio, FTP RealAudio or dial-in telephone. Please visit our website at http://www.arnewsline.org for a list of telephone numbers (you have to pay your own long distance charges) and links to audio servers providing our voice newscast (for free).

de
The Newsline Production Team

==========

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1272 with a release date of Friday, December 28th, 2001 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

A not so welcome FCC Christmas present for several hams and an ARRL survey says that most hams no longer want the novice bands. These stories are first on this New Years week edition of the Amateur Radio Newsline coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC DESIGNATES KEVIN MITNICK, N6NHG, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION TO PUBLIC HEARING

A convicted computer hacker now has to face an FCC if he wants to keep his ham radio license. This, as the regulatory agency designates the Amateur Radio license renewal application of Kevin David Mitnick, N6NHG, for hearing. We have this report:

--

According to the FCC, Kevin David Mitnick is best known to the world as a hacker who admitted that he broke into a number of computer systems and stole proprietary software belonging to Motorola, Novell, Fujitsu, Sun Microsystems and other companies. He has also admitted using a number of means to commit

his crimes including social engineering, cloned cellular phones ad sniffer programs placed on a victims computer system. Mitnick even acknowledged altering the programming of computer systems belonging to the University of Southern California and using these computers to store programs that he had misappropriated.

Mitnick was sentenced to forty six months in federal prison for his August 9th 1999 conviction. He had previously been sentenced to twenty-two months in prison for possessing cloned cellular phones after his arrest in North Carolina in 1995 and for violating his supervised release that had been imposed after his conviction for unrelated computer fraud in 1989. He is currently on probation following his release from prison in January of 2001. And in December of 1999, Kevin David Mitnick, N6NHG, applied for renewal of his Amateur Radio Station and his General Class Operators License.

His license expired on December 12th 1999. The FCC put the renewal application on hold pending further inquiry. Now the agency has made public that it intends to challenge Mitnick's right to hold a ham radio license and has issued a Hearing Designation Order. In plain English, that means Kevin David Mitnick has to prove to the government why it should renew his ham ticket or have his license cancelled.

The FCC is challenging Mitnick's license renewal request on the ground that his past criminal behavior raises a substantial and material question as to whether Mitnick possesses what the it terms as the requisite character qualifications to remain a Commission licensee. The FCC says that in the context of broadcasting licenses, it has long held that evidence of any conviction for misconduct constituting a felony will be considered as relevant to its evaluation of an applicant's character. It also says that the broadcast character qualifications standards have been used as guidelines in the evaluation of non broadcast licenses including those in the Amateur Service and that the courts have upheld the Commission's right to do this.

The agency cites two recent cases. That of Herbert L. Schoenbohm, the ex-KV4FZ and Leslie Brewer who used to be KC4HAZ. Brewer, also known as the Tampa Party Pirate lost his ticket because of his unlicensed broadcasting in the commercial F-M band . Schoenbohm lost his based on a fraud conviction of using an unauthorized telephone access device. And the FCC says that any conviction for fraudulent conduct calls in question a licensee's ability to act in a manner consistent with FCC regulations.

And so the FCC has ordered that a hearing be held before an Administrative Law Judge to determine the effect of the criminal convictions of Kevin David Mitnick on his qualifications to be a Commission licensee. It also says that pursuant to provisions of the Communications Act, the burden will be on Kevin David Mitnick, N6NHG, to provide proof that his license renewal application should be granted. Mitnick was given 20 days of the mailing of the Hearing Designation Order to file a response.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline. I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

The hearing designation order on Mitnick’s license was adopted by the Commission on December 11th but not released until Friday, December 21st. Ironically, less than twenty-four hours earlier, Mitnick had made a guest appearance on Art Bell’s Coast to Coast A-M where he discussed his future plans. At that time he was apparently unaware that the FCC had some plans of its own in regard to whether or not N6NHG will remain a radio amateur and Commission licensee.

The complete text of the Mitnick FCC Hearing Designation Order is on the web at: http://www.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2001/db1221/fcc01359.txt (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: GERRITSON LICENSE PLACED ON HOLD PENDING POSSIBLE HEARING

Kevin Mitnick, N6NHG, is not the only person hearing from the FCC in recent days. So have a number of others including another Southern California resident who could face the same kind of a hearing. Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, is the FCC’s Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement:

--
Hollingsworth: “We notified a Bell California licensee; Jack Gerritson, ex-KG6IRO, that the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, had set aside his Technician grant so that a recent conviction for radio interference could be evaluated. Now, he has no authority to operate Amateur Radio equipment until the matter is resolved.”
--

The action to place Gerritson's license up for hearing was taken November 14, 2001 and is based in part upon complaints about the operation of his station and questions regarding Gerritson's qualifications to be a Commission licensee. The FCC says that both issues were raised as the result of Gerritson's 1999 arrest and year 2000 conviction for interference to police radio communications. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC REOPENS KY-W.VA REPEATER CASE

The FCC is also continuing its crackdown in the area of repeater interference issues. In fact it is taking a second look at a coordinated versus uncoordinated issue in the Tennessee and West Virginia border area. Again, Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH:

--
Hollingsworth: “We notified parties in a repeater dispute in West Virginia that we would be reopening that case after information that one of the repeaters is coordinated after all. We had declined to intervene earlier this year in that case.”
--

The letter stating that the FCC is reopening that case went to Michael Horn, KB8GDF, of Lenore West Virginia, Kenneth Brown KF8HL of Davin West Virginia and Carl Tussey, KB4UCE of South Williamson Kentucky. Back on January 24, 2001,

had notified the three that it had received a complaint that they were operating an uncoordinated repeater on 145.390 MHz in Mingo County, West Virginia, and that this repeater was causing interference to the coordinated KC8FKP repeater operated by the Portsmouth Radio Club that uses the same frequency. The matter was closed when the FCC interpreted a notation in the South-Eastern Repeater Associations Repeater Journal that the status of the KC8FKP repeater was not known and interpreted this as meaning that the repeater was also was not coordinated.

But now the FCC says that it has recently come to it's attention that although in the SERA Repeater Journal says that the KC8FKP repeater may be listed as unknown, it is still a coordinated system. Therefore, the FCC is re-opening its review of the issues in this matter. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: IS A GOVERNMENT AGENCY RUNNING A HAM REPEATER?

Is a government agency operating ham radio repeaters in violation of Part 97 rules? Specifically, the FCC wants to know who is really running the KD6LSO and W6SON repeaters in Sonoma County California.

The FCC says that it has received allegations that the county is in charge not the hams whose call signs appear on the machines. Since a county governmental entity cannot be an Amateur licensee, the FCC is collecting information in order to determine if there are breach of its rules. (FCC)

**

BREAK 1

This is ham radio news coming to you from the United States of America. We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world, including Rocky Mountain Radio League repeaters serving Denver and Bloomfield Colorado.

(5 Sec Pause Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: ARRL STUDY SAYS NOVICE BANDS MAY NOT BE NEEDED

An ARRL study group has recommended doing away with the current novice bands and divvying them up among the remaining licenses classes. Amateur Radio Newsline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details:

--

An ARRL Novice Spectrum Study Committee has recommended that the League petition the FCC to eliminate the CW novice subbands. It also wants a rules change that will allow Novice and Technician licensees with element 1 credit to be permitted to operate Morse code on the General 80, 40, 15 and 10 meter C-W allocations at up to 200 watts power out.

These are just two of the suggestions contained in a report that will be presented to the Leagues Board of Directors when that group convenes in mid January. The study committee will also suggest recognizing portions of the 80, 40, 15 and 10 meter Morse bands for what it calls ''slow CW operation.'' The committee says that this would aid new operators in enhancing their Morse code skills.

Finally, the panel also recommends re-farming -- that’s another way of saying reapportioning -- reapportioning the current Novice and Tech Plus subbands in part. This, to allow expansion of the phone allocations on 80, 40 and 15 meters.

What will the ARRL Board of Directors do? We should know in less then a month.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP

--

The committee's determinations were based on opinions expressed by 4744 hams who respond to an ARRL Novice Spectrum Study survey launched last June. Those expressing their opinions included ARRL members and also non-members. What’s really interesting is that nearly 61% of those responding were Extra class licensees. (ARRL bulletin)

**

FCC INSPECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT: THE NAMES THE SAME

The latest report of the FCC's Office of the Inspector General contained very few items of intrigue. But according to the C-G-C Communicator, one of the more colorful incidents involved a person who allegedly used the name of an FCC employee to obtain the government-rate for a hotel room in conjunction with a government-sponsored event.

Well, it turns out that the subject was legitimately attending the event, was entitled to the government room rate and just happened to have the same name as the FCC employee. The bottom line: Case dismissed.

The complete report is on the FCC website at http://www.fcc.gov/oig/Semiannual093001-1101.pdf (CGC Communicator)

**

AMERICA AT WAR: NYC PHONE SERVICE STILL SPOTTY

It's been almost four months since the attack on the World Trade Center, and telephone service near ground zero in lower Manhattan is anything but normal.

According to news reports, repair people have restored service to most customers, but thousands of lines still aren't working. As a result, customers complain that some business lines can call out, but customers can't call in.

The collapse of Seven World Trade Center crushed thousands of underground cables at Verizon's nearby switching station. About 200-thousand telephone lines and three-point-five million data circuits were affected. The company says it'll spend as much as one-point-nine billion dollars to repair the

damage. (Telecommunications Online)

**

INTERNET SECURITY: PROBLEMS WITH XP

If you just bought a new computer equipped with the Microsoft X-P operating system, or have upgraded your old one, listen up. The Federal Bureau of Investigation says that you should take certain steps to protect yourself against hackers who might try to take advantage of major flaws that have been found in X-P.

The bureau's National Infrastructure Protection Center says that in addition to installing a free software fix offered by Microsoft on the company's Web site, consumers and corporations using Windows XP should disable the product's universal plug and play features as well. The FBI also warned computer system administrators to actively monitor for specific types of Internet traffic that might indicate an attack was under way.

The FBI did not provide detailed instructions how to disable plug and play. Outside experts also caution that disabling the affected Windows XP features threatens to render unusable an entire category of high-tech devices about to go on the market. This includes a new class of computer printers that are easier to set up. But the same experts also acknowledge that disabling plug and play in X-P could afford some protection against similar flaws discovered in the future.

Microsoft considers disabling plug and play options as being unnecessary but the company does acknowledge that Windows X-P suffers from serious problems that can let hackers steal or destroy data files across the Internet or implant their own unwanted software. The FBI says that the glitches were unusually serious because they allow hackers to seize control of all Windows X-P operating system software without requiring a computer user to do anything except connect to the Internet. (Published news reports)

**

THE LAW: A FIGHT AGAINST GRAY MARKET ELECTRONICS

A group of American high-tech companies is opening the year 2002 with a campaign to protect consumers from unwittingly buying consumer electronic products intended for foreign markets. Electronics that the manufacturers claim may not work in the United States.

Compaq Computer is one of the companies involved in the campaign. It says that the group will warn consumers about the dangers of buying such products, and how to avoid getting duped. The other companies in the group are Hewlett-Packard, 3 Com, Nortel Networks, and Xerox. The effort may prompt more lawsuits against distributors who resell so called gray market items in the United States. (Computer Products Daily)

**

SPECIAL EVENTS: USS ARIZONA K7A A SUCCESS

Steve Gurley, KJ7WK the coordinator of the USS Arizona Special Events Station K7A tells the Amateur Radio Newsline that the event was an overwhelming success. Gurley says that the memorial station contacted amateurs in all 50 states, and 8 other countries while handling over 2600 QSO's. In fact says KJ7WK, the sponsoring group has already received certificate requests from 609 stations as we go to air. There were ten operators in three counties in the Phoenix Arizona metroplex operational during most of the three days K7A was on the air. (KJ7WK)

**

SCHOLARSHIPS: DARA SCHOLARSHIPS FOR 2002

The Dayton Amateur Radio Association says that the nominating period for its annual scholarship program is now open. The deadline to receive applications is June 1, 2002 and the announcement of winners will occur around June 15, 2002. Applications are available from the DARA Scholarship Committee, 9873 Lower Valley Pike, Medway, Ohio 45341. Please note that this is a new address from years past. Again it is the DARA Scholarship Committee, 9873 Lower Valley Pike, Medway, Ohio 45341. Also, for more information on the Dayton Amateur Radio Association and its programs, please visit www.dara-w8bi.com on the world wide web. (DARA)

**

AWARDS: DARA OPENS NOMINATIONS FOR HAM OF THE YEAR

The Dayton Amateur Radio Association also asks that we remind you that the nominating period for the 2002 Dayton Hamvention Awards is now open. There are three awards presented each year. They are the Radio Amateur of the Year, Special Achievement, and Technical Excellence.

All amateurs Novice through Extra are eligible. Awards are decided by the Awards Committee, based partially upon the information received. Magazine articles, newsletters, newspaper clippings, videos and the like are appreciated but cannot be returned. The deadline for nominations is January 31, 2002. Nominations should be sent to Post Office Box 964, Dayton Ohio 45401. They can also be submitted by completing the e-form on the web at www.hamvention.org. (DARA)

**

BREAK 2

News never takes a holiday and neither do we. Ringing in the New Year from the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, with links to the world from our only official website - www.arnewsline.org.

(5 sec pause here)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: BADGER STATE SMOKE SIGNALS EDITOR JIM ROMALFANGER, K9ZZ - SK

I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

The ham who put the state of Wisconsin on the ham radio map has passed away. This, with word that Jim Romelfanger, K9ZZ died Saturday evening December 22nd of an apparent heart attack..

According to Romalfanger's close friend Ken Ebneter, K9EN, Jim has been in declining health for some time. Romalfanger had a stroke a few weeks ago, affecting his right arm which was already weakened by polio. But Ebneter says that K9ZZ seemed to be improving until just recently. Ebneter says that Romalfanger had been in the hospital early last week but was home when he passed away of an apparent heart attack. In fact, K9ZZ had stopped by to visit a ham radio friend that afternoon. Another friend found him dead that evening when he stopped by to visit.

His full name was Arthur James Louis Romelfanger but to the world of ham radio he was Jim, K9ZZ. And Jim Romalfanger made Wisconsin a ham radio household word by editing as three decade state-wide ham radio monthly newspaper called Badger State Smoke Signals -- and doing so as a volunteer.

Notice we said newspaper and not newsletter. This is because Smoke Signals is just that. A newspaper that at its peak ran up to 40 pages filled with articles about ham radio in the Badger State. In addition to being the 32 year editor of Smoke Signals, Romalfanger was nationally published over the years in CQ, QST, 73, Ham Radio, Popular Electronics, and other magazines.

Jim Romalfanger was first licensed January 1958 in Pacific Beach, California, as KN6LWB. Upgraded to General in May of 1958. He returned to Wisconsin that summer and became K9PKQ. In 1977, changed call to K9ZZ and held that call sign the rest of his life. Funeral services were scheduled for Friday, December 27th at St. Joseph Catholic Church in Baraboo Wisconsin.

Jim, from all of your friends at the Amateur Radio Newsline: We are going to miss you. (The Baraboo News Republic, K9EN, WB9QZB, and other friends of K9ZZ contributed to this report.)

**

AMAZING DISCOVERIES: CIRCLES WITHIN A CIRCLE

One of the most curious pure mathematical discoveries for 2001 was announced in the easy-to-read article at an incredibly long website. In brief the article says that research has led to some remarkable geometric findings involving interrelationships between tangent circles and spheres. In other words, mysterious circles within a circle.

As one researcher put it, "Where do these numbers come from? What's going on here?" Find out by going to www.sciencenews.org/20010421/bob18.asp (CGC Communicator)

**

INTERENATIONAL - CANADA: NEW ALBERTA SM

On the international front, word that Thomas Martens, VE6TRM, has been appointed the new Radio Amateurs of Canada Section Manager for the province of Alberta and the North West Territories. Martens replaces Alan Faint VE6QQ will

be stepping down from the position due to personal reasons. Martens will serve the remainder of Faint’s term which runs through June 30th, 2003. (RAC)

**

INTERNATIONAL-AUSTRALIA: CSIRO MICROTURBINES

Australian hospitals, restaurants and schools could soon source clean, reliable energy from mini power generators that operate independent of the main grid. This as CSIRO has installed Australia's first commercial microturbine, at their North Ryde Laboratory, Sydney.

The size of a small refrigerator, the turbine produces 30 kilowatts of power, independent of the electricity grid. And it does this with reduced greenhouse and other gas emissions. Thirty kilowatts is enough to power a medium commercial building such as a restaurant.

Along with fuel cells, gas engines, storage technologies and some renewable technologies, microturbines can be used to generate power close to the end-user and provide major gains in reliability and power quality. Once the design can trickle down to the home user level and price range, it could offer hams a way of always having emergency power always at hand. (Q-News)

**

SHORTWAVE MONITORING : RADIO NORWAY CLOSES

The Board of Directors of the Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation has decided to stop its own programs by Radio Norway International. This is effective as of December 31st of 2001.

According to DF5SX and G3VGW, Radio Norway’s final show was hosted by veteran broadcaster Einar Lie on New Years Eve. Also, the 1200 kilowatt Medium Wave transmitter on 1314 kHz on Kvitsoy was supposed to cease operation by December the 31st as well.

The Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation will have to negotiate with transmitter providers Norkring and Radio Denmark to close down as well. The Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation and Norkring have a contract for running the transmissions that goes through December 31st, 2003. The agency also has a leasing agreement with Radio Denmark for the same period. (Media Network)

**

DX

In D-X, keep an ear open for King George Island in the South Shetland group. HFZ0POL is reported on all H-F bands, including the newer ones, using CW, SSB, RTTY and PSK31. QSL HF0POL via SQ5TA.

And the United Arab Emerates has been heard lately A61AJ. He has been QRV on 40 meters CW around 1400 UTC. Q-S-L A61AJ via N4QB. (Various DX sources)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: RILEY SAYS THANKS

And finally as the year 2001 comes to an end, the FCC’s Chief Rules enforcer, Riley Hollingsworth has some words of praise for the ham radio community. He passed them along through his bi-weekly Enforcement Log at www.rainreport.com, and thanks to them, we have is words for you:

--
Hollingsworth: “I would like to point out Hap, that this is the end of the third year of Amateur Radio enforcement and I will honestly say that the overall level of compliance in the Amateur Radio Service is outstanding. The Amateur licensees do a great job and they do a great job of showing that the Amateur Radio Service is -- indeed -- the only fail-safe communications system in the world and we are very proud of them.”
--

And if I can take off my reporters hat for a moment and editorialize a bit, I guess I speak for many who truly appreciate what you have done to return the Amateur Radio bands to the law abiding members of the nations ham radio community. (ARNewsline(tm), RAIN)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, KC5MFA, saying Happy 2002, God Bless America, and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2001. All rights reserved.

6100. RESTRUCTURING: ARRL STUDY SAYS NOVICE BANDS MAY NOT BE NEEDED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 19:07:16 UTC
From: N9NWO <2121d@gte.net>
Message-ID: <3C2CC31A.AF190B57@gte.net>
Source record: 29147
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

RESTRUCTURING: ARRL STUDY SAYS NOVICE BANDS MAY NOT BE NEEDED

An ARRL study group has recommended doing away with the current novice bands and divvying them up among the remaining licenses classes.

Amateur Radio Newsline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details:
--

An ARRL Novice Spectrum Study Committee has recommended that the League petition the FCC to eliminate the CW novice subbands. It also wants a rules change that will allow Novice and Technician licensees with element 1 credit to be permitted to operate Morse code on the General 80, 40, 15 and 10 meter C-W allocations at up to 200 watts power out.

These are just two of the suggestions contained in a report that will be

presented to the Leagues Board of Directors when that group convenes in mid January. The study committee will also suggest recognizing portions of the 80, 40, 15 and 10 meter Morse bands for what it calls ''slow CW operation.'' The committee says that this would aid new operators in enhancing their Morse code skills.

Finally, the panel also recommends re-farming -- that's another way of saying reapportioning -- reapportioning the current Novice and Tech Plus

subbands in part. This, to allow expansion of the phone allocations on 80, 40 and 15 meters.

What will the ARRL Board of Directors do? We should know in less then a

month.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Norm Seeley, KI7UP

--

The committee's determinations were based on opinions expressed by 4744 hams who respond to an ARRL Novice Spectrum Study survey launched last June. Those expressing their opinions included ARRL members and also non-members. What's really interesting is that nearly 61% of those responding were Extra class licensees. (ARRL bulletin)

**

What we need is for the CW/digital portion of the
bands to be open to everyone (if qualified). No

sub bands.

6101. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 19:39:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228143934.10110.00001463@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 29148

In article <3c2c89da_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

(at least 10 times...)

N2EY wrote:

>> Why allow them "modern digital modes" but not analog voice modes,
>> which are far more popular?
>
>Actually, there isn't a logical, valid reason not to give them
>voice privileges as well ...

But you proposed giving them ONLY "modern digital modes" (without specifying
which modes fit that description". No mention of analog voice modes at all.

>but I had to ask the question
>to ferret out your response ...

All you had to do was ask a straight question. No "ferret" needed.

>which seems aimed at
>"encouraging" (or, more accurately, arm-twisting) people
>to learn Morse by limiting the majority of their frequency
>privileges to that mode ...
>
Nope.

The idea of expanding Novice/Tech Plus CW privs on HF was Mr. Plourde's, not
mine. I responded to it and increased the spectrum. I also suggested that in a
new system, the mode choices of the entry class license would be much wider.

Your statements about "modern digital modes" seems aimed at "encouraging" (or,
more accurately, arm-twisting) people to use those modes by limiting the
majority of their HF frequency privileges to those modes.

Look at the big picture and the new ideas being presented, Carl. Think future,
not past.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6102. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 19:39:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228143939.10110.00001464@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 29149

In article <3c2c93eb_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011228080245.09102.00000780@mb-ct.aol.com...
>> In article <pan.2001.12.28.05.14.32.940745.17079@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
>> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>>
>> >So I'll repeat the question you ducked: What makes you
>> >think that your standards are the community's?
>>
>> The reactions of those who DO comment. Like Riley. Is HE a "bluenose"?
>
>C'mon.

Where are we going?

> Riley is just another ham.

No, he's not. If he were, you would not have sought out his opinion.

>His opinion on whether the FCC should be
>in the business of judging callsigns or not, was sought because I knew that,
>as a person from the FCC, his opinion would be listened to.

Then he's NOT "just another ham". You can't have it both ways.

> If I'd said to
>Larry R., or anyone else, "Hey, ask Cecil if the FCC should take my callsign
>away," that would have garnered nothing but the usual cat meows from a bunch
>of grown men.

I have no idea what "cat meows from a group of grown men" is supposed to mean.

And Cecil never posts anyhting seriously here. He's told us that many times.
Plus it's clear to anyone who has read rrap that Cecil would side with you, so
there's no reason to even bother asking him.

Asking Riley was a smart move because he ISN'T "just another ham" and he would
be listened to. Trouble is, he didn't agree with you.
>
>> >>> The
>> >>> only complaints I've heard about Kim's call sign (or similar ones) are
>> >>> from a few bluenoses here on rrap.
>> >>
>> >> What's a "bluenose", Jon? Please, be specific.
>> >
>> >http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?va=bluenose

>>
>> Ya can't even bother to cut-and-paste.
>
>Main Entry: blueï¿½nose
>Pronunciation: 'blï¿½-"nOz
>Function: noun
>Date: 1903
>: a person who advocates a rigorous moral code
>
>How's that? Sounds appropriate.

Sounds like a compliment.
>
>> >>>Hardy an outpouring of community outrage!
>> >>
>> >> Most hams outside of rrap don't know calls like that even exist.
>> >
>> >There are a number of calls with
>>
>> [that suffix]
>
>Which one?

The one in your callsign.

>> >And there are other
>> >suffixes in use that I suspect you would also find "inappropriate." (I
>can
>> >only "suspect" since you are unwilling to make any specific complaint
>> >against Kim's suffix.)
>>
>> "Inappropriate" is quite specific.
>>
>> You work in an office/lab environment up there in CT, Jon. Would it be
>> appropriate to come to work on a regular workday in midsummer wearing a
>> swimsuit and sandals? How about wearing old faded jeans and a T-shirt to a
>> formal dinner party or wedding? Those clothes are perfectly appropriate
>for
>> other situations. You're the same person. Why not wear the same clothes?
>
>I think that's an excellent analogy.

Thank you.

>Since the ARS is neither professional
>in nature, nor is it formal, then a fun callsign is quite appropriate for
>the venue.

I disagree. The ARS IS "formal in nature" because we use a limited public
resource that others want to use. I have nothing against "fun" callsigns, but I
don't find inappropriate callsigns to be "fun".

>We come into contact with emergency responders, indeed even
>provide free service for those organizations. I've recently resigned my
>position as Hunt County EC, but my callsign has *never* been brought into
>question by *anyone* I wish to serve.

All that means is that they chose not to comment on it. As public officials,
they could be in quite an uncomfortable situation if they commented in any way.

>In fact, my callsign has been
>commented on, negatively, only once by a local ham, the Section Manager now.
>He was not the Section Manager then.

Do you think his opionion has changed?

>In usual and customary manner, I would
>say that making no comment can be translated to: yes, it's tacky/vulgar/etc.
>but not worth getting that upset about; or, "shrug shoulders no big deal."

What "usual and customary manner"?

Making no comment can also be interpreted as politeness, avoiding a
confrontation, trying not to call attention to something, or a form of
shunning.

>> > Lots of hams come in contact with those call signs
>> >yet make no noise about it.
>>
>> How do you know? I've never heard any of them on the air. And please note
>that
>> the FCC does NOT issue them sequentially.
>
>Who cares if the FCC issues them sequentially or not? Doesn't matter.

Yes, it does. By not issuing certain calls in sequence, the FCC recognizes that
those calls are NOT simply random colections of letters and a number.

>What if I'd gotten

[that callsign]

>as a callsign issued sequentially

You couldn't. FCC wouldn't issue it. You had to specifically request it.

However, if the FCC changed its rules and issued it sequentially, you could say
"It's not my choice; FCC just gave it to me".

With choice comes responsibility.

> and, for reasons of
>tradition or attachment, had decided that I just couldn't do without my
>original callsign?

Just "get over it". Shrug shoulders, go on living, no big deal.

>I am pretty sure there are some people who've gotten
>calls that may be risque to them, but choose to keep them for that reason.

>Are they "inappropriate" for the ARS?

Depends on the callsign. Your suffix is not issued sequentially, so anybody
with a call like yours asked for it specifically.

>> > Whether most hams know they exist is
>> >irrelevant; most hams who DO know haven't raised objections.
>>
>> How do you know that? The objectors here on rrap are a sizable group, but
>you
>> dismiss us and our opinions as irrelevant.
>
>I don't know that Jon dismisses them as irrelevant.

Sure seems to me like he does.

>I know that I do not.
>I dismiss them because I don't agree with your opinion of the callsign.

Same thing. You dismiss opinions that you don't agree with. You've already
said, if I recall right, that nothing anybody can say would change your
opinion. That's preemptive dismissal of all opposing opinions.
>
>> >>> How does the call sign N2EY "reflect positively" on the service?
>> >>
>> >> It is appropriate in any situation.

>So is

[Kim's call]

> It has been used during EmComm, Traffic Nets, conversation,
>contesting, packet, APRS, emails, as my nametag for hamfests, etc.

That simply means it was used, not that it was appropriate. If I wore the same
T-shirt, bathing trunks and sandals to a whole bunch of events, would that make
those clothes appropriate?

>In fact,
>I think it was Jon Bloom that I met at Arlington Hamfest a couple of years
>ago with my

[callsign]

> T-shirt on.

Jon has a T-shirt with your callsign on it? ;-)

>> >It is irrelevant in any situation other than station identification since
>> >it has no meaning.
>>
>> It has a lot of meaning to those hams who know me.

>As I said in a post before, so does my callsign.

Which disproves the statement "It is irrelevant in any situation other than
station identification since it has no meaning."

>Even for those hams who
>don't like me either as a person or just because of the callsign (weird,
>huh), they immediately recognize who is behind my callsign and that I am
>quite serious about what I am doing.

Maybe - I don't know them, and I don't know what you are like on the air.

>I will not engage in inappropriate
>conversations on the air...well, most of the time;

Ah - but what's "inappropriate"? Your "inappropriate" may be someone else's
"fun".

> I take public service and
>emergency communication very seriously; I am a fairly good storm spotter
>(out of practice here in Texas with no significant weather in my area the
>past few years); and my callsign is nearly immediately recognizable during
>the worst of conditions. Lots of meaning, to many hams.
>
Which disproves the statement "It is irrelevant in any situation other than
station identification since it has no meaning."

>> >Just like any other call sign.
>>
>> Then there's no reason Kim can't change hers to "W5KIM" or "W5MKW".

>Of course there's no reason.

Then why not do it? "W5KIM" is instantly recognizable and makes it easy to
associate name and call.

>Except that I chided all the guys for getting
>their initials.

So?

> Heck, where's the creativity in that? A vanity callsign
>should be a vanity callsign. Initials, smitials, be creative and have fun.

Sure. "W5KIM" is creative and fun.

>The other part of the whole thing is that, yes, the FCC will issue such
>calls. (I wasn't sure they would when I applied...LOL).

They issue them ON REQUEST because they'd set themselves up for a lot of
headaches and maybe even a lawsuit if they didn't.
>
>> >>>To those outside ham radio, it's just a jumble of
>> >>> letters and numbers, no more.
>> >>
>> >> You are mistaken. If that were so, broadcast stations would not care
>> >> what their callsigns were.
>> >

>> >We're talking about HAM RADIO call signs, Jim, not broadcast call signs.
>
>Exactly.

It's the same principle.
>
>> Same principle. To get a reaction and promote an image. The callsign KISS
>was
>> fought over in court.
>>
>> >(BTW, in case you haven't listened to broadcast radio lately, most
>> >stations de-emphasize the call sign as a marketing identification. They
>> >prefer to use catchy phrases with the frequency in them, like "Big D
>> >103.")

>Hey, Jon, it's even being done on ham radio. Our 145.190 machine here in
>Dallas says, "Welcome to the Big Machine in Big D..." It's really neat.
>(It is the best machine and the most coverage--ooops, except for maybe one
>other repeater--in Dallas).

Does it ever give the actual callsign? And what makes it the "best" machine?

>And, the "owner" is so controversial that even
>though it's the best machine, it isn't the emergency communications
>machine...now, ain't politics a hoot?

Why is the "owner" controversial?
>
>> Only those stations that can't get a catchy one. The point is still the
>same:
>> It's NOT just a random, meaningless collection.

That's the point.
>> >
>> >> Suppose a major network was going to do a special, and then a series,
>on
>> >> ham radio. Tons of priceless publicity for the ARS. They want a family
>> >> show, not a late-night series to replace the Howard Stern TV show.
>> >>
>> >> Suppose they wanted to have a real live amateur radio callsign in the
>> >> title - like the classic "WKRP in Cincinnati" show had a BC callsign.
>> >>
>> >> Suppose they asked YOU to recommend an unassigned amateur callsign
>> >> (nobody has WKRP, either). Would YOU recommend a callsign like Kim's,
>or
>> >> something else? Why or why not? Please, be specific.
>
>Why not? Tell ya one thing, if you want attention to the hobby, "an
>interview with a female ham,

[with Kim's call]

> would get people watching and listening.

All publicity is not good publicity.

>They may come with evil, misguided intentions,

Like what?

>but I'd be so perfectly
>representative of the ARS on TV that any of those people would soon change
>their minds or recede into nothingness.

I don't think you are "perfectly representative of the ARS", Kim. Nobody is.
Sorry, but that's my perception from what I've read here over the years.

>The callsign is fun, the person is
>fun, the callsign is not vulgar, the person is not vulgar.

Your opinion only. Is it forbidden to disagree? Seems like it, judging by the
reactions to my disagreement.

>One of the
>things I think would be great to point out in an interview would be the very
>nature of the politics of my callsign.

What politics? It's a matter of appropriateness, that's all.

> For anyone thinking that ham radio
>is a stuck-up's hobby, they'd have to change their mind.

The problem is, what their mind would change to.

>> >I wouldn't recommend putting a call sign in the title in the first place;
>> >it would be poor marketing.
>
>I think so, too.

Why? It worked for "WKRP".

> A good title for a ham radio show would be something like,
>"Getting to Know Your Neighbor...A Few Countries Away." Something like
>that.

You gotta be kidding. Way too long and not nearly catchy enough.

>If we were ever lucky enough (yeah, let's really dream here), and we
>warranted a weekly show, I'd be more embarrassed to associate myself with
>RRAP than I would with any one ham or any one ham's callsign. Truthfully.

Then why are you here?

>> WHY? "WKRP in Cincinnati" was a very highly rated show. The callsign made
>it
>> easy to remember. In fact most people abbreviate the title to just "WKRP".
>>
>> >But if they were adamant, sure, they could use
>> >a call sign like Kim's. (Heck, they could use Kim's call sign. As long as
>> >it's okay with her.) I don't think it would result generally in the
>> >smirking, nudging and winking present from a few here on rrap.

>
>Nope, I don't think it would, either. In fact, I think to the common person
>(a non-ham) it would have to be pointed out that my callsign is unusual.

That's scary.
>
>> If that's Hq's idea of good marketing, it's no wonder so few people know
>about
>> ham radio.

>Oh no, Jim. I am really, really disappointed in *you* having that
>mentality. Good grief.

What mentality?

It's an "if-then" statement.

Is it not true that few people outside ham radio know about it? Isn't one of
the goals of the ARRL to market and publicize amateur radio in a positive
light?

If the "if-then" statement is not true, the statement is not valid, anyway.

>> >I find it interesting that you are unwilling or unable to say
>specifically
>> >what's inappropriate about Kim's call sign and unwilling or unable to
>> >explain why you think the community also considers it inappropriate.
>>
>> See above.
>>
>> >Pretty weak, Jim.
>>
>> I find it interesting that you would think it suitable as a marketing tool
>for
>> Amateur Radio, Jon.

>I find it interesting that you are of the opinion that Jon brought up the
>idea of marketing ham radio through my callsign. Wasn't it *YOU* who
>presented the scenario, requesting a *specific* response from Jon?

Yep. So what?

>I think
>nearly any respect I had for you is precarious at this point, Jim.

Why? For being honest? How much respect would you have if I toed the
electropolitically-correct line while thinking differently? Should I bow and
scrape before Jon because he's on the Hq staff? I don;t think he wants that.

I note that other rrappers climb all over the ARRL and Hq staffers and you
never bat an eye about it.

>I never
>would have believed for you to use that kind of debating style.

>
What kind? Be specific.

>My callsign, no one's callsign, should be used as a marketing tool for ham
>radio.

Why not? It worked really well for WKRP. I think it's a good idea, but the
callsign used must be appropriate and unassigned. Like W9MWC.

>I don't think Jon is advocating the idea.

I think he was.

> He was responding to the
>silly notion you presented.
>
A TV special and series on ham radio is a silly notion? I think not!

"Ensemble" comedies are the trend nowadays. The first significant one was
"Barney Miller", a true classic. "WKRP" followed close thereafter. "Cheers" and
"Seinfeld" derive from those shows. Today we have shows like "Ally McBeal"
which are the direct descendants. A ham-radio-based show could be great - IF it
were done right. A disaster, if done wrong.

Did you see the movie "Contact"? Do you think your call would have been
appropriate for use in that film?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6103. RE.. RESTRUCTURING: ARRL STUDY SAYS NOVICE BANDS MAY NOT BE NEEDED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 19:44:55 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ehVv5d9jBHA.1232@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 29150

N9NWO stated:

> What we need is for the CW/digital portion of the
> bands to be open to everyone (if qualified). No
> sub bands.

Your statement is ambiguous to me. ("No sub bands")

Do you mean:

1) That voice and image modes should be allowed in
the current CW/data portions of the bands?

2) That any class of license ought to be able to operate
CW/data in all the current CW/portions of the bands?

3) Both 1 and 2 above?

4) Something else? (Explain)

73, de Hans, K0HB

6104. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 20:12:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp2bvfr.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29001
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 18:43:23 GMT, N9NWO wrote:

>Such was it back in simpler times.

I was on the streets pre-Miranda and I remember seeing a crazy late teen who needed six Deputies to restrain him after he got taken to the station. LT "Iron Pants" Bailey calmly put a revolver in the kid's mouth and said "sing, n****r". We recovered the goods from eight recent burglaries.

Was "justice" served? Do you want to go back to those days? I surely don't.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6105. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 20:21:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2CD45C.A7FA2CE2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29002

Jon Bloom wrote:
> If her name were Teresa Isabel Thompson, would her choice of W5TIT as a
> call sign still be trashy in your opinion?

Just shows that the people who don't like W5TIT are not being objective.
It is Kim's motives that are being criticized, not the callsign per se.
--
cheers, CAM, W5DXP

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
Check out our new Unlimited Server. No Download or Time Limits!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! ==-----

6106. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 20:23:39 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228152339.05344.00001456@mb-mg.news.cs.com>
Source record: 29003

>>Such was it back in simpler times.
>
> I was on the streets pre-Miranda and I remember seeing a crazy late
> teen who needed six Deputies to restrain him after he got taken to
> the station. LT "Iron Pants" Bailey calmly put a revolver in the
> kid's mouth and said "sing, n****r". We recovered the goods from
> eight recent burglaries.
>
> Was "justice" served? Do you want to go back to those days? I
> surely don't.
>
>--
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Me neither, Phil. The end might've been the desired result, but the means just makes me want to puke! :-(

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

6107. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 22:03:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2CDF63.F43D90E1@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29004

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Krell wrote:
> > > So who decides what is juvenile?
> >
> > Surprise! SOCIETY!!
>
> Exactly where does this body of society meet to sit down and
> write out what is juvenile? Saying "society" is just another
> argumentum ad populum. Society is an ill-defined nebulous
> blob with no enforcement power outside of government.

Cecil, you're a ill-defined, neblous blob with no enforcement power
either insideor outside of government.

6108. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 22:11:32 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ebT81v#jBHA.1340@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 29005

Jon Bloom wrote:

> If her name were Teresa Isabel Thompson, would her choice of W5TIT as a
> call sign still be trashy in your opinion?

It would be just as trashy, but I'd probably have given her
"the benefit of the doubt" and not responded to her "what
do you think of my vanity call sign" query. At least she'd
have had a better "story" to tell about why she made that
choice.

(���) 73, de Hans, K0HB

6109. Trance-Formation of America: Epilogue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 22:23:36 UTC
From: bill@trance-formation.org
Message-ID: <4uh3yh$4qu$4@195.238.3.180>
Source record: 29016
Cross-posted to: rec.collecting.cards.non-sports,rec.music.artists.debbie-gibson,rec.food.chocolate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The safety and serenity of Alaska provided an atmosphere conducive to deprogramming, despite the pandemonium that ensued. Mark Phillips was the first man who not only did not abuse us, but cared for our welfare and well being. His patient, gentle manner was therapeutic, while his propensity for handling weapons and apparent intellect kept us safe against all odds. Through his noble actions, Mark taught Kelly and me that the world of human interaction in which we had existed for so long was contrary to most human behavior. We learned that goodness does exist on this Earth, and that there were those in Washington, D.C. who refused to tolerate the mind-control atrocities they witnessed us and others enduring.

As my eyes opened and I woke up to reality, I became enraged. Enraged for the traumas inflicted on my daughter. Enraged for a lifetime of abuse at the hands of our country's so called "leaders". Enraged that the American public had no idea as to who and what was/is running their country. Mark helped me refocus my rage in a productive direction when he told me, "The best revenge is total recovery."

I began recovering at the rate of 18 hours a day through intensive therapy destined to restore my memory and, ultimately, my mind. I learned the ins and outs of my own mind and recovered my memories in a journal. The stack of journals grew as over a decade of White House/ Pentagon-level abuse flooded my mind and intruded on my thoughts. Pictures from my past flashed across my mind as neuron pathways opened in my brain. I was regaining access to my own mind and control over my future by recovering my memory of my past.

Best of all, I was falling deeply in love with Mark Phillips. Why wouldn't I fall in love? He rescued my daughter and me from certain demise, restored my free will, and was helping me recover in total safety, and was the polar opposite of my abusers. He treated me with love, respect, and thoughtful consideration . Equally as important, Mark proved to be an ideal father figure to Kelly. He provided here with unconditional love and deep understanding. Through him, Kelly caught a glimpse of how kind men could be--and how good life could be. I had long since ceased to know that such a man even existed.

The love factor in my recovery is considerable. Not only did Mark Phillips save my life, but now I had a reason to live it! The love we share kept me going at times--like when Kelly was institutionalized in 1989 for homicidal/suicidal behavior. The loving relationship that Mark shared with Kelly during our short year together as a family was sufficient to arm here with the strength to survive her ensuing ordeal

as a victim of the so-called mental health and criminal justice system.

Kelly, now 15, remains a political prisoner in the custody of the State of Tennessee where she is denied qualified therapy for the MK-Ultra Project Monarch Mind-Control abuses she endured. The state of Tennessee, under the politically powerful influence of Kelly's abusers, is in violation of numerous laws and basic civil rights in their determined efforts to keep Kelly from qualified therapy and the family she loves.

While many of those in positions to make a difference in Kelly's case operate on a "Need to Know" basis rather than deliberately conspire with the bad guys, a closer look into Kelly's case history should raise serious questions in their minds. Questions like; "What could a child have to do with the so called "National Security" of our country?" The Juvenile court judge presiding over Kelly's case closed the doors to the media and onlookers for "reasons of National Security" while gross and blatant violations of laws and rights ensued.

For over three long years, Kelly and I have been denied our right to an unbiased attorney while court-appointed advocates and so-called "guardians" join forces with attorneys paid off by me pedophile father. My own court-appointed attorney, who doubles for the Juvenile Court judge when he takes a day off, has yet to represent my interest. My interest is in Kelly's well being and future-- and if she will have a future at all.

While Kelly is still amnesic with regard to most of her past, she is deliberately denied therapeutical access to her past, due to who and what she will recall. I am denied access to Kelly for fear she would be triggered into remembering by my mere presence. As for my deliberately "triggering" Kelly to remember what she was supposed to forget, as her abusers fear, it has been my experience that recovery must come from the inside out. Not from outside input. I want no less for Kelly that the piece/peace of mind I have gained through qualified rehabilitation. Which raises the questions: Why has the Juvenile court prohibited us from saying the name "George Bush?" Why is the "Wizard of Oz" a taboo subject for Kelly while the State of Tennessee provides her with Stephen King horror novels? Why are Kelly and I forbidden by the court to say the words "President," "politics," New World Order", and "mind-control"?.

In an attempt by state employees to "normalize" our relationship, Kelly and I are forbidden to discuss the past, my immediate efforts to affect her dire and desperate situation, or future plans as a family.

Most appalling and unjust in Kelly's view is the State of Tennessee's refusal to allow her any contact whatsoever with Mark Phillips. While I am hindered from having private conversations with my daughter due to court ordered supervisions and censorship, Kelly is denied the right to even wave to Mark across the parking lot. Considering that, like me,

Mark has never been named as an abuser, declared unfit, or violated any court orders, the questions must be asked: "Why does the State of Tennessee go to such lengths to ban all communication between Kelly and the man who rescued her and taught her the meaning of unconditional love?"

Kelly has asked these questions for years to no avail. The State of Tennessee refuses to even acknowledge her request for"an unbiased attorney who will represent her interests instead of those of the state". Kelly's pleas for an attorney to represent her go no farther than the deaf ears of the assigned state social worker "managing" her case. This social worker is operating on a "Need to Know" basis that has no basis, and she "Needs to Know" that she, along with the State of Tennessee, will be held accountable in the event that Kelly hurts someone or herself.

Kelly's frustrations have mounted beyond her ability to cope. I applaud Kelly for her determined but weakened efforts to stay in control of her own mind despite being denied qualified rehabilitation for the devastating results of Project Monarch Mind-Control abuses. Kelly's daily attempts to accomplish the impossible by psychoLOGICALLY managing her psychiatric disorder is proportionate to her high intellect and willful determination. But it is not enough to fend off the Psychological Warfare that has been waged against her through CIA Damage Containment practices designed to keep her contained in amnesic silence. She needs help. She needs a collective voice.

Kelly can be helped through public outcry and through abolishment of the 1947 National Security Act (and 1984 Reagan Amendment to same) that has destroyed the true security of our once great nation. You can write the State of Tennessee demanding to know why Kelly is being denied her right to qualified rehabilitation.

Thank you. - Cathy O'Brien

Every submitted comment of encouragement will be greatly appreciated!

--
http://www.trance-formation.org/
http://www.trance-formation.com/

Trance-Formation of America:

Project Monarch (excerpt #1)
http://www.trance-formation.com/book_excerpts/monarch.htm
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?ID=100925768100
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=EC8F5BAE.8523C14B%40trance-formation.com&output=gplain
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?STYPE=msgid&MSGI=%3CEC8F5BAE.8523C14B@trance-formation.com%3E

From Dorothy to Tinker-Belle (excerpt #2)
http://www.trance-formation.com/book_excerpts/dorothy.htm

http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?ID=100925953900
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=11757353565781042415208 78%40news.clara.net&output=gplain
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?STYPE=msgid&MSGI=%3C62371BB7.8BC522F0@news.clara.net%3E

The Most Dangerous Game (excerpt #3)
http://www.trance-formation.com/book_excerpts/game.htm
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?ID=100930112200
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=MPG.3f72db4fab9e%40166.82.1.9&output=gplain
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?STYPE=msgid&MSGI=%3CMPG.3f72db4fab9e@166.82.1.9%3E

You Are What You Read (excerpt #4)
http://www.trance-formation.com/book_excerpts/read.htm
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?ID=100933907900
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=1ef3ad%245oz%241%40168.95.195.16&output=gplain
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?STYPE=msgid&MSGI=%3C1ef3ad%245oz%241@168.95.195.16%3E

The Most Dangerous Game: Revisited (excerpt #5)
http://www.trance-formation.com/book_excerpts/regame.htm
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?ID=100949997400
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=e138c973.25b3142c%40trance-formation.org&output=gplain
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?STYPE=msgid&MSGI=%3Ce138c973.25b3142c@trance-formation.org%3E

Clinton Coke Lines (excerpt #6)
http://www.trance-formation.com/book_excerpts/cokelines.htm
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?ID=100950207100
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=311e7c95.f10eeeaa%40trance-formation.org&output=gplain
http://howardk.moonfall.com/msgid.cgi?STYPE=msgid&MSGI=%3C311e7c95.f10eeeaa@trance-formation.org%3E
--

6110. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 22:35:08 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E2163CA5AE4B3689.B733AC71010B9C05.9A10F0561F4BE00A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29006

On 28 Dec 2001 17:02:54 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Do you see the parallel? Do you begin to understand why I bothered to post in
>these threads?

Sure--because you think you know better than Kim what is "good
for the ARS."

Guess what?

A lot of us think you're wrong.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6111. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 22:56:09 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0j3i0aic2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29021
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.flamenet,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Homoxsexual pedophile pervert
"Joanie" <alt.flame@flameawayroger.com> wrote in message
news:a0i90u$4kn$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > >> Why were you kicked out of the Air Force Roger?
> > >>
> > >> See photo of KC8JBO and his pointed circus boy
> > >>head here: www.angelfire.com/al/sj61 courtesy of the
> > >>BARF chief of communications.
> > >>
> > >
> > > Man, that's one ugly fucking redneck. I almost feel sorry for 8L0J08.
> > > Almost. I bet that mustache is the pubic hair from his mothers twat.

No, it's from YOUR mommy's twat.

> > Damn, I was beaten to the punch. I wanted to be the first to come up
> > with a photo of Woger. Oh well. I'll have one of his mommie's house in a
> > few days. By all reports it's a beat up shack.
> >
> The photo is about 20 years old.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA Prove it.

>Roger tried to pass himself off as looking younger.

While "Joanie" tries to pass himself off on the liberty net as straight.
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...over 50 years old and never been
married....bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha.then ol' Steve Turdeater goes up
to Richland, OH and fucks his momma up the ass.

>Truth is Roger is fat now, very fat, with

<guffaw> Suuuuure I am, FATASS.

> gray hair and looks beyond his years from smoking dope.

Bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha.. that why I got carded a few weeks ago
when I bought some beer?

> Marshall county property tax records are on line and show the
> house Roger lives in is owned by his mother and only his mother,

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA Marshall county tax records are not
on line, you fucking imbecile.

> despite Roger's lies otherwise.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA.....
So YOU say.

> Property evaluation is $35,000, so it must be a typical WV hovel.

And the Gurnsey county records assess that hole in the ground in Feeport under 20,000....and now the insurance fraud is so high in Ohio, the homeowner's insurance is increasing.

And let's not even mention Dicksucking Dave Heil's hovel in Cameron what that .8 of an acre is assesed at...under $25,000
......bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha

> Roger Wiseman, the troll-on-demand.

Anonymous COWARD, buttfucked BITCH on demand.

Hey Lardasssssssssssss, when are you going to quit QRMing on HF...You've already been DFed by the FCC.

6112. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 23:02:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8E6ADA8FD8153304.6E769D4FA5DBBED2.2E067B86E5283A6A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29007

On 28 Dec 2001 13:02:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>You called me a "bluenose" but haven't said what a bluenose is.

A person who brown noses bluebloods?

>"Nobody complained" is not a compelling argument. Weak, very weak.

Not as weak as your vague complaints about the call or the
idiotic statements being made that "most hams" are offended by it when
it is clear that only a small group of moralists feel that way.

>The reactions of those who DO comment. Like Riley. Is HE a "bluenose"?

How about my comments? Cecil's? Jon's? Krell's? So far as I
can see, there are more people posting to this thread that they DO
support her choice of call signs than there are posting that they
don't!

That sort of kills your argument, doesn't it?

>>> What's a "bluenose", Jon? Please, be specific.
>>
>>http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?va=bluenose
>
>Ya can't even bother to cut-and-paste.

And you can't even bother to click a link!

Here, for the terminally lazy, is the content of the link he
provided:

=====
Main Entry: blueï¿½nose
Pronunciation: 'blï¿½-"nOz
Function: noun
Date: 1903
a person who advocates a rigorous moral code
=====

>"Inappropriate" is quite specific.

True.

Provided, of course, that there is general agreement that
something IS inappropriate for a given purpose. That doesn't happen to
be the case with Kim's call sign.

>You work in an office/lab environment up there in CT, Jon. Would it be
>appropriate to come to work on a regular workday in midsummer wearing a
>swimsuit and sandals? How about wearing old faded jeans and a T-shirt to a
>formal dinner party or wedding? Those clothes are perfectly appropriate for
>other situations. You're the same person. Why not wear the same clothes?

Because there is GENERAL AGREEMENT as to what is and is not
appropriate in those settings. Change your scenario a bit, however.
What if he works in an office/lab environment in CT, and chooses to
come to WORK in those "old faded jeans and a T-shirt?" Would THAT be
inappropriate? It would if his firm has a set policy that includes a
dress code. It would NOT if his firm had no policy against employees
dressing in that manner. In other words, it would be up to the
company, not society, to define what is or is not appropriate for its
workers.

In Kim's case a very close parallel exists. Instead of a
company being the arbitrator of "appropriateness," that decision is
left to the FCC (don't believe it--try applying for the call sign
W2SOS and see how quickly your application is turned down). And since
they issued Kim's call, it is apparent that by their set of standards,
her call IS appropriate for issuance to a radio amateur.

THAT, Jim, is the ONLY criteria for "appropriateness" that is
relevant to Kim's call sign.

>> Lots of hams come in contact with those call signs
>>yet make no noise about it.
>
>How do you know? I've never heard any of them on the air. And please note that
>the FCC does NOT issue them sequentially.

Nor, as I've pointed out before (and been ignored since it
weakens your case to admit it) do they issue ?#GOD sequentially.
Unless you are willing to state here publicly that "GOD" is not
appropriate for amateur radio, your argument fails completely.

>> Whether most hams know they exist is
>>irrelevant; most hams who DO know haven't raised objections.
>
>How do you know that? The objectors here on rrap are a sizable group, but you
>dismiss us and our opinions as irrelevant.

No, Jim, the objectors here on rrap are NOT a sizable group.
There are you, Larry Roll, Dick Carroll, Dave Heil, and Dwight Stewart
who is away right now. Essentially, that's the ball game. A couple
others have made comments about it, but they aren't active in the
thread. On the opposite side are myself, Cecil, Jon, Krell, Rich, and
(of course) Kim herself. As in the case of your group, there are
several other people who have made brief comments of support then not
continued in the thread. From what I can see, the supporters are a
larger group than the opponents of her sign.

More important, however, is the fact that NEITHER group has
any business pushing their views down Kim's throat. If she wants to
change her call sign, she is completely free to do so whenever she
wishes. If she does not wish to do so, that is just as valid a choice.
But in both cases it IS her choice, not that of people who feel
compelled to tell her how to live her life, as is true of you and
others.

>Then there's no reason Kim can't change hers to "W5KIM" or "W5MKW".

None at all (assuming those calls are available)--but neither
is there any reason she SHOULD do so. That was a choice available to
her when she originally applied for a vanity call, and it was her
choice at the time not to apply for it.

You expect others to respect your right to choose--try showing
the same respect for them as well.

>>I find it interesting that you are unwilling or unable to say specifically
>>what's inappropriate about Kim's call sign and unwilling or unable to
>>explain why you think the community also considers it inappropriate.
>
>See above.

We have--and it still avoids his question completely, as you
well know.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6113. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 23:02:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2CED13.F3FC2715@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29008

Jon Bloom wrote:

> >I consider her choice trashy. So would most

> > folks.
>
> I don't think so. W5TIT is not the same thing as TIT. Most people
> recognize that.
>

Balderdash! She chose that callsign for one reason and one reason only, by her own statements here. In fact she very recently stated she wasn't at all sure the FCC would issue it. Wanta try for a better position?

>
> If her name were Teresa Isabel Thompson, would her choice of W5TIT as a
> call sign still be trashy in your opinion?
>

If an elephant had wings he could fly, or try. Teresa Isabel Thompson would avoid her initials on her vanity callsign if she cared at all about the image she projected for ham radio. Kim obviously doesn't and that comes as no surprise.

>
> > Kind of like your and my next door
> > neighbors, who we'd also chide if they made such a silly choice of
> > vanity call.
>
> My neighbors make all kinds of silly choices, but I don't chide them for a
> silly choice if it doesn't affect me personally. I don't expect them to
> chide me when I make a silly choice that doesn't affect them personally,
> either. Where I was brought up, that's called being a good neighbor.

Oh, I would imagine if your neighbors started hanging out lewd signs around the neighborhood, or all over town, as could be the expected result of on-air amateur radio callsign usage, you might decide differently.

6114. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 23:06:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2CEE1C.3B45AF1C@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29009
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N9NWO wrote

> So one day my sergeant

> was getting back on his cycle after lunch and just
> putting on his helmet. The pimp shoots him with
> a sawed off shotgun. Thanks to the leather coat
> and helmet (and the fact that the pimp was standing
> so far away that the shot from sawed off gun just
> lost its force) he was unhurt. He turned, drew his
> .44 Mag (big thing back in the days of revolvers,
> especially out west) and knee caps the jerk. Then
> called for an ambulance. End of Story.
>
> Such was it back in simpler times.

Nothing radical about that. Anyone who cracks a cap at a cop is paid for, then or now. Pimp was VERY lucky he didn't get the slug in the gut.

6115. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 23:08:46 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <6BBDB28D09B17F70.F62170F68BFF9448.8ACAB8899B197C01@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29010

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 09:41:45 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>So is W5TIT. It has been used during EmComm, Traffic Nets, conversation,
>contesting, packet, APRS, emails, as my nametag for hamfests, etc. In fact,
>I think it was Jon Bloom that I met at Arlington Hamfest a couple of years
>ago with my W5TIT T-shirt on.

Now THAT would have been an interesting addition to a wet
t-shirt contest! ;-)

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6116. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 23:16:55 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <DBD8DA82FE84A6E4.97AE7ECBE90C07F9.80DB367B6488B232@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29011

On 28 Dec 2001 13:02:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>The "nobody complains" argument doesn't hold any water.

Don't be ridiculous, Jim.

You (and others) claim that the call is inappropriate and that
the "community standards" define that inappropriateness. Yet the ONLY
way that "community standards" are defined is by the voices of that
community. You now state that it doesn't matter if nobody complains.
All that indicates is that either: (1) You are so self-righteous you
actually believe that you have the right to establish community
standards yourself (don't feel bad, so do Donald Wildmon [AFA] and
Fred Phelps [GodHatesFags.org]) or; (2) your "community standards" are
a straw dog, and the actual community standards condone rather than
condemn Kim's call.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6117. Re: I made it home alive

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 23:24:48 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <FC6B1F0428AA551B.D5A60E54D5FC835D.1D174141AF973579@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29012

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 08:12:44 -0500, "WebDoc REACT Unit #602"
<arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:

>Well Rick, I was working in NYC as a volunteer with the Red Cross, I has
>been there since October 3rd. I had planned to take my test there so I could
>enjoy the hobby on my time off. I live in the N.W. Ohio area, like 40
>minutes from Toledo, so now that I am home I can take the test there.
>Understand better now? heheheh.

Makes sense.

BTW, we must live fairly near each other--I'm in Southcentral
Michigan a little North of the Ohio line and, also, about 40-50
minutes from Toledo.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6118. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 23:37:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2CF554.EBB1C7B6@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29013

CAM wrote:

> Jon Bloom wrote:
> > If her name were Teresa Isabel Thompson, would her choice of W5TIT as a
> > call sign still be trashy in your opinion?
>
> Just shows that the people who don't like W5TIT are not being objective.
> It is Kim's motives that are being criticized, not the callsign per se.

Ah, just for the confused, if not for Kim's motives she would not have that callsign.

6119. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 23:45:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2CF736.8E2CFB40@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29014

Kim-W5TIT wrote

>Because I don't agree with people who think my callsign

> is tacky or vulgar/whatever, it is their expectation that I am still to live
> "up" (as they put it) to their standards. If I don't wave their flag, I am
> public enemy number one.

More of your defective thought process at work. No one "expects" anything at all of you. If you were not who and what you are, you wouldn't have chosen that callsign. Do not confuse the criticism with anyone's expectations. What you are is a demonstration of one thing that ham radio should not be - lewd. By your own amission, you chose your callsign for lewd reasons. Sin ce gthe most public part of a ham radio operator is his callsign, you clearly chose to place lewdness at the fore of your ham radio experience. Tho you didn't describe it that way, you didn't need to, the implication was more than clear in your statements.
Lewdness has no place in ham radio, otherwise Riley wouldn't consider you to be like the others in ham radio who are putting the service "one step closer to extinction". End of story.

6120. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-28 23:50:54 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <yz7X7.244493$3d2.12003595@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29015

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:DBD8DA82FE84A6E4.97AE7ECBE90C07F9.80DB367B6488B232@lp.airnews.net...
> On 28 Dec 2001 13:02:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >The "nobody complains" argument doesn't hold any water.
>
> Don't be ridiculous, Jim.
>
> You (and others) claim that the call is inappropriate and that
> the "community standards" define that inappropriateness. Yet the ONLY
> way that "community standards" are defined is by the voices of that
> community. You now state that it doesn't matter if nobody complains.
> All that indicates is that either: (1) You are so self-righteous you
> actually believe that you have the right to establish community
> standards yourself (don't feel bad, so do Donald Wildmon [AFA] and
> Fred Phelps [GodHatesFags.org]) or; (2) your "community standards" are
> a straw dog, and the actual community standards condone rather than
> condemn Kim's call.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH

I think it far more likely the community pleads de minimus. While this call is a crime it is a common crime and one of a category often encountered. Generic Look at me, I'm Sandra Dee.

Sane people generally realize that they are not about to educate idiot drivers with any sort of retaliation and are not about to instill taste in the terminally tasteless so we take Carl Jung's advice and cultivate our little garden and save a corner of the world.

The amazing thing about this thread is that so many supposedly mature men are being led around by the testicles at the instigation of a flaming airhead. The light in the eyes is the sun shining thru the back of her head but she learned to manipulate men and in fact has a history of it both on this group and in whatever parts of her life she has chosen to expose.

It appears Larry has the most to answer for but the lemming brigade needs a bit of navel contemplation as well. What a bunch of maroons, with Rick bucking for captaincy.

Dick NBK

6121. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 00:11:06 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2D0A1A.7232F011@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29017

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil, you're a ill-defined, neblous blob with no enforcement power
> either inside or outside of government.

Which is exactly as it should be. You guys are trying to be the
Thought Police and it ain't gonna work.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6122. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 00:15:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2D0B1A.4BD31D2D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29018

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What you are
> is a demonstration of one thing that ham radio should not be - lewd.

So Dick thinks that female anatomy is lewd. Dick, you really are a
member of the Taliban, aren't you? Kim, you better cover yourself
from head to toe or Dick will beat you with a stick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6123. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 00:21:26 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2D0C86.94C36C73@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29019

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > > If her name were Teresa Isabel Thompson, would her choice of W5TIT as a
> > > call sign still be trashy in your opinion?
> >
> > Just shows that the people who don't like W5TIT are not being objective.
> > It is Kim's motives that are being criticized, not the callsign per se.
>
> Ah, just for the confused, if not for Kim's motives she would not have that
> callsign.

I rest my case. Kim's motives have absolutely nothing to do with whether
Kim's callsign is trashy. Kim's callsign is either objectively trashy or
it is not. Seems to me, the majority believes it is NOT trashy.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6124. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 00:27:43 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2D0DFF.5DBA46E9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29020

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> > I don't think so. W5TIT is not the same thing as TIT. Most people
> > recognize that.
>
> Balderdash! She chose that callsign for one reason and one reason only, by
> her own statements here.

Kim's reasons for choosing that callsign are irrelevant. What is relevant is
whether the callsign is objectively trashy or not. Seems the posters who
think it is trashy are a negligible number of social dinosaurs.

> Oh, I would imagine if your neighbors started hanging out lewd signs around
> the neighborhood, or all over town, as could be the expected result of on-air
> amateur radio callsign usage, you might decide differently.

There you have it, folks. Dick thinks the female anatomy is lewd. Cover up
all the women or else risk getting beaten with sticks by the Big Dick.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6125. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 01:56:39 UTC
From: lousherry@lanset.com
Message-ID: <3C2D22D7.B785A728@lanset.com>
Source record: 29023
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I'll still take a New Yorker over a California any day. At least you know
where they are coming from!

Phil Cane wrote:

> On Wed, 26 Dec 2001 04:41:08 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Things change, and sometimes pretty fast, but if we're headed down that
> >slippery slope, I haven't seen a lot of evidence of it. Of course I have
> >seen some. One of he most gregarious cases was in New York Cit. In 1962 I
> >watched a NYPD street cop give a guy an awful cussing in public while he
> >stood with his hand on the butt of his revolver as if he dared the guy to
> >respond in any way. The fellow' soffense was cuttting across one extra
> >traffic lane to get to a (rare) parking spot. There was no safety reason
> >for him not to do that, except the LEO noted his out of state license
> >plate, and after all, some jerk behind who wanted the spot himself
> >honked.....
>
> That was standard NYPD practice in those days. I too saw it done
> and was appalled, even though I grew up in NYC, because I had been
> exposed to four years of the California Highway Patrol's extra
> courteous manners in the interim.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6126. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 01:59:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228205921.13985.00002119@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29022

In article <3c271712_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

>
>In the spirit of the holiday season (whatever your
>religious persuasion), I'd like to take this opportunity
>to sincerely convey wishes for a happy holiday
>season and a prosperous new year to you, on behalf
>of both myself and the entire Board of Directors and
>membership of No Code International.
>

Carl:

Thank you. I just returned from an excellent Christmas with my
family up in Buffalo; had to drive thru a blizaard this morning to
get out of town! I hope you and all at NCI had a wonderful
holiday season, and have a very safe and happy new year!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6127. Did Tacoma do anything after they passed the law?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 02:26:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0j9sgtbg1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29024

This has been asked, but never answered.

Tacoma (Wash) passed the following city ordinance:

"It is unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation, to
(a) use citizens band radio equipment not authorized
by the Federal Communications Commission; (b) to
allow the unauthorized operation of citizens band
radio equipment on a frequency between 24 MHz
and 35 MHz. "

Have the city fathers actually done anything with that
law...i.e. telling their police force to enforce the law
against someone?

It has been suggested, and I strongly agree, that the
driving force behind this ordinance must have been one
or more local complaints regarding one or more
CB violators...BUT no one seems to know anything.

On further examination of the law itself, part A seems
to be an oxymoron...to wit, how can a radio truly
be a Citizens Band radio but not be authorized by
the FCC. Without the FCC "approval" the radio, whatever it
may be, isn't a CB radio at all. It may be capable of
being operated in the CB band or elsewhere between
24-35MHz, but that sure doesn't make the radio itself
a CB radio.

Just some additional thoughts on the (obvious to me anyway)
unenforceable and rather dumb law.

Cheers & Happy New Year to all,
Bill K2UNK

6128. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 02:36:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2d2db2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29026

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011228143939.10110.00001464@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <3c2c93eb_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20011228080245.09102.00000780@mb-ct.aol.com...
> >> In article <pan.2001.12.28.05.14.32.940745.17079@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom
> >> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
> >>
> >> >So I'll repeat the question you ducked: What makes you
> >> >think that your standards are the community's?
> >>
> >> The reactions of those who DO comment. Like Riley. Is HE a "bluenose"?
> >
> >C'mon.
>
> Where are we going?
>
> > Riley is just another ham.
>
> No, he's not. If he were, you would not have sought out his opinion.
>

Well, believe whatever you wish. Riley is just another ham. His opinion
holds more weight because he is a ham who works for the FCC.

> >
> >His opinion on whether the FCC should be
> >in the business of judging callsigns or not, was sought because I knew
that,
> >as a person from the FCC, his opinion would be listened to.
>
> Then he's NOT "just another ham". You can't have it both ways.
>

As I said, believe what you wish.

> >
> > If I'd said to
> >Larry R., or anyone else, "Hey, ask Cecil if the FCC should take my
callsign
> >away," that would have garnered nothing but the usual cat meows from a
bunch
> >of grown men.

>
> I have no idea what "cat meows from a group of grown men" is supposed to
mean.
>
> And Cecil never posts anyhting seriously here. He's told us that many
times.
> Plus it's clear to anyone who has read rrap that Cecil would side with
you, so
> there's no reason to even bother asking him.
>

Oh, for goodness sake, take your pick then, Jim.

>
> Asking Riley was a smart move because he ISN'T "just another ham" and he
would
> be listened to. Trouble is, he didn't agree with you.
>

Actually, yes he did, Jim. You and all the others seem to miss the point
that he confirmed my belief that the FCC was not in the business of judging
callsigns. I didn't ask him what he *thought* of my callsign (that should
have been obvious to anyone). That he added his personal opinion was a
footnote to his comments. I'll say the same thing to you: if you think I am
stupid enough to have thought for one minute that Riley was a "supporter" of
a callsign like mine, then you're nuts.

> >
> >> >>> The
> >> >>> only complaints I've heard about Kim's call sign (or similar ones)
are
> >> >>> from a few bluenoses here on rrap.
> >> >>
> >> >> What's a "bluenose", Jon? Please, be specific.
> >> >
> >> >http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?va=bluenose
> >>
> >> Ya can't even bother to cut-and-paste.
> >
> >Main Entry: blue�nose
> >Pronunciation: 'bl�-"nOz
> >Function: noun
> >Date: 1903
> >: a person who advocates a rigorous moral code
> >
> >How's that? Sounds appropriate.
>
> Sounds like a compliment.
> >

I'm glad you like it. Like I said, sounds appropriate to me.

> >
> >> >>>Hardy an outpouring of community outrage!
> >> >>
> >> >> Most hams outside of rrap don't know calls like that even exist.
> >> >
> >> >There are a number of calls with
> >>
> >> [that suffix]
> >
> >Which one?
>
> The one in your callsign.
>

You may pick apart a callsign. I never have and never do. I don't go
around calling my husband CAW. And, I wouldn't go around calling you EY.
If it's "traditional" that suffixes are the part of a callsign that hams
focus on, then sobeit...but I don't partake of tradition. My callsign, yes,
has a suffix...but it's the whole callsign that goes together.

> >> >
> >> >And there are other
> >> >suffixes in use that I suspect you would also find "inappropriate." (I
> >can
> >> >only "suspect" since you are unwilling to make any specific complaint
> >> >against Kim's suffix.)
> >>
> >> "Inappropriate" is quite specific.
> >>
> >> You work in an office/lab environment up there in CT, Jon. Would it be
> >> appropriate to come to work on a regular workday in midsummer wearing a

> >> swimsuit and sandals? How about wearing old faded jeans and a T-shirt
to a
> >> formal dinner party or wedding? Those clothes are perfectly appropriate
> >for
> >> other situations. You're the same person. Why not wear the same
clothes?
> >
> >I think that's an excellent analogy.
>
> Thank you.
>
> >Since the ARS is neither professional
> >in nature, nor is it formal, then a fun callsign is quite appropriate for
> >the venue.
>
> I disagree. The ARS IS "formal in nature" because we use a limited public
> resource that others want to use. I have nothing against "fun" callsigns,
but I
> don't find inappropriate callsigns to be "fun".
>

And, I don't think that the ARS is formal in nature. I don't think my use of a government anything is formal in nature. You may not find my callsign to be appropriate for you and, thus, it isn't fun for you. But I do.

> >
> >We come into contact with emergency responders, indeed even
> >provide free service for those organizations. I've recently resigned my
> >position as Hunt County EC, but my callsign has *never* been brought into
> >question by *anyone* I wish to serve.
>
> All that means is that they chose not to comment on it. As public officials,
> they could be in quite an uncomfortable situation if they commented in any way.
>

And all it means here is that people choose to comment. I don't think the public officials "thought" of my callsign in any other way than a callsign. You see...it is my opinion that for my callsign to be inappropriate, there is an inappropriate thought that goes with it. I don't have inappropriate thoughts about tits, and I don't think most officials of public service would, either. I'd worry if they did.

> >
> >In fact, my callsign has been
> >commented on, negatively, only once by a local ham, the Section Manager now.
> >He was not the Section Manager then.
>
> Do you think his opionion has changed?
>

No, my point is that he is the only one to have made a negative comment.

> >
> >In usual and customary manner, I would
> >say that making no comment can be translated to: yes, it's tacky/vulgar/etc.
> >but not worth getting that upset about; or, "shrug shoulders no big deal."
>
> What "usual and customary manner"?
>
> Making no comment can also be interpreted as politeness, avoiding a
> confrontation, trying not to call attention to something, or a form of
> shunning.
>

Which is quite hamlike. And far more respectable than a lot of behavior displayed here. I rather like to believe that my callsign is generally accepted...not that it matters, because it's still great fun to many of us. But, I like to believe that silence is golden. You like to believe there is some dark, shadowy, implication to it.

> >> >
> >> > Lots of hams come in contact with those call signs
> >> >yet make no noise about it.
> >>
> >> How do you know? I've never heard any of them on the air. And please
note
> >that
> >> the FCC does NOT issue them sequentially.
> >
> >Who cares if the FCC issues them sequentially or not? Doesn't matter.
>
> Yes, it does. By not issuing certain calls in sequence, the FCC recognizes
that
> those calls are NOT simply random colections of letters and a number.
>
> >What if I'd gotten
>
> [that callsign]
>
> >as a callsign issued sequentially
>
> You couldn't. FCC wouldn't issue it. You had to specifically request it.
>
> However, if the FCC changed its rules and issued it sequentially, you
could say
> "It's not my choice; FCC just gave it to me".
>
> With choice comes responsibility.
>
> > and, for reasons of
> >tradition or attachment, had decided that I just couldn't do without my
> >original callsign?
>
> Just "get over it". Shrug shoulders, go on living, no big deal.
>
> >I am pretty sure there are some people who've gotten
> >calls that may be risque to them, but choose to keep them for that
reason.
> >Are they "inappropriate" for the ARS?
>
> Depends on the callsign. Your suffix is not issued sequentially, so
anybody
> with a call like yours asked for it specifically.
>

Oh good grief. That must mean a whole lot more to you than it does to me,
Jim.

> >> >
> >> > Whether most hams know they exist is
> >> >irrelevant; most hams who DO know haven't raised objections.
> >>

> >> How do you know that? The objectors here on rrap are a sizable group,
but
> >you
> >> dismiss us and our opinions as irrelevant.
> >
> >I don't know that Jon dismisses them as irrelevant.
>
> Sure seems to me like he does.
>
> >I know that I do not.
> >I dismiss them because I don't agree with your opinion of the callsign.
>
> Same thing. You dismiss opinions that you don't agree with. You've already
> said, if I recall right, that nothing anybody can say would change your
> opinion. That's preemptive dismissal of all opposing opinions.
> >

I think most of us dismiss opinions we don't agree with. You dismiss mine,
don't you? In fact, that's preemptive dismissal of all opposing opinions to
yours, right? Nothing anyone could say will change your opinion about my
callsign.

> >> >>>
> >> >>> How does the call sign N2EY "reflect positively" on the service?
> >> >>
> >> >> It is appropriate in any situation.
>
> >So is
>
> [Kim's call]
>
> > It has been used during EmComm, Traffic Nets, conversation,
> >contesting, packet, APRS, emails, as my nametag for hamfests, etc.
>
> That simply means it was used, not that it was appropriate. If I wore the
same
> T-shirt, bathing trunks and sandals to a whole bunch of events, would that
make
> those clothes appropriate?
>

Actually, it wouldn't matter to me what you wear, Jim, really wouldn't.
I've learned that people dressed as you describe above can be as serious,
respectable, and goal oriented as the next. I'd look more for how you
behaved. The dirty trick is when you show up in a suit and tie and act like
a complete oaf. That happens all the time, too.

> >
> >In fact,
> >I think it was Jon Bloom that I met at Arlington Hamfest a couple of
years

> >ago with my
>
> [callsign]
>
> > T-shirt on.
>
> Jon has a T-shirt with your callsign on it? ;-)
>
> >> >It is irrelevant in any situation other than station identification since
> >> >it has no meaning.
> >>
> >> It has a lot of meaning to those hams who know me.
>
> >As I said in a post before, so does my callsign.
>
> Which disproves the statement "It is irrelevant in any situation other than
> station identification since it has no meaning."
>
> >Even for those hams who
> >don't like me either as a person or just because of the callsign (weird,
> >huh), they immediately recognize who is behind my callsign and that I am
> >quite serious about what I am doing.
>
> Maybe - I don't know them, and I don't know what you are like on the air.
>
> >I will not engage in inappropriate
> >conversations on the air...well, most of the time;
>
> Ah - but what's "inappropriate"? Your "inappropriate" may be someone else's
> "fun".
>

Exactly, Jim...and I get to choose, for me, what my limitations are. I have never, ever, ever commented on anyone's on-air tactics or practices, EXCEPT for when training in emergency communication, and then only to confirm procedures. I choose not to pontificate to anyone about how they operate. They may operate in any manner they choose. Whether I *participate* in how they operate is another matter.

> >
> > I take public service and
> >emergency communication very seriously; I am a fairly good storm spotter
> >(out of practice here in Texas with no significant weather in my area the
> >past few years); and my callsign is nearly immediately recognizable during
> >the worst of conditions. Lots of meaning, to many hams.
> >
> Which disproves the statement "It is irrelevant in any situation other

than
> station identification since it has no meaning."
>

I don't think I made that statement.

> >> >
> >> >Just like any other call sign.
> >>
> >> Then there's no reason Kim can't change hers to "W5KIM" or "W5MKW".
>
> >Of course there's no reason.
>
> Then why not do it? "W5KIM" is instantly recognizable and makes it easy to
> associate name and call.
>

Because, Jim. I don't like W5KIM. I like W5TIT. Why don't *you* get
W5KIM?

> >
> >Except that I chided all the guys for getting
> >their initials.
>
> So?
>

In other words, I think getting initials is pretty boring.

> >
> > Heck, where's the creativity in that? A vanity callsign
> >should be a vanity callsign. Initials, smitials, be creative and have
fun.
>
> Sure. "W5KIM" is creative and fun.
>

Uh, to you. It's not to me.

> >
> >The other part of the whole thing is that, yes, the FCC will issue such
> >calls. (I wasn't sure they would when I applied...LOL).
>
> They issue them ON REQUEST because they'd set themselves up for a lot of
> headaches and maybe even a lawsuit if they didn't.
> >

I didn't say I was looking for an excuse of why they do it.

> >>
> >> >>>To those outside ham radio, it's just a jumble of
> >> >>> letters and numbers, no more.
> >> >>

> >> >> You are mistaken. If that were so, broadcast stations would not care
> >> >> what their callsigns were.
> >> >
> >> >We're talking about HAM RADIO call signs, Jim, not broadcast call
signs.
> >
> >Exactly.
>
> It's the same principle.
> >
> >> Same principle. To get a reaction and promote an image. The callsign
KISS
> >was
> >> fought over in court.
> >>
> >> >(BTW, in case you haven't listened to broadcast radio lately, most
> >> >stations de-emphasize the call sign as a marketing identification.
They
> >> >prefer to use catchy phrases with the frequency in them, like "Big D
> >> >103.")
>
> >Hey, Jon, it's even being done on ham radio. Our 145.190 machine here in
> >Dallas says, "Welcome to the Big Machine in Big D..." It's really neat.
> >(It is the best machine and the most coverage--ooops, except for maybe
one
> >other repeater--in Dallas).
>
> Does it ever give the actual callsign? And what makes it the "best"
machine?
>

It has to, Jim. That's what the three dots are at the end of the quotation. That genearlly implies that there is more but it is being left out. It's the best coverage. Or, like I said, nearly the best. One other, the 145.35 may be better.

> >
> >And, the "owner" is so controversial that even
> >though it's the best machine, it isn't the emergency communications
> >machine...now, ain't politics a hoot?
>
> Why is the "owner" controversial?
> >

That is not for me to discuss. He is not here, and chooses not to be.

> >>
> >> Only those stations that can't get a catchy one. The point is still the
> >same:
> >> It's NOT just a random, meaningless collection.
>

> That's the point.
> >> >
> >> >> Suppose a major network was going to do a special, and then a
series,
> >on
> >> >> ham radio. Tons of priceless publicity for the ARS. They want a
family
> >> >> show, not a late-night series to replace the Howard Stern TV show.
> >> >>
> >> >> Suppose they wanted to have a real live amateur radio callsign in
the
> >> >> title - like the classic "WKRP in Cincinnati" show had a BC
callsign.
> >> >>
> >> >> Suppose they asked YOU to recommend an unassigned amateur callsign
> >> >> (nobody has WKRP, either). Would YOU recommend a callsign like
Kim's,
> >or
> >> >> something else? Why or why not? Please, be specific.
> >
> >Why not? Tell ya one thing, if you want attention to the hobby, "an
> >interview with a female ham,
>
> [with Kim's call]
>
> > would get people watching and listening.
>
> All publicity is not good publicity.
>

Ah. Well you believe differently than I. I think any publicity can be
turned into good publicity.

> >
> >They may come with evil, misguided intentions,
>
> Like what?
>
> >but I'd be so perfectly
> >representative of the ARS on TV that any of those people would soon
change
> >their minds or recede into nothingness.
>
> I don't think you are "perfectly representative of the ARS", Kim. Nobody
is.
> Sorry, but that's my perception from what I've read here over the years.
>

Well, excuse me for being so literal. OH, that's you being so literal.

> >
> >The callsign is fun, the person is
> >fun, the callsign is not vulgar, the person is not vulgar.
>
> Your opinion only. Is it forbidden to disagree? Seems like it, judging by
the
> reactions to my disagreement.
>

It is not my opinion only--that's me getting literal back to you. It is
absolutely not forbidden to disagree. My reaction to your disagreement is
simply to respond to tell you that I don't agree with you. So, after this
I'll stop responding to you, lest you think I am forbidding you to disagree
(like I'd want to do that).

> >
> >One of the
> >things I think would be great to point out in an interview would be the
very
> >nature of the politics of my callsign.
>
> What politics? It's a matter of appropriateness, that's all.
>

No, there's a great deal of politics involved.

> >
> > For anyone thinking that ham radio
> >is a stuck-up's hobby, they'd have to change their mind.
>
> The problem is, what their mind would change to.
>

I don't forsee it as a problem.

> >>
> >> >I wouldn't recommend putting a call sign in the title in the first
place;
> >> >it would be poor marketing.
> >
> >I think so, too.
>
> Why? It worked for "WKRP".
>
> > A good title for a ham radio show would be something like,
> >"Getting to Know Your Neighbor...A Few Countries Away." Something like
> >that.
>
> You gotta be kidding. Way too long and not nearly catchy enough.
>

It would catch my eye. OH, but we wouldn't want people like me to get
caught, would we?

> >
> >If we were ever lucky enough (yeah, let's really dream here), and we
> >warranted a weekly show, I'd be more embarrassed to associate myself with
> >RRAP than I would with any one ham or any one ham's callsign.
Truthfully.
>
> Then why are you here?
>

I think I say later that I don't even know.

> >>
> >> WHY? "WKRP in Cincinnati" was a very highly rated show. The callsign
made
> >it
> >> easy to remember. In fact most people abbreviate the title to just
"WKRP".
> >>
> >> >But if they were adamant, sure, they could use
> >> >a call sign like Kim's. (Heck, they could use Kim's call sign. As long
as
> >> >it's okay with her.) I don't think it would result generally in the
> >> >smirking, nudging and winking present from a few here on rrap.
> >
> >Nope, I don't think it would, either. In fact, I think to the common
person
> >(a non-ham) it would have to be pointed out that my callsign is unusual.
>
> That's scary.
> >
> >> If that's Hq's idea of good marketing, it's no wonder so few people
know
> >about
> >> ham radio.
>
> >Oh no, Jim. I am really, really disappointed in *you* having that
> >mentality. Good grief.
>
> What mentality?
>
> It's an "if-then" statement.
>
> Is it not true that few people outside ham radio know about it? Isn't one
of
> the goals of the ARRL to market and publicize amateur radio in a positive
> light?
>
> If the "if-then" statement is not true, the statement is not valid,
anyway.
>
> >> >I find it interesting that you are unwilling or unable to say
> >specifically

> >> >what's inappropriate about Kim's call sign and unwilling or unable to
> >> >explain why you think the community also considers it inappropriate.
> >>
> >> See above.
> >>
> >> >Pretty weak, Jim.
> >>
> >> I find it interesting that you would think it suitable as a marketing
tool
> >for
> >> Amateur Radio, Jon.
>
> >I find it interesting that you are of the opinion that Jon brought up the
> >idea of marketing ham radio through my callsign. Wasn't it *YOU* who
> >presented the scenario, requesting a *specific* response from Jon?
>
> Yep. So what?
>
> >I think
> >nearly any respect I had for you is precarious at this point, Jim.
>
> Why? For being honest? How much respect would you have if I toed the
> electropolitically-correct line while thinking differently? Should I bow
and
> scrape before Jon because he's on the Hq staff? I don;t think he wants
that.
>

No, I don't think he wants that either. You are the one who brought up the
callsign marketing scenario, asked his specific opinion about it. Then, when
he answers you, you chide him for "think[ing] it [my callsign] suitable as a
marketing tool for Amateur Radio, Jon." THAT is what I disrespect, Jim, not
your disagreement.

>
> I note that other rrappers climb all over the ARRL and Hq staffers and you
> never bat an eye about it.
>

Must I get into everyone's stuff, Jim? Are you now dictating what I may
choose and not choose to comment on? I may not even read posts to which you
refer. It depends on the mood I am in that day. Sometimes I read all in a
whole thread, sometimes I read only Cecil's, or Rick's, or yours, or
whomever. Is there a rule I am breaking?

> >
> >I never
> >would have believed for you to use that kind of debating style.
> >
> What kind? Be specific.
>

I just told you. Asking for a specific reaction to a scenario you develop, then pouncing on the idea presented as though the person is the one who came up with the scenario.

> >
> >My callsign, no one's callsign, should be used as a marketing tool for ham
> >radio.
>
> Why not? It worked really well for WKRP. I think it's a good idea, but the
> callsign used must be appropriate and unassigned. Like W9MWC.
>
> >I don't think Jon is advocating the idea.
>
> I think he was.
>
> > He was responding to the
> >silly notion you presented.
> >
> A TV special and series on ham radio is a silly notion? I think not!
>

I think it is. I think I am as right as your "I think he was" a few lines up.

>
> "Ensemble" comedies are the trend nowadays. The first significant one was
> "Barney Miller", a true classic. "WKRP" followed close thereafter. "Cheers" and
> "Seinfeld" derive from those shows. Today we have shows like "Ally McBeal"
> which are the direct descendants. A ham-radio-based show could be great - IF it
> were done right. A disaster, if done wrong.
>
> Did you see the movie "Contact"? Do you think your call would have been
> appropriate for use in that film?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Why not?

Kim W5TIT

6129. Re: What not to say to a cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 02:44:16 UTC
From: S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <773a0faf.0112281844.2faf845a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29025
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I once was stopped with a transgender
"girlfriend" on the Bay Bridge by a CHP
cop and I was able to talk my way out of
it by telling the cop we were on our way
to a costume party.

Absolutely true,

Landshark

--
My Best Wishes For A Very Happy New Year To Everyone

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:<a0i5np$mn1$5@dosa.alt.net>...
> "LloydVFP" <LloydVFP@KV4FZmyHero.net> wrote in message
> news:a0gq8q$f9r$0@pita.alt.net...
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a0fchi$q4t$2@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
> > > news:I9yW7.125$8M.574732@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
> > > >
> > > > Swift Rider <c_howard_in@disguise.com> wrote in Alt.Law-Enforcement...
> > > >
> > > > : The WORST Things to Say to a Police Officer:
> > > > :
> > > > :
> > > > : 1. I can't reach my license unless you hold my beer.
> > > > :
> > > > : 2. Sorry, Officer, I didn't realize my radar detector wasn't plugge

> in.
> > > > :
> > > > : 3. Aren't you the guy from the Village People?
> > > > :
> > > > : 4. Hey, you must've been doin' about 125 mph to keep up with me!
> Good
> job!
> > > > :
> > > > : 5. Excuse me. Is "stick up" hyphenated?
> > > > :
> > > > : 6. I though you had to be in relatively good physical condition to
> be
> a
> > > > : police officer.

> > > > :
> > > > : 7. I was going to be a cop, but I decided to finish high school
> instead.
> > > > :
> > > > : 8. Bad cop! No donut!
> > > > :
> > > > : 9. You're not gonna check the trunk, are you?
> > > > :
> > > > : 10. Gee, that gut sure doesn't inspire confidence.
> > > > :
> > > > : 11. Didn't I see you get your butt kicked on "Cops"?
> > > > :
> > > > : 12. Wow, you look just like the guy in the picture on my
> girlfriend's
> > > > : nightstand!
> > > > :
> > > > : 13. Is it true that people become cops because they are too dumb to
> work
> at
> > > > : McDonald's?
> > > > :
> > > > : 14. I pay your salary!
> > > > :
> > > > : 15. So, uh, you on the take, or what?
> > > > :
> > > > : 16. Gee, Officer! That's terrific. The last officer only gave me a
> warning,
> > > > : too!
> > > > :
> > > > : 17. Do you know why you pulled me over? OK, just so one of us does.
> > > > :
> > > > : 18. I was trying to keep up with traffic. Yes, I know there is no
> other
> car
> > > > : around me&emdash;that's how far ahead of me they are.
> > > > :
> > > > : 19. What do you mean. "Have I been drinking?" You're the trained
> specialist.
> > > > :
> > > > : 20. Well, when I reached down to pick up my bag of crack, my gun
> fell
> off
> my
> > > > : lap and got lodged between the brake pedal and the gas pedal,
> forcing
> me
> to
> > > > : speed out of control.
> > > > :
> > > > : 21. Hey, is that a 9 mm? That's nothing compared to this .44 magnum.

> > > > :
> > > > 22. It's not my car, BUT..... (care of Nightcrawler)
> > > >
> > > > 23. I know my rights!!!!
> >
> > 24. KC8JBO, Wogie Wiseman, would say to the cop: Will you
> > be my boyfriend? LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL
>
> N0VFP, Llllardasssss lllllloyd has said to a cop, "Can I slurp your
> nutsacks to let me off these felonies?" See, Lllardasssss lllloyd has
> quite a criminal record, for buggering boys , cows, and pumpkins in and
> around Athens, AL.
>
> This was just faxed from the Birminham Field office:
>
> The Great Pumpkin
> Birmingham Post-Herald
> October 14, 2000
>
> Police arrested Lloyd A. Davies, a 27 year old white male, resident of
> Athens, Alabama in the Anderson Pumpkin patch at 11:38pm Friday. Davies
> will be charged with lewd and lascivious behavior, public indecency,
> and public intoxication at the Athens Municipal Courthouse Monday. The
> suspect allegedly stated that as he was passing a pumpkin patch, he
> decided to stop. "You know, a pumpkin is soft and squishy inside, and
> there was no one around here for miles. At least I thought there
> wasn't." he stated in a phone interview from the Athens Municipal
> Courthouse Jail.
> Davies went on to state that he pulled over to the side of the road,
> picked out a pumpkin that he felt was appropriate to his purposes, cut
> a hole in it, and proceeded to satisfy his alleged "need". "I guess I
> was just really into it, you know?" he commented with evident
> embarrassment. In the process, Torrance apparently failed to notice the
> Athens Municipal police car approaching and was unaware of his audience
> until officer Brenda Taylor approached him. "It was an unusual
> situation, sure." said officer Taylor. "I walked up to (Davies) and
> he's... just working away at this pumpkin."
> Taylor went on to describe what happened when she approached Davies. "I
> just went up and said, 'Excuse me sir, but do you realize that you are
> screwing a pumpkin?' He got real surprised as you'd expect, and then
> looked me straight in the face and said,
> 'A pumpkin? Damn... is it midnight already?"

6130. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 02:54:20 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2d318d_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29028

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2CF736.8E2CFB40@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote
>
> >Because I don't agree with people who think my callsign
>
> > is tacky or vulgar/whatever, it is their expectation that I am still to
live
> > "up" (as they put it) to their standards. If I don't wave their flag, I
am
> > public enemy number one.
>
> More of your defective thought process at work. No one "expects"
anything at
> all of you. If you were not who and what you are, you wouldn't have chosen
that
> callsign. Do not confuse the criticism with anyone's expectations. What
you are
> is a demonstration of one thing that ham radio should not be - lewd. By
your
> own amission, you chose your callsign for lewd reasons. Sin ce gthe most
public
> part of a ham radio operator is his callsign, you clearly chose to place
> lewdness at the fore of your ham radio experience. Tho you didn't describe
it
> that way, you didn't need to, the implication was more than clear in your
> statements.
> Lewdness has no place in ham radio, otherwise Riley wouldn't consider you
to be
> like the others in ham radio who are putting the service "one step closer
to
> extinction". End of story.
>

You're hilarious, Dick. How paranoid are you of the world around you?

Kim W5TIT

6131. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 02:57:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2d3238_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29031

"Richard McCollum" <rmcollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:yz7X7.244493$3d2.12003595@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> The amazing thing about this thread is that so many supposedly mature men
> are being led around by the testicles at the instigation of a flaming
> airhead.
>

Kind of reminds you of how easily distracted men are, eh?

>
> The light in the eyes is the sun shining thru the back of her
> head but she learned to manipulate men and in fact has a history of it
> both on this group and in whatever parts of her life she has chosen to
> expose.
>

Ewwww, you really, really have some axes to grind, Dick. That meets the
definition of many stories I've heard of women, but not of me.

>
> It appears Larry has the most to answer for but the lemming brigade needs
> a bit of navel contemplation as well. What a bunch of maroons, with Rick
> bucking for captaincy.
>
> Dick N�BK
>
>

Kim W5TIT

6132. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 02:58:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2d3273_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29032

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2D0B1A.4BD31D2D@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > What you are
> > is a demonstration of one thing that ham radio should not be - lewd.
>
> So Dick thinks that female anatomy is lewd. Dick, you really are a
> member of the Taliban, aren't you? Kim, you better cover yourself
> from head to toe or Dick will beat you with a stick.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

I think Dick is a figment of my imagination... ;)

Kim W5TIT

6133. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:00:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2D24DD.BF36ED05@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29027

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> news:DBD8DA82FE84A6E4.97AE7ECBE90C07F9.80DB367B6488B232@lp.airnews.net...
> > On 28 Dec 2001 13:02:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> > >The "nobody complains" argument doesn't hold any water.
> >
> > Don't be ridiculous, Jim.
> >
> > You (and others) claim that the call is inappropriate and that
> > the "community standards" define that inappropriateness. Yet the ONLY
> > way that "community standards" are defined is by the voices of that
> > community. You now state that it doesn't matter if nobody complains.
> > All that indicates is that either: (1) You are so self-righteous you
> > actually believe that you have the right to establish community
> > standards yourself (don't feel bad, so do Donald Wildmon [AFA] and
> > Fred Phelps [GodHatesFags.org]) or; (2) your "community standards" are
> > a straw dog, and the actual community standards condone rather than
> > condemn Kim's call.
> >
> > Rick
> >
> > --
> >
> > Rick Adams--KE8HH
>
> I think it far more likely the community pleads de minimus. While this
> call is a crime it is a common crime and one of a category often
> encountered. Generic Look at me, I'm Sandra Dee.
>
> Sane people generally realize that they are not about to educate idiot
> drivers with any sort of retaliation and are not about to instill taste in
> the terminally tasteless so we take Carl Jung's advice and cultivate our
> little garden and save a corner of the world.

True, but allowing them a free pass only exacerbates their cluelessness, even allows them to think it's even right since "no one is complaining, so what's your problem?"
All the while genteel people everywhere are on the edge of barfing. (NO, I don't see myself as genteel. I'm too much a realist).

>
>
> The amazing thing about this thread is that so many supposedly mature men

> are being led around by the testicles at the instigation of a flaming
> airhead. The light in the eyes is the sun shining thru the back of her
> head but she learned to manipulate men and in fact has a history of it
> both on this group and in whatever parts of her life she has chosen to
> expose.

Well at least she THINKS she does. What she pay for what she gets is
anybody's guess. Here she hasn't got much..

>
>
> It appears Larry has the most to answer for but the lemming brigade needs
> a bit of navel contemplation as well. What a bunch of maroons, with Rick
> bucking for captaincy.

No argumento.

6134. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:03:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228220312.05154.00000682@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 29030

In article <t52X7.37$jk5.3907@news.ntplx.net>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
writes:

> Each to his own opinion, right? (Jim, on the other
>hand, wants to treat her choice as trashy while fastidiously avoiding
>calling it that. At least you're up-front about it.)

You're mistaken, Jon. I use the word "inappropriate" because that's what it is.
If I thought it was trashy I'd say trashy.
>
>> If I saw an automobile with the vanity plates

[deleted]

>> I would also be of
>> the opinion that the owner (whether female or male) made a trashy
>> choice. So would most folks.
>
>Including me.

Ahhh - so there are choices of identifier that are trashy in Jon Bloom's
opinion?

>But I wouldn't feel compelled to tell the driver my opinion.

Does another driver's choice of vanity plates have any effect on the amateur
radio service and its image? Not usually. Does the choice of callsign? Quite
possibly.

>My neighbors make all kinds of silly choices, but I don't chide them for a
>silly choice if it doesn't affect me personally. I don't expect them to
>chide me when I make a silly choice that doesn't affect them personally,
>either.

But what some hams do DOES affect other hams personally.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6135. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:03:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011228220313.05154.00000683@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 29029

In article <E2163CA5AE4B3689.B733AC71010B9C05.9A10F0561F4BE00A@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 28 Dec 2001 17:02:54 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Do you see the parallel? Do you begin to understand why I bothered to post
>in
>>these threads?
>
> Sure--because you think you know better than Kim what is "good
>for the ARS."

And Kim thinks she knows better than me what is good for the ARS. So do you.
>
> Guess what?
>
> A lot of us think you're wrong.

And a lot of folks think I'm right. Doesn't matter - it's not up to a vote.

I think what really bugs you, Rick, is that there are some of us here on rrap
who you cannot intimidate and who state our opinions as we see them regardless
of how electropolitically incorrect they may be to some.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

6136. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:05:55 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2d344a_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29035

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011228220313.05154.00000683@mb-fm.aol.com...
> In article
<E2163CA5AE4B3689.B733AC71010B9C05.9A10F0561F4BE00A@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >On 28 Dec 2001 17:02:54 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> >>Do you see the parallel? Do you begin to understand why I bothered to
post
> >in
> >>these threads?
> >
> > Sure--because you think you know better than Kim what is "good
> >for the ARS."
>
> And Kim thinks she knows better than me what is good for the ARS. So do
you.
> >
> > Guess what?
> >
> > A lot of us think you're wrong.
>
> And a lot of folks think I'm right. Doesn't matter - it's not up to a
vote.
>
> I think what really bugs you, Rick, is that there are some of us here on
rrap
> who you cannot intimidate and who state our opinions as we see them
regardless
> of how electropolitically incorrect they may be to some.
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
Is this a new buzz word, or what?

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>

Kim W5TIT

6137. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:06:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2D2657.F9DA7EE4@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29033

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > What you are
> > is a demonstration of one thing that ham radio should not be - lewd.
>
> So Dick thinks that female anatomy is lewd.

Offensive forcing of the sexual parts of the anatomy on others or the public at large is lewd, by either sex, and is so codified under law almost everywhere. Minor violations such as this are generally viewed as tasteless, trashy, clueless, the result of the lack of decent upbringing, or the lack of any serious hint of a clue. Ugly, offensive behavior, in short.
If your mileage varies, it might mean you need a new odometer.

> Dick, you really are a
> member of the Taliban, aren't you? Kim, you better cover yourself
> from head to toe or Dick will beat you with a stick.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6138. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:07:37 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2d34b3_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29036

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2D2657.F9DA7EE4@townsqr.com...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > What you are
> > > is a demonstration of one thing that ham radio should not be - lewd.
> >
> > So Dick thinks that female anatomy is lewd.
>
> Offensive forcing of the sexual parts of the anatomy on others or the
> public at large is lewd, by either sex, and is so codified under law
almost
> everywhere.
>

ROFLMAO...er, your witness, Counselor.

>
> Minor violations such as this are generally viewed as
> tasteless, trashy, clueless, the result of the lack of decent upbringing,
> or the lack of any serious hint of a clue. Ugly, offensive behavior, in
> short.
> If your mileage varies, it might mean you need a new odometer.
>
>
>
> > Dick, you really are a
> > member of the Taliban, aren't you? Kim, you better cover yourself
> > from head to toe or Dick will beat you with a stick.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Hey, Dick: The Taliban made me do it.

Kim W5TIT

6139. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:10:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2D275C.DA030237@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29034

CAM wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > CAM wrote:
> >
> > > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > > > If her name were Teresa Isabel Thompson, would her choice of W5TIT as a
> > > > call sign still be trashy in your opinion?
> > >
> > > Just shows that the people who don't like W5TIT are not being objective.
> > > It is Kim's motives that are being criticized, not the callsign per se.
> > >
> > Ah, just for the confused, if not for Kim's motives she would not have that
> > callsign.
> >
> I rest my case.

You don't HAVE a case to rest.

> Kim's motives have absolutely nothing to do with whether
> Kim's callsign is trashy.

Only that her trashy motives led her to request a trashty callsign.

> Kim's callsign is either objectively trashy or
> it is not. Seems to me, the majority believes it is NOT trashy.

Either you are objectively an idiot or you are not. Seems to me you are.

6140. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:18:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2D2920.9C5F5C61@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29037

Kim-W5TIT wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C2CF736.8E2CFB40@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > Kim-W5TIT wrote
> >
> > >Because I don't agree with people who think my callsign
> >
> > > is tacky or vulgar/whatever, it is their expectation that I am still to
> live
> > > "up" (as they put it) to their standards. If I don't wave their flag, I
> am
> > > public enemy number one.
> >
> > More of your defective thought process at work. No one "expects"
> anything at
> > all of you. If you were not who and what you are, you wouldn't have chosen
> that
> > callsign. Do not confuse the criticism with anyone's expectations. What
> you are
> > is a demonstration of one thing that ham radio should not be - lewd. By
> your
> > own amission, you chose your callsign for lewd reasons. Sin ce gthe most
> public
> > part of a ham radio operator is his callsign, you clearly chose to place
> > lewdness at the fore of your ham radio experience. Tho you didn't describe
> it
> > that way, you didn't need to, the implication was more than clear in your
> > statements.
> > Lewdness has no place in ham radio, otherwise Riley wouldn't consider you
> to be
> > like the others in ham radio who are putting the service "one step closer
> to
> > extinction". End of story.
> >
>
> You're hilarious, Dick. How paranoid are you of the world around you?

A one-liner from you simply means you have no valid response.

Paranoid? Not very, but enough that I sure don't intend to stand there and let
some
clown take me out "on my own terms":...

6141. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:24:53 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <9IaX7.201522$WW.11754880@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29038

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2D24DD.BF36ED05@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> >
news:DBD8DA82FE84A6E4.97AE7ECBE90C07F9.80DB367B6488B232@lp.airnews.net...
> > > On 28 Dec 2001 13:02:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> > >
> > I think it far more likely the community pleads de minimus. While
this
> > call is a crime it is a common crime and one of a category often
> > encountered. Generic Look at me, I'm Sandra Dee.
> >
> > Sane people generally realize that they are not about to educate idiot
> > drivers with any sort of retaliation and are not about to instill
taste in
> > the terminally tasteless so we take Carl Jung's advice and cultivate
our
> > little garden and save a corner of the world.
>
> True, but allowing them a free pass only exacerbates their
cluelessness, even
> allows them to think it's even right since "no one is complaining, so
what's
> your problem?"

It might be more effective if we simply ignored it. Or better yet, ask why she selected W as opposed to K or N thereby shifting the discussion to an unexpected part of the call sign.

You say 'clueless' while I think it is a post-pubescent call for attention. Neither one of us is going to ever know for sure but the search for identity thru call signs, toys, etc. seems to be spreading thru a lot of the world. Seen what is done to head and tail lites, not to mention the ubiquitous 'virginity lamps' below the bumper. Had a guy with red front turn signals pull into traffic last week. That will definitely wake you up on a winter's day.

Want to see a bozo pissed off? One of the state Patrolmen, presumably after the obligatory drug search, ticketed one of these big 4x4 monster trucks for failure to have a run-under bar in back and irregular height head lamps. I have had the feeling that Omaha could knock 5 a year off

the fatality rate by simply going on bozo patrol and just having a hell of a good time. It was, BTW, the run-under bar the owner most objected to; apparently the truck would be less kewl.

Whatever. I am freaking tired of the whole verstunken issue.

Dick

6142. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:35:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2D2D16.91478AF2@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29039

Richard McCollum wrote:

. It was, BTW, the run-under bar the owner most objected to;

> apparently the truck would be less kewl.

.
If ur not kewl today, you're NOT.

>
> Whatever. I am freaking tired of the whole verstunken issue.

Agree wholly here. Bozo patrol on rrap is not too productive.

6143. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:38:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2D3A9C.D2CB9E74@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29040

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Offensive forcing of the sexual parts of the anatomy on others or the
> public at large is lewd, by either sex, and is so codified under law almost
> everywhere.

And Kim has not done that. All Kim has done is request a cute callsign.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6144. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:43:17 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2D3BD5.C6E0B9B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29041

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Thank you. I just returned from an excellent Christmas with my
> family up in Buffalo; had to drive thru a blizaard this morning to
> get out of town!

You were lucky to get out of Buffalo. Last I heard they had seven
feet of snow, a new record.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6145. OUCH!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 03:51:49 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <p5bX7.244760$3d2.12028649@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29042

Larry, I am in Rochester, NY. I do appreciate what you said about a blizzard. Last I heard, Buffalo had received between 4 and 5 feet of snow since Xmas eve and more is still comming down! Yesterday, they were predicting up to 75 inches of snow through this one big storm (lake effect). In any case, have a safe and happy new year! I hope you don't have weather that bad at home.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011228205921.13985.00002119@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c271712_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >In the spirit of the holiday season (whatever your
> >religious persuasion), I'd like to take this opportunity
> >to sincerely convey wishes for a happy holiday
> >season and a prosperous new year to you, on behalf
> >of both myself and the entire Board of Directors and
> >membership of No Code International.
> >
>
> Carl:
>
> Thank you. I just returned from an excellent Christmas with my
> family up in Buffalo; had to drive thru a blizaard this morning to
> get out of town! I hope you and all at NCI had a wonderful
> holiday season, and have a very safe and happy new year!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

6146. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:15:23 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2001.12.28.23.15.23.125581.30082@arrl.org>
Source record: 29043

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 22:03:12 -0500, N2EY wrote:
> In article <t52X7.37$jk5.3907@news.ntplx.net>, Jon Bloom
> <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>> Each to his own opinion, right? (Jim, on the other
>>hand, wants to treat her choice as trashy while fastidiously avoiding
>>calling it that. At least you're up-front about it.)
>
> You're mistaken, Jon. I use the word "inappropriate" because that's what
> it is. If I thought it was trashy I'd say trashy.

Since you refuse to state your reason for finding it inappropriate, you leave us no choice but to infer the reason. Until I see something that leads me to conclude otherwise, I'll continue to infer that you think it's trashy, despite your protestations to the contrary. Why? Because I can't think of any other reason you could have, although there may be other words that could be used to describe it.

> Ahhh - so there are choices of identifier that are trashy in Jon Bloom's
> opinion?

Sure. But in each of Hans' hypothetical cases the identifier was a well-known vulgarism. W5TIT is not a vulgarism. It's not even a word.

>>But I wouldn't feel compelled to tell the driver my opinion.
>
> Does another driver's choice of vanity plates have any effect on the
> amateur radio service and its image? Not usually. Does the choice of
> callsign? Quite possibly.

You've adduced not a shred of evidence that it does so. This topic has been debated in this NG for almost two years now, and I've yet to see a single concrete example of any effect on the ARS from Kim's choice of call sign. Your repeated assertions that it may be damaging are based on nothing of substance.

>>My neighbors make all kinds of silly choices, but I don't chide them for
>>a silly choice if it doesn't affect me personally. I don't expect them
>>to chide me when I make a silly choice that doesn't affect them
>>personally, either.
>
> But what some hams do DOES affect other hams personally.

How? Specifically, and concretely, describe one real (not hypothetical) example of how Kim's call sign has negatively affected you or anyone else personally. Do you know of people who have not entered ham radio because

of Kim's call sign? Is Kim's call sign causing RFI at your QTH? Are you finding less rare DX because of Kim's call sign? Is Kim's call sign causing ionospheric disturbances? What?

Jon

6147. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:22:59 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2001.12.28.23.22.59.305685.30082@arrl.org>
Source record: 29044

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 18:02:20 -0500, Dick Carroll wrote:
> Jon Bloom wrote:
>
>> I don't think so. W5TIT is not the same thing as TIT. Most people
>> recognize that.
>>
>>
> Balderdash! She chose that callsign for one reason and one reason
> only, by
> her own statements here.

Her motive for choosing it is not the issue, Dick. The issue is whether the call sign itself is damaging to the amateur service. Show me a concrete example of the damage, that's all I ask.

Jon

6148. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:27:37 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2001.12.28.23.27.37.779643.30082@arrl.org>
Source record: 29045

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 22:05:55 -0500, Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> of how electropolitically incorrect they may be to some.
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
> Is this a new buzz word, or what?

It's a classic red herring. Rather than debate the actual issue, you say that others are trying to suppress the debate itself. Frequently resorted to when one is unable to frame a meaningful argument in support of an untenable position.

Jon

6149. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235143.13985.00002129@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29153

In article <20011226064243.28248.00000649@mb-cq.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Larry, I just don't get you. You badmouth some people who have passed
>>the 5wpm exam and congratulate others. How do you decide who gets what
>>response?
>
>It appears quite simple. Those that sing Larry's praises on rrap are told
>they
>deserve congratulations for passing the 5 wpm test. Those that do not praise
>Larry receive the badmouth treatment.
>
>It appears to me that in Larry's view, it really IS all about Larry.

Ed:

This is not about me. Bert E-mailed me and made this posting in which he thanked me for encouraging him to learn and use CW. He is now going for his 20-WPM Code Proficiency certificate, which I think is great! I took no credit; he did all the work. All I did was tell him something I already knew about him, even he didn't at the time -- that he could learn and use CW if he made the decision to do so. Now, and in the future, he has the right to offer the same encouragement to others, and I hope they accept it the way he did!

73 de Larry, K3LT

Happy New Year!

6150. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235143.13985.00002130@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29154

In article <3C29F36A.2B0A7A03@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Richard McCollum wrote:
>> There is
>> no basic conflict in welcoming those who pass the rules currently in
>> effect while not having a lot of use for the rules currently in effect;
>
>Unfortunately, Larry is not that way. He has bitched loud and long
>about post-restructuring extras not deserving their privileges.

Cecil:

I've never stated that post-Restructuring Extras do not "deserve"
their privileges -- only that they haven't had to make as much of an
effort to learn the useful knowledge and skills that were required
under the superior pre-Restructuring licensing system. The
post-Restructuring Extras may therefore not value their privileges
as much as the Pre's, and may be more prone to misbehave
on-the-air.

Please provide the quote where I've said post-Restructuring Extras
do not deserve their privileges, or you will have again admitted that
you are a liar.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6151. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235144.13985.00002131@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29048

In article <3C295404.DB50EBF7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Dave Heil wrote:
>> You don't really want me to start dredging up some of the things you've
>> said to Dick Carroll and Larry have them come back to prove you a liar,
>> do you?
>
>They started it, Dave. I merely defended myself.

Cecil:

How have you "defended" yourself? We've seen you dig a deep
hole for yourself and jump head first right into it, but you've not
"defended" any of your bizarre statements in a manner which would
justify them in any way.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6152. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235145.13985.00002133@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29151

In article <3C25F749.FA191C94@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Please provide a quote where I said *all* no-code Techs are
>> "technical dumb-shits," or words to that effect.
>
>Larry, when you say nocode techs are dumb-shits, the English
>language implication is "all". If you meant "some", you should
>have said "some". Would you like to correct your statement?

Cecil:

No, I think I'd rather have you provide a copy/paste of that
posting as proof that I actually said it. If you can't, then you're
lying -- but that wouldn't be anything new, would it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

6153. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235145.13985.00002132@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29158

In article <A17D53CE133D6D39.5F6E437A9BAFA70A.F74698D962F766B7@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> Maybe that's the entire problem, Dave.
>
> You, Dick, and Larry all feel that a woman should behave
>differently than a man in public (and probably in private as well) and
>that she has an obligation to appear demure, innocent, and moral. When
>a woman demonstrates that she is as much a whole person as a man is
>and isn't willing to defer to your "superior" male values, you go ape
>and can't allow her decisions to go unchallenged.

Rick:

If there were any other YL hams in this newsgroup, it is entirely
likely that at least one of them would take offense to Kim's call
sign, and state so in this thread. This has nothing to do with Kim
being a woman demonstrating that she is a "whole person" -- as if
any of us thought women wern't "whole" people in the first place.
However, don't worry -- I'm sure your liberal, feminist views were
noted by Kim, and I'm sure you have earned her friendship -- although
I can't understand why anyone would want it!

> It isn't a question of Kim's call sign bothering you--it's
>just that you don't think she knows her place!

I can't speak for Dick or Dave, but I, for one, could care less about
Kim's so-called "place" and whether or not she knows it. All I know
is that she selected a call sign which is potentially harmful to the
positive image of the ARS -- and since she's a participant of this
newsgroup, she has been called to task because of it. After a couple
of thousand postings here and on the real "...one step closer to
extinction" thread (it has only 3 dots in the ellipsis -- not four), she
as still failed to adequately defend her decision to choose that
call sign in anything like a convincing manner, thus proving that
she only did it to call attention to herself by means of calling
attention to her secondary sexual characteristics. This demonstrates
extremely bad taste and poor judgment on her part, and does not
create a positive image for YL hams, or women in general. I am
still unable to understand why she would do this, if not to
proactively demonstrate her contempt for her fellow radio amateurs.
Whatever "place" Kim may have in the world, it certainly isn't
among radio amateurs who consider themselves to be intelligent,
decent, respectable radio amateurs who are concerned with
putting forth a positive public image.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6154. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235146.13985.00002135@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29049

In article <3C25FAB4.E4B5E4F4@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> You can't use the Ph. D-to-B.S. comparison, because either one
>> is way off the scale compared to acquiring an Extra-class license
>> these days -- or at any time, for that matter.
>
>Are you also so ignorant that you don't understand ratios, Larry?
>Do you comprehend 1/2 = 1000000/2000000?

Cecil:

Really? I'm not sure I understand. Why don't you give me half
a billion dollars, and then, maybe, I'll have a clearer idea of what
you're talking about!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6155. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235146.13985.00002134@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29050

In article <3C25F749.FA191C94@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Please provide a quote where I said *all* no-code Techs are
>> "technical dumb-shits," or words to that effect.
>
>Larry, when you say nocode techs are dumb-shits, the English
>language implication is "all". If you meant "some", you should
>have said "some". Would you like to correct your statement?

Cecil:

You have exactly one posting to produce the quote where I said
"no-code Techs are [technical] dumb shits," or you have once again
proven that you are a liar!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6156. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235147.13985.00002137@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29046

In article <3C25F946.49F399ED@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Nobody is committing "assault and battery" on anyone else in this
>> newsgroup, electronically or otherwise.
>
>Larry, your sadistic postings are there for all to see. How you can
>deny your verbal assaults is beyond comprehension.

Cecil:

Stop electronically stalking me.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6157. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235147.13985.00002136@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29047

In article <3C25F902.BF4BE4F6@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry, you electronically stalked Ed until he gave up on this newsgroup.
>Now you are electronically stalking Kim. Why do you get so much pleasure
>from sadistically verbally assaulting your fellow hams?

Cecil:

You are now electronically stalking me and sadistically accusing
me of doing things I have not done. I assume you are doing this
for your own pleasure. Stop trying to justify your own misdeeds by
throwing them back on others.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6158. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235147.13985.00002138@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29155

In article <3C25FA22.7019572B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Your homework for tonight is to find and post a direct quote from
>> me where I said I was "condemning" Ed for offering his personal
>> opinion while in an ARRL position.
>
>"Condemning" is my word for what you did to Ed, Larry. Everyone
>who was reading this newsgroup at the time witnessed your
>sadistic attack upon Ed. I'm not going to waste my time digging
>it up again because it would add nothing new to the situation.
>You have already proven yourself to be a sadistic jerk time
>and again.

Cecil:

Since when has Ed Hare appointed you as his defender? The
fact that you can't come up with any quotes from me to support
what you've said only prove that you're a liar. So, quit
electronically stalking me with your lies and sadistic accusations,
and mind your own business.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6159. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235148.13985.00002139@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29156

In article <3E832F4B49721019.61A9FC192BC734FB.5A2A07BAE7B05EF8@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
> Get off your "holier-than-thou" stance, Dickie, the offensive
>and classless people in this newsgroup aren't Kim and her
>supporters--they are you, Larry Roll, and Dave Heil who insist that
>YOUR values are more important than those of others and that YOU are
>the final arbitrars of morality.
>
> Rick

Rick:

This thread isn't about me, Dick, Dave, or anyone else being an arbiter of morality. It's about the poor judgement of one ham in choosing a call sign which portrays female radio amateurs in an undeservedly negative manner, reflects a poor image of all radio amateurs, and has potential for harm to the image of the ARS which has been recognized by a high-profile radio amateur who also happens to be an FCC official. There is nothing going on here other than hams giving their opinions on a policy-related matter, which is well within the bounds of the topics germane to this newsgroup.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6160. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235149.13985.00002140@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29152

In article <3C26538E.3EB73DDE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >> >So Dave, are you going to bring that lawsuit against Kim or just try
>> >> >to kill her with the jawbone of an ass?
>> >>
>> >> Has he been dismembering Larry Roll again?
>> >>
>> >> Rick
>> >
>> >If Cecil is still using his, perhaps you'd loan yours.
>>
>> Sorry Dave, I can't help you.
>>
>> I don't _have_ a Larry Roll to lend you.
>
>Just pass the jawbone, Samson.
>
>Dave K8MN

Hmmm...so Rick Adams has called me an "ass" on this newsgroup,
while at the same time threatening to have my internet access
terminated for expressing my opinion about Kim's poor choice of a
call sign?

Mind your *own* jawbone, Rick!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6161. FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 04:51:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011228235150.13985.00002141@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29157

Greetings All:

To those who have been insisting that the FCC has the best interests of the ARS at heart, I offer the following. I seems like "Restructuring" isn't the only way they had in mind to put an end to our tomfoolery on all this valuable RF real estate. Now they're saying licensed radio amateurs don't have any need to establish a station in our own homes. Get ready to lose some more spectrum -- and soon! Read it and weep...

73 de Larry, K3LT

****

SB QST @ ARL $ARLB056
ARLB056 FCC Denial Leaves League Eyeing Congressional Action on CC&Rs

ZCZC AG56
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 56 ARLB056
From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT December 28, 2001
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB056
ARLB056 FCC Denial Leaves League Eyeing Congressional Action on CC&Rs

The FCC has affirmed a November 2000 staff-level decision that declined to include privately imposed deed covenants, conditions and restrictions--CC&Rs--under the limited federal preemption known as PRB-1. That policy requires municipalities to ''reasonably accommodate'' amateur communication in antenna-related zoning and regulation.

The ARRL last year appealed to have the full FCC review the earlier denial. The Commission turned down the League's Application for Review December 18 in a Memorandum Opinion and Order released December 26.

''There has not been a sufficient showing that CC&Rs prevent Amateur Radio operators from pursuing the basis and purpose of the Amateur Service,'' the FCC said. The Commission said hams still can get on the air without installing residential antenna systems by operating away from home, while mobile or at club stations.

The FCC said it recognizes the importance of preserving the integrity of contractual relations that CC&Rs represent. But it asserted that the ARRL had ''submitted no specific evidence that

would persuade us to abandon our long-standing policy of excluding CC&Rs in private covenants from our ruling in PRB-1.''

ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, expressed disappointment in the Commission's ruling. ''The biggest problem Amateur Radio operators face today is being able to put up an antenna,'' Haynie said. ''Our only approach now is to get a bill into Congress.''

The FCC itself even hinted that Congressional action ought to be a next logical step. ''However, should Congress see fit to enact a statutory directive mandating the expansion of our reasonable accommodation policy,'' the FCC declared in its MO&O, ''the Commission would expeditiously act to fulfill its obligation thereunder.''

In its Application for Review last year, the ARRL maintained that the FCC should have the same interest in the effective performance of an Amateur Radio station and in the promotion of amateur communications regardless of whether the licensee's property is publicly regulated or privately governed by homeowners' associations and their architectural control committees.

A copy of the FCC's Memorandum Opinion and Order in RM-8763 is available on the FCC Web site, http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-01-372A1.doc .
NNNN
/EX

6162. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 05:02:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011229000254.27168.00000726@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 29159

In article <3c2c8a9d_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wa6vse@fast.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011227220325.01870.00000569@mb-fz.aol.com...
>> In article
><XZpW7.242101$3d2.11769921@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
>> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:
>>
>> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>> >
>> >> > If the
>> >> > Novice is promoted to this class by simply waiving element 2
>then the
>> >> > situation becomes much clearer.
>> >
>> >> Yup - but is it right to give away upgrades like that?
>
>Nope ...

>> >Well, yes, it is because they have been law abiding hams for years,
>possibly
>> >decades and granting them Element 2 is not going to ire anyone.
>
>No ... they haven't demonstrated the qualifications tested by the
>other
>test element.

OK, I'm gonna put on my devil's advocate hat here....

What "qualifications" are needed to be an Extra that are not possessed by an
Advanced? Forget about the VE rules and regs, because pre-VE-era Extras are not
retested in order to be VEs.

The only difference between the operating privileges of an Extra and an
Advanced are a few subbands on 80, 40, 20 and 15. Extras get no additional
modes or power - the ONLY difference is those little subbands. What
"qualifications" are needed to operate on, say, 3524 that are not needed to
operate on 3526?

Devil's advocate hat off.
>
>> It might upset those who recently took a test to upgrade. Didja know
>that both
>> the NCVEC and NCI OPPOSED the ARRL BoD idea to give a "free" upgrade
>of Novices

>> and Tech Pluses to General?
>
>That's true ... as NCI has stated all along, we are "No Code
>International,"
>not "No Qualifications International."

Shall we review how the written tests were cut in number and size again?
>
>> The whole Extra written test! Today, a current Advanced has to take
>a 50
>> question written to get the Extra - same as a General. Auto-upgrade
>would not
>> go over big with some folks.
>
>And the more technical content (not that it's THAT hard, but it's
>reasonable for granting a license to operate and experiment)
>is virtually all in the Extra test now ... the written elements for
>General are quite elementary ...

Devil's advocate hat back on...

WHY is that "technical content" essential for OPERATING privileges, or to experiment? All US hams except Novices can use ALL authorized modes and frequencies above 30 Mhz right now - the FCC thinks the written testing is adequate. Current Generals, who have been tested even less than Advanceds, can experiment on every band and mode authorized to US hams - they just can't use some subbands on 80/40/20/15.

Devil's advocate hat off.
>
>Now who's proposing to "dumb down" amateur radio???
>
Not me.
>
>> >> > All this is accomplished by waiving Element 2 for Novices and
>waiving
>> >> > Element 4(B) for Advanced. I think this is a very tiny price to
>pay in
>> >order
>> >> > to have a structure which can have some basic adjustments
>applied for
>> >better
>> >> > transitioning of everyone throughout the ARS experience.
>> >
>> >> I see your point, but others may be outraged and the FCC may nix
>the
>> >> whole free upgrade idea.
>
>NO "freebie" no-test upgrades for novices or advanced ... the material
>in those elements is necesssary to assure reasonable qualifications.

I better put that hat back on..

On the one hand you don't want to give free upgrades to Novices. On the other,
you want to give allow Novices and Tech Pluses to use "modern digital modes"
and analog voice modes. Huh?
>
>If someone has been an advanced for a while, the liklihood is that
>they weren't interested in code and have been unwilling to put forth
>the effort to get to 20 wpm.

For some, yes. But the 20 wpm test has been avoidable by medical waiver for
more than a decade.

For at least some Advanceds, the written exam is the problem. Do not assume
that because the written test wasn't hard for you that it's a pushover for
everyone.

>With the 20 wpm gone, I have little
>sympathy for someone who isn't willing to take a relatively easy
>50 question written test to upgrade from adanced to extra.

20 wpm was relatively easy for many hams, and relatively tough for others. Same
for the written tests.

Sounds to me like you want to make everyone jump through the same written test
hoops you did.

>> >> An ARRL committee is proposing virtually the same thing,
>> >> (good) plus widening the 'phone slots on those bands (bad).
>> >
>> >I agree with you here, also.
>
>So do I (surprised) ... I personally oppose widening the phone
>bands (at least at this time) because I don't think we should
>allow the lower parts of the bands to be over-run with SSB,
>which could discourage the development of more modern
>digital modes.

So it's OK with you if the SSB folks are hemmed in by limited subbands.

>He's corrrect ... they are NOT "CW only" sub-bands (except if you
>hold a novice/tech+ license) ... others are technically free to use
>PSK31, Clover, PacTor, or other digital modes there, as long as
>they meet the (stupid) occupied bandwidth restrictions ...

The bandwidth restrictions are not stupid at all.

>Why

[annoy]

> the FCC by going back incesantly asking them to
>do things that they have already determined they're not going
>to do because they don't serve the public interest?

I agree that it's not a good idea to keep asking the FCC to do things they've
already said they won't do. The "serve the public interest" is a matter of

opinion. Much of what the FCC does is done to reduce FCC admin work. That's not necessarily a bad thing.
>
>So there are approx. 40k novice licenses still valid and approx.
>87k advanced licenses still valid (source "Year End Census of
>Amateur Radio Operators," The W5YI Report.

You can get exact numbers from my posts in the thread "ARS License Numbers"

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of December 14, 2001:

Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)
Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)
Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)
General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)
Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)
Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)
Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)

>What's the big
>deal? And there are some tech+ who will end up getting renewed
>as techs (but still keep their limited HF privs) if they don't
>upgrade.
>What does that hurt?

Ask Mr. Plourde.
>
>It took me from the time the rules changed until recently to find
>time to get around to going to a VE session to take the extra
>written and upgrade ...

That's you. Others have different situations.

>I didn't

[complain]

>I didn't ask to have the
>test waived ...

But you did wait until the 13 and 20 wpm code tests were gone.

> why should anyone get a total freebie??? If they
>don't want to, or don't have the time to, upgrade, they should

>remain satisfied with what they have. There is no reason to
>change the system ... nobody should get privileges they aren't
>qualified for, nor should anyone lose privileges they've already
>earned.

Sounds like what some folks were saying before the restructuring. Folks you
vehemently disagree with.

>> >I think other hams see what's happening... the new ones come in and
>get to
>> >general and extra very quickly and the elders are being 'corraled'
>out in
>> >their pastures.
>
>How are "the elders being 'corraled' out in their pastures" ???
>(serious question ... I don't get what you're infering here ...)

I think he means that newcomers with quick memories, good health and lots of
time go from zip to Extra in a short time, bypassing hams with much more time
in the ARS. Heck, that's what I did 30+ years ago.
>
>> Hmm - interesting. Could even result in a situation where the
>newbies say to
>> the oldsters "I did it, so you have to, as well!"
>
>Turnabout is fair play, they say :-) As one who has followed the
>rules and taken and passed the extra written, I *could* take that
>view with respect to "waiving" the extra written and giving
>advanceds a free upgrade ... but that is NOT my motivation for
>opposing such a freebie ...

Maybe.

>the motivation is PURELY that there
>is legitimate material in the extra written test that should be tested
>and advanceds should have to demonstrate that they know that
>material before being granted the additional privileges of the
>extra class (and I am NOT refering to the few small "extra only"
>sub-band slots ... I'm refering to the other things that are reserved
>for extras ...)

Like what? What are the other Extra-only privileges that require more testing
of Advanceds? What is in the Extra test that is so necessary for Advanceds to
know?
>
>> >> 3) the big opportunities of the post-2003 era are not being
>addressed
>> >> adequately.
>
>I agree with that ... there is still not a good vision in the majority
>of the amateur community about what we need to do and where
>we need to go, in terms of technology and using our spectrum

>more fully and efficiently.

So how you gonna educate 'em? Shove "modern digital modes" down their throats?
>
>More space for 50 year old SSB technology is NOT the answer,
>IMNSHO ...

even if it's what most hams want?

fun fact: SSB was first used by hams in the early 1930s, almost 70 years ago.

> again I refer the interested to public comments by
>Dale Hatfield and other FCC officials on the future of amateur
>radio

I read 'em. Main point he makes is "don't ask for lots of little subbands for every activity". And "we gotta get some hams up to speed on the current regs".

>> I dunno about that. Their system may not know who is an "old" Tech
>Plus and who
>> isn't.
>
>The FCC's system "knows" who is an "old" Tech Plus and who is not,

They do? Then why not just hand out Generals to them?

>but as was pointed out, the system is programmed such that the VECs
>are the "engine" for input to the system and it would cost the FCC a
>LOT
>in manpower and reprogramming to do such upgrades directly themselves.

So the FCC avoids the work.
>
>I don't see taking one's paperwork to a VE session to get the upgrade
>as being such an onerous thing ...

If one is healthy and able to get there.
>
>> I mean three slots by mode type: CW, digital, analog voice or image.
>For
>> example, 40 meters might be 7000-7075 CW, 7075-7150 digital,
>7150-7300 analog
>> voice or image.
>
>More "balkanization" as I pointed out before ... a BAD idea as RULES.

I think they're a good idea.

>I have no problem with flexible, voluntary bandplans and "gentleman's
>agrements" ... they can be changed far more easily than FCC rules
>as needs change ... casting sub-band usage by mode into the relative
>concrete of Part 97 will ultimately hurt our ability to adapt to
>modernizing
>changes in technology and usage patterns

But you want to hold the line on the analog 'phone subbands. You don't want to widen them, even though the usage might indicate that more 'phone spectrum is justified. Looks like a double standard.

I say having "subbands by mode type" gives the best compromise.
>
>> >What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???
>>
>> Offer an upgrade incentive.
>
>"Incentive Licensing" was a dismal failure ...

How do you figure? It was all about increasing technical knowledge. I think it was propelled by Sputnik fever.

> philosophically,
>I agree with prior comments that power limitations make more
>sense than mode limitations, since they are more solidly based
>on some reasonable relation to one's technical knowledge,
>as demonstrated by passing the more difficult tests.

Huh? The FCC sez Techs are qualified to use 1.5 kW transmitters on VHF/UHF - are they wrong?

>(however, I also realize the unfortunate political reality that
>taking amps away from those who currently are allowed
>to use them will raise hell that will make the code/no-code
>debate look pale by comparison ... therefore, I would, be
>reluctant to propose such a thing, even though I think it's a
>good idea ... too many folks just don't realize that there is
>far more "bang for the buck" to be had with better antennas
>and better modulation and coding schemes than with brute
>force power)

Better antennas are not possible for many hams. Better modulation and coding schemes are often do not offer what many hams want (hence the popularity of SSB).

>>The point is to come up with something that isn't just another
>> patch slapped on the old system.
>
>As I see it, given that Morse testing will go away completely
>after WRC-03, the system isn't so bad

I don't take it as a given, but that's beside the point. Main thing is to look beyond the code test thingie.

> ... current novices
>are declining by at least 5k/year, either through upgrades,
>going SK, or simply not renewing ...

We don't know if that's a linear function, though.

>adanceds have declined
>about 20k since "restructuring," through the same mechanisms

>... tech+'s have declined about 45k, presumably mostly through
>upgrades to general, and those who don't upgrade will be
>renewed as techs, but retain their (limited) HF privs ...

Same for those classes.
>
>What's the problem with this? Over time, through upgrades
>and attrition, we will have only 3 license classes ... some
>might argue that 2 is sufficient (that's the norm in much of
>the world and it doesn't seem to cause any problem), but
>I'm OK with 3 ... particularly if the "power vs. technical
>knowledge" thing were enacted, though *I'm* certainly not
>planning to propose it ...

Then we have a patchwork system for many years to come. New Techs continue to get full power licenses for just a 35 question test, while HF/MF remains primarily in the hands of Generals and above. Newcomers still face the "200 page book just to use an HT" problem W1RFI describes. And getting full privileges requires jumping through written test hoops just to get more spectrum.

The future deserves better.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6163. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 05:18:35 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2C99A1.890B548F@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29160
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Ed Cregger wrote:
>
> They can have it. Ten meters was trashed years ago.
>
> Ed Cregger
> nm2k@adoublerl.net
>
> "ROCK" <rock1@antisocial.com> wrote in message
> news:xxyW7.12069$uM.141230@rwcrnsc54...
> > Okay lets all just take it 1 Jan 2002 19:00hrs (est)
> everybody just meet on
> > 28.500 and we will all have one big key down LoL, just
> take it over and
> > everybody will be happy.
> >

keyclownslappa@hotmail.com (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:

>DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....

>http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/

Just shows how clue less most cbers are.

6164. Re: What not to say to a cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 05:24:03 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net>
Message-ID: <TrcX7.16508$hB2.3917379607@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29161
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

To all Concerned,
Rec.Radio.Cb has been plagued by
a troll for over a year now. He has been
forging people addys, making forged posts,
doing harassing, accusing, vile, vulgar posts
using some 60+ screen nics at AOL,Verizon,
@Home for the ISP.

Any post made with my screen name will be
from SBCGlobal.net, anywhere else is a forge.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is not from
SBCGlobal.net is a FORGE. This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. Be aware of George WA3MO^

"Landshark" <S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:773a0faf.0112281844.2faf845a@posting.google.com...
> I once was stopped with a transgender
> "girlfriend" on the Bay Bridge by a CHP
> cop and I was able to talk my way out of
> it by telling the cop we were on our way
> to a costume party.
>
> Absolutely true,
>
> Landshark
>
> --
> My Best Wishes For A Very Happy New Year To Everyone
>
>
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:<a0i5np$mn1$5@dosa.alt.net>...
> > "LloydVFP" <LloydVFP@KV4FZmyHero.net> wrote in message
> > news:a0gq8q$f9r$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > news:a0fchi$q4t$2@dosa.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > "N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
> > > > news:I9yW7.125$8M.574732@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...

> > > > >
> > > > > Swift Rider <c_howard_in@disguise.com> wrote in
Alt.Law-Enforcement...
> > > > >
> > > > > : The WORST Things to Say to a Police Officer:
> > > > > :
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 1. I can't reach my license unless you hold my beer.
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 2. Sorry, Officer, I didn't realize my radar detector wasn't
plugge
>
> > in.
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 3. Aren't you the guy from the Village People?
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 4. Hey, you must've been doin' about 125 mph to keep up with me!
> > Good
> > job!
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 5. Excuse me. Is "stick up" hyphenated?
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 6. I though you had to be in relatively good physical condition
to
> > be
> > a
> > > > > : police officer.
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 7. I was going to be a cop, but I decided to finish high school
> > instead.
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 8. Bad cop! No donut!
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 9. You're not gonna check the trunk, are you?
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 10. Gee, that gut sure doesn't inspire confidence.
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 11. Didn't I see you get your butt kicked on "Cops"?
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 12. Wow, you look just like the guy in the picture on my
> > girlfriend's
> > > > > : nightstand!
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 13. Is it true that people become cops because they are too dumb
to
> > work
> > at
> > > > > : McDonald's?
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 14. I pay your salary!

> > > > > :
> > > > > : 15. So, uh, you on the take, or what?
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 16. Gee, Officer! That's terrific. The last officer only gave me
a
> > warning,
> > > > > : too!
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 17. Do you know why you pulled me over? OK, just so one of us
does.
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 18. I was trying to keep up with traffic. Yes, I know there is
no
> > other
> > car
> > > > > : around me&emdash;that's how far ahead of me they are.
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 19. What do you mean. "Have I been drinking?" You're the trained
> > specialist.
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 20. Well, when I reached down to pick up my bag of crack, my gun
> > fell
> > off
> > my
> > > > > : lap and got lodged between the brake pedal and the gas pedal,
> > forcing
> > me
> > to
> > > > > : speed out of control.
> > > > > :
> > > > > : 21. Hey, is that a 9 mm? That's nothing compared to this .44
magnum.
> > > > > :
> > > > > > 22. It's not my car, BUT..... (care of Nightcrawler)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 23. I know my rights!!!!
> > > >
> > > 24. KC8JBO, Wogie Wiseman, would say to the cop: Will you
> > > be my boyfriend? LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL
> > >
> > N0VFP, Llllardasssss lllllloyd has said to a cop, "Can I slurp your
> > nutsacks to let me off these felonies?" See, Lllardasssss lllloyd has
> > quite a criminal record, for buggering boys , cows, and pumpkins in and
> > around Athens, AL.
> > >
> > This was just faxed from the Birminham Field office:
> > >
> > The Great Pumpkin
> > Birmingham Post-Herald
> > October 14, 2000

> >
> > Police arrested Lloyd A. Davies, a 27 year old white male, resident of
> > Athens, Alabama in the Anderson Pumpkin patch at 11:38pm Friday. Davies
> > will be charged with lewd and lascivious behavior, public indecency,
> > and public intoxication at the Athens Municipal Courthouse Monday. The
> > suspect allegedly stated that as he was passing a pumpkin patch, he
> > decided to stop. "You know, a pumpkin is soft and squishy inside, and
> > there was no one around here for miles. At least I thought there
> > wasn't." he stated in a phone interview from the Athens Municipal
> > Courthouse Jail.
> > Davies went on to state that he pulled over to the side of the road,
> > picked out a pumpkin that he felt was appropriate to his purposes, cut
> > a hole in it, and proceeded to satisfy his alleged "need". "I guess I
> > was just really into it, you know?" he commented with evident
> > embarrassment. In the process, Torrance apparently failed to notice the
> > Athens Municipal police car approaching and was unaware of his audience
> > until officer Brenda Taylor approached him. "It was an unusual
> > situation, sure." said officer Taylor. "I walked up to (Davies) and
> > he's... just working away at this pumpkin."
> > Taylor went on to describe what happened when she approached Davies. "I
> > just went up and said, 'Excuse me sir, but do you realize that you are
> > screwing a pumpkin?' He got real surprised as you'd expect, and then
> > looked me straight in the face and said,
> > 'A pumpkin? Damn... is it midnight already?"

6165. Re: Did Tacoma do anything after they passed the law?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 05:31:32 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <UycX7.336599$5A3.129657557@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 29162

When I called The City of Tacoma the clerk told me it was because of 1 rouge CBer who was bleeding over peoples telephones, radios, TV, etc. he was asked to stop he did not so they took action by passing this bill. I imagine he was in the city that was the impression I got from her.

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:a0j9sgtbg1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> This has been asked, but never answered.
>
> Tacoma (Wash) passed the following city ordinance:
>
> "It is unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation, to
> (a) use citizens band radio equipment not authorized
> by the Federal Communications Commission; (b) to
> allow the unauthorized operation of citizens band
> radio equipment on a frequency between 24 MHz
> and 35 MHz. "
>
> Have the city fathers actually done anything with that
> law...i.e. telling their police force to enforce the law
> against someone?
>
> It has been suggested, and I strongly agree, that the
> driving force behind this ordinance must have been one
> or more local complaints regarding one or more
> CB violators...BUT no one seems to know anything.
>
> On further examination of the law itself, part A seems
> to be an oxymoron...to wit, how can a radio truly
> be a Citizens Band radio but not be authorized by
> the FCC. Without the FCC "approval" the radio, whatever it
> may be, isn't a CB radio at all. It may be capable of
> being operated in the CB band or elsewhere between
> 24-35MHz, but that sure doesn't make the radio itself
> a CB radio.
>
> Just some additional thoughts on the (obvious to me anyway)
> unenforceable and rather dumb law.
>
> Cheers & Happy New Year to all,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

6166. Re: The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 05:39:16 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <8GcX7.336613$5A3.129663404@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 29163

Phil, I spoke to a clerk from Tacoma she told me the bill was passed as a result of one Cb operator bleeding TV's, Telephones etc,etc... He thumbed his nose at them supposedly I guess since the FCC did nothing about it they passed the ordinance.

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message news:cuvyxnansvbet.goxflk0.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On 22 Dec 2001 05:03:15 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >One has to wonder what sparked the passage of such a law. Were
> >residents experiencing TVI or other problems? Somebody had to have a
> >reaosn to push this through.
>
> That was the reason that Sen. Feingold pushed the bill through
> The Congress giving away the FCC's jurisdiction to local entities.
>
> The local worthies of Beloit whined that the FCC wouldn't do
> anything - most probably because it was audio rectification and/or
> fundamental overload which the FCC told them - rightfully - was
> curable only at the affected equipment.
>
> Supposedly that's what happened in Tacoma. We'd be interested in
> hearing how this was applied to the "culprit" in question and what
> the results were.
>
> "You can't make chicken stew out of chicken feathers."
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>
>

6167. Re: What not to say to a cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 05:47:11 UTC
From: "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com>
Message-ID: <zNcX7.336628$5A3.129669039@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 29164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I say turn him in If what you are saying is true he will lose his ISP.
Right? You have all the proof all the forged posts can be traced to his isp
so Turn him in Maybe the results will not be what you think they are. I say
Go for it. The truth will set you free. Fagwhale

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net> wrote in message
news:TrcX7.16508$hB2.3917379607@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> To all Concerned,
> Rec.Radio.Cb has been plagued by
> a troll for over a year now. He has been
> forging people addys, making forged posts,
> doing harassing, accusing, vile, vulgar posts
> using some 60+ screen nics at AOL,Verizon,
> @Home for the ISP.
>
> Any post made with my screen name will be
> from SBCGlobal.net, anywhere else is a forge.
>
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Please note that any post that is not from
> SBCGlobal.net is a FORGE. This person has
> been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
> time now. Be aware of George WA3MO^
>
>
> "Landshark" <S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:773a0faf.0112281844.2faf845a@posting.google.com...
> > I once was stopped with a transgender
> > "girlfriend" on the Bay Bridge by a CHP
> > cop and I was able to talk my way out of
> > it by telling the cop we were on our way
> > to a costume party.
> >
> > Absolutely true,
> >
> > Landshark
> >
> > --
> > My Best Wishes For A Very Happy New Year To Everyone

> >
> >
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:<a0i5np$mn1$5@dosa.alt.net>...
> > > "LloydVFP" <LloydVFP@KV4FZmyHero.net> wrote in message
> > > news:a0gq8q$f9r$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> > > news:a0fchi$q4t$2@dosa.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
> > > > > news:I9yW7.125$8M.574732@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Swift Rider <c_howard_in@disguise.com> wrote in
> Alt.Law-Enforcement...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > : The WORST Things to Say to a Police Officer:
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 1. I can't reach my license unless you hold my beer.
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 2. Sorry, Officer, I didn't realize my radar detector wasn't
> plugge
> > >
> > > in.
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 3. Aren't you the guy from the Village People?
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 4. Hey, you must've been doin' about 125 mph to keep up with
me!
> > > Good
> > > job!
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 5. Excuse me. Is "stick up" hyphenated?
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 6. I though you had to be in relatively good physical
condition
> to
> > > be
> > > a
> > > > > > : police officer.
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 7. I was going to be a cop, but I decided to finish high
school
> > > instead.
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 8. Bad cop! No donut!
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 9. You're not gonna check the trunk, are you?
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 10. Gee, that gut sure doesn't inspire confidence.

> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 11. Didn't I see you get your butt kicked on "Cops"?
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 12. Wow, you look just like the guy in the picture on my
> > > girlfriend's
> > > > > > : nightstand!
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 13. Is it true that people become cops because they are too
dumb
> to
> > > work
> > > at
> > > > > > : McDonald's?
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 14. I pay your salary!
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 15. So, uh, you on the take, or what?
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 16. Gee, Officer! That's terrific. The last officer only gave
me
> a
> > > warning,
> > > > > > : too!
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 17. Do you know why you pulled me over? OK, just so one of us
> does.
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 18. I was trying to keep up with traffic. Yes, I know there is
> no
> > > other
> > > car
> > > > > > : around me&emdash;that's how far ahead of me they are.
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 19. What do you mean. "Have I been drinking?" You're the
trained
> > > specialist.
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 20. Well, when I reached down to pick up my bag of crack, my
gun
> > > fell
> > > off
> > > my
> > > > > > : lap and got lodged between the brake pedal and the gas pedal,
> > > forcing
> > > me
> > > to
> > > > > > : speed out of control.
> > > > > > :
> > > > > > : 21. Hey, is that a 9 mm? That's nothing compared to this .44
> magnum.

> > > > > > :
> > > > > > 22. It's not my car, BUT..... (care of Nightcrawler)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 23. I know my rights!!!!
> > > >
> > > > 24. KC8JBO, Wogie Wiseman, would say to the cop: Will you
> > > > be my boyfriend? LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL
> > >
> > > N0VFP, Llllardasssss lllllloyd has said to a cop, "Can I slurp your
> > > nutsacks to let me off these felonies?" See, Lllardasssss lllloyd
has
> > > quite a criminal record, for buggering boys , cows, and pumpkins in
and
> > > around Athens, AL.
> > >
> > > This was just faxed from the Birminham Field office:
> > >
> > > The Great Pumpkin
> > > Birmingham Post-Herald
> > > October 14, 2000
> > >
> > > Police arrested Lloyd A. Davies, a 27 year old white male, resident of
> > > Athens, Alabama in the Anderson Pumpkin patch at 11:38pm Friday.
Davies
> > > will be charged with lewd and lascivious behavior, public indecency,
> > > and public intoxication at the Athens Municipal Courthouse Monday. The
> > > suspect allegedly stated that as he was passing a pumpkin patch, he
> > > decided to stop. "You know, a pumpkin is soft and squishy inside, and
> > > there was no one around here for miles. At least I thought there
> > > wasn't." he stated in a phone interview from the Athens Municipal
> > > Courthouse Jail.
> > > Davies went on to state that he pulled over to the side of the road,
> > > picked out a pumpkin that he felt was appropriate to his purposes, cut
> > > a hole in it, and proceeded to satisfy his alleged "need". "I guess I
> > > was just really into it, you know?" he commented with evident
> > > embarrassment. In the process, Torrance apparently failed to notice
the
> > > Athens Municipal police car approaching and was unaware of his
audience
> > > until officer Brenda Taylor approached him. "It was an unusual
> > > situation, sure." said officer Taylor. "I walked up to (Davies) and
> > > he's... just working away at this pumpkin."
> > > Taylor went on to describe what happened when she approached Davies.
"I
> > > just went up and said, 'Excuse me sir, but do you realize that you are
> > > screwing a pumpkin?' He got real surprised as you'd expect, and then
> > > looked me straight in the face and said,
> > > 'A pumpkin? Damn... is it midnight already?"
>
>

6168. Re: What not to say to a cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 06:05:07 UTC
From: S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <773a0faf.0112282205.62b4dad6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29165
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Typical forgery by the AKC trouble
maker club king. First I write what I think is
a truthful post about my gay past hoping
that my little buddy will get the hint and
move on from that topic. Now he's forging
me from an account that the addy looks almost
the same as mine. BE ON THE ALERT. I have
switched to this hotmail account in order
to confuse the little troll.
Now all he can do is imitate me. We'll
see who is the real Landshark.
Here's a test: do a lookup on "Landshark"
in the usenet archives. You will find all kinds
of flames, innacuracies and crap posted by me,
the real Landshark.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is not from
S3uell_SBCGlobalnet@hotmail.com is a FORGE.
The "other" Landshark has been a troll on
Rec.Radio.CB for a long time now. Be aware of
Saucer Men and jock straps.

6169. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 06:15:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0jna8hch1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29166

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011229000254.27168.00000726@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3c2c8a9d_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20011227220325.01870.00000569@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >> In article
> ><XZpW7.242101$3d2.11769921@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> >> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:
> >>
> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >> >
> >> > If the
> >> > Novice is promoted to this class by simply waiving element 2
> >then the
> >> > situation becomes much clearer.
> >> >
> >> Yup - but is it right to give away upgrades like that?
> >
> >Nope ...
>
> >> >Well, yes, it is because they have been law abiding hams for years,
> >possibly
> >> >decades and granting them Element 2 is not going to ire anyone.
> >
> >No ... they haven't demonstrated the qualifications tested by the
> >other
> >test element.
>
> OK, I'm gonna put on my devil's advocate hat here....
>
> What "qualifications" are needed to be an Extra that are not possessed by
an
> Advanced? Forget about the VE rules and regs, because pre-VE-era Extras
are not
> retested in order to be VEs.
>
> The only difference between the operating privileges of an Extra and an
> Advanced are a few subbands on 80, 40, 20 and 15. Extras get no additional
> modes or power - the ONLY difference is those little subbands. What
> "qualifications" are needed to operate on, say, 3524 that are not needed
to

> operate on 3526?

So then are you suggesting that the former Advanced test should be
the requirement for Extra...rather than the current Extra syllabus?

> Devil's advocate hat off.
> >
> >> It might upset those who recently took a test to upgrade. Didja know
> >that both
> >> the NCVEC and NCI OPPOSED the ARRL BoD idea to give a "free" upgrade
> >of Novices
> >> and Tech Pluses to General?
> >
> >That's true ... as NCI has stated all along, we are "No Code
> >International," not "No Qualifications International."
>
> Shall we review how the written tests were cut in number and size again?

Not because of any request of NCI.

> >> The whole Extra written test! Today, a current Advanced has to take
> >> a 50 question written to get the Extra - same as a General.
> >> Auto-upgrade would not go over big with some folks.
> >
> >And the more technical content (not that it's THAT hard, but it's
> >reasonable for granting a license to operate and experiment)
> >is virtually all in the Extra test now ... the written elements for
> >General are quite elementary ...
>
> Devil's advocate hat back on...
>
> WHY is that "technical content" essential for OPERATING privileges, or to
> experiment? All US hams except Novices can use ALL authorized modes and
> frequencies above 30 Mhz right now - the FCC thinks the written testing is
> adequate. Current Generals, who have been tested even less than Advanceds,
can
> experiment on every band and mode authorized to US hams - they just can't
use
> some subbands on 80/40/20/15.
>
> Devil's advocate hat off.
> >
> >Now who's proposing to "dumb down" amateur radio???
> >
> Not me.

Could'a fooled me by your devil's advocate scenarios.

(SNIP)
> >With the 20 wpm gone, I have little
> >sympathy for someone who isn't willing to take a relatively easy
> >50 question written test to upgrade from adanced to extra.

>
> 20 wpm was relatively easy for many hams, and relatively tough for others.
Same
> for the written tests.

I doubt the equivalence of that comparison. I'd suggest more
people can get up to speed for the written than with the 20wpm.
One can "study" the written in many forums (ARRL license manuals,
QRZ online, etc.). Not so for practicing to pass 20 wpm.

> Sounds to me like you want to make everyone jump through the same written
test
> hoops you did.

Surely you jest :-)

(SNIP)

> > why should anyone get a total freebie??? If they
> >don't want to, or don't have the time to, upgrade, they should
> >remain satisfied with what they have. There is no reason to
> >change the system ... nobody should get privileges they aren't
> >qualified for, nor should anyone lose privileges they've already
> >earned.
>
> Sounds like what some folks were saying before the restructuring.
> Folks you vehemently disagree with.

That argument/analogy only holds IF you believe the current
testing requirements for the written are unreasonable and/or
unjustified.

(SNIP)

> I think he means that newcomers with quick memories, good health and lots
of
> time go from zip to Extra in a short time, bypassing hams with much more
time
> in the ARS. Heck, that's what I did 30+ years ago.

That will always be the case for some people. It happens in
business too.

(SNIP)

> >The FCC's system "knows" who is an "old" Tech Plus and who is not,
>
> They do? Then why not just hand out Generals to them?

Because many have NOT passed the General written. Most of those
that have passed General (i.e. pre 1987) have upgraded already if they are
still active and know about restructuring.

> >I don't see taking one's paperwork to a VE session to get the upgrade
> >as being such an onerous thing ...
>
> If one is healthy and able to get there.

If someone is unhealthy truly housebound, I'm
sure accomodations could be made if a request
was made known.

> >> I mean three slots by mode type: CW, digital, analog voice or image.
> >For
> >> example, 40 meters might be 7000-7075 CW, 7075-7150 digital,
> >7150-7300 analog
> >> voice or image.
> >
> >More "balkanization" as I pointed out before ... a BAD idea as RULES.
>
> I think they're a good idea.

We'll agree to disagree then.

> I say having "subbands by mode type" gives the best compromise.
> >
> >> >What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???
> >>
> >> Offer an upgrade incentive.
> >
> >"Incentive Licensing" was a dismal failure ...
>
> How do you figure? It was all about increasing technical knowledge. I
think it
> was propelled by Sputnik fever.

If so it was 10 years in the making...Sputnick was 1957 as
I recall.

> > philosophically,
> >I agree with prior comments that power limitations make more
> >sense than mode limitations, since they are more solidly based
> >on some reasonable relation to one's technical knowledge,
> >as demonstrated by passing the more difficult tests.
>
> Huh? The FCC sez Techs are qualified to use 1.5 kW transmitters on
VHF/UHF -
> are they wrong?

I believe they are on that point. Personally (K2UNK
opinion only...NOT an NCI position) I'd just as much
see an overall power limit of 500 watts for any ham
license. Many countries have limits lower than that.

> >>The point is to come up with something that isn't just another
> >> patch slapped on the old system.
> >

> >As I see it, given that Morse testing will go away completely
> >after WRC-03, the system isn't so bad
>
> I don't take it as a given, but that's beside the point. Main thing is to
look
> beyond the code test thingie.
>
> > ... current novices
> >are declining by at least 5k/year, either through upgrades,
> >going SK, or simply not renewing ...
>
> We don't know if that's a linear function, though.

It will probably run that way for several years.

> >adanceds have declined
> >about 20k since "restructuring," through the same mechanisms
> >... tech+'s have declined about 45k, presumably mostly through
> >upgrades to general, and those who don't upgrade will be
> >renewed as techs, but retain their (limited) HF privs ...
>
> Same for those classes.

I looked at the Spumoni data today...my guess is
that those declines and changes will continue for
several years.

> >What's the problem with this? Over time, through upgrades
> >and attrition, we will have only 3 license classes ... some
> >might argue that 2 is sufficient (that's the norm in much of
> >the world and it doesn't seem to cause any problem), but
> >I'm OK with 3 ... particularly if the "power vs. technical
> >knowledge" thing were enacted, though *I'm* certainly not
> >planning to propose it ...
>
> Then we have a patchwork system for many years to come. New Techs continue
to
> get full power licenses for just a 35 question test, while HF/MF remains
> primarily in the hands of Generals and above. Newcomers still face the
"200
> page book just to use an HT" problem W1RFI describes. And getting full
> privileges requires jumping through written test hoops just to get more
> spectrum.
>
> The future deserves better.

Your suggestion then is?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6170. Re: The actual Tacoma Law

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 06:22:13 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0jnmgkik1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29168

> > On 22 Dec 2001 05:03:15 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> > >One has to wonder what sparked the passage of such a law. Were
> > >residents experiencing TVI or other problems? Somebody had to have a
> > >reaosn to push this through.

Phil wrote:
> > We'd be interested in hearing how this was
> > applied to the "culprit" in question and what the results were.

"middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com> wrote in message
news:8GcX7.336613$5A3.129663404@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> Phil, I spoke to a clerk from Tacoma she told me the bill was passed as a
> result of one Cb operator bleeding TV's, Telephones etc,etc... He thumbed
> his nose at them supposedly I guess since the FCC did nothing about it
they
> passed the ordinance.

Did the clerk offer any information as to what
happened AFTER the ordinance passed?

Did the local police file charges against the CBer?

Just what did the local police do?

Really curious,
Bill K2UNK

> >
> > That was the reason that Sen. Feingold pushed the bill through
> > The Congress giving away the FCC's jurisdiction to local entities.
> >
> > The local worthies of Beloit whined that the FCC wouldn't do
> > anything - most probably because it was audio rectification and/or
> > fundamental overload which the FCC told them - rightfully - was
> > curable only at the affected equipment.
> >

> >
> > "You can't make chicken stew out of chicken feathers."
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >
> >
> >
>

>

6171. What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 06:24:21 UTC
From: The Better Amateur Radio Federation <lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm>
Message-ID: <df31ce2887f82b3e1477ab770fb88e3b@spamfreenews.com>
Source record: 29167
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

We are a Ham Radio/SWL club for Straight, White, Americans. We have a new focus! We have left our past roots and have found a new purpose! To share with our white brothers and sisters!

Membership details will be posted soon! We will exchange Shortwave logs and Ham Radio info!

--
Lloyd Davies, N0VFP ICQ # 107841547
Chief of Communications
The Better Amateur Radio Federation
Ham radio for Straight, White, Americans!
http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61

6172. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 06:52:43 UTC
From: 91bxuc2hvc8e001@sneakemail.com
Message-ID: <Xns918612FF042FJimnospamcom@24.253.156.38>
Source record: 29169
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation"
<lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm> wrote in
news:df31ce2887f82b3e1477ab770fb88e3b@spamfreenews.com:

> What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?
>
> We are a Ham Radio/SWL club for Straight, White, Americans. We have a
> new focus! We have left our past roots and have found a new purpose!
> To share with our white brothers and sisters!
>
> Membership details will be posted soon! We will exchange Shortwave
> logs and Ham Radio info!
>
>
>
>
>
>
> --
> Lloyd Davies, N0VFP ICQ # 107841547
> Chief of Communications
> The Better Amateur Radio Federation
> Ham radio for Straight, White, Americans!
> http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61
>
>
>
>

Not to mention stalking women on aol... hahaha

This document has not been altered, i obtained it, and simply reposted this
pathetic internet romance? hahahah

Subj: Check out Looking for Alabama Gal
Date: 12/7/00 6:52:53 PM Central Standard Time
From: Sohole

Click here: Looking for Alabama Gal
a added bonus for aol users click above
after you read the lloyd files

here for your pleasure
THE LLOYD FILES
lloyd trys to talk him up sum !

more to come

chapter one:

Height: 5' 6"
Body Style: Average

Race/Ethnicity: White (White American)
Religion: Christian (Baptist)

Education: Some College
Occupation: Customer Support
Income: Prefer not to say

Marital Status: Single
Has Children: No
Wants Children: Yes

Drinking: Drink Occasionally
Smoking: Don't Smoke

Dating Distance Range: 150 Miles

ubj: Re: ????
Date: 11/29/00 11:54:32 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

no i did not block you. Your name does not show up. I've been tired and not
feeling well the last few days. Hello and I'm glad you had a good time. As
far Christmas goes, I'm afraid I am not going to be able to come down. I have
other plans.

Lloyd
Subj: Re: did you get my picture?
Date: 11/18/00 11:11:18 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Thanks for your picture. you look very pretty and professional. I have had a
long day of work today. I have to work tomorrow and then get packed up to head
to iowa. I'll be there for about a week over Thanksgiving. Means I'll be here
by myself for Christmas. I'm tired tonite. I've had alot on my mind. More
than usaual.

Take care and have a good weekend,

Lloyd
ubj: did you get my picture?
Date: 11/16/00 1:30:29 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Did it come through all right? I just wanted to know. Are you going to
send
me yours?

Lloyd
Subj: Here they are
Date: 11/15/00 4:13:20 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

File: lloyd1.jpg (113037 bytes)
DL Time (24000 bps): < 1 minute

Here are some pictures of me like I promised. I dont know how well they
came
out, but thgey seem ok. I used my Kodak digital camera. It's a simple
camera.

Lloyd

Please send me your picture please.

Subj: Re: ????
Date: 11/29/00 11:54:32 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

no i did not block you. Your name does not show up. I've been tired and
not
feeling well the last few days.

Subj: Missed you tonite
Date: 11/14/00 12:12:53 AM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

I was thinking about you tonite. I see you got my mail today. you didnt
write
me back.

Lloyd

ubj: How are you?
Date: 11/13/00 12:14:19 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Did you have a good weekend? Had to work all weekend. I'm getting ready
to

visit my Mom next week in Iowa. I'll be gone all next week for
Thanksgiving.
You got Thanksgiving plans? You'll probably goto warm Florida! Iowa
gets
very cold this time of year.

I'm gonna get my picture taken this week to send to you. I have a digital
camera. I'll send it as soon as I get it taken.

Are you still in School? I did'nt know If you were or not.

Love,

Lloyd

Subj: Re: Hello
Date: 11/11/00 12:21:44 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

I dont have one done of me yet, But i will get one for you this next week.
Are
you trying to keep me in suspense? Are you that pretty that my computer
would
break?

I'm not real shy, I just like to keep one thing at a time. My SN is my Ham
Radio call sign.

I hope you are feeling better and that you were thinking of me this week. I
did not vote, I did not get register in time. I would have voted for Bush.

Lloyd Davies

Subj: Hello
Date: 11/7/00 11:40:47 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Have'nt heard from you. Been busy? I have been working alot. So, how are
things going? Did you get a picture to send me yet? I was just
wondering.

Lloyd

ubj: Missed you today
Date: 11/5/00 3:58:58 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

I've been on most of the Afternoon. Hope you are doing OK. Well, I have to
work tonight at my job. But, I should be off at 10pm or after.

Lloyd

Subj: where are you tonite?
Date: 11/4/00 10:36:02 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

I've been on online all nite where have you been? I've been watching TV tonite. Hope you have a good weekend.

Ps, I think I may have missed you telling me what you look like.

Lloyd

Subj: Re: re : AOL love
Date: 11/4/00 6:02:14 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

File: truck1.ZIP (199585 bytes)
DL Time (24000 bps): < 2 minutes

Here are a couple of pictures of my truck. Sorry I don't have a picture of myself.
They may take a while to download. Will you be online tonight? I'm gonna be
on off and on. Let's chat sweetheart.

Lloyd
Subj: Re: re : AOL love
Date: 11/4/00 4:59:03 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

Thanks for your response. What's going on in Jan? I have a picture of my pickup truck, 1997 S-10. Would you like to see it? I really like it a lot.

Take care,

Lloyd

Subj: Re: re : AOL love
Date: 11/4/00 2:47:44 PM Central Standard Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

How are you?

I'm sorry I have not had time to write you back. I've been working a lot right
now. I am currently trying to get some more computer courses. For starters, I
have brown hair, brown eyes. I have a few extra pounds, but been trying get to
them off. I see you are college educated. I like that in a girl. I once dated a gal once, who all she wanted to do was sit at home and watch TV. Not

my kind of gal! I have a computer education, and trying to get my A+ certification. I would make a good amount of money if I could get it passed.
I'll be taking an online course.

Well, I write you later

Lloyd

Subj: Re: re : AOL love
Date: 10/22/00 1:45:22 PM Central Daylight Time
From: N0VFP
To: Sohole

hello,

I'm sorry i dont even know who you are.

Do you have a picture for starters?

Lloyd
[end reposts]

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...

6173. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 11:27:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112290327.1f3a5cdb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29170

"Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> wrote in message
news:<1RmW7.198773$WW.11506255@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote
>
> > If bragging rights is the name of the game then what the hell, thee me
> > and gazillions of others around here did the 20wpm thing at our
> > neigborhood FCC offices which the lightweights around here will never
> > do.
>
> Gazillions??? Stick to the facts. All of you people who did do the 20 wpm
> thing at your neighborhood FCC offices had the proclivity and predilection
> to accomplish morse code at a reasonably rapid rate and you should be
> commended for that. Although, just as you or your buddy will only attain a
> certain speed and will never approach the speed operators who break records
> of > 60 wpm. There are plenty of people who because of their own proclivity
> and predilection will never be able to approach 12 wpm.
>
Translation: "Stroke my "proclivities & predilictions", I doan wanna
have to do the work involved to even do 13wpm to get on the bands,
whine, whine." And the FCC sez "Oh you pore babies, sure, no problem,
equal opportunity for everybody is the big IN thing, so now it's 5wpm"
>
A la the public education disaster in this country.
>

> The ARS is full of operators selected from society who could, in fact,
> attain those speeds. This was a good thing in the past when CW operators
> were needed throughout the services but these days it's just flat out not
> needed. The skills sets needed has shifted. Deal with it.
>
Bullshit. I didn't get into ham radio to become a commercial cw
operator and I don't know anybody who did. The usefulness of cw hasn't
"shifted" a damned bit in the near half century I've been beeping
below the phone bands. Ya can either copy the stuff at a workable
speed and have the choice of running either phone or cw or ya stick
yourself with just motormouthing and keyboarding. No skin off my teeth
believe me, I don't need any more QRM.
>
>
>
> When you call people lightweights are you REALLY in the belief that you are
> superior?
>
>

No, I'm just average. I don't approve of dropping the bar to feed the "proclivity and predilections" of the below-average. Hasn't worked in any other sector of society and it ain't gonna work in ham radio.
>
>
>You are when it comes to beeping fast... granted... but that's as
> far as it goes.
>
>
Case in point: Some months ago a bunch of us RRAPers, a mix of both NCTAs and PCTAs decided to put our radios, fists and ears where our mouths were and got together on 7.037 for a cw roundtable. We took RRAP to the airwaves Gawd forbid. I was in it with a lousy little underdash TS-50 mobile xcvr and some wire thru some trees. Everybody worked everybody, Texas to Minnesota, Philly to California solid copy all the way. Get back to me when you pull any such thing off on 40m SSB.
>
>
Ayup. CW is no longer "useful". Uh-huh.
>
>
Deal with it.
>
w3rv

6174. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 12:46:07 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0kjoe$g0a$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29176
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Lllllllardasssssss Lllllllllloyd
"The Better Amateur Radio Federation"
<lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:df31ce2887f82b3e1477ab770fb88e3b@spamfreenews.com...
> What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Usenet whipping boys.

> We are a Ham Radio/SWL club for Straight, White, Americans.

But you're not straight, Llllllardaasssss Lllllllloyd..you're a FAGGOT.

> We have a new focus!
> We have left our past roots and have found a new purpose! To share

Translation: Lllllllardasssssssss Lllllloyd "invented this NEW BARF" since
the old BARF didn't have much to do with him.

> with our white brothers and sisters!

Translation: Llllloneely Llllllardasssssssss Lllllllloyd desperately want s to
be a part of something, anything.

> Membership details will be posted soon! We will exchange Shortwave logs
and
> Ham Radio info!

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHA....go sell those parts at the flea market,
Lllllllardasssssss lllllllllllloyd.

6175. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 13:07:20 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0kf2t017ee@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29171

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011228235150.13985.00002141@mb-md.aol.com...

> Greetings All:
>
> To those who have been insisting that the FCC has the best interests
> of the ARS at heart, I offer the following. I seems like "Restructuring"
> isn't the only way they had in mind to put an end to our tomfoolery on
> all this valuable RF real estate. Now they're saying licensed radio
> amateurs don't have any need to establish a station in our own homes.
> Get ready to lose some more spectrum -- and soon! Read it and weep...
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I think you may be reading more into this than what is actually there.
Besides, you may not be able to put up a 200 foot tower with a TH6DXX, but
there are many ways to install a hidden antenna, or even put up a temporary
antenna if you work only contests.
Of course there is another option - MOVE!

6176. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 13:14:24 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0kfg5018o1@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29172

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2D2657.F9DA7EE4@townsqr.com...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > What you are
> > > is a demonstration of one thing that ham radio should not be - lewd.
> >
> > So Dick thinks that female anatomy is lewd.
>
> Offensive forcing of the sexual parts of the anatomy on others or the
> public at large is lewd, by either sex, and is so codified under law
almost
> everywhere. Minor violations such as this are generally viewed as

Kim's callsign violates the law? What bodily orifice did you pull that one
out of?

> tasteless, trashy, clueless, the result of the lack of decent upbringing,
> or the lack of any serious hint of a clue. Ugly, offensive behavior, in
> short.

Some of us find your behavior ugly and offensive.

6177. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 13:19:08 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0kfp2019ab@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29173

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2001.12.28.23.27.37.779643.30082@arrl.org...

> It's a classic red herring. Rather than debate the actual issue, you say
> that others are trying to suppress the debate itself. Frequently resorted
> to when one is unable to frame a meaningful argument in support of an
> untenable position.
>
> Jon

Usenet is not a high school debate team. There are no rules, and no one is required to engage in meaningful arguments. It is much better to compare it to Hyde Park in London, where you can bring your soapbox and talk about anything you want, if you don't mind being heckled.

6178. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 13:42:57 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0kh5m01c8k@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29175

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2D275C.DA030237@townsqr.com...

You, Dick, are objectively a hypocrite. You write this response...

> Either you are objectively an idiot or you are not. Seems to me you are.

and in another, you wrote this...

>> It doesn't matter unless you are trying to mimic "1984"'s thought
>> police
>
> OM you're running just ahead of the idiot police.

I could go on, but the real gem is this...

>> You're hilarious, Dick. How paranoid are you of the world around you?
>
> A one-liner from you simply means you have no valid response.

Interesting. Your insults and ad hominem attacks are "valid responses" to
reasonable statements, and Kim's one liner is not. I can't wait to see what
kind of pathetic excuse you have for this one.

6179. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 13:53:49 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2001.12.29.08.53.49.279212.9222@arrl.org>
Source record: 29174

On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 08:19:08 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> Usenet is not a high school debate team. There are no rules, and no one
> is required to engage in meaningful arguments.

Neither is anyone precluded from doing so -- nor from pointing out when
someone else isn't doing so.

> It is much better to
> compare it to Hyde Park in London, where you can bring your soapbox and
> talk about anything you want, if you don't mind being heckled.

Not all newsgroups are like that, although this one certainly is!

Jon

6180. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 14:35:25 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2dd5dd_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29177

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2D275C.DA030237@townsqr.com...
>
> > Kim's motives have absolutely nothing to do with whether
> > Kim's callsign is trashy.
>
> Only that her trashy motives led her to request a trashty callsign.
>

Hey, Dick? Could you give me a clue as to what "trashy motives" you'd be thinking of? What's your motivation for believing it?

Kim W5TIT

6181. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 14:37:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2dd65b_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29178

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2D2920.9C5F5C61@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:3C2CF736.8E2CFB40@townsqr.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > Kim-W5TIT wrote
> > >
> > > >Because I don't agree with people who think my callsign
> > >
> > > > is tacky or vulgar/whatever, it is their expectation that I am still
to
> > live
> > > > "up" (as they put it) to their standards. If I don't wave their
flag, I
> > am
> > > > public enemy number one.
> > >
> > > More of your defective thought process at work. No one "expects"
> > anything at
> > > all of you. If you were not who and what you are, you wouldn't have
chosen
> > that
> > > callsign. Do not confuse the criticism with anyone's expectations.
What
> > you are
> > > is a demonstration of one thing that ham radio should not be - lewd.
By
> > your
> > > own amission, you chose your callsign for lewd reasons. Sin ce gthe
most
> > public
> > > part of a ham radio operator is his callsign, you clearly chose to
place
> > > lewdness at the fore of your ham radio experience. Tho you didn't
describe
> > it
> > > that way, you didn't need to, the implication was more than clear in
your
> > > statements.
```

> > > Lewdness has no place in ham radio, otherwise Riley wouldn't consider
you
> > to be
> > > like the others in ham radio who are putting the service "one step
closer
> > to
> > > extinction". End of story.
> > >
> >
> > You're hilarious, Dick. How paranoid are you of the world around you?
>
> A one-liner from you simply means you have no valid response.
>
> Paranoid? Not very, but enough that I sure don't intend to stand there
and let
> some
> clown take me out "on my own terms":...
>

No, a one-line response from me generally (not always) means something was funny, or that something was just not worth much more. I love the way you answer the question about being paranoid. It sounds along the same lines as, "I'm not nuts, it's the rest of the world."

Kim W5TIT
Was that response better for you?

6182. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 14:52:42 UTC
From: John Kimball <johnkimb@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <a0klbdjgq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29179
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.flamenet,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 17:56:09 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in
Message id: <a0j3i0aic2@dosa.alt.net>:

>Homoxsexual pedophile pervert
>"Joanie" <alt.flame@flameawayroger.com> wrote in message
>news:a0i90u$4kn$0@pita.alt.net...
>> > >
>> > >> Why were you kicked out of the Air Force Roger?
>> > >>
>> > >> See photo of KC8JBO and his pointed circus boy
>> > >>head here: www.angelfire.com/al/sj61 courtesy of the
>> > >>BARF chief of communications.
>> > >>
>> > >
>> > > Man, that's one ugly fucking redneck. I almost feel sorry for 8L0J08.
>> > > Almost. I bet that mustache is the pubic hair from his mothers twat.
>
>No, it's from YOUR mommy's twat.

Well, that proves that the picture is indeed 8L0J08.
BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!

>> > Damn, I was beaten to the punch. I wanted to be the first to come up
>> > with a photo of Woger. Oh well. I'll have one of his mommie's house in a
>> > few days. By all reports it's a beat up shack.
>> >
>> The photo is about 20 years old.
>
>BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA Prove it.

You just did, you perennial fuckup. See above.

>>Roger tried to pass himself off as looking younger.
>
>While "Joanie" tries to pass himself off on the liberty net as straight.
>BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...over 50 years old and never been
>married....bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha.then ol' Steve Turdeater goes up
>to Richland, OH and fucks his momma up the ass.
>
>>Truth is Roger is fat now, very fat, with
>
><guffaw> Suuuuure I am, FATASS.
>
>

>> gray hair and looks beyond his years from smoking dope.
>
>Bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha.. that why I got carded a few weeks ago
>when I bought some beer?

Probably because you're only 4"11".

>> Marshall county property tax records are on line and show the
>> house Roger lives in is owned by his mother and only his mother,
>
>BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA Marshall county tax records are not
>on line, you fucking imbecile.

How does it feel to be so outed, 8L0J08?

--
"For sale - Taliban rifles. Only dropped once."
Alan Gore in adfp

6183. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:03:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011229100303.09102.00000817@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29180

In article <3C26577F.DBD75DA7@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> You are the who pointed out that the guy gets lost. Maybe it'd be
>> easier for him to ride in or follow the other vehicle....unless the
>> other guys make him bring up the rear.
>
>The beauty of ham radio is that there needs be no meeting place or
>meeting time or even a campsite picked out. Everyone gets on a
>mountaintop repeater and decides where to camp out.

And anyone with a suitable receiver can just listen and hear what the group decides.

>Some of the
>Phoenix area mountaintop repeaters cover 1000 square miles.
>
That's pretty poor coverage. 1000 square miles is a circle with radius of less than 18 miles.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6184. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:06:31 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2ddd1c_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29181

```
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:9IaX7.201522$WW.11754880@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:3C2D24DD.BF36ED05@townsqr.com...
> >
> >
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > > "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> > >
> news:DBD8DA82FE84A6E4.97AE7ECBE90C07F9.80DB367B6488B232@lp.airnews.net...
> > > > On 28 Dec 2001 13:02:47 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> > > >
> > > I think it far more likely the community pleads de minimus. While
> this
> > > call is a crime it is a common crime and one of a category often
> > > encountered. Generic Look at me, I'm Sandra Dee.
> > >
> > > Sane people generally realize that they are not about to educate idiot
> > > drivers with any sort of retaliation and are not about to instill
> taste in
> > > the terminally tasteless so we take Carl Jung's advice and cultivate
> our
> > > little garden and save a corner of the world.
> >
> > True, but allowing them a free pass only exacerbates their
> cluelessness, even
> > allows them to think it's even right since "no one is complaining, so
> what's
> > your problem?"
>
> It might be more effective if we simply ignored it.
>

And, we'll all make mental notes of what a wonderful job you've been doing
of ignoring this thread and posting to it the last several days.

>
> Or better yet, ask
> why she selected W as opposed to K or N thereby shifting the discussion to
> an unexpected part of the call sign.
>
```

OHGAWD, there are therapy sessions for what you have, Dick M. OK, since you haven't read the many posts on the story, here you go:

When I originally decided to apply for my call, I *did* want the K prefix. BUT, a gentleman in Florida had K5TIT. It seems to me that this was somewhere around two(?) years ago. Well, when I found out that a *man* had a requested suffix with 'TIT', I sent him an email and asked him, nicely and respectfully, why a man had that callsign. He wrote a very nice email back stating that he'd wanted K5TET, to commemorate the Tet Offensive in Viet Nam, but that when he'd tried for it, it was taken. So, he got K5TIT. And, to add to the story, just this year (I think) or maybe late last year, Michael sent me an email and said he was relinquishing K5TIT, so that makes it available in two years, or a little less now. That's the story.

Now, maybe you can explain to me why a 'W' is a "distraction" over the N or the K prefix. That one just goes way beyond my ability to understand. Oh, the reason I didn't get N5TIT, which was available when I applied, was there was somewhat of an
'N5' club on the repeater at the time and, for reasons I won't mention here, I did not want to have them thinking I was "following" them. We were having differences.

>
> You say 'clueless' while I think it is a post-pubescent call for
> attention. Neither one of us is going to ever know for sure but the
> search for identity thru call signs, toys, etc. seems to be spreading thru
> a lot of the world.
>

Yeah, and you seem to have some baggage you are carrying around in that respect, Dick M.

>
> Seen what is done to head and tail lites, not to
> mention the ubiquitous 'virginity lamps' below the bumper. Had a guy with
> red front turn signals pull into traffic last week. That will definitely
> wake you up on a winter's day.
>

Not that I support the idiots with all the car affects running around, but different does get your attention, doesn't it?

>
> Want to see a bozo pissed off? One of the state Patrolmen, presumably
> after the obligatory drug search, ticketed one of these big 4x4 monster
> trucks for failure to have a run-under bar in back and irregular height
> head lamps. I have had the feeling that Omaha could knock 5 a year off
> the fatality rate by simply going on bozo patrol and just having a hell of
> a good time.
>

I agree with you. If the cops *would* go on what you call bozo-patrol (I like that) the revenue generated could probably fix every pot hole in the city and black top all dirt roads.

>
> It was, BTW, the run-under bar the owner most objected to;
> apparently the truck would be less kewl.
>

Oh, like you never wanted to be cool, huh?

>
> Whatever. I am freaking tired of the whole verstunken issue.
>
> Dick
>

Then you'll not be posting anymore to the thread you are so successfully
ignoring?

Kim W5TIT

6185. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:07:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2ddd4e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29182

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2D2D16.91478AF2@townsqr.com...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
>
> . It was, BTW, the run-under bar the owner most objected to;
>
> > apparently the truck would be less kewl.
>
> .
> If ur not kewl today, you're NOT.
>
>
> >
> > Whatever. I am freaking tired of the whole verstunken issue.
>
> Agree wholly here. Bozo patrol on rrap is not too productive.
>

Take a look in the mirror, Dick C. There's a big bust waiting for you
there.

Kim W5TIT

6186. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:08:50 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2dddb1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29184

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2D3A9C.D2CB9E74@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Offensive forcing of the sexual parts of the anatomy on others or the
> > public at large is lewd, by either sex, and is so codified under law
almost
> > everywhere.
>
> And Kim has not done that. All Kim has done is request a cute callsign.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Oh, CECIL!!! Now, you've gone and done it. Dick's having some kind of
cyber-paranoid hallucination and enjoying it, then you go and burst his ever
loving...er, bubble(?)

;) Kim W5TIT

6187. Re: CBERS CONSIDER 28 MHZ AS "CB"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:15:07 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonlineNOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <%5lX7.234941$bs2.43155072@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 29183
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Get a clue........When it's cross posted like this thread is.....It's
TROLL fodder!
Train
"JR" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C2C99A1.890B548F@mailcity.net...
>
>
> Ed Cregger wrote:
> >
> > They can have it. Ten meters was trashed years ago.
> >
> > Ed Cregger
> > nm2k@adoublerl.net
> >
> > "ROCK" <rock1@antisocial.com> wrote in message
> > news:xxyW7.12069$uM.141230@rwcrnsc54...
> > > Okay lets all just take it 1 Jan 2002 19:00hrs (est)
> > everybody just meet on
> > > 28.500 and we will all have one big key down LoL, just
> > take it over and
> > > everybody will be happy.
> > >
>
> keyclownslappa@hotmail.com (IllegalCBersMustGO) wrote:
>
> >DON'T BELIEVE ME? CHECK OUT THE FREQUENCY CHART ON THIS CB PAGE.....
>
> >http://www.geocities.com/ssb27mhz/
>
> Just shows how clue less most cbers are.

6188. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:19:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2de03b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29185

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2001.12.28.23.15.23.125581.30082@arrl.org...
>
> Are you
> finding less rare DX because of Kim's call sign?
>
> Jon

heh heh. That reminds of this. When I first got my new Radio Shack 10M rig, I spent the one of the first weekends with it on the air mobile on 10M. There were 2 or 3 different DX pileups and I can't, for the life of me, ever remember what they were. In fact, one was so rare that my DX-loving friend freaked when I told him the callsign--and he was quite surprised the station had been on 10M.

At any rate, the thing I was proudest about that radio was that, with only 25 watt output, and mobile, in 2 instances I got instant callback from the DX-station, with a QST request to everyone to please stand by and let him hear the "Tango India Tango" station. He was giggling his butt off when he asked for confirmation. He also asked for a QSL card; and I ashamedly promised one, but have never done it yet. Anyway, on the third instance, first call and I got him. Now, more than that I got through because of my callsign--what that proved to me was that 25 watts mobile is probably quite sufficient for DXing or contesting, er, if you've got the right callsign...LOL

Personal note to self: New Year's Resolution is to absolutely get my QSL card designed so I can get on 10M and begin sending them out. I design QSL cards for folks, but have never even done my own.

Kim W5TIT

6189. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:22:21 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2de0cf$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29186

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011228235143.13985.00002130@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3C29F36A.2B0A7A03@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Richard McCollum wrote:
> >> There is
> >> no basic conflict in welcoming those who pass the rules currently in
> >> effect while not having a lot of use for the rules currently in effect;
> >
> >Unfortunately, Larry is not that way. He has bitched loud and long
> >about post-restructuring extras not deserving their privileges.
>
> Cecil:
>
> I've never stated that post-Restructuring Extras do not "deserve"
> their privileges -- only that they haven't had to make as much of an
> effort to learn the useful knowledge and skills that were required
> under the superior pre-Restructuring licensing system.
>

Shhh, Shhh, Cecil. It's the eggnog and rum.

ROFLMAO...Kim W5TIT
(See, Dick C.? That's a one liner because I think was Larry said is funny).

6190. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:33:53 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2de385_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29188

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011228235145.13985.00002132@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article
<A17D53CE133D6D39.5F6E437A9BAFA70A.F74698D962F766B7@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >
> > Maybe that's the entire problem, Dave.
> >
> > You, Dick, and Larry all feel that a woman should behave
> >differently than a man in public (and probably in private as well) and
> >that she has an obligation to appear demure, innocent, and moral. When
> >a woman demonstrates that she is as much a whole person as a man is
> >and isn't willing to defer to your "superior" male values, you go ape
> >and can't allow her decisions to go unchallenged.
>
> Rick:
>
> If there were any other YL hams in this newsgroup, it is entirely
> likely that at least one of them would take offense to Kim's call
> sign, and state so in this thread.
>

Larry: there've been three women I can think of that have posted to this
newsgroup since I've been posting. Two of them thought my callsign was
fine. I don't think the other ever said a word about it. Well, not on the
newsgroup anyway. She sent me a private email. One of them was the gal who
posts in here every once in a while and is blind, I think.

>
> This has nothing to do with Kim
> being a woman demonstrating that she is a "whole person" -- as if
> any of us thought women wern't "whole" people in the first place.
>

I think it has more to do with it, for you, than you realize Larry. Surely
you don't fixate yourself on my callsign just for the visual effects.

>
> However, don't worry -- I'm sure your liberal, feminist views were
> noted by Kim, and I'm sure you have earned her friendship -- although
> I can't understand why anyone would want it!
>

Actually, I can't stand most feminists. I think they're a bunch of whiney
rich brats that need validation other than good sex.

> >
> > It isn't a question of Kim's call sign bothering you--it's
> >just that you don't think she knows her place!
>
> I can't speak for Dick or Dave, but I, for one, could care less about
> Kim's so-called "place" and whether or not she knows it.
>

The phrase, Larry, just for your future reference, is that you *couldn't*
care less. That implies you are caring about as little as you possibly can.
Or, do you care more than you wish you did.

>
> All I know
> is that she selected a call sign which is potentially harmful to the
> positive image of the ARS -- and since she's a participant of this
> newsgroup, she has been called to task because of it.
>

I love how the argument "potentially" has come into play. That's hilarious.
I could also "potentially" kill someone the next time I get in a vehicle,
Larry. Shall I refrain from driving. In fact, with all the "potentials" in
life, we may as well just hit the easy chair.

>
> After a couple
> of thousand postings here and on the real "...one step closer to
> extinction" thread (it has only 3 dots in the ellipsis -- not four),
>

OHMYGAWD...looky, now there's a *REAL* and *FAKE* thread. ROFLMAO.

>
> she
> as still failed to adequately defend her decision to choose that
> call sign in anything like a convincing manner, thus proving that
> she only did it to call attention to herself by means of calling
> attention to her secondary sexual characteristics.
>

Ummm, they are my primary sexual characteristics, Larry, thank you very
much. And, there is no need for defense of my callsign. Only the argument
against that there are people who have attitudes like yours.

>
> This demonstrates
> extremely bad taste and poor judgment on her part, and does not
> create a positive image for YL hams, or women in general.
>

Awwwwww, is one of your whiney babes telling you all about how it's all *my*
fault that she is the way she is? Oh yeah, that's right, you have no babes.

>
> I am
> still unable to understand why she would do this, if not to
> proactively demonstrate her contempt for her fellow radio amateurs.
> Whatever "place" Kim may have in the world, it certainly isn't
> among radio amateurs who consider themselves to be intelligent,
> decent, respectable radio amateurs who are concerned with
> putting forth a positive public image.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

No, Larry, my place in the world is where ever there are real decent people.
You are on your part of the bands, and I am on mine, at any given point.
And, I will move if I ever hear your call, believe me. :o

Kim W5TIT

6191. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:41:48 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0koolsrf3@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29189
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"The Better Amateur Radio Federation" <Lloyd@msn.nospammmmm> wrote in
message news:2887f82b3e1477ab770fb88e3@taranews.net...
>
> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 06:52:43 GMT, Jim <91bxuc2hvc8e001@sneakemail.com>
wrote:
> : "The Better Amateur Radio Federation"
> : <lloyd_vfp.KV4FZliveson@msn.com.no.spammmmm> wrote in
> : news:df31ce2887f82b3e1477ab770fb88e3b@spamfreenews.com:
> : pathetic internet romance? hahahah
>
> You got that lie from Liar Wiseman, faggot boy.
>
> second complaint registered and some hackers told about your cable IP.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

The reason Lllardasssss Llllloyd's "romance " wasn't successful is because
he's GAY.

6192. Re: I made it home alive

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:54:20 UTC
From: WebDoc REACT Unit #602 <arcweb@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <IkIX7.13797$_K.1687092@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 29187

Rick Adams wrote in message ...
> Makes sense.
>
> BTW, we must live fairly near each other--I'm in Southcentral
>Michigan a little North of the Ohio line and, also, about 40-50
>minutes from Toledo.
>
> Rick
>
>--
>
>Rick Adams--KE8HH
>adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net
>
>"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
>will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."
>
>Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

I live 18 miles from Bowling Green Oh. Almost straight south of Adrian Mi.

Keith Hosman

6193. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 15:59:53 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ZLIX7.245310$3d2.12076142@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29190

Update on the Buffalo area: they received over SEVEN FEET of snow.
Rochester and some surrounding towns have sent snowplows to Buffalo to help.
Be glad you weren't stuck there! (they don't need radios, they need snow
removal equipment!)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011228205921.13985.00002119@mb-md.aol.com...
> In article <3c271712_2@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >In the spirit of the holiday season (whatever your
> >religious persuasion), I'd like to take this opportunity
> >to sincerely convey wishes for a happy holiday
> >season and a prosperous new year to you, on behalf
> >of both myself and the entire Board of Directors and
> >membership of No Code International.
> >
>
> Carl:
>
> Thank you. I just returned from an excellent Christmas with my
> family up in Buffalo; had to drive thru a blizaard this morning to
> get out of town! I hope you and all at NCI had a wonderful
> holiday season, and have a very safe and happy new year!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

6194. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:03:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DE950.ECB04D27@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29191

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Larry, you electronically stalked Ed until he gave up on this newsgroup.
> >Now you are electronically stalking Kim. Why do you get so much pleasure
> >from sadistically verbally assaulting your fellow hams?
>
> You are now electronically stalking me and sadistically accusing
> me of doing things I have not done.

Nope, I'm not, Larry. I'm merely relating what I have observed on
this newsgroup.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

6195. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:05:56 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DE9E4.C003F69A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29192

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> This thread isn't about me, Dick, Dave, or anyone else being an
> arbiter of morality. It's about the poor judgement of one ham ...

If what you judge to be poor judgment is not being an arbiter
of morality, pray tell, what is it? I think *your* judgment is
poor.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6196. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:07:21 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DEA39.F99CCD3A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29193

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Nobody is committing "assault and battery" on anyone else in this
> >> newsgroup, electronically or otherwise.
> > >
> > >Larry, your sadistic postings are there for all to see. How you can
> > >deny your verbal assaults is beyond comprehension.
> >
> > Stop electronically stalking me.

Mounting a defense against a stalker is not stalking, Larry.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

6197. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:08:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DEA86.19BEAC4C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29194

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> Since when has Ed Hare appointed you as his defender? The
> fact that you can't come up with any quotes from me to support
> what you've said only prove that you're a liar.

Nope, it only proves that I am too smart to fall for your
attempts to waste my time.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6198. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:11:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DEB23.F9F1667B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29195

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >The beauty of ham radio is that there needs be no meeting place or
> >meeting time or even a campsite picked out. Everyone gets on a
> >mountaintop repeater and decides where to camp out.
>
> And anyone with a suitable receiver can just listen and hear what the group
> decides.

An hour after the decision has been made? Miss that conversation and
he's out in the cold.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6199. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:14:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DEBE6.6C275D51@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29196

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Larry, when you say nocode techs are dumb-shits, the English
> >language implication is "all". If you meant "some", you should
> >have said "some". Would you like to correct your statement?
>
> No, I think I'd rather have you provide a copy/paste of that
> posting as proof that I actually said it. If you can't, then you're
> lying -- but that wouldn't be anything new, would it?

After thousands of people have read your numerous postings telling
us how dumbed-down techs are, there is no need for me to waste my
time digging up your old postings. Heck, you have even said that
post-restructuring generals and extras are dumbed-down.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6200. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:16:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DEC4C.94C6FA6D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29198

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> You have exactly one posting to produce the quote where I said
> "no-code Techs are [technical] dumb shits," or you have once again
> proven that you are a liar!

No need to waste my time that way, Larry. You have posted hundreds
of times that nocode techs are dumbed-down. You have even posted
that post-restructuring generals and extras are dumbed-down.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6201. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:17:35 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DEC9F.F6F5B2C3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29199

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Are you also so ignorant that you don't understand ratios, Larry?
> >Do you comprehend 1/2 = 1000000/2000000?
>
> Really? I'm not sure I understand.

Maybe you need to come to my GED math classes - they're free.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

6202. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:20:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DED3F.3BB032C5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29197

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >> You don't really want me to start dredging up some of the things you've
> >> said to Dick Carroll and Larry have them come back to prove you a liar,
> >> do you?
> > >
> > >They started it, Dave. I merely defended myself.
> >
> > How have you "defended" yourself?

I'm a mild-mannered guy, Larry, an Aquarian seeker of truth and
wisdom. But I do believe in self-defense. With bullies like you
and Dick around, don't expect me to be passive.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

6203. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:27:20 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DEEE8.23CE6BBD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29200

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I am
> still unable to understand why she would do this, if not to
> proactively demonstrate her contempt for her fellow radio amateurs.

Larry, even if the original reason was different, IMO, it has been
worth it to see Kim and her callsign get your goat.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6204. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:31:55 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DEFFB.95740808@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29201

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I've never stated that post-Restructuring Extras do not "deserve"
> their privileges -- only that they haven't had to make as much of an
> effort to learn the useful knowledge and skills that were required
> under the superior pre-Restructuring licensing system. The
> post-Restructuring Extras may therefore not value their privileges
> as much as the Pre's, and may be more prone to misbehave
> on-the-air.

So you have just said that post-restructuring extras don't
deserve their privileges, just in different words.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6205. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:33:54 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DF072.7A69ACB6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29202

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> This is not about me. Bert E-mailed me and made this posting in
> which he thanked me for encouraging him to learn and use CW. He
> is now going for his 20-WPM Code Proficiency certificate, which
> I think is great! I took no credit; he did all the work. All I did was
> tell him something I already knew about him, even he didn't at
> the time -- that he could learn and use CW if he made the decision
> to do so. Now, and in the future, he has the right to offer the same
> encouragement to others, and I hope they accept it the way he
> did!

Compare that treatment to the treatment of the pre-restructuring
extra who favored elimination of the Morse code test.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6206. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:40:22 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2DF1F6.4ABD4091@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29203

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The FCC has affirmed a November 2000 staff-level decision that
> declined to include privately imposed deed covenants, conditions and
> restrictions--CC&Rs--under the limited federal preemption known as
> PRB-1.

This is what I have been saying for years, Larry. CC&Rs are a
private contract willingly entered into when a ham buys or
rents a place to live. If you are opposed to that private
contract, then don't sign that private contract. It is not
the role of the federal government to overthrow private
contracts.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6207. Re: What not to say to a cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 16:52:57 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net>
Message-ID: <JxmX7.17175$qz4.4024064113@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29205
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Forge,
Please disregard any post made from hotmail
using my screen nic or addy. This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for over a year
now.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. Hotmailprivacy@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Be aware of George WA3MO^

"Landshark" <S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:773a0faf.0112282205.62b4dad6@posting.google.com...
> Typical forgery by the AKC trouble
> maker club king. First I write what I think is
> a truthful post about my gay past hoping
> that my little buddy will get the hint and
> move on from that topic. Now he's forging
> me from an account that the addy looks almost
> the same as mine. BE ON THE ALERT. I have
> switched to this hotmail account in order
> to confuse the little troll.
> Now all he can do is imitate me. We'll
> see who is the real Landshark.
> Here's a test: do a lookup on "Landshark"
> in the usenet archives. You will find all kinds
> of flames, innacuracies and crap posted by me,
> the real Landshark.
>
>
> Landshark
>
>
> --
> Please note that any post that is not from

> S3uell_SBCGlobalnet@hotmail.com is a FORGE.
> The "other" Landshark has been a troll on
> Rec.Radio.CB for a long time now. Be aware of
> Saucer Men and jock straps.

6208. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 17:55:42 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2E039E.464819AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29207

Jon Holder wrote:
> Want to give ham radio a Merry Christmas? Disband and turn amateur radio
> over to those who really worked for their licenses, those who learned
> CW!

Where in the Part 97 'Basis and purpose, subsection 97.1' does it mention
work? OTOH, your above posting violates the goodwill attribute.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6209. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 18:00:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2E04DA.EE828F2B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29208

Jon Holder wrote:
>
> MOVE WHERE?
>
> Most homes built after 1980 or so have CC&R's that pretty much prohibit
> antennas period.

It is not the responsibility of the federal government to provide
a ham with an antenna unrestricted home. It is the responsibility
of the individual to find an antenna unrestricted home. I have
lived in Houston, Silicon Valley, and the Phoenix area and never
had a problem with CC&Rs. I went so far as to buy two acres in
the Phoenix area for the purpose of erecting ham antennas.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6210. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 18:28:44 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2D52E8.4BB99D69@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29209
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

KC8JBO wrote:
>
>
> Translation: Lllloneely Llllardasssssssss Llllllloyd desperately want s to
> be a part of something, anything.

want s = wants, try to get it right, woger.

6211. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 18:53:10 UTC
From: Jon Holder <jaholder@grapevine.net>
Message-ID: <3C2E1116.E7714B1F@grapevine.net>
Source record: 29204

Whatever.

Want to give ham radio a Merry Christmas? Disband and turn amateur radio over to those who really worked for their licenses, those who learned CW!

6212. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 18:59:18 UTC
From: Jon Holder <jaholder@grapevine.net>
Message-ID: <3C2E1286.BAAFAA93@grapevine.net>
Source record: 29206

MOVE WHERE?

Most homes built after 1980 or so have CC&R's that pretty much prohibit
antennas period.

Krell wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20011228235150.13985.00002141@mb-md.aol.com...
>
> > Greetings All:
> >
> > To those who have been insisting that the FCC has the best interests
> > of the ARS at heart, I offer the following. I seems like "Restructuring"
> > isn't the only way they had in mind to put an end to our tomfoolery on
> > all this valuable RF real estate. Now they're saying licensed radio
> > amateurs don't have any need to establish a station in our own homes.
> > Get ready to lose some more spectrum -- and soon! Read it and weep...
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> I think you may be reading more into this than what is actually there.
> Besides, you may not be able to put up a 200 foot tower with a TH6DXX, but
> there are many ways to install a hidden antenna, or even put up a temporary
> antenna if you work only contests.
> Of course there is another option - MOVE!

6213. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 19:04:17 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0l40802m3k@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29210

"Jon Holder" <jaholder@grapevine.net> wrote in message
news:3C2E1286.BAAFAA93@grapevine.net...
> MOVE WHERE?
>
> Most homes built after 1980 or so have CC&R's that pretty much prohibit
> antennas period.

So? What's wrong with finding an older house? Sounds like you want to have
your cake and eat it, too.

6214. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 19:43:39 UTC
From: Glendale Autoparts <Glendale_Autoparts@BossHogStore.com>
Message-ID: <a0l6bt$b1r$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29211
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a0i5nm$mn1$4@dosa.alt.net...
> Lllardasssssssssss Llllllloyd aka
> "Joanie" <alt.flame@flameawayroger.com> wrote in message
> news:a0hph4ldp0@dosa.alt.net...
> > Why were you kicked out of the Air Force Roger?
>
> I wasn't DUMBASS. I have a Honorable Discharge (DD-256AF & on the DD-214).
> You 'll belive that fake preacher Turder and other imbeciles. You never
even
> served, Lardasssssss Llllllloyd, and are still a virgin. I 'd say you were
a
> homosexual, Llllardasssssss Llllllloyd.
>
>
> > See photo of KC8JBO and his pointed circus boy
> > head here: www.angelfire.com/al/sj61 courtesy of the
> > BARF chief of communications.
>
> See Llllardasssssssss Llllllloyd and his melon-shaped head, porky-pig like
> face,
> pencil mustache because his dominant female chromosomes won't allow
anything
> thicker, and that may be the reason the girls fall down with laughter when
> they are shown his tiny, miniscule nub that he tries to pass off as a
penis.
>
GOTCHA Woger, SPANK. The Air Force discharge is a
DD-4762-Q and it is not on a DD-214, only the character of the
discharge is on the DD-214, thus proving you never received a
honorable discharge!

6215. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 19:44:59 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112291144.74b93757@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29212
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!
"Roger Halstead" <rdhalste@tm.net>
news:CoyW7.1399$Dl1.693885@monger.newsread.com.

One more troll!

Roger (K8RI)

"Not a troll Roger, that web page exists, read it. Sporadic Waves has
been a mag for freebanders like me for a long time now. We are also
concerned about truckers on 10 meters as they are usurping our
expansion space. We are eyeing 12 meters as a solution"

6216. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 20:52:18 UTC
From: Jesus Slut Fucker: Usenet Adminstrator <pparis7@NOFUCKINGSPAMhome.com>;
Message-ID: <3C2E2B9E.6030800@NOFUCKINGSPAMhome.com>
Source record: 29213
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,alt.flamenet,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

John Kimball wrote:

> On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 17:56:09 -0500, "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in
> Message id: <a0j3i0aic2@dosa.alt.net>:
>
>
>>Homoxsexual pedophile pervert
>>"Joanie" <alt.flame@flameawayroger.com> wrote in message
>>news:a0i90u$4kn$0@pita.alt.net...
>>
>>>>>>> Why were you kicked out of the Air Force Roger?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> See photo of KC8JBO and his pointed circus boy
>>>>>>head here: www.angelfire.com/al/sj61 courtesy of the
>>>>>>BARF chief of communications.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>Man, that's one ugly fucking redneck. I almost feel sorry for 8L0J08.
>>>>>Almost. I bet that mustache is the pubic hair from his mothers twat.
>>>>>
>>No, it's from YOUR mommy's twat.
>>
>
> Well, that proves that the picture is indeed 8L0J08.
> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!
>
>
>>>>Damn, I was beaten to the punch. I wanted to be the first to come up
>>>>with a photo of Woger. Oh well. I'll have one of his mommie's house in a
>>>>few days. By all reports it's a beat up shack.
>>>>
>>>>
>>> The photo is about 20 years old.
>>>
>>BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA Prove it.
>>
>
> You just did, you perennial fuckup. See above.
>
>
>>>Roger tried to pass himself off as looking younger.
>>>
>>While "Joanie" tries to pass himself off on the liberty net as straight.

>>BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...over 50 years old and never been
>>married....bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha.then ol' Steve Turdeater goes up
>>to Richland, OH and fucks his momma up the ass.
>>
>>
>>>Truth is Roger is fat now, very fat, with
>>>
>><guffaw> Suuuuure I am, FATASS.
>>
>>
>>
>>>gray hair and looks beyond his years from smoking dope.
>>>
>>Bwhahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha.. that why I got carded a few weeks ago
>>when I bought some beer?
>>
>
> Probably because you're only 4"11".

...and acts like a four year old....

>
>>>Marshall county property tax records are on line and show the
>>>house Roger lives in is owned by his mother and only his mother,
>>>
>>BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA Marshall county tax records are not
>>on line, you fucking imbecile.
>>
>
> How does it feel to be so outed, 8L0J08?

The very funny thing is that I can't find where Woger paid any federal
income tax. Funny thing though, his mommie Marie claims a dependent. I
suspect it is 50 something Woger. This is the loser that laughed the
hardest about Henne having to move back in with his mommie.

-Jesus

--

Do as thousands of Gay men have already done and view Woger's
home page, Woger's page contains contact numbers, you can sign
his guest book, send him e-mail or just look at his loser ass:

http://home.gay.com/8L0J08/

Or:

Woger Wiseman's Profile:

http://profiles.gay.com/scripts/viewprofile?for=8L0J08

_____
Further sicking pics of Woger:

http://www.angelfire.com/al/sj61

CAPTAIN FAG UNMASKED:
http://members.home.net/pparis7/Jesus/flag.htm

Other Gay.com flamer profiles:

Aaron Henne:
http://profiles.gay.com/scripts/viewprofile?for=flaagg1

Brent Hamm aka The Terminator
http://profiles.gay.com/scripts/viewprofile?for=termy

Get Your Jesus Slut Fucker Newsgroups Here:

news://news.epita.fr/alt.fan.giant-fucking-dick-jesus-slut-fucker
news://newscache0.freenet.de/alt.fan.giant-fucking-dick-jesus-slut-fucker
news://newscache3.freenet.de/alt.fan-giant-fucking-dick-jesus-slut-fucker
news://newscache1.freenet.de/alt.fan-giant-fucking-dick-jesus-slut-fucker
news://ftp.tomica.ru/alt.fan-giant-fucking-dick-jesus-slut-fucker
news://newscache2.freenet.de/alt.fan.giant-fucking-dick-jesus-slut-fucker
news://209.11.114.102/alt.fan.giant-fucking-dick-jesus-slut-fucker
news://202.85.164.51/alt.fan.giant-fucking-dick-jesus-slut-fucker

Woger Wiseman Newsgroups:

news://news.epita.fr/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache0.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache3.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache1.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://ftp.tomica.ru/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman
news://newscache2.freenet.de/alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

6217. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:03:07 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <3C1B3B88FA43535E.A1ECAAA4C530805D.A8961E2562F81507@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29214

On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:49 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Hmmm...so Rick Adams has called me an "ass" on this newsgroup,
>while at the same time threatening to have my internet access
>terminated for expressing my opinion about Kim's poor choice of a
>call sign?

1. If you make yourself into an ass, it's only fitting to
identify you as one.

2. I NEVER "threatened to have your internet access
terminated." That is a typical Larry Roll lie. Quote back my "threat,"
Larry. Put up or Shut up.

3. You don't "express your opinion" of Kim's call sign, Larry,
you harass her about it in every thread you find her in. Clearly, the
only way you can convince yourself that you are still a "man" is to
intimidate a woman, and it's obviously enraging you that she isn't
being intimidated by your cheap and shoddy actions.

>Mind your *own* jawbone, Rick!

Larry, go take your Viagra, dig out your Hustler magazine, and
pretend that you can find a woman that would put up with you.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6218. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:09:01 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <7E11FD656F8B94AC.077AE5ECB086D813.090F155996AAB65A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29215

On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:48 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:
>This thread isn't about me, Dick, Dave, or anyone else being an
>arbiter of morality.

Of course it is. It's YOUR thread and you're trying to be the
arbiter of Kim's morality. Why ELSE would you continue to hound her
about her call sign?

>It's about the poor judgement of one ham in
>choosing a call sign which portrays female radio amateurs in an
>undeservedly negative manner, reflects a poor image of all radio
>amateurs, and has potential for harm to the image of the ARS
>which has been recognized by a high-profile radio amateur who
>also happens to be an FCC official.

No, Larry. That's pure bull and any intelligent person in this
ng knows it.

What this thread is about is Larry Roll trying to prove his
manhood by harassing a fellow ham into capitulating to your
unreasonable demands and out-of-date values. You started the thread.
You insist that you will perpetuate it until Kim changes her call. You
are the one who preaches about the ARS. Try acting like a responsible
ham instead of a spoiled three year-old and stop trying to impose your
values on others if you feel so strongly about representing the ARS
responsibly.

>There is nothing going on
>here other than hams giving their opinions on a policy-related
>matter, which is well within the bounds of the topics germane to
>this newsgroup.

Kim's call sign has absolutely nothing to do with ham radio
policy--even YOU can't be stupid enough to think people will believe
that dishonest statement!

You don't want to talk about policy, Larry, you want to harass
a woman because she won't give in to your demands.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6219. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:09:29 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <A10FD5715EDEE559.243BCAFF50116CA3.B1FC68CC611407D6@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29216

On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:47 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Stop electronically stalking me.

Grow up, you idiot!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6220. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:12:00 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <5EC2616372D482F4.E48391021E9BF3EA.BF221493688BD774@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29217

On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 20:58:07 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>I think Dick is a figment of my imagination... ;)

Then please stop sharing your nightmares with the rest of
us--he's giving ham radio a bad name (and odor)!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6221. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:15:19 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <469872877C743924.3D38E761281E55BC.54CCFDA5C1CE2793@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29218

On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 03:18:30 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
wrote:
> A one-liner from you simply means you have no valid response.

Or doesn't want to waste one on someone as unimportant as you.

> Paranoid? Not very, but enough that I sure don't intend to stand there and let
>some clown take me out "on my own terms":...

Whose terms DO you let clowns take you out on?

Geez, Dick, Clowns? You're even kinkier than Dave with his
mid-winter camping trips with guys!

Get your mind off Kim's TIT, Dickie, it's making you remember
the joys of your fetishes.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6222. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:24:34 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C2E428E.BF9584B2@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29219
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Twistedhed didn't write:
>
> Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!
> "Roger Halstead" <rdhalste@tm.net>
> news:CoyW7.1399$Dl1.693885@monger.newsread.com.
>
> One more troll!
>
> Roger (K8RI)
>
> "Not a troll Roger, that web page exists, read it. Sporadic Waves has
> been a mag for freebanders like me for a long time now. We are also
> concerned about truckers on 10 meters as they are usurping our
> expansion space. We are eyeing 12 meters as a solution"

ATTENTION NEWSGROUP PEOPLE!!!

If you see any cross-posted messages with the groups.google.com organization,
consider it highly suspect as a forge and DO NOT RESPOND! Thank you.

6223. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:26:36 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8AB10CD9FBCDFA43.AF0493CC6D58AB55.A816DC4932F586D1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29220

On 29 Dec 2001 03:03:13 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>> Sure--because you think you know better than Kim what is "good
>>for the ARS."
>
>And Kim thinks she knows better than me what is good for the ARS. So do you.

Not at all, Jim.

Kim simply doesn't feel that her PERSONAL choice of a
perfectly legal call sign is anyone's business but her own, and I
happen to agree.

This "good for the ARS" crap is a smoke screen. No one in his
or her right mind would seriously believe that Kim's call sign will
make even the slightest difference to the ARS and you know that as
well as I do. What is really going on is a witch hunt in which a group
of crotchety, grouchy, old men are enraged because they can't
intimidate a woman into obeying them. I'm sorry you feel the need to
support that kind of disgusting behavior toward a fellow ham, but
obviously you do.

>And a lot of folks think I'm right. Doesn't matter - it's not up to a vote.

That's right, Jim, it isn't.

KIM made her choice--she didn't ask the people here to help
her decide if she SHOULD do so or not, and thus it isn't up to anyone
here to try to harass her into changing her sign. I don't give a
flying damn if every ham in the news group feels her call is
inappropriate (which obviously is NOT the case)--it is HER call sign,
not their's, and her decision alone that is relevant.

>I think what really bugs you, Rick, is that there are some of us here on rrap
>who you cannot intimidate and who state our opinions as we see them regardless
>of how electropolitically incorrect they may be to some.

Who _I_ can't intimidate? You self-righteous prig, it is YOU
and your cronies who are trying to intimidate someone--Kim--into doing
something that she doesn't wish to do (change her call sign). Who in
the hell gave you right wing fanatics the right to try to intimidate
someone into capitulating to your prudish demands?

You're a bunch of losers, Jim. And it is hams like you, Larry,
Dick and Dave who are bringing the ARS "one step closer to extinction"
with your outrageous behavior, blatant harassment, and attempted
intimidation of another ham.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6224. New topic: Quality or Quantity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:37:59 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <bBrX7.745$9d.126208@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 29221

Here's a new topic for all!

Regardless of mode or band of transmission, is ham radio really about the quality of the QSO or the quantity of the QSO's?? And state why please.

Ryan KC8PMX

6225. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:39:50 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0liisgpb1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29227
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Perverted Pedophile with the mangled face
"Goo-gobbling Joanie" <Glendale_Autoparts@BossHogStore.com> wrote in message
news:a0l6bt$b1r$0@dosa.alt.net...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:a0i5nm$mn1$4@dosa.alt.net...
> > Lllardasssssssssss Lllllloyd aka
> > "Joanie" <alt.flame@flameawayroger.com> wrote in message
> > news:a0hph4ldp0@dosa.alt.net...
> > > Why were you kicked out of the Air Force Roger?
> >
> > I wasn't DUMBASS. I have a Honorable Discharge (DD-256AF & on the
DD-214).
> > You 'll belive that fake preacher Turder and other imbeciles. You never
> even
> > served, Lardasssssss Lllllloyd, and are still a virgin. I 'd say you
were
> a
> > homosexual, Llllardasssss Lllllloyd.

[...]

> > See Llllardasssssss Lllllloyd and his melon-shaped head, porky-pig like
> > face,
> > pencil mustache because his dominant female chromosomes won't allow
> anything
> > thicker, and that may be the reason the girls fall down with laughter
when
> > they are shown his tiny, miniscule nub that he tries to pass off as a
> penis.
> >
> GOTCHA Woger, SPANK. The Air Force discharge is a
> DD-4762-Q

It may be NOW, but not when I served, Clusterfuck.

>and it is not on a DD-214,

Learn to fucking read, I didn't say it WAS on a DD214, I said my discharge
is printied on a DD-256 AF.

>only the character of the
> discharge is on the DD-214, thus proving you never received a
> honorable discharge!

Really, then how cAn I explain those papers that are right in front of me now?
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
The AIR FORCE DISCHARGE was issued on a DD-256-AF when I served, DUMBFUCK. The DD-214 is the Report of Seperation of Active Duty, the section e. has character of service in which "Honorable" is typed there.which proves you never fucking served at all.
Why does W4NTI discuss his DD-214 if it doesn't exist. You are one dumb fucking, taliban supporting, UNAMERICAN .

6226. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:41:05 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0liitgpb2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29228
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
Known convicted felon
"JizzRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C2D52E8.4BB99D69@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> >
> > Translation: Lllllloneely Llllllardassssssssss Llllllloyd desperately want
s to
> > be a part of something, anything.
>
> want s = wants, try to get it right, woger.

Try beginning a sentence with a capital letter, dumbfuck.
```

6227. New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:42:14 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <aFrX7.746$9d.125819@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 29222

What are your Amateur Radio goals for 2002? Try something new?? Elmer someone?? Promote the hobby better?? Build something?? Or ?? Please keep the topic somewhat close to Amateur Radio..

May you be blessed with a safe and wonderful 2002!

Ryan KC8PMX

6228. ARES/RACES ACTIVITIES

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:44:43 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <vHrX7.747$9d.126510@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 29223

What is your local ARES/RACES group doing on the local basis? Do they just get together to meet or are they active in training and other activities? What are those activities and training they are pursuing? We are using the January meeting of 2002 for our local group to do a "evaluation" to see where we are at, and of course, where we need to go forward with and always looking for new, great ideas.

Ryan KC8PMX

6229. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 22:49:00 UTC
From: archer@topnow.com
Message-ID: <31b19051.0112291448.4c9be3f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29224
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:<a0koolsrf3@dosa.alt.net>...

> The reason Lllardasssss Llllloyd's "romance " wasn't successful is because
> he's GAY.

Gads, I HOPE NOT! Lloyd would pass neither the minimum intelligence nor style
requirements needed to be accepted in such company. The scummiest gay person
I know personally beats Lloyd as a human being, any old day.

-- Ross

6230. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 23:02:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011229180241.24724.00000581@mb-mr.aol.com>
Source record: 29225

In article <a0jna8hch1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

(N2EY wrote):.
>>
>> The only difference between the operating privileges of an Extra and an
>> Advanced are a few subbands on 80, 40, 20 and 15. Extras get no additional
>> modes or power - the ONLY difference is those little subbands. What
>> "qualifications" are needed to operate on, say, 3524 that are not needed
>to
>> operate on 3526?
>
>So then are you suggesting that the former Advanced test should be
>the requirement for Extra...rather than the current Extra syllabus?

Nope.

Carl (WA6VSE) has said that existing Advanceds should not be given Extra class licenses without passing the Extra class test because those Advanceds have not demonstrated the necessary qualifications. I'm simply trying to figure out what qualifications he's talking about.

Carl describes incentive licensing as "a dismal failure" and says that license test requirements should ONLY be based on demonstrating the necessary qualifications.

>> Devil's advocate hat off.

>> Shall we review how the written tests were cut in number and size again?
>
>Not because of any request of NCI.

Carl also says that the writtens are not "dumbed down", even though their size and number was radically decreased on April 15, 2000.
>
>> >> The whole Extra written test! Today, a current Advanced has to take
>> >> a 50 question written to get the Extra - same as a General.
>> >> Auto-upgrade would not go over big with some folks.
>> >
>> >And the more technical content (not that it's THAT hard, but it's
>> >reasonable for granting a license to operate and experiment)
>> >is virtually all in the Extra test now ... the written elements for
>> >General are quite elementary ...
>>
>> Devil's advocate hat back on...
>>

>> WHY is that "technical content" essential for OPERATING privileges, or to
>> experiment? All US hams except Novices can use ALL authorized modes and
>> frequencies above 30 Mhz right now - the FCC thinks the written testing is
>> adequate. Current Generals, who have been tested even less than Advanceds,
>can
>> experiment on every band and mode authorized to US hams - they just can't
>use
>> some subbands on 80/40/20/15.
>>
>> Devil's advocate hat off.
>> >
>> >Now who's proposing to "dumb down" amateur radio???
>> >
>> Not me.
>
>Could'a fooled me by your devil's advocate scenarios.

You're missing my point then, Bill. All I've done is point out the facts and
conclusions that follow logically IF one accepts Carl's philosophy of license
testing.

>> >With the 20 wpm gone, I have little
>> >sympathy for someone who isn't willing to take a relatively easy
>> >50 question written test to upgrade from adanced to extra.
>>
>> 20 wpm was relatively easy for many hams, and relatively tough for others.
>Same
>> for the written tests.
>
>I doubt the equivalence of that comparison. I'd suggest more
>people can get up to speed for the written than with the 20wpm.
>One can "study" the written in many forums (ARRL license manuals,
>QRZ online, etc.). Not so for practicing to pass 20 wpm.

Not at all! One can practice 20 wpm on the air, with a computer, or with tapes
or other recordings. MFJ even makes a "personal code trainer".
>
>> Sounds to me like you want to make everyone jump through the same written
>test
>> hoops you did.
>
>Surely you jest :-)

No, I'm quite serious.
>
>> > why should anyone get a total freebie??? If they
>> >don't want to, or don't have the time to, upgrade, they should
>> >remain satisfied with what they have. There is no reason to
>> >change the system ... nobody should get privileges they aren't
>> >qualified for, nor should anyone lose privileges they've already
>> >earned.

>>
>> Sounds like what some folks were saying before the restructuring.
>> Folks you vehemently disagree with.
>
>That argument/analogy only holds IF you believe the current
>testing requirements for the written are unreasonable and/or
>unjustified.

If one accepts Carl's statements, they ARE unjustified beyond the General
level.
>
>> >The FCC's system "knows" who is an "old" Tech Plus and who is not,
>>
>> They do? Then why not just hand out Generals to them?
>
>Because many have NOT passed the General written. Most of those
>that have passed General (i.e. pre 1987) have upgraded already if they are
>still active and know about restructuring.

Yet Carl suggests giving them HF privileges to operate "modern digital modes"
and even voice privileges.

>> I say having "subbands by mode type" gives the best compromise.
>> >
>> >> >What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???
>> >>
>> >> Offer an upgrade incentive.
>> >
>> >"Incentive Licensing" was a dismal failure ...
>>
>> How do you figure? It was all about increasing technical knowledge. I
>think it
>> was propelled by Sputnik fever.
>
>If so it was 10 years in the making...Sputnick was 1957 as
>I recall.

Yes, it was.

Sputnik (note the spelling) was launched in 1957, an soon thereafter (1958) the
FCC started asking about ways to entice more hams to take the Extra exam.
Nothing much formal happened until 1963, when the ARRL BoD responded with a
proposal that became RM-299. This was followed by a number of proposals,
suggestions and counterproposals, ending in the 1966(?) announcement of
"incentive licensing". First phase went into effect in late 1967.

Remember that during the 1957-1963 period the Soviets had one space triumph
after another while the US tried to catch up.

>> > philosophically,
>> >I agree with prior comments that power limitations make more
>> >sense than mode limitations, since they are more solidly based

>> >on some reasonable relation to one's technical knowledge,
>> >as demonstrated by passing the more difficult tests.
>>
>> Huh? The FCC sez Techs are qualified to use 1.5 kW transmitters on
>VHF/UHF -
>> are they wrong?
>
>I believe they are on that point.

So the mere fact that FCC does something isn't proof that it's the right thing
to do. What a concept!

>> >adanceds have declined
>> >about 20k since "restructuring," through the same mechanisms
>> >... tech+'s have declined about 45k, presumably mostly through
>> >upgrades to general, and those who don't upgrade will be
>> >renewed as techs, but retain their (limited) HF privs ...
>>
>> Same for those classes.
>
>I looked at the Spumoni data today...my guess is
>that those declines and changes will continue for
>several years.

The Speroni (note the spelling) data is a big help, but I use another source
that keeps Techs and Tech Pluses separate.
>
>> >What's the problem with this? Over time, through upgrades
>> >and attrition, we will have only 3 license classes ... some
>> >might argue that 2 is sufficient (that's the norm in much of
>> >the world and it doesn't seem to cause any problem), but
>> >I'm OK with 3 ... particularly if the "power vs. technical
>> >knowledge" thing were enacted, though *I'm* certainly not
>> >planning to propose it ...
>>
>> Then we have a patchwork system for many years to come. New Techs continue
>to
>> get full power licenses for just a 35 question test, while HF/MF remains
>> primarily in the hands of Generals and above. Newcomers still face the
>"200
>> page book just to use an HT" problem W1RFI describes. And getting full
>> privileges requires jumping through written test hoops just to get more
>> spectrum.
>>
>> The future deserves better.
>
>Your suggestion then is?

Posted here a few days ago - the "Basic/Intermediate/Full" system. I can post
it again if you want.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6231. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 23:09:38 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <9E33B83C3A945BD6.DF7A150EDDE14856.99CF88BB207AF109@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29226

On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:45 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>If there were any other YL hams in this newsgroup, it is entirely
>likely that at least one of them would take offense to Kim's call
>sign, and state so in this thread.

What on earth makes you think there AREN'T other women in this
group, Larry? The fact that none of them has come out to agree with
your nonsense about Kim's call? Perhaps they don't feel like being the
next target of your holier-than-thou witch hunt.

>This has nothing to do with Kim
>being a woman demonstrating that she is a "whole person" -- as if
>any of us thought women wern't "whole" people in the first place.

Obviously you see women as "whole people." You simply see them
as INFERIOR "whole people."

>However, don't worry -- I'm sure your liberal, feminist views were
>noted by Kim, and I'm sure you have earned her friendship -- although
>I can't understand why anyone would want it!

Because, unlike you and the rest of the stooges, she has
class, honesty, and intelligence.

Seems like a good reason to me.

>I can't speak for Dick or Dave,

Why not? You're all clones anyway.

>but I, for one, could care less about
>Kim's so-called "place" and whether or not she knows it.

Sure.

> All I know
>is that she selected a call sign which is potentially harmful to the
>positive image of the ARS -- and since she's a participant of this
>newsgroup, she has been called to task because of it.

Who the hell elected YOU the ham-cops for the news group? If
you don't like her call, mind your own damn business you hypocritical
busy-body!

> After a couple
>of thousand postings here and on the real "...one step closer to
>extinction" thread (it has only 3 dots in the ellipsis -- not four), she

>as still failed to adequately defend her decision to choose that
>call sign in anything like a convincing manner, thus proving that
>she only did it to call attention to herself by means of calling
>attention to her secondary sexual characteristics.

Perhaps you can explain why on earth you think she has any
obligation TO "defend her decision." Get off your pedestal, Larry, she
has no obligation to defend, explain, justify, or accept your
judgement on this or any other decision she makes. It's HER call sign,
you mental midget, not yours. And it's HER decision. Don't like it?
Tough. Live with it.

> This demonstrates
>extremely bad taste and poor judgment on her part, and does not
>create a positive image for YL hams, or women in general.

No you stupid cretin, it demonstrates independence and
self-confidence, two qualities I'm quite sure you HATE to see in a
woman.

>I am
>still unable to understand why she would do this, if not to
>proactively demonstrate her contempt for her fellow radio amateurs.

Larry, get a grip.

She didn't "DO" anything to you or to the ARS. She made a
personal choice about a personal matter, and since she did so you have
made it your life's work to harass and ridicule her in this news
group. It is YOU who demonstrate contempt for your fellow hams, not
Kim.

>Whatever "place" Kim may have in the world, it certainly isn't
>among radio amateurs who consider themselves to be intelligent,
>decent, respectable radio amateurs who are concerned with
>putting forth a positive public image.

How would you know--you certainly don't qualify for that group
yourself.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6232. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 23:14:01 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0lj1g$i2f$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29229
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ross Archer" <archer@topnow.com> wrote in message
news:31b19051.0112291448.4c9be3f8@posting.google.com...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:<a0koolsrf3@dosa.alt.net>...
>
> > The reason Lllardasssss Llllloyd's "romance " wasn't successful is
because
> > he's GAY.
>
> Gads, I HOPE NOT! Lloyd would pass neither the minimum intelligence nor
style
> requirements needed to be accepted in such company. The scummiest gay
person
> I know personally beats Lloyd as a human being, any old day.
>
> -- Ross

LOL!!!!! That's funny, Ross.
But you've got to admit, somebody who's almost thirty years old an still a
virgin has to be well, you know. lol!

6233. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 23:21:35 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <E447BB6B107727DE.124A1E3F3A33C370.703D7850046C58A1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29230

On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:50 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Greetings All:
>
>To those who have been insisting that the FCC has the best interests
>of the ARS at heart, I offer the following. I seems like "Restructuring"
>isn't the only way they had in mind to put an end to our tomfoolery on
>all this valuable RF real estate. Now they're saying licensed radio
>amateurs don't have any need to establish a station in our own homes.
>Get ready to lose some more spectrum -- and soon! Read it and weep...
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

More "gloom and doom" Larry?

Get a grip! Simply because the FCC doesn't view it as
essential for a ham to have a permanent station location does NOT mean
they are trying to strip any frequencies from us. With today's
equipment, you DON'T need a permanent station location--modern rigs
are very capable of mobile or portable operations, something that the
HF rigs a few decades ago weren't really suited for.

It's a ham's choice whether or not he or she will move into an
area with antenna restrictions--no one is forced to do so, they can
live elsewhere if they feel the restrictions are more important than
the location. If enough hams take the attitude that they won't buy
homes in restricted communities, and if that has an economic impact on
the community, the restrictions will disappear. If not, it's a simple
question of market economics (non-hams may be MORE willing to buy in
an area where antennas are banned), not something that involves (or
SHOULD involve) the government directly.

Don't like a restriction? Don't sign a purchase agreement for
property until you know it doesn't have any in its deed of title.

Sounds simple enough to me.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6234. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 23:34:09 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112291534.19deabfe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29231

>
> Brian,
> I passed the Extra so I have the "option" of operating anywhere
> in the ham bands/modes authorized for a USA ham. I almost
> never operate in Extra subbands....BUT I always have the
> option if I want to. Additionally, Extra allows me to be a
> VE for any level testing.
>
As a low-band dxer/contester I'd be severely limited if I couldn't
operate in the setasides. Not counting 2m ops I probably spend 3/4 of
my time in the cw & phone Extra setasides. Fact is that I'd still be a
General if the FCC hadn't reshuffled the deck in '68, I took the Extra
exam simply to get my most valuable spectrum space BACK. Good thing
RRAP wasn't around then huh? The VE system wasn't even on the horizon
back then. To each their own depending on what one does with a ham
ticket when and why.
>
>
> > If bragging rights is the name of the game then what the hell, thee me
> > and gazillions of others around here did the 20wpm thing at our
> > neigborhood FCC offices which the lightweights around here will never
> > do.
>
> If it makes you feel good, feel free to brag all you want.
>
>
I said *IF* bragging rights is the name of the game . . .
>
>
Or as N2EY sez "If ya done it it ain't bragging."
>
>
> Cheers and Happy Holidays
> Bill K2UNK
>
dit-dit.
>
w3rv

6235. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 23:34:37 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <90E3D6D1570A9910.83930DFBE28A5089.C902006E0695907E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29232

On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 09:07:24 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
wrote:

>Take a look in the mirror, Dick C. There's a big bust waiting for you
>there.

There is?

Maybe that's why Dick is so offended by your call sign.

He wanted it for himself!

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6236. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 23:37:04 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2E53A0.F657108A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29233

KC8PMX wrote:
> What are your Amateur Radio goals for 2002?

To try to stay alive until the next straight key night.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6237. Re: I made it home alive

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-29 23:44:26 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <8B0394A9B4095697.DB57949AE4A0C1F9.3F69CF8D1D28DAC1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29234

On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 10:54:20 -0500, "WebDoc REACT Unit #602"
<arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:

>I live 18 miles from Bowling Green Oh. Almost straight south of Adrian Mi.

Like I said--we live fairly near each other. One of the
campuses I teach at is in Adrian (I'll be there throughout the Winter
term on Tuesday nights in fact).

Have a great day,

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6238. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 00:00:25 UTC
From: f1dfr@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <a4a80311.0112291600.21adbcd7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29235

Jon Holder <jaholder@grapevine.net> wrote in message
news:<3C2E1116.E7714B1F@grapevine.net>...
> Whatever.
>
> Want to give ham radio a Merry Christmas? Disband and turn amateur radio
> over to those who really worked for their licenses, those who learned
> CW!

WORK ? for a hobby ? This guy is totally mad !!

Yesterday, I was talking with the CPU of my IC-746 (it's a special
version who talks ...) and asked "Must I know CW to use your HF bands
?" and he said "Of course no, just select the band you want to use and
speak normally in the mike like on VHF bands". That ICOM TRX is really
a good friend !

Happy new year 2002 to all people who want to suppress the S.25-5 in
2003 !!

Only a year and a half to wait for the end of the CW facism ... I
suggest a site
with a daily countdown to the next WRC opening. The event will be
greater than the break of Berlin's wall.

6239. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 00:09:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0lm8k$q4j$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29236

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011229180241.24724.00000581@mb-mr.aol.com...
> In article <a0jna8hch1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> (N2EY wrote):.
> >>
> >> The only difference between the operating privileges of an Extra and an
> >> Advanced are a few subbands on 80, 40, 20 and 15. Extras get no
additional
> >> modes or power - the ONLY difference is those little subbands. What
> >> "qualifications" are needed to operate on, say, 3524 that are not
needed
> >to
> >> operate on 3526?
> >
> >So then are you suggesting that the former Advanced test should be
> >the requirement for Extra...rather than the current Extra syllabus?
>
> Nope.
>
> Carl (WA6VSE) has said that existing Advanceds should not be given Extra
class
> licenses without passing the Extra class test because those Advanceds have
not
> demonstrated the necessary qualifications. I'm simply trying to figure out
what
> qualifications he's talking about.

Very simple...the Extra class written exam. Before the NEW structure,
all that involved was the 4B (I think that was it) which
I and others passed and obtained CSCE credit for. Once 4/15/00
came and went, we had a paper upgrade. Those that were advanced
and didn't follow that path now have a "combined" 4A/4B exam to contend
with. That's the breaks.

> Carl describes incentive licensing as "a dismal failure" and says that
license
> test requirements should ONLY be based on demonstrating the necessary
> qualifications.

And that's what it is per my comments above.

> >> Devil's advocate hat off.
>

> >> Shall we review how the written tests were cut in number and size
again?
> >
> >Not because of any request of NCI.
>
> Carl also says that the writtens are not "dumbed down", even though their
size
> and number was radically decreased on April 15, 2000.

The number of questions doesn't change the scope and
or difficulty of learning the knowledge needed
to pass.

> >> >> The whole Extra written test! Today, a current Advanced has to take
> >> >> a 50 question written to get the Extra - same as a General.
> >> >> Auto-upgrade would not go over big with some folks.
> >> >
> >> >And the more technical content (not that it's THAT hard, but it's
> >> >reasonable for granting a license to operate and experiment)
> >> >is virtually all in the Extra test now ... the written elements for
> >> >General are quite elementary ...
> >>
> >> Devil's advocate hat back on...
> >>
> >> WHY is that "technical content" essential for OPERATING privileges, or
to
> >> experiment? All US hams except Novices can use ALL authorized modes and
> >> frequencies above 30 Mhz right now - the FCC thinks the written testing
is
> >> adequate. Current Generals, who have been tested even less than
Advanceds,
> >> can experiment on every band and mode authorized to US hams - they just
> >> can't use some subbands on 80/40/20/15.
> >>
> >> Devil's advocate hat off.
> >> >
> >> >Now who's proposing to "dumb down" amateur radio???
> >> >
> >> Not me.
> >
> >Could'a fooled me by your devil's advocate scenarios.
>
> You're missing my point then, Bill. All I've done is point out the facts
and
> conclusions that follow logically IF one accepts Carl's philosophy of
license
> testing.

The question then is on what do you wish to see happen
with the testing...status quo, change to something else?

> >> >With the 20 wpm gone, I have little
> >> >sympathy for someone who isn't willing to take a relatively easy
> >> >50 question written test to upgrade from adanced to extra.
> >>
> >> 20 wpm was relatively easy for many hams, and relatively tough for
others.
> >> Same for the written tests.
> >
> >I doubt the equivalence of that comparison. I'd suggest more
> >people can get up to speed for the written than with the 20wpm.
> >One can "study" the written in many forums (ARRL license manuals,
> >QRZ online, etc.). Not so for practicing to pass 20 wpm.
>
> Not at all! One can practice 20 wpm on the air, with a computer, or with
tapes
> or other recordings. MFJ even makes a "personal code trainer".

The point is that it involves onter devices to do the practice.
Reading a text manual on the written test is something
people can do in alot more venues than practicing code.

> >> Sounds to me like you want to make everyone jump through the same
written
> >> test hoops you did.
> >
> >Surely you jest :-)
>
> No, I'm quite serious.

Then exactly WHAT do YOU want as requirements?

> >> > why should anyone get a total freebie??? If they
> >> >don't want to, or don't have the time to, upgrade, they should
> >> >remain satisfied with what they have. There is no reason to
> >> >change the system ... nobody should get privileges they aren't
> >> >qualified for, nor should anyone lose privileges they've already
> >> >earned.
> >>
> >> Sounds like what some folks were saying before the restructuring.
> >> Folks you vehemently disagree with.
> >
> >That argument/analogy only holds IF you believe the current
> >testing requirements for the written are unreasonable and/or
> >unjustified.
>
> If one accepts Carl's statements, they ARE unjustified beyond the General
> level.

I don't see the logic in your conclusion.

> >> >The FCC's system "knows" who is an "old" Tech Plus and who is not,
> >>
> >> They do? Then why not just hand out Generals to them?

> >
> >Because many have NOT passed the General written. Most of those
> >that have passed General (i.e. pre 1987) have upgraded already if they
are
> >still active and know about restructuring.
>
> Yet Carl suggests giving them HF privileges to operate "modern digital
> modes" and even voice privileges.
>
> >> I say having "subbands by mode type" gives the best compromise.
> >> >
> >> >> >What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???
> >> >>
> >> >> Offer an upgrade incentive.
> >> >
> >> >"Incentive Licensing" was a dismal failure ...
> >>
> >> How do you figure? It was all about increasing technical knowledge. I
> >> think it was propelled by Sputnik fever.
> >
> >If so it was 10 years in the making...Sputnick was 1957 as
> >I recall.
>
> Yes, it was.
>
> Sputnik (note the spelling) was launched in 1957, an soon thereafter
(1958) the
> FCC started asking about ways to entice more hams to take the Extra exam.
> Nothing much formal happened until 1963, when the ARRL BoD responded with
a
> proposal that became RM-299. This was followed by a number of proposals,
> suggestions and counterproposals, ending in the 1966(?) announcement of
> "incentive licensing". First phase went into effect in late 1967.
>
> Remember that during the 1957-1963 period the Soviets had one space
triumph
> after another while the US tried to catch up.

Whch had more to do with physics and rocketry than
anything electronic.

> >> > philosophically,
> >> >I agree with prior comments that power limitations make more
> >> >sense than mode limitations, since they are more solidly based
> >> >on some reasonable relation to one's technical knowledge,
> >> >as demonstrated by passing the more difficult tests.
> >>
> >> Huh? The FCC sez Techs are qualified to use 1.5 kW transmitters on
> >VHF/UHF -
> >> are they wrong?
> >

> >I believe they are on that point.
>
> So the mere fact that FCC does something isn't proof that it's the right
thing
> to do. What a concept!

We can always agree to disagree. The issue of disagreement, if severe,
ends up being adjuticated by the courts. No one has taken the FCC
to that path regarding any disagreement as to ham requirements to my
knowledge.

> >> >advanceds have declined
> >> >about 20k since "restructuring," through the same mechanisms
> >> >... tech+'s have declined about 45k, presumably mostly through
> >> >upgrades to general, and those who don't upgrade will be
> >> >renewed as techs, but retain their (limited) HF privs ...
> >>
> >> Same for those classes.
> >
> >I looked at the Spumoni data today...my guess is
> >that those declines and changes will continue for
> >several years.
>
> The Speroni (note the spelling) data is a big help, but I use another
source
> that keeps Techs and Tech Pluses separate.
> >
> >> >What's the problem with this? Over time, through upgrades
> >> >and attrition, we will have only 3 license classes ... some
> >> >might argue that 2 is sufficient (that's the norm in much of
> >> >the world and it doesn't seem to cause any problem), but
> >> >I'm OK with 3 ... particularly if the "power vs. technical
> >> >knowledge" thing were enacted, though *I'm* certainly not
> >> >planning to propose it ...
> >>
> >> Then we have a patchwork system for many years to come. New Techs
> >> continue to get full power licenses for just a 35 question test, while
> >> HF/MF remains primarily in the hands of Generals and above.
> >> Newcomers still face the "200
> >> page book just to use an HT" problem W1RFI describes. And getting full
> >> privileges requires jumping through written test hoops just to get more
> >> spectrum.
> >>
> >> The future deserves better.
> >
> >Your suggestion then is?
>
> Posted here a few days ago - the "Basic/Intermediate/Full" system. I can
post
> it again if you want.

I'll find it.

Cheers and Happy New Year,
Bill K2UNK

6240. Re: New topic: Quality or Quantity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 00:14:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0lmhf$mk5$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29237

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:bBrX7.745$9d.126208@newshog.newsread.com...
> Here's a new topic for all!
>
> Regardless of mode or band of transmission, is ham radio really about the
> quality of the QSO or the quantity of the QSO's?? And state why please.

Ryan,

It is whatever the individual ham wants it to be. Some enjoy
making many contacts to add to their "worked lists" while
others enjoy the individual contact as one might enjoy
having a conversation with another person who could be anywhere else
in the globe. There is NO one answer.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6241. Re: New topic: Quality or Quantity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 00:30:23 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0ln5v0khn@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29238

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:bBrX7.745$9d.126208@newshog.newsread.com...
> Here's a new topic for all!
>
> Regardless of mode or band of transmission, is ham radio really about the
> quality of the QSO or the quantity of the QSO's?? And state why please.
>
> Ryan KC8PMX

Quality over quantity. Why? What good is it to work DX if all you're going to do is exchange callsigns and signal reports? Why not learn to speak another language instead of complaining about 20 meters being overrun in the evening by "southern" stations? Instead exchanging enough info to obtain a piece of wallpaper, why not find out about a foreign staition's culture, interests, family, etc.? This is what ham radio should be about. Thanks to the pursuit of contest rankings and the DXCC, this is no longer the case.

6242. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 00:50:03 UTC
From: Landshark <Landshark@TheLandshark.com>
Message-ID: <%wtX7.17277$T25.4124931309@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29239
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Correct, any post that comes
from google or hotmail using my screen
name is a forge.

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. Hotmailprivacy@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com csr@megapop.net
Be aware of George WA3MO^

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:3C2E428E.BF9584B2@hotSPAMmail.com...
> Twistedhed didn't write:
> >
> > Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!
> > "Roger Halstead" <rdhalste@tm.net>
> > news:CoyW7.1399$Dl1.693885@monger.newsread.com.
> >
> > One more troll!
> >
> > Roger (K8RI)
> >
> > "Not a troll Roger, that web page exists, read it. Sporadic Waves has
> > been a mag for freebanders like me for a long time now. We are also
> > concerned about truckers on 10 meters as they are usurping our
> > expansion space. We are eyeing 12 meters as a solution"
>
> ATTENTION NEWSGROUP PEOPLE!!!
>
> If you see any cross-posted messages with the groups.google.com
organization,
> consider it highly suspect as a forge and DO NOT RESPOND! Thank you.

6243. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 01:03:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011229200322.04115.00000642@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29240

In article <3C2D3BD5.C6E0B9B3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Thank you. I just returned from an excellent Christmas with my
>> family up in Buffalo; had to drive thru a blizaard this morning to
>> get out of town!
>
>You were lucky to get out of Buffalo. Last I heard they had seven
>feet of snow, a new record.

Yeah, but they can handle it. Snow removal equipment from Rochester and other NY places are being sent.

Oddly enough, later in the winter storms like this don't happen up there, because the lakes freeze over.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6244. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 01:03:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011229200322.04115.00000643@mb-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 29241

In article <3C2DEB23.F9F1667B@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >The beauty of ham radio is that there needs be no meeting place or
>> >meeting time or even a campsite picked out. Everyone gets on a
>> >mountaintop repeater and decides where to camp out.
>>
>> And anyone with a suitable receiver can just listen and hear what the group
>> decides.
>
>An hour after the decision has been made? Miss that conversation and
>he's out in the cold.

All that means is that he needs to know when to listen, and on what frequency.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

6245. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 01:03:53 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112291703.1ad64562@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29242

> > >
> > > Which means the govt. does have an interest in protecting the
> historic
> > > and traditional nature of some things, even if they are public
> > > property.
> >
> > That's not the point at all ...
>
> Yes, it is.
>
No it's not, cw is not a "museum piece". In the end cw will survive
handily on it's own merits. It'll get bashed until down the road when
it's "rediscovered" as the the way out of the swamp of noclues.
>
>
> >
> > And preserving traditions is NOT a legitimate purpose of
> > regulation.
>
Hey Carl, try romping around the 220+ year old revetments in Valley
Forge National Park with yer ATV and I absolutely guarantee you'll
meet some federal "regulators" real quick like.
>
>
> The important point is that the NALs are practically all issued to
> hams using 'phone modes.
>
>
Yer talking at a vacuum. The PR problem the cw contingent has is that
the noclues can't decipher the beeps down the band therefore all
comments they have on the subject are suppositions generated in their
heads vs. from observations of the quality of the actual
communications and the behavior of the users of the mode.
>
>
> Do the math, Carl. Is 190 questions in 5 tests more than 120 questions
> in 3 tests? Has the testing for any of the license classes been
> increased? Have the nature of the questions or the method of testing
> changed? A big "NO" on all counts.
> >
He wasn't there when the FCC took privs AWAY from us if we didn't
upgrade. Boy that woulda really boiled his oil. I'd like to been a fly
on the wall when he huddled with his "buddies" at the FCC then. Heeee!
>

>
Carl the Allentown Tool . . .
>
>
>
> Riley is the direct result of constant requests for more enforcement
> by the ARRL and "old fashioned" hams who saw the service going
> downhill.
>
Humbug. Dig into Riley's dark past with the FCC. He got smart and
lucky and found an out-of-the-way non-toxic jihad to land on which
nobody in FCC management cares about one way or another the way I
understnd it else he'd have found himself in a career jam. He doesn't
bother them, they don't bother him, he generates NALs and bits and
pieces of Treasury income and PR especially in Newington that's the
real name of his game. Which is not to trivialize the ovedue spankings
he's passing out but let's keep it in perspective.
>
>
>
> The commitment and responsibility of hams to an orderly service and
> following the rules is THE major factor in keeping the ARS from being
> just like cb. How that commitment and sense of responsibility comes
> about is a major concern in preserving and improving the ARS.
> >
>
Amen. CB is a good example of the respect freebies for the masses
garner.
>
>
Screw 'em all Jimbo: We beep, let 'em go down with the sinking ship
they asked for, we'll still be at it, we're bulletproof, we have the
SKILL we WORKED to develop.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
w3rv

6246. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 01:04:38 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0112291704.1611de77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com (One High Powered MUtha!) wrote in message
news:<3c2dfc7f.866300@netnews.att.net>...
> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 02:12:05 GMT, "Sam" <kg4heb@psknet.com> wrote:
>
> >Can the SB-220 transmit on 11 meters without any mod being done to it . I
> >was told that transmitting on 11 with the 220 could hurt it ! True ?? If it
> >is capable of transmitting on 11 with a 220 with out changing anything on it
> >, how do you do it - tune the 220 on 10m then tune the transceiver over to
> >11 meters if so what would be the SWR ???? Thanks, Sam
> >
> >
>
> i'm going to try and answer this... if i'm wrong, please the experts
> can correct me... that amp has a tuned input circut... the way you
> would set it up for 11 meters would be to tune that input circut, the
> one that says 10 meter until there is no swr on your radio...
> basically the black cat jb2000 is the same amp, but less the
> bandswitching... i am assuming the tank circut can handle the 11 meter
> operation... i could be wrong... another thing... if you're running
> am, don't crank 100 watts into it or the tubes will go flat or worse
> you'll fry the amp, my suggestion is get a texas star 250 turn the
> power down to about 50 watts am carrier let the amp swing to about
> 80-100 watts..... ... easier on the tubes and the amp... also might
> wanna tune it for max, then back off the load a bit, the save the
> tubes.... should do okay for about 800 to 1000 watts on am might do
> the same on ssb... again depending on the amount of drive, which
> voltage you've got the amp set up for... I suggest 220vdc
>
> good luck man
>
> OHPM
>
>
> one high powered mutha
> powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
> i don't play
> i drop da maul

Don't retune it. Why not just use it on 10M? That's where most CBers
are using the lower channels where there is only morse code on.

6247. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 01:12:35 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C2E69F0.EDF5458E@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29244
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Scott Unit-69 didn't write:
>
> Don't retune it. Why not just use it on 10M? That's where most CBers
> are using the lower channels where there is only morse code on.

Notice this is cross-posted from groups.google.com.

This fits the rules for a forge, and a forge it is.

6248. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 01:27:38 UTC
From: LloydVFP <KV4FZliveson@KV4FZforever.org>
Message-ID: <a0lqh2$c1k$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29245
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Really, then how cAn I explain those papers that are right in front of me
> now?
> BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> The AIR FORCE DISCHARGE was issued on a DD-256-AF when I served, DUMBFUCK.
> The DD-214 is the Report of Seperation of Active Duty, the section e. has
^^^^^^^^^^^^

> character of service in which "Honorable" is typed there.which proves you
> never fucking served at all.

Wogey, The correct spelling is "separation" and not
"seperation." Errrrr, what college did you claim to have earned
a "degree" from. Me thinks you are a phoney, with a "degree"
from some diploma mill (you send $50, they send you a "degree.")
HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR

6249. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 01:44:08 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <fduX7.100308$BX4.6297430@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29246

Well, Bert,
You are quite welcome! I don't think I did all that much, but you are most welcome anyhoo!

Jerry

Bert Craig <kc2hmn@cs.comnospam> wrote in message news:20011224171540.14772.00001392@mb-bj.news.cs.com...
> Hi everybody,
>
> I just wanted to take a moment to thank a few of the folks on r.r.a.p. for all
> the help they gave me with my license upgrade. Ed Hare for never even allowing
> me to entertain the thought that I wouldn't lick the code test like a postage
> stamp. Jerry Oxendine and Jim Hampton for encouraging me to "enjoy" the code
> and giving me pointers in 'Conversational CW 101' so I wouldn't sound like a
> horses you-know-what upon my first true AR CW QSO. Dick McCollum gets BIG TIME
> kudos for answering a multitude of questions with the patience of Job.
> Especially for telling me to "calm down," when, for reasons unknown to this
> day, all my "Fast Farnsworth" practice flew out the window and I couldn't copy
> 5-wpm to save my life...on the day before the test.
>
> I'm forced to put Dick Carroll and Larry Roll in a separate paragraph because
> they helped me with something other than the code...an attitude adjustment.
> Their self-made reputations as r.r.a.p. "toughies" are forever shattered in
> this ham's eyes as they demonstrated that they would've gladly given me their
> "lucky" shirts off their backs if it'd help me pass. Needless to say both were
> very happy to hear that I passed. BTW, if you study with the ARRL 'Fast
> Farnsworth' CD's, the actual exam characters will feel like they're "floating
> in."
>
> I originally did not want to write this because I thought it might be

construed
> as a "congratulate me" post. I did so because I want to let anybody who
might
> be "put off" by what they perceive as an attitude know that these folks
WANT to
> help you...so stick around.
>
> I'd be remiss if I didn't mention one other guy, a non-ham. My college
> certification professor, Mr. Cronk. He fixed it so that we could NOT earn
our
> sheepskins by just memorizing exam pool questions, hence the birth of the
> infamous "Cronk screenings." The General was easy but the Extra required
the
> dusting off of some pretty deeply buried electronics theory. Thanks
Professor
> C.!
>
> If I failed to mention any of you who encouraged me along the way, forgive
me.
> I just wanted to acknowledge the folks I leaned on the most. Thanks again.
I
> promise to pass it on to others. :-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> KC2HMN

6250. Re: New topic: Goals for 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 01:54:50 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a0ls5a$5r3$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 29305

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message news:aFrX7.746$9d.125819@newshog.newsread.com...
> What are your Amateur Radio goals for 2002? Try something new?? Elmer
> someone?? Promote the hobby better?? Build something?? Or ?? Please keep
> the topic somewhat close to Amateur Radio..
>
> May you be blessed with a safe and wonderful 2002!
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
>
>

My goal for 2002 is to pass that lousy code test!!
That and try 6 meter and 2 meter ssb/cw out for size,
the new Ten Tec '6n2' gets delivered Jan 2 :)

--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

6251. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 02:07:15 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <0zuX7.100373$BX4.6309814@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29247

WHOA!

I chose to remain Advanced for other reasons--espcially after the
restructuring. One was
that I wanted to keep the "distinction" of having done the 13 WPM instead of
being "lumped"
in with the new Extras. Not to be conceited, but because I did, after all,
complete more stringent CW requirements to achieve General and above. I
don't really care what someone
else did to achieve their ticket, but I would like to have/keep credit in
some small way for
what I did do. Just as when I first became a ham, there was no other way
except thru the
CW door. A couple years later, the Tech - came along and those folks came
in by doing less
that I did. Now, that's perfectly OK, but I would, at least, like it known
that I did a little more
rather than having it swept under the rug. So if I upgrade now by taking
the other Element, what will I gain? A little more bandwidth that might be
thrown wide open in a year or two?
Be able to say I passed the test, only to have that door swung wide open as
well? Except for
the fact that I happen to enjoy CW (and I need to get back at it--I'm
rusty), I did all that for
naught. All I 'd had to do was wait a couple years for the CW requirements
to lessen, and waltz thru the door with all the other "Lites". I bear no
one ill will for passing whatever tests are
applicable. But, again, except for the little bit of bandwidth, what do I
gain? What can I do with an Extra ticket that I'm not already doing?

Jerry
K4KWH

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011229000254.27168.00000726@mb-cb.aol.com...
> In article <3c2c8a9d_1@news7.fast.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wa6vse@fast.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20011227220325.01870.00000569@mb-fz.aol.com...
> >> In article
> ><XZpW7.242101$3d2.11769921@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
> >> "Richard Plourde" <rplourde@att.net> writes:
> >>

> >> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >> >
> >> >> > If the
> >> >> > Novice is promoted to this class by simply waiving element 2
> >then the
> >> >> > situation becomes much clearer.
> >> >
> >> >> Yup - but is it right to give away upgrades like that?
> >
> >Nope ...
>
> >> >Well, yes, it is because they have been law abiding hams for years,
> >possibly
> >> >decades and granting them Element 2 is not going to ire anyone.
> >
> >No ... they haven't demonstrated the qualifications tested by the
> >other
> >test element.
>
> OK, I'm gonna put on my devil's advocate hat here....
>
> What "qualifications" are needed to be an Extra that are not possessed by
an
> Advanced? Forget about the VE rules and regs, because pre-VE-era Extras
are not
> retested in order to be VEs.
>
> The only difference between the operating privileges of an Extra and an
> Advanced are a few subbands on 80, 40, 20 and 15. Extras get no additional
> modes or power - the ONLY difference is those little subbands. What
> "qualifications" are needed to operate on, say, 3524 that are not needed
to
> operate on 3526?
>
> Devil's advocate hat off.
> >
> >> It might upset those who recently took a test to upgrade. Didja know
> >that both
> >> the NCVEC and NCI OPPOSED the ARRL BoD idea to give a "free" upgrade
> >of Novices
> >> and Tech Pluses to General?
> >
> >That's true ... as NCI has stated all along, we are "No Code
> >International,"
> >not "No Qualifications International."
>
> Shall we review how the written tests were cut in number and size again?
> >
> >> The whole Extra written test! Today, a current Advanced has to take
> >a 50

> >> question written to get the Extra - same as a General. Auto-upgrade
> >would not
> >> go over big with some folks.
> >
> >And the more technical content (not that it's THAT hard, but it's
> >reasonable for granting a license to operate and experiment)
> >is virtually all in the Extra test now ... the written elements for
> >General are quite elementary ...
>
> Devil's advocate hat back on...
>
> WHY is that "technical content" essential for OPERATING privileges, or to
> experiment? All US hams except Novices can use ALL authorized modes and
> frequencies above 30 Mhz right now - the FCC thinks the written testing is
> adequate. Current Generals, who have been tested even less than Advanceds,
can
> experiment on every band and mode authorized to US hams - they just can't
use
> some subbands on 80/40/20/15.
>
> Devil's advocate hat off.
> >
> >Now who's proposing to "dumb down" amateur radio???
> >
> Not me.
> >
> >> >> > All this is accomplished by waiving Element 2 for Novices and
> >waiving
> >> >> > Element 4(B) for Advanced. I think this is a very tiny price to
> >pay in
> >> >order
> >> >> > to have a structure which can have some basic adjustments
> >applied for
> >> >better
> >> >> > transitioning of everyone throughout the ARS experience.
> >> >
> >> >> I see your point, but others may be outraged and the FCC may nix
> >the
> >> >> whole free upgrade idea.
> >
> >NO "freebie" no-test upgrades for novices or advanced ... the material
> >in those elements is necessary to assure reasonable qualifications.
>
> I better put that hat back on..
>
> On the one hand you don't want to give free upgrades to Novices. On the
other,
> you want to give allow Novices and Tech Pluses to use "modern digital
modes"
> and analog voice modes. Huh?

> >
> >If someone has been an advanced for a while, the liklihood is that
> >they weren't interested in code and have been unwilling to put forth
> >the effort to get to 20 wpm.
>
> For some, yes. But the 20 wpm test has been avoidable by medical waiver
for
> more than a decade.
>
> For at least some Advanceds, the written exam is the problem. Do not
assume
> that because the written test wasn't hard for you that it's a pushover for
> everyone.
>
> >With the 20 wpm gone, I have little
> >sympathy for someone who isn't willing to take a relatively easy
> >50 question written test to upgrade from adanced to extra.
>
> 20 wpm was relatively easy for many hams, and relatively tough for others.
Same
> for the written tests.
>
> Sounds to me like you want to make everyone jump through the same written
test
> hoops you did.
>
> >> >> An ARRL committee is proposing virtually the same thing,
> >> >> (good) plus widening the 'phone slots on those bands (bad).
> >> >
> >> >I agree with you here, also.
> >
> >So do I (surprised) ... I personally oppose widening the phone
> >bands (at least at this time) because I don't think we should
> >allow the lower parts of the bands to be over-run with SSB,
> >which could discourage the development of more modern
> >digital modes.
>
> So it's OK with you if the SSB folks are hemmed in by limited subbands.
>
>
> >He's corrrect ... they are NOT "CW only" sub-bands (except if you
> >hold a novice/tech+ license) ... others are technically free to use
> >PSK31, Clover, PacTor, or other digital modes there, as long as
> >they meet the (stupid) occupied bandwidth restrictions ...
>
> The bandwidth restrictions are not stupid at all.
>
> >Why
>
> [annoy]

>
> > the FCC by going back incesantly asking them to
> >do things that they have already determined they're not going
> >to do because they don't serve the public interest?
>
> I agree that it's not a good idea to keep asking the FCC to do things
they've
> already said they won't do. The "serve the public interest" is a matter of
> opinion. Much of what the FCC does is done to reduce FCC admin work.
That's not
> necessarily a bad thing.
> >
> >So there are approx. 40k novice licenses still valid and approx.
> >87k advanced licenses still valid (source "Year End Census of
> >Amateur Radio Operators," The W5YI Report.
>
> You can get exact numbers from my posts in the thread "ARS License
Numbers"
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
> As of December 14, 2001:
>
> Novice - 40,337 (decrease of 8,992)
> Tech - 233,654 (increase of 28,260)
> Tech Plus - 85,869 (decrease of 42,991)
> General - 138,560 (increase of 25,883)
> Advanced - 86,617 (decrease of 13,165)
> Extra - 97,829 (increase of 19,079)
> Total - 682,866 (increase of 8,074)
>
>
> >What's the big
> >deal? And there are some tech+ who will end up getting renewed
> >as techs (but still keep their limited HF privs) if they don't
> >upgrade.
> >What does that hurt?
>
> Ask Mr. Plourde.
> >
> >It took me from the time the rules changed until recently to find
> >time to get around to going to a VE session to take the extra

> >written and upgrade ...
>
> That's you. Others have different situations.
>
> >I didn't
>
> [complain]
>
> >I didn't ask to have the
> >test waived ...
>
> But you did wait until the 13 and 20 wpm code tests were gone.
>
> > why should anyone get a total freebie??? If they
> >don't want to, or don't have the time to, upgrade, they should
> >remain satisfied with what they have. There is no reason to
> >change the system ... nobody should get privileges they aren't
> >qualified for, nor should anyone lose privileges they've already
> >earned.
>
> Sounds like what some folks were saying before the restructuring. Folks
you
> vehemently disagree with.
>
> >> >I think other hams see what's happening... the new ones come in and
> >get to
> >> >general and extra very quickly and the elders are being 'corraled'
> >out in
> >> >their pastures.
> >
> >How are "the elders being 'corraled' out in their pastures" ???
> >(serious question ... I don't get what you're infering here ...)
>
> I think he means that newcomers with quick memories, good health and lots
of
> time go from zip to Extra in a short time, bypassing hams with much more
time
> in the ARS. Heck, that's what I did 30+ years ago.
> >
> >> Hmm - interesting. Could even result in a situation where the
> >newbies say to
> >> the oldsters "I did it, so you have to, as well!"
> >
> >Turnabout is fair play, they say :-) As one who has followed the
> >rules and taken and passed the extra written, I *could* take that
> >view with respect to "waiving" the extra written and giving
> >advanceds a free upgrade ... but that is NOT my motivation for
> >opposing such a freebie ...
>
> Maybe.

>
> >the motivation is PURELY that there
> >is legitimate material in the extra written test that should be tested
> >and advanceds should have to demonstrate that they know that
> >material before being granted the additional privileges of the
> >extra class (and I am NOT refering to the few small "extra only"
> >sub-band slots ... I'm refering to the other things that are reserved
> >for extras ...)
>
> Like what? What are the other Extra-only privileges that require more
testing
> of Advanceds? What is in the Extra test that is so necessary for Advanceds
to
> know?
> >
> >> >> 3) the big opportunities of the post-2003 era are not being
> >addressed
> >> >> adequately.
> >
> >I agree with that ... there is still not a good vision in the majority
> >of the amateur community about what we need to do and where
> >we need to go, in terms of technology and using our spectrum
> >more fully and efficiently.
>
> So how you gonna educate 'em? Shove "modern digital modes" down their
throats?
> >
> >More space for 50 year old SSB technology is NOT the answer,
> >IMNSHO ...
>
> even if it's what most hams want?
>
> fun fact: SSB was first used by hams in the early 1930s, almost 70 years
ago.
>
> > again I refer the interested to public comments by
> >Dale Hatfield and other FCC officials on the future of amateur
> >radio
>
> I read 'em. Main point he makes is "don't ask for lots of little subbands
for
> every activity". And "we gotta get some hams up to speed on the current
regs".
>
> >> I dunno about that. Their system may not know who is an "old" Tech
> >Plus and who
> >> isn't.
> >
> >The FCC's system "knows" who is an "old" Tech Plus and who is not,
>

> They do? Then why not just hand out Generals to them?
>
> >but as was pointed out, the system is programmed such that the VECs
> >are the "engine" for input to the system and it would cost the FCC a
> >LOT
> >in manpower and reprogramming to do such upgrades directly themselves.
>
> So the FCC avoids the work.
> >
> >I don't see taking one's paperwork to a VE session to get the upgrade
> >as being such an onerous thing ...
>
> If one is healthy and able to get there.
> >
> >> I mean three slots by mode type: CW, digital, analog voice or image.
> >For
> >> example, 40 meters might be 7000-7075 CW, 7075-7150 digital,
> >7150-7300 analog
> >> voice or image.
> >
> >More "balkanization" as I pointed out before ... a BAD idea as RULES.
>
> I think they're a good idea.
>
> >I have no problem with flexible, voluntary bandplans and "gentleman's
> >agrements" ... they can be changed far more easily than FCC rules
> >as needs change ... casting sub-band usage by mode into the relative
> >concrete of Part 97 will ultimately hurt our ability to adapt to
> >modernizing
> >changes in technology and usage patterns
>
> But you want to hold the line on the analog 'phone subbands. You don't
want to
> widen them, even though the usage might indicate that more 'phone spectrum
is
> justified. Looks like a double standard.
>
> I say having "subbands by mode type" gives the best compromise.
> >
> >> >What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???
> >>
> >> Offer an upgrade incentive.
> >
> >"Incentive Licensing" was a dismal failure ...
>
> How do you figure? It was all about increasing technical knowledge. I
think it
> was propelled by Sputnik fever.
>
> > philosophically,

> >I agree with prior comments that power limitations make more
> >sense than mode limitations, since they are more solidly based
> >on some reasonable relation to one's technical knowledge,
> >as demonstrated by passing the more difficult tests.
>
> Huh? The FCC sez Techs are qualified to use 1.5 kW transmitters on
VHF/UHF -
> are they wrong?
>
> >(however, I also realize the unfortunate political reality that
> >taking amps away from those who currently are allowed
> >to use them will raise hell that will make the code/no-code
> >debate look pale by comparison ... therefore, I would, be
> >reluctant to propose such a thing, even though I think it's a
> >good idea ... too many folks just don't realize that there is
> >far more "bang for the buck" to be had with better antennas
> >and better modulation and coding schemes than with brute
> >force power)
>
> Better antennas are not possible for many hams. Better modulation and
coding
> schemes are often do not offer what many hams want (hence the popularity
of
> SSB).
>
> >>The point is to come up with something that isn't just another
> >> patch slapped on the old system.
> >
> >As I see it, given that Morse testing will go away completely
> >after WRC-03, the system isn't so bad
>
> I don't take it as a given, but that's beside the point. Main thing is to
look
> beyond the code test thingie.
>
> > ... current novices
> >are declining by at least 5k/year, either through upgrades,
> >going SK, or simply not renewing ...
>
> We don't know if that's a linear function, though.
>
> >adanceds have declined
> >about 20k since "restructuring," through the same mechanisms
> >... tech+'s have declined about 45k, presumably mostly through
> >upgrades to general, and those who don't upgrade will be
> >renewed as techs, but retain their (limited) HF privs ...
>
> Same for those classes.
> >
> >What's the problem with this? Over time, through upgrades

> >and attrition, we will have only 3 license classes ... some
> >might argue that 2 is sufficient (that's the norm in much of
> >the world and it doesn't seem to cause any problem), but
> >I'm OK with 3 ... particularly if the "power vs. technical
> >knowledge" thing were enacted, though *I'm* certainly not
> >planning to propose it ...
>
> Then we have a patchwork system for many years to come. New Techs continue
to
> get full power licenses for just a 35 question test, while HF/MF remains
> primarily in the hands of Generals and above. Newcomers still face the
"200
> page book just to use an HT" problem W1RFI describes. And getting full
> privileges requires jumping through written test hoops just to get more
> spectrum.
>
> The future deserves better.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

6252. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 02:32:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2e7ddf_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29250

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:5EC2616372D482F4.E48391021E9BF3EA.BF221493688BD774@lp.airnews.net...
> On Fri, 28 Dec 2001 20:58:07 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I think Dick is a figment of my imagination... ;)
>
> Then please stop sharing your nightmares with the rest of
> us--he's giving ham radio a bad name (and odor)!
>
> Rick
>
> --
>

Aw, c'mon, Rick. I am a sharing kind of person. :p

Kim W5TIT

6253. Re: OUCH!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 02:34:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011229213435.13985.00002218@mb-md.aol.com>
Source record: 29248

In article <p5bX7.244760$3d2.12028649@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"JAMES HAMPTON" <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>Larry, I am in Rochester, NY. I do appreciate what you said about a
>blizzard. Last I heard, Buffalo had received between 4 and 5 feet of snow
>since Xmas eve and more is still comming down! Yesterday, they were
>predicting up to 75 inches of snow through this one big storm (lake effect).
>In any case, have a safe and happy new year! I hope you don't have weather
>that bad at home.
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA

Jim:

My "ancestral home" where my parents still live is in Alden, NY,
about halfway between Batavia and Buffalo. I left there yesterday
morning, after digging out my own car and my parent's matched
set of 2000 Lincoln Town Cars out from under a foot of snow each.
I then had a fairly easy drive on freshly plowed roads to Batavia,
where I got on the Thruway, headed East, and from then on, the
only snow I saw was that which was falling off of the cars coming
from Buffalo! I just had an IM session with my brother Tom, and
he said he finally got my parent's long driveway cleared, access to the
garage on the lower level re-established, and no more new snow
since 2 PM today. At least in Buffalo, such a snowfall doesn't
result in total incapacitation for more than a day or so. Here in
Delaware, it would probably cause Governor Minner to declare a
state of emergency, and then I'd have to deal with listening to all
the 2-meter Ham Heroes securing their places of fame and glory!

6254. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 02:35:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2e7eac$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29301

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:90E3D6D1570A9910.83930DFBE28A5089.C902006E0695907E@lp.airnews.net...
> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 09:07:24 -0600, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Take a look in the mirror, Dick C. There's a big bust waiting for you
> >there.
>
> There is?
>
> Maybe that's why Dick is so offended by your call sign.
>
> He wanted it for himself!
>
> Rick
>
> --
>

Oh, jeeze, I stuck my foot in my mouth on that one...LOL. Hey, no pun
intended!

Kim W5TIT

6255. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 02:37:09 UTC
From: "\"Landshark\"" <Landshark@TheLandshark.com>
Message-ID: <p5vX7.17415$UQ1.4144444564@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

It figures,

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. Hotmailprivacy@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:3C2E69F0.EDF5458E@hotSPAMmail.com...
> Scott Unit-69 didn't write:
> >
> > Don't retune it. Why not just use it on 10M? That's where most CBers
> > are using the lower channels where there is only morse code on.
>
> Notice this is cross-posted from groups.google.com.
>
> This fits the rules for a forge, and a forge it is.

6256. Re: New topic: Quality or Quantity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 02:47:54 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2e8189_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29303

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:bBrX7.745$9d.126208@newshog.newsread.com...
> Here's a new topic for all!
>
> Regardless of mode or band of transmission, is ham radio really about the
> quality of the QSO or the quantity of the QSO's?? And state why please.
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>

Well, it's "about" whatever each ham wants it to be. A DX ham may have no use whatever for extended conversations on the air, and I even know some who do nothing but DX--save the mobile trip to and from work each day where, sometimes, they will be on 2M or 70cm.

Then, there is the contester, doing nothing but contests. Literally no conversation, there.

What about SSTV and things like that? Are you including those modes in your query? Not really a "QSO", so to speak, but a contact.

A conversationalist doesn't really like all the quick-and-get stuff. I know I'd much rather spend even all afternoon on HF with a round table! We've done that at night before. Used to be about 10-15 of us on 28.400 who'd get there every evening, Sat and Sun morning. Just a local rag chew, with occasional contacts hearing us and saying hello. It was really neat.

Kim W5TIT

6257. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 02:49:32 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2E80BC.30FB8337@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29302

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >An hour after the decision has been made? Miss that conversation and
> >he's out in the cold.
>
> All that means is that he needs to know when to listen, and on what frequency.

But nobody knows when - it's all spontaneous.
"Hey, anybody wanna go camping?"
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6258. Re: ARES/RACES ACTIVITIES

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 02:52:49 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2e82a9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29304

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:vHrX7.747$9d.126510@newshog.newsread.com...
> What is your local ARES/RACES group doing on the local basis? Do they
just
> get together to meet or are they active in training and other activities?
> What are those activities and training they are pursuing? We are using
the
> January meeting of 2002 for our local group to do a "evaluation" to see
> where we are at, and of course, where we need to go forward with and
always
> looking for new, great ideas.
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
>

Is there anyone in your group with a GPS and some map program (Street Atlas or whatever)? If so, how 'bout mapping the entire county? I started this in Hunt County this year, and have only the northwest one-half left. I took my ARES Asst. EC (who is now ARES EC) with me, and we mapped spotting locations, utility substations, water towers, hospitals, police and fire stations, schools, etc. It took several weekends, lots of gas, and lots of time--but if there's ever a really serious disaster in Hunt County, or if there is even a tornado on the ground, we'll be able to track its path and know the danger. The mapped locations that net control would use has the phone number for each location.

Just a thought...

Kim W5TIT

6259. Re: OUCH!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 02:58:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2e83e6$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29307

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011229213435.13985.00002218@mb-md.aol.com...
>
> Here in
> Delaware, it would probably cause Governor Minner to declare a
> state of emergency, and then I'd have to deal with listening to all
> the 2-meter Ham Heroes securing their places of fame and glory!

What? Modern rigs have things called on/off buttons, Larry. If yours is broke, you could just pull the plug or take the batteries out. Don't have a modern rig?

Kim W5TIT

6260. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 03:00:30 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2E834E.2014983C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29306

f1dfr wrote:
> The event will be greater than the break of Berlin's wall.

Such delusions of grandeur. Probably 99.97% of the population
of the USA couldn't care less about amateur Morse code testing.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6261. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 03:21:04 UTC
From: oneangryman@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <8c61e9d6.0112291921.5f516c38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29308
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com (Twistedhed) wrote in message
news:<e9de0154.0112201650.5423f9f0@posting.google.com>...
> "Hammies and dog-pound refugees (dogie,nad,pipeboy) would do well to
> read my scintillating prose and learned insights on the fine art of
> freebanding. A pet peeve of mine is that hammies (certain ones) put
> down radio hobbyists like myself just because they are CBers and just
> because they use gear that's advanced. I have logged more DX on the
> freeband than most 2 meter hams have in a lifetime. Why shouldn't I be
> treated with respect? All I am asking is that the issue of legality be
> put aside and my acheivements be recognized for what they are"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "If you take the time to read this you will see that we on freeband
> have problems with troublemakers too. They don't abide by our rules.
> They don't care what others think. They jam and make noises on 27.555.
> Read about it in my article. They are wrecking my freeband and they
> should be stopped"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "I admit I get all upset when hammies tell me I am breaking rules. I
> don't care about rules. I don't care what others think. If I want to
> operate freeband it is my responsibility and I don't like to hear
> anyone putting me down for it. Read about how we have created our own
> little illegal alternative to ham radio on the freeband. You hammies
> can be jealous"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "Hammies try to say that there are goverment users on 27.555 and
> above. I have never heard any myself so that proves there are none.
> Because of course what I say is true and everyone else is a liar.
> Read my wonderful prose and see for yourself"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> "Geniuses like me don't need to obey laws since we are above the
> masses. Take that, you pussy-footed hams"

Your an outlaw genius? If my grandmother had wheels would that make
her a wagon?
Here is a web site for you to check out Mr. Genius;

http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html
Try to learn something about us 'hammies'
Free band was fun, but I grew up and left the 'Childrens Band' and
joined the REAL radio operators!

BTW all Google posts are fake just like this one is. E-:)

signed
One Angry No Code Ham
Member Number 1 of the No Code Liberation Army (NCLA)

6262. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 03:26:39 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberal.comz>
Message-ID: <a0m1iqdel0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29309
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:a0lj1g$i2f$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> "Ross Archer" <archer@topnow.com> wrote in message
> news:31b19051.0112291448.4c9be3f8@posting.google.com...
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:<a0koolsrf3@dosa.alt.net>...
> >
> > > The reason Lllardasssss Llllloyd's "romance " wasn't successful is
> because
> > > he's GAY.
> >
> > Gads, I HOPE NOT! Lloyd would pass neither the minimum intelligence nor
> style
> > requirements needed to be accepted in such company. The scummiest gay
> person
> > I know personally beats Lloyd as a human being, any old day.
> >
> > -- Ross
>
> LOL!!!!! That's funny, Ross.
> But you've got to admit, somebody who's almost thirty years old an still a
> virgin has to be well, you know. lol!

That's not too far from an almost fifty year old who still lives at home
with his mommy.
That kind of guy has to be, well, you know. Har Har Har Har

6263. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 03:34:41 UTC
From: oneangryman@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <8c61e9d6.0112291934.78db8d40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29310
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C2E428E.BF9584B2@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> Twistedhed didn't write:
> >
> > Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!
> > "Roger Halstead" <rdhalste@tm.net>
> > news:CoyW7.1399$Dl1.693885@monger.newsread.com.
> >
> > One more troll!
> >
> > Roger (K8RI)
> >
> > "Not a troll Roger, that web page exists, read it. Sporadic Waves has
> > been a mag for freebanders like me for a long time now. We are also
> > concerned about truckers on 10 meters as they are usurping our
> > expansion space. We are eyeing 12 meters as a solution"
>
> ATTENTION NEWSGROUP PEOPLE!!!
>
> If you see any cross-posted messages with the groups.google.com organization,
> consider it highly suspect as a forge and DO NOT RESPOND! Thank you.

You'll never know just how right you are!

signed
One Angry No Code Ham
Member Number 1 of the No Code Liberation Army (NCLA)

There are 3 older fake identities just in the sig file alone.
Just for you CB'rs and SLOW readers they are;
1 One Angry Man
2 No Code Amateur
3 The No Code Liberation Army

Any of them ring a bell? YeeHaw

6264. FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 04:15:57 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OeOlDgOkBHA.1348@cpimsnntpa02>
Source record: 29311

> More "gloom and doom" Larry?

> Get a grip! Simply because the FCC doesn't view it as
> essential for a ham to have a permanent station location does NOT mean
> they are trying to strip any frequencies from us. With today's
> equipment, you DON'T need a permanent station location--modern rigs
> are very capable of mobile or portable operations, something that the
> HF rigs a few decades ago weren't really suited for.

> Sounds simple enough to me.

If it sounds "simple enough" to you, then perhaps you haven't thought through the implications of the FCC denial of the petition to extend PRB-1 antenna protection to Amateur Radio Service antennas.

Personally, I think that Larry completely understates the case, and in fact this is the most chilling decision from the FCC since "banish them to 200 meters and down". The denial signals to me the possible end of Federal support for the Amateur Radio Service.

Consider that while FCC denies protection from CC&Rs to amateurs, it recently GRANTED this protection to home entertainment antennas.

I'll say that again. The FCC recently GRANTED protection from CC&Rs for home entertainment system antennas, but DENIES the same protection to amateur antenna systems.

Instead, they basically tell us to "go eat cake", go for a ride in your car, or go down to the club station. Uhhhhhhhh, is there a club station near you which can be shared by all the amateurs in your community? And would you leave your latest project down there while you rethink some of the circuit designs? How about running the Sweepstakes contest all weekend from your minivan?

The message is very clear to me -- "You amateurs don't have enough financial or political clout for us to worry about.

Now, to address your notion of "Don't sign an agreement... blah, blah, blah...." What a cop out! Tell it to a 15 year-old teenager who just developed an interest in amateur radio.

"Hey, Dad, I've been reading on the web about amateur radio, and it seems like a really interesting hobby. If I study and pass the license tests, can you help me put up a small antenna in the back yard?"

"Sounds like a great idea, son. But I have to check with the HOA first -- seems I remember something about antennas in our deed."

Next day -- "Sorry son, but we are restricted from putting up an antenna on our property. I guess Ham radio is out of the question for you. Maybe I'll get you one of those new video game systems instead."

Kids who live in newer developments (can you say semi-affluent, well educated kids, with bright career futures) are effective barred from meaningful involvement in the full range of Amateur Radio activities -- this is one of the demographic targets we need desperately to reach to fulfill the charter of our service.

If may well be that a healthy amateur radio service, which appeals to bright young scientifically-inclined youngsters is no longer a federal objective, and that 97.1 is nothing more than eyewash.

Clearly this is a fit subject for discussion on rraPOLICY, and should not be lightly dismissed with phrases like "Get a grip!"

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

6265. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 04:28:05 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <bd4b97c8c546d0f63e2c1f1747a74a0e.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 29312

"CAM" wrote:

> It is not the responsibility of the federal government to provide
> a ham with an antenna unrestricted home. It is the responsibility
> of the individual to find an antenna unrestricted home.

Tell that to owners of home entertainment systems for which
the FCC has PRE-EMPTED all CC&R restrictions.

> I went so far as to buy two acres in the Phoenix area
> for the purpose of erecting ham antennas.

Tell that to a young family man raising a family, or to a
teenager who just got interested in our hobby, or to a
retiree on pension who's just decided to pursue his dream of
being a ham. Maybe you'll share with them?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

6266. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 04:41:38 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2E9B02.440216E8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29313

K0HB wrote:
> Tell that to a young family man raising a family, or to a
> teenager who just got interested in our hobby, or to a
> retiree on pension who's just decided to pursue his dream of
> being a ham.

Life's rough all over, Hans. I drove a pickup with 200,000
miles on it so I could possess those two acres. People must
proprietize their wants/needs. Which is more important -
a ham antenna or a vehicle? Yet, the federal government
doesn't guarantee us vehicles.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6267. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 04:47:57 UTC
From: "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
Message-ID: <a0m69i0dn9@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29317
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

How about we just forward it to Riley and let him sort it out.

Done.

--
- - -

Regards,
Joe S.

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:3C2E69F0.EDF5458E@hotSPAMmail.com...
> Scott Unit-69 didn't write:
> >
> > Don't retune it. Why not just use it on 10M? That's where most CBers
> > are using the lower channels where there is only morse code on.
>
> Notice this is cross-posted from groups.google.com.
>
> This fits the rules for a forge, and a forge it is.

6268. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 04:50:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2E9CFA.7B2E2AEE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29314

K0HB wrote:
> The message is very clear to me -- "You amateurs don't have
> enough financial or political clout for us to worry about.

Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you? Any other
legal contracts you would like to dismiss?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6269. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 04:57:32 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <ea5e406520f1494a1d5731e9819c0871.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 29315

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
> state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you? Any other
> legal contracts you would like to dismiss?

Nope.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

6270. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 05:01:42 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <3109a004b83e2a1d1c437d5b0a7ca7bb.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 29316

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2E9B02.440216E8@IEEE.org...

> Which is more important - a ham antenna or a vehicle?

A lovely non-sequitur, Cecil.

I've heard you are an intellectually gifted man,
but it appears that you have neglected to unwrap
all your presents.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

6271. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 05:12:34 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2DE9CF.F6ACCA14@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29318
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KC8JBO wrote:

>
> Really, then how cAn I explain those papers that are right in front of me
> now?

Why the capital letter in the middle of can, learn the proper use
of capitalization, woger.

> character of service in which "Honorable" is typed there.which proves you
> never fucking served at all.

Why the period between there and which, learn proper punctuation,
woger.

6272. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 05:14:58 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2DEA5F.A8BEE253@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29319
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

KC8JBO wrote:

> LOL!!!!! That's funny, Ross.
> But you've got to admit, somebody who's almost thirty years old an still a
> virgin has to be well, you know. lol!

That's 'thirty years and still a virgin', learn the difference
between 'an' and 'and', woger.

6273. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 05:26:06 UTC
From: "Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <smhlawrence.get_rid_of_thispart_to_reply@lycos.com>
Message-ID: <3C2EA598.5DCD2BDA@lycos.com>
Source record: 29320
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

The Better Amateur Radio Federation wrote:

> What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Ummm....group masturbation accompanied by the strains of Wagner, writhing around in your feces?

(I think I'm pretty close to the mark, there)

73,

Steve Lawrence
Omaha

6274. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 05:32:21 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <4a0ba24e92da60f68c3300f4b517f794.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 29321

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
> state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you?

The Commission has determined affirmatively that it
does in fact have the jurisdiction to preempt private land use
regulations, and Congress has expressly ordered the Commission to
exercise such jurisdiction in the context of over-the-air
entertainment device antennas in residential areas.

The Commission has acknowledged that private land use regulations
are often used as a means of precluding the use of outdoor antennas,
and for this reason has preempted such antenna regulations in the
case of CC&Rs prohibiting video (TV) entertainment reception.

It is true a priori that private land use regulations which preclude
or fail to reasonably accommodate Amateur communications, or which
do not constitute the minimum practicable regulation to accomplish
the private land use authority's legitimate goal, are just as
inconsistent with the strong Federal interest in Amateur Radio
communications as are zoning regulations of those same facilities
which do not meet the same test. It would be illogical to assert
that the Commission has any less interest in unreasonable covenant
regulation of amateur antennas than it has with respect to unreasonable
zoning regulation of those same antennas.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

6275. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 06:11:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2EA32A.E6FCEF8@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29322

CAM wrote:

> K0HB wrote:
> > Tell that to a young family man raising a family, or to a
> > teenager who just got interested in our hobby, or to a
> > retiree on pension who's just decided to pursue his dream of
> > being a ham.
>
> Life's rough all over, Hans. I drove a pickup with 200,000
> miles on it so I could possess those two acres. People must
> proprietize their wants/needs. Which is more important -
> a ham antenna or a vehicle? Yet, the federal government
> doesn't guarantee us vehicles.

Yup. And if you were a kid getting interested in ham radio today you'd be faced with being prohibited from it instead of how it worked out for you in the 50's. So it's fine for you to have freedom from such unrealistic restrictions but not those who have no control nor involvement in them but who must abide by someone elses stupidity. I gotta say, it's typical of ya, pal.

6276. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 06:19:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <3C2EA527.D544997F@townsqr.com>
Source record: 29323

Hans Brakob wrote:

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
> > state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you?
>
> The Commission has determined affirmatively that it
> does in fact have the jurisdiction to preempt private land use
> regulations, and Congress has expressly ordered the Commission to
> exercise such jurisdiction in the context of over-the-air
> entertainment device antennas in residential areas.
>
> The Commission has acknowledged that private land use regulations
> are often used as a means of precluding the use of outdoor antennas,
> and for this reason has preempted such antenna regulations in the
> case of CC&Rs prohibiting video (TV) entertainment reception.
>
> It is true a priori that private land use regulations which preclude
> or fail to reasonably accommodate Amateur communications, or which
> do not constitute the minimum practicable regulation to accomplish
> the private land use authority's legitimate goal, are just as
> inconsistent with the strong Federal interest in Amateur Radio
> communications as are zoning regulations of those same facilities
> which do not meet the same test. It would be illogical to assert
> that the Commission has any less interest in unreasonable covenant
> regulation of amateur antennas than it has with respect to unreasonable
> zoning regulation of those same antennas.

Dawgone, Hans, I do believe you're cornfuses poor ol' Cec. Maybe scotch
got what his one-hit $hit missed.

6277. Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 08:24:18 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112300024.125df714@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29324
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
this
group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
frequencies
from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
think.
We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
conditions.
We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
technical
issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us
is
rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
should
not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
do.
For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
is
a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
is
that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
talk with
him before you condemn him.

This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html

I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)

Unit 2711, Florida

6278. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 08:41:16 UTC
From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com
Message-ID: <e9de0154.0112300041.308b692c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29325
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

BTW all Google posts are fake just like this one is. E-:)

"Fake? You think this is fake? I spent a whole year writing it and
you'd better appreciate me and my superior intellect"

http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html

6279. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 11:21:36 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <4NCX7.315575$W8.11841332@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29326
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bozo*Flush says Google Forge.

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
news:e9de0154.0112300024.125df714@posting.google.com...
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
> this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
> frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
> think.
> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
> conditions.
> We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
> technical
> issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us
> is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
> should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
> do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
> is
> a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
> is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
> talk with
> him before you condemn him.
>
> This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
> http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
> Unit 2711, Florida

6280. Re: I Am An Outlaw CB Genius!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 11:22:26 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <SNCX7.315577$W8.11840948@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29327
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

GoogleForge

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
news:e9de0154.0112300041.308b692c@posting.google.com...
> BTW all Google posts are fake just like this one is. E-:)
>
> "Fake? You think this is fake? I spent a whole year writing it and
> you'd better appreciate me and my superior intellect"
>
> http://sporadicwaves.tripod.com/page7.html

6281. Re: I Am A NOCODE Lifer Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 12:27:02 UTC
From: "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com>
Message-ID: <3C2F0803.3435EE7D@hotSPAMmail.com>
Source record: 29328
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

One Angry Man wrote:
> You'll never know just how right you are!
>
> signed
> One Angry No Code Ham
> Member Number 1 of the No Code Liberation Army (NCLA)

You can be as angry as you want to be. Those of us who have done nothing wrong, have nothing to worry about.

> There are 3 older fake identities just in the sig file alone.
> Just for you CB'rs and SLOW readers they are;
> 1 One Angry Man
> 2 No Code Amateur
> 3 The No Code Liberation Army
>
> Any of them ring a bell? YeeHaw

Who cares?

P.S. I hold no stinkin' ticket.

6282. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 13:03:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230080314.05154.00000693@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 29329

In article <0zuX7.100373$BX4.6309814@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>, "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> writes:

>WHOA!

Oh, Wilbur!!
>
>I chose to remain Advanced for other reasons--espcially after the
>restructuring. One was
>that I wanted to keep the "distinction" of having done the 13 WPM instead of
>being "lumped"
>in with the new Extras. Not to be conceited, but because I did, after all,
>complete more stringent CW requirements to achieve General and above.

I understand where you're coming from, Jerry, but an Advanced license by itself doesn't mean you passed 13 wpm, just like an Extra today doesn't mean you passed 20 wpm. Medical waivers for 13 and 20 wpm code have been available since 1990, so unless you can show that your license was issued before then, there's no proof of 13 wpm. Just like there's no proof of 20 wpm for my Extra unless it's also known that I got it before 1990 (1970, to be exact).

>So if I upgrade now by taking
>the other Element, what will I gain? A little more bandwidth that might be
>thrown wide open in a year or two?

That, maybe a 1x2 or 2x1 call (which you probably have no interest in) and more VE privs (which may make no difference to you either).

> But, again, except for the little bit of bandwidth, what do I
>gain? What can I do with an Extra ticket that I'm not already doing?

BINGO!

Operationally, the ONLY difference between an Advanced and an Extra is access to a few subbands. Those are where the DX is often found, 'specially the rare ones, but if you're not a DXer it makes no difference.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6283. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 13:11:28 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0n728$4i7$2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29331
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

AIDS ravaged
"JizzRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> jizzburped in message
news:3C2DEA5F.A8BEE253@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > LOL!!!!! That's funny, Ross.
> > But you've got to admit, somebody who's almost thirty years old an still
a
> > virgin has to be well, you know. lol!
>
> That's 'thirty years and still a virgin',

Speaking from experience, Jizzwallowing JR?

> learn the difference
> between 'an' and 'and', woger.

Poor Jizz recepticle, his lack of talent in ANYTHING leaves he/she/it to
this. According to Llllardasssss llllloyd, he doesn't even give good
blowjobs to Lllllloyd.

6284. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 13:12:40 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0n72a$4i7$3@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29332
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <smhlawrence.get_rid_of_thispart_to_reply@lycos.com>
wrote in message news:3C2EA598.5DCD2BDA@lycos.com...
>
>
> The Better Amateur Radio Federation wrote:
>
> > What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?
>
> Ummm....group masturbation accompanied by the strains of Wagner, writhing
around
> in your feces?
>
> (I think I'm pretty close to the mark, there)
>
> 73,
>
> Steve Lawrence
> Omaha

Let's not leave out the "Horst Wessel" song in Lllardasssssss' masturbatory
set.

6285. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 13:15:47 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0n8b7$6u8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29333
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"LloydVFP" <KV4FZliveson@KV4FZforever.org> wrote in message
news:a0lqh2$c1k$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > Really, then how can I explain those papers that are right in front of
me
> > now?
> > BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!

Methjadone just kick in, heroin addict?

> > The AIR FORCE DISCHARGE was issued on a DD-256-AF when I served,
DUMBFUCK.
> > The DD-214 is the Report of Seperation of Active Duty, the section e.
has
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^
>
> > character of service in which "Honorable" is typed there.which proves
you
> > never fucking served at all.
>
> Wogey, The correct spelling is "separation" and not
> "seperation."

Anonymous coward, you still assfucking your two daughters?

> Errrrr, what college did you claim to have earned
> a "degree" from.

One that knows to put question marks after questions, DUMBFUCK.
You obviously didn't go to college.

> Me thinks you are a phoney, with a "degree"
> from some diploma mill (you send $50, they send you a "degree.")
> HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR HAR

Methinks you are a perverted pedophile who has a felony criminal record.
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!

6286. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 13:19:12 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0n8b8$6u8$1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29334
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"JizzRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wiped the 12-year-old sperm from
his double chins and slobbered in message
news:3C2DE9CF.F6ACCA14@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> >
> > Really, then how cAn I explain those papers that are right in front of
me
> > now?
>
> Why the capital letter in the middle of can, learn the proper use
> of capitalization, woger.

Why the typo-laming when the archives show what an illiterate fuck you are?

> > character of service in which "Honorable" is typed there.which proves
you
> > never fucking served at all.
>
> Why the period between there and which, learn proper punctuation,
> woger.

Follow your own advice, Jizzswallowing John Perry. Questions usually end
punctuated with question marks, but those two mangled sentences above you
wrote didn't.
Hypocrite.

6287. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 13:22:38 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0n8b9$6u8$2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29335
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:3863f3fe3ec89d6a53d@houston-hunks.com...
>
> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 17:39:50 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> :
> : Really, then how cAn I explain those papers that are right in front of
me
> -------------------^^^ (Extreme agitation causes shift bar strike)

Fix your margins, fuckwit.

> : now?
> : BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> : The AIR FORCE DISCHARGE was issued on a DD-256-AF when I served,
DUMBFUCK.
> : The DD-214 is the Report of Seperation of Active Duty, the section e.
has
> ------------------------------^^^^^^^^^^ (Hands start to shake here.)
>
> : character of service in which "Honorable" is typed there.which proves
you
> -(Hands trembling now: misses space bar and shift key)----^^

Faggot Lee's hands tremble when he fucks those little kids up the ass and
gives them a reach-around. The convicted felon Faggot Lee's palsied hands
tremble when they get near underage boys' cock.

> : never fucking served at all.
> : Why does W4NTI discuss his DD-214 if it doesn't exist. You are one dumb
> : fucking, taliban supporting, UNAMERICAN .
> --(Lips quiver as extra space inserted)--^

Faggot Lee's lips quiver when he sucks off those underage boys.

> Yep, I'd say that the writer looks so very upset that his claims are
> suspicious.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!
Prove it, fuckwit.

6288. REPOST: Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 13:22:38 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <7$--$$-$$-%%%-_$%$@news.noc.cabal.int>
Source record: 29508
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Faggot Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:3863f3fe3ec89d6a53d@houston-hunks.com...
>
> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 17:39:50 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote:
> :
> : Really, then how cAn I explain those papers that are right in front of
me
> -------------------^^^ (Extreme agitation causes shift bar strike)

Fix your margins, fuckwit.

> : now?
> : BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> : The AIR FORCE DISCHARGE was issued on a DD-256-AF when I served,
DUMBFUCK.
> : The DD-214 is the Report of Seperation of Active Duty, the section e.
has
> ------------------------------^^^^^^^^^^ (Hands start to shake here.)
>
> : character of service in which "Honorable" is typed there.which proves
you
> -(Hands trembling now: misses space bar and shift key)----^^

Faggot Lee's hands tremble when he fucks those little kids up the ass and
gives them a reach-around. The convicted felon Faggot Lee's palsied hands
tremble when they get near underage boys' cock.

> : never fucking served at all.
> : Why does W4NTI discuss his DD-214 if it doesn't exist. You are one dumb
> : fucking, taliban supporting, UNAMERICAN .
> --(Lips quiver as extra space inserted)--^

Faggot Lee's lips quiver when he sucks off those underage boys.

> Yep, I'd say that the writer looks so very upset that his claims are
> suspicious.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!
Prove it, fuckwit.

========= WAS CANCELLED BY =======:
Path: news.sol.net!spool1-nwblwi.newsops.execpc.com!newsfeeds.sol.net!news-out.visi.com!he
rmes.visi.com!newsfeed1.earthlink.net!newsfeed.earthlink.net!uunet!lax.uu.net!news.navix.n
et!u-n-c-a-n-c-e-l-l-e-r
From: "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Newsgroups: alt.config,comp.lang.c,alt.2600

Subject: cmsg cancel <a0n8b9$6u8$2@pita.alt.net>
Control: cancel <a0n8b9$6u8$2@pita.alt.net>
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2001 07:37:06 GMT
Organization: Navix Internet Subscribers
Lines: 2
Message-ID: <cancel.a0n8b9$6u8$2@pita.alt.net>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 166.102.15.34
X-Trace: iac5.navix.net 1009792962 972 166.102.15.34 (31 Dec 2001 10:02:42 GMT)
X-Complaints-To: abuse@navix.net
NNTP-Posting-Date: 31 Dec 2001 10:02:42 GMT
X-No-Archive: yes
Comment: Anarchy! Fuck You!
X-Commentary: I love NewsAgent 1.10, Sandblaster Build 74 (19 March 1999) and the Polaris Cancel Engine V. 6.1
X-Unacanc3l: yes

This message was cancelled from within Mozilla...not

6289. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 14:00:32 UTC
From: "Jim Bromley, K7JEB" <j.e.bromley@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <46FX7.205538$WW.11911456@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29330

> HEH. I think I'll have to take your word for it!
> Hey, my husband--oh, OM as I suppose I should call
> him for hamdom (even though I think YL and OM are
> pretty tacky)--has a Worked All El Paso certificate!
> Were you in on that? It took him about, hmmmmm,
> maybe a year to do it?

> Kim W5TIT (husband is W5CAW)

Well, my last residence in El Paso was in 1971, so it
wasn't me. Actually, the WAE award is issued by the
El Paso ARC (W5ES), of which I was never a member.
So I don't know the details about issuing them. That
certificate has been in existence for 50 years that
I know of and qualifies, I suppose, as an historical
artifact or something like that.

I keep suggesting to the people I talk to in Glendale,
California that we should institute a "Worked All
Glendale" award (the 'WAG' award), but, as you well
know, suggestive three-letter acronyms/abbreviations
tend to upset and confuse people.

--
Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
Glendale, Arizona

6290. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 14:01:55 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0n8bq$6u8$h@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29336
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.2600

Testicleless COWARD
"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDicksucker@Liberal.comz> wrote in message
news:a0md4r$7en$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
>
> Heck, a fifty dollar diploma? At least Roger's buddy, W4AMP went to school
> for nine months. Of course AMP claims to be an Engineer, a title that
takes
> most students four years to accomplish, and that at an accredited college.
> (it is his lie....let him tell it the way he wants...)
> Roger claims to have a college degree, yet cannot spell or author a
cohesive

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!
You mean "coherent sentence," DUMBASS. "Cohesive" is what is happeneing to
youtr jack-rag under your bed, sticking together after all the sperm
deposits. Hope your mommy doesn't find out you are using a pair of her
panties as a jack rag.

> sentence. W4AMP claims to be an engineer with an income of $90,000 per
> annum. Neither one of these guys is telling the truth.
> Roger lives with his mother

I do? BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA you need to get up-to-date.

>and AMP, despite his alleged "ninety thou" per
> annum income continues to live in a run-down rental while dodging bill
> collectors.

While Oraasssssss pimps his daughters and Arselicks was fired twice from his
position with the FCC for jamming.

> The only perceivable difference between the two is that Roger apparently
> meets and pays his bills. AMP is struggling to make ends meet what with a
> run-down second-hand car and pay-as-you-go cell phones that were recently
> shut off due to non-payment.
> Wogie seems to live within his means. AMP? Heck...he has no "means" and
> will forever be what he is...a shameless liar.

Sounds like the little fatassed wire-puller and conduit bender is jealous of
W4AMP.

6291. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:06:39 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F2D7F.B4935D69@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29337

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Yup. And if you were a kid getting interested in ham radio today you'd
> be faced with being prohibited from it instead of how it worked out for
> you in the 50's. So it's fine for you to have freedom from such
> unrealistic restrictions but not those who have no control nor
> involvement in them but who must abide by someone elses stupidity. I
> gotta say, it's typical of ya, pal.

When the father of that kid defaults on his home loan, does the loan company allow the kid to continue living there? It's unfortunate, but a kid is affected by the contracts willingly entered into by the father.

You seem to have a double standard, Dick. You argue that Kim's legal callsign is detrimental to the ARS and a lot of people are turned off by it. Many neighbors consider HF antennas to be eyesores, are turned off by them, and want to be protected from them by the CC&Rs. Seems you talk with forked tongue.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6292. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:09:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F2E16.E166F1D7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29338

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Dawgone, Hans, I do believe you're cornfuses poor ol' Cec. Maybe scotch
> got what his one-hit $hit missed.

Dick, do you often go about trying to break the contracts
that you have signed?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6293. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:20:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F30AC.6EF20444@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29339
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Twistedhed wrote:
> We are treated like 2nd class citizens.

Would you like for a homeless person to start living in
the back seat of your vehicle?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6294. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:22:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230102215.03703.00000783@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29342

In article <3C2E9B02.440216E8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>K0HB wrote:
>> Tell that to a young family man raising a family, or to a
>> teenager who just got interested in our hobby, or to a
>> retiree on pension who's just decided to pursue his dream of
>> being a ham.
>
>Life's rough all over, Hans. I drove a pickup with 200,000
>miles on it so I could possess those two acres.

So everyone must do as you did?

>People must
>proprietize their wants/needs.

"Proprietize"? Maybe you mean "prioritize".

Is ham radio to be limited only to those who can find two unrestricted acres?

> Which is more important -
>a ham antenna or a vehicle?

Why must there be a choice?

>Yet, the federal government
>doesn't guarantee us vehicles.

They DO guarantee that we have certain freedom of use of our vehicles, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6295. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:22:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230102215.03703.00000782@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29343

In article <E447BB6B107727DE.124A1E3F3A33C370.703D7850046C58A1@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:50 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>wrote:
>
>>Greetings All:
>>
>>To those who have been insisting that the FCC has the best interests
>>of the ARS at heart, I offer the following. I seems like "Restructuring"
>>isn't the only way they had in mind to put an end to our tomfoolery on
>>all this valuable RF real estate. Now they're saying licensed radio
>>amateurs don't have any need to establish a station in our own homes.
>>Get ready to lose some more spectrum -- and soon! Read it and weep...
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> More "gloom and doom" Larry?

Nope - facts and reasonable conclusions.
>
> Get a grip!

Which means what?

>Simply because the FCC doesn't view it as
>essential for a ham to have a permanent station location does NOT mean
>they are trying to strip any frequencies from us.

It sure doesn't help the ARS grow and prosper, though. If the ARS doesn't grow and prosper, there will be no reason for our frequencies to be preserved for our use. And make no mistake, there are plenty of folks who would be really happy to see ham radio just disappear.

>With today's
>equipment, you DON'T need a permanent station location-

Nobody NEEDS to be ham at all, either.

>-modern rigs
>are very capable of mobile or portable operations, something that the
>HF rigs a few decades ago weren't really suited for.

The antennas haven't gotten any smaller, though. Mobile is no solution for those without suitable vehicles. Portable is fine if you're a camping type - useless if you're not.

> It's a ham's choice whether or not he or she will move into an
>area with antenna restrictions--no one is forced to do so, they can
>live elsewhere if they feel the restrictions are more important than
>the location.

That's not true in the vast majority of cases. Young hams usually don't choose where they live. Amateurs with families usually do not have autocratic power to decide where to live based solely on antenna considerations.

In real life, home choice is often driven by a number of factors:

- cost
- availability (you can't buy what's not for sale)
- suitable location (jobs, family, stores)
- size and features
- school district
- special family member needs (handicapped access, health care access, special educational facilities, etc.)

There is also the fact that many people aren't in a position to move just so they can become hams.

>If enough hams take the attitude that they won't buy
>homes in restricted communities, and if that has an economic impact on
>the community, the restrictions will disappear.

Nope. For one thing, there just aren't enough hams looking to buy houses to make much of a difference. Surf over to

http://www.realtor.com

and get an idea of the size of the real estate market. How many hams do you think are looking for houses at any one time?

For another thing, the restrictions are carefully designed to be extremely difficult to remove. Even if both buyer and seller want to be rid of them, they are specifically set up so that they cannot be removed in future sales.

>If not, it's a simple
>question of market economics (non-hams may be MORE willing to buy in
>an area where antennas are banned), not something that involves (or
>SHOULD involve) the government directly.

Just the opposite. It forces hams into "ghettos" that are constantly shrinking.

>
> Don't like a restriction? Don't sign a purchase agreement for
>property until you know it doesn't have any in its deed of title.

In many situations there is no reasonable choice. And what if a person decides to become a ham after buying a house - should they be forced to move?
>
> Sounds simple enough to me.

It's not.

Would you have the same attitude towards CC&Rs which specified that only married couples could engage in certain activities on the property? Or that restricted anyone from perfectly legal at-home activities like alcohol use or eating meat? Particularly when the percentage of properties so restricted grew every year, making it harder and harder to find an unrestricted house?

--

"No-antenna" covenants started in the '70s in California (natch) as a sweetheart deal between developers and cable providers. The cable companies picked up the cost of wiring new developments for cable and the developers inserted the "no antennas" restrictions in the fine print. End result was a guaranteed captive market for the cable TV folks.

As I understand it, the reason TV dishes are exempted is that the "pizza dish" satellite companies pushed a test case all the way to the Supreme Court, claiming that the restrictive covenants created a monopoly for the cable folks and excluded the pizza dish folks from the pay-TV market. Supremes said it was restriction of trade, monopolistic practice, that sort of thing, and broke the covenants - except in historic areas.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6296. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:22:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230102216.03703.00000785@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29340

In article <3C2A43C9.5B613C6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>McCollum sometimes has a way with a phrase, doesn't he?

Absolutely. You can see the Midwest Vonnegut/Twain/Heller influences, plus the
original McC style and the careful application to ham radio. Really well done.

> I like it.

One of the reasons I read rrap. My list of reasons is a very short one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6297. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:22:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230102216.03703.00000784@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29341

In article <3C2E9CFA.7B2E2AEE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>K0HB wrote:
>> The message is very clear to me -- "You amateurs don't have
>> enough financial or political clout for us to worry about.
>
>Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
>state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you?

Yes, because the contract unreasonably denies a citizen his/her inalienable
rights. The govt. does that sort of thing all the time.

> Any other
>legal contracts you would like to dismiss?

Not at the moment.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6298. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:22:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230102218.03703.00000786@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29344

In article <a0lm8k$q4j$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

>> Carl (WA6VSE) has said that existing Advanceds should not be given Extra
>class
>> licenses without passing the Extra class test because those Advanceds have
>not
>> demonstrated the necessary qualifications. I'm simply trying to figure out
>what
>> qualifications he's talking about.
>
>Very simple...the Extra class written exam.

The exam is not a qualification, it's a requirement that must be met. Same as
the 20 wpm code test.

>Before the NEW structure,
>all that involved was the 4B (I think that was it) which
>I and others passed and obtained CSCE credit for.

Yeah, I know. I passed it in August, 1970, between sophomore and junior year of
high school. Age 16. Woulda done it earlier but they had that 2 year experience
thing back then.

>Once 4/15/00
>came and went, we had a paper upgrade. Those that were advanced
>and didn't follow that path now have a "combined" 4A/4B exam to contend
>with. That's the breaks.
>
Old 4A was 50 questions and old 4B was 40. New 4 is 50 questions.

But none of this answers the original question: What is so special about 3524
kHz that one needs to be tested more to use it than 3526?

>> Carl describes incentive licensing as "a dismal failure" and says that
>license
>> test requirements should ONLY be based on demonstrating the necessary
>> qualifications.
>
>And that's what it is per my comments above.

Why is Element 4 "necessary"? Because the FCC says so?

>> Carl also says that the writtens are not "dumbed down", even though their
>size

>> and number was radically decreased on April 15, 2000.
>
>The number of questions doesn't change the scope and
>or difficulty of learning the knowledge needed
>to pass.

Sure it does.

>> You're missing my point then, Bill. All I've done is point out the facts
>and
>> conclusions that follow logically IF one accepts Carl's philosophy of
>license
>> testing.
>
>The question then is on what do you wish to see happen
>with the testing...status quo, change to something else?

See previous posts on "basic/intermediate/full".

>> >> Sounds to me like you want to make everyone jump through the same
>written
>> >> test hoops you did.
>> >
>> >Surely you jest :-)
>>
>> No, I'm quite serious.
>
>Then exactly WHAT do YOU want as requirements?

A simple basic test to get started, a more involved test for more privs, and a
fairly comprehensive test for full privileges. And make the privileges match
the testing level.

The big problem lots of ham have with the current system is that the privileges
don't match the testing.

>> >> > why should anyone get a total freebie??? If they
>> >> >don't want to, or don't have the time to, upgrade, they should
>> >> >remain satisfied with what they have. There is no reason to
>> >> >change the system ... nobody should get privileges they aren't
>> >> >qualified for, nor should anyone lose privileges they've already
>> >> >earned.
>> >>
>> >> Sounds like what some folks were saying before the restructuring.
>> >> Folks you vehemently disagree with.
>> >
>> >That argument/analogy only holds IF you believe the current
>> >testing requirements for the written are unreasonable and/or
>> >unjustified.
>>
>> If one accepts Carl's statements, they ARE unjustified beyond the General
>> level.

>
>I don't see the logic in your conclusion.

I'm simply pointing out the inconsistency in Carl's statements. He calls the code tests "making hams jump through hoops" because they are not NECESSARY in order to operate an amateur transmitter on non-Morse modes. And he points to FCC statements and the R&O for 98-143 for proof.

OK, fine, apply that same logic to the writtens. FCC sez a General and its associated tests fully qualifies a ham to use full power on all authorized amateur modes and bands. By Carl's logic, all the NECESSARY stuff to operate any ham transmitter is contained in the testing for General. Thus, the Extra test is just as much "making hams jump through hoops" as the old code tests were - IF one accepts Carl's premises.
>
>> >> >The FCC's system "knows" who is an "old" Tech Plus and who is not,
>> >>
>> >> They do? Then why not just hand out Generals to them?
>> >
>> >Because many have NOT passed the General written. Most of those
>> >that have passed General (i.e. pre 1987) have upgraded already if they
>are
>> >still active and know about restructuring.
>>
>> Yet Carl suggests giving them HF privileges to operate "modern digital
>> modes" and even voice privileges.
>>
>> >> I say having "subbands by mode type" gives the best compromise.
>> >> >
>> >> >> >What are you trying to do with these mode limitations???
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Offer an upgrade incentive.
>> >> >
>> >> >"Incentive Licensing" was a dismal failure ...
>> >>
>> >> How do you figure? It was all about increasing technical knowledge. I
>> >> think it was propelled by Sputnik fever.
>> >
>> >If so it was 10 years in the making...Sputnick was 1957 as
>> >I recall.
>>
>> Yes, it was.
>>
>> Sputnik (note the spelling) was launched in 1957, an soon thereafter
>(1958) the
>> FCC started asking about ways to entice more hams to take the Extra exam.
>> Nothing much formal happened until 1963, when the ARRL BoD responded with
>a
>> proposal that became RM-299. This was followed by a number of proposals,
>> suggestions and counterproposals, ending in the 1966(?) announcement of
>> "incentive licensing". First phase went into effect in late 1967.

>>
>> Remember that during the 1957-1963 period the Soviets had one space
>triumph
>> after another while the US tried to catch up.
>
>Whch had more to do with physics and rocketry than
>anything electronic.

Yup, absolutely. In fact, one of the reasons the Soviets built such big rockets was that their electronics were bigger and heavier.

But the effect of all those early Soviet space triumphs was to focus attention here on "science" (actually, engineering) in all fields, not just rocketry.

>> >> Huh? The FCC sez Techs are qualified to use 1.5 kW transmitters on
>> >VHF/UHF -
>> >> are they wrong?
>> >
>> >I believe they are on that point.
>>
>> So the mere fact that FCC does something isn't proof that it's the right
>thing
>> to do. What a concept!
>
>We can always agree to disagree. The issue of disagreement, if severe,
>ends up being adjuticated by the courts. No one has taken the FCC
>to that path regarding any disagreement as to ham requirements to my
>knowledge.

Most folks don't have anywhere near the resources to sue the FCC - easier to just pass the tests! The point is still made - the mere fact that the FCC does something doesn't mean it's the right thing to do.
>> Posted here a few days ago - the "Basic/Intermediate/Full" system. I can
>post
>> it again if you want.
>
>I'll find it.

Remember, it's a raw outline of a plan for a post-end-of-S25.5 licensing system.

Cheers and Happy New Year,

You too, Bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6299. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:32:14 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F337E.95F5E883@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29345

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >People must
> >proprietize their wants/needs.
>
> "Proprietize"? Maybe you mean "prioritize".

Egads - I sure did. Got my roots mixed up.

> Is ham radio to be limited only to those who can find two unrestricted acres?

Did I say that? I merely gave an example of what can be done. Everywhere
I have lived, the first thing I did was check the CC&Rs. Just like any
other contract, if I didn't like the terms and conditions, I didn't sign.

> They DO guarantee that we have certain freedom of use of our vehicles, though.

There are many places where motor vehicles are prohibited, e.g. inside
the shopping mall. Do you advocate driving motor vehicles everywhere?
Do you object to all legal contracts, Jim, or just CC&Rs?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6300. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:37:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F349E.AC8A601@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29346

N2EY wrote:
> As I understand it, the reason TV dishes are exempted is that the "pizza dish"
> satellite companies pushed a test case all the way to the Supreme Court,
> claiming that the restrictive covenants created a monopoly for the cable folks
> and excluded the pizza dish folks from the pay-TV market. Supremes said it was
> restriction of trade, monopolistic practice, that sort of thing, and broke the
> covenants - except in historic areas.

Too bad the same approach won't work for *amateurs*. Are there any guaranteed
freedoms or laws on the side of the amateur radio operators? I suspect it would
be unconstitutional for the federal government to interfere with willingly
signed CC&R contracts.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6301. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:38:02 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F34DA.C8132ED5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29347

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3C2E9CFA.7B2E2AEE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >K0HB wrote:
> >> The message is very clear to me -- "You amateurs don't have
> >> enough financial or political clout for us to worry about.
> > >
> > >Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
> > >state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you?
>
> Yes, because the contract unreasonably denies a citizen his/her inalienable
> rights. The govt. does that sort of thing all the time.

Now, we're getting somewhere. What inalienable rights are being violated?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6302. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:52:35 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <95bu2u8msof02mvqjtp165ol6sn6krlh86@4ax.com>
Source record: 29348

On 30 Dec 2001 00:24:18 -0800, twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com (Twistedhed) wrote:

>I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in >this >group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the >frequencies >from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might >think.

Hmmm, are you licensed operators, operating under the authorization of the government of your country of residence with active participation in public service, public safety and emergency response? Do you have a call sign issued to you by your operating authority, thereby providing an easily verified method of identifying the originator of transmissions from your station? No, I think the only thing you have in common with hams is that you know how to key up a mike and speak into it.

>We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip >conditions. >We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know >technical >issues as well or better.

No, you are illegal operators with a knowledge of propagation and skip conditions. You are criminals with high-ticket tools with which you engage in your criminal activities.

>However, the attitude of some hams toward us >is >rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This >should >not be.

The attitude hams have toward you is the same as hams would have toward any other criminal. You are not treated as 2nd class citizens any more than the drunk driver, the shoplifter or chronic speeder in our neighborhood. You are treated with every bit of respect that you deserve, criminal.

>We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams >do.

And those rights are the right to study for a license and to operate according to the law - or face criminal action and the disdain of those who prefer to obey the law and operate within the law. You

seem to think that you deserve a free ride, all the rights and
privileges of ham operating, but none of the responsibilities.

>For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
>is
>a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
>is
>that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
>talk with
>him before you condemn him.

Oh, I've talked to plenty of them... I've also talked to
criminals of every other type as well. There seems to be a common
thread running through each of them, the belief that the rules apply
to others, not to them.

Raymond Sirois AB2HR
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet:\\thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

6303. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105549.14755.00001761@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29253

In article <3C2D3BD5.C6E0B9B3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Thank you. I just returned from an excellent Christmas with my
>> family up in Buffalo; had to drive thru a blizaard this morning to
>> get out of town!
>
>You were lucky to get out of Buffalo. Last I heard they had seven
>feet of snow, a new record.

Cecil:

Yes, indeed. And they're just lucky that the temps wern't a few
degrees lower, with a nice strong wind. There could have been
double that amount -- with homes, businesses, and highways
totally buried. The Buffalo area is a major disaster waiting to
happen, San Andreas fault-like in it's nature. We got all that
snow because Lake Erie was unseasonably warm -- 41 degrees
F. -- it's usually frozen by now. The warm damp air off the lake,
combined with cold air sweeping over it from Canada, makes
a very efficient snow making machine. All of which is why I'm
safely down here in Delaware!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6304. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105549.14755.00001762@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29349

In article <3C2DEEE8.23CE6BBD@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I am
>> still unable to understand why she would do this, if not to
>> proactively demonstrate her contempt for her fellow radio amateurs.
>
>Larry, even if the original reason was different, IMO, it has been
>worth it to see Kim and her callsign get your goat.

Cecil:

Don't look now, but you haven't seen that! It is not my goat
that has been got -- it's Kim's and, most definitely, Rick's!
They've been quite entertaining!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6305. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105550.14755.00001763@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29257

In article <8AB10CD9FBCDFA43.AF0493CC6D58AB55.A816DC4932F586D1@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>> Sure--because you think you know better than Kim what is "good
>>>for the ARS."
>>
>>And Kim thinks she knows better than me what is good for the ARS. So do you.
>
>
> Not at all, Jim.
>
> Kim simply doesn't feel that her PERSONAL choice of a
>perfectly legal call sign is anyone's business but her own, and I
>happen to agree.
>
> This "good for the ARS" crap is a smoke screen. No one in his
>or her right mind would seriously believe that Kim's call sign will
>make even the slightest difference to the ARS and you know that as
>well as I do. What is really going on is a witch hunt in which a group
>of crotchety, grouchy, old men are enraged because they can't
>intimidate a woman into obeying them. I'm sorry you feel the need to
>support that kind of disgusting behavior toward a fellow ham, but
>obviously you do.
>
>>And a lot of folks think I'm right. Doesn't matter - it's not up to a vote.
>
> That's right, Jim, it isn't.
>
> KIM made her choice--she didn't ask the people here to help
>her decide if she SHOULD do so or not, and thus it isn't up to anyone
>here to try to harass her into changing her sign. I don't give a
>flying damn if every ham in the news group feels her call is
>inappropriate (which obviously is NOT the case)--it is HER call sign,
>not their's, and her decision alone that is relevant.
>
>>I think what really bugs you, Rick, is that there are some of us here on
>rrap
>>who you cannot intimidate and who state our opinions as we see them
>regardless
>>of how electropolitically incorrect they may be to some.
>
> Who _I_ can't intimidate? You self-righteous prig, it is YOU
>and your cronies who are trying to intimidate someone--Kim--into doing

>something that she doesn't wish to do (change her call sign). Who in
>the hell gave you right wing fanatics the right to try to intimidate
>someone into capitulating to your prudish demands?
>
> You're a bunch of losers, Jim. And it is hams like you, Larry,
>Dick and Dave who are bringing the ARS "one step closer to extinction"
>with your outrageous behavior, blatant harassment, and attempted
>intimidation of another ham.
>
> Rick

Why is it that when I read this, I recall the image of Nikita Kruschev,
pounding his shoes on his desk at the UN?

73 de Larry, K3LT

6306. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105553.14755.00001765@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29251

In article <3c28a7f2_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>> While I've long suspected that you are incapable of telling the
>> difference between right and wrong, good taste and poor taste and poetry
>> compared to Rod McKuen, I've always had hope that you could be persuaded
>> that you've done something rather stupid.
>>
>> I maintain that hope.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>OK, Larry. OH, it's Dave who echoes Larry's thoughts now. Isn't that just
>so cute? Now you wish to determine what someone's idea of poetry is. Do
>you advocate judging how everyone shall live, what art they shall also
>believe is beautiful, what political thoughts are correct?

Kim:

Those look like Dave's thoughts, not mine. My thoughts will always
say, right at the end...

73 de Larry, K3LT

6307. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105553.14755.00001764@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29258

In article <9E33B83C3A945BD6.DF7A150EDDE14856.99CF88BB207AF109@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>>If there were any other YL hams in this newsgroup, it is entirely
>>likely that at least one of them would take offense to Kim's call
>>sign, and state so in this thread.
>
> What on earth makes you think there AREN'T other women in this
>group, Larry? The fact that none of them has come out to agree with
>your nonsense about Kim's call? Perhaps they don't feel like being the
>next target of your holier-than-thou witch hunt.

Rick:

I rather suspect that if there were other women in this newsgroup,
which there obviously are not, that some of them would have risen
to Kim's defense -- or joined in her opposition. I wouldn't go so far
as to say that amateur radio-related newsgroups are a "guy thing,"
but the male dominance seen here doesn't surprise me.

>>This has nothing to do with Kim
>>being a woman demonstrating that she is a "whole person" -- as if
>>any of us thought women wern't "whole" people in the first place.
>
> Obviously you see women as "whole people." You simply see them
>as INFERIOR "whole people."

Not really. I just see Kim as a misguided person, seeking attention in
an inappropriate manner.

>>However, don't worry -- I'm sure your liberal, feminist views were
>>noted by Kim, and I'm sure you have earned her friendship -- although
>>I can't understand why anyone would want it!
>
> Because, unlike you and the rest of the stooges, she has
>class, honesty, and intelligence.

Class? Her call sign would tend to serve as evidence to the contrary.
I'll reserve judgment on her honesty and intelligence, however.

> Seems like a good reason to me.
>
>>I can't speak for Dick or Dave,
>
> Why not? You're all clones anyway.

All evidence seems to indicate that they are just as capable of
independent thought as you would consider yourself to be. Why do
you feel it necessary to belittle us by using derogatory terms such
as "clones?" Why can't you liberals keep from resorting to
personal attacks when you're up against the wall?

>>but I, for one, could care less about
>>Kim's so-called "place" and whether or not she knows it.
>
> Sure.
>
>> All I know
>>is that she selected a call sign which is potentially harmful to the
>>positive image of the ARS -- and since she's a participant of this
>>newsgroup, she has been called to task because of it.
>
> Who the hell elected YOU the ham-cops for the news group? If
>you don't like her call, mind your own damn business you hypocritical
>busy-body!

It was Kim who sought the validation of an FCC official -- and was
soundly put in her place as a result. She brought this upon herself by
her "in your face" attitude, in an attempt to call attention to herself in
an inappropriate manner. She is now being forced to defend her
poor choice of call sign, and doing such a miserable job of it, that she
has essentially abandoned that task, and left it up to you to do for her.

>> After a couple
>>of thousand postings here and on the real "...one step closer to
>>extinction" thread (it has only 3 dots in the ellipsis -- not four), she
>>as still failed to adequately defend her decision to choose that
>>call sign in anything like a convincing manner, thus proving that
>>she only did it to call attention to herself by means of calling
>>attention to her secondary sexual characteristics.
>
> Perhaps you can explain why on earth you think she has any
>obligation TO "defend her decision." Get off your pedestal, Larry, she
>has no obligation to defend, explain, justify, or accept your
>judgement on this or any other decision she makes. It's HER call sign,
>you mental midget, not yours. And it's HER decision. Don't like it?
>Tough. Live with it.

You really need to do something about your ADD, Rick. I have
stated many times that I have no choice but to "live with" Kim's
call sign. I am not making any demands on her to change it. I'm
just attempting to influence her to do the right thing and change
it voluntarily.

>> This demonstrates
>>extremely bad taste and poor judgment on her part, and does not
>>create a positive image for YL hams, or women in general.
>
> No you stupid cretin, it demonstrates independence and

>self-confidence, two qualities I'm quite sure you HATE to see in a
>woman.

Your immature personal attacks do nothing to lend credence to
what you say. If I were you, I wouldn't bother replying to my
postings, unless and until you can do so at a level of maturity
which a person in your position should exhibit when engaged
in an intellectual discussion.

>>I am
>>still unable to understand why she would do this, if not to
>>proactively demonstrate her contempt for her fellow radio amateurs.
>
> Larry, get a grip.

I am gripping my tea mug, even as we type…well, actually, in
between spurts of typing!

> She didn't "DO" anything to you or to the ARS. She made a
>personal choice about a personal matter, and since she did so you have
>made it your life's work to harass and ridicule her in this news
>group. It is YOU who demonstrate contempt for your fellow hams, not
>Kim.

Not really. All I've done here is point out the error of Kim's
choice, and offered her the encouragement and support she
needs to make the right choice. I've repeatedly stated that I
would congratulate her if she choose to change her call sign
to one which is more appropriate, reflects good taste and
judgment, and doesn't serve to take the ARS "…one step
closer to extinction."

>>Whatever "place" Kim may have in the world, it certainly isn't
>>among radio amateurs who consider themselves to be intelligent,
>>decent, respectable radio amateurs who are concerned with
>>putting forth a positive public image.
>
> How would you know--you certainly don't qualify for that group
>yourself.

I don't see how you can say that, Rick. I am an Amateur Extra
Class licensee in good standing, who doesn't sport a call sign which
flagrantly calls attention to me in an immature, inappropriate, and
demeaning manner. Unfortunately, Kim can't say the same of
herself, the Extra-class bit notwithstanding.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6308. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105554.14755.00001766@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29254

In article <3C2DEC4C.94C6FA6D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> You have exactly one posting to produce the quote where I said
>> "no-code Techs are [technical] dumb shits," or you have once again
>> proven that you are a liar!
>
>No need to waste my time that way, Larry. You have posted hundreds
>of times that nocode techs are dumbed-down. You have even posted
>that post-restructuring generals and extras are dumbed-down.

Cecil:

Admittedly, I have -- but only in general terms. I've made no blanket statements that *all* No-code Techs or Post-Restructuring Gen/Extras are "technical dumb shits," or words to that effect. IOW, I admit that there are hams within those categories who possess a high level of technical skill -- but that is usually because they work in the electronics field in some capacity. I expect people who make their living as technicians and engineers to have professional skill levels. What's so unusual about that?

73 de Larry, K3LT

6309. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105554.14755.00001767@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29350

In article <3C2DEC9F.F6F5B2C3@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Are you also so ignorant that you don't understand ratios, Larry?
>> >Do you comprehend 1/2 = 1000000/2000000?
>>
>> Really? I'm not sure I understand.
>
>Maybe you need to come to my GED math classes - they're free.

Cecil:

If I ever find myself in your neck of the woods, I'll gladly take you
up on that! I need all the free math classes I can get my hands on!

73 de Larry, K3LT

6310. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105555.14755.00001768@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29255

In article <3C1B3B88FA43535E.A1ECAAA4C530805D.A8961E2562F81507@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:49 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>wrote:
>
>>Hmmm...so Rick Adams has called me an "ass" on this newsgroup,
>>while at the same time threatening to have my internet access
>>terminated for expressing my opinion about Kim's poor choice of a
>>call sign?
>
> 1. If you make yourself into an ass, it's only fitting to
>identify you as one.
>
> 2. I NEVER "threatened to have your internet access
>terminated." That is a typical Larry Roll lie. Quote back my "threat,"
>Larry. Put up or Shut up.

Rick:

I reported on what I read, that's all. It was no lie. I'll start providing
quotes as soon as Cecil and every one else of the NCTA persuasion
catches up on at least a decade's worth.

> 3. You don't "express your opinion" of Kim's call sign, Larry,
>you harass her about it in every thread you find her in. Clearly, the
>only way you can convince yourself that you are still a "man" is to
>intimidate a woman, and it's obviously enraging you that she isn't
>being intimidated by your cheap and shoddy actions.
>
>>Mind your *own* jawbone, Rick!
>
> Larry, go take your Viagra, dig out your Hustler magazine, and
>pretend that you can find a woman that would put up with you.
>
> Rick

More insults. How charming. However, not worthy of a reply.

73 de Larry, K3LT

6311. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105556.14755.00001769@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29256

In article <7E11FD656F8B94AC.077AE5ECB086D813.090F155996AAB65A@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>>This thread isn't about me, Dick, Dave, or anyone else being an
>>arbiter of morality.
>
> Of course it is. It's YOUR thread and you're trying to be the
>arbiter of Kim's morality. Why ELSE would you continue to hound her
>about her call sign?

Rick:

I must note that for a university professor, you don't seem to exhibit
much understanding of the meaning of the term "morality." Perhaps
I shouldn't be surprised, however. In selecting her particular Vanity
Call Sign, Kim demonstrated poor taste and bad judgment; however,
I have no basis for making any sort of commentary regarding her
personal morality. She may be as moral as the Mother Superior
of the local convent, or not -- for all I know. I will assume, in the
absence of any evidence to the contrary, that Kim's personal
behavior demonstrates high moral standards. However, that has
nothing to do with her choice of call sign -- even moral, decent people
are capable of making foolish choices.

>>It's about the poor judgement of one ham in
>>choosing a call sign which portrays female radio amateurs in an
>>undeservedly negative manner, reflects a poor image of all radio
>>amateurs, and has potential for harm to the image of the ARS
>>which has been recognized by a high-profile radio amateur who
>>also happens to be an FCC official.
>
> No, Larry. That's pure bull and any intelligent person in this
>ng knows it.

Well, from your POV, you're upset because I'm holding Kim's feet
to the fire for selecting a Vanity call sign which reflects poorly on the
positive image of radio amateurs -- YL's in particular. I'm sorry if
this bothers you, but I cannot be held responsible for keeping your
most exalted liberal elite lordship perfectly happy 24/7!

> What this thread is about is Larry Roll trying to prove his
>manhood by harassing a fellow ham into capitulating to your
>unreasonable demands and out-of-date values.

Really? What have I demanded from anyone? I've suggested to Kim
that she would be highly praised for doing the right thing if she changed

her call sign to one which wasn't so patently offensive. However, I haven't "harassed" her in any way.

>You started the thread.

So what? People start threads here all the time. Big steenking deal!

>You insist that you will perpetuate it until Kim changes her call.

I may, or I may not. I haven't decided yet. I must admit, I am getting a bit bored with this...but perhaps not bored enough...yet!

>You
>are the one who preaches about the ARS. Try acting like a responsible
>ham instead of a spoiled three year-old and stop trying to impose your
>values on others if you feel so strongly about representing the ARS
>responsibly.

Once again, Rick, this isn't about me. It is about Kim, who is representing the ARS *irresponsibly.*

>>There is nothing going on
>>here other than hams giving their opinions on a policy-related
>>matter, which is well within the bounds of the topics germane to
>>this newsgroup.
>
> Kim's call sign has absolutely nothing to do with ham radio
>policy--even YOU can't be stupid enough to think people will believe
>that dishonest statement!

Well, I haven't seen any new postings today other than yours. We'll see.

> You don't want to talk about policy, Larry, you want to harass
>a woman because she won't give in to your demands.
>
> Rick

Once again, Rick -- I haven't "demanded" anything of Kim, and wouldn't waste my time trying to.

73 de Larry, K3LT

Happy New Year!

6312. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 15:55:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011230105557.14755.00001770@mb-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 29252

In article <A10FD5715EDEE559.243BCAFF50116CA3.B1FC68CC611407D6@lp.airnews.net>,
Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:

>
>On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:47 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>wrote:
>
>>Stop electronically stalking me.
>
> Grow up, you idiot!
>
> Rick

Rick:

How charming. Don't look now, but you've got the wrong bloke,
mate. It was Cecil who started this "electronic stalking" thing
going on here. However, the direct insult of being called an
"idiot" is noted; I wonder what voyager.net's Terms Of Service
have to say about that?

73 de Larry, K3LT

6313. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:03:48 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f3a6b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29259

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:OeOlDgOkBHA.1348@cpimsnntpa02...
>
> > More "gloom and doom" Larry?
>
> > Get a grip! Simply because the FCC doesn't view it as
> > essential for a ham to have a permanent station location does NOT mean
> > they are trying to strip any frequencies from us. With today's
> > equipment, you DON'T need a permanent station location--modern rigs
> > are very capable of mobile or portable operations, something that the
> > HF rigs a few decades ago weren't really suited for.
>
> > Sounds simple enough to me.
>
> If it sounds "simple enough" to you, then perhaps you haven't
> thought through the implications of the FCC denial of the
> petition to extend PRB-1 antenna protection to Amateur Radio
> Service antennas.
>
> Personally, I think that Larry completely understates the case,
> and in fact this is the most chilling decision from the FCC since
> "banish them to 200 meters and down". The denial signals to
> me the possible end of Federal support for the Amateur Radio
> Service.
>
> Consider that while FCC denies protection from CC&Rs to
> amateurs, it recently GRANTED this protection to home entertainment
> antennas.
>
> I'll say that again. The FCC recently GRANTED protection from
> CC&Rs for home entertainment system antennas, but DENIES
> the same protection to amateur antenna systems.
>
> Instead, they basically tell us to "go eat cake", go for a ride in
> your car, or go down to the club station. Uhhhhhhhh, is there
> a club station near you which can be shared by all the amateurs
> in your community? And would you leave your latest project
> down there while you rethink some of the circuit designs?
> How about running the Sweepstakes contest all weekend
> from your minivan?
>
> The message is very clear to me -- "You amateurs don't have
> enough financial or political clout for us to worry about.

> Now, to address your notion of "Don't sign an agreement...
> blah, blah, blah...." What a cop out! Tell it to a 15 year-old
> teenager who just developed an interest in amateur radio.
>
> "Hey, Dad, I've been reading on the web about amateur
> radio, and it seems like a really interesting hobby. If I
> study and pass the license tests, can you help me put up
> a small antenna in the back yard?"
>
> "Sounds like a great idea, son. But I have to check with
> the HOA first -- seems I remember something about
> antennas in our deed."
>
> Next day -- "Sorry son, but we are restricted from putting
> up an antenna on our property. I guess Ham radio is out
> of the question for you. Maybe I'll get you one of those
> new video game systems instead."
>
> Kids who live in newer developments (can you say semi-
> affluent, well educated kids, with bright career futures)
> are effective barred from meaningful involvement in the
> full range of Amateur Radio activities -- this is one of the
> demographic targets we need desperately to reach to
> fulfill the charter of our service.
>
> If may well be that a healthy amateur radio service, which
> appeals to bright young scientifically-inclined youngsters is
> no longer a federal objective, and that 97.1 is nothing more
> than eyewash.
>
> Clearly this is a fit subject for discussion on rraPOLICY, and
> should not be lightly dismissed with phrases like "Get a grip!"
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Hey, remember all the high and mighty code/no-code arguments and near knock-down-drag-outs there've been right here on this newsgroup? Well, according to the folks who just couldn't stand the post-restructuring set up, the ARS is degraded to stupidity anyway, right? So, why would they now all come to the defense of such a degraded service?

Kim W5TIT

6314. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:06:14 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f3af6$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29260

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2F2D7F.B4935D69@IEEE.org...> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Yup. And if you were a kid getting interested in ham radio today you'd
> > be faced with being prohibited from it instead of how it worked out for
> > you in the 50's. So it's fine for you to have freedom from such
> > unrealistic restrictions but not those who have no control nor
> > involvement in them but who must abide by someone elses stupidity. I
> > gotta say, it's typical of ya, pal.
>
> When the father of that kid defaults on his home loan, does the loan
> company allow the kid to continue living there? It's unfortunate, but
> a kid is affected by the contracts willingly entered into by the
> father.
>
> You seem to have a double standard, Dick. You argue that Kim's legal
> callsign is detrimental to the ARS and a lot of people are turned off
> by it. Many neighbors consider HF antennas to be eyesores, are turned
> off by them, and want to be protected from them by the CC&Rs. Seems
> you talk with forked tongue.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Thank you...I was just about to post something along those lines.

Kim W5TIT

6315. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:08:04 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f3b6f$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29261

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2F2E16.E166F1D7@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Dawgone, Hans, I do believe you're cornfuses poor ol' Cec. Maybe scotch
> > got what his one-hit $hit missed.
>
> Dick, do you often go about trying to break the contracts
> that you have signed?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Aw, Cec...it's all a part of the "less government" party that is in office. You know, the ones who now have their fingers in just about every cookie jar there is? Less government is always better, until they're needed for things like breaking contractual obligations, voluntarily signed between non-government entities.

Kim W5TIT

6316. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:12:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f3c78_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29262

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230102215.03703.00000783@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <3C2E9B02.440216E8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >K0HB wrote:
> >> Tell that to a young family man raising a family, or to a
> >> teenager who just got interested in our hobby, or to a
> >> retiree on pension who's just decided to pursue his dream of
> >> being a ham.
> >>
> >Life's rough all over, Hans. I drove a pickup with 200,000
> >miles on it so I could possess those two acres.
>
> So everyone must do as you did?
>
> >People must
> >proprietize their wants/needs.
>
> "Proprietize"? Maybe you mean "prioritize".
>
> Is ham radio to be limited only to those who can find two unrestricted
acres?
>
> > Which is more important -
> >a ham antenna or a vehicle?
>
> Why must there be a choice?
>
> >Yet, the federal government
> >doesn't guarantee us vehicles.
>
> They DO guarantee that we have certain freedom of use of our vehicles,
though.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

It seems to me that just a few short months ago, when several of us were up
in arms about CCRs, that the debate's two angles were: either you support
the "law" of the neighborhood, or you stay the Hell out of it and find
somewhere else to live. I was one of the people who think it absolutely
ludicrous that anyone would *ever* agree to move into such a neighborhood

and I would do everything in my power not to. I think there were even a few typical responses to that about my "whining" again.

Now, this comes up and I see a whole bunch of those I debated, who are now on the side of letting a government come in and negate the contract that was signed. Will you people puhleeze make up my mind? You're nuts. Don't move into a neighborhood with CCRs or HOAs. It's as anti-American as you can get.

Kim W5TIT

6317. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:14:46 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f3cf8_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29263

Why should a majority of the population yield to the wants and desires of a very, very minute part of the population?

Kim W5TIT

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20011230102215.03703.00000782@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <E447BB6B107727DE.124A1E3F3A33C370.703D7850046C58A1@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:50 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >wrote:
> >
> >>Greetings All:
> >>
> >>To those who have been insisting that the FCC has the best interests
> >>of the ARS at heart, I offer the following. I seems like "Restructuring"
> >>isn't the only way they had in mind to put an end to our tomfoolery on
> >>all this valuable RF real estate. Now they're saying licensed radio
> >>amateurs don't have any need to establish a station in our own homes.
> >>Get ready to lose some more spectrum -- and soon! Read it and weep...
> >>
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > More "gloom and doom" Larry?
>
> Nope - facts and reasonable conclusions.
> >
> > Get a grip!
>
> Which means what?
>
> >Simply because the FCC doesn't view it as
> >essential for a ham to have a permanent station location does NOT mean
> >they are trying to strip any frequencies from us.
>
> It sure doesn't help the ARS grow and prosper, though. If the ARS doesn't grow
> and prosper, there will be no reason for our frequencies to be preserved for
> our use. And make no mistake, there are plenty of folks who would be really
> happy to see ham radio just disappear.

>
> >With today's
> >equipment, you DON'T need a permanent station location-
>
> Nobody NEEDS to be ham at all, either.
>
> >-modern rigs
> >are very capable of mobile or portable operations, something that the
> >HF rigs a few decades ago weren't really suited for.
>
> The antennas haven't gotten any smaller, though. Mobile is no solution for
> those without suitable vehicles. Portable is fine if you're a camping
type -
> useless if you're not.
>
> > It's a ham's choice whether or not he or she will move into an
> >area with antenna restrictions--no one is forced to do so, they can
> >live elsewhere if they feel the restrictions are more important than
> >the location.
>
> That's not true in the vast majority of cases. Young hams usually don't
choose
> where they live. Amateurs with families usually do not have autocratic
power to
> decide where to live based solely on antenna considerations.
>
> In real life, home choice is often driven by a number of factors:
>
> - cost
> - availability (you can't buy what's not for sale)
> - suitable location (jobs, family, stores)
> - size and features
> - school district
> - special family member needs (handicapped access, health care access,
special
> educational facilities, etc.)
>
> There is also the fact that many people aren't in a position to move just
so
> they can become hams.
>
> >If enough hams take the attitude that they won't buy
> >homes in restricted communities, and if that has an economic impact on
> >the community, the restrictions will disappear.
>
> Nope. For one thing, there just aren't enough hams looking to buy houses
to
> make much of a difference. Surf over to
>
> http://www.realtor.com

>
> and get an idea of the size of the real estate market. How many hams do
you
> think are looking for houses at any one time?
>
> For another thing, the restrictions are carefully designed to be extremely
> difficult to remove. Even if both buyer and seller want to be rid of them,
they
> are specifically set up so that they cannot be removed in future sales.
>
> >If not, it's a simple
> >question of market economics (non-hams may be MORE willing to buy in
> >an area where antennas are banned), not something that involves (or
> >SHOULD involve) the government directly.
>
> Just the opposite. It forces hams into "ghettos" that are constantly
shrinking.
>
> >
> > Don't like a restriction? Don't sign a purchase agreement for
> >property until you know it doesn't have any in its deed of title.
>
> In many situations there is no reasonable choice. And what if a person
decides
> to become a ham after buying a house - should they be forced to move?
> >
> > Sounds simple enough to me.
>
> It's not.
>
> Would you have the same attitude towards CC&Rs which specified that only
> married couples could engage in certain activities on the property? Or
that
> restricted anyone from perfectly legal at-home activities like alcohol use
or
> eating meat? Particularly when the percentage of properties so restricted
grew
> every year, making it harder and harder to find an unrestricted house?
>
> --
>
> "No-antenna" covenants started in the '70s in California (natch) as a
> sweetheart deal between developers and cable providers. The cable
companies
> picked up the cost of wiring new developments for cable and the developers
> inserted the "no antennas" restrictions in the fine print. End result was
a
> guaranteed captive market for the cable TV folks.
>
> As I understand it, the reason TV dishes are exempted is that the "pizza

dish"
> satellite companies pushed a test case all the way to the Supreme Court,
> claiming that the restrictive covenants created a monopoly for the cable
folks
> and excluded the pizza dish folks from the pay-TV market. Supremes said it
was
> restriction of trade, monopolistic practice, that sort of thing, and broke
the
> covenants - except in historic areas.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

6318. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:17:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f3dab_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29264

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230102216.03703.00000784@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <3C2E9CFA.7B2E2AEE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >K0HB wrote:
> >> The message is very clear to me -- "You amateurs don't have
> >> enough financial or political clout for us to worry about.
> > >
> > >Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
> > >state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you?
> >

>
> Yes, because the contract unreasonably denies a citizen his/her
inalienable
> rights. The govt. does that sort of thing all the time.
>

Wait. Weren't *you* just saying that ham radio is not an inalienable right,
Jim? I know someone, and many, do. So, it's not an inalienable right to be
a ham, but it is an inalienable right to have antennas?

> >
> > > Any other
> > >legal contracts you would like to dismiss?
> >
> Not at the moment.
> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

It's easy to confuse this mind, especially when surrounded by so much wishy
washy.

Kim W5TIT

6319. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:24:08 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f3f32_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29266

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011230105553.14755.00001764@mb-cg.aol.com...
>
> All evidence seems to indicate that they are just as capable of
> independent thought as you would consider yourself to be. Why do
> you feel it necessary to belittle us by using derogatory terms such
> as "clones?" Why can't you liberals keep from resorting to
> personal attacks when you're up against the wall?
>

You had too much vacation, Larry. Isn't the word "liberal" used by you (above) to imply a derogatory attribute to Rick? So, which is it? Rick can't use derogatory terms, but you can?

Kim W5TIT

6320. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:26:05 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f3fb4_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29267

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011230105553.14755.00001764@mb-cg.aol.com...
>
> You really need to do something about your ADD, Rick. I have
> stated many times that I have no choice but to "live with" Kim's
> call sign. I am not making any demands on her to change it. I'm
> just attempting to influence her to do the right thing and change
> it voluntarily.
>

And, Rick, Larry's not nuts, it's the *rest* of the world. (buhruther) LOL

Kim W5TIT

6321. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:29:13 UTC
From: "\"Landshark\"" <Landshark@TheLandshark.com>
Message-ID: <thHX7.18821$ge4.3725200451@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 29265
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Good God! He is really grasping
for attention by digging up this post.

Troll post by the resident forger
on Rec.Radio.CB

Landshark

--
Please note that any post that is from
S3Buell_SBCGlobailnet@hotmail.com
is a FORGE. My Addy is always going to
be from SBCGlobal.Net This person has
been a troll on Rec.Radio.CB for a long
time now. If you want to send a complaint,
forward each message complete with headers
to TOSUSENET@AOL.COM. Hotmailprivacy@hotmail.com,
groups-abuse@google.com
Beware of George WA3MO^

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:4NCX7.315575$W8.11841332@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Bozo*Flush says Google Forge.
>
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> news:e9de0154.0112300024.125df714@posting.google.com...
> > I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
> > this
> > group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
> > frequencies
> > from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
> > think.
> > We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
> > conditions.
> > We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
> > technical
> > issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us
> > is
> > rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
> > should
> > not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
> > do.
> > For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
> > is

> > a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
> > is
> > that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
> > talk with
> > him before you condemn him.
> >
> > This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
> > http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html
> >
> > I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
> >
> > Unit 2711, Florida
>
>

6322. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:29:39 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f4076$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29269

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011230105553.14755.00001764@mb-cg.aol.com...
>
> I don't see how you can say that, Rick. I am an Amateur Extra
> Class licensee in good standing, who doesn't sport a call sign which
> flagrantly calls attention to me in an immature, inappropriate, and
> demeaning manner. Unfortunately, Kim can't say the same of
> herself, the Extra-class bit notwithstanding.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Sure I can say that--I am a Tech+ Class licensee in good standing, who doesn't sport a callsign which flagrantly calls attention to me in am immature, inappropriate, and demeaning manner. It's quite true. It is you, and people like you, who are calling attention to me in an immature, inappropriate, and in a demeaning manner, though. ;)

Kim W5TIT

6323. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:32:02 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f4105_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29270

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011230105554.14755.00001766@mb-cg.aol.com...
> In article <3C2DEC4C.94C6FA6D@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> You have exactly one posting to produce the quote where I said
> >> "no-code Techs are [technical] dumb shits," or you have once again
> >> proven that you are a liar!
> >
> >No need to waste my time that way, Larry. You have posted hundreds
> >of times that nocode techs are dumbed-down. You have even posted
> >that post-restructuring generals and extras are dumbed-down.
>
> Cecil:
>
> Admittedly, I have -- but only in general terms. I've made no blanket
> statements that *all* No-code Techs or Post-Restructuring Gen/Extras
> are "technical dumb shits," or words to that effect. IOW, I admit that
> there are hams within those categories who possess a high level of
> technical skill -- but that is usually because they work in the
> electronics field in some capacity. I expect people who make their living
> as technicians and engineers to have professional skill levels. What's
> so unusual about that?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

ROFLMEBU (that's rolling on the floor laughing my ever loving butt off).
Oh, Cecil. This is hysterical. If only I felt like I had the time and that
Larry was worth the effort...LOL

Kim W5TIT

6324. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:34:48 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f41a9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29271

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20011230105556.14755.00001769@mb-cg.aol.com...
>
> Really? What have I demanded from anyone? I've suggested to Kim
> that she would be highly praised for doing the right thing if she changed
> her call sign to one which wasn't so patently offensive. However, I
> haven't "harassed" her in any way.
>

Larry. Larry. Larry. The day I hear you utter praise in my direction, I
will be smelling my armpits before I think it's related to anything else.

Kim W5TIT

6325. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:35:21 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <22f95753a243693d99f882d77b3604c9.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 29268

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message news:3c2f3a6b_1@newsa.ev1.net...

>
> Hey, remember all the high and mighty code/no-code arguments and near
> knock-down-drag-outs there've been right here on this newsgroup? Well,
> according to the folks who just couldn't stand the post-restructuring set
> up, the ARS is degraded to stupidity anyway, right? So, why would they now
> all come to the defense of such a degraded service?
>

In other words, you'd rather not discuss this issue.

Excellent. Set up your newsreader to ignore it.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

6326. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 16:46:11 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f4454_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29272

"K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
news:22f95753a243693d99f882d77b3604c9.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c2f3a6b_1@newsa.ev1.net...
>
> >
> > Hey, remember all the high and mighty code/no-code arguments and near
> > knock-down-drag-outs there've been right here on this newsgroup? Well,
> > according to the folks who just couldn't stand the post-restructuring
set
> > up, the ARS is degraded to stupidity anyway, right? So, why would they
now
> > all come to the defense of such a degraded service?
> >
>
> In other words, you'd rather not discuss this issue.
>

Well, actually, I am wondering why whomever started this and whomever is all upset about it, wasn't discussing it prior to any decisions being made by the FCC. It's funny that it's always *after the fact* that these issues are raised on a newsgroup.

>
> Excellent. Set up your newsreader to ignore it.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

And, I would like to know why the folks who argue on the side of the ARS being so dumbed down, worthless, invaded, nothing but CBish, etc., etc., would now be so very concerned about it? Did they expect that their blase attitude would have a *positive* effect on the ARS?

Another think I'd like to know is why the folks who were just vociferously arguing *for* CCRs just a couple/few months ago--and who were throwing the usual insults at people who don't like them--are now crying out for a federal mandate to negate the very contracts they were bothering to wave in the faces of people? I think the words they used were something to the effect of: "if you don't like it, then don't move into a neighborhood like that." OK, I'm convinced. So, why is that such a crappy belief to have now? It seems to me that Cecil, and me I suppose, are now stating exactly

what was stated to us--and yet, is that the attitude of resentment I see? Yep, it sure it.

Not that I think either way on the issue. I'd rather get to the meat of the matter in the apparent problem a lot of folks are having on focusing on exactly what they believe--or else, maybe it is that they feel however they think is best "at the time" with a propensity for quick change if it suits them. Yeah, I think that's it.

Kim W5TIT

6327. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 17:47:52 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <uFYVrlVkBHA.1704@cpimsnntpa03>
Source record: 29273

Cecil said:

> I suspect it would be unconstitutional for the federal government to
> interfere with willingly signed CC&R contracts.

You suspect wrong. The federal government (FCC) issued a preemption voiding CC&Rs which prohibit visual entertainment (TV) antennas. That rule was designed to promote two FEDERAL OBJECTIVES: (a) to ensure that consumers have access to a broad range of video programming services ("the couch potatoes gotta have their TV"), and (b) to foster full and fair competition among different types of video programming services (to allow over-the-air broadcasts to compete with cable). That preemption was issued at the urging of Congress, and was upheld by the Supreme Court.

Since there is also a FEDERAL OBJECTIVE to promote a strong amateur radio service (see 97.1) it follows that a preemption in the case of amateur radio antennas would be a perfectly legitimate course of action, almost a no-brainer.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

PS: For Kim -- Many of us have been involved in this effort for a long time. The sudden interest shown here on rraPolicy is in the fact that FCC denied our petition.

PPS: For all -- My interest in this matter is for the future of our Amateur Radio Service. I personally have no such restrictions in my property deeds.

6328. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 17:47:56 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f547b_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29274

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:uFYVrlVkBHA.1704@cpimsnntpa03...
>
> PS: For Kim -- Many of us have been involved in this effort for a long
time.
> The sudden interest shown here on rraPolicy is in the fact that FCC denied
> our petition.
>

This is the first I'd heard about it. If I'd known of it, I probably would
have sent a comment to the FCC. How come you brought it up "after the
fact?" I am not saying that flippantly, I'd really like to know.

>
> PPS: For all -- My interest in this matter is for the future of our
Amateur
> Radio Service. I personally have no such restrictions in my property
deeds.
>

Neither do I. And, I'd refuse a petition from a neighborhood to start such
restricitions, and I would never be in a neighborhood with an HOA or such
restrictive CCRs. At least, I hope it doesn't ever get to the point where
that is all that's left. At the same time, I don't think I would knowingly
sign such an agreement and then look for a way out of it at a later date.
But, I can't say for sure--because I've never been in that position (except
for marriage, of course).

Kim W5TIT

6329. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 17:54:33 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c2f5604_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29276

Oh, one more comment:

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:uFYVrlVkBHA.1704@cpimsnntpa03...
>
> Since there is also a FEDERAL OBJECTIVE to promote a strong amateur radio
> service (see 97.1) it follows that a preemption in the case of amateur
radio
> antennas would be a perfectly legitimate course of action, almost a
> no-brainer.
>

Except that there is no "financial" loss or competitive issues in the case of amateur radio. I don't know if they did, but if amateur radio antenna manufacturers got into the fray and could prove that they are somehow limited in business matters by such things as the CCRs and HOAs, then there may be a valid argument for the FCC/government to listen to. The preemption for manufacturers and providers of commercial television services is a money-matter.

There may be a FEDERAL OBJECTIVE to promote a strong amateur radio service, but there is no "meat" behind that objective. At least not enough for this kind of battle.

The bottom line is always that amateur radio is "just a hobby." I'm not saying that to be flippant, either. I feel certain that is the feeling among many decision makers, including Congress, who influence and can have an effect on the service. That we provide the services we do is so not in the limelight, that it's just not a concern. Unfortunately.

Kim W5TIT

6330. Re: New topic: Quality or Quantity

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 17:57:14 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <f1d3b905af1f9b91286200edeb5f6bd3.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 29275

"KC8PMX" wrote:

> Regardless of mode or band of transmission, is ham radio really about the
> quality of the QSO or the quantity of the QSO's?? And state why please.

I think the answer is "it depends".

I just finished a 45 minute QSO with Peter, DH2DL, near Dresden. We
spoke of many things (terrorism, ancestral roots, Yagi antenna design)
and it probably would fit your definition of a "quality" QSO.

Yesterday I spent some time participating in the "Stu Perry" 160M
radiosport event, and my objective was a large "quantity" of QSO's
to validate my station/antenna engineering and to hone my skills
at communicating under adverse conditions.

I think ham radio is "about" both of those (and other) things.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

6331. Re: What not to say to a cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 18:12:49 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112301012.3811c70d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29277
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message news:<a0i5np$mn1$5@dosa.alt.net>...
> "LloydVFP" <LloydVFP@KV4FZmyHero.net> wrote in message
> news:a0gq8q$f9r$0@pita.alt.net...
> > "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
> news:a0fchi$q4t$2@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org> wrote in message
> > > news:I9yW7.125$8M.574732@paloalto-snr2.gtei.net...
> > > >
> > > > Swift Rider <c_howard_in@disguise.com> wrote in Alt.Law-Enforcement...
> > > >
> > > > : The WORST Things to Say to a Police Officer:
> > > > :
> > > > :
> > > > : 1. I can't reach my license unless you hold my beer.
> > > > :
> > > > : 2. Sorry, Officer, I didn't realize my radar detector wasn't plugged
> in.
> > > > :
> > > > : 3. Aren't you the guy from the Village People?
> > > > :
> > > > : 4. Hey, you must've been doin' about 125 mph to keep up with me!
> Good
> job!
> > > > :
> > > > : 5. Excuse me. Is "stick up" hyphenated?
> > > > :
> > > > : 6. I though you had to be in relatively good physical condition to
> be
> a
> > > > : police officer.
> > > > :
> > > > : 7. I was going to be a cop, but I decided to finish high school
> instead.
> > > > :
> > > > : 8. Bad cop! No donut!
> > > > :
> > > > : 9. You're not gonna check the trunk, are you?
> > > > :
> > > > : 10. Gee, that gut sure doesn't inspire confidence.
> > > > :
> > > > : 11. Didn't I see you get your butt kicked on "Cops"?
> > > > :
```

> > > > : 12. Wow, you look just like the guy in the picture on my
> girlfriend's
> > > > > : nightstand!
> > > > :
> > > > > : 13. Is it true that people become cops because they are too dumb to
> work
> at
> > > > > : McDonald's?
> > > > :
> > > > > : 14. I pay your salary!
> > > > :
> > > > > : 15. So, uh, you on the take, or what?
> > > > :
> > > > > : 16. Gee, Officer! That's terrific. The last officer only gave me a
> warning,
> > > > > : too!
> > > > :
> > > > > : 17. Do you know why you pulled me over? OK, just so one of us does.
> > > > :
> > > > > : 18. I was trying to keep up with traffic. Yes, I know there is no
> other
> car
> > > > > : around me&emdash;that's how far ahead of me they are.
> > > > :
> > > > > : 19. What do you mean. "Have I been drinking?" You're the trained
> specialist.
> > > > :
> > > > > : 20. Well, when I reached down to pick up my bag of crack, my gun
> fell
> off
> my
> > > > > : lap and got lodged between the brake pedal and the gas pedal,
> forcing
> me
> to
> > > > > : speed out of control.
> > > > :
> > > > > : 21. Hey, is that a 9 mm? That's nothing compared to this .44 magnum.
> > > > :
> > > > > 22. It's not my car, BUT..... (care of Nightcrawler)
> > > > >
> > > > > 23. I know my rights!!!!
> >
> > 24. KC8JBO, Wogie Wiseman, would say to the cop: Will you
> > be my boyfriend? LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL
>
> N0VFP, Llllardasssss lllllloyd has said to a cop, "Can I slurp your
> nutsacks to let me off these felonies?" See, Lllardasssss lllloyd has
> quite a criminal record, for buggering boys , cows, and pumpkins in and
> around Athens, AL.

>
> This was just faxed from the Birminham Field office:
>
> The Great Pumpkin
> Birmingham Post-Herald
> October 14, 2000
>
> Police arrested Lloyd A. Davies, a 27 year old white male, resident of
> Athens, Alabama in the Anderson Pumpkin patch at 11:38pm Friday. Davies
> will be charged with lewd and lascivious behavior, public indecency,
> and public intoxication at the Athens Municipal Courthouse Monday. The
> suspect allegedly stated that as he was passing a pumpkin patch, he
> decided to stop. "You know, a pumpkin is soft and squishy inside, and
> there was no one around here for miles. At least I thought there
> wasn't." he stated in a phone interview from the Athens Municipal
> Courthouse Jail.
> Davies went on to state that he pulled over to the side of the road,
> picked out a pumpkin that he felt was appropriate to his purposes, cut
> a hole in it, and proceeded to satisfy his alleged "need". "I guess I
> was just really into it, you know?" he commented with evident
> embarrassment. In the process, Torrance apparently failed to notice the
> Athens Municipal police car approaching and was unaware of his audience
> until officer Brenda Taylor approached him. "It was an unusual
> situation, sure." said officer Taylor. "I walked up to (Davies) and
> he's... just working away at this pumpkin."
> Taylor went on to describe what happened when she approached Davies. "I
> just went up and said, 'Excuse me sir, but do you realize that you are
> screwing a pumpkin?' He got real surprised as you'd expect, and then
> looked me straight in the face and said,
> 'A pumpkin? Damn... is it midnight already?"

probably a close friend of yours chuckie....the nut doesn't fall far
from the tree does it good buddy????

6332. Re: Help:Steel Tubes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 18:43:22 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0112301043.24364036@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29278
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

genocide2rf357@aol.com (Genocide2RF357) wrote in message
news:<20011230100154.13599.00002293@mb-fq.aol.com>...
> Hello,
> What would be a good choice of tubes or a tube that will do 2.5KW.Also what
> would be a good tube or tubes to do 5KW just wondering.Thanks for the info in
> advance.
>
> 73's from Mike
>
> NOTE:I know that cb amps are illegal and running power is illegal also I dont
> care and was just curious what tubes are capable of this i did not say they
> were going to be used but what the hell you may never know!!!!

We know they are gonna be used heh heh....

6333. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 18:47:39 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2EA8D3.D54B8132@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29279
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

KC8JBO wrote:

> > That's 'thirty years and still a virgin',
>
> Speaking from experience, Jizzwallowing JR?

Sheesh, learn proper quoting and responding in the newsgroups
woger, I did not post the above. Moron!!!

6334. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 18:50:31 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2EA981.431F464E@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29280
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KC8JBO wrote:

> Methjadone just kick in, heroin addict?

What is 'methjadone'? Learn to spell, woger.

6335. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 18:53:31 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0112301053.5568bce1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29281
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Sam" <kg4heb@psknet.com> wrote in message
news:<rmrX7.1642$Dl1.828244@monger.newsread.com>...
> I know he knows a lot , that's great . I wish I could learn something from
> this guy . But, he is just too damn rude . I never said anything out of the
> way until he started with his sarcasm . - and dick , congrats on being an
> extra class, but lighten up . Just remember you wasn't born with that
> knowledge . You yourself had to learn somewhere . 73's Sam
> "middlefiger4@home.comss" <middlefinger4@home.com> wrote in message
> news:qcrX7.337933$5A3.130209700@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> > Sam, you should understand You have a Extra Class Ham in Dick who is
> willing
> > to lead you down the road to Illegal CB ... If you want to he can take you
> > where you want to go...
> >
> > "Sam" <kg4heb@psknet.com> wrote in message
> > news:zOqX7.1638$Dl1.827048@monger.newsread.com...
> > > I think that's the first post this guy has posted that doesn't have any
> > > sarcasm . That I have seen . All said .
> > > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:1GqX7.245582$3d2.12104448@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Tim" <timnebo@aol.comLOL> wrote in message
> > > > news:20011229153217.10842.00002189@mb-fa.aol.com...
> > > > > hi mike, mine sure enough has a qaud set of 3-500z tubes in it. now
> did
> i say
> > > > > it was made that way by heatkit? no. using your logic then all of
> the
> alphas
> > > > > and alike amps using big ceramic tubes would be illegal and they are
> not. i
> > > > > doubt youve seen a sb220 like mine unless youve been around some
> high
> powered
> > > > > specialist. it takes some care to do right.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > You are quite right; as an Amateur, I could own the old megawatt from
> > > > > Radio Moscow without FCC approval for no better reason than they do
> not
> > > > > approve anything beyond Part 15 in the Amateur Service.
> > > > >

> > > > As far as putting four tubes in the box, nothing that a complete
> redesign
> > > > of the power supply and output tank would not do along with a general
> > > > beefing but being for a single band not that big a problem. Just what
> you
> > > > would have in terms of heat dissipation is another issue. Run it AM
> with
> > > > a big aluminum heat sink on top and serve scrambled eggs to your
> friends.
> > > > Restricted by that case, the blower might have to say Cummins on it.
> > > >
> > > > You better believe it takes some care to do it right.
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

Yeah but Dick is better than a lot of the hams in the NG. At least he
doesn't whine about "legalities" and will take the time to explain how
amps work and how to tune them for CB.

6336. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 18:53:42 UTC
From: f1dfr@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <a4a80311.0112301053.51d6466c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29282

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2E834E.2014983C@IEEE.org>...
> f1dfr wrote:
> > The event will be greater than the break of Berlin's wall.
>
> Such delusions of grandeur. Probably 99.97% of the population
> of the USA couldn't care less about amateur Morse code testing.

The world is not only composed of the USA ...

6337. FCC Ethical Scenario

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:21:31 UTC
From: "W. Mark" <Yudlink@yudlinkmark.org>
Message-ID: <a0npg1$7vs$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 29283

Hypothetical situation in a large city:

FCC official runs for and gets elected president of local radio club. His or her FCC supervisor does not see a potential ethical problem with this. Should the supervisor have advised the FCC employee not to allow one self to be placed in a potential conflict-of-interest ethical situation? Does the supervisor have authority to make such a determination? In the next few weeks, the local sheriff's dept. becomes the victim of a jammer on their public safety freqs. The FCC assists, as time permits, but tells the S.O. it lacks funds and personnel (familiar FCC bullshit). Local commercial interests have been experiencing harmful interference for weeks, causing loss of business revenue. FCC renders very little assistance, quoting the same B.S. about lack of funds and personnel, other priorities, etc. In several instances, it is the FCC official who was elected radio club president that informs the sheriff and commercial interests that little or no FCC assistance will be forthcoming. Weeks go by. A local ham repeater owner experiences interference from a pager co. He contacts the FCC official who is radio club president, requesting FCC assistance in locating the offending pager co. Within 24 hrs., there is a full FCC response, involving government vehicles, FCC employees on official time, including overtime. The FCC effort continues nonstop, with the radio club president, who is a FCC employee, leading the FCC effort to locate the offending pager. The pager is located, and the pager company is cited. The FCC radio club president is commended by local hams for the immediate and complete FCC response in locating the pager interference to the ham repeater. Meanwhile, the Sheriff's Office and commercial interests are still experiencing interference problems. In fact, it's been weeks since the FCC office has even contacted them to get an update. The Sheriff's Office and commercial interests are livid when they learn of the immediate, complete and nonstop response by the FCC to find the pager interference to a ham repeater. Congressman gets involved, local and state officials, as well as the media.

So, the question is, what, if anything, should or will happen here? Will heads roll? Will there be discipline? Apologies? Will the Sheriff ever get his interference problem solved? Will there be a FCC cover-up? Of course, this is only a hypothetical situation, or is it? Suppose the hypothetical FCC employee involved here has a long record of doing this sort of thing? That is, showing favoritism to his ham radio buddies. What do you think, hypothetically speaking, of course?

6338. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:29:15 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0112301129.73745e9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29284
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C2F0803.3435EE7D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> One Angry Man wrote:
> > You'll never know just how right you are!
> >
> > signed
> > One Angry No Code Ham
> > Member Number 1 of the No Code Liberation Army (NCLA)
>
>
> You can be as angry as you want to be. Those of us who have done
> nothing wrong, have nothing to worry about.

BTW I do not consider illegal CB or bootlegging "wrong". Those of us
who choose to operate outside the law do it with a clear conscience. I
know that upsets some people, but too damn bad.

6339. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:30:23 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F6B4F.85E082FE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29285

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
> > 2. I NEVER "threatened to have your internet access
> >terminated." That is a typical Larry Roll lie. Quote back my "threat,"
> >Larry. Put up or Shut up.
>
> I reported on what I read, that's all. It was no lie. I'll start providing
> quotes as soon as Cecil and every one else of the NCTA persuasion
> catches up on at least a decade's worth.

Confused over the difference between "could" and "shall"?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6340. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:34:11 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F6C33.9787314@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29286

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In selecting her particular Vanity
> Call Sign, Kim demonstrated poor taste and bad judgment;

So you say, Larry. One time is understandable. Ten times is
too many. 100 times is harassment. You have demonstrated
extremely poor taste and bad judgment in harassing Kim
with your personal opinion hundreds of times over and over.
You have turned your personal opinion into a Big Lie.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6341. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:35:47 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F6C93.FF09AAE1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29287

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> Larry. Larry. Larry. The day I hear you utter praise in my direction, I
> will be smelling my armpits before I think it's related to anything else.

Oh no, Kim! Now you've done it. "Utter" will remind Larry of "udder"
and that will set him off all over again.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6342. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:37:28 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F6CF8.760B4A82@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29288

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> How charming. Don't look now, but you've got the wrong bloke,
> mate. It was Cecil who started this "electronic stalking" thing
> going on here. However, the direct insult of being called an
> "idiot" is noted; I wonder what voyager.net's Terms Of Service
> have to say about that?

Does it say, "Thou shalt not call Larry Roll an idiot."?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6343. Re: FCC Ethical Scenario

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:38:17 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <W2KX7.326582$er5.6884406@e3500-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29289

This reminds me of the guy in a Western comedy who is pinned down by gunfire
and cautiously
raises his hat up on his gunbarrel to see if the zone is hot. Makes me
wonder if this is one of
those
"it-is-actually-real-but-I-am-going-to-stick-my-hat-up-to-see-what-happens"
kind of a
thing. Wouldn't surprise me if it WAS real.

Jerry
K4KWH
W. Mark <Yudlink@yudlinkmark.org> wrote in message
news:a0npg1$7vs$0@pita.alt.net...
> Hypothetical situation in a large city:
>
> FCC official runs for and gets elected president of local radio club.
> His or her FCC supervisor does not see a potential ethical problem with
> this. Should the supervisor have advised the FCC employee not to
> allow one self to be placed in a potential conflict-of-interest ethical
> situation? Does the supervisor have authority to make such a
> determination? In the next few weeks, the local sheriff's dept.
> becomes the victim of a jammer on their public safety freqs. The
> FCC assists, as time permits, but tells the S.O. it lacks funds and
> personnel (familiar FCC bullshit). Local commercial interests have
> been experiencing harmful interference for weeks, causing loss of
> business revenue. FCC renders very little assistance, quoting the same
> B.S. about lack of funds and personnel, other priorities, etc. In several
> instances, it is the FCC official who was elected radio club president
> that informs the sheriff and commercial interests that little or no FCC
> assistance will be forthcoming. Weeks go by. A local ham repeater
> owner experiences interference from a pager co. He contacts the FCC
> official who is radio club president, requesting FCC assistance in
> locating the offending pager co. Within 24 hrs., there is a full FCC
> response, involving government vehicles, FCC employees on official
> time, including overtime. The FCC effort continues nonstop, with the
> radio club president, who is a FCC employee, leading the FCC effort
> to locate the offending pager. The pager is located, and the pager
> company is cited. The FCC radio club president is commended by
> local hams for the immediate and complete FCC response in locating
> the pager interference to the ham repeater. Meanwhile, the Sheriff's
> Office and commercial interests are still experiencing interference
> problems. In fact, it's been weeks since the FCC office has even
> contacted them to get an update. The Sheriff's Office and commercial
> interests are livid when they learn of the immediate, complete and nonstop

> response by the FCC to find the pager interference to a ham repeater.
> Congressman gets involved, local and state officials, as well as the
media.
>
> So, the question is, what, if anything, should or will happen here?
> Will heads roll? Will there be discipline? Apologies? Will the Sheriff
> ever get his interference problem solved? Will there be a FCC cover-up?
> Of course, this is only a hypothetical situation, or is it? Suppose the
> hypothetical FCC employee involved here has a long record of doing this
> sort of thing? That is, showing favoritism to his ham radio buddies.
What
> do you think, hypothetically speaking, of course?
>
>

6344. Re: UK "Foundation" Class Amateur License (Soon to Be: Cecil the Liar)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:38:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F6D3C.959C5EAC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29290

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> You have exactly one posting to produce the quote where I said
> >> "no-code Techs are [technical] dumb shits," or you have once again
> >> proven that you are a liar!
> >>
> >No need to waste my time that way, Larry. You have posted hundreds
> >of times that nocode techs are dumbed-down. You have even posted
> >that post-restructuring generals and extras are dumbed-down.
>
> Admittedly, I have -- but only in general terms.

I rest my case.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
```

6345. Re: Correlation between code proficiency and technical proficiency

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:46:12 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F6F04.7FA67AA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29291

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> CAM wrote:
> >Maybe you need to come to my GED math classes - they're free.
>
> If I ever find myself in your neck of the woods, I'll gladly take you
> up on that! I need all the free math classes I can get my hands on!

Great gobs of goose grease - a human being has taken over control of
Larry's keyboard - somebody call the cops. Happy New Year, Larry.
And Happy New Year everyone else.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6346. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:48:53 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F6FA5.C47B4707@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29292

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Larry, even if the original reason was different, IMO, it has been
> >worth it to see Kim and her callsign get your goat.
>
> Don't look now, but you haven't seen that!

What one sees is subjective, Larry. Seems to me your attacks
are impotent.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6347. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:49:31 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <97KX7.108310$BX4.6929525@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29293

Maybe it IS too simplistic, but I made certain about those CC&R things
BEFORE I moved into my home 15 years ago. I made it clear to my real estate
agent that I would NOT accept
2 things: 1) having some busybody, blue-haired old lady looking at me over
her Ben Franklins
and telling me what I can and can't do, and 2) a heat pump. If I was going
to enjoy my hobby
down in that newly acquired basement, I'd be damned if I was going to freeze
to death while
doing it! LOL! I fired her when she, after being told of the heating
requirement, attempted to
"force" me to accept a home with a heat pump. I still shiver when I think
about it!

Jerry

Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c2f4454_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> "K0HB" <k0hb@qwest.net> wrote in message
> news:22f95753a243693d99f882d77b3604c9.15732@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
> news:3c2f3a6b_1@newsa.ev1.net...
> >
> > >
> > > Hey, remember all the high and mighty code/no-code arguments and near
> > > knock-down-drag-outs there've been right here on this newsgroup?
Well,
> > > according to the folks who just couldn't stand the post-restructuring
> set
> > > up, the ARS is degraded to stupidity anyway, right? So, why would
they
> now
> > > all come to the defense of such a degraded service?
> > >
> >
> > In other words, you'd rather not discuss this issue.
> >
>
> Well, actually, I am wondering why whomever started this and whomever is
all
> upset about it, wasn't discussing it prior to any decisions being made by
> the FCC. It's funny that it's always *after the fact* that these issues
are

> raised on a newsgroup.
>
> >
> > Excellent. Set up your newsreader to ignore it.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> >
>
> And, I would like to know why the folks who argue on the side of the ARS
> being so dumbed down, worthless, invaded, nothing but CBish, etc., etc.,
> would now be so very concerned about it? Did they expect that their blase
> attitude would have a *positive* effect on the ARS?
>
> Another think I'd like to know is why the folks who were just vociferously
> arguing *for* CCRs just a couple/few months ago--and who were throwing the
> usual insults at people who don't like them--are now crying out for a
> federal mandate to negate the very contracts they were bothering to wave
in
> the faces of people? I think the words they used were something to the
> effect of: "if you don't like it, then don't move into a neighborhood like
> that." OK, I'm convinced. So, why is that such a crappy belief to have
> now? It seems to me that Cecil, and me I suppose, are now stating exactly
> what was stated to us--and yet, is that the attitude of resentment I see?
> Yep, it sure it.
>
> Not that I think either way on the issue. I'd rather get to the meat of
the
> matter in the apparent problem a lot of folks are having on focusing on
> exactly what they believe--or else, maybe it is that they feel however
they
> think is best "at the time" with a propensity for quick change if it suits
> them. Yeah, I think that's it.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

6348. Re: "....one step closer to extinction. "

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:52:10 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F706A.860FD61E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29294

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I am an Amateur Extra Class licensee in good standing, ...

Not with everyone, Larry. Some of us consider you to be a
despicable ham who is guilty of harassment.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6349. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:55:13 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F7121.555E7F3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29296

f1dfr wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2E834E.2014983C@IEEE.org>...
> > f1dfr wrote:
> > > The event will be greater than the break of Berlin's wall.
> >
> > Such delusions of grandeur. Probably 99.97% of the population
> > of the USA couldn't care less about amateur Morse code testing.
>
> The world is not only composed of the USA ...

Have it your way. Guess what happens to the above percentage when
China's population is included?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6350. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:57:35 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2EB939.60780F69@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29295

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <E447BB6B107727DE.124A1E3F3A33C370.703D7850046C58A1@lp.airnews.net>,
> Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> writes:
>
> >On 29 Dec 2001 04:51:50 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >wrote:
> > >
> > >>Greetings All:
> > >>
> > >>To those who have been insisting that the FCC has the best interests
> > >>of the ARS at heart, I offer the following. I seems like "Restructuring"
> > >>isn't the only way they had in mind to put an end to our tomfoolery on
> > >>all this valuable RF real estate. Now they're saying licensed radio
> > >>amateurs don't have any need to establish a station in our own homes.
> > >>Get ready to lose some more spectrum -- and soon! Read it and weep...
> > >>
> > >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > More "gloom and doom" Larry?
> >
> > Nope - facts and reasonable conclusions.
> > >
> > > Get a grip!
> >
> > Which means what?
> >
> > >Simply because the FCC doesn't view it as
> > >essential for a ham to have a permanent station location does NOT mean
> > >they are trying to strip any frequencies from us.
> >
> > It sure doesn't help the ARS grow and prosper, though. If the ARS doesn't grow
> > and prosper, there will be no reason for our frequencies to be preserved for
> > our use. And make no mistake, there are plenty of folks who would be really
> > happy to see ham radio just disappear.
> >
> > >With today's
> > >equipment, you DON'T need a permanent station location-
> >
> > Nobody NEEDS to be ham at all, either.
> >
> > >-modern rigs
> > >are very capable of mobile or portable operations, something that the
> > >HF rigs a few decades ago weren't really suited for.

>
> The antennas haven't gotten any smaller, though. Mobile is no solution for
> those without suitable vehicles. Portable is fine if you're a camping type -
> useless if you're not.
>
> > It's a ham's choice whether or not he or she will move into an
> >area with antenna restrictions--no one is forced to do so, they can
> >live elsewhere if they feel the restrictions are more important than
> >the location.
>
> That's not true in the vast majority of cases. Young hams usually don't choose
> where they live. Amateurs with families usually do not have autocratic power to
> decide where to live based solely on antenna considerations.
>
> In real life, home choice is often driven by a number of factors:
>
> - cost
> - availability (you can't buy what's not for sale)
> - suitable location (jobs, family, stores)
> - size and features
> - school district
> - special family member needs (handicapped access, health care access, special
> educational facilities, etc.)
>
> There is also the fact that many people aren't in a position to move just so
> they can become hams.
>
> >If enough hams take the attitude that they won't buy
> >homes in restricted communities, and if that has an economic impact on
> >the community, the restrictions will disappear.
>
> Nope. For one thing, there just aren't enough hams looking to buy houses to
> make much of a difference. Surf over to
>
> http://www.realtor.com
>
> and get an idea of the size of the real estate market. How many hams do you
> think are looking for houses at any one time?
>
> For another thing, the restrictions are carefully designed to be extremely
> difficult to remove. Even if both buyer and seller want to be rid of them, they
> are specifically set up so that they cannot be removed in future sales.
>
> >If not, it's a simple
> >question of market economics (non-hams may be MORE willing to buy in
> >an area where antennas are banned), not something that involves (or
> >SHOULD involve) the government directly.
>
> Just the opposite. It forces hams into "ghettos" that are constantly shrinking.
>

> >
> > Don't like a restriction? Don't sign a purchase agreement for
> >property until you know it doesn't have any in its deed of title.
>
> In many situations there is no reasonable choice. And what if a person decides
> to become a ham after buying a house - should they be forced to move?
> >
> > Sounds simple enough to me.
>
> It's not.
>
> Would you have the same attitude towards CC&Rs which specified that only
> married couples could engage in certain activities on the property? Or that
> restricted anyone from perfectly legal at-home activities like alcohol use or
> eating meat? Particularly when the percentage of properties so restricted grew
> every year, making it harder and harder to find an unrestricted house?
>
> --
>
> "No-antenna" covenants started in the '70s in California (natch) as a
> sweetheart deal between developers and cable providers. The cable companies
> picked up the cost of wiring new developments for cable and the developers
> inserted the "no antennas" restrictions in the fine print. End result was a
> guaranteed captive market for the cable TV folks.
>
> As I understand it, the reason TV dishes are exempted is that the "pizza dish"
> satellite companies pushed a test case all the way to the Supreme Court,
> claiming that the restrictive covenants created a monopoly for the cable folks
> and excluded the pizza dish folks from the pay-TV market. Supremes said it was
> restriction of trade, monopolistic practice, that sort of thing, and broke the
> covenants - except in historic areas.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I'm amazed as I follow this debate that some talk of ham radio as
if it were something of real importance. If you life would
drastically change for the worse if ham radio went away, you need
help.

6351. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 19:59:53 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2EB9C4.E4009689@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29297

CAM wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > As I understand it, the reason TV dishes are exempted is that the "pizza dish"
> > satellite companies pushed a test case all the way to the Supreme Court,
> > claiming that the restrictive covenants created a monopoly for the cable folks
> > and excluded the pizza dish folks from the pay-TV market. Supremes said it was
> > restriction of trade, monopolistic practice, that sort of thing, and broke the
> > covenants - except in historic areas.
>
> Too bad the same approach won't work for *amateurs*. Are there any guaranteed
> freedoms or laws on the side of the amateur radio operators? I suspect it would
> be unconstitutional for the federal government to interfere with willingly
> signed CC&R contracts.

The people who signs CC&R contracts and then bitch, are just like
those who build a house off the end of a runway of a busy airport
and then bitch about the noise and want to get the runway shut
down.

6352. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 20:05:01 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F736D.EBD75602@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29298

K0HB wrote:
>
> Cecil said:
>
> > I suspect it would be unconstitutional for the federal government to
> > interfere with willingly signed CC&R contracts.
>
> You suspect wrong. The federal government (FCC) issued a preemption voiding
> CC&Rs which prohibit visual entertainment (TV) antennas.

Where in the Constitution are the feds granted that power? Does that power
apply to non-commercial items?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6353. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 20:15:58 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F75FE.6BD490BD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29299
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Scott Unit-69 wrote:
> BTW I do not consider illegal CB or bootlegging "wrong". Those of us
> who choose to operate outside the law do it with a clear conscience. I
> know that upsets some people, but too damn bad.

Like all people who operate outside the law, one must be willing to
suffer the consequences of one's actions. Spitting on the sidewalk
will get one flogged in at least one nation.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6354. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 20:24:42 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a0nt67$91d$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 29354
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Scott Unit-69" <uppluss@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:a2cf6f35.0112301129.73745e9e@posting.google.com...
> "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C2F0803.3435EE7D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> > One Angry Man wrote:
> > > You'll never know just how right you are!
> > >
> > > signed
> > > One Angry No Code Ham
> > > Member Number 1 of the No Code Liberation Army (NCLA)
> >
> >
> > You can be as angry as you want to be. Those of us who have done
> > nothing wrong, have nothing to worry about.
>
> BTW I do not consider illegal CB or bootlegging "wrong". Those of us
> who choose to operate outside the law do it with a clear conscience. I
> know that upsets some people, but too damn bad.

And when "Uncle Charlie" AKA Riley Hollingsworth drops by and
asks you to turn over the contents of your shack, you can tell him how
your not doing anything "wrong" and see how it plays with him.

Unit 798 in the cornfields of Indiana on the side and QRT FROM NOW ON.
(The heck with freebanding, the legal way is lots more fun!)
--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Progress does not consist of replacing a theory that is wrong
with one that is right. It consists of replacing a theory that is
wrong with one that is more subtly wrong. Never attribute to
malice that which is adequately explained by stupidity.
-Hawkin's Theory

6355. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 20:32:42 UTC
From: onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com
Message-ID: <3c2f7974.1135127@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 29300
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 23:47:57 -0500, "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
wrote:

>How about we just forward it to Riley and let him sort it out.
>
>Done.

fuck gayboy riley and his bullshit i'd like that asshole son of a
bitch to come fuck with me he'd be pulling bullets out his ass i'd
nail his ass with my 9MM

fuck that cock suckin' bastard

OHPM

one high powered mutha
powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
i don't play
i drop da maul

6356. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 20:33:08 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8SKX7.205982$WW.11947188@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29351
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Scott did not write this Cecil. Be very leery of things sent via Google
or other public urinals.

Dick N&#65533;BK

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2F75FE.6BD490BD@IEEE.org...
> Scott Unit-69 wrote:
> > BTW I do not consider illegal CB or bootlegging "wrong". Those of us
> > who choose to operate outside the law do it with a clear conscience. I
> > know that upsets some people, but too damn bad.
>
> Like all people who operate outside the law, one must be willing to
> suffer the consequences of one's actions. Spitting on the sidewalk
> will get one flogged in at least one nation.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6357. Re: FCC Ethical Scenario

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 20:34:08 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a0ntnu$91j$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 29353

"W. Mark" <Yudlink@yudlinkmark.org> wrote in message news:a0npg1$7vs$0@pita.alt.net...
> Hypothetical situation in a large city:
>
> FCC official runs for and gets elected president of local radio club.
> His or her FCC supervisor does not see a potential ethical problem with
> this. Should the supervisor have advised the FCC employee not to
> allow one self to be placed in a potential conflict-of-interest ethical
> situation? Does the supervisor have authority to make such a
> determination? In the next few weeks, the local sheriff's dept.
> becomes the victim of a jammer on their public safety freqs. The
> FCC assists, as time permits, but tells the S.O. it lacks funds and
> personnel (familiar FCC bullshit). Local commercial interests have
> been experiencing harmful interference for weeks, causing loss of
> business revenue. FCC renders very little assistance, quoting the same
> B.S. about lack of funds and personnel, other priorities, etc. In several
> instances, it is the FCC official who was elected radio club president
> that informs the sheriff and commercial interests that little or no FCC
> assistance will be forthcoming. Weeks go by. A local ham repeater
> owner experiences interference from a pager co. He contacts the FCC
> official who is radio club president, requesting FCC assistance in
> locating the offending pager co. Within 24 hrs., there is a full FCC
> response, involving government vehicles, FCC employees on official
> time, including overtime. The FCC effort continues nonstop, with the
> radio club president, who is a FCC employee, leading the FCC effort
> to locate the offending pager. The pager is located, and the pager
> company is cited. The FCC radio club president is commended by
> local hams for the immediate and complete FCC response in locating
> the pager interference to the ham repeater. Meanwhile, the Sheriff's
> Office and commercial interests are still experiencing interference
> problems. In fact, it's been weeks since the FCC office has even
> contacted them to get an update. The Sheriff's Office and commercial
> interests are livid when they learn of the immediate, complete and nonstop
> response by the FCC to find the pager interference to a ham repeater.
> Congressman gets involved, local and state officials, as well as the media.
>
> So, the question is, what, if anything, should or will happen here?
> Will heads roll? Will there be discipline? Apologies? Will the Sheriff
> ever get his interference problem solved? Will there be a FCC cover-up?
> Of course, this is only a hypothetical situation, or is it? Suppose the
> hypothetical FCC employee involved here has a long record of doing this
> sort of thing? That is, showing favoritism to his ham radio buddies. What
> do you think, hypothetically speaking, of course?
>
>

If he really wanted to be a hero here, he could have offered the help of the radio club to the Sheriff and business people to help out where the "official" FCC response was lacking.

As it is now heads should roll, hypothetically speaking, of course!
--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

6358. Open Letter to Mr. Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 20:40:30 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C2F7BBE.5EAFC23A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29352

Open letter to Mr. Hollingsworth.

Re: Kevin Mitnick (N6NHG)

Dear Mr. Hollingsworth,

A wise person once said-
"If I stand idly by as injustice is done,
then my hands, too,
are stained with that injustice."

A lot of people in the ham community
see revoking Mr. Mitnick's license as an unjust over-reaction.
It's not like he was on 14.313 thumbing his nose at everyone.
I could name current licensees with criminal records that make
Mr. Mitnick look like a gilded saint. But then, they didn't
make the national news. Uncle can get more headlines beating up
a celebrity then by whacking a real criminal.
I wonder about the morality of "making an example"
of someone who has paid their debt.

Mr. Mitnick did his time and, as far as we know,
has been straight since. More then a few believe
that someone in Justice ordered someone else
to slap the boy, just for the sake of petty vengeance.

We're concerned.
If one person is treated unjustly,
what about when it's *our* turn?
But we're not the ones "on the ground" in this case;
we must rely on those empowered with the public trust
to show us the justice of such matters.
What do *you* say about it?
You are respected in the community.
Your words carry weight with us.
If there is justification for continuing to kick this man
after he's served his sentence,
surely it can stand the test of public disclosure.

We just want know our hands are clean.

Sincerely, David S.

6359. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 21:08:20 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8nLX7.206017$WW.11946913@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29355
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

You know, Onesey, if you did not go into these fits of testosterone poisoning now and again you might be worth keeping out of the killfile

"One High Powered Mother Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote in message news:3c2f7974.1135127@netnews.att.net...
> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 23:47:57 -0500, "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
> wrote:
>
> >How about we just forward it to Riley and let him sort it out.
> >
> >Done.
>
>
> fuck gayboy riley and his bullshit i'd like that asshole son of a
> bitch to come fuck with me he'd be pulling bullets out his ass i'd
> nail his ass with my 9MM
>
> fuck that cock suckin' bastard
>
> OHPM
>
>
> one high powered mutha
> powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
> i don't play
> i drop da maul

6360. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 21:13:40 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8sLX7.206026$WW.11951458@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29356
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Aside from the fact that Scott did not write this idiocy, when are you
taking the code test so you can enjoy it a hell of a lot more???

Dick N�BK

"KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
news:a0nt67$91d$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> "Scott Unit-69" <uppluss@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:a2cf6f35.0112301129.73745e9e@posting.google.com...
> > "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
> news:<3C2F0803.3435EE7D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> > > One Angry Man wrote:
> > > > You'll never know just how right you are!
> > > >
> > > > signed
> > > > One Angry No Code Ham
> > > > Member Number 1 of the No Code Liberation Army (NCLA)
> > >
> > >
> > > You can be as angry as you want to be. Those of us who have done
> > > nothing wrong, have nothing to worry about.
> >
> > BTW I do not consider illegal CB or bootlegging "wrong". Those of us
> > who choose to operate outside the law do it with a clear conscience. I
> > know that upsets some people, but too damn bad.
>
> And when "Uncle Charlie" AKA Riley Hollingsworth drops by and
> asks you to turn over the contents of your shack, you can tell him how
> your not doing anything "wrong" and see how it plays with him.
>
> Unit 798 in the cornfields of Indiana on the side and QRT FROM NOW ON.
> (The heck with freebanding, the legal way is lots more fun!)
> --
>
> '73' From KB9TMP
> NCI-2385
>
> Progress does not consist of replacing a theory that is wrong
> with one that is right. It consists of replacing a theory that is
> wrong with one that is more subtly wrong. Never attribute to
> malice that which is adequately explained by stupidity.
> -Hawkin's Theory
>
>

6361. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 21:18:59 UTC
From: John <n1umj@ARRL.net>
Message-ID: <7xLX7.42739$Sj1.18328536@typhoon.ne.mediaone.net>
Source record: 29357
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Next time I meet a free bander I will have him reported like they should be.
it is not a free band you like the bands so much and the radios get off your
wellfair receaving, lazy child molesting asses and work for the lisence for
the first time in your life and show people equipment and this country a
little respect. I have no respect for the "free banders" at all. Work for it
like everyone else if you want the ham bands or stay the hell in the 1-40
channels range where you belong. You do not deserve any more respect then
the person I shot for breaking in to my house a few years back or the one I
caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
"Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
news:e9de0154.0112300024.125df714@posting.google.com...
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
> this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
> frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
> think.
> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
> conditions.
> We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
> technical
> issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us
> is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
> should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
> do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
> is
> a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
> is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
> talk with
> him before you condemn him.
>
> This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
> http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
> Unit 2711, Florida

6362. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 21:31:20 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <IILX7.206051$WW.11953034@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29358
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The post was a forgery, John. Lot of that of late. Suggest before replying check the routing: if you see Google or Newsnet or any of the other well-known public urinals you can safely forget it. The ethics of responding to cross-posts I will leave to you but that is another indication that something is bogus.

Dick N&#65533;BK

"John" <n1umj@ARRL.net> wrote in message
news:7xLX7.42739$Sj1.18328536@typhoon.ne.mediaone.net...
> Next time I meet a free bander I will have him reported like they should be.
> it is not a free band you like the bands so much and the radios get off your
> wellfair receaving, lazy child molesting asses and work for the lisence for
> the first time in your life and show people equipment and this country a
> little respect. I have no respect for the "free banders" at all. Work for it
> like everyone else if you want the ham bands or stay the hell in the 1-40
> channels range where you belong. You do not deserve any more respect then
> the person I shot for breaking in to my house a few years back or the one I
> caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
> AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> news:e9de0154.0112300024.125df714@posting.google.com...
> > I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
> > this
> > group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
> > frequencies
> > from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
> > think.
> > We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
> > conditions.
> > We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
> > technical
> > issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us
> > is
> > rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
> > should

> > not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
> > do.
> > For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
> > is
> > a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
> > is
> > that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
> > talk with
> > him before you condemn him.
> >
> > This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
> > http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html
> >
> > I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
> >
> > Unit 2711, Florida
>
>

6363. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 21:33:00 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F880C.56F97454@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29359
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> Scott did not write this Cecil. Be very leery of things sent via Google
> or other public urinals.

Hi Dick, I wasn't responding to any single individual but to the world
at large. Thus the use of the pronoun "one".

> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Scott Unit-69 wrote:
> > > BTW I do not consider illegal CB or bootlegging "wrong". Those of us
> > > who choose to operate outside the law do it with a clear conscience. I
> > > know that upsets some people, but too damn bad.
> >
> > Like all people who operate outside the law, one must be willing to
> > suffer the consequences of one's actions. Spitting on the sidewalk
> > will get one flogged in at least one nation.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6364. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 21:35:51 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2F88B7.FB31D411@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29360
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

John wrote:
> ... or the one I
> caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
> AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!

In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6365. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 21:40:59 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <LRLX7.206064$WW.11952679@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29361
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2F88B7.FB31D411@IEEE.org...
> John wrote:
> > ... or the one I
> > caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER
WALK
> > AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
>
> In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Nebraska for one but it is not a great idea. Remnant of what was once
known as the Shoot Your Neighbor Act.

6366. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 21:45:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ZVLX7.206066$WW.11953961@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29362

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:LRLX7.206064$WW.11952679@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C2F88B7.FB31D411@IEEE.org...
> > John wrote:
> > > ... or the one I
> > > caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER
> WALK
> > > AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
> > >
> > In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> Nebraska for one but it is not a great idea. Remnant of what was once
> known as the Shoot Your Neighbor Act.
>
>

Probably should also point out that Taxation Without Representation is
legal in NE as well.
The fact pattern that brought this case to court in the late 50s no longer
exist but the precedent is still there.

Dick N&#65533;BK

6367. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 22:06:33 UTC
From: Compassionate Conservative <Compassionate@right.wing>
Message-ID: <jl3v2ukc95n5n49j8r41709v371tc0fviv@4ax.com>
Source record: 29363

On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 22:50:02 -0600, The ignorant moron CAM
<Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> spewed hate by saying:

>K0HB wrote:
>> The message is very clear to me -- "You amateurs don't have
>> enough financial or political clout for us to worry about.
>
>Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
>state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you? Any other
>legal contracts you would like to dismiss?

Like most home owners I did not sign a agreement on deed restrictions.
It was a done deal. The buyer of a used house is not given a copy of
any deed restrictions but must check the county records to find if
there are any restrictions on the deed.

--

Destroy Wahhabism

6368. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 22:12:21 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0o3cf06to@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29367
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Scott Unit-69" <uppluss@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:a2cf6f35.0112301129.73745e9e@posting.google.com...

> > You can be as angry as you want to be. Those of us who have done
> > nothing wrong, have nothing to worry about.
>
> BTW I do not consider illegal CB or bootlegging "wrong". Those of us
> who choose to operate outside the law do it with a clear conscience. I
> know that upsets some people, but too damn bad.

I don't think you do it with a clear conscience. I think you do it because
there is very little chance of your getting busted.

6369. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 22:19:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp4lklu.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29364

On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 14:04:17 -0500, Krell wrote:

>> Most homes built after 1980 or so have CC&R's that pretty much prohibit
>> antennas period.
>
>So? What's wrong with finding an older house? Sounds like you want to have
>your cake and eat it, too.

No, I want to have ham radio as my hobby, not reconstructing and
doing continuous maintenance on an older home.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6370. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 22:19:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp4m0qv.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29365

On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 18:21:35 -0500, Rick Adams wrote:

> More "gloom and doom" Larry?
>
> Get a grip! Simply because the FCC doesn't view it as
>essential for a ham to have a permanent station location does NOT mean
>they are trying to strip any frequencies from us. With today's
>equipment, you DON'T need a permanent station location--modern rigs
>are very capable of mobile or portable operations, something that the
>HF rigs a few decades ago weren't really suited for.

The FCC is merely echoing the Ninth Circuit in _Howard v City of Burlingame_ ten years ago when it said that the FCC license does not guarantee erection of any antenna of one's choice.

We're missing the real nugget hidden in the Order. For many years both I and Chris Imlay, the ARRL General Counsel, have said out front that the FCC won't assert pre-emption over CC&Rs until The Congress tells it to, as it did for OTARDs. Buried deep in the verbiage of the subject Order, the FCC clearly stated that it wanted The Congress to tell it to assert pre-emption before it will do so. Chris, the author of the Petition, had to go through the motions to get that sort of "committment". Now we can go to The Congress and say "see, we need you to support ham radio".

"Hang in there, baybee...."

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6371. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 22:34:22 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ODMX7.206130$WW.11957866@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29366
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well, we had a case a few years back. There had been some robberies and a few people shot individuals crazy enough to break into their homes. No problem with that, of course; what was interesting is a couple years ago a guy heard something breaking in his garage. He grabbed a gun and shot a guy stealing a bicycle. The thief was in the driveway at the time with the bike. The grand jury let him go. A lot of people are getting fed up with what has been happening the last 10 or 20 years or so.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2F88B7.FB31D411@IEEE.org...
> John wrote:
> > ... or the one I
> > caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER
WALK
> > AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
>
> In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6372. Re: FCC Ethical Scenario

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 22:39:15 UTC
From: JAMES HAMPTON <j.r.hampton@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <nIMX7.206135$WW.11958323@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29368

I thought that line of thought was over when John F. Kennedy was elected president.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"W. Mark" <Yudlink@yudlinkmark.org> wrote in message news:a0npg1$7vs$0@pita.alt.net...
> Hypothetical situation in a large city:
>
> FCC official runs for and gets elected president of local radio club.
> His or her FCC supervisor does not see a potential ethical problem with
> this. Should the supervisor have advised the FCC employee not to
> allow one self to be placed in a potential conflict-of-interest ethical
> situation? Does the supervisor have authority to make such a
> determination? In the next few weeks, the local sheriff's dept.
> becomes the victim of a jammer on their public safety freqs. The
> FCC assists, as time permits, but tells the S.O. it lacks funds and
> personnel (familiar FCC bullshit). Local commercial interests have
> been experiencing harmful interference for weeks, causing loss of
> business revenue. FCC renders very little assistance, quoting the same
> B.S. about lack of funds and personnel, other priorities, etc. In several
> instances, it is the FCC official who was elected radio club president
> that informs the sheriff and commercial interests that little or no FCC
> assistance will be forthcoming. Weeks go by. A local ham repeater
> owner experiences interference from a pager co. He contacts the FCC
> official who is radio club president, requesting FCC assistance in
> locating the offending pager co. Within 24 hrs., there is a full FCC
> response, involving government vehicles, FCC employees on official
> time, including overtime. The FCC effort continues nonstop, with the
> radio club president, who is a FCC employee, leading the FCC effort
> to locate the offending pager. The pager is located, and the pager
> company is cited. The FCC radio club president is commended by
> local hams for the immediate and complete FCC response in locating
> the pager interference to the ham repeater. Meanwhile, the Sheriff's
> Office and commercial interests are still experiencing interference
> problems. In fact, it's been weeks since the FCC office has even
> contacted them to get an update. The Sheriff's Office and commercial
> interests are livid when they learn of the immediate, complete and nonstop
> response by the FCC to find the pager interference to a ham repeater.
> Congressman gets involved, local and state officials, as well as the media.
>
> So, the question is, what, if anything, should or will happen here?
> Will heads roll? Will there be discipline? Apologies? Will the Sheriff

> ever get his interference problem solved? Will there be a FCC cover-up?
> Of course, this is only a hypothetical situation, or is it? Suppose the
> hypothetical FCC employee involved here has a long record of doing this
> sort of thing? That is, showing favoritism to his ham radio buddies.
What
> do you think, hypothetically speaking, of course?
>
>

6373. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 22:42:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0o5gsajr1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29370

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230102218.03703.00000786@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <a0lm8k$q4j$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> >> Carl (WA6VSE) has said that existing Advanceds
> >> should not be given Extraclass
> >> licenses without passing the Extra class test because
> >> those Advanceds have not
> >> demonstrated the necessary qualifications.
> >> I'm simply trying to figure out what
> >> qualifications he's talking about.
> >
> >Very simple...the Extra class written exam.
>
> The exam is not a qualification, it's a requirement that must be met.
> Same as the 20 wpm code test.

The eam is the means to determine the qualification.
For 20wpm,, the qualification was to have the ability
to recieve at 20 wpm...as determined by passing a
test which was the actual requirement.

Likewise, the Extra written is the test methodology
(Element 4) used to determine IF the applicant has sufficient
knowledge of theory/rule/regs which are part of the
syllabus of knowledge used to prepare the test element
itself which is the requirement.

> >Before the NEW structure,
> >all that involved was the 4B (I think that was it) which
> >I and others passed and obtained CSCE credit for.
>
> Yeah, I know. I passed it in August, 1970, between sophomore and junior
year of
> high school. Age 16. Woulda done it earlier but they had that 2 year
experience
> thing back then.
>
> >Once 4/15/00
> >came and went, we had a paper upgrade. Those that were advanced
> >and didn't follow that path now have a "combined" 4A/4B exam to contend
> >with. That's the breaks.

> >
> Old 4A was 50 questions and old 4B was 40. New 4 is 50 questions.
>
> But none of this answers the original question: What is so special about
3524
> kHz that one needs to be tested more to use it than 3526?

It really is still an aspect of "incentive licensing".

> >> Carl describes incentive licensing as "a dismal failure" and says that
> >license
> >> test requirements should ONLY be based on demonstrating the necessary
> >> qualifications.
> >
> >And that's what it is per my comments above.
>
> Why is Element 4 "necessary"? Because the FCC says so?

See my comment above...the test is the means to ascertain
an individuals knowledge.

> >> Carl also says that the writtens are not "dumbed down", even though
> >> their size and number was radically decreased on April 15, 2000.
> >
> >The number of questions doesn't change the scope and
> >or difficulty of learning the knowledge needed
> >to pass.
>
> Sure it does.

Let's make this simple.... I give you 200 words
to learn the spelling of. You have NO knowledge
of which words will be on a test. You still need
to learn them all regardless of the test being
25 or 50 of the words picked at random.
Same applies to all types of testing.

> >> You're missing my point then, Bill. All I've done is point out the
> >> facts and conclusions that follow logically IF one accepts
> >> Carl's philosophy of license testing.
> >
> >The question then is on what do you wish to see happen
> >with the testing...status quo, change to something else?
>
> See previous posts on "basic/intermediate/full".
>
> >> >> Sounds to me like you want to make everyone jump through the same
> >> >> written test hoops you did.
> >> >
> >> >Surely you jest :-)
> >>
> >> No, I'm quite serious.

> >
> >Then exactly WHAT do YOU want as requirements?
>
> A simple basic test to get started, a more involved test for more privs,
and a
> fairly comprehensive test for full privileges. And make the privileges
match
> the testing level.

How does that differ from Tech/General/Extra today?

> The big problem lots of ham have with the current system is that the
privileges
> don't match the testing.

Then what alignment would you like for privileges
vs license (I can't find your prior post on those
details...so maybe repubishing would help me
understand your position.) I have some thoughts
on those lines also...perhaps we are in closer agreement
than we think.

> >> >> > why should anyone get a total freebie??? If they
> >> >> >don't want to, or don't have the time to, upgrade, they should
> >> >> >remain satisfied with what they have. There is no reason to
> >> >> >change the system ... nobody should get privileges they aren't
> >> >> >qualified for, nor should anyone lose privileges they've already
> >> >> >earned.
> >> >>
> >> >> Sounds like what some folks were saying before the restructuring.
> >> >> Folks you vehemently disagree with.
> >> >
> >> >That argument/analogy only holds IF you believe the current
> >> >testing requirements for the written are unreasonable and/or
> >> >unjustified.
> >>
> >> If one accepts Carl's statements, they ARE unjustified beyond the
> >> General level.
> >
> >I don't see the logic in your conclusion.
>
> I'm simply pointing out the inconsistency in Carl's statements. He calls
the
> code tests "making hams jump through hoops" because they are not NECESSARY
in
> order to operate an amateur transmitter on non-Morse modes. And he points
to
> FCC statements and the R&O for 98-143 for proof.
>
> OK, fine, apply that same logic to the writtens. FCC sez a General and its
> associated tests fully qualifies a ham to use full power on all authorized

> amateur modes and bands. By Carl's logic, all the NECESSARY stuff to
operate
> any ham transmitter is contained in the testing for General. Thus, the
Extra
> test is just as much "making hams jump through hoops" as the old code
tests
> were - IF one accepts Carl's premises.

OK, I don't necessarily disagree with your logic on that.
The issue still is (IMHO) retaining some aspect of incentive
in the licensing steps.

<SNIP>
> >> Remember that during the 1957-1963 period the Soviets had one space
> >> space triumph after another while the US tried to catch up.
> >
> >Whch had more to do with physics and rocketry than
> >anything electronic.
>
> Yup, absolutely. In fact, one of the reasons the Soviets built such big
rockets
> was that their electronics were bigger and heavier.
>
> But the effect of all those early Soviet space triumphs was to focus
attention
> here on "science" (actually, engineering) in all fields, not just
rocketry.

But that doesn't seem to suggest that the Sputnik was the prime
motivator of incentive licensing. Anyway...that's one of those
speculative discussions that we can all down a few adult
beverages discussing sometime :-)

> >> >> Huh? The FCC sez Techs are qualified to use 1.5 kW transmitters on
> >> >> VHF/UHF - are they wrong?
> >> >
> >> >I believe they are on that point.
> >>
> >> So the mere fact that FCC does something isn't proof that it's the
right
> >> right thing to do. What a concept!
> >
> >We can always agree to disagree. The issue of disagreement, if severe,
> >ends up being adjuticated by the courts. No one has taken the FCC
> >to that path regarding any disagreement as to ham requirements to my
> >knowledge.
>
> Most folks don't have anywhere near the resources to sue the FCC - easier
to
> just pass the tests! The point is still made - the mere fact that the FCC
does

> something doesn't mean it's the right thing to do.

I never said they did.

> >> Posted here a few days ago - the "Basic/Intermediate/Full" system.
> >> I can post it again if you want.
> >
> >I'll find it.
>
> Remember, it's a raw outline of a plan for a post-end-of-S25.5 licensing
> licensing system.

Please repost or email me directly.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6374. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 22:47:36 UTC
From: middlefinger4@home.com
Message-ID: <cQMX7.339527$5A3.130999106@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 29369
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard what do you mean it was a forge? So anyone with the name of Dick or Richard who posts to a any NG is going to be a forge ? The content of what is posted is important not the name signed behind it but that the problem with guys like you you are so quick to defend Illegal CB operators you should actually hand in your license Dick, Honest Injun you are nothing more than a Big Old baby

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:IILX7.206051$WW.11953034@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> The post was a forgery, John. Lot of that of late. Suggest before
> replying check the routing: if you see Google or Newsnet or any of the
> other well-known public urinals you can safely forget it. The ethics of
> responding to cross-posts I will leave to you but that is another
> indication that something is bogus.
>
> Dick N&#65533;BK
>
> "John" <n1umj@ARRL.net> wrote in message
> news:7xLX7.42739$Sj1.18328536@typhoon.ne.mediaone.net...
> > Next time I meet a free bander I will have him reported like they should
> be.
> > it is not a free band you like the bands so much and the radios get off
> your
> > wellfair receaving, lazy child molesting asses and work for the lisence
> for
> > the first time in your life and show people equipment and this country a
> > little respect. I have no respect for the "free banders" at all. Work
> for it
> > like everyone else if you want the ham bands or stay the hell in the
> 1-40
> > channels range where you belong. You do not deserve any more respect
> then
> > the person I shot for breaking in to my house a few years back or the
> one I
> > caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER
> WALK
> > AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
> > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> > news:e9de0154.0112300024.125df714@posting.google.com...
> > > I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
> > > this
> > > group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
> > > frequencies

> > > from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
> > > think.
> > > We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
> > > conditions.
> > > We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
> > > technical
> > > issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us
> > > is
> > > rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
> > > should
> > > not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
> > > do.
> > > For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
> > > is
> > > a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
> > > is
> > > that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
> > > talk with
> > > him before you condemn him.
> > >
> > > This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
> > > http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html
> > >
> > > I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
> > >
> > > Unit 2711, Florida
> >
> >
>
>

6375. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 22:54:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0o67l$32v$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29371

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2E9B02.440216E8@IEEE.org...
> K0HB wrote:
> > Tell that to a young family man raising a family, or to a
> > teenager who just got interested in our hobby, or to a
> > retiree on pension who's just decided to pursue his dream of
> > being a ham.
>
> Life's rough all over, Hans. I drove a pickup with 200,000
> miles on it so I could possess those two acres. People must
> proprietize their wants/needs. Which is more important -
> a ham antenna or a vehicle? Yet, the federal government
> doesn't guarantee us vehicles.
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

Additionally, these days there are many ways to
enjoy being a ham without actually having an HF station
in the home. Icom 706 in the acr gives you full
HF ability.

Also, there are many "indoor" antennas that have
worked well for many people. I have NO outside
HF antenna yet have, on occasion, worked Europe,
the Pacific rim, South America, etc...all with just
a folded dipole strung in the attic. My rig is
100w Kenwood TS-690 (same as TS-450 with 6m).

Additionally too, as others have noted, there are many
older homes that have NO such CC&R restrictions...
and lastly, IF buying a new home is so paramont
then buy a piece of property and devolpe it yourself.
(i.e. hire a builder to spot build the house you want
on your property/lot.)

The issue of CC&Rs is one that ain't gonna die easy.
It really is an issue of contract law. The ONLY reason that
federal preemption exists for TV reception is because
the cable industry tried to use the CC&Rs to exclude
all other competition. That ticked off the public
interest consumer types who went to bat against the
restrictions with strong support (i.e. $$$) from regular
broadcast TV station owners as well as Direct Broadcast
Satellite system providers. Like it or not, it is an
economic issue that ham radio doesn't equate to.

Cheers and Happy New Year to all,
Bill K2UNK

6376. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:01:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0o6kp$264$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29372

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:3C2EA32A.E6FCEF8@townsqr.com...
>
>
> CAM wrote:
>
> > K0HB wrote:
> > > Tell that to a young family man raising a family, or to a
> > > teenager who just got interested in our hobby, or to a
> > > retiree on pension who's just decided to pursue his dream of
> > > being a ham.
> >
> > Life's rough all over, Hans. I drove a pickup with 200,000
> > miles on it so I could possess those two acres. People must
> > proprietize their wants/needs. Which is more important -
> > a ham antenna or a vehicle? Yet, the federal government
> > doesn't guarantee us vehicles.
>
> Yup. And if you were a kid getting interested in ham radio today you'd
> be faced with being prohibited from it instead of how it worked out for
> you in the 50's.

Actually, I see it easier today than in the 50s.
My first station cost about $150 to set up (that's
1957 dollars) for which I had to work over
150 hours to earn. Today there are 2m
HTs and mobiles that can be had for little more
than $150 and that teen can be on the air.

> So it's fine for you to have freedom from such
> unrealistic restrictions but not those who have no control nor
> involvement in them but who must abide by someone elses stupidity. I
> gotta say, it's typical of ya, pal.

The same CC&Rs that ban antennas also often ban many
other exterior activities that a homeowner without CC&Rs
can enjoy:
- Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in
the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?
- Should CC&Rs that prohibit the color, type and design
of the homes exterior be premted on first amendment basis?
- Should CC&Rs that prohibit pets be preempted?

Just some thoughts.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6377. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:06:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0o74s$p56$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29373

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230102215.03703.00000783@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <3C2E9B02.440216E8@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >K0HB wrote:
> >> Tell that to a young family man raising a family, or to a
> >> teenager who just got interested in our hobby, or to a
> >> retiree on pension who's just decided to pursue his dream of
> >> being a ham.
> >>
> >Life's rough all over, Hans. I drove a pickup with 200,000
> >miles on it so I could possess those two acres.
>
> So everyone must do as you did?
>
> >People must
> >proprietize their wants/needs.
>
> "Proprietize"? Maybe you mean "prioritize".
>
> Is ham radio to be limited only to those who can find two unrestricted
acres?

Not at all as I have noted in several other posts.
Do CC&Rs "limit" the choice of operating? Sure
they do...BUT they don't eliminate all options.

> > Which is more important -
> >a ham antenna or a vehicle?
>
> Why must there be a choice?

Life is full of those choices. We all make them
every day based on our own needs, desires, economics
and many other criterior. At one point in my
teen years you can bet the vehicle became the
prime consumer of my dollars to the detriment of
my ham radio interests. That was a personal
decision based on my need to have a vehicle for
many reasons as opposed to staying home and
enjoying ham radio.

> >Yet, the federal government
> >doesn't guarantee us vehicles.

>
> They DO guarantee that we have certain
> freedom of use of our vehicles, though.

That is in no way anologous to Cecil's point.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6378. Re: What not to say to a cop

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:09:31 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0obtv$ee8$2@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29381
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Homosexual
"STD SpecialDelivery Jones" <SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com> wrote in
message news:d9f7b76c.0112301012.3811c70d@posting.google.com...
> "KC8JBO" <kc8jbo@alt.net> wrote in message
news:<a0i5np$mn1$5@dosa.alt.net>...
[,,,]

> >
> > N0VFP, Llllardasssss lllllloyd has said to a cop, "Can I slurp your
> > nutsacks to let me off these felonies?" See, Lllardasssss lllloyd has
> > quite a criminal record, for buggering boys , cows, and pumpkins in and
> > around Athens, AL.
> >
> > This was just faxed from the Birminham Field office:
> >
> > The Great Pumpkin
> > Birmingham Post-Herald
> > October 14, 2000
> >
> > Police arrested Lloyd A. Davies, a 27 year old white male, resident of
> > Athens, Alabama in the Anderson Pumpkin patch at 11:38pm Friday. Davies
> > will be charged with lewd and lascivious behavior, public indecency,
> > and public intoxication at the Athens Municipal Courthouse Monday. The
> > suspect allegedly stated that as he was passing a pumpkin patch, he
> > decided to stop. "You know, a pumpkin is soft and squishy inside, and
> > there was no one around here for miles. At least I thought there
> > wasn't." he stated in a phone interview from the Athens Municipal
> > Courthouse Jail.
> > Davies went on to state that he pulled over to the side of the road,
> > picked out a pumpkin that he felt was appropriate to his purposes, cut
> > a hole in it, and proceeded to satisfy his alleged "need". "I guess I
> > was just really into it, you know?" he commented with evident
> > embarrassment. In the process, Torrance apparently failed to notice the
> > Athens Municipal police car approaching and was unaware of his audience
> > until officer Brenda Taylor approached him. "It was an unusual
> > situation, sure." said officer Taylor. "I walked up to (Davies) and
> > he's... just working away at this pumpkin."
> > Taylor went on to describe what happened when she approached Davies. "I
> > just went up and said, 'Excuse me sir, but do you realize that you are
> > screwing a pumpkin?' He got real surprised as you'd expect, and then
> > looked me straight in the face and said,
> > 'A pumpkin? Damn... is it midnight already?"
>

>
> probably a close friend of yours chuckie....the nut doesn't fall far
> from the tree does it good buddy????

That why you are so close to your convicted felon daddy?

6379. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:10:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0o75k$70q$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29375

"Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> wrote in message
news:3c2f3c78_2@newsa.ev1.net...
<SNIP>
> It seems to me that just a few short months ago, when several of us were
up
> in arms about CCRs, that the debate's two angles were: either you support
> the "law" of the neighborhood, or you stay the Hell out of it and find
> somewhere else to live. I was one of the people who think it absolutely
> ludicrous that anyone would *ever* agree to move into such a neighborhood
> and I would do everything in my power not to. I think there were even a
few
> typical responses to that about my "whining" again.
>
> Now, this comes up and I see a whole bunch of those I debated, who are now
> on the side of letting a government come in and negate the contract that
was
> signed. Will you people puhleeze make up my mind? You're nuts. Don't
move
> into a neighborhood with CCRs or HOAs. It's as anti-American as you can
> get.

It is actually totally American as no one is "forced" to move in
and accept the CC&Rs. The ability to own a home and
be a ham has many options that allow for choice...UNLESS
the person absolutely wants to live in a certain subdivision.
The choice is yours.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6380. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:11:49 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011230181212.783$f1@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 29374
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Post forwarded to rhollingsworth@fcc.gov
CC: info@fbi.gov
Re: Subject Death Threats

"One High Powered Mother Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote in
message news:3c2f7974.1135127@netnews.att.net...
> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 23:47:57 -0500, "Joe S." <joe@schlatter.org>
> wrote:
>
> >How about we just forward it to Riley and let him sort it out.
> >
> >Done.
>
>
> fuck gayboy riley and his bullshit i'd like that asshole son of a
> bitch to come fuck with me he'd be pulling bullets out his ass i'd
> nail his ass with my 9MM
>
> fuck that cock suckin' bastard
>
> OHPM
>
>
> one high powered mutha
> powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
> i don't play
> i drop da maul

6381. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:11:59 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0obu6$ee8$4@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29382
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Soon to receive an NAL from Riley for jamming,
"JizzRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C2EA981.431F464E@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > Methjadone just kick in, heroin addict?
>
> What is 'methjadone'? Learn to spell, woger.

Quit jamming your local repeaters, Jizz Recepticle.

6382. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:13:51 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0obu7$ee8$5@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29383
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"JizzswallowingRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C2EA8D3.D54B8132@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > > That's 'thirty years and still a virgin',
> >
> > Speaking from experience, Jizzwallowing JR?
>
> Sheesh,

Translation: "JR is so ugly his own mother is hesitant to fuck him, unless
he puts on that black garbage bag first.

>learn proper quoting and responding in the newsgroups
> woger, I did not post the above. Moron!!!

Yes you did, Jizzzwallowing JR, in fact, you're doing some illegal things on
the air.

6383. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:14:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0o7d0haf1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29376

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gp4lklu.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 14:04:17 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >> Most homes built after 1980 or so have CC&R's that pretty much prohibit
> >> antennas period.
> >
> >So? What's wrong with finding an older house? Sounds like you want to
have
> >your cake and eat it, too.
>
> No, I want to have ham radio as my hobby, not reconstructing and
> doing continuous maintenance on an older home.
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Then buy a lot somewhere and build it yourself.
There is plenty of land in NJ with NO restrictions at all.
You could also buy a rundown old home, demolish it, and
have a new home built in the same location. Inner city
and urban development/redevelopment is doing exactly
that in some areas.

Really, folks, every new home built does NOT come
with CC&Rs. Many in large tract subdividions do, but
all new construction is not limited to that scenario only.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6384. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:25:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a0o820his1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 29377

"Compassionate Conservative" <Compassionate@right.wing> wrote in message
news:jl3v2ukc95n5n49j8r41709v371tc0fviv@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 29 Dec 2001 22:50:02 -0600, The ignorant moron CAM
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> spewed hate by saying:
>
> >K0HB wrote:
> >> The message is very clear to me -- "You amateurs don't have
> >> enough financial or political clout for us to worry about.
> > >
> >Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
> >state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you? Any
> >other legal contracts you would like to dismiss?
>
> Like most home owners I did not sign a agreement on deed restrictions.
> It was a done deal. The buyer of a used house is not given a copy of
> any deed restrictions but must check the county records to find if
> there are any restrictions on the deed.

Then you had one sorry ass attorney handle your
purchase. ANY attorney worth his/her salt
would have uncovered such CC&Rs or any
other deed restrictions BEFORE you closed.

I can tell you this...ANY future purcase I might
make would include the right to decline the deal
IF upon researching the title/property there were
ANY CC&Rs/restrictions uncovered. Indeed, if
you are searching for a new home, you should
make that requirement crystal clear to the real
estate agent you are working with. "I didn't know"
after you closed the deal, doesn't help you.

6385. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-30 23:44:28 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wFNX7.206213$WW.11964847@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29378

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:a0o6kp$264$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> The same CC&Rs that ban antennas also often ban many
> other exterior activities that a homeowner without CC&Rs
> can enjoy:
> - Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in
> the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?
> - Should CC&Rs that prohibit the color, type and design
> of the homes exterior be premted on first amendment basis?
> - Should CC&Rs that prohibit pets be preempted?
>
> Just some thoughts.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Good points all, Bill. As you know, the Neighborhood Nazis often go beyond the letter of the CC&Rs and dream up all sorts of requirements like trashcan removal on pick-up days with 27 minutes after pick up, etc. to drive everyone nutso.

Some years ago we had occasion to discuss the plight of a friend of one of our radio club types who lived in a really upscale place for no better reason than he had sold a home in CA for an idiotic amount of coin and needed to bury it in a shack in STL. He was on the road and neither he nor his wife was really ready to go into the landscaping and groundskeeping biz like the locals were making large noises about.

So one quiet day a few trucks arrived and the plantings were done. Geraniums in about a dozen used toilets from an area the city was trying to make look like East Berlin plus a really nice floral display in a six-stall urinal complete with overhead tank. Both of the residents were conveniently gone for a few days.

When they returned and the fit hit the shan with the dread words, 'this was not really what we had in mind', he quietly pointed out that it met the letter of the request they had no legal right to make and presented them with his list of demands which summed to 'get outa my face'. He then slapped them with the restraining order his legal buddy had obtained. Things were resolved and the vitreous china returned to the vitreous china boneyard where it was headed anyway.

I would travel thru this area when the interstate exit was upgefouled and one day happened to be at a stop sign with my four-character plates in a

state where six was the norm and you had to be a poobah or know one to get one of the 9999 four-digit plates as personal plates had not yet been invented. Whether it was for driving a ratty Dodge Dart or having something he didn't I have no clue but I got a filthy look that would corrode gold.

People get wired about a lot of silly things.

Dick N&#65533;BK

6386. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 00:11:18 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0oadn01r5d@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29380
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"John" <n1umj@ARRL.net> wrote in message
news:7xLX7.42739$Sj1.18328536@typhoon.ne.mediaone.net...
> Next time I meet a free bander I will have him reported like they should
be.
> it is not a free band you like the bands so much and the radios get off
your
> wellfair receaving, lazy child molesting asses and work for the lisence
for
> the first time in your life and show people equipment and this country a
> little respect. I have no respect for the "free banders" at all. Work for
it
> like everyone else if you want the ham bands or stay the hell in the 1-40
> channels range where you belong. You do not deserve any more respect then
> the person I shot for breaking in to my house a few years back or the one
I
> caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
> AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!

If this is the case, I wouldn't be a bit surprised if the burgler found a slick lawyer and a liberal judge and sued you for his medical bills, lost wages, mental stress, etc,. You'd probably been better off to kill the bastard.

6387. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 00:22:49 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0ob1201s67@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29385

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gp4lklu.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> >So? What's wrong with finding an older house? Sounds like you want to
have
> >your cake and eat it, too.
>
> No, I want to have ham radio as my hobby, not reconstructing and
> doing continuous maintenance on an older home.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Like I said...

6388. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 00:28:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp6caqz.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29379

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 09:32:14 -0600, CAM wrote:

>Do you object to all legal contracts, Jim, or just CC&Rs?

I object to CC&Rs which do not allow site-reasonable antennas or contain any other restriction that is the product of abject ignorance.

A 50 foot tower on a quarter-acre lot is site-reasonable. A 150 foot tower is not.

My $5K went into rebuilding parts of this 30 year old house which were safety hazards rather than the 50 foor tower and beam(s) that we had planned on.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6389. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 00:48:15 UTC
From: fgillil@tincan.org
Message-ID: <e182e02.0112301648.4e42c24f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29384
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

uppluss@hotmail.com (Scott Unit-69) wrote in message
news:<a2cf6f35.0112301129.73745e9e@posting.google.com>...
> "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C2F0803.3435EE7D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> > One Angry Man wrote:
> > > You'll never know just how right you are!
> > >
> > > signed
> > > One Angry No Code Ham
> > > Member Number 1 of the No Code Liberation Army (NCLA)
> >
> >
> > You can be as angry as you want to be. Those of us who have done
> > nothing wrong, have nothing to worry about.
>
> BTW I do not consider illegal CB or bootlegging "wrong". Those of us
> who choose to operate outside the law do it with a clear conscience. I
> know that upsets some people, but too damn bad.

Are there any other illegal activities you do not consider to be
"wrong"? If someone commits a crime against you, will you ignore
it because he didn't think he was "wrong"? I doubt it.

6390. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:00:32 UTC
From: Garvin@Truss.net
Message-ID: <1f5846q.o9rnl2q4yuf5N%Garvin@Truss.net>
Source record: 29386
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Twistedhed <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote:

> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
> this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
> frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
> think.
> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
> conditions.
> We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
> technical
> issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us
> is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
> should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
> do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
> is
> a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
> is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
> talk with
> him before you condemn him.
>
> This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
> http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
> Unit 2711, Florida

You are a freeLOADER and break the Federal FCC rules regarding
communications. Get legal and you'll get respect.

--
Why is the alphabet in that order? Is it because of that
song?□ - George Carlin□□□□□□□□□□□□

6391. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:03:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230200301.10110.00001608@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 29387

In article <3C2F34DA.C8132ED5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Yes, because the contract unreasonably denies a citizen his/her inalienable
>> rights. The govt. does that sort of thing all the time.
>
>Now, we're getting somewhere. What inalienable rights are being violated?

Liberty and pursuit of happiness.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6392. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:13:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp6fa90.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29388

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 18:14:42 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Then buy a lot somewhere and build it yourself.

Give me your address - I'll have the builder send the bills to you.

>There is plenty of land in NJ with NO restrictions at all.

Who wants to live in New Jer'-sey?

>You could also buy a rundown old home, demolish it, and
>have a new home built in the same location. Inner city
>and urban development/redevelopment is doing exactly
>that in some areas.

And at least in this area the total price for "redevelopment" homes
is astronomical, and in most areas "out here", the developer with
the CC&Rs gets the property before private buyers even know that
it's on the market, and it gets zoned for multiple residential use.

>Really, folks, every new home built does NOT come >with CC&Rs.

Depends on where you are. ARRL's survey showed otherwise.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

6393. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:13:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp6fsj1.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29390

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 18:25:51 -0500, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> Like most home owners I did not sign a agreement on deed restrictions.
>> It was a done deal. The buyer of a used house is not given a copy of
>> any deed restrictions but must check the county records to find if
>> there are any restrictions on the deed.
>
>Then you had one sorry ass attorney handle your
>purchase. ANY attorney worth his/her salt
>would have uncovered such CC&Rs or any
>other deed restrictions BEFORE you closed.

Both California and Oregon REQUIRE the seller to provide the
potential buyer with notice of any CC&Rs or easements which attach
to the property. Most Realtors know how to get it. When we were
house-looking here, our Realtor's office usually got it by fax
before we were finished looking at the property of the seller did
not proffer it.

>I can tell you this...ANY future purcase I might
>make would include the right to decline the deal

Without penalty and with the return of any deposit/earnest money.

>IF upon researching the title/property there were
>ANY CC&Rs/restrictions uncovered.

Smart move.

>Indeed, if
>you are searching for a new home, you should
>make that requirement crystal clear to the real
>estate agent you are working with. "I didn't know"
>after you closed the deal, doesn't help you.

Yup.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6394. Re: FCC Ethical Scenario

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:13:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp6g4v2.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29389

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:39:15 GMT, JAMES HAMPTON wrote:

>I thought that line of thought was over when John F. Kennedy was elected
>president.

IF it was real (and that's a big IF) one call from the Sheriff to
the Regional Director or the Bureau/Division Chief in Washington
brings the 2 kilowatt spotlight to bear on the situation.

Solving interference to government or public safety communications
ranks just below solving interference to military, aviation, and
marine commmunications on the priority ladder.

Plenty of nights I've been out there in the cold doing that.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6395. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:29:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp6gsv3.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29391
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 19:11:18 -0500, Krell wrote:

>> caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
>> AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
>
>If this is the case, I wouldn't be a bit surprised if the burgler found a
>slick lawyer and a liberal judge and sued you for his medical bills, lost
>wages, mental stress, etc,.

As a minimum the hospital where he was sewed back together
would sue to recover their medical bills, rest assured.

>You'd probably been better off to kill the bastard.

Then the family would sue for civil "wrongful death" damages.

There are LOTS of cases in almost every state that hold that
deadly force is not justified in a property-only crime.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6396. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:36:00 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2F0887.5F109704@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29392
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KC8JBO wrote:
>
> Soon to receive an NAL from Riley for jamming,
> "JizzRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2EA981.431F464E@mailcity.net...
> >
> >
> > KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > > Methjadone just kick in, heroin addict?
> >
> > What is 'methjadone'? Learn to spell, woger.
>
> Quit jamming your local repeaters, Jizz Recepticle.

You're one to talk of jamming after Riley and the FCC boys spanked
you for jamming on HF. Shall I post the letter sent to you from
Riley, woger?

6397. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:38:33 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2F0920.8CB900C2@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Twistedhed wrote:
>
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
> this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
> frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
> think.
> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
> conditions.
> We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
> technical
> issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us
> is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
> should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
> do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
> is
> a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
> is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
> talk with
> him before you condemn him.
>
> This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
> http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
> Unit 2711, Florida

If you want respect, do something that deserves respect. Breaking
the law by freebanding deserves no respect. By the way, there is
no 'freeband', those frequencies are allocated.

6398. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:40:58 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2F09B0.5FE37606@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29394
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 19:11:18 -0500, Krell wrote:
>
> >> caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
> >> AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
> > >
> >If this is the case, I wouldn't be a bit surprised if the burgler found a
> >slick lawyer and a liberal judge and sued you for his medical bills, lost
> >wages, mental stress, etc,.
>
> As a minimum the hospital where he was sewed back together
> would sue to recover their medical bills, rest assured.
>
> >You'd probably been better off to kill the bastard.
>
> Then the family would sue for civil "wrongful death" damages.
>
> There are LOTS of cases in almost every state that hold that
> deadly force is not justified in a property-only crime.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Shoot to kill then drag him inside and put a weapon in his hand.

6399. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:42:36 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2F0A14.8BA83AA5@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29395
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Scott Unit-69 wrote:
>
> "Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C2F0803.3435EE7D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> > One Angry Man wrote:
> > > You'll never know just how right you are!
> > >
> > > signed
> > > One Angry No Code Ham
> > > Member Number 1 of the No Code Liberation Army (NCLA)
> >
> >
> > You can be as angry as you want to be. Those of us who have done
> > nothing wrong, have nothing to worry about.
>
> BTW I do not consider illegal CB or bootlegging "wrong". Those of us
> who choose to operate outside the law do it with a clear conscience. I
> know that upsets some people, but too damn bad.

There are others who choose to operate outside the law with a
clear conscience. When one of these robs your house, you may get
upset, but too damn bad.

6400. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:47:34 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2F0B3C.E5A6211E@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29396
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Shrimp Biskit wrote:
>
> Post forwarded to rhollingsworth@fcc.gov
> CC: info@fbi.gov
> Re: Subject Death Threats

You cc to info@fbi.gov is a waste of time. It states plainly on
the FBI web site, "At this time, FBI Headquarters does not accept
E-mail. If you have any comments or questions about the FBI or
this web site, please write to:
Federal Bureau of Investigation
J. Edgar Hoover Building
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20535-0001
(202) 324-3000

So who are you trying to impress?

6401. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:48:59 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C2F0B92.D7DE52E4@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29397
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

KC8JBO wrote:
>
> "JizzswallowingRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
> news:3C2EA8D3.D54B8132@mailcity.net...
> >
> >
> > KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > > > That's 'thirty years and still a virgin',
> > >
> > > Speaking from experience, Jizzwallowing JR?
> >
> > Sheesh,
>
> Translation: "JR is so ugly his own mother is hesitant to fuck him, unless
> he puts on that black garbage bag first.
>
> >learn proper quoting and responding in the newsgroups
> > woger, I did not post the above. Moron!!!
>
> Yes you did, Jizzzwallowing JR, in fact, you're doing some illegal things on
> the air.

It is sooooo, sooooo, easy to pull your little tiny chain, woger.

6402. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:50:15 UTC
From: onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com
Message-ID: <3c2fc40d.4073196@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 29398
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 01:47:34 GMT, JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote:

>
>
>Shrimp Biskit wrote:
>>
>> Post forwarded to rhollingsworth@fcc.gov
>> CC: info@fbi.gov
>> Re: Subject Death Threats
>
>You cc to info@fbi.gov is a waste of time. It states plainly on
>the FBI web site, "At this time, FBI Headquarters does not accept
>E-mail. If you have any comments or questions about the FBI or
>this web site, please write to:
> Federal Bureau of Investigation
> J. Edgar Hoover Building
> 935 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
> Washington, D.C. 20535-0001
> (202) 324-3000
>
>So who are you trying to impress?

and not only that like I'm really gonna put my REAL name and address
there... dumb ass.

one high powered mutha
powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
i don't play
i drop da maul

6403. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:56:52 UTC
From: fgillil@tincan.org
Message-ID: <e182e02.0112301756.3739ef67@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29399
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<IILX7.206051$WW.11953034@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> The post was a forgery, John. Lot of that of late. Suggest before
> replying check the routing: if you see Google or Newsnet or any of the
> other well-known public urinals you can safely forget it. The ethics of
> responding to cross-posts I will leave to you but that is another
> indication that something is bogus.
>
> Dick Nï¿½BK

It may have been a forge, but it bears a remarkable similarity to
twistie's rants on the freebanding issue. I think it reflects his
position very well.

6404. Re: RE.. RESTRUCTURING: ARRL STUDY SAYS NOVICE BANDS MAY NOT BE NEEDED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 01:59:26 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <2EPX7.727$jg4.674657@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 29400

Herr Hans
#2

: > What we need is for the CW/digital portion of the
: > bands to be open to everyone (if qualified). No
: > sub bands.
:
: Your statement is ambiguous to me. ("No sub bands")
:
: Do you mean:
:
: 1) That voice and image modes should be allowed in
: the current CW/data portions of the bands?
:
: 2) That any class of license ought to be able to operate
: CW/data in all the current CW/portions of the bands?
:
: 3) Both 1 and 2 above?
:
: 4) Something else? (Explain)
:
: 73, de Hans, K0HB
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

6405. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:00:49 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230210049.05494.00004156@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 29401

>>I chose to remain Advanced for other reasons--espcially after the
>>restructuring. One was
>>that I wanted to keep the "distinction" of having done the 13 WPM instead of
>>being "lumped"
>>in with the new Extras. Not to be conceited, but because I did, after all,
>>complete more stringent CW requirements to achieve General and above.
>
>I understand where you're coming from, Jerry, but an Advanced license by
>itself
>doesn't mean you passed 13 wpm, just like an Extra today doesn't mean you
>passed 20 wpm. Medical waivers for 13 and 20 wpm code have been available
>since
>1990, so unless you can show that your license was issued before then,
>there's
>no proof of 13 wpm. Just like there's no proof of 20 wpm for my Extra unless
>it's also known that I got it before 1990 (1970, to be exact).

I disagree, Jim. While what you say is technically correct, it is most certainly the exception to the rule. Would you agree that during pre-restructuring amateur radio licensing, at least one ham has "bought" his/her way past the code? Of course, we know this because of the reported VEC irregularities of late. Remember the Puerto Rico VEC fiasco of the early 80's? Heck, it could've even occurred when the FCC still did the testing. FCC personnel aren't infallible. (Isn't that right, Bert?)

My point is that these scenarios are the exceptions, not the rule. If we were to give the exceptions the same weight as the rule, then everyone's Tech plus or higher could be legitimately questioned. I remember seeing an advertisement for a one day or weekend course for hams who wished to cancel their extra tickets just so they could take all the required elements to grab their advanced ticket before 4/14/00. This was the equivalent of "downgrading" and was the subject of a thread here not too long ago. A bit extreme, but the motivation is understandable. It's the only proof of having passed a 13 w.p.m. code test.

>Operationally, the ONLY difference between an Advanced and an Extra is access
>to a few subbands. Those are where the DX is often found, 'specially the rare
>ones, but if you're not a DXer it makes no difference.

Some would consider this some very prime real estate. Take care and 73.

Mark

6406. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:01:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230210101.09102.00000857@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29407

In article <3c2f547b_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>And, I'd refuse a petition from a neighborhood to start such
>restricitions, and I would never be in a neighborhood with an HOA or such
>restrictive CCRs. At least, I hope it doesn't ever get to the point where
>that is all that's left.

You might find yourself in that very situation someday. That's why it's important even if it doesn't affect your right now,

>At the same time, I don't think I would knowingly
>sign such an agreement and then look for a way out of it at a later date.

Who can say what the future may bring? I live in a house built 52 years ago, and it has deed restrictions - for things like setbacks and not raising livestock. No antenna restrictions. The folks who built this place could not have imagined that a time would come when people didn't have "aerials".

>But, I can't say for sure--because I've never been in that position (except
>for marriage, of course).

"Of course"? No, not at all.

Why in the world should CC&Rs be more sacred and harder to get out of than marriages?

Anyone who has gotten divorced is just like the person who bought a restricted property and now wants out of the restrictions.

Would you say to a person who wants out of a marriage, "You should not have signed the contract if you didn't like the conditions and restrictions"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6407. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:01:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230210102.09102.00000858@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29403

In article <3C2EB939.60780F69@mailcity.net>, JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net> writes:

>I'm amazed as I follow this debate that some talk of ham radio as
>if it were something of real importance.

Why? It's important to some people.

> If you life would
>drastically change for the worse if ham radio went away, you need
>help.

Who said anyhting about drastic change? Should people just accept the loss of something they like to do because of Gladys Kravitz's opinion?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

6408. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:01:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230210102.09102.00000859@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29404

In article <3C2EB9C4.E4009689@mailcity.net>, JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net> writes:

>The people who signs CC&R contracts and then bitch, are just like
>those who build a house off the end of a runway of a busy airport
>and then bitch about the noise and want to get the runway shut
>down.

Or like those who get married and then decide they don't want to be with that person for the rest of their life.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6409. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:01:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230210103.09102.00000860@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29408

In article <3C2F337E.95F5E883@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >People must
>> >proprietize their wants/needs.
>>
>> "Proprietize"? Maybe you mean "prioritize".
>
>Egads - I sure did. Got my roots mixed up.

Yup.
>
>> Is ham radio to be limited only to those who can find two unrestricted
>acres?
>
>Did I say that?

You implied it.

>I merely gave an example of what can be done.

In some cases. Not in all cases.

> Everywhere
>I have lived, the first thing I did was check the CC&Rs.

Because you were already a ham.

>Just like any
>other contract, if I didn't like the terms and conditions, I didn't sign.

Uh huh.
>
>> They DO guarantee that we have certain freedom of use of our vehicles,
>though.
>
>There are many places where motor vehicles are prohibited, e.g. inside
>the shopping mall.

False. I see little electric carts and motorized wheelchairs in our local malls
all the time.

The point is that we are guaranteed certain freedoms in the use of our
vehicles. Limitations are imposed only to protect the safety of others.

That's why we have building codes.

How does a simple HF wire dipole between two trees, connected to a QRP ham rig, negatively affect the safety of others.

> Do you advocate driving motor vehicles everywhere?

Everywhere it's reasonable and safe to drive them, yes.

>Do you object to all legal contracts, Jim, or just CC&Rs?

Contracts were made to be broken, Cecil. Here's an example:

One of the most serious contracts most people ever make is to get married. Listen to the words at most weddings:

"love, honor, and cherish"
"in good times and bad"
"in sickness and in health"
"for richer or poorer"
"til death us do part"

In most ceremonies the people entering into the contract face each other and say out loud that they have come to the contract freely and unreservedly, and accept ALL its terms. They make the contract in front of witnesses and get both community and legal acceptance. In most ceremonies there are NO escape clauses and NO limitations.

Yet about 50% of marriages in the USA end in divorce. All it takes is for one of the parties to say "I don't wanna do this anymore" and it's OVER. Doesn't matter if the other party agrees, doesn't matter how much damage it does to other people. No reason need be given other than "I want out". Nowadays there is almost no stigma attached to divorce - in fact, most divorces are "no fault".

Why should CC&Rs be more sacred than marriage?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6410. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:01:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230210104.09102.00000861@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29405

In article <3C2F349E.AC8A601@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> As I understand it, the reason TV dishes are exempted is that the "pizza
>dish"
>> satellite companies pushed a test case all the way to the Supreme Court,
>> claiming that the restrictive covenants created a monopoly for the cable
>folks
>> and excluded the pizza dish folks from the pay-TV market. Supremes said it
>was
>> restriction of trade, monopolistic practice, that sort of thing, and broke
>the
>> covenants - except in historic areas.
>
>Too bad the same approach won't work for *amateurs*.

It might work, but there's the risk that if the case were lost it would be
worse.

> Are there any guaranteed
>freedoms or laws on the side of the amateur radio operators?

Sure.

>I suspect it would
>be unconstitutional for the federal government to interfere with willingly
>signed CC&R contracts.

Nope. The pizza dish case proves that. The Supremes ruled for the satcom folks,
and it's the Supremes who say what's constitutional.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6411. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:01:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230210105.09102.00000863@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29402

In article <3c2f3cf8_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim- <nospam@none.net> writes:

>Why should a majority of the population yield to the wants and desires of a
>very, very minute part of the population?

Because all people have certain inalienable rights.

And please learn to edit old stuff from your posts, Kim.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6412. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:01:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230210105.09102.00000862@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29406

In article <3c2f3c78_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>It seems to me that just a few short months ago, when several of us were up
>in arms about CCRs, that the debate's two angles were: either you support
>the "law" of the neighborhood, or you stay the

[expletive deleted]

>out of it and find
>somewhere else to live.

I don't recall it that way, Kim.

>I was one of the people who think it absolutely
>ludicrous that anyone would *ever* agree to move into such a neighborhood
>and I would do everything in my power not to.

That's nice. Hope it works out that way for ya.

>I think there were even a few
>typical responses to that about my "whining" again.

>Now, this comes up and I see a whole bunch of those I debated, who are now
>on the side of letting a government come in and negate the contract that was
>signed.

People do change their minds. Sometimes.

>Will you people puhleeze make up my mind?

That's your job, Kim.

>You're nuts.

I don't think so.

> Don't move
>into a neighborhood with CCRs or HOAs.

Sometimes there is no realistic choice.

> It's as anti-American as you can
>get.

That I agree with. But it's been SOP since the 1970s, and it's spreading. In some areas if you say "I only want to see unrestricted properties" to a realtor, the list of places to look at is very short.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6413. Re: RADIO LAW: TACOMA BANS NON FCC CERTIFIED CB GEAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:06:58 UTC
From: N9NWO <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Message-ID: <6LPX7.776$jg4.679473@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 29409

: > However, what I have a problem with is that
: > so many in the US just can not accept that someone
: > might be better than they.
:
: Well sweetheart, you have a *huge* problem with me
: then.
:
: I do not accept that anyone is "better" than I, and I
: especially do not accept that a uniform, badge,
: or election results makes them better.
:
: Our founding fathers, whom you are so proud to
: cite, seemed to feel a lot like me when they
: said.... "We hold these truths to be self-evident...
: ...that all men are created equal...."

Our country is based on people being unequal.
Is everyone born with the same wealth? Can you
be the best you can be? If you can then some
will be superior to others.

Likewise so many Americans, especially in the
suburbs, have become such wimps that those
who have served in the military, police and
fire fighting (to include those who did so in the
past) are superior due to their ability to survive
in a crisis situation. People have become so
specialized that many no longer have across
the board life skills thus making them dependent
(inferior) to those who still have such skills.
We just are not a nation of farm boys anymore.

The police see how weak minded folks are,
what a bunch of sheeple they are. And remember
that the police academy preaches superiority. It
is felt that if a cop does not think he is superior then
he not only risks his life but the lives of his fellow
officers. He has to have the attitude, the game face,
to survive on the streets.

6414. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:12:23 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <C9A6C420A9462AC9.94974FA3AB67EA50.4645D57CB582981D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29410

On 30 Dec 2001 15:55:55 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>> 2. I NEVER "threatened to have your internet access
>>terminated." That is a typical Larry Roll lie. Quote back my "threat,"
>>Larry. Put up or Shut up.
>
>Rick:
>
>I reported on what I read, that's all. It was no lie. I'll start providing
>quotes as soon as Cecil and every one else of the NCTA persuasion
>catches up on at least a decade's worth.

Translation: I _can't_ provide the quotes because they don't
exist in the first place, so I'll pretend it's all Cecil's fault
instead.

Weak, Larry.

I'm not Cecil. It doesn't matter if he provides quotes or not,
I DO provide them. Base your responses on my behavior not on
Cecil's.

>> Larry, go take your Viagra, dig out your Hustler magazine, and
>>pretend that you can find a woman that would put up with you.
>>
>> Rick
>
>More insults. How charming. However, not worthy of a reply.

Yet you replied.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6415. Re: Happy Holidays from NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:16:16 UTC
From: radiohead11m@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230211616.05494.00004166@mb-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 29411

>Dear r.r.a.p.'ers,
>
>In the spirit of the holiday season (whatever your
>religious persuasion), I'd like to take this opportunity
>to sincerely convey wishes for a happy holiday
>season and a prosperous new year to you, on behalf
>of both myself and the entire Board of Directors and
>membership of No Code International.
>
>73,
>- --
>Carl R. Stevenson - wa6vse

... .- -- . - --- -.-- --- ..- --..-- -.-. .- .-. .-.. .-.-.- -...-

--... ...-- -.. . -- .- .-. -.- . ... --. ..- -.. -.. -..-

...-.-

6416. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:21:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230212147.14481.00001007@mb-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 29412

>Subject: Respect For Freebanders
>From: twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com (Twistedhed)
>Date: 12/30/2001 2:24 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <e9de0154.0112300024.125df714@posting.google.com>

>I am posting here because of some of the nasty things.....

Someone obviously can't think of any NEW stupid things to say about
breaking the law, so they just re-circulate the OLD stupid things.

Conservation?

6417. Re: What is the purpose of the NEW B.A.R.F.?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:28:25 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0poj4$e3k$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29439
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"Jizzswallowing Recepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C2F0B92.D7DE52E4@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > "JizzswallowingRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2EA8D3.D54B8132@mailcity.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > KC8JBO wrote:
> > >
> > > > That's 'thirty years and still a virgin',
> > > >
> > > > Speaking from experience, Jizzwallowing JR?
> > >
> > > Sheesh,
> > >
> > Translation: "JR is so ugly his own mother is hesitant to fuck him,
unless
> > he puts on that black garbage bag first.
> >
> > >learn proper quoting and responding in the newsgroups
> > > woger, I did not post the above. Moron!!!
> >
> > Yes you did, Jizzzwallowing JR, in fact, you're doing some illegal
things on
> > the air.
>
> It is sooooo, sooooo, easy to pull your little tiny chain, woger.

Is it,? But not as easy as when you pull that tiny, tiny thing you try to
pass off as a pecker, Jizzswallowing Recepticle.
```

6418. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:30:09 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0poj6$e3k$1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29440
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jizzswallowing Recepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C2F0887.5F109704@mailcity.net...
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > Soon to receive an NAL from Riley for jamming,
> > "JizzRecepticle" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
> > news:3C2EA981.431F464E@mailcity.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > KC8JBO wrote:
> > >
> > > > Methjadone just kick in, heroin addict?
> > >
> > > What is 'methjadone'? Learn to spell, woger.
> >
> > Quit jamming your local repeaters, Jizz Recepticle.
>
> You're one to talk of jamming after Riley and the FCC boys spanked

Jizzwallowing recepticle's jamming of his local repeaters, noted. And his
identity and callsign sent to rholling@fcc.gov.

> you for jamming on HF. Shall I post the letter sent to you from
> Riley, woger?

Go ahead, it's so old news, it just shows how fucking desperate you are,
puppet.

6419. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:34:16 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <10C06F27E74095B4.4F46FCC4017D8788.2E8FB25D1013BBD3@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29413

On 30 Dec 2001 15:55:56 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I must note that for a university professor, you don't seem to exhibit
>much understanding of the meaning of the term "morality."

Perhaps because I don't accept some of the definitions in use
by those who oppose Kim's call sign as valid?

>Perhaps I shouldn't be surprised, however.

Of course not. I think for myself and use words correctly.

>In selecting her particular Vanity
>Call Sign, Kim demonstrated poor taste and bad judgment;

In your opinion.

The fact that you keep restating this point does NOT make it a
fact, Larry, it's STILL only your opinion.

Many of us disagree with you.

>however,
>I have no basis for making any sort of commentary regarding her
>personal morality.

True.

>She may be as moral as the Mother Superior
>of the local convent, or not -- for all I know.

I hope not. Most Mother Superior's tend to be rigidly
inflexible in their interpretation of "right and wrong" and to base
their moral values on those demanded of them by their religion instead
of on their own sense of morality and justice.

>I will assume, in the
>absence of any evidence to the contrary, that Kim's personal
>behavior demonstrates high moral standards.

How very generous of you.

>However, that has
>nothing to do with her choice of call sign -- even moral, decent people
>are capable of making foolish choices.

True.

Of course it's purely a matter of opinion whether or not Kim's
call sign _represents_ a "foolish choice" or not. Personally I (and,
again, many other people here) don't think it was. You do. So what?

>Well, from your POV, you're upset because I'm holding Kim's feet
>to the fire for selecting a Vanity call sign which reflects poorly on the
>positive image of radio amateurs -- YL's in particular.

No, Larry, you are harassing a fellow ham because in your
personal opinion her call sign is inappropriate. Only your rigid and
old-fashioned way of thinking leads to the conclusion that her call
sign reflects poorly on the image of radio amateurs. Personally, I
find inflexible, prejudiced, or overly controlling hams (which
DEFINITELY includes you and Dick Carroll) as being the ones whose
behavior "reflects poorly on the positive image of radio amateurs."

>I'm sorry if
>this bothers you, but I cannot be held responsible for keeping your
>most exalted liberal elite lordship perfectly happy 24/7!

Larry, are you just stupid or are you so set in your views
that you can't even understand English?

I am NOT a liberal, you ignorant ass, I am libertarian. That
makes me just as much a liberal as your use of HF makes you a
freebander!

It DOES bother me, Larry, because I don't like seeing my hobby
trashed by an idiot like you whose only goal in life is to prove that
he can make women capitulate to his demands.

>> What this thread is about is Larry Roll trying to prove his
>>manhood by harassing a fellow ham into capitulating to your
>>unreasonable demands and out-of-date values.
>
>Really? What have I demanded from anyone?

That Kim change her call sign. Are you really so brain dead
that you didn't know what you have been harassing her about?

>I've suggested to Kim
>that she would be highly praised for doing the right thing if she changed
>her call sign to one which wasn't so patently offensive.

Fine.

IF she changes it voluntarily, praise her.

Otherwise shut up about her call sign.

>However, I
>haven't "harassed" her in any way.

Bunk.

We BOTH know you're a liar about that, Larry. As does anyone
else who still reads this thread.

Live in your fantasies, Larry, they're all you have.

>>You started the thread.
>
>So what? People start threads here all the time. Big steenking deal!
>
>>You insist that you will perpetuate it until Kim changes her call.
>
>I may, or I may not. I haven't decided yet. I must admit, I am getting
>a bit bored with this...but perhaps not bored enough...yet!

Please do. We're ALL bored with you!

>Once again, Rick, this isn't about me. It is about Kim, who is
>representing the ARS *irresponsibly.*

No, Larry, it's about you and your self-righteous stupidity.

>> Kim's call sign has absolutely nothing to do with ham radio
>>policy--even YOU can't be stupid enough to think people will believe
>>that dishonest statement!
>
>Well, I haven't seen any new postings today other than yours. We'll
>see.
>
>> You don't want to talk about policy, Larry, you want to harass
>>a woman because she won't give in to your demands.

>Once again, Rick -- I haven't "demanded" anything of Kim, and
>wouldn't waste my time trying to.

Larry--stuff it. We're sick and tired of constantly seeing you
lie. Try the truth once in a while, Larry, it might make you look like
less of a loser.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6420. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:47:02 UTC
From: KB9TMP <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com>
Message-ID: <a0ojj3$a0d$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 29415
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:8sLX7.206026$WW.11951458@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> Aside from the fact that Scott did not write this idiocy, when are you
> taking the code test so you can enjoy it a hell of a lot more???
>
> Dick N�BK
>

As soon as I can get my copy up to the 5wpm requirement.
I'm listening to the ARRL code practice files off the Internet
and I'll go for my test as soon as I can copy the 7.5 wpm
files, that way I'll know for _SURE_ I can do the 5 wpm test.
--

'73' From KB9TMP
NCI-2385

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
-Peer's Law

6421. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:53:04 UTC
From: Rick Adams <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net>
Message-ID: <1CEE8BC495EC91B4.E34015EC399F3182.35952BCF8C5364AA@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 29414

On 30 Dec 2001 15:55:57 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>How charming. Don't look now, but you've got the wrong bloke,
>mate. It was Cecil who started this "electronic stalking" thing
>going on here. However, the direct insult of being called an
>"idiot" is noted; I wonder what voyager.net's Terms Of Service
>have to say about that?

Absolutely nothing, you moron. Not only do I have a commercial
connection to the Inet, which means I'm a NOT a dial-up user and have
different contractual obligations, but I don't use Voyager's news
server (take a look at my headers--my messages originate either with
my Airnews account or my Altopia one, depending on which server is
running faster at the time) which means I'm only limited by the
COU/TOS of those services, NEITHER of which has any policy concerning
message content or frequency.

On the other hand, since you have an aol account (which, to a
networker, is sort of like being a Novice class ham who can't even
remember the morse code), you ARE limited by a COU/TOS agreement that
specifically prohibits behavior which is harassing, offensive, or
violates the charter of a news group.

Have a nice day, idiot.

Rick

--

Rick Adams--KE8HH
adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net

"... and the only measure of your worth and your deeds
will be the love you leave behind when you're gone."

Fred Small, J.D., "Everything Possible"

6422. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 02:53:19 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0ojrd010uk@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29422

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230200301.10110.00001608@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <3C2F34DA.C8132ED5@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >> Yes, because the contract unreasonably denies a citizen his/her
inalienable
> >> rights. The govt. does that sort of thing all the time.
> >
> >Now, we're getting somewhere. What inalienable rights are being violated?
>
> Liberty and pursuit of happiness.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

That's as may be, however, that particular phrase is mentioned in the
Declaration of Independence, not the U.S. Constitution.

6423. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:03:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230220307.06877.00000825@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 29416

In article <3c2f3dab_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011230102216.03703.00000784@mb-da.aol.com...
>> In article <3C2E9CFA.7B2E2AEE@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> >K0HB wrote:
>> >> The message is very clear to me -- "You amateurs don't have
>> >> enough financial or political clout for us to worry about.
>> >
>> >Let me get this straight. You want the FCC to make null and void a
>> >state enforced legal contract agreed to and signed by you?

>> Yes, because the contract unreasonably denies a citizen his/her
>inalienable
>> rights. The govt. does that sort of thing all the time.

>Wait.

For what?

>Weren't *you* just saying that ham radio is not an inalienable right,
>Jim?

I honestly don't remember.

I do think that reasonable enjoyment of one's property comes under "pursuit of happiness". Having a reasonable antenna installation is necessary for receiving, too. The whole anti-antenna CC&R thing is a direct result of an attempt to eliminate free reception of the electromagnetic spectrum by the very people who "own" the spectrum. Gawd, I wish Charlie Stewart were around today.

>I know someone, and many, do.

I have no idea what this is supposed to mean.

> So, it's not an inalienable right to be
>a ham, but it is an inalienable right to have antennas?

It's an inalienable right to have REASONABLE antennas. Many CC&R's prohibit ALL antennas - even if they cannot be seen from the street or neighbor's properties, even if they blend in very well, etc. There are CC&R neighborhoods with aerial utilities: great big 40-50 foot poles out front with 13.2 kV three-phase on a 10 foot crossarm, big heavy triplex and a transformer on every third pole, cable TV and telephone cables the size of your arm, and drops for all of this running everywhere. But DON'T dare put up a G5RV or a VHF Yagi in

those neighborhoods because of "aesthetic values". Huh?

(btw - I think power poles are beautiful).

>> > Any other
>> >legal contracts you would like to dismiss?
>>
>> Not at the moment.

>It's easy to confuse this mind, especially when surrounded by so much wishy
>washy.

If you look at my posts you will see that I have always been against
unreasonable anti-antenna CC&Rs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6424. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:03:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011230220311.06877.00000826@mb-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 29417

In article <a0o5gsajr1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>The eam is the means to determine the qualification.
>For 20wpm,, the qualification was to have the ability
>to recieve at 20 wpm...as determined by passing a
>test which was the actual requirement.

I had to send and receive at 20 wpm.
>
>Likewise, the Extra written is the test methodology
>(Element 4) used to determine IF the applicant has sufficient
>knowledge of theory/rule/regs which are part of the
>syllabus of knowledge used to prepare the test element
>itself which is the requirement.

Of course - but the question is, WHY is that requirement needed? (See below)
>
>> >Before the NEW structure,
>> >all that involved was the 4B (I think that was it) which
>> >I and others passed and obtained CSCE credit for.
>>
>> Yeah, I know. I passed it in August, 1970, between sophomore and junior
>year of
>> high school. Age 16. Woulda done it earlier but they had that 2 year
>experience
>> thing back then.
>>
>> >Once 4/15/00
>> >came and went, we had a paper upgrade. Those that were advanced
>> >and didn't follow that path now have a "combined" 4A/4B exam to contend
>> >with. That's the breaks.
>> >
>> Old 4A was 50 questions and old 4B was 40. New 4 is 50 questions.
>>
>> But none of this answers the original question: What is so special about
>3524
>> kHz that one needs to be tested more to use it than 3526?
>
>It really is still an aspect of "incentive licensing".

BINGO!!!!

The idea is that the system "rewards" the passing of additional tests by giving
out additional privileges, even though the additional tests do NOT contain
material that is "necessary" to use the new privileges. In other words, hams

are rewarded for "jumping through the hoop" of Element 4.

>> >> Carl describes incentive licensing as "a dismal failure" and says that
>> >license
>> >> test requirements should ONLY be based on demonstrating the necessary
>> >> qualifications.
>> >
>> >And that's what it is per my comments above.

But now you say "It really is still an aspect of "incentive licensing".". And
you are absolutely correct, Bill. It's about incentives and rewards, not
showing necessary qualifications.
>>
>> Why is Element 4 "necessary"? Because the FCC says so?
>
>See my comment above...the test is the means to ascertain
>an individuals knowledge.

Yup - even though the knowledge was shown to be adequate on a lower-level test.
>
>> >> Carl also says that the writtens are not "dumbed down", even though
>> >> their size and number was radically decreased on April 15, 2000.
>> >
>> >The number of questions doesn't change the scope and
>> >or difficulty of learning the knowledge needed
>> >to pass.
>>
>> Sure it does.
>
>Let's make this simple.... I give you 200 words
>to learn the spelling of. You have NO knowledge
>of which words will be on a test. You still need
>to learn them all regardless of the test being
>25 or 50 of the words picked at random.
>Same applies to all types of testing.

Nope.

The amateur writtens are not a spelling test. The questions are not simply
chosen at random, and are not unrelated.

>> A simple basic test to get started, a more involved test for more privs,
>and a
>> fairly comprehensive test for full privileges. And make the privileges
>match
>> the testing level.
>
>How does that differ from Tech/General/Extra today?

1) Tech today is a big step for newcomers who do not have technical
backgrounds. They get way too much VHF/UHF, and if they pass 5 wpm code get way
too little HF/MF

2) General today is "about right" except the written test is mostly regs and not technical enough

3) The privileges earned do not match the knowledge tested closely enough

4) There is no experience requirement

5) VE qualification should be a separate issue

6) Current system is a patchwork quilt of a system dating back more than 50 years.
>
>> The big problem lots of ham have with the current system is that the
>privileges
>> don't match the testing.
>
>Then what alignment would you like for privileges
>vs license (I can't find your prior post on those
>details...so maybe repubishing would help me
>understand your position.) I have some thoughts
>on those lines also...perhaps we are in closer agreement
>than we think.

See end of this post.
>
>> >> >> > why should anyone get a total freebie??? If they
>> >> >> >don't want to, or don't have the time to, upgrade, they should
>> >> >> >remain satisfied with what they have. There is no reason to
>> >> >> >change the system ... nobody should get privileges they aren't
>> >> >> >qualified for, nor should anyone lose privileges they've already
>> >> >> >earned.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Sounds like what some folks were saying before the restructuring.
>> >> >> Folks you vehemently disagree with.
>> >> >
>> >> >That argument/analogy only holds IF you believe the current
>> >> >testing requirements for the written are unreasonable and/or
>> >> >unjustified.
>> >>
>> >> If one accepts Carl's statements, they ARE unjustified beyond the
>> >> General level.
>> >
>> >I don't see the logic in your conclusion.
>>
>> I'm simply pointing out the inconsistency in Carl's statements. He calls
>the
>> code tests "making hams jump through hoops" because they are not NECESSARY
>in
>> order to operate an amateur transmitter on non-Morse modes. And he points
>to
>> FCC statements and the R&O for 98-143 for proof.
>>
>> OK, fine, apply that same logic to the writtens. FCC sez a General and its

>> associated tests fully qualifies a ham to use full power on all authorized
>> amateur modes and bands. By Carl's logic, all the NECESSARY stuff to
>operate
>> any ham transmitter is contained in the testing for General. Thus, the
>Extra
>> test is just as much "making hams jump through hoops" as the old code
>tests
>> were - IF one accepts Carl's premises.
>
>OK, I don't necessarily disagree with your logic on that.
>The issue still is (IMHO) retaining some aspect of incentive
>in the licensing steps.

Which means incentive licnesing is NOT "a dismal failure".
>
><SNIP>
>> >> Remember that during the 1957-1963 period the Soviets had one space
>> >> space triumph after another while the US tried to catch up.
>> >
>> >Whch had more to do with physics and rocketry than
>> >anything electronic.
>>
>> Yup, absolutely. In fact, one of the reasons the Soviets built such big
>rockets
>> was that their electronics were bigger and heavier.
>>
>> But the effect of all those early Soviet space triumphs was to focus
>attention
>> here on "science" (actually, engineering) in all fields, not just
>rocketry.
>
>But that doesn't seem to suggest that the Sputnik was the prime
>motivator of incentive licensing.

It does to me. Lots of folks were shaken up by how much the Soviets were ahead
of us in space. Tom Wolfe's "The Right Stuff" tells the story very well.

> Anyway...that's one of those
>speculative discussions that we can all down a few adult
>beverages discussing sometime :-)

Works for me! Make mine a Sam Adams.

Here's a revised and cleaned-up version of myu earlier post, with some
suggestions by Rich Plourde incorporated. Remember that this is more of a
"thought experiment" than a finished job. The names of the proposed license
classes were chosen to avoid confusion with the existing classes.

How about this:

Right now:

1) Give all Novices and Tech Pluses 200 W CW only on all nonphone General HF/MF bands, 160-10. (They haven't been tested on other modes for HF)

2) Allow all "old" Tech Pluses to get Generals by a simple mail or online procedure, instead of forcing them to attend VE sessions.

3) Resolve the 40 meter mess at WRC 2003 to get a worldwide exclusive amateur allocation, even if it gives away spectrum. 7000-7200 worldwide exclusive amateur is better for everyone than 7000-7300 in Region 2 and 7000-7100 everywhere else. 7000-7300 worldwide exclusive amateur would be wonderful.

4) Develop bandplans for all HF/MF that separate CW, digital and analog voice/image modes.

After S25.5 is gone:

1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the names if you

don't like them)

2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license class. (Some bands, like 10 and the WARC bands, may be split by mode only).

3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs, procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff, main purpose is to keep
Basics out of trouble. Basics get 100-150 watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so
on VHF/UHF (determined by RF exposure limits). Modes are CW, analog voice, PSK31 and many of the other common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or be club trustees. Basics get all
VHF/UHF and about half of HF/MF spectrum. Basic is meant as the entry level. Test content matches privileges granted.

4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical and RF exposure stuff,
with some regs to cover expanded privs. Intermediates get 300-400 watts on all
bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs after qualification (see below),
control ops for repeaters, and club trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF
and about three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires at least one year experience as a Basic.

5) Full license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs, procedures,
safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some regs to cover expanded
privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands, etc. except that Fulls can be VEs
only after qualification (see below). Full license requires ar least one

year
(preferably two years) as an Intermediate.

6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable.

7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or six-character calls,
and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character calls.

8) There is a separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs.

9) Existing Novices become Basics, existing Techs, Tech Pluses, Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras become Fulls.

10) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to upgrade, but their
time in existing classes counts.

End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges. And the testing matches the priviliges granted.

The power levels are set about one S-unit apart. Perhaps current hams would be allowed to use the existing power levels so nobody loses privileges.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6425. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:08:50 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <6FQX7.316668$W8.11919805@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29418

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230102216.03703.00000785@mb-da.aol.com...
> In article <3C2A43C9.5B613C6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >McCollum sometimes has a way with a phrase, doesn't he?
>
> Absolutely. You can see the Midwest Vonnegut/Twain/Heller influences,
plus the
> original McC style and the careful application to ham radio. Really well
done.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Take it for whatever ; Lennie once called it cynical-chic which I found amusing.

You have left out the biggest single influence on whatever literary style I might possess, Tom McCahill who invented auto testing about 1949 for Mechanix Illustrated. I regularly use one of his lines -- whipping Granny down to the pool hall. He had a thing about Pontiacs, particularly the 50s versions where Chief Pontiac on the hood actually lit up (note they have done goofy things like that to this day) so old guys could sight on it at 110 ft/sec on the Santa Monica Freeway. And the description of a 58 model as having a trunk that would hold 17 dead giraffes and a catcher's mitt.

And MAD magazine of the vintage that printed its lawyer's name on the masthead of the magazine to eliminate the middle man. I remember an awful lot of their song rewrites: When the Wisconsin U band actually played On! Wisconsin (the Budweiser Song is much more common) I found myself blaring out with Push Rice Krispies, push Rice Krispies, Snap. Crackle, and Pop and ending in And While You are Pushing, Don't Forget All-Bran. And who could forget My Fair Ad Man. Wouldst I could be so good. Had a 10 inch 33 of Tom Leherer.

And who called them the dead Eisenhower years?? Al Capp managed to get his spoof of Marlene Detrich past the censors, Apassionata von Klimax. Even the Playtex Living Girdle was mildly surrealistic. WW2 types could not handle surrealism; neither can Boomers. Got the Washington- New Orleans game on in Spanish -- that is surrealism, or something. Probably no worse than ESPN.

Actually, I expect to see the kids of today beat the living crap out of us if they can resist the temptation and the commercial pressure to overproduce everything and leave something for the whimsical spirit to seize upon and run with. They lack the advantage of radio but they have the advantage -- as we 'tweeners had -- of growing up between large generations who find power so attractive they will have to die first before giving it up. When you know blessed well you will never run things, it is far easier to be whimsical. Kind of the diff between Harry Potter and the Rings which have diametrically opposite effects on the God Squad. Go Harry! We all know it ends in Those Were the Days My Friend but WTH.

Plunk Your Magic Twanger, Froggie.

Dick, NBK ENTP

6426. Re: I Am A NOCODE Lifer Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:11:04 UTC
From: oneangryman@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <8c61e9d6.0112301911.33d9511a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Scott (Unit-69)" <upplus@hotSPAMmail.com> wrote in message
news:<3C2F0803.3435EE7D@hotSPAMmail.com>...
> One Angry Man wrote:
> > You'll never know just how right you are!
> >
> > signed
> > One Angry No Code Ham
> > Member Number 1 of the No Code Liberation Army (NCLA)
>
>
> You can be as angry as you want to be. Those of us who have done
> nothing wrong, have nothing to worry about.
>

And the ones who have done nothing wrong are not the ones I'm angry at.
BTW the name comes from the movie Twelve Angry Men!

>
> > There are 3 older fake identities just in the sig file alone.
> > Just for you CB'rs and SLOW readers they are;
> > 1 One Angry Man
> > 2 No Code Amateur
> > 3 The No Code Liberation Army
> >
> > Any of them ring a bell? YeeHaw
>
>
> Who cares?

This was wrote to prove that any jerk can post from Google as
anybody they want to be at the time. The fact that you don't
care means nothing to me.

>
> P.S. I hold no stinkin' ticket.

Like I care? If you want it you can get it EASY
just 35 simple questions. If you don't want it
fine, enjoy your life, just stay out of the ham bands
and let it rip, no one cares except Riley.

signed
One Angry Man

6427. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:15:01 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <VKQX7.316679$W8.11919242@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
news:a0ojj3$a0d$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:8sLX7.206026$WW.11951458@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Aside from the fact that Scott did not write this idiocy, when are you
> > > taking the code test so you can enjoy it a hell of a lot more???
> > >
> > > Dick N�BK
> > >
>
> As soon as I can get my copy up to the 5wpm requirement.
> I'm listening to the ARRL code practice files off the Internet
> and I'll go for my test as soon as I can copy the 7.5 wpm
> files, that way I'll know for _SURE_ I can do the 5 wpm test.
> --
>
> '73' From KB9TMP
> NCI-2385
>
> Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> -Peer's Law
>
>

Like the tag line. And the best of luck to you so you can pontificate with the best. Take a look at Morse Academy at http://ah0a.org and see if it meets a need. Some of the groupies who have passed the Extra of late swear by the ARRL tapes. Damfino.

6428. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:20:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <APQX7.316688$W8.11918421@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29421

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:1CEE8BC495EC91B4.E34015EC399F3182.35952BCF8C5364AA@lp.airnews.net...
> On 30 Dec 2001 15:55:57 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >How charming. Don't look now, but you've got the wrong bloke,
> >mate. It was Cecil who started this "electronic stalking" thing
> >going on here. However, the direct insult of being called an
> >"idiot" is noted; I wonder what voyager.net's Terms Of Service
> >have to say about that?
>
> Absolutely nothing, you moron. Not only do I have a commercial
> connection to the Inet, which means I'm a NOT a dial-up user and have
> different contractual obligations, but I don't use Voyager's news
> server (take a look at my headers--my messages originate either with
> my Airnews account or my Altopia one, depending on which server is
> running faster at the time) which means I'm only limited by the
> COU/TOS of those services, NEITHER of which has any policy concerning
> message content or frequency.
>
> On the other hand, since you have an aol account (which, to a
> networker, is sort of like being a Novice class ham who can't even
> remember the morse code), you ARE limited by a COU/TOS agreement that
> specifically prohibits behavior which is harassing, offensive, or
> violates the charter of a news group.
>
> Have a nice day, idiot.
>
> Rick
>
> --
>
> Rick Adams--KE8HH

OOOOOOOOOOOOH. Eemotion. Watch it Rick, they'll heave you out of the faculty lounge for that. Nah, just move to the other side of the room and give you the sick cow stare.

6429. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:26:41 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011230222707.122$4B@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 29423
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"JR" <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote in message
news:3C2F0B3C.E5A6211E@mailcity.net...
>
> So who are you trying to impress?

WWTK?

6430. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:27:53 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011230222818.836$As@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 29424
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Like they can't trace the ip back to you?

"One High Powered Mother Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote in
message news:3c2fc40d.4073196@netnews.att.net...
> On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 01:47:34 GMT, JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net> wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >Shrimp Biskit wrote:
> >>
> >> Post forwarded to rhollingsworth@fcc.gov
> >> CC: info@fbi.gov
> >> Re: Subject Death Threats
> >
> >You cc to info@fbi.gov is a waste of time. It states plainly on
> >the FBI web site, "At this time, FBI Headquarters does not accept
> >E-mail. If you have any comments or questions about the FBI or
> >this web site, please write to:
> > Federal Bureau of Investigation
> > J. Edgar Hoover Building
> > 935 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
> > Washington, D.C. 20535-0001
> > (202) 324-3000
> >
> >So who are you trying to impress?
>
>
> and not only that like I'm really gonna put my REAL name and address
> there... dumb ass.
Like they can't trace the ip back to you?

6431. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:53:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2FE12B.C232E621@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29425

N2EY wrote:
> You implied it.

Nope, you may have inferred it but I didn't imply it. I gave
a single example of what I did to solve my problem. It was
not meant as a universal solution.

> Why should CC&Rs be more sacred than marriage?

I'm sure you can solve the CC&R problem the same way you
can solve the marriage problem - move out.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6432. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:58:15 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2FE257.A0B96566@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29426

N2EY wrote:
> Would you say to a person who wants out of a marriage, "You should not have
> signed the contract if you didn't like the conditions and restrictions"?

Moving out solves both problems.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6433. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 03:59:48 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2FE2B4.804B3643@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29427

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >What inalienable rights are being violated?
>
> Liberty and pursuit of happiness.

You should have considered that before signing the CC&R contract. :-)
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6434. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 04:04:46 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2FE3DE.24B8B0FC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29428
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
>
> Nebraska for one but it is not a great idea. Remnant of what was once
> known as the Shoot Your Neighbor Act.

In the few states I've lived in, one must be in danger of life and
limb before deadly force can be used. Property doesn't count.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6435. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 04:07:29 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C2FE481.F345BCBD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JAMES HAMPTON wrote:
> Well, we had a case a few years back. There had been some robberies and a
> few people shot individuals crazy enough to break into their homes. No
> problem with that, of course; what was interesting is a couple years ago a
> guy heard something breaking in his garage. He grabbed a gun and shot a guy
> stealing a bicycle. The thief was in the driveway at the time with the
> bike. The grand jury let him go. A lot of people are getting fed up with
> what has been happening the last 10 or 20 years or so.

Shooting someone under those circumstances is taking a huge risk. The
grand jury may or may not be understanding.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6436. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 04:41:43 UTC
From: uppluss@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a2cf6f35.0112302041.30a7365b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29430
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<middlefinger4@home.com> wrote in message
news:<cQMX7.339527$5A3.130999106@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>...
> Richard what do you mean it was a forge? So anyone with the name of Dick or
> Richard who posts to a any NG is going to be a forge ? The content of what
> is posted is important not the name signed behind it but that the problem
> with guys like you you are so quick to defend Illegal CB operators you
> should actually hand in your license Dick, Honest Injun you are nothing
> more than a Big Old baby

I say Dick is more like one of us than he is a ham. That's why we like
him and accept him. I don't think he wouldn't miss his license in the
least. Care to try again Georgie?

>
> "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:IILX7.206051$WW.11953034@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > The post was a forgery, John. Lot of that of late. Suggest before
> > replying check the routing: if you see Google or Newsnet or any of the
> > other well-known public urinals you can safely forget it. The ethics of
> > responding to cross-posts I will leave to you but that is another
> > indication that something is bogus.
> >
> > Dick Nï¿½BK
> >
> > "John" <n1umj@ARRL.net> wrote in message
> > news:7xLX7.42739$Sj1.18328536@typhoon.ne.mediaone.net...
> > > Next time I meet a free bander I will have him reported like they should
> be.
> > > it is not a free band you like the bands so much and the radios get off
> your
> > > wellfair receaving, lazy child molesting asses and work for the lisence
> for
> > > the first time in your life and show people equipment and this country a
> > > little respect. I have no respect for the "free banders" at all. Work
> for it
> > > like everyone else if you want the ham bands or stay the hell in the
> 1-40
> > > channels range where you belong. You do not deserve any more respect
> then
> > > the person I shot for breaking in to my house a few years back or the
> one I
> > > caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER
> WALK
> > > AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!

> > > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed_webtvnet@subdimension.com> wrote in message
> > > news:e9de0154.0112300024.125df714@posting.google.com...
> > > > I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in
> > > > this
> > > > group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
> > > > frequencies
> > > > from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might
> > > > think.
> > > > We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
> > > > conditions.
> > > > We use Yasus, Kenwoods and Icomm radios just like you do, so we know
> > > > technical
> > > > issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us
> > > > is
> > > > rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
> > > > should
> > > > not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams
> > > > do.
> > > > For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding
> > > > is
> > > > a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying
> > > > is
> > > > that maybe the next time you meet a freebander it might be wise to
> > > > talk with
> > > > him before you condemn him.
> > > >
> > > > This article ought to clarify things, as I am the author:
> > > > http://sporadic1.tripod.com/page7.html
> > > >
> > > > I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
> > > >
> > > > Unit 2711, Florida
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

6437. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 04:54:11 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <TbSX7.316850$W8.11929552@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2FE3DE.24B8B0FC@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
> >
> > Nebraska for one but it is not a great idea. Remnant of what was once
> > known as the Shoot Your Neighbor Act.
>
> In the few states I've lived in, one must be in danger of life and
> limb before deadly force can be used. Property doesn't count.
> --
> cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

The original Shoot Your Neighbor Act allowed plugging for your life, property or that of a neighbor. This, of course, did not make forgetting your key and crawling in your kitchen window the smartest move in history without your kelvar BVDs in place.

And where she shot the burglar on the lawn who strangely turned out to be her drunken husband carrying a 12-pack in rather than out it did make prosecuting the dear lady just a bit tougher when her belief rather than reality controlled. In Texas or Nebraska juries try the victim as well as the accused anyway and to hear tell, they leave that to Grand Juries in New York.

As you can imagine this was a bit of a nightmare to LEOs, prosecutors, and the coroners' golf tournament so the neighbor aspect is pretty well gone but no one is going to cry too loudly if someone offs a rustler or a speed freak stealing anhydrous ammonia from your tank. They caught a guy in Iowa with five cows in his car; that ranks with shooting a bear in your pajamas -- and not having the slightest idea how the bear got into your pajamas. But Iowegians are a bit strange anyway.

And we all know the statutes and practice often differ. The gendarmes have been known to throw armed robbers who bought the big one back into the store before beginning the investigation, particularly if he is one of the usual suspects. Prosecutors have been known to charge with an eye to the next election, and juries have been known to decide that the world did not lose a hell of a lot when it lost the late lamented deceased.

So it really helps to be right when offing someone.

Today's Omaha World-Herald repeated the results of a legislative study done on the death penalty which found a distinct urban/rural split that in the final analysis proves only that urban prosecutors do not ask for it in marginal cases but rural ones do while the juries bring the issue back to par. I personally oppose the death penalty not on theoretical grounds but the fact that it is damned expensive and contains no mechanism for adjusting the system when, not if, it hangs the wrong man as Wisconsin did in 1852 and never has since. A good false imprisonment case deserves at least the treatment the NTSB gives an airplane crash or for that matter the same treatment when the Nebraska Hiway Dept kills five kids in a school bus.

As a practical matter, I doubt the law as she is done differs more between NE and TX than it differs between rural and urban areas in either state.

Dick N&#65533;BK

6438. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 05:02:40 UTC
From: fgillil@tincan.org
Message-ID: <e182e02.0112302102.bbbfe5b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29432
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:<3C2F88B7.FB31D411@IEEE.org>...
> John wrote:
> > ... or the one I
> > caught bREAKING IN TO CARS IN MY DRIVEWAY THIS SUMMER WHO WILL NEVER WALK
> > AGAIN BECAUSE OF ME!
>
> In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?

Florida, if you believe twistie. He thinks is perfectly legal to
shoot college kids picking mushrooms in a field. I'm not kidding,
check the archives.

6439. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 09:31:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0112310131.692cc35a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29433

```
. . . .
> things, it is far easier to be whimsical. Kind of the diff between Harry
> Potter and the Rings which have diametrically opposite effects on the God
> Squad. Go Harry! We all know it ends in Those Were the Days My Friend
> but WTH.
>
> Plunk Your Magic Twanger, Froggie.
>
> Dick, Nï¿½BK ENTP
>
Bwaaaaahaha! Booful but they'll never get it . . !
>
w3rv
```

6440. Re: No Code Hams Whining

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 12:54:12 UTC
From: kc2hmn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <beb0a48b.0112310454.6efec4ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29434
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<VKQX7.316679$W8.11919242@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "KB9TMP" <NoMoreSpam4Me@antisocial.com> wrote in message
> news:a0ojj3$a0d$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> > "Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> > news:8sLX7.206026$WW.11951458@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > > Aside from the fact that Scott did not write this idiocy, when are you
> > > taking the code test so you can enjoy it a hell of a lot more???
> > >
> > > Dick Ni¿½BK
> > >
> >
> > As soon as I can get my copy up to the 5wpm requirement.
> > I'm listening to the ARRL code practice files off the Internet
> > and I'll go for my test as soon as I can copy the 7.5 wpm
> > files, that way I'll know for _SURE_ I can do the 5 wpm test.

Go for it! I can testify to the sense of accomplishment. It may sound
cliche-like, but privileges earned are far more appreciated and less
likely to be taken for granted. Good luck, I'll keep my fingers
crossed for you. (A little luck never hurt anybody...unless it's bad
luck, that is.)

> > --
> >
> > '73' From KB9TMP
> > NCI-2385
> >
> > Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
> > learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is
> > full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant
> > without having come by their ignorance the hard way.
> > -Peer's Law
> >
> >
>
> Like the tag line. And the best of luck to you so you can pontificate
> with the best. Take a look at Morse Academy at http://ah0a.org and see if
> it meets a need. Some of the groupies who have passed the Extra of late
> swear by the ARRL tapes. Damfino.

I used the ARRL CD's and was quite pleased with the results. The code
is taught/sent/practiced/learnt (Your choice.) @ 18-wpm with increased
spacing between the words to slow the overall word rate to 5-wpm. This

is known as ARRL/Fast Farnsworth. Traditional Farnsworth is 13 to 15-wpm with the appropriately "spaced out" to 5-wpm. IMHO, using the ARRL CD's offers two advantages. The first being that it's a little faster than the actual test. Not so much that it bothers you while practicing, but enough so that you notice it immediately when the actual test begins. I actually started grinning when they sent the opening two sets of three V's. (..._)

The second advantage is that it allows for a quicker/easier transition to higher speeds should you desire to use it after passing. This is still a work-in-progress for me, so I'll let you know. ;-) The code tests are given in Farnsworth now. I'm not exactly sure whar the motivation is behind this. Some on the NG have suggested that it may have been a backhanded attempt to retain a pseudo-13-wpm code test since the gaps between the words really aren't saying anything...literally. I dunno...and, quite frankly, don't care...I'll use it to my advantage. You take it easy and the very best of luck to you.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

6441. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 12:57:26 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0pn8602o0d@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C2FE3DE.24B8B0FC@IEEE.org...
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
> >
> > Nebraska for one but it is not a great idea. Remnant of what was once
> > known as the Shoot Your Neighbor Act.
>
> In the few states I've lived in, one must be in danger of life and
> limb before deadly force can be used. Property doesn't count.

I remember an incident in East Liverpool, Ohio in 1981, in which a business owner was being robbed every weekend. He'd had enough and decided to stand watch. Early on a Sunday morning, he shot an intruder - a 17-year-old - and heard others outside take off when they heard the shots. It was ruled a justifiable homocide. I don't know if or how Ohio law has changed since then.

6442. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:02:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231080250.03703.00000804@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29437

In article <a0o75k$70q$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>It is actually totally American as no one is "forced" to move in
>and accept the CC&Rs. The ability to own a home and
>be a ham has many options that allow for choice...UNLESS
>the person absolutely wants to live in a certain subdivision.
>The choice is yours.
>
Sorry, but in many areas that's simply not the case. Often there is NO choice
of unrestricted property, particularly where most of the homes have been built
in the past 20-30 years.

My current house is over 50 years old and has over a page and a half of
fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing directly about antennas, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6443. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:02:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231080251.03703.00000806@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29435

In article <3C2FE2B4.804B3643@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >What inalienable rights are being violated?
>>
>> Liberty and pursuit of happiness.
>
>You should have considered that before signing the CC&R contract. :-)

If a contract violates the law of the land, it is not a valid contract.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

6444. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:02:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231080251.03703.00000805@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29436

In article <3C2FE12B.C232E621@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> You implied it.
>
>Nope, you may have inferred it but I didn't imply it.

I would not have inferred it if you didn't imply it.

>I gave
>a single example of what I did to solve my problem. It was
>not meant as a universal solution.

The universal solution is for the FCC to do for hams what they did for
satellite dishes.
>
>> Why should CC&Rs be more sacred than marriage?
>
>I'm sure you can solve the CC&R problem the same way you
>can solve the marriage problem - move out.

That doesn't answer the question.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

6445. Re: FCC writes off hams? (Was: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extincti

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:02:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231080252.03703.00000807@mb-da.aol.com>
Source record: 29438

In article <a0o820his1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Compassionate Conservative" <Compassionate@right.wing> wrote
>>
>> Like most home owners I did not sign a agreement on deed restrictions.
>> It was a done deal. The buyer of a used house is not given a copy of
>> any deed restrictions but must check the county records to find if
>> there are any restrictions on the deed.
>
>Then you had one sorry ass attorney handle your
>purchase. ANY attorney worth his/her salt
>would have uncovered such CC&Rs or any
>other deed restrictions BEFORE you closed.

I ALWAYS require a copy of ALL restrictions before even making an offer. I use
a buyer's agent, (a realtor who is working for me, not the seller) and my agent
knows up-front about presenting all restrictions. And the services of a
competent real estate attorney are
just about essential.
>
>I can tell you this...ANY future purcase I might
>make would include the right to decline the deal
>IF upon researching the title/property there were
>ANY CC&Rs/restrictions uncovered.

Yup.

>Indeed, if
>you are searching for a new home, you should
>make that requirement crystal clear to the real
>estate agent you are working with.

This applies to ANY real estate transaction, so you don't have surprises later
on.

It's also important to have correct interpretations of CC&Rs. For example, the
deed restrictions on my 52 year old house say the only "structures" that can
be built are "a single-family house costing at least $10,500 to build" (!) and
a garage for one or two cars. What's a "structure"? Anything with a permanent
foundation. Fences and utility poles don't count because they don't have
permanent foundations. So I can't have a free-standing tower with a concrete
foundation. But that's no big deal because there's no reasonable way to have a
free-standing tower on the property anyway.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6446. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:26:29 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <pan.2001.12.31.08.26.29.289093.20925@arrl.org>
Source record: 29442

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 12:47:56 -0500, Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> This is the first I'd heard about it. If I'd known of it, I probably
> would have sent a comment to the FCC. How come you brought it up "after
> the fact?" I am not saying that flippantly, I'd really like to know.

The petition was sent to the FCC in December 1999 and was widely reported at the time, including here on rrap. And of course, that was a petition for reconsideration of the FCC's denial of an earlier petition, so the topic had been reported on earlier, too. If you weren't aware of it at the time, maybe you were't following the various amateur radio news sources. Or maybe it simply didn't register on your radar.

Jon

6447. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:31:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3069e9_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29443

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230210101.09102.00000857@mb-ct.aol.com...
>
> >But, I can't say for sure--because I've never been in that position
(except
> >for marriage, of course).
>
> "Of course"? No, not at all.
>
> Why in the world should CC&Rs be more sacred and harder to get out of than
> marriages?
>

I don't think they should be.

>
> Anyone who has gotten divorced is just like the person who bought a
restricted
> property and now wants out of the restrictions.
>
> Would you say to a person who wants out of a marriage, "You should not
have
> signed the contract if you didn't like the conditions and restrictions"?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Apples and oranges, Jim. However, just as divorce is a solution to that in the world of marriage; moving out of the neighborhood is a better solution than wasting my tax dollars going to the government.

Kim W5TIT

6448. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:32:09 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c306a09_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29444

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230210102.09102.00000859@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3C2EB9C4.E4009689@mailcity.net>, JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
writes:
>
> >The people who signs CC&R contracts and then bitch, are just like
> >those who build a house off the end of a runway of a busy airport
> >and then bitch about the noise and want to get the runway shut
> >down.
>
> Or like those who get married and then decide they don't want to be with
that
> person for the rest of their life.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

So, get a divorce. Or, move out of the restricted neighborhood.

Kim W5TIT

6449. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:36:15 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c306afe_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29445

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230210103.09102.00000860@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3C2F337E.95F5E883@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >> >People must
> >> >proprietize their wants/needs.
> >>
> >> "Proprietize"? Maybe you mean "prioritize".
> >
> >Egads - I sure did. Got my roots mixed up.
>
> Yup.
> >
> >> Is ham radio to be limited only to those who can find two unrestricted
> >acres?
> >
> >Did I say that?
>
> You implied it.
>
> >I merely gave an example of what can be done.
>
> In some cases. Not in all cases.
>
> > Everywhere
> >I have lived, the first thing I did was check the CC&Rs.
>
> Because you were already a ham.
>
> >Just like any
> >other contract, if I didn't like the terms and conditions, I didn't sign.
>
> Uh huh.
> >
> >> They DO guarantee that we have certain freedom of use of our vehicles,
> >though.
> >
> >There are many places where motor vehicles are prohibited, e.g. inside
> >the shopping mall.
>

> False. I see little electric carts and motorized wheelchairs in our local
malls
> all the time.
>
> The point is that we are guaranteed certain freedoms in the use of our
> vehicles. Limitations are imposed only to protect the safety of others.
>
> That's why we have building codes.
>
> How does a simple HF wire dipole between two trees, connected to a QRP ham
rig,
> negatively affect the safety of others.
>
> > Do you advocate driving motor vehicles everywhere?
>
> Everywhere it's reasonable and safe to drive them, yes.
>
> >Do you object to all legal contracts, Jim, or just CC&Rs?
>
> Contracts were made to be broken, Cecil. Here's an example:
>
> One of the most serious contracts most people ever make is to get married.
> Listen to the words at most weddings:
>
> "love, honor, and cherish"
> "in good times and bad"
> "in sickness and in health"
> "for richer or poorer"
> "til death us do part"
>
> In most ceremonies the people entering into the contract face each other
and
> say out loud that they have come to the contract freely and unreservedly,
and
> accept ALL its terms. They make the contract in front of witnesses and get
both
> community and legal acceptance. In most ceremonies there are NO escape
clauses
> and NO limitations.
>
> Yet about 50% of marriages in the USA end in divorce. All it takes is for
one
> of the parties to say "I don't wanna do this anymore" and it's OVER.
Doesn't
> matter if the other party agrees, doesn't matter how much damage it does
to
> other people. No reason need be given other than "I want out". Nowadays
there
> is almost no stigma attached to divorce - in fact, most divorces are "no
> fault".

>
> Why should CC&Rs be more sacred than marriage?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

They're not. And, if you don't like the marriage you're in, get a divorce. If you don't like neighborhoods with whatever CCRs you can't agree with, then don't move in. Same for HOAs. If a neighborhood elects to change the environment, then move out--just as a divorce is a solution to no longer wishing to be married. It's that simple.

Kim W5TIT
(You bit the marriage thing way too hard, Jim. Not a good example, at all).

6450. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:38:18 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c306b78$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29446

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230210105.09102.00000863@mb-ct.aol.com...
> In article <3c2f3cf8_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim- <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >Why should a majority of the population yield to the wants and desires of
a
> >very, very minute part of the population?
>
> Because all people have certain inalienable rights.
>
> And please learn to edit old stuff from your posts, Kim.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

As a side note, Jim: I'll post however I choose to post, thank you very
much.

I don't think having an antenna for ham radio outside in any manner we wish
it is a certain inalienable right.

Kim W5TIT

6451. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:43:26 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c306cac$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29448

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011230210105.09102.00000862@mb-ct.aol.com...
>
> > Don't move
> >into a neighborhood with CCRs or HOAs.
>
> Sometimes there is no realistic choice.
>
> > It's as anti-American as you can
> >get.
>
> That I agree with. But it's been SOP since the 1970s, and it's spreading.
In
> some areas if you say "I only want to see unrestricted properties" to a
> realtor, the list of places to look at is very short.
>

There must be movement somewhere, Jim. Rather than spend time after the
fact, get involved prior to the fact--change HOAs, get rid of 'em, whatever.
Or, research CCRs before you move in.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Then, spend your energy changing and getting rid of HOAs and research a CCR
before you move in to a home, or buy that piece of property. When I
bought this one, the only restriction is that I cannot raise swine. I can
live with that--forever--so I bought. Now, when I go to sell my property a
pig farmer won't be able to buy it. If *just* a pig farmer comes along and
he's all that wants to buy my property, do I go run off whining to the
government to change my CCR? Hardly.

Kim W5TIT

6452. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:46:40 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C306C40.54E5A2F1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29447

N2EY wrote:
>
> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> You implied it.
> > >
> > >Nope, you may have inferred it but I didn't imply it.
> >
> > I would not have inferred it if you didn't imply it.

You infer lots of things that I don't imply. In fact, akin to a
devil's advocate position, you often present a devil's inferrence.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6453. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:48:59 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c306dfa$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29450

"Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
news:10C06F27E74095B4.4F46FCC4017D8788.2E8FB25D1013BBD3@lp.airnews.net...
>
> It DOES bother me, Larry, because I don't like seeing my hobby
> trashed by an idiot like you whose only goal in life is to prove that
> he can make women capitulate to his demands.
>

<giggle> If you've ever gone back through and read a lot of the posts from Larry, you'll understand that he seems to be one of those people who always sets unrealistic, unattainable goals for himself--those that are beyond his capability.

The one above is probably his most significant. Women giving in to Larry's demands? Rick! ;)

Kim W5TIT

6454. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:50:24 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C306D20.6F7EA2B9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29449

N2EY wrote:
> My current house is over 50 years old and has over a page and a half of
> fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing directly about antennas, though.

When I bought my house in CA, I deleted (lined out) the antenna
restriction part before I signed the contract.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6455. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:54:58 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c306f61$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29452

Still doing a magnificent job of ignoring, aren't you Dick M.?

Kim W5TIT

"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:APQX7.316688$W8.11918421@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Rick Adams" <adamsr@NOSPAM.voyager.net> wrote in message
> news:1CEE8BC495EC91B4.E34015EC399F3182.35952BCF8C5364AA@lp.airnews.net...
> > On 30 Dec 2001 15:55:57 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> > wrote:
> >
> > >How charming. Don't look now, but you've got the wrong bloke,
> > >mate. It was Cecil who started this "electronic stalking" thing
> > >going on here. However, the direct insult of being called an
> > >"idiot" is noted; I wonder what voyager.net's Terms Of Service
> > >have to say about that?
> >
> > Absolutely nothing, you moron. Not only do I have a commercial
> > connection to the Inet, which means I'm a NOT a dial-up user and have
> > different contractual obligations, but I don't use Voyager's news
> > server (take a look at my headers--my messages originate either with
> > my Airnews account or my Altopia one, depending on which server is
> > running faster at the time) which means I'm only limited by the
> > COU/TOS of those services, NEITHER of which has any policy concerning
> > message content or frequency.
> >
> > On the other hand, since you have an aol account (which, to a
> > networker, is sort of like being a Novice class ham who can't even
> > remember the morse code), you ARE limited by a COU/TOS agreement that
> > specifically prohibits behavior which is harassing, offensive, or
> > violates the charter of a news group.
> >
> > Have a nice day, idiot.
> >
> > Rick
> >
> > --
> >
> > Rick Adams--KE8HH
>
> OOOOOOOOOOOH. Eemotion. Watch it Rick, they'll heave you out of the
> faculty lounge for that. Nah, just move to the other side of the room and
> give you the sick cow stare.
>

>

6456. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 13:56:36 UTC
From: CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3C306E94.B991323@IEEE.org>
Source record: 29451
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Krell wrote:
> I remember an incident in East Liverpool, Ohio in 1981, in which a business
> owner was being robbed every weekend. He'd had enough and decided to stand
> watch. Early on a Sunday morning, he shot an intruder - a 17-year-old - and
> heard others outside take off when they heard the shots. It was ruled a
> justifiable homocide. I don't know if or how Ohio law has changed since
> then.

There was a case in South Texas that was ruled a suicide. A guy allegedly
shot himself in the back seven times with a semiautomatic rifle.
--
cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

6457. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 14:01:22 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3070e1$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29453

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2001.12.31.08.26.29.289093.20925@arrl.org...
> On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 12:47:56 -0500, Kim-W5TIT wrote:
> > This is the first I'd heard about it. If I'd known of it, I probably
> > would have sent a comment to the FCC. How come you brought it up "after
> > the fact?" I am not saying that flippantly, I'd really like to know.
>
> The petition was sent to the FCC in December 1999 and was widely reported
> at the time, including here on rrap. And of course, that was a petition
> for reconsideration of the FCC's denial of an earlier petition, so the
> topic had been reported on earlier, too. If you weren't aware of it at the
> time, maybe you were't following the various amateur radio news sources.
> Or maybe it simply didn't register on your radar.
>
> Jon

Yeah, I think Dec '99 is just about the time I found this newsgroup. And, I really never get the time to read QST if I was getting it at the time.

CCRs are a little different of an animal, and they can often be changed (I'm told) with little difficulty. HOAs, on the other hand, should be outlawed (in my opinion) and I just have no sympathy for someone who signs a contract and then wants to spend my tax dollars changing the contract. Move off the property. Make HOAs illegal.

Kim W5TIT

6458. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 14:11:31 UTC
From: onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com
Message-ID: <3c2f200e.1669259@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 29454
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:27:53 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
<pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:

>Like they can't trace the ip back to you?

like they'd take the time to do that....

if someone shot riley, that'd be another story.... but they wouldn't
just for someone saying they would get real

one high powered mutha
powered by 2 - 4CX25,000's
i don't play
i drop da maul

6459. Re: SB-220 ON 11 METERS !!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 14:47:29 UTC
From: Shrimp Biskit <pipedream@hotmail.comsp>
Message-ID: <20011231094809.181$V9@news.newsreader.com>
Source record: 29455
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"One High Powered Mother Flipper!" <onehighpoweredmutha@mail.com> wrote in
message news:3c2f200e.1669259@netnews.att.net...
> On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:27:53 -0500, "Shrimp Biskit"
> <pipedream@hotmail.comsp> wrote:
>
> >Like they can't trace the ip back to you?
>
>
> like they'd take the time to do that....
>
> if someone shot riley, that'd be another story.... but they wouldn't
> just for someone saying they would get real

For your sake you had better hope so, just because you wanted to sound like
a tough guy to impress your rec.radio.cb friends.So if Riley does show up at
your QTH your gonna kill him right thats what it sounds like to me If your
gonna bust a cap in his ass what end result woul you be looking for. Ever
heard of Chris Marquis?

6460. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 15:03:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231100300.10110.00001633@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 29456

In article <uFYVrlVkBHA.1704@cpimsnntpa03>, "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> writes:

>Cecil said:
>
>> I suspect it would be unconstitutional for the federal government to
>> interfere with willingly signed CC&R contracts.
>
>You suspect wrong. The federal government (FCC) issued a preemption voiding
>CC&Rs which prohibit visual entertainment (TV) antennas. That rule was
>designed to promote two FEDERAL OBJECTIVES: (a) to ensure that consumers
>have access to a broad range of video programming services ("the couch
>potatoes gotta have their TV"), and (b) to foster full and fair competition
>among different types of video programming services (to allow over-the-air
>broadcasts to compete with cable). That preemption was issued at the urging
>of Congress, and was upheld by the Supreme Court.

Hans,

A question: Does the preemption cover only pay-TV antennas like the pizza dish satellite receivers and terrestrial microwave services, or all TV antennas like the plain old VHF-UHF log-periodics?

>
>Since there is also a FEDERAL OBJECTIVE to promote a strong amateur radio
>service (see 97.1) it follows that a preemption in the case of amateur radio
>antennas would be a perfectly legitimate course of action, almost a
>no-brainer.
>
EXACTLY!!!!

73 de Jim, N2EY

6461. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 15:03:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231100300.10110.00001632@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 29457

In article <3c2f5604_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>Oh, one more comment:
>
>"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
>news:uFYVrlVkBHA.1704@cpimsnntpa03...
>>
>> Since there is also a FEDERAL OBJECTIVE to promote a strong amateur radio
>> service (see 97.1) it follows that a preemption in the case of amateur
>radio
>> antennas would be a perfectly legitimate course of action, almost a
>> no-brainer.
>
>Except that there is no "financial" loss or competitive issues in the case
>of amateur radio.

Doesn't matter.

>I don't know if they did, but if amateur radio antenna
>manufacturers got into the fray and could prove that they are somehow
>limited in business matters by such things as the CCRs and HOAs, then there
>may be a valid argument for the FCC/government to listen to.

Same goes for the rig manufacturers. But that's not the main argument.

> The preemption
>for manufacturers and providers of commercial television services is a
>money-matter.
>
Not exclusively. In fact, not primarily.

The EM spectrum belongs to everyone. Broadcast services that use the EM
spectrum are allocated their spectrum space
because it is in the public interest. This is true for both free and pay TV and
radio systems. CC&Rs that unreasonably restrict
a person's access to the EM spectrum violate that person's rights to access
public property.

In other words, the "couch potatoes" DO have a right to their TV, because it's
THEIR spectrum, and TV exists for them.

>There may be a FEDERAL OBJECTIVE to promote a strong amateur radio service,
>but there is no "meat" behind that objective. At least not enough for this
>kind of battle.

Not yet. But that can change.
>

>The bottom line is always that amateur radio is "just a hobby."

Nope. If it were "just a hobby" it would have disappeared long ago.

>I'm not
>saying that to be flippant, either. I feel certain that is the feeling
>among many decision makers, including Congress, who influence and can have
>an effect on the service. That we provide the services we do is so not in
>the limelight, that it's just not a concern. Unfortunately.

Then that impression needs to be changed. And it can be.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6462. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 15:03:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231100302.10110.00001634@mb-mb.aol.com>
Source record: 29458

In article <a0o6kp$264$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Yup. And if you were a kid getting interested in ham radio today you'd
>> be faced with being prohibited from it instead of how it worked out for
>> you in the 50's.
>
>Actually, I see it easier today than in the 50s.
>My first station cost about $150 to set up (that's
>1957 dollars) for which I had to work over
>150 hours to earn. Today there are 2m
>HTs and mobiles that can be had for little more
>than $150 and that teen can be on the air.

Apples and oranges comparison, though. While a lot of fun and useful in its way, the ham with only a $150 HT has very limited options. Except during rare band openings, his/her available QSOs are limited to very local simplex contacts and the repeaters that can be reached (very limited).

Back in the late '60s I built a station based on surplus ARC-5 units. 80/40 CW only, 50 watts or so. Cost less than $50 including key and 'phones. With it I could reliably work practically any similarly-equipped ham within a thousand miles. Unreliably I could work anywhere in the world. Plus a lot more - because I had a decent antenna. Nothing fancy, just the classic inverted L random wire out to the crabapple tree.

>
>> So it's fine for you to have freedom from such
>> unrealistic restrictions but not those who have no control nor
>> involvement in them but who must abide by someone elses stupidity. I
>> gotta say, it's typical of ya, pal.
>
>The same CC&Rs that ban antennas also often ban many
>other exterior activities that a homeowner without CC&Rs
>can enjoy:
>- Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in
>the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?

Yes, if the repairs are "reasonable". Changing a tail light bulb or windshield wipers is "reasonable", doing a months-long customizing job in a shared driveway is not. Note that if the CC&R says "no auto repairs", even 10 minute repairs are forbidden. ("ABNER!! Darren Stevens is changing his spark plugs!!!)

>- Should CC&Rs that prohibit the color, type and design
>of the homes exterior be premted on first amendment basis?

I think you mean "changing the ....". Again, if the changes are reasonable. Being forced to repaint one's house in the same color forever is unreasonable. Having a list of approved colors and color combinations for the homeowner to choose from is reasonable.

>- Should CC&Rs that prohibit pets be preempted?

Depends on the pets and other regulations concerning pets, like noise ordinances governing barking. No pets means no goldfish or hamsters, btw.

My township has a serious leash law - a dog found loose can cost its owner a BIG fine (up to $1000). Everybody who owns a dog has an invisible fence and good leashes.
>
>Just some thoughts.

The key to all this is "reasonable". Sweeping prohibitions of common at-home activities are not reasonable. Same with restrictions that make such activities impractical or extremely limited.

One of the real problems I have with CC&Rs is their stealthy nature. In many localities it requires serious research to discover if they even exist. While some states have disclosure laws, such disclosure is not universal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6463. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 15:33:24 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c3084d1_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29459

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231100302.10110.00001634@mb-mb.aol.com...
> >
> >The same CC&Rs that ban antennas also often ban many
> >other exterior activities that a homeowner without CC&Rs
> >can enjoy:
> >- Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in
> >the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?
>
> Yes, if the repairs are "reasonable". Changing a tail light bulb or
windshield
> wipers is "reasonable", doing a months-long customizing job in a shared
> driveway is not. Note that if the CC&R says "no auto repairs", even 10
minute
> repairs are forbidden. ("ABNER!! Darren Stevens is changing his spark
plugs!!!)
>

While I wouldn't like it (not one bit) to have car parts, grease, oil, and the smell wafting over and into my windows, a person who has paid for their little piece of real estate should be able to do whatever they wish--within the law--on it (in my opinion). I don't think a law prohibiting them from doing whatever car repair they must on *their* vehicle(s) is resonable. Note that I said *their* vehicle. That means that they don't get to help every Tom, Dick, and Harry that shows up with a car problem.

I have a neighbor just down the road. He has taken to turning his piece of property into a salvage yard, literally. It's "nicely" organized, and he keeps it as clean as one could, but it is still unsightly and unfair for me to have to deal with it. I have no problem with it, *except* that I don't think he should be allowed to do it in the event that anyone else gets the same idea. He runs a business off the property, so he is breaking far more than one or two CCRs. I haven't done it yet, but I fully intend to contact my county authorities about it. If he wants to keep a "few" things lying around in his yard, I have no problem. But, he has nearly one acre of stuff, and growing.

> >
> >- Should CC&Rs that prohibit the color, type and design
> >of the homes exterior be premted on first amendment basis?
>
> I think you mean "changing the ....". Again, if the changes are
reasonable.
> Being forced to repaint one's house in the same color forever is
unreasonable.

> Having a list of approved colors and color combinations for the homeowner
to
> choose from is reasonable.
>

I don't think my "neighbor" (if one could call someone like that a neighbor)
has any right to give me a choice of colors, limiting me to their idea of
what I should be able to do with my home.

> >
> >- Should CC&Rs that prohibit pets be preempted?
>
> Depends on the pets and other regulations concerning pets, like noise
> ordinances governing barking. No pets means no goldfish or hamsters, btw.
>

I think CCRs are generally a cheap way out to protect us from the creeps of
the world. A CCR that prohibits "pets" keeps the creep next door from
raising those nasty smelling chickens, or pigs, or whatever. HOAs are there
for the same reason. To me, both represent the fact that we need "someone
or something" else to do our talking for us these days. We've become
"afraid" to deal with our neighbor and ask them that they be reasonable. On
the other side, we've become intolerant of dealing with situations we don't
seem to be able to control in any other way but through a court system.
Pitiful. I will go to the county about my neighbor. If they deem he is
doing nothing wrong, or if they choose to do nothing about it, I must then
live with the fact that he's there and he's going to have his junkyard.
That's all there is to it.

>
> My township has a serious leash law - a dog found loose can cost its owner
a
> BIG fine (up to $1000). Everybody who owns a dog has an invisible fence
and
> good leashes.
> >
> >Just some thoughts.
>
> The key to all this is "reasonable". Sweeping prohibitions of common
at-home
> activities are not reasonable. Same with restrictions that make such
activities
> impractical or extremely limited.
>

I think everyone needs to chill and quit trying to tell everyone else how to
live and how they must use their property. The day someone wants to share
the expenses of my property and home is the day they'll have a say in what I
do with it--*if* I want them sharing.

>
> One of the real problems I have with CC&Rs is their stealthy nature. In

many
> localities it requires serious research to discover if they even exist.
While
> some states have disclosure laws, such disclosure is not universal.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

CCRs are a little different and, you're right, it takes some work to find them a lot of times. However, I am told that most were implemented long ago and can be changed fairly easy. An HOA, on the other hand, just gets my blood to boiling.

Kim W5TIT

6464. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 15:41:07 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c308698_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29460

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231100300.10110.00001632@mb-mb.aol.com...
> In article <3c2f5604_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >Oh, one more comment:
> >
> >"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.net> wrote in message
> >news:uFYVrlVkBHA.1704@cpimsnntpa03...
> >>
> >> Since there is also a FEDERAL OBJECTIVE to promote a strong amateur
radio
> >> service (see 97.1) it follows that a preemption in the case of amateur
> >radio
> >> antennas would be a perfectly legitimate course of action, almost a
> >> no-brainer.
> >
> >Except that there is no "financial" loss or competitive issues in the
case
> >of amateur radio.
>
> Doesn't matter.
>

You don't think it had anything to do with the preemption ruling?

> >
> >I don't know if they did, but if amateur radio antenna
> >manufacturers got into the fray and could prove that they are somehow
> >limited in business matters by such things as the CCRs and HOAs, then
there
> >may be a valid argument for the FCC/government to listen to.
>
> Same goes for the rig manufacturers. But that's not the main argument.
>

Well, to you and I it may not be. But, money talks.

> >
> > The preemption
> >for manufacturers and providers of commercial television services is a
> >money-matter.
> >
> Not exclusively. In fact, not primarily.
>

I bet money would be more the determining factor than any "right" we've got to expect reasonable access.

> The EM spectrum belongs to everyone. Broadcast services that use the EM
> spectrum are allocated their spectrum space
> because it is in the public interest. This is true for both free and pay TV and
> radio systems. CC&Rs that unreasonably restrict
> a person's access to the EM spectrum violate that person's rights to access
> public property.

See above. I may not disagree with you, Jim. I just don't think our lawmakers are as motivated by what is right as by how much money is affected.

> In other words, the "couch potatoes" DO have a right to their TV, because it's
> THEIR spectrum, and TV exists for them.

That being said, I don't think it was *really* the primary motivation. I think the primary motivation was a money factor.

> >There may be a FEDERAL OBJECTIVE to promote a strong amateur radio service,
> >but there is no "meat" behind that objective. At least not enough for this
> >kind of battle.
> Not yet. But that can change.

And, that's a high mountain to climb.

> >The bottom line is always that amateur radio is "just a hobby."
> Nope. If it were "just a hobby" it would have disappeared long ago.

Well, it hangs on by a thread. I mean, ham radio is great and it's a wonderful hobby--but it's always just kind of "been there." There's never been enough of us ham radio operators to "save the spectrum" if the will be done that mows us over. Really. We are so few in numbers; and we've never done much about getting the public to realize who and what we are. One need not be a ham to support us--a concept never really farmed.

> >I'm not

> >saying that to be flippant, either. I feel certain that is the feeling
> >among many decision makers, including Congress, who influence and can
have
> >an effect on the service. That we provide the services we do is so not
in
> >the limelight, that it's just not a concern. Unfortunately.
>
> Then that impression needs to be changed. And it can be.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

A high mountain to climb. I'm willing to "market" ham radio at my office or by casual encounters and queries. Am I willing to do much more? Gosh, no. And I think most amateurs aren't even willing to do as much as I. Certainly not as much as you, Jim.

Kim W5TIT

6465. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 16:12:14 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <y70Y7.317622$W8.11978530@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29461

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0112310131.692cc35a@posting.google.com...
> . . . .
> > things, it is far easier to be whimsical. Kind of the diff between
Harry
> > Potter and the Rings which have diametrically opposite effects on the
God
> > Squad. Go Harry! We all know it ends in Those Were the Days My
Friend
> > but WTH.
> >
> > Plunk Your Magic Twanger, Froggie.
> >
> > Dick, N&#65533;BK ENTP
> >
> Bwaaaaahaha! Booful but they'll never get it . . !
> >
> w3rv

Of course not because it is not part of the shared experience. Jim's ARC5 in another post is a classic case; you have to have been there. And you and I will never know about female, black, gay and later groupies will never have heard of Froggie the Gremlin to their unending deprivation but that is the way it is.

My grandmother was a great fan of Baron Munchhausen a radio show I believe out of Milwaukee so we got a lot of 'vas you dere, Sharlie' but it took years before I had a clue what she was talking about. And Fran Stryker at WXYZ Detroit who was never west of Chicago in his life and had a predeliction for taking his themes from opera overtures did a western with a pretty dumb hero who used a .45 caliber shotgun and was constantly bailed out by his faithful Indian companion who it might be argued called him 'dumbshit' at every opportunity and another where the Mountie's dog was the star and sold great shitpots of KennelRation. Hey man, you gotta believe.

Content is a matter for judgement: listen to Elvis and it sounds like the Jordanaires phoned it in. But the current groupies lost something: in pop culture everything is overproduced and expensive and in radio things are overproduced and expensive and the chips they are made of go obsolete.

Unfortunately, you can no longer build ARC5 transmitters in the garage between Buddy Holly's recording sessions and doing a port, polish, and relieve on your flathead. Life moves on.

And our choice is pretty simple, do we stay a part of the program or spend our time at QCWA luncheons? Our part in the program is largely that of the old male elephants they move with the younger herds to maintain some sense of decorum and order, take names, kick butts, provide some support when the young bucks realize they just did something dumb, and generally play the classic Grandpa which like sergeanting is a lost art. Oh well.

Still wonder if Brittany's are real.

Dick N&#65533;BK

6466. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 16:38:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231113808.09746.00002459@mb-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 29462

>Subject: Re: Respect For Freebanders
>From: CAM Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 12/31/2001 7:56 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3C306E94.B991323@IEEE.org>

>There was a case in South Texas that was ruled a suicide. A guy allegedly
>shot himself in the back seven times with a semiautomatic rifle.

I remember the joke about the person of a certain ethnicity that was found
bound, gaged, feet in concrete, shot and stabbed....

Also ruled a determined suicide by a racially biased coroner.

Steve

6467. Re: Open Letter to Mr. Hollingsworth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 16:42:31 UTC
From: SDSpecialDeliveryJones@stalag13.com
Message-ID: <d9f7b76c.0112310842.5492552e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 29463

David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3C2F7BBE.5EAFC23A@ix.netcom.com>...
> Open letter to Mr. Hollingsworth.
>
> Re: Kevin Mitnick (N6NHG)
>
> Dear Mr. Hollingsworth,
>
> A wise person once said-
> "If I stand idly by as injustice is done,
> then my hands, too,
> are stained with that injustice."
>
> A lot of people in the ham community
> see revoking Mr. Mitnick's license as an unjust over-reaction.
> It's not like he was on 14.313 thumbing his nose at everyone.
> I could name current licensees with criminal records that make
> Mr. Mitnick look like a gilded saint. But then, they didn't
> make the national news. Uncle can get more headlines beating up
> a celebrity then by whacking a real criminal.
> I wonder about the morality of "making an example"
> of someone who has paid their debt.
>
> Mr. Mitnick did his time and, as far as we know,
> has been straight since. More then a few believe
> that someone in Justice ordered someone else
> to slap the boy, just for the sake of petty vengeance.
>
> We're concerned.
> If one person is treated unjustly,
> what about when it's *our* turn?
> But we're not the ones "on the ground" in this case;
> we must rely on those empowered with the public trust
> to show us the justice of such matters.
> What do *you* say about it?
> You are respected in the community.
> Your words carry weight with us.
> If there is justification for continuing to kick this man
> after he's served his sentence,
> surely it can stand the test of public disclosure.
>
> We just want know our hands are clean.
>
> Sincerely, David S.

mr mitnik is a interesting case.....a hacker who broke into various high profile sites on the internet. and he says he did it just to do it and he did no damage. i don't know. he did violate the terms of his probation and was caught after much search for him by sprint engineers, almost red handed. that being said, is this a excuse for the government to incarcarate the man in solitary confinement without charge or benefit of writ of habeas corpus for 5 freekin years. i think that mr mitnik pissed in the wrong cornflakes. and i think it also shows what this government of our is capable of. and all of this took place before the anti terrorism laws went into effect. as far as i am concerned, i am beginning to see the writing on the wall, and can see our freedoms slowing ebbing away...and to tell you the truth, i now, i hate to say, believe that the guys running around in the woods pretending to play war games, the militias, i believe they were called,...perhaps they had it right.....can anyone say...'black helicopter'...i knew you could........

6468. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 17:03:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231120325.09102.00000868@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29464

In article <3C306C40.54E5A2F1@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >> You implied it.
>> >
>> >Nope, you may have inferred it but I didn't imply it.
>>
>> I would not have inferred it if you didn't imply it.
>
>You infer lots of things that I don't imply.

No, I only infer what you imply. Often you deny what you imply.

>In fact, akin to a
>devil's advocate position, you often present a devil's inferrence.

Maybe the devil makes you do it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6469. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 17:03:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231120325.09102.00000869@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29465

In article <3C306D20.6F7EA2B9@IEEE.org>, CAM <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> My current house is over 50 years old and has over a page and a half of
>> fine-print deed restrictions. Nothing directly about antennas, though.
>
>When I bought my house in CA, I deleted (lined out) the antenna
>restriction part before I signed the contract.
>--
You cannot do that with deed restrictions. They are part of the deed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6470. Re: Victims of W4AMP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 17:08:49 UTC
From: JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C31366F.E3B23E83@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29466
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.geno-paris,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KC8JBO wrote:

>
> Jizzwallowing recepticle's jamming of his local repeaters, noted. And his
> identity and callsign sent to rholling@fcc.gov.

That is a pretty good trick woger since I haven't been on a local
repeater in several years. Just what is the identify and callsign
you reported to Riley, woger? Like you think Riley is going to
listen to someone he has caught jamming?

6471. Re: FCC Ethical Scenario

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 17:14:07 UTC
From: Hans Brakob <k0hb@qwest.net>
Message-ID: <eb84cb0d636b978c1607ba9a118c8154.15732@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 29467

Yudlink wrote:

> What do you think, hypothetically speaking, of course?

I think you're a troll with an agenda.

Hans

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

6472. broadcast on 6 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 17:24:28 UTC
From: John O'Flaherty <wewelcomespam@blackhole.net>
Message-ID: <3C309F4C.284AE08C@blackhole.net>
Source record: 29468

Last night (12-30-2001), I heard a radio station, WWCR, on 52.040,050 MHz. It was fairly clear, and at first I was delighted, as it's the first thing I've ever heard on 6 meters on my 756pro. (I live in a valley and have only a single 120 foot dipole as an antenna, tuned by an AH4 automatic tuner).
The signal seemed to really be on that frequency, because retuning the antenna tuner to other bands diminished the signal strength. The material being broadcast was information about short-wave listening- a rebroadcast of 'Popular Communications' and some Voice of America short-wave reports.
I consulted the web and found out that WWCR is a religious broadcaster located in Tennessee (I live in Imperial, MO, just south of St. Louis.) They had a list of times and frequencies, and I listened at all of them to see if I found the same material. Most of the frequencies had religious propaganda on them, but one, 3.210 MHz, had a duplicate of what I heard on 6 meters. I notice that 52.040050 isn't an exact multiple of 3.210. It is close to an exact multiple of one of their other frequencies- 7.435 MHz * 6.999334... = 52.04... but that frequency had the religious propaganda- not the same program as that appearing on 6 meters.
Has anyone an idea about how a signal at 3.210 could get translated up to 6 meters with no appearance of other modulation?

--
john

6473. Re: broadcast on 6 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 17:42:02 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Kr1Y7.317718$W8.11988245@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29469

"John O'Flaherty" <wewelcomespam@blackhole.net> wrote in message
news:3C309F4C.284AE08C@blackhole.net...
>
> Last night (12-30-2001), I heard a radio station, WWCR, on 52.040,050
> MHz. It was fairly clear, and at first I was delighted, as it's the
> first thing I've ever heard on 6 meters on my 756pro. (I live in a
> valley and have only a single 120 foot dipole as an antenna, tuned by an
> AH4 automatic tuner).
> The signal seemed to really be on that frequency, because retuning the
> antenna tuner to other bands diminished the signal strength. The
> material being broadcast was information about short-wave listening- a
> rebroadcast of 'Popular Communications' and some Voice of America
> short-wave reports.
> I consulted the web and found out that WWCR is a religious broadcaster
> located in Tennessee (I live in Imperial, MO, just south of St. Louis.)
> They had a list of times and frequencies, and I listened at all of them
> to see if I found the same material. Most of the frequencies had
> religious propaganda on them, but one, 3.210 MHz, had a duplicate of
> what I heard on 6 meters. I notice that 52.040050 isn't an exact
> multiple of 3.210. It is close to an exact multiple of one of their
> other frequencies- 7.435 MHz * 6.999334... = 52.04... but that frequency
> had the religious propaganda- not the same program as that appearing on
> 6 meters.
> Has anyone an idea about how a signal at 3.210 could get translated up
> to 6 meters with no appearance of other modulation?
>
> --
> john

Sounds like a receiver spur to me. Or some kind of product from your six
meter receiver being blasted by Channel 2 pix carrier at 55.25. Don't
know where 2 is these days physically and Imperial covers a multitude of
sins as well as geography but 55.25 less 52+ comes out to 3.21 or so.

Say hi to any remaining buzzards on 25/85 for me.

Dick NBK

6474. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 17:47:27 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Gr1Y7.116527$BX4.7450679@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29470
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard,

I ask this somewhat tongue in cheek, but would you mind <<snicker>>telling me HOW that
fellow got FIVE <<giggle>> cows in his car <LMFAO> (I can't hold it in any longer)? I know folks take cattle rustling seriously, but 5 cows in a car is a really "minimalist" approach
(LOUD guffaws)!

Best 73

Jerry
Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:TbSX7.316850$W8.11929552@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3C2FE3DE.24B8B0FC@IEEE.org...
> > Richard McCollum wrote:
> > >
> > > "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > > In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
> > >
> > > Nebraska for one but it is not a great idea. Remnant of what was once
> > > known as the Shoot Your Neighbor Act.
> >
> > In the few states I've lived in, one must be in danger of life and
> > limb before deadly force can be used. Property doesn't count.
> > --
> > cheers, CAM http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>
> The original Shoot Your Neighbor Act allowed plugging for your life,
> property or that of a neighbor. This, of course, did not make forgetting
> your key and crawling in your kitchen window the smartest move in history
> without your kelvar BVDs in place.
>
> And where she shot the burglar on the lawn who strangely turned out to be
> her drunken husband carrying a 12-pack in rather than out it did make
> prosecuting the dear lady just a bit tougher when her belief rather than
> reality controlled. In Texas or Nebraska juries try the victim as well as
> the accused anyway and to hear tell, they leave that to Grand Juries in
> New York.
>
> As you can imagine this was a bit of a nightmare to LEOs, prosecutors, and

> the coroners' golf tournament so the neighbor aspect is pretty well gone
> but no one is going to cry too loudly if someone offs a rustler or a speed
> freak stealing anhydrous ammonia from your tank. They caught a guy in
> Iowa with five cows in his car; that ranks with shooting a bear in your
> pajamas -- and not having the slightest idea how the bear got into your
> pajamas. But Iowegians are a bit strange anyway.
>
> And we all know the statutes and practice often differ. The gendarmes
> have been known to throw armed robbers who bought the big one back into
> the store before beginning the investigation, particularly if he is one of
> the usual suspects. Prosecutors have been known to charge with an eye to
> the next election, and juries have been known to decide that the world did
> not lose a hell of a lot when it lost the late lamented deceased.
>
> So it really helps to be right when offing someone.
>
> Today's Omaha World-Herald repeated the results of a legislative study
> done on the death penalty which found a distinct urban/rural split that in
> the final analysis proves only that urban prosecutors do not ask for it in
> marginal cases but rural ones do while the juries bring the issue back to
> par. I personally oppose the death penalty not on theoretical grounds but
> the fact that it is damned expensive and contains no mechanism for
> adjusting the system when, not if, it hangs the wrong man as Wisconsin did
> in 1852 and never has since. A good false imprisonment case deserves at
> least the treatment the NTSB gives an airplane crash or for that matter
> the same treatment when the Nebraska Hiway Dept kills five kids in a
> school bus.
>
> As a practical matter, I doubt the law as she is done differs more between
> NE and TX than it differs between rural and urban areas in either state.
>
> Dick NBK
>
>

6475. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 17:51:01 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3v1Y7.116537$BX4.7454161@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 29471
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And some states, infested and run with the pinko, liberal-minded legals,
would prosecute the
store owner for "entrapment". It's high time the bill is marked "paid"
everytime a loser attempts
to victimize the public.

Jerry

Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a0pn8602o0d@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
>snip>>
> I remember an incident in East Liverpool, Ohio in 1981, in which a
business
> owner was being robbed every weekend. He'd had enough and decided to stand
> watch. Early on a Sunday morning, he shot an intruder - a 17-year-old -
and
> heard others outside take off when they heard the shots. It was ruled a
> justifiable homocide. I don't know if or how Ohio law has changed since
> then.
>
>

6476. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 18:36:08 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <se2Y7.317771$W8.11990974@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:Gr1Y7.116527$BX4.7450679@e3500-atl1.usenetserver.com...
> Richard,
>
> I ask this somewhat tongue in cheek, but would you mind
<<snicker>>telling
> me HOW that
> fellow got FIVE <<giggle>> cows in his car <LMFAO> (I can't hold it in
any
> longer)? I know folks take cattle rustling seriously, but 5 cows in a
car
> is a really "minimalist" approach
> (LOUD guffaws)!
>
> Best 73
>
> Jerry

Small cows and a big car I guess. He had removed the seats. It was actually only about a year or two ago because I read it in the Omaha paper while driving my bus on Sunday morning watching the coal trains go by on the UP mainline. The article had to do with the increase in amateur rustling and this guy was definitely an amateur.

I can see the deputy stopping a car well down on the axles with five irritated animals all roped up grinding down the county road at nite. Just what do you use for an opening line?

It was a neighbor that needed an addition to his herd and wasn't going too far. He wasn't much of a farmer and not much of a rustler either. Given his purpose these were more than likely young heifers and not Angus steers but getting them in the car without needing hernia surgery is a monumental achievement. I would expect he had some help.

It is not as totally ridiculous as it might seem. Driving cattle vehicles at nite is not among your wisest career choices, the western half of Nebraska is still open range. As a kid I remember the signs on the hiway marking the end of the brand-inspection area. As Judge Bean put it, there are a whole lot more cowboys that need hanging than there are cattle that need rustling.

And Iowegians can be weird.

Dick NBK

6477. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:04:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231140451.27168.00000798@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 29474

>> I'm surprised that he didn't reply that the new licensee should raise his
>> code speed to 40 WPM so that he could be considered a real ham despite the
>> new regs.

>He can't. He can't do that fast...LOL
>
I can.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"It ain't braggin' if ya really done it" - Babe Ruth

6478. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:04:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231140451.27168.00000799@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 29477

In article <3c306cac$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011230210105.09102.00000862@mb-ct.aol.com...
>>
>> > Don't move
>> >into a neighborhood with CCRs or HOAs.
>>
>> Sometimes there is no realistic choice.
>>
>> > It's as anti-American as you can
>> >get.
>>
>> That I agree with. But it's been SOP since the 1970s, and it's spreading.
>In
>> some areas if you say "I only want to see unrestricted properties" to a
>> realtor, the list of places to look at is very short.

>There must be movement somewhere, Jim.

I have no idea what that means, Kim.

>Rather than spend time after the
>fact, get involved prior to the fact--change HOAs, get rid of 'em, whatever.
>Or, research CCRs before you move in.

Do you know what the acronyms "HOA" and "CC&R" stand for, Kim?

>Then, spend your energy changing and getting rid of HOAs and research a CCR
>*before* you move in to a home, or buy that piece of property.

That's what I do, and have done all my life. That's what I encourage others,
hams and nonhams, to do.
My point is that restricted property is becoming so common that "don't buy a
restricted house" is simply
not a realistic option in many cases today.

>When I
>bought this one, the only restriction is that I cannot raise swine.

So no pigs can live on your land, ever?

> I can
>live with that--forever--so I bought.

Same here. In fact, I have restrictions against all sorts of livestock.

Now suppose you got one of those little Vietnamese potbellied pigs as a pet. That's a violation.

> Now, when I go to sell my property a
>pig farmer won't be able to buy it. If *just* a pig farmer comes along and
>he's all that wants to buy my property, do I go run off whining to the
>government to change my CCR? Hardly.

That's you. Others disagree. Such disagreements are what keep lawyers in business.

Think about WHY the restriction against pigs is there.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6479. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:04:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231140452.27168.00000800@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 29476

In article <3c306b78$1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011230210105.09102.00000863@mb-ct.aol.com...
>> In article <3c2f3cf8_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim- <nospam@none.net> writes:
>>
>> >Why should a majority of the population yield to the wants and desires of
>a
>> >very, very minute part of the population?
>>
>> Because all people have certain inalienable rights.
>>
>> And please learn to edit old stuff from your posts, Kim.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>As a side note, Jim: I'll post however I choose to post, thank you very
>much.

Just a suggestion to make your stuff more readable and avoid wasting USENET
resources.
>
>I don't think having an antenna for ham radio outside in any manner we wish
>it is a certain inalienable right.

That's why the term "reasonable".

73 de Jim, N2EY

6480. Re: Radio Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:04:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231140453.27168.00000802@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 29475

In article <y70Y7.317622$W8.11978530@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>Unfortunately, you can no longer build ARC5 transmitters in the garage
>between Buddy Holly's recording sessions and doing a port, polish, and
>relieve on your flathead. Life moves on.

Actually you can do the ARC-5 thing but it'll cost ya. Don't get Kelly & me
started about small engine work.

>And our choice is pretty simple, do we stay a part of the program or spend
>our time at QCWA luncheons? Our part in the program is largely that of
>the old male elephants they move with the younger herds to maintain some
>sense of decorum and order, take names, kick butts, provide some support
>when the young bucks realize they just did something dumb, and generally
>play the classic Grandpa which like sergeanting is a lost art. Oh well.

Been there, done that, still here. Yer preachin' to the choir.
>
>Still wonder if Brittany's are real.

awcumon, as fake as a $3 bill.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6481. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:04:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231140453.27168.00000801@mb-cb.aol.com>
Source record: 29478

In article <3c3069e9_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011230210101.09102.00000857@mb-ct.aol.com...
>>
>> >But, I can't say for sure--because I've never been in that position
>(except
>> >for marriage, of course).
>>
>> "Of course"? No, not at all.
>>
>> Why in the world should CC&Rs be more sacred and harder to get out of than
>> marriages?
>
>I don't think they should be.

Neither do I. So it should be at least as easy to get out of a deed restriction as it is to get out of a marriage. Easier, in fact.

>
>> Anyone who has gotten divorced is just like the person who bought a
>restricted
>> property and now wants out of the restrictions.
>>
>> Would you say to a person who wants out of a marriage, "You should not
>have
>> signed the contract if you didn't like the conditions and restrictions"?

>Apples and oranges, Jim.

Nope. Not at all. It's a valid analogy. Both are legal contracts, signed freely by the parties involved.

Marriage is a contract whose term is agreed upon to last as long as both of the parties to the contract are alive. Divorce is a way of breaking the conditions of that contract without anybody dying.

The type of CC&Rs being talked about are mostly deed restrictions. A deed restriction is a legal contract that restricts the owner of the property from doing certain things as long as he/she owns it. The FCC's preemption for TV antennas was effectively a "divorce" from certain conditions of the CC&Rs.

>However, just as divorce is a solution to that in
>the world of marriage; moving out of the neighborhood is a better solution
>than wasting my tax dollars going to the government.

Nope. Wrong. Mistake.

Just as a divorce is a way out of a marriage contract without anybody dying, the FCC's preemption is a way out of antenna restrictions without anybody moving.

Telling someone "just don't buy that house if you don;t like the restrictions" is the same as saying "just don't get married if you aren't going to stay with it". Nobody HAS to get married - lots of couples simply live together, buy property together, have children together, and do practically all the things married couples do without having that "til death us do part" legal contract.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6482. Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:06:45 UTC
From: Polly FQF <StumpjumpernR1@stumpjumpersBARF.org>
Message-ID: <a0qcu1$2ir$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29473
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman,alt.flame,alt.2600,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If I recall, Roger Wiseman, KC8JBO, published a list of
his enemies here not too long ago, a lengthy list indeed! So
Wogey, how about publishing a list of your friends? Then
again, you and I know, you have zero friends, save for the
"companions" you have brief moments with down at O'Leary's
Hourly Motel & Lavendar Lounge.

Polly FQF
Chief Mule Humper

6483. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:30:55 UTC
From: Krell <krell1215@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <a0qe9n029dj@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 29479
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3C306E94.B991323@IEEE.org...
> Krell wrote:
> > I remember an incident in East Liverpool, Ohio in 1981, in which a
business
> > owner was being robbed every weekend. He'd had enough and decided to
stand
> > watch. Early on a Sunday morning, he shot an intruder - a 17-year-old -
and
> > heard others outside take off when they heard the shots. It was ruled a
> > justifiable homocide. I don't know if or how Ohio law has changed since
> > then.
>
> There was a case in South Texas that was ruled a suicide. A guy allegedly
> shot himself in the back seven times with a semiautomatic rifle.

...or the case in Texas about two years ago in which a man killed his wife's
lover. He was found guilty, but the sentence was time already served.

6484. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:53:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C30C224.BB48E409@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29480

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011230210102.09102.00000859@mb-ct.aol.com...
> > In article <3C2EB9C4.E4009689@mailcity.net>, JR <radiobuf@mailcity.net>
> writes:
> >
> > >The people who signs CC&R contracts and then bitch, are just like
> > >those who build a house off the end of a runway of a busy airport
> > >and then bitch about the noise and want to get the runway shut
> > >down.
> >
> > Or like those who get married and then decide they don't want to be with
> that
> > person for the rest of their life.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> So, get a divorce. Or, move out of the restricted neighborhood.

It is reasurring to know that you are well rounded, Kim. You're square-headed on any number of topics. Moving is often not an option. If I'd lived in such a neighborhood when I was first licensed at age 14, I'd have to have run away from home in order to move out of the neighborhood. I couldn't have talked my parents into moving since the church would never have understood why Dad moved out of the rectory.

If you can't reasonably do what you want with land which you have purchased, it really isn't your land.

Out here on the ridge, my neighbors not only haven't complained about the two towers and numerous wires, they've helped me to install them. I've even received permission to run radials for the 160m inverted "L" onto neighboring pasture land.

Dave K8MN

6485. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:55:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3C30C2CC.15408267@earthlink.net>
Source record: 29481

Kim-W5TIT wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20011230210105.09102.00000863@mb-ct.aol.com...
> > In article <3c2f3cf8_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim- <nospam@none.net> writes:
> >
> > >Why should a majority of the population yield to the wants and desires of
> a
> > >very, very minute part of the population?
> >
> > Because all people have certain inalienable rights.
> >
> > And please learn to edit old stuff from your posts, Kim.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> As a side note, Jim: I'll post however I choose to post, thank you very
> much.
>
> I don't think having an antenna for ham radio outside in any manner we wish
> it is a certain inalienable right.

I don't like the pukey green color of your house. I hate those pink
plastic flamingos along your driveway and your maple leaves blow in my
yard. Your cheap, plastic lawn furniture is an eyesore. Hey, are you
going to keep that Winnebago there?

Dave K8MN

6486. Happy/Bad New Year!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 19:59:33 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3C30C3A5.3BA2820C@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 29482

Happy New Year to all the good people and
Get Bent to all the bad people.

You decide which is which.

6487. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 20:15:08 UTC
From: KC8PMX <kc8pmx@tm.net>
Message-ID: <gH3Y7.17$5d.5475@newshog.newsread.com>
Source record: 29483

Actually we should have all the deaf people move near the airports..... and
have the Jehovahs Witnesses deliver the mail in those areas!

>
> The people who signs CC&R contracts and then bitch, are just like
> those who build a house off the end of a runway of a busy airport
> and then bitch about the noise and want to get the runway shut
> down.

6488. Re: A word of thanks...& a new Extra. :-)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 20:24:29 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c30cac0_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29484

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231140451.27168.00000798@mb-cb.aol.com...
>
>
> >> I'm surprised that he didn't reply that the new licensee should raise
his
> >> code speed to 40 WPM so that he could be considered a real ham despite
the
> >> new regs.
>
> >He can't. He can't do that fast...LOL
> >
> I can.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> "It ain't braggin' if ya really done it" - Babe Ruth

Yeah, but you're far from the inhuamness of a Larry Roll, Jim. Oh, and I happen to know of a gal here who has an ARRL certificate for 45 wpm. Ever worked KF9AS?

Kim W5TIT

6489. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 20:32:52 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c30ccb2_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29485

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231140451.27168.00000799@mb-cb.aol.com...
>
> >Rather than spend time after the
> >fact, get involved prior to the fact--change HOAs, get rid of 'em,
whatever.
> >Or, research CCRs before you move in.
>
> Do you know what the acronyms "HOA" and "CC&R" stand for, Kim?
>

Yes. Why do you ask? HOA is a Home Owners Association and CC&R, I believe,
is something to the effect of Code of Covenants and Restrictions.

> >
> >Then, spend your energy changing and getting rid of HOAs and research a
CCR
> >*before* you move in to a home, or buy that piece of property.
>
> That's what I do, and have done all my life. That's what I encourage
others,
> hams and nonhams, to do.
> My point is that restricted property is becoming so common that "don't buy
a
> restricted house" is simply
> not a realistic option in many cases today.
>

Then, not being a butt here--just putting in a reality check, maybe the
major portion of the population where you have done this all your life is
not in agreement with your wants and desires.

> >
> >When I
> >bought this one, the only restriction is that I cannot raise swine.
>
> So no pigs can live on your land, ever?
>

I suppose not. I know they won't live here as long as I own the land...LOL
I think there's also one against chickens on this land; however, chickens I
raised--until I realized I am not such a pioneering woman. Well, actually I
think I am--it's just a little more difficult to work from 6:00A-7:00P and
be anything in kind to being happy to go visit the coop.

> >
> > I can
> >live with that--forever--so I bought.
>
> Same here. In fact, I have restrictions against all sorts of livestock.
>

I'd have to drag mine back out, but I think it's just chickens and pigs.

>
> Now suppose you got one of those little Vietnamese potbellied pigs as a
pet.
> That's a violation.
>

I won't be getting a Vietnamese potbellied pig as a pet. They're cute,
until they get to about 2 months old.

> >
> > Now, when I go to sell my property a
> >pig farmer won't be able to buy it. If *just* a pig farmer comes along
and
> >he's all that wants to buy my property, do I go run off whining to the
> >government to change my CCR? Hardly.
>
> That's you. Others disagree. Such disagreements are what keep lawyers in
> business.
>

Yeah, well. Don't ask me my opinion *most* (sorry Phil) lawyers. That is,
most lawyers I've had experience with; I can't speak for the entire
industry. Cops, lawywers, courts and me don't get along. And, it doesn't
take a good lawyer, it just takes lots of money; not my idea of justice.

>
> Think about WHY the restriction against pigs is there.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Mine is not to reason why...something like that. I don't know. I generally
don't wonder about things I agree with :p

Kim W5TIT

6490. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 20:34:37 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c30cd1a$1_2@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29486

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231140452.27168.00000800@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >
> >As a side note, Jim: I'll post however I choose to post, thank you very
> >much.
>
> Just a suggestion to make your stuff more readable and avoid wasting
USENET
> resources.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I know what the basis is. It's also a waste of USENET resources if there's
a response to a post that just wouldn't make sense to the first time reader
and they have to go back and start looking through them all.

Kim W5TIT

6491. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 20:43:27 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c30cf2e_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29487

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231140453.27168.00000801@mb-cb.aol.com...
> >>
> >> Why in the world should CC&Rs be more sacred and harder to get out of
than
> >> marriages?
> >
> >I don't think they should be.
>
> Neither do I. So it should be at least as easy to get out of a deed
restriction
> as it is to get out of a marriage. Easier, in fact.
> >

Well, I don't know about that. It was downright dangerous for me to remain
in my first marriage. Either I would have killed him or he would have
killed me, I am near certain of that.

All kidding aside. It *is* as easy for you to get out of deed restrictions;
either get them changed (or live with it), or move away.

> >>
> >> Anyone who has gotten divorced is just like the person who bought a
> >restricted
> >> property and now wants out of the restrictions.
> >>
> >> Would you say to a person who wants out of a marriage, "You should not
> >have
> >> signed the contract if you didn't like the conditions and
restrictions"?
>
> >Apples and oranges, Jim.
>
> Nope. Not at all. It's a valid analogy. Both are legal contracts, signed
freely
> by the parties involved.
>

I don't think it's all that valid an analogy, but I'll humor you.

>
> Marriage is a contract whose term is agreed upon to last as long as both
of the
> parties to the contract are alive. Divorce is a way of breaking the
conditions
> of that contract without anybody dying.

>

And, all one need to do to get out of the contract is either file for a
divorce, tell the loser he's/she's got to go, or move away yourself.
Hopefully, there will be no children involved.

>
> The type of CC&Rs being talked about are mostly deed restrictions. A deed
> restriction is a legal contract that restricts the owner of the property
from
> doing certain things as long as he/she owns it. The FCC's preemption for
TV
> antennas was effectively a "divorce" from certain conditions of the CC&Rs.
>
> >However, just as divorce is a solution to that in
> >the world of marriage; moving out of the neighborhood is a better
solution
> >than wasting my tax dollars going to the government.
>
> Nope. Wrong. Mistake.
>
> Just as a divorce is a way out of a marriage contract without anybody
dying,
> the FCC's preemption is a way out of antenna restrictions without anybody
> moving.
>

Well, I think it makes a lot more sense for me to either shut up in a case
where I don't have what I want, or move away from it. You may be willing to
take it on as a louder issue than that, and my standing is that CCRs need to
be researched and fought prior to a buy, and HOAs, well, you know my
feelings about them.

>
> Telling someone "just don't buy that house if you don;t like the
restrictions"
> is the same as saying "just don't get married if you aren't going to stay
with
> it".
>

Not quite. When most people do both, they do believe they are going to
stick with it.

>
> Nobody HAS to get married - lots of couples simply live together, buy
> property together, have children together, and do practically all the
things
> married couples do without having that "til death us do part" legal
contract.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>

And, nobody HAS to have a house. I know apartment owners whose logs will rival even the best of antenna farms.

And, I did live with my second choice of a life-partner. We were together 14 years, still the longest relationship I was ever in. We are still wonderful friends. But, we fell out of love. Now, I am in love with my husband of 12 years. I think he and I will stick. I shouldn't have made any decisions to marry or live with someone until I met him. ;)

Kim W5TIT

6492. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 20:49:30 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c30d097_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29488

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C30C224.BB48E409@earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Or like those who get married and then decide they don't want to be
with
> > that
> > > person for the rest of their life.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > So, get a divorce. Or, move out of the restricted neighborhood.
>
> It is reasurring to know that you are well rounded, Kim. You're
> square-headed on any number of topics.
>

Too much rum, Dave? I love how you start right off with insults. You can't
have a conversation without insults, can you?

>
> Moving is often not an option.
> If I'd lived in such a neighborhood when I was first licensed at age 14,
> I'd have to have run away from home in order to move out of the
> neighborhood. I couldn't have talked my parents into moving since the
> church would never have understood why Dad moved out of the rectory.
>

There's lots of restrictions on kids and we are all usually bound by
decisions our parents make. What's your point?

>
> If you can't reasonably do what you want with land which you have
> purchased, it really isn't your land.
>

Well, it truly isn't your land anyway, because the government can use
"eminent domain" if they choose to.

>
> Out here on the ridge, my neighbors not only haven't complained about
> the two towers and numerous wires, they've helped me to install them.
> I've even received permission to run radials for the 160m inverted "L"
> onto neighboring pasture land.
>
> Dave K8MN

>

Then, I don't know that you have a problem such as Jim/N2EY fights. Neither do I. We've got a 70' foot tower, a 40' pushup, a 20' pushup, and a 50' pushup pole. We've yet to put the 30' tower up, as I got the 50' pushup for $20 and am happy with it. I may use the 30' for ATV if I ever get into that with any seriousness.

Kim W5TIT

6493. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 20:50:32 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c30d0d5_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29489

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3C30C2CC.15408267@earthlink.net...
> >
> > I don't think having an antenna for ham radio outside in any manner we
wish
> > it is a certain inalienable right.
>
> I don't like the pukey green color of your house. I hate those pink
> plastic flamingos along your driveway and your maple leaves blow in my
> yard. Your cheap, plastic lawn furniture is an eyesore. Hey, are you
> going to keep that Winnebago there?
>
> Dave K8MN

Do you have a point, Dave?

Kim W5TIT

6494. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 20:54:14 UTC
From: Kim-W5TIT <nospam@none.net>
Message-ID: <3c30d1b4_1@newsa.ev1.net>
Source record: 29490

"KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@tm.net> wrote in message
news:gH3Y7.17$5d.5475@newshog.newsread.com...
> Actually we should have all the deaf people move near the airports.....
and
> have the Jehovahs Witnesses deliver the mail in those areas!
>
>

I've got a cure for the Jehovah's Witnesses! Tell them dirty joke *every*
time they show up at your door. Really. It'll take 'em once or twice, but
they'll get lost.

Still haven't figured out what keeps the Baptists away. I did yell at one
who showed up dressed like a clown offering to take my two children to
Sunday School and they even got a free goldfish for going...buhruther...I
asked her if God had approved the clown suit. She still came back a few
times, but we were living in the commune--I mean apartment at the time. No
property ownership means they can do whatever they want.

Kim W5TIT

6495. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 21:03:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231160312.09102.00000875@mb-ct.aol.com>
Source record: 29491

In article <3c3084d1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011231100302.10110.00001634@mb-mb.aol.com...
>> >
>> >The same CC&Rs that ban antennas also often ban many
>> >other exterior activities that a homeowner without CC&Rs
>> >can enjoy:
>> >- Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in
>> >the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?
>>
>> Yes, if the repairs are "reasonable". Changing a tail light bulb or
>windshield
>> wipers is "reasonable", doing a months-long customizing job in a shared
>> driveway is not. Note that if the CC&R says "no auto repairs", even 10
>minute
>> repairs are forbidden. ("ABNER!! Darren Stevens is changing his spark
>plugs!!!)
>
>While I wouldn't like it (not one bit) to have car parts, grease, oil, and
>the smell wafting over and into my windows, a person who has paid for their
>little piece of real estate should be able to do whatever they wish--within
>the law--on it (in my opinion).

Then you are against covenants and restrictions, because they are not laws but
contracts.

>I don't think a law prohibiting them from
>doing whatever car repair they must on *their* vehicle(s) is resonable.
>Note that I said *their* vehicle. That means that they don't get to help
>every Tom, Dick, and Harry that shows up with a car problem.

So it's OK for a neighbor to make noise, a stink and a mess working on their
OWN car, but it's not OK for them to spend ten minutes helping out a friend or
neighbor?

By that logic, if you showed up at a friend's house with a minor problem
(busted hose or belt, dead battery) your friend can't help you out - even
though he's in the middle of changing engines on his own car in the driveway.
>
>I have a neighbor just down the road. He has taken to turning his piece of
>property into a salvage yard, literally. It's "nicely" organized, and he
>keeps it as clean as one could, but it is still unsightly and unfair for me
>to have to deal with it.

WHY is it "unfair for you to have to deal with it"? What do you have to "deal with"?

And if they are all HIS cars, what right have YOU to tell him what he can do with them?

You wrote, above:

" a person who has paid for their little piece of real estate should be able to do whatever they wish--within the law--on it (in my opinion). "

>I have no problem with it, *except* that I don't
>think he should be allowed to do it in the event that anyone else gets the
>same idea. He runs a business off the property, so he is breaking far more
>than one or two CCRs.

How do you know he's in violation of anything? Have you researched the deed to his land? If yours is unrestricted except for pigs living there, his may be just as unrestricted.

> I haven't done it yet, but I fully intend to contact
>my county authorities about it. If he wants to keep a "few" things lying
>around in his yard, I have no problem. But, he has nearly one acre of
>stuff, and growing.

" a person who has paid for their little piece of real estate should be able to do whatever they wish--within the law--on it. "

Is there a law against having a lot of old cars where you live?

>> >- Should CC&Rs that prohibit the color, type and design
>> >of the homes exterior be premted on first amendment basis?
>>
>> I think you mean "changing the ....". Again, if the changes are
>reasonable.
>> Being forced to repaint one's house in the same color forever is
>unreasonable.
>> Having a list of approved colors and color combinations for the homeowner
>to
>> choose from is reasonable.
>
>I don't think my "neighbor" (if one could call someone like that a neighbor)
>has any right to give me a choice of colors, limiting me to their idea of
>what I should be able to do with my home.

>> >- Should CC&Rs that prohibit pets be preempted?
>>
>> Depends on the pets and other regulations concerning pets, like noise
>> ordinances governing barking. No pets means no goldfish or hamsters, btw.

>I think CCRs are generally a cheap way out to protect us from the creeps of
>the world.

In part. There are also safety and "good neighbor" issues, like noise and upkeep requirements. In some communities the proximity of properties makes

aesthetic issues important.

> A CCR that prohibits "pets" keeps the creep next door from
>raising those nasty smelling chickens, or pigs, or whatever. HOAs are there
>for the same reason. To me, both represent the fact that we need "someone
>or something" else to do our talking for us these days.

For the most part, it's builders and developers who are behind these things,
for a variety of reasons.

> We've become
>"afraid" to deal with our neighbor and ask them that they be reasonable. On
>the other side, we've become intolerant of dealing with situations we don't
>seem to be able to control in any other way but through a court system.
>Pitiful.

What's pitiful is that some people have not developed the idea that they are
responsible to the community to take care of their properties in a reasonable
way.

>I will go to the county about my neighbor. If they deem he is
>doing nothing wrong, or if they choose to do nothing about it, I must then
>live with the fact that he's there and he's going to have his junkyard.
>That's all there is to it.

And you'll have to "deal with it"

>> My township has a serious leash law - a dog found loose can cost its owner
>a
>> BIG fine (up to $1000). Everybody who owns a dog has an invisible fence
>and
>> good leashes.
>> >
>> >Just some thoughts.
>>
>> The key to all this is "reasonable". Sweeping prohibitions of common
>at-home
>> activities are not reasonable. Same with restrictions that make such
>activities
>> impractical or extremely limited.
>
>I think everyone needs to chill and quit trying to tell everyone else how to
>live and how they must use their property. The day someone wants to share
>the expenses of my property and home is the day they'll have a say in what I
>do with it--*if* I want them sharing.

Then what right do you have to go to the county about what your neighbor is
doing with the old cars? You're not "chilling" - you're telling him how to live
and how he must use his property, and getting the govt. to do the job of
confronting him.

Suppose the county says "We know - he's technically in violation of a few
things. But someone must file a formal complaint before we can take any

action". Will you file the complaint?

>> One of the real problems I have with CC&Rs is their stealthy nature. In
>many
>> localities it requires serious research to discover if they even exist.
>While
>> some states have disclosure laws, such disclosure is not universal.

>CCRs are a little different and, you're right, it takes some work to find
>them a lot of times. However, I am told that most were implemented long ago
>and can be changed fairly easy. An HOA, on the other hand, just gets my
>blood to boiling.

Kim, by that statement, you obviously don't know what CC&R or HOA stand for.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6496. Re: Wiseman's Enemies & Friends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 21:04:41 UTC
From: KC8JBO <kc8jbo@alt.net>
Message-ID: <a0qnhdip1@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 29493
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Polly FQF" <Stumpjumpernr1@stumpjumpersBARF.org> wrote in message
news:a0qcu1$2ir$0@dosa.alt.net...
> If I recall, [Lay off the heroin and you might be able to]

Hey Polly, how's it feel to get FIRED from SEARS for stealing store
merchandise?
How's it feel to live with the fact you drove your own daughter to suicide?
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!

6497. Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 21:18:54 UTC
From: Howard Johnson <hjohnson5700@home.net>
Message-ID: <nbl13usvkden8loqf7hni42f42c3310ctr@4ax.com>
Source record: 29492

I do not have any license right now, but I have been studying the code
for a while now and plan to take the test for General in February
(next testing period that I can attend).

My question: On test day, do I have to take a Technician written
first then a General written or just the General?

==========

Yours truly,

Howard Johnson

*** Spam Filter in place... change 5700 to 57 for correct reply address! ***

==========

6498. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:18:53 UTC
From: kc2hmn@cs.comnospam
Message-ID: <20011231171853.05351.00002236@mb-de.news.cs.com>
Source record: 29494

>I do not have any license right now, but I have been studying the code
>for a while now and plan to take the test for General in February
>(next testing period that I can attend).

Good luck, I', sure you'll do great. :-)

>My question: On test day, do I have to take a Technician written
>first then a General written or just the General?

The short answer is yes, they must be taken in order. If you're feeling thrifty, you may take them all in the same session for the same fee of $10. (Same as you'd be charged for just one element.) Best of luck to you and Happy New Year.

73 de Bert
KC2HMN

6499. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:27:28 UTC
From: Joshua Houk <jlhouk@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3C30E644.647AE6DE@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29495

Howard Johnson wrote:

> I do not have any license right now, but I have been studying the code
> for a while now and plan to take the test for General in February
> (next testing period that I can attend).
>
> My question: On test day, do I have to take a Technician written
> first then a General written or just the General?

You will need to take the Technician exam if you want a General license. The good news is that it's a fairly easy test if you know General class theory - a lot of it you'll already know or can deduce just from common sense. I'd suggest going over the question pools or practice exams on the net to see how much you'll need to study.

If you don't want to take everything right away, you can take the General exam and the code exam at the next session and assuming you pass those you have credit for those elements for 365 days, and as long as you pass your Technician exam by then you'll get your General ticket. The bad news is, of course, that you won't get a license at the first session.

Hope this helps,

Joshua Houk, KF4PZI

6500. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:35:13 UTC
From: JR <radiobuff@mailcity.net>
Message-ID: <3C3182EF.31F8077D@mailcity.net>
Source record: 29496

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3c3084d1_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim" <nospam@none.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20011231100302.10110.00001634@mb-mb.aol.com...
> >> >
> >> >The same CC&Rs that ban antennas also often ban many
> >> >other exterior activities that a homeowner without CC&Rs
> >> >can enjoy:
> >> >- Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in
> >> >the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?
> >>
> >> Yes, if the repairs are "reasonable". Changing a tail light bulb or
> >windshield
> >> wipers is "reasonable", doing a months-long customizing job in a shared
> >> driveway is not. Note that if the CC&R says "no auto repairs", even 10
> >minute
> >> repairs are forbidden. ("ABNER!! Darren Stevens is changing his spark
> >plugs!!!)
> >>
> >While I wouldn't like it (not one bit) to have car parts, grease, oil, and
> >the smell wafting over and into my windows, a person who has paid for their
> >little piece of real estate should be able to do whatever they wish--within
> >the law--on it (in my opinion).
>
> Then you are against covenants and restrictions, because they are not laws but
> contracts.
>
> >I don't think a law prohibiting them from
> >doing whatever car repair they must on *their* vehicle(s) is resonable.
> >Note that I said *their* vehicle. That means that they don't get to help
> >every Tom, Dick, and Harry that shows up with a car problem.
>
> So it's OK for a neighbor to make noise, a stink and a mess working on their
> OWN car, but it's not OK for them to spend ten minutes helping out a friend or
> neighbor?
>
> By that logic, if you showed up at a friend's house with a minor problem
> (busted hose or belt, dead battery) your friend can't help you out - even
> though he's in the middle of changing engines on his own car in the driveway.
> >
> >I have a neighbor just down the road. He has taken to turning his piece of
> >property into a salvage yard, literally. It's "nicely" organized, and he

> >keeps it as clean as one could, but it is still unsightly and unfair for me
> >to have to deal with it.
>
> WHY is it "unfair for you to have to deal with it"? What do you have to "deal
> with"?
>
> And if they are all HIS cars, what right have YOU to tell him what he can do
> with them?
>
> You wrote, above:
>
> " a person who has paid for their little piece of real estate should be able to
> do whatever they wish--within the law--on it (in my opinion). "
>
> >I have no problem with it, *except* that I don't
> >think he should be allowed to do it in the event that anyone else gets the
> >same idea. He runs a business off the property, so he is breaking far more
> >than one or two CCRs.
>
> How do you know he's in violation of anything? Have you researched the deed to
> his land? If yours is unrestricted except for pigs living there, his may be
> just as unrestricted.
>
> > I haven't done it yet, but I fully intend to contact
> >my county authorities about it. If he wants to keep a "few" things lying
> >around in his yard, I have no problem. But, he has nearly one acre of
> >stuff, and growing.
>
> " a person who has paid for their little piece of real estate should be able to
> do whatever they wish--within the law--on it. "
>
> Is there a law against having a lot of old cars where you live?
>
> >> >- Should CC&Rs that prohibit the color, type and design
> >> >of the homes exterior be premted on first amendment basis?
> >>
> >> I think you mean "changing the ....". Again, if the changes are
> >reasonable.
> >> Being forced to repaint one's house in the same color forever is
> >unreasonable.
> >> Having a list of approved colors and color combinations for the homeowner
> >to
> >> choose from is reasonable.
> >
> >I don't think my "neighbor" (if one could call someone like that a neighbor)
> >has any right to give me a choice of colors, limiting me to their idea of
> >what I should be able to do with my home.
>
> >> >- Should CC&Rs that prohibit pets be preempted?
> >>

> >> Depends on the pets and other regulations concerning pets, like noise
> >> ordinances governing barking. No pets means no goldfish or hamsters, btw.
>
> >I think CCRs are generally a cheap way out to protect us from the creeps of
> >the world.
>
> In part. There are also safety and "good neighbor" issues, like noise and
> upkeep requirements. In some communities the proximity of properties makes
> aesthetic issues important.
>
> > A CCR that prohibits "pets" keeps the creep next door from
> >raising those nasty smelling chickens, or pigs, or whatever. HOAs are there
> >for the same reason. To me, both represent the fact that we need "someone
> >or something" else to do our talking for us these days.
>
> For the most part, it's builders and developers who are behind these things,
> for a variety of reasons.
>
> > We've become
> >"afraid" to deal with our neighbor and ask them that they be reasonable. On
> >the other side, we've become intolerant of dealing with situations we don't
> >seem to be able to control in any other way but through a court system.
> >Pitiful.
>
> What's pitiful is that some people have not developed the idea that they are
> responsible to the community to take care of their properties in a reasonable
> way.
>
> >I will go to the county about my neighbor. If they deem he is
> >doing nothing wrong, or if they choose to do nothing about it, I must then
> >live with the fact that he's there and he's going to have his junkyard.
> >That's all there is to it.
>
> And you'll have to "deal with it"
>
> >> My township has a serious leash law - a dog found loose can cost its owner
> >a
> >> BIG fine (up to $1000). Everybody who owns a dog has an invisible fence
> >and
> >> good leashes.
> >> >
> >> >Just some thoughts.
> >>
> >> The key to all this is "reasonable". Sweeping prohibitions of common
> >at-home
> >> activities are not reasonable. Same with restrictions that make such
> >activities
> >> impractical or extremely limited.
> >>
> >I think everyone needs to chill and quit trying to tell everyone else how to

> >live and how they must use their property. The day someone wants to share
> >the expenses of my property and home is the day they'll have a say in what I
> >do with it--*if* I want them sharing.
>
> Then what right do you have to go to the county about what your neighbor is
> doing with the old cars? You're not "chilling" - you're telling him how to live
> and how he must use his property, and getting the govt. to do the job of
> confronting him.
>
> Suppose the county says "We know - he's technically in violation of a few
> things. But someone must file a formal complaint before we can take any
> action". Will you file the complaint?
>
> >> One of the real problems I have with CC&Rs is their stealthy nature. In
> >many
> >> localities it requires serious research to discover if they even exist.
> >While
> >> some states have disclosure laws, such disclosure is not universal.
>
> >CCRs are a little different and, you're right, it takes some work to find
> >them a lot of times. However, I am told that most were implemented long ago
> >and can be changed fairly easy. An HOA, on the other hand, just gets my
> >blood to boiling.
>
> Kim, by that statement, you obviously don't know what CC&R or HOA stand for.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

If you sign the deed restriction, and you are agreeing to abide by
those restrictions when you sign, then you haven't a leg to stand
on. Don't sign if you do not want to abide by them.

6501. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:39:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp7zt95.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29497
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:04:46 -0600, CAM wrote:

>Richard McCollum wrote:
>>
>> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>> > In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
>>
>> Nebraska for one but it is not a great idea. Remnant of what was once
>> known as the Shoot Your Neighbor Act.
>
>In the few states I've lived in, one must be in danger of life and
>limb before deadly force can be used. Property doesn't count.

In fact it was in Nebraska that the famous case of setting a spring
gun trap to "catch" burglars held that deadly force may not be used
to stop property-only crimes.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6502. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:39:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp7zya6.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29498
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 01:40:58 GMT, JR wrote:

>> There are LOTS of cases in almost every state that hold that
>> deadly force is not justified in a property-only crime.
>
>Shoot to kill then drag him inside and put a weapon in his hand.

But the forensic guys and gals can see through that, too.

Don't you watch CSI on Thursday nights? <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6503. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:39:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp80vq7.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29501

On 31 Dec 2001 02:01:03 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>In most ceremonies the people entering into the contract face each
>other and say out loud that they have come to the contract freely and
>unreservedly, and accept ALL its terms. They make the contract in
>front of witnesses and get both community and legal acceptance. In
>most ceremonies there are NO escape clauses and NO limitations.

In Jewish practice, the marriage contract is in writing, it is read
aloud at the wedding ceremony, and contains specific clauses of
obligations of either party to the other in the event that one
party can no longer carry out the obligations of a spouse.

A "pre-nup" whose origins go back about 2200 years....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6504. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:39:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp81bz8.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29502

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001 07:50:24 -0600, CAM wrote:

>When I bought my house in CA, I deleted (lined out) the antenna
>restriction part before I signed the contract.

You can do that with a sales contract. You cannot do that with an easement without the agreement of the dominant holder (the person to whom the easement is granted) and you cannot do that with a CC&R without the agreement of every other owner in the development affected by the restriction.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
California Lawyer

6505. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:39:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp82cua.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29499

On 31 Dec 2001 15:03:00 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>In other words, the "couch potatoes" DO have a right to their TV,
>because it's THEIR spectrum, and TV exists for them.

Every spectrum regulation professional knows deep down that it's the
broadcast/video companies who own that portion of the spectrum, and
TV programming exists to fill the gaps between advertising messages.

Hey, this is starting to sound like ba.broadcast......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6506. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:39:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp82109.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29503

On 31 Dec 2001 15:03:00 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>A question: Does the preemption cover only pay-TV antennas like the
>pizza dish satellite receivers and terrestrial microwave services, or
>all TV antennas like the plain old VHF-UHF log-periodics?

All broadcast/video OTARDs, including plain old TV antennas.

HOWEVER, it does not cover TV-type antennas used for any other
purpose, such as "stealth" amateur radio transmitting antennas. The
FCC has already closed that loophole.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6507. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 22:39:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@no.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.gp82k1b.pminews@or.news.verio.net>
Source record: 29500

On 31 Dec 2001 15:03:02 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>- Should the feds exempt personal repair of autos in
>>the driveway of homes that have such CC&R restrictions?
>
>Yes, if the repairs are "reasonable".

Auto repair is not an activity regulated and protected by the
Federal government. Ham radio is.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6508. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 23:03:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231180316.01870.00000683@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 29506

In article <3c30d097_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-W5TIT" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>Then, I don't know that you have a problem such as Jim/N2EY fights.

Who says I have a problem or a fight? My interest in restrictions is their effect on the ARS and its future. At this stage of my life I don't want a tower - another thing to maintain.

>Neither
>do I. We've got a 70' foot tower, a 40' pushup, a 20' pushup, and a 50'
>pushup pole. We've yet to put the 30' tower up, as I got the 50' pushup for
>$20 and am happy with it.

Do you have any antennas, or just towers and poles? ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

I may use the 30' for ATV if I ever get into that
>with any seriousness.
>

6509. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 23:03:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231180318.01870.00000684@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 29505

In article <3c30cf2e_1@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011231140453.27168.00000801@mb-cb.aol.com...
>> >>
>> >> Why in the world should CC&Rs be more sacred and harder to get out of
>than
>> >> marriages?
>> >
>> >I don't think they should be.
>>
>> Neither do I. So it should be at least as easy to get out of a deed
>restriction
>> as it is to get out of a marriage. Easier, in fact.
>
>Well, I don't know about that.

Why not? In both cases the issue is breaking a contract that was freely entered into, BEFORE its term is up, without sacrificing all claims/terms of the contract.

> It was downright dangerous for me to remain
>in my first marriage. Either I would have killed him or he would have
>killed me, I am near certain of that.

Doesn't matter. You both agreed to stick together "til death us do part" or some such verbiage.
>
>All kidding aside. It *is* as easy for you to get out of deed restrictions;
>either get them changed (or live with it), or move away.

If you think getting deed restrictions changed is easy, then you don't understand them at all.

Moving away is like the person who "got out of" a marriage by simply disappearing. Used to be pretty common before divorces were easy to get. The most unhappy party simply left and abandoned everything, or nearly so.
>
>> >> Anyone who has gotten divorced is just like the person who bought a
>> >restricted
>> >> property and now wants out of the restrictions.
>> >>
>> >> Would you say to a person who wants out of a marriage, "You should not
>> >have
>> >> signed the contract if you didn't like the conditions and
>restrictions"?

>>
>> >Apples and oranges, Jim.
>>
>> Nope. Not at all. It's a valid analogy. Both are legal contracts, signed
>freely
>> by the parties involved.
>
>I don't think it's all that valid an analogy, but I'll humor you.

How is it not valid? Aren't both of them private legal contracts? Isn't getting a divorce just a way of breaking some of the terms of the contract - specifically, the one about "til death"?
>
>> Marriage is a contract whose term is agreed upon to last as long as both
>of the
>> parties to the contract are alive. Divorce is a way of breaking the
>conditions
>> of that contract without anybody dying.
>
>And, all one need to do to get out of the contract is either file for a
>divorce, tell the loser he's/she's got to go, or move away yourself.

The last two do not end the legal contract.

A marriage is actually a private contract that is recorded by the govt. The parties involved agree to conduct their behavior in certain ways for as long as both of them are alive. A "marriage license" simply means that the govt. will record the contract, and that it meets the applicable laws of the state (age, health, etc.).

"Filing for divorce" means that one or both of the parties involved in a PRIVATE contract petitions the GOVERNMENT to overturn (break) the contract before its term is over. Even if one of the parties objects, the state almost always sides with the person who wants to get out of the contract and allows the divorce. AND, the joint property is usually divided without regard to who wanted to break the contract.

A deed restriction is actually a private contract that is recorded by the govt. The owner(s) of the property agrees to conduct his/her/their behavior with property for as long as he/she/they own it. "Recording the deed" simply means that the govt. records the contract and that it meets the applicable laws of the state (you can't deed-restrict against race or religion, for example).

"Breaking a deed restriction" means that one or more of the parties involved in a PRIVATE contract petitions the GOVERNMENT to overturn (break) the contract before its term is over - BEFORE the property is sold. Yet deed restrictions are very hard to break, and the cry is often heard "You shouldn't have bought it if you didn't want the restrictions".

>Hopefully, there will be no children involved.

I don't know the stats, but a LOT of divorces involve kids. Doesn't stop the state from allowing them.

>> The type of CC&Rs being talked about are mostly deed restrictions. A deed
>> restriction is a legal contract that restricts the owner of the property
>from
>> doing certain things as long as he/she owns it. The FCC's preemption for
>TV
>> antennas was effectively a "divorce" from certain conditions of the CC&Rs.
>>
>> >However, just as divorce is a solution to that in
>> >the world of marriage; moving out of the neighborhood is a better
>solution
>> >than wasting my tax dollars going to the government.
>>
>> Nope. Wrong. Mistake.
>>
>> Just as a divorce is a way out of a marriage contract without anybody
>dying,
>> the FCC's preemption is a way out of antenna restrictions without anybody
>> moving.
>
>Well, I think it makes a lot more sense for me to either shut up in a case
>where I don't have what I want, or move away from it.

That would be like saying "if you aren't happy in a marriage, either shut up
and live with it or move away with what you can carry and leave everything else
behind"

>You may be willing to
>take it on as a louder issue than that, and my standing is that CCRs need to
>be researched and fought prior to a buy, and HOAs, well, you know my
>feelings about them.

I don't know why you consider CC&Rs acceptable but hate HOAs so much.

>> Telling someone "just don't buy that house if you don;t like the
>restrictions"
>> is the same as saying "just don't get married if you aren't going to stay
>with
>> it".
>
>Not quite.

No, they are exactly the same.

>When most people do both, they do believe they are going to
>stick with it.
>
Yet one can easily get out of a marriage. Not so deed restrictions.
>>
>> Nobody HAS to get married - lots of couples simply live together, buy
>> property together, have children together, and do practically all the
>things
>> married couples do without having that "til death us do part" legal
>contract.

>And, nobody HAS to have a house. I know apartment owners whose logs will
>rival even the best of antenna farms.

Nobody in an apartment wins the DX test.
>
>And, I did live with my second choice of a life-partner. We were together
>14 years, still the longest relationship I was ever in. We are still
>wonderful friends. But, we fell out of love.

Since you weren't married, there was no problem getting out, then.

>Now, I am in love with my
>husband of 12 years. I think he and I will stick. I shouldn't have made
>any decisions to marry or live with someone until I met him. ;)

The point remains that you DID petition the state to break a contract - same as somebody who wants the FCC to preempt a CC&R.

I'm just saying the two cases (divorce and breaking a deed restriction) are examples of the SAME thing, and should be treated similarly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6510. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 23:03:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20011231180319.01870.00000685@mb-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 29504

In article <3c30ccb2_2@newsa.ev1.net>, "Kim-" <nospam@none.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20011231140451.27168.00000799@mb-cb.aol.com...
>>
>> >Rather than spend time after the
>> >fact, get involved prior to the fact--change HOAs, get rid of 'em,
>whatever.
>> >Or, research CCRs before you move in.
>>
>> Do you know what the acronyms "HOA" and "CC&R" stand for, Kim?
>
>Yes. Why do you ask?

Because the way you use them sometimes indicates that you don't.

> HOA is a Home Owners Association

That's right.

>and CC&R, I believe,
>is something to the effect of Code of Covenants and Restrictions.

Close but no cookie.

"Codes, Covenants and Restrictions"
>
>> >Then, spend your energy changing and getting rid of HOAs and research a
>CCR
>> >*before* you move in to a home, or buy that piece of property.
>>
>> That's what I do, and have done all my life. That's what I encourage
>others,
>> hams and nonhams, to do.
>> My point is that restricted property is becoming so common that "don't buy
>a
>> restricted house" is simply
>> not a realistic option in many cases today.
>
>Then, not being a butt here--just putting in a reality check, maybe the
>major portion of the population where you have done this all your life is
>not in agreement with your wants and desires.

Most of the population has no idea what CC&Rs are.
>
>> >When I
>> >bought this one, the only restriction is that I cannot raise swine.

>>
>> So no pigs can live on your land, ever?
>
>I suppose not.

Ya never know what can happen.

> I know they won't live here as long as I own the land...LOL

Indeed.

>I think there's also one against chickens on this land; however, chickens I
>raised--until I realized I am not such a pioneering woman. Well, actually I
>think I am--it's just a little more difficult to work from 6:00A-7:00P and
>be anything in kind to being happy to go visit the coop.

All depends on how one wants to spend their energy.
>
>> > I can
>> >live with that--forever--so I bought.
>>
>> Same here. In fact, I have restrictions against all sorts of livestock.
>
>I'd have to drag mine back out, but I think it's just chickens and pigs.

>> Now suppose you got one of those little Vietnamese potbellied pigs as a
>pet.
>> That's a violation.
>
>I won't be getting a Vietnamese potbellied pig as a pet. They're cute,
>until they get to about 2 months old.

Like many porcine species - cute and cuddly when they're little, ugly and
disagreeable when they get older.

The question was to prove a point: The restriction against "raising swine" is
open to interpretation. Some folks would argue that the potbellied pig is a
"pet", not "swine" (which is plural, anyway). All depends how you define the
word "pig".
>
>> > Now, when I go to sell my property a
>> >pig farmer won't be able to buy it. If *just* a pig farmer comes along
>and
>> >he's all that wants to buy my property, do I go run off whining to the
>> >government to change my CCR? Hardly.
>>
>> That's you. Others disagree. Such disagreements are what keep lawyers in
>> business.
>
>Yeah, well. Don't ask me my opinion *most* (sorry Phil) lawyers. That is,
>*most* lawyers I've had experience with; I can't speak for the entire
>industry. Cops, lawywers, courts and me don't get along.

One can only wonder why.

> And, it doesn't
>take a good lawyer, it just takes lots of money; not my idea of justice.

Maybe where you are. Ever hear the term "Philadelphia lawyer"?
>>
>> Think about WHY the restriction against pigs is there.

>Mine is not to reason why...something like that. I don't know. I generally
>don't wonder about things I agree with :p

Perhaps that's the problem.

The prohibition against "raising swine" probably comes from the issues of noise, smell and contaminated water runoff. In other words, the neighbors don't want to live next to a pig farm.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6511. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 23:08:12 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <wd6Y7.208092$WW.12080574@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29507
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@no.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.gp7zt95.pminews@or.news.verio.net...
> On Sun, 30 Dec 2001 22:04:46 -0600, CAM wrote:
>
> >Richard McCollum wrote:
> >>
> >> "CAM" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> >> > In what state is it legal to shoot someone in your driveway?
> >>
> >> Nebraska for one but it is not a great idea. Remnant of what was
once
> >> known as the Shoot Your Neighbor Act.
> >>
> >In the few states I've lived in, one must be in danger of life and
> >limb before deadly force can be used. Property doesn't count.
>
> In fact it was in Nebraska that the famous case of setting a spring
> gun trap to "catch" burglars held that deadly force may not be used
> to stop property-only crimes.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

Think the case you have in mind was over in Iowa where the local farmer got a bit tired of people busting into the old family home to scarf antiques and set up a shotgun which had a non-fatal effect on one such looter. The looter's lawyer was smart enough to get him pled guilty to a misdemenor and ended up suing the farmer. Twelve dear ladies moved their heads up and down in response to the judges instructions and wiped out yon farmer.

6512. Re: Test Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 23:49:08 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10112312348540.3647-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 29509

On Mon, 31 Dec 2001, Howard Johnson wrote:
>I do not have any license right now, but I have been studying the code
>for a while now and plan to take the test for General in February
>(next testing period that I can attend).
>
>My question: On test day, do I have to take a Technician written
>first then a General written or just the General?

In order to get a license, you will have to take the Technician written as well
(and to get the general class license, 5wpm code too).

6513. Re: FCC takes ARS Another Step Closer To Extinction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 23:52:56 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <sT6Y7.261881$3d2.12361633@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29510

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20011231180319.01870.00000685@mb-fz.aol.com...
> Maybe where you are. Ever hear the term "Philadelphia lawyer"?
> >>

73 de Jim, N2EY

Yup, a holdover from railroads, particularly the Pennsy. One of the great problems the railroads had was financing rolling stock and keeping it from automatically falling into the collateral for the first-mortgage bonds so the grand and glorious Philadelphia Plan was developed that pioneered a lot of things including off balance-sheet financing. A lot of rail cars for a lot of years were decorated with brass plates announcing that the car was financed under the Philadelphia Plan by East Dinglehoofer Bank and Trust and not just on the Pennsy.

Railroad attorneys, including one Abraham Lincoln, were among the best lint-pickers, gnat-strainers, camel-swallowers, loophole pullers, and fly-speck finders available for a number of years but the Pennsy's ranked at the top of the heap. Lincoln convinced a court that a low railroad bridge across the Mississippi was not really a hazard to navigation because the owners could put hinges in the smokestacks. He was from Illinois but with that performance he deserved Philadelphia.

Dick N�BK

6514. 2002

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-12-31 23:59:57 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccollOMA@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <1_6Y7.261889$3d2.12361624@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29511

As the clock approaches 200201010000Z on the shack wall, New Years for the radioactive, may your 2002 be rewarding, fun, and full of those things you will remember when the snow on your roof does not refer to your dwelling.

Dick McCollum N&#65533;BK